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I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT EFFORTS AT THE NATIONAL FOREFRONT

In the ongoing absence of comprehensive immigration reform at the federal level, state and local governments have stepped in to fill the void. The recent passage of SB1070 in Arizona -- an oversweeping state law that requires Arizona police to ask virtually any immigrant for his or her “papers” -- and the current controversy surrounding the case of Jessica Colotl, a college student in Cobb County, Georgia, who was stopped on campus for “obstructing traffic” -- and nearly deported -- have brought state and local efforts to enforce federal immigration law to the national forefront.

State and local efforts to enforce federal immigration law not only affect the individuals who are targeted and arrested; they also have a serious and long-term impact on children. Approximately five million children in the United States have at least one undocumented parent.[3] Although most of these children are U.S. citizens by birth, they increasingly face potential separation from their parents. The unintended consequences (i.e., the long-term, harmful impact on children) of overreaching immigration enforcement are exacerbated by the inherent tension between immigration law and family law.

This study addresses this important and growing problem as it relates to Latino children in Georgia. Because this study is preliminary, it is intended to: (1) provide a basis to begin long-term documentation of the stories of children affected by immigration enforcement in Georgia; (2) serve as a catalyst to continue a more thorough and long-term review of these issues in Georgia, or, at a minimum, to continue monitoring of these issues; and (3) serve as a source and resource for others who are studying these issues at the local, regional and national levels.

FOCUS OF STUDY: LOCAL ENFORCEMENT EFFORTS

Although the current administration has shifted federal immigration enforcement efforts from worksite raids to other strategies, the federal government continues to enforce the nation's immigration laws with an apparent and aggressive focus on removing as many individuals as possible. In 2009, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) reported a record number of deportations, representing a 13% increase from 2008, and in 2008, ICE’s removal numbers exceeded the previous year’s total by over 23%. One law enforcement tool that facilitates these increased deportations is the 287(g) program. This program, which was incorporated into the 1996 comprehensive immigration reforms, gives the federal government the power to delegate its immigration enforcement authority to state and local law enforcement agencies.

Before 2006, the federal government entered into six 287(g) agreements. Since that time, the program has become increasingly more popular. Seventy-one law enforcement agencies in 26 states currently participate in the program. And, consistent with the focus on enforcement and increased deportations, the current administration has expanded the number of state and local law enforcement agencies with access to its Secure Communities program, thus facilitating the initiation of even more removal proceedings for people who are arrested by local police for minor offenses.

Use of the 287(g) program has become a politically popular reaction to the increasing immigrant population in Georgia. Five law enforcement agencies – four counties as well as the State -- are currently participating in the 287(g) program in Georgia. Several other counties also participate ICE’s Secure Communities program, thus increasing the number of removals, and expanding the 287(g) program without ICE oversight. This study therefore relies mainly on information gathered from Gwinnett and Cobb coun-
ties, both of which are 287(g) participants. The study also includes data from “outlier” cities and counties, where local law enforcement officials and others (including school officials) assume the role of immigration officials (with the goal of arresting immigrants for deportation.)

THE IMPACT OF IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT ON CHILDREN

Recent national studies demonstrate that family separation resulting from immigration enforcement has a long-term, harmful effect on children. The stories collected for this report support these national findings, and demonstrate the painful consequences of family separation that deeply affect children in the State of Georgia. In 71% of the cases collected for this study, children of a deported parent remained in the United States, with many of these children suffering harmful consequences. For example, Mario, a fifth grader from Cobb County, had a longstanding fear that his father would be stopped, arrested and deported for driving without a license. Even before Mario’s nightmare became a reality, he developed an anxiety condition that eventually became a physical bladder condition. Since the time he developed this physical condition, Mario’s father has been arrested and will be deported. Mario will now be repeating fifth grade as a special education/special needs student because of his physical condition.

In many of the stories collected for this study, the children of deported parents did not come to the attention of Georgia’s foster care system, the Division of Child and Family Services (DFCS). However, the research revealed the difficulty of tracking the number of children who come to the attention of DFCS as a result of immigration enforcement. The cases in which DFCS was involved illustrate the complex interplay between immigration and child welfare law. The research also revealed several cases concerning immigrant children, some of whom were unaccompanied minors (without a parent or legal guardian in this country), who may have come to DFCS’s attention at a late stage, and have suffered because of their immigration status. In one case, a community advocate reported the legal adoption of an undocumented child.[4] After the adoption was finalized, the child’s undocumented status was discovered and attempts were made to have the child deported.[5] In another case, the underage undocumented sister-in-law of a U.S. citizen businessman continues to be subjected to sexual abuse because she is fearful of reporting the abuse (due to her immigration status). Finally, the story of Luis, a homeless, honors high-school student in Cobb County, Georgia, fully illustrates the harmful and life-altering impact of the interplay between “zero tolerance” policies in the educational system and immigration enforcement. The school found a tool from one of Luis’s two after-school jobs in his backpack when conducting a search of students’ bookbags. Based on the state’s zero tolerance law, the school reported Luis to the police. He was taken into custody and transferred to a federal detention center. Luis was recently deported.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The study sets forth a number of recommendations to ameliorate the potentially traumatic impact of immigration enforcement on children in Georgia. These recommendations include: (1) county and local law enforcement adoption of guidelines that strictly prohibit stationing checkpoints and road blocks near schools, churches, and day care centers; (2) state, county and local law enforcement adoption of ICE humanitarian guidelines regarding sole caregivers; (3) continued efforts among all stakeholders in the Georgia foster care system to strengthen cultural competency through training and continued development of materials related to the needs of immigrants and through recruitment of bilingual and bicultural members of the workforce; and (4) creation of a cooperative system of mandatory reporting by various local, state and federal agencies involved in the child welfare and immigration enforcement system.
CONCLUSION

This report underscores the vital need for our nation’s policymakers and leaders to address comprehensive immigration reform.

II.  INTRODUCTION AND GOALS OF STUDY

In the ongoing absence of comprehensive immigration reform at the federal level, state and local governments have stepped in to fill the void. The recent passage of SB1070 in Arizona has brought state and local efforts to enforce federal immigration law to the national forefront. SB1070 is an over-sweeping state law that requires police across Arizona to investigate the immigration status of every person they have “reasonable suspicion” to believe is in the country without legal status; as drafted, the law encourages police to arrest anyone who looks “illegal” to the police.[6]

The case of Jessica Colotl also illustrates the clash between federal and local enforcement of immigration law. Ms. Colotl was stopped by police for “impeding the flow of traffic” on the grounds of Kennesaw State College, in Cobb County, Georgia.[7] Ms. Colotl was arrested for driving without a license, placed in a local detention center, and eventually transferred to a federal detention center to await deportation.[8] Attorney and community advocates negotiated her release and a one-year deferment for her to complete her education; however, local law enforcement officials continue to push for her re-arrest and deportation.[9] In addition, a number of political candidates in Georgia are now proposing to ban undocumented college students’ access to higher education in the state because of her case.[10] This story further underscores the serious and life-changing effect local law enforcement has on the everyday lives of young adults trying to create a brighter future for themselves through higher education.

Laws such as SB1070 and other local efforts to enforce federal immigration law not only affect the individuals who are targeted and arrested, such as Ms. Colotl. They also have a serious and long-term impact on children. Approximately five million children in the United States have at least one undocumented parent.[11] Although most of these children are U.S. citizens by birth, a majority of them live in immigrant families, and they increasingly face potential separation from their parents.[12] In Georgia, Latino children represent more than one-third (35%) of the total Latino population in Georgia.[13] Approximately 84% of those children are U.S. citizens.[14]

The unintended consequences (i.e., the long-term, harmful impact on children) of overreaching immigration enforcement efforts are exacerbated by the inherent tension between immigration law and family law. When a person faces deportation or “removal” from the United States, it is as an individual, not as a family unit.[15] In contrast, long-standing principles of family and child welfare law incorporate the “best interests of the child,” thus highlighting the potential conflict between immigration enforcement and family integrity. “Although the role of family is critical in shaping who qualifies to immigrate to the United States, when a person faces removal from the United States, it is as an individual, not as a family unit.”[16] More importantly, most of our legal immigration system is based upon keeping families together, not separating them.[17] The dichotomy of separating families through removal has not yet been addressed in any meaningful way by Congress.

This study addresses this important and growing problem in the State of Georgia. The Sapelo Foundation commissioned this study to research, investigate and document: (1) the impact of immigration enforcement efforts on the children of Latino parents in the State of Georgia; and (2) the interplay between immigration enforcement efforts and the child foster care system (i.e., the extent to which children of detained and/or deported Latino parents come to the attention of DFCS).[18] In light of the condensed (approxi-
mately three-month) time frame for research, investigation and compilation of data and narratives, this study is intended to provide a “snapshot” view of these issues. Based on the preliminary nature of this study, its main goals are threefold: (1) to provide a basis to begin long-term documentation of the stories of children affected by immigration enforcement in Georgia; (2) to serve as a catalyst to continue a more thorough and long-term review of these issues in Georgia, or, at a minimum, to continue monitoring of these issues; and (3) to serve as a source and resource for others who are studying this issue at the state, regional and national levels.

III. METHODOLOGY

A. FOCUS OF STUDY: LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT

Although the current administration has shifted federal immigration enforcement efforts from worksite raids to other strategies (see Text Box below), the federal government continues to enforce the nation’s immigration laws with an apparent focus on removing as many individuals as possible. In 2009, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) reported a record number of 387,790 immigrant removals, which represents a 13% increase from 2008.[19] The contents of “leaked” internal ICE documents urging an increase in the number of non-criminal removals and incorporating removal “quotas” as employee-performance measures further suggest ICE’s aggressive focus on high removal numbers including removals based on non-serious, low-level violations.[20]

A primary law enforcement tool that facilitates these increased deportations is the 287(g) program. This program, named after Section 287 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), was incorporated into the 1996 comprehensive immigration reforms and gives the federal government the power to delegate its immigration enforcement authority to state and local law enforcement agencies.[21] Before 2006, the federal government entered into six 287(g) agreements.[22] Since that time, the program has become increasingly more popular. Seventy-one law enforcement agencies in 26 states currently participate in the program.[23]

A number of reports issued by both non-governmental advocacy organizations as well as governmental agencies (including the DHS Inspector General’s office), have raised serious concerns about the program and its implementation.[24] Some of the chief criticisms of the program are that: (1) it creates incentives for the police to engage in racial profiling; and (2) the program undermines the immigrant community’s trust and confidence in local police because of the local/federal law enforcement collaboration.[25]

Although the 287(g) program was intended to target immigrants with serious criminal histories, ICE has allowed local law enforcement to continue “street-level” operations that result in the arrest of immigrants who do not have serious criminal histories.[26] ICE’s focus on low-level violations (rather than prioritizing serious criminal violations) and the large number of arrests and deportations based on low-level violations (such as minor traffic infractions) is another major critique of the 287(g) program.[27] Notwithstanding these criticisms, funding for the program has grown exponentially from a budget of $5 million in 2006 to a budget of $68 million for fiscal year 2010.[28]

The current administration has also increased the number of state and local law enforcement agencies with access to its Secure Communities program, thus facilitating the initiation of more removal proceedings for people who are arrested by local police for minor offenses. The Secure Communities program operates jointly between DHS, the Department of Justice and participating law enforcement agencies to automatically and simultaneously check the digital fingerprints of individuals arrested and booked at the local level against both FBI criminal history records and biometrics-based immigration records maintained by DHS.[29] The Secure Communities Program in effect expands the 287(g) program without ICE oversight. [30]
Consistent with trends across the county, use of the 287(g) program has become a politically popular reaction to the increasing immigrant population in Georgia. Five law enforcement agencies, including Cobb and Gwinnett Counties, are currently participating in the program. This study therefore relies mainly on information gathered from Cobb and Gwinnett counties. The research also includes data from “outlier” cities and counties, where local law enforcement and other officials assume the role of immigration officers (with the goal of arresting immigrants for deportation).

NATIONAL TRENDS RELATED TO IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT AND CHILD WELFARE ISSUES

Recent national trends and developments in the area of immigration enforcement and child welfare provide a context in which to view this state-based study. These developments include an increasing number of reports documenting problems with the 287(g) program, changes in the 287(g) program and proposed national legislation addressing the interplay between immigration enforcement and child welfare issues.

CHANGES IN FEDERAL IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT STRATEGIES AND PROBLEMS WITH THE 287(g) PROGRAM

The current administration has initiated several changes in immigration enforcement. Some of these changes include:
(1) Issuance of humanitarian guidelines delineating terms for parental release during worksite raids resulting in 25 or more arrests;
(2) the end of large worksite raids;
(3) worksite enforcement focused on electronic verification of workers; and
(4) reforms to the 287(g) program, including, a purported focus on arresting and detaining individuals who have committed serious crimes.

FEDERAL LEGISLATION ADDRESSING THE IMPACT OF FAMILY SEPARATION: THE HELP ACT

The Humane Enforcement and Legal Protections (HELP) for Separated Children Act, HR3531, sponsored by Representative Lynn Woolsey (D-CA), proposes reforms to protect children, families and communities impacted by immigration enforcement. The bill provides nationwide protocols to help keep children with their parents or caregiver and out of the children welfare system while immigration proceedings are pending. It also establishes guidelines for immigration enforcement activities involving designated vulnerable populations, including pregnant or nursing women, individuals with impacted children, and individuals with special needs or disabilities. The Act requires that all decisions related to the care, custody and placement of a separated child be based upon the best outcome for the child.

Based on these developments, it is possible that the changes in federal policies and laws related to immigration enforcement and the child welfare system will occur in the future. However, in spite of ongoing reports highlighting the troubling aspects of the 287(g) program, the administration expanded the program to include a number of new participants. The program continues to operate in a number of counties in Georgia, and continues to impact immigrant families living in the state, thus underscoring the need to document the ongoing, harmful daily consequences immigration enforcement has on these families.

[1] These guidelines provide for identification of individuals arrested who may be sole care givers or who have other humanitarian concerns such as: serious medical conditions that require special attention, pregnant women, nursing mothers, parents who are sole caretakers of minor children or disabled or seriously ill relatives. ICE Guidelines for Identifying Humanitarian Concerns among Administrative Arrestees at 1, available at: http://www.nilc.org/immsemplymnt/wkplce_enfrcmnt/wkplcenfrcr025.htm. Before conducting any large worksite raid, ICE is supposed to coordinate with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services’ Division of Immigration Health Services (DIHS) to provide sufficient personnel to screen the humanitarian needs of detainees. Id. If DIHS is unable to support ICE, ICE is supposed to coordinate with an appropriate state or local social service agency or contract personnel to provide humanitarian screening. Id. In April 2009, ICE made...
these guidelines applicable to worksite enforcements involving 25 or more arrested workers. ICE Fact Sheet, “Worksite Enforcement Strategy,” April 30, 2009.


[4] ICE Fact Sheet, “Updated Facts on ICE’s 287(g) Program,” April 12, 2010, available at: www.ice.gov/pi/news/factsheets/section 287_g-reform.htm. The reforms in the 287(g) program included revised 287(g) agreements to ensure uniform implementation. The new agreements supposedly have 287(g) participants prioritize resources to target serious criminal violations (such as murder, rape, robbery or kidnapping). See Cristina Rodríguez, Muzaffar Chishti, Randy Capps, and Laura St. John, “A Program in Flux: New Priorities and Implementation Challenges for 287(g),” March 2010, Migration Policy Institute, Washington, D.C. (discussing, inter alia, the history and context of the 287(g) program and analyzing the terms of the new 2009 template).


[6] Id.

[7] Id.

B. GENERAL METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

This study was conducted in a short time frame -- approximately three months – and is therefore preliminary. With respect to the formulation of a framework for this study and the issues for investigation, the author interviewed policy analysts, researchers, academics and other experts at the national, state and local level. These individuals are leading the efforts in researching, investigating, and monitoring current developments in this field, and have published extensively. Many of these experts are members of the Migration and Child Welfare National Network. The author also conducted research on the available literature, applicable laws and statistics on topics relevant to this issue.

The primary mode of research to document the impact of immigration enforcement efforts on the children of Latino immigrant parents in Georgia has been interviews with a number of stakeholders. The author interviewed affected family members and/or neighbors of affected families. The author also interviewed the following:

- community advocates involved with grass roots and faith-based organizations and churches
- legal practitioners in the field of immigration and child welfare law
- state and local public service providers (e.g., social workers and health care professionals)
- public and private school educators (e.g., school teachers, counselors, parent liasons, translators and other school officials)
- government officials involved in the state child foster care system, the juvenile justice system, and the federal immigration enforcement system

Some interviews, such as those of family members, neighbors of affected family members, educators and public service providers, were conducted on a confidential basis.

The interviews were primarily in person but also by telephone. Approximately 45 interviews were conducted. These interviews resulted in the collection of 34 stories (for purposes of a “sample”) in which one or both parents with children had been arrested, detained and/or deported. The arrests, detentions and deportations mainly arose out of local law enforcement activities. The facts of several stories are included
IV. RELEVANT DEMOGRAPHIC BACKGROUND AND TRENDS

A. DEMOGRAPHICS OF THE CHILD POPULATION IN THE UNITED STATES AND GEORGIA

Understanding the changing demographic characteristics of America’s and Georgia’s children provides a logical starting point to discuss the issues addressed in this report. While the number of children living in the United States has increased, the ratio of children to adults has decreased.[33] At the same time, the racial and ethnic composition of America’s children is continually changing. In 2008, there were 73.9 million children in the United States; 56% of those children were White, non-Hispanic, 22% were Hispanic, 15% were Black, 4% were Asian and 5% were “other races.”[34] The percentage of children who are Hispanic has increased from 9% in 1980 to 22% in 2008, and is estimated to reach 25% by 2021.[35]

According to 2006 U.S. Census estimates, Georgia has a child population of 2,452,225, 10% of whom are Latino.[36] A recent study from the Southern Education Foundation (SEF) concluded that Georgia is one of six southern states that now has a majority of non-White students enrolled in the public school system.[37] The SEF study found that in 2009, 54% of the student population enrolled in Georgia public schools was non-White.[38] In 1986, Latino children numbered 1 out of 200 students in the State of Georgia.[39] In contrast, by the year 2008, one out of 10 students was Latino.[40] Thus, the changing face of Georgia’s school population includes an increasing number of Latino children, many of whom are vulnerable and at risk of suffering the traumatizing impact of family separation.

B. GEORGIA’S CHANGING POPULATION AND LAWMAKERS’ RESPONSE TO THIS CHANGE

Since 1990, Georgia, like many other “Sun Belt” states, experienced a large increase in the Latino population due to increased job opportunities in the construction, retail and services sectors.[41] During the 1990’s, Georgia’s foreign-born population increased 233% — the second largest percentage increase in the country.[42] This growth continued after the 2000 Census. For example, Atlanta was ranked ninth among the top 10 metropolitan areas with the greatest Hispanic population growth from 2000 to 2007.[43] As of 2009, the total number of foreign-born residents in Georgia was 577,273.[44] Foreign-born residents now account for 7% of the total state population, with 43.7% of those residents reporting Hispanic or Latino origin.[45]

This tremendous and sudden shift in the foreign-born population has also made immigration an increasingly controversial issue in a number of southern states, including Georgia. The rapid population change in areas which have not previously experienced new immigrant residents has resulted in the “upending” of traditional notions of population growth.[46] This phenomenon, in combination with the ongoing national economic crisis and the lack of comprehensive immigration reform at the federal level has led to the passage of numerous state and local that severely restrict the rights of immigrants.[47] For example, in 2009, state legislatures considered and enacted record levels of immigrant-related legislation, with 222 laws enacted and 131 resolutions adopted in 48 states.[48]

Georgia is no exception to this trend. In 2006, the Georgia General Assembly passed SB529, entitled the “Georgia Security and Immigration Compliance Act.” At the time, this law was one of the harshest immigration-related state laws enacted.[49] Since 2006, legislators at both the state and local level in Georgia have continued to propose, and, in some cases, enact legislation that restricts the rights of immigrants
living in the state and imposes additional and sometimes costly requirements on businesses operating in the state. Most recently, the Georgia Assembly proposed legislation restricting limited English proficient (LEP) citizens’ and legal residents’ ability to take the driver’s exam and obtain a license. All of the leading candidates (R) for Governor of Georgia have expressed their desire to pass a law in Georgia similar to Arizona’s SB1070. One of these candidates, who is a former United States Congressman, has also proposed federal legislation to deny citizenship to children born in the United States if the children’s parents do not have legal status.

GEORGIA STATE DIVISION OF FAMILY AND CHILD SERVICES’ (DFCS) RESPONSE TO THE GROWING IMMIGRANT POPULATION IN GEORGIA: CULTURAL COMPETENCY MANUALS AND TRAINING

As the Georgia foreign-born population was growing in the 1990’s, social workers in the state’s foster care system began to see an increase in cases that required them to address the needs of immigrant children and families, including Latino families. DFCS responded with the publication of a training manual entitled “Culturally Competent Practice with Latino Clients.” The manual and related training were intended to provide DFCS workers (trainees) with the tools to understand Latino client populations and cultures in order to successfully respond to these clients’ needs. In 2006, the broader issue of immigrant children’s needs came to the attention of DFCS, as did the need to address issues related to implementation of SB529. DFCS formed a working group to evaluate its policies and procedures to include cross-culture service delivery to immigrant families and to identify strategies and train DFCS case workers to work cross culturally while maintaining the protection, safety, and permanency of the children they serve. After several years of research and working with DFCS focus groups across the state, the group concluded with a recommendation to address the challenges and barriers immigrant children and families experience when navigating the child welfare system. It also recommended specialized training for social services staff to address cultural and language barriers, practice and service delivery, and community engagement. The efforts of the group culminated in DFCS’s publication of a comprehensive training manual (and training modules) entitled “Working with Immigrant Children and Families,” which was published in 2009.

[1] March 16, 2010 interview with Renee Ivis King, MSW, PhD, the former DFCS Program Planning and Development Unit specialist. Ms. King, along with a number of others, developed the “Working with Immigrant Children and Families” manual, infra, n. [4], for DFCS service providers. April 12, 2010 Interview with David Boyle, retired Dean of the Dalton State School of Social Work, and co-author of a manual on Latino cultural competence issues, infra, n. [2].
[3] Id. at 5.

V. FINDINGS
A. HOW CHILDREN OF ARRESTED AND/OR DETAINED PARENTS COME TO THE ATTENTION OF DFCS

Based on the research and interviews conducted for this study, whether a child comes to the attention of DFCS when the child’s immigrant parent is arrested and detained in Cobb, Gwinnett, and other counties
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surrounding metropolitan Atlanta depends on several factors, including:

(1) the location of the child at the time of the parent’s arrest;
(2) whether the child’s other parent or another relative is immediately available to assume caregiving responsibilities for the child; and
(3) the extent to which the family has taken precautionary measures in the event of an emergency (i.e., signed power of attorney forms, guardianship or temporary custody papers; and/or provided children’s school with updated family emergency contact information, including names and telephone numbers).

Several individuals interviewed for this study explained that if a parent was arrested with her minor child (or children), the police officer may provide the parent with the opportunity to contact another family member or friend to pick up the children before the parent was formally arrested. For example, in March of this year, Maria was stopped at a road block/checkpoint in Cobb County at 9 p.m. with her three children (all under seven). The police officer who stopped her told her if she did not have someone come to pick up her three children within 30 minutes, he would call DFCS. Maria asked the officer if she could walk her children to her house, which was close. The officer told her no, and asked her to talk to her six-year old daughter because her daughter was crying so much. Maria explained that the officer told her, “It’s my job to arrest you,” and treated the situation like it was a joke. She then telephoned a friend of the family, who was able to come within 30 minutes. Several public school educators explained that school policies require the school to contact all available emergency contacts listed for a student before contacting DFCS. Some individuals also noted that: (1) the local police may not ask parents if they have children at home (when a parent is arrested during school hours), and (2) if the children’s attendance at school is not at issue, the child will generally not come to the attention of DFCS.

As noted below, in the majority of cases collected for this report, the children of detained parents did not come to the attention of DFCS. However, the research also revealed the difficulty of concretely tracking the number of children who come to the attention of DFCS as a result of immigration enforcement; there is currently no consistent tracking of this information by ICE, local agencies partnering with ICE or DFCS. Those individuals who work closely with the community and other affected family members and neighbors interviewed for this study reported some cases in which children of detained parents came to the attention of DFCS. These cases illustrate the problematic interplay between immigration enforcement and family unity. In one such case, the mother of a 10 year old U.S. citizen boy and his 12 year old U.S. citizen sister had been deported, and their father had abandoned them. DFCS was unable to locate the children’s relatives before parental rights were terminated; however, when the Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA) became involved, CASA located family members in Texas. According to CASA, when the ten-year old boy received news that he would be moving to Texas to live with his aunt, he dropped the phone because he was so happy. Advocates working with the community also noted other cases involving DFCS which do not involve the detention or deportation of an immigrant parent. For example, one advocate mentioned a case in which an undocumented child was adopted. After the adoption, it was discovered the child was not a U.S. citizen, and DFCS began to investigate the possibility of deporting the child.

Some individuals explained that families take precautions, either informally or formally, to ensure that children do not become part of the DFCS system. Carlos and Maria, a couple living in Cobb County, explained that after their next door neighbor Lydia was arrested (for driving without a license) and detained, her husband believed that DFCS was planning to get involved in the case. He immediately contacted the children’s uncle in Chicago; within several days after Lydia’s arrest, her brother arrived and returned to Chicago with Lydia’s three children. Another community advocate noted that the use of power of attorney
forms has helped many families prepare in case a parent is arrested and detained.[66]

Several individuals interviewed explained that the police routinely park their patrol cars in particular neighborhood near a church or a school, and in one location in particular in Cobb County, where there is both a Catholic Church and a school.[67]

B. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS: IN MOST CASES, FAMILIES WERE SEPARATED, AND THE CHILDREN OF DEPORTED PARENTS REMAINED IN THE UNITED STATES

The author collected information related to 34 cases (involving approximately 40 families and approximately 85 children)[68] in which one or both parents had been detained and/or deported in the State of Georgia.[69] In 24 of the 34 cases (approximately 71%), the children stayed in the United States after at least one parent had been deported. In seven of those 24 cases in which the children remained in the United States, the children spent some time in DFCS custody. In four of the seven cases involving DFCS custody, the children were reunited with family members.[70] In one case involving DFCS, an undocumented child has a step-father who is a potential family placement but the immigrant child may be eligible for Special Immigrant Juvenile Status (SIJS) (see Text Box).[71] Possible placement with his step-father is therefore being delayed in order to explore fully the opportunity of gaining SIJS.[72] In one of the cases in which the children stayed in the United States after the father was deported, the economic condition of the remaining family members (mother and three U.S. citizen daughters, two of whom were under the age of 10) severely declined, and the teenaged girl developed substance abuse problems; she is now in juvenile detention.[73] In two of the 10 cases in which the children will follow (or have followed) a deported parent, the remaining family members (one family with two U.S. citizen children under age five and the other family with two U.S. citizen children under age five and an undocumented 14 year-old) are still in the process of making appropriate arrangements (such as securing a passport) to travel back to the deported parent’s country of origin.[74]
C. THE EFFECT OF IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT ON CHILDREN AND YOUNG ADULTS

1. National Studies

Recent national studies demonstrate that family separation based on a parent’s detention and/or deportation significantly impacts children’s physical and emotional health as well as their educational and social development.[75] In March of this year, the University of California, Berkeley, and the University of California, Davis issued a report documenting the harmful effects that deportation of lawful immigrant parents has had on nearly 88,000 citizen children in just one decade.[76] The report finds that forced removal of lawful permanent resident parents (or green card holders) convicted of relatively minor crimes can lead to psychological harm, behavioral changes, and disruptions in the health and education of tens of thousands of citizen children.[77] Another recent report issued from First Focus and the Migration and Child Welfare Network examines the impact immigration enforcement has on the thousands of children of undocumented immigrants, 73% of whom are U.S. citizens. [78] The report finds, among other things, that immigration enforcement results in risks to child safety and well-being.[79] Finally, in two comprehensive studies assessing the impact of immigration enforcement on children, the Urban Institute researched short and long-term impacts on children.[80] In the most recent of these two studies, the Urban Institute examined the consequences of parental arrest, detention and deportation on 190 children in 85 families in six locations across the country.[81] This study provides extensive documentation demonstrating that immigration enforcement affects children’s lives in a number of ways including widespread changes in child behavior (e.g., regular crying, anxiety, withdrawal, clinginess, anger, and aggression) and disruptions in school such as missed days and problems with academic performance.[82] To date, these studies have focused mainly on the effects of worksite and home raids rather than on local law enforcement efforts, which is the focus of this study.

2. The Real Impact of Immigration Enforcement on Children in Georgia: Their Stories

Consistent with the findings in the national studies, many individuals interviewed for this study noted that elementary aged school children often cried, and displayed anxious, distrustful and/or rebellious behavior in the context of parental separation caused by an arrest and/or deportation.[83] As one advocate recently explained, “Children are internalizing the anti-immigrant sentiment” reflected in law enforcement’s overzealous focus on immigration.[84] One teacher reported that some of her grade-school students who do not have legal status feel “out of place.”[85] When asked why they do not want to tell her where they live, they responded, “[W]e’re not supposed to be here.”[86] At the middle and high school levels, public educators and other service providers explained that students often drop out of school to take care of the family (not because of a lack of interest in school); others noted some teenagers: (1) experienced a sense of hopelessness, depression; and (2) increased discussion and threats of suicide.[87]

The following stories provide a more complete picture of how immigration enforcement efforts significantly (and negatively) impact the health, life and education of Latino children in Georgia.

A. Mario from Cobb County and Gerardo from Gwinnett County

One public school educator in Cobb County described the case of Mario, who is in fifth grade.[88] Mario was concerned and worried that his father would be stopped by the police. His anxiety problem developed into a physical bladder condition that causes him to use the restroom facilities constantly. Mario has talked about his fears with the school psychologist so that the school can help him and possibly place him in a special education class. Mario’s worst fear recently became a reality when his father was arrested for driv-
ing without a license in Cobb County. The school is continuing to assist Mario with his anxiety problem; he receives therapy and is permitted to leave the classroom whenever he needs to. Mario will be assigned to a special education/special needs program with a teacher in a smaller classroom setting. As a result of this situation, Mario will be repeating fifth grade. The educator also described an incident when Mario recently came into the office crying because his mother had dropped him off at school, and there was a police car stationed next to the school that day. He was upset and ran out of the school to make sure the police did not arrest his mother.[89]

A health-care provider in Gwinnett County shared a similar story about Gerardo, a six-year old client.[90] Gerardo’s parents have not been deported, but he is traumatized by the possibility that his parents may be deported. His mother was arrested (for driving without a license) in Gwinnett, and Gerardo witnessed the event. He was having nightmares about the incident and now is terrified of policemen. At first the health-care provider believed the source of Gerardo’s trauma was witnessing his mother’s arrest but then discovered that the fear of deportation was the actual trauma, and the sight of policemen was a visual trigger to that fear. Gerardo became anxious, never wanting his parents out of his sight. He now considers all policemen bad.

B. Eva and Juan

Eva has a seven-year old son in elementary school in a county located in northern Georgia.[91] One day while she was at work, Eva received an urgent phone call from her son’s school. The school’s bilingual family advocate called Eva to inform her that her son was suffering from a severe asthma attack and needed immediate attention. Eva immediately drove to her son’s school and went directly to the school office to check in so that she could take her son home for medical home-care breathing treatment or to a doctor to receive medical treatment. When she spoke to the school secretary, the secretary and school office staff demanded that Eva produce a form of identification, which she was unable to do. (Eva had left work in the middle of the day and borrowed a car to get to the school.) Because Eva did not have a form of identification with her, the school secretary tried to prevent her from picking up her son. In the meantime, another secretary went out to the parking lot to take down the tag number of the car Eva had driven.[92] The bilingual advocate and school nurse eventually convinced the secretary to permit Eva to pick up her son.[93]

While she was taking her son home to get his breathing treatment for his asthma attack, the school notified the police of the tag number. [94] Three police cars followed Eva to her home and stopped her just as she was pulling into her apartment complex.[95] The police instructed her to leave her son with a neighbor.[96] The officers then proceeded to handcuff and arrest her in front of her son, who was crying and traumatized by seeing his mother in handcuffs.[97] Although the asthma attack abated, Juan was unable to receive his breathing treatment and was left in the custody and care of a neighbor. As a result of this incident, the advocate in the school who was responsible for notifying Eva resigned several months later in protest.

C. Eight Children in Northern Georgia County

In 2008, a public educator[98] who worked in an elementary school in a county north of Atlanta routinely passed the same mobile park both on her way to and from school. One day early in the spring of 2008, at approximately 3 p.m., she was coming home from school and saw eight students from the school (who had been dropped off) waiting in front of the mobile home park. The school bus had just dropped them
off there and none of the children’s parents was home. The teacher stopped in front of the park to wait
with the children. All of the children were crying and distressed. None of them knew what had happened.
While she was waiting with the students, the teacher called the school principal. He informed her there
was nothing the school could do -- the school’s responsibility ended once the school bus dropped the chil-
dren off at home. The teacher waited for 30 minutes. Finally, the uncle of one of her students arrived and
explained that someone had “taken away” all their parents. The uncle then drove the children to his house
and to the house of other relatives and friends.

The following day, the teacher e-mailed the principal to follow up on the issue to ensure that the school
would provide assistance, if necessary, in support of the children in this situation. The principal responded
that the school would investigate the situation. The eight children stayed in school for the remainder of
the school year, but, according to the teacher, the school did not address the issue. When she approached
the school counselor about this matter, he was indifferent. According to the teacher, when she asked him
about the situation, he was unconcerned and responded, “It’s not our problem.” As a result of this inci-
dent, the educator resigned from the county school system at the end of the school year.

3. OTHER CASES

Each of the following stories presents scenarios in which the child may have been eligible to apply for SIJS
but the circumstances did not provide an opportunity to do so.

a. Patricia

Patricia is an undocumented immigrant who was brought to the United States by her mother.[99] When
she was 11, she was sexually abused by her uncle; at 12, neighbors began giving her drugs and alcohol,
and at 13, she was raped by her mother’s boyfriend. When Patricia reported the assault to her mother,
her mother became angry and sent her back to Mexico. When in Mexico, she was sexually abused by her
uncle, physically abused by her father, and in and out of several rehabilitation centers. After she turned 16,
Patricia started attending school regularly and also started working to help earn money for her family. At
the time, her brother became extremely sick, and Patricia called her mother in Georgia for assistance.

Patricia came back to Georgia (with the help of her mother). In July 2008, Patricia went back to school
in Gwinnett County, and her mother’s boyfriend began sexually abusing her again. Rather than tell her
mother, Patricia confided to her friends, who reported the abuse to the Gwinnett County DFCS office. She
moved out of the house and reported the abuse to a DFCS caseworker. Patricia’s mother told the case-
worker that there was no need for further investigation because the family was returning to Mexico. How-
ever, the family remained in Georgia for several months and the abuse continued.

The family eventually decided to move from Georgia. In November 2008, while they were at the bus
station in Texas, Patricia’s mother abandoned Patricia and her brother. Patricia decided to come back to
Georgia. She called DFCS to ask for help. DFCS placed Patricia and her brother in foster homes. While in
foster care, Patricia experienced serious behavior problems such as self-mutilation, and suicidal thoughts.
However, DFCS focused on reunifying Patricia with her family rather than addressing her psychological and
substance abuse issues.[100] Before she turned 18, Patricia attempted suicide. She was taken into emer-
gency care and finally received the medication and counseling she needed. Several months later, in Febru-
ary 2009, the Juvenile Court of Gwinnett County found that Patricia and her brother were deprived (with-
out a parent or legal guardian in Gwinnett County) and ruled that the permanency plan for them remained
reunification with their family in Mexico. The court specifically rejected Patricia’s argument that it was not
in her best interest to return to her native country. [101]

When she turned 18, DFCS released Patricia without any treatment plan or medications. [102] She became homeless, had one episode which required a three-day hospital stay, and continued to suffer from severe psychological problems. Patricia eventually obtained legal status by securing a U visa and has since moved out of state.[103]

**b. Ana**

Clarisa, a domestic violence survivor living in northern Georgia, had finally obtained legal status. [104] She decided to live with Rosa and Ana, her two sisters. Rosa is married to Leo, is a well-known businessman in the community who runs an office that serves the Latino community. He is also a part-time pastor. Ana is Clarisa’s and Rosa’s younger teenage (minor) sister, who also lives in Rosa’s house. Ana is undocumented.

After Clarisa and her daughter moved into Rosa’s house, she realized that Leo was sexually abusing her minor sister Ana. On a number of occasions, Leo declared his love for Ana publicly, in front of friends and family (including his wife). Clarisa called DFCS to report the abuse. Although DFCS came to the home to conduct an interview, Ana was too scared to confirm the abuse, and to date, no further interviews have been conducted by DFCS. Clarisa felt unsafe living in the house because Leo had threatened her on a number of occasions. Although Clarisa had been planning to move to her own apartment in a nearby town (with both her daughter and Ana), she and her daughter moved out of the state on short notice. Ana continues to live in Clarisa’s house, and continues to be subjected to her brother-in-law’s sexual abuse.[105]

**c. Luis**

The case of Luis, a homeless, honors high-school student in Cobb County, Georgia, fully illustrates the harmful and life-altering impact of overzealous “zero tolerance” policies in the educational system and immigration enforcement. Luis came to the United States and lived with his uncle, who was an alcoholic.[106] Luis was unable to continue living with his uncle because of his uncle’s alcoholism and became homeless.[107] He continued to attend school and maintain high grades in addition to working two after-school jobs.[108] In early 2009, the school found a tool from one of Luis’s after-school jobs in his backpack when conducting a search of students’ bookbags.[109] Based on the state’s zero tolerance law,[110] the school reported Luis to the police, who in turn reported him to federal immigration authorities. Soon after, Luis was deported.

**VI. RECOMMENDATIONS**

As the research and findings contained in this study indicate, immigration enforcement efforts severely impact Latino children in the State of Georgia. In addition to focusing on the passage of comprehensive immigration reform at the federal level, all stakeholders in the immigration and child welfare system need to take effective steps to institute procedures and policies that ameliorate the potentially traumatic and life-altering impact of immigration enforcement on children. The following recommendations set forth an initial starting point for such action:

1. State and local law enforcement agencies should adopt guidelines that strictly prohibit stationing checkpoints and road blocks near schools, churches, day care centers and health clinics.
(2) State, county and local law enforcement officers should adopt ICE humanitarian guidelines regarding sole caregivers, which provide for specific consideration of children’s needs.

(3) Humanitarian policies should be adopted for all types of immigration enforcement activities that may result in family separation. As explained above (supra, first Text Box, n. [1]) currently, ICE humanitarian guidelines only apply to workplace raids involving 25 or more individuals.

(4) Law enforcement officers deputized under the 287(g) program should receive specific training in cultural competency and how to handle arrests where a minor child is present so as to minimize trauma to the child. Such training should be done in collaboration with qualified social service agencies.

(5) Community groups, legal service providers, lawyers and all others working with the community should continue to engage in public education campaigns to assist families to prepare powers of attorney and other appropriate documents to ensure their children have trusted adults who are legally authorized to make decisions on behalf of their children in the event that a parent is detained and/or deported.

(6) Additional studies specific to Georgia should be supported and conducted and should extend to all immigrant families impacted by immigration enforcement efforts.

(7) DFCS and its partner agencies (at the local, county, state and federal level) should continue their efforts to strengthen the cultural competency of the foster care system in Georgia through training and continued development of materials related to the needs of immigrants and through recruitment of bilingual and bicultural members of the workforce. As part of this effort, all stakeholders in the foster care system in Georgia should collaborate to strengthen cultural competency.

(8) DFCS training should incorporate specific methods for caseworkers to conduct adequate screening to identify early in the process possible SIJS applicants.

(9) The various local, state and federal agencies involved in the child welfare and immigration enforcement system should institute a cooperative system of mandatory reporting that tracks information related to immigrant families. To the extent feasible, these agencies should collaborate with the Mexican Consulate and other Consulates to create accurate and comprehensive statistics related to immigrant families and children in the child welfare system.
XII. CONCLUSION

This report underscores the vital need for our nation’s policymakers and leaders to address comprehensive immigration reform. As Michelle Obama recently told a young girl asking about her mother’s undocumented status, “We have to work on [comprehensive immigration reform], we have to fix that, in that everybody’s got to work together in Congress to make sure that happens.”[111]

Comprehensive immigration reform should ensure a legal and orderly system that humanely and justly serves the needs of all families living in the United States.
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ADDITIONAL RESOURCES
Associations, Organizations and Other Entities Addressing Immigration/Child Welfare Issues and/or Providing Services to the Latino Community in Georgia

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

American Bar Association
Center on Children and the Law
Chicago, Illinois
http://www.abanet.org
321 N. Clark St.
Chicago, IL 60654-7598/ Tel. 800.285.2221

American Immigration Lawyers Association (AILA)
Washington, D.C.
http://www.aila.org
1331 G St., NW Suite 300
Washington, DC 20005-3142/ Tel. 202.507.7600

Annie E. Casey Foundation
Baltimore, Maryland
http://www.aecf.org
701 St. Paul Street,
Baltimore, MD 21202/ Tel. 410.547.6600

Brookings Institution
Washington, D.C.
http://www.brookings.edu
1775 Massachusetts Ave, NW
Washington, DC 20036/ Tel. 202.797.6000

First Focus
Washington D.C.
(Focus on advocacy for children)
http://www.firstfocus.net
1110 Vermont Ave. NW, Suite 900
Washington, D.C. 20005/ Tel. 202.657.0670

Migration & Child Welfare Network
American Humane Society
Englewood, Colorado
http://www.americanhumanesociety.org
63 Inverness Drive East,
Englewood, Colorado 80112/ Tel. 800.227.4645
Migration Policy Institute
Washington D.C.
http://www.migrationpolicy.org
1400 16th Street NW, Ste 300,
Washington D.C. 20005/Tel. 202.657.0670

National Council of La Raza
Washington, D.C.
http://www.nclr.org
Raul Yzaguirre Building
1126 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036/ Tel. (202) 785-1670

Pew Hispanic Center
Pew Research Center
Washington, D.C.
http://pewhispanic.org/about/
Pew Research Center
1615 L Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036-5610 /Tel. 202.419.3600 main telephone

Urban Institute
Washington, D.C.
http://www.urban.org
2100 M Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20037/ Tel. 202.833.7200

Women’s Refugee Commission
Detention & Asylum Program
New York, New York
http://www.womenrefugeecommission.org
122 East 42nd Street
New York, New York 10168/Tel. 212.551.3115

GEORGIA-BASED ORGANIZATIONS

Alterna Community
LaGrange, Georgia
Anton Flores-Maisonet
P.O. Box 4043
LaGrange, Georgia 30241/Tel. 706.302.9661
www.alternacommunity.com
www.youtube.com/alternamedia

American Civil Liberties Union of Georgia
Atlanta, Georgia
http://www.aclu.org/
1900 The Exchange SE, Building 400, Suite 425,
Atlanta, GA 303398 /Tel. 770.303.9966
Executive Director, Debbie Seagraves

Atlantans Building Leadership for Empowerment (ABLE)
Atlanta, Georgia
(Interfaith grass-roots coalition)
http://www.gamaliel.org/ABLE
Tel. 770.366.3681
Leader organizer, Sherita M. Edwards

Caminar Latino Inc.,
Atlanta, Georgia
(Latino community-based organization focusing on issues related to domestic violence)
http://www.caminarlatino.org/
PO Box 48623, Doraville, Georgia 30362 /Tel. 404.413.6348
Executive Director, Jessica Nunan

Catholic Charities of Atlanta
Atlanta, Georgia
http://www.catholiccharitiesatlanta.org/
680 W. Peachtree St. NW
Atlanta, Georgia 30308 /Tel. 404.885.7483 or 404.885.7237
Executive Director, Sue Colussy

CETPA, Georgia
(Professional Mental Health Counseling Services for Latino Community)
Norcross, Georgia
http://www.cetpa.org/
6020 Dawson Boulevard, Suite i
Norcross, Georgia 30093 /Tel. 770.662.0249
Executive Director, Pierluigi Mancini

Coalición de Líderes Latinos (CLILA )
Dalton, Georgia
http://www.lidereslatinos.org
911 E Morris St, Suite K
Dalton, Georgia/Tel. 706-529-9216
Director, America Gruner

Court Appointed Special Advocates, Georgia
Atlanta, Georgia
http://www.gacasa.org/ or http://www.fultoncountycasa.org/
1776 Peachtree Rd. NW, Suite 219, South Tower
Atlanta, GA 30309 /Tel. 404.874.2888
Or 395 Pryor Street, SW, Suite 4116
Atlanta, Georgia 30312/Tel. 404.224.4720
Executive Director, Iris Thomas Ross

© 2010 Elise Shore All Rights Reserved
Culture Connect Inc.
Decatur, Georgia
http://www.cultureconnectinc.org/
4151 Memorial Drive Suite 207E, Decatur, Georgia 30032/Tel. 404.292.8457
Executive Director, Alexis Dumas

Division of Family & Children Services (DFCS), Georgia
Atlanta, Georgia
www.dfcs.dhr.georgia.gov
Central City North Service Center, 84 Walton Street, NW,
Atlanta, Georgia 30303/Tel. 404.657.8000 or 404.657.8100

Georgia Appleseed
Atlanta, Georgia
http://www.gaappleseed.org/
1100 Peachtree Street, Suite 2800, Atlanta, Georgia 30309 /Tel. 404.685.6750
Executive Director, Sharon Hill

Georgia Association of Latino Elected Officials
Atlanta, Georgia
http://www.galeo.org/
1100 Peachtree Street, Suite 2800, Atlanta, Georgia 30309 /Tel. 404.745.2580
Executive Director, Jerry Gonzalez

Georgia Campaign for Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention, Georgia
Atlanta, Georgia
http://www.gcapp.org/home
1450 West Peachtree Street, NW Suite 200
Atlanta, Georgia 30309/Tel. 404.524.2277
President and CEO, Michele Ozumba

Georgia Latino Alliance for Human Rights
Atlanta, Georgia
http://www.glahr.org/
2215 Perimeter Park Dr, Suite 6
Atlanta Georgia 30341 /Tel. 770.457.5232
Executive Director, Adelina Nicholls

Georgia Legal Services
Atlanta, Georgia
http://www.glsp.org
104 Marietta Street, 250, Atlanta, Georgia, 30303 /Tel. 404.206.5175
Homero León, Jr., Attorney

Hispanic Health Coalition of Georgia
Atlanta, Georgia
PO Box 450005
Atlanta, Georgia/Tel. 678.843.8905
President, Olga Lucia Jimenez

Interfaith Children’s Movement
Atlanta, Georgia
http://www.interfaithchildrensmovement.org
info@interfaithchildrensmovement.org/Tel: 770-498-2141

JUSTGeorgia
Atlanta, Georgia
http://www.justga.org/
100 Edgewood Avenue N.E., Suite 1580, Atlanta, Georgia 30303 /Tel. 404.521.0311
Program Manager, Julia Day Neighbors

Latin American Association
Atlanta, Georgia
http://www.thelaad.org/
Atlanta Outreach Center
2750 Buford Hwy.
Atlanta, Georgia 30324 /Tel. 404.638.1800
Chief Executive Officer, Millie Irizarry

Latinos for Education and Justice Organization, Inc
Calhoun, Georgia
1289 Curtis Parkway
Calhoun, Georgia /Tel: 706-625-0658
President, Roberta (Bobbie) Warmack

Mundo Hispanico
Norcross, Georgia
http://www.mundohispanico.com/
6455 Best Friend Rd.
Norcross, Georgia 30071 /Tel. 404 881.0441

Raksha, Inc.
Atlanta, Georgia
http://www.raksha.org/
P.O. Box 12337
Atlanta, Georgia 30335 /Tel. 404.876.0670
Executive Director, Aparna Bhattacharyya

Refugee Family Services
Atlanta, Georgia
http://www.refugeefamilyservices.org
5561 Memorial Dr.
Stone Mountain Georgia, 30083-3237 /Tel. 404.299.6217
Executive Director, Alan Shaklan
Sapelo Foundation, Georgia
Brunswick, Georgia
http://www.sapelofoundation.org/
1712 Ellis Street, 2nd Floor
Brunswick, Georgia 31520/Tel. 912.265.0520
Executive Director, Phyllis Bowen

Southern Education Foundation
Atlanta, Georgia
http://www.sefatl.org
35 Auburn Ave NE, 2nd Floor
Atlanta, Georgia 30303/Tel: 404.523.0001
Executive Director, Lynn Huntley

Southern Poverty Law Center
Immigrants Justice Project/Proyecto de Justicia Inmigrante
Atlanta, Georgia
http://www.splcenter.org/
233 Peachtree Street Northeast, Atlanta, Georgia, 30303-1504 /Tel. 404.521.6700
Legal Director, Mary Bauer

ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONS

Emory School of Law
The Barton Child Law and Policy Center
Atlanta, Georgia
Gambrell Hall
Atlanta, Georgia 30322/Tel. 404.727.6664

Hunter College School of Social Work,
New York, New York
http://www.hunter.cuny.edu/socwork/
129 East 79th Street
New York, NY 10075 /Tel. 212.452.7302

Jane Addams College of Social Work, University of Illinois
Chicago, Illinois
http://www.socialwork.uic.edu/
1040 West Harrison Street
Chicago, Illinois 60607-7134/Tel. 312.996.0044

School of Social Work, Dalton State College
Dalton, Georgia
http://www.daltonstate.edu and http://www.daltonstate.edu/socialwork
1650 College Drive
Dalton, Georgia 30720/Tel. 706.272.2682
CONSULATES LOCATED IN GEORGIA

Consulate General of the Argentine Republic
http://www.consuladoargentinoatlanta.org/
245 Peachtree Center Avenue Suite 2101, Atlanta, GA 30303 /Tel. 404.880.0805
Marcelo Gerschenfeld, Consul General

Consulate General of the Bahamas
2970 Clairmont Road, Suite 690, Atlanta, GA 30329 /Tel. 404.214.0492
Katherine Smith, Consul General

Consulate General of the Federal Republic of Brazil
3500 Lenox Road, Suite 800, Atlanta, GA 303269 /Tel. 404.949.2400
Adalnio Senna Ganem, Consul General

Consulate General of the Republic of Colombia
http://www.consuladodecolombiaatlanta.com/
5901 B Peachtree Dunwoody Rd, Suite 405, Atlanta GA 30328 /Tel. 1.888.764.3326
Camilo De Bedout Herrera, Consul General

Consulate General of the Republic of Costa Rica
http://www.costarica-embassy.org/consular/consulates/default.htm
1870 The Exchange, Suite 100, Atlanta, GA 30339 /Tel. 770.951.7025 or 770.951.7026
Manuel Dobles, Consul General

Consulate General of the Republic of El Salvador
http://www.elsalvador.org/
9740 Main St., Suite 120, Woodstock, GA 30188 /Tel. 770.591.4140
Asdrubal Aguilar, Consul General

Consulate General of the Republic of Guatemala
http://www.consulado-guatemala.org/pplk_en.asp
2750 Buford Highway , Atlanta, GA 30324 /Tel. 404.320.8804
Beatriz Illescas Putzeys, Consul General

Consulate General of the Republic of Honduras
http://www.consulado-guatemala.org/pplk_en.asp
6825 Jimmy Carter Boulevard, Building 1400, Suite 1490, Norcross, GA 30071 /Tel. 770.645.8881
Rosa Pineda, Consul General

Consulate General of Mexico
http://portal.sre.gob.mx/atlanta/
Consulate General of the Republic Peru
http://www.consuladoperu.com/
4360 Chamblee Dunwoody, Suite 580, Atlanta, GA 30341 /Tel. 678.336.7010
Francisco Rivarola, Consul General
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