

**New Jersey Department of Human Services
Task Force on Child Abuse and Neglect
Citizen Review Panel**

Survey Conducted at NJEA on Child Abuse and Neglect

The Citizen Review Panel (CRP) of the New Jersey Task Force on Child Abuse prepared a survey for distribution at the New Jersey Education Association (NJEA) convention. The intent of the survey was to gather information from teachers, principals, administrators and other education personnel regarding their understanding and knowledge of child abuse and neglect policies and procedures and their actions based on that understanding and knowledge. The survey was distributed and collected at the convention on November 10-11, 2005. Data entry began in late November and was completed before the end of December. A total of 610 surveys were collected and entered for analysis. For most of these 610 surveys, full responses from all participants were provided. For example, for eight of the ten survey questions, the percentage of missing data or no response was less than 4.6%. Data was compiled and analyzed for a preliminary draft presentation at the January 4, 2006 meeting of the CRP.

This report examines response frequencies to all of the survey questions and also looks at the relationships between responses to selected questions. Where appropriate, statistical tests of significance were applied to the data.

Results

Question 1: What is your occupation?

About 2/3 of all respondents (66.7%) identified themselves as a Teacher. As can be seen in Table 1, the next most frequent occupation identified was School Nurse, 3.9% of all respondents (the Other category was chosen by 13.9% but only a minority of these participants, listed an actual "other" occupation).

Table 1: Occupation

	Frequency	Percent
Teacher	407	66.7
School Nurse	24	3.9
Secretary	16	2.6
Principal	4	.7
Administrator	5	.8
School Social Worker	13	2.1
Guidance Counselor/Student Services	14	2.3
Special Services/Services for Disabled	22	3.6
Phys. Ed./Athletics Staff	4	.7
Other	85	13.9
Total	594	97.4
Missing	16	2.6
Total	610	100.0

What this means to the analysis of the survey data is that conclusions are effectively about what the 400+ Teachers reported in their surveys. The number of respondents who identified occupations other than Teacher is, in each instance, too small to have any bearing on the

analysis. In addition, this means that any analyses that propose to compare the responses of Teachers to those of the other occupations cannot be legitimately conducted due to the very small sample sizes for the other occupations.

Question 2: County where you are employed?

Table 2 summarizes information about the counties where survey respondents are employed. All 21 counties in New Jersey were represented by at least three respondents. In the majority of instances, the percent of survey respondents from a county was somewhat similar to the percentage of state residents that a county's population represents as can be seen by comparing the Percent column with the Percent of State Pop. Column in Table 2. However, there were a few incongruities. The counties of Bergen, Morris and Passaic were underrepresented* by the survey sample. Atlantic, Cape May, Cumberland, Hudson and Salem counties were overrepresented by the survey sample.** In these cases, drawing generalizations about a county from the survey data from these counties would be questionable.

Table 2: County of Employment

	Frequency	Percent	Percent of State Pop
Atlantic**	68	11.1	3.0
Bergen*	22	3.6	10.51
Burlington	35	5.7	5.03
Camden	64	10.5	6.05
Cape May**	18	3.0	1.22
Cumberland**	24	3.9	1.74
Essex	58	9.5	9.43
Gloucester	27	4.4	3.03
Hudson**	21	3.4	7.24
Hunterdon	5	.8	1.45
Mercer	28	4.6	4.17
Middlesex	38	6.2	8.92
Monmouth	39	6.4	7.31
Morris*	15	2.5	5.59
Ocean	30	4.9	6.07
Passaic*	40	6.6	5.81
Salem**	12	2.0	0.76
Somerset	12	2.0	3.54
Sussex	3	.5	1.71
Union	37	6.1	6.21
Warren	6	1.0	1.22
Total	602	98.7	
Missing	8	1.3	
Total	610	100.0	

* Underrepresentation = survey sample % is .5 or less times the % of state population

** Overrepresentation = survey sample % is 2.0 or more times the % of state population

Question3: Length of time employed in current position?

Table 3: Length of Employment

	Frequency	Percent
0 to 4 months	66	10.8
5 months to 1 yr.	25	4.1
1 to 3 yrs.	124	20.3
4+ years	386	63.3
Total	601	98.5
Missing	9	1.5
Total	610	100.0

Almost 2/3 of the survey respondents (63.3%) indicated a length of employment of four or more years. About 15% (14.9%) said they had been employed in the current position less than one year (Table 3). There was no information available about what the *total* length of employment has been for these respondents, including all positions held.

Question 4a: Do you receive training on recognizing abuse and neglect?

About 1/3 of the respondents reported they had not received training on recognizing abuse and neglect. Another 11.6% had not because of being new to the job. More than half the respondents said they had received training.

Table 4a: Received Training

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	326	53.4
No	206	33.8
Not yet, I am newly hired	71	11.6
Total	603	98.9
Missing	7	1.1
Total	610	100.0

Table 4a indicates that 326 respondents said they had received training on recognizing abuse and neglect while in their current position. Question 4b asked: ***If yes (to Question 4a), how often?*** In Table 4b, there were 297 respondents who reported on frequency of training, 91% of the 326 in Question 4a who said they had received training. Of the 297 respondents, nearly half (49.2%) indicated training was on an annual (once a year) basis. No other choice garnered _ of the remaining responses.

Table 4b: Frequency of Training

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Twice in one year	39	6.4	13.1
Once a year	146	23.9	49.2
Once in two years	48	7.9	16.2
Other	64	10.5	21.5
Total	297	48.7	100.0
Missing	313	51.3	
Total	610	100.0	

Question 4c asked the respondents who said they had been trained to indicate **“Training was conducted by”**. 286 of the 326 trained staff (88%) responded. Table 4c summarizes the results. It was reported that almost _ of the training (49.3%) was conducted by School Personnel. An Outside Agency was responsible for about _ of the training (26.6%). DYFS staff were responsible for 12.2% of the training.

Table 4c: Who Conducted Training

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
School Personnel	141	23.1	49.3
Computer	7	1.1	2.4
Outside Agency	76	12.5	26.6
Don't Know	27	4.4	9.4
DYFS Staff	35	5.7	12.2
Total	286	46.9	100.0
Missing	324	53.1	
Total	610	100.0	

Question 5: Have you been advised about your school's child abuse and neglect reporting policy?

Question 6: Are you aware of the dual reporting requirement of notifying the appropriate law enforcement authority as well as DYFS?

Of the 582 responses to Question 5, more than 70% indicated they had been advised about the child abuse and neglect reporting policy of their school. 23.3% said they had not yet been advised about their school’s reporting policy. Similarly, more than 2/3 of the respondents (67.4%) said they were aware of the requirement that a dual report about abuse or neglect must be made to the appropriate law enforcement agency and DYFS. Almost 30% (29.5%) said they were not aware of the reporting requirement. Table 5 and Table 6 below summarize the response to these two questions.

Table 5: Advised on Child Abuse & Neglect Policy

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	440	72.1
No	142	23.3
Total	582	95.4
Missing	28	4.6
Total	610	100.0

Table 6: Aware of Dual Reporting Requirement

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	411	67.4
No	180	29.5
Total	591	96.9
Missing	19	3.1
Total	610	100.0

Survey participants were asked to designate their first and second choices to contact if they suspected child abuse of any kind (physical, sexual emotional) or neglect (Question 7). Their

choices included the School Principal, their Department Head and Special Services. Tables 7a and 7b below summarize the responses regarding who would be contacted first (Table 7a) and who would be contacted next (Table 7b).

Table 7a: Suspicion of Abuse/Neglect – First Contact

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Teacher	38	6.2	7.7
School Nurse	163	26.7	33.1
School Principal	141	23.1	28.6
School Secretary	2	.3	.4
Department Head	15	2.5	3.0
Special or Disabled Svcs.	4	.7	.8
SCR directly	93	15.2	18.9
Other	37	6.1	7.5
Total	493	80.8	100.0
Missing	117	19.2	
Total	610	100.0	

When asked whom they would contact first (Table 7a) when abuse or neglect was suspected, respondents were most likely to select School Nurse (26.7%), School Principal (23.1%) and SCR directly (15.2%). Controlling for the 117 who did not provide an answer to this question, those percentages grew to 33.1%, 28.6%, and 18.9%, respectively (Valid Percent). Together, the three most frequent choices accounted for 64% of all respondents and 80.6% of the actual given responses.

When given the opportunity to make a second choice (Table 7b) about who would be contacted, the most frequently selected choices were the same three, in a slightly different order – School Principal (21.5%), School Nurse (11.0%) and SCR directly (10.7%). When the 292 individuals who did not respond to this question are not included, the percentages of those who did respond become School Principal – 41.2%, School Nurse – 21.1%, and SCR directly – 20.4.

The survey respondents reported that if they suspected any type of child abuse or neglect, they were most likely to turn to the School Nurse with this information, although the School Principal was contacted almost as often as a first choice. As the next contact, the School Principal was clearly the most likely choice, therefore the most likely pattern of response would be to see the School Nurse and then the School Principal about the suspicion. In both cases, contacted the SCR was the third most popular alternative.

Table 7b: Suspicion of Abuse/Neglect – Next Contact

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Teacher	8	1.3	2.5
School Nurse	67	11.0	21.1
School Principal	131	21.5	41.2
School Secretary	2	.3	.6
Department Head	10	1.6	3.1
Special or Disabled Svcs.	22	3.6	6.9
SCR directly	65	10.7	20.4
Other	13	2.1	4.1
Total	318	52.1	100.0
Missing	292	47.9	
Total	610	100.0	

Two general questions regarding awareness of reporting procedures were Question 8, ***“Were you aware that a person making a child abuse report could obtain limited feedback from DYFS about the report?”*** and Question 9, ***“ Were you aware that the request for feedback must be made in writing to DYFS?”***

Table 8: Awareness of Limited Feedback

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	265	43.4
No	323	53.0
Total	588	96.4
Missing	22	3.6
Total	610	100.0

Table 9: Awareness of Feedback Request in Writing

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	177	29.0
No	419	68.7
Total	596	97.7
Missing	14	2.3
Total	610	100.0

For both questions, a minority of respondents reported awareness of the procedure. Only 43.4% said they were aware that they could obtain limited feedback from DYFS about a child abuse report they submitted (Table 8). Just 29% were aware that any request for feedback from DYFS must be made in written form (Table 9).

Question 10: What would you suggest to improve communication between schools and DYFS, or to make the reporting process better?

Table 10: Suggestions

	Frequency	Percent
No Response	435	71.3
Response	175	28.7
Total	610	100.0

When asked what suggestions could be made to improve communication or the reporting process between schools and DYFS, 175 of the respondents (28.7%) offered at least one suggestion (Table 10).

Table 11: Most Frequently Cited Suggestions for Improvement

Suggestion Categories	N	%
In-service education/training/workshops in schools (by DFYS)	44	25.1%
Training (procedures/policies)	27	15.4%
Visit schools/outreach to school staff	12	6.9%
Follow up/feedback to school staff	11	6.3%
Improve quality of communication/conversation with schools	10	5.7%
Policy and Procedure workshops	10	5.7%
Improve response time to reports of abuse	4	2.3%
Hire more social workers	2	1.1%
Other (single entries)	61	34.9%
Total	175	

The suggestions from the 175 respondents to Question 10 were sorted into a number of descriptive categories. As can be seen in Table 11, above, these categories demonstrate some overlap. For instance, **in-service education or training by DYFS staff** for school personnel and **visiting schools/outreach to school staff** are similar in the general sense they both involve going into the school community. The difference lies in how specific the respondent was when suggesting the visiting/outreach. In the first example, respondents specifically suggested in-service education or workshops in the schools while the responses included in the second example were not that specific. Therefore, depending on the specific detail desired in the analysis, it could be said that 44 respondents suggested in-service education, training or workshops in the schools and 12 suggested a visit to the school for outreach to staff, or that 56 respondents suggested DYFS staff go into the school community to support school staff. For this description, the analysis is more rather than less specific.

In-service education et. al. by DYFS staff was the most frequent suggestion to come from the school personnel, accounting for about 25% of all responses. Training, specifically on policies and procedures, was the next most likely suggestion at 15.4%. No other single suggestion was more than 6.9% of the total responses.

It was noted in Table 2 that, with a few exceptions, the percentage of those who participated in the survey as a function of their county of employment was similar to the percentage of the state population that each county represents. For example 5.7% of the survey participants were employed in Burlington County. The population of Burlington County is 5.03% of the total population of New Jersey. For analytical purposes, this similarity enhances the value of the data regarding any statewide generalizations based on the location of the respondent employment.

County of Employment (Question 2) was examined as a function three of the survey questions that inquire about the respondent’s awareness of child abuse and neglect reporting policy and/or procedure. If a significant difference was found on these variables, as a function of County of Employment, it would suggest communication and information management issues that are county-based and training needs that would be targeted to some counties rather than all or none of the counties.

County of Employment was not significantly associated with responses to Question 5: **“Have you been advised about your school’s child abuse and neglect reporting policy?”** All survey respondents, regardless of county of employment, were equally likely to say they have (or have not) been advised about this policy. Table 12, below, summarizes the pattern of responses

Table 12: County of Employment X Advised About Reporting Policy

2. County where you are employed?	5. Have you been advised about your school's child abuse and neglect reporting policy?		
	Yes	No	Total
Atlantic	49	15	64
Bergen	18	3	21
Burlington	22	12	34
Camden	46	16	62
Cape May	11	7	18
Cumberland	20	4	24
Essex	43	11	54
Gloucester	16	10	26
Hudson	16	4	20
Hunterdon	3	1	4
Mercer	16	11	27
Middlesex	30	7	37
Monmouth	35	3	38
Morris	11	2	13
Ocean	18	11	29
Passaic	31	7	38
Salem	7	4	11
Somerset	7	4	11
Sussex	2	1	3
Union	29	6	35
Warren	6	0	6
Total	436	139	575

County of Employment was also not significantly related to responses to Question 6: “**Are you aware of the dual reporting requirement of notifying the appropriate law enforcement authority as well as DYFS?**” Table 13 displays the pattern of responses.

Table 13: County of Employment X Awareness of Dual Reporting Requirement

	6. Are you aware of the dual reporting requirement of notifying the appropriate law enforcement authority as well as DYFS?			
2. County where you are employed?	Yes	No	Total	% of Yes Responses
Atlantic	47	19	66	71%
Bergen	15	7	22	68%
Burlington	23	10	33	70%
Camden	44	20	64	69%
Cape May	11	7	18	61%
Cumberland	16	7	23	70%
Essex	42	13	55	76%
Gloucester	10	15	25	40%
Hudson	15	6	21	71%
Hunterdon	2	3	5	40%
Mercer	16	10	26	62%
Middlesex	26	11	37	70%
Monmouth	31	7	38	82%
Morris	9	4	13	69%
Ocean	17	13	30	57%
Passaic	27	12	39	69%
Salem	8	4	12	67%
Somerset	9	3	12	75%
Sussex	3	0	3	100%
Union	31	6	37	84%
Warren	4	1	5	80%
Total	406	178	584	70%

There was no *significant effect* on responses to Question 6 as a function of the location of employment of the respondent. Statewide, 70% of the respondents said they were aware of the dual reporting requirement. However, despite the lack of significant results, several counties had results far below this mean percentage (70%) of respondents. These five counties are shaded in Table 13. In two instances, the percentage of respondents who were aware of the dual reporting requirement was 40% and for the three other examples, the percentage was no greater than 62% (the next smallest percentage was 67%). Therefore, although there was no statistically significant difference in responses due to employment location, a desired outcome, there were responses from a few counties where the awareness of the policy was much less than the other counties. This should suggest a further examination of policy awareness for a few counties, if not all of the counties.

Similarly, County of Employment was not significantly associated with responses to Question 8: “**Were you aware that a person making a child abuse report could obtain limited feedback from DYFS about the report?**” This is also a desired outcome in that it indicates

that there is no difference in respondents' awareness of the procedure regarding obtaining limited feedback as a function of where the respondent works (Table 14)

Table 14: County of Employment X Awareness of Procedure for Limited Feedback

	8. Were you aware that a person making a child abuse report could obtain limited feedback from DYFS about the report?		
2. County where you are employed?	Yes	No	Total
Atlantic	26	39	65
Bergen	9	12	21
Burlington	17	17	34
Camden	24	39	63
Cape May	7	10	17
Cumberland	12	12	24
Essex	29	25	54
Gloucester	8	18	26
Hudson	7	14	21
Hunterdon	2	3	5
Mercer	10	16	26
Middlesex	15	22	37
Monmouth	20	19	39
Morris	8	7	15
Ocean	15	13	28
Passaic	19	21	40
Salem	3	8	11
Somerset	6	6	12
Sussex	1	2	3
Union	22	12	34
Warren	3	3	6
Total	263	318	581

Employment experience, the length of time the survey respondent was employed in his/her current position (note that a more complete measure of experience would be one that included all work experience rather than just experience in the current position) was the focus of Question 3: “**Length of time employed in current position?**” In Table 3, it can be seen that the most frequent choice was *4+ years*, 63.3% of all responses. Responses to Question 3 were examined for an association with Question 5 (advisement on reporting policy), Question 6 (awareness of dual reporting requirements) and Question 8 (awareness about obtaining limited feedback from DYFS).

Responses to Question 5: “**Have you been advised about your school's child abuse and neglect reporting policy?**” were significantly associated with the length of time the respondent was employed in his/her current position. Table 15 illustrates this relationship. As length of employment increases, the percentage of those who responded “yes” increases to a level higher than the average percentage of those who were advised (80% to 76%, respectively).

The more time spent in the current position, the greater the chance that the respondent was advised on this policy, a desired and perhaps even expected outcome but one that lends support to the value of work experience.

Table 15: Length of Employment X Advised About Reporting Policy*

3. Length of time employed in current position.	5. Have you been advised about your school's child abuse and neglect reporting policy?			
	Yes	No	Total	% of Yes Responses
0 to 4 months	43	19	62	69%
5 months to 1 yr.	15	10	25	60%
1 to 3 yrs.	84	37	121	69%
4+ years	296	72	368	80%
Total	438	138	576	76%

* Significant at the $p = .01$ level

Length of time employed was also significantly related to responses to Question 6: **“Are you aware of the dual reporting requirement of notifying the appropriate law enforcement authority as well as DYFS?”** In Table 16, it can be seen that as the length of employment increases for respondents, the percentage that say they are aware of the dual reporting requirement increases. The percentage increases from 56% to 74% (with one decrease where there are small frequencies of responses – 5 months to 1 yr.), as length of employment increases. Again, results confirm what would be expected as time on the job increases and opportunities for training and/or for experience to influence work outcomes increases.

Table 16: Length of Employment X Awareness of Dual Reporting Requirement*

3. Length of time employed in current position.	6. Are you aware of the dual reporting requirement of notifying the appropriate law enforcement authority as well as DYFS?			
	Yes	No	Total	% of Yes Responses
0 to 4 months	35	28	63	56%
5 months to 1 yr.	11	14	25	44%
1 to 3 yrs.	82	39	121	68%
4+ years	279	96	375	74%
Total	407	177	584	70%

* Significant at the $p = .01$ level

When length of time employed in current position was compared to responses to Question 8: **“Were you aware that a person making a child abuse report could obtain limited feedback from DYFS about the report?”** there was no significant relationship uncovered. Unlike overall responses to the previous two questions which were 76% and 70% respectively, only 45% of respondents said they were aware they could obtain limited feedback from DYFS. Awareness percentages were depressed for every level of length of employment, when compared to the previous questions and the percentages evidenced much less change as experience increased. Thus, awareness in general remained much lower for this issue and was not significantly influenced by length of time employed in the current position. Table 17 illustrates these relationships.

Table 17: Length of Employment X Awareness of Procedure for Limited Feedback

	8. Were you aware that a person making a child abuse report could obtain limited feedback from DYFS about the report?			
3. Length of time employed in current position.	Yes	No	Total	% of Yes Responses
0 to 4 months	34	30	64	53%
5 months to 1 yr.	7	16	23	30%
1 to 3 yrs.	55	65	120	46%
4+ years	166	208	374	44%
Total	262	319	581	45%

The final section of this report focuses on relationships between responses to Question 4a: “**Do you receive training on recognizing abuse and neglect?**” and responses to questions that looked at the respondents knowledge or awareness of child abuse and neglect policy and procedures. When responses to this question were examined in regard to responses to Question 7: “**If you suspect child abuse (physical, sexual, emotional, or neglect), please designate whom you contact first and next.**” no significant relationship was found. The report of prior training had no impact on what person was identified as the first contact when abuse or neglect was suspected. Similarly, prior training had no effect on the person identified as the next choice in this situation. It would appear that whatever the content of the prior training, it did not effectively specify a first and second preferred choice to report to (or this information was not well retained) when abuse or neglect was suspected. Tables 18 and 19 summarize these two relationships.

Table 18: Contact First X Received Training

	4a. Do you receive training on recognizing abuse and neglect			
7a. Contact First	Yes	No	Not yet, I am newly hired	Total
Teacher	22	11	5	38
School Nurse	80	66	17	163
School Principal	71	48	20	139
School Secretary	1	1	0	2
Department Head	6	3	6	15
Special or Disabled Svcs.	2	2	0	4
SCR directly	56	30	6	92
Other	16	15	6	37
Total	254	176	60	490

Table 19: Contact Next X Received Training

	4a. Do you receive training on recognizing abuse and neglect			
7b. Contact Next	Yes	No	Not yet, I am newly hired	Total
Teacher	3	2	3	8
School Nurse	35	22	10	67
School Principal	66	48	16	130
School Secretary	2	0	0	2
Department Head	3	6	1	10
Special or Disabled Svcs.	13	6	3	22
SCR directly	41	15	7	63
Other	7	6	0	13
Total	170	105	40	315

Responses to Question 4a: ***“Do you receive training on recognizing abuse and neglect?”*** were compared to responses to Question 5: ***“Have you been advised about your school's child abuse and neglect reporting policy?”*** These responses were strongly and significantly related. Respondents who indicated they had received training on recognizing abuse and neglect were much more likely to report they had been advised about their school's child abuse and neglect reporting policy than if they said they had no received training. Table 20 summarizes this relationship.

Table 20: Advised About Reporting Policy X Received Training*

	4a. Do you receive training on recognizing abuse and neglect			
5. Have you been advised about your school's child abuse and neglect reporting policy?	Yes	No	Not yet, I am newly hired	Total
Yes	296	102	36	434
No	17	94	31	142
Total	313	196	67	576

* Significant at the p = .01 level

Responses to Question 4a were also compared to responses to Question 6: ***“Are you aware of the dual reporting requirement of notifying the appropriate law enforcement authority as well as DYFS?”*** Again, a strong relationship between the responses was found. If a respondent said he had received training he or she was more likely to indicate awareness of the dual reporting requirement. Finally, when responses to Question 4a were compared to responses to Question 8: ***“Were you aware that a person making a child abuse report could obtain limited feedback from DYFS about the report?”*** it was again revealed that a significant association existed. If a respondent said he or she had received training on recognizing abuse and neglect, it was more likely that respondent would also report awareness that limited feedback from DYFS about the report could be obtained. Tables 21 and 22, below, present these relationships.

Table 21: Awareness of Dual Reporting Requirement X Received Training*

	4a. Do you receive training on recognizing abuse and neglect			
6. Are you aware of the dual reporting requirement of notifying the appropriate law enforcement authority as well as DYFS?	Yes	No	Not yet, I am newly hired	Total
Yes	263	106	37	406
No	53	94	32	179
Total	316	200	69	585

- Significant at the p = .01 level

Table 22: Awareness of Procedure for Limited Feedback X Received Training*

	4a. Do you receive training on recognizing abuse and neglect			
8. Were you aware that a person making a child abuse report could obtain limited feedback from DYFS about the report?	Yes	No	Not yet, I am newly hired	Total
Yes	174	62	26	262
No	143	136	41	320
Total	317	198	67	582

- * Significant at the p = .01 level

Table 23 summarizes the relationships between responses to three questions regarding qualities of the respondents to this survey and responses to the three questions that examined the respondent's awareness of child abuse policies, requirements and procedures.

Table 23: Respondent Qualities X Awareness of Policies, Requirements and Procedures

	Advised About Reporting Polices (Question 5)	Aware of Dual Reporting Requirement (Question 6)	Aware of Limited Feedback Procedure (Question 8)
County of Employment (Question 2)	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant
Length of Employment (Question 3)	Significant	Significant	Not Significant
Received Training (Question 4)	Significant	Significant	Significant

Clearly, where the respondent was employed had little impact on responses to the questions that examined awareness of child abuse and neglect policies, requirements, and procedures. However, the length of employment of a respondent did have a positive effect on being advised about reporting policies and being aware of a reporting requirement. It did not positively affect awareness of the procedure for obtaining limited feedback about a report from DYFS (it was previously noted that the overall response to this question was much less likely to result in a

positive response than for the other two questions). When it was reported that training on reporting child abuse had been received, there was a strong and positive effect on responses to all three “awareness” questions.

Recommendations

Increase the percentage of school personnel who are trained on recognizing child abuse and neglect.

At the time of this survey, only 53.4% of the respondents indicated they had received training on child abuse and neglect recognition. With the strong effect shown by these results for the relationship between receiving training and awareness of policy, requirements and/or procedures, it would seem imperative that a larger percentage of school personnel be trained.

There was no significant interaction between receiving training on recognizing child abuse and neglect and how the respondent reacted when there was a suspicion of abuse or neglect. Training had no impact on who was identified as the first and next choice to be contacted when suspicions existed. However, it should be noted that many school systems have their own reporting procedure that very often includes medical personnel (the school nurse) and administrative staff (the principal). It is possible that, when faced with a choice between following school (and employer) procedures and observing a relatively new law regarding SCR reporting, many respondents chose the former. To confirm and further illuminate this behavior, follow up with school administration would be advisable.

Increase the percentage of non-teacher participants in the survey sample

Nearly 2/3 of all the survey participants identified themselves as a teacher. No other category of occupation was greater than 3.9%. For the results of this survey to be relevant to a greater variety of school personnel, the percentages of respondents from each occupation category should be higher and also more consistently representative of the personnel profile in the school systems.

With future surveys, record the following information about the respondent:

County of residence. The current survey asked respondents to identify the county where they are employed. Several analyses of responses to that question were conducted for this report. Data regarding county of employment does provide useful information regarding the distribution of the survey. As noted in Table 2, the percentages of respondents who work in a particular county, with a few exceptions, are similar to the percentage of the total state population that that county’s population represents. However, if the intent was to learn more about the relationship between a county and awareness of child abuse and neglect policies and procedures, the county of residence for the respondent, rather than the county of employment, would seem a better choice for data collection. Information about the employer of the respondent would be more properly gained through the collection of data about school district.

School district. Information on the school district of the respondent would be more useful in directing follow up efforts to train and educate school personnel, than any data collected with the current survey. It would also have the potential to improve the report by permitting an analysis by district rather than county. Information about district would, of course, also provide information about county of employment.