



THE FLORIDA STUDY OF PROFESSIONALS FOR SAFE FAMILIES (FSPSF)

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR**

Dina J. Wilke, PhD, MSW

**KEY PROJECT STAFF**

Melissa Radey, PhD, MSSW, MA (co-PI)

Philip Osteen, PhD, MSW (co-PI)

Erin King (PhD Research Assistant)

Carmella Miller (PhD Research Assistant)

Caitlin Nolan (PhD Research Assistant)

Sarah Rakes (PhD Research Assistant)

Lisa Panisch (MSW Research Assistant)

Peter Yun (MSW Research Assistant)

Lisa Magruder (Project Manager)

**FINAL REPORT**

7/17/17

*For contract period ending 6/30/17*

**BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT:** Recruitment and retention for child welfare professionals are widespread issues for the Department of Children and Families (DCF) and the Community-Based Care organizations (CBCs). High staff turnover puts vulnerable children at greater risk for recurrence of maltreatment, impedes timely intervention referrals and, ultimately, delays permanency. Annual attrition estimates across the state range between 25%-60%.

The Florida Study of Professionals for Safe Families (FSPSF) has completed year 2 of a proposed 5-year longitudinal study of newly hired employees into child protective investigator (CPI) and case manager (CM) positions. Our intent is to learn about individual, organizational, and community influences on child welfare employee retention, and ultimately, child and family outcomes. This statewide study is examining **worker personal characteristics** (e.g., educational background, family history, self-esteem, etc.) **worker beliefs and behaviors** (e.g., stress and burnout, work/family balance, social support and coping, etc.), **organizational characteristics** (e.g., physical environment, supervisory and management practices, vacancy rate, etc.), and **work characteristics** such as caseload size and severity, prevalence of child deaths, and exposure to threats and violence. We are also examining **community context** (e.g., unemployment, poverty rates, etc.) recognizing that the local community may impact worker retention and child and family outcomes.

The FSPSF utilizes three broad strategies to answer several different research questions. First, respondents are surveyed every 6-7 months with a core instrument. Second, in addition to the core instrument, in-depth modules will be rotated during the data collection period. Each module will be completed three times during the 5-year study. Modules will include: 1) Mental Health; 2) Work/Personal Life Balance; 3) Supervision and Organizational Functioning. The intent of this strategy is to gain a deeper understanding of key areas of worker personal or organizational characteristics that may impact job satisfaction and retention. Finally, qualitative interviews will be used to further augment information gathered on the in-depth modules, or to explore special topics as they arise.

FSPSF project staff have recruited all Child Protective Investigators (CPIs) and Case Managers (CMs) who were in pre-service training between Sept. 1, 2015 and December 31, 2016. We are following this sample of new hires for five years, even if they leave their child welfare positions during the study timeframe. This strategy is critical to understanding employment outcomes for those who leave their initial CPI/CM positions. Participants were recruited during their pre-service training, a mandatory training for all new hires not currently holding Florida certification in the job for which they have been hired.

Overall, 100% of administrative units across the state of Florida have agreed to be part of the study. This includes 17 Community-Based Care organizations, 6 regions for the Department of Children and Families, and 6 Sheriff Offices.

**Child and Family Services Reviews (CSFR) OUTCOMES:** Although all of the CSFR outcomes are indirectly related to the health and productivity of the workforce, which this study seeks to assess, none of the CSFR outcomes are expected to be directly impacted through this study.

#### **MEASUREABLE OBJECTIVES AND PROGRESS TO DATE:**

Objectives 4.4 and 4.5: Analysis and findings for W2

- Wave 2 data collection began in March 2016 and was completed in mid-June 2017. Data continue to be finalized, and preliminary results are available in Appendix A (items comprising scales are available in Appendix B).
  - Data have been organized in three categories of responses:
    - ✦ Data that describe the **transition experiences** for all respondents;

- ✦ Data that describe **turnover**, and examine turnover among different groups of participants. This section will also focus on those who have left and describe their reasons for leaving;
- ✦ Data that describe the **current work experiences** of those who remain in a child welfare position. This will also include data that compares W1 to W2 responses to present any changes over time. Note that these findings will also include respondents who changed jobs but whose new job is still in a child welfare position.
- The final retention rate for W2 is 87%; there were 1,306 W2 respondents out of an eligible 1,501 study participants. This rate of response significantly exceeds typical rates for online survey research.
- The data presented represent findings from approximately 6-months post baseline data collection. For case managers, this time period reflects, on average, two months in training, and four months of casework. For child protective investigators, this time period reflects about three months of training and three months of casework
- Overall, the rate of study participants who left their agency stands at 18.1 percent ( $n = 236$ ). Of those who left, 20.4 percent ( $n = 48$ ) left during pre-service training.

Objectives 5.5 and 5.6: Status of online survey response rate for W3 and W4.

- The current retention rate for W3 stands at 79 percent. Note that we are in the middle of the final panel and would expect that rate to increase.
- We have completed one (of four) panels for the W4 survey, which was first distributed in May 2017. There are a few things to note from that panel:
  - The current retention rate stands at 74 percent. This rate is lower than we have been achieving in previous waves, although not necessarily unexpected given this is the 18-month post baseline survey. It remains higher than typical online survey research, but it is something that we will be monitoring to see if methodology adjustments are needed for future panels.
  - We have implemented an experimental incentive manipulation with the W4 distribution. We randomly assigned participants to one of three incentive conditions: 1) \$40 up front with the invitation to participate email; 2) \$20 up front and \$20 upon completion; 3) \$40 upon completion (this condition is our current practice) in order to assess if different timing and levels of incentives impact participation rates. Through the first panel, there are no statistical differences, although we will continue this experiment through the second panel.
  - The W4 substantive module assesses mental health, which includes a screening question for suicide ideation. We currently have an 8.8 percent positive rate. We utilize an IRB-approved protocol where one of our clinically-trained research assistants' attempts to make contact with each positive response by phone. This is something we are monitoring closely, as our positive rate stands higher than the rate for general human service workers.

**Summary of activities and findings for each goal from July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017**

**Goal 1:** Complete Wave 1 data collection and summarize findings.

- Wave 1 data collection was completed in mid-January 2017. Results were finalized and distributed to stakeholder throughout the spring.
- Individual benchmark reports were distributed to agencies in April 2017 that included statewide data, statewide data within category (e.g., CM, DCF PI, and Sheriff PI), and agency-level data.

**Goal 2:** Complete training calendar analysis.

- The training calendar analysis was completed by January 2017. Preliminary findings that included PI and the prior CM curricula, were presented at the DCF Dependency Summit in September 2016.
- Analyses are currently underway that match training calendar to study participants along with their W1 and W2 data to assess if training, along with other personal characteristics, impacts work self-efficacy and retention. We anticipate this analysis to be completed in the fall.

**Goal 3:** Finalize the contextual model.

- The list of variables for the contextual analyses was finalized in September 2016, and county-level file of most variables was generated. However, the model is being revisited as not all of the desired variables are available at the county-level as was previously thought. We also identified a new data source (NCANDS), that will allow us access to county-level child welfare data.

**Goal 4:** Complete Wave 2 data collection and summarize findings.

- All of that information is summarized in this deliverable.

**Goal 5:** Launch Wave 3 data collection.

- The Wave 3 instrument and substantive module (work/family/life balance) were finalized in February 2017, and launched in March 2017. Three of the four panels are complete, and the fourth panel is in the field. Wave 3 should be completed in mid-August.
  - Note that with W3, we are back on a 12-month data collection cycle. All of participants in the supplemental sample (collected to assess for potential differences due to changes in the case manager specialty curriculum) have been folded into the panels established in the first 12-months of data collection.

**Goal 6:** Launch Wave 4 data collection.

- The Wave 4 instrument and substantive module (mental health) were finalized in April 2017 and the first panel was distributed in May 2017.
- The original date of distribution was expected to be April 2017. However, our survey distribution plan calls for alternating distribution between six and seven months in order to assess for seasonal differences in work experiences. The seven-month plan began with Wave 4.

**Dissemination Activities since March 31, 2017**

***Abstracts accepted for the 2017 CSWE Annual Program Meeting:***

Wilke, D. J., & Randolph, K. A. Predictors of Early Departure among Recently Hired Child Welfare Workers.

Randolph, K. A., & Wilke, D. J. Comparing Child Welfare Employment Experiences between Early-leavers and Those Who Remain.

King, E. A., Radey, M., & Schelbe, L. Recently-Hired Child Welfare Worker Perceptions of Pre-Service Training.

***Abstracts submitted to the 2018 Society for Social Work & Research annual meeting:***

Kennedy, S. C., Spinelli, C., & Wilke, D. J. Development and Validation of the Child Welfare Provider Stigma Inventory.

King, E., Radey, M., & Wilke, D. J. Exploring the Relationship of Client-Perpetrated Violence and Intent to Leave Among Child Welfare Workers.

Nolan, C. R., & Radey, M. The Effects of Childhood Maltreatment History, Individual Characteristics, and Workplace Factors on Psychological Distress and Sleep Disturbance Among Florida's Newly-Hired Child Welfare Workers.

Nolan, C. R., & Wilke, D. J. Assessing the Impact of Childhood Maltreatment History and Potential Risk and Protective Factors on Psychological Distress Among Newly-Hired Frontline Child Welfare Workers.

Osteen, P. J., Wilke, D. J., Carter, T., Hardwick, A., Holland, M., & Jacobs, K. Comparing Predictors of 6- and 12-Month Job Exit among Recently Hired Child Welfare Workers

Radey, M., Schelbe, L., & Wilke, D. J. Workplace Support among Recently-Hired Frontline Child Welfare Workers: Who has it and why?

Wilke, D. J., & Randolph, K. A., Profiles of Departure: Comparing 6- and 12-Month Turnover of Recently-Hired Child Welfare Workers

Wilke, D. J., & Randolph, K. Comparing Predictors of 6- and 12-Month Job Exit among Recently Hired Child Welfare Workers

***Manuscripts submitted:***

Wilke, D. J., Radey, M., King, E., Spinelli, C., Rakes, S., & Nolan, C. R. A multi-level conceptual model to examine child welfare worker turnover and retention decisions. Submitted to the *Journal of Public Child Welfare*.

Magruder, L. L., & Wilke, D. J. Using text messages to increase participant response in web-based survey research: A brief. Submitted to *Social Work Research*.

***Manuscripts published or accepted for publication:***

Radey, M., Schelbe, L., Spinelli, C.L. (2017). Learning, negotiating, and surviving in child welfare: Social capitalization among recently-hired workers. *Journal of Public Child Welfare*. DOI: 10.1080/15548732.2017.1328380

Radey, M., & Schelbe, L. (In press). From classroom to caseload: Transition experiences of frontline child welfare workers. *Child Welfare*.

Schelbe, L., Radey, M., & Panish, L. (2017). Satisfactions and stressors experienced by recently-hired frontline child welfare workers. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 78, 56-63.

Wilke, D. J., Radey, M., & Langenderfer-Magruder, L. (2017). Recruitment and retention of child welfare workers in longitudinal research: Successful strategies from the Florida Study of Professionals for Safe Families. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 78, 122128.

## TRANSITION EXPERIENCES

### 1. Protected Caseload Following Pre-Service Training

			Job Category			Total
			Case manager	DCF PI	Sheriff PI	
Protected Caseload	No	Count	181	47	4	232
		%	24.7%	11.5%	3.4%	18.4%
	Yes	Count	552	361	113	1026
		%	75.3%	88.5%	96.6%	81.6%
Total		Count	733	408	117	1258
		%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

### 2. Specialized Mentoring During Transition

			Job Category			Total
			Case manager	DCF PI	Sheriff PI	
Specialized Mentoring	No	Count	262	135	12	409
		%	35.7%	33.1%	10.3%	32.5%
	Yes	Count	471	273	105	849
		%	64.3%	66.9%	89.7%	67.5%
Total		Count	733	408	117	1258
		%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**a. Who Provided the Mentoring**

			Job Category		
			Case manager	DCF PI	Sheriff PI
Who provided the mentoring?	A job coach	Count	54	27	12
		%	11.5%	9.9%	11.4%
	A supervisor	Count	263	139	35
		%	55.8%	50.9%	33.3%
	An assigned experienced case worker	Count	60	43	48
		%	12.7%	15.8%	45.7%
	A volunteer team member	Count	72	50	7
		%	15.3%	18.3%	6.7%
	Someone else:	Count	22	14	3
		%	4.7%	5.1%	2.9%
	Total	Count	471	273	105
		%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**3. Importance of Mentoring During Transition**

			Job Category			Total
			Case manager	DCF PI	Sheriff PI	
How important was the mentoring/coaching?	Very important	Count	422	246	94	762
		%	89.8%	90.1%	90.4%	90.0%
	Somewhat important	Count	44	26	9	79
		%	9.4%	9.5%	8.7%	9.3%
	Not at all important	Count	4	1	1	6
		%	0.9%	0.4%	1.0%	0.7%
Total	Count	470	273	104	847	
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

#### 4. Consistency between Training and Agency Practice

			Job Category			Total	
			Case manager	DCF PI	Sheriff PI		
<b>Consistency between agency's approach to work and preservice training</b>	Very consistent	Count	102	44	45	191	
		%	13.9%	10.8%	38.5%	15.2%	
	Somewhat consistent	Count	347	232	63	642	
		%	47.4%	56.9%	53.8%	51.1%	
	Rarely consistent	Count	193	88	6	287	
		%	26.4%	21.6%	5.1%	22.8%	
	Not at all consistent	Count	90	44	3	137	
		%	12.3%	10.8%	2.6%	10.9%	
	Total		Count	732	408	117	1257
			%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

### TURNOVER

#### 1. Employed in the Same Agency by Job Category

			Still Employed at Same Agency		Total
			No	Yes	
<b>Job category</b>	Case manager	Count	153	611	764
		%	20.0%	80.0%	100.0%
	DCF PI	Count	67	354	421
		%	15.9%	84.1%	100.0%
	Sheriff PI	Count	16	105	121
		%	13.2%	86.8%	100.0%
Total		Count	236	1070	1306
		%	18.1%	81.9%	100.0%



## 2. Employed in the Same Agency by Region

			Still Employed at Same Agency		Total	
			No	Yes		
DCF Region	NWR	Count	19	103	122	
		%	15.6%	84.4%	100.0%	
	NER	Count	28	194	222	
		%	12.6%	87.4%	100.0%	
	CER	Count	62	304	366	
		%	16.9%	83.1%	100.0%	
	SCR	Count	78	300	378	
		%	20.6%	79.4%	100.0%	
	SER	Count	22	111	133	
		%	16.5%	83.5%	100.0%	
	SOR	Count	25	55	80	
		%	31.2%	68.8%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	34	1067	1301
			%	18.0%	82.0%	100.0%

### 3. Employed in the Same Agency by College Major

			Still Employed at Same Agency		Total	
			No	Yes		
College major	Criminal Justice/Criminology	Count	46	233	279	
		%	16.5%	83.5%	100.0%	
	Psychology	Count	66	277	343	
		%	19.2%	80.8%	100.0%	
	Social Work	Count	57	204	261	
		%	21.8%	78.2%	100.0%	
	Other Human Service	Count	38	169	207	
		%	18.4%	81.6%	100.0%	
	Non-Human Service	Count	28	185	213	
		%	13.1%	86.9%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	235	1068	1303
			%	18.0%	82.0%	100.0%

### 4. Employed in the Same Agency by Previous Child Welfare Work Experience

			Still Employed at Same Agency		Total
			No	Yes	
Worked in child welfare prior to current job	No	Count	104	513	617
		%	16.9%	83.1%	100.0%
	Yes	Count	85	326	411
		%	20.7%	79.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	189	839	1028

### 5. Employed in the Same Agency by Personal History of Childhood Maltreatment

			Still Employed at Same Agency		Total
			No	Yes	
History of childhood maltreatment	No	Count	133	644	777
		%	17.1%	82.9%	100.0%
	Yes	Count	102	425	527
		%	19.4%	80.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	235	1069	1304
		%	18.0%	82.0%	100.0%

### AMONG THOSE WHO LEFT THEIR AGENCY

#### 1. Left Before the End of Pre-Service Training

Left Position Before the End of Pre-service Training?		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	187	79.6	79.6
	Yes	48	20.4	100.0
	Total	235	100.0	
Missing	System	1		
Total		236		

## 2. Primary Reason for Leaving

Primary Reason for Leaving				
		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	The job responsibilities	44	18.6	18.6
	Your supervisor or supervision	25	10.6	29.2
	The agency's environment	40	16.9	46.2
	Your professional goals	18	7.6	53.8
	A change in family circumstances	23	9.7	63.6
	Involuntary departure	19	8.0	71.6
	Some other reason	67	28.4	100.0
	Total	236	100.0	

Note: the "Some other reason" answer category allowed for respondents to fill in a reason. These reasons are still being coded.

a **Primary JOB RESPONSIBILITY Reason for Leaving**

What is the PRIMARY concern about your job responsibilities?				
		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	This job was not in my field of training.	1	2.3	2.3
	I spent too much time traveling.	3	6.8	9.1
	I was not able to fully utilize my skills.	1	2.3	11.4
	I was worried about my safety.	2	4.5	15.9
	Child welfare work was too emotionally difficult.	6	13.6	29.5
	I had to work too many hours.	7	15.9	45.5
	I had too many cases to manage.	9	20.5	65.9
	I had to complete too much paperwork.	1	2.3	68.2
	My caseload was too complex to manage.	8	18.2	86.4
	Some other reason:	6	13.6	100.0
	Total	44	100.0	
Missing	LOGICAL SKIP	192		
Total		236		

**b Primary AGENCY ENVIRONMENT Reason for Leaving**

What is the PRIMARY concern about the agency's environment?				
		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Administrators did not show a genuine concern about the staff.	8	20.0	20.0
	I was not provided with the resources (supplies or equipment) needed to do my job.	7	17.5	37.5
	Administrators had unreasonable expectations about how much work I could complete.	14	35.0	72.5
	Administrators pushed me to respond to cases in ways that were against my best judgment.	2	5.0	77.5
	Administrators were more concerned about following policies and procedures than with helping clients.	3	7.5	85.0
	Some other reason:	6	15.0	100.0
	Total	40	100.0	
Missing	LOGICAL SKIP	196		
Total		236		

**c Primary SUPERVISION Reason for Leaving**

What is the PRIMARY Concern about Your Supervisor				
		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Was not available when I needed consultation.	3	12.0	12.0
	Was not able to understand or work with the cultural differences between us.	2	8.0	20.0
	Did not know how to provide constructive feedback.	3	12.0	32.0
	Had unreasonable expectations about my performance.	7	28.0	60.0
	"Bad-mouthed" the agency or clients.	1	4.0	64.0
	Some other reason:	9	36.0	100.0
	Total	25	100.0	
Missing	LOGICAL SKIP	211		
Total		236		

d Primary FAMILY REASON for Leaving

Type of Family Changes				
		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	I or my spouse/partner gave birth/adopted a new child and I wanted to stay home.	1	3.2	3.2
	I could not manage the combination of my work and family responsibilities.	6	19.4	22.6
	A family member had a medical condition in need of my caretaking.	8	25.8	48.4
	Other family issue:	16	51.6	100.0
	Total	31	100.0	
Missing	LOGICAL SKIP	205		
Total		236		



## CURRENT WORK EXPERIENCES OF CHILD WELFARE WORKERS

	All Florida Child Welfare Workers (N = 1,128) Average (SD)	All DCMs (n = 652) Average (SD)	All DCF CPIs (n = 368) Average (SD)	All Sheriff CPIs (n = 108) Average (SD)
<b>WORK EXPERIENCE</b>				
<i>Days spent some time working in the past week (range 0-7)</i>	5.7 (.97)	5.6 (.91)	5.9 (1.03)	5.6 (.93)
<i>Total hours worked in the past week (range 0-100)</i>	45.6 (13.0)	44.1 (11.8)	46.9 (14.3)	49.6 (13.6)
<i>Agency policy on vehicle use</i>				
Agency provides/almost always available	16.3%	7.8%	9.3%	96.0%
Agency provides/not often available	14.0%	17.3%	11.8%	0.0%
Expected to use personal vehicle	68.0%	73.0%	77.8%	1.0%
Other	1.7%	1.9%	1.1%	3.0%
<i>Job satisfaction</i>				
Pay	1.6 (1.1)	1.5 (1.0)	1.5 (1.1)	2.4 (1.3)
Benefits (range 0-5)	2.7 (1.2)	2.4 (1.2)	3.0 (1.0)	3.4 (.96)
<i>Serious consideration of leaving, past 6 months - Yes</i>	54.8%	57.0%	56.1%	37.5%
<b>CASELOAD EXPERIENCES</b>				
<i>Approximate caseload size (range 0-50)</i>	14.6 (7.3)	12.5 (5.4)	23.5 (17.1)	23.5 (15.7)
<i>Number of children (range 0-140)</i>	26.6 (16.2)	21.3 (9.6)	33.8 (20.3)	36.5 (19.8)
<i>New cases - past month (range 0-32)</i>	6.5 (6.8)	2.0 (2.3)	12.3 (5.6)	15.7 (5.7)
<i>Cases transferred from a coworker - past month (range 0-25)</i>	1.8 (2.8)	2.0 (2.5)	1.8 (3.5)	.62 (1.1)
<i>Cases closed - past month (range 0-30)</i>	3.8 (4.6)	.78 (1.3)	7.7 (4.2)	9.4 (4.5)

	All Florida Child Welfare Workers (N = 1,128) Average (SD)	All DCMs (n = 652) Average (SD)	All DCF CPIs (n = 368) Average (SD)	All Sheriff CPIs (n = 108) Average (SD)
<i>Proportion of cases considered to be exceptionally difficult (range 0-100)</i>	26.6 (18.4)	28.8 (19.2)	33.8 (20.3)	36.5 (19.8)
<i>Perception of caseload size</i>				
Too low (mean size = 8.6)	2.2%	1.7%	3.2%	1.0%
About right (mean size = 12.2)	54.3%	59.3%	48.2%	43.3%
Too high (mean size = 18.0)	43.5%	39.0%	48.6%	55.7%
<i>Total visits – past week (range 0-50)</i>	9.6 (6.7)	7.9 (5.5)	12.3 (7.3)	11.7 (7.7)
<i>Total miles driven – past week (range 0-2,500)</i>	186.4 (182.2)	188.1 (171.6)	179.6 (205.4)	199.3 (157.8)
<i>Hours spent driving (noncommute) – past week (range 0-48)</i>	9.1 (7.5)	8.9 (7.4)	9.3 (7.8)	10.1 (7.3)
<i>Client-perpetrated violence - yes</i>				
Non-physical	76.0%	73.7%	78.5%	81.6%
Threats	37.1%	36.4%	40.2%	31.1%
Physical assault	2.5%	3.3%	1.4%	1.0%
<b>RESPONSES TO WORK CONDITIONS</b>				
<i>Time pressure (range 0-3)</i>	2.2 (.73)	2.2 (.72)	2.2 (.72)	2.1 (.80)
<i>Global stress (range 0-4)</i>	1.5 (.86)	1.5 (.83)	1.4 (.89)	1.3 (.86)
<i>Secondary traumatic stress (range 0-4)</i>	1.4 (.88)	1.5 (.89)	1.4 (.85)	1.2 (.86)
<i>Burnout</i>				
Work-related	2.3 (.87)	2.4 (.87)	2.3 (.87)	2.2 (.84)
Client-related (range 0-4)	2.0 (.87)	2.0 (.89)	1.9 (.86)	1.7 (.73)
<i>Sleep disturbance (range 0-4)</i>	1.7 (1.0)	1.7 (1.0)	1.7 (1.0)	1.4 (.94)

	All Florida Child Welfare Workers (N = 1,128) Average (SD)	All DCMs (n = 652) Average (SD)	All DCF CPIs (n = 368) Average (SD)	All Sheriff CPIs (n = 108) Average (SD)
<i>Psychological distress</i> (range 0-4)	1.0 (.90)	1.1 (.93)	1.0 (.88)	.81 (.76)
<b>SOURCES OF RESILIENCE</b>				
<i>Commitment</i> Child welfare profession Current agency (range 0-5)	2.2 (.96) 1.6 (.87)	2.2 (.96) 1.6 (.87)	2.3 (.95) 1.6 (.92)	2.4 (.92) 2.2 (.88)
<i>Self-efficacy</i> (range 0-5)	3.9 (.97)	3.8 (.92)	3.8 (1.03)	4.0 (1.05)
<i>Reciprocal peer support</i> (range 0-4)	2.6 (.78)	2.6 (.79)	2.6 (.77)	2.7 (.75)
<i>Social support</i> Supervisor Co-worker (range 0-3)	1.9 (.87) 2.0 (.73)	1.8 (.85) 2.0 (.72)	1.9 (.89) 2.0 (.76)	2.2 (.81) 2.2 (.67)
<b>SUBSTANTIVE MODULE ADMINISTRATION &amp; SUPERVISION</b>				
<i>Organizational cultural competence</i> (range 0-4)	2.5 (.94)	2.5 (.94)	2.5 (.98)	2.6 (.94)
<i>Learning culture</i> (range 0-4)	2.4 (.90)	2.3 (.87)	2.3 (.92)	2.8 (.85)
<i>Administrative leadership</i> (range 0-5)	3.1 (1.1)	3.1 (1.1)	3.0 (1.2)	3.7 (.96)
<i>Supervisory feedback</i> Credibility Quality Availability Promotes feedback seeking (range 0-6)	4.5 (1.3) 4.2 (1.4) 3.9 (1.4) 4.1 (1.4)	4.4 (1.4) 4.2 (1.4) 3.8 (1.4) 4.0 (1.4)	4.6 (1.3) 4.2 (1.3) 3.9 (1.4) 4.1 (1.4)	4.9 (1.2) 4.7 (1.3) 4.3 (1.4) 4.4 (1.4)
<i>Encouraging critical thinking</i> (range 0-5)	2.5 (.99)	2.4 (.99)	2.6 (.98)	2.8 (.89)

## WAVE 1 TO WAVE 2 CHANGES

ITEM	WAVE 1	WAVE 2
Work/Life Balance - Work interferes with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Romantic relationships</li> <li>• Having/raising children</li> <li>• Taking care of ill/elderly/disabled loved one</li> </ul>	21.2% 31.8% 45.4%	61.8% 70.6% 76.7%
Social Support: (range 0-3) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supervisor</li> <li>• Co-workers</li> </ul>	2.1 (.78) 2.1 (.70)	1.9 (.86) 2.0 (.73)
Total hours worked past 7 days (range 0-100)	39.1 (.10.0)	45.8 (12.9)
Psychological distress (range 0-4)	.54 (.54)	1.1 (.90)
Sleep disturbance (range 0-4)	1.1 (.82)	1.7 (1.0)
Job satisfaction (range 0-5) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pay</li> <li>• Benefits</li> </ul>	2.6 (1.1) 3.2 (1.0)	1.6 (1.1) 2.7 (1.1)

## Appendix B

### Child Maltreatment

While you were growing up, did your parents/caregivers regularly...

1. push, grab, or shove you?
2. throw something at you?
3. slap or hit you?
4. call you names, or say other hurtful or insulting things to you?
5. make you watch or do sexual things?
6. leave you alone or unsupervised when you were too young to be alone?
7. make you do chores that were too difficult or dangerous for someone your age?
8. have you go without things you needed like clothes, shoes, or school supplies because they spent the money on themselves?
9. make you go hungry or not prepare regular meals?
10. ignore or fail to get you medical treatment when you were sick or hurt?

### Job Satisfaction – Pay

1. I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.
2. Raises are too few and far between.
3. I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me.
4. I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.

### Job Satisfaction – Benefits

1. I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive.
2. The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.
3. The benefit package we have is equitable.
4. There are benefits we do not have which we should have.

### Social Support – Supervisor

1. How much can your supervisor be relied on when things get tough at work?
2. How much is your supervisor willing to listen to your work-related problems?
3. How helpful is your supervisor to you in getting your job done?
4. How much is your supervisor willing to listen to your personal problems?

### Social Support – Co-worker

1. How much can your co-workers be relied on when things get tough at work?
2. How much are your co-workers willing to listen to your work-related problems?
3. How helpful are your co-workers to you in getting your job done?
4. How much are your co-workers willing to listen to your personal problems?

**Client-Perpetrated Violence – Non-physical**

1. Yelled at, shouted at, or sworn at by a client or other household member
2. Personal property or workplace property damaged

**Client-Perpetrated Violence – Threats**

1. Threatened by a client without physical contact
2. Threatened with damage or theft of your personal or workplace property
3. Threatened with a weapon

**Client-Perpetrated Violence – Assault**

1. Physically assaulted by a client or other household member without physical injury
2. Assaulted by a client or other household member resulting in mild soreness or minor injury
3. Assault that led to pain or soreness that lasted overnight, but no visit to a physician or the ER
4. Assault that required an emergency room or physician visit

**Time Pressure**

1. I have too much work to do in the amount of time that I have.
2. I don't have enough time to do my job effectively.
3. I am too busy at work.
4. My workload is too high.
5. I have a lot of time pressure in my work.

**Stress**

1. That you were unable to control the important things in your life?
2. Confident about your ability to handle your personal problems?
3. That things were going your way?
4. That difficulties were piling up so high that you could not overcome them?

### **Secondary Traumatic Stress – Past 7 days**

1. I felt emotionally numb.
2. My heart started pounding when I thought about my work with clients.
3. It seemed as if I was reliving the trauma(s) experience by my client(s).
4. I had trouble sleeping.
5. I felt discouraged about the future.
6. Reminders of my work with clients upset me.
7. I had little interest in being around others.
8. I felt jumpy.
9. I was less active than usual.
10. I thought about my work with clients when I didn't intend to.
11. I had trouble concentrating.
12. I avoided people, places, or things that reminded me of my work with clients.
13. I had disturbing dreams about my work with clients.
14. I wanted to avoid working with some clients.
15. I was easily annoyed.
16. I expected something bad to happen.
17. I noticed gaps in my memory about client sessions.

### **Burnout – Work-related**

1. Do you feel worn out at the end of the working day?
2. Are you exhausted in the morning at the thought of another day at work?
3. Do you feel that every working hour is tiring for you?
4. Do you have enough energy for family and friends during leisure time?
5. Is your work emotionally exhausting?
6. Does your work frustrate you?
7. Do you feel burnt out because of your work?

### **Burnout – Client-related**

1. Do you find it hard to work with clients?
2. Does it drain your energy to work with clients?
3. Do you find it frustrating to work with clients?
4. Do you feel that you give more than you get back when you work with clients?
5. Are you tired of working with clients?
6. Do you sometimes wonder how long you will be able to continue to work with clients?

**Sleep Disturbance**

1. Two hours or longer before you could fall asleep
2. Woke up and took an hour or more to get back to sleep
3. Woke up at least two hours earlier than you wanted to
4. Feeling sleepy during the day

**Psychological Distress**

1. Nervous
2. Hopeless
3. Restless or fidgety
4. So depressed that nothing could cheer you up
5. Everything was an effort
6. Worthless

**Commitment – Child welfare profession**

1. I plan to leave child welfare as soon as possible.
2. I would have a hard time finding a job outside child welfare.
3. I have too much time invested in child welfare to leave.
4. I am committed to continuing to work in child welfare.
5. For me to leave child welfare would mean giving up a substantial investment in training.
6. My professional goals include working with children and families, but not necessarily in child welfare.
7. I expect to still be working in child welfare in 5 years.

**Commitment – Current agency**

1. I plan to leave this agency as soon as possible.
2. I have too much time invested at this agency to leave.
3. I expect to still be working at this agency in 5 years.
4. I am committed to staying at this agency.
5. I would gain little from switching to another agency.
6. I would have a hard time finding another job at a different agency.

**Self-Efficacy**

1. I have the skills that I need to do my job effectively.
2. I consistently plan ahead and then carry out my plans.
3. I usually accomplish whatever I set my mind to.
4. I am effective and confident in doing my job.
5. I have been effective in my work here.



**Reciprocal Peer Support**

1. We talk about the stress we feel related to this job.
2. We talk about what we like about working in this agency.
3. We talk about the things we don't like about working in this agency.
4. We talk about off-the-job interests we have in common.
5. We discuss things that are happening in our personal lives.
6. We provide each other with encouragement.
7. We listen to each other when someone needs to talk.

**Social Support – Supervisor**

1. My supervisor can be relied on when things get tough at work.
2. My supervisor is willing to listen to work-related problems.
3. My supervisor is helpful in getting my job done.
4. My supervisor is willing to listen to personal problems.
5. My supervisor is easy to talk to.

**Social Support – Co-workers**

1. My co-workers can be relied on when things get tough at work.
2. My co-workers are willing to listen to work-related problems.
3. My co-workers are helpful in getting my job done.
4. My co-workers are willing to listen to personal problems.
5. My co-workers are easy to talk to.

**Organizational Cultural Competence**

1. Staff recruitment, hiring, and retention practices reflect the goal to achieve diversity and cultural competence.
2. Participants for all advisory committees and councils are recruited and supported to ensure the diverse cultural representation of the organization's geographic area.
3. Services are routinely and systematically reviewed for methods, strategies, and ways of service for children and their families in culturally competent ways.
4. Translations and interpretation assistance is available and utilized when needed.
5. Pictures, posters, printed materials, and toys reflect the culture and ethnic backgrounds of the children and families served.
6. When food is discussed or used in assessment or treatment, the cultural and ethnic background of the child and family is considered.

## **Learning Culture**

1. Staff discuss new evidence-based practice.
2. Staff look for new and better ways to meet the needs of families.
3. Staff share learning from conferences and training with others in the agency.
4. Staff take time to reflect about the work.
5. Staff strategize ways to improve practice.
6. Staff seek opportunities to learn new approaches.
7. Staff seek feedback from others about how to improve job performance.
8. Staff are encouraged to share feedback about how agency practice could be improved.
9. Staff feel comfortable sharing their challenges with supervisors.
10. Supervisors and managers are open to feedback about how things can be improved in our agency.
11. Staff use data to make decisions.

## **Administrative Leadership**

1. Build consensus with staff around proposed system or practice changes.
2. Give people the right amount of freedom and choice in determining how to do their work.
3. Provide opportunities for career development, including mentoring staff and training.
4. Ensure the delivery of high-quality programs, services, and products.
5. Encourage new ideas and innovations.
6. Readily adapt to new information, changing conditions, or unexpected obstacles.
7. Implement plans consistent with the long-term interests of the agency.
8. Clearly communicate links between agency vision and work unit goals.
9. Adjust agency priorities quickly as situations change.
10. Manage and resolve conflicts and disagreements in a constructive manner.
11. Lead with a results-oriented approach.
12. Position the agency (department) for future success by identifying new opportunities.
13. Ask "what can we learn?" when things don't go as expected.
14. Communicate effectively with all levels of staff through various methods (oral presentations, written documents, etc.).
15. Treat staff with courtesy, sensitivity, and respect.

## **Supervisory Feedback – Credibility**

1. My supervisor is generally familiar with my performance on the job.
2. In general, I respect my supervisor's opinions about my job performance.
3. My supervisor is fair when evaluating my job performance.

## **Supervisory Feedback – Quality**

1. My supervisor gives me useful feedback about my job performance.
2. The feedback I receive from my supervisor helps me do my job.
3. The performance information I receive from my supervisor is generally not very meaningful.

**Supervisory Feedback – Availability**

1. My supervisor is usually available when I want performance information.
2. My supervisor is too busy to give me feedback.
3. The only time I receive performance feedback from my supervisor is during my performance review.

**Supervisory Feedback – promotes feedback seeking**

1. My supervisor is often annoyed when I directly ask for performance feedback.
2. I feel comfortable asking my supervisor for feedback about my work performance.
3. My supervisor encourages me to ask for feedback whenever I am uncertain about my job performance.

**Critical Thinking**

1. My supervisor asks me the kind of questions that make me think.
2. My supervisor does more talking than listening during my supervision.
3. My supervisor brings a different perspective to my cases, which is helpful.
4. It is OK to disagree with my supervisor.
5. My supervisor wants to understand why I made a decision in a case.
6. My supervisor encourages me to think about all aspects of a case.
7. My supervisor helps me to recognize my own biases.
8. My supervisor usually just tells me what to do.