



## A Return to Orphanages?

Madelyn Freundlich  
Leslee Morris  
Emily Blair

Children's Rights

July 2004

## Table of Contents

	Page
Acknowledgments	3
Introduction	4
Defining an Orphanage in the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	8
An Historical Perspective: Orphanages in America	10
The “New Orphanages”: “Everything Old is New Again”	17
Making Sense of the “Return to Orphanages” Movement	27
Endnotes	33
Appendices	
Appendix A   Institutions in the U.S. for the Care of Children and Youth in Foster Care	43
Appendix B   “New Orphanages” in the United States	45

## **Acknowledgments**

Children's Rights wishes to thank the Center for Adoption Research, University of Massachusetts for its generous support of this study. Appreciation also is extended to Meg Yardley who provided invaluable research assistance and to Carmen Hernandez who provided administrative support throughout the study and the development of this report.

## Introduction

Orphanages hold a well-recognized place in the history of caring for children. In the mid- to late 19<sup>th</sup> century, orphanages housed children who were orphaned or abandoned or whose parents were temporarily unable to care for them because of illness or poverty. At the time, few other options were available for dependent children. By the early 1900s, however, there were growing concerns about the use of orphanages, and alternative ways of caring for children, including direct supports and services for families, boarding out (the forerunner of foster care), and adoption came to be championed over the institutional care of children. The negative developmental, psychological and social effects on children as a result of institutionalization were receiving increasing attention, and alternatives to orphanages became the focus of various social and legislative reforms. Within a few decades, orphanages across the country closed or were redesigned to provide different types of services for children. As institutional care of children fell into disfavor, the very word “orphanage” became highly charged.

Nonetheless, proposals to reinstitute “orphanages” have appeared with surprising regularity in U.S. child welfare policy and practice. In the mid-1990s, the Republican Party and Representative Newt Gingrich endorsed orphanages as a key component of their proposed Contract with America and the Personal Responsibility Act of 1995. The legislation, as proposed, would have limited the availability of benefits under the Aid to Families with Dependent Children program, resulting in significant savings to the government – savings that Representative Gingrich and others suggested could be used to establish and operate orphanages for poor children.<sup>1</sup> A backlash to the proposal ensued, however, and Gingrich and his calls for a return to orphanages became the target of widespread criticism by child welfare organizations and religious leaders. On the recommendation of their pollsters, the Republican Party in 1995 “removed the term ‘orphanage’ from their

vocabulary and removed references to its use in all future [editions] of their Contract with America.”<sup>2</sup>

Notwithstanding the politically and emotionally charged debate that erupted regarding orphanages in the mid-1990s, orphanages again have made an appearance as we enter the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Reports from across the country indicate that a number of facilities bearing a close resemblance to traditional concepts of orphanages are being proposed and developed as “better” ways of caring for children and youth, particularly children and youth in the foster care system. Typically, these facilities do not call themselves “orphanages,” but instead carry such names as “children’s homes,” “group care facilities,” “residential treatment homes,” “residential charter schools,” “cottages,” “ranches,” and “academies.” In fact, there has been a proliferation in the descriptive names of facilities which provide institutional care for children. This development has made it increasingly difficult to understand the exact nature of the services that these facilities provide or propose to provide: Are they modern-day “orphanages” or are they something else? Irrespective of the name that they select for themselves, some of these facilities view themselves as substitutes for family care on a long-term basis; they focus on the basic care of children and youth and do not offer treatment for children’s mental health or behavioral problems; and they do not promote children’s connections with their biological families or, when necessary, actively plan for alternative permanent families for children and youth. These very characteristics suggest that they function as contemporary orphanages notwithstanding the names under which they operate. As one child welfare professional interviewed for this study observed, it can be expected that these types of facilities will choose to “go by other names now because they know ‘orphanage’ is an inflammatory word.”

At the same time that orphanages have been cyclically embraced as a promising alternative for children in foster care, there has been growing concern about the impact of institutional care on

children, both in the United States and abroad.<sup>3</sup> Research clearly has established the negative physical, developmental, psychological and social consequences of institutional care on children and youth.<sup>4</sup> A significant number of children and youth in the United States, nonetheless, continue to be placed in institutional settings, although the exact number is not clear. There are data, however, on the number of children in foster care – the population of children who often are the group designated as needing institutional-type care – who are placed in institutions. Of the 542,000 children in foster care in September 2001, 10 percent (56,509 children and youth) were living in institutional settings.<sup>5</sup> The proportion of children in foster care who are placed in institutions, however, varies significantly from state to state. In 2001, for example, some states reported that more than a quarter of the children in foster care in their systems were in institutions – including Kentucky (35 percent), Wyoming (32 percent), Connecticut (26 percent), and North Dakota (26 percent). Other states, by contrast, reported extremely low rates of institutional care for children in foster care, states such as New Hampshire (1 percent), Rhode Island (1 percent), Alaska (2 percent), and California (2 percent).<sup>6</sup>

In many communities across the United States, institutions for the care of children have long been in existence. In other communities, efforts are being made to establish new facilities to house children and youth in foster care – known in some circles as the “new orphanages.” The scope of efforts to establish these “new orphanages,” however, has not been clear. At best, there have been anecdotal accounts of efforts in particular communities, raising concerns but not certainties, about a possible trend once again toward “orphanages” for children and youth in foster care. With funding from the Adoption Research Center at the University of Massachusetts, Children’s Rights conducted a study to chart the current “orphanage” landscape in the United States, with particular focus on recent efforts to establish new institutions for the care of children and youth in foster care. Three questions shaped the study:

- To what extent are efforts being made to establish “new orphanages” for the care of children and youth in foster care?
- What are the characteristics of these facilities?
- What factors are associated with efforts to establish these facilities?

The study took place over a six-month time period (February through July of 2004) and utilized the following methods:

- A review of newspaper and other media databases (using Lexis Nexis, Westlaw and other databases) to identify efforts to establish orphanages
- A review of materials pertaining to orphanage efforts compiled by the Policy Department of Children’s Rights from 2002 to present
- Interviews with child welfare professionals whose work has focused on identifying and responding to efforts to establish institutions for the care of children and youth in foster care<sup>7</sup>
- Contacts with and a review of Web sites developed by entities attempting to develop and operate “new orphanages” for children in foster care

This report provides the results of this study. First is a discussion of contemporary “orphanages” and the challenges associated with both defining the term and applying it to modern-day institutional care. Next is a description of the historical context in which orphanages have operated in the United States with a focus on some of the more well-established institutions for the care of children in this country. The next section describes recent efforts to develop “new orphanages” across the United States, highlighting both successful and pending efforts. Finally, the report provides an analysis of these developments in light of what is understood regarding “best practice” for the care of children and youth in foster care, particularly in relation to care arrangements that meet their well-being and permanency needs.

## Defining an “Orphanage” in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century

A critical conceptual question encountered in this study was how to define the term “orphanage.” Historically, “orphanage” has been defined as “an institution or asylum for the care of orphans” or as “a public institution for the care of orphans.”<sup>8</sup> These definitions, reflecting the historical nature of orphanages, were found to offer little assistance in making distinctions among the facilities that currently comprise the broad variety of institutional settings for children and youth in the United States. Terms such as “asylum” and “orphan” have largely fallen into disfavor and, therefore, could yield little guidance in developing a working contemporary definition of “orphanage.”

It became necessary for purposes of this study to develop a definition of “orphanage” that captured the elements of care that historically have characterized “orphanages” but which also reflected the contemporary realities of institutional care for children. With these principles in mind and with the guidance of leading child welfare advocates,<sup>9</sup> Children’s Rights adopted the following definition of “orphanage” for purposes of this study:

An orphanage is a residential childcare facility that is intended to care for children from the time of their admission until their maturity or emancipation, and which holds itself out as an acceptable or superior substitute for the children’s families. It does not function as a family resource center to reunify families or work to help children live in alternate families; nor does it provide comprehensive professional treatment services for children to address their emotional, behavioral, or other problems.

Even with this definition in place, however, identifying facilities that operate as orphanages proved challenging for two key reasons. First is the anomaly frequently encountered between the services that facilities actually provide and their self-proclaimed or attributed status as a facility. The *Milton Hershey School* in Hershey, Pennsylvania and *Jonah House* offer examples of the incongruity. The Milton Hershey School often is mentioned in the literature as one of the leading examples of



orphanages in the United States. It is, however, a “residential school” to which children are referred by their families, the state, or a social service agency. Approximately 1,200 youth ages four through 15 live at the 92-year-old school.<sup>10</sup> By contrast, Jonah House is a proposed “home” in Idaho that its founders proclaim to be an “orphanage.” The couple who plan to bring Jonah House to fruition, Roxanne and Wes Smith, hope to house at least 12 children in foster care who are awaiting adoptive families. The Smiths, in announcing their plans for their “orphanage,” stated that they did not have expertise in operating an “orphanage” aside from having raised four children of their own, but indicated that “it just feels like something [we are] supposed to be doing.”<sup>11</sup> The Smiths plan to care for a dozen children in foster care on a temporary basis but consider their home an “orphanage”; the Milton Hershey School houses more than a thousand children and calls itself a “school.”

A second challenge in identifying “orphanages” arises because a facility’s long-term care of children may not be the stated intent, but that outcome may be the reality for many, if not most, of the children served. In the current policy and legal climate which focuses on permanency for children and youth in foster care, there are few facilities that openly state that they do not seek to ensure that in most cases, the children and youth they serve either return home or have new families through adoption. Nonetheless, many facilities operate as “de facto” orphanages, articulating values related to children’s connections with family but not actually engaging in affirmative efforts to reunite children with their parents or extended families or finding new families for them through adoption. In these cases, children remain in the facilities’ permanent care until they age out of the foster care system. These facilities essentially serve as substitute “families” for children and youth even though they shun the label of “orphanage.”

Research makes clear that the very decision to place children into institutional care settings significantly lessens their chances for permanency, particularly their opportunities to be adopted.<sup>12</sup> Approximately 60 percent of children adopted each year from the foster care system are adopted by

their foster parents.<sup>13</sup> When children are placed in institutional settings, these potential adoptive family resources obviously are not available. Absent affirmative efforts on behalf of these facilities to reunify children with their parents or extended family members or to recruit adoptive families for them, permanency is far less likely to be achieved. Instead, children and youth are more likely to grow up in these facilities – the very outcome associated with traditional orphanages.

While recognizing these challenges, this study nevertheless attempted to identify facilities that met, as closely as possible, the study’s working definition of “orphanage.” A facility was considered an “orphanage” if it met the definitional elements and was either designed to provide, or operated in a way that provided, long-term care for children and youth in the foster care system, whether intentionally or by failing to actively work to achieve a permanent family for each child. Not included within the definition of “orphanage” and therefore excluded from the study were: (1) facilities that provide treatment services for children’s emotional and behavioral problems when intensive levels of care are professionally indicated; and (2) boarding schools and residential academies in which parents make voluntary arrangements for their children’s education and care, parents remain active in their children’s lives, and the facility closes during vacation periods and the summer when children return home.

### **An Historical Perspective: Orphanages in America**

Across the United States, there are facilities that began as “orphanages” and that either continue to serve in that role or serve other roles in caring for children in the foster care system. Because of their religious roots, ongoing community support, generous donations, and other factors, many of these facilities have provided institutional care for children and youth for decades. A number of these facilities have existed since the early 1900s, but only in rare cases do they continue to be known as “orphanages.” The following briefly describes some of the institutions that

historically have played key roles in the institutional care of children and youth in this country.

Consistently identified as the “oldest continuously existing orphanage” in the United States, *Bethesda Orphanage* was founded by George Whitefield in 1740 on a site north of Savannah, Georgia. Like many founders of early orphanages in the U.S., Whitefield established Bethesda Orphanage as a “method of fulfilling Christ’s teachings”.<sup>14</sup> The facility continues to this day as the *Bethesda Home for Boys*, serving boys from 6 to 14 years of age.<sup>15</sup> Its current mission is described as treatment-oriented and family-oriented, with a focus on serving “youth that have experienced severe deterioration or adjustment problems within their biological, extended, or foster families” and who are diagnosed with “problems ranging from Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder of Conduct and Adjustment Disorder.”<sup>16</sup>

The *Hephzibah Orphanage* in Macon, Georgia was established in 1900 when Mary Wessels opened her home to a dozen children left homeless when a local orphanage was destroyed by fire.<sup>17</sup> She subsequently used a small inheritance to purchase a home that would allow her to serve more children.<sup>18</sup> Now operated by the Wesleyan Church and known as the *Hephzibah Children’s Association*, the program currently offers residential, long-term care for “young children who have been traumatized by abuse, neglect, or the loss of their parents,” although it also offers family-based services, foster care services, and school-age day care.<sup>19</sup> Although the Hephzibah Children’s Association receives some governmental funding, it largely is funded by private and church donations.

Originally known as the *Florida Baptist Orphanage*, the *Florida Baptist Children’s Homes*, as it is currently known, is comprised of residential campuses scattered throughout the state of Florida. When it was founded in 1904, the orphanage opened its doors to 23 white children, and it continued to serve only white children until 1969 when as a “children’s home,” it began serving children of all races. Currently, 186 children reside on residential campuses in six Florida cities. Children remain

in residential care for an average of two to three years.<sup>20</sup> Although the organization has changed names and structures over its 100-year existence, its mission has continued to be “to provide a stable, caring, and Christian home for children in need,”<sup>21</sup> introducing children to Jesus and teaching them how, “He died for them so that they may have Everlasting Life.”<sup>22</sup> Media accounts quote the organization’s president Jimmy McAdams as stating, “whenever a child in the state needs an alternative family, we want to be there first . . . and we want to stay the longest.”<sup>23</sup> Although some children served through the program may go on to be adopted, only prospective adoptive parents who meet specific criteria related to Christian beliefs and life styles are accepted.<sup>24</sup> Florida Baptist Children’s Homes receives donations from over 2,800 Baptist churches located in Florida as well as approximately \$3 million each year from the state.<sup>25</sup>

Perhaps the best-known organization associated with orphanage care in the United States is *Boys Town*. Founded in 1917, the program, now known as *Girls and Boys Town*, operates in 19 sites in 14 states. It enjoys the support of celebrities, corporate sponsors, and politicians who donate time and money to the organization. Mickey Rooney, the actor who once played a troubled youth in the 1938 film “Boys Town,” is one of the many celebrities who has endorsed the work of Girls and Boys Town.<sup>26</sup>

The residential services component of Girls and Boys Town provides over 100 “long-term residential care homes” across the United States.<sup>27</sup> The largest facility, located in Omaha, Nebraska, houses 700 children annually in 72 “homes.”<sup>28</sup> Children usually remain between 12 and 18 months, although “if a boy or girl does not have a place to go, she or he may remain at Girls or Boys Town until graduation.”<sup>29</sup> Girls and Boys Town operates with funding from interest, dividends and gains on a trust fund established in 1941 for Boys Town (which covers between 30 percent and 40 percent of operating costs); program fees from state agency reimbursements and medical insurance (25 percent and 35 percent of operating costs); and contributions (between 30 percent and 40 percent of

operating costs).<sup>30</sup>

Given its longstanding history, sources of sustainable funding, and strong community support, Girls and Boys Town is solidly established as an organization. Nonetheless, it has experienced some challenges in its recent expansion efforts. In 2002, the organization acquired four large duplex townhouses on a two-acre plot in Washington, D.C. and planned to build four additional homes for 40 “abused children.”<sup>31</sup> It was not able, however, to house at-risk youth as planned as a result of community opposition to the proposal, which some characterized as emanating from an “anti-Boys Town group”<sup>32</sup> and others explained as sound objections to “orphanage” care for children.<sup>33</sup> Girls and Boys Town eventually decided to forego the effort. It liquidated its investment and sold the property to JPI Apartment Development of Dallas for an undisclosed amount.<sup>34</sup>

An even older facility with a history as a “Roman Catholic orphanage,” *St. Mary’s Training School* was founded in 1883 in Des Plaines, Illinois shortly after the Great Chicago Fire and various epidemics resulted in hundreds of children becoming orphaned and homeless.<sup>35</sup> Now known as *Maryville Youth Academy*, the program is comprised of more than 20 youth facilities, the largest of which is the Des Plaines campus.<sup>36</sup> Like Boys Town, Maryville Youth Academy has enjoyed the support of well-known individuals such as Henry Hyde, George Wendt, Bobby Hull, and Harry Caray, sportscaster and owner of the famous Chicago restaurant and an orphan himself who “always held a special place in his heart for other parentless children.”<sup>37</sup> As described in the organization’s literature, “Today’s Maryville child is not an orphan of natural disaster, but has instead faced a war of an altogether different type: drugs, gangs, guns, and violence that know no boundaries. Children are placed with Maryville as a result of being physically battered, emotionally scarred, sexually abused and abandoned by family and society.”<sup>38</sup> The program is described as “the state’s largest home of last resort for abused and abandoned kids, many with psychiatric problems.”<sup>39</sup>

Maryville, however, recently has faced a number of serious programmatic and financial problems. Programmatically, issues regarding its handling of a suicide, sexual assaults, and other violent incidents at its 270-bed Des Plaines campus surfaced in 2003.<sup>40</sup> Among the serious concerns noted was the fact that in 2001, the police had been called to the facility 909 times.<sup>41</sup> Of particular concern was the revelation that program staff had “tampered” with reports concerning the suicide of a 14-year-old resident in order to shield the agency from liability.<sup>42</sup> In addition, the State also found that the Des Plaines campus was plagued by “an unruly management, a lack of vision, and poor staff training.”<sup>43</sup> Issues also were raised about the Academy’s financial management, characterized by the Cook County Public Guardian as a “mess.”<sup>44</sup> This matter had serious implications because of the substantial levels of government funding that the program received, approximately \$62 million in 2002 alone.<sup>45</sup>

In 2003, the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) decided to drastically reduce its use of the Maryville Des Plaines campus for children in foster care and made plans to move most of the DCFS residents to other facilities.<sup>46</sup> At the same time, Maryville was served with a federal grand jury subpoena seeking financial, medical, and personnel records. Maryville Academy is currently reexamining its role in providing residential and treatment services, with proposed plans to develop an “academic enrichment center” which would house up to 130 youth ages 17 and older.<sup>47</sup> DCFS has indicated that it will limit future admissions to the program to older youth in foster care who volunteer for the proposed “educational enrichment” program.<sup>48</sup>

A final example of a well-established organization dedicated to the institutional care of children is *SOS Children’s Villages*. SOS Children’s Villages, which is based on a model developed in 1945, “give[s] children who have lost their parents or who are no longer able to live with them a permanent home and a stable environment.”<sup>49</sup> Under the umbrella organization, SOS Kinderdorf International (based in Austria), the organization currently has 442 villages in 131 countries with

another 24 villages under construction. The “village” typically is a cluster of 8 to 15 homes in which “a family of boys and girls of different ages . . . grow up together as siblings” and where “children are raised by a carefully screened and trained SOS Children’s Villages parent who lives in the home and cares for the children unconditionally.”<sup>50</sup> SOS Children’s Villages has garnered considerable support. Sarah Ferguson, Duchess of York and spokesperson for SOS Children’s Villages, states, “SOS Children’s Villages is about holding dignity, courage, and self-respect. More people should support SOS because it’s right, it’s true and it’s good.”<sup>51</sup>

In 1999, SOS’s international parent organization was nominated for a Nobel Peace Prize. The United States is home to two villages, both of which serve “abused and neglected children” in the foster care system.<sup>52</sup> One village is located in Florida and one in Illinois. Established in the early 1990s, the Florida SOS Children’s Village is based in Coconut Creek and has 15 family houses, a Village Director’s house, an SOS “aunts’ house,” a community house, a workshop, a storeroom, and a sport facility.<sup>53</sup> It serves 50 children. The village’s operating budget is \$2.4 million, a third of which is from private and corporate donations.<sup>54</sup> The program is staffed by “adults who [have] made long-term commitments to raise the youngsters as their own.”<sup>55</sup> The President and Executive Director of the Florida SOS Children’s Village promotes the program as providing a home for “children who have little chance for adoption and reunification with their families.”<sup>56</sup>

In recent years, the facility has been rocked with allegations of excessive use of corporal punishment and inadequate supervision of the youngsters in its care.<sup>57</sup> Media accounts revealed that between 1999 and 2001, there were 33 reports filed with the state’s child abuse hotline alleging abuse at the facility, of which one-half were substantiated.<sup>58</sup> During that time period, 13 “house parents” and 14 “parent assistants” resigned or were fired.<sup>59</sup> Nonetheless, political officials in Florida continue to view the SOS program as “a potential national alternative to traditional foster care choices.”<sup>60</sup>

The second SOS facility in the United States is located in Lockport, Illinois, a community near Chicago, and is operated under the auspices of SOS Children’s Villages Illinois. It began operation in 1993. SOS Children’s Villages Illinois states that the goal of the Illinois program is to build “entire villages for children that have been removed from their biological families due to neglect, abuse and/or abandonment.”<sup>61</sup> The Lockport program currently serves 63 children – ranging in age from 5 months to 20 years of age – who live in 11 single-family homes (each with 4 or 5 bedrooms).<sup>62</sup> As with other villages, the homes are grouped together to constitute a “village,” which also includes the house of the Village Director, a workshop, an office building, and a community and learning center.<sup>63</sup>

In 2003, media reports indicated that SOS Children’s Village Illinois planned to assume responsibility for a village to be developed in Chicago that followed the Lockport model.<sup>64</sup> The proposed project involved an environmental clean-up of a 7-acre industrial site and the construction of 12 single-family homes and 4 two-flats for foster families.<sup>65</sup> Reports indicated that City Council approval was being sought.<sup>66</sup> The status of this effort is currently unclear.

There is considerable variation among the facilities that long have provided institutional care for children in the United States. Some have recreated themselves and become treatment-oriented facilities, with mixed results. Others have continued in their mission to provide long-term care for children and youth, but usually under such names as “homes,” “academies,” and “villages.” Some have encountered community opposition to expansion efforts; others have encountered serious problems in connection with the institutional care that they provide. In addition to the facilities highlighted in this short report, there are many other entities in the United States that provide institutional care for children and youth in foster care. Appendix A lists some of these facilities and their websites. Some of these facilities may well fall within the working definition of an “orphanage,” while others, because they have designed or redesigned their services to address



children's safety, well-being and permanency needs in new ways, are appropriately categorized outside the "orphanage" label. The notable variation among facilities makes it necessary to carefully assess each of these facilities to determine the exact nature and scope of the services provided.

### **The "New Orphanages": "Everything Old is New Again"**

As occurred a decade before, the early 2000s witnessed a growing drumbeat of support for the development of new orphanages in the United States for the care of children in foster care. Advocacy for a "return to orphanages" emanated from several sources. Some of the interest in developing new orphanages has come from organizations such as the Coalition for Residential Education (CORE), a group that advocates for the institutionalization of children "languishing in a flawed foster care system."<sup>67</sup> CORE, for example, promotes "residential education" as providing "two or more years [of stability]" and permanence for youth when the child's birth family or a foster family is not a "possibility"<sup>68</sup> and disputes "the myths about residential education" that characterize it as "institutional," "last hope settings," or "Oliver Twist-like environments."<sup>69</sup> In some communities, legislative bodies have initiated efforts to establish orphanages as a "new" component of the community's foster care system. In Los Angeles County, for example, a proposal introduced in 2004 would permit county funds to be invested in the development of orphanages for the care of children removed from their parents' custody and placed in state custody.<sup>70</sup>

Articulate individuals, some of whom grew up in orphanages themselves, also have argued that orphanages are critically needed. Many consider Richard McKenzie to be the leading advocate of modern-day orphanages. An economics professor at University of California at Irvine, McKenzie grew up in an orphanage in North Carolina. McKenzie wrote *The Home: A Memoir of Growing Up in an Orphanage* and edited the widely-read compendium of essays on orphanages, *Rethinking Orphanages for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. He also was executive producer of a 2004 documentary entitled *Homecoming: The*

*Forgotten World of America's Orphanages*, which features the stories of 15 alumni from four orphanages.<sup>71</sup> McKenzie argues that “the nation’s growing problems with family stability, child abuse and neglect, welfare reform, and foster care ensure that some modern form of private orphanage care will continue to return.”<sup>72</sup> He states, “What we need is a Wal-Mart model [of orphanages] to provide kids with as good care as they would otherwise get.”<sup>73</sup> Finally, support for orphanages has come from a group of corporations that includes the Target Corporation and other major businesses. These companies have invested significant funds in efforts to institutionalize children who are in the foster care system.

The resurgence of interest in and support for new orphanages has led to a number of efforts across the United States to establish such facilities. Appendix B lists some of the facilities that represent the “new orphanage” movement. Some of these efforts have been more successful than others. In some cases, new orphanages have come to fruition; in other cases, planners continue to struggle as they attempt to bring their envisioned facilities to reality. The following discussion highlights several of these efforts.

Opening its doors in 2001, *Place of Hope*, located in Palm Beach Gardens, Florida, is considered by Florida Department of Children and Family to be a “rare success story in a difficult field and a badly needed addition to a county that never has enough foster homes.”<sup>74</sup> Christ Fellowship pastor Tom Mullins and his wife Donna established Place of Hope after they visited orphanages in Eastern Romania.<sup>75</sup> The facility currently provides long-term care for up to 36 children who live in six “cottages” and who are raised by “house parents” who live with the children 24 hours a day, five days a week.<sup>76</sup> Plans are underway to expand the program to serve 66 children in 11 homes.<sup>77</sup> Most children served by Place of Hope are between the ages of six through ten years, although some children are older.<sup>78</sup> According to media accounts, “some of the children . . . will return to parents . . . others will be adopted. Some will stay at Place of Hope until they are 18.”<sup>79</sup>

Place of Hope promises care “permeated by a Christian theistic worldview”<sup>80</sup> and the program includes daily devotionals, evangelical services, and nightly house prayers for the children, an issue that has caused some controversy.<sup>81</sup> The Fellowship of Christ Church raised a portion of the money to build Place of Hope, and operational funding for its \$1.5 million annual budget comes from the state, grants, private donations (including a gift from media mogul Lowell Paxson), and corporate gifts.

*Hope Village for Children* in Meridian, Mississippi is another successful recent effort to establish an orphanage. A private, non-profit organization housed on 22 acres, it opened in 2002. Hope Village provides long-term residential care for children in the form of two “cottages:” one for ten girls and one for ten boys. Hope Village states that reunification and adoption efforts may be made for children served through its “transitional residential care” program, but that its “residential group homes” are designed to provide “a permanent home for children who do not thrive in foster care and who cannot be returned to the family. This service will be offered until a child reaches adulthood and will include the opportunity for a college education.”<sup>82</sup> In December 2002, Larry King interviewed actress Sela Ward, who was instrumental in establishing Hope Village:

Ward: I'd started this home called Hope Village for Children for abused and neglected kids, a permanent shelter and emergency shelter in Meridian and my – it's really rethinking the orphanage for the 21st Century, creating these safe, nurturing environments for kids because foster care, if you saw the *TIME* magazine cover article a couple years ago, clearly is not working. More kids get killed.

King: So you started this home, it's in Meridian only?

Ward: In Meridian only. The first one, it's the – I hope it will be the state-of-the-art prototype to franchise all over the country.<sup>83</sup>

*San Pasqual Academy*, located in San Diego, California, likewise has benefited from the endorsement of a well-known public figure: James Milliken, the widely respected presiding judge of the San Diego Juvenile Court. Judge Milliken founded San Pasqual Academy in October 2001 as a placement alternative for teens in San Diego. Currently licensed for 135 youth, the Academy plans

ultimately to provide long-term care for 250 youth who can “live, study, play, and grow up there.”<sup>84</sup>

Youth are given the opportunity to inspect the facility and may then “volunteer to enroll” in the program.<sup>85</sup> Youth live in “family groups” of six to eight youngsters in residence halls with adult staff serving as “caring role models and advisors.”<sup>86</sup> Milliken has made clear that although he believes that working with families toward reunification is essential, alternative care arrangements such as “boarding schools” for children in foster care are equally important:

Well, as a judge, my opinion is that the real solution to the foster care problem is to focus the courts’ energy on the parent’s compliance with the reunification plan rather than trying to fix foster care, because there are many things about foster care that we can’t fix. But if we have managed a case properly, and we still end up having to leave some kids in foster care, then I think we have an obligation to those kids to have quality programming. Quality programming means a menu of placement alternatives that includes boarding schools, in addition to foster care and group homes. That means we need a whole lot more boarding schools nationally, and other innovative placements. We have to understand that we need a range of opportunities...I personally think that this is not THE solution, it’s part of a solution. I think that the system at large is basically in denial about the very well-known and obvious problems associated with kids being foster care... San Pasqual or boarding schools for the kids who are high functioning and can take responsibility for themselves in a relatively open setting and can succeed in school are, in my opinion, a must.<sup>87</sup>

San Pasqual Academy is funded with a mixture of private and public money. The County committed \$7 million toward the project; The Child Abuse Prevention Foundation contributed \$5 million; Metabolife Foundation pledged another \$5 million over 10 years; and Qualcomm made a \$1.5 million gift in the form of computers.<sup>88</sup> Its annual operating budget is between \$8 million and \$9.5 million.<sup>89</sup>

Reactions to San Pasqual Academy have varied. Some have objected to the facility as an “old-style orphanage,”<sup>90</sup> arguing that the money should be spent on supporting and retaining what works best for children: families.<sup>91</sup> Others, however, have strongly supported the effort as having the “potential to do something special for kids who haven’t had many breaks,”<sup>92</sup> and have expressed hopes that it will become a national model.<sup>93</sup>

Other efforts to establish new orphanage-type facilities have not been as successful as Place of Hope, Hope Village and San Pasqual Academy. Among these less viable projects was an effort by *SOS Children's Villages* to develop a village in Milwaukee to serve 60 to 80 children. Local media reported that the project envisioned, as is the case with other SOS Children's Villages, "a community in which children can live as long as they need a home – a few months, a year, or a decade . . . until [a] permanent placement option is found . . . [or the village] could become a permanent placement."<sup>94</sup> With a projected cost of approximately \$5,020,000, planners sought support primarily from private grants. Local opposition to the project, however, quickly arose. A commentary by Joel McNally, a columnist for *The Capital Times* in Madison, Wisconsin, reflects the nature of the opposition:

Apparently, you can't keep a bad idea down. Just when you think the Dickensian model of keeping poor children warehoused in orphanages has receded into the dark ages, some modern day Fagin tries to re-create those cruel institutions under a different name. The euphemism to try to disguise the cold, impersonal institution of orphanages as something more benign is a proposal for a Milwaukee Children's Village.<sup>95</sup>

The Milwaukee SOS Children's Village has been delayed as funding continues to be pursued.<sup>96</sup>

In Minnesota, Mary Joe Copeland initiated highly publicized efforts in the early 2000s to establish what she clearly describes as a new "orphanage," *Gift of Mary Children's Home* to be named after the Virgin Mary.<sup>97</sup> As she explains the project, her vision is to serve youth whose parents are unfit and others who "are orphans . . . they don't have parents."<sup>98</sup> She describes her goal as providing housing and long-term care for children as young as four years old and for "permanency youth," that is, children "stuck in the foster care system and unlikely to leave it."<sup>99</sup> The plan is to have each home (comprised of eight bedrooms and five bathrooms) house up to ten children, a "teaching couple," and an assistant.<sup>100</sup> Copeland's effort has stirred considerable controversy. On the one hand, supporters such as Minnesota State Representative Jim Ramstad have described her as "America's Mother Teresa,"<sup>101</sup> and President Bush endorsed her approach as a model that should be

replicated nationwide.<sup>102</sup> Others, with sometimes grudging admiration, dub her “a renegade” and one who “bucks standard procedures.”<sup>103</sup> Yet others refer to her project as a flawed “fantasy”<sup>104</sup> and as a “silly story” that she is “sticking with.”<sup>105</sup>

Four Minnesota suburbs rejected Copeland’s efforts to build her facility in their communities before the City Council of Eagan, Minnesota voted in 2002 in favor of rezoning 35 acres so that Copeland could build 20 cottage-style homes for 200 children. An editorial in a local newspaper, however, suggested that the City Council’s support for the endeavor was not shared by the community as a whole: “Ask the people who work in child protection everyday what they think is best for kids and they will tell you: Anything but this.”<sup>106</sup>

Gift of Mary Children’s Home will require approximately \$30 million for facility construction and an additional \$30 million endowment for operations.<sup>107</sup> Copeland, an experienced fundraiser who amassed \$50 million in donations for her homeless shelter, Sharing and Caring Hands,<sup>108</sup> was successful with early fundraising efforts for the Gift of Mary Children’s Home. She gained the support of the Target Corporation, which agreed to contribute up to \$3 million toward the cost of building the proposed 200-bed facility.<sup>109</sup> The Gift of Mary Children’s Home, however, has struggled to raise the remaining funds for the project, and it is now hoped that groundbreaking will occur sometime in 2005.<sup>110</sup>

In 1998, Atlanta businessman and founder of The United States 10K Classic, Donald H. Whitney announced plans to build *World Children’s Center*, a community serving homeless, orphaned, neglected and abused children from the state of Georgia, the U.S., and the world.<sup>111</sup> As envisioned, the facility will serve sibling groups of children of two or more who are between the ages of two and eight when they arrive at the Center. The community initially will consist of 24 homes with two “surrogate parents” and up to six children in each home.<sup>112</sup> While expressing support for family reunification, kinship care, and adoption, the Center also states that these options are not

appropriate or viable for many children and as a result, it offers “the next best option” for children of living in a “planned community of surrogate families that will provide long-term individual care.”<sup>113</sup> Children will “live and grow at the Center through high school and beyond.”<sup>114</sup>

Reports indicate that groundbreaking for the World Children’s Center will occur in 2005 with construction to be accomplished over a ten-year period. In phase one, up to 24 homes serving 144 children will be built; in phase two, the number of homes will increase to 36 (serving 216 children); and in phase three, the full complement of 40 homes serving 240 children will be completed.<sup>115</sup> Whitney reportedly secured \$25 million in funding for the project from companies such as Publix Supermarkets, Coca-Cola, Gatorade, and BellSouth,<sup>116</sup> with a contribution of an additional \$1 million from Aquafina in 2003.<sup>117</sup> The Center plans a diversified funding base comprised of private sector support (62 percent), “public venues” (17 percent), program income (12 percent), and public sector support for programs and services (9 percent).<sup>118</sup> It recently was reported that Whitney had abandoned hopes of building on the land he acquired in Pine Mountain, Georgia but that he remains committed to finding another site and building the center.<sup>119</sup> The Center’s Web site indicates that several sites are currently under consideration and a decision will be made in the fall of 2004.<sup>120</sup>

Another orphanage yet to come to fruition is *Promiseland Ranch*, to be built in the San Diego, California area. The project originated in 1998 when a parcel of land in Campo, a rural community 50 miles east of San Diego, was donated to Father Joe’s Villages, an organization led by Father Joe Carroll and comprised of a “family” of non-profit entities that provide services to “needy men, women, and children.”<sup>121</sup> Upon touring the donated property, Father Joe and others described the property as the ideal site for a “backcountry home for children without a place to call home. “The land cried out, ‘Send me children!’ says Father Joe, so that’s what we plan to do.”<sup>122</sup> Envisioned as “a modern-day Boys Town,” the Ranch initially was promoted as a program to serve approximately

200 children in foster care through building 28 cottages, each of which would house six to eight youth whose parents have “drug or alcohol problems. They are orphaned for all intents and purposes.”<sup>123</sup>

There was, however, fallout over the originally donated property,<sup>124</sup> and in the summer of 2003, the Stephen and Mary Birch Foundation donated the Flying A Ranch, a 120-acre site also in the Campo area, to Father Joe’s Villages.<sup>125</sup> The property was deemed to be the “perfect location for a children’s village,” and Father Joe stated that “it’s time Southern California had a facility similar to Girls and Boys Town in Nebraska and this is where it is going to happen.”<sup>126</sup> The current plan is to develop five clusters of five houses, each of which will house eight girls and boys, with a couple living in a nearby apartment who will “raise the children.”<sup>127</sup> Youth between the ages of 12 and 18 are to be served although “younger siblings might live there also to keep the family together.”<sup>128</sup> As of 2004, the money needed for construction had not been fully secured. Twelve million dollars had been committed, but an additional \$30 to \$40 million was needed as an endowment for operations. Money is being sought through private donations, thereby “tak[ing] a significant burden off the county.”<sup>129</sup> Plans for the facility were to be submitted to the San Diego Planning Commission in the summer of 2004, with the expectation that the facility will begin operation in late 2005 or early 2006.

In Florida, Miami Dolphins chaplain Reverend Leo Armbrust has secured \$2 million towards *Renaissance Village*, his envisioned residential facility that will include a “significant and renewable source of funding” – a golf course.<sup>130</sup> Renaissance Village is envisioned as a “long-term residential facility to house, educate, treat, and prepare disadvantaged children to lead productive lives.”<sup>131</sup> After “exhaustive research” to determine the priority needs of “the most underserved segment of Palm Beach County’s child population,” the planners have targeted boys and girls ages 13 to 18 who are “typically labeled ‘disadvantaged’ or ‘at-risk’ and suffer from one or more symptoms that traditionally foreshadow significant future problems.”<sup>132</sup> Youth will be able to stay



“as long as needed” in a “living and learning environment that reduces risks on-and off-campus to the maximum extent that is humanly possible.”<sup>133</sup> Embracing an identity as a “residential school,” the planners emphasize that the facility, which will serve children in foster care, will *not* be an open campus, a foster home, or the student’s primary residence.<sup>134</sup>

As has been the case with other proposed facilities, Reverend Armbrust has encountered difficulties in finding a community in which he can build his facility, having purchased and subsequently sold a series of properties in Palm Beach County, Florida over the past several years. He has stated, however, that he remains dedicated to finding property on which to build the facility.<sup>135</sup> Community and environmentalist resistance to the project persist, however, and in the summer of 2004, a Palm Beach County commissioner appealed to community leaders to assist Reverend Armbrust in finding a site for the facility and an adjacent golf course and club that would serve as an income source for the project.<sup>136</sup>

In a development in Clay County, Florida that parallels Reverend Armbrust’s Palm Beach County efforts, Keith Denton, who grew up in an Alabama orphanage, plans a new orphanage, *Seamark Ranch*, on the site of a donated 468-acre parcel of land. Having raised approximately \$600,000, he plans to develop and implement a long-term care facility for up to 100 children, ages six through sixteen “where there is no hope for reconciliation with their parents as a result of abuse, neglect, abandonment, homelessness or being an orphan.”<sup>137</sup> Homes will be built for a maximum of eight children and it is anticipated that “in almost every case, children’s circumstances [will] necessitate their placement through high school graduation.”<sup>138</sup> The proposed “Seamark Program” is based on “a Christian, professional approach in providing services to children” that incorporates a “Christian family and home system” in which each child is raised by a “Christian Houseparent couple” and receives “Christian professional services” under the direction of a “highly trained Christian counselor with a Ph.D.”<sup>139</sup> Media reports indicate that Denton planned to break ground in

September 2003 with construction of the first children's homes to be completed by the end of summer 2004.<sup>140</sup> Seamark Ranch's Web site, however, does not indicate that these steps have been completed successfully.

In 2003, Julie Rich, an adopted person and an adoptive parent, announced her interest in establishing *Our Children's Home* in Columbus, Ohio to care for children and youth in foster care. She described her interest in purchasing property to develop a "family-style home where 40 children who have been removed permanently from their parents would be loved and nurtured until they are adopted."<sup>141</sup> The literature for the effort states that the facility would be neither "an orphanage" nor a "treatment center" but instead, would be a "safe, stable place for children," "dedicated to nurturing and healing children for life" and "dedicated to preserving sibling groups – in Our Home and in their adoptive families."<sup>142</sup> It also states that although adoption will be pursued for each child, "if they need to, children will be able to stay until adulthood."<sup>143</sup> In the summer of 2003, media accounts indicated that Rich and others working with her had not yet begun fundraising but were interested in acquiring a 16-acre site that was for sale for \$2.5 million.<sup>144</sup> The current status of these efforts is not clear.

A final development on which this study focused is the effort of House Majority Leader Tom DeLay to construct a planned foster care "community" in Texas to be called *The Oaks at Rio Bend*.<sup>145</sup> The vision for this effort is "to create . . . [a] nurturing, permanent environment [that] will provide caring families and stable homes for children in foster care."<sup>146</sup> Described as a "residential facility for abused children with no place to go," the facility will be comprised of small family homes staffed by "loving houseparents."<sup>147</sup> In the initial stages, homes will be constructed for eight foster families who will be able to bring three children of their own with them and who will also accept three foster children.<sup>148</sup> This model – a "campus for nuclear families and their foster kids" – is heralded as innovative, having not been undertaken elsewhere in the United States.<sup>149</sup> A

“community” that includes a chapel and a multi-service center will surround the homes.<sup>150</sup> The homes will be “permanent” for children: “even when they leave, the bed won’t be filled by someone else.”<sup>151</sup>

The “planned community” will be based in Richmond, Texas (a suburb of Houston) on land donated by the George Foundation.<sup>152</sup> The property has been officially “under construction” since September 2003, although as of June 2004, no construction had as yet taken place.<sup>153</sup> The Rio Bend Web site, however, states that the eight homes to be constructed will be ready for occupancy in February 2005 with a grand opening for the community scheduled for March 2005.<sup>154</sup> Lutheran Social Services of the South will manage the community.<sup>155</sup>

The DeLay Foundation for Kids, established by Representative DeLay and his wife in 1998 to raise money for “at risk” children, has raised the seed money for the project.<sup>156</sup> It is anticipated that the first phase of the project will cost \$10 million.<sup>157</sup> Fundraising continues with a goal of \$26 million needed to “furnish and endow the facility.”<sup>158</sup>

### **Making Sense of the “Return to Orphanage” Movement**

The interest in and support for “new orphanages” that arose in the early 2000s appears to be related to a number of factors. One of the strongest motivating factors was a growing dissatisfaction with the quality of child welfare services in the United States and the negative outcomes for children and youth being served through the foster care system. Many of the individuals involved with efforts to create institutions for children expressed frustration with the current foster care system and their desire to find better options. The child welfare experts interviewed for this study agreed that pessimism regarding the current foster care system has precipitated many orphanage-type efforts. In this regard, a number of child welfare professionals made observations:

“Stories come out about foster homes with 12 kids and no supervision, children bouncing from foster home to foster home; being put up in motels and sleeping on office floors. So people think, ‘foster care stinks, the kids have to go someplace, so we had better build orphanages.’ Nowadays, when newspapers do exposés of problems in family foster care, people respond, ‘we had better go back to orphanages.’ Politicians look at this and think, ‘we’ve got to do something’ – and then a powerful, politically connected network of providers is already in place who say ‘turn to us.’”

“The negative publicity around foster care is what drives people to think institutional care is a good option.”

“People think that the abuses that happen when a kid bounces around to 20 different foster families wouldn’t happen if the kid was in an orphanage. We have not built a quality system for kids and for families, and that is what makes people open to the idea of orphanages.”

“[The view is] that child welfare is completely broken and nothing about it works – [that] is basically the thread that unites pro-orphanage people.”

In addition to the impetus provided by growing dissatisfaction with foster care, these efforts also moved forward in virtually every case as a result of an individual who passionately championed the effort. As one child welfare professional noted, “There is nostalgia around orphanages and when frustration with the child welfare system coincides with a dynamic individual who champions the orphanage cause, that’s when you get a resurgence [of interest in orphanages].” For some individual champions, the motivation was religious in nature; for others, it was deeply personal (as in cases where the individual had lived in an orphanage as a child); and for yet others, it was a combination of the two. Child welfare professionals highlighted the key role that passionate individuals with strong religious convictions have played in many of these efforts:

“What causes people to make orphanages is a need to take care of other people’s kids for whatever reason – it could be altruism, a desire to please God, whatever – and that need will not go away so we will always have orphanages.”

“In some cases, the desire for orphanages comes from the religious community – the Place of Hope in Palm Beach, Florida is a faith-based operation heavily funded by Lowell Paxson of Pax-TV.”

“It seems like the religious fervor is never very far away from the desire to put these kids in residential facilities – the strong desire or zeal to take deprived children and give them new values.”

“Many of the orphanage [facilities] I have encountered are run by ministers who also have a radio program through which they raise their funds. It can be very lucrative. The state may not be involved [in their operation] at all. They also have been successful in some states in keeping religiously-affiliated organizations exempt from state licensure.”

In some cases, champions were not religiously-oriented. For these efforts, well-known actresses and well-established businessmen lent credence and visibility to fund-raising and efforts to engage the community’s support for “new orphanages.”

The efforts to establish these facilities also shared, to varying degrees, a number of other features:

1. *A commitment to the value of families for children and the importance of reunification and adoption for children and youth in foster care, but an assertion that for “many” children and youth, permanency is simply not feasible.* No facility stated (at least publicly) that permanency for children and youth is unimportant. In most cases, however, the facilities maintained that they served or would serve children and youth for whom permanency was not possible, even in cases where the target population of children was quite young. Most facilities hastened to make clear that they would be a “permanent” home for the children they served, although most did not assert that they meant that a child, having reached adulthood, could return to live at the facility or be supported by it (the exception being The Oaks at Rio Bend). In most instances, “permanency” meant that the facility would provide a place for the child to live until he or she reached 18 years of age.
2. *Use of a cottage model staffed by house parents.* The model overwhelmingly endorsed by the newer orphanages was a cottage-style approach in which between six and eight children

live in a “home” staffed by “houseparents” who “raise” the children. Place of Hope, Hope Village, Gift of Mary Children’s Home, World Children’s Center, Promiseland Ranch, Seamark Ranch, and The Oaks at Rio Bend all espouse this model of care. The model appears based on assumptions that “trained” houseparents will provide consistent parenting analogous to what families provide and children will benefit as a result.

Research, however, indicates that there is a high turnover rate among houseparents,<sup>159</sup> and suggests that living in a cottage may be no more stable for children than is the case with other forms of institutional care.

3. *The need for large sums of money to bring the project to reality and the need to rely on a diversified funding base for ongoing operations that includes both public and private dollars.* The start-up construction costs for each of the facilities examined were in the multimillion dollar range, and most facilities projected annual operating budgets of well over \$1 million (in some cases, considerably more). Most relied or planned to rely on a mixture of public dollars (in some cases, substantially so) and private donations. Interestingly, some of the yet-to-be-realized facilities (Gift of Mary Children’s Home and World Children’s Center being two excellent examples) experienced significant success in attracting large corporate funders. Target, Aquafina, and CocaCola, to name a few of the corporate sponsors of such efforts, have not historically played active roles in the child welfare arena and yet were successfully courted by the “new orphanages.” What has attracted corporate sponsors to these efforts is not clear. In response to questions about the high level of financial support for orphanages in the San Diego area, Joy Warrant, a young adult who as a child was placed in foster care with her two sisters, advanced one theory: “Donors like to give money to new facilities. They like to see their name on a plaque or

on a room. But day-to-day life isn't going to be wonderful. [There are] fantasies that it's going to be like Cider House Rules. There is no Dr. Larch."<sup>160</sup>

4. *A desire to replicate programs across the country.* Consistently, facilities that have begun operations (including Place of Hope and San Pasqual Academy) and those that have not yet begun operations (such as Gift of Mary's Children Home, which President Bush already has endorsed as a national model, and The Oaks at Rio Bend) express the desire, as stated by actress Sela Ward, that their programs will be "the state-of-the-art prototype to franchise all over the country." Interestingly, none of the programs mentions an evaluation of their efforts despite their interest in national replication.
5. *Local resistance.* Many of the proposed facilities have faced not only financial challenges but difficulties convincing their local communities that their proposed orphanage is a good idea. Mary Jo Copeland's project was repeatedly denied approval before the Eagan City Council endorsed her proposal (though many residents in Eagan continue to object to it); SOS Children's Villages' effort in Milwaukee and Girls and Boys Town's effort in Washington, D.C. had to be abandoned because of local resistance; and some of the efforts in Florida have been stalled as efforts have been made to find sites for the proposed facilities that local communities will accept.

These factors, some of which simply describe these efforts but others of which support or work against them, combined in a variety of ways to yield different results. Some facilities successfully moved forward, and others struggled to come to reality.

Based on the research conducted for this study, it appears that the interest in creating orphanages that began in early 2000s peaked when Mary Jo Copeland and Gift of Mary's Children's

Home caught the eye of the media and several prominent child welfare organizations that went on record opposing the facility.<sup>161</sup> Since that time, fewer proposals to create new orphanages have been made, although, as the results of this study indicate, many efforts that began in early 2000s are still pending.

If, in fact, the number of proposed new orphanages for children has decreased or stabilized, the reasons may be twofold, as suggested by the child welfare professionals interviewed for this study. First, these facilities involve an extraordinary level of investment, both in construction costs and operating budgets. The development of these facilities has been constrained in many communities because the planners simply have not been able to raise the needed funds to move forward. At the same time, state and county governments are facing budgetary crises of their own which have limited the extent to which they can or will invest in expensive institutional care for children and youth in foster care. Second, despite ardent advocacy on behalf of institutional care and the benefits that it can achieve, there may be an increasing realization that institutional environments do not result in good outcomes for children and youth. In some cases, child welfare professionals report the demise of new orphanages as a result of a combination of financial realities and the inability to demonstrate positive outcomes. One child welfare professional, for example, described the recent closing of Synergy Residential Academy, which opened in 2000 in Minneapolis, Minnesota:

“Economic factors seem to be the most pertinent factor which keeps these types of facilities from developing today. States and counties are in financial straits and the \$120-\$150 a day placement costs are just out of the realm when you can pay foster parents \$20 a day. Also, these group care facilities just don’t have outcomes, and that’s what buried Synergy Residential Academy. Synergy, a residential boarding school, just didn’t have the outcomes to justify the expense . . . and in Sacramento, California there’s actually a reduction in group care because it is not very effective and is very expensive.”



Several child welfare professionals interviewed for this study, however, made clear that any leveling of interest in orphanage building is likely to be short-lived:

“There’s nothing new about the phenomenon. It surfaces and goes underground, but it never goes away. It’s not a trend, it’s a forever interest that ebbs and flows.”

“I am not sure there’s a national trend now, although there seems to be things popping up in certain pockets of the country, like Florida. But there is no doubt that it will cycle around again.”

It can be expected that many of the current efforts to establish “new orphanages” – particularly in Florida, Texas, and the Midwest – will continue. It also can be expected that long-standing institutional care providers (particularly Girls and Boys Town and SOS Children’s Villages) and some of the newly established orphanages (such as San Pasqual Academy, Place of Hope, and Hope Village) will make efforts to replicate their programs elsewhere in the United States. Finally, it can be expected that a resurgence of interest in orphanages will occur, and that once again, efforts will be made at the practice and policy levels to place more children and youth in foster care in these settings. The potential impact of these developments on children and youth is significant. Some will continue to promote institutional care; others will object, contending, as did one child welfare professional interviewed for this study, “No matter what the intent is of the people behind orphanages, it will end up being a poor system for poor children.”

---

## Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> McKenzie, R.B. (Ed.) (1999). *Rethinking Orphanages for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. Subsequently, the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act of 1996 was enacted. Like the proposed 1995 legislation, it significantly limited the benefits available to families under the newly named Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) program, which replaced the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program. It did not reference orphanages as an alternative form of care for children.

- 
- <sup>2</sup> McKenzie, R.B. (Ed.). (1999). *Rethinking Orphanages for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. (p. 95)
- <sup>3</sup> Frank, D.A., Klass, P.E., Earls, F., & Eisenberg, L. (1996). Infants and Young Children in Orphanages: One View From Pediatrics and Child Psychiatry. *Pediatrics*, 97 (4), 569-575.
- <sup>4</sup> Frank, D.A., Klass, P.E., Earls, F., & Eisenberg, L. (1996). Infants and Young Children in Orphanages: One View From Pediatrics and Child Psychiatry. *Pediatrics*, 97 (4), 569-575; Barth, R.P. (2001). *Institutions vs. Foster Homes: The Empirical Base for the Second Century of Debate*. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina School of Social Work, Jordan Institute for Families.
- <sup>5</sup> U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2004). The AFCARS Report. Online: <http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/programs/cb/publications/afcars/report8.htm>, accessed 7/17/04.
- <sup>6</sup> U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Ways and Means. (2003). *The 2003 Green Book*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.
- <sup>7</sup> The following individuals were interviewed: Mary Bissell, Senior Fellow, American Foundation, Washington, D.C.; Paul Demuro, Child Welfare Consultant, Montclair, NJ; Mary Ford, Program and Policy Specialist, North American Council on Adoptable Children, St. Paul, MN; Jake Terpstra, Child Welfare Consultant, Grand Rapids, MI; Elie Ward, Executive Director, Statewide Youth Advocacy, Inc., Albany, NY; and Richard Wexler, Executive Director, National Coalition for Child Protection Reform, Alexandria, VA.
- <sup>8</sup> Hyperdictionary. (2003). Online: <http://www.hyperdictionary.com/dictionary/orphanage>, accessed 7/14/04.
- <sup>9</sup> Children's Rights acknowledges the invaluable assistance of Jake Terpstra, Richard Wexler, Joe Kroll, and Mary Ford.
- <sup>10</sup> The Milton Hershey School Web site. (2004). Online: <http://www.mhs-pa.org>, accessed 7/6/04.
- <sup>11</sup> Ginter, B. (1992, April 17). You asked for it. *Idaho Falls Post Register*, p. C1.
- <sup>12</sup> Barth, R.P. (2001). *Institutions vs. Foster Homes: The Empirical Base for the Second Century of Debate*. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina School of Social Work, Jordan Institute for Families.
- <sup>13</sup> U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2004). The AFCARS Report. Online: <http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/programs/cb/publications/afcars/report8.htm>, accessed 7/17/04.
- <sup>14</sup> Bethesda Home for Boys Web site. (n.d.). Online: <http://www.bethesdahomeforboys.org>, accessed 7/14/04.
- <sup>15</sup> Bethesda Home for Boys Web site. (n.d.). Online: <http://www.bethesdahomeforboys.org>, accessed 7/14/04.
- <sup>16</sup> Bethesda Home for Boys Admissions Web site. (n.d.). Online: <http://www.bethesdahomeforboys.org/adm.htm>, accessed 7/14/04.
- <sup>17</sup> Hephzibah Children's Association Web site. (n.d.). Online: <http://www.hephzibahhome.org>, accessed 7/14/04.

- 
- <sup>18</sup> Hephzibah Children's Association History Web site. (n.d.). Online: <http://www.hephzibahhome.org/history.html>, accessed 7/15/04.
- <sup>19</sup> Hephzibah Children's Association History Web site. (n.d.). Online: <http://www.hephzibahhome.org/history.html>, accessed 7/15/04.
- <sup>20</sup> Crouse, J. (2004, February 1). A place to call home. *Lakeland Ledger*, p. A1.
- <sup>21</sup> Crouse, J. (2004, February 1). A place to call home. *Lakeland Ledger*, p. A1.
- <sup>22</sup> Florida Baptist Children's Home Web site. (n.d.). Online: <http://www.fbchomes.org>, accessed 7/6/04.
- <sup>23</sup> Crouse, J. (2004, February 1). A place to call home. *Lakeland Ledger*, p. A1.
- <sup>24</sup> The Florida Baptist Children's Home Web site lists the following criteria for prospective adoptive parents:
- You are at least 23 years old.
  - You are a Florida resident and U.S. citizen.
  - You have been married for at least two years (single persons may be eligible to adopt).
  - You are a professing Christian.
  - You are an active participant in a local Christian church.
  - You reflect a disciplined Christian lifestyle, including abstaining from alcohol, tobacco products and illegal drugs.
  - You or your spouse are less than 40 years older than the child (exceptions may be made).
- Florida Baptist Children's Home Web site. (n.d.). Online: <http://www.fbchomes.org/adoption.html>, accessed 7/6/04.
- <sup>25</sup> Crouse, J. (2004, February 1). A place to call home. *Lakeland Ledger*, p. A1.
- <sup>26</sup> Jacobs, P. (2003, July 18). Mickey Rooney honored at Boys and Girls Town. Online: <http://www.girlsandboystown.org/news/releases/65thanniversary.asp>, accessed 7/13/04.
- <sup>27</sup> Girls and Boys Town Question and Answer Web site. (n.d.). Online: <http://www.girlsandboystown.org/aboutus/qa/general.asp>, accessed 7/13/04.
- <sup>28</sup> Girls and Boys Town Question and Answer Web site. (n.d.). Online: <http://www.girlsandboystown.org/aboutus/qa/general.asp>, accessed 7/13/04.
- <sup>29</sup> Girls and Boys Town Question and Answer Web site. (n.d.). Online: <http://www.girlsandboystown.org/aboutus/qa/general.asp>, accessed 7/13/04.
- <sup>30</sup> Girls and Boys Town Question and Answer Web site. (n.d.). Online: <http://www.girlsandboystown.org/aboutus/qa/general.asp>, accessed 7/13/04.
- <sup>31</sup> Fisher, M. (2002, August 8). Boys Town boss shows he's no Father Flanagan. *Washington Post*, p. B01.
- <sup>32</sup> Spencer, D. (2001, September 5). Boys' Town goes to war: Father Val Peter: His own worst enemy? Online: [http://www.cir-usa.org/articles/boystown\\_TheHill\\_ValPeter.html](http://www.cir-usa.org/articles/boystown_TheHill_ValPeter.html), accessed 7/6/04.

- 
- <sup>33</sup> Spencer, D. (2001, September 5). Boys' Town goes to war: Father Val Peter: His own worst enemy? Online: [http://www.cir-usa.org/articles/boystown\\_TheHill\\_ValPeter.html](http://www.cir-usa.org/articles/boystown_TheHill_ValPeter.html), accessed 7/6/04.
- <sup>34</sup> Spencer, D. (2004, June 23). Hillscape: Metro – Boys Site. Online: <http://www.hillnews.com/hillscape/062304.aspx>, accessed 7/17/04.
- <sup>35</sup> Maryville Academy: Harry's favorite charity. (n.d.). Online: <http://www.harrycarays.com/hmaryv.htm>, accessed 7/14/04; Maryville feels 1-2 punch. (2003, September 20). Online: <http://catholiccitizens.org/platform/platformview.asp?c=8543>, accessed 7/14/04.
- <sup>36</sup> Maryville feels 1-2 punch. (2003, September 20). Online: <http://catholiccitizens.org/platform/platformview.asp?c=8543>, accessed 7/14/04.
- <sup>37</sup> Maryville Academy: Harry's favorite charity. (n.d.). Online: <http://www.harrycarays.com/hmaryv.htm>, accessed 7/14/04; Maryville feels 1-2 punch. (2003, September 20). Online: <http://catholiccitizens.org/platform/platformview.asp?c=8543>, accessed 7/14/04.
- <sup>38</sup> Maryville Academy: Harry's favorite charity. (n.d.). Online: <http://www.harrycarays.com/hmaryv.htm>, accessed 7/14/04.
- <sup>39</sup> Fusco, C. & Novak, T. (2003, July 11). Smyth gives up control at Maryville. Online: <http://www.rickross.com/reference/general/general559.html>, accessed 7/14/04.
- <sup>40</sup> Fusco, C. & Novak, T. (2003, July 11). Smyth gives up control at Maryville. Online: <http://www.rickross.com/reference/general/general559.html>, accessed 7/14/04.
- <sup>41</sup> Casillas, O. & Heinzmann, D. (2002, September 7). A troubled Maryville attempts to heal itself. *Chicago Sun Times*, p. A3.
- <sup>42</sup> Maryville feels 1-2 punch. (2003, September 20). Online: <http://catholiccitizens.org/platform/platformview.asp?c=8543>, accessed 7/14/04.
- <sup>43</sup> Maryville feels 1-2 punch. (2003, September 20). Online: <http://catholiccitizens.org/platform/platformview.asp?c=8543>, accessed 7/14/04.
- <sup>44</sup> Fusco, C. and Novak, T. (2003, July 11). Smyth gives up control at Maryville. Online: <http://www.rickross.com/reference/general/general559.html>, accessed 7/14/04.
- <sup>45</sup> Fusco, C. and Novak, T. (2003, July 11). Smyth gives up control at Maryville. Online: <http://www.rickross.com/reference/general/general559.html>, accessed 7/14/04.
- <sup>46</sup> Maryville feels 1-2 punch. (2003, September 20). Online: <http://catholiccitizens.org/platform/platformview.asp?c=8543>, accessed 7/14/04.
- <sup>47</sup> Casillas, O. & Chase, J. (2003, October 5). Maryville tug of war intense: Power and pride played big roles. *Chicago Tribune*, p. C1.
- <sup>48</sup> Wexler, R. (2004). Just say no to orphanages. Online: <http://www.nccpr.org/newissues/15.html>, accessed 7/14/04.
- <sup>49</sup> SOS Children's Villages Web site. (n.d.). Online: <http://www.sos-childrensvillages.org>, accessed 7/6/04.

- 
- <sup>50</sup> Austrian-American Alliance for the Children Web site: SOS Children's Villages-USA. (n.d.). Online: <http://www.spiderloom.com/Operaball/charity.html>, accessed 7/17/04.
- <sup>51</sup> SOS Children's Villages Web site. (n.d.). Online: <http://www.sos-childrensvillages.org>, accessed 7/6/04.
- <sup>52</sup> Austrian-American Alliance for the Children Web site: SOS Children's Villages-USA. (n.d.). Online: <http://www.spiderloom.com/Operaball/charity.html>, accessed 7/17/04.
- <sup>53</sup> SOS Children's Villages Web site. (n.d.). Online: <http://www.sos-childrensvillages.org>, accessed 7/6/04.
- <sup>54</sup> O'Matz, M. (2002, April 21). Model children's home falls short of expectations: Public records reveal troubling incidents. *South Florida Sun Sentinel*, p. 1A.
- <sup>55</sup> O'Matz, M. (2002, April 21). Model children's home falls short of expectations: Public records reveal troubling incidents. *South Florida Sun Sentinel*, p. 1A.
- <sup>56</sup> Arouh, L. & Bruszer, M. (2002, April 29). Positive results were ignored. *Sun Sentinel*, p. 19A.
- <sup>57</sup> O'Matz, M. (2002, April 21). Model children's home falls short of expectations: Public records reveal troubling incidents. *South Florida Sun Sentinel*, p. 1A.
- <sup>58</sup> O'Matz, M. (2002, April 21). Model children's home falls short of expectations: Public records reveal troubling incidents. *South Florida Sun Sentinel*, p. 1A.)
- <sup>59</sup> O'Matz, M. (2002, April 21). Model children's home falls short of expectations: Public records reveal troubling incidents. *South Florida Sun Sentinel*, p. 1A.)
- <sup>60</sup> SOS Children's Villages—USA. (2000). *Home Front*, 7(3), p. 2
- <sup>61</sup> SOS Children's Villages Illinois Web site. (n.d.). Online: <http://www.sosillinois.org>, accessed 7/17/04.
- <sup>62</sup> SOS Children's Villages Web site. (n.d.). Online: <http://www.sos-childrensvillages.org>, accessed 7/6/04; SOS Children's Villages Illinois Web site. (n.d.). Online: <http://www.sosillinois.org>, accessed 7/17/04.
- <sup>63</sup> SOS Children's Villages Web site. (n.d.). Online: <http://www.sos-childrensvillages.org>, accessed 7/6/04; SOS Children's Villages Illinois Web site. (n.d.). Online: <http://www.sosillinois.org>, accessed 7/17/04.
- <sup>64</sup> Washburn, G. (2003, January 16). 'Village' planned for foster homes. *Chicago Tribune*. Online: <http://student-voices.org/news/index.php3?NewsID=4302>, accessed 7/17/04.
- <sup>65</sup> Washburn, G. (2003, January 16). 'Village' planned for foster homes. *Chicago Tribune*. Online: <http://student-voices.org/news/index.php3?NewsID=4302>, accessed 7/17/04.
- <sup>66</sup> Washburn, G. (2003, January 16). 'Village' planned for foster homes. *Chicago Tribune*. Online: <http://student-voices.org/news/index.php3?NewsID=4302>, accessed 7/17/04.
- <sup>67</sup> Selvaggi, J. (2003, April 6). Residential education will give more kids a chance. *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*, p. H3.
- <sup>68</sup> Selvaggi, J. (2003, April 6). Residential education will give more kids a chance. *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*, p. H3.

- 
- <sup>69</sup> Coalition for Residential Education. (n.d.) Online: <http://www.residentialeducation.org/about.html>, accessed 7/22/04.
- <sup>70</sup> Adoption Week E-Magazine. (2004, March 2). Online: <http://e-magazine.adoption.com/issue/02Mar04.html>, accessed 7/13/04.
- <sup>71</sup> Jacobus, C. (2004, May 23). Focusing positive spotlight on orphanages: McKenzie hopes film helps experts rethink the orphanage option. *Mecklenburg Neighbors*, p. 20M.
- <sup>72</sup> McKenzie, R.B. (Ed.) (1999). *Rethinking Orphanages for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- <sup>73</sup> Mattson, M. (2003, September 14). Orphanages may grow from child care storms. *Florida Times Union*, p. D1.
- <sup>74</sup> Chapman, K. (2003, May 11). Religious foster care stirs church-state debate. *Palm Beach Post*, p. 1A.
- <sup>75</sup> Chapman, K. (2003, May 11). Religious foster care stirs church-state debate. *Palm Beach Post*, p. 1A.
- <sup>76</sup> Place of Hope Web site. (n.d.). Online: <http://www.placeofhope.com/>, accessed 7/15/04; Chapman, K. (2003, May 11). Religious foster care stirs church-state debate. *Palm Beach Post*, p. 1A.
- <sup>77</sup> Chapman, K. (2003, May 11). Religious foster care stirs church-state debate. *Palm Beach Post*, p. 1A.
- <sup>78</sup> Chapman, K. (2003, May 11). Religious foster care stirs church-state debate. *Palm Beach Post*, p. 1A.
- <sup>79</sup> Chapman, K. (2003, May 11). Religious foster care stirs church-state debate. *Palm Beach Post*, p. 1A.
- <sup>80</sup> Chapman, K. (2003, May 11). Religious foster care stirs church-state debate. *Palm Beach Post*, p. 1A.
- <sup>81</sup> Chapman, K. (2003, May 11). Religious foster care stirs church-state debate. *Palm Beach Post*, p. 1A.
- <sup>82</sup> Hope Village Web site. (n.d.). Online: <http://www.hopevillagems.org>, accessed 7/6/04.
- <sup>83</sup> CNN Larry King Live: Interviews with Sela Ward, Kevin Kline, Joe Viterelli (2002, December 14). Online: <http://www.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/0212/14/lklw.00.html>, accessed 7/6/04.
- <sup>84</sup> San Pasqual Academy Web site. (n.d.). Online: <http://www.sanpasqualacademy.org>, accessed 7/6/04; False prophets: San Pasqual Academy proves critics wrong. (2002, May 19). *San Diego Union-Tribune*, p. G2.
- <sup>85</sup> False prophets: San Pasqual Academy proves critics wrong. (2002, May 19). *San Diego Union-Tribune*, p. G2.
- <sup>86</sup> Evans, J. (2004, February). San Pasqual Academy: An educational and social experiment that works. Online: [http://www.ramonajournal.com/News/2004/0204/Front\\_Page/010.html](http://www.ramonajournal.com/News/2004/0204/Front_Page/010.html), accessed 7/15/04.
- <sup>87</sup> Selvaggi, J. (n.d.). Faces of residential education: Judge James Milliken, "21<sup>st</sup> Century Reformer." Online: <http://www.residentialeducation.org/voices/archives/milliken.html>, accessed 7/6/04.
- <sup>88</sup> False prophets: San Pasqual Academy proves critics wrong. (2002, May 19). *San Diego Union-Tribune*, p. G2.

- 
- <sup>89</sup> Hagstrom, S. (2000, May 11). Cider House dreams. *San Diego City Lights*. Online: <http://www.sdreader.com/php/cityshow.php?id=C051100>, accessed 7/15/04.
- <sup>90</sup> False prophets: San Pasqual Academy proves critics wrong. (2002, May 19). *San Diego Union-Tribune*, p. G2.
- <sup>91</sup> Hagstrom, S. (2000, May 11). Cider House dreams. *San Diego City Lights*. Online: <http://www.sdreader.com/php/cityshow.php?id=C051100>, accessed 7/15/04.
- <sup>92</sup> Hagstrom, S. (2000, May 11). Cider House dreams. *San Diego City Lights*. Online: <http://www.sdreader.com/php/cityshow.php?id=C051100>, accessed 7/15/04.
- <sup>93</sup> False prophets: San Pasqual Academy proves critics wrong. (2002, May 19). *San Diego Union-Tribune*, p. G2.
- <sup>94</sup> Abdul-Alim, J. (2002, May 29). Advocates take a village to task. *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel*. Online: [http://www.jsonline.com/news/Metro/may\\_02/46996.asp](http://www.jsonline.com/news/Metro/may_02/46996.asp), accessed 7/6/04.
- <sup>95</sup> McNally, J. (2002, June 15). Children's Village scary. *Capital Times*, p. 12A.
- <sup>96</sup> Abdul-Alim, J. (2002, May 29). Advocates take a village to task. *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel*. Online: [http://www.jsonline.com/news/Metro/may\\_02/46996.asp](http://www.jsonline.com/news/Metro/may_02/46996.asp), accessed 7/6/04.
- <sup>97</sup> Cass, D. (2002, July 21). She walks through walls. *New York Times Magazine*, pp. 37-39.
- <sup>98</sup> Cass, D. (2002, July 21). She walks through walls. *New York Times Magazine*, pp. 37-39.
- <sup>99</sup> Cass, D. (2002, July 21). She walks through walls. *New York Times Magazine*, pp. 37-39; Orphanages: Which kids could they help? (2002, March 28). *Minneapolis Star Tribune*, p. 22A.
- <sup>100</sup> Gift of Mary Children's Home Environment Web site. (2002). Online: <http://www.giftofmary.org/environment.asp>, accessed 7/15/04.
- <sup>101</sup> Cass, D. (2002, July 21). She walks through walls. *New York Times Magazine*, pp. 37-39.
- <sup>102</sup> Tomson, E. (2002, July 21). In Mary Jo's hands. *St. Paul Pioneer Press*, p. F1.
- <sup>103</sup> Tomson, E. (2002, July 21). In Mary Jo's hands. *St. Paul Pioneer Press*, p. F1.
- <sup>104</sup> Caring for kids: The flaws in Copeland's fantasy. (2001, December 16). *Minneapolis Star Tribune*, p. 38A.
- <sup>105</sup> Orphanage scrap: Sticking with a silly story. (2002, May 4). *Minneapolis Star Tribune*, p. 24A.
- <sup>106</sup> Caring for kids: The flaws in Copeland's fantasy. (2001, December 16). *Minneapolis Star Tribune*, p. 38A.
- <sup>107</sup> Tomson, E. (2002, July 21). In Mary Jo's hands. *St. Paul Pioneer Press*, p. F1.
- <sup>108</sup> Cass, D. (2002, July 21). She walks through walls. *New York Times Magazine*, pp. 37-39.
- <sup>109</sup> Gottfried, M. (2003, October 5). Children's group home put on hold. *St. Paul Pioneer Press*, p. B3.
- <sup>110</sup> Gottfried, M. (2003, October 5). Children's group home put on hold. *St. Paul Pioneer Press*, p. B3.

- 
- <sup>111</sup> World Children's Center Web site. (2003). Online: <http://www.worldchildrenscenter.org>, accessed 7/6/04.
- <sup>112</sup> World Children's Center Web site. (2003). Online: <http://www.worldchildrenscenter.org>, accessed 7/17/04.
- <sup>113</sup> World Children's Center Web site. (2003). Online: <http://www.worldchildrenscenter.org>, accessed 7/17/04.
- <sup>114</sup> World Children's Center Web site. (2003). Online: <http://www.worldchildrenscenter.org>, accessed 7/17/04.
- <sup>115</sup> World Children's Center Phase 1 Web site. (2003). Online: <http://www.worldchildrenscenter.org/center/phase1.html>, accessed 7/17/04
- <sup>116</sup> Basu, M. (2002, October 30). Center to open arms to world's orphans. *The Atlanta Journal and Constitution*, p. 1A.
- <sup>117</sup> World Children's Center Web site. (2003). Online: <http://www.worldchildrenscenter.org>, accessed 7/17/04.
- <sup>118</sup> World Children's Center Community Impact Web site. (2003). Online: <http://www.worldchildrenscenter.org/center/impact.html>, accessed 7/17/04.
- <sup>119</sup> Proposed children's center drops appeal of zoning decision. (2004, February 4). *Augusta Chronicle*. On file with authors.
- <sup>120</sup> World Children's Center Location Web site. (2003). Online: <http://www.worldchildrenscenter.org/center/location.html>, accessed 7/17/04.
- <sup>121</sup> Father Joe's Villages Web site. (2004). Online: <http://www.fatherjoesvillages.org/villages.html>, accessed 7/15/04.
- <sup>122</sup> Children's Village History Web site. (2004). Online: <http://www.toussaintvillages.org/childrensvillage/history.html>, accessed 7/15/04.
- <sup>123</sup> Hewell, V. (n.d.). PromiseLand Ranch: A home in the country. Online: [http://www.fatherjoesvillages.org/village\\_news/copy/toussaint.html](http://www.fatherjoesvillages.org/village_news/copy/toussaint.html), accessed 6/11/04.
- <sup>124</sup> Mallgren, L. (2004, June 10). St. Vincent de Paul working toward East County youth facility. *The Daily Transcript*, p. 3A.
- <sup>125</sup> Children's Village History Web site. (2004). Online: [www.toussaintvillages.org/childrensvillage/history.html](http://www.toussaintvillages.org/childrensvillage/history.html), accessed 7/11/04.
- <sup>126</sup> Children's Village History Web site. (2004). Online: [www.toussaintvillages.org/childrensvillage/history.html](http://www.toussaintvillages.org/childrensvillage/history.html), accessed 7/11/04.
- <sup>127</sup> Mallgren, L. (2004, June 10). St. Vincent de Paul working toward East County youth facility. *The Daily Transcript*, p. 3A.



- 
- <sup>128</sup> Mallgren, L. (2004, June 10). St. Vincent de Paul working toward East County youth facility. *The Daily Transcript*, p. 3A.
- <sup>129</sup> Mallgren, L. (2004, June 10). St. Vincent de Paul working toward East County youth facility. *The Daily Transcript*, p. 3A.
- <sup>130</sup> Renaissance Village Introduction Web site. (n.d.). Online: <http://www.renvill.org/introduction.htm>, accessed 7/6/04.
- <sup>131</sup> Renaissance Village Introduction Web site. (n.d.). Online: <http://www.renvill.org/introduction.htm>, accessed 7/6/04.
- <sup>132</sup> Renaissance Village Introduction Web site: Who Will Renaissance Village Serve? (n.d.). Online: [http://www.renvill.com/intro\\_serve.htm](http://www.renvill.com/intro_serve.htm), accessed 7/15/04.
- <sup>133</sup> Renaissance Village Introduction Web site: Who Will Renaissance Village Serve? (n.d.). Online: [http://www.renvill.com/intro\\_serve.htm](http://www.renvill.com/intro_serve.htm), accessed 7/15/04.
- <sup>134</sup> Renaissance Village Introduction Web site: Who Will Renaissance Village Serve? (n.d.). Online: [http://www.renvill.com/intro\\_serve.htm](http://www.renvill.com/intro_serve.htm), accessed 7/15/04.
- <sup>135</sup> Caputo, M. (2003, February 27). Priest pulls back in school ruckus. *Palm Beach Post*. Online: <http://winterhawkfl.tripod.com/article.htm>, accessed 7/15/04.
- <sup>136</sup> Chapman, K. (2004, June 22). Official appeals for help to find teen village site. *Palm Beach Post*, p. B3.
- <sup>137</sup> Seamark Ranch Admission Web site. (n.d.). Online: <http://www.seamarkranch.com/admission.asp>, accessed 7/15/04; Mattson, M. (2003, September 14). Orphanages may grow from child care storms. *Florida Times Union*, p. D1.
- <sup>138</sup> Seamark Ranch Admission Web site. (n.d.). Online: <http://www.seamarkranch.com/admission.asp>, accessed 7/15/04.
- <sup>139</sup> Seamark Ranch Program Web site. (n.d.). Online: <http://www.seamarkranch.com/program.asp>, accessed 7/15/04.
- <sup>140</sup> Stuart, D. (2003, January 31). Seamark Ranch lands 468-acre donation. *Jacksonville Business Journal*, p. 12.
- <sup>141</sup> Pyle, E. (2003, July 20). A home for kids awaiting adoption. *The Columbus Dispatch*, p. 1B.
- <sup>142</sup> Development Committee. (2003). *Our Children's Home*. On file with authors.
- <sup>143</sup> Development Committee. (2003). *Our Children's Home*. On file with authors.
- <sup>144</sup> Pyle, E. (2003, July 20). A home for kids awaiting adoption. *The Columbus Dispatch*, p. 1B.
- <sup>145</sup> Christensen, D. (2003, April 9). For some key Congressmen, spring break in the Keys. *Miami Daily Business Review*. On file with authors.
- <sup>146</sup> Oaks at Rio Bend Mission/ Vision Web site. (n.d.). Online: <http://www.riobend.org/aboutus/mission.php>, accessed 7/15/04.

- 
- <sup>147</sup> Getting Things Done for Children: Congressman DeLay's Legislative Accomplishments. (n.d.). Online: <http://tomdelay.house.gov/Children/childrenswork.htm>, accessed 7/15/04.
- <sup>148</sup> Fenske, S. (2004, June 10). Sweet charity: For years Tom DeLay has used nonprofits to help himself. Now the heat is on. *Houston Press*, p. B2.
- <sup>149</sup> Fenske, S. (2004, June 10). Sweet charity: For years Tom DeLay has used nonprofits to help himself. Now the heat is on. *Houston Press*, p. B2.
- <sup>150</sup> Fenske, S. (2004, June 10). Sweet charity: For years Tom DeLay has used nonprofits to help himself. Now the heat is on. *Houston Press*, p. B2.
- <sup>151</sup> Fenske, S. (2004, June 10). Sweet charity: For years Tom DeLay has used nonprofits to help himself. Now the heat is on. *Houston Press*, p. B2.
- <sup>152</sup> Fenske, S. (2004, June 10). Sweet charity: For years Tom DeLay has used nonprofits to help himself. Now the heat is on. *Houston Press*, p. B2.
- <sup>153</sup> Fenske, S. (2004, June 10). Sweet charity: For years Tom DeLay has used nonprofits to help himself. Now the heat is on. *Houston Press*, p. B2.
- <sup>154</sup> Oaks at Rio Bend Construction Timeline Web site. (n.d.). Online: <http://www.riobend.org/aboutus/timeline.php>, accessed 7/15/04.
- <sup>155</sup> Fenske, S. (2004, June 10). Sweet charity: For years Tom DeLay has used nonprofits to help himself. Now the heat is on. *Houston Press*, p. B2.
- <sup>156</sup> Fenske, S. (2004, June 10). Sweet charity: For years Tom DeLay has used nonprofits to help himself. Now the heat is on. *Houston Press*, p. B2.
- <sup>157</sup> Fenske, S. (2004, June 10). Sweet charity: For years Tom DeLay has used nonprofits to help himself. Now the heat is on. *Houston Press*, p. B2.
- <sup>158</sup> Oaks at Rio Bend Needs and Objectives Web site. (n.d.). Online: <http://www.riobend.org/volunteer/needs.php>, accessed 7/15/04.
- <sup>159</sup> North American Council on Adoptable Children. (1995). *There is a better way: Family-based alternatives to institutional care*. St. Paul, MN: Author.
- <sup>160</sup> Hagstrom, S. (2000, May 11). Cider House dreams. *San Diego City Lights*. Online: <http://www.sdreader.com/php/cityshow.php?id=C051100>, accessed 7/15/04.
- <sup>161</sup> Children's Rights, the author of this study, was one of the organizations that publicly opposed Ms. Copeland's efforts as well as efforts to build orphanages in other communities in the United States.

**Appendix A**  
**Institutions in the United States for the Care of Children and Youth in Foster Care**

Name of facility	Location	Date of opening	Web Page if Available
Goodland Presbyterian Children's Home	Hugo, Oklahoma	1848	<a href="http://www.goodland.org">http://www.goodland.org</a>
Children's Village	Dobbs Ferry, New York	1851	<a href="http://www.childrensvillage.org">http://www.childrensvillage.org</a>
Presbyterian Home for Children	Alabama (Various locations)	1868	<a href="http://www.phfc.org">http://www.phfc.org</a>
Kentucky Baptist Homes for Children	Kentucky (Various locations)	1869	<a href="http://www.kbhc.org">http://www.kbhc.org</a>
Masonic Home for Children at Oxford	Oxford, North Carolina	1873	<a href="http://www.mhc-oxford.org">http://www.mhc-oxford.org</a>
Buckner Children and Family Services	Texas (Various locations)	1879	<a href="http://www.buckner.org">http://www.buckner.org</a>
Baptist Children's Homes of North Carolina	North Carolina (Various locations)	1885	<a href="http://www.bchfamily.org">http://www.bchfamily.org</a>
Missouri Baptist Children's Home	Missouri (Various locations)	1886	<a href="http://www.mbch.org">http://www.mbch.org</a>
Alaska Children's Services	Anchorage, Alaska	1890	<a href="http://www.acs.ak.org">http://www.acs.ak.org</a>
Alabama Baptist Children's Homes	Alabama (Various locations)	1892	<a href="http://www.abchome.org">http://www.abchome.org</a>
Connie Maxwell Children's Home	Greenwood, South Carolina	1892	<a href="http://www.conniemaxwell.com">http://www.conniemaxwell.com</a>
Arkansas Baptist Children's Homes	Arkansas (Various locations)	1894	<a href="http://www.abchomes.org">http://www.abchomes.org</a>
Cunningham Children's Home	Urbana, Illinois	1894	<a href="http://www.cunninghamhome.org">http://www.cunninghamhome.org</a>
Baptist Children's Village (Mississippi)	Mississippi (Various locations)	1897	<a href="http://www.baptistchildrensvillage.com">http://www.baptistchildrensvillage.com</a>
Georgia Baptist Children's Homes and Family Ministries	Palmetto, Georgia	1899	<a href="http://www.gbchfm.org">http://www.gbchfm.org</a>
Louisiana Baptist Children's Home	Louisiana (Various locations)	1899	<a href="http://www.lbch.org">http://www.lbch.org</a>
Baker Victory Services	Lackawanna, New York	Late 1800s	<a href="http://www.bakervictoryservices.org">http://www.bakervictoryservices.org</a>
Potter Children's Home	Bowling Green, Kentucky	1901	<a href="http://members.aol.com/potterch">http://members.aol.com/potterch</a>
Oklahoma Baptist Homes for Children	Oklahoma (Various locations)	1903	<a href="http://www.obhc.org">http://www.obhc.org</a>
Presbyterian Children's Homes and Services	Texas (Various locations)	1903	<a href="http://www.pchas.org">http://www.pchas.org</a>
Texarkana Baptist Orphanage	Texarkana, Arizona	1907	<a href="http://www.abaptist.org/orphanage">http://www.abaptist.org/orphanage</a>
Epworth Children & Family Services	St. Louis, Missouri	1909	<a href="http://www.epworth.org/epworth.htm">http://www.epworth.org/epworth.htm</a>
Milton Hershey School	Hershey, Pennsylvania	1909	<a href="http://www.mhs-pa.org">http://www.mhs-pa.org</a>
David and Margaret Home	LaVerne, California	1910	<a href="http://www.dmhhome.org">http://www.dmhhome.org</a>

Mooseheart Child City and School	Mooseheart, Illinois	1913	<a href="http://www.mooseheart.org">http://www.mooseheart.org</a>
Murphy-Harpst Children's Centers	Cedartown, Georgia	1914	<a href="http://www.murphyharpst.org">http://www.murphyharpst.org</a>
Boles Children's Home	Quinlan, Texas	1924	<a href="http://www.boleschildrenshome.org">http://www.boleschildrenshome.org</a>
Tipton Home	Tipton, Oklahoma	1924	<a href="http://www.tiptonhome.com">http://www.tiptonhome.com</a>
Christian Home and Bible School	Mt. Dora, Florida	1945	<a href="http://www.chbs.org">http://www.chbs.org</a>
Home on the Range	Sentinel Butte, North Dakota	1950	<a href="http://www.gohotr.org">http://www.gohotr.org</a>
Texas Baptist Children's Home and Family Services	Texas (Various locations)	1950	<a href="http://www.tbch.org">http://www.tbch.org</a>
South Texas Children's Homes	Beeville, Texas	1952	<a href="http://www.stch.org">http://www.stch.org</a>
Bethel Bible Village	Hixson, Tennessee	1954	<a href="http://www.bbv.org">http://www.bbv.org</a>
Sunshine Acres Children's Home	Mesa, Arizona	1954	<a href="http://www.sunshineacres.org">http://www.sunshineacres.org</a>
Rawhide Boys Ranch	New London, Wisconsin	1965	<a href="http://www.rawhide.org">http://www.rawhide.org</a>
High Plains Children's Home	Amarillo, Texas	1967	<a href="http://www.hpch.org">http://www.hpch.org</a>
Hope Children's Home	Tampa, Florida	1968	<a href="http://www.hopechildrenshome.org">http://www.hopechildrenshome.org</a>
Big Oak Ranch	Alabama (Various locations)	1974	<a href="http://www.bigoak.org">http://www.bigoak.org</a>
Boys Hope Girls Hope	New York City, Chicago, San Francisco and other cities	1977	<a href="http://www.boyshopegirlshope.org">http://www.boyshopegirlshope.org</a>
Casa de Amparo (House of Refuge)	Oceanside, California	1978	<a href="http://www.casadeamparo.com">http://www.casadeamparo.com</a>
Spofford Home	Kansas City, Missouri	1978	<a href="http://www.spoffordhome.org">http://www.spoffordhome.org</a>
Tennessee Baptist Children's Homes	Tennessee (Various locations)	1981	<a href="http://www.tbch4kids.org">http://www.tbch4kids.org</a>
Carpenter's Way	Cataula, Georgia	1992	<a href="http://www.carpentersway.org">http://www.carpentersway.org</a>
SOS Children's Village	Coconut Creek, Florida	1993	<a href="http://www.soschildrensvillages.org">http://www.soschildrensvillages.org</a>
SOS Children's Village	Lockport, Illinois	1994	<a href="http://www.soschildrensvillages.org">http://www.soschildrensvillages.org</a>

**Appendix B**  
**“New Orphanages” in the United States**

<b>Name of facility</b>	<b>Location of Facility</b>	<b>Date of opening</b>	<b>Web Page if Available</b>
Place of Hope	Palm Beach, Florida	2001	<a href="http://www.placeofhope.com">http://www.placeofhope.com</a>
Covenant Academy	Faribault, Minnesota	2001	<a href="http://www.ccsfm.org/academy/covenant.html">http://www.ccsfm.org/academy/covenant.html</a>
San Pasqual Academy	San Diego, California	2001	<a href="http://www.sanpasqualacademy.org">http://www.sanpasqualacademy.org</a>
Goshen Valley Boys' Ranch	Georgia (Various locations)	2002	<a href="http://www.goshenvalley.org">http://www.goshenvalley.org</a>
Hope Village for Children	Meridian, Mississippi	2002	<a href="http://www.hopevillages.org">http://www.hopevillages.org</a>
Promiseland Ranch/ A Children's Village	San Diego County, California	2003	<a href="http://www.toussaintvillages.org/childrensvillage">http://www.toussaintvillages.org/childrensvillage</a>
Children's Harbor	Hollywood, Florida	Anticipated 2004	<a href="http://www.childrensharbor.org">http://www.childrensharbor.org</a>
Gift of Mary Children's Home	Eagan, Minnesota	Anticipated 2005	<a href="http://www.giftofmary.org">http://www.giftofmary.org</a>
Oaks at Rio Bend	Richmond, Texas	Anticipated 2005	<a href="http://www.riobend.org">http://www.riobend.org</a>
Renaissance Village	Florida	Anticipated Date changes	<a href="http://www.renvill.org">http://www.renvill.org</a>
Seamark Ranch	Florida	Anticipated Date changes	<a href="http://www.seamarkranch.com">http://www.seamarkranch.com</a>
World Children's Center	Georgia	Anticipated Date changes	<a href="http://www.worldchildrenscenter.org">http://www.worldchildrenscenter.org</a>
Jonah House	Idaho Falls, Idaho	No Date Announced	Not Available
MacDonell UM Children's Services	Houma, Louisiana	Not Available	Not Available
New Mexico Baptist Children's Home	Portales, New Mexico	Not Available	<a href="http://www.pdrpip.com/BCH">http://www.pdrpip.com/BCH</a>
Our Children's Home	Columbus, Ohio	Not Available	Not Available
Windwood Farm Home for Children	Awendaw, South Carolina	Not Available	Not Available
Anchor House	Auburndale, Florida	Not Available	<a href="http://www.cfdiocese.org/orgs/anchor/anchor.html">http://www.cfdiocese.org/orgs/anchor/anchor.html</a>