

Evaluation of Washington Department of Social and Health Services Children's Administration's Solution Based Casework practice model

INTERIM REPORT

Part II: Supervisors' baseline survey results

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

Prepared by

Sandra Lyons

Mark Courtney

Maureen Newby

JoAnn Lee

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

Contents

Acknowledgements	1
Executive Summary	1
CHAPTER 1. Introduction	3
Components of the implementation strategy	3
Study design and methods	5
CHAPTER 2. Supervisors' Baseline Survey Responses	6
Current casework practices	6
Obstacles to helping families	8
Job demands	9
Role expectations	10
Control at work	10
Social interactions	10
Leadership	10
Organizational culture and climate	11
Perception of group work	11
Team climate and psychological safety	12
Job satisfaction and turnover intention	12
Professional burnout	12
Supervisors' perceptions of social workers' caseworker practices	13
References	17
TABLES	
Table 1. Approach to families	6
Table 2. Use of informal supports	7
Table 3. Perception of superior's support	7
Table 4. Obstacles to new approaches	7
Table 5. Inclusion of families in case planning	7
Table 6. Monitoring family progress	7
Table 7. Family assessment procedures	8
Table 8. Organizational characteristics	8

Table 9. Family characteristics	8
Table 10. Service characteristics	8
Table 11. Culturally sensitive services	9
Table 12. Foster home characteristics	9
Table 13. Court characteristics	9
Table 14. Quantitative job demands	9
Table 15. Learning demands	9
Table 16. Role clarity	10
Table 17. Role conflict	10
Table 18. Positive challenge at work	10
Table 19. Control of decisions and work pacing	10
Table 20. Support from superior	10
Table 21. Empowering leadership	10
Table 22. Social climate and cultural sensitivity	11
Table 23. Human resources primacy	11
Table 24. Perception of group work	11
Table 25. Team climate	12
Table 26. Team psychological safety	12
Table 27. Job satisfaction and turnover intention	12
Table 28. Emotional exhaustion	12
Table 29. Depersonalization	13
Table 30. Personal accomplishment	13
Table 31. Time supervising assessed worker	13
Table 32. Solution-Focused interviewing	13,14
Table 33. Family development	14
Table 34. Prevention	14
Table 35. Cultural Sensitivity	14
Table 36. Family involvement in case planning	15
Table 37. Monitoring/Acknowledging progress	15
Table 38. Assessment skills	15
Table 39. Case planning skills	16

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

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

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

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

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

To determine the degree to which implementing Solution Based Casework succeeds in improving child and family outcomes, Children's Administration requested Partners for Our Children to conduct an

ongoing implementation study and impact evaluation. In the initial phase of the study, Partners for Our Children interviewed key informants involved in designing and directing implementation of Solution Based Casework, conducted focus groups with social workers and supervisors participating in Solution Based Casework training, and observed Solution Based Casework training activities supporting implementation. Partners for Our Children also surveyed social workers and supervisors to obtain baseline assessments on relevant aspects of their work. Randomly selected parents were also interviewed prior to implementation of the practice model.

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

Key Findings from the Supervisor Survey

Surveys were administered to supervisors to obtain baseline measures of their current approaches to casework practice, their perceptions of obstacles to helping families who receive services from Children's Administration, and their job satisfaction and perceptions of working conditions. The baseline survey also asked supervisors of case-carrying social workers to assess the casework practices of a randomly-selected social worker they supervise. Between February 28 and September 25, 2008, surveys were distributed to 239 supervisors statewide. Sixty-nine percent of the supervisors completed the survey and fifty percent of the supervisors assessed the casework practices of one of their supervisees.

Supervisors' responses to survey questions about current casework practices suggested that they and their immediate superiors support the strengths-based and family-centered principles underpinning Solution Based Casework. They supported using a strengths-based approach in working with families, relying on families'

informal supports in casework practice, and preferred using families' skill development rather than service attendance in assessing progress. Likewise, supervisors perceived their supervisees' practice to be consistent with Solution Based Casework principles. These findings have favorable implications for the implementation of Solution Based Casework. The practice model's core principles are compatible with supervisors' professional social work values and Solution Based Casework training can build on this foundation.

Supervisors identified caseload size and the amount of paperwork required of staff as moderate obstacles to using new casework approaches like Solution Based Casework. Some supervisors also viewed the quality of working relationships with families and the number of problems facing families—two areas that Solution Based Casework training addresses—as significant obstacles to using new casework approaches. Future training might emphasize how the new practice model addresses these areas of supervisors' concerns.

Supervisors saw the lack of available foster homes to be more of an obstacle to helping families than the ability of available foster homes to care for children. Children's Administration is currently seeking avenues to improve the recruitment of foster homes. Provision of Solution Based Casework training to Division of Licensing Resources supervisors and workers may play a useful role in Children's Administration's current efforts to improve foster home recruitment.

Service characteristics viewed by supervisors as significant obstacles to helping families included deficiencies in service availability and effectiveness, and the lack of culturally competent and sensitive services. This latter area is one in which the Implementation Team plans to make improvements in Solution Based Casework training.

Regarding their job demands, supervisors were most concerned about the amount of work they are responsible for and not having time to develop new ideas. This latter finding could pose an obstacle to the successful implementation of Solution Based Casework since supervisors and their staff will need time to integrate the new ideas and skills taught in Solution Based Casework training into their daily practice.

Among the indicators of professional burnout they were asked about, supervisors reported feeling emotionally exhausted from their work and expressed moderate agreement with statements about their intention to leave

the organization. The relationship between these work related stressors and the implementation of Solution Based Casework are unclear. These stressors may impede the implementation of Solution Based Casework, or if successfully implemented, Solution Based Casework might reduce the levels of these stressors.

Overall, there were few between-region differences in supervisors' views of current casework practices, obstacles to helping families, the nature of their jobs, and the organizational characteristics of their offices. However, Region 5 supervisors consistently rated a number of items in each of these areas lower than did supervisors in other regions. These between-region differences should be interpreted somewhat cautiously because a larger percentage of supervisors in Region 5 than in other Children's Administration regions completed the survey. Hence, regional comparisons may be biased. However, to the extent that the differences are valid, these findings suggest that, to the degree that organizational factors have an effect, Solution Based Casework may be more difficult to implement in Region 5. On the other hand, Region 5 may benefit more than other regions from Solution Based Casework if it is successfully implemented.

Next Steps

Children's Administration is to be commended for carefully monitoring and rigorously evaluating its implementation of Solution Based Casework. As noted by members of the practice model Implementation Team, while significant progress has been made over the first phase of implementation, improvements to the curriculum, training, and coaching are underway. Partners for Our Children will continue to monitor the next phase of the implementation effort and will assess its impact on the outcomes of children and families. In addition to observing office level training of workers, conducting focus groups with trainees, and interviewing key informants, a second wave of supervisor and worker survey data will be collected. The evaluation will also make use of administrative records to assess child maltreatment, the kinds and quantity of services provided, and child and family outcomes including children's entry to out-of-home care, children's length of stay in out-of-home care, children's reunification with their families, and the post-reunification re-entry of children to out-of-home care.

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The report begins with a brief description of the components of CA’s implementation strategy and POC’s study design and methods. We then present findings from a baseline survey of social work supervisors. Findings from POC’s survey of case-carrying social workers and focus groups

with supervisors and workers at SBC pilot sites and interviews with key informants are presented in companion reports.

Components of the Implementation Strategy

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

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

Solution Based Casework Coaches. Twelve SBC coaches were hired to train and coach CA supervisors and workers in Solution Based Casework principles and

skills. Most of the coaches are experienced child welfare workers but had not had previous experience as trainers of Solution Based Casework. One exception is the lead coach who was recruited from another state that had implemented SBC.

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

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

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

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

Solution-Based Curriculum. CA adopted a SBC training curriculum designed by Dr. Dana Christensen and his colleagues at the Kent School of Social Work, University of Louisville, and, in consultation with Dr. Christensen, adapted it to be specific to CA's casework context. The adapted SBC curriculum is comprised of four units:

foundational concepts, assessment, case planning, and practice and review. The foundational concepts unit introduces the theoretical frameworks underpinning SBC—family development, solution-focused interviewing, and relapse prevention—and presents the evidence supporting the practice model. The remaining units elaborate on each of the three components of SBC's framework and introduce practice techniques that operationalize the practice principles.

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

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

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

The SBC three-day intensive training was offered to supervisors in all six CA regions between February and late July 2008 and to workers in three pilot sites between April and late July 2008. Workers not trained at selected pilot sites will be trained between April and October 2009.

Study Design and Methods

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

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

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

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

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

Supervisor Surveys. Surveys were administered to supervisors to obtain baseline measures of their current approaches to casework practice, their perceptions of obstacles to helping families who receive services from CA, and their job satisfaction and perceptions of working conditions.¹ The baseline survey also asked supervisors of case-carrying social workers to assess the casework practices of a randomly-selected social worker they supervise. Supervisors were given a list of workers drawn from CAMIS-GUI and asked to assess the first worker on the list who met the following criteria: the worker was a case-carrying worker (i.e., Child Protective Services, Child and Family Welfare Services, Family Reunification Services, or Family Voluntary Services), the supervisor was currently supervising the worker, and the supervisor had supervised the worker for at least 30 days.

Between February 28 and September 25, 2008, supervisors completed paper surveys either mailed to them prior to the three-day intensive SBC training or given to them on the first day of training and collected by the last day of training. Surveys were distributed to 239 supervisors statewide. Sixty-nine percent of the supervisors completed the survey and 50 percent of the supervisors assessed the casework practices of one of their supervisees.²

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

² Regional supervisor response rates were: Region 1 forty-five percent, Region 2 sixty-one percent, Region 3 sixty-eight percent, Region 4 seventy-one percent, Region 5 one-hundred percent, and Region 6 sixty-eight percent. Of the regional supervisors who completed Part 1 of the survey, the following percentages assessed the casework practices of one of their supervisees: Region 1 ninety-two percent, Region 2 eighty-eight percent, Region 3 sixty-eight percent, Region 4 ninety-two percent, Region 5 ninety-three percent, and Region 6 ninety-two percent.

CHAPTER 2

Supervisors' Baseline Survey Responses

This section of the report describes supervisors' baseline perceptions of current approaches to casework practice (Tables 1 – 7) and obstacles to helping families who receive services from CA (Tables 8 – 13), their job satisfaction and perceptions of working conditions (Tables 14 – 30), and their perceptions of social workers' casework practices (Tables 31 – 39). For each survey question, we report the mean response for supervisors statewide and within each of CA's six regions. We also report between region-differences. Because the number of supervisors in each region is small, our ability to detect statistically significant between-region differences was limited. We report between-region differences that were significant at the $p \leq .10$ level and $\geq .30$ standard deviations different from the statewide mean.^{3,4} In addition to reporting the mean response for each survey item, where appropriate, we also report supervisors' mean score on computed scales.⁵

One-hundred and sixty-four supervisors completed the supervisor survey, for a response rate of 69 percent. These respondents supervised workers in FVS (26%), CFWS (51%), FRS (20%), CPS (32%), DLR (9%), Intake (13%), and Adoption (14%). Eleven percent of the supervisors worked in Region 1, 12 percent in Region 2, 18 percent in Region 3, 21 percent in Region 4, 22 percent in Region 5, and 17 percent in Region 6. Supervisors reported that, on average, they were supervising seven workers. They had been in their current positions at CA and had supervised child welfare workers for about two years. Sixty-eight percent of the supervisors were female

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

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

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

and 30 percent were male. Forty-five percent of the supervisors held a master's degree in social work and 13 percent held a master's degree in another field. Forty-one percent of respondents held a bachelor's degree—12 percent in social work and 29 percent in another field. On average, the supervisors were 47 years old. Eighty-two percent of the supervisors identified themselves as Caucasian, six percent were African-American, eight percent were American Indian, eight percent were Hispanic, and two percent were Asian American or Pacific Islander. Of the 164 respondents, 43 percent reported having received training in SBC. One-hundred and nineteen supervisors (90% of the supervisors who completed the survey) assessed the casework practices of an FVS, CFWS, FRS, or CPS worker that they supervised. DLR, Intake, and Adoption supervisors were not asked to assess a worker.

Current Casework Practices

Table 1. Approach to Families^a

	Region						Statewide		Total
	1 (n=17) ^b	2 (n=18)	3 (n=28)	4 (n=37)	5 (n=37)	6 (n=24)	Mean	SD	
6b. Families often have many more problems than strengths	2.7	2.5	2.9	2.3	2.6	2.4	2.6	1.01	162
6c. Emphasizing family strengths draws attention away from efforts to protect children	2.3	1.8	1.9	1.9	2.5	1.8	2.0	1.13	162
6e. All parents have strengths and resources they can use to solve problems	4.1	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.5	0.69	161
6f. Even abusive and neglectful parents sometimes do a good job parenting	3.9	4.2	4.1	4.3	4.0	4.4	4.2	0.80	160
6h. There is always an exception to a parent's pattern of problem behavior	3.9	3.5	4.0	4.0	3.6	3.6	3.8	0.87	160

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

Supervisors generally reported a strengths-based attitude towards families and there were no significant between-region differences in these attitudes.

- They were in slight disagreement with the statement that families have more problems than strengths (6b) and somewhat disagreed with the statement that emphasizing family strengths draws away from efforts to protect children (6c).
- They were somewhat to strongly in agreement with the idea that parents have strengths and resources to rely on (6e) and that even maltreating parents sometimes do a good job of parenting (6f).
- They somewhat agreed that there is always an exception to a pattern of problem parenting (6h).

Table 2. Use of Informal Supports^a

	Region						Statewide		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	Mean	SD	Total
	(n=17) ^b	(n=18)	(n=28)	(n=37)	(n=37)	(n=24)			
6o. Including the relatives and friends of parents in case planning is not particularly helpful for most families	1.6	1.8	1.5	1.6	1.8	1.6	1.6	0.89	161
6p. Most families have relatives or friends who are supportive and helpful to them	3.9	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.1	0.73	161
6q. Family and friends' support can be as effective as professional services in finding solutions to parenting problems	3.9	4.4	4.3	4.6 ^c	4.1	4.0	4.2	0.88	161

^aScale: 1=strongly disagree 2=somewhat disagree 3=neutral 4=somewhat agree 5=strongly agree
^bActual regional *ns* may vary due to missing data.
^cSig. diff. from Region 6 *p* <.10

Supervisors generally reported a strong belief that families have access to informal supports (i.e., family and friends) and that good casework practice should rely on such supports.

- They somewhat to strongly disagreed that including families' informal supports in case planning is not helpful (6o).
- They somewhat agreed that families have informal supports to rely on (6p).
- They somewhat agreed that informal supports can be as effective as professional help (6q), with Region 4 supervisors reporting somewhat stronger support for this statement than those in Region 6.

Table 3. Perception of Superior's Support^a

	Region						Statewide		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	Mean	SD	Total
	(n=17) ^b	(n=18)	(n=28)	(n=37)	(n=37)	(n=24)			
6d. My immediate superior emphasizes the importance of assessing family strengths	3.2	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	4.0	3.8	1.04	160
6l. My immediate superior emphasizes the importance of involving families in case planning and decisions	4.1	4.3	4.4	4.1	4.2	4.6	4.3	0.89	159
Perception of superior's support scale ^c	3.6	4.1	4.2	4.0	4.0	4.3	4.1	0.88	158

^aScale: 1=strongly disagree 2=somewhat disagree 3=neutral 4=somewhat agree 5=strongly agree
^bActual regional *ns* may vary due to missing data.
^cCronbach's alpha = .80

Supervisors generally expressed somewhat strong agreement with statements (6d and 6l) indicating that their immediate superior supported the kinds of strengths-based and family-centered practice principles that are consistent with Solution Based Casework, with no significant differences in responses between regions. Support was stronger for the perception that superiors value family involvement than for the perception that they value assessing family strengths.

Table 4. Obstacles to New Approaches^a

	Region						Statewide		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	Mean	SD	Total
	(n=17) ^b	(n=18)	(n=28)	(n=37)	(n=37)	(n=24)			
6t. It is difficult to use new approaches to helping families because the necessary organizational support is not provided	3.4	2.9	3.5	3.3	3.3	3.4	3.3	1.12	161
6u. It is difficult to use new approaches to helping families because of all my other responsibilities	3.2	2.8	3.1	3.0	2.9	2.8	3.0	1.19	159
6v. It is difficult to use new approaches to helping families because of pressures from the court	3.4	2.7	3.0	3.2	3.2	2.8	3.1	1.13	157
6w. It is difficult to use new approaches to helping families because of media or political pressure on Children's Administration	2.8	3.0	2.8	2.8	3.3	2.6	2.9	1.20	162
Obstacles to new approaches scale ^c	3.2	2.9	3.1	3.1	3.2	2.9	3.1	0.90	161

^aScale: 1=strongly disagree 2=somewhat disagree 3=neutral 4=somewhat agree 5=strongly agree
^bActual regional *ns* may vary due to missing data.
^cCronbach's alpha = .78

Supervisors expressed fairly neutral attitudes towards whether there are significant obstacles (e.g., lack of organizational support, existing responsibilities, the courts, and the media) to using new approaches to helping families (6t, 6u, 6v, 6w), and there were no significant between-region differences. Lack of organizational support was seen as a greater obstacle than media or political pressure.

Table 5. Inclusion of Families in Case Planning^a

	Region						Statewide		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	Mean	SD	Total
	(n=17) ^b	(n=18)	(n=28)	(n=37)	(n=37)	(n=24)			
6m. Parents are less resistant when they have input in the case plan and services	4.2	4.4	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.6	4.5	0.69	160
6n. Parents are more motivated to change when they define the problem	4.1	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.1	4.4	4.3	0.73	161
Inclusion of families in case planning scale ^c	4.1	4.4	4.5	4.6	4.2	4.5	4.4	0.63	160

^aScale: 1=strongly disagree 2=somewhat disagree 3=neutral 4=somewhat agree 5=strongly agree
^bActual regional *ns* may vary due to missing data.
^cCronbach's alpha = .74

Supervisors reported somewhat to strong agreement with statements supportive of parental involvement in case planning (6m and 6n), with no significant variation in average responses between regions.

Table 6. Monitoring Family Progress^a

	Region						Statewide		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	Mean	SD	Total
	(n=17) ^b	(n=18)	(n=28)	(n=37)	(n=37)	(n=24)			
6r. Monitoring families' attendance at services is a good way to assess their progress	2.8	3.1	2.9	3.2	3.3	2.8	3.0	1.15	161
6s. Assessing families' skill development is important to assessing their progress	4.4	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.5	0.60	162

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

Supervisors expressed a neutral attitude towards the idea that monitoring of families' service attendance is a good way to assess progress (6r) while expressing somewhat to strong support for assessment of families' skill development (6s). There were no significant between-region differences in these responses.

Table 7. Family Assessment Procedures^a

A clear and useful procedure is in place for assessing . . .	Region						Statewide		
	1 (n=17) ^b Mean	2 (n=18) Mean	3 (n=28) Mean	4 (n=37) Mean	5 (n=37) Mean	6 (n=24) Mean	Mean	SD	Total
7a. parental substance abuse	3.1	2.8 ^c	3.4	3.1	3.8	3.3	3.3	1.18	152
7b. parental mental health	2.6	2.8	2.3	2.9	2.7	2.7	2.7	1.21	153
7c. risk of child maltreatment	3.8	3.3	3.6	3.9	3.6	3.6	3.7	0.98	156
7d. domestic violence	2.1	2.5	2.8	2.8	2.7	2.5	2.6	1.08	154
7e. parenting skills	2.8	3.1	2.7	3.2	3.2	2.7	3.0	1.10	155
7f. families' basic needs	3.5	3.1	3.3	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.4	1.04	155
Family assessment procedures scale ^d	3.0	2.9	3.1	3.2	3.2	3.0	3.1	0.80	152

^aScale: 1=strongly disagree 2=somewhat disagree 3=neutral 4=somewhat agree 5=strongly agree
^bActual regional ns may vary due to missing data.
^cSig. diff. from Region 5 $p < .10$
^dCronbach's alpha = .82

On average, supervisors expressed neutral attitudes regarding whether current family assessment procedures were clear and useful.

- They reported most confidence in assessment procedures concerning the risk of child maltreatment (7c) and the least confidence concerning assessment of domestic violence (7d) and parental mental health (7b).
- Region 2 supervisors reported less confidence in parental substance abuse assessment procedures (7a) than did supervisors in Region 5.

Obstacles to Helping Families

Table 8. Organizational Characteristics^a

	Region						Statewide		
	1 (n=17) ^b Mean	2 (n=18) Mean	3 (n=28) Mean	4 (n=37) Mean	5 (n=37) Mean	6 (n=24) Mean	Mean	SD	Total
8a. Amount of paperwork/forms to be completed	3.6	3.4	3.8	3.6	3.5	3.4	3.5	0.67	161
8b. Size of caseloads	3.6	3.7	3.8	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.6	0.68	161
8c. Overall staff morale	3.2	2.9	2.9	2.9	3.4	2.7 ^c	3.0	0.87	163
8d. Number of organizational rules	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.5	3.2	3.3	0.73	162
8h. Quality of working relationships with supervisory staff	1.6	1.9	2.0	1.8	2.1	1.8	1.9	0.81	159
8i. Quality of working relationships with managerial staff	2.4	2.4	2.1	2.6	2.5	2.2	2.4	0.92	161
8j. Organizational concerns with legal vulnerability	3.0	2.9	2.9	2.8 ^c	3.4	2.8	3.0	0.83	160
8n. Overall quality of the organizational environment where I work	2.5	2.3	2.4	2.2	2.7	2.0 ^c	2.4	0.80	162
Organizational characteristics scale ^d	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.8	3.1	2.7	2.9	0.49	162

^aScale: 1= no obstacle at all 2=slight obstacle 3=moderate obstacle 4=significant obstacle
^bActual regional ns may vary due to missing data.
^cSig. diff. from Region 5 $p < .10$
^dCronbach's alpha = .78

Supervisors on average felt that organizational characteristics were moderate obstacles to helping families.

- They perceived caseload size (8b) and the amount of paperwork required of staff (8a) to be the most significant obstacles while the quality of relationships with managerial staff (8i) and the overall quality of the organizational environment (8n) were seen as less significant.
- Staff morale (8c) and the overall organizational environment (8n) were seen as more significant obstacles to helping families in Region 5 than in Region 6.
- Concerns about legal vulnerability (8j) were seen as more significant obstacles in Region 5 than in Region 4.

Table 9. Family Characteristics^a

	Region						Statewide		
	1 (n=17) ^b Mean	2 (n=18) Mean	3 (n=28) Mean	4 (n=37) Mean	5 (n=37) Mean	6 (n=24) Mean	Mean	SD	Total
8e. Cooperation shown by families	2.3 ^c	2.3 ^c	3.0	2.6	2.5 ^c	2.3 ^c	2.5	0.76	162
8l. Number of problems facing families	3.1	2.9	3.2	3.0	3.0	2.9	3.0	0.74	162
8q. Quality of working relationships with families	3.1 ^d	3.5 ^c	2.7 ^d	3.7	3.1 ^d	2.8 ^d	3.2	0.90	162

^aScale: 1= no obstacle at all 2=slight obstacle 3=moderate obstacle 4=significant obstacle
^bActual regional ns may vary due to missing data.
^cSig. diff. from Region 3 $p < .10$
^dSig. diff. from Region 4 $p < .10$

Supervisors reported that family characteristics posed slight to moderate obstacles to helping families.

- The quality of working relationships with families (8q) and the number of problems facing families (8l) were more significant obstacles than the cooperation shown by families (8e).
- Region 3 supervisors reported cooperation shown by families (8e) to be a more significant obstacle for them than did supervisors in Regions 1, 2, 5 and 6.
- Supervisors in Regions 2 and 4 generally reported the quality of working relationships with families (8q) to be a more significant obstacle than did supervisors in other regions.

Table 10. Service Characteristics^a

	Region						Statewide		
	1 (n=17) ^b Mean	2 (n=18) Mean	3 (n=28) Mean	4 (n=37) Mean	5 (n=37) Mean	6 (n=24) Mean	Mean	SD	Total
8k. Lack of availability of services needed to help families solve problems	3.4	3.0	3.4	3.0	3.1	3.3	3.2	0.80	162
8m. Effectiveness of services available to families	3.2	2.9	3.2	3.0	3.1	3.2	3.1	0.73	160
8o. Problems arising from families' involvement with multiple service systems	2.5	2.6	2.7	2.6	3.0 ^c	2.4	2.7	0.73	162

^aScale: 1= no obstacle at all 2=slight obstacle 3=moderate obstacle 4=significant obstacle
^bActual regional ns may vary due to missing data.
^cSig. diff. from Region 6 $p < .10$

Supervisors reported issues having to do with service availability (8k), effectiveness (8m), and families' involvement in multiple service systems (8o) to be moderate obstacles to helping families, with service availability and effectiveness being relatively more significant obstacles. Region 5 supervisors reported families' involvement in multiple service systems (8o) to be a more significant obstacle than did supervisors in Region 6.

Table 11. Culturally Sensitive Services^a

	Region						Statewide		
	1 (n=17) ^b Mean	2 (n=18) Mean	3 (n=28) Mean	4 (n=37) Mean	5 (n=37) Mean	6 (n=24) Mean	Mean	SD	Total
8f. Language barriers between families and providers	1.9 ^c	2.5	2.4	2.7	2.2	2.4	2.4	0.79	159
8g. Cultural barriers between families and service providers	2.4	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.7	2.5	2.6	0.68	160
8p. Lack of availability of culturally competent services for families	2.5	2.7	2.7	3.0	2.9	3.0	2.8	0.83	163
Cultural sensitivity scale ^d	2.3	2.6	2.6	2.7	2.6	2.6	2.6	0.63	161

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

^bActual regional ns may vary due to missing data.

^cSign. diff. from Region 4 $p < .10$

^dCronbach's alpha = .76

Supervisors reported issues having to do with the cultural sensitivity of services to be slight to moderate obstacles to helping families.

- Lack of availability of culturally competent services (8p) is seen as a greater obstacle than were language barriers between families and providers (8f).
- Language barriers were seen as less of an obstacle in Region 1 than in Region 4.

Table 12. Foster Home Characteristics^a

	Region						Statewide		
	1 (n=17) ^b Mean	2 (n=18) Mean	3 (n=28) Mean	4 (n=37) Mean	5 (n=37) Mean	6 (n=24) Mean	Mean	SD	Total
8r. Lack of available foster homes	3.4	3.3 ^c	3.9	3.7	3.5	3.3 ^c	3.5	0.70	160
8s. Ability of available foster homes to care for the children Children's Administration serves	2.6 ^c	2.4 ^c	3.6	2.5 ^c	2.7 ^c	3.0 ^c	2.9	0.86	160

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

^bActual regional ns may vary due to missing data.

^cSign. diff. from Region 3 $p < .10$

Supervisors saw the lack of available foster homes (8r) as a moderate to significant obstacle to helping families and the ability of available foster homes to care for the children served by the Children's Administration (8s) as a moderate obstacle.

- The lack of homes (8r) was seen as relatively more problematic in Region 3 than in Regions 2 and 6.
- The ability of available homes to care for the children served (8s) was seen as more problematic in Region 3 than in all other regions.

Table 13. Court Characteristics^a

	Region						Statewide		
	1 (n=17) ^b Mean	2 (n=18) Mean	3 (n=28) Mean	4 (n=37) Mean	5 (n=37) Mean	6 (n=24) Mean	Mean	SD	Total
8t. Quality of working relationship with court liaisons	2.2	2.2	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.2	2.3	0.89	131
8u. Quality of working relationships with attorneys	2.4	2.4	2.5	2.5	2.3	2.8	2.5	0.89	144
8v. Quality of working relationships with child advocates	2.1	2.4	2.1	2.6	2.4	2.0 ^c	2.3	0.86	142
8w. Quality of working relationships with judges	2.0 ^c	2.2 ^c	2.5	3.1	2.6	2.3 ^c	2.5	0.98	138
Court characteristics scale ^d	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.7	2.4	2.3	2.4	0.72	139

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

^bActual regional ns may vary due to missing data.

^cSign. diff. from Region 4 $p < .10$

^dCronbach's alpha = .78

Characteristics of the courts were seen by supervisors as slight to moderate obstacles to helping families.

- Working relationships with child advocates (8v) were seen as a greater obstacle in Region 4 than in Region 6.
- Working relationships with judges (8w) were seen as a greater obstacle in Region 4 than in Regions 1, 2 and 6.

Job Demands

Table 14. Quantitative Job Demands^a

	Region						Statewide		
	1 (n=17) ^b Mean	2 (n=18) Mean	3 (n=28) Mean	4 (n=37) Mean	5 (n=37) Mean	6 (n=24) Mean	Mean	SD	Total
10a. Do you have too much to do?	4.2	3.9	4.5	4.2	4.0	4.0	4.1	0.88	163
10b. Is your workload irregular so that work piles up?	3.4	3.4	3.9	3.3	3.7	3.5	3.6	1.01	162
Quantitative job demands scale ^c	3.8	3.6	4.2	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	0.84	162

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

^bActual regional ns may vary due to missing data.

^cCronbach's alpha = .74

Supervisors reported sometimes to often having problems with workload demands including the amount of work (10a) and irregularity of work (10b), with the amount of work being the biggest problem. There were no significant between-region differences in average responses to these questions.

Table 15. Learning Demands^a

	Region						Statewide		
	1 (n=17) ^b Mean	2 (n=18) Mean	3 (n=28) Mean	4 (n=37) Mean	5 (n=37) Mean	6 (n=24) Mean	Mean	SD	Total
10c. Are your work tasks too difficult for you?	1.6	1.5	1.8	2.0	2.0	1.8	1.8	0.76	163
10d. Do you perform work tasks for which you need more training?	2.6	2.2	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.2	2.4	0.96	162
10e. Do you perform work tasks for which you need more experience?	2.3	2.2	2.4	2.3	2.3	2.0	2.3	1.01	162
Learning demands scale ^c	2.2	2.0	2.2	2.2	2.3	2.0	2.2	0.75	163

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

^bActual regional ns may vary due to missing data.

^cCronbach's alpha = .75

Supervisors reported that they seldom to sometimes experience their work to be beyond their abilities. They reported more concern about their work requiring more training (10d) and/or experience (10e) than the work being too difficult for them per se (10c). There were no significant between-region differences in these responses.

Role Expectations

Table 16. Role Clarity^a

	Region						Statewide		
	1 (n=17) ^b Mean	2 (n=18) Mean	3 (n=28) Mean	4 (n=37) Mean	5 (n=37) Mean	6 (n=24) Mean	Mean	SD	Total
10f. Have clear, planned goals and objectives been defined for your job?	2.9	3.5	3.2	3.6	3.8	3.4	3.4	1.11	163
10g. Do you know exactly what is expected of you at work?	3.5	3.8	3.7	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.8	0.96	163
Role clarity scale ^c	3.2	3.7	3.4	3.7	3.8	3.6	3.6	0.95	163

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

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

^cCronbach's alpha = .81

Supervisors reported moderate levels of clarity about the nature of their job. They sometimes to often had clear goals and objectives (10f) and knew what was expected of them at work (10g). There were no significant between-region differences in these responses.

Table 17. Role Conflict^a

	Region						Statewide		
	1 (n=17) ^b Mean	2 (n=18) Mean	3 (n=28) Mean	4 (n=37) Mean	5 (n=37) Mean	6 (n=24) Mean	Mean	SD	Total
10h. Are you given assignments without adequate resources to complete them?	3.1	2.8	3.4 ^c	3.1	3.1	2.6	3.0	0.99	162
10i. Do you receive incompatible requests from two or more people?	2.6	2.3	2.6	2.8	2.7	2.3	2.6	1.08	163

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

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

^cSig. diff. from Region 6 *p* < .10

Supervisors reported moderate levels of role conflict in their jobs. On average, they reported that they are sometimes given assignments without adequate resources (10h) and seldom to sometimes receive incompatible requests from two or more people (10i). There were no significant between-region differences in these responses.

Control at Work

Table 18. Positive Challenge at Work^a

	Region						Statewide		
	1 (n=17) ^b Mean	2 (n=18) Mean	3 (n=28) Mean	4 (n=37) Mean	5 (n=37) Mean	6 (n=24) Mean	Mean	SD	Total
10j. Is your work challenging in a positive way?	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	0.72	163
10k. Are you given meaningful assignments?	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.4	0.86	162

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

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

Supervisors reported *sometimes* to *often* experiencing positively challenging work (10j) and meaningful assignments (10k), with no differences on average between regions.

Table 19. Control of Decisions and Work Pacing^a

	Region						Statewide		
	1 (n=17) ^b Mean	2 (n=18) Mean	3 (n=28) Mean	4 (n=37) Mean	5 (n=37) Mean	6 (n=24) Mean	Mean	SD	Total
10v. Can you influence the amount of work assigned to you?	2.2	2.4	2.1	2.4	2.1	2.0	2.2	0.84	161
10u. Can you influence decisions that are important for your work?	3.0	3.2	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.1	3.3	0.80	162
10w. Can you set your own work pace?	3.2	3.2	3.0	3.2	3.1	3.4	3.2	1.17	161

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

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

Although supervisors reported that they are *sometimes* to *often* able to set their own work pace (10w) and influence decisions important to their work (10u), they were seldom able to influence the amount of work they are assigned (10v). There were no significant regional differences in these responses.

Social Interactions

Table 20. Support From Superior^a

	Region						Statewide		
	1 (n=17) ^b Mean	2 (n=18) Mean	3 (n=28) Mean	4 (n=37) Mean	5 (n=37) Mean	6 (n=24) Mean	Mean	SD	Total
10m. If needed, can you get support and help with your work from your immediate superior?	3.8	3.6	3.4 ^c	3.8	4.2	3.9	3.8	1.06	160
10l. If needed, is your immediate superior willing to listen to work related problems?	4.1	3.9	4.0	4.2	4.4	4.1	4.2	0.86	162
10o. Are your work achievements appreciated by your immediate superior?	3.9	3.4	3.5	3.6	3.9	3.7	3.7	1.10	157
Support from superior scale ^d	3.9	3.6	3.6	3.9	4.2	3.9	3.9	0.91	161

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

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

^cSig. diff. from Region 5 *p* < .10

^dCronbach's alpha = .88

On average, supervisors reported being *often* supported by their own superior. Region 3 supervisors reported being less likely to receive support and help (10m) than did supervisors in Region 5.

Leadership

Table 21. Empowering Leadership^a

	Region						Statewide		
	1 (n=17) ^b Mean	2 (n=18) Mean	3 (n=28) Mean	4 (n=37) Mean	5 (n=37) Mean	6 (n=24) Mean	Mean	SD	Total
10p. Does your immediate superior encourage you to participate in important decisions?	4.1	3.6	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.8	1.03	160
10q. Does your immediate superior help you develop your skills?	3.6	3.3	3.3	3.4	3.7	3.3	3.4	1.14	158
Empowering leadership scale ^c	3.8	3.4	3.5	3.6	3.7	3.5	3.6	1.02	158

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

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

^cCronbach's alpha = .84

Supervisors reported they are *sometimes to often* empowered by their superior through encouragement to participate in decisions (10p) and provision of help in skill development (10q), with no significant differences between regions.

Organizational Culture and Climate

Table 22. Social Climate and Cultural Sensitivity^a

The climate in this office is . . .	Region						Statewide		
	1 (n=17) ^b Mean	2 (n=18) Mean	3 (n=28) Mean	4 (n=37) Mean	5 (n=37) Mean	6 (n=24) Mean	Mean	SD	Total
12a. encouraging and supportive	3.1	3.4	3.5	3.8 ^c	2.9	3.5	3.4	1.00	160
12b. distrustful and suspicious	2.8 ^d	2.8 ^d	2.2 ^c	1.8 ^e	2.9	2.2	2.4	1.07	160
12c. relaxed and comfortable	3.2	3.1	3.2	3.6 ^c	2.9	3.5	3.3	0.97	161
12d. rigid and rule-based	2.5	2.5	2.0 ^c	2.2	2.7	2.2	2.4	0.95	160
Social climate scale ^e	3.3	3.3	3.6 ^c	3.8 ^e	3.1	3.6 ^c	3.5	0.81	161
12e. People in this office are sensitive to differences in their coworkers' cultural beliefs, values, and practices	3.4	3.5	3.5	4.0 ^e	3.1	3.6	3.5	1.00	160

^aScale: 1=very little or not at all 2=rather little 3=somewhat 4=rather much 5=very much

^bActual regional ns may vary due to missing data.

^cSig. diff. from Region 5 $p < .10$

^dSig. diff. from Region 4 $p < .10$

^eCronbach's alpha = .83

Overall, supervisors reported a moderately supportive social climate in their offices, with some significant differences between regions.

- Region 4 supervisors reported their offices to be more encouraging and supportive (12a) than did supervisors in Region 5.
- Supervisors in Regions 1 and 2 reported their offices to be more distrustful and suspicious (12b) than did supervisors in Region 4.
- Supervisors in Region 5 also reported their offices to be more distrustful and suspicious (12b) than did supervisors in Regions 3 and 4, as well as more rigid and rule based (12d), than did supervisors in Region 3.
- The overall social climate reported by supervisors in Region 5 was relatively poorer than the social climate reported by supervisors in Regions 3, 4 and 6.

Supervisors were, on average, *somewhat to rather much* in agreement with the statement that they and their coworkers were sensitive to differences in their coworkers' cultural beliefs, values, and practices (12e). Region 4 supervisors reported a higher level of agreement with this statement than did supervisors in Region 5.

Table 23. Human Resources Primacy^a

	Region						Statewide		
	1 (n=17) ^b Mean	2 (n=18) Mean	3 (n=28) Mean	4 (n=37) Mean	5 (n=37) Mean	6 (n=24) Mean	Mean	SD	Total
13a. Workers are rewarded (money, encouragement) for a job well done	3.1	3.2	3.1	3.0	2.5	3.1	3.0	1.19	161
13b. Workers are well taken care of in the organization	2.4	2.1	2.5	2.2	2.2	2.5	2.3	1.00	163
13c. Management is interested in the health and well-being of the personnel	2.6	2.4	2.8	2.9	2.2	2.7	2.6	1.18	163
Human resources primacy scale ^c	2.7	2.5	2.8	2.7	2.3	2.8	2.6	0.90	163

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

^bActual regional ns may vary due to missing data.

^cCronbach's alpha = .73

Supervisors were neutral to somewhat in disagreement with statements indicative of organizational and management support for their working conditions, with the least support being expressed for the statement “workers are well taken care of in the organization” (13b). There were no between-region differences in average responses.

Perception of Group Work

Table 24. Perception of Group Work^a

	Region						Statewide		
	1 (n=17) ^b Mean	2 (n=18) Mean	3 (n=28) Mean	4 (n=37) Mean	5 (n=37) Mean	6 (n=24) Mean	Mean	SD	Total
12f. You appreciate belonging to this office	3.8	4.2	4.2	4.2	3.8	4.2	4.1	0.95	161
12g. Your office is successful at problem solving	3.2	3.4	3.8 ^e	4.0 ^c	3.1	3.7	3.6	0.95	161
Perception of group work scale ^d	3.5	3.8	4.0	4.1 ^c	3.5	4.0	3.8	0.86	161

^aScale: 1=very little or not at all 2=rather little 3=somewhat 4=rather much 5=very much

^bActual regional ns may vary due to missing data.

^cSig. diff. from Region 5 $p < .10$

^dCronbach's alpha = .79

Supervisors were somewhat to rather much in agreement with statements indicative of appreciation for belonging to one's office (12f) and office-level success in solving problems (12g). Regions 3 and 4 reported more positive perceptions of group problem solving than did Region 5. Region 4 supervisors reported overall higher agreement with these statements than did supervisors in Region 5.

Team Climate and Psychological Safety

Table 25. Team Climate^a

	Region						Statewide		
	1 (n=17) ^b Mean	2 (n=18) Mean	3 (n=28) Mean	4 (n=37) Mean	5 (n=37) Mean	6 (n=24) Mean	Mean	SD	Total
11h. People in this office have a "we are together" attitude	3.2	3.2	3.6 ^c	3.6 ^c	2.5	3.7 ^c	3.3	1.18	163
11i. People in this office keep each other informed about work-related issues	3.4	3.5	3.6	3.8 ^c	3.3	3.8	3.6	0.98	162
11j. People in this office feel understood and accepted by each other	3.1	3.2	3.7 ^c	3.8 ^c	2.8	3.3	3.3	1.00	162
11k. There are real attempts to share information throughout the office	3.4	3.5	4.0 ^c	3.9	3.4	3.8	3.7	1.03	161
11l. People in this office are always searching for fresh, new ways of looking at problems	2.7	3.2	3.4	3.6	2.9	3.1	3.2	1.15	161
11m. In this office, we take the time to develop new ideas	2.5	3.0	3.2	3.3 ^c	2.6	3.2	3.0	1.15	161
11n. People in this office cooperate to help develop and apply new ideas	3.1	3.3	3.4	3.6 ^c	2.8	3.4	3.3	1.02	161
Team climate scale ^d	3.1	3.3	3.6 ^c	3.7 ^c	2.9	3.5 ^c	3.3	0.84	161

^aScale: 1=strongly disagree 2=somewhat disagree 3=neutral 4=somewhat agree 5=strongly agree
^bActual regional *ns* may vary due to missing data.
^cSig. diff. from Region 5 *p* <.10
^dCronbach's alpha = .89

Overall, supervisors expressed fairly neutral sentiments about team climate in their offices, though there were significant between-region differences. Sentiment was most positive regarding information sharing (11k) and least positive regarding taking time to develop new ideas (11m). In general, where between-region differences existed, supervisors in Region 5 reported poorer team climate than did supervisors in Regions 3, 4 and/or 6.

Table 26. Team Psychological Safety^a

	Region						Statewide		
	1 (n=17) ^b Mean	2 (n=18) Mean	3 (n=28) Mean	4 (n=37) Mean	5 (n=37) Mean	6 (n=24) Mean	Mean	SD	Total
11a. If you make a mistake in this office, it is often held against you	3.2	2.7	2.8	2.9	3.3	2.6	2.9	1.16	162
11b. People in this office are able to bring up problems and tough issues	3.4	3.5	3.9	4.2 ^c	3.4	3.5	3.7	1.13	163
11c. People in this office sometimes reject others for being different	3.1	2.5	2.3 ^c	2.5	3.2	3.1	2.8	1.19	163
11d. It is safe to take a risk in this office	2.5	2.6	3.3	3.1	2.7	3.3	3.0	1.10	162
11e. It is difficult to ask other people in this office for help	2.1	2.0	2.1	1.9	2.3	1.7	2.0	1.07	162
11f. No one in this office would deliberately act in a way that undermines my efforts	2.6	2.4	3.2	3.4 ^c	2.4	3.0	2.9	1.26	163
11g. Working with people in this office, my unique skills and talents are valued and utilized	3.6	3.7	4.0 ^c	3.9	3.3	3.8	3.7	0.95	163
Team psychological safety scale ^d	3.1	3.3	3.6 ^c	3.6 ^c	3.0	3.5 ^c	3.4	0.73	163

^aScale: 1=strongly disagree 2=somewhat disagree 3=neutral 4=somewhat agree 5=strongly agree
^bActual regional *ns* may vary due to missing data.
^cSig. diff. from Region 5 *p* <.10
^dCronbach's alpha = .76

Supervisors reported being neutral to somewhat in agreement with statements indicative of the psychological safety of the offices in which they work, though there were some significant between-region differences. In

general, where between-region differences existed, supervisors in Region 5 reported poorer team climate than did supervisors in Regions 3, 4 and/or 6.

Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intention

Table 27. Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intention

	Region						Statewide		
	1 (n=17) ^b Mean	2 (n=18) Mean	3 (n=28) Mean	4 (n=37) Mean	5 (n=37) Mean	6 (n=24) Mean	Mean	SD	Total
Job Satisfaction^a									
13c. All in all, I am satisfied with my job	4.1	4.4	4.1	4.1	3.7	4.1	4.0	0.97	163
Long-term Turnover Intention^a									
13f. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization	3.9	3.9	3.7	3.8	3.5	3.8	3.7	1.09	162
Short-term Turnover Intention^a									
13g. I often look for job opportunities outside this organization	2.0	1.7	1.9	1.8	1.8	2.4	1.9	1.11	161
Obligation toward Coworkers^a									
13h. I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it	3.3	3.8	3.6	4.0	3.5	3.7	3.7	1.25	162

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

Supervisors expressed moderate levels of agreement with statements pertaining to job satisfaction (13d and 13e), intention to leave the organization (13f and 13g), and obligation to stay with one's coworkers (13h). There were no between-region differences in average responses.

Professional Burnout

Table 28. Emotional Exhaustion^a

	Region						Statewide		
	1 (n=17) ^b Mean	2 (n=18) Mean	3 (n=28) Mean	4 (n=37) Mean	5 (n=37) Mean	6 (n=24) Mean	Mean	SD	Total
14a. I feel emotionally drained from my work	3.1	2.9	3.2	3.0	2.8	3.1	3.0	1.19	163
14c. I feel used up at the end of the workday	3.2	3.3	3.3	3.2	2.7	3.0	3.1	1.26	163
14e. I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job	2.2	2.4	2.5	2.4	2.5	2.4	2.4	1.24	161
14h. I feel burned out from my work	1.8	1.5	1.8	1.8	1.6	2.2	1.8	1.04	161
14i. I feel frustrated by my job	2.5	2.1	2.2	2.0	2.1	2.4	2.2	1.09	162
Emotional exhaustion scale ^c	2.5	2.4	2.6	2.5	2.4	2.6	2.5	0.94	163

^aScale: 1=less than a few times a year/never 2=a few times a month 3=once a week 4=a few times a week 5=every day
^bActual regional *ns* may vary due to missing data.
^cCronbach's alpha = .87

Supervisor responses to questions about the level of emotional exhaustion associated with their job indicated that on average they experienced such feelings between *a few times a month* and *once a week*. The most common experiences of this sort were feeling emotionally drained (14a) and feeling used up at the end of the day (14c). No between-region differences were found in the pattern of responses.

Table 29. Depersonalization^a

	Region						Statewide		
	1 (n=17) ^b	2 (n=18)	3 (n=28)	4 (n=37)	5 (n=37)	6 (n=24)	Mean	SD	Total
14p. I've become more callous toward people since I took this job	1.8	1.6	1.6	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.5	0.77	161
14q. I worry that this job is hardening me emotionally	1.7	1.6	1.8	1.5	1.6	1.6	1.6	0.96	162
Depersonalization scale ^c	1.7	1.6	1.7	1.4	1.5	1.5	1.6	0.77	161

^aScale: 1=less than a few times a year/never 2=a few times a month 3=once a week 4=a few times a week 5=every day
^bActual regional ns may vary due to missing data.
^cCronbach's alpha = .72

Supervisors' answers to questions pertaining to depersonalization at work indicated that they seldom experienced such feelings. There were no significant between-region differences in these experiences.

Table 30. Personal Accomplishment^a

	Region						Statewide		
	1 (n=17) ^b	2 (n=18)	3 (n=28)	4 (n=37)	5 (n=37)	6 (n=24)	Mean	SD	Total
14b. I can deal very effectively with the problems of families	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.5	4.3	0.90	159
14d. I feel my work makes a positive difference in people's lives	3.8	4.4	4.5	4.0	3.9	4.0	4.1	1.06	162
14g. I can easily create a relaxed atmosphere with families	4.3	4.2	4.1	3.8	3.9	4.0	4.0	1.03	155

Supervisors' responses to questions pertaining to their feelings of personal accomplishment indicated that they experienced such feelings a few times per week. Region 3 supervisors reported more frequently feeling that they had accomplished many worthwhile things (14o) than supervisors in Regions 1 and 5.

Supervisors' Perceptions of Social Workers' Caseworker Practices

Supervisors of case-carrying social workers assessed the casework practices of a randomly-selected social worker they supervised. Supervisors assessed the workers' interviewing, assessment, engagement, and case planning skills, and their sensitivity to cultural differences. Supervisors' responses to these survey items are presented in Tables 32 to 39.

Between 60 and 80 percent of supervisors reported meeting with their supervisees over seven times per month both in person and in group settings. They reported observing their supervisees working with families (4d) less frequently. There were significant between-region differences in frequency of meeting/observation, with supervisors in Regions 2 and 6 generally reporting more frequent interaction with their supervisees.

Table 31. Time Supervising Assessed Worker

In the past six months, how often have you . . .	Region						Statewide	
	1 (n=12) ^a	2 (n=15)	3 (n=19)	4 (n=24)	5 (n=24)	6 (n=24)	Mean	Total (N=118)
4a. attended a unit meeting with this worker^b	%	%	%	%	%	%		%
Never	0	0	5	0	0	0		1
1-3 times	8	0	26	13	13	4		11
4-6 times	33	7	11	33	38	8		22
7-9 times	0	13	11	25	4	13		12
10 times or more	58	80	47	29	46	75		54
4b. met with this worker to provide one-on-one supervision^c								
Never	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
1-3 times	8	0	11	0	13	0		5
4-6 times	0	0	16	21	33	4		14
7-9 times	17	13	21	17	4	13		14
10 times or more	75	87	53	63	50	83		67
4c. met with this worker in team or group meetings to provide supervision^b								
Never	0	0	16	4	4	4		5
1-3 times	33	7	16	21	33	0		18
4-6 times	25	13	11	29	21	4		17
7-9 times	0	20	26	17	29	25		21
10 times or more	42	60	32	29	13	67		39
4d. observed this worker interacting with families^b								
Never	25	0	11	13	0	4		8
1-3 times	33	0	11	21	42	13		20
4-6 times	25	27	21	29	38	33		30
7-9 times	8	27	16	25	8	8		15
10 times or more	8	47	42	13	13	42		27

^aActual ns may vary due to missing data.
^bp < .01
^cp < .05

Table 32. Solution-Focused Interviewing^a

	Region						Statewide		
	1 (n=12) ^b	2 (n=15)	3 (n=19)	4 (n=24)	5 (n=25)	6 (n=24)	Mean	SD	Total
5a. Accepts families choices about services	3.7	3.4	3.6	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.6	0.53	114
5b. Supports families choices even if he/she disagrees with them	3.5	3.1	3.4	3.1	3.1	3.3	3.2	0.67	115
5c. Works with family to help them accept responsibility for their behavior and choices	3.7	3.8	3.9	3.9	3.6	3.9	3.8	0.46	116
5d. Is comfortable pointing out problems resulting from a family's behavior	3.6	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.6	3.8	3.8	0.49	116
5e. Seeks information from family members about how to respond to their needs	3.8	3.3 ^c	3.9 ^d	3.7	3.3	3.6	3.6	0.59	117
5g. Encourages parents to raise questions	3.6	3.3	3.6	3.8	3.3	3.6	3.5	0.67	115
5j. Asks parents questions to find out what their ideas of solutions are	3.8	3.5	3.8	3.7	3.5	3.5	3.6	0.59	114
5k. Helps parents sort out what might be the best action to take to solve their problems	3.7	3.5	3.9	3.7	3.4	3.6	3.6	0.60	116
5l. Acknowledges parents' views of social services	3.7	3.3	3.8	3.8	3.5	3.6	3.6	0.57	112
5o. Looks for small exceptions to problems and asks parents for details to generate solutions to problem behavior	3.4	2.8	3.4	3.1	3.0	3.2	3.1	0.69	104
5p. Looks for ways to build on what parents have done well	3.6	3.3	3.7	3.7	3.4	3.7	3.6	0.62	117
5w. Expresses concern and caring for family members	3.7	3.4	3.9	4.0 ^d	3.6	3.8	3.7	0.49	118
5x. Acknowledges parents' frustration and anger as normal and understandable given their situation	3.5	3.4	3.8	3.7	3.5	3.7	3.6	0.61	113

Table 32. Solution-Focused Interviewing^a (cont.)

5y. Shares responsibility with parents for finding and achieving solutions to problems	3.5	3.3	3.5	3.7	3.4	3.6	3.5	0.62	109
5z. Accompanies parents to services	2.9	3.1	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.7	2.9	0.83	104
5aa. Recognizes and acknowledges difference between parents' intention and action	3.3	3.1	3.5	3.6	3.3	3.5	3.4	0.61	104
5bb. Recognizes and helps parents overcome discouragement	3.5	3.2	3.6	3.7	3.4	3.5	3.5	0.61	116
Solution-focused interviewing scale ^e	3.5	3.3	3.7	3.6	3.4	3.5	3.5	0.39	116

^aScale: 1=not at all like worker 2=rarely like worker 3=somewhat like worker 4=very much like worker
^bActual regional ns may vary due to missing data.
^cSig. diff. from Region 3 $p < .10$
^dSig. diff. from Region 5 $p < .10$
^eCronbach's alpha = .92

The survey asked supervisors a series of questions to determine the ways they perceived their supervisees' practices to be consistent with Solution Based Casework. Overall, the supervisors' answers suggested that they viewed their supervisees' practice to be somewhat to very much consistent with the new practice model. There were some significant between-region differences.

- Supervisors in Region 3 reported somewhat higher agreement than supervisors in Regions 2 and 5 with the statement that their supervisees seek information from family members about how to respond to their needs (5e).
- Supervisors in Region 4 reported somewhat higher agreement than those in Region 5 with the statement that the supervisees expressed concern and caring for family members (5w).

Table 33. Family Development^a

	Region						Statewide		
	1 (n=12) ^b	2 (n=15)	3 (n=19)	4 (n=24)	5 (n=25)	6 (n=24)	Mean	SD	Total
5cc. Places parents' behavior in context of family's stage of development	3.0	2.7	3.2	3.1	2.9	2.7	2.9	0.87	96
5dd. Defines problems as difficult situation in everyday family life	3.2	2.9	3.2	3.3	3.0	3.0	3.1	0.71	101
5ee. Focuses on helping family successfully manage everyday tasks	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.8	3.3	3.5	3.4	0.66	106
5ff. Aware of family developmental needs	3.4	3.1	3.4	3.5	3.0	3.5	3.3	0.78	106
5gg. Identifies specific family management tasks that are giving a family problems	3.3	3.4	3.6	3.6	3.4	3.5	3.5	0.68	106
5hh. Assesses how each family member's interaction results in their unsuccessful attempts to accomplish family management tasks	3.1	2.9	3.3	3.5	3.0	3.4	3.2	0.75	98
5ii. Helps family to recognize behavior patterns that undermine their ability to accomplish everyday tasks	3.3	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.5	0.60	108
5nn. Identifies everyday family management tasks that challenge family or create risk	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.7	3.2	3.5	3.5	0.70	108
Family development scale ^e	3.3	3.2	3.4	3.6	3.2	3.4	3.3	0.57	105

^aScale: 1=not at all like worker 2=rarely like worker 3=somewhat like worker 4=very much like worker
^bActual regional ns may vary due to missing data.
^cCronbach's alpha = .92

Supervisors were asked a series of questions addressing their perceptions of their supervisees' attention to family development in their practice. Their responses indicated that they perceive their supervisees' practice to be somewhat to very much attentive to family development. There were no significant between-region differences in these supervisor perceptions.

Table 34. Prevention^a

	Region						Statewide		
	1 (n=12) ^b	2 (n=15)	3 (n=19)	4 (n=24)	5 (n=25)	6 (n=24)	Mean	SD	Total
5jj. Identifies skills needed by family to reduce safety risks	3.6	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.5	3.6	3.7	0.56	115
5kk. Helps individual family members to identify patterns of problematic behavior	3.5	3.5	3.8	3.7	3.4	3.5	3.6	0.63	111
5ll. Helps family identify situations that are high-risk for them and early warning signals	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.8	3.6	0.61	107
5mm. Identifies specific risk prevention skills that are needed	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.8	3.6	3.6	3.5	0.62	111
5oo. Provides child safety information even if the family disagrees with the information	3.5	3.5	3.7	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.7	0.55	116
5qq. Helps parents learn strategies to avoid, cope, or escape from high-risk situations	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.6	3.2	3.6	3.4	0.65	106
Prevention scale ^e	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.6	0.48	112

^aScale: 1=not at all like worker 2=rarely like worker 3=somewhat like worker 4=very much like worker
^bActual regional ns may vary due to missing data.
^cCronbach's alpha = .88

Supervisors were asked a series of questions about their perceptions of their supervisees' practice directed towards helping families prevent future maltreatment of their children. Supervisors' responses indicated that they perceived their supervisees' practice to be somewhat to very much focused on prevention. There were no significant between-region differences in these supervisor perceptions.

Table 35. Cultural Sensitivity^a

	Region						Statewide		
	1 (n=12) ^b	2 (n=15)	3 (n=19)	4 (n=24)	5 (n=25)	6 (n=24)	Mean	SD	Total
5t. Considers family's beliefs, values, and practices in identifying resources to help them	3.7	3.6	3.8	3.8	3.5	3.5	3.7	0.53	114
5u. Works with families to identify culturally specific services and resources	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.7	3.5	3.6	3.6	0.55	112
5v. Explores the role of culture in family problem solving and help seeking	3.6	3.3	3.5	3.7	3.5	3.5	3.5	0.60	110
Cultural sensitivity scale ^e	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.7	3.5	3.6	3.6	0.49	111

^aScale: 1=not at all like worker 2=rarely like worker 3=somewhat like worker 4=very much like worker
^bActual regional ns may vary due to missing data.
^cCronbach's alpha = .85

Supervisors were asked a series of questions about their perceptions of the cultural sensitivity of their supervisees' practice. Their responses indicated that they perceived their supervisees' practice to be somewhat to very much attentive to cultural issues. There were no significant between-region differences in these supervisor perceptions.

Table 36. Family Involvement in Case Planning^a

	Region						Statewide		
	1 (n=12) ^b	2 (n=15)	3 (n=19)	4 (n=24)	5 (n=25)	6 (n=24)	Mean	SD	Total
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean			
5f. Focuses more on what family members want than on what he/she thinks they need	3.4	2.8	3.1	2.9	3.2	3.2	3.1	0.68	113
5h. Considers herself/himself the expert when it comes to what is good for parents and their child	2.7	2.3	2.5	2.8	2.7	2.4	2.6	0.87	112
5i. In deciding what services are needed, considers parents' opinions to be more important than his/her own	3.3 ^c	2.7	3.0	2.7	2.8	2.8	2.9	0.67	107
5q. States treatment goals in terms of what parents will do, not what they will not do	3.3	3.2	3.7	3.8 ^d	3.3	3.5	3.5	0.64	111
5s. Incorporates family's beliefs, values, and practices in case planning	3.7	3.3	3.6	3.7	3.4	3.5	3.5	0.55	113
5rr. Includes objectives in case plan that family members will work on together	3.5	3.1	3.5 ^d	3.7 ^d	2.8 ^e	3.4	3.3	0.75	107
5ss. Includes objectives in case plan for individual family members to work on to accomplish family management task(s)	3.1	3.5	3.4	3.6 ^d	2.9	3.3	3.3	0.84	100
5tt. Uses parents' language in formulating case plans	3.2	2.8	3.3	3.5	3.0	3.1	3.2	0.84	99
5uu. Specifies in case plan everyday life tasks that family members will follow to accomplish each objective	2.8	2.9	2.8	3.4	2.7	3.0	3.0	0.88	101
5vv. When setting goals, helps parents state what they want in concrete, behavioral, and measurable terms	2.9	3.1	3.2	3.4	3.0	3.0	3.1	0.80	103
5zz. Tasks included in the case plans are related to reducing risk to family safety	3.6	3.7	3.8	3.9	3.5	3.7	3.7	0.49	111
Case planning scale ^e	3.3	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.1	3.3	3.3	0.45	108

^aScale: 1=not at all like worker 2=rarely like worker 3=somewhat like worker 4=very much like worker
^bActual regional ns may vary due to missing data.
^cSig. diff. from Region 4 p<.10
^dSig. diff. from Region 5 p<.10
^eSig. diff. from Region 6 p<.10
^fCronbach's alpha = .82

Supervisors were asked a series of questions about their perceptions of their supervisees' efforts to involve families in case planning. Their responses indicated that they perceived their supervisees' practice to be somewhat to very much focused on involving families in case planning. There were some significant between-region differences in these supervisor perceptions.

- Supervisors in Region 4 reported somewhat higher agreement than supervisors in Regions 5 with the statement that their supervisees state treatment goals in terms of what parents will do, rather than what they will not do (5q).
- Supervisors in Region 4 reported somewhat higher agreement than supervisors in Regions 5 with the statement that their supervisees state treatment goals in terms of what parents will do, rather than what they will not do (5q).
- Supervisors in Regions 3 and 4 reported somewhat higher agreement than those in Region 5 with the statement that their supervisees included objectives in the case plan that family members will work on together (5rr).
- Supervisors in Region 4 reported somewhat higher agreement than supervisors in Region 5 with the statement that their supervisees included objectives in the case plan for individual family members to work on to accomplish family management tasks (5ss).

Table 37. Monitoring/Acknowledging Progress^a

	Region						Statewide		
	1 (n=12) ^b	2 (n=15)	3 (n=19)	4 (n=24)	5 (n=25)	6 (n=24)	Mean	SD	Total
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean			
5m. Finds ways to praise parents' strengths and progress	4.0 ^c	3.5	3.7	3.7	3.4	3.8	3.7	0.54	114
5n. Looks for small successes that families have made on their own	3.8	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.3	3.7	3.6	0.59	113
5r. Documents, acknowledges and helps families recognize small successes	3.7	3.0 ^d	3.6	3.6	3.3	3.6	3.4	0.64	112
5pp. Focuses on helping family develop risk reducing skills rather than service delivery	3.0	2.9	3.1	3.3	3.0	3.3	3.1	0.77	103
5ww. Works with family to develop measures of success	3.1	3.3	3.5	3.5	3.2	3.1	3.3	0.77	103
5xx. Tasks included in case plans are small and manageable	3.3	3.5	3.2	3.7	3.2	3.3	3.4	0.63	110
5yy. Timelines for tasks are reasonable and clearly articulated	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.8	3.4	3.3	3.5	0.67	111
Monitoring/acknowledging progress scale ^e	3.5	3.3	3.5	3.6	3.3	3.4	3.4	0.48	109

^aScale: 1=not at all like worker 2=rarely like worker 3=somewhat like worker 4=very much like worker
^bActual regional ns may vary due to missing data.
^cSig. diff. from Region 5 p<.10
^dSig. diff. from Regions 1 and 6 p<.10
^eCronbach's alpha = .82

Supervisors were asked a series of questions about their perceptions of their supervisees' efforts to create reasonable expectations for families and involve families in monitoring their own progress. Their responses indicated that they perceived their supervisees' practice to be somewhat to very much focused on these goals. There were some significant between-region differences in these supervisor perceptions.

- Supervisors in Region 1 reported somewhat higher agreement than supervisors in Regions 5 with the statement that their supervisees find ways to praise parents' strengths and progress (5m).
- Supervisors in Regions 1 and 6 reported somewhat higher agreement than those in Region 2 with the statement that their supervisees document, acknowledge and help families recognize small successes (5r).

Table 38. Assessment Skills^a

	Region						Statewide		
	1 (n=12) ^b	2 (n=15)	3 (n=19)	4 (n=24)	5 (n=25)	6 (n=24)	Mean	SD	Total
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean			
6a. Assessing problems	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.4	0.75	117
6b. Assessing family strengths	4.3	3.8	4.3	4.4	4.1	4.0	4.2	0.83	118
6c. Assessing risk/safety	4.1	4.3	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.1	4.3	0.91	115
6d. Assessing substance abuse	3.8	3.6	3.8	3.9	3.9	4.1	3.9	0.94	107
6e. Assessing domestic violence	3.6	3.7	3.8	4.1	3.8	4.0	3.9	0.87	109
6f. Assessing mental health	3.8	4.0	3.9	4.2	3.8	4.0	4.0	0.83	112
6g. Assessing family functioning	4.3	3.8	3.9	4.3	3.9	4.0	4.0	0.85	115
6h. Assessing child functioning and well-being	4.3	4.1	4.2	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.2	0.83	116
6i. Assessing family development	3.6	3.5	3.7	4.2	3.7	3.8	3.8	0.97	112
Assessment skills scale ^e	4.0	3.9	4.0	4.3	4.0	4.1	4.1	0.67	115

^aScale: 1=poorly skilled 5=highly skilled
^bActual regional ns may vary due to missing data.
^cCronbach's alpha = .92

Supervisors were asked a series of questions about their perceptions of their supervisees' assessment skills across a number of dimensions of family functioning. Their responses indicated that they perceive their supervisees' to be fairly highly skilled at assessment (an average of 4.1 on a 5-point scale). There were no significant between-region differences in these supervisor perceptions.

Supervisors were asked a series of questions about their perceptions of a number of aspects of their supervisees' case planning skills. Their responses indicated that they perceive their supervisees' to be fairly highly skilled at case planning (an average of 3.9 on a 5-point scale). There were no significant between-region differences in these supervisor perceptions.

Table 39. Case Planning Skills^a

	Region						Statewide		
	1 (n=12) ^b	2 (n=15)	3 (n=19)	4 (n=24)	5 (n=25)	6 (n=24)	Mean	SD	Total
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean			
6j. Engaging parents in planning and services	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.3	3.8	4.0	4.1	0.91	114
6l. Case planning	4.0	3.7	3.9	4.4	4.0	3.9	4.0	0.89	113
6q. Permanency planning	3.8	3.8	3.9	4.1	3.9	3.7	3.9	1.03	100
6k. Facilitating family meetings	3.9	3.9	3.7	3.9	3.5	3.8	3.8	1.02	104
6p. Counseling families	4.0	3.4	3.4	4.1	3.4	3.8	3.7	0.99	97
6n. Working with parents who repeat behaviors that keep children at risk	3.7	3.9	4.0	4.3	3.5	3.8	3.9	1.01	112
6o. Developing safety plans	4.2	3.7	3.9	4.2	4.0	3.9	4.0	0.89	111
Case planning skills scale ^c	4.2	3.8	3.9	4.2	3.6	3.9	3.9	0.76	99

^aScale: 1=poorly skilled 5=highly skilled

^bActual regional ns may vary due to missing data.

^cCronbach's alpha = .91

REFERENCES

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

Recommended Citation:

Lyons, Sandra; Courtney, Mark; Newby, Maureen; Lee, JoAnn (2009.) Evaluation of Washington State Department of Social and Health Services Children's Administration's Solution Based Casework Practice Model Interim Report Part II: Supervisors' Baseline Survey Results.

Seattle: Partners for Our Children, School of Social Work, University of Washington.

Acknowledgements:

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

Contact:

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