

Evaluation of Washington's Solution Based Casework practice model

INTERIM REPORT

Part III: Social workers' baseline survey results

Partners for Our Children is committed to improving the lives of Washington state foster children through rigorous research, analysis and evidence-based innovation. The organization, founded in 2007, is a collaborative effort of the University of Washington School of Social Work, Washington State Department of Social and Health Services and private funders.

Prepared by
Sandra Lyons
Mark Courtney
Maureen Newby
JoAnn Lee

Partners for Our Children
Box 359476
Seattle, WA 98195-9476
Telephone: 206.221.3100
partnersforourchildren.org

Contents

Acknowledgements	1
Executive Summary	1
Chapter 1. Introduction	6
Components of the implementation strategy	6
Study design and methods	8
Chapter 2. Social Workers' Baseline Survey Responses ...	9
Current casework practices	9
Obstacles to helping families	12
Job demands	14
Role expectations	15
Control at work	15
Social interactions	16
Leadership	16
Organizational culture and climate	17
Perception of group work	17
Team climate and psychological safety	18
Job satisfaction and turnover intention	19
Professional burnout	19
CHAPTER 3. Social Workers' Assessments of Cases ...	20
Perpetrators of maltreatment	22
Caregivers' history	22
Stability of primary caregivers' living arrangements	23
Primary caregivers' money management characteristics	24
Caregivers' disposition	25
Children's disabilities and problems	26
Permanency plans for child(ren) in out-of-home care	28
Primary caregivers' contact with child(ren) place in out-of-home care	28
Workers' casework approach	29
Workers' inclusion of family in case planning	31
Workers' contact with caregivers and children	31

Barriers to achieving casework goals	32
Access to services and informal support	33
Caregiver services	33
Child services	35
Appendix A: Parental Disposition Items, Child Well-Being Scale	43
References	44

TABLES

Table 2.1a. Approach to families by region	9
Table 2.1b. Approach to families by service area	10
Table 2.2a. Use of informal supports by region	10
Table 2.2b. Use of informal supports by service area	10
Table 2.3a. Perception of superior's support by region	10
Table 2.3b. Perception of superior's support by service area	10
Table 2.4a. Obstacles to new approaches by region	10
Table 2.4b. Obstacles to new approaches by service area	11
Table 2.5a. Inclusion of families in case planning by region	11
Table 2.5b. Inclusion of families in case planning by service area	11
Table 2.6a. Monitoring family progress by region	11
Table 2.6b. Monitoring family progress by service area	11
Table 2.7a. Family assessment procedures by region	11
Table 2.7b. Family assessment procedures by service area	12
Table 2.8a. Organizational characteristics by region	12
Table 2.8b. Organizational characteristics by service area	12
Table 2.9a. Family characteristics by region	12
Table 2.9b. Family characteristics by service area	12
Table 2.10a. Service characteristics by region	13
Table 2.10b. Service characteristics by service area	13
Table 2.11a. Foster home characteristics by region	13
Table 2.11b. Foster home characteristics by service area	13
Table 2.12a. Court characteristics by region	14
Table 2.12b. Court characteristics by service area	14

Table 2.13a.	Quantitative job demands by region	14
Table 2.13b.	Quantitative job demands by service area	14
Table 2.14a.	Learning demands by region	14
Table 2.14b.	Learning demands by service area	15
Table 2.15a.	Role clarity by region	15
Table 2.15b.	Role clarity by service area	15
Table 2.16a.	Role conflict by region	15
Table 2.16b.	Role conflict by service area	15
Table 2.17a.	Positive challenge at work by region	15
Table 2.17b.	Positive challenge at work by service are	15
Table 2.18a.	Control of decisions and work pacing by region	15
Table 2.18b.	Control of decisions and work pacing by service area	16
Table 2.19a.	Cases with crisis or violence by region	16
Table 2.19b.	Cases with crisis or violence by service area	16
Table 2.20a.	Support from superior by region	16
Table 2.20b.	Support from superior by service area	16
Table 2.21a.	Empowering leadership by regions	16
Table 2.21b.	Empowering leadership by service area	17
Table 2.22a.	Social climate and cultural sensitivity by region	17
Table 2.22b.	Social climate and cultural sensitivity by service area	17
Table 2.23a.	Human resources primacy by region	17
Table 2.23b.	Human resources primacy by service area	17
Table 2.24a.	Perception of group work by region	17
Table 2.24b.	Perception of group work by service area	18
Table 2.25a.	Team psychological safety by region	18
Table 2.25b.	Team psychological safety by service area	18
Table 2.26a.	Team climate by region	18
Table 2.26b.	Team climate by service area	19
Table 2.27a.	Job satisfaction and turnover intention by region	19
Table 2.27b.	Job satisfaction and turnover intention by service area	19
Table 2.28a.	Emotional exhaustion by region	19
Table 2.28b.	Emotional exhaustion by service area	20
Table 2.29a.	Depersonalization by region	20
Table 2.29b.	Depersonalization by service area	20

Table 2.30a.	Personal accomplishment by region	20
Table 2.30b.	Personal accomplishment by service area	20
Table 3.1.	Caregiver demographics	21
Table 3.2.	Child demographics	21
Table 3.3a.	Relationship to the perpetrator(s) of maltreatment by region	22
Table 3.3b.	Relationship to the perpetrator(s) of maltreatment by service area.	22
Table 3.3c.	Relationship to the perpetrator(s) of maltreatment by service context	22
Table 3.4a.	Caregiver(s) has a prior open CPS/CFWS case by region.	22
Table 3.4b.	Caregiver(s) has a prior open CPS/CFWS case by service area	22
Table 3.4c.	Caregiver(s) has a prior open CPS/CFWS case by service context	22
Table 3.5a.	Primary caregiver's parental rights terminated in the past by region	23
Table 3.5b.	Primary caregiver's parental rights terminated in the past by service area	23
Table 3.5c.	Primary caregiver's parental rights terminated in the past by service context	23
Table 3.6a.	Primary caregiver's childhood history of maltreatment by region	23
Table 3.6b.	Primary caregiver's childhood history of maltreatment by service area.	23
Table 3.6c.	Primary caregiver's childhood history of maltreatment by service context	23
Table 3.7a.	Number of times primary caregiver changed residence by region	23
Table 3.7b.	Number of times primary caregiver changed residence by service area.	24
Table 3.7c.	Number of times primary caregiver changed residence by service context	24
Table 3.8a.	Primary caregiver homeless by region	24
Table 3.8b.	Primary caregiver homeless by service area	24
Table 3.8c.	Primary caregiver homeless by service context.	24
Table 3.9a.	Primary caregiver is living with friend or other family member by region	24
Table 3.9b.	Primary caregiver is living with friend or other family member by service area	24

Table 3.9c.	Primary caregiver is living with friend or other family member by service context	24
Table 3.10a.	Primary caregiver has enough income for child(ren)'s basic needs by region	24
Table 3.10b.	Primary caregiver has enough income for child(ren)'s basic needs by service area	25
Table 3.10c.	Primary caregiver has enough income for child(ren)'s basic needs by service context	25
Table 3.11a.	Primary caregiver's money management skills by region	25
Table 3.11b.	Primary caregiver's money management skills by service area	25
Table 3.11c.	Primary caregiver's money management skills by service context	25
Table 3.12a.	Primary caregiver's disposition by region	26
Table 3.12b.	Primary caregiver's disposition by service area	26
Table 3.12c.	Primary caregiver's disposition by service context	26
Table 3.13a.	Diagnosed child disabilities by region	27
Table 3.13b.	Diagnosed child disabilities by service area	27
Table 3.13c.	Diagnosed child disabilities by service context	27
Table 3.14a.	Child substance abuse, behavior and health problems by region	27
Table 3.14b.	Child substance abuse, behavior and health problems by service area	27
Table 3.14c.	Child substance abuse, behavior and health problems by service context	28
Table 3.15a.	Permanency plan(s) for child(ren) in out-of-home care by region	28
Table 3.15b.	Permanency plan(s) for child(ren) in out-of-home care by service area	28
Table 3.16.	Person to whom custody will be transferred by region	28
Table 3.17.	Likelihood that the child(ren) will be returned home with the next six months by region	28
Table 3.18.	Primary caregiver's understanding of the court's return conditions by region	28
Table 3.19a.	Primary caregiver is allowed unsupervised visits by region	29
Table 3.19b.	Primary caregiver is allowed unsupervised visits by service area	29
Table 3.20a.	Primary caregivers' face-to-face contact with children in out-of-home care by region	29

Table 3.20b.	Primary caregivers' face-to-face contact with children in out-of-home care by service area	29
Table 3.21a.	Primary caregivers' phone contact with children in out-of-home care by region	29
Table 3.21b.	Primary caregivers' phone contact with children in out-of-home care by service area	29
Table 3.22a.	Court-approved visits refused by substitute caregiver by region	29
Table 3.22b.	Court-approved visits refused by substitute caregiver by service area.	29
Table 3.23a.	Workers' approach to families by region.	30
Table 3.23b.	Workers' approach to families by service area	30
Table 3.23c.	Workers' approach to families by service context.	30
Table 3.24a.	Workers' use of informal supports by region.	30
Table 3.24b.	Workers' use of informal supports by service area	30
Table 3.24c.	Workers' use of informal supports by service context.	31
Table 3.25a.	Workers' inclusion of family in case planning by region	31
Table 3.25b.	Workers' inclusion of family in case planning by service area.	31
Table 3.25c.	Workers' inclusion of family in case planning by service context	31
Table 3.26a.	Workers' contact with children and caregivers by region	31
Table 3.26b.	Workers' contact with children and caregivers by service area.	32
Table 3.26c.	Workers' contact with children and caregivers by service context	32
Table 3.27a.	Barriers to achieving casework goals by region	32
Table 3.27b.	Barriers to achieving casework goals by service area	32
Table 3.27c.	Barriers to achieving casework goals by service context	33
Table 3.28a.	Services and support by region	33
Table 3.28b.	Services and support by service area.	33
Table 3.28c.	Services and support by service context	33
Table 3.29.	Caregiver services needed and provided	33
Table 3.30.	Caregiver services not provided	34
Table 3.31.	Needed caregiver services provided by service context	35
Table 3.32.	Child(ren) services needed and provided	35
Table 3.33.	Child(ren) services not provided	36
Table 3.34.	Needed child(ren) services provided by service context	36

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to acknowledge the organizations and individuals who assisted with this study. First, administrators and staff of the Washington State Department of Social and Health Services and the Children's Administration have maintained a commitment to the independent evaluation of the implementation of the new practice model. This group includes Robin Arnold-Williams, former Secretary, Washington State Department of Social and Health Services, Cheryl Stephani, former Assistant Secretary, Children's Administration, and Dana Phelps, Evidence Based Practice Manager, Children's Administration.

We are also grateful for the support given to us by members of the Practice Model Implementation Management Team. We especially thank Dana Phelps, Chris Robinson, and Elizabeth Jones for reviewing survey instruments and for sharing their knowledge of the practice model and the plan for its implementation. Elizabeth Jones and Jessica Pierce were instrumental in the collection of survey data from workers in three pilot sites. We are also greatly indebted to the many Children's Administration social workers who contributed their time to complete surveys.

We want to acknowledge the invaluable assistance provided by Nancy Raiha, Senior Research Manager, and staff at the DSHS, Research and Data Analysis Division in developing and carrying-out the web-based worker surveys. Cindy Ellingson and Matthew Orme, Children's Administration Decision Support Unit, were also instrumental to the successful execution of the web-based survey of workers.

We also benefited from the capable assistance of our own staff. Kathy Brennan, Maureen Marcenko, Jane Macy, Jean Kruzich facilitated the administration of surveys at a number of pilot sites across the state. Kristina Bueno and Renee Lamberjack were largely responsible for the entry of survey data collected from workers at training sites.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Washington State Department of Social and Health Services, Children's Administration has undertaken the system-wide implementation of a new casework practice model—Solution Based Casework. By implementing Solution Based Casework, Children's Administration hopes to substantially shift the way child welfare is

practiced in Washington and thereby improve outcomes for the children and families it serves.

To determine the degree to which implementing Solution Based Casework succeeds in improving child and family outcomes, Children's Administration requested Partners for Our Children to conduct an ongoing implementation study and impact evaluation. In the initial phase of the study, Partners for Our Children interviewed key informants involved in designing and directing implementation of Solution Based Casework, conducted focus groups with social workers and supervisors participating in Solution Based Casework training, and observed Solution Based Casework training activities supporting implementation. Partners for Our Children also surveyed social workers and supervisors to obtain baseline assessments on relevant aspects of their work. Randomly selected parents were also interviewed prior to implementation of the practice model.

This report from Partners for Our Children's implementation study and impact evaluation of the new practice model provides an overview of Children's Administration's implementation of Solution Based Casework. It describes the organizational context in which the Solution Based Casework model is being implemented and reviews workers' baseline perceptions of approaches to casework practice and obstacles to helping families who receive services from CA, their job satisfaction and views of working conditions. It also presents findings from social workers' assessments of families served by the CA. Findings from Partners for Our Children's survey of social work supervisors and interviews and focus groups with supervisors, Regional Administrators, and members of the Implementation Team are presented in companion reports.

Key Findings from the Worker Survey

Surveys were administered to case-carrying social workers to obtain baseline measures of their current approaches to casework practice, their perceptions of obstacles to helping families who receive services from CA, their job satisfaction and perceptions of working conditions. The baseline survey also asked social workers to assess a family randomly-selected from their caseload. Worker baseline surveys were completed between April 4 and October 16, 2008. The overall response rate was 96 percent.

Current Casework Practices. Although workers reported that their superiors emphasize the importance of a

strengths-based approach to casework and of involving families in case planning, their attitudes toward the family-centered and strengths-based principles underpinning SBC were generally favorable but inconsistent. Although workers agreed that parents have strengths and resources that can be relied on to solve problems, they were neutral about whether there were exceptions to parents' problem behaviors. Workers were also neutral about whether monitoring families' attendance at services is a good way to assess their progress, but agreed that family skill development is an important aspect of assessing progress.

Obstacles to Helping Families. Workers indicated that the most significant organizational obstacles to helping families were the amount of paperwork to be completed and the size of caseloads. Whereas the quality of relationships with families was viewed by workers as only a slight obstacle, the cooperation shown by families and the number of problems facing families were viewed as moderate obstacles to helping families. The lack of foster homes was perceived to be more of an obstacle to helping families than was the ability of available foster homes to care for children.

Service characteristics that workers identified as obstacles to helping families included the lack of availability of needed services, the effectiveness of available services, the lack of culturally competent services, language and cultural barriers between families and service providers, and families' involvement in multiple service systems.

Job and Organizational Characteristics. Workers held positive views of their superiors' supportiveness. They felt that their immediate superiors supported and helped them with their work, listened to work related problems, and appreciated their work achievements. Workers also reported that their immediate superiors encouraged them to participate in important decisions and helped them to develop their skills.

Knowing what is expected of them at work, having clear goals and objectives for their jobs, being given assignments without adequate resources to complete them, and receiving incompatible requests from two or more people were not particularly problematic for workers. Although they did not feel that their work tasks were too difficult or that they needed more training or experience to perform their work tasks, workers reported often having problems with workload demands including having too much to

do, having work pile up, and having little influence over the amount of work assigned to them.

Organizational Culture and Climate. Workers held favorable views of the cultural and team climate and the psychological safety of their work units. They described the social climate in their units as encouraging, supportive, relaxed, trustful, and comfortable, and said that their co-workers are sensitive to each other's differences and are successful at problem solving. Workers were least positive about their units taking time to develop new ideas. This latter finding could pose an obstacle to the successful implementation of SBC since workers will need time to integrate new ideas and skills taught in SBC training into their daily practice.

Job Satisfaction. Workers were moderately satisfied with their jobs. Workers reported experiencing feelings of personal accomplishment from their work, but felt emotionally drained and used up at the end of the day. Workers were neutral to somewhat in disagreement with statements indicative of organizational and management concern for their well-being and working conditions.

Regional and Service Area Variation.

Compared with workers in other regions, Region 4 workers identified more obstacles to helping families including organizational characteristics, service characteristics (i.e. language and cultural barriers between families and service providers, and the lack of culturally competent services), the lack of foster homes, and the ability of available foster homes to care for children. Region 4 workers also viewed the quality of working relationships with attorneys as more of an obstacle, and relationships with judges and pressure from the court as lesser obstacles, than one or more of the other regions.

Region 5 workers viewed organizational characteristics as slightly larger obstacles to helping families than did workers in other regions. Compared with other regions, Region 5 workers perceived service characteristics (i.e., cultural and language barriers between families and service providers and the lack of culturally competent services) and the lack of available foster homes as being lesser obstacles. Region 5 workers also viewed the quality of working relationships with attorneys and judges as smaller obstacles, and legal vulnerability and pressure from the court as larger obstacles, than one or more of the other regions.

Although Region 2 workers more often than workers in other regions reported having too much to do and

having a less positive team climate, they also said their work was more often challenging in a positive way and that they knew exactly what is expected of them at work. Compared with workers in other regions, Region 2 workers expressed a higher level of agreement that management is interested in the health and well being of the personnel and that workers are well taken care of in the organization. They were less frequently frustrated by their job and agreed that they would be very happy to spend the rest of their career with the organization.

Compared with social workers assigned to other service areas, CFWS workers reported more often having too much to do, being given assignments without adequate resources, and changing their work day because of sudden crises in their work with families. They also more frequently experienced emotional exhaustion.

Key Findings from Social Workers' Assessments of Cases

Findings from social workers' assessments of families randomly-selected from their caseloads, including information on the families' background characteristics, the primary caregivers' parenting skills, their casework approach to the family, barriers to achieving casework goals, and services needed by and provided to the families, are summarized below.

Perpetrators of Maltreatment. Statewide, workers identified the primary caregiver as a perpetrator of maltreatment in three-quarters of the assessed cases. Workers who assessed CFWS cases and cases in which children had been placed in out-of-home care were more likely to report that primary caregivers were perpetrators of maltreatment. Secondary caregivers were identified as perpetrators in 30 percent of the cases.

Caregivers' History. Although nearly three-quarters of caregivers living in the assessed households had had a prior open case with CPS or CFWS, only a small percentage of primary caregivers (14%) had had their parental rights terminated in the past. Larger proportions of caregivers receiving CFWS services and caregivers whose children had been placed were more likely to have had their parental rights terminated in the past.

Four in ten primary caregivers had experienced childhood maltreatment. Larger percentages of caregivers receiving CFWS services and those whose child(ren) were in out-of-home care had been physically abused, sexually abused, neglected, or had witnessed domestic violence.

Stability of Primary Caregivers' Living Arrangements. About one-third of the caregivers had changed residence one or more times in the six months prior to the worker survey. Caregivers receiving CFWS services and those whose children had been placed were more likely to have changed residence, to be homeless, or to be living with friends or relatives.

Primary Caregivers' Money Management Characteristics. Fifty-eight percent of workers statewide indicated that caregivers had enough income to provide for their child(ren)'s basic needs. Caregivers receiving CFWS services and caregivers whose children had been placed were less likely to have enough income to meet their child(ren)'s basic needs. Compared with CPS workers, social workers who assessed CFWS cases were significantly less likely to report that caregivers manage money well.

Caregiver Disposition. Workers' indicated that primary caregivers' parenting behaviors on average were neither adequate nor severely inadequate. Workers assessed caregivers to be least adequate in their capacity for child care, their recognition of family problems, and protecting their children from abuse. Workers assessed caregivers whose children had been placed in out-of-home care to be significantly less adequate than caregivers whose children were not placed. Caregivers in Region 1 were scored lowest and Region 4 caregivers were scored highest by workers' assessing their parenting.

Child(ren)'s Disabilities and Problems. Among children in the assessed families, learning and mental or behavioral health problems were more common than developmental, physical, speech, hearing, or vision disorders. Larger proportions of CFWS cases and cases in which a child had been placed included a child with a diagnosed disorder. Compared with Region 3, Region 6 had larger proportions of cases that included a child with vision and mental or behavioral health difficulties. Workers in Regions 4 and 5 reported larger percentages of cases with children who had developmental and speech disabilities than workers in Region 2. Smaller percentages of cases in Region 1 than in other regions included a child with diagnosed learning, mental or behavioral, or developmental problems.

About one-third of the cases included a child with a serious behavior problem and one in ten cases included a child with a serious health problem. Eleven percent of cases included a child who abused alcohol, and 13 percent included a child who abused drugs. Larger

percentages of CFWS cases and cases in which a child had been placed included a child with a serious behavior or health problem. A smaller percentage of cases in Region 1 than in other regions included a child with a behavior problem. Region 5 had a smaller percentage of cases that included a child with a serious health problem than Region 6.

Permanency Plans for Child(ren) in Out-of-Home Care. Although, among children placed in out-of-home care, the most common permanency plan was to return custody to the primary caregiver, workers reported that caregivers whose children had been placed did not have a very good understanding of the court's return conditions. Workers also were not generally optimistic that the child(ren) would be returned home within the next six months.

About one-quarter of children placed in out-of-home care had a permanency plan of adoption. Larger percentages of workers in Regions 1 and 3 than in Region 6 reported that the permanency plan was adoption. Region 1 workers were more likely than workers in Regions 3 and 5 to report that no plan had been established.

Primary Caregivers' Contact with Child(ren) Placed in Out-of-Home Care. Nearly two-thirds of the caregivers whose children had been placed had face-to-face contact, and 40 percent had face-to-face contact at least four times in the month prior to the survey. One-third of the caregivers had had no contact with their children. Region 5 workers were more likely than Region 1 workers to report that caregivers had had no face-to-face contact with their child(ren).

Workers' Casework Approach. Overall, workers reported taking a strengths-based, solution-focused approach to working with the assessed families. Similarly, workers held neutral to somewhat positive views of the supportiveness of caregivers' relatives and friends and the helpfulness of including them in case planning. Workers who assessed CFWS cases and cases in which a child was in out-of-home care were less likely to have used strengths-based, solution-focused practices. Workers who assessed cases in which a child was in out-of-home care were less likely to report that caregivers had helpful informal supports.

Workers' Inclusion of Family in Case Planning. Statewide, workers indicated that primary caregivers had played a central role in case planning and were involved in creating service plans. Caregivers receiving CFWS

services and those whose child(ren) had been placed were less likely to have been involved in service planning.

Workers' Contact with Caregivers and Children. As part of the family assessment, workers estimated how much contact they had with the child(ren) and the primary and substitute caregivers in the three months prior to the survey. Workers indicated that on average, they had had face-to-face contact with primary caregivers twice and phone contact between two and three times. Workers also had face-to-face contact with the child(ren) two to three times. Workers reported having slightly less face-to-face contact than phone contact with substitute caregivers, but indicated that they had had some form of contact with them about twice in the three month period.

Workers who assessed CFWS cases reported having more frequent contact with primary caregivers, children, and substitute caregivers. Region 1 workers had more face-to-face contact with primary caregivers than did workers in Regions 4 and 5. Social workers reported having about the same amount of face-to-face and phone contact with primary caregivers regardless of whether or not a child had been placed in out-of-home care. However, workers who assessed cases in which a child had been placed reported having more face-to-face contact with the child(ren) and more face-to-face and phone contact with the child(ren)'s substitute caregiver.

Barriers to Achieving Casework Goals. Statewide, workers indicated that there were only slight to moderate barriers to achieving casework goals. Workers perceived primary caregivers' cooperation and the number of different problems facing families to be the most substantial barriers. Compared with workers in Regions 5 and 6, Region 4 workers perceived cultural differences between families and service providers to be a slightly larger barrier to achieving goals.

CFWS workers reported a greater number of slight to moderate barriers than did workers who assessed CPS, FVS, or FRS cases. In particular, the cooperation shown by the primary caregiver and the number of different problems facing the family were reported to be larger barriers in CFWS cases. Workers perceived caregivers' cooperation and the number of problems facing the family to be larger barriers to achieving goals for cases in which a child had been placed.

Access to Services and Informal Support. Workers assessed the availability and accessibility of services for the family and the adequacy of the caregivers' informal

support system. Statewide, workers reported that the availability and accessibility of services were marginal to adequate. Caregivers' informal support systems were characterized as consisting primarily of their family and friends. Caregivers whose children had been placed in out-of-home care were reported to be significantly less supported.

Caregiver Services. Social workers reported what services they thought caregivers needed in order for their child(ren) to be able to live safely in the caregiver's home. They also reported what services they thought caregivers believed were needed and what services were provided. The services that the largest percentages of workers reported that they and the caregiver believed were needed (i.e., social emotional support, basic parenting assistance, mental health services, and family counseling), along with substance abuse services, were also the services provided to the most caregivers. Also, workers' reports suggest that caregivers were more likely to receive a service if the caregiver thought it was needed.

Three-quarters to two-thirds of the caregivers who needed the following services received them: help with transportation, day care, substance abuse services, medical services, social and emotional support, basic parenting assistance, education planning for child(ren), help with basic food and clothing, mental health services, and school attendance or performance services. Less than half of the caregivers received needed respite care, family conflict resolution, anger management services, nurturing and socialization services, help with education or GED, and help with employment.

Workers most often cited *family refused* as the reason needed services were not provided. Depending on the service, workers reported that between 8 and 23 percent of families had refused a needed service. The largest percentages of families had refused domestic violence services, help with employment, anger management services, and help with education or GED.

Compared with caregivers whose children were not placed in out-of-home care, smaller percentages of caregivers whose children were placed received the following needed services: basic home management, social and emotional support, family counseling, mental health services, medical services, domestic violence services, family conflict resolution, community activities, help with employment, help with basic food and clothing, help with financial assistance, and help with education or a GED.

Child Services. Social workers also reported the services they thought the caregiver's child(ren) needed in order to be able to live safely in the caregiver's home and what services they thought any family member believed were needed. Half of the workers reported that the children needed mental health services and about one-third reported that children needed medical services, school attendance assistance, and community activities. Nearly 20 percent of the workers indicated that developmental disabilities and alcohol or drug abuse services were needed. Smaller percentages of workers reported that family members thought that these services were needed. Services were more likely to have been provided if family members thought they were needed.

If a needed service had not been provided, the worker identified the reason the service was not provided. Roughly two-thirds or more of the families whose children needed a service received the service. Compared with other needed services, a smaller proportion of children, about two-thirds, who were thought to need alcohol or drug abuse services received them. *Family refused* service was given as the most common reason children did not receive services. Larger percentages of cases in which a child had been placed received each of the services listed except services to address developmental disabilities.

Next Steps

Children's Administration is to be commended for carefully monitoring and rigorously evaluating its implementation of Solution Based Casework. Partners for Our Children will continue to monitor the next phase of the implementation effort and will assess its impact on the outcomes of children and families. In addition to observing office level training of workers, conducting focus groups with trainees, and interviewing key informants, a second wave of supervisor and worker survey data will be collected. The evaluation will also make use of administrative records to assess child maltreatment, the kinds and quantity of services provided,

and child and family outcomes including children's entry to out-of-home care, children's length of stay in out-of-home care, children's reunification with their families, and the post-reunification re-entry of children to out-of-home care.

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Washington State Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS), Children’s Administration (CA) has undertaken the system-wide implementation of a new casework practice model—Solution Based Casework (SBC). The SBC model integrates family development and prevention theory with strengths-based social work practice as an approach to family assessment, case planning, and case management in the provision of child welfare services (Christensen, Todahl, and Barrett, 1999). Based on this practice paradigm, the National Resource Center on Child Welfare Training and Evaluation (NRC-CWTE) at the Kent School of Social Work, University of Louisville, has developed a series of modules to train child welfare workers in the casework model and a set of practice skills with which to approach their work with families. Initial case review studies evaluating the implementation of SBC in Kentucky suggest that the model may effectively promote the worker-client relationship and goal achievement for complex child welfare cases (Antel, Barbee, Christensen, and Martin, 2008).

CA believes that implementation of SBC represents a substantial shift in the way child welfare is practiced in Washington. By implementing SBC, CA hopes to improve child welfare practice in the following ways.

- Promote family engagement and reduce adversarial casework.
- Find solutions rather than list problems.
- Promote collaborative relationships.
- Ensure the family culture is understood and respected.
- Ensure case planning is “family-owned” as well as “worker-owned”.
- Emphasize skill acquisition and not just service completion.

These changes in child welfare practice are expected to result in better outcomes for children and families served by the CA.

Implementing SBC statewide is an enormous undertaking and requires a substantial investment of state resources. The magnitude and import of this effort calls for careful monitoring and rigorous evaluation. Hence, CA requested

Partners for Our Children (POC) to conduct an ongoing implementation study and impact evaluation to determine the degree to which implementing SBC results in improved outcomes for children and families.

This report from POC’s implementation study and impact evaluation of CA’s new practice model provides an overview of CA’s implementation of Solution Based Casework. In addition to describing the organizational context in which the SBC model is being implemented, this report reviews social workers’ perceptions of current approaches to casework practice and obstacles to helping families who receive services from CA, and their job satisfaction and working conditions. It also presents findings from social workers’ assessments of families served by the CA.

The report begins with a brief description of the components of CA’s implementation strategy and POC’s study design and methods. We then present findings from a baseline survey of social workers. Findings from POC’s baseline survey of social work supervisors, focus groups with supervisors and social workers, and interviews with Regional Administrators and members of the Implementation Team are presented in companion reports.

Components of the Implementation Strategy

Implementation Team. The Practice Model Implementation Team is responsible for developing and overseeing the Solution Based Casework implementation plan which includes organizational readiness, communication, training, quality assurance, and evaluation. The Implementation Team is comprised of CA’s clinical director, implementation manager, practice and quality manager, SBC lead coach, administrative support, a Division of Licensing Resources representative, and consultants from Rhodes Consulting, Boeing, and Casey Family Programs. Boeing donated a consultant’s time to advise CA on organizational readiness for the system-wide implementation of SBC. Casey Family Programs supports CA’s SBC coaches including their training which was provided by the model’s developers.

The Implementation Team worked closely with POC to design the practice model evaluation and to develop training observation protocols, key informant and focus group interview guides, and worker and supervisor surveys.

Solution Based Casework Coaches. Twelve SBC coaches were hired to train and coach CA supervisors and workers in Solution Based Casework principles and skills. Most of the coaches are experienced child welfare workers but had not had previous experience as trainers of Solution Based Casework. One exception is the lead coach who was recruited from another state that had implemented SBC.

All twelve coaches attended a five-day training in Solution Based Casework provided by Dr. Dana Christensen at the Kent School of Social Work, University of Louisville. Coaches also received Undoing Racism, Solution-Focused Management, and Motivational Interviewing training and visited other states that have implemented Solution Based Casework.

In addition to the initial five-day training in SBC, CA retained the services of Dr. Christensen for ongoing phone and in-person consultation for coaches. To hone their training skills, coaches were also observed by and received feedback from the lead coach.

SBC coaches are responsible for teaching the three-day Intensive SBC curriculum to supervisors and social workers and for providing post-training SBC coaching. Coaches work in teams of three to cover the three-day SBC curriculum. Each coach provides post-training coaching in SBC skills to an assigned group of trainees.

Solution-Focused Management. In addition to the SBC training provided to workers and supervisors, CA's system-wide implementation plan includes Solution-Focused Management (SFM) training of all Executive Staff, Office Chiefs, Division Supervisors and Managers, Headquarters Program Managers, Deputy Regional Administrators, Area Administrators, Regional Business Managers, Regional Implementers, and Regional Program Managers. SFM shares many principles and practice techniques with SBC but is specifically designed for managers. SFM offered a two-day introductory training and two-follow up workshops. Post-training, trainees were encouraged to form SFM peer consultation groups. The SFM two-day training began in early February and ended in late April 2008. The two workshops were offered between mid-April and late August 2008. SFM training was provided by Dr. Stephen Langer & Associates of Northwest Brief Therapy Training Center, Olympia, Washington.

Solution-Based Curriculum. CA adopted a SBC training curriculum designed by Dr. Dana Christensen and his colleagues at the Kent School of Social Work, University

of Louisville, and, in consultation with Dr. Christensen, adapted it to be specific to CA's casework context. The adapted SBC curriculum is comprised of four units: foundational concepts, assessment, case planning, and practice and review. The foundational concepts unit introduces the theoretical frameworks underpinning SBC—family development, solution-focused interviewing, and relapse prevention—and presents the evidence supporting the practice model. The remaining units elaborate on each of the three components of SBC's framework and introduce practice techniques which operationalize the practice principles.

The assessment unit places the assessment process in the context of a family's stage of development in the family life cycle and focuses on helping the family identify the everyday life task it is trying to accomplish. Thus, attention is shifted away from simply listing family problems to seeking solutions for achieving family goals. This unit also introduces solution-focused interviewing skills to engage family members in the assessment process. Recognizing family routines, the difference between intentions and actions, threats of discouragement, and building consensus are emphasized as important components of a good assessment.

Unit three of the curriculum introduces case planning using SBC principles and practice skills. SBC practice shifts ownership of the case plan from the worker to co-ownership by the family and the worker. An SBC case plan would not be just a list of services the worker believes the family needs but would include the goals the family wants to achieve. Thus, the plan is goal rather than service oriented. When the focus is on achieving specific measurable goals, the worker is able to document and celebrate change made by the family. SBC case plans also include a family safety plan designed to help families identify triggering events and early warning signs and develop effective coping strategies to avoid relapse.

Over the course of the three-day training, many opportunities are provided for trainees to apply SBC practice skills through role playing and small group exercises. Case vignettes developed by the CA clinical director and SBC coaches in consultation with Dr. Christensen were used in training exercises. Some of the vignettes involve workers assessing a family and developing a case plan. Other scenarios involve a supervisor consulting with a social worker.

The SBC three-day intensive training was offered to supervisors in all six CA regions between February and late July

2008 and to workers in three pilot sites between April and late July 2008. Workers not trained at selected pilot sites will be trained between April and October 2009.

Study Design and Methods

Overall Design. The overall goal of the practice model evaluation is to assess its impact on CA policies, organizational structures and procedures, supervisor and social worker attitudes and practices, the experiences of CA clients, and outcomes for children and families served by the CA.

To evaluate the implementation of the SBC practice model, POC is using a pretest-posttest non-experimental, mixed qualitative and quantitative methodological approach. In the initial phases, POC interviewed key informants involved in designing and directing implementation of SBC, conducted focus groups with social workers and supervisors participating in SBC training, and observed SBC training activities supporting implementation. To obtain baseline assessments on several aspects of CA's work, POC also surveyed social workers, supervisors, and randomly selected parents served by the CA. This report describes findings from the baseline survey of and focus groups with social workers. Results from the baseline parent and supervisor surveys are presented in separate reports.

A core rationale underlying the SBC model is that a family-centered and strengths-based approach to case-work practice will enhance parent engagement in child welfare services and thereby improve child and family outcomes. Thus, our pre and post implementation measures assess changes in:

- worker attitudes, beliefs, and practices (e.g., greater faith in parents' willingness and ability to identify what needs to be done to improve the safety and well-being of their children; increased efforts by caseworkers to engage extended family members and other family supports in case planning),
- parental perceptions of the extent to which social workers assess for parent strengths, seek parental input, actively engage parents in the planning process, and respect parents' cultural and ethnic background,
- family understanding and ownership of case plan goals and access to parent identified services,
- outcomes for children and families including reduction in the length of time children spend in out-of-home care; reduction in re-referrals for and

re-occurrence of child abuse and neglect; greater rates of reunification and reduction in re-entries of children after return home to their families.

In later phases, the evaluation will make use of DSHS administrative records to assess child maltreatment, the kinds and quantity of services provided, and child and family outcomes. Outcomes that will be examined include children's entry to out-of-home care, children's length of stay in out-of-home care, children's reunification with their families, and the post-reunification re-entry of children to out-of-home care. Methods used to collect the data presented in this report are described in greater detail below.

Social worker surveys. Surveys were administered to case-carrying social workers to obtain baseline measures of their current approaches to casework practice, their perceptions of obstacles to helping families who receive services from CA, their job satisfaction and perceptions of working conditions. The baseline survey also asked social workers to assess a family randomly-selected from their caseload.¹

The criteria for selecting cases for workers to assess were as follows. For Child and Family Welfare Services (CFWS) cases, priority was given to cases assigned to the worker for at least 30 days and no more than 365 days, at least one child had been placed in out-of-home care for a minimum of 30 days and no child had been placed for more than 365 days. If none of the worker's cases met the priority criteria, a case was selected that had been assigned to the worker for a least eight days but not longer than two years and at least one child had been placed for eight days but not more than two years.

Cases selected for Family Voluntary Services (FVS), Child Protective Services (CPS), and Family Reconciliation Services (FRS) workers had been assigned for a minimum of 30 and a maximum of 365 days, at least one child had been placed for a minimum of 30 days and no child had been placed for more than 365 days, no child had been placed, or no child had been directly placed and no other children related to the case had been placed over 365 days.

¹ Survey questions were drawn from several sources including Edmondson's psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams, Kivimaki's team climate inventory, Lindstrom's psychological and social factors at work, Maslach's burnout inventory, Moynihan's job satisfaction and turnover intention, Courtney's evaluation of safety services in Milwaukee County, and Daro's evaluation of Community Partnerships for Children.

Pilot site workers completed paper surveys that were either mailed to them before the training or that were administered at the pilot site. Pilot site workers returned their completed survey at the pilot site by the end of the third day of SBC training or mailed it to POC. Non-pilot site workers whose offices will be trained beginning April 2009 completed a web-based survey that was developed and administered by the DSHS Division of Research and Data Analysis. Worker baseline surveys were completed between April 4 and October 16, 2008. The overall response rate was 96 percent.²

CHAPTER 2

Social Workers' Baseline Survey Responses

This section of the report describes social workers' baseline perceptions of approaches to casework practice (Tables 1a – 7b), obstacles to helping families who receive services from CA (Tables 8a – 12b), and their job satisfaction and perceptions of working conditions (Tables 13a – 30b). For each survey question, we report the mean response for social workers statewide, within each of CA's six regions, and within FVS, FRS, CFWS, CPS, and workers assigned to multiple service areas. We report between category differences that were significant at the $p \leq .05$ level and $\geq .30$ standard deviations different from the statewide mean.³ In addition to reporting the mean response for individual survey items, where appropriate, we also report workers' mean score on computed scales.^{4,5}

² Regional response rates were: Region 1 ninety-four percent, Region 2 ninety-six percent, Region 3 ninety-five percent, Region 4 ninety-six percent, Region 5 ninety-six percent, and Region 6 ninety-eight percent.

³ Significance tests indicate only that a difference is greater than zero but not by how much. An effect size (e.g., $\geq .30$ standard deviations) is a standardized measure of how large a difference is from zero and allows comparisons of different variables and different scales of measurement.

⁴ The significance level was adjusted for the number of pairwise comparisons for each item but not for the overall number of items tested. This means that some of the significant findings may be an artifact of the large number of tests conducted (i.e., a result of chance.)

⁵ Scales were computed if Cronbach's alpha for a set of items was $\geq .70$. Cronbach's alpha is a measure of internal reliability of the items in an index. It ranges from zero to one and indicates how much the items in an index are measuring the same thing. A cutoff of $.70$ indicates that the scales are at least moderately reliable.

One-thousand four-hundred and forty-eight workers completed the worker survey. These respondents worked in Family Voluntary Services (FVS) (13%), Child and Family Welfare Services (CFWS) (48%), Family Reconciliation Services (FRS) (7%), Child Protective Services (CPS) (26%), Division of Licensing Resources (DLR) (7%), Intake (7%), and Adoption (10%). Seventeen percent of the workers worked in Region 1, 13 percent in Region 2, 18 percent in Region 3, 20 percent in Region 4, 14 percent in Region 5, and 18 percent in Region 6. Workers had been in their current positions at CA about three years. Seventy-six percent of the workers were female and 22 percent were male. Fourteen percent of the workers held a master's degree in social work and 32 percent held a master's degree in another field. Fifty-one percent of respondents held a bachelor's degree—35 percent in social work and 16 percent in another field. On average, the workers were 40 years old. Seventy-three percent of the workers identified themselves as Caucasian, seven percent were African-American, six percent were American Indian, 11 percent were Hispanic, and five percent were Asian American or Pacific Islander. Nine-hundred and sixty-nine workers completed the section of the worker survey in which they assessed a family that was randomly selected from their caseload.

Current Casework Practices

Table 2.1a. Approach to Families by Region^a

	1 (n=250) ^b	2 (n=186)	3 (n=263)	4 (n=290)	5 (n=205)	6 (n=254)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total	
3b. Families served often have more problems than strengths	2.6	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.5	2.4	2.5	0.91	1400
3c. Emphasizing family strengths draws attention from protecting children	1.9	1.8	1.8	1.9	1.9	1.7	1.8	0.87	1397
3e. All parents have strengths and resources they can use to solve problems	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.5	0.74	1410
3f. Even abusive and neglectful parents sometimes do a good job parenting	3.2	3.3	3.2	3.3	3.2	3.3	3.2	0.78	1410
3h. There is always an exception to a parent's pattern of problem behavior	3.1	3.0	3.0	3.1	3.0	3.2	3.1	0.77	1304

^aScale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=somewhat disagree, 3=somewhat agree, 4=strongly agree

^bActual regional *ns* may vary due to missing data.

- Social workers *somewhat agreed* about the statements that even abusive and neglectful parents sometimes do a good job parenting (3f) and there is always an exception to a parent's pattern of problem behavior (3h).
- Workers somewhat-to-strongly agreed with the statement that all parents have strengths and resources to solve problems (3e).

- They were neutral with the statement that families have more problems than strengths (3b), and *some-what disagreed* with the statement that emphasizing family strengths draws attention from protecting children (3c).

There were no significant between-region or between-service area differences in workers' responses to these items.

Table 2.1b. Approach to Families by Service Area^a

	FVS (n=97) ^b	CFWS (n=602)	FRS (n=39)	CPS (n=290)	Multiple (n=121)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
3b. Families served often have many more problems than strengths	2.4	2.5	2.6	2.5	2.4	2.5	0.91	1113
3c. Emphasizing family strengths draws attention away from efforts to protect children	1.8	1.8	2.1	1.9	1.8	1.9	0.87	1116
3e. All parents have strengths and resources they can use to solve problems	3.4	3.6	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.5	0.73	1121
3f. Even abusive and neglectful parents sometimes do a good job parenting	3.3	3.3	2.9	3.2	3.2	3.3	0.77	1123
3h. There is always an exception to a parent's pattern of problem behavior	3.1	3.1	2.9	3.1	3.2	3.1	0.77	1034

^aScale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=somewhat disagree, 3=somewhat agree, 4=strongly agree
^bActual regional ns may vary due to missing data.

Table 2.2a. Use of Informal Supports by Region^a

	1 (n=250) ^b	2 (n=186)	3 (n=263)	4 (n=290)	5 (n=205)	6 (n=254)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
3o. Including the relatives and friends of parents in case planning is not particularly helpful for most families	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.9	1.8	1.8	1.8	0.85	1393
3p. Most families have relatives or friends who are supportive and helpful to them	3.2	3.4 ^c	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.2	3.3	0.66	1408
3q. Family and friends' support can be as effective as professional services in finding solutions to parenting problems	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.3	3.3	3.4	0.70	1401

^aScale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=somewhat disagree, 3=somewhat agree, 4=strongly agree
^bActual regional ns may vary due to missing data.
^cSig. diff. from Regions 1, 5 and 6 $p < .05$

Social workers *somewhat disagreed* that including informal supports in case planning is not helpful (3o). They held positive views towards the statements that families have relatives or friends that are supportive (3p) and family and friends can be effective parenting supports (3q). Compared with Regions 1, 5 and 6, Region 2 workers were in slightly more agreement

with the statement that families have supportive families or friends. Workers assigned to multiple service areas disagreed to a greater extent than FRS workers that including relatives and friends in case planning is not helpful (3o).

Table 2.2b. Use of Informal Supports by Service Area^a

	FVS (n=97) ^b	CFWS (n=602)	FRS (n=39)	CPS (n=290)	Multiple (n=121)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
3o. Including the relatives and friends of parents in case planning is not particularly helpful for most families	1.8	1.8	2.2 ^c	1.9	1.7	1.8	0.84	1115
3p. Most families have relatives or friends who are supportive and helpful to them	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.4	3.2	0.66	1123
3q. Family and friends' support can be as effective as professional services in finding solutions to parenting problems	3.4	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	0.70	1118

^aScale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=somewhat disagree, 3=somewhat agree, 4=strongly agree
^bActual regional ns may vary due to missing data.
^cSig. diff. from Multiple Service Areas $p < .05$

Table 2.3a. Perception of Superior's Support by Region^a

My immediate superior emphasizes the importance of . . .	1 (n=250) ^b	2 (n=186)	3 (n=263)	4 (n=290)	5 (n=205)	6 (n=254)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
3d. assessing family strengths	3.2	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	0.80	1358
3l. involving families in case planning and decisions	3.5	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	0.66	1352
Perception of superior's support scale ^c	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.4	0.66	1313

^aScale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=somewhat disagree, 3=somewhat agree, 4=strongly agree
^bActual regional ns may vary due to missing data.
^cCronbach's alpha = .78

Social workers *somewhat-to-strongly agreed* with statements that superiors emphasize the importance of family strengths (3d) and involving families in case planning (3l). There were no between-region differences. CFWS workers agreed slightly more than workers assigned to multiple service areas that their supervisor emphasizes the importance of assessing family strengths (3d).

Table 2.3b. Perception of Superior's Support Service Area^a

My immediate superior emphasizes the importance of . . .	FVS (n=97) ^b	CFWS (n=602)	FRS (n=39)	CPS (n=290)	Multiple (n=121)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
3d. assessing family strengths	3.4	3.4 ^c	3.4	3.2	3.1	3.3	0.79	1087
3l. involving families in case planning and decisions	3.7	3.6	3.7	3.5	3.5	3.6	0.66	1109
Perception of superior's support scale ^d	3.5	3.5	3.6	3.4	3.3	3.5	0.66	1076

^aScale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=somewhat disagree, 3=somewhat agree, 4=strongly agree
^bActual regional ns may vary due to missing data.
^cSig. diff. from Multiple Service Areas $p < .05$
^dCronbach's alpha = .78

Table 2.4a. Obstacles to New Approaches by Region^a

It is difficult to use new approaches to helping families because . . .	1 (n=250) ^b	2 (n=186)	3 (n=263)	4 (n=290)	5 (n=205)	6 (n=254)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
3l. the organizational support is not provided	2.8	2.9	3.1 ^c	3.0	2.9	2.8	2.9	0.81	1306
3u. of all my other responsibilities	2.6	2.6	2.8	2.7	2.6	2.6	2.6	0.95	1346
3v. media or political pressure on Children's Administration	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.4	2.4	2.2	2.3	0.94	1259
Obstacles to new approaches scale ^d	2.6	2.6	2.7	2.7	2.6	2.5	2.6	0.73	1336

^aScale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=somewhat disagree, 3=somewhat agree, 4=strongly agree
^bActual regional ns may vary due to missing data.
^cSig. diff. from Regions 1 and 6 $p < .05$
^dCronbach's alpha = .71

Workers were asked a set of questions about possible obstacles to using new approaches to helping families.

Overall, they were neutral about the obstacles listed. Regions 1 and 6 workers disagreed slightly more than workers in Region 3 that the organization does not provide support for using new approaches (3t). CFWS and CPS workers expressed more concern about lack of organizational support (3t) than did workers assigned to multiple service areas. FVS workers disagreed more than CFWS that other responsibilities are an obstacle to using new approaches to help families (3u).

Table 2.4b. Obstacles to New Approaches by Service Area^a

It is difficult to use new approaches to helping families because . . .	FVS (n=97) ^b	CFWS (n=602)	FRS (n=39)	CPS (n=290)	Multiple (n=121)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
3t. the organizational support is not provided	2.8	3.0 ^c	2.9	3.0 ^c	2.7	2.9	0.81	1047
3u. of all my other responsibilities	2.5 ^d	2.8	2.3	2.6	2.5	2.7	0.95	1083
3v. media or political pressure on Children's Administration	2.2	2.4	2.2	2.3	2.2	2.3	0.94	1007
Obstacles to new approaches scale ^e	2.5	2.7	2.4	2.6	2.5	2.7	0.72	1070

^aScale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=somewhat disagree, 3=somewhat agree, 4=strongly agree

^bActual regional ns may vary due to missing data.

^cSig. diff. from Multiple Service Areas $p < .05$

^dSig. diff. from CFWS $p < .05$

^eCronbach's alpha = .71

Table 2.5a. Inclusion of Families in Case Planning by Region^a

	1 (n=250) ^b	2 (n=186)	3 (n=263)	4 (n=290)	5 (n=205)	6 (n=254)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
3m. Parents are less resistant when they have input in the case plan and services	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.5	3.7	3.6	0.60	1409
3n. Parents are more motivated to change when they define problem	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.5	0.64	1396
Inclusion of families in case planning scale ^e	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.6	3.5	0.55	1385

^aScale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=somewhat disagree, 3=somewhat agree, 4=strongly agree

^bActual regional ns may vary due to missing data.

^eCronbach's alpha = .73

Social workers *somewhat-to-strongly agreed* that inclusion of families in case planning results in less resistance (3m) and increases motivation to change (3n). There were no significant between-region or between service area differences in these responses.

Table 2.5b. Inclusion of Families in Case Planning by Service Area^a

	FVS (n=97) ^b	CFWS (n=602)	FRS (n=39)	CPS (n=290)	Multiple (n=121)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
3m. Parents are less resistant when they have input in the case plan and services	3.7	3.6	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.6	0.61	1129
3n. Parents are more motivated to change when they define the problem	3.6	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	0.63	1116
Inclusion of families in case planning ^c	3.7	3.5	3.6	3.5	3.6	3.5	0.55	1110

^aScale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=somewhat disagree, 3=somewhat agree, 4=strongly agree

^bActual regional ns may vary due to missing data.

^cCronbach's alpha = .73

Table 2.6a. Monitoring Family Progress by Region^a

	1 (n=250) ^b	2 (n=186)	3 (n=263)	4 (n=290)	5 (n=205)	6 (n=254)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
3r. Monitoring families' attendance at services is a good way to assess their progress	2.6 ^c	2.8	2.8	2.9	2.8	2.8	2.8	0.88	1403
3s. Assessing families' skill development is important to assessing their progress	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.6	0.58	1398

^aScale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=somewhat disagree, 3=somewhat agree, 4=strongly agree

^bActual regional ns may vary due to missing data.

^cSig. diff. from Region 4 $p < .05$

Whereas workers were neutral about the statement that monitoring families' attendance at services is a good way to assess their progress (3r), they *somewhat-to-strongly agreed* that family skill development is an important aspect of assessing family progress (3s). Region 1 workers disagreed more than Region 4 workers that service attendance is a good way to monitor progress (3r). There were no between-service area differences in these responses.

Table 2.6b. Monitoring Family Progress by Service Area^a

	FVS (n=97) ^b	CFWS (n=602)	FRS (n=39)	CPS (n=290)	Multiple (n=121)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
3r. Monitoring families' attendance at services is a good way to assess their progress	2.7	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.8	2.8	0.88	1124
3s. Assessing families' skill development is important to assessing their progress	3.6	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.6	3.6	0.57	1114

^aScale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=somewhat disagree, 3=somewhat agree, 4=strongly agree

^bActual regional ns may vary due to missing data.

Table 2.7a. Family Assessment Procedure by Region^a

A clear and useful procedure is in place to assess . . .	1 (n=250) ^b	2 (n=186)	3 (n=263)	4 (n=290)	5 (n=205)	6 (n=254)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
4a. parental substance abuse	3.3	3.5	3.4	3.2 ^c	3.6	3.5	3.4	1.13	1356
4b. parental mental health	3.0	3.1	2.8	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	1.19	1358
4c. risk of child maltreatment	3.6	3.7	3.5	3.6	3.7	3.7	3.6	1.06	1372
4d. domestic violence	2.8	2.9	3.0	3.0	2.9	2.9	2.9	1.16	1353
4e. parenting skills	3.1	3.1	3.0	2.9	3.0	3.1	3.0	1.14	1364
4f. families' basic needs as they pertain to child safety	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.6	3.4	1.08	1369
Family assessment procedures scale ^d	3.2	3.3	3.2	3.2	3.3	3.3	3.2	0.88	1355

^aScale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=somewhat disagree, 3=neutral, 4=somewhat agree, 5=strongly agree

^bActual regional ns may vary due to missing data.

^cSig. diff. from Region 5 $p < .05$

^dCronbach's alpha = .88

Social workers were neutral to somewhat in agreement that clear and useful procedures are in place to assess parental substance abuse, parental mental health, risk of child maltreatment, domestic violence, parenting skills, and families' basic needs as they pertain to child safety. Workers were more confident that procedures for assessing risk of child maltreatment (4c) than domestic violence are clear and useful (4d). Region 5 workers agreed somewhat more than Region 4 workers that there are clear procedures to assess parental substance abuse. There were no significant between-service area differences in workers' responses to these items.

Table 2.7b. Family Assessment Procedure by Service Area^a

A clear and useful procedure is in place to assess . . .	FVS (n=97) ^b	CFWS (n=602)	FRS (n=39)	CPS (n=290)	Multiple (n=121)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
4a. parental substance abuse	3.5	3.5	3.1	3.4	3.3	3.4	1.14	1123
4b. parental mental health	2.9	3.1	2.8	2.8	2.9	3.0	1.20	1120
4c. risk of child maltreatment	3.7	3.7	3.4	3.6	3.7	3.7	1.07	1118
4d. domestic violence	2.9	3.1	2.9	2.8	2.8	2.9	1.18	1115
4e. parenting skills	3.1	3.2	2.7	2.9	2.9	3.0	1.16	1121
4f. assessing families' basic needs as they pertain to child safety	3.5	3.4	3.2	3.4	3.4	3.4	1.09	1119
Family assessment procedure scale ^c	3.3	3.3	3.0	3.1	3.2	3.2	0.90	1119

^aScale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=somewhat disagree, 3=neutral, 4=somewhat agree, 5=strongly agree
^bActual regional *ns* may vary due to missing data.
^cCronbach's alpha = .88

Obstacles to Helping Families

Table 2.8a. Organizational Characteristics by Region^a

	1 (n=250) ^b	2 (n=186)	3 (n=263)	4 (n=290)	5 (n=205)	6 (n=254)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
5a. The amount of paperwork/forms to be completed	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.5	0.72	1427
5b. Size of caseloads	3.5	3.5	3.7 ^e	3.5	3.5	3.3	3.5	0.78	1425
5c. Overall staff morale	3.0 ^d	2.7 ^e	3.0	3.0 ^e	3.1 ^e	2.7	2.9	0.98	1422
5d. The number of organizational rules	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.0	3.1	0.89	1416
5h. The quality of working relationships with supervisory staff	1.9	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.1	1.8	2.0	0.98	1422
5i. Quality of working relationships with managerial staff	2.3	2.2	2.2	2.4	2.4	2.1	2.3	1.03	1417
5j. Organizational concerns with legal vulnerability	2.6 ^f	2.7	2.7	2.8	2.9 ^e	2.5	2.7	0.91	1415
5n. Overall quality of organizational environment where I work	2.5 ^e	2.2 ^f	2.5 ^e	2.5 ^e	2.6 ^e	2.2	2.4	0.95	1419
Organizational characteristics scale ^g	2.8 ^e	2.7	2.8 ^e	2.8 ^e	2.9 ^e	2.6	2.8	0.60	1423

^aScale: 1=no obstacle at all, 2=slight obstacle, 3=moderate obstacle, 4=significant obstacle
^bActual regional *ns* may vary due to missing data.
^cSig. diff. from Region 6 *p* <.05
^dSig. diff. from Regions 2 and 6 *p* <.05
^eSig. diff. from Regions 4 and 5 *p* <.05
^fSig. diff. from Region 5 *p* <.05
^gCronbach's alpha = .82

Social workers were asked a series of questions about organizational characteristics that might be an obstacle to helping families. Workers on average felt that organizational characteristics were *slight to moderate obstacles*. They indicated that the amount of paperwork to be completed (5a) and the size of caseloads (5b) were the most significant obstacles, and that the quality of supervisory relationships (5h) was the least significant obstacle.

- Region 2 workers considered staff morale (5c) to be less of an obstacle than workers in Regions 1, 4 and 5.
- Region 5 workers considered concerns with legal vulnerability (5j) to be more of an obstacle than Region 1 workers, and quality of the organizational environment (5n) to be more of an obstacle than Region 2 workers.

- Overall, Region 6 workers considered organizational characteristic to be less of an obstacle than workers in Regions 1, 3, 4 and 5.

CPS workers reported the amount of paperwork (5a) and the size of caseloads (5b) to be less significant obstacles than CFWS workers. CPS workers also indicated that the number of organizational rules (5d) to be a less significant obstacle than workers assigned to multiple service areas.

Table 2.8b. Organizational Characteristics by Service Area^a

	FVS (n=97) ^b	CFWS (n=602)	FRS (n=39)	CPS (n=290)	Multiple (n=121)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
5a. The amount of paperwork/forms to be completed	3.4	3.6 ^c	3.3	3.3	3.4	3.5	0.70	1137
5b. Size of caseloads	3.5	3.6 ^c	3.4	3.3	3.4	3.5	0.77	1135
5c. Overall staff morale	2.9	2.9	3.2	2.9	2.9	2.9	1.00	1133
5d. Number of organizational rules	3.1	3.1	3.1	2.9 ^d	3.3	3.1	0.89	1131
5h. The quality of working relationships with supervisory staff	1.8	1.9	2.1	2.0	2.0	2.0	0.97	1132
5i. The quality of working relationships with managerial staff	2.2	2.2	2.4	2.2	2.1	2.2	1.03	1128
5j. Organizational concerns with legal vulnerability	2.8	2.7	2.6	2.5	2.6	2.7	0.91	1130
5n. The overall quality of the organizational environment where I work	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.3	2.4	0.95	1132
Organizational characteristics scale ^e	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.7	2.8	2.8	0.60	1136

^aScale: 1=no obstacle at all, 2=slight obstacle, 3=moderate obstacle, 4=significant obstacle
^bActual regional *ns* may vary due to missing data.
^cSig. diff. from CPS *p* <.05
^dSig. diff. from Multiple Service Areas *p* <.05
^eCronbach's alpha = .82

Table 2.9a. Family Characteristics by Region^a

	1 (n=250) ^b	2 (n=186)	3 (n=263)	4 (n=290)	5 (n=205)	6 (n=254)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
5e. Cooperation shown by families	2.7	2.7	2.5	2.6	2.7	2.6	2.6	0.79	1419
5l. The number of problems facing families	3.1	3.0	3.0	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	0.80	1413
5s. The quality of working relationships with families	2.2	2.3	2.2	2.3	2.3	2.1	2.2	0.78	1413

^aScale: 1=no obstacle at all, 2=slight obstacle, 3=moderate obstacle, 4=significant obstacle
^bActual regional *ns* may vary due to missing data.

Workers reported that family characteristics posed *slight to moderate obstacles* to helping families. Workers rated cooperation shown by families (5e) and problems facing families (5l) as *moderate obstacles*, while the quality of relationships with families (5s) is a *slight obstacle*. There were no significant between-region or between-service area differences in workers' responses to these items.

Table 2.9b. Family Characteristics by Service Area^a

	FVS (n=97) ^b	CFWS (n=602)	FRS (n=39)	CPS (n=290)	Multiple (n=121)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
5e. Cooperation shown by families	2.6	2.7	2.5	2.6	2.6	2.6	0.79	1131
5l. The number of problems facing families	3.1	3.1	2.9	3.0	3.1	3.1	0.80	1130
5s. The quality of working relationships with families	2.1	2.3	2.1	2.2	2.2	2.2	0.76	1128

^aScale: 1=no obstacle at all, 2=slight obstacle, 3=moderate obstacle, 4=significant obstacle
^bActual regional *ns* may vary due to missing data.

Table 2.10a. Service Characteristics by Region^a

	1	2	3	4	5	6	Statewide		
	(n=250) ^b	(n=186)	(n=263)	(n=290)	(n=205)	(n=254)	Mean	SD	Total
5f. Language barriers between families and service providers	2.1 ^c	2.4	2.2 ^d	2.5	2.2 ^d	2.4	2.3	0.88	1420
5g. Cultural barriers between families and service providers	2.3 ^d	2.4	2.3 ^d	2.6	2.3 ^d	2.3 ^d	2.4	0.84	1421
5k. The lack of availability of services needed to help families solve problems	3.1	3.1	3.2	3.2	3.1	3.1	3.1	0.85	1412
5m. The effectiveness of services available to families	2.8	2.8	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.8	2.8	0.78	1416
5o. Problems arising from families' involvement with multiple service systems	2.6	2.5	2.5	2.6	2.7	2.5	2.6	0.78	1420
5p. The lack of availability of culturally competent services for families	2.5 ^d	2.5 ^d	2.7	2.9	2.7	2.6 ^d	2.6	0.91	1416
Service characteristics scale ^e	2.6 ^d	2.6	2.6	2.8	2.6 ^d	2.6 ^d	2.6	0.57	1424

^aScale: 1=no obstacle at all, 2=slight obstacle, 3=moderate obstacle, 4=significant obstacle

^bActual regional *ns* may vary due to missing data.

^cSig. diff. from Regions 2, 4 and 6 *p* <.05

^dSig. diff. from Region 4 *p* <.05

^eCronbach's alpha = .77

Workers reported that various service characteristics were *slight to moderate obstacles* to helping families. They rated language barriers (5f) and cultural barriers (5g) as *slight obstacles*, and the lack of services needed (5k), effectiveness of available services (5m), family involvement in multiple service systems (5o), and lack of culturally competent services (5p) as *moderate obstacles* to helping families. There were some between-region differences.

- Overall, Region 4 workers indicated that service characteristics were more of an obstacle than workers in Regions 1, 5 and 6.
- Workers in Regions 4 and 6 rated language barriers (5f) as more of an obstacle than workers in Regions 1, 3 and 5.
- Region 4 workers rated cultural barriers (5g) as more of an obstacle than workers in Regions 1, 3, 5 and 6.
- Compared with workers in Regions 1, 2 and 6, Region 4 workers rated the lack of culturally competent services (5p) as more of an obstacle to helping families.

There were no between-service area differences in workers' responses.

Table 2.10b. Service Characteristics by Service Area^a

	FVS	CFWS	FRS	CPS	Multiple	Statewide		
	(n=97) ^b	(n=602)	(n=39)	(n=290)	(n=121)	Mean	SD	Total
5f. Language barriers between families and service providers	2.3	2.3	2.5	2.4	2.3	2.3	0.89	1134
5g. Cultural barriers between families and service providers	2.4	2.4	2.3	2.4	2.3	2.4	0.84	1134
5k. The lack of availability of services needed to help families solve problems	3.2	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.3	3.1	0.85	1129
5m. The effectiveness of services available to families	2.9	2.8	2.7	2.8	3.0	2.8	0.78	1132
5o. Problems arising from families' involvement with multiple service systems	2.5	2.6	2.4	2.5	2.4	2.6	0.78	1135
5p. The lack of availability of culturally competent services for families	2.7	2.6	2.9	2.6	2.6	2.6	0.92	1133
Service characteristics scale ^c	2.7	2.6	2.7	2.6	2.7	2.6	0.57	1138

^aScale: 1=no obstacle at all, 2=slight obstacle, 3=moderate obstacle, 4=significant obstacle

^bActual regional *ns* may vary due to missing data.

^cCronbach's alpha = .77

Table 2.11a. Foster Home Characteristics by Region^a

	1	2	3	4	5	6	Statewide		
	(n=250) ^b	(n=186)	(n=263)	(n=290)	(n=205)	(n=254)	Mean	SD	Total
5q. The lack of available foster homes	3.3 ^c	3.6	3.6	3.7 ^d	3.5	3.4	3.5	0.71	1423
5r. Ability of available foster homes to care for the children Children's Administration serves	3.1 ^c	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.2	3.3	0.80	1418
Foster home characteristics scale ^e	3.2 ^c	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.3	3.4	0.68	1416

^aScale: 1=no obstacle at all, 2=slight obstacle, 3=moderate obstacle, 4=significant obstacle

^bActual regional *ns* may vary due to missing data.

^cSig. diff. from Regions 2, 3 and 4 *p* <.05

^dSig. diff. from Region 6 *p* <.05

^eCronbach's alpha = .79

Statewide, workers reported that the lack of foster homes (5q) was more of an obstacle to helping families than the ability of available foster homes to care for children (5r).

- Region 1 workers reported that the lack of foster homes (5q) and the ability of available homes to care for children (5r) were less of an obstacle than workers in Regions 2, 3 and 4.
- Region 4 workers reported that the lack of available foster homes (5q) was more of an obstacle to helping families than Region 6 workers.

There were no between-service area differences in workers' responses.

Table 2.11b. Foster Home Characteristics by Service Area^a

	FVS	CFWS	FRS	CPS	Multiple	Statewide		
	(n=97) ^b	(n=602)	(n=39)	(n=290)	(n=121)	Mean	SD	Total
5q. The lack of available foster homes	3.5	3.5	3.6	3.4	3.6	3.5	0.72	1135
5r. Ability of available foster homes to care for the children Children's Administration serves	3.3	3.3	3.5	3.2	3.2	3.3	0.81	1130
Foster home characteristics scale ^c	3.4	3.4	3.6	3.3	3.4	3.4	0.70	1128

^aScale: 1=no obstacle at all, 2=slight obstacle, 3=moderate obstacle, 4=significant obstacle

^bActual regional *ns* may vary due to missing data.

^cCronbach's alpha = .79

Table 2.12a. Court Characteristics by Region^a

	1	2	3	4	5	6	Statewide		
	(n=250) ^b	(n=186)	(n=263)	(n=290)	(n=205)	(n=254)	Mean	SD	Total
5t. The quality of working relationships with court liaisons	2.0	2.1	1.9	1.9	2.0	2.0	2.0	0.90	1397
5u. The quality of working relationships with attorneys	2.3 ^e	2.1	2.0	2.0 ^d	2.1	2.3	2.1	0.92	1403
5v. The quality of working relationships with CASA, guardians ad litem, or other child advocates	1.9	1.9	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.9	2.0	0.90	1399
5w. The quality of working relationships with judges	2.0 ^e	2.1 ^e	2.1 ^e	2.5 ^e	2.1	1.9	2.1	0.97	1400
5x. It is difficult to use new approaches to helping families because of pressures from the court	2.2 ^e	2.3	2.3	2.5 ^d	2.2	2.1	2.3	0.97	1387
Court characteristics scale ^f	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.2	2.1	2.0	2.1	0.74	1400

^aScale: 1=no obstacle at all, 2=slight obstacle, 3=moderate obstacle, 4=significant obstacle

^bActual regional *ns* may vary due to missing data.

^cSig. diff. from Region 4 *p* <.05

^dSig. diff. from Region 6 *p* <.05

^eSig. diff. from Regions 5 and 6 *p* <.05

^fCronbach's alpha = .86

Workers reported that court characteristics were a *slight obstacle* to helping families.

- Region 4 workers reported that the quality of working relationships with attorneys (5u) was slightly more of an obstacle than workers in Regions 1 and 6.
- Region 4 workers also reported that the quality of relationships with judges (5w) was less of an obstacle than workers in all of the other regions.
- Region 4 workers reported that pressure from the court (5x) was less of an obstacle than workers in Regions 1 and 6.

Workers assigned to multiple service areas rated pressure from the court (5x) as less of an obstacle to helping families than FVS and CFWS workers.

Table 2.12b. Court Characteristics by Service Area^a

	FVS	CFWS	FRS	CPS	Multiple	Statewide		
	(n=97) ^b	(n=602)	(n=39)	(n=290)	(n=121)	Mean	SD	Total
5t. The quality of working relationships with court liaisons ^c	2.1	2.0	1.8	1.9	1.8	1.9	0.90	1123
5u. The quality of working relationships with attorneys	2.2	2.2	1.9	2.0	2.2	2.1	0.91	1126
5v. The quality of working relationships with CASA, guardians ad litem, or other child advocates	1.9	2.0	2.1	1.8	1.8	1.9	0.90	1126
5w. The quality of working relationships with judges	2.1	2.2	1.8	2.0	1.9	2.1	0.97	1127
5x. It is difficult to use new approaches to helping families because of pressures from the court	2.4 ^e	2.3 ^e	2.2	2.1	2.0	2.2	0.96	1122
Court characteristics scale ^d	2.2	2.1	2.0	2.0	1.9	2.1	0.72	1126

^aScale: 1=no obstacle at all, 2=slight obstacle, 3=moderate obstacle, 4=significant obstacle

^bActual regional *ns* may vary due to missing data.

^cSig. diff. from Multiple Service Areas *p* <.05

^dCronbach's alpha = .86

Job Demands

Table 2.13a. Quantitative Job Demands by Region^a

	1	2	3	4	5	6	Statewide		
	(n=250) ^b	(n=186)	(n=263)	(n=290)	(n=205)	(n=254)	Mean	SD	Total
6a. Do you have too much to do?	4.0 ^e	4.1	4.3 ^d	4.1	4.2	4.0	4.1	0.93	1428
6b. Is your workload irregular so that the work piles up?	3.7	3.7	3.9	3.6	3.7	3.6	3.7	1.04	1422
Quantitative job demands scale ^c	3.8 ^e	3.9	4.1 ^f	3.8	4.0	3.8	3.9	0.90	1421

^aScale: 1=never/very seldom, 2=seldom, 3=sometimes, 4=often, 5=always/very often

^bActual regional *ns* may vary due to missing data.

^cSig. diff. from Region 3 *p* <.05

^dSig. diff. from Region 6 *p* <.05

^eCronbach's alpha = .80

^fSig. diff. from Regions 4 and 6 *p* <.05

Workers reported that they *often* have problems with workload demands including the amount of work (10a) and irregularity of work (10b), with the amount of work being the more frequent problem. Region 3 workers reported that they have too much to do (6a) more often than workers in Regions 1 and 6. CFWS workers report that they have too much to do (6a) more often than workers in all of the other service areas.

Table 2.13b. Quantitative Job Demands by Service Area^a

	FVS	CFWS	FRS	CPS	Multiple	Statewide		
	(n=97) ^b	(n=602)	(n=39)	(n=290)	(n=121)	Mean	SD	Total
6a. Do you have too much to do?	4.0 ^e	4.4 ^d	3.7	4.0	4.1	4.2	0.91	1134
6b. Is your workload irregular so that the work piles up?	3.6	3.9	3.5	3.7	3.7	3.8	1.03	1129
Quantitative job demands scale ^c	3.8 ^e	4.1 ^f	3.6	3.8	3.9	4.0	0.88	1128

^aScale: 1=never/very seldom, 2=seldom, 3=sometimes, 4=often, 5=always/very often

^bActual regional *ns* may vary due to missing data.

^cSig. diff. from CFWS *p* <.05

^dSig. diff. from FRS, CPS, and Multiple Service Areas *p* <.05

^eCronbach's alpha = .80

^fSig. diff. from FRS and CPS *p* <.05

Table 2.14a. Learning Demands by Region^a

	1	2	3	4	5	6	Statewide		
	(n=250) ^b	(n=186)	(n=263)	(n=290)	(n=205)	(n=254)	Mean	SD	Total
6c. Are your work tasks too difficult for you?	1.7	1.8	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	0.85	1420
6d. Do you perform work tasks for which you need more training?	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.3	2.3	2.4	2.3	0.96	1423
6e. Do you perform work tasks for which you need more experience?	2.0	2.1	2.3	2.2	2.1	2.2	2.2	0.98	1426
Learning demands scale ^c	2.0	2.0	2.2	2.1	2.1	2.2	2.1	0.78	1429

^aScale: 1=never/very seldom, 2=seldom, 3=sometimes, 4=often, 5=always/very often

^bActual regional *ns* may vary due to missing data.

^cCronbach's alpha = .78

Workers reported that they *seldom* feel that their work tasks are too difficult (6c) or that they need more training (6d) or experience (6e) to perform their work tasks. There were no between-region or between-service area differences in workers' responses.

Table 2.14b. Learning Demands by Service Area^a

	FVS (n=97) ^b	CFWS (n=602)	FRS (n=39)	CPS (n=290)	Multiple (n=121)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
6c. Are your work tasks too difficult for you?	1.9	2.0	1.8	1.8	1.9	1.9	0.85	1130
6d. Do you perform work tasks for which you need more training?	2.4	2.4	2.3	2.3	2.6	2.4	0.97	1132
6e. Do you perform work tasks for which you need more experience?	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.2	2.4	2.3	0.98	1132
Learning demands scale ^c	2.2	2.2	2.1	2.1	2.3	2.2	0.78	1135

^aScale: 1=never/very seldom, 2=seldom, 3=sometimes, 4=often, 5=always/very often

^bActual regional *ns* may vary due to missing data.

^cCronbach's alpha = .78

Table 2.15a. Role Clarity by Region^a

	1 (n=250) ^b	2 (n=186)	3 (n=263)	4 (n=290)	5 (n=205)	6 (n=254)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
6f. Have clear, planned goals and objectives been defined for your job?	3.6	3.8	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	1.09	1425
6g. Do you know exactly what is expected of you at work?	3.9 ^c	4.2	3.9	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	0.98	1425
Role clarity scale ^d	3.8	4.0	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	0.94	1421

^aScale: 1=never/very seldom, 2=seldom, 3=sometimes, 4=often, 5=always/very often

^bActual regional *ns* may vary due to missing data.

^cSig. diff. from Region 2 *p* <.05

^dCronbach's alpha = .77

Role Expectations

Workers reported *sometimes* to *often* having clear goals and objectives for their job (6f) and knowing what is expected of them at work (6g). Region 2 workers reported knowing exactly what is expected of them (6g) more often than Region 1 workers. There were no significant between-service area differences in workers' role clarity.

Table 2.15b. Role Clarity by Service Area^a

	FVS (n=97) ^b	CFWS (n=602)	FRS (n=39)	CPS (n=290)	Multiple (n=121)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
6f. Have clear, planned goals and objectives been defined for your job?	3.5	3.6	3.9	3.5	3.4	3.6	1.07	1132
6g. Do you know exactly what is expected of you at work?	3.9	4.0	4.2	3.9	4.0	3.9	0.97	1131
Role clarity scale ^c	3.7	3.8	4.0	3.7	3.7	3.8	0.92	1128

^aScale: 1=never/very seldom, 2=seldom, 3=sometimes, 4=often, 5=always/very often

^bActual regional *ns* may vary due to missing data.

^cCronbach's alpha = .77

Table 2.16a. Role Conflict by Region^a

	1 (n=250) ^b	2 (n=186)	3 (n=263)	4 (n=290)	5 (n=205)	6 (n=254)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
6h. Are you given assignments without adequate resources to complete them?	2.7 ^c	2.8	3.1	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.9	1.12	1419
6i. Do you receive incompatible requests from two or more people?	2.4	2.3	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.2 ^d	2.4	1.10	1414

^aScale: 1=never/very seldom, 2=seldom, 3=sometimes, 4=often, 5=always/very often

^bActual regional *ns* may vary due to missing data.

^cSig. diff. from Region 3 *p* <.05

^dSig. diff. from Regions 3, 4, and 5 *p* <.05

Workers reported *seldom* to *sometimes* being given assignments without adequate resources to complete them (6h), and receiving incompatible requests from two or more people (6i). Region 1 workers reported being given assignments without adequate resources (6h) less

often than Region 3 workers. Region 6 workers reported receiving incompatible requests (6i) less often than workers in Regions 3, 4 and 5. CFWS workers reported that they are given assignments without adequate resources (6h) more often than CPS workers.

Table 2.16b. Role Conflict by Service Area^a

	FVS (n=97) ^b	CFWS (n=602)	FRS (n=39)	CPS (n=290)	Multiple (n=121)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
6h. Are you given assignments without adequate resources to complete them?	2.9	3.1 ^c	2.5	2.7	2.9	2.9	1.09	1128
6i. Do you receive incompatible requests from two or more people?	2.3	2.6	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.5	1.09	1125

^aScale: 1=never/very seldom, 2=seldom, 3=sometimes, 4=often, 5=always/very often

^bActual regional *ns* may vary due to missing data.

^cSig. diff. from CPS *p* <.05

Table 2.17a. Positive Challenge at Work by Region^a

	1 (n=250) ^b	2 (n=186)	3 (n=263)	4 (n=290)	5 (n=205)	6 (n=254)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
6j. Is your work challenging in a positive way?	3.8	3.9 ^c	3.7	3.6	3.7	3.7	3.7	0.95	1423
6k. Are you given meaningful assignments?	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.7	3.8	0.87	1419
Positive challenge at work scale ^d	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.8	0.81	1415

^aScale: 1=never/very seldom, 2=seldom, 3=sometimes, 4=often, 5=always/very often

^bActual regional *ns* may vary due to missing data.

^cSig. diff. from Region 4 *p* <.05

^dCronbach's alpha = .73

Control at Work

Statewide, workers indicated that they *sometimes* to *often* feel that their work is challenging in a positive way (6j) and that they are given meaningful assignments (6k). Region 2 workers were more likely than Region 4 workers to report that their work is *often* challenging. There were no between-service area differences in these responses.

Table 2.17b. Positive Challenge at Work by Service Area^a

	FVS (n=97) ^b	CFWS (n=602)	FRS (n=39)	CPS (n=290)	Multiple (n=121)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
6j. Is your work challenging in a positive way?	3.8	3.7	3.9	3.7	3.8	3.7	0.94	1131
6k. Are you given meaningful assignments?	3.9	3.7	3.9	3.8	3.9	3.8	0.86	1130
Positive challenge at work scale ^c	3.9	3.7	3.9	3.8	3.9	3.8	0.80	1126

^aScale: 1=never/very seldom, 2=seldom, 3=sometimes, 4=often, 5=always/very often

^bActual regional *ns* may vary due to missing data.

^cCronbach's alpha = .73

Table 2.18a. Control of Decisions and Work Pace by Region^a

	1 (n=250) ^b	2 (n=186)	3 (n=263)	4 (n=290)	5 (n=205)	6 (n=254)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
6v. Can you influence the amount of work assigned to you?	2.4	2.4	2.1	2.3	2.1	2.3	2.3	1.08	1423
6u. Can you influence decisions that are important for your work?	3.5	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.5	1.08	1418
6w. Can you set your own work pace?	3.2	3.4	3.1	3.4	3.3	3.2	3.3	1.17	1423

^aScale: 1=never/very seldom, 2=seldom, 3=sometimes, 4=often, 5=always/very often

^bActual regional *ns* may vary due to missing data.

Although workers reported only *seldom* to *sometimes* influencing the amount of work assigned to them (6v), they indicated more frequently influencing decisions important for their work (6u), and setting their own work pace (6w). There were no between-region or between service area differences in workers' control of decisions or work pace.

Table 2.18b. Control of Decisions and Work Pace by Service Area^a

	FVS (n=97) ^b	CFWS (n=602)	FRS (n=39)	CPS (n=290)	Multiple (n=121)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
6v. Can you influence the amount of work assigned to you?	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.5	2.2	1.07	1130
6u. Can you influence decisions that are important for your work?	3.6	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.7	3.5	1.08	1125
6w. Can you set your own work pace?	3.3	3.3	3.4	3.1	3.2	3.2	1.17	1130

^aScale: 1=never/very seldom, 2=seldom, 3=sometimes, 4=often, 5=always/very often
^bActual regional ns may vary due to missing data.

Table 2.19a. Cases with Crisis or Violence by Region^a

	1 (n=250) ^b	2 (n=186)	3 (n=263)	4 (n=290)	5 (n=205)	6 (n=254)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
6x. Do you have to change plans for the work day because of sudden crises in your work with families?	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.4	3.4	3.6	3.5	1.04	1420
6y. Does your work expose you to threats and violence?	3.0 ^c	2.9	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.6	2.7	1.07	1419

^aScale: 1=never/very seldom, 2=seldom, 3=sometimes, 4=often, 5=always/very often
^bActual regional ns may vary due to missing data.
^csig. diff. from Region 6 p <.05

Workers statewide reported having to *sometimes* to *often* change their plans for the work day because of crises in their work with families. CFWS workers were more likely than FRS workers to report *often* changing their work day because of family crises. Although statewide, workers indicated that their work *seldom* to *sometimes* expose them to threats and violence, CPS workers reported being exposed to threats and violence more frequently than did CFWS and FRS workers. FRS workers were also less often exposed to threats and violence than FVS workers and workers assigned to multiple service areas.

Table 2.19b. Cases with Crisis or Violence by Service Area^a

	FVS (n=97) ^b	CFWS (n=602)	FRS (n=39)	CPS (n=290)	Multiple (n=121)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
6x. Do you have to change plans for the work day because of sudden crises in your work with families?	3.5	3.8 ^c	3.2	3.6	3.7	3.7	0.97	1128
6y. Does your work expose you to threats and violence?	3.0 ^c	2.8 ^d	2.3 ^e	3.2	2.9	2.9	1.04	1127

^aScale: 1=never/very seldom, 2=seldom, 3=sometimes, 4=often, 5=always/very often
^bActual regional ns may vary due to missing data.
^csig. diff. from FRS p <.05
^dsig. diff. from FRS and CPS p <.05
^esig. diff. from CPS and Multiple Service Areas p <.05

Social Interactions

Table 2.20a. Support From Superior by Region^a

	1 (n=250) ^b	2 (n=186)	3 (n=263)	4 (n=290)	5 (n=205)	6 (n=254)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
6m. If needed, can you get support and help with your work from your immediate superior?	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.2	0.99	1422
6l. If needed, is your immediate superior willing to listen to work related problems?	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	0.91	1424
6o. Are your work achievements appreciated by your immediate superior?	4.1	4.0	4.0	4.1	4.0	4.0	4.0	1.07	1423
Support from superior scale ^c	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.2	0.89	1424

^aScale: 1=never/very seldom, 2=seldom, 3=sometimes, 4=often, 5=always/very often
^bActual regional ns may vary due to missing data.
^cCronbach's alpha = .87

Workers felt that their immediate superiors *often* support and help them with their work (6m), listen to work related problems (6l) and appreciate their achievements (6o). There were no between-region or between-service area differences in workers' average responses to these items.

Table 2.20b. Support From Superior by Service Area^a

	FVS (n=97) ^b	CFWS (n=602)	FRS (n=39)	CPS (n=290)	Multiple (n=121)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
6m. If needed, can you get support and help with your work from your immediate superior?	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.0	4.1	1.02	1128
6l. If needed, is your immediate superior willing to listen to work related problems?	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.3	0.94	1131
6o. Are your work achievements appreciated by your immediate superior?	4.1	4.0	4.1	3.9	4.0	4.0	1.09	1129
Support from superior scale ^c	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.2	0.91	1130

^aScale: 1=never/very seldom, 2=seldom, 3=sometimes, 4=often, 5=always/very often
^bActual regional ns may vary due to missing data.
^cCronbach's alpha = .87

Leadership

Table 2.21a. Empowering Leadership by Region^a

	1 (n=250) ^b	2 (n=186)	3 (n=263)	4 (n=290)	5 (n=205)	6 (n=254)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
6p. Does your immediate superior encourage you to participate in important decisions?	4.1	4.0	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.1	1.00	1422
6q. Does your immediate superior help you develop your skills?	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.8	1.16	1422
Empowering leadership scale ^c	4.0	3.9	3.9	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	1.00	1418

^aScale: 1=never/very seldom, 2=seldom, 3=sometimes, 4=often, 5=always/very often
^bActual regional ns may vary due to missing data.
^cCronbach's alpha = .83

Workers also reported that their immediate superiors *often* encourage them to participate in important decisions and help them to develop their skills. There were no significant between-region or between-service area differences in workers' average responses to these items.

Table 2.21b. Empowering Leadership by Service Area^a

	FVS (n=97) ^b	CFWS (n=602)	FRS (n=39)	CPS (n=290)	Multiple (n=121)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
6p. Does your immediate superior encourage you to participate in important decisions?	4.2	4.1	3.9	4.0	4.1	4.1	1.03	1129
6q. Does your immediate superior help you develop your skills?	4.0	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.8	1.17	1129
Empowering leadership scale ^c	4.1	4.0	3.8	3.9	3.9	3.9	1.01	1126

^aScale: 1=never/very seldom, 2=seldom, 3=sometimes, 4=often, 5=always/very often
^bActual regional *ns* may vary due to missing data
^cCronbach's alpha = .83

Organizational Culture and Climate

Table 2.22a. Social Climate and Cultural Sensitivity by Region^a

The climate in this unit is . . .	1 (n=250) ^b	2 (n=186)	3 (n=263)	4 (n=290)	5 (n=205)	6 (n=254)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
8a. encouraging and supportive	3.8	3.8	4.0	3.9	3.8	4.0	3.9	1.07	1423
8b. distrustful and suspicious	2.0 ^c	2.0 ^d	1.7	1.7	1.8	1.7	1.8	0.99	1413
8c. relaxed and comfortable	3.6	3.6	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.8	3.7	1.07	1421
8d. rigid and rule-based	2.1	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.9	2.0	2.0	1.02	1417
8e. People in this unit are sensitive to differences in their coworkers' cultural beliefs, values, and practices	3.7	3.6	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.8	1.13	1422
Social climate scale ^e	3.8	3.9	4.0	3.9	4.0	4.0	3.9	0.84	1420

^aScale: 1=very little or not at all, 2=rather little, 3=somewhat, 4=rather much, 5=very much
^bActual regional *ns* may vary due to missing data.
^cSig. diff. from Regions 3, 4 and 6 *p* <.05
^dSig. diff. from Region 3 *p* <.05
^eCronbach's alpha = .82

Workers reported that the social climate in their unit is encouraging, supportive, relaxed, and comfortable (8a and 8c). Conversely, workers did not feel the social climate in their unit was distrustful or rule-based (8b and 8d). Workers also reported that their co-workers are rather sensitive to each other's differences (8e). There were no significant between-region. Workers in the FVS service area reported that their unit was more relaxed than workers who were in multiple areas (8e). In general, FVS workers are the most positive about their social climate, especially compared with CPS workers and workers in multiple service areas.

Table 2.22b. Social Climate and Cultural Sensitivity by Service Area^a

The climate in this unit is . . .	FVS (n=97) ^b	CFWS (n=602)	FRS (n=39)	CPS (n=290)	Multiple (n=121)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
8a. encouraging and supportive	4.1	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.9	1.07	1133
8b. distrustful and suspicious	1.6	1.7	1.9	1.9	2.0	1.8	0.98	1125
8c. relaxed and comfortable	3.9 ^c	3.7	3.4	3.6	3.4	3.7	1.07	1132
8d. rigid and rule-based	1.8	2.0	1.9	2.1	2.1	2.0	1.01	1128
8e. People in this unit are sensitive to differences in their coworkers' cultural beliefs, values, and practices	4.0	3.9	3.6	3.7	3.7	3.8	1.12	1133
Social climate scale ^d	4.1 ^c	4.0	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.9	0.83	1131

^aScale: 1=very little or not at all, 2=rather little, 3=somewhat, 4=rather much, 5=very much
^bActual regional *ns* may vary due to missing data.
^cSig. diff. from Multiple Service Areas *p* <.05
^dCronbach's alpha = .82
^eSig. diff. from CPS and Multiple Service Areas *p* <.05

Table 2.23a. Human Resources Primacy by Region^a

	1 (n=250) ^b	2 (n=186)	3 (n=263)	4 (n=290)	5 (n=205)	6 (n=254)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
9a. Workers are rewarded (money, encouragement) for a job well done	2.7	2.9	2.7	2.6	2.6	2.8	2.7	1.31	1419
9b. Workers are well taken care of in the organization	2.3	2.6 ^c	2.3	2.2	2.2	2.5	2.3	1.15	1421
9c. Management is interested in the health and well-being of the personnel	2.5	2.8 ^d	2.5	2.4	2.4	2.8 ^d	2.5	1.26	1414
Human resources primacy scale ^e	2.5	2.8 ^d	2.5	2.4	2.4	2.7	2.5	1.07	1421

^aScale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=somewhat disagree, 3=neutral, 4=somewhat agree, 5=strongly agree
^bActual regional *ns* may vary due to missing data.
^cSig. diff. from Region 4 *p* <.05
^dSig. diff. from Regions 4 and 5 *p* <.05
^eCronbach's alpha = .83

Workers were neutral to somewhat in disagreement with statements indicative of organizational and management support for their working conditions, with the least support being expressed for the statement *workers are well taken care of in the organization* (9b). Compared with workers in Regions 4 and 5, workers in Regions 2 and 6 were in greater agreement with the statement *management is interested in the health and well-being of the personnel* (9c). Region 2 workers also agreed to a greater extent than Region 4 workers that *workers are well taken care of in the organization* (9b). There were no between-service area differences in average responses.

Table 2.23b. Human Resources Primacy by Service Area^a

	FVS (n=97) ^b	CFWS (n=602)	FRS (n=39)	CPS (n=290)	Multiple (n=121)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
9a. Workers are rewarded (money, encouragement) for a job well done	2.6	2.7	2.4	2.5	2.9	2.7	1.29	1126
9b. Workers are well taken care of in the organization	2.3	2.3	2.1	2.2	2.4	2.3	1.13	1128
9c. Management is interested in the health and well-being of the personnel	2.5	2.5	2.1	2.5	2.8	2.5	1.25	1122
Human resources primacy scale ^c	2.5	2.5	2.3	2.4	2.7	2.5	1.06	1128

^aScale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=somewhat disagree, 3=neutral, 4=somewhat agree, 5=strongly agree
^bActual regional *ns* may vary due to missing data.
^cCronbach's alpha = .83

Perception of Group Work

Table 2.24a. Perception of Group Work by Region^a

	1 (n=250) ^b	2 (n=186)	3 (n=263)	4 (n=290)	5 (n=205)	6 (n=254)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
8f. You appreciate belonging to this unit	4.1	4.0	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.2	1.00	1424
8g. Your unit is successful at problem solving	3.9	3.9	4.0	4.0	3.9	4.1	4.0	1.00	1419
Perception of group work scale ^c	4.0	3.9	4.2	4.1	4.0	4.1	4.1	0.94	1418

^aScale: 1=very little or not at all, 2=rather little, 3=somewhat, 4=rather much, 5=very much
^bActual regional *ns* may vary due to missing data.
^cCronbach's alpha = .86

Workers were *rather much* in agreement with statements indicating that they appreciate belonging to their unit (8f) and that their unit is successful at problem solving (8g).

There were no significant between-region or between-service area differences in these worker perceptions.

Table 2.24b. Perception of Group Work by Service Area^a

	FVS (n=97) ^b	CFWS (n=602)	FRS (n=39)	CPS (n=290)	Multiple (n=121)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
8f. You appreciate belonging to this unit	4.3	4.2	4.0	4.1	4.0	4.2	1.01	1133
8g. Your unit is successful at problem solving	4.1	4.0	3.9	4.0	3.9	4.0	1.00	1128
Perception of group work scale ^c	4.2	4.1	4.0	4.1	4.0	4.1	0.94	1127

^aScale: 1=very little or not at all, 2=rather little, 3=somewhat, 4=rather much, 5=very much
^bActual regional *ns* may vary due to missing data.
^cCronbach's alpha = .86

Team Climate and Psychological Safety

Table 2.25a. Team Psychological Safety by Region^a

	1 (n=250) ^b	2 (n=186)	3 (n=263)	4 (n=290)	5 (n=205)	6 (n=254)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
7a. If you make a mistake in this unit, it is often held against you	2.3	2.2	2.2	2.4	2.4	2.2	2.3	1.18	1423
7b. People in this unit are able to bring up problems and tough issues	3.9	3.8	4.0	3.9	4.0	4.0	4.0	1.06	1420
7c. People in this unit sometimes reject others for being different	2.3 ^c	2.4 ^c	1.8 ^d	2.2	2.3	2.1	2.2	1.23	1418
7d. It is safe to take a risk in this unit	3.5	3.2 ^c	3.6	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.5	1.15	1421
7e. It is difficult to ask other people in this unit for help	2.0	1.9	1.7	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.15	1419
7f. No one in this unit would deliberately act in a way that undermines my efforts	3.7 ^c	3.6 ^c	4.1	3.9	3.8	3.9	3.9	1.30	1419
7g. Working with people in this unit, my unique skills and talents are valued and utilized	3.8	3.9	4.0	3.9	4.0	3.9	3.9	1.04	1423
Team psychological safety scale ^c	3.8 ^c	3.7 ^c	4.0	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.9	0.79	1422

^aScale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=somewhat disagree, 3=neutral, 4=somewhat agree, 5=strongly agree
^bActual regional *ns* may vary due to missing data.
^cSign. diff. from Region 3 *p* < .05
^dSign. diff. from Regions 4 and 5 *p* < .05
^eCronbach's alpha = .81

Workers *somewhat agreed* with statements indicative of the psychological safety of the units in which they work. Where between-region differences existed, workers in Region 3 reported a more positive team climate than workers in Regions 1 and/or 2. CPS workers reported a less positive team climate than FVS workers.

Table 2.25b. Team Psychological Safety by Service Area^a

	FVS (n=97) ^b	CFWS (n=602)	FRS (n=39)	CPS (n=290)	Multiple (n=121)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
7a. If you make a mistake in this unit, it is often held against you	2.1	2.3	2.2	2.4	2.3	2.3	1.17	1131
7b. People in this unit are able to bring up problems and tough issues	4.2 ^c	4.0 ^c	3.9	3.7	4.0	4.0	1.07	1129
7c. People in this unit sometimes reject others for being different	2.0 ^c	2.1	2.4	2.4	2.2	2.2	1.24	1127
7d. It is safe to take a risk in this unit	3.6	3.5	3.4	3.3	3.5	3.5	1.15	1129
7e. It is difficult to ask other people in this unit for help	1.8	1.9	1.7	1.9	2.0	1.9	1.17	1128
7f. No one in this unit would deliberately act in a way that undermines my efforts	4.0	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.8	1.31	1129
7g. Working with people in this unit, my unique skills and talents are valued and utilized	4.0	3.9	4.0	3.9	4.0	3.9	1.04	1131
Team psychological safety scale ^d	4.0 ^c	3.9	3.9	3.7	3.8	3.8	0.80	1130

^aScale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=somewhat disagree, 3=neutral, 4=somewhat agree, 5=strongly agree
^bActual regional *ns* may vary due to missing data.
^cSign. diff. from CPS *p* < .05
^dCronbach's alpha = .81

Table 2.26a. Team Climate by Region^a

	1 (n=250) ^b	2 (n=186)	3 (n=263)	4 (n=290)	5 (n=205)	6 (n=254)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
7h. Have a "we are together" attitude	3.7 ^c	3.7 ^c	4.1	3.9	3.8	3.9	3.9	1.13	1422
7i. Keep each other informed about work	3.8	3.8	4.0	3.9	3.9	4.0	3.9	1.06	1421
7j. People feel understood and accepted	3.7 ^c	3.7 ^c	4.1	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.9	1.04	1421
7k. Attempts to share information	3.9	3.9	4.1	4.0	4.0	4.1	4.0	1.03	1420
7l. Always searching for fresh, new ways of looking at problems	3.5	3.6	3.8	3.6	3.5	3.6	3.6	1.13	1417
7m. Take the time to develop new ideas	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.3	3.2	3.3	3.3	1.15	1420
7n. Cooperate to develop and apply new ideas	3.5	3.5	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.6	3.5	1.12	1413
Team climate scale ^d	3.6 ^c	3.7	3.9	3.7	3.7	3.8	3.7	0.93	1419

^aScale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=somewhat disagree, 3=neutral, 4=somewhat agree, 5=strongly agree
^bActual regional *ns* may vary due to missing data.
^cSign. diff. from Region 3 *p* < .05
^dCronbach's alpha = .94

Overall, workers held positive views of the team climate in their units, though workers were least positive regarding taking time to develop new ideas (7m). Where there were between-region differences, workers in Region 3 reported a more positive team climate than did workers in Regions 1 and/or 2. There were no between-service area differences in average responses.

Table 2.26b. Team Climate by Service Area^a

	FVS (n=97) ^b	CFWS (n=602)	FRS (n=39)	CPS (n=290)	Multiple (n=121)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
7h. People in this unit have a "we are together" attitude	4.0	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.9	1.13	1130
7i. People in this unit keep each other informed about work related issues	3.9	3.9	3.7	3.8	3.9	3.9	1.06	1131
7j. People in this unit feel understood and accepted by each other	4.0	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.9	1.04	1129
7k. There are real attempts to share information throughout the unit	4.1	4.0	3.9	3.9	4.0	4.0	1.04	1129
7l. People in this unit are always searching for fresh, new ways of looking at problems	3.7	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.6	3.6	1.13	1127
7m. In this unit, we take the time needed to develop new ideas	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.2	3.3	3.3	1.16	1132
7n. People in this unit cooperate to help develop and apply new ideas	3.6	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.6	3.5	1.13	1128
Team climate scale ^c	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.7	3.7	0.93	1130

^aScale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=somewhat disagree, 3=neutral, 4=somewhat agree, 5=strongly agree
^bActual regional *ns* may vary due to missing data.
^cCronbach's alpha = .94

Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intention

Table 2.27a. Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intention by Region

	1 (n=250) ^b	2 (n=186)	3 (n=263)	4 (n=290)	5 (n=205)	6 (n=254)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
Job Satisfaction ^a									
9d. In general, I do not like my job	1.9	1.8	1.9	2.0	2.1	2.0	2.0	1.19	1418
9e. All in all, I am satisfied with my job	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.9	1.07	1420
Long-Term Turnover Intention ^a									
9f. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization	3.5	3.6	3.3	3.1 ^c	3.5	3.4	3.4	1.24	1420
Short-Term Turnover Intention ^a									
9g. I often look for job opportunities outside this organization	2.3	2.3	2.4	2.6	2.4	2.3	2.4	1.27	1416
Obligations Toward Coworkers ^a									
9h. I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it	3.3	3.5	3.6	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.5	1.23	1418

^aScale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=somewhat disagree, 3=neutral, 4=somewhat agree, 5=strongly agree
^bActual regional *ns* may vary due to missing data.
^cSig. diff. from Region 1, 2 and 5 *p* <.05

Workers reported moderate levels of agreement with statements pertaining to job satisfaction (9d and 9e), intention to leave the organization (9f and 9g), and obligation to stay with one's coworkers (9h). Compared with workers in Regions 1, 2 and 5, Region 4 workers reported a lower level of agreement with the statement *I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization*. FRS workers disagreed more strongly with the statement *I do not like my job* than CFWS workers.

Table 2.27b. Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intention by Service Area

	FVS (n=97) ^a	CFWS (n=602)	FRS (n=39)	CPS (n=290)	Multiple (n=121)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
Job Satisfaction ^b								
9d. In general, I do not like my job	2.0	2.1 ^c	1.4	2.0	1.9	2.0	1.19	1125
9e. All in all, I am satisfied with my job	4.0	3.7	4.2	4.0	3.8	3.8	1.06	1127
Long-Term Turnover Intention ^b								
9f. I would be happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization	3.3	3.3	3.7	3.4	3.3	3.3	1.23	1127
Short-Term Turnover Intention ^b								
9g. I often look for job opportunities outside this organization	2.5	2.4	2.1	2.3	2.3	2.4	1.25	1124
Obligations Toward Coworkers ^b								
9h. I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it	3.3	3.6	3.2	3.4	3.4	3.5	1.20	1128

^aActual regional *ns* may vary due to missing data.
^bScale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=somewhat disagree, 3=neutral, 4=somewhat agree, 5=strongly agree
^cSig. diff. from FRS *p* <.05

Professional Burnout

Table 2.28a. Emotional Exhaustion by Region^a

	1 (n=250) ^b	2 (n=186)	3 (n=263)	4 (n=290)	5 (n=205)	6 (n=254)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
10a. I feel emotionally drained from my work	2.9	2.8	3.1	2.9	2.9	3.0	2.9	1.21	1419
10c. I feel used up at the end of the workday	3.1	3.0	3.3	3.0	3.1	3.2	3.1	1.26	1413
10e. I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job	2.6	2.5	2.6	2.5	2.6	2.6	2.6	1.32	1415
10h. I feel burned out from my work	2.2	2.2	2.3	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2	1.30	1412
10i. I feel frustrated by my job	2.6	2.4 ^c	2.8	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.6	1.30	1414
Emotional exhaustion scale ^d	2.7	2.6	2.8	2.6	2.7	2.7	2.7	0.97	1415

^aScale: 1=less than a few times a year/never, 2= a few times a month, 3=once a week, 4= a few times a week, 5=every day
^bActual regional *ns* may vary due to missing data.
^cSig. diff. from Region 3 *p* <.05
^dCronbach's alpha = .81

Worker responses to questions about the level of emotional exhaustion associated with their job indicate that on average they experience such feelings between *a few times a month* and *once a week*. The most common experiences of this sort were feeling emotionally drained (10a) and feeling used up at the end of the day (10c). Region 3 workers more frequently felt frustrated by their job than Region 2 workers. CFWS workers experienced most indicators of emotional exhaustion more frequently than FVS, FRS, and/or CPS workers.

Table 2.28b. Emotional Exhaustion by Service Area^a

	FVS (n=97) ^b	CFWS (n=602)	FRS (n=39)	CPS (n=290)	Multiple (n=121)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
10a. I feel emotionally drained from work	3.0 ^c	3.2 ^d	2.4	2.8	3.0	3.0	1.20	1127
10c. O feel used up at the end of the workday	2.9 ^e	3.4 ^d	2.6	3.0	3.1	3.2	1.25	1122
10e. I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job	2.4 ^e	2.8 ^c	2.1	2.5	2.5	2.6	1.31	1125
10h. I feel burned out from my job	2.1	2.4 ^c	1.6 ^f	2.2	2.2	2.3	1.30	1123
10i. I feel frustrated by my job	2.8	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.7	2.6	1.29	1119
Emotional exhaustion scale ^e	2.6	2.9 ^d	2.3	2.6	2.7	2.8	0.96	1125

^aScale: 1=less than a few times a year/never, 2=a few times a month, 3=once a week, 4=a few times a week, 5=every day
^bActual regional *n*s may vary due to missing data.
^cSign. diff. from FRS *p* <.05
^dSign. diff. from FRS and CPS *p* <.05
^eSign. diff. from CFWS *p* <.05
^fSign. diff. from CPS and Multiple Service Areas *p* <.05
^gCronbach's alpha = .81

Table 2.29a. Depersonalization by Region^a

	1 (n=250) ^b	2 (n=186)	3 (n=263)	4 (n=290)	5 (n=205)	6 (n=254)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
10p. I've become more callous toward people since I took this job	1.9	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.6	1.7	1.09	1404
10q. I worry that this job is hardening me emotionally	2.0	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.19	1412
Depersonalization scale ^c	1.9	1.7	1.8	1.7	1.8	1.7	1.8	1.06	1401

^aScale: 1=less than a few times a year/never, 2=a few times a month, 3=once a week, 4=a few times a week, 5=every day
^bActual regional *n*s may vary due to missing data.
^cCronbach's alpha = .84

Workers' answers to questions pertaining to depersonalization at work indicate that they seldom experience such feelings. Although there were no significant between-region differences in these experiences, compared with CFWS and CPS workers, FRS workers worried less often that their job was hardening them emotionally.

Table 2.29b. Depersonalization by Service Area^a

	FVS (n=97) ^b	CFWS (n=602)	FRS (n=39)	CPS (n=290)	Multiple (n=121)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
10p. I've become more callous toward people since I took this job	1.6	1.8	1.5	1.7	1.6	1.7	1.09	1121
10q. I worry that this job is hardening me emotionally	1.8	1.9	1.4 ^c	1.9	1.8	1.9	1.20	1124
Depersonalization scale ^c	1.7	1.8	1.5	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.06	1119

^aScale: 1=less than a few times a year/never, 2=a few times a month, 3=once a week, 4=a few times a week, 5=every day
^bActual regional *n*s may vary due to missing data.
^cSign. diff. from CFWS and CPS *p* <.05
^dCronbach's alpha = .84

Table 2.30a. Personal Accomplishment by Region^a

	1 (n=250) ^b	2 (n=186)	3 (n=263)	4 (n=290)	5 (n=205)	6 (n=254)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
10b. I can deal very effectively with the problems of families	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.4	0.82	1406
10d. I feel my work makes a positive difference in people's lives	3.9	4.1	3.9	3.8	4.0	4.0	3.9	1.13	1413
10g. I can easily create a relaxed atmosphere with families	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.2	0.90	1405
10r. I feel exhilarated after working closely with families	3.2	3.1	3.3	3.2	3.3	3.2	3.2	1.23	1397
10o. I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job	3.7	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.8	3.8	3.7	1.11	1410
10s. I feel a sense of pride and accomplishment from my work	3.7	3.9	3.7	3.6	3.9	3.7	3.7	1.20	1409
Personal accomplishment scale ^c	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.9	3.9	3.9	0.77	1409

^aScale: 1=less than a few times a year/never, 2=a few times a month, 3=once a week, 4=a few times a week, 5=every day
^bActual regional *n*s may vary due to missing data.
^cCronbach's alpha = .80

Workers' responses to questions pertaining to their feelings of personal accomplishment indicate that they experience such feelings *a few times per week*. There were no significant between-region or between service area differences in workers' average responses.

Table 2.30b. Personal Accomplishment by Service Area^a

	FVS (n=97) ^b	CFWS (n=602)	FRS (n=39)	CPS (n=290)	Multiple (n=121)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
10b. I can deal effectively with the problems of families	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	0.80	1118
10d. I feel my work makes a positive difference in people's lives	3.9	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.8	3.9	1.13	1121
10g. I can easily create a relaxed atmosphere with families	4.3	4.2	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.2	0.88	1117
10r. I feel exhilarated after working closely with families	3.3	3.2	3.3	3.2	3.2	3.2	1.21	1114
10o. I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job	3.6	3.8	3.9	3.6	3.6	3.7	1.11	1119
10s. I feel a sense of pride and accomplishment from my work	3.6	3.7	4.1	3.7	3.8	3.7	1.18	1117
Personal accomplishment scale ^c	3.9	3.9	4.0	3.8	3.8	3.9	0.75	1120

^aScale: 1=less than a few times a year/never, 2=a few times a month, 3=once a week, 4=a few times a week, 5=every day
^bActual regional *n*s may vary due to missing data.
^cCronbach's alpha = .80

CHAPTER 3

Social Workers' Assessments of Cases

CFWS, CPS, FRS, and FVS social workers (N=971) each assessed one family randomly-selected from their caseload. Workers provided information on the family's background characteristics, the primary caregiver's parenting skills, their casework approach to the family, barriers to achieving casework goals, and services needed by and provided to the family. For each survey question, we report the workers' responses statewide, by CA region, and by service area.⁶ We also report workers' responses by the context in which the family received services. Cases in which no child had been placed are designated "in-home" and those in which at least one child was placed are referred to as "out-of-home". We report between category mean differences that were significant at the *p* ≤ .05 level and ≥ .30 standard deviations different. In addition to reporting the mean response

⁶ χ^2 tests adjusted for multiple comparisons (Keppel, 1991) were used to compare differences in proportions between regions, CPS and CFWS, and in-home and out-of-home cases. ANOVA and Bonferroni post-hoc comparisons were used to assess mean differences between regions, service areas, and in-home and out-of-home cases.

Table 3.1. Caregiver Demographics

	Statewide	
	Primary (n = 971)	Secondary (n = 498)
Relationship to Child (%)		
Mother	77	8
Father	8	61
Other relative	8	15
Non-Relative	2	16
Other	4	0
Missing	1	0
Gender (%)		
Female	87	15
Male	8	66
Missing	5	20
Race (%)		
Caucasian	73	72
African American	10	7
American Indian	9	7
Asian American/Pacific Islander	2	3
Hispanic/Latino	8	11
Other	2	2
Missing	1	1
Mean Age (n)	36 (911)	40 (465)
Mean number of adults (n)	1.9 (967)	2.4 (497)
Mean number of children (n)	2.3 (953)	2.4 (490)

to individual Likert scales, where appropriate, we also report workers’ mean score on computed scales.⁷

Table 31 shows the demographic characteristics of the primary and secondary caregivers—the adults responsible for providing care for the child or children most of the time—who were living in the assessed household at the time the case was referred to the Children’s Administration. On average, the assessed households included two adults and two children. Most of the primary caregivers in the households were mothers (77%) and female (87%). Primary caregivers were, on average, 36 years-old. Nearly three-quarters of the primary caregivers were Caucasian and about one-third was African-American, American-Indian, Asian-American, or Hispanic.

Fifty-one percent of the households included a secondary caregiver. On average, secondary caregivers were 40

⁷ Scales were computed if Cronbach’s alpha for a set of items was $\geq .70$. Cronbach’s alpha is a measure of internal reliability of the items in an index. It ranges from zero to one and indicates how much the items in an index are measuring the same thing. Using a score of .70 as the cutoff for computing scales means that the scales are at least moderately reliable.

Table 3.2. Child Demographics

	Statewide (N = 2137)
Relationship to Primary Caregiver (%)	
Son	46
Daughter	43
Other relative	7
Other relationship	1
Unrelated	2
Missing	2
Race (%)	
Caucasian	68
African American	16
American Indian	12
Asian American/Pacific Islander	4
Hispanic/Latino	15
Other	0
Missing	3
Out-of-Home Care	44
Mean age (n)	9.3 (2111)
Mean number of children (n)	2.3 (953)

years-old. About two-thirds of secondary caregivers were male. Almost two-thirds of the secondary caregivers were fathers, 8 percent were mothers, 15 percent were related to the child(ren) in some other way, and 16 percent were not related to the (child)ren in the household. Statewide, nearly three-quarters of the secondary caregivers were Caucasian and about one-third were of a racial minority. Whereas 75 percent or more of the caregivers in Regions 1, 3, 5 and 6 were Caucasian, caregivers in Regions 2 and 4 were more racially diverse (not shown).

Two-thousand one-hundred and thirty-seven children were living in the caregivers’ households at the time the families were referred to CA.⁸ Most of these children were the sons or daughters of the primary caregivers (see Table 3.2). Their average age was nine years. Statewide, the majority of children were Caucasian and 47 percent were youth of color. Children in Regions 2 and 4 were more racially diverse than children in Regions 1, 3, 5 and 6 (not shown). Forty-four percent of the children had been placed in out-of-home care.

⁸ Eighteen cases were missing demographic information on the child(ren) living in the caregiver’s household. Twenty-seven youth who were over the age of 18 were excluded from the analysis.

Perpetrators of Maltreatment⁹

The survey asked social workers to report the relationship of the perpetrator of maltreatment to the maltreated child(ren). The primary caregiver was a perpetrator in 75 percent of the cases statewide. Secondary caregivers were identified as perpetrators in 30 percent of the cases. Other relatives and non-relatives were identified as perpetrators in only five to ten percent of the cases.

A larger percentage of Region 1 than Region 5 workers reported secondary caregivers to be perpetrators of maltreatment. A smaller proportion of workers in Region 4 than workers in Regions 1, 3, 5 and 6 indicated that secondary caregivers were perpetrators.

Workers who assessed CPS cases were less likely than CFWS workers to report that primary caregivers were perpetrators of maltreatment. Caregivers whose children had been placed in out-of-home care were more likely to be identified by workers as a perpetrator of maltreatment.

Table 3.3a. Relationship to the Perpetrator(s) of Maltreatment by Region^a

	1 (n=80)	2 (n=66)	3 (n=90)	4 (n=95)	5 (n=68)	6 (n=77)	Statewide (N=476)
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Primary caregiver	80.9 ^b	78.1	72.2	73.8	70.1	76.6	75.4
Secondary caregiver	35.3	28.5	32.0	20.3 ^{c-d}	30.6	32.9	29.8
Other relative	9.8	10.9	11.8	11.8	9.0	8.4	10.3
Non-relative	1.7 ^d	5.8	5.9	5.3	6.7	4.8	5.0
Unknown	4.6	3.6	4.7	7.5	6.7	6.6	5.7

^aThe columns may add to more than 100% because respondents were allowed to report more than one perpetrator.

^bSig. diff. from Region 5 $p < .05$

^cSig. diff. from Regions 1 and 6 $p < .01$

^dSig. diff. from Regions 3 and 5 $p < .05$

Table 3.3b. Relationship to the Perpetrator(s) of Maltreatment by Service Area^a

	FVS (n=107)	FRS (n=48)	CFWS (n=569)	CPS (n=243)	Statewide (N=967)
	%	%	%	%	%
Primary caregiver	72.0	27.1	83.1 ^b	68.3	75.4
Secondary caregiver	36.4	14.6	28.1	33.7	29.8
Other relative	15.0	4.2	10.2	9.9	10.3
Non-relative	1.9	0.0	5.3	6.6	5.0
Unknown	7.5	37.5	4.0	2.5	5.7

^aThe columns may add to more than 100% because respondents were allowed to report more than one perpetrator.

^bSig. diff. from CPS $p < .01$

⁹ A question asking workers to report the type of maltreatment that the child(ren) in the family were subjected to immediately preceding the family's current involvement with Children's Administration was inadvertently excluded from the worker web survey. For future reports, maltreatment type for these cases will be gathered from the Children's Administration's administrative records.

Table 3.3c. Relationship to the Perpetrator(s) of Maltreatment by Service Context^a

	In-Home (n=440)	Out-of-Home (n=477)	Statewide (N=917)
	%	%	%
Primary caregiver	67.5 ^b	82.8	75.5
Secondary caregiver	29.1	31.2	30.2
Other relative	9.5	11.7	10.7
Non-relative	5.0	5.5	5.2
Unknown	6.8	5.0	5.9

^aThe columns may add to more than 100% because respondents were allowed to report more than one perpetrator.

^b $p < .01$

Caregivers' History

Child welfare workers were asked about caregivers' prior history with the Children's Administration and about the caregivers' childhood history of maltreatment. Seventy-one percent of workers statewide indicated that caregivers living in the household had had a prior open case with CFWS or CPS. A smaller percentage of caregivers in Region 4 than in Region 6 had had a prior open case. There were no significant differences between service areas or between in-home and out-of-home cases.

Table 3.4a. Caregiver(s) had a Prior Open CPS/CFWS Case by Region

1 (n=173)	2 (n=131)	3 (n=165)	4 (n=183)	5 (n=130)	6 (n=166)	Statewide (N=948)
%	%	%	%	%	%	%
73.4	70.2	70.3	65.0 ^a	71.5	75.9	71.0

^aSig. diff. from Region 6 $p < .05$

Table 3.4b. Caregiver(s) had a Prior Open CPS/CFWS Case by Service Area

FVS (n=107)	FRS (n=46)	CFWS (n=552)	CPS (n=243)	Statewide (N=948)
%	%	%	%	%
76.6	63.0	69.6	73.3	71.0

Table 3.4c. Caregiver(s) had a Prior Open CPS/CFWS Case by Service Context

In-Home (n=435)	Out-of-Home (n=468)	Statewide (N=903)
%	%	%
70.1	72.2	71.2

Statewide, 14 percent of primary caregivers had had their parental rights terminated in the past. There were no significant between-region differences. Larger proportions of caregivers receiving CFWS services than those receiving CPS services had had their parental rights terminated in the past. Also, caregivers whose children had been placed were more likely to have had their parental rights terminated in the past.

Table 3.5a. Primary Caregiver's Parental Rights Terminated in the Past by Region

1 (n=173)	2 (n=135)	3 (n=167)	4 (n=184)	5 (n=132)	6 (n=168)	Statewide (N=959)
%	%	%	%	%	%	%
18.5	11.1	13.2	13.0	12.9	13.1	13.8

Table 3.5b. Primary Caregiver's Parental Rights Terminated in the Past by Service Area

FVS (n=106)	FRS (n=48)	CFWS (n=561)	CPS (n=244)	Statewide (N=959)
%	%	%	%	%
8.5	2.1	19.8 ^a	4.5	13.8

^aSig. diff. from CPS $p < .01$

Table 3.5c. Primary Caregiver's Parental Rights Terminated in the Past by Service Context

In-Home (n=439)	Out-of-Home (n=472)	Statewide (N=911)
%	%	%
7.7 ^a	19.3	13.7

^a $p < .01$

Statewide, primary caregivers were reported to have experienced childhood maltreatment including physical abuse (30%), sexual abuse (23%), neglect (38%), and witnessing domestic violence (27%). Larger percentages of caregivers in Region 6 than in Region 4 had experienced childhood physical abuse, sexual abuse, and neglect. Also, larger proportions of Region 6 caregivers than caregivers in Regions 3, 4 and 5 had witnessed domestic violence. Compared with Region 1, a smaller percentage of Region 4 caregivers had witnessed domestic violence as a child.

Caregivers' childhood history of maltreatment varied significantly by service area. For each type of maltreatment, larger percentages of caregivers receiving CFWS services compared with those receiving CPS services had been maltreated in childhood.

Larger percentages of caregivers whose child(ren) were in out-of-home care than those whose child(ren) were not placed had been physically abused, sexually abused, neglected, and had witnessed domestic violence.

Table 3.6a. Primary Caregiver's Childhood History of Maltreatment by Region^a

	1 (n=174) ^b	2 (n=137)	3 (n=169)	4 (n=187)	5 (n=134)	6 (n=168)	Statewide (N=969)
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Physical abuse	34.5	34.1	27.7	22.4 ^c	27.7 ^d	37.3	30.5
Sexual abuse	20.8	24.4	22.4	17.9 ^d	23.2	28.5	22.7
Neglect	42.0	37.4	32.5	27.1 ^c	40.6	50.6	38.2
Witness to domestic violence	31.4 ^a	30.8	20.3	19.4	25.6 ^d	33.1 ^e	26.6

^aThe columns add to more than 100% because respondents were allowed to report more than one type of maltreatment.

^bActual *ns* may vary due to missing data.

^cSig. diff. from Region 6 $p < .01$

^dSig. diff. from Region 6 $p < .05$

^eSig. diff. from Region 4 $p < .05$

^fSig. diff. from Regions 3 and 4 $p < .01$

Table 3.6b. Primary Caregiver's Childhood History of Maltreatment by Service Area^a

	FVS (n=107) ^b	FRS (n=48)	CFWS (n=570)	CPS (n=244)	Statewide (N=969)
	%	%	%	%	%
Physical abuse	33.0	31.8	34.1 ^c	20.9	30.5
Sexual abuse	29.5	4.8	26.7 ^c	13.7	22.7
Neglect	45.3	40.9	41.3 ^c	27.2	38.2
Witness to domestic violence	24.8	25.0	31.9 ^c	15.6	26.6

^aThe columns may add to more than 100% because respondents were allowed to report more than one type of abuse or neglect.

^bActual *ns* may vary due to missing data.

^cSig. diff. from CPS $p < .01$

Table 3.6c. Primary Caregiver's Childhood History of Maltreatment by Service Context^a

	In-Home (n=441) ^b	Out-of-Home (n=477)	Statewide (N=918)
	%	%	%
Physical abuse	24.0 ^c	36.4	30.4
Sexual abuse	16.4 ^c	28.7	22.9
Neglect	34.1 ^c	42.5	38.5
Witness to domestic violence	20.7 ^c	32.3	26.7

^aThe columns add to more than 100% because respondents were allowed to report more than one type of abuse or neglect.

^bActual *ns* may vary due to missing data.

^c $p < .01$

Stability of Primary Caregivers' Living Arrangements

Workers reported how often during the last six months the primary caregiver had changed residence. Fifty-two percent of the workers indicated that the caregiver had not changed residence, 26 percent reported that the caregiver had changed residence once or twice, and 11 percent said the caregiver had changed residence three or more times.

There were no between-region differences. A smaller proportion of CPS workers than CFWS caseworkers reported that the caregiver had changed residence. In addition, caregivers whose child(ren) had not been placed were less likely than caregivers who had at least one child placed in out-of-home care to have changed residence.

Table 3.7a. Number of Times Primary Caregiver Changed Residence by Region

	1 (n=172)	2 (n=132)	3 (n=164)	4 (n=183)	5 (n=129)	6 (n=163)	Statewide (N=943)
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
None	50.0	46.2	55.5	55.2	48.8	53.4	51.9
Once or twice	29.1	30.3	24.4	23.0	27.1	25.8	26.4
Three or more	12.8	12.1	11.0	7.7	9.3	14.7	11.2
Don't know	8.1	11.4	9.1	14.2	14.7	6.1	10.5

Table 3.7b. Number of Times Primary Caregiver Changed Residence by Service Area

	FVS (n=107)	FRS (n=47)	CFWS ^a (n=550)	CPS (n=239)	Statewide (N=943) ^b
	%	%	%	%	%
None	58.9	72.3	41.5	68.6	51.9
Once or twice	34.6	8.5	27.5	23.8	26.4
Three or more	3.7	0.0	16.9	3.8	11.2
Don't know	2.8	19.1	14.2	3.8	10.5

^aSig. diff. from CPS $p < .01$

Table 3.7c. Number of Times Caregiver Changed Residence by Service Context

	In-Home ^a (n=433)	Out-of-Home (n=469)	Statewide (N=902)
	%	%	%
None	62.6	41.4	51.6
Once or twice	26.8	26.4	26.6
Three or more	5.5	17.1	11.5
Don't know	5.1	15.1	10.3

^a $p < .01$

Workers also reported whether the caregiver was homeless. Statewide, 13 percent of the caregivers were homeless. Although there were no between-region differences in homelessness, a larger percentage of caregivers receiving CFWS services than those receiving CPS services were homeless. Also, a larger proportion of caregivers whose children had been placed in out-of-home care were homeless.

Table 3.8a. Primary Caregiver Homeless by Region

1 (n=170)	2 (n=130)	3 (n=162)	4 (n=181)	5 (n=126)	6 (n=161)	Statewide (N=930)
%	%	%	%	%	%	%
11.8	13.1	14.8	13.3	11.9	11.2	12.7

Table 3.8b. Primary Caregiver Homeless by Service Area

FVS (n=104)	FRS (n=44)	CFWS (n=539)	CPS (n=240)	Statewide (N=930)
%	%	%	%	%
5.8	4.3	16.5 ^a	8.8	12.7

^aSig. diff. from CPS $p < .01$

Table 3.8c. Primary Caregiver Homeless by Service Context

In-Home (n=428)	Out-of-Home (n=459)	Statewide (N=887)
%	%	%
7.0 ^a	18.5	13.0

^a $p < .01$

Statewide, among primary caregivers who were not homeless, 16 percent were living with a friend or family member. Larger percentages of caregivers were living with friends or family members in Regions 1, 2, 3, and 6 compared with Region 5. Compared with CPS cases, a larger proportion of caregivers in CFWS cases were living with friends or relatives. Caregivers whose

child(ren) had been placed were more likely to be living with a friend or family member than caregivers whose child(ren) had not been placed.

Table 3.9a. Primary Caregiver is Living with Friend or Other Family Member by Region

1 (n=129)	2 (n=102)	3 (n=123)	4 (n=133)	5 (n=95)	6 (n=126)	Statewide (N=708) ^a
%	%	%	%	%	%	%
20.9	20.6	17.9	12.8	6.3 ^{b,c}	17.5	16.2

^aN includes only workers who indicated the caregiver was not homeless.

^bSig. diff. from Regions 1, 2 and 3 $p < .01$

^cSig. diff. from Region 6 $p < .05$

Table 3.9b. Primary Caregiver is Living with Friend or Other Family Member by Service Area

FVS (n=90)	FVS (n=40)	CFWS (n=374)	CPS (n=204)	Statewide (N=708) ^a
%	%	%	%	%
15.6	5.3	20.2 ^b	12.7	16.6

^aN includes only workers who indicated the caregiver was not homeless.

^bSig. diff. from CPS $p < .05$

Table 3.9c. Primary Caregiver is Living with Friend or Other Family Member by Service Context

In-Home (n=365)	Out-of-Home (n=309)	Statewide (N=708) ^a
%	%	%
12.9 ^b	20.7	16.2

^aN includes only workers who indicated the caregiver was not homeless.

^b $p < .01$

Primary Caregivers' Money Management Characteristics

Social workers were asked whether or not the primary caregiver had sufficient income to provide for their child(ren)'s basic needs and a series of questions about the caregiver's prioritization and distribution of money.

Overall, 58 percent of the workers indicated that caregivers had enough income to provide for their child(ren)'s basic needs. There were no between-region differences. A smaller percentage of workers who assessed CFWS cases than those who assessed CPS cases reported that caregivers had enough income to provide for their child(ren)'s basic needs. A smaller proportion of workers indicated that caregivers whose children had been placed had enough income to meet their child(ren)'s basic needs.

Table 3.10a. Primary Caregiver has Enough Income for Child(ren)'s Basic Needs by Region

	1 (n=173)	2 (n=131)	3 (n=163)	4 (n=183)	5 (n=133)	6 (n=167)	Statewide (N=950)
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Yes	57.8	56.5	57.7	59.6	55.6	61.7	58.3
Don't know	11.6	12.2	10.4	14.8	16.5	7.2	12.0

Table 3.10b. Primary Caregiver has Enough Income for Child(ren)'s Basic Needs by Service Area

	FVS (n=107)	FRS (n=48)	CFWS (n=555)	CPS (n=240)	Statewide (N=950)
	%	%	%	%	%
Yes	72.0	75.0	47.2 ^a	74.6	58.3
Don't know	5.6	14.6	15.7	5.8	12.0

^aSig. diff. from CPS $p < .01$

Table 3.10c. Primary Caregiver has Enough Income for Child(ren)'s Basic Needs by Service Context

	In-Home (n=436)	Out-of-Home (n=471)	Statewide Total (N=907)
	%	%	%
Yes	74.5 ^a	42.5	57.9
Don't know	6.4	16.8	11.8

^a $p < .01$

On average, workers statewide responded neutrally to questions about caregivers making sure that their child(ren)'s financial needs were met and prioritizing essential items. Workers were in greater disagreement with the statement that caregivers budget the family's money wisely. There were no significant between-region differences.

Compared with other workers, social workers who assessed CFWS cases were significantly less likely to agree with statements about caregivers' ability to manage money well. For each statement, whereas FRS workers answered that they *agreed* or were *neutral*, CFWS workers disagreed.

Table 3.11a. Primary Caregiver's Money Management Skills by Region^a

	1 (n=174) ^b	2 (n=137)	3 (n=169)	4 (n=187)	5 (n=134)	6 (n=168)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total	
Caregiver makes sure that his/her child(ren)'s financial needs are met before spending money on her/himself	3.2	3.1	2.8	2.8	2.9	3.1	3.0	1.4	801
Caregiver budgets the family's money wisely and plans for unseen financial problems	3.6	3.6	3.4	3.2	3.2	3.6	3.4	1.3	773
Caregiver will purchase essential items (e.g., food) before spending money on nonessentials	3.1	3.1	2.8	2.8	2.8	3.1	3.0	1.4	779
Primary caregiver money management skills scale ^c	3.3	3.3	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.2	3.1	1.3	792

^aScale: 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=neutral, 4=disagree, 5=strongly disagree

^bActual *ns* vary due to missing data.

^cCronbach's alpha = .95

Table 3.11b. Primary Caregiver Money Management Skills by Service Area

	FVS (n=107) ^b	FRS (n=48)	CFWS (n=570)	CPS (n=244)	Statewide		Total
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
Caregiver makes sure that his/her child(ren)'s financial needs are met before spending money on her/himself	2.6 ^c	2.4 ^c	3.3 ^d	2.6	3.0	1.4	801
Caregiver budgets the family's money wisely and plans for unseen financial problems	3.3 ^c	2.7 ^c	3.7 ^d	3.1	3.4	1.3	773
Caregiver will purchase essential items (e.g., food) before spending money on nonessentials	2.8 ^c	2.2 ^c	3.3 ^d	2.6	3.0	1.3	779
Primary caregiver money management skills scale ^d	2.9 ^c	2.4 ^c	3.4 ^d	2.7	3.1	1.3	792

^aScale: 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=neutral, 4=disagree, 5=strongly disagree

^bActual *ns* may vary due to missing data.

^cSig. diff. from CFWS $p < .01$

^dSig. diff. from CPS $p < .01$

^eSig. diff. from CFWS $p < .05$

^fCronbach's alpha = .95

Social workers who assessed cases in which a child(ren) had been placed in out-of-home care were less likely to agree with statements indicating that caregivers prioritized child(ren) and future needs in their money management practices than the workers who assessed cases with children living in home.

Table 3.11c. Primary Caregiver Money Management Skills by Service Context^a

	In-Home (n=441) ^b	Out-of-Home (n=447)	Statewide			Total
	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total	
Caregiver makes sure that his/her child(ren)'s financial needs are met before spending money on her/himself	2.5 ^c	3.5	3.0	1.4	765	
Caregiver budgets the family's money wisely and plans for unseen financial problems	3.0 ^c	3.9	3.4	1.3	737	
Caregiver will purchase essential items (e.g., food) before spending money on nonessentials	2.5 ^c	3.5	3.0	1.3	743	
Primary caregiver money management skills scale ^d	2.7 ^c	3.6	3.1	1.3	756	

^aScale: 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=neutral, 4=disagree, 5=strongly disagree

^bActual *ns* may vary due to missing data.

^c $p < .01$

^dCronbach's alpha = .95

Caregivers' Disposition

Workers responded to a set of items from the Child Well-Being Scales (Magura and Moses, 1986) measuring "Parental Disposition" (14 items focusing on parenting skills, problem recognition, motivation, and the primary caregiver's relationship to the child(ren)). The Child Well-Being Scales were designed specifically for use in child welfare services as a means of both initial assessment and monitoring of progress over time. Response options vary from item to item, ranging from three to six categories. The wording of these categories also varies, but most cover a range from *Adequate* (=1) to *Severely Inadequate* (=4). The items are then weighted in terms of the impact of "seriousness" of each item on a child's overall well-being. The weighted item scores range from 1 to 100 with high scores indicating high child well-

being, and these weighted items are reported in Tables 3.12a-c. Appendix A provides the scoring scheme for the “Parental Disposition” items.

For most of the “Parental Disposition” items, workers’ assessments indicated that primary caregivers were not adequate, but also were not severely inadequate. Workers assessed caregivers to be least adequate in their capacity for child care, their recognition of family problems, and protecting their children from abuse. The average “Parental Disposition” scale score was lowest in Region 1 and highest in Region 4. CFWS workers assessed caregivers to be less adequate on several “Parental Disposition” items than did CPS workers (and to a lesser extent FVS and FRS workers); there was an overall scale score difference between CFWS and CPS.

Workers assessed caregivers whose children had been placed in out-of-home care to be significantly less adequate than caregivers whose children were not placed on every “Parental Disposition” item. Notably, workers’ assessments indicated that caregivers whose children had been placed were *moderately inadequate* in their capacity for child care and *somewhat inadequate* in protecting their children from abuse.

Table 3.12a. Primary Caregiver’s Disposition by Region

	1	2	3	4	5	6	Statewide		
	(n=174) ^a	(n=137)	(n=169)	(n=187)	(n=134)	(n=168)	Mean	SD	Total
Primary caregiver’s capacity for child care	57.8	63.2	59.6	67.7	61.1	61.3	61.8	31.2	868
Primary caregiver’s recognition of family problems	64.0	67.8	66.1	71.5	66.3	67.7	67.3	24.0	873
Primary caregiver’s motivation to solve problems	77.0	81.6	79.4	83.3	79.6	79.6	80.1	18.1	757
Primary caregiver’s cooperation with case planning and services	71.1	74.7	71.2	76.3	73.7	70.5	72.8	23.2	858
Primary caregiver’s expectation of children	77.3	79.6	77.5	80.4	77.7	77.2	78.3	16.6	788
Primary caregiver’s acceptance of and affection for children	80.7	83.0	82.8	83.3	78.4	79.5	81.3	21.2	783
Primary caregiver’s consistency of discipline	77.5	79.2	79.0	83.0	78.3	79.4	79.5	15.6	655
Primary caregiver’s teaching and stimulating of children	77.0 ^b	79.0	78.9	83.7	78.4	79.7	79.5	16.2	680
Primary caregiver’s approval of children	80.5	82.3	83.8	84.9	82.3	82.2	82.7	11.9	627
Abusive physical discipline	82.8	79.0	88.5	84.3	82.1	83.0	83.5	30.2	671
Threat of abuse	79.1	76.5	86.3	82.3	82.0	81.2	81.4	26.2	635
Protection from abuse	53.1	59.0	55.9	67.2	60.0	49.7	57.5	39.1	401
Disposition scale ^{c, d}	73.2	75.7	74.7	78.6	73.9	73.7	75.0	16.8	840

^aActual *n*s may vary due to missing data.

^bSig. diff. from Region 4 *p* < .05

^cCronbach’s alpha = .89

^dScale was calculated for respondents who answered at least five of the 12 items included in the scale; and scale scores were adjusted for the number of items the respondent answered.

Table 3.12b. Primary Caregiver’s Disposition by Service Area

	FVS	FRS	CFWS	CPS	Statewide		
	(n=107) ^a	(n=48)	(n=570)	(n=244)	Mean	SD	Total
Primary caregiver’s capacity for child care	70.8 ^b	74.9 ^b	52.9 ^e	75.8	61.8	31.2	868
Primary caregiver’s recognition of family problems	69.6	73.5	64.1 ^c	72.1	67.3	24.0	873
Primary caregiver’s motivation to solve problems	80.8	82.9	77.8 ^c	83.8	80.1	18.1	757
Primary caregiver’s cooperation with case planning and services	74.9	79.4 ^d	69.5 ^e	78.6	72.8	23.2	858
Primary caregiver’s expectation of children	78.3	80.5	76.3 ^c	82.0	78.3	16.6	788
Primary caregiver’s acceptance of and affection for children	80.2	72.1 ^c	81.2	83.9	81.3	21.2	783
Primary caregiver’s consistency of discipline	79.1	76.8	78.2 ^c	83.0	79.5	15.6	655
Primary caregiver’s teaching and stimulating of children	80.8	80.7	78.7	80.2	79.5	16.2	680
Primary caregiver’s approval of children	80.4 ^d	78.4 ^d	84.0	81.9	82.7	11.9	627
Abusive physical discipline	87.5	82.5	81.2	86.1	83.5	30.2	671
Threat of abuse	80.7	74.0	80.9	84.2	81.4	26.2	635
Protection from abuse	43.4 ^e	75.9 ^d	52.1 ^c	71.9	57.5	39.1	401
Disposition scale ^{c, e}	76.1	78.4	72.2 ^c	79.9	75.0	16.9	840

^aActual *n*s may vary due to missing data.

^bSig. diff. from CFWS *p* < .01

^cSig. diff. from CPS *p* < .01

^dSig. diff. from CFWS *p* < .05

^eSig. diff. from FRS and CPS *p* < .01

^fCronbach’s alpha = .89

^gScale was calculated for respondents who answered at least five of the 12 items included in the scale; and scale scores were adjusted for the number of items the respondent answered.

Table 3.12c. Primary Caregiver’s Disposition by Service Context

	In-Home	Out-Of-Home	Statewide	
	(n=441) ^a	(n=447)	Mean	SD
Primary caregiver’s capacity for child care	75.2 ^b	48.0	61.4	31.0
Primary caregiver’s recognition of family problems	72.9 ^b	60.9	66.8	23.9
Primary caregiver’s motivation to solve problems	84.5 ^b	74.8	80.0	17.9
Primary caregiver’s cooperation with case planning and services	79.6 ^b	66.0	72.7	23.1
Primary caregiver’s expectation of children	82.9 ^b	72.8	78.1	16.5
Primary caregiver’s acceptance of and affection for children	84.5 ^b	78.2	81.5	21.2
Primary caregiver’s consistency of discipline	83.1 ^b	75.1	79.4	15.6
Primary caregiver’s teaching and stimulating of children	83.4 ^b	75.2	79.5	16.1
Primary caregiver’s approval of children	83.4	81.6	82.6	11.8
Abusive physical discipline	88.4 ^b	78.1	83.6	30.1
Threat of abuse	84.5	78.2	81.6	25.9
Protection from abuse	67.4 ^b	46.6	57.3	39.2
Disposition scale ^{c, d}	80.0 ^e	66.1	72.9	18.6

^aActual *n*s may vary due to missing data.

^b*p* < .05

^cCronbach’s alpha = .89

^dScale was calculated for respondents who answered at least five of the 12 items included in the scale; and scale scores were adjusted for the number of items the respondent answered.

^e*p* < .01

Children’s Disabilities and Problems

Workers reported whether any child in the family had been professionally diagnosed with a learning disorder, a mental or behavioral disorder, or a developmental, physical, speech, hearing, vision or other disability. Workers also indicated whether any child in the family abused alcohol or other drugs, or had serious behavior or health problems.

Workers indicated that child learning (47%) and mental or behavioral health problems (32%) were more common

than developmental, physical, speech, hearing, or vision challenges. There were several significant between-region differences in the percentage of cases that included a child(ren) with a disability. Smaller percentages of cases in Region 1 than in Regions 2, 3, 5 or 6 included a child(ren) with diagnosed learning, mental or behavioral, or developmental problems. Compared with Region 3, Region 6 had larger proportions of cases that included a child(ren) with vision and mental or behavioral health difficulties. Workers in Regions 4 and 5 reported larger percentages of cases with child developmental and speech disabilities than workers in Region 2.

Larger proportions of CFWS cases than CPS cases included a child(ren) with a diagnosed learning, mental or behavioral, developmental, physical, speech, hearing, vision, or some other disorder. Cases in which a child(ren) had been placed were more likely than cases in which no child was placed to include child(ren) who had been diagnosed with a disorder.

Table 3.13a. Diagnosed Child Disabilities by Region^a

	1 (n=174) ^b	2 (n=137)	3 (n=169)	4 (n=187)	5 (n=134)	6 (n=168)	Statewide (N=969)
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Learning	38.0 ^c	49.2	43.0 ^d	48.6	46.0	56.6	46.8
Mental or behavioral	22.2 ^{e,f}	39.7	32.7	29.3	33.6	37.8	32.1
Developmental	10.6 ^g	21.6 ^h	15.2	11.8	14.9	16.0	14.7
Physical	8.8	9.8	6.8	4.2	7.8	9.7	7.7
Speech	20.7	23.2 ⁱ	16.1	13.2	12.3	18.4	17.3
Hearing	3.8	5.0	3.5	2.4	1.8	5.0	3.6
Vision	5.0	8.5	4.2 ^l	7.9	6.3	11.2	7.1
Other	5.8	5.1	4.1	3.8 ^j	9.6	6.3	5.6

^aThe columns add to more than 100% because respondents were allowed to report more than one type of disorder or disability.

^bActual *ns* may vary due to missing data.

^cSig. diff. from Region 6 *p* < .01

^dSig. diff. from Region 6 *p* < .05

^eSig. diff. from Regions 2 and 6 *p* < .01

^fSig. diff. from Regions 3 and 5 *p* < .05

^gSig. diff. from Region 2 *p* < .01

^hSig. diff. from Region 4 *p* < .05

ⁱSig. diff. from Regions 4 and 5 *p* < .05

^jSig. diff. from Region 5 *p* < .05

Table 3.13b. Diagnosed Child Disabilities by Service Area^a

	FVS (n=107) ^b	FRS (n=48)	CFWS (n=570)	CPS (n=244)	Statewide (N=969)
	%	%	%	%	%
Learning	44.0	63.0	51.6 ^c	34.0	46.8
Mental or behavioral	29.9	34.1	36.1 ^c	23.5	32.1
Developmental	19.6	9.1	16.8 ^e	9.0	14.7
Physical	5.6	0.0	9.8 ^d	5.4	7.7
Speech	15.6	2.3	22.4 ^c	9.4	17.3
Hearing	2.3	2.3	4.7 ^d	1.8	3.6
Vision	7.1	4.7	9.3 ^c	2.7	7.1
Other	3.4	0.0	8.2 ^c	1.8	5.6

^aThe columns add to more than 100% because respondents were allowed to report more than one type of disorder or disability.

^bActual *ns* may vary due to missing data.

^cSig. diff. from CPS *p* < .01

^dSig. diff. from CPS *p* < .05

Table 3.13c. Diagnosed Child Disabilities by Service Context^a

	In-Home (n=441) ^b	Out-of-Home (n=477)	Statewide (N=918)
	%	%	%
Learning	41.7 ^c	52.1	47.1
Mental or behavioral	28.3 ^c	35.9	32.3
Developmental	11.7 ^c	18.0	15.0
Physical	5.1 ^c	10.6	7.9
Speech	13.1 ^c	21.9	17.7
Hearing	2.6	4.3	3.5
Vision	5.2 ^c	9.1	7.2
Other	2.6 ^c	8.9	5.9

^aThe columns add to more than 100% because respondents were allowed to report more than one type of disorder or disability.

^bActual *ns* may vary due to missing data.

^c*p* < .01

^d*p* < .05

Eleven percent of cases included a child(ren) who abused alcohol, and 13 percent included a child(ren) who abused drugs. Workers also indicated that 34 percent of cases included a child(ren) with a serious behavior problem, and that 10 percent included a child with a serious health problem.

A smaller percentage of cases in Region 1 than in Regions 2, 5 and 6 included a child(ren) with a behavior problem. Compared with Region 6, Region 5 had a smaller percentage of cases that included a child(ren) with a serious health problem.

Larger percentages of CFWS than CPS cases included a child(ren) with an alcohol, drug, serious behavior, or serious health problem. Cases in which a child(ren) had been placed in out-of-home care included significantly larger percentages of children who had drug, behavior, or health problems.

Table 3.14a. Child Substance Abuse, Behavior and Health Problems by Region^a

	1 (n=174) ^b	2 (n=137)	3 (n=169)	4 (n=187)	5 (n=134)	6 (n=168)	Statewide (N=969)
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Alcohol abuse	8.9	15.2	10.2	10.0	11.0	10.5	10.8
Drug abuse	11.2	13.3	13.4	11.8	14.8	13.3	12.8
Serious behavior problem	26.9 ^c	38.9	32.5	33.5	8.8	37.7	34.3
Serious health problem	9.6	8.9	10.4	9.8	6.5 ^d	15.5	10.3

^aThe columns may add to more than 100% because respondents were allowed to report more than one type of problem.

^bActual *ns* may vary due to missing data.

^cSig. diff. from Regions 2, 5 and 6 *p* < .05

^dSig. diff. from Region 6 *p* < .05

Table 3.14b. Child Substance Abuse, Behavior and Health Problems by Service Areas^a

	FVS (n=107) ^b	FRS (n=48)	CFWS (n=570)	CPS (n=244)	Statewide (N=969)
	%	%	%	%	%
Alcohol abuse	8.0	40.4	10.7 ^c	6.4	10.8
Drug abuse	12.0	34.8	13.9 ^d	6.4	12.8
Serious behavior problems	27.5	66.0	36.5 ^d	26.1	34.3
Serious health problems	7.3	11.1	12.6 ^d	6.0	10.3

^aThe columns may add to more than 100% because respondents were allowed to report more than one type of problem.

^bActual *ns* may vary due to missing data.

^cSig. diff. from CPS *p* < .05

^dSig. diff. from CPS *p* < .01

Table 3.14c. Child Substance Abuse, Behavior and Health Problems by Service Context^a

	In-Home (n=441) ^b	Out-of-Home (n=477)	Statewide (N=918)
	%	%	%
Alcohol abuse	9.6	11.5	10.6
Drug abuse	10.3 ^c	14.8	12.6
Serious behavior problems	27.6 ^d	40.5	34.3
Serious health problems	7.0 ^d	14.2	10.7

^aThe columns may add to more than 100% because respondents were allowed to report more than one type of problem.

^bActual *ns* may vary due to missing data.

^c*p* <.05

^d*p* <.01

Permanency Plans for Child(ren) in Out-of-Home Care

Four-hundred and eighty-two workers assessed cases in which at least one child had been placed in out-of-home care. The survey asked these workers about the permanency plans for the child(ren) in out-of-home care.

Statewide, workers reported that the court-approved permanency plan for cases with child(ren) in out-of-home care was return home (42%), adoption (26%), emancipation/independent living (4%), and guardianship (8%).

Larger percentages of workers in Regions 1 and 3 than in Region 6 reported that the permanency plan was adoption. Region 1 workers were more likely than workers in Regions 3 and 5 to report that no plan had been established. Compared with workers who assessed CPS cases, larger percentages of workers who assessed CFWS cases indicated that there was a permanency plan for child(ren) who had been placed.

Table 3.15a. Permanency Plan(s) for Child(ren) in Out-of-Home Care by Region

	1 (n=80) ^{a, b}	2 (n=66)	3 (n=89)	4 (n=95)	5 (n=68)	6 (n=77)	Statewide (N=475) ^c
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Return home	42.5	42.4	40.4	35.8	38.2	50.6	41.6
Adoption	35.0 ^d	21.2	33.7 ^e	24.2	22.1	19.5	26.3
Emancipation/Independent living	2.5	0.0	1.1	5.3	7.4	5.2	3.6
Guardianship	5.0	12.1	4.5	9.5	10.3	6.5	7.8
No plan yet established	12.5 ^f	7.6	4.5	8.4	4.4	6.5	7.4

^aThe numbers and percents refer to cases, not children.

^bThe columns may add to more than 100% because respondents were allowed to report more than one permanency plan.

^cN includes the respondents who assessed cases with child(ren) in out-of-home care and reported the permanency plan.

^dSign. diff. from Region 6 *p* <.05

^eSign. diff. from Region 6 *p* <.01

^fSign. diff. from Region 3 and 5 *p* <.05

Table 3.15b. Permanency Plan(s) for Child(ren) in Out-of-Home Care by Service Area^a

	FVS (n=20) ^{a, b}	FRS (n=7)	CFWS (n=404)	CPS (n=45)	Statewide (N=476) ^c
	%	%	%	%	%
Return home	30.0	28.6	42.3 ^d	40.9	41.6
Adoption	10.0	0.0	29.7 ^d	6.8	26.3
Emancipation/Independent living	5.0	14.3	3.7 ^d	0.0	3.6
Guardianship	10.0	0.0	8.4 ^d	2.3	7.8
No plan yet established	15.0	28.6	5.4	18.2	7.4

^aN includes the respondents who assessed cases with child(ren) in out-of-home care and reported the permanency plan.

^bThe columns may add to more than 100% because respondents were allowed to report more than one permanency plan.

^cThe numbers and percents refer to cases, not children.

^dSign. diff. CPS *p* <.01

Workers who indicated that the permanency plan was to return the child(ren) home were asked to whom custody would be transferred, how likely it was for the child(ren) to be returned home within six months, and how well the primary caregiver understood the court's return conditions.¹⁰

Seventy percent of workers reported that custody would be transferred to the primary caregiver when the child(ren) returned home. Workers indicated that it was *not very to somewhat likely* that the child(ren) would be returned home within the next six months, and that primary caregivers had only a *fair to good understanding* of the court's return conditions. There were no significant between-region differences.

Table 3.16. Person to Whom Custody will be Transferred by Region

	1 (n=33)	2 (n=27)	3 (n=37)	4 (n=28)	5 (n=23)	6 (n=34)	Statewide (N=179) ^a
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Primary caregiver	57.6	74.1	67.6	78.6	60.9	79.4	70.0
Secondary caregiver	9.1	7.4	8.8	7.1	8.7	2.9	7.2
Primary and secondary caregiver	6.1	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	2.2
Other	27.3	14.8	23.5	14.3	30.4	14.7	20.6

^aN includes respondents who assessed cases with child(ren) in out-of-home care whose permanency plan was return home and who reported the custody plan.

Table 3.17. Likelihood that the Child(ren) will be Returned Home within the Next Six Months by Region^a

	1 (n=33)	2 (n=27)	3 (n=37)	4 (n=34)	5 (n=26)	6 (n=39)	Total (N=196) ^b	
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
	2.3	2.7	2.4	2.5	2.5	2.7	2.5	1.0 196

^aScale: 1=very likely, 2=somewhat likely, 3=not very likely, 4=very unlikely

^bN includes respondents who assessed cases with child(ren) in out-of-home care and that had a permanency plan of return home.

Table 3.18. Primary Caregiver's Understanding of the Court's Return Conditions by Region^a

	1 (n=34)	2 (n=27)	3 (n=37)	4 (n=34)	5 (n=26)	6 (n=39)	Statewide Total (N=197) ^b		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
	2.4	2.3	2.5	2.5	2.3	2.6	2.4	0.9	197

^aScale: 1=very good understanding, 2=good understanding, 3=fair understanding, 4=poor to very poor understanding

^bN includes respondents who assessed cases with child(ren) in out-of-home care whose permanency plan was return home and reported the custody plan.

Primary Caregivers' Contact with Child(ren) Placed in Out-of-Home Care

Workers who assessed cases in which a child(ren) had been placed were asked whether the primary caregiver had unsupervised visitation rights, how often caregivers had phone and face-to-face contact with their children, and how often court-approved visitations were refused by substitute caregivers.

¹⁰ Because a majority of cases with a permanency plan of return home (87%) were receiving CFWS services, responses to these questions are analyzed only by regions.

Workers statewide reported that 28 percent of the primary caregivers were allowed to have unsupervised visits with their children. There were no significant between-region or between-service area differences.

Table 3.19a. Primary Caregiver is Allowed Unsupervised Visits by Region

1 (n=75)	2 (n=54)	3 (n=73)	4 (n=77)	5 (n=57)	6 (n=65)	Statewide (N=401)
%						
22.7	24.1	32.9	35.1	24.6	24.6	27.9

Table 3.19b. Primary Caregiver is Allowed Unsupervised Visits by Service Area

1 (n=34)	2 (n=27)	3 (n=37)	4 (n=34)	5 (n=26)	6 (n=39)	Statewide Total (N=197) ^b		
Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
2.4	2.3	2.5	2.5	2.3	2.6	2.4	0.9	197

^aScale: 1=very good understanding, 2=good understanding, 3=fair understanding, 4=poor to very poor understanding
^bN includes respondents who assessed cases with child(ren) in out-of-home care whose permanency plan was return home and reported the custody plan.

Workers estimated the number of times during the month prior to the survey that caregivers had had contact with their child(ren). Statewide, 31 percent of workers reported that caregivers had had no face-to-face contact with their child(ren). Twenty-two percent of workers indicated that caregivers had had face-to-face contact one to four times, and 40 percent of workers said caregivers had had face-to-face contact at least four times. Region 5 workers were more likely than Region 1 workers to report that caregivers had had no face-to-face contact with their child(ren). There were no significant between-service area differences.

Table 3.20a. Primary Caregivers' Face-to-Face Contact with Children in Out-of-Home Care by Region

	1 ^a (n=73)	2 (n=54)	3 (n=71)	4 (n=76)	5 (n=55)	6 (n=66)	Statewide (N=395)
%							
None	28.8	33.3	25.4	38.2	41.8	22.7	31.3
One to four times	13.7	20.4	22.5	25.0	27.3	21.2	21.5
Four or more times	49.3	38.9	43.7	30.3	27.3	48.5	40.2
Don't know	8.2	7.4	8.5	6.6	3.6	7.6	7.1

^aSign. diff. from Region 5 $p < .05$

Table 3.20b. Primary Caregivers' Face-to-Face Contact with Children in Out-of-Home Care by Service Area

	FVS (n=14)	FRS (n=4)	CFWS (n=348)	CPS (n=29)	Statewide (N=395) ^a
%					
None	14.3	0.0	33.6	17.2	31.3
One to four times	21.4	0.0	23.0	6.9	21.5
Four or more times	42.9	75.0	39.9	34.5	40.2
Don't know	21.4	25.0	3.4	41.4	7.1

Overall, primary caregivers were reported to have had more face-to-face than phone contact with their children who were placed in out-of-home care. Statewide, 41 percent of workers indicated that caregivers had had no phone contact with their children. There were no

significant between-region or between-service area differences in the amount of phone contact that primary caregivers had with their children.

Table 3.21a. Primary Caregivers' Phone Contact with Children in Out-of-Home Care by Region

	1 (n=73)	2 (n=53)	3 (n=71)	4 (n=77)	5 (n=52)	6 (n=65)	Statewide (N=391)
%							
None	41.1	41.5	33.8	40.3	48.1	43.1	40.8
One to four times	8.2	11.3	15.5	15.6	19.2	9.2	13.0
Four or more times	27.4	28.3	29.6	32.5	23.1	26.2	28.1
Don't know	23.3	18.9	21.1	11.7	9.6	21.5	18.1

Table 3.21b. Primary Caregivers' Phone Contact with Children in Out-of-Home Care by Service Area

	FVS (n=14)	FRS (n=4)	CFWS (n=346)	CPS (n=27)	Statewide (N=391)
%					
None	21.4	0.0	43.6	22.2	40.8
One to four times	14.3	0.0	13.3	11.1	13.0
Four or more times	21.4	25.0	29.2	18.5	28.1
Don't know	42.9	75.0	13.9	48.1	18.1

Statewide, workers reported that substitute caregivers had refused to allow primary caregiver visits in only three percent of the cases in which children had been placed in out-of-home care. A larger percentage of Region 3 than Region 5 workers reported that substitute caregivers had refused primary caregiver visits. There were no significant between-service area differences.

Table 3.22a. Court-Approved Visits Refused by Substitute Caregiver by Region

	1 (n=74)	2 (n=54)	3 (n=73)	4 (n=79)	5 (n=55)	6 (n=66)	Statewide (N=401)
%							
Yes	4.1	3.7	6.8 ^a	2.5	0.0	1.5	3.2
Don't know	4.1	3.7	1.4	5.1	9.1	6.1	4.7

^aSign. diff. from Region 5 $p < .05$

Table 3.22b. Court-Approved Visits Refused by Substitute Caregiver by Service Area

	FVS (n=14)	FRS (n=7)	CFWS (n=353)	CPS (n=30)	Statewide (N=401)
%					
Yes	0.0	0.0	3.4	3.3	3.2
Don't know	21.4	0.0	2.8	20.0	4.7

Workers' Casework Approach

Social workers were asked a series of questions about their approach to working with the family they assessed and about their use of informal supports. Overall, workers reported taking a strengths-based, solution-focused approach to working with assessed families. There were no between-region differences in the workers' approach. Workers who assessed CFWS cases were in somewhat

less agreement with statements about a strengths-based, solution-focused casework approach than were workers who assessed CPS or FVS cases. Workers who assessed cases in which no child had been placed were somewhat more likely than workers who assessed cases in which a child(ren) was in out-of-home care to have used a strengths-based, solution-focused approach.

Table 3.23a. Workers' Approach to Families by Region^a

	Region						Statewide		Total
	1 (n=174) ^b Mean	2 (n=137) Mean	3 (n=169) Mean	4 (n=187) Mean	5 (n=134) Mean	6 (n=168) Mean	Mean	SD	
Focusing on family strengths is essential to helping this family resolve problems	3.9	4.0	4.1	4.1	4.0	4.1	4.0	1.0	931
This family has more problems than strengths	2.7	2.5	2.6	2.6	2.8	2.6	2.6	1.2	925
Emphasizing this family's strengths draws attention away from efforts to protect their children	2.3	2.1	2.3	2.1	2.3	2.2	2.2	1.1	926
The primary caregiver in this family has strengths and resources she/he can use to solve problems	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.8	1.1	924
The primary caregiver in this family sometimes does a good job parenting	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.9	3.8	1.1	926
Building on the primary caregiver's successful strategies is the beginning step to helping her/him succeed	3.9	4.0	4.0	3.9	3.7	4.0	3.9	1.1	922
There are exceptions to the primary caregiver's pattern of problem behavior	3.5	3.3	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.7	3.5	1.1	923
Building trusting relationships with the primary caregiver is an essential part of helping this family	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.3	4.2	1.0	922
Workers' approach to families scale ^c	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.9	3.8	.72	926

^aScale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=somewhat disagree, 3=neutral, 4=somewhat agree, 5=strongly agree
^bActual ns may vary due to missing data.
^cCronbach's alpha = .83

Table 3.23b. Workers' Approach to Families by Service Area^a

	Service Area				Statewide		Total
	FVS (n=107) ^b Mean	FRS (n=48) Mean	CFWS (n=570) Mean	CPS (n=244) Mean	Mean	SD	
Focusing on family strengths is essential to helping this family resolve problems	4.3 ^c	4.2	4.0	4.1	4.0	1.0	931
This family has more problems than strengths	2.2 ^c	2.7	2.8	2.5 ^c	2.6	1.2	925
Emphasizing this family's strengths draws attention away from efforts to protect their children	2.1	2.1	2.3	2.2	2.2	1.1	926
The primary caregiver in this family has strengths and resources she/he can use to solve problems	4.0 ^d	3.8	3.7	3.9	3.8	1.1	924
The primary caregiver in this family sometimes does a good job parenting	4.2 ^e	4.0	3.7	4.0 ^c	3.8	1.1	926
Building on the primary caregiver's successful strategies is the beginning step to helping her/him succeed	4.1 ^e	4.4 ^f	3.8	4.0	3.9	1.1	922
There are exceptions to the primary caregiver's pattern of problem behavior	3.6	3.3	3.4	3.6	3.5	1.1	923
Building trusting relationships with the primary caregiver is an essential part of helping this family	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.2	1.0	922
Workers' approach to families scale ^g	4.0 ^e	3.9	3.7	3.9 ^c	3.8	.72	928

^aScale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=somewhat disagree, 3=neutral, 4=somewhat agree, 5=strongly agree
^bActual ns may vary due to missing data.
^csig. diff. from CFWS $p < .01$
^dsig. diff. from CFWS $p < .05$
^esig. diff. from FRS and CFWS $p < .05$
^fsig. diff. from CFWS and CPS $p < .01$
^gCronbach's alpha = .83

Table 3.23c. Workers' Approach to Families by Service Context^a

	In-Home (n=441) ^b	Out-of-Home (n=447)	Statewide		Total
	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	
Focusing on family strengths is essential to helping this family resolve problems	4.2 ^c	3.9	4.1	1.0	888
This family has more problems than strengths	2.3 ^c	3.0	2.6	1.2	882
Emphasizing this family's strengths draws attention away from efforts to protect their children	2.1 ^c	2.4	2.2	1.1	883
The primary caregiver in this family has strengths and resources she/he can use to solve problems	4.1 ^c	3.6	3.8	1.1	881
The primary caregiver in this family sometimes does a good job parenting	4.1 ^c	3.6	3.8	1.1	883
Building on the primary caregiver's successful strategies is the beginning step to helping her/him succeed	4.1 ^c	3.7	3.9	1.1	880
There are exceptions to the primary caregiver's pattern of problem behavior	3.6 ^c	3.4	3.5	1.1	883
Building trusting relationships with the primary caregiver is an essential part of helping this family	4.4 ^c	4.1	4.2	1.0	881
Workers' approach to families scale ^d	4.0 ^c	3.6	3.8	.7	885

^aScale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=somewhat disagree, 3=neutral, 4=somewhat agree, 5=strongly agree
^bActual ns may vary due to missing data.
^c $p < .01$
^dCronbach's alpha = .83

Workers were neutral to somewhat in agreement that the caregiver's had supportive and helpful relatives and friends and that including them in case planning was helpful. There were no between-region or between service-area differences in workers attitudes toward the helpfulness of caregivers' informal supports. Workers who assessed cases in which a child(ren) was in out-of-home care were less likely to report that caregivers had helpful informal supports.

Table 3.24a. Workers' Use of Informal Supports by Region^a

	Region						Statewide		Total
	1 (n=174) ^b Mean	2 (n=137) Mean	3 (n=169) Mean	4 (n=187) Mean	5 (n=134) Mean	6 (n=168) Mean	Mean	SD	
Including the relatives and friends of the caregiver(s) in case planning is not particularly helpful for this family	2.6	2.4	2.5	2.6	2.8	2.5	2.6	1.3	921
The primary caregiver(s) in this family has relatives and friends who are supportive and helpful	3.6	3.8	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	1.2	924

^aScale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=somewhat disagree, 3=neutral, 4=somewhat agree, 5=strongly agree
^bActual ns may vary due to missing data.

Table 3.24b. Workers' Use of Informal Supports by Service Area^a

	Service Area				Statewide		Total
	FVS (n=107) ^b Mean	FRS (n=48) Mean	CFWS (n=570) Mean	CPS (n=244) Mean	Mean	SD	
Including the relatives and friends of the caregiver(s) in case planning is not particularly helpful for this family	2.5	2.7	2.6	2.5	2.6	1.3	921
The primary caregiver(s) in this family has relatives and friends who are supportive and helpful	3.8	3.6	3.5	3.7	3.6	1.2	924

^aScale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=somewhat disagree, 3=neutral, 4=somewhat agree, 5=strongly agree
^bActual ns may vary due to missing data.

Table 3.24c. Workers' Use of Informal Supports Service Context^a

	In-Home (n=441) ^b	Out-of-Home (n=447)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
Including the relatives and friends of the caregiver(s) in case planning is not particularly helpful for this family	2.5	2.6	2.6	1.3	879
The primary caregiver(s) in this family has relatives and friends who are supportive and helpful	3.8 ^c	3.4	3.6	1.2	882

^aScale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=somewhat disagree, 3=neutral, 4=somewhat agree, 5=strongly agree
^bActual *ns* may vary due to missing data.
^c*p* <.01

Workers' Inclusion of Family in Case Planning

Workers assessed the extent of primary caregivers' involvement in developing service plans. Statewide, workers indicated that primary caregivers were *somewhat involved* in creating the service plan and *somewhat agreed* that the primary caregivers had a central role in case planning. There were no between-region differences in caregivers' inclusion in case planning.

Compared with caregivers who were receiving FVS, FRS, and CPS services, caregivers receiving CFWS services were less likely to have been involved in creating the service plan. Caregivers whose child(ren) had not been placed were more involved in service planning than caregivers of child(ren) who had been placed.

Table 3.25a. Workers' Inclusion of Family in Case Planning by Region

	1 (n=174) ^a	2 (n=137)	3 (n=169)	4 (n=187)	5 (n=134)	6 (n=168)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
How involved was the primary caregiver in creating the service plan? ^b	2.1	2.2	2.1	2.1	2.3	2.1	2.1	1.0	922
The primary caregiver(s) in this family plays a central role in identifying service needs and goals in case plans ^c	3.7	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.5	3.8	3.7	1.2	922

^aActual *ns* may vary due to missing data.
^bScale: 1=very involved, 2=somewhat involved, 3=slightly involved, 4=not involved at all
^cScale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=somewhat disagree, 3=neutral, 4=somewhat agree, 5=strongly agree

Table 3.25b. Workers' Inclusion of Family in Case Planning by Service Area

	FVS (n=107) ^a	FRS (n=48)	CFWS (n=570)	CPS (n=244)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
How involved was the primary caregiver in creating the service plan? ^b	1.8 ^c	1.7 ^c	2.3 ^d	2.0	2.1	1.0	922
The primary caregiver(s) in this family plays a central role in identifying service needs and goals in case plans ^c	4.0 ^c	4.3 ^c	3.6 ^d	3.9	3.7	1.2	922

^aActual *ns* may vary due to missing data.
^bScale: 1=very involved, 2=somewhat involved, 3=slightly involved, 4=not involved at all
^cSig. diff. from CFWS *p* <.01
^dSig. diff. from CPS *p* <.01
^eItem scale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=somewhat disagree, 3=neutral, 4=somewhat agree, 5=strongly agree

Table 3.25c. Workers' Inclusion of Family in Case Planning by Service Context^a

	In-Home (n=441) ^b	Out-of-Home (n=447)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
How involved was the primary caregiver in creating the service plan? ^b	1.9 ^c	2.4	2.1	1.0	882
The primary caregiver(s) in this family plays a central role in identifying service needs and goals in case plans ^d	4.0 ^c	3.5	3.7	1.2	879

^aActual *ns* may vary due to missing data.
^bScale: 1=very involved, 2=somewhat involved, 3=slightly involved, 4=not involved at all
^c*p* <.01
^dScale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=somewhat disagree, 3=neutral, 4=somewhat agree, 5=strongly agree

Workers' Contact with Caregivers and Children

As part of the family assessment, workers estimated how much contact they had with the child(ren) and the primary and substitute caregivers within the last three months. Workers indicated that on average, they had had face-to-face contact with primary caregivers twice and phone contact between two and three times in the last three months. Workers also had face-to-face contact with the child(ren) two to three times. Workers reported having slightly less face-to-face contact than phone contact with substitute caregivers, but indicated that they had had some form of contact with them about twice in the last three months. Region 1 workers had more face-to-face contact with primary caregivers than did workers in Regions 4 and 5.

Table 3.26a. Workers' Contact with Children and Caregivers by Region^a

	1 (n=174) ^b	2 (n=137)	3 (n=169)	4 (n=187)	5 (n=134)	6 (n=168)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
face-to-face contact with the primary caregiver	3.4 ^c	3.2	3.2	2.8	2.7	3.2	3.1	1.5	899
phone contact with the primary caregiver	3.7	3.7	3.8	3.4	3.6	3.5	3.6	1.5	895
face-to-face contact with the children involved in the case	3.7	3.7	3.4	3.3	3.2	3.6	3.5	1.3	896
face-to-face contact with the child(ren)'s substitute caregiver	2.7	3.0	2.6	2.6	2.5	2.9	2.7	1.5	838
phone contact with the child(ren)'s substitute caregiver	3.2	3.3	3.3	3.1	2.9	3.4	3.2	1.8	841
Extent of workers' contact scale ^d	3.4	3.4	3.2	3.0	3.0	3.3	3.2	1.1	843

^aScale: 1=no contact, 2=once, 3=twice, 4=three times, 5=four or more times
^bActual *ns* may vary due to missing data.
^cSig. diff. from Regions 4 and 5 *p* <.05
^dCronbach's alpha = .77

Compared with workers who assessed FRS and CPS cases, workers who assessed CFWS cases reported having more frequent contact with child(ren) and with substitute caregivers. CFWS workers had more frequent contact with the primary caregiver than CPS workers. Workers who assessed FVS cases indicated that they had

more frequent contact with the child(ren) and caregivers than workers who assessed CPS cases, but less frequent contact than workers who assessed CFWS cases.

Table 3.26b. Workers' Contact with Children and Caregivers by Service Area^a

How often in the last three months did you have...	FVS (n=107) ^b	FRS (n=48)	CFWS (n=570)	CPS (n=244)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
face-to-face contact with the primary caregiver	3.6 ^{c,d}	2.9	3.2 ^d	2.7	3.1	1.5	899
phone contact with the primary caregiver	4.0 ^d	3.7	3.7 ^d	3.2	3.6	1.5	895
face-to-face contact with the children involved in the case	3.4 ^{c,e}	2.8 ^f	3.9 ^d	2.7	3.5	1.3	896
face-to-face contact with the child(ren)'s substitute caregiver	1.9 ^f	2.0 ^f	3.3 ^d	1.9	2.7	1.5	838
phone contact with the child(ren)'s substitute caregiver	2.3 ^f	2.0 ^f	3.9 ^d	2.1	3.2	1.8	841
Extent of workers' contact scale ^g	3.0 ^g	2.7 ^f	3.6 ^d	2.5	3.2	1.1	843

^aScale: 1=no contact, 2=once, 3=twice, 4=three times, 5=four or more times

^bActual ns may vary due to missing data.

^cSig. diff. from FRS $p < .05$

^dSig. diff. from CPS $p < .01$

^eSig. diff. from CFWS and CPS $p < .01$

^fSig. diff. from CFWS $p < .01$

^gCronbach's alpha = .77

Social workers reported having about the same amount of face-to-face and phone contact with primary caregivers regardless of whether or not a child(ren) had been placed in out-of-home care. However, workers who assessed cases in which a child(ren) had been placed reported having more face-to-face contact with the child(ren) and more face-to-face and phone contact with the child(ren)'s substitute caregiver.

Table 3.26c. Workers' Contact with Children and Caregivers by Service Context

How often in the last three months did you have...	In-Home (n=441) ^b	Out-of-Home (n=447)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
face-to-face contact with the primary caregiver	3.1	3.1	3.1	1.5	858
phone contact with the primary caregiver	3.7	3.6	3.6	1.5	855
face-to-face contact with the children involved in the case	3.2 ^c	3.8	3.5	1.3	854
face-to-face contact with the child(ren)'s substitute caregiver	2.0 ^c	3.4	2.7	1.5	802
phone contact with the child(ren)'s substitute caregiver	2.2 ^c	4.2	3.2	1.8	803
Extent of workers' contact scale ^d	2.8 ^c	3.6	3.2	1.1	806

^aScale: 1=no contact, 2=once, 3=twice, 4=three times, 5=four or more times

^bActual ns may vary due to missing data.

^c $p < .01$

^dCronbach's alpha = .77

Barriers to Achieving Casework Goals

Social workers were asked to identify barriers to achieving casework goals. Statewide, workers indicated that there were only *slight to moderate* barriers to achieving goals. Workers perceived primary caregivers' cooperation and the number of different problems facing families to be the most substantial barriers. Compared with workers in Regions 5 and 6, Region 4 workers perceived cultural differences between families and service providers to be a slightly larger barrier to achieving goals.

Table 3.27a. Barriers to Achieving Casework Goals by Region^a

	1 (n=174) ^b	2 (n=137)	3 (n=169)	4 (n=187)	5 (n=134)	6 (n=168)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
Cooperation shown by the primary caregiver	2.5	2.6	2.5	2.4	2.6	2.6	2.5	1.2	898
Language barriers between family and service providers	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.1	0.5	888
Cultural barrier between family and service providers	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.4 ^c	1.2	1.2	1.2	0.6	886
The lack of available services needed by the family	1.6	1.6	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.8	1.7	0.9	888
The number of different problems facing the family	2.3	2.4	2.4	2.2	2.4	2.3	2.3	1.1	886
The effectiveness of services available to the family	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.7	1.8	1.9	1.8	0.9	881
Problems arising from family's involvement with multiple service systems	1.7	1.5	1.6	1.6	1.7	1.7	1.6	0.8	885
The lack of availability of culturally competent services	1.2	1.3	1.2	1.4	1.2	1.2	1.2	0.7	879
Barriers to achieving casework goals scale ^d	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	0.5	883

^aScale: 1=no barrier at all, 2=slight barrier, 3=moderate barrier, 4=significant barrier

^bActual ns may vary due to missing data.

^cSig. diff. from Regions 5 and 6 $p < .05$

^dCronbach's alpha = .70

Although workers did not identify any *significant barriers*, CFWS workers reported a greater number of *slight to moderate barriers* than did workers who assessed CPS, FVS, or FRS cases. In particular, the cooperation shown by the primary caregiver and the number of different problems facing the family were reported to be larger barriers in CFWS cases. Workers perceived caregivers' cooperation and the number of problems facing the family to be larger barriers to achieving goals for cases in which a child(ren) had been placed.

Table 3.27b. Barriers to Achieving Casework Goals by Service Area^a

	FVS (n=107) ^b	FRS (n=48)	CFWS (n=570)	CPS (n=244)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
Cooperation shown by the primary caregiver	2.4	2.3 ^c	2.7	2.1 ^d	2.5	1.2	898
Language barriers between family and service providers	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	0.5	888
Cultural barrier between family and service providers	1.2	1.1 ^c	1.3	1.2	1.2	0.6	886
The lack of available services needed by the family	1.7	1.6	1.7	1.6	1.7	0.9	888
The number of different problems facing the family	2.1 ^e	2.2	2.5	2.0 ^d	2.3	1.1	886
The effectiveness of services available to the family	1.8	1.5 ^c	1.9	1.7	1.8	0.9	881
Problems arising from family's involvement with multiple service systems	1.5 ^e	1.7	1.8	1.4 ^d	1.6	0.8	885
The lack of availability of culturally competent services	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.2	1.2	0.7	879
Barriers to achieving casework goals scale ^e	1.6 ^e	1.6 ^c	1.8	1.5 ^d	1.7	0.5	883

^aScale: 1=no barrier at all, 2=slight barrier, 3=moderate barrier, 4=significant barrier

^bActual ns may vary due to missing data.

^cSig. diff. from CFWS $p < .05$

^dSig. diff. from CFWS $p < .01$

^eCronbach's alpha = .70

Table 3.27c. Barriers to Achieving Casework Goals by Service Context^a

	In-Home Care (n=441) ^b		Out-of-Home Care (n=447)		Statewide		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Cooperation shown by the primary caregiver	2.2 ^c		2.9		2.5	1.2	858
Language barriers between family and service providers	1.1		1.1		1.1	0.5	849
Cultural barrier between family and service providers	1.2		1.3		1.2	0.6	847
The lack of available services needed by the family	1.6		1.7		1.7	0.9	848
The number of different problems facing the family	2.0 ^c		2.6		2.3	1.1	846
The effectiveness of services available to the family	1.7		1.9		1.8	0.9	844
Problems arising from family's involvement with multiple service systems	1.5		1.7		1.6	0.8	847
The lack of availability of culturally competent services	1.2		1.3		1.2	0.6	841
Barriers to achieving casework goals scale ^d	1.6 ^c		1.8		1.7	0.5	845

^aScale: 1=no barrier at all, 2=slight barrier, 3=moderate barrier, 4=significant barrier
^bActual *ns* may vary due to missing data.

^c*p* < .01
^dCronbach's alpha = .70

Access to Services and Informal Support

Workers assessed the availability and accessibility of services for the family and the adequacy of the caregivers' informal support system. Statewide, workers reported that the availability and accessibility of services were between *marginal* and *adequate*. Workers' characterized caregivers' informal support systems to consist primarily of family and friends (i.e., *family bound* or *family and friend related*). There were no between-region or between-service area differences. Caregivers whose children had been placed in out-of-home care were reported to be significantly less supported.

Table 3.28a. Services and Support by Region

	1 (n=174) ^a		2 (n=137)		3 (n=169)		4 (n=187)		5 (n=134)		6 (n=168)		Statewide		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Availability/accessibility of services for family ^b	86.9		87.8		89.2		91.0		90.4		87.3		88.8	14.1	847
Support for primary caregiver ^c	88.4		89.6		88.5		89.1		88.1		87.7		88.6	13.8	816

^aActual *ns* may vary due to missing data.
^bScale: 100=adequate 77=marginal, 68=moderately inadequate 57=seriously inadequate 29=severely inadequate
^cScale: 100=supported 96=family and friend related 85=family bound 73=friend dependent 67=family dyad 56=completely isolated

Table 3.28b. Services and Support by Service Area

	FVS (n=107) ^a	FRS (n=48)	CFWS (n=570)	CPS (n=244)	Statewide		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	SD	Total
Availability / accessibility of services for family ^b	88.2	90.5	89.0	88.0	88.8	14.1	847
Support for primary caregiver ^c	90.6	87.0	87.4	90.3	88.6	13.8	816

^aActual *ns* may vary due to missing data.
^bScale: 100=adequate 77=marginal, 68=moderately inadequate 57=seriously inadequate 29=severely inadequate
^cScale: 100=supported 96=family and friend related 85=family bound 73=friend dependent 67=family dyad 56=completely isolated

Table 3.28c. Services and Support by Service Context

	In-Home (n=441) ^a		Out-Of-Home (n=447)		Statewide		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	Total	
Availability / accessibility of services for family ^b	89.3		88.4		88.9	14.1	810
Support for primary caregiver ^c	90.6 ^d		86.4		88.5	13.9	780

^aActual *ns* may vary due to missing data.
^bScale: 100=adequate 77=marginal, 68=moderately inadequate 57=seriously inadequate 29=severely inadequate
^cScale: 100=supported 96=family and friend related 85=family bound 73=friend dependent 67=family dyad 56=completely isolated
^d*p* < .05

Caregiver Services

Table 3.29. Caregiver Services Needed and Provided

	Service Needed			Service Provided		
	Worker Suggested	Caregiver Wanted	Worker Suggested and Caregiver Wanted	Worker Suggested	Caregiver Wanted	All Families
	(N=971)	(N=971)	(N=971)	(N=971)		
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Social / emotional support	66	40	39	70	79	47
Basic parenting assistance	63	31	31	66	77	43
Mental health services	63	32	32	65	84	42
Substance abuse services	48	25	25	73	88	37
Family counseling	63	35	35	56	68	37
Help w/ transportation	34	27	26	77	83	28
Child behavior management services	43	24	23	61	80	27
Basic home management	45	21	21	52	63	24
Education plan for child(ren)	33	19	19	67	75	23
Day care	28	18	18	74	82	22
Medical services	26	18	17	72	75	20
School attendance / performance services	29	18	18	63	70	19
Domestic violence services	32	13	13	56	79	18
Help w/ basic food / clothing	24	18	17	68	77	18
Family conflict resolution	35	19	18	49	63	18
Community activities	32	17	17	51	73	17
Help finding a place to live	26	21	20	57	65	16
Help w/ financial assistance	24	17	17	63	74	16
Nurturing / socialization services	31	11	11	45	63	15
Anger management services	27	9	9	47	76	14
Help w/ employment	26	14	13	34	49	10
Developmental disabilities support services	15	8	7	57	63	9
Help w/ other housing services	13	10	9	56	65	8
Respite care	13	8	7	52	62	7
Other services	18	10	9	38	47	7
Help w/ education / GED	14	8	8	39	56	6

Social workers reported the services they thought caregivers needed in order for their child(ren) to be able to live safely in the caregiver's home. They also reported what services they thought caregivers believed were needed.

About two-thirds of workers reported that caregivers needed social and emotional support, basic parenting assistance, mental health services, and family counseling. Less than half of the workers indicated that caregivers needed any of the other 22 services. Workers' reports on the services they perceived caregivers thought were needed indicate that fewer caregivers than workers believed that any of the services were needed. But if the worker reported that a service was needed, they were more likely to report that the caregiver thought the service

Table 3.30. Caregiver Services Not Provided

	Service Needed		Reason Service Not Provided						
	Worker or Family's Opinion	Service Provided	Family Refused	Service Deferred	Still CPS	Service Not Available	Child care/ Transportation	Cultural/ Language	Other/ Don't Know
	N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Help w/ transportation	363	74	8	2	3	2	1	0	4
Day care	294	71	11	4	2	2	1	0	5
Substance abuse services	502	71	17	2	2	1	1	1	4
Medical services	282	70	12	2	1	1	0	0	6
Social / emotional support	663	69	13	5	2	2	1	1	7
Basic parenting assistance	643	66	15	9	2	2	1	0	7
Education plan for child(ren)	341	65	11	5	1	3	1	1	9
Help w/ basic food / clothing	263	65	12	2	2	3	1	0	8
Mental health services	633	65	19	5	2	1	0	0	7
School attendance / performance services	303	61	10	6	2	2	1	0	12
Help w/ financial assistance	258	60	12	3	2	2	0	0	8
Child behavior management services	437	59	15	5	3	1	0	1	8
Help finding a place to live	278	56	17	8	3	5	0	0	9
Family counseling	639	56	15	13	3	1	1	1	11
Domestic violence services	324	54	23	7	3	2	1	0	7
Help w/ other housing services	152	53	13	8	3	4	1	1	10
Developmental disabilities support services	175	53	17	5	4	6	2	3	10
Basic home management	468	51	14	19	2	5	0	0	8
Community activities	331	50	16	12	3	3	2	0	11
Respite care	148	48	11	5	3	5	1	1	12
Family conflict resolution	357	48	18	7	3	6	0	1	13
Anger management services	284	46	21	10	4	2	0	0	13
Nurturing / socialization services	314	45	17	11	4	5	1	1	10
Help w/ education / GED	161	37	20	18	2	2	1	1	14
Other services	187	36	20	7	1	6	1	1	9
Help w/ employment	285	33	21	19	3	5	1	1	14

was needed. Thus, compared with the other services, larger percentages of workers reported that caregivers thought they needed social and emotional support, basic parenting assistance, mental health services, and family counseling.

A comparison of the workers' own opinions with workers' perceptions of the caregivers' opinions about services suggests that caregivers disagreed with workers more often than workers disagreed with caregivers about whether a service was needed. The services that the largest percentages of workers reported that they and the caregiver believed were needed (i.e. social emotional support, basic parenting assistance, mental health services, and family counseling), along with substance abuse services, were also the services provided to the most caregivers. Also, workers' reports suggest that caregivers were more likely to receive a service if the caregiver thought it was needed (see Table 3.29).

For services that workers indicated were needed by the caregiver, the worker reported whether the service had been provided. If the needed service had not been provided, the worker identified the reason the service was not provided. Although no service was provided to all of the caregivers who needed them, three-quarters

to two-thirds of the caregivers who needed the following services received them: help with transportation, day care, substance abuse services, medical services, social and emotional support, basic parenting assistance, education plan for child(ren), help with basic food and clothing, mental health services, and school attendance or performance services. Less than half of the caregivers received needed respite care, family conflict resolution, anger management services, nurturing and socialization services, help with education or GED, and help with employment (see Table 3.30).

Workers most often cited *family refused* as the reason needed services were not provided. Depending on the service, workers reported that between 8 and 23 percent of families had refused a needed service. The largest percentages of families (20 to 23%) had refused domestic violence services, help with employment, anger management services, and help with education or GED. Workers cited *service deferred* as the second most common reason that needed services had not been provided. Only small percentages of caregivers were said to have not received a needed service because the case was still CPS, the service was not available, lack of child care or transportation prohibited the family from obtaining services, or

cultural or language barriers prohibited the families use of services.

There was only one between-region difference in the percentages of families who were provided needed services. A smaller percentage of families in Region 1 were provided needed community activities (32%) compared with Region 3 (56%), Region 4 (50%), Region 5 (52%), and Region 6 (65%) ($p < .05$) (not shown).

Table 3.31. Needed Caregiver Services Provided by Service Context

	Service Provided		
	In-Home Care	Out-of-Home Care	Statewide
	%	%	%
Basic parenting assistance	65	67	66
Basic home management	64 ^a	41	51
Social / emotional support	74 ^b	66	69
Substance abuse services	71	71	71
Family counseling	62 ^a	49	56
Mental health services	72 ^a	61	65
Medical services	81 ^a	62	70
Developmental disabilities support services	63	47	53
Domestic violence services	62 ^b	49	54
Family conflict resolution	56 ^a	41	48
Anger management services	52	44	46
Nurturing / socialization services	49	42	45
Community activities	60 ^a	42	50
Child behavior management services	64	55	59
Education plan for child(ren)	70	62	65
School attendance / performance services	58	63	61
Day care	77	68	71
Respite care	47	50	48
Help finding a place to live	63	52	56
Help w/ other housing services	62	45	53
Help w/ employment	45 ^a	26	33
Help w/ basic food / clothing	78 ^a	57	65
Help w/ transportation	76	73	74
Help w/ financial assistance	71 ^b	55	60
Help w/ education / GED	53 ^a	31	37
Other services	35	35	36

^a $p < .01$
^b $p < .05$

Compared with caregivers whose children were placed in out-of-home care, larger percentages of caregivers whose children had not been placed received the following needed services: basic home management, social and emotional support, family counseling, mental health services, medical services, domestic violence services, family conflict resolution, community activities, help with employment, help with basic food and clothing, help with financial assistance, and help with education or a GED.

Child Services

Social workers also reported the services they thought the caregiver’s child(ren) needed in order to be able to live safely in the caregiver’s home and what services they thought any family member believed were needed. Fifty-one percent of the workers reported that the children needed mental health services. About one-third of workers reported children’s need for medical services, school attendance assistance, and community activities. Nearly 20 percent of the workers indicated that developmental disabilities and alcohol or drug abuse services were needed. Smaller percentages of workers reported that family members thought that each of these services was needed. Services were more likely to have been provided if family members thought they were needed.

For services that workers indicated were needed by the child(ren), the worker reported whether the service had been provided. If the needed service had not been provided, the worker identified the reason the service was not provided. Roughly two-thirds or more of the families whose children needed a service received service. Compared with other needed services, a smaller percentage of children (64%) who were thought to need alcohol or drug abuse services received them. *Family refused* service was given as the most common reason children did not receive services.

There were no between-region differences in the percentages of families who were provided with needed services for their child(ren). Larger percentages of cases in which a child had been placed received each of the services listed except services to address developmental disabilities.

Table 3.32. Child(ren) Services Needed and Provided

	Service Needed			Service Provided		
	Worker Suggested	Family Wanted	Worker Suggested and Family Wanted	Worker Suggested	Family Wanted	All Families
	(N=971)	(N=971)	(N=971)	(N=971)		
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Mental health services	51	32	32	77	82	40
Medical services	35	23	23	85	88	31
School attendance assistance	37	24	23	78	80	30
Community activities	32	20	20	73	84	25
Developmental disabilities services	17	9	9	73	82	1
Alcohol / drug abuse services	18	10	10	64	78	12

Table 3.33. Child(ren) Services Not Provided

	Service Needed Worker or Family's Opinion	Service Provided	Reason Service Not Provided						
			Family Refused	Service Deferred	Still CPS	Service Not Available	Child care/ Transportation	Cultural/ Language	Other/ Don't Know
	N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Medical services	361	84	4	1	1	0	0	1	4
School attendance assistance	384	77	8	2	1	1	0	0	7
Mental health services	519	75	9	3	2	0	0	1	6
Community activities	335	72	8	3	2	1	0	1	7
Developmental disabilities services	183	69	5	4	3	4	1	1	8
Alcohol/drug abuse services	192	62	18	1	3	2	1	1	7

Table 3.34. Needed Child(ren) Services Provided by Service Context

	Service Provided		
	In-Home Care	Out-of-Home Care	Statewide
	%	%	%
Alcohol/drug abuse services	53 ^a	69	62
Mental health services	70 ^b	80	75
Medical services	79 ^a	88	84
Developmental disabilities services	64	73	69
School attendance assistance	65 ^b	85	77
Community activities	66 ^a	77	72

^ap < .01
^bp < .05

APPENDIX A

Parental Disposition Items Child Well-Being Scale

Primary caregiver's capacity for child care	100=adequate inadequate	63=marginally 13=severely	adequate inadequate	48=moderately inadequate
Primary caregiver's recognition of family problems	100=adequate inadequate	55=moderately inadequate	inadequate	43=seriously inadequate
Primary caregiver's motivation to solve problems	100=adequate inadequate	70=moderately 50=seriously	inadequate	62=seriously 31=severely
Primary caregiver's cooperation with case planning and services	100=adequate inadequate	59=mildly 46=seriously	inadequate	54=moderately inadequate
Primary caregiver's expectation of children	100=very realistic improvement)	80=somewhat 65=somewhat	unrealistic (but open unrealistic (but not open	47=very unrealistic
Primary caregiver's acceptance of and affection for children	100=very accepting and affectionate	70=fairly accepting and affectionate, but with reservations	45=not affectionate, but not openly rejecting or hostile	35=openly rejecting or hostile
Primary caregiver's consistency of discipline	100=high consistency improvement)	85=marginal consistency (but open to improvement)	70=marginal consistency (but not open to improvement)	53=low consistency
Primary caregiver's teaching and stimulating of children	100=high activity	84=moderate activity	70=passive approach, some deprivation	41=considerable deprivation
Primary caregiver's approval of children	100=approval is primary way of guiding children and disapproval both used conditionally	78=approval is primary way of guiding children	72=disapproval is primary way of guiding children	63=excessive and severe disapproval used
Abusive physical discipline	100=no physical discipline	93=physical discipline used (but not excessive or inappropriate)	22=excessive or inappropriate discipline used (but no resulting injuries)	18=excessive or inappropriate physical force used (resulting in superficial injury)
Threat of abuse	100=no verbal or physical threat	54=indirect or implied verbal threat only	46=direct verbal threat	17=direct physical threat (but no actual harm)
Protection from abuse	100=adequate inadequate	30=somewhat inadequate	12=seriously inadequate	

REFERENCES

- Antle, B. F., Barbee, A. P., Christensen, D. N., Martin, M. H. (2008). Solution Based Casework in child welfare: preliminary evaluation research. *Journal of Public Child Welfare*, Vol. 2(2), 197-227.
- Berg, I. K., and Kelly, S. (2000). *Building Solutions in Child Protective Services*. W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., New York, NY.
- Christensen, D.N., Todahl, J., Barrett, W. C. (1999). *Solution Based Casework: An Introduction to Clinical and Case Management Skills in Casework Practice*. Walter de Gruyter, Inc., New York, NY.
- Courtney, M. E., McMurtry, S. L., Bost, N., Maldre, K., Power, P., Zinn, A. (2002). *An Evaluation of Safety Service in Milwaukee County*. Chapin Hall Center for Children at the University of Chicago, Chicago, IL.
- Daro, D., Budde, S., Vaker, S., Nesmith, A., Harden, A. (2005). *Community Partnerships for Protecting Children: Phase II Outcome Evaluation*. Chapin Hall Center for Children at the University of Chicago, Chicago, IL.
- Edmondson, A. C. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 44(2): 350.
- Keppel, G. (1991). *Design and Analysis: A Researcher's Handbook*. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Kivimäki, M. and Elovainio, M. (1999). A short version of the Team Climate Inventory: development and psychometric properties. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72 (2). pp. 241-246.
- Lindstrom, K., Elo, A. L., Skogstad, A., Dallner, M., Gamberale, F., Hottinen, V., Knardahl, S., Orhede, E. (2000). *User's Guide for the QPS Nordic: General Nordic Questionnaire for Psychological and Social Factors at Work*. København : Nordic Council of Ministers, Copenhagen.
- Maslach, C., and Jackson, S. E. (1986). *Maslach Burnout Inventory Manual*, 2nd ed., Consulting Psychologists Press, Palo Alto, CA.
- Moynihan, D. P., and Pandey, S. K. (2008). The ties that bind: social networks, person-organization value fit, and turnover intention. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(2):205-227.

Recommended Citation:

Lyons, Sandra; Courtney, Mark; Newby, Maureen; Lee, JoAnn (2009.) Evaluation of Washington's Solution Based Casework Practice Model Interim Report Part III: Social Workers' Baseline Survey Results. Seattle: Partners for Our Children, School of Social Work, University of Washington.

Acknowledgements:

This report would not have been possible without the support of our partner, the Washington State Department of Social and Health Services Children's Administration. We are also greatly indebted to the many Children's Administration social workers who contributed their time to complete surveys.

Contact:

Sandra Lyons
Partners for Our Children
Box 359476
Seattle, WA 98195-9476
Email: Sandra.lyons@partnersforourchildren.org