

Southern Regional Quality Improvement Center Summary of the Results of the Needs Assessment

The region selected by the SR QIC is large and diverse, encompassing 10 states primarily in the rural south: Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, South Carolina, Tennessee and West Virginia. However, the needs assessment revealed many similarities across these primarily rural states and common issues plaguing their public child welfare systems. All but three of these states have a composite ranking of indicators of child well-being of greater than 41st in the nation (Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2001).

For this needs assessment, the SR QIC implemented a multifaceted or triangulated approach, culminating in a convergent analysis of data collected from multiple sources. This effort allowed us to identify a project focus area that responds to a significant need felt across the region that has the potential to impact the quality of service provision as well as child and family outcomes ultimately. The focus area will be the basis for which applications for demonstration projects will be sought.

The needs assessment began with a review of national data sets, compiled by Annie E. Casey Foundation in *KidsCount* and the National Data Analysis System maintained by the National Resource Center on Information Technology in Child Welfare, relevant to children, families, and the child protection system in this region. Seven of the states in our region have a national composite rank based on indicators of child well-being above 40 (Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2001). Not surprisingly, the need is great in this region. Four of the ten states are above the national mean for children reported as abused/neglected and referred for investigation per 1,000 children in the population (NDAS, 2001). Notable statistics that are indicative of the overall status of the CPS systems in our region are as follows:

- Arkansas ranks well below Child Welfare League of America's national standard of no more than 89% of children with two or more placement settings in a year;
- Kentucky is ranked 48th in the number of children with substantiated/indicated reports of child abuse and neglect per 1,000 (NRITCW, 2001);
- Louisiana is ranked 50th in the percent of children in the high risk category;
- Mississippi is ranked 51st in teen births as a percentage of total births (Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2001);
- Missouri is significantly above Child Welfare League of America's national standard of 6% or fewer children re-entering foster care less than 12 months after a prior episode; and,
- West Virginia was significantly above Child Welfare League of America's national standard of 5% or fewer children had another substantiated/indicated report within 6 months of a prior episode (NRITCW, 2001).

Please refer to Appendix A for tables detailing a number of relevant data. Clearly, multiple needs are present and targeted areas have the potential for significant impact.

Other data which contributed to the selection of a focus area for future grants came from these activities conducted as a part of the needs assessment: deliberation by members of the QIC Advisory Board; interviews and presentations conducted by members of the SR QIC Advisory Board in each state; focus group conference calls; and a review of state and national level documents related to the child protection system. These efforts will each be reviewed in turn.

Deliberations and Efforts of the SR QIC Advisory Board

Each member of the Advisory Board has been very active in the needs assessment process. The Board is composed of a representative from each of the ten states. More specifically, these include: three deans and one faculty member from university social work programs; five high level administrators from public child welfare agencies; and two parent advocates. An early step in our needs assessment process was the discussion, in our first advisory board meeting, of the problems confronting their protective service systems and the most pressing needs they saw. A number of issues arose from that discussion, including the quality of casework assessment, staff turnover, and parent involvement in the

treatment process. The thread that ran through the entire discussion, however, was an issue that all agreed was a very pressing need: the enhancement of the skills of child protective services supervisors, particularly in the area of casework supervision. This was seen as not only a weak link in each system, but a possible solution to many of the other problems noted.

Based on these discussions, a needs assessment committee was formed. The committee determined that it was necessary to collect multi-layered data from the following sources: state administrative level public child welfare staff, university personnel middle managers, supervisors, line staff; and community partners, and consumers of services. The Advisory Board members conducted 335 key informant interviews with persons who spanned all of these categories, and submitted summary reports on the results of these interviews. In general, this process confirmed the appropriateness of the selection of focusing on casework supervision.

Focus Groups Via Conference Call

The primary method for eliciting input from administrative and university level staff was via conference call focus groups. The state's Advisory Board member and public child welfare agency determined which personnel would participate. Eight conference calls were conducted in which forty-nine individuals participated. One staff member from the SR QIC facilitated all of the calls using a standardized format. They began with a general discussion of the QIC purpose and process, which was followed by an open opportunity for participants to suggest potential focus areas for projects to be funded by the SR QIC. The following topics were raised:

- Supervision/Casework supervision [7 states];
- strengthening assessment of families [4 states];
- safety decisions/effectiveness of safety assessment [2 states];
- organizational culture [2 states];
- retention issues [2 states]; and,

- a number of other topics raised by one state.

When asked for their response to the Advisory Board’s suggestion that supervisory enhancement was an important focus area, all states agreed this would be an appropriate and powerful focus area for demonstration projects that would have the potential to impact their systems. Examples of quotes from this discussion include: “...all management staff recognize this is a need;” “...this is right on target;” “...if we could improve supervision it would alleviate many of our other issues;” and, “...this is a very good domain...My gut tells me this is the right focus area.”

Participants were then asked what problems they were observing that they attributed and what strategies had the potential to improve the quality of supervision. The participants attributed the following problems they are experiencing directly to inadequate field supervision:

- retention [4 states];
- overemphasis on administrative aspects of supervision [4 states];
- new supervisors having little experience before promotion [4 states];
- perception that line supervisors are just “another level of bureaucracy”—not important component in service provision;
- lack of follow up after initial training;
- difficulty in filling supervisor positions; and,
- inconsistency in what supervisors should do on a daily basis.

The issue of the lack of effective casework supervision came through clearly and was well-articulated by one supervisor: “I am spread so thin. I don’t get to really look at workers’ cases—the approach the worker is taking, what they are doing with cases, educational supervision.”

It was important to assess what participants believed might improve supervision in their state. The following suggestions were generated as having the potential to enhance the quality of supervision:

- follow-up on information from training [2 states]; case staffing/ conferences w/staff [2 states];
- helping staff make good decisions [2 states];
- supporting staff [2 states];
- mentoring supervisors;
- implementing a case review process;
- addressing over-representation of cases in specific geographic areas and in certain demographic categories and applying Council on Accreditation standards;
- helping staff practice effectively and remain current on evidence-based practice;
- identifying ways to mentor and coach staff;
- constructing ways for supervisors to stay current on effective practice;
- using supervision to educate staff, including developing questioning techniques
- developing techniques to make knowledge and skills addressed in staff-supervisor interaction “stick” ; and,
- time management techniques.

These suggestions provide insight into interventions which projects may implement and evaluate as to their impact on quality of supervision, worker skill and client outcomes.

Content Analysis of National/General and State Reports and Documents

Reports and documents were collected from each state based on what they had available. It was deemed important to use what information had been collected for other purposes, such as the state’s Child and Family Services Review or surveys of staff or client opinions, rather than burdening states with a new process. Sixty documents were reviewed in the following categories:

- 5 Annual Reports;
- 2 CFSR Statewide Assessments;
- 1 CFSR Program Improvement Plan;
- 1 CFSR Executive Summary and Report Card;
- 3 Staff survey/focus group reports/evaluations;
- 3 State consumer/community survey/focus group reports ;
- 5 Citizen Review Panel reports/documents;
- 4 Strategic/Practice improvement plans;
- 4 Case review reports
- 7 Other assessments/practice review reports; and,
- 12 Program/initiative descriptions/other.

Please refer to Appendix B for a listing of documents reviewed by state.

State assessment, case review and planning documents proved to be an excellent source of information regarding the needs of the CPS system. From a review of them, five categories of need were identified. Four are listed as follows:

- Assessment [6 states];
- Service Provision [6 States], including a need for improvement in services to foster children/ permanency (6 documents), crafting services and monitoring (3 documents), case planning (4 documents), timeliness (3 documents), effectiveness/ recidivism (3 documents), safety/risk assessment (3 documents) and family involvement (2 documents);
- Information systems [3 states]; and,
- Retention [3 states].

The most frequently identified category was consistent with the results of other needs assessment strategies: Supervision issues were identified by seven states, with several subcategories being identified:

- Failure to adequately training staff (3 documents);
- Failure to adequately supporting staff (3 documents);
- general concerns about the quality of supervision (3 documents);
- lack of understanding of the range of supervisory responsibilities/ ability to handle workload (2 documents);
- insufficient staff feedback (2 documents); and,
- lack of direction in the provision of effective family services (2 documents).

Supervision is clearly seen as a targeted area for promoting systemic improvement. Many states have planned strategies to address concerns regarding the quality of supervision as well as other aspects of service delivery that are seen as needing improvement. A number of strategies with a supervisory component were identified to address documented needs:

- staff training [6 states];
- review/refine supervisory process [5 states];
- supervisory training [4 states];
- redesign CPS services/practice [4 states];
- refine assessment process [3 states];
- supervisors to conduct case record reviews [2 states]; and,
- provide support to supervisors [2 states].

Three states were able to provide consumer or community partner assessment documents. It is not surprising that the items here involved direct service provision, staff retention, working conditions and organizational culture. One state's documents predominantly addressed supervision as a need directly. Clearly, all of the other issues noted can be linked to this topic, as will be demonstrated in the literature review.

Four states provided staff survey or focus group results. All four noted inadequate supervision, while three found retention/burn out issues as well as workload and salary issues being noted in one. Again, the link to the role of supervision in each of these issues with the exception of the latter is clear.

In addition to state documents, nine nationally issued or more general documents were reviewed which spoke to the current status and challenges facing the child protection system (See Appendix B). Two documents clearly address the topic of enhancing the casework supervision process—why it is critical to the SR QIC's region and how enhancing supervision has the potential to contribute to the field nationally.

Of 51 national research priorities identified in *A Research Agenda for Public Child Welfare* (NAPCHWA and NRCCM, 2001) several priorities on caseworker characteristics, retention and numerous practice topics that could be impacted by supervision were identified. These included how the organization of child welfare services affects outcomes. For this report, committees of experts were convened regionally and of the regional research priorities several involved our proposed focus area:

- What factors influence supervisors' impact on practice for successful client outcomes?
- How is a prognosis influenced by caseworker background (including supervision)?
- What is the relationship between agency structures [organizational change, turnover, staff background and practice] and program effectiveness?
- How can organizations better support practice?
- How do characteristics of organizational systems impact outcomes?
- How do administrators' beliefs knowledge and management style impact policy, practice and workers?

The research questions to be addressed within this topic of supervision by projects funded by the SR QIC clearly address several of these national research questions as listed above.

A recently published survey conducted by the American Public Human Services Association (2001), *Report from the Child Welfare Workforce Survey*, further argues for the relevance of a focus on supervision. The median turnover rates reported by public child welfare agencies were 22% for workers and 6% supervisors, while 67% of the worker and 50% of the supervisor turnover was deemed preventable. One of the seven issues related to retention most highly rated by respondent child welfare administrators was the amount and quality of supervision. Increased/improved supervisory training was one of 8 retention strategies most highly rated as successful. In 10 states conducting worker satisfaction surveys, the most frequent recommendations were improved supervision, management and staff communication, and fairness in the job.

The Child Welfare Workforce Survey report (2001) noted that of 11 states reporting their retention issue to be improved somewhat, staff training (including 3 targeting supervisory) was most frequently the strategy to which it was attributed. The final open-ended question asked for the most important actions child welfare agencies must take in the future to recruit and retain quality staff approximately one third of all states named supervision, support, TA and supervisory accountability; and over half named staff training including supervisory training as being the most important.

Independent Survey Conducted by the University of Kentucky

During Advisory Board meetings and focus groups with child welfare agencies and universities the lack of information on current supervision practice in our region and the specific aspects of supervision that should be emphasized was frequently discussed. A number of the states in the SR QIC region were interested in tapping the opinions of

middle managers, supervisors and line workers relative to the importance of supervision in the provision of effective casework. State child welfare administrators were interested in identifying specific activities and skills which had the greatest potential for promoting effective service provision as opined by staff in their agencies. Martin Tracy, Associate Dean for Research of the UK College of Social Work, agreed to work with these states to survey staff regarding these topics using primarily an electronic surveying process (see Appendix C for a copy of the survey). With the permission of the participating states, the results of this survey were shared with the SR QIC for the purpose of further framing the research questions and foci for funding applicants wishing to conduct demonstration projects related to improving the quality of casework supervision in their state.

Participation in this survey process was totally voluntary, both for states and staff electing to complete the survey. Six states (Alabama, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri and West Virginia) issued an invitation to their staff to complete the survey. Other states in the region were unable to participate due to other priorities during the window of time allotted for the process, but have indicated a significant interest in the results. Staff could respond to the survey electronically on the University of Kentucky website or via hard copy. A total of 836 surveys were submitted over a four week period. Ten surveys were received after the deadline. The response rate varied by state for various reasons, including competing work priorities at the time of distribution, difficulty with the software and distribution of the survey in county-based systems. The rates by individual states were: Alabama 5.6%; Arkansas 31.2%; Louisiana 16.9%; Mississippi 40.6%; Missouri 11%; West Virginia 10%. The overall response rate was 15.1%.

A brief summary of findings relevant to the clarification of a focus area for the SR QIC will be summarized here. Tables of quantitative results and a summary of the content analysis of the open-ended responses can be found in a separate document: *University of*

Kentucky Child Protection Supervision Survey Results (2002). Tables and Figures in the Appendix showing the demographics of the sample include state, position, employment setting (rural/urban), years of experience in child welfare, years in supervision and number of staff supervised. In terms of their position within the agency, 64% of respondents were line workers, 26% were supervisors, and 11% were middle managers. Thirty-seven percent of the workers responding had less than three years experience in child welfare, and 25% of supervisors had less than seven years experience in child welfare. The majority of supervisors had 3-7 years of experience supervising and oversee the work of 4-6 staff.

Eighty-one percent of the total sample believed supervision is very important to the provision of effective casework. Respondents were asked to select the primary responsibility of supervisors. The majority (45%) selected supporting the work of line workers, with the remainder categorized as follows: 25% monitoring practice; 10% policy compliance; 7% making casework decisions, 6% other; 4% training, and 3% administration. Content analysis of text responses of those selecting “other” revealed that the vast majority were unable to select one, preferring a combination. Supervisors and workers responded differently regarding the primary responsibility (see Table 3). Supervisors selected monitoring practice and supporting with nearly equal frequency. Fifty percent of workers chose supporting, and only 21% chose monitoring. This was a statistically significant difference. Notably, when asked where they most often turn for support/advice/guidance on work-related issues, 45% of line workers with less than a year experience and 38% with 1 to less than 3 years experience turn to a co-worker or peer rather than their supervisor (see Table 4).

Analysis of the data yielded many findings that are relevant to this needs assessment.

The survey gathered data on the importance staff assign to various aspects of supervision and characteristics/skills of supervisors (see Tables 6 and 15). On-the-job training and modeling good practice were the aspects of supervision most frequently rated as very important, while classroom training and administrative duties were most frequently rated as very or somewhat unimportant. Supervisory characteristics most frequently rated as very important, in order were: communication skills, interpersonal skills, casework supervision skills/techniques, critical thinking skills, and child welfare direct service experience. The two items most frequently rated as very/somewhat unimportant were a social work degree and an advanced social work degree.

Another important purpose was to identify which aspects of supervision and characteristics are either *not available at an adequate level or effectively provided* in their agency (see Tables 9, 10, 12, 13, 18 and 19). Aspects of supervision most frequently reported, in order, were mentoring, monitoring and addressing worker well-being, addressing issues of worker safety, developing community resources, on-the-job training, exploring ethical issues, promoting self-reflective practice, and policy clarification. It is also interesting that in order of frequency, mentoring, on-the job training, policy clarification, and classroom training were most frequently noted as *not being available* to supervisors at an adequate level. Workers were also asked to select from a list of terms those that accurately describe their supervisor (see Table 21). Over 70% selected accessible, competent, knowledgeable, and supportive. On the other hand, over 10 % selected inconsistent, rigid and unreliable.

Chi-square analysis was conducted on all results to determine if statistically significant differences were found based on position, years of experience and area of employment. Ten questions were significant based on whether respondents worked in a rural or urban setting (see Tables 8, 11, 14, 17 and 20). Thirty-one comparisons were

significant when examined by whether the respondent was a worker, supervisor or middle manager (see Tables 7,10,13,16, and 18). Years of experience in child welfare was examined by coding the data in three different ways. One configuration was to determine if two categories, ≤ 2 and > 2 years reveal interesting findings. A second broke up respondents at 1, 3, 7, 15 and over fifteen years. Nothing especially significant was revealed in either. The coding strategy that best illustrated the differences in findings, however, divided the data divide the data into four categories: <1 , $1 - <3$, $3 - <7$, and ≥ 7 years. Fifteen questions had significant differences based on this configuration (see Tables 9, 12, and 19).

Each participating state will be provided with a state-specific analysis of the survey conducted by the University of Kentucky. Some of this data may also be useful as a form of baseline regarding the current state of supervision in our region. Overall, this study is a rich source of information for public child welfare agencies in our region. This data lends much support to the findings of other components in this needs assessment, particularly in identifying aspects of supervision needing attention. Specifically,

- There are significant percentages of relatively inexperienced workers and supervisors in our region;
- Administrative duties are seen as less important to service provision than many other aspects of supervision although they often take precedence;
- Staff in all categories emphasize the importance of supervisors supporting staff and promoting improved practice, however a significant proportion of workers turn elsewhere for support and guidance on work-related issues;
- Supervisory techniques that are targeted toward improving worker practice, such as case review and consultation, exploring ethical issues, promoting self-reflective practice, modeling good practice, and promoting workers' identification of

important casework questions, are considered important but are often not provided effectively or at an adequate level;

- The importance and need for these supervisory practices tend to be appreciated more frequently by staff in supervisory and management positions; and,
- Mechanisms for supporting supervisors, such as continuing education, mentoring and peer consultation, are also considered important but are often absent.

Summary

It is clear from a convergent analysis of the results of this needs assessment that the states in our region, and with all likelihood many nationally, would benefit from research into the impact of structured methods of clinical casework supervision on child protection practice. Current supervision practice in public child welfare has become focused on administrative aspects of supervision due largely to the complexities of reporting and accountability requirements. This comes at a great cost of which agencies are very aware—in staff turnover, worker competence and skill, and potentially in adverse outcomes for the families and children being served. The casework supervision practice most frequently occurring is characterized as triage—in which workers come to the supervisor with a crisis or complex casework problem and the supervisor directs what they should do. This approach, along with many aspects of the traditional child welfare system, promotes a less clinical and perhaps less effective approach to child protection casework—one that focuses on case management and the documentation of activities, not treatment outcomes. Agency administrators, supervisors and workers alike have expressed a desire for more quality supervision and specifically techniques focused on the educational and supportive roles of supervision. A supervisory approach that promotes the following would go a great distance in correcting current problems:

- Scheduled individual or group supervision conferences;

- Enhanced worker critical thinking skills;
- Opportunities for workers to engage in self-reflection, to examine and consider ways to improve their practice;
- Identification of important casework questions that get to the heart of issues related to the family maltreatment and apply the knowledge gained in assessment and treatment;
- Worker skill and focus on evidence-based practice, both in looking to the professional literature for guidance in casework and in the implementation of program evaluation which promote an outcomes orientation to their work with families;
- The establishment of an organizational culture in which support, learning, and clinical supervision and consultation are encouraged; and,
- The use of case review, observation, and similar methods by supervisors to assess worker skill and gauge progress.

Price (1949) describes the majority of these aspects the use of supervision as a medium for teaching casework: “The syllabus for supervisors is the workers’ practice as revealed in records...Supervision is teaching based on the utilization and thorough understanding of the dynamics of the individual personality of the worker being supervised. This knowledge is obtained from the worker’s handling of cases (p. 637, 639).” It is understood that such an approach to supervision in child welfare can be time consuming, in a system in which workload is already overwhelming. Projects will be sought that attempt to develop and research techniques that promote these objectives while taking into account, and measuring, the potential impact on supervisor and worker workload.

**Appendix A: Summary of Descriptive Data
Regarding the Demographics and Child Protection Systems in the
Southern Regional Quality Improvement Center for Child Protection
Region**

Tables summarizing data compiled for each of the ten states in the SR QIC Region can be found at the website: <http://www.uky.edu/SocialWork/trc/qic.html>

Sources:

Child Welfare League of America, *State Child Welfare Agency Survey 1998*

Child Welfare League of America, *State Child Welfare Agency Survey 1999*

Annie E. Casey Foundation, *KidsCount 2001*

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration on Children, Youth and Families, *Child Maltreatment 1998: Reports from the States to the National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System*

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration on Children, Youth and Families, *Child Maltreatment 1997: Reports from the States to the National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System*

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration on Children, Youth and Families, *Child Maltreatment 1996: Reports from the States to the National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System*

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect, *Summary Data Component Statistics 1990-1995*

U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Estimates of the Population of State by age, Sex, Race & Hispanic Origin: 1990-1999*

**Appendix B: Southern Regional Quality Improvement Center
Needs Assessment
Documents Reviewed and Analyzed**

General

- ☑ Annie E. Casey Foundation (2001). *KIDS COUNT Data Book*. Washington, DC: Annie E. Casey Foundation.
- ☑ American Public Human Services Association (2001). *Report from the Child Welfare Workforce Survey: State and County Data and Findings*.
- ☑ National Resource Center on Information Technology in Child Welfare (2001). *National Data Analysis System*. (<http://ndas.cwla.org/>)
- ☑ National Association for Public Child Welfare Administrators & the National Resource Center on Child Maltreatment (2001). *A Research Agenda for Public Child Welfare*.
- ☑ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Administration for Children and Families (2000). *Child Maltreatment 1998: Reports from the States to the National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- ☑ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Administration for Children and Families (2001). *National Survey of Child and Adolescent Well-Being: State Child Welfare Agency Survey Report*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- ☑ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Administration for Children and Families (2001). *Safety, Permanency and Well-Being: Child Welfare Outcomes 1999 Annual Report*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- ☑ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Administration for Children and Families (2000). *Safety, Permanency and Well-Being: Child Welfare Outcomes 1998 Annual Report*. Washington: Government Printing Office.
- ☑ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Administration for Children and Families (2001). *The AFCARS Report: Interim FY 1999*. Washington: Government Printing Office.

State Specific Documents

(This does not include mission and vision statements, and program description documents posted on each state's website and <http://www.uky.edu/SocialWork/trc/qic.html> which were also reviewed.)

Alabama

- ☑ *1998 Alabama DHR Annual Report*
- ☑ *Quality Assurance Annual Report, Fiscal Year 2001*
- ☑ *Department of Human Resources, Family Partnership, Statewide Assessment for Child and Family Service Review, January 2002*

Arkansas

- ☑ *Child and Family Service Review Statewide Assessment May 2001*
- ☑ *Peer Consultation Process 1999 Report*
- ☑ Arkansas Kids Count (2000). *New Report Evaluates State's Child Welfare Cases*.
- ☑ University of Arkansas(2001). *An Exploratory Evaluation of Former Child Welfare Stipend Students Who are Currently Employed at DCFS in Arkansas*
- ☑ *Annual Report of the Arkansas Citizen Review Panels July 2000-June 2001*

- ☑ *DCFS Position Control Report 2002*
- ☑ *Individual Training Needs Assessment Report: Family Service Workers , 2002*
- ☑ *Individual Training Needs Assessment Report: Supervisors*
- ☑ *Annual Report Card, SFY 2001*
- ☑ *DCFS Quarterly Performance Report, 4th Quarter SFY 2001*

Georgia

- ☑ *CSFR Program Improvement Plan*
- ☑ *Protecting Children: Child Abuse in Georgia 2000*
- ☑ *DHR: Foster Care in GA 2001*
- ☑ *DHR: Children First 2001*
- ☑ *DHR: Infant Mortality 2000*
- ☑ *Safe Futures for GA's Children: A Comprehensive Plan for Child Welfare Reform (1/01)*
- ☑ *CFSR 2001 Final Report Card and Exec. Summary*
- ☑ *Briefing Paper and Checklist for Supervisor Mentor Program*

Kentucky

- ☑ *Kentucky Cabinet for Families and Children (2001). All Families Matter: Outcome Report 2000.*
- ☑ *Kentucky Cabinet for Families and Children (2001). Strategic Plan Revision (draft).*
- ☑ *Kentucky Citizen's Review Panels for Child Protective Services (2001). 2001 Annual Report.*
- ☑ *Kentucky Citizen's Review Panels for Child Protective Services (2000). 2000 Annual Report.*
- ☑ *Kentucky Cabinet for Families and Children (2001). Customer Satisfaction Survey Preliminary Report Bluegrass and Fayette Service Region (draft)*
- ☑ *Kentucky Citizen's Review Panels for Child Protective Services (2001). Jefferson Citizen Review Panel Community Survey Final Report*
- ☑ *Kentucky Youth Advocates (2001). Warning Signs: The Current Status of Kentucky's Services to Abused and Neglected Children.*
- ☑ *Kentucky Cabinet for Families and Children (2001). Protecting Children: Working and Learning Together. The Current Status of Kentucky's Services to Abused and Neglected Children.*
- ☑ *Triad Research Group (2000). Kentucky Residents' Perceptions of Services for Children at Risk of Abuse and Neglect.*

Louisiana

- ☑ *Office of Community Services Mission, Goals and Objectives*
- ☑ *2000 Child and Family Services Plan Citizen Review Panel Section*
- ☑ *Annual Report for the Covington Citizen's Review Panel Year 2000 and other related Citizen Review Panel documents from 1999*

Missouri

- ☑ *Child Abuse and Neglect in Missouri: Report for Calendar Year 2000*
- ☑ *2001 Peer Record Review Results*
- ☑ *Social Service Supervisor Focus Group Results 2000*
- ☑ *Internal Turnover rate documents*

- ☑ *DFS Children's Services Annual Report FY 2000*
- ☑ *2001 Practice Development Review Annual Report 2001*

Mississippi

- ☑ *2001-4 Strategic Plan*
- ☑ *Lori Woodruff. Study on the Effect of Supportive Supervision on DPW County Social Workers' Decision to Continue or Terminate Their Employment*
- ☑ *Children's Bureau Fact Sheet on the Intensive Service Options Project*
- ☑ *State Level Citizens Review Board DFCS Five-Year Plan Review and Recommendations 2001*
- ☑ *State Level Citizens Review Board DFCS Five-Year Plan Review and Recommendations 2002*

South Carolina

- ☑ *Department for Social Services FS and FI Training Courses list*
- ☑ *DSS Mission Statement, Program Descriptions, General Overview, Program Trends and Statistical Data*

Tennessee

- ☑ *Department of Children's Service Mission Statement, Vision and Goals, Program Descriptions*
- ☑ *Child Protective Services Commissioner's Case File Review of Indicated Neglect and Abuse Investigations, FY2000-2001*
- ☑ *Child Sexual Abuse State Plan, January 2001*
- ☑ *Report on Grant Activities: ROCM Total Quality Management Program CPS Case Record Review, 1999*
- ☑ *Monthly Analysis of CPS Performance, Calendar Year 2001*
- ☑ *Weekly Activity Reports, 11/01 – 3/02*
- ☑ *Activities to be Assisted with Children's Justice Act Funds and CJA Task Force Membership Profile*
- ☑ *Task Force Recommendations, 200-2003*
- ☑ *Tennessee Citizens Review Panels Annual Progress Report, 1999-2000*

West Virginia

- ☑ *The WV Five-Year Child and Family Services Plan 1999 Executive Summary*
- ☑ *Children's Bureau Fact Sheet on the Services to Substance-Abusing Caretakers Project*
- ☑ *WV Office of Social Services Program Review Initiatives and Executive Summary of Statewide Child Welfare Review 1999*
- ☑ *Families and Children Tracking System Description*
- ☑ *CFSR Statewide Assessment, March 2002*

Appendix C: UK Child Protection Supervision Survey

Instructions

The University of Kentucky is interested in your ideas regarding how supervision can positively impact the provision of effective child protective services and would appreciate your answering the following questions.

Your responses are anonymous and only the results of the aggregate analysis will be available to administrators in your agency. Your honesty is greatly appreciated. Please be reminded that electronic transfer of information is not secure, however, measures have been taken to ensure that no information identifying you will be attached to your responses when you submit a completed survey.

There are 53 questions in the survey and it should take about twenty minutes to complete it. Thank you very much for your time in providing us with this valuable information.

Answer questions as they relate to you and your work. For most answers, check the box(es) most applicable to you or fill in the blanks where indicated.

Section 1

1. Where do you work?

(Select only one.)

- Alabama
- Arkansas
- Georgia
- Kentucky
- Louisiana
- Mississippi
- Missouri
- South Carolina
- Tennessee
- West Virginia

2. Do you work in a rural or urban setting?

(Select only one.)

- Urban
- Rural (an area not within the boundary of a city having a population of 50,000 or less and it is immediately adjacent to an urbanizing area with a population density of more than 100 per square mile)

3. Do you work in a public or private contract agency?

(Select only one.)

- Public
- Private contract

4. Years of experience in child welfare:

5. What position do you hold in the agency?

(Select only one.)

- Line worker...(Please go to question No. 8)
- Supervisor...(Please go to the next question)
- Middle manager...(Please go to the next question)

6. How many years of experience do you have as a supervisor?

7. How many staff do you supervise?

8. What do you consider should be the primary responsibility of public child welfare supervisors?

(Select only one.)

- Monitoring practice
- Training
- Administration
- Policy compliance
- Supporting the work of line workers
- Making casework decisions
- Other

9. If you indicated 'Other' on the previous question, please indicate what you consider should be the primary responsibility of public child welfare supervisors (Otherwise, please continue to the next question):

10. Where do you most often turn when you need support/advice/guidance on work-related issues?

(Select only one.)

- A co-worker/peer
- Supervisor
- Middle or regional management staff
- Central/state office staff
- Outside the agency
- Other
- No one

11. If you indicated 'Other' in the previous question, please explain where you most often turn when you need support/advice/guidance on work-related issues (Otherwise, please continue to the next question):

12. Please indicate how important you believe supervision is to the provision of effective casework:

(Select only one.)

- Very Important
- Somewhat Important
- Neutral
- Somewhat Unimportant
- Very Unimportant

Section 2

Please indicate how important each of the following possible aspects of child welfare supervision is to enhancing the worker's provision of effective child protection services:

Please circle the appropriate ranking for each of the following:	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Neutral	Somewhat Unimportant	Very Unimportant
13. Classroom training	1	2	3	4	5
14. On-the-job training	1	2	3	4	5
15. Case review	1	2	3	4	5
16. Case consultation	1	2	3	4	5
17. Case decision-making	1	2	3	4	5
18. Mentoring	1	2	3	4	5
19. Exploring ethical issues	1	2	3	4	5
20. Promoting self-reflective practice	1	2	3	4	5
21. Modeling good practice	1	2	3	4	5
22. Promoting workers identification of important casework questions	1	2	3	4	5
23. Assuring culturally competent practices	1	2	3	4	5
24. Addressing issues of worker safety	1	2	3	4	5
25. Policy clarification	1	2	3	4	5
26. Monitoring and addressing worker well-being	1	2	3	4	5
27. Developing relationships with community service partners	1	2	3	4	5
28. Developing community resources	1	2	3	4	5
29. Performance evaluation	1	2	3	4	5

30. Providing ongoing feedback	1	2	3	4	5
31. Administrative duties (i.e., approving travel/timesheets, reporting requirements)	1	2	3	4	5
32. Facilitating staff/management communication	1	2	3	4	5
33. Resolving office conflict	1	2	3	4	5
34. Handling client/community complaints	1	2	3	4	5

Subsection 2

35. In reference to the question from Section 2, please list any other aspects or activities in supervision that have the significant potential to enhance the workers provision of effective services.

Section 3

36. Please indicate which of these items you believe are either not available at an adequate level or not effectively provided in child welfare supervision in your agency: (Select all that apply)

- Classroom training
- On-the-job training
- Case review
- Case consultation
- Case decision-making
- Mentoring
- Exploring ethical issues
- Promoting self-reflective practice
- Modeling good practice
- Promoting workers identification of important casework questions
- Assuring culturally competent practices
- Addressing issues of worker safety
- Policy clarification
- Monitoring and addressing worker well-being
- Developing relationships with community service partners
- Developing community resources
- Performance evaluation
- Providing ongoing feedback
- Administrative duties (i.e., approving travel/timesheets, reporting requirements)
- Facilitating staff/management communication
- Resolving office conflict
- Handling client/community complaints

Section 4

Please indicate the importance of each of the following items regarding the extent to which you think public child welfare supervisors really need each in order to succeed in enhancing worker's ability to provide effective services:

Please circle the appropriate ranking for each of the following:	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Neutral	Somewhat Unimportant	Very Unimportant
37. Initial training in child welfare supervision	1	2	3	4	5
38. Continuing education / In-service training	1	2	3	4	5
39. Casework supervision skills / techniques	1	2	3	4	5
40. Critical thinking skills	1	2	3	4	5
41. Mentoring	1	2	3	4	5
42. Child welfare direct service experience	1	2	3	4	5
43. Leadership skills	1	2	3	4	5
44. Interpersonal skills	1	2	3	4	5

45. Communication skills	1	2	3	4	5
46. Cultural competence	1	2	3	4	5
47. A process for peer support / consultation	1	2	3	4	5
48. Social Work degree	1	2	3	4	5
49. Advanced Social Work degree	1	2	3	4	5

Subsection 4

50. In reference to the question in Section 4, please list any other items that you think public child welfare supervisors really need in order to succeed in enhancing worker's ability to provide effective services. Also, please indicate any specific topics you think should be included in pre-service and in-service training. Also, please indicate what are the most important practice and supervision techniques.

Section 5

51. Please indicate which of these items you believe are either not available at an adequate level or not effectively provided to public child welfare supervisors in your agency:

(Select all that apply.)

- Initial training in child welfare supervision
- Continuing education / In-service training
- Casework supervision skills / techniques
- Critical thinking skills
- Mentoring
- Child welfare direct service experience
- Leadership skills
- Interpersonal skills
- Communication skills
- Cultural competence
- A process for peer support / consultation
- Social Work degree
- Advanced Social Work degree
- Other as previously described in Subsection 4

52. If you are a worker, please indicate which of the following words accurately describe your supervisor:

(Select all that apply.)

- Accessible
- Competent
- Ethical
- Fair
- Flexible
- Inconsistent
- Inept
- Knowledgeable
- Organized
- Respectful
- Responsive
- Rigid
- Supportive
- Thorough
- Trustworthy
- Unreliable
- Not Applicable (I am a supervisor or middle manager)

53. If you are a supervisor or middle manager, please respond to the following. If you could develop skills/knowledge in any area that would enhance your effectiveness as a supervisor, what would it be? For all participants, please make any additional comments relating to the survey topics in the provided space below: