# **Ohio Alternative Response Evaluation Final Report**

**Technical Appendix** 

**Institute of Applied Research** 

Copyright © 2010 by the Institute of Applied Research
Institute of Applied Research
103 W. Lockwood, Suite 200
St. Louis, MO 63119
(314) 968-9625
www.iarstl.org

# **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Pathway Assignment	1
The Family Sample	5
Short-Term Imbalances in Random Assignment	7
Limits of Random Assignment: Treatment-Oriented Analysis	7
Data Collection Instrument	15

This document is a consideration of certain methodological issues relevant to the final report of the Ohio Alternative Response (AR) Evaluation. It is intended for evaluators and others who might desire greater detail. It also contains three of the data collection instruments used in the study for those that might want to use them.

# **Pathway Assignment**

We are including the actual pathway assignment form used during the pilot phase. For anyone contemplating using this form or items similar to these, we have also included after the form certain suggestions that were part of an earlier IAR report provided to the pilot counties.

Start of Pathway Assignment Tool

Pathway Assignment Tool

Family Name:	Date Report Accepted:	/	
Intake Number:			
Enter a Y or N for all <b>Bold</b> Required or Discrete The following are based on <b>allegations</b> , regardless of wh			
TRADITIONAL RESPONSE RE	QUIRED:	Enter Y or I	N for each item
Report alleges serious harm to a child (if Y is ent	ered, check one of the items be	elow)	Y or N:
Felony child endangerment or assault (as defined in statut Child abuse or neglect that has resulted in serious injury of Report requires the involvement of a Child Advocacy Cer	r harm		
Report alleges sexual abuse of a child			Y or N:
[] Criminal sexual conduct (as defined in statute) [] Other alleged sexual abuse [] Report requires the involvement of a Child Advocacy Cer	nter		
Report involves a suspicious child fatality or ho	omicide		Y or N:
Report requires a specialized assessment			Y or N:
[] Alleged perpetrator is a person responsible for the child's [] Alleged perpetrator has access to the child by virtue of his			
Report requires a third party assessment:			Y or N:
<ul> <li>Any employee of an institution or facility that is licensed the PCSA.</li> <li>A foster caregiver or pre-finalized adoptive parent that is PCSA.</li> <li>A type B family day care home certified by a County Dep Any employee or agent of ODJFS or the PCSA</li> <li>Any authorized person representing ODJFS or the PCSA</li> <li>Any other PCSA conflict of interest.</li> </ul>	licensed, certified, or approved artment of Job and Family Serv	by ODJFS and s	upervised by the

If any of the following boxes are marked "yes" it is <u>county discretion</u> whether the family qualifies for the Alternative Response pathway. Mark any item that applies, <u>even if required items were marked above</u>.

DISCRETIONARY		
	Y or N:	
Frequency, similarity, or recentness of past reports	Y or N:	
Long term court-ordered placement will be needed	Y or N:	
	Y or N:	
Parent/legal guardian has declined services in the past	Y or N:	
Parent/legal guardian is unable/unwilling to achieve child safety	Y or N:	
Past maltreatment concerns not resolved at previous closing	Y or N:	
	Y or N:	
Appropriate for AR but not assigned:		
[] Zip code not included in AR pilot		
13 Staffing considerations		
Other (please specify)		
Optional Narrative Explanation:	<u> </u>	
Pathway Assigned (check one): TR AR Date Assigned://_		
Signature Mail copies monthly to the Institute of Ap	phed Res	earch

End of Pathway Assignment Tool

The following conclusions and recommendations were not included in Chapter 3.

Continued use of the Pathway Assignment Tool. The pathway assignment tool remains the only way that counties can systematically document the trends in decision making regarding pathways, and why some types of families and situations receive a traditional response. The assumption underlying AR in Ohio (and elsewhere) is that the *family assessment is the preferred approach to families* and "traditional" incident-driven investigations are only appropriate when certain well-defined conditions concerning criminality and danger are present. The information garnered through analysis of the pathway assignment document helps to show how Ohio counties are developing their understanding and acceptance of AR as a method for addressing family needs. The analysis of the written comments also suggests that differences existed concerning which families can best be served through the new approach.

The current paper form, however, has disadvantages, and can be cumbersome and subject to miscoding. A preferable approach will be to integrate pathway assignment into the SACWIS intake system with appropriate filters and error traps to insure basic accuracy. Simple monthly reports can be designed that will permit local offices to determine what proportion of reports received entered the AR family assessment pathway and why the remaining families were assigned to a traditional investigation.

Over 30 percent of the forms received by evaluators had written comments. This is a strong indication that the local decision makers had concerns that were not explicitly addressed in the existing tool or that they were unclear about the meaning of certain items. Certain changes in items, addition of other items and explicit instructions can reduce or even eliminate the need for written comments. A well-designed pathway decision making form can be completed in less than one minute by the experienced worker.

It is important to remember that a form cannot take the place of judgment. Pathway assignment requires informed and trained decision makers that are familiar with the purposes and the limitations of the AR family assessment approach. However, a well-designed form and instructions can support and document decision making, as well as provide greater uniformity and fairness within and between local offices.

**The Mandatory Items.** A more efficient approach might be to relegate the specifications under mandatory items 1, 2, 4 and 5 to an instruction manual. In SACWIS, these could appear as popup help screens. If it is important for offices to be able to count any of these for administrative purposes then the main item itself should be divided. The current two-step process (check the main item and then check the specification) did not work well in the paper form (see Analysis in Chapter 3, pp 22ff of the Evaluation Report).

Criminal Charges and Dangerous or Violent Situations. Law enforcement responses or possible responses for child endangerment or harm and other criminal charges were commented on for a number of reports. In others, the possibility seemed to underlie other comments such as substance abuse activities going on in the home or among the caregivers or the presence of firearms. These comments occurred even when the serious harm category and the previous offence category were not indicated. It may be advisable to generalize the discretionary item on legal intervention beyond simply violent situations. If this is done accompanying instruction should clarify why an investigation might be necessary in these circumstances. Domestic violence was explicitly mentioned in a number of cases. Like all the categories of comments, we can assume that it was known, suspected or later discovered in other cases but not written down. This is an important issue for AR and might be discussed in instructions for situations in which law enforcement is not involved.

**Substance Abuse.** Substance abuse issues appeared in comments most frequently. An item might be added in the discretionary section to assist decision makers in determining the conditions under which substance abuse requires an investigation. A central issue is whether the short-term response (30 to 60 days) that is usually characteristic of AR family assessments is likely to be helpful to caregivers with this problem, although the alternative *would not necessarily be an investigation* but a longer-term service response.

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Involvement of law enforcement was a specific item in the pathway (track) assignment tool used during the earlier Missouri pilot of AR (1995 to 1998).

**Sexual Abuse.** This category did not appear to be problematic. In a very small number of cases, the presence of a sex offender or past sexual abuse incidents were mentioned. The relevance of these might be defined in accompanying instructions.

Family History with the Agency. Comments concerning the history of the family with CPS sometimes appeared to have an implicit assumption that because the agency has not been successful with the family in the past, an investigation is the only course of action that can be taken. Yet, many anecdotal cases can be found of families with a long history of investigations and lack of cooperation that were subsequently engaged through the family assessment approach. One of the interesting findings of this evaluation is that a large proportion of families that entered the study groups had CPS histories—sometimes extensive and involving child removals. It is clear that a history with the agency was not a factor in pathway assignment for some offices and some decision makers. The conditions under which a history with the agency should exclude an AR family assessment ought to be explicitly discussed in pathway assignment instructions.

An Outline for a Revised Pathway Assignment Tool. It would be worthwhile to involve the local pathway assignment decision makers in the revision process. The revised tool should then be tested and afterward integrated into SACWIS intake screens. Without predetermining the content of items, the present analysis suggests that the following topics should be considered. The terms "inappropriate" and "appropriate" in the descriptions of discretionary items must be explicitly defined in accompanying instructions because *none of these items per se should exclude a family from an AR family assessment*.

#### **Mandatory Items**

- 1. Allegations of serious harm to a child (multiple items, if necessary as discussed above).
- 2. Allegations of sexual abuse of a child
- 3. A suspicious child fatality or homicide
- 4. Need for a specialized assessment
- 5. Need for a third party assessment

#### **Discretionary Items**

- 1. Currently open traditional assessment
- 2. History with agency: (explicitly listing the types of past reports or past interactions, if any, that might make an AR family assessment inappropriate)
- 3. Legal: Law enforcement involvement occurred or is likely
- 4. Legal: Previous child harm offenses charged against the perpetrator
- 5. Legal: Past or present criminal activity that might make an AR family assessment inappropriate
- 6. Substance abuse that might make an AR family assessment inappropriate or point up the need for a more intensive approach
- 7. Mental health and emotional stability concerns that might make a TR assessment necessary

- 8. Other risky conditions that might make a TR assessment necessary (specify)
- 9. Past unresolved maltreatment concerns that might make an AR family assessment inappropriate

#### The Family Sample

Responses were received from 804 families. The actual number of family responses was somewhat larger because some families were inadvertently contacted twice. When the second responses of families were set aside, the final sample consisted of 804 unduplicated families.

Completion of the family survey was voluntary, as can be seen in the cover letter, which is reprinted in the listing of instruments at the end of the present document. And while we amply demonstrated in Chapter 4 of the final report the comparability of the responding experimental group families to families in the control group, we did not consider the extent to which this group of families as a whole resembled or differed from the larger sample of families in the study.

The method used was to compare the family survey sample with the entire study sample (including the family survey sample) on common variables that were found in or derived from administrative (SACWIS) data. On demographic variables *no statistically significant differences* were found for means of the following variables.

Number of children in the case of ages:

less than one year

one to three

four to five

six to 11

12 to 17

18 years or older

Number of adults in the case of ages:

18 to 24 years

25 to 34

35 to 44

45 to 54

55 years or older

Total number of adults in the case

Total number of children in the case

In all cases the mean values for the above variables for the family survey and entire study sample were virtually identical. Concerning caregivers, the large majority were female, as indicated in Chapter 4. On the variable of age of the female caregiver, a difference was found of 28.7 years for the family survey sample compared to 27.3 years for the full study sample (p = .016)

No differences were found for the race of the family as indicated in admin data with 62.6 percent of the family survey sample indicated as Caucasian compared to 62.7 percent of the entire study sample and 27 percent of the family survey sample African American compared to 24.8 percent of the entire study sample (with 10.3 and 12.3 percent respectively having missing data).

Regarding allegations for the target incident, no statistically significant differences were found for child neglect with 45.2 percent of the family survey sample reported for neglect compared to 42.9 percent of the full study sample. No differences were found for the small category of emotional maltreatment (4.4 percent and 4.0 percent respectively). A statistically significant difference (p < .001) was observed, however, for physical abuse with 44.4 percent of the family survey sample reported for physical abuse compared to 36.6 percent of the full study sample, a difference of 7.8 percent.

Regarding past accepted reports of abuse and neglect, families in the survey sample had experienced a mean of 1.7 compared to 1.5 for families in the full study sample. This difference was also statistically significant (p = .048).

Thus, three differences were found: age of female caregiver, number of past accepted reports and proportion of target reports for physical abuse. Another area of difference was found in the comparative proportions of survey sample cases residing in the 10 pilot counties. These were off by one to two percent in most cases but Franklin County (the largest county in the study) was underrepresented in the survey sample by 3.6 percent and Lucas County (the second largest county in the study) was overrepresented in the survey sample by 2.4 percent. The numbers of cases in most counties were small, which exaggerated percentage differences.

Comparative analyses, such as those presented in the Chapter 4 and elsewhere of the present report were not altered by weighted analysis (for example, adjusted for differences in county proportions). We have planned further outcome analyses of the family survey sample similar to those conducted for the 2006 Minnesota Extended Analysis (see our website) if Ohio permits follow-up to continue. The issue of statistical control or weighting of the survey sample will be reconsidered if this course is pursued.

# **Short-Term Imbalances in Random Assignment**

This is a suggestion for evaluators utilizing random assignment. One of the problems with the random assignment program used in Minnesota and Ohio was strings of experimental or control cases that sometimes led to imbalances in worker caseloads. Local decision makers entered identifying information on reports considered appropriate for AR. Our online program used a random number generator to assign experimental or control status to entered reports. The problem with this process is that it is possible in a short sequence of entries with 50/50 weighting of experimental/control (E/C) cases to have an imbalance of one type of case or the other. For example, in a sequence of ten entries eight cases might be assigned to the control group. Over time as more and more reports are entered the proportions even out, but short-term imbalances can lead to caseload imbalances in counties that have specialized AR assessment workers or traditional investigators.

One way around this problem, that we became aware of after the Ohio pilot had begun, is to use two tiers of randomization. First, a sequence length is randomly selected. For example, sequence lengths of 8, 10 and 12 might be used. Second, half the cases in the sequence are designated E and the other half C and then randomly distributed within the sequence. This method requires a way of storing each sequence. For example, a particular office might enter four cases using the first four items of eight-case sequence ECEECCCE, yielding three experimental and one control case. When they next opened the randomizer the program would have to begin on the fifth item in this sequence—thus, the need to store the sequence and the pointer location within the sequence. It would probably be simpler to create a database (list) of random sequences and random numbers within sequences. The database would need to be large enough, of course, to accommodate all the entries from a particular location. Separate databases would be needed for each location. In this case the randomizer program would only need to store a number designating the last item accessed in the database and position the database pointer to the next item. This is certainly a more complex program than the few lines of code needed for generating random Es and Cs, but it avoids the shortterm imbalance problem than we have experienced several times in random assignment evaluations.

# **Limits of Random Assignment: Treatment-Oriented Analysis**

In this section we describe the problem of controlling the specific elements of the experimental treatment. The advantage of random assignment is the creation of roughly equivalent groups of families for comparative purposes. This equivalence has the most utility in situations where a clearly defined, univocal and controlled difference in the way the groups are treated—the experimental treatment—can be put in place. In the most banal terms: one group gets the pill, the other gets the placebo, and nothing else is different. If differences are found

in outcome measures, it is possible to point with some confidence to the experimental treatment as the likely explanation.

In field experiments within active programs, like the present study, the experimental treatment cannot be so tightly controlled. The best we can say of simple experimental-control comparisons of outcomes in this study is that on average the new approach (the experimental treatment) produced improved outcomes. The reason why we can only speak of averages is that the implementation of the new approach can and does vary from office to office, among worker and from one family to another. It does not consist of a prescribed action or set of actions: do this with each experimental family and do not do it with any control families. Rather the implementation consists of general rules and guidelines that require creativity and improvisation by workers. The guidelines set the context but what goes on is not workers doing something to families but interactions among workers, family members and in some cases other individuals. The conditions that make certain interactions more likely can be somewhat controlled (through the formal structure of home visits and the training of workers) but the interactions themselves cannot be controlled. The experimental treatment emerges from these interactions. In addition, the treatment takes place over time and changes as relationships develop or fail to develop. The timeframe cannot be controlled. The treatment may consist of one visit with the family and be over in a day or it may stretch over several weeks of multiple visits, telephone contacts. Further, the treatment may be restricted to talk among the worker and family members or it may involve many other individuals, including friends, relatives and service providers. Finally, the treatment may involve no services or assistance to the family, direct services by workers, education about the sources of services and assistance in the community, or referrals to and facilitation of services through other organizations.

Evaluators have little control over whether the treatment happens, how long it continue and what concrete resources come into play. Even more disturbing to the experimentalist is that aspects of the new approach may be enacted in the control group. For instance, some investigators insist on acting like social workers and if they can overcome the initial negative response of families to being investigated they can develop positive, helping relationships similar to the relationships that are promoted under the AR approach.

Because the experimental treatment is variable, what exactly it was that made a difference in outcomes cannot be fully understood from simple experimental-control comparisons of final outcome variables. What can be done? The process study provides a basis for understanding the underlying changes that led to new outcomes. Some experimental differences—instrumental outcomes—can be examined as part of the process analysis. For example, experimental-control variations in service approaches, family caregiver responses, the intensity and length of work with families, and so on can be analyzed. In addition, other combined quantitative and qualitative measures including worker values and attitudes, community knowledge and attitudes, differences in office organization, variations in service availability, and so on can be considered. In one approach, the final integration of outcome and process findings occurs as part of report writing. In the analysis phases of the evaluation, multiple methods create streams of knowledge based on various data sources. In the

integration phase, the streams are recombined into, hopefully, a coherent whole that is understandable and valid. The validity flows as much from the coherence of the presentation in the report as it does from associations, correlations and outcome differences.

Another approach integrates information about instrumental changes directly into the outcome analysis. For example, concerning poverty-related services one might argue: You have shown that levels and types of services change under AR (DR) and you have coupled this with other qualitative data from families and workers to explain that these differences were implicated in producing more positive longer-term outcome such as reductions in new reports of child maltreatment. The arguments are logical and the evidence is not unconvincing but if what you say is correct shouldn't you be able to conduct a statistical analysis that shows that improvements in experimental group occur more often in families where these instrumental changes took place? Why not introduce these differences into outcome analyses as covariates representing intervening variables? Or maybe you could segment the experimental and control groups into served versus not served subgroups to be analyzed separately.

Integration of process and outcome findings in the final report and introduction of process variables into the outcome analysis are admissions that the experimental method in this study has serious limitations. The experimental treatment—the new AR approach—is complex and variable, and rather than treating it as a black box it is critical that we understand what it was that happened or did not happen in the experimental cases that led to the longer-term differences observed.

Thus, we ask what differences in the experimental treatment, the AR family assessment, are relevant and might be examined? AR family assessments include child safety assessments and safety plans but this does not differentiate them clearly from traditional investigations, which also consider child safety. Rather, the AR experimental treatment can be conceptualized as potentially incorporating three major components that distinguish it from the traditional approach.

- 1) There is the removal of negative actions and events from the first encounter with the family. These include the shift in primary focus away from the incident recounted in the report, the avoidance of formal (and informal) designations of victims and perpetrators of abuse and neglect, absence of a determination (substantiation or indication) of child maltreatment, and in most states the avoidance of an addition of the caregiver's name to a central registry of child abuse perpetrators. This removal of the negative occurs in virtually all AR cases because these aspects of traditional CPS investigations are explicitly removed from the formal structure of the AR family assessment.
- 2) The second component of the AR family assessment is improved family engagement. This may occur in part because of the removal of negative elements but AR workers are trained to emphasize that they have not come into the home to accuse or find fault but are there to offer assistance. They are also trained to solicit the

participation of the entire family—all the members—in the process and to focus on family strengths and resources as well as family needs. There is an emphasis on building relationships of respect and trust with family members. Some investigators also take this approach to the extent that they were able within the formal structure of the investigation but we have found that indicators of positive engagement are not found as often under traditional investigation as under AR and that the negative aspects of investigations can obstruct and delay the process of engagement with the family.

3) A third component of the family assessment centers on services. AR workers are trained to conduct broader assessments of family needs than in traditional investigations. This involves beginning the assessment of service needs at the time of the first visit by the family assessment worker rather than delaying it for weeks until a service worker meets with the family. Assessment of needs is also a participatory process and leads to a service plan. The combination of a focus on broader needs, beyond what is needed to insure immediate child safety, of all families encountered and the participation of the family in decision making leads to more needs being discovered and discussed and to a greater emphasis on poverty-related services. This in turn leads to increases in services.

As noted, the second and third components play out in different ways and are not always fully accomplished. They involve communication and the development of affective relationships that are dependent on the skills of the worker and the cooperation of the family. And it may be added that even in cases in which they are enacted fully with families, the question can still be asked, what elements produced the changes observed? For example, in Minnesota there was a desire to know whether the family friendly approach or increased services or some combination of the two explained the positive outcomes observed.

An integrated process-outcome statistical analysis will consider the extent to which these components were present and accomplished in experimental cases and whether they might also have occurred in control cases. It will also attempt to partial out the effects of each. We focused on these as part of the process analysis in Ohio but were unable to integrate them statistically into the analysis of outcomes for several reasons, including the absence of SACWIS administrative data for experimental cases on contacts, service plans and services and the short timeframe for follow-up data collection and analysis. In Minnesota, our follow-up study introduced certain factors into the outcome analysis that measured directly and indirectly variation in the experimental treatment, including family satisfaction, delivery of services and formal case opening. Each was shown to have had effects—both separately and as interactions—on outcome measures.<sup>2</sup> This analysis went beyond purely experimental considerations by introducing covariates that were uncontrolled in the study.

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> See Siegel, G., & Loman, L. A. (2006). *Extended follow-up study of Minnesota's family assessment response*. Institute of Applied Research. Retrieved from: <a href="http://www.iarstl.org/papers/FinalMNFARReport.pdf">http://www.iarstl.org/papers/FinalMNFARReport.pdf</a>

Pathway Change and Intention to Treat. Our approach has been to set aside experimental cases that received none of the three components listed above. This was a first kind of tightening of the design to test whether the treatment—the change in approach under AR—made a difference. These are cases of pathway change in which families were immediately found to be inappropriate for an AR family assessment. For example, an experimental case may have an initial report of lack of proper supervision of a child. Then a worker discovers the possibility of sexual abuse of a child in the family. Sexual abuse cases require an investigation and the family is switched from an AR family assessment to a traditional investigation. We have found that pathway change typically occurs in roughly two percent of families assigned to family assessments in alternative (differential) response programs. As indicated in Chapter 3, this happened for two percent of the experimental families in Ohio. Our approach has been to then apply statistical controls to equalize the groups, particularly using the strongest risk characteristic of families: past CPS reports and/or cases.

Not setting aside such cases changes the focus of evaluation from whether the change in approach to families made a difference to whether random assignment made a difference, the so-called "intention to treat" approach. The former is the reason for doing the study and is simply a first step in what ought to be a more detailed departure from a one-dimensional experimental analysis. As a general rule, it is better to give up the strictest experimental comparability to deal with variations in the experimental treatment in order to understand why observed differences occurred.

An exception arises when the reasons for pathway change are directly related to the outcome being measured. In our analysis of child removal and placement changes in Chapter 10, we alluded to this. The reasoning is as follows. The best measure of placement outcomes in a study of this kind would exclude child removals and placements that occurred during the original target investigation/assessment/service case. The activities during this case constitute the experimental treatment and it would be best to measure outcomes only after the treatment was completed. In Minnesota we did this because a longer follow-up period was available for tracking families. In that state, we only counted child removals after the initial assessment/case was concluded, that is, after the final contact with the family. There was generally a hiatus of weeks or months until a new report was received followed by an investigation that led to a child being placed. In Ohio, the follow-up time was much shorter and we were forced to begin measuring removals and placements that occurred during the original target assessment/case. We also learned that in certain counties the primary reason for pathway change was that such severe safety concerns were found that a child had to be removed from the home. In Ohio, therefore, the pathway change reason was potentially confounded with the outcome being measured. Most child removals in the experimental and control group, nonetheless, occurred several months later but because we were counting from the date of the original child maltreatment report, we conducted the outcome analysis both ways—with and without pathway change cases. We found a statistically significant difference in child placement both when pathway change cases were excluded and when they were included in the analysis.

<b>Ohio Alternative Re</b>	sponse Evaluation:	<b>Final Report</b>	<b>Technical</b>	<b>Appendix</b>

#### **Data Collection Instruments**

Some interest has been expressed in the data collection instruments that were used in Ohio and Minnesota. Three are included in this document: the family questionnaire, the case-specific survey instrument and the general worker survey. Not included are the community survey instrument, the family interview protocol, the protocols for worker and supervisor interviews during site visits or other more specialized interview instruments (e.g., interviews of juvenile judges). The three that are included have been edited slightly to represent the slightly different versions used in the Ohio and Minnesota AR evaluations.

**Family Questionnaire.** This instrument was mailed to families with a cover letter explaining the voluntary nature of their participation and offering them a \$20 stipend if they completed and returned the instrument. The cover letter and questionnaire are included in the following six pages. The family questionnaire is five pages in this document but with proper formatting can be fitted on four pages. We printed it on 11x17 inch paper folded to  $8^{1/2}x11$  and then tri-folded to fit into a standard business envelope.

«FIRST\_NAME» «LAST\_NAME» «ADDRESS\_LI» «ADDRESS\_L2» «CITY\_NAME», «STATE\_CODE» «ZIP5\_CODE»

Dear «FIRST NAME» «LAST NAME»,

The Ohio Supreme Court and the Department of Jobs and Family Services has asked the Institute of Applied Research (IAR) to evaluate services provided to families and children in Ohio counties. As part of this study we are contacting a sample of families who have been visited by a county child welfare worker within the last year about the well-being of a child. We are asking how satisfied families are with the services they received and with the way they were treated, and we would like to know how your family is doing.

We are asking you to assist us in this research by completing the enclosed survey. The survey is **completely voluntary** and **completely confidential**. If you return the completed survey to us **you will receive \$20 for your time**. No one but IAR researchers will ever see any survey returned to us or even be given a list of families who participated in the study. Our reports include only summaries of what groups of families say. Whether or not you participate in the survey, you will not lose any services you may be receiving.

The purpose of the research is to learn whether services help the families and children who receive them and to assist the state and counties improve services for families like yours. As you will see from the survey, we would like to learn what assistance your family received, what you thought about the experience, and how you and your children are doing. There are some background questions to help us understand what groups of families tell us. If there are questions you prefer not to answer just leave them blank.

It is important that we hear back from you. Please answer the questions on the survey and mail it to me in the envelope provided. It does not need a stamp. It will only take a few minutes. Don't forget to write your name and address on the form so we can send you \$20 for your help.

If you have any questions about the research we are doing or the survey itself, don't hesitate to call or email me. I hope you chose to participate in this survey. Your views are important. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Tony Loman

#### **Confidential Family Survey**

A children's services worker visited you one or more times in the last year concerning the well-being of a child. Please answer the following questions about those visits (or visit).

1.	· ·	th the way you and your family were treated by the caseworker	
		rkers that visited your home?	
	<ul><li>□ Very satisfied</li><li>□ Generally satisfied</li></ul>	<ul> <li>☐ Generally dissatisfied</li> <li>☐ Very dissatisfied</li> </ul>	
	in Generally satisfied	Toty dissuisited	
2.	How satisfied are you wi	th the help you received or were offered?	
	☐ Very satisfied	☐ Generally dissatisfied ☐ No help was offered	
	☐ Generally satisfied	☐ Very dissatisfied	
3	Overall is your family b	etter off or worse off because of this experience?	
J.	☐ Much better off	□ Somewhat worse off □ Made no difference	
	☐ Somewhat better off	☐ Much worse off	
4.	Overall, were you treated	l in a manner that you would say was:	
	☐ Very friendly	☐ Unfriendly	
	☐ Friendly	☐ Very unfriendly	
_	W	1	
5.	□ A great deal	decisions that were made about your family and child(ren)?  □ A little □ No decisions were made	
	☐ Somewhat	□ Not at all	
	_ Somewhat	- Not at all	
6.	Did the worker who met	with you listen to what you and other family members had to	
	say?		
	☐ Very much	☐ A little	
	☐ Somewhat	□ Not at all	
_	5.1.1		
7.		with you try to understand your family's situation and needs?	
	☐ Very much	☐ A little	
		□ Not at all	
	☐ Somewhat	□ Not at all	
8.	☐ Somewhat		
8.	☐ Somewhat	□ Not at all  no was present when the worker first came to your home? □ Your spouse	
8.	☐ Somewhat  Please check everyone will ☐ You ☐ Any of your children	no was present when the worker first came to your home?  \[ \text{Your spouse} \] \[ \text{Other relatives} \]	
8.	☐ Somewhat  Please check everyone will ☐ You ☐ Any of your children ☐ Friends	no was present when the worker first came to your home?  Your spouse Other relatives A worker from another agency	
8.	☐ Somewhat  Please check everyone will ☐ You ☐ Any of your children	no was present when the worker first came to your home?  \[ \text{Your spouse} \] \[ \text{Other relatives} \]	
	☐ Somewhat  Please check everyone w ☐ You ☐ Any of your children ☐ Friends ☐ Law enforcement	no was present when the worker first came to your home?  ☐ Your spouse ☐ Other relatives ☐ A worker from another agency ☐ Others (write in)	
	☐ Somewhat  Please check everyone w ☐ You ☐ Any of your children ☐ Friends ☐ Law enforcement  Were there any matters	no was present when the worker first came to your home?  Your spouse Other relatives A worker from another agency Others (write in) Chat were important to you that were not discussed?	
	☐ Somewhat  Please check everyone w ☐ You ☐ Any of your children ☐ Friends ☐ Law enforcement  Were there any matters	no was present when the worker first came to your home?  ☐ Your spouse ☐ Other relatives ☐ A worker from another agency ☐ Others (write in)	
9.	☐ Somewhat  Please check everyone w ☐ You ☐ Any of your children ☐ Friends ☐ Law enforcement  Were there any matters ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, please	no was present when the worker first came to your home?  Your spouse Other relatives A worker from another agency Others (write in)  Chat were important to you that were not discussed?  describe these matters:	
9. 10.	☐ Somewhat  Please check everyone w ☐ You ☐ Any of your children ☐ Friends ☐ Law enforcement  Were there any matters ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, please  Did the worker(s) help you ————————————————————————————————————	no was present when the worker first came to your home?  Your spouse Other relatives A worker from another agency Others (write in)  Chat were important to you that were not discussed?  describe these matters:  or another family member get any of the following help or services?  of the following where you received help	
9. 10.	☐ Somewhat  Please check everyone w ☐ You ☐ Any of your children ☐ Friends ☐ Law enforcement  Were there any matters ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, please  Did the worker(s) help youCheck and ing	no was present when the worker first came to your home?    Your spouse   Other relatives   A worker from another agency   Others (write in)	
9. 10. Hous: Mone	☐ Somewhat  Please check everyone will you ☐ Any of your children ☐ Friends ☐ Law enforcement  Were there any matters in Yes ☐ No If Yes, please  Did the worker(s) help you ————————————————————————————————————	no was present when the worker first came to your home?    Your spouse   Other relatives   A worker from another agency   Others (write in)	
9. 10. House Mone Help	Please check everyone w  you Any of your children Friends Law enforcement  Were there any matters yes No If Yes, please  Did the worker(s) help you ————————————————————————————————————	no was present when the worker first came to your home?  Your spouse Other relatives A worker from another agency Others (write in)  Chat were important to you that were not discussed?  describe these matters:  or another family member get any of the following help or services?  of the following where you received help	
9. 10. House Mone Help Medic	Please check everyone will you Any of your children Friends Law enforcement  Were there any matters and Yes No If Yes, please  Did the worker(s) help your children Help your children help your children help your check and ing the your paying utilities call or dental care for you or your far	no was present when the worker first came to your home?  Your spouse Other relatives A worker from another agency Others (write in)  Chat were important to you that were not discussed?  I describe these matters:  Or another family member get any of the following help or services?  or the following where you received help Food or clothing for your family Appliances or furniture or home repair Any other financial help  mily Welfare/public assistance services	
9. 10. House Mone Help Medic Help	Please check everyone will you Any of your children Friends Law enforcement  Were there any matters Yes No If Yes, please  Did the worker(s) help you Check and ing you pay your rent paying utilities cal or dental care for you or your far for a family member with a disability	no was present when the worker first came to your home?    Your spouse   Other relatives   A worker from another agency   Others (write in)   Chat were important to you that were not discussed?    Chat were important to you that were not discussed?   Others (write in)   Chat were important to you that were not discussed?   Or another family member get any of the following help or services?   Or another family member get any of the following help or services?   Or another family member get any of the following help or services?   Or another family member get any of the following help or services   Appliances or furniture or home repair   Any other financial help   Others (write in)   Others (write	
9.  10.  House Mone Help Medic Help Assis	Please check everyone will you  ☐ Any of your children ☐ Friends ☐ Law enforcement  Were there any matters ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, please  Did the worker(s) help you ————————————————————————————————————	no was present when the worker first came to your home?    Your spouse   Other relatives   A worker from another agency   Others (write in)   Chat were important to you that were not discussed?   It were important to you that were not discussed?	
9. Hous Mone Help Medic Help Assis Help	Please check everyone will you  Any of your children  Friends  Law enforcement  Were there any matters  Yes No If Yes, please  Did the worker(s) help you  Check and ing  ey to pay your rent paying utilities cal or dental care for you or your far for a family member with a disability tance in your home, such cooking or getting mental health services	no was present when the worker first came to your home?    Your spouse   Other relatives   A worker from another agency   Others (write in)   Chat were important to you that were not discussed?   describe these matters:    or another family member get any of the following help or services?   Other following where you received help   Food or clothing for your family   Appliances or furniture or home repair   Any other financial help   Welfare/public assistance services   Legal services   Cleaning   Child care or day care   Respite care for time away from your children   Child care or day from your	
9. House Mone Help Medic Help Assis Help Help	Please check everyone will you   ☐ Any of your children ☐ Friends ☐ Law enforcement  Were there any matters ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, please  Did the worker(s) help you   ☐ The paying utilities cal or dental care for you or your far for a family member with a disabilit tance in your home, such cooking or getting mental health services in getting alcohol or drug treatment	no was present when the worker first came to your home?    Your spouse   Other relatives   A worker from another agency   Others (write in)	
9.  10.  House Mone Help Medic Help Assis Help Help Paren	Please check everyone will you  Any of your children  Friends  Law enforcement  Were there any matters  Yes No If Yes, please  Did the worker(s) help you  Check and ing  ey to pay your rent paying utilities cal or dental care for you or your far for a family member with a disability tance in your home, such cooking or getting mental health services	no was present when the worker first came to your home?    Your spouse   Other relatives   A worker from another agency   Others (write in)   Chat were important to you that were not discussed?   describe these matters:    or another family member get any of the following help or services?   Other following where you received help   Food or clothing for your family   Appliances or furniture or home repair   Any other financial help   Welfare/public assistance services   Legal services   Cleaning   Child care or day care   Respite care for time away from your children   Child care or day from your	

11, 1	Did the worker	neip ,	,		i neip o	1 SCI VIC	CS.			□ 1es	$\Box$ N
		If yes	s, what?								
>	If you received  The kind you nee  Enough to really	eeded?	_	□ gen	s from the nerally yes nerally yes	☐ genera	ally no	□ did no	Source, wo	y services	
13.	Was there any	help t	hat your	family	needed	that yo	u did n	ot recei	ve?	☐ Yes	s 🗆 N
44 '	Were you offer	If ye	s, what?		* 1	* 4 = 70		- 1			<b>-</b> ,
14.								d aown	?	☐ Yes	s 🗆 N
<b>15.</b> !	If yes, what did y <b>Did the worker</b>							nvwher	e else who	ere	
	you could get so	-				_		11y		☐ Yes ☐ No	
	If yes, did yo		-		Ü	•				☐ Yes ☐ No	
			•		Ü	•					
	Did the worker sure	: conta	ict any of	ther ag	ency or	source	of assis	tance fo	or you?	☐ Yes ☐ No [	□ Not
	Did the worker						p to you	ır famil	y (such a	S,	
	transportation,								-	∃Yes □ No	
	•	•	O,		• , ,					_	
	If yes, what?										
			che	eck all that						Cours	<b>A A</b>
	☐ Angry ☐ Afraid		☐ Reli	. 1					•		
	☐ Stressed		□ Hon			□ Wor	ried		☐ Comforte		
	☐ Irritated		☐ Hop ☐ Satis	oeful		☐ Word	ried used		☐ Comforte ☐ Reassure ☐ Grateful	ed	
	☐ Anxious			oeful sfied		☐ Conf ☐ Tens ☐ Nega	ried Tused e ative		☐ Reassure ☐ Grateful ☐ Positive	ed	
L			□ Satis □ Help □ Plea	oeful sfied ped ased		☐ Conf ☐ Tens ☐ Nega ☐ Pessi	ried Tused e ative imistic		☐ Reassure ☐ Grateful ☐ Positive ☐ Encoura	ed ged	
	□ Dissatisfied		□ Satis □ Help	oeful sfied ped ased		☐ Conf ☐ Tens ☐ Nega ☐ Pessi	ried Tused e ative		☐ Reassure ☐ Grateful ☐ Positive	ed ged	
	Please tell us w		☐ Satis ☐ Help ☐ Plea ☐ Than	oeful sfied ped ased nkful ou in th		☐ Conf☐ Tens☐ Nega☐ Pessi☐ Disco	ried Tused e ative imistic		☐ Reassure ☐ Grateful ☐ Positive ☐ Encoura ☐ Optimist	ed ged	
	Please tell us w	$\square$ M	☐ Satis ☐ Help ☐ Plea ☐ Than ☐ the ses with years ☐ Satis ☐ Help ☐ Years ☐ Than ☐ Than	oeful sfied ped ased nkful ou in th	□ My n	☐ Conf ☐ Tens ☐ Nega ☐ Pessi ☐ Disco	ried Tused e ative imistic	□ My si	☐ Reassure ☐ Grateful ☐ Positive ☐ Encoura ☐ Optimist	ged tic	
	Please tell us w	$\square$ M	☐ Satis ☐ Help ☐ Plea ☐ Than	oeful sfied ped ased nkful ou in th		☐ Conf ☐ Tens ☐ Nega ☐ Pessi ☐ Disco	ried Tused e ative imistic	□ My si	☐ Reassure ☐ Grateful ☐ Positive ☐ Encoura ☐ Optimist	ged tic	
	Please tell us wand  ☐ My husband  ☐ My wife  Number of children y	□ M □ M you are re	☐ Satis ☐ Help ☐ Plea ☐ Than  es with ye Iy boyfriend Iy girlfriend esponsible fo	oeful sfied ped used nkful ou in th	☐ My n☐ My fa	☐ Conf ☐ Tens ☐ Nega ☐ Pessi ☐ Disc ☐ Disc ehold. mother father	ried fused e titive imistic ouraged	□ My si	☐ Reassure ☐ Grateful ☐ Positive ☐ Encoura ☐ Optimist	ged tic	
	Please tell us will  ☐ My husband  ☐ My wife  Number of children y Other persons (please	☐ M ☐ M you are re e list their	□ Satis □ Help □ Plea □ Than  es with year  Ity boyfriend Ity girlfriend esponsible for relation to girlfriend	oeful sfied ped ased nkful  ou in th	☐ My n ☐ My f	☐ Conf ☐ Tens ☐ Nega ☐ Pessi ☐ Disco ehold. mother father eir ages:	ried Pused e attive simistic ouraged	□ My si □ Other	☐ Reassure ☐ Grateful ☐ Positive ☐ Encoura ☐ Optimist  ster/brother friend/rooms	ged tic	
	Please tell us wand  ☐ My husband  ☐ My wife  Number of children y	☐ M ☐ M you are re e list their	Satis  Help Help Plea Than  es with year  y boyfriend y girlfriend esponsible for ir relation to	oeful sfied ped used nkful  ou in th  or: you)	☐ My n ☐ My f	☐ Conf ☐ Tens ☐ Nega ☐ Pessi ☐ Disco ehold. mother father eir ages:	ried Pused e attive simistic ouraged	□ My si □ Other	Reassure Reassure Reassure Reassure Rocateful Positive Encourag Optimist  ster/brother friend/rooms	ged tic mate	
	Please tell us will  ☐ My husband  ☐ My wife  Number of children y Other persons (please	☐ M ☐ M you are re e list their	Satis  Help Plea Than  es with year  year  year  girlfriend  esponsible for relation to girlfriend  Check if	oeful sfied ped used nkful  ou in th  or: you)  age and  Write	☐ My n ☐ My f List thei	☐ Conf ☐ Tens ☐ Nega ☐ Pessi ☐ Disco ehold. mother father sir ages:	ried Fused e tive imistic ouraged	□ My si □ Other	Reassure Reassure Reassure Reassure Routeful Positive Encourag Optimist  ster/brother friend/rooms  L your cl	ged tic mate hildren.	
	Please tell us will  ☐ My husband  ☐ My wife  Number of children y Other persons (please	☐ M ☐ M you are re e list their	Satis  Help Plea Than  es with year  year  year  girlfriend  esponsible for relation to girlfriend  Check if	oeful sfied ped used nkful  ou in th  or: you)	☐ My n ☐ My f List their	☐ Conf ☐ Tens ☐ Nega ☐ Pessi ☐ Disco ehold. mother father air ages: information	ried Fused e titive imistic ouraged  ation ak	☐ My si☐ Other  Dout AL	Reassure Reassure Reassure Reassure Routeful Positive Encourag Optimist  ster/brother friend/rooms  L your cl If the child in	ged tic mate	r or w
20. I	Please tell us will  ☐ My husband  ☐ My wife  Number of children y Other persons (please	☐ M ☐ M you are re e list their	Satis  Help Plea Than  es with year  year  It is supported to be a support of the	oeful sfied ped used nkful  ou in th  or: you)  age and  Write Grade in	☐ My n ☐ My f List their	☐ Conf ☐ Tens ☐ Nega ☐ Pessi ☐ Disco ehold. mother father air ages: information	ried Fused e tive imistic ouraged	☐ My si☐ Other  Dout AL	Reassure Reassure Reassure Reassure Routeful Positive Encourag Optimist  ster/brother friend/rooms  L your cl If the child in	ged tic mate  hildren. is in school ras doing better	r or w
20. I	Please tell us will be a minimum of the manner of the minimum of	☐ M ☐ M  you are re e list their	□ Satis □ Help □ Plea □ Than  es with year  Ity boyfriend Ity girlfriend esponsible for relation to girlfriend  Check if he or she is in school	oeful sfied ped used nkful  ou in th  or: you)  age and  Write Grade in	☐ My n ☐ My f List their	☐ Conf ☐ Tens ☐ Nega ☐ Pessi ☐ Disc  ehold. mother father fir ages:  informatid is in scl doing in s	ried Fused e titive imistic ouraged  ation ak	☐ My si☐ Other  Dout AL	Reassure Reassure Reassure Reassure Routeful Positive Encourag Optimist  ster/brother friend/rooms  L your cl If the child in	ged tic mate hildren. is in school ras doing better ool than in the same	r or w
20. I	Please tell us will My husband My wife  Number of children y Other persons (please  Please provide  s FIRST name	☐ M ☐ M  you are re e list their	Satis  Satis  Help Plea Than  es with year  Ity boyfriend  Ity girlfriend  esponsible for relation to girlfriend  Check if he or she is in	oeful sfied ped used nkful  ou in th  or: you)  age and  Write Grade in	☐ My n ☐ My f List thei  School i  If the chi she is o	☐ Conf ☐ Tens ☐ Nega ☐ Pessi ☐ Disco ehold. mother father fir ages: informatid is in sci	ried fused e ative imistic ouraged  ation at chool cur	☐ My si☐ Other  Dout AL  ow he or rently.	Reassure Reassure Reassure Reassure Routeful Positive Encourag Optimist  ster/brother friend/rooms  L your cl If the child he or she is in school	ged tic mate  hildren. is in school ras doing bettel ool than in the	r or we
20. I	Please tell us will My husband My wife  Number of children y Other persons (please  Please provide  s FIRST name	☐ M ☐ M gou are re e list their  the fol  Age	□ Satis □ Help □ Plea □ Than  es with year  Ity boyfriend Ity girlfriend esponsible for relation to girlfriend  Check if he or she is in school	oeful sfied ped used nkful  ou in th  or: you)  age and  Write Grade in school	☐ My n ☐ My f List their  School i  If the chi she is c	☐ Conf ☐ Tens ☐ Nega ☐ Pessi ☐ Disc  ehold. mother father fir ages:  informatid is in scl doing in s	ried Fused e tive imistic ouraged  ation at hool rate h chool cur	☐ My si☐ Other  Dout AL  ow he or rently.	Reassure Reassure Reassure Reassure Reassure Routeful Positive Encourag Optimist  Ster/brother friend/rooms  L your cl If the child he or she is in school	ged tic mate hildren. is in school ras doing better ool than in the same	r or we ne pas
20. I	Please tell us will My husband My wife  Number of children y Other persons (please  Please provide  s FIRST name	☐ M ☐ M gou are re e list their  the fol  Age	□ Satis □ Help □ Plea □ Than  es with year  Ity boyfriend Ity girlfriend esponsible for relation to girlfriend Check if he or she is in school	oeful sfied ped used nkful  ou in th  or: you)  age and  Write Grade in school	☐ My n ☐ My f List thei  School i  If the chi she is o excellent ☐	☐ Conf ☐ Tens ☐ Nega ☐ Pessi ☐ Disc  ehold. mother father fir ages:  informatid is in scl doing in s	ation at hool cur	☐ My si ☐ Other  Dout AL ow he or rently.  poor ☐	Reassure Reassure Reassure Reassure Reassure Routeful Positive Encourag Optimist  Ster/brother friend/rooms  L your cl If the child he or she is in school	mate hildren. is in school ras doing better ool than in the	r or we ne pas

# 3:

21. D	o you feel more	e or less able to ca	re for you	r child(	ren) nov	w than	you did a	year ago	?
	Much more □ So	mewhat more $\Box$ About	it the same	☐ Somewh	nat less	Much les	SS		
				_ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~					
	-	t year at this tim	e, how con	fident d	lo you fe	el abou	ıt your ab	ility to de	eal
W	ith issues								
ir	ı your life?								
	Much more ☐ So	mewhat more	ut the same	☐ Somewh	nat less	Much les	ss		
		ildren in your ho	usehold:		<u>che</u>	<u>ck yes d</u>	or no for e		
>								No	
>		because they are sick?						No	
>	_	ental disability (such as r		ion)?				No	
>	• •	tly about feeling unwell						No	
>		tly about headaches or si	tomachaches?					No	
>		_						No	
>	•	getting along with their t						No	
>	•	getting along with other						No	
>	-	o school or skip without						No	
>	•	owards you or others in	the household?	•				No	
	, ,	_						No	
		nt feel anxious or unsafe	?					No	
								No	
	•	nake them difficult to co	ntrol?				□ Yes □	No	
	Engage in occasion	nal delinquent behavior?	)				□ Yes □	No	
24 LI	low much stress	do vou oumantl	E7				111		
	eel about the fo	s do you currently	y		a lot	some	a little	no	
of stress		O							
1.		ive available each month	•						
2.			<u>.</u>						
3.		with other adults in your	life						
4.									
5.	_	-							
6.		opiness of your children							
7.		-							
8.									
25. D	o you feel any i	more or less stres	s now			a lot	somewhat	somewhat	a lot
	•	ear ago regarding			more	more	less	less	
1.		ve available each month							
2.									
3.		with other adults in your	life						
4.									
5.									
6.		opiness of your children							
7.									
8.	Your life in genera	al							

## **26.** Is there anyone in your life that you:

	Yes, whenever I need it	Yes, occasionally	Yes, but rarely	No, I have no one
can turn to in times of stress?				
can talk to about things going on in your life?				
know will help you if you really need it?				
ask to care for your children when you need it?				
ask to help you with transportation if you need it?				
can turn to for financial help if you need it?				
27. How would you describe your current living arrangements?  □ Excellent □ Satisfactory □ Less than satisfactory □ Unacceptable				

27.	How would you describe  □ Excellent □ S	your current livi atisfactory	ng arrangements?  ☐ Less than satisfa	actory	☐ Unacceptable
28.	. How long have you li	ved at your pi	resent address?	years (or	months)
29.	How many times hav	re you changed  ☐ Two times			·?
30.	What current medical coverage d	o you have for yoursel	f and your child(ren)		
	You	□no insurance	e □private insurance □	☐Medicaid ☐ Othe	er
	Your child(ren):	□no insurance	e □private insurance □	☐Medicaid ☐ Othe	er
31.	. What is your marital ☐ Married ☐ S	status? eparated	☐ Divorced	□ Widov	wed ☐ Never married
32.	Are you currently en	nployed? □ Ye	es, full time $\Box$ Yes, p	part time	☐ Not currently employed
33.	If you are currently employed, ho ☐ Less than 20 hours week	ow many hours do you  20 to 29 hor			$\square$ 40 hours or more per
34.	. How many months w	ere employed	during the past 1	2 months?	
35.	If you are living with ☐ Yes, full time ☐ Yes, par				e employed?
	What is your level of ☐ Grade school	☐ High scl	hool diploma or Gl	ED	☐ A four-year
	college degree or more  ☐ Some high school		ollege or a two yea	r degree	
37.	. Has anyone in your h (check ALL that app		eived any of the fo	llowing during	g the past 12 months?
	☐ Food stamps ☐ Retirement check ☐ Housing assistance			☐ WIC ☐ Utilities assistar Security disability	

38. What was your to	tal household incon	ne during the past 1	12 months?		
(Please add up ever	ything, including wa	ages, salaries, welfar	re, gifts—all	the money coming	
into the household.			, 0	, c	
☐ Less than \$4,999		,999 □ \$40,000 to	\$49.999	□ \$70,000 to \$79,999	
□ \$5,000 to \$9,999	□ \$20,000 to \$29	,999 □ \$50,000 to	\$59,999	□ \$80,000 to \$89,999	
□ \$10,000 to \$14,999	□ \$30,000 to \$39	,999 □ \$60,000 to	\$69,000	□ \$90,000 +	
39. Has your current	income increased o	r decreased since t	his time last	vear?	
	☐ Decreased	☐ No change		<i>J</i> ==== :	
We are interested in	anything else you mi	ght want to say abo	ut your expe	rience.	
Thank you.					
Please fill in the follov	ving information so	that we can send y	vou vour CE	IFCK	
	C	•	. •	ieck.	
Your Name		Street or PC	O Box		
City		State	7in		
City		State	z.ip _		

Institute of Applied Research, 103 W. Lockwood, Suite 200, St. Louis, MO 63119

**The Case-Specific Survey Instrument.** This might also be called the case-review instrument. It was sent to the workers responsible for sample cases after the final contact with the family. In the Ohio and Minnesota studies this instrument was in the format of an online survey. Workers received an email with the following text:

Dear	
Dear	•

The Institute of Applied Research (IAR) is conducting the evaluation of the Ohio Alternative Response (AR) Pilot Project. Some of the reports of child abuse and neglect that your office receives each month are being assigned to an experimental group (receiving AR) and others to a control group (receiving a traditional response). Over all 10 counties in the pilot, several hundred families are assigned each month.

We are selecting a sample each month (from Aug 08 to Aug 09) of experimental cases (assigned to AR) and control cases that received a traditional investigation for follow-up with the workers who were assigned to the case. The purpose of this follow-up is to obtain information in a consistent manner that only workers can provide. We follow up only after cases are closed.

One of your cases is listed below. When you click on the link (below the case name) a survey form will open in your web browser. Read all the instructions carefully. Most of the questions can be answered by clicking on the proper checkbox. A few ask you to type in short answers. Press the SUBMIT button when you are done.

We are aware of the demands on the time of workers and this is the reason we are sampling families rather than asking about every family. However, because of this, we need worker responses on each and every sample family we ask about.

We will try to limit the number of requests to each worker. During the next few months we may ask you about more than one family per month. Please be patient with us, but if you have questions or comments do not hesitate to reply to this email. Your supervisor or the office director should be able to explain the need for this survey.

If we have made a mistake and this is not your case, please reply to this email and tell us so.

Thanks for your help. Your feedback is essential and will play a big part in the findings of the Ohio AR Evaluation. We ask that you complete the survey within the next week.

Intake ID#: nnnnnnnnnn, Intake Date: 04/28/2009

Report Name: XXXXX XXXXXX

Case ID#: nnnnnnnnn Close Date: 06/01/2009 Experimental Group

https://www.iarstl.org/oh/-----/

Tony Loman

Institute of Applied Research

(314) 968-9625

The following is a paper version of the instrument that was developed for one Minnesota county. The online version was continuous, that is, there were no inserts, as seen below.

Confidential Questionnaire
AR/DR Case Specific Instrument
Family Name: Case ID:
Your Name:County:
If you are not a member of the county Child Protection staff, please write in the name of your organization or agency:
Part One
1. Did you: (check all that apply)
<ul> <li>□ conduct the initial assessment at the beginning of this case?</li> <li>□ conduct an interim or follow-up assessment while the case was open?</li> <li>□ conduct a final assessment at case closure?</li> <li>□ provide case management, support, and/or referral services to this family?</li> <li>□ provide any other direct services to this family?</li> <li>2. Please Identify anyone else who may know more things about this case than you know.</li> </ul>
(Write in their address if different from yours. If there is no one, proceed to question 3.)  Name Organization
Address Email address
Is this: ☐ a county staff person ☐ a community agency staff person
<b>3. Was this</b> : □ an Alternative Response case □ a Traditional Response case  If this was an <b>Alternative Response</b> (AR) case answer the next three questions (a,b,c):
a. If the initial report on this family had been investigated in the traditional manner would it have been substantiated, in your judgment?
☐ certainly yes ☐ probably yes ☐ probably no ☐ certainly no ☐ unsure
b. Did this family refuse all efforts to provide assistance or services? $\square$ yes $\square$ no
c. Did this family receive any services under AR that they would not hade received, in your judgment, under a Traditional Response?
☐ certainly yes ☐ probably yes ☐ probably no ☐ certainly no ☐ unsure
If this was a <b>Traditional Response</b> case answer the next two questions (d & e):
d. Would an Alternative Response been appropriate in this case, in your opinion?
□certainly yes □ probably yes □ probably no □ certainly no □ unsure
e. Are you aware of any services this family did not receive but might have with Alternative Response?
□ certainly yes □ probably yes □ probably no □ certainly no □ unsure
Comments:

4. Number of contacts with Family ( <u>estimate if necessary</u> ):	
a. How many face-to-face meetings did you have with mem	bers of the family?
b. How many telephone contacts did you have with membe	rs of the family?
c. How many other contacts did you have with a famil	y member (court visits, etc.)?
d. How many contacts did you have with others on behalf o	f this family?
e. How many other face-to-face contacts did other social we	orkers/agency providers have?
5. Please indicate whether there were any extenuating circ very difficult, impossible or unnecessary. (Check as mai	
☐ traditional assessment was un-substantiated ☐ traditional assessment substantiated but low risk case not ☐ family fled or moved out of the county ☐ alleged perpetrator left family ☐ alleged perpetrator was separated by court ☐ alleged perpetrator was imprisoned ☐ a caregiver was hostile throughout the case ☐ a caregiver missed appointments often ☐ caregiver was uncooperative in other ways ☐ a child was uncooperative ☐ other agency/non-CPS worker had major responsibility for other	
Comments:	first social and social by social
6. Was a child in this family threatened or harmed before the following?	ne first assessment contact by <u>any</u> or
<ul> <li>neglect or abandonment</li> <li>physical abuse or emotional maltreatment</li> <li>sexual maltreatment</li> <li>lack of supervision or proper care</li> <li>poor or damaging adult-child relationship</li> <li>other threats to child safety</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>yes □ no</li> </ul>
If you checked yes to any item in question 6, complete the	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
you did not check yes to any, continue below without com	pleting the chart.
7a. Were any services, support or assistance provided to t $\square$ yes $\square$ no $\square$ uncertain whether family actually receive	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
7b. Was any information about where services may be found	nd given to the family?
$\square$ yes, and family acted on this info $\square$ yes, but whether family received services is unknown	☐ no ☐ uncertain

you answered yes nswered no or unc									If you
On the following you met with the cooperative."	scale p	lease rat	e the co	operatio	n or attit	ude of fa	mily me	mbers th	
ver <u>y</u> uncooperative	ı		•	_				ve	ery cooperative
-5 -4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
If you met with th rate their coopera						t <b>han one</b> □ does no			-
ery uncooperative -5 -4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	ery cooperative +5
you did not have to nished. If you com							nay stop	here, you	ı are
art Two									
Did you or anoth services or assis school neighborhood mental health palcohol/drug re MR/DD provide youth organiza health care projob service/em employment &	organiza provider chab age er ution ovider ploymer training	rom any ation ency/prog at security agency (	of the fo	llowing?					ŭ
☐ support group ☐ childcare/preso			ad Start						
<ul><li>☐ community act</li><li>☐ domestic violer</li><li>☐ emergency foo</li></ul>	nce shel	ter							
☐ church or religi☐ recreational fa☐ neighbors/frien☐ other	acility (	e.g. YM							
Comments:									

11. On the following scale (from 1 to 5, where 1=not at all, 5=completely), indicate whether the level of service response in this case was sufficient to: (circle)

			at all	completely
	<ul><li>a. meet the immediate threats to a child in this fab. reduce threats of possible future child abuse</li><li>c. meet other family needs affecting child well-b</li></ul>	or neglect	1234561 1234561	7 8 9 10
12.	Overall, how well were the services that were of the family? (circle)	re actually p	provided matched to the	ne service needs
	very poorly matched ve	ry well matche	ed	
	12345678910			
13.	In your judgment, how effective were the problems or in producing needed changes?		rovided to the family	in solving their
	very ineffective ve	ry effective		
	12345678910			
14.	If there were any services this family needed reason, please list them here.	or needed I	more of that it did not (	get for any
	1			
	2			
	3			
15	Check any of the following reasons why the	family may i	not have been fully ser	nved.
IJ.	□ size of worker caseload	iaiiiiy iiiay i	lot have been fully ser	veu
	☐ limited staff time to work with family			
	other pressing cases on caseload			
	☐ problems beyond scope of CPS to remedy ☐ limited funds for needed vendor services			
	□ other			
16.	Overall, how involved was the extended fami needed support and/or assistance to this fam		outside the household	d) in providing
	not at all			
	☐ very little ☐ moderately			
	□ extensively			
17.	Overall, how involved were unfunded commanily?	munity reso	urces (i.e. churches)	in assisting this
	not at all			
	□ very little			
	<ul><li>☐ moderately</li><li>☐ extensively</li></ul>			
	- evicusively			

- 18. Family Functioning. Check the boxes next to any area (<u>if uncertain leave blank</u>)1) That was addressed (instruction/counseling, direct services, referrals, etc.) during the case, and/or
  - 2) That showed marked improvement over the course of the case, whether addressed or not (Check boxes under 1 or 2 or both. Leave blank if uncertain.)

	1) Need or Risk Condition found (check if yes)	Condition     addressed     while in contact     with family	3) Improvement (check one)		
	(Crieck ii yes)	with fairing	Little	Moderate	Much
Structural condition/safety of home					
Cleanliness/order of home					
Housing					
Rent/Utilities					
Food/Clothing					
Parenting skills of adults					
Approach to child discipline					
Control of child(ren)					
Emotional maturity of parent/caretaker					
Poor or harmful Interaction in family					
Domestic violence					
Alcohol abuse					
Other substance abuse					
Adult disability or mental retardation					
Child disability or mental retardation					
Inadequate family income / poverty					
Underemployment or unemployment					
Financial planning/money handling skills					
Household management skills					
School attendance of children					
Progress of children in school					
Physical health of parent/caregiver					
Physical health of children					
Mental health of parent/caregiver					
Mental health of children					
Quality/stability of adult relationships					
Parent-child relationship/communication					
Stability/integrity of family as a unit					
Developmental level of child(ren)					
Support system of friends and neighbors					
Extended family emotional support					
Extended family financial support					
Knowledge of community services					
Ability to access needed services					

INSERT, SIDE A - THREATS TO A CHILD

(1) CI	RT, SIDE A – THREATS TO A heck all Then for every y threats problem	(2) In	dicate	whethe			reat	(3) Was the issue addressed?										
prese	ent in this checked,	d, 🖳						Yes, by:					No, because					Don't
case	case first. complete (2) and (3)		At first contact		At closure		County staff	Vender agency/ paid provider	Unpaid com- munity resource	Family resource/ kin	Other/ don't know	Funds unavail- able	Provider unavail- able	Un- cooper- ative family	Threat removed	Other	know/ not sure	
	child lacked basic needs (food, clothes, hygiene)	mild	mod	sev	mild	mod	sev											
	home unsafe or unclean	mild	mod	sev	mild	mod	sev											
	homelessness or potential homelessness	mild	mod	sev	mild	mod	sev											
	abandonment	mild	mod	sev	mild	mod	sev											
	locking in or out	mild	mod	sev	mild	mod	sev											
	caretaker neglected medi- cal/healthcare need of child	mild	mod	sev	mild	mod	sev											
	_educational neglect/truancy	mild	mod	sev	mild	mod	sev											
	other neglect	mild	mod	sev	mild	mod	sev											
	violence to child by caretaker (non-disciplinary)	mild	mod	sev	mild	mod	sev											
	excessive discipline	mild	mod	sev	mild	mod	sev											
	emotional maltreatment	mild	mod	sev	mild	mod	sev											
	child witnessed domestic violence/ violence in home	mild	mod	sev	mild	mod	sev											
	sexual maltreatment	mild	mod	sev	mild	mod	sev											
	other abuse	mild	mod	sev	mild	mod	sev											
	child 6yrs old or younger left unsupervised	mild	mod	sev	mild	mod	sev											
	child 7-12 left unsupervised	mild	mod	sev	mild	mod	sev											
	other harm (e.g. burns, fractures)	mild	mod	sev	mild	mod	sev											
	verbal or physical fights	mild	mod	sev	mild	mod	sev											
	rejection of child by parent	mild	mod	sev	mild	mod	sev											
	rejection of parent by child	mild	mod	sev	mild	mod	sev											
																		<u> </u>
		mild	mod	sev	mild	mod	sev											

#### Ohio Alternative Response Pilot Project Evaluation: Final Report-Technical Appendix

INSERT, SIDE B:

#### **SERVICES TO FAMILY**

The following is a list of services that are sometimes provided to families.

#### 1) Place a check after any service to indicate:

- 1. <u>service provided during the case</u> service were provided to a family member(s) while the case was open and had not been in place at the time of the first visit.
- 2. <u>info/referral provided</u> services information was given or referrals were made,
- 3. <u>service in place before case</u> service was in place at the time of first visit

# 2) For any service received by the family, give us some idea of the level of services received or used from very little (1) to very much (5).

For each service check <b>all</b> that apply	(1)	(2)	(3)		Level of participation or use by family (circle)				
<u>ш</u> им орру	Service provided	Info/ referral provided	Service in place at start	Very	Very little <			y much	
Childcare/daycare services				□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5	
Respite care/crisis nursery				□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5	
Medical or dental care				□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5	
Marital/family/group counseling				□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5	
Individual counseling				□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5	
Mental health/psychiatric services				□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5	
Drug abuse treatment				□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5	
Alcohol abuse treatment				□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5	
Domestic violence services				□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5	
Emergency shelter				□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5	
Help with rent or house payments				□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5	
Housing services				□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5	
Help with household needs (utilities, repair, etc.)				□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5	
Emergency food				□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5	
TANF, SSI or food stamps				□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5	
Assistance with transportation				□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5	
Assistance with employment				□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5	
Vocational/skill training				□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5	
Educational services				□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5	
Legal services				□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5	
Parenting classes				□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5	
Homemaker/home management assistance				□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5	
Assistance from support groups				□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5	
Disability services				□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5	
Recreational services				□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5	
Family preservation services				□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5	
Independent living services				□1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5	
Other:				□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5	

<b>General Worker Survey.</b> This survey was also an online instrument. The survey was conducted at two points in Ohio, the early survey near the end of 2008 and the late survey near the end of 2009. The two instruments used were practically identical. The late survey instrument is shown here. The following is the email sent to workers.
Dear
As you may know, the Institute of Applied Research (IAR) is evaluating the Ohio Alternative Response Pilot Project. The pilot is being conducted in 10 Ohio counties. There are a number of parts to the evaluation. At this stage we are asking you to participate in the GENERAL SURVEY of workers.
Some of you may have received earlier survey requests about specific experimental or control cases. That survey will be repeated monthly during the next several months. The survey linked to the present email is different and is meant to find out about workers' general knowledge, attitudes and experiences with AR during the early stages of the pilot.
The survey can be accessed by clicking on the link below. The link will open your browser and show you the survey form. You should be able to complete it in about 15 to 20 minutes. Most questions can be answered by clicking check boxes. You can go back and change answers at any time.
After you have answered all the questions you must click on the Submit button at the bottom of the form to send the survey to IAR.
This survey is not anonymous but will be treated in the strictest confidence. No one outside the IAR research team will ever know what any individual respondent submitted.
The primary AR contact in your county is aware of this survey. If you have any questions about the content of the survey or find yourself confused by it, don't hesitated to email me your questions or to call. Your answers are critical to determining whether the Ohio AR pilot was successfully implemented.
You can access the survey by clicking on this link:
Thank you.
Tony Loman Institute of Applied Research St. Louis, Missouri

314 968 9625

# **DR/AR Worker Survey**

Your name		County		
rour name		County		
Position/Title				
This questionnaire is confidential but	not anonymous. No one o	outside the research team will view it.		
1. How long have you wo	orked as a child p	rotection case manager or supervisor? S	Since (mo/ /_	′yr) ——
case assessme case management	eening nt – traditional inve nt – Alternative Re	out-of-home placement case stigations family preservation services sponse adoption staff supervision		
3. If you have a caseload	l:			
3a. How many cases a	are on your curre	nt caseload?		
3b. How many of thes	e are Alternative	Response (AR) cases, if any?		
		e July 2008, either assessment or ongoir until now (enter 0 if none)	ıg, estima	ite
4. If you are a supervisor since July 2008?	r, <u>about</u> how man	y of workers handling AR cases have yo	u supervi	sed
often do families you w	vork with view you or both AR famili	· ·	oport and onal	
	AR families Other families	never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		don't knov
6. To what extent do fami the involvement of the chil	-	h feel they are better off or worse off bed ncy?	cause of	
know		worse off	better off	don't
	AR families Other families	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		
7. To what extent do you work with?	feel able to interv	rene in an effective way with the children	and fami	lies you
	AR families Other families	never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	10 <sup>°</sup>	don't know

8.	Please rate your overall ability to help families and children in cases you work with obtain
	the services/assistance they need.

	very poor excellent	don't know
AR families	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	
Other families	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	

- 9. The following is a list of specific services and service providers. Please tell us (by circling yes or no):
  - a) Are you aware of any providers (resources) of these services in your service area? If yes:
  - b) Do you know the name of a contact person within such a provider agency or have you ever met with anyone from such an agency or resource?
- c) Have you referred a client child or family to any such provider or resource within the last month?

	a) any provider in area		b) know o	or met act person	c) referred to in the last month		
a. child care (day care)	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	
<ul> <li>b. respite care/crisis nursery</li> </ul>	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	
c. mental health services	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	
d. substance abuse treatment	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	
e. MR/DD services	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	
f. medical services	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	
g. dental services that accept Medicaid	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	
h. transportation services	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	
i. domestic violence services/shelter	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	
j. food services/food pantry	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	
k. housing assistance	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	
I. utilities & other household assistance	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	
m. Job Service (Employment Security)	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	
n. JTPA services	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	
<ul> <li>o. other employment services</li> </ul>	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	
<ul> <li>p. adult educational services</li> </ul>	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	
q. adult vocational training	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	
r. parenting classes	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	
s. household management	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	
t. youth organizations (e.g. Boy Scouts)	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	
u. recreational facilities (e.g. YMCA)	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	
v. neighborhood organizations	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	
w. legal services	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	
x. support grps (e.g., parents anonymous)	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	
y. early childhood services	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	
z. community action agency	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	
aa.churches/religious organizations	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	

10. How would you rate your overall knowledge of service resources in the community?

## Ohio Alternative Response Pilot Project Evaluation: Final Report-Technical Appendix

11. How would you rate your office's w	_	ationsh	ip with the foll	owing?		
	no relationship	poor	fair	good	excellent	:
unsure		•		· ·		
<ul> <li>a. local law enforcement authorities</li> </ul>		1 2	3 4 5	6 7 8 -	9 10	
b. juvenile court		1 2	3 4 5	6 7 8 -	9 10	
<ul><li>c. circuit court/prosecuting attorney</li></ul>		1 2	3 4 5	6 7 8 -	9 10	
d. school administrators and teachers		1 2	3 4 5	6 7 8 -	9 10	$\Box$
e. hospitals, clinics and school nurses		1 2	3 4 5	6 7 8 -	9 10	一百
f. mental health providers	Ħ	1 2	3 4 5	6 7 8 -	9 10	一
g. Job Service and JTPA offices			3 4 5	-		
h. churches/religious organizations	H		3 4 5	-		
cran crack, engan engan en		_				
12. How effective is the current child p	rotection s	system	overall in prote	ecting childre	en in	
client families who are at risk of:	ve	rv.			Vorv	
	ineffe				very effective	unsure
a. sexual maltreatment	1	2	- 3 4 5	6 7 8	0 10	
			- 3 4 5 (	-		님
b. moderate to severe physical abuse			- 3 4 5 (			_ H
c. neglect of basic needs (food, clothing	9,,	_				
d. lack of supervision of young children	-	_	3 4 5			
e. medical neglect	1	2	3 4 5	6 7 8	9 10	Ш
13. In your experience how effective is client families in which there is:	the currer	nt child	protection sys	tem in worki	ng with	
one it rainines in which there is.	ve	ry			very	
	ineffec	ctive			effective	unsure
a. drug abuse	1	2	3 4 5	6 7 8	9 10	
b. alcohol abuse	1	2	3 4 5	6 7 8	9 10	一
c. domestic violence/spouse abuse	1	2	3 4 5	6 7 8	9 10	
d. extreme poverty	1	2	3 4 5	6 7 8	9 10	Ħ
e. extreme child behavior problems			- 3 4 5			Ħ
f. mental illness			- 3 4 5	-		H
g. mental retardation/developmental d			- 3 4 5	-		- 7
h. extremely poor parenting skills			- 3 4 5	-		H
i. educational neglect			- 3 4 5			- H
j. parent-adolescent conflict			- 3 4 5 (	-	-	H
j. parent-adolescent connict	ı	2	3 4 5	0 7 0	9 10	Ш
14. If you worked in child protection be Response demonstration affected h is, are you doing anything different	now you ap	proach				
☐ not at all ☐ in small way	/s ∏i	n a few	important ways	□a grea	at deal	
☐ I began working in child protection	_			□ a groc	at dodi	
Please explain your answer briefly:						_
15. How well do you understand the go approach to child abuse/neglect that is being   ☐ thoroughly ☐ adequately ☐ less	-	ited in t	his demonstra	-		

16. the					ır opini	ion how de	oes the A	R approach co	mpare to						
traditional approach regarding child safety?															
	<ul> <li>Children are more often safe under traditional investigations than under AR</li> <li>Children are about equally safe under AR and traditional investigations</li> <li>Children are more often safe under AR than in traditional investigations</li> <li>Do not know or cannot judge</li> </ul>														
	When AR has a family-centered														
and	receive?														
	1) the appro	oach		%											
	2) services			%											
		total =	100	%											
18.	18. Would the AR approach have a positive effect on families if there were no additional funds for services?														
	☐ yes, Please explain y		but not as <i>briefly:</i>	much	□ r	ot sure		no							
19.	Do you feel the need for more training related to Alternative Response?  yes, a lot yes, a little no unsure  19a. If yes, what kind of training or technical assistance would help you and your co-workers the most?														
<ul><li>19b. What kind of training has helped you the most in the past?</li><li>20. In your view, what are the major differences between Alternative Response and traditional CPS in your county?</li></ul>															
	,			like	ch more ely with AR	somewhat more likely with AR	no difference	somewhat more likely with traditional CPS	much more likely with trad. CPS						
a.	Families approa non-accusing m			г	_										
b.	No finding or sul														
C.	Families receive														
d. e.	Families receive Families receive				$\dashv$	H	$\vdash$	H	H						
f.	Families referred				_	Ш			Ш						
_	or agencies in co														
g. h.	Separate interviews Family members				$\dashv$				H						
i.	Cooperation of o	caregivers/fa	mily mem	bers[	j										
j.	Participation in o	decisions an	d case pla	ıns[											

21. Overall, how satisfied are you with	the child pr	otection system	n in place in	your county?								
	very dissatisfied	l		very satisfied u	ingura							
		2 3 4 5 -	6 7 0									
	1	2 3 4 5 -	0 / 0	9 10	Ш							
22. Overall, how satisfied are you with your child protection job?												
	very	1		very								
	dissatisfied			satisfied u	nsure							
	1	2 3 4 5 -	6 7 8	9 10								
23. Overall, how satisfied are you with your workload and duties?  very  very  very												
	dissatisfied	l		satisfied u	nsure							
	1	2 3 4 5 -	6 7 0	0 10								
	1	2 3 4 5 -	0 / 0	9 10	Ш							
24. To what extent do you feel "burned out" by the demands of your job?												
·	not at all	•	•	completely	unsure							
	1	2 3 4 5 -	6 7 8	9 10								
			_	_								
25. Overall, how satisfied are <u>you</u> with	n the Alterna not at all	tive Response <sub>l</sub>	program in p	place in your cou completely	-							
		2 3 4 5 -	0 7 0	, ,	unsure							
	1	2 3 4 5 -	6 7 8	9 10	Ш							
26. Has Alternative Response in any	wav caused a	an increase or c	decrease in v	our:								
	large	small	no	small	large							
	increase	increase	change	decrease	.a.ge							
decrease												
a. caseload size												
b. <b>workload</b>	Ц	Ц	Ц	Ц	Ц							
c. paperwork	닏	H	H	H	Н							
d. <b>job-related stress</b>	Ш				Ш							
27. Has the introduction of AR made it	any more o	r loss likely that	t vou will ren	nain in this field	of							
work?	ally illole o	i less likely tilal	t you will reli	iam in tills neid	O1							
A little more likely												
☐ No effect												
A little less likely												
☐ Much less likely												
28. Is there anything that is preventing	a the Alterna	ative Response	from workin	g as well as voi	J							
think it could or should be working?												
	_											

29. Is there anything about the way AR approach is being implemented in your county that you consider exemplary or that involves something other counties should be aware of and

consider?