

The author(s) shown below used Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice and prepared the following final report:

**Document Title: National Evaluation of the Safe Kids/Safe Streets Program: Final Report
Volume IV: Survey of Agency Personnel**

Author(s): WESTAT

Document No.: 210273

Date Received: June 2005

Award Number: 97-MU-MU-0005

This report has not been published by the U.S. Department of Justice. To provide better customer service, NCJRS has made this Federally-funded grant final report available electronically in addition to traditional paper copies.

Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Contents

	<u>Page</u>
1. Introduction and Overview	1
Overview of the Safe Kids/Safe Streets Initiative.....	1
This Report.....	3
2. Methodology	5
3. Survey Respondents and Their Agencies.....	9
Respondent Information.....	9
Roles in the Child Protection System.....	12
Personal Role	12
Agency Role.....	15
4. Contact and Information Sharing.....	21
Individual Contact With Outside Agencies.....	21
Information Sharing Between Agencies	24
5. Status of the Community’s Child Protection System.....	29
6. Contributions of Safe Kids/Safe Streets to Changes in the Child Protection System	35
7. Summary and Conclusions.....	39
Appendix A. Survey of Agency Personnel	
Appendix B. Cover Letter	
Appendix C. Tables	

Contents

List of Tables

	<u>Page</u>
Table 2-1 Response Rate for Each Site by Respondent Category	7
Table 3-1 Type of Agency by Site.....	9
Table 3-2 Level of Supervisory Responsibility and Agency Type.....	10
Table 3-3 Length of Time with Agency or Organization by Agency Type.....	11
Table 3-4 Length of Time in Position and Agency Type	11
Table 3-5 Length of Time in Position and Site.....	12
Table 3-6 Professional Role in the Child Protection System by Agency Type	13
Table 3-7 Professional Role in the Child Protection System by Site	15
Table 3-8 Agency Role in the Child Protection System by Agency Type	16
Table 3-9 Agency Role in the Child Protection System by Site.....	18
Table 3-10 Level of Understanding About Agency Role and Responsibilities by Agency Type	19
Table 3-11 Level of Understanding About Agency Role and Responsibilities by Site.....	19
Table 4-1 Type of Interaction With Agencies To Conduct Specific Activities.....	22
Table 4-2 Increased Contact With Agencies by Agency Type.....	24
Table 4-3 Reason for Increased Contact With Other Agencies by Agency Type	25
Table 4-4 Ratings of Communication and Information Sharing With Different Agencies	26
Table 4-5 Reasons Communication or Information Sharing Have Improved	27
Table 5-1 Changes in the Community’s Child Protection System in the Last 2 Years	29
Table 5-2 Rating of Improvements for Different Activities and Procedures.....	30
Table 5-3 Most Important Improvements in the Procedures and Activities of the Child Protection System.....	32

List of Tables (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
Table 5-4	Areas Where the Child Protection Systems Still Need the Most Improvement by Agency Type.....33
Table 5-5	Overall Rating of Community’s Child Protection System by Site.....34
Table 6-1	Agencies’ Familiarity With Safe Kids/Safe Streets Program.....36
Table 6-2	Sites’ Familiarity With Safe Kids/Safe Streets Program.....37
Table 6-3	Improvements in Child Protection System Attributed to the Safe Kids/ Safe Streets Program37
Table C-1	Type of Interaction With Agencies To Conduct Specific Activities by Agency TypeC-1
Table C-2	Type of Interaction With Agencies To Conduct Specific Activities by Site.....C-1
Table C-3	Improved Communication and Information Sharing on Individual Cases Over the Last 2 Years by Agency TypeC-2
Table C-4	Improved Communication and Information Sharing on Individual Cases Over the Last 2 Years by Site.....C-2
Table C-5	Reasons Communication or Information Sharing Have Improved by SiteC-3
Table C-6	Improvements for Different Activities and Procedures by Agency TypeC-4
Table C-7	Improvements for Different Activities and Procedures by SiteC-5
Table C-8	Most Important Improvements in the Procedures and Activities of the Child Protection System by Site.....C-6
Table C-9	Areas Where the Child Protection System Still Needs the Most Improvement by SiteC-7

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

1. Introduction and Overview

Overview of the Safe Kids/Safe Streets Initiative

Many studies suggest that child abuse and neglect are risk factors for the development of juvenile delinquency and other problem behaviors.¹⁻⁷ The Safe Kids/Safe Streets (SK/SS) program is a Federal initiative designed to reduce delinquency through comprehensive, community-wide collaboratives to combat child abuse and neglect. As defined by the original request for proposal, a collaborative is defined as a program in which members “share responsibility, accountability, and resources...extend and institutionalize multidisciplinary practices across the systems that prevent, intervene in, or treat child abuse and neglect (or have the potential to do so).”

SK/SS is sponsored by the U.S. Department of Justice’s Office of Justice Programs (OJP). Three offices within OJP—the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), the Executive Office for Weed & Seed (EOWS), and the Office on Violence Against Women (OVW)—fund and supervise the participating sites, with OJJDP providing overall coordination.

Five sites were selected to implement the SK/SS program, which began in 1997. The sites are varied, ranging from mid-sized cities (Huntsville, Alabama; Kansas City, Missouri; and Toledo, Ohio) to rural (Burlington, Vermont) and Tribal (Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan) areas. Initial awards for the first 18 months ranged from \$425,000 for the rural and Tribal sites to \$800,000 for Huntsville and \$923,645 for Kansas City. Unlike the other sites,

¹ Kelley, B.T., Thornberry, T.P., & Smith, C.A. (1997). *In the wake of child maltreatment*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

² Lemmon, J.H. (1999, June). How child maltreatment affects dimensions of juvenile delinquency in a cohort of low-income urban youths. *Justice Quarterly*, 16(2), 357-76.

³ National Institute of Justice. (1995). *Childhood victimization and risk for alcohol and drug arrests*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.

⁴ National Institute of Justice. (1996). *The cycle of violence revisited*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.

⁵ Weeks, R., & Widom, C.S. (1998). *Early childhood victimization among incarcerated adult male felons*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.

⁶ Widom, C.S. (1995). *Victims of childhood sexual abuse—Later criminal consequences. Research in Brief*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.

⁷ Wiebush, R., Freitag, R., & Baird, C. (2001). *Preventing delinquency through improved child protection services*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.

Introduction and Overview

Toledo received only "seed money"—an award of \$125,000 intended to encourage promising activities already underway in the community.

Sites were eligible to receive the same amount each year for 4 more years. Actually, projects spent their awards at different rates, and all were still in operation as of June 2003. Kansas City and Sault Ste. Marie were still using their fourth awards, while the remaining sites had spent most of their fifth awards.

In return for SK/SS support, participating communities were expected to:

- Restructure and strengthen their criminal and juvenile justice systems to become more comprehensive and proactive in helping children, adolescents, and their families who have been involved in abuse and neglect or are at risk;
- Implement or strengthen coordinated management of abuse and neglect cases by improving policy and practice in the criminal justice, juvenile justice, child welfare, family services, and related systems; and
- Develop comprehensive, community-wide, cross-agency strategies to reduce child and adolescent abuse and neglect and resulting child fatalities.⁸

OJP required the sites to develop and obtain approval for an Implementation Plan that included four key elements or strategies:

- **System reform and accountability.** Sites were to reform policies, practices, and procedures across multiple systems and agencies to better identify and respond to child abuse and neglect and hold offenders accountable. Improvements in cross-agency training and communication were expected to be an important part of this strategy.
- **A continuum of services to protect children and support families.** Sites were to work to provide a full range of services and supports to children and families, ranging from prevention to treatment. In doing so, they were to explore ways to use existing services and resources more effectively, including public and private funding and informal support systems.
- **Data collection and evaluation.** Sites were to improve their information-sharing across systems and agencies and make data collection about child abuse and neglect cases more uniform, so as to facilitate decisionmaking in individual cases and case management. Sites also had to participate in the

⁸ Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. (1996, July). *Safe Kids/Safe Streets—Community approaches to reducing abuse and neglect and preventing delinquency*. FY 1996 discretionary competitive program announcements and application kit (p. 34). Washington, DC: Author.

Introduction and Overview

national evaluation and conduct a local evaluation of their efforts, to ensure that community-wide objectives and outcomes were being met.

- **Prevention education and public information.** Using multiple media, sites were to educate the community about child abuse and neglect and how to report it, community services for children and families, and good parenting practices.

These strategies embody a commitment to cross-agency, multisystem approaches. Therefore, broad-based local collaborations were central to planning and carrying them out. The SK/SS collaboratives were expected to include policymakers, decisionmakers, and frontline workers from the justice, child welfare, family service, educational, health and mental health systems, along with nontraditional partners such as religious and charitable organizations, community organizations, the media, and victims and their families.⁹ All sites began with some history of collaboration around child abuse and neglect, but SK/SS challenged them to raise collaboration to new levels—by including a broader range of partners and taking on a more ambitious, change-oriented agenda.

The grantee agencies and their staff provide leadership and support for the collaborations. Four of the five grantees are nonprofit organizations. The exception is Sault Ste. Marie, where a Tribal government agency of the Sault Sainte Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians takes the lead.

This Report

This report is one of several completed by Westat, the national evaluator of the SK/SS program, since the initiative began in 1997. It describes a survey designed to determine how supervisory and frontline staff in agencies view the child protection system, the different agencies involved in the system, and their role in the system. The survey also sought to determine whether changes initiated by the projects in concert with agency directors or administrators were affecting lower level staff in the different agencies. This survey was conducted late in 2002, approximately 5½ years after the initial SK/SS awards were made.

The current report forms Volume IV of Westat's final evaluation of the SK/SS effort. Besides the Survey of Agency Personnel (SAP), Westat has used a variety of methods to study the process and impact of SK/SS. Evaluation staff visited each site about twice a year to

⁹ *Ibid.*

Introduction and Overview

conduct process interviews with staff, key stakeholders, and others in the community and to observe project activities such as forums or meetings. Westat also regularly reviewed project documentation, budgets, and agency administrative data, such as statistics on reporting and investigation of child abuse and neglect. In 2000 and 2002, Westat conducted structured interviews with "key informants," targeting individuals who play key roles in the child protection system or are well placed to observe its operations. Finally, we conducted a survey of stakeholders three times during the project period (1998, 2001, and 2003). Together, these surveys were designed to determine how collaboration members, project staff, agency representatives, and frontline staff feel about SK/SS and find out what roles they have actually played in it. Evaluation findings through 2001 were covered in previous reports.¹⁰⁻¹⁴ More recent findings are described here and in Volumes I, II, and III of the final evaluation report.

¹⁰ Gragg, F., Cronin, R., Myers, T., Schultz, D., & Sedlak, A. (1999). *An examination of the Safe Kids/Safe Streets planning process: Year 1 final report for the national evaluation of the Safe Kids/Safe Streets program*. Rockville, MD: Westat.

¹¹ Gragg, F., Cronin, R., Schultz, D., & Myers, T. (2000). *From planning to implementation: A year 2 status report on the national evaluation of the Safe Kids/Safe Streets program*. Rockville, MD: Westat.

¹² Gragg, F., Cronin, R., Schultz, D., & Eisen, K. (2001). *Year 3 status report on the implementation of the Safe Kids/Safe Streets program*. Rockville, MD: Westat.

¹³ Gragg, F., Cronin, R., Schultz, D., & Eisen, K. (2002). *Year 4 status report on the implementation of the Safe Kids/Safe Streets program*. Rockville, MD: Westat.

¹⁴ Cronin, R., & Gragg, F. (2002). *Implementation of the Safe Kids/Safe Streets program: Report on the stakeholder survey, year 3*. Rockville, MD: Westat.

2. Methodology

The Survey of Agency Personnel was designed as a mail survey of frontline workers at agencies that handle or see cases of child maltreatment. The survey instrument consisted of 21 questions (see Appendix A for the final survey form). Two of the questions required open-ended responses, while the remainder required the respondent to check or circle the most appropriate response. Local evaluators and project directors at all sites were asked to review and comment on the draft instrument.

The survey included respondents from all SK/SS sites except Toledo. Toledo was excluded because the project received a significantly smaller grant than the other sites, which resulted in the project's pursuing different strategies relative to the other sites. The survey targeted frontline workers in six different types of agencies or organizations as listed below.

- Law enforcement agencies (patrol officers and detectives in specialized units);
- Child protective services agencies (supervisors and caseworkers);
- Court organizations, such as court-appointed special/juvenile advocates (CASA/CAJA) and guardians ad litem (GAL);
- Schools (principals and guidance counselors);
- Prosecuting/state attorney's offices (attorneys and victim witness staff or volunteers); and
- Support divisions (victim/witness specialists and volunteers).

Agencies were carefully selected to allow an examination of whether the different strategies implemented at the SK/SS sites affected comparable groups. As key members of the child protection system at all sites, child protective services (CPS), law enforcement, and prosecuting/district attorney's offices joined the collaborations early. In most sites, the projects brought GALs or CASAs into the collaboration during the planning stages or shortly thereafter. While OJP identified schools as key collaborative partners in the original solicitation, the sites found it difficult to engage school system administrators, principals, or teachers in the collaborative work. For this survey, we included school representatives because they are often seen as operating outside of the formal child protection system. From this vantage point, they offer an important perspective on both collaboration development and system change.

Methodology

Survey administration began in September of 2002 with an initial mailing of the survey together with a cover letter explaining its purpose (see Appendix B for the cover letter). The final survey was mailed to 585 individuals working in the targeted agencies or organizations. Surveys were customized to use the distinctive local name of each project in the questionnaire and cover letter. Each survey contained a unique tracking number that identified the respondent to enable targeted followup to nonrespondents. However, all data were treated as confidential, and no personal identifiers remained in the final dataset. Three followup mailings were sent. Nonrespondents were sent (1) a postcard reminding them about the survey, (2) a letter and second survey, and (3) a final letter and survey with a Federal Express return envelope. Additionally, because of concerns with low response in Kansas City, a second postcard reminder was sent, and the Kansas City project director sent a mailing asking agency personnel to complete the survey.

Table 2-1 shows the target sample size and number of completed surveys for each site by respondent category. In some sites, the number of potential respondents in a given category was large enough that a sample was drawn. Otherwise, all listed personnel in the category were targeted for data collection. Even though comparable agencies were selected across the four sites, the sample composition differed. For example, law enforcement officers made up approximately 20 percent of the targeted respondents in Burlington, Huntsville, and Sault Ste. Marie, but 49 percent in Kansas City. Conversely, school personnel accounted for between 40 and 53 percent of the respondents in Burlington, Huntsville, and Sault Ste. Marie versus 27 percent in Kansas City. These variations reflect differences in site strategies as well as the size of the community.

Overall, the response rate was 60 percent. Across the sites, the response rate ranged from 65 percent in Sault Ste. Marie to 57 percent in Burlington. Looking at different agency categories, prosecuting or state attorneys had the highest response rate (92%) followed by professional staff in court organizations like GAL/CASA (71%), schools (63%), child protective services agencies (59%), law enforcement (53%), and victim/witness organizations (18%).

Table 2-1. Response Rate for Each Site by Respondent Category

Respondent category	Burlington		Huntsville		Kansas City		Sault Ste. Marie		Total	
	Total mailed	Total completed	Total mailed	Total completed	Total mailed	Total completed	Total mailed	Total completed	Total mailed	Total completed
Child protective services agencies	37	17 46%	35*	24 69%	31	18 58%	8	7 88%	111	66 59%
Law enforcement agencies (LEA)	30*	12 40%	40*	17 43%	95*	59 62%	10	5 50%	175	93 53%
Schools	60*	40 67%	80*	54 68%	52	26 50%	26	18 69%	218	138 63%
GAL/CASA ^a	20	15 75%	33*	23 70%	6	4 67%	0	0	59	42 71%
Prosecuting/state attorney's offices	2	1 50%	2	2 100%	8	8 100%	1	1 100%	13	12 92%
Victim/witness staff/volunteers	1	0 0%	3	1 33%	3	0 0%	4	1 25%	11	2 18%
Total	150	85 57%	193	121 63%	193	115 60%	49	32 65%	585	353 60%

* This number represents a sample of respondents in the category.

a Involvement of CASA/CAJA volunteers or GAL attorneys differed by site. In Kansas City and Burlington, GALs responded to the survey. In Huntsville, the respondents in this category were CASA/CAJA volunteers.

Methodology

Survey forms were reviewed as they came in and entered in an electronic database for analysis. Codes were developed for all open-ended and other-specify response fields. Certain variables were derived to collapse categories within a variable or to combine responses across a set of variables. Database checks identified inconsistent or out-of-range values before the database was finalized.

All analyses were conducted using SAS. For each survey question, the analyses examined the responses by agency category and by site. The chi-square statistic (χ^2) was used to test whether the differences in the frequency distribution of responses across agency categories or across sites were larger than one would expect by chance. Tables indicate whether the chi-square statistics are significant at the .05 level.

3. Survey Respondents and Their Agencies

Respondent Information

This section provides information about the frontline workers who responded to the Survey of Agency Personnel, including their agency or organization, length of time at agency, length of time in position, level of supervisory responsibility, and their perceived role in the child protection system. As described in the preceding section, all analyses examined responses by agency and by site. When significant differences by agency or site emerged, the findings are discussed accordingly. Otherwise, only the overall totals across all respondents are described.

Table 3-1 shows the distribution of respondents by agency. Overall, school professionals composed 39 percent of all respondents, while personnel from law enforcement agencies made up 26 percent of the total. Nineteen percent of respondents were from CPS agencies; 12 percent were CASAs or GAL, and 4 percent were from some other agency or organization (including prosecuting attorneys and victim/witness advocates).

	Burlington (N=85)	Huntsville (N=121)	Kansas City (N=115)	Sault Ste. Marie (N=32)	Total (N=353)
Schools	47%	45%	23%	56%	39%
Law enforcement	14	14	51	16	26
Child protective services	20	20	16	22	19
GAL/CASA	18	19	3	----	12
Other agency/group	1	2	7	6	4
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

a $X^2 = 77.51, p < .001$.

As would be expected from the sample design, in all sites except Kansas City, the largest percentage of respondents were from schools (Table 3-1). Only 23 percent of Kansas City respondents were school personnel, compared to 47 percent of Burlington respondents, 45 percent of Huntsville respondents, and 56 percent of Sault Ste. Marie respondents. Personnel from law enforcement agencies (LEA) made up 51 percent of the Kansas City respondents, while the corresponding percentages for the other sites were much lower (14% for Burlington

Survey Respondents and Their Agencies

and Huntsville and 16% for Sault Ste. Marie). This pattern suggests that the interpretation of any site-based differences needs to consider the different mix of respondents in Kansas City.

The Survey of Agency Personnel targeted frontline workers in an attempt to understand how the project’s system reform and other efforts filtered down to those working more directly with children and families. Table 3-2 shows that this goal was achieved with 71 percent of respondents reporting no supervisory responsibilities. Across agency categories, it was more common for CPS workers (73%), law enforcement officers (81%), and GAL/CASAs (88%) to have no supervisory responsibilities than it was for those from schools (59%) or other agencies or organizations (57%).

	CPS (N=66)	LEA (N=93)	Schools (N=138)	GAL/ CASA (N=42)	Other Agency (N=14)	Total (N=353)
None	73%	81%	59%	88%	57%	71%
Supervise some people	24	18	36	5	29	25
No information	3	1	5	7	14	4
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

a $X^2 = 20.74, p < .001$ (X^2 analysis excludes no information).

The survey also asked how long the agency staff had worked in their respective agencies (Table 3-3). Overall, many respondents reported lengthy tenures in their agencies. While 17 percent of respondents had been with their agency for less than 3 years, and 23 percent had been there for 3 to 5 years, more than one-half (55%) had more than 5 years with their agency. Further examination shows notable differences, depending on the respondent’s agency. Almost all of the law enforcement officers (90%) and other agency/group staff (93%) had been with the agency more than 3 years, while fewer CPS workers (71%), school staff (78%), and GAL/CASAs (60%) had been with their agency or organization that long.

Table 3-4 shows how long agency staff had been in their current positions. The distribution looks similar to the length of time in the agency or organization, with 29 percent in their current position for 3 to 5 years and 32 percent in their current position for more than 5 years. Again, the analyses revealed differences depending on the type of agency or organization. One-half of the CPS workers had been in their position for less than 3 years. In contrast, the remaining frontline workers reported lengthier tenures. Just 31 percent of law

Survey Respondents and Their Agencies

Table 3-3. Length of Time with Agency or Organization by Agency Type^a

	CPS (N=66)	LEA (N=93)	Schools (N=138)	GAL/ CASA (N=42)	Other Agency (N=14)	Total (N=353)
Less than 3 year	26%	5%	18%	26%	7%	17%
3-5 years	26	25	17	31	29	23
More than 5 years	45	65	61	29	64	55
No information	3	5	4	14	----	5
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

a $X^2 = 26.41, p < .001$ (X^2 analysis excludes no information).

Table 3-4. Length of Time in Position and Agency Type^a

	CPS (N=66)	LEA (N=93)	Schools (N=138)	GAL/ CASA (N=42)	Other Agency (N=14)	Total (N=353)
Less than one year	14%	14%	8%	17%	14%	12%
1-2 years	36	17	18	14	14	21
3-5 years	32	35	25	24	29	29
More than 5 years	14	30	44	29	29	32
No information	5	3	5	17	14	6
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

a $X^2 = 28.56, p < .01$ (X^2 analysis excludes no information).

enforcement officers and GAL/CASAs, 26 percent of school staff, and 28 percent of agency staff in the other category had worked in their position for less than 3 years. At the same time, a large percentage of law enforcement officers (65%) and school staff (69%) reported being in their position for more than 3 years compared to those from any of the remaining agencies.

The length of time agency staff had been in their current positions also varied by site (Table 3-5). While more than one-half (56%) of Sault Ste. Marie respondents had been in their current position for more than 5 years, this was less common for respondents in the other sites. Just 22 percent of Burlington respondents, 39 percent of Huntsville respondents, and 26 percent of Kansas City respondents had been in their current position for more than 5 years. The predominance of school staff among the Sault Ste. Marie respondents helps explain this pattern. The preceding table showed that school teachers and guidance counselors were more likely to have spent long periods in their current position.

Survey Respondents and Their Agencies

Table 3-5. Length of Time in Position and Site^a

	Burlington (N=85)	Huntsville (N=121)	Kansas City (N=115)	Sault Ste. Marie (N=32)	Total (N=353)
Less than one year	12%	12%	15%	3%	12%
1-2 years	25	17	22	19	21
3-5 years	29	26	34	19	29
More than 5 years	22	39	26	56	32
No information	12	6	3	3	6
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

a $X^2 = 17.38, p < .05$ (X^2 analysis excludes no information).

Roles in the Child Protection System

Personal Role

To help understand any changes in responsibilities within the child protection system, agency staff were asked to describe both their own professional role within the system and that of their agency. A majority of respondents viewed reporting suspected cases of abuse or neglect (78%), reporting children at risk of abuse (65%), and providing information on resources available for victims (64%) as part of their professional role in the child protection system (Table 3-6). Nearly one-half of respondents said that investigating allegations of child abuse or neglect was part of their role, while one-third included monitoring compliance with a safety order and educating children on child abuse as their role in the child protection system. Fewer than one-third of the respondents considered the other responsibilities as part of their professional responsibility in the child protection system.

The table also shows that professional roles in the child protection system differed depending on the specific agency or organization. Overall, frontline workers perceive their role in the system as following the traditional responsibilities of their agency. Staff from law enforcement agencies and schools were more likely than anyone else to include reporting suspected cases of abuse or neglect (86% for law enforcement respondents and 97% for school respondents) and reporting children at risk of abuse or neglect (70% for law enforcement respondents and 78% for school respondents) as part of their professional role. This pattern reflects the degree to which police officers and teachers have direct contact with children before they enter the system. For the most part, the workers in any of the other agency groups (CPS,

Survey Respondents and Their Agencies

Table 3-6. Professional Role in the Child Protection System by Agency Type*

	CPS (N=66)	LEA (N=93)	Schools (N=138)	GAL/ CASA (N=42)	Other Agency (N=14)	Total (N=353)
Report suspected case of abuse/neglect ^a	64%	86%	97%	24%	57%	78%
Report children at risk of abuse ^b	62	70	78	24	36	65
Information on resources available ^c	85	48	77	26	64	64
Investigate allegations of child abuse ^d	67	83	12	55	50	47
Monitor compliance with safety order ^e	68	26	12	55	50	33
Educate children on child abuse ^f	36	6	63	----	7	33
Advocate for the victim ^g	48	3	26	64	64	30
Provide parenting education ^h	47	3	49	2	7	29
Make sure perpetrator held accountable ⁱ	35	47	4	19	86	26
Service to child/nonoffending parent ^j	67	9	26	5	7	26
Educate community on child abuse issues ^k	41	11	30	10	64	26
Prevention service to at-risk families ^l	67	10	23	----	14	25
Provide services/treatment to offenders ^m	56	1	6	----	7	13
Other role	15	----	1	5	14	4
No role in child protection system	2	5	----	7	----	3

* Percentages are not additive because respondents could select multiple roles.

a $X^2 = 125.5, p < .001$.

h $X^2 = 81.5, p < .001$.

b $X^2 = 48.13, p < .001$.

i $X^2 = 88.9, p < .001$.

c $X^2 = 52.97, p < .001$.

j $X^2 = 80.81, p < .001$.

d $X^2 = 139.96, p < .001$.

k $X^2 = 33.59, p < .001$.

e $X^2 = 80.66, p < .001$.

l $X^2 = 85.23, p < .001$.

f $X^2 = 107.26, p < .001$.

m $X^2 = 126.46, p < .001$.

g $X^2 = 77.1, p < .001$.

GAL/CASA, and other agencies or groups) encounter children already involved with the system, giving them less opportunity to report child maltreatment.

While most agency staff from CPS (67%), law enforcement (83%), and GAL/CASA offices (55%) viewed investigating child maltreatment allegations as part of their role, only 12 percent of school staff included this as part of their role. Not surprisingly, most CPS agency staff (68%) and GAL/CASA (55%) viewed monitoring compliance with a safety order as part of their role. In terms of holding perpetrators accountable for their actions, agency staff in the other agency/group category (86%) stood out, including this in their professional role much more often than others. This finding makes sense since many of the respondents in this category were prosecuting or district attorneys who are responsible for prosecuting the

Survey Respondents and Their Agencies

perpetrators of child maltreatment. This group was also more likely to include educating the community on child abuse issues (64%) and advocating for the victim (64%) as part of their role in the formal system. Again, this focus on education and advocacy reflects the makeup of this group that includes both victim services workers and attorneys.

The workers' perspectives on services and education related to child safety and protection follow from their traditional roles within the child protection system. Many more respondents from CPS agencies included providing services to children and nonoffending parents (67%), treatment to offenders (56%), and prevention for at-risk families (67%) as part of their professional role compared to respondents from the different agencies or organizations. Both CPS agency staff and school officials were more likely to view providing resource information (85% for CPS respondents and 77% for school respondents) and parenting education (47% for CPS respondents and 49% for school respondents) as part of their role in the system than any of the remaining respondents. While 63 percent of school respondents included educating children on child abuse as part of their role, about one-third or fewer of respondents in any of the remaining groups included such education efforts as part of their role.

Further analysis revealed some differences in professional roles for frontline workers from the different sites (Table 3-7). Respondents from Kansas City (90%) and Sault Ste. Marie (84%) were more likely to view reporting suspected child maltreatment as part of their professional role in the child protection system than respondents from Burlington (69%) or Huntsville (69%). The prevalence of law enforcement officers in Kansas City and school staff in Sault Ste. Marie help explain the reason workers at these two sites differ from the others in how they view their own responsibility for reporting child maltreatment. Law enforcement and school personnel serve as mandated reporters bringing cases into the system, while CPS workers, GAL/CASA, and staff in the other agency/group category work within the child protection system. Moreover, just 23 percent of Kansas City respondents described education as part of their role. This compares to 44 percent of Burlington respondents, 36 percent of Huntsville respondents, and 31 percent of Sault Ste. Marie respondents. In addition, more Kansas City respondents included investigating child maltreatment allegations (60%) and holding perpetrators accountable (37%) as part of their role in the system than did respondents from the other sites. Again, this pattern reflects the larger proportion of Kansas City respondents from law enforcement.

Survey Respondents and Their Agencies

Table 3-7. Professional Role in the Child Protection System by Site*

	Burlington (N=85)	Huntsville (N=121)	Kansas City (N=115)	Sault Ste. Marie (N=32)	Total (N=353)
Report suspected case of abuse/neglect ^a	69%	69%	90%	84%	78%
Report children at risk of abuse	64	59	70	75	65
Information on resources available	67	68	57	72	64
Investigate allegations of child abuse ^b	32	48	60	41	47
Monitor compliance with safety order	32	32	32	38	33
Educate children on child abuse ^c	44	36	23	31	33
Advocate for the victim ^d	46	28	22	28	30
Provide parenting education ^e	42	27	17	47	29
Make sure perpetrator held accountable ^f	18	21	37	28	26
Service to child/nonoffending parent	31	22	26	25	26
Educate community on child abuse issues	34	21	23	31	26
Prevention service to at-risk families ^g	33	18	22	38	25
Provide services/treatment to offenders	13	12	17	9	13
Other role	5	3	3	9	4
No role in child protection system	4	2	3	----	3

* Percentages are not additive because respondents could select multiple roles.

a $X^2 = 22.36, p < .001$.

e $X^2 = 20.08, p < .001$.

b $X^2 = 16.64, p < .001$.

f $X^2 = 12.78, p < .01$.

c $X^2 = 10.3, p < .05$.

g $X^2 = 9.39, p > .05$.

d $X^2 = 15.43, p < .01$.

Workers from the sites placed different emphasis on expanding prevention services and educating parents. At the individual level, Burlington and Sault Ste. Marie respondents more often included providing prevention services for at-risk families (33% for Burlington and 38% for Sault Ste. Marie) and parenting education (42% for Burlington and 47% for Sault Ste. Marie) in their professional roles than did respondents from the other sites. Finally, many more Burlington respondents (46%) viewed victim advocacy as part of their professional role in the child protection system than respondents from Huntsville (28%), Kansas City (22%), or Sault Ste. Marie (28%).

Agency Role

The survey also explored how frontline workers perceived the roles and responsibilities of their agency within the child protection system (Table 3-8). Overall, the agency roles parallel the individual roles with a majority of respondents, including reporting suspected child maltreatment (76%), reporting at-risk children (65%), providing information on

Survey Respondents and Their Agencies

Table 3-8. Agency Role in the Child Protection System by Agency Type*						
	CPS (N=66)	LEA (N=93)	Schools (N=138)	GAL/ CASA (N=42)	Other Agency (N=14)	Total (N=353)
Report suspected case of abuse/neglect ^a	65%	84%	94%	24%	57%	76%
Report children at risk of abuse ^b	64	72	77	21	36	65
Information on resources available ^c	91	45	75	29	64	64
Investigate allegations of child abuse ^d	94	91	12	48	57	54
Educate children on child abuse ^e	65	13	66	7	7	42
Monitor compliance with safety order ^f	91	32	17	50	50	40
Educate community on child abuse issues ^g	83	24	30	24	50	39
Make sure perpetrator held accountable ^h	55	54	4	19	93	32
Provide parenting education ⁱ	76	4	52	0	7	36
Prevention service to at-risk families ^j	83	9	35	2	14	32
Advocate for the victim ^k	61	9	21	67	64	32
Service to child/nonoffending parent ^l	86	12	25	10	14	31
Provide services/treatment to offenders ^m	76	3	12	----	14	20
Other role	5	----	----	2	----	1
No role in child protection system	2	3	1	----	----	1

* Percentages are not additive because respondents could select multiple roles.

a $X^2 = 127.11, p < .001$. h $X^2 = 133.26, p < .001$.
 b $X^2 = 60.98, p < .001$. i $X^2 = 116.91, p < .001$.
 c $X^2 = 71.87, p < .001$. j $X^2 = 124.12, p < .001$.
 d $X^2 = 213.85, p < .001$. k $X^2 = 83.18, p < .001$.
 e $X^2 = 110.66, p < .001$. l $X^2 = 125.46, p < .001$.
 f $X^2 = 108.95, p < .001$. m $X^2 = 158.86, p < .001$.
 g $X^2 = 73.96, p < .001$.

available resources (64%), and investigating allegations of child maltreatment (54%) as part of their agency’s role in the system.

The analyses also revealed different patterns in agency roles depending on the specific agency category. Many more respondents from law enforcement agencies (84%) and schools (94%) saw reporting suspected maltreatment and at-risk children as part of their agency’s role in the child protection system compared to other respondents. As would be expected, CPS agency staff and law enforcement officers were much more likely to describe their agency’s role as investigating allegations of child abuse and neglect (94% and 91%, respectively). Many more CPS agency staff include monitoring compliance with a safety order (91%), providing services to the child or nonoffending parent (86%), providing services to

Survey Respondents and Their Agencies

offenders (76%), providing prevention services for at-risk families (83%), providing information on available resources (91%), providing parenting education (76%), and educating the community on child abuse issues (83%) as part of their agency's role in the child protection system. For all of these specific roles, the corresponding percentages for other respondents were much lower. Almost all of the respondents in the other agency/group category (93%), mostly district or prosecuting attorneys, viewed their agency's role as ensuring that the perpetrator was held accountable, while just 55 percent of CPS agency staff, 54 percent of law enforcement staff, 4 percent of school staff, and 19 percent of the GAL/CASAs included this as part of their agency's role. CPS agency (65%) and school staff (66%) were much more likely than others to include educating children on child abuse issues as part of their agency's role in the system. Finally, staff from CPS agencies (61%), GAL/CASA offices (67%), and other agencies or groups (64%) more often included victim advocacy as part of their agency's role than did staff from law enforcement (9%) or schools (21%).

The analyses also revealed a number of site differences in agency roles in the child protection system (Table 3-9). Agency staff in Kansas City (86%) and Sault Ste. Marie (91%) more often said that reporting suspected child maltreatment was part of their agency's role in the child protection system than staff from Burlington (68%) or Huntsville (69%). In several other areas, agency personnel from Kansas City differed from those in the other sites. For example, many more agency professionals in Kansas City viewed investigating allegations of child maltreatment (72%) and making sure the perpetrator is held accountable (45%) as part of their agency's role in the child protection system. Compared to other sites, fewer agency personnel from Kansas City viewed certain activities as part of their agency's role in the child protection system, including providing information on available resources (52%), providing parenting education (23%), and educating children on child abuse (31%).

Agency staff from Burlington and Sault Ste. Marie indicated a greater agency role in prevention than those in other sites. Nearly one-half (47%) of Burlington staff and 41 percent of Sault Ste. Marie staff considered providing prevention services to at-risk families as part of their agency's role, compared to 28 percent for Huntsville and 23 percent for Kansas City. Finally, agency personnel in Burlington were much more likely to include victim advocacy as part of their agency's role in the child protection system than were frontline workers from any other site.

Survey Respondents and Their Agencies

Table 3-9. Agency Role in the Child Protection System by Site*

	Burlington (N=85)	Huntsville (N=121)	Kansas City (N=115)	Sault Ste. Marie (N=32)	Total (N=353)
Report suspected case of abuse/neglect ^a	68%	69%	86%	91%	76%
Report children at risk of abuse	65	60	67	75	65
Information on resources available ^b	69	69	52	75	64
Investigate allegations of child abuse ^c	36	53	72	41	54
Educate children on child abuse ^d	53	46	31	41	42
Monitor compliance with safety order	42	40	37	41	40
Educate community on child abuse issues	45	41	31	38	39
Provide parenting education ^e	47	39	23	44	36
Make sure perpetrator held accountable ^f	26	23	45	31	32
Prevention service to at-risk families ^g	47	28	23	41	32
Advocate for the victim ^h	51	29	23	28	32
Service to child/nonoffending parent	36	32	26	28	31
Provide services/treatment to offenders	28	20	16	19	20
Other role	4	----	1	----	1
No role in child protection system	2	1	2	----	1

* Percentages are not additive because respondents could select multiple roles.

a $X^2 = 25.41, p < .001$.

e $X^2 = 13.91, p < .01$.

b $X^2 = 9.31, p < .05$.

f $X^2 = 17.9, p < .001$.

c $X^2 = 33.74, p < .001$.

g $X^2 = 14.84, p < .01$.

d $X^2 = 9.72, p < .05$.

h $X^2 = 18.66, p < .001$.

Agency personnel were asked to rate on a 5-point scale how well people in other agencies understood the roles and responsibilities of their agency (Table 3-10). Nearly half (46%) reported that other agencies had a good understanding (rated 4 or 5 on the scale). An additional 43 percent reported that other agencies understood somewhat. There were notable differences depending on the respondent's agency. Agency personnel from the schools were more much likely to rate positively how well other agencies viewed the school's role. While nearly two-thirds of school staff said that other agencies understood a lot or had an excellent understanding, the corresponding percentages for law enforcement staff (42%), other staff from other agencies or groups (36%), CPS agency staff (32%), and GAL/CASAs (26%) were much lower.

Survey Respondents and Their Agencies

Table 3-10. Level of Understanding About Agency Role and Responsibilities by Agency Type^a

	CPS (N=66)	LEA (N=93)	Schools (N=138)	GAL/ CASA (N=42)	Other Agency (N=14)	Total (N=353)
Do not understand/understand very little ^b	15%	13%	3%	12%	7%	9%
Understand somewhat	52	42	33	60	57	43
Understand a lot/excellent understanding ^c	32	42	62	26	36	46
No information	2	3	2	2	----	2
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

a $X^2 = 32.32, p < .001$ (X^2 analysis excludes no information).

b Respondent ranked level of understanding on a 5-point scale where “1=Do not understand” and “5=Have an excellent understanding.” This category includes responses marked 1 or 2.

c This category includes responses marked 4 or 5.

The overall level of understanding of the roles of different agencies in the child protection system varied by site (Table 3-11). About one-half of the agency staff in Burlington (52%), Huntsville (49%), and Sault Ste. Marie (56%) felt that different agencies understood a lot about their agency’s role in the system. This compares to just over one-third (35%) of agency staff in Kansas City.

Table 3-11. Level of Understanding About Agency Role and Responsibilities by Site^a

	Burlington (N=85)	Huntsville (N=121)	Kansas City (N=115)	Sault Ste. Marie (N=32)	Total (N=353)
Do not understand/understand very little ^b	4%	7%	17%	3%	9%
Understand somewhat	42	45	43	38	43
Understand a lot/excellent understanding ^c	52	49	35	56	46
No information	2	----	4	3	2
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

a $X^2 = 18.89, p < .01$ (X^2 analysis excludes no information).

b Respondent ranked level of understanding on a 5-point scale where “1=Do not understand” and “5=Have an excellent understanding.” This category includes responses marked 1 or 2.

c This category includes responses marked 4 or 5.

Survey Respondents and Their Agencies

4. Contact and Information Sharing

As part of their system reform efforts, the SK/SS sites worked to improve contact and information sharing among agencies in the child protection system. While the sites each used different methods toward this end, they shared the basic goal of more frequent and effective contact among those involved with specific cases of child maltreatment. The Survey of Agency Personnel asked a series of questions to gauge the degree of contact and information sharing by staff in the targeted agencies.

Individual Contact With Outside Agencies

Respondents reported varied levels of involvement with agency staff outside their own agency depending on the specific kind of interaction (Table 4-1). Frontline workers interacted most often to refer victims (73%) and to share case-level information (69%). Over one-half of agency staff interacted with one or more agencies when working to develop a plan for the child and family (55%), attend meetings together (55%), conduct joint investigations (54%), and share information on agency programs (53%). Agency staff also interacted while attending training sessions (46%), receiving referrals from agencies (44%), and participating in multidisciplinary teams (43%). Contact between agencies was also facilitated by co-location of staff. One-quarter of respondents worked in the same location as staff from multiple different agencies.

The level of involvement with outside agencies varies depending on the specific agency (Table C-1 in Appendix C). For example, school personnel interacted much less for such activities as conducting joint investigations (27%), sharing case-level information (60%), and receiving referrals (23%), than did staff from child protective services, law enforcement, GAL/CASA organizations, and other agencies/groups. These findings reflect the degree to which school staff remain outside the formal child protection system. At the same time, law enforcement personnel were less likely to interact with agencies to develop a plan for the child and family (30%) or to participate in a multidisciplinary team (25%) when compared to staff from CPS, schools, GAL/CASA organizations, and other agencies/groups. Here, the police officers and detectives report less interaction for activities related to the ongoing monitoring of children and families involved with the child protection system.

Contact and Information Sharing

	No interaction with agencies	Interact with 1-3 agencies	Interact with 4 or more agencies	Total
Refer victims	27%	20%	53%	100%
Share case information	31	26	43	100
Develop plans	45	23	32	100
Attend meetings	45	14	42	100
Conduct joint investigations	46	34	19	100
Share agency information	47	12	41	100
Attend trainings	54	8	39	100
Receive referrals	56	6	39	100
Participate in MDT	57	12	32	100
Work in same location	75	5	20	100

a Respondents did not rate interactions with their own agencies.

The analyses also show how law enforcement officers and school staff interacted with their counterparts in different agencies less often for training and information sharing activities. Fewer staff from both schools (33%) and law enforcement agencies (40%) interacted with other agency personnel through training sessions than staff from CPS (68%), GAL/CASA organizations (62%), and other agencies/groups (71%). Further, fewer law enforcement officers (42%) and school staff (44%) reported attending meetings with agency personnel outside their own agency than did CPS workers (79%), GAL/CASA (71%), and workers from other agencies/groups (71%). Not surprisingly, GAL/CASA staff contacted agencies less often to refer victims (43%) than CPS staff (89%), law enforcement officers (76%), school staff (70%), and staff from other agencies/groups (79%). CPS staff (79%) and those from other agencies/groups (79%) reported more interactions with outside agencies to share information on agency programs that did frontline workers in the remaining types of agencies.

The level of involvement with outside agencies also varied by site (Table C-2 in Appendix C). Fewer agency staff in Kansas City (38%) worked with outside agencies to develop a plan for the child and family than those in Burlington (68%), Huntsville (60%), or Sault Ste. Marie (59%). Again, this likely reflects the large portion of law enforcement officers among the Kansas City respondents. The concentration of police officers' time at the front-end of the system means that they have less involvement with planning. Agency staff in Sault Ste. Marie reported more contact to share information on agency programs (78%), while more Burlington agency staff attended cross-agency training sessions (65%) more often than those from other sites. Respondents from the smaller jurisdictions (Burlington and Sault Ste. Marie)

Contact and Information Sharing

more often worked in the same location (36% and 34%, respectively). The corresponding percentages for Huntsville and Kansas City agency staff were 20 percent and 19 percent.

Apart from the level of involvement with different agencies, the project's system reform efforts also sought to change the frequency of contact between agencies. Overall, more than three-quarters of those responding (77%) had increased contact with at least one agency (Table 4-2).¹⁵ This includes 16 percent of agency staff who reported more frequent contact with one to three agencies, 32 percent who reported more frequent contact with four to six agencies and 25 percent who reported more frequent contact with seven to nine agencies. Staff from certain agencies reported greater degrees of contact with outside agencies. Eighty-four percent of CPS agency staff, 76 percent of GAL/CASA staff, and 72 percent of other agency/group staff had more frequent contact with at least four different agencies. This compares to 60 percent of law enforcement agency staff and just 36 percent of school staff. These results show how staff from agencies with ongoing involvement with children and families have increased their contacts with outside agencies more than those from agencies involved at the front-end of the child protection system.

Agency staff gave a variety of reasons for the increased contact with outside agencies (Table 4-3). Among those with increased contact, 49 percent said that improved knowledge of whom to contact contributed to the change. Other reasons for increased contact include closer relationships with staff (39%), new programs or services (23%), changes in policies and procedures by agencies (16%), and changes in policies and procedures in the respondent's own agency (11%). The reasons for more frequent contact varied somewhat for staff from different agencies. A majority of agency staff from CPS (51%), GAL/CASA organizations (51%), and other agencies/groups (73%) credited their increased contact to closer relationships with staff at those agencies. This compares to 35 percent for law enforcement staff and 25 percent for school staff. In contrast, staff from CPS (19%), law enforcement (14%), and other agencies/groups (27%), more often attributed increased contact to changes in policies at their own agency than did staff from schools (4%) or GAL/CASA organizations (3%).

¹⁵ Note that respondents were only allowed to indicate increased contact with agencies other than their own.

Contact and Information Sharing

Table 4-2. Increased Contact With Agencies by Agency Type^a

Number of agencies	CPS (N=66)	LEA (N=93)	Schools (N=138)	GAL/ CASA (N=42)	Other Agency (N=14)	Total (N=353)
0	11%	20%	34%	12%	21%	23%
1 to 3	3	15	28	7	7	16
4 to 6	14	46	26	50	29	32
7 to 9	70	14	10	26	43	25
No information	3	4	2	5	0	3
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

a $X^2 = 123.2, p < .001$ (X^2 analysis excludes no information).

Information Sharing Between Agencies

Respondents were asked to rate changes in communication and information sharing with specific agencies on individual cases of child abuse and neglect over the past 2 years. Only a minority of agency staff felt that communication and information sharing with any agency had actually improved in the last 2 years (Table 4-4). Twenty-nine percent of the professionals surveyed said that communication with CPS had improved, while 25 percent noted improvements with law enforcement. Less than one-fifth of agency staff reported improvements in communications and information sharing with the family or juvenile court (19%), domestic violence programs (18%), treatment providers (18%), elementary or secondary schools (17%), and the prosecuting or district attorney's office (14%). Improvements in communication with daycare centers or preschools (10%), the GALs (9%), or CASAs (7%) were even less common.

Further analysis revealed that the ratings of improvements in information sharing with specific agencies differed depending on the type of respondent (Table C-3 in Appendix C).

- **Improved information sharing with CPS.** The GAL/CASAs (43%) and staff from other agencies/groups (71%) noted more improvements in communication with CPS than law enforcement (26%) or school (23%) staff.
- **Improved information sharing with law enforcement.** More CPS workers (32%), school staff (23%), and other agency/group staff (71%) found improvements in information sharing with law enforcement. In contrast, only 2 percent of the GAL/CASAs thought communication with law enforcement had improved.

Contact and Information Sharing

Table 4-3. Reason for Increased Contact With Other Agencies by Agency Type*

	CPS (N=66)	LEA (N=93)	Schools (N=138)	GAL/ CASA (N=42)	Other Agency (N=14)	Total (N=353)
Improved knowledge of whom to contact	47%	49%	47%	46%	82%	49%
Closer relationship with staff ^a	51	35	25	51	73	39
Own agency changed policies ^b	19	14	4	3	27	11
Other agencies changed policies	10	16	15	24	27	16
New programs and services	37	19	18	22	18	23
Other reason for increased contact	25	27	36	27	36	30

* Percentages are not additive because respondents could select multiple reasons.

a $X^2 = 17.3, p > .05$.

b $X^2 = 13.37, p < .01$.

- **Improved information sharing with Family or Juvenile Court.** More CPS (32%) and other agency/group (36%) workers thought communication with the Family or Juvenile Court had improved compared to law enforcement (15%), school (12%), and GAL/CASAs (24%).
- **Improved information sharing with prosecuting or district attorney’s office.** Many more CPS (24%) and law enforcement (25%) workers felt that communication with the prosecuting or district attorney’s office had improved than did school staff (4%) or GAL/CASAs (7%).
- **Improved information sharing with domestic violence programs.** While none of the GAL/CASAs rated their communication with domestic violence programs as improved, 30 percent of CPS workers, 19 percent of law enforcement officers, 15 percent of school professionals, and 38 percent of the other agency/group workers felt that information sharing with domestic violence programs had improved.
- **Improved information sharing with CASAs.** Seventeen percent of CPS workers and 14 percent of workers from other agencies/groups noted improvements in information sharing with CASAs. In contrast, fewer than 5 percent of law enforcement officers and school professionals rated their communication with CASAs as improved.
- **Improved information sharing with GALs.** Nearly one-quarter (24%) of CPS workers and 14 percent of workers from other agencies/groups felt that information sharing with GALs had improved. Fewer than 5 percent of law enforcement officers and school professionals rated their communication with GALs as improved.

Contact and Information Sharing

Table 4-4. Ratings of Communication and Information Sharing With Different Agencies

	Improved	Not improved	Missing	Total
Child protective services	29%	61%	10%	100%
Police/sheriff	25	53	22	100
Family/juvenile court	19	56	26	100
Prosecutor's/district attorney's office	14	48	38	100
Daycare centers/preschools	10	47	44	100
Elementary or secondary schools	17	48	35	100
Domestic violence programs	18	45	37	100
CASA	7	44	49	100
GAL	9	46	45	100
Treatment providers	18	51	31	100

- Improved information sharing with treatment providers.** CPS workers (33%), school staff (15%), GAL/CASAs (14%), and other agency/group staff (64%) all noted some improvement in information sharing with treatment providers. Not surprisingly, relatively few law enforcement officers (6%) rated communication with treatment providers as improved.

A few differences also emerged when examining the ratings of improvements in information sharing by site (Table C-4 in Appendix C). Many more Sault Ste. Marie workers (41%) rated communication with the Family or Juvenile Court as improved compared to workers from Burlington (19%), Huntsville (16%), and Kansas City (16%). For domestic violence programs, only 10 percent of Kansas City agency personnel rated their own communication and information sharing with domestic violence programs as improved. This compares to 26 percent for Burlington, 19 percent for Huntsville, and 23 percent for Sault Ste. Marie.

The survey also asked about the reasons for improved communication and information sharing (Table 4-5). More than one-half of agency staff (58%) said that an awareness of whom to talk to in agencies resulted in improved communication and information sharing. While 38 percent found that changes in the policies and procedures of other agencies resulted in improvements, 30 percent said that policy or procedural changes in their own agency led to better communication and information sharing. Around one-fifth of agency staff attributed improvements in communication and information sharing to changes in personnel (21%) and improvements in data systems (18%).

Contact and Information Sharing

	CPS (N=66)	LEA (N=93)	Schools (N=138)	GAL/ CASA (N=42)	Other Agency (N=14)	Total (N=353)
Know whom to talk to in other agencies ^a	67%	52%	65%	33%	64%	58%
Changes in other agencies related to information sharing	44	36	35	47	29	38
Changes in own agency related to information sharing ^b	52	32	21	20	21	30
Changes in personnel	15	16	28	30	7	21
Improvements in data system ^{c/}	17	27	19	----	21	18
Other reasons	10	2	9	13	14	9
Not improved/not applicable ^{d/}	27	53	42	29	----	39
* Percentages are not additive because respondents could select multiple reasons.						
a $X^2 = 10.84, p < .05.$			c $X^2 = 10.04, p < .05.$			
b $X^2 = 15.16, p < .01.$			d $X^2 = 22.86, p < .001.$			

The reasons for improved communication and information sharing differed depending on the respondent's agency (Table 4-5). More CPS workers (52%) credited improved communication to changes in their own agencies than did law enforcement officers (32%), school staff (21%), GAL/CASAs (20%), and other agency/group workers (21%). None of the GAL/CASAs listed improvements in data systems as a reason for improved communication with agencies. In contrast, around one-fifth of the workers from each of the remaining types of agencies listed such data system improvements as a reason for better information sharing with agencies. Similarly, less than one-third of the GALs/CASAs listed knowing whom to talk to as an important reason for improved communication with agencies, while a majority of agency staff from each of the other types of agencies considered this as a reason for improved information sharing.

In a few instances, the reasons for improved communication and information sharing also varied by site (Table C-5 in Appendix C). Only 22 percent of Burlington respondents listed changes in the policies or procedures of agencies as a reason for improved communication between their agency and other agencies. In the other sites, 40 percent or more of the respondents credited such agency-level changes for the improved communication.

Contact and Information Sharing

Likewise, very few Kansas City respondents (5%) viewed changes in personnel as an important reason for improved communication. This compares to 28 percent for Burlington, 23 percent for Huntsville, and 39 percent for Sault Ste. Marie.

5. Status of the Community’s Child Protection System

The SK/SS sites focused on the community child protection system and the agencies that operate within it. Many times the activities and efforts started with high-level agency staff working with their counterparts in other agencies to devise solutions to systemic problems. One important aspect of the overall project is the degree to which these solutions filtered down to the agency staff working directly with children and families. The Survey of Agency Personnel first asked agency staff for a general assessment of changes in the community’s child protection system (Table 5-1). Overall, only 27 percent of respondents said that the child protection system had improved in the last 2 years. More than two-thirds (67%) felt that things had stayed the same or some things had changed, while other had gotten worse. Only 4 percent of responding agency personnel felt that things had gotten worse in the child protection system. When those respondents who had short tenures in their agencies are excluded from the analysis, the results look the same.

	Total (N=353)
Things have improved	27%
Some things have improved, others gotten worse	30
Things have stayed the same	33
Things have gotten worse	4
No information	6
Total	100%

To get a finer-grained perspective on how agency staff viewed recent changes in the child protection system, the survey also asked about improvements in specific activities or procedures (Table 5-2). The areas with the most improvement relate to how professionals recognize and respond to child maltreatment. Overall, agency staff viewed knowledge of child abuse resources as the area of greatest improvement (39%). More than one-quarter of agency staff felt that cross-agency coordination (31%), recognition by professionals of child abuse and its causes and effects (31%), and appropriate reporting of child abuse and neglect (29%) had improved. Agency staff also noted other areas of improvement, including identification of at-risk families (24%), referrals for services (24%), staff training and resources (24%), case assessments (21%), and resources and services for nonoffending parents (20%). Less than one-

Status of the Community's Child Protection System

Table 5-2. Rating of Improvements for Different Activities and Procedures

	Improved	Stayed the Same	Worsened	DK/Missing	Total
Knowledge of child abuse resources	39%	34%	1%	26%	100%
Cross-agency coordination	31	27	10	32	100
Recognition by professionals of abuse and its causes/effects	31	38	3	28	100
Appropriate reporting of child abuse/neglect	29	43	3	25	100
Identification of at-risk families	24	39	4	33	100
Referrals for services	24	32	6	37	100
Staff training and resources	24	38	7	31	100
Case assessment	21	34	7	38	100
Services for victims/nonoffending parent	20	31	10	39	100
Co-investigation of cases	19	30	5	47	100
Timely provision of services	18	36	15	31	100
Joint decisionmaking across agencies	16	28	9	47	100
Length of time to process a case	14	33	14	40	100
Educating children about child abuse	14	37	2	47	100
Parenting education	13	38	6	43	100
Charging/sanctioning perpetrators	10	31	7	52	100
Services for perpetrators	7	28	6	59	100
Staff workloads	6	16	45	33	100
Other activities	----	----	1	99	100

fifth of respondents rated co-investigation of cases (19%), timely provision of services (18%), joint decisionmaking across agencies (16%), length of time to process a case (14%), educating children about child abuse (14%), and parenting education (13%) as having improved in the last 2 years. Respondents reported other areas even less often, including the charging or sanctioning of perpetrators (10%), services for perpetrators (7%), and staff workloads (6%).

The improvements in the activities and procedures of the community child protection system differed depending on the particular agency (Table C-6 in Appendix C). For the most part, agency staff more familiar with a particular activity or procedure noted that as an

Status of the Community's Child Protection System

area of improvement. While CPS workers (27%), GAL/CASAs (26%), and other agency/group workers (21%) all found improvement with the length of time to process a case, law enforcement officers (4%) and school staff (9%) did not. CPS workers (35%) and GAL/CASAs (26%) also rated the timeliness of services as improved more often than law enforcement officers (8%), school staff (14%), or workers from other agencies/groups (14%). More CPS workers (17%) and GAL/CASAs (12%) noted improvements in staff workloads compared to law enforcement officers (3%), school staff (2%), and other agency/group workers (0%).

The sites varied in how agency staff viewed the major areas of improvement within the child protection system (Table C-7 in Appendix C). Overall, the agency staff in Huntsville found more improvement than workers in other sites. More Huntsville agency staff saw improvements in case assessments (29%), timeliness (26%), and availability of services (31%) than those from Burlington, Kansas City, and Sault Ste. Marie. Overall, relatively few frontline workers acknowledged improvement in staff workloads at their agency. More Sault Ste. Marie workers (28%) saw improvement in joint decisionmaking across agencies than those in the other sites. Finally, while few Burlington (12%) and Kansas City (7%) workers felt that the community had made improvements in educating children about child abuse, many more workers in Huntsville (20%) and Sault Ste. Marie (22%) recognized improvements in this area.

Given the wide range of activities and procedures within the child protection system, the survey also asked staff to identify the two most important areas of improvement (Table 5-3). Fourteen percent of these workers considered cross-agency coordination as the area with the most improvement. Agency staff also listed appropriate reporting child abuse or neglect (13%) and knowledge of child abuse resources (11%) as areas of big improvement. All of the other activities and procedures were listed as the most important improvement by fewer than 10 percent of respondents.

Further analyses explored site differences in the most important improvements to the community child protection system (Table C-8 in Appendix C). Huntsville workers (14%) rated the timely provision of services as the most improved area more often than those from Burlington (4%), Kansas City (3%), and Sault Ste. Marie (0%). While few Kansas City workers (8%) found cross-agency coordination as the area of greatest improvement, more workers in Burlington (19%), Huntsville (12%), and Sault Ste. Marie (28%) rated this as the most improved area. Workers at the different sites also viewed improvements to services for victims and nonoffending parents differently. While 9 percent of Huntsville workers thought

Status of the Community's Child Protection System

this area had improved the most, just 5 percent of Kansas City workers, 3 percent of Sault Ste. Marie workers, and none of the Burlington workers ranked this as the most improved area.

Table 5-3. Most Important Improvements in the Procedures and Activities of the Child Protection System*

	CPS (N=66)	LEA (N=93)	Schools (N=138)	GAL/ CASA (N=42)	Other Agency (N=14)	Total (N=353)
Cross-agency coordination	17%	11%	12%	24%	14%	14%
Appropriate reporting of child abuse/neglect	14	13	15	5	7	13
Knowledge of child abuse resources	14	9	13	7	0	11
Identification of at-risk families ^a	14	4	14	0	0	9
Recognition by professionals of abuse and its causes/effects	8	8	10	7	0	8
Co-investigation of cases	9	10	2	10	7	7
Timely provision of services	14	2	6	10	0	7
Referrals for services	9	3	7	2	7	6
Joint decisionmaking across agencies	6	2	4	5	14	5
Length of time to process a case	9	0	3	17	14	5
Services for victims/nonoffending parent	6	9	4	0	0	5
Staff training and resources	5	5	4	7	7	5
Case assessment	14	4	0	5	0	4
Educating children about child abuse	3	3	7	0	0	4
Charging/sanctioning perpetrators	5	5	1	2	14	3
Parenting education	0	0	7	2	0	3
Staff workloads	5	0	1	5	0	2
Services for perpetrators	0	1	1	2	7	1
Other activities ^b	6	37	28	26	0	25

* Percentages are not additive because respondents could select multiple categories.

a $X^2 = 13.52, p < .01$.

b $X^2 = 24.83, p < .001$.

In an effort to understand where the community child protection system still needed help, agency staff identified the specific procedures and activities most in need of improvement (Table 5-4). Nearly one-third said that staff workloads (32%) needed the most improvement. Other areas in need of improvement included the length of time to process a case (13%), timely provision of services (13%), and cross-agency coordination (10%). For the remaining procedures, 10 percent or less of agency staff considered them to need improvement.

Status of the Community's Child Protection System

Table 5-4. Areas Where the Child Protection Systems Still Need the Most Improvement by Agency Type*

	CPS (N=66)	LEA (N=93)	Schools (N=138)	GAL/ CASA (N=42)	Other Agency (N=14)	Total (N=353)
Staff workloads ^a	48%	25%	29%	36%	21%	32%
Length of time to process a case	11	11	13	19	14	13
Timely provision of services ^b	9	4	21	17	7	13
Cross-agency coordination ^c	0	9	15	12	21	10
Staff training and resources ^d	12	18	3	10	----	9
Charging/sanctioning perpetrators	6	12	4	7	0	7
Services for victims/nonoffending parent	9	2	9	7	7	7
Identification of at-risk families	3	0	8	10	7	5
Case assessment	5	4	4	10	----	5
Recognition by professionals of abuse	6	4	2	7	14	5
Parenting education	6	2	7	2	0	5
Joint decisionmaking across agencies	5	0	7	5	7	4
Services for perpetrators	11	3	2	0	----	4
Reporting of child abuse/neglect	3	5	----	5	7	3
Knowledge of child abuse resources	3	4	2	----	----	3
Co-investigation of cases	2	1	1	0	0	1
Referrals for services	2	0	1	2	----	1
Educating children about child abuse	5	0	1	----	----	1
No improvements needed	0	8	2	----	----	3

* Percentages are not additive because respondents could select multiple categories.

a $X^2 = 12.06, p < .05$.

c $X^2 = 13.26, p > .01$.

b $X^2 = 15.53, p < .01$.

d $X^2 = 17.57, p > .01$.

Table 5-4 also shows how the need for improvement in specific activities and procedures differed depending on the agency. None of the CPS workers thought that cross-agency coordination needed the most improvement. Yet, many more workers from law enforcement (9%), schools (15%), GAL/CASA (12%), and other agencies/groups (21%) listed this as an area needing the most improvement. School staff (21%) and GAL/CASAs (17%) more often considered the timely provision of services as the area needing the most improvement than did CPS workers (9%), law enforcement officers (4%), and workers from other agencies/groups (7%). While very few school and other agency/group workers considered staff training and resources as the area needing the most improvement, CPS workers (12%), law enforcement officers (18%), and GAL/CASAs (10%) felt this area needed the most improvement. Nearly one-half (48%) of CPS workers listed staff workloads as the area of the community child protection system most in need of improvement. This compares to 36 percent

Status of the Community's Child Protection System

of GAL/CASAs, 25 percent of law enforcement officers, 29 percent of school staff, and 21 percent of other agency/group staff.

There were also differences by site in the parts of the child protection system that needed the most improvement (Table C-9 in Appendix C). While workers in Burlington (16%), Huntsville (18%), and Sault Ste. Marie (19%) considered the timely provision of services as the area most in need of improvement, only 4 percent of Kansas City workers felt that way. Many more frontline workers in Burlington (47%) thought that staff workloads needed the most improvement compared to workers in Huntsville (27%), Kansas City (28%), and Sault Ste. Marie (25%). While fewer than 5 percent of workers in Burlington, Huntsville, and Kansas City identified parenting education as needing improvement, 16 percent of the Sault Ste. Marie listed this as the part of the community child protection system most in need of improvement.

Overall, agency workers gave the child protection system in their community somewhat mixed ratings (Table 5-5). While one-fifth of the workers said that the system needed improvement, another 20 percent rated the child protection system as good or excellent. The majority (52%) said that the system performed adequately, but still needed work. The overall assessment of the child protection system also differed by site. Just 9 percent of Kansas City workers rated the system as good or excellent. In contrast, 27 percent of Burlington workers, 21 percent of Huntsville workers, and 34 percent of Sault Ste. Marie workers said that their community child protection system was in good shape.

	Burlington (N=85)	Huntsville (N=121)	Kansas City (N=115)	Sault Ste. Marie (N=32)	Total (N=353)
Needs improvement ^b	25%	15%	27%	3%	20%
Doing OK, but needs some work	41	60	52	56	52
Doing good or excellent ^c	27	21	9	34	20
No information	7	4	12	6	8
Total (N=353)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

a $X^2 = 25.93, p < .001$ (X^2 analysis excludes no information).
b Respondent rated the child protection system on a 5-point scale where "1=Needs much improvement" and "5=Excellent." This category includes responses marked 1 or 2.
c This category includes responses marked 4 or 5.

6. Contributions of Safe Kids/Safe Streets to Changes in the Child Protection System

The Survey of Agency Personnel was designed to understand how frontline workers at agencies and organizations involved with child maltreatment cases viewed the child protection system. At each of the SK/SS sites, the projects worked on changing the system through a variety of different programs and activities. The frontline workers varied in the degree to which they knew of the projects and the projects' roles in specific efforts to improve the system (Table 6-1). Overall, nearly one-fifth (19%) of the workers surveyed had not heard of the SK/SS project. Other workers had heard of the project, but were not familiar with any specific programs or activities (39%) or had read about the project (34%). Some workers were more directly involved with the SK/SS projects. Around one-quarter of the workers had used materials (29%), attended training (27%), received funding (24%), and/or attended meetings related to the project (21%).

The degree of familiarity with the SK/SS projects varied for workers from the different agencies (Table 6-1). CPS and other agency/group workers were the most likely to have actually heard of the SK/SS program. Just 6 percent of CPS workers had never heard of SK/SS, compared to 31 percent of law enforcement officers, 17 percent of school staff, and 26 percent of the GAL/CASAs. All of the workers in the other agency/group category (consisting mostly of prosecuting attorneys and victim services workers) had heard of the SK/SS project. A similar pattern emerges when looking at those who had heard of the project but were not familiar with the specific programs or activities. About one-half of law enforcement officers, school staff, and GAL/CASAs were not familiar with SK/SS efforts but had heard of the project. This compares to 16 percent of CPS workers and 14 percent of workers from other agencies/groups. At the same time, law enforcement officers were less likely to have read about the SK/SS project, when compared to CPS workers (37%), school staff (41%), GAL/CASAs (29%), and other agency/group staff (43%). CPS workers and GAL/CASAs reported more direct contact with the SK/SS projects. Many more CPS workers and other agency/organization staff had attended SK/SS meetings (35% and 43%, respectively), received funding from SK/SS (45% and 64%, respectively), attended training conducted by SK/SS (56% and 64%, respectively), and used materials from SK/SS (53% and 50%, respectively) compared to the remaining types of workers.

Contributions of Safe Kids/Safe Streets to Changes in the Child Protection System

Table 6-1. Agencies' Familiarity With Safe Kids/Safe Streets Program*

	CPS (N=66)	LEA (N=93)	Schools (N=138)	GAL/ CASA (N=42)	Other Agency (N=14)	Total (N=353)
Have not heard of SK/SS program ^a	6%	31%	17%	26%	----	19%
Not familiar with efforts but have heard of ^b	16	52	45	52	14%	39
Read about things they have done ^c	37	17	41	29	43	34
Attended meetings ^d	35	13	18	10	43	21
Served on a SK/SS program committee	10	11	6	6	21	9
Received funding from SK/SS program ^e	45	27	9	10	64	24
Attended training conducted by SK/SS program ^f	56	20	14	13	64	27
Used materials from SK/SS program ^g	53	17	23	16	50	29
Other	3	2	2	----	7	2
* Percentages are not additive because respondents could select multiple categories.						
a $X^2 = 21.14, p < .001.$						
b $X^2 = 27.24, p < .001.$						
c $X^2 = 11.98, p < .05.$						
d $X^2 = 44.83, p < .001.$						
e $X^2 = 49.75, p < .001.$						
f $X^2 = 28.66, p < .001.$						
g $X^2 = 28.66, p < .001.$						

The survey findings also show the varying degrees of familiarity with SK/SS for frontline workers at the different sites (Table 6-2). While all of the Sault Ste. Marie respondents had heard of SK/SS, conversely, 24 percent of Burlington respondents, 13 percent of Huntsville respondents, and 28 percent of Kansas City respondents had not heard of SK/SS. At some sites, frontline workers were more likely to have direct contact with the projects through meetings or committees. In Burlington and Sault Ste. Marie, around one-third of the workers had attended SK/SS meetings (31% and 41%, respectively) compared to less than one-fifth of workers in the other sites. Similarly, more of the workers in Burlington (15%) and Sault Ste. Marie (16%) had served on a SK/SS committee than those in Huntsville (4%) or Kansas City (7%). Finally, Kansas City stood out from the other sites in how many frontline workers had received SK/SS funding. A substantial minority (40%) of the frontline workers in Kansas City reported receiving funds from SK/SS when compared to those in Burlington (14%), Huntsville (17%), and Sault Ste. Marie (24%).

Contributions of Safe Kids/Safe Streets to Changes in the Child Protection System

Table 6-2. Sites' Familiarity With Safe Kids/Safe Streets Program*					
	Burlington (N=85)	Huntsville (N=121)	Kansas City (N=115)	Sault Ste. Marie (N=32)	Total (N=353)
Have not heard of SK/SS program ^a	24%	13%	28%	----	19%
Not familiar with efforts but have heard of	42	41	37	34%	39
Read about things they have done	32	40	27	34	34
Attended meetings ^b	31	12	17	41	21
Served on a SK/SS program committee ^c	15	4	7	16	9
Received funding from SK/SS program ^d	14	17	40	22	24
Attended training conducted by SK/SS program	25	25	29	34	27
Used materials from SK/SS program	20	30	33	31	29
Other	2	3	2	----	2
* Percentages are not additive because respondents could select multiple categories.					
a $X^2 = 17.06, p < .001.$		c $X^2 = 8.55, p < .05.$			
b $X^2 = 15.62, p < .01.$		d $X^2 = 18.27, p < .001.$			

The final question on the Survey of Agency Personnel asked all respondents whether the SK/SS project had improved the child protection system in their community. Overall, just over one-third (34%) of the frontline workers surveyed believed that the SK/SS project could be credited with improving the child protection system (Table 6-3). Only 3 percent of the workers said that SK/SS definitely did not improve the system, while the remaining 63 percent could not characterize the project's role because they were not familiar enough with the program to do so. This finding holds when looking across the different types of workers and the different project sites.

Table 6-3. Improvements in Child Protection System Attributed to the Safe Kids/Safe Streets Program	
	Total
Yes	34%
No	3
Don't know/not ascertained	63
Total (N=285)	100%

Contributions of Safe Kids/Safe Streets to Changes in the Child Protection System

7. Summary and Conclusions

The Survey of Agency Personnel sought to understand how frontline workers viewed individual-, agency-, and community-level changes to the child protection system. This survey was not designed to assess the impact of any specific effort by the SK/SS projects, but rather to gain an understanding of any improvements to the system from the perspective of frontline workers. To that end, the survey targeted individuals in child protective services, law enforcement, schools, GAL/CASA, and other agencies/groups like prosecutors and victim services workers. The survey achieved an overall response rate of 60 percent. School personnel such as principals and guidance counselors made up 39 percent of the respondents, followed by workers from law enforcement (26%), child protective services (19%), GAL/CASA organizations (12%), and other agencies/groups (4%). Further, school personnel were the most common group in all sites except Kansas City, where just over one-half of the respondents were law enforcement officers. The prevalence of school staff provides an interesting perspective on changes to the system since schools are generally considered outside the formal child protection system. With less than one-third of the respondents claiming any supervisory responsibility, the survey successfully reached the frontline workers originally targeted. Most of the frontline workers reported lengthy tenures in their respective agencies, and nearly two-thirds had been in their current position for more than 3 years. This stability was particularly evident among law enforcement officers and workers from other agencies/groups (such as prosecutors and victim services workers).

A series of questions explored how frontline workers viewed their professional role and their agency's role in the child protection system. Overall, most frontline workers viewed reporting child maltreatment as part of their responsibility. The reporting role was most common for workers from law enforcement and schools—the agencies generally considered to be the primary sources of reports of child maltreatment. The roles related to investigating child maltreatment were considerably less common. However, as expected, CPS workers and law enforcement officers more often included investigation as part of their professional role in the child protection system. While relatively few frontline workers considered service-related responsibilities as part of their role, two-thirds of CPS workers included providing services as part of their professional role. In addition, both CPS workers and school staff considered prevention education and public information as part of their work more often than the other frontline workers.

Summary and Conclusions

In terms of agency roles in the child protection system, the survey respondents generally described their agency's role as similar to their individual roles. Many frontline workers identified reporting child maltreatment as part of their agency's responsibility. With a high proportion of law enforcement officers in Kansas City and school staff in Sault Ste. Marie, it is not surprising that the frontline workers in these sites stood out from the others in the degree to which they viewed reporting as part of their agency's role. Further, more of the Kansas City workers viewed investigating child maltreatment and holding perpetrators accountable as their agency's responsibility when compared to workers from other sites. In all sites but Kansas City, workers identified providing information on available resources, providing parenting education, and educating children as important agency-level responsibilities. More workers in Burlington and Sault Ste. Marie listed prevention activities as part of their agency's role, likely reflecting the large proportion of school personnel in these sites. Overall, frontline workers believed that staff in different agencies understood their own agency's role in the child protection system. In particular, school personnel felt that agency staff grasped the role of school personnel as reporters of child maltreatment. Looking across the different sites, fewer frontline workers in Kansas City felt that others understood their agency's role in the child protection system.

The frontline workers provided valuable information on individual-level involvement in the activities and procedures related to handling child maltreatment cases. Agency staff interacted with one another most often to refer victims and share case information. Not surprisingly, staff from the various agencies worked in different ways within the child protection system. School staff were less likely to conduct joint investigations, share case information, and receive referrals than the staff from the other types of agencies or organizations. Together with law enforcement officers, school personnel also attended training and meetings less often than the other frontline workers. Law enforcement officers were less likely to be involved with activities like developing a plan for the child and family and participating in multidisciplinary teams.

The survey also revealed the degree of contact between agency staff at the SK/SS sites. Overall, more than three-quarters of the frontline workers reported more frequent contact with staff from at least one agency; one-quarter reported more frequent contact with seven to nine agencies. Those from agencies with ongoing involvement with children and families, like CPS, GAL/CASA organizations, and other agencies/groups, had a greater degree of increased contact than those from agencies involved at the front-end of the child protection system (such

Summary and Conclusions

as law enforcement and schools). The reasons for increased contact reflect a change in the relationships among workers at the different agencies. Frontline workers cited improved knowledge of whom to contact and closer relationships with agency staff as the primary reasons for the more frequent contact with agency staff.

At the agency-level, the frontline workers provided their perspective on changes in communication and information sharing on individual cases of child abuse and neglect between their agency and other agencies. Overall, the frontline workers saw little improvement in information sharing on specific cases. Despite more frequent contact with agency staff, less than one-third of the frontline workers believed that communication and information sharing on specific cases had changed with any specific agency in the preceding 2 years. Nonetheless, certain groups of workers noted changes in communication with some of the agencies. For example, GAL/CASAs found more improvement in their communication with CPS than those from any of the other agencies. CPS workers were more likely to find improvement in information sharing with the Family or Juvenile Court and with GALs/CASAs. The reasons for improvements in communication and information sharing on individual cases included an awareness of whom to talk to in agencies and changes in the policies and procedures in both other agencies and their own agencies regarding sharing case information.

Looking at changes from a community perspective, more than one-quarter of the frontline workers felt that the overall child protection system in their community had improved over the preceding 2 years. Many agency staff noted improvements in the areas related to recognition and appropriate reporting of child maltreatment. This includes the community's knowledge of child abuse and neglect resources, cross-agency coordination, professional recognition of child abuse and its causes and effects, and appropriate reporting of child abuse and neglect. When compared to staff from the different agencies, CPS workers more often acknowledged improvements in activities related to case processing and services, including case assessments, case processing, and timeliness of services. Looking at the different sites, the frontline workers in Huntsville were more likely to find improvements in different aspects of the system than staff in the other sites. The survey also asked respondents to identify which areas needed the most improvement. Nearly one-third of the frontline workers felt that staff workloads needed the most improvement. Two other areas frequently cited as needing improvement were the length of time to process a case and the timeliness of providing services.

Summary and Conclusions

Overall, agency staff gave mixed ratings to their community's child protection system. While 20 percent said that the system was excellent or good, another 20 percent indicated that the system still needed much improvement. This same pattern held for staff from the different agencies. In terms of the different sites, the frontline workers in Burlington and Kansas City more often rated their community's child protection system as needing a lot of improvement. The other sites expressed more satisfaction with the system in their community. A separate question asked agency staff whether the SK/SS programs could be credited with improving the child protection system. More than one-third of all the frontline workers felt that SK/SS had improved the system in their community. Many of the rest of them could not respond to this question because they had not heard of SK/SS or had heard of the project but did not know anything about the specific efforts.

In summary, the findings from this survey reveal some individual, agency, and community level changes in the child protection system at the different SK/SS sites. Frontline workers from different agencies interact with one another to bring children into the system and to intervene once they enter the system. Agency staff also believed that the frequency of their contact with professionals had actually increased over the preceding 2 years. SK/SS efforts included attempts to increase contact among these staff by providing training on roles and responsibilities of different agencies, as well as conducting cross-agency training to introduce workers across agencies. Frontline workers saw some improvement in communication and information sharing on individual cases of child abuse and neglect, mostly in terms of interactions with CPS and law enforcement. Increased information sharing was another goal of the SK/SS projects at each of these sites. At the community level, many frontline workers thought that the child protection system had improved, particularly in areas related to the recognition and appropriate reporting of child abuse and neglect. Yet, the overall ratings of the child protection system revealed that the same percentage of agency staff thought the system needed improvement as thought the system was performing very well. Agency staff familiar with SK/SS credited the project with improving the child protection system in their community.

APPENDIX A

Survey of Agency Personnel

Survey of Agency Personnel

1. Please indicate the type of agency or program you currently work for. (Check one.)

- a. Child Protective Services (DFS)
- b. Law Enforcement (Police/Sheriff)
- c. Prosecutor/DA's Office/State's Attorney
- d. Family or Juvenile Court
- e. Court-Appointed Special Advocate (CASA)
- f. Guardian ad Litem (GAL)
- g. Victim/Witness Services
- h. Elementary or Secondary Education
- i. Other (specify _____)

2. When were you first hired by this agency/organization? _____/_____
(Mo) (Yr)

3. When were you first assigned to your current position? _____/_____
(Mo) (Yr)

4. Do you have supervisory responsibilities?

- Yes _____ Number of persons supervised No

5. How would you describe **your own professional role** in the child protection system? (Check all that apply.)

- a. I do not have a role in the child protection system [**SKIP to Question 6.**]
- b. Report suspected cases of abuse or neglect
- c. Report children at risk of abuse or neglect
- d. Investigate allegations of child abuse and neglect
- e. Monitor compliance with the safety/protection order
- f. Make sure perpetrators are held accountable
- g. Provide services/treatment to the child/non-offending parent
- h. Provide services/treatment to offenders
- i. Provide prevention services to at risk families
- j. Provide information on resources available
- k. Provide parenting education
- l. Educate children on child abuse issues
- m. Educate the community or professionals on child abuse issues
- n. Advocate for the victim/non-offending parent
- o. Other (specify _____)

Appendix A. Survey of Agency Personnel

6. How would you describe **the role of your agency** in the child protective system? (Check all that apply.)

- a. My agency is not part of the child protection system [**SKIP to Question 7.**]
- b. Report suspected cases of abuse or neglect
- c. Report children at risk of abuse or neglect
- d. Investigate allegations of child abuse and neglect
- e. Monitor compliance with the safety/protection order
- f. Make sure perpetrators are held accountable
- g. Provide services/treatment to the child/non-offending parent
- h. Provide services/treatment to offenders
- i. Provide prevention services to at risk families
- j. Provide information on resources available
- k. Provide parenting education
- l. Educate children on child abuse issues
- m. Educate the community or professionals on child abuse issues
- n. Advocate for the victim/non-offending parent
- o. Other (specify _____)

7. How well do you think people in other agencies understand the roles and responsibilities your agency has in the child protection system? (Circle appropriate response.)

Have an excellent <u>understanding</u>		Understand <u>somewhat</u>		Do not <u>understand</u>
5	4	3	2	1

Appendix A. Survey of Agency Personnel

8. In what ways do you work with the following agencies on child protection issues? Please read each type of activity and circle all agency numbers with which you **personally** work in this way. (Do not circle the number for your own agency.)

	Child Protective Services (DFS)	Police/Sheriff	Family/Juvenile Court	Prosecutor	Schools	Domestic Violence	CASA	Guardian ad Litem	Treatment Providers	Does Not Apply
a. Conduct joint investigations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	88
b. Work together to develop a plan for the child and family	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	88
c. Share case-level information	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	88
d. Participate in MDT (multidisciplinary team)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	88
e. Share information on agency programs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	88
f. Attend meetings together	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	88
g. Work in the same location	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	88
h. Attend training sessions together	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	88
i. Refer victims or perpetrators to them	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	88
j. Receive referrals from them	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	88
k. Other (specify _____)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	88

9. In the past 2 years, have you had more frequent contact with any of these agencies? (Check all that apply.)

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> a. I have not had more frequent contact with these agencies [Skip to Question 11.] | <input type="checkbox"/> f. Schools |
| <input type="checkbox"/> b. Child Protective Services (DFS) | <input type="checkbox"/> g. Domestic Violence |
| <input type="checkbox"/> c. Police/Sheriff | <input type="checkbox"/> h. Court-Appointed Special Advocate |
| <input type="checkbox"/> d. Family or Juvenile Court | <input type="checkbox"/> i. Guardian ad Litem |
| <input type="checkbox"/> e. Prosecutor | <input type="checkbox"/> j. Treatment Providers |

10. Why do you have more frequent contact with the agencies you indicated in Question 9? (Check all that apply.)

- a. Improved knowledge of whom to contact
- b. Have developed a closer relationship with current staff
- c. My agency has changed its policies and procedures about working with other agencies
- d. Other agencies have changed their policies and procedures about working with us
- e. New programs and services are in place
- f. Other (specify _____)

Appendix A. Survey of Agency Personnel

11. Have you seen changes in the community's child protection system in the last 2 years? (Check one.)

- a. Yes, things have improved
 b. Yes, things have gotten worse
 c. Yes, some things have improved while others have gotten worse
 d. No, things have stayed the same

12. Please circle whether the following procedures and activities within the community's child protection system have improved, stayed the same, or gotten worse in the last 2 years. (Circle only one response for each procedure/activity.)

	<u>Improved</u>	<u>Stayed the same</u>	<u>Worsened</u>	<u>Don't know</u>
a. Appropriate reporting of child abuse and neglect	1	2	3	8
b. Identification of at risk families	1	2	3	8
c. Case assessment	1	2	3	8
d. Cross-agency coordination	1	2	3	8
e. Co-investigation of cases	1	2	3	8
f. Joint decisionmaking across agencies	1	2	3	8
g. Charging/sanctioning perpetrators	1	2	3	8
h. Length of time to process a case	1	2	3	8
i. Timely provision of services	1	2	3	8
j. Resources and services for victims and non-offending parents	1	2	3	8
k. Services for perpetrators	1	2	3	8
l. Referrals for services	1	2	3	8
m. Knowledge of child abuse resources among professionals	1	2	3	8
n. Recognition by professionals of child abuse and its causes and effects	1	2	3	8
o. Staff training and resources	1	2	3	8
p. Staff workloads	1	2	3	8
q. Parenting education	1	2	3	8
r. Education for children about child abuse	1	2	3	8
s. Other (specify _____)	1	2	3	8

13. If you indicated any improvements in Question 12, please list the 2 that you consider the most important. (You may just use the letters from Question 12.)

- I didn't see any improvements

Appendix A. Survey of Agency Personnel

14. From Question 12, please list the 2 areas where the child protective system still needs the most improvement. (You may just use the letters from Question 12.)

No improvements needed

15. Overall, how would you rate your community's child protection system? (Circle the appropriate response.)

<u>Excellent</u>		Doing ok, needs some <u>work</u>		<u>Needs much improvement</u>	Don't know the system well enough <u>to rate</u>
5	4	3	2	1	8

16. Has communication and information sharing **on individual cases of child abuse and neglect** changed between your agency and other agencies in the last 2 years? (Circle one response for each agency.)

	<u>Improved</u>	<u>Stayed the same</u>	<u>Worsened</u>	<u>Don't work with agency</u>	<u>This is my agency</u>
a. Child Protective Services (DFS)	1	2	3	4	5
b. Police/Sheriff	1	2	3	4	5
c. Family/Juvenile Court	1	2	3	4	5
d. Prosecutor's/DA's Office	1	2	3	4	5
e. Daycare Centers/Preschools	1	2	3	4	5
f. Elementary or Secondary Schools	1	2	3	4	5
g. Domestic Violence Programs	1	2	3	4	5
h. Court-Appointed Special Advocate	1	2	3	4	5
i. Guardian Ad Litem	1	2	3	4	5
j. Treatment Providers	1	2	3	4	5
k. Other (specify _____)	1	2	3	4	5

17. Where communication and information sharing has improved, why do you think it has improved? (Check all that apply.)

- a. Changes within my agency in policies or procedures regarding sharing case information
- b. Changes in other agencies in policies or procedures regarding sharing case information
- c. Improvements in data systems
- d. Am aware of whom to talk to in other agencies
- e. Changes in personnel
- f. Other (specify _____)
- g. Not applicable/It has not improved

Appendix A. Survey of Agency Personnel

18. Please describe your familiarity with KIDSAFE. (Check all that apply.)

- a. Have not heard of KIDSAFE [**Skip to Question 21.**]
- b. Am not familiar with their efforts, but I have heard of the program
- c. Read about things they have done in the community
- d. Attended meeting(s)
- e. Served on a KIDSAFE committee or task force
- f. My agency has received funds from KIDSAFE
- g. Attended training(s) conducted by KIDSAFE
- h. Used materials provided by KIDSAFE
- i. Other (specify _____)

19. Do you feel that KIDSAFE has helped improve the child protection system in your community?

- Yes No Don't know

20. If yes, what is the most important way that KIDSAFE has improved the system?

21. We would welcome any other comments you have about your experiences with KIDSAFE or the child protection system in Jackson County. Also, please feel free to expand on any of your answers to questions above.

Thanks for your help!

Please send the questionnaire in the attached enveloped. If you have misplaced the envelope, forward the questionnaire to

Westat
1650 Research Blvd, RW2642
Rockville, MD 20850
Attention: Ann Kline

APPENDIX B

Cover Letter



1650 Research Boulevard • Rockville, Maryland 20850-3195
tel. 301-251-1500 • fax 301-294-2040 • www.westat.com

October 1, 2002

[Name/address of agency personnel]

Dear [Name]

We are writing to ask your help in our ongoing evaluation of the Safe Kids/Safe Streets Program in <City> and four other communities. <Lead agency> was awarded a cooperative agreement for this program, funded through the <OJP Funding office> in the U.S. Department of Justice. As the national evaluators of that program, we are very interested in how your agency operates and the responsibilities your agency has in the child protection system. You do not need to have been involved with the Safe Kids/Safe Streets Program in order to answer these questions.

Our questionnaire is designed to help Westat and the Department of Justice understand how the child protection system operates in your community. As you will see, we ask a number of questions about this system and the agencies that are involved. All communities are different and you should answer the questions based on your experience in your community. While your participation is voluntary, your answers are important to ensure the comprehensiveness and validity of the survey. Your answers will be kept confidential and only aggregated survey responses will be presented in reports and tabulations. No information that can be identified with an individual respondent will be released in any form.

We recognize the time demands required for your job, but ask that you take just 15 minutes and complete this questionnaire. Do not be concerned if others who work with you have received the same survey. We are interested in your personal views. Please return the survey in the envelope that has been provided.

Please do not write your name or any other identifying information on the form. The identification number on the form is for tracking purposes only, so that we can accurately report response rates. The only identifying information we will include in the analyses is the program site. The data will be used to examine and compare community activities across five sites where the Safe Kids/Safe Streets initiative has been implemented. We will also share the aggregated results with the Safe Kids/Safe Streets Project staff in <City>.

If you have any questions you may contact <local project director> at <phone number> or me at (301) 738-3610. We will be happy to address any questions you might have.

Thank you for your help in this effort.

Sincerely,

Frances Gragg
Project Director
National Evaluation of Safe Kids/Safe Streets

Enclosure

APPENDIX C

Tables

Appendix C. Tables

Table C-1. Type of Interaction With Agencies To Conduct Specific Activities by Agency Type¹

	CPS (N=66)	LEA (N=93)	Schools (N=138)	GAL/ CASA (N=42)	Other Agency (N=14)	Total (N=353)
Refer victims ²	89%	76%	70%	43%	79%	73%
Share case information ³	83	63	60	79	86	69
Develop plans ⁴	86	30	49	86	36	55
Attend meetings ⁵	79	42	44	79	71	55
Conduct joint investigations ⁶	73	77	27	60	50	54
Share agency information ⁷	79	42	45	57	79	53
Attend trainings ⁸	68	40	33	62	71	46
Receive referrals ⁹	79	47	23	43	71	44
Participate in MDT ¹⁰	65	25	40	50	79	43
Work in same location	26	34	16	30	29	25

¹ Respondents did not rate interactions with their own agencies.
² $\chi^2=83.48$, $p<.001$.
³ $\chi^2=73.33$, $p<.001$.
⁴ $\chi^2=126.8$, $p<.001$.
⁵ $\chi^2=83.76$, $p<.001$.
⁶ $\chi^2=81.51$, $p<.001$.
⁷ $\chi^2=67.29$, $p<.001$.
⁸ $\chi^2=44.11$, $p<.001$.
⁹ $\chi^2=82.12$, $p<.001$.
¹⁰ $\chi^2=70.77$, $p<.001$.

Table C-2. Type of Interaction With Agencies To Conduct Specific Activities by Site¹

	Burlington (N=85)	Huntsville (N=121)	Kansas City (N=115)	Sault Ste. Marie (N=32)	Total (N=353)
Refer victims	68%	62%	75%	78%	73%
Share case information	78	69	63	66	69
Develop plans ²	68	60	38	59	55
Attend meetings	65	54	45	72	55
Conduct joint investigations	42	59	60	44	54
Share agency information ³	59	53	43	78	53
Attend trainings ⁴	65	41	37	50	46
Receive referrals	54	36	46	40	44
Participate in MDT	55	42	34	50	43
Work in same location ⁵	36	20	19	34	25

¹ Respondents did not rate interactions with their own agencies.
² $\chi^2=21.93$, $p<.01$.
³ $\chi^2=17.99$, $p<.01$.
⁴ $\chi^2=18.47$, $p<.01$.
⁵ $\chi^2=17.74$, $p<.01$.

Appendix C. Tables

Table C-3. Improved Communication and Information Sharing on Individual Cases Over the Last 2 Years by Agency Type

	CPS (N=66)	LEA (N=93)	Schools (N=138)	GAL/ CASA (N=42)	Other Agency (N=14)	Total (N=353)
CPS ¹	NA	26%	23%	43%	71%	29%
Police/sheriff ²	32%	NA	23	2	71	25
Family/Juvenile Court ³	32	15	12	24	36	19
Prosecutor/DA's office ⁴	24	25	4	7	NA	14
Daycare centers/ preschools	17	4	13	0	7	10
Elementary/secondary schools	29	11	NA	10	21	17
Domestic violence programs ⁵	30	19	15	0	38	18
CASA ⁶	17	5	4	NA	14	7
GAL ⁷	24	2	5	NA	14	9
Treatment providers ⁸	33	6	15	14	64	18

¹ $\chi^2=20.29$, $p<.001$.

² $\chi^2=26.65$, $p<.001$.

³ $\chi^2=10.65$, $p<.05$.

⁴ $\chi^2=12.43$, $p<.05$.

⁵ $\chi^2=13.28$, $p<.01$.

⁶ $\chi^2=8.96$, $p<.05$.

⁷ $\chi^2=12.57$, $p<.01$.

⁸ $\chi^2=31.27$, $p<.001$.

Table C-4. Improved Communication and Information Sharing on Individual Cases Over the Last 2 Years by Site

	Burlington (N=85)	Huntsville (H=121)	Kansas City (N=115)	Sault Ste. Marie (N=32)	Total (N=353)
CPS	28%	33%	27%	28%	29%
Police/sheriff	29	19	23	37	25
Family/Juvenile Court ¹	19	16	16	41	19
Prosecutor/DA's office	13	13	12	26	14
Daycare centers/preschools	7	12	6	19	10
Elementary/secondary schools	16	24	10	29	17
Domestic violence programs ²	26	19	10	23	18
CASA	4	8	7	13	7
GAL	11	11	5	9	9
Treatment providers	26	20	10	22	18

¹ $\chi^2=8.68$, $p<.05$.

² $\chi^2=11.03$, $p<.05$.

Appendix C. Tables

	Burlington (N=85)	Huntsville (N=121)	Kansas City (N=115)	Sault Ste. Marie (N=32)	Total (N=353)
Know whom to talk to in other agencies ^a	62%	54%	54%	74%	58%
Changes in other agencies related to information sharing	22	42	44	52	38
Changes in agency related to information sharing ^b	22	27	35	48	30
Changes in personnel	28	23	5	39	21
Improvements in data system ^c	12	17	23	22	18
Other reasons	9	10	9	4	9
Not improved/not applicable ^d	32	36	50	28	39
¹ Percentages are not additive because respondents could select multiple reasons. ² $\chi^2=10.19$, $p<.05$. ³ $\chi^2=13.38$, $p<.05$.					

Appendix C. Tables

	CPS (N=66)	LEA (N=93)	Schools (N=138)	GAL/ CASA (N=42)	Other Agency (N=14)	Total (N=353)
Knowledge of child abuse resources	41%	31%	44%	29%	50%	39%
Cross-agency coordination	48	25	26	31	43	31
Recognition by professionals of abuse	39	25	33	29	36	31
Reporting of child abuse/neglect	38	32	29	10	29	29
Identification of at-risk families	42	17	24	7	29	24
Referrals for services	39	23	22	14	21	24
Staff training and resources	36	14	24	26	29	24
Case assessment	41	22	10	21	29	21
Services for victims/nonoffending parent	29	18	14	19	36	20
Co-investigation of cases	32	24	8	24	21	19
Timely provision of services ²	35	8	14	26	14	18
Joint decisionmaking across agencies	27	14	10	19	29	16
Length of time to process a case ³	27	4	9	26	21	14
Educating children about child abuse	14	6	23	2	7	14
Parenting education	17	4	18	12	0	13
Charging/sanctioning perpetrators	12	14	4	5	36	10
Services for perpetrators	9	9	2	13	21	7
Staff workloads ⁴	17	3	2	12	0	6
¹ For analyses, the three classifications improved, stayed the same, worsened were dichotomized to reflect improvements versus not improved (stayed the same plus worsened). ² $\chi^2=12.64$, $p<.05$. ³ $\chi^2=17.27$, $p<.01$. ⁴ $\chi^2=12.60$, $p<.05$.						

Appendix C. Tables

Table C-7. Improvements for Different Activities and Procedures by Site¹					
	Burlington (N=85)	Huntsville (N=121)	Kansas City (N=115)	Sault Ste. Marie (N=32)	Total (N=353)
Knowledge of child abuse resources	42%	40%	36%	34%	39%
Cross-agency coordination	35	35	20	47	31
Recognition by professionals of abuse	34	31	28	41	31
Reporting of child abuse/neglect	25	33	29	28	29
Identification of at-risk families	29	24	18	28	24
Referrals for services	22	29	21	25	24
Staff training and resources	28	26	19	25	24
Case assessment ²	20	29	14	19	21
Services for victims/nonoffending parent ³	14	31	12	19	20
Co-investigation of cases	18	22	15	25	19
Timely provision of services ⁴	18	26	9	16	18
Joint decisionmaking across agencies ⁵	20	18	8	28	16
Length of time to process a case	12	20	9	13	14
Educating children about child abuse ⁶	12	20	7	22	14
Parenting education	15	15	8	16	13
Charging/sanctioning perpetrators	8	5	13	19	10
Services for perpetrators	6	8	5	13	7
Staff workloads ⁷	0	13	3	9	6
<p>¹ For analyses, the three classifications improved, stayed the same, worsened were dichotomized to reflect improvements versus not improved (stayed the same plus worsened).</p> <p>² $\chi^2=8.85, p<.05$.</p> <p>³ $\chi^2=12.96, p<.05$.</p> <p>⁴ $\chi^2=10.60, p<.05$.</p> <p>⁵ $\chi^2=10.40, p<.05$.</p> <p>⁶ $\chi^2=8.20, p<.05$.</p> <p>⁷ $\chi^2=22.22, p<.001$.</p>					

Appendix C. Tables

	Burlington (N=85)	Huntsville (N=121)	Kansas City (N=115)	Sault Ste. Marie (N=32)	Total (N=353)
Cross-agency coordination ²	19%	12%	8%	28%	14%
Reporting of child abuse/neglect	13	11	16	9	13
Knowledge of child abuse resources	11	10	12	9	11
Identification of at-risk families	11	10	7	9	9
Recognition by professionals of abuse	11	4	10	9	8
Co-investigation of cases	4	11	3	9	7
Timely provision of services ³	4	14	3	0	7
Referrals for services	6	5	7	3	6
Joint decisionmaking across agencies	5	4	3	9	5
Length of time to process a case	7	7	3	0	5
Services for victims/nonoffending parent ⁴	0	9	5	3	5
Staff training and resources	4	5	5	9	5
Case assessment	5	8	1	0	4
Educating children about child abuse	4	3	3	9	4
Charging/sanctioning perpetrators	1	1	7	6	3
Parenting education	6	2	3	0	3
Staff workloads	0	5	1	0	2
Services for perpetrators	2	1	1	0	1

¹ Percentages are not additive because respondents could select multiple categories.
² $\chi^2=10.92$, $p<.05$.
³ $\chi^2=17.63$, $p<.001$.
⁴ $\chi^2=8.81$, $p<.05$.

Appendix C. Tables

Table C-9. Areas Where the Child Protection System Still Needs the Most Improvement by Site¹

	Burlington (N=85)	Huntsville (N=121)	Kansas City (N=115)	Sault Ste. Marie (N=32)	Total (N=353)
Staff workloads ²	47%	27%	28%	25%	32%
Length of time to process a case	13	17	8	16	13
Timely provision of services ³	16	18	4	19	13
Cross-agency coordination	16	10	9	3	10
Staff training and resources	5	12	11	3	9
Charging/sanctioning perpetrators	4	8	9	3	7
Services for victims/nonoffending parent	9	4	7	9	7
Identification of at-risk families	2	5	7	6	5
Case assessment	5	7	4	0	5
Recognition by professionals of abuse	6	6	1	9	5
Parenting education ⁴	4	3	4	16	5
Joint decisionmaking across agencies	6	7	2	0	4
Services for perpetrators	2	3	6	0	4
Reporting of child abuse/neglect	1	2	6	0	3
Knowledge of child abuse resources	1	3	3	3	3
Co-investigation of cases	0	2	1	0	1
Referrals for services	2	1	0	0	1
Educating children about child abuse	0	2	1	6	1
No improvements needed	0	1	6	6	3

¹ Percentages are not additive because respondents could select multiple categories.
² $\chi^2=11.74$, $p<.01$.
³ $\chi^2=12.05$, $p<.01$.
⁴ $\chi^2=9.12$, $p<.05$.