



National Survey of Child
and Adolescent Well-Being

NSCAW II WAVE 2 REPORT

Children and Families Receiving Child Welfare Services Post-Baseline

OPRE Report #2013-08
August 2012

NSCAW II WAVE 2 REPORT: CHILDREN AND FAMILIES RECEIVING CHILD WELFARE SERVICES POST-BASELINE

FINAL REPORT

OPRE Report #2013-08

August 2012

Melissa Dolan, Cecilia Casanueva, Keith Smith, and Heather Ringeisen, RTI International.

Submitted to:

Mary Bruce Webb, Project Officer
Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation
Administration for Children and Families
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

Contract Number: HHS P2320062930YC

Project Director: Kathryn Dowd
RTI International
3040 East Cornwallis Road
Post Office Box 12194
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709-2194

This report is in the public domain. Permission to reproduce is not necessary. Suggested citation: Dolan, M., Smith, K., Casanueva, C., & Ringeisen, H. (2012). *NSCAW II Wave 2 Report: Child and Caregiver Need and Receipt of Child Welfare Services Post-Baseline*. OPRE Report #2013-08, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Disclaimer

The views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, the Administration for Children and Families, or the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

This report and other reports sponsored by the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation are available at <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/index.html>.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION TO NSCAW II, WAVE 2.....	1
SUMMARY OF REPORT FINDINGS.....	2
GUIDE TO THE NSCAW II, WAVE 2 REPORT SERIES	3
CHILD CHARACTERISTICS AT WAVE 2	4
SERVICES CASEWORKERS.....	4
CASEWORKER REPORTS OF SERVICE NEED, REFERRAL, AND RECEIPT.....	5
CHILD SERVICE NEEDS IDENTIFIED BY CASEWORKER REPORT AND CHILD ASSESSMENTS.....	8
CONTACT AND SATISFACTION WITH CASEWORKERS AND THE CHILD WELFARE SYSTEM.....	9
CASEWORKER REPORT OF PERMANENCY FOR CHILDREN IN OUT-OF-HOME CARE.....	10
EXHIBITS	11
REFERENCES	26
APPENDIX.....	27

LIST OF EXHIBITS

Number	Page
1. Child Characteristics at Wave 2.....	11
2. Caseworker Characteristics at Wave 2	12
3. Caseload and Employment Characteristics by Caseworker Report at Wave 2	13
4. Caregiver Service Needs, Referrals, and Receipt by Caseworker Report at Wave 2.....	14
5. Family Preservation Services Received by Caseworker Report at Wave 2.....	16
6. Duration in Weeks of Caregiver and Family Services Received by Caseworker Report at Wave 2	17
7. Child Service Need, Referral, and Receipt by Caseworker Report at Wave 2.....	18
8. Most Recent Meeting with Caseworker Among Children 11 to 17 Years Old by Child Report.....	19
9. Number of Different Caseworkers in Past 18 months Among Children 11 to 17 Years Old by Child Report	21
10. Most Recent Verbal Contact with Caseworker by In-Home Parent Report	22
11. Number of Different Caseworkers Spoken with Since Baseline Interview by In- Home Parent Report.....	24

Introduction to NSCAW II, Wave 2

The second National Survey of Child and Adolescent Well-Being (NSCAW II) is a longitudinal study intended to answer a range of fundamental questions about the functioning, service needs, and service use of children who come in contact with the child welfare system (CWS). The study is sponsored by the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families (ACF), U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). It examines the well-being of children involved with child welfare agencies; captures information about the investigation of abuse or neglect that brought the child into the study; collects information about the child's family; provides information about child welfare interventions and other services; and describes key characteristics of child development. Of particular interest to the study are children's health, mental health, and developmental risks, especially for those children who experienced the most severe abuse and exposure to violence.

The study includes 5,872¹ children ranging in age from birth to 17.5 years old at the time of sampling. Children were sampled from child welfare investigations closed between February 2008 and April 2009 in 83 counties nationwide. The cohort includes substantiated and unsubstantiated investigations of abuse or neglect, as well as children and families who were and were not receiving services. Infants and children in out-of-home placement were oversampled to ensure adequate representation of high-risk groups. Face-to-face interviews or assessments were conducted with children, parents and nonparent adult caregivers (e.g., foster parents, kin caregivers, group home caregivers), and investigative caseworkers. Baseline data collection began in March 2008 and was completed in September 2009. Additional information about the NSCAW II history, sample design and methods, instrumentation, as well as a summary of differences between the NSCAW I and NSCAW II cohorts can be found in the first report of this NSCAW II Baseline series.² A series of baseline reports on these data have been published (OPRE Reports 2011–27a-g) and are publicly available at: http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/abuse_neglect/nscaw/index.html.

Wave 2 is a follow-up of children and families approximately 18 months after the close of the NSCAW II index investigation. The NSCAW II cohort of children who were approximately 2 months to 17.5 years old at baseline ranged in age from 16 months to 19 years old at Wave 2. Data collection for the second wave of the study began in October 2009 and was completed in January 2011.

Wave 2 data collection procedures mirrored the baseline data collection effort with a few notable exceptions:

¹ At the time the baseline analyses and reports were prepared, the size of the cohort was 5,873. One child case was identified as ineligible during Wave 2, resulting in a revised NSCAW II cohort size of 5,872.

² Comparisons between NSCAW I and NSCAW II estimates require statistical testing. Analysis for comparison purposes requires a different set of weights; these are available through the National Data Archive for Child Abuse and Neglect at Cornell University.

- A small number (n=90) of children in the cohort became young adults aged 18 years and older prior to their Wave 2 interview. NSCAW II questionnaire modules for young adults focus on different topics and constructs than modules administered to younger children. In addition, a corresponding caregiver interview is not sought once a child turns 18. Because of these factors and the small sample size of this subgroup at Wave 2, young adults were excluded from the Wave 2 report series.
- At baseline, an *investigative* caseworker interview was pursued for every child in the cohort. At Wave 2, a *services* caseworker interview was pursued only if the child was living out of home at Wave 2 or if the child or family had received services paid for or provided by Child Protective Services since the baseline interview date. In cases where the caregiver reported no services or was uncertain if services had been received, service use was verified with the participating county child welfare agency. If needed, a services caseworker interview was pursued even in situations where the child and/or caregiver were not interviewed for Wave 2.

Wave 2 interviews were completed with 4,750 children and 4,958 caregivers. On average, interviews with children and caregivers were conducted 18.7 months (range 14.9 to 24.7 months) and 18.6 months (range 14.9 to 24.1 months) after the investigation end date, respectively. Approximately 51% of children and families had received services since the baseline interview and thus required a services caseworker interview. Wave 2 interviews were completed with 2,843 caseworkers. On average, services caseworker interviews were conducted 19.0 months after the investigation end date (range 15.4 to 23.3 months). Wave 2 weighted response rates were 82.8% for children, 86.3% for caregivers, and 93.9% for caseworkers.

Summary of Report Findings

This report summarizes the experiences of a subset of children and families in the NSCAW II cohort who had contact with the CWS between baseline and Wave 2 interviews. The majority of caseworkers interviewed at Wave 2 worked in a child welfare agency unit providing ongoing services (78.5%), while the rest worked in intake units focused only on investigations (13.7%) or in intake units that managed cases from investigation through dependency (7.8%). Caseworkers reported on service needs, referrals, and receipt for the child, and for the child's *in-home caregiver* or *reunification caregiver* depending on whether the child was living in-home or out of home and there was ever a plan to reunify. Caseworkers reported on two different types of reunification caregivers: (1) caregivers for whom there was a current reunification plan (i.e., *current reunification caregivers*), and (2) caregivers for whom reunification efforts had failed (i.e., *reunification effort caregivers*).

Overall, caseworkers reported that three quarters of caregivers had at least one service need. Caseworkers reported that more than half of all caregivers needed mental health services. In-home caregivers were less likely to be described by caseworkers as being in need of or being referred for mental health services, substance use services, housing assistance, or legal aid than either current reunification or reunification effort caregivers. Caseworkers were more likely to report that a formal assessment for an alcohol, drug, or mental health problem was conducted for both types of reunification caregivers than for in-home caregivers.

Differences in service receipt were observed among caregivers who were referred for services. Caseworkers were more likely to report receipt of domestic violence services among in-home caregivers and current reunification caregivers than among caregivers where there was a plan to reunify but efforts failed. This latter group of caregivers was also less likely to receive financial or employment assistance than in-home caregivers or current reunification caregivers.

Overall, caseworkers reported that more than 80% of children had at least one service need. The most frequently needed services were routine health exams and immunizations (69.0%), dental exams (57.6%), and services for emotional/behavioral health (43.0%). Caseworkers reported very high levels of service receipt among the subset of children who were referred for services.

Caseworker reports of child developmental needs, emotional/behavioral needs, and substance use needs were compared to the assessment of those needs via standardized measures. There were high levels of agreement between caseworker reports and standardized assessments for cases with no identified developmental needs (79.1%), behavioral/emotional needs (71.6%), and substance use needs (95.3%). In cases where standardized assessments indicated children had needs, agreement in caseworkers' reports differed across domains. Caseworkers affirmed behavioral/emotional needs in over two thirds of cases (65.3%), developmental needs in over half of cases (54.2%), and substance use needs in 30.3% of cases.

Guide to the NSCAW II, Wave 2 Report Series

This report is the second in a series of reports describing findings from the NSCAW II 18-month follow-up (Wave 2) data. It describes caseworker reports of child and family needs for child welfare services and receipt of such services between the index investigation date and the Wave 2 caseworker interview approximately 18 months later. Just over one half of the children and caregivers interviewed at Wave 2 had a corresponding services caseworker interview. This report focuses on the subgroup of children and families who experienced out-of-home care and/or used CWS services post-investigation.

The Wave 2 report series is not intended to describe the developmental trajectories of each child in the cohort, but instead to provide a snapshot of child and family well-being 18 months after the index investigation of maltreatment that brought the child into the study. At Wave 2, all children are a year and a half older and may or may not be living with the same caregiver or in the same setting as they were at baseline. Two reports in this series include an examination of constructs specifically relevant to the passage of time for these children, including permanency (e.g., placement changes, adoption) and safety (e.g., re-reports of maltreatment).

The topics covered in other NSCAW II Wave 2 reports in this series include:

- Child Well-Being (physical health and special health care needs, cognitive functioning and academic achievement, social, emotional, and behavioral health, developmental assessments of young children, and risky behavior in adolescents)

- Child Safety (re-reports of abuse or neglect following the baseline index investigation, exposure to violence, aggression, and conflict)
- Child Permanency (permanency planning, reunification, adoption, placement changes, contact with biological parents)
- Children’s Services (insurance status, health and mental health services, and special education)
- Caregiver Characteristics and Services (caregiver physical and mental health, substance use, intimate partner violence, involvement with the law, and services received by in-home parents)

The data analyzed in this report have been released through the National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect (NDACAN) in NSCAW II data version 2-1.

Child Characteristics at Wave 2

Exhibit 1 gives an overview of some of the key characteristics of children in the NSCAW II cohort at Wave 2. Approximately one half of the sample was male (50.9%). One ninth (12.8%) of the children were 16 months to 2 years old, 23.1% were 3 to 5 years old, 30.0% were 6 to 10 years old, and 34.2% were 11 to 17 years old. Four out of 10 children (41.2%) were White, 29.0% were Hispanic, 22.5% were Black, and 7.3% described their race/ethnicity as “Other.”

At the time of the Wave 2 interview, the majority of children were living at home with parents (85.5%), while 10.7% were living with a kin primary caregiver. A kin caregiver may be a grandparent, aunt or uncle, sibling, or other relative; 8.3% were in an informal kin care arrangement and 2.4% were in formal kin care. In formal kin care living arrangements, the caregiver receives some financial support. A smaller proportion of children lived in foster care (2.9%) and in group homes (0.5%).

Services Caseworkers

Caseworker Characteristics. Exhibit 2 describes the demographic characteristics of the 2,828 services caseworkers interviewed at Wave 2. The majority of caseworkers were female (83.2%). Approximately 70% (71.3%) of caseworkers were 25 to 44 years old, with fewer caseworkers younger than 25 years old (2.5%), 45 to 54 years old (17.9%), or 54 years old or older (8.3%). Over half were White (56.4%), 21.9% were Black, 19.5% were Hispanic, and 2.2% described their race/ethnicity as “Other.”

The majority of caseworkers reported attaining a general bachelor’s degree (50.8%) or bachelor’s of social work degree specifically (23.1%), while approximately 25% (25.4%) had attained a master’s-level degree. Few caseworkers reported having less than a bachelor’s degree (0.7%) or a doctorate (0.1%). Approximately 70% (69.7%) of caseworkers reported an annual salary between \$30,000 and \$49,999. Nearly one quarter (24.0%) of caseworkers had salaries over \$50,000 per year.

Caseworkers were asked to describe their assigned work unit within the child welfare agency. Most caseworkers participating in the Wave 2 interview worked in a unit providing ongoing services (78.5%). Fewer caseworkers worked in an intake unit focused only on investigations (13.7%) or in an intake unit that managed cases from investigation through dependency (7.8%).

Caseload and Employment Characteristics. Services caseworkers were asked to provide information on their caseload and their employment as a child welfare worker. As shown in Exhibit 3, caseworkers reported that average of 11 children in their caseload who were receiving prevention services in their homes with the goal of preventing out-of-home placement (median=5.0). On average, caseworkers reported that 10 to 11 of the children in their caseload were in out-of-home placement (median=7.0), and that about 3 children were receiving in-home services after returning from out-of-home placement (median=0.0). The Child Welfare League of America's (1998) standards recommend no more than 17 active families for a caseworker providing ongoing services to families. When the three types of caseloads were summed (in-home prevention services, out-of-home placement, and in-home services after returning from out-of-home placement), 44.8% of caseworkers had a caseload of 17 or fewer, while 55.2% had 18 or more cases in their caseload. Of those with 18 or more cases in their caseload, 40% reported having more than 25 cases.

Caseworkers reported an average of 7.1 hours of supervisor contact per week (median=3.0) and an average of 7.4 hours of training on ethnic/cultural issues in the past 12 months.

Caseworkers representing children in the NSCAW II cohort were experienced in their positions, with an average of 6 years of tenure at their assigned agency (median=4.0) and 8 years of tenure in the CWS (median=5.0).

Caseworker Reports of Service Need, Referral, and Receipt

Types of Caregivers. At the time of the Wave 2 interview, caseworkers were asked to report on service needs, referrals, and receipt for the *in-home caregiver* if the child was currently living with the caregiver, and for the *reunification caregiver* if the child was out of home and there was ever a plan to reunify. If the child was out of home and the caseworker reported that no reunification plan was ever in place, no services questions were asked. Caseworkers reported on two different types of reunification caregivers: (1) caregivers for whom there was a current reunification plan (i.e., *current reunification caregivers*), and (2) caregivers for whom reunification efforts had failed (i.e., *reunification effort caregivers*).

Caseworkers reported on the services needs and receipt for 1,454 in-home caregivers, 525 current reunification caregivers, and 593 reunification effort caregivers. The majority of in-home caregivers were biological or adoptive parents (92.2%) or kin (7.0%), with less than one percent identified as "other" relationship to child. The majority of reunification caregivers were biological parents (90.2%) or kin (7.9%), with less than 2 percent identified as "other" relationship to child.

Among the reunification caregivers, caseworkers reported that *current reunification caregivers* were most likely to be mothers (86.5%). Fathers comprised 11.8% of the group and less than two percent were identified as kin or “other” relationship to child. In contrast, *reunification effort caregivers* (where reunification efforts were attempted but failed) were reported by caseworkers to be mothers (45.3%), fathers (37.8%), grandparents (7.5%), other kin (10.2%), or “other” relationship to child (3.2%).

Caregiver Need for, Referral to, and Receipt of Services. Caseworkers were asked to report on their perception of caregiver need for and referral to services from the index investigation date through the date of the Wave 2 interview (approximately 18 months later). Caseworkers were asked about a range of caregiver services, including mental health, substance use, domestic violence, income support, housing, employment, legal, and services for a health problem. Caseworkers reported on caregivers’ need for services independently of the outcome of the index maltreatment investigation or the availability of services in a particular area. In the subset of cases where a service referral was made, caseworkers were asked to report on whether the caregiver received the service. Overall, caseworkers reported that 25.2% of caregivers had 0 service needs, 33.6% had 1 to 2 service needs, 24.6% had 3 to 4 service needs, and 16.6% had 5 or more service needs.

As shown in Exhibit 4, caseworkers reported that in-home caregivers most frequently needed financial assistance (42.9%) and mental health services (39.2%). Caseworkers reported that current reunification and reunification effort caregivers most frequently needed substance use services (64.8% and 58.3%, respectively) and mental health services (64.0% and 52.5%, respectively).

Caseworkers reported that in-home caregivers were less likely to have a need for mental health services (39.2%) than were current reunification caregivers (64%) or caregivers where there was a plan to reunify but efforts failed (i.e., reunification effort caregivers; 52.5%). Caseworkers also indicated that in-home caregivers were less likely to need substance use services (24.7%) than either of the two types of reunification caregivers (64.8% and 58.3%, respectively). Similarly, caseworkers reported that in-home caregivers were less likely to report a need for housing assistance or legal aid (18.4% and 17.6%, respectively) than were current reunification caregivers (40.6% and 41.5%, respectively) or reunification effort caregivers (36.5% and 41.2%, respectively). As a result of lower perceived need, caseworkers were less likely to report referring in-home caregivers to mental health, substance use, and housing services than either of the two types of reunification caregivers.

Caseworkers were asked if caregivers received a formal assessment for an alcohol problem, drug problem, or mental health problem. Caseworkers were more likely to report that a formal assessment was conducted for both types of reunification caregivers than for in-home caregivers. Current reunification (43.5%) and reunification effort (32.7%) caregivers were more likely to have had a formal assessment for an alcohol problem than in-home caregivers (16.7%), for a drug problem (60.4% and 52.6% respectively, compared to 23.4%), and for a mental health problem (52.1% and 51.6% respectively, compared to 32.0%).

Service receipt also differed across caregiver types (Exhibit 4). As previously noted, caseworkers reported on service receipt only in cases where a service referral had been made;

caseworker report of service receipt was not based on caregiver need alone. Caseworkers were more likely to report receipt of domestic violence services among in-home caregivers (87.7%) than among current reunification caregivers (62.6%) or reunification effort caregivers (36.3%). Current reunification caregivers were more significantly likely to receive domestic violence services than caregivers where there was a plan to reunify but efforts failed. Caseworkers reported that reunification effort caregivers were less likely to receive financial or employment assistance (46.3% and 37.7%, respectively) than in-home caregivers (88.9% and 71.8%, respectively) or current reunification caregivers (87.0% and 74.2%, respectively).

Caseworkers also reported on caregiver receipt of substance use services; the most common types reported were outpatient services (68.9%), 12-step programs (32.4%), inpatient treatment (14.2%), intensive day treatment/partial hospitalization (12.6%), methadone (3.9%), detox (3.6%) and “other” services (27.7%). The most common types of mental health services caregivers received were outpatient treatment (62.8%), intensive day treatment/partial hospitalization (4.2%), inpatient treatment (2.7%), in and “other” services (34.4%).

Note that this report focuses on caseworker perception of caregivers’ needs, which may differ from caregivers’ reports of need. One study using NSCAW I data indicated that caseworkers did not identify a need for domestic violence services in 22% of cases where caregivers reported experiencing domestic violence victimization in the past year, and that this under-identification was more likely in cases receiving services (Kohl, Barth, Hazen, & Landsverk, 2005). NSCAW II baseline data have indicated a high level of service needs among in-home caregivers that the CWS may not consistently perceive (Wilson, Dolan, Smith, Casanueva, & Ringeisen, 2012).

Family Preservation Services. Caseworkers reported on the receipt of family preservation services from the time of the investigation through the date of the Wave 2 interview. Exhibit 5 provides the percentage of each caregiver type receiving services such as parenting skills; individual or family counseling; in-home services such as monitoring visits, services to prevent out-of-home placement, or reunification services, job assistance, financial assistance, and respite care. According to caseworkers, most in-home caregivers received parenting skills training (55.1%) and individual counseling (53.5%). Among current reunification caregivers, most received nonintensive in-home services such as monitoring visits (73.8%) and parenting skills training (72.2%), while among reunification effort caregivers most received individual counseling (65.6%) and nonintensive in-home services such as monitoring visits (65.1%).

Caseworkers were more likely to report receipt of individual counseling services among current reunification caregivers (69.3%) than among in-home caregivers (53.5%). Caseworkers were less likely to report receipt of nonintensive in-home services such as monitoring visits among in-home caregivers (44.7%) than among current or reunification effort caregivers (73.8% and 65.1%, respectively).

Exhibit 6 provides information on the duration of family preservation services caregivers and their families received. Across all caregiver types, caregivers received in-home services (i.e., nonintensive services such as monitoring visits, services to prevent out-of-home placement, preservation/reunification services) for the longest duration, followed by individual and family counseling services. Caseworkers were more likely to report a longer duration of nonintensive

in-home services such as monitoring visits for caregivers where there was a plan to reunify but efforts failed (average of 61.6 weeks) than among in-home caregivers (average of 43.0 weeks).

Child Need for, Referral to, and Receipt of Services. Caseworkers were asked to report on child need for and referral to services from the index investigation date through the date of the Wave 2 interview. Overall, caseworkers reported that 18.6% of children had 0 service needs, 33.5% had 1 to 2 service needs, 27.7% had 3 to 4 service needs, and 20.2% had 5 or more service needs.

As shown in Exhibit 7, caseworkers reported on a range of child services, including routine health exams, dental, vision, and hearing services, developmental screening and special education, and services focused on mental health, substance use, and delinquency. Caseworkers reported that children had the greatest need for routine health exams and immunizations (69.0%), dental exams (57.6%), and emotional/behavioral health (43.0%). For children in need of services, caseworkers reported referral rates ranging from 5.1% to 68.5%. Caseworkers reported the most frequent reason they did not make a referral was that children were already receiving the service. Caseworkers reported very high levels of service receipt among the subset of children who were referred for services (88 to 99%).

Caseworkers reported that a formal assessment for an emotional/behavioral or attention problem was conducted in 43.0% of all child cases. Formal assessments for drug or alcohol problems were conducted with far less frequency (9.3% and 4.5%, respectively).

Child Service Needs Identified by Caseworker Report and Child Assessments

Developmental Need. Caseworkers were asked to report on child need for: (1) services to identify a learning disability, and (2) special education classes or services. If a caseworker responded yes to either of these items, the child was categorized as having a developmental need. A corresponding index of need based on caregiver report and standardized child assessments was developed. Assessed developmental need was defined as children birth to 5 years old having a diagnosed mental or medical condition that has a high probability of resulting in developmental delay (e.g., Down syndrome) and/or being 2 standard deviations below the mean in at least one developmental area or 1.5 standard deviations below the mean in two areas. Areas included cognitive development based on the Battelle Developmental Inventory, 2nd Edition (BDI-2; Newborg, 2005) or Kaufman Brief Intelligence Test (K-BIT; Kaufman & Kaufman, 2004) communication development based on the Preschool Language Scale-3 (PLS-3; Zimmerman, Steiner, & Pond, 1992), and adaptive development based on the Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scale (VABS) Screener—Daily Living Skills domain (Sparrow, Carter, & Cicchetti, 1993).

The developmental need index identified the presence of a developmental need in 30.7% of children. Of these, 54.2% also had a caseworker report of need. In 45.8% of cases, developmental need was identified by the index, but not by caseworker report. The developmental need index indicated the absence of developmental need in 69.3% children. Of these, 79.1% of caseworkers also identified no child need. In 20.9% of cases the caseworker identified a developmental need, but the standardized measures did not.

Risk of Behavioral/Emotional Problems. Caseworkers were asked to report on child need for: (1) services for an emotional, behavioral, or attention problem, (2) services for delinquency, and whether the child was taking any medications for emotional or behavioral problems. If a caseworker responded yes to any of these items, the child was categorized as having a behavioral/emotional need. A corresponding index of need based on caregiver report, teacher report, and direct child assessments was developed. Children 1.5 to 17 years old were considered to be at risk for a behavioral/emotional problems if either (1) a caregiver reported an elevated score (>1.5 standard deviations above the mean) on the Total Problems, Internalizing, or Externalizing scales of the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL; Achenbach & Rescorla, 2001); (2) an adolescent reported an elevated score (>1.5 standard deviations above the mean) on the Total Problems, Internalizing, or Externalizing scales of the Youth Self-Report (Achenbach & Rescorla, 2001); (3) a teacher reported an elevated score (>1.5 standard deviations above the mean) on the Total Problems, Internalizing, or Externalizing scales of the Teacher's Report Form (Achenbach & Rescorla, 2001).

The behavioral/emotional problem index identified the presence of a child behavioral/emotional need in 41.4% of children. Of these, 65.3% also had a caseworker report of need. In 34.7% of cases, behavioral/emotional need was identified by the index but not by caseworker report. The index indicated the absence of behavioral/emotional need in 58.6% of children. Of these, 71.6% of caseworkers also identified no child need. In 28.4% of cases the caseworker identified an behavioral/emotional need, but the standardized measures did not.

Risk of a Substance Abuse Problem. Caseworkers were asked to report on child need for: (1) alcohol services, and (2) drug services. If a caseworker responded yes to either of these items, the child was categorized as having a substance abuse need. A corresponding index of need based on child assessment for adolescents 11 to 17 years old. Risk of a substance abuse problem was defined by a total score of 2 or more on the CRAFFT (Car, Relax, Alone, Forget, Friends, Trouble) substance abuse screening test (CRAFFT; Knight, Sherritt, Shrier, Harris, & Chang, 2002). A CRAFFT total score of 2 or more is highly correlated with having a substance-related diagnosis and the need for substance abuse treatment.

The substance use index identified the presence of a substance use need in 22.5% of adolescents. Of these, 30.3% also had a caseworker report of need. In 69.7% of cases, substance use was identified by the index, but not by caseworker report. The index indicated the absence of substance use problems in 77.5% of adolescents. Of these, 95.3% of caseworkers also identified no problems. In 4.7% of cases, the caseworker identified a substance use need, but the standardized measure did not.

Additional information on the well-being of the NSCAW II cohort of children as assessed via the aforementioned assessments may be found in the *NSCAW II Wave 2 Report: Child Well-Being*.

Contact and Satisfaction with Caseworkers and the Child Welfare System

Child Contact with Caseworker. Children 11 to 17 years old were asked about the amount of contact they had with caseworkers and perceived satisfaction with these interactions. Nearly one half of children 11 to 17 years old (46.1%) reported that they had met with a

caseworker in the past 18 months. Children were asked about the timing of their most recent caseworker meeting (Exhibit 8). Nearly one quarter of children (24.7%) had met with a caseworker within the past month, 34.7% had met with a caseworker 1 to 6 months ago, and 40.7% had met with a caseworker between 6 and 18 months ago. Hispanic children were significantly more likely to report having met with a caseworker more than 6 months ago (55.9%) than to have met with a caseworker within the past month when compared to Black children (39.9%), White children (27.6%) and children of “Other” ethnicity (39.2%). Not surprisingly, children in foster care and children in group homes or residential care were more likely to report a recent meeting with a caseworker than children living in-home or in informal kin care.

Children 11 to 17 years old who had at least one meeting with a caseworker in the past 18 months were also asked about interactions with other caseworkers. Exhibit 9 describes the number of different caseworkers that 11- to 17-year-old children reported they had spoken in the past 18 months. Over three quarters of children (75.2%) reported speaking with one or two caseworkers, while one quarter (24.8%) had spoken to three or more.

Parent Contact with Caseworker. In-home parents (biological and adoptive) were asked about the amount of contact they had with caseworkers, and their perceived satisfaction with these interactions. Because the NSCAW II interview focuses on the child’s current caregiver, information about caseworker interactions with parents of children living in out-of-home care is out of the scope of the present report. About three quarters of parents (73.6%) reported having verbal contact with a caseworker since the baseline interview. Of these, 28.9% had contact with a caseworker within the past month, 41.4% had contact with a caseworker 1 to 6 months ago, and 29.7% had contact with a caseworker more than 6 months ago (Exhibit 10).

Exhibit 11 describes the number of different caseworkers with whom in-home parents had spoken since the index maltreatment investigation. Nearly three quarters of parents (73.7%) reported verbal contact with only one or two caseworkers, while 26.3% reported contact with three or more. Parents who were 60 years of age or older (8.4%) were less likely to report contact with three or more caseworkers than parents who were 20 to 29 years of age (23.5%), 30 to 49 years of age (27.2%), or 50 to 59 years of age (44.6%).

Caseworker Report of Permanency for Children in Out-of-Home Care

Caseworkers were asked to report on the likelihood of reunification for children in out-of-home care in Wave 2. In nearly 80% of cases (79.9%) caseworkers reported that children were “unlikely” or “very unlikely” to return home. In approximately one fifth of cases (20.9%), caseworkers indicated that the child was “likely” or “very likely” to return home. When asked about the actions taken to identify an alternative, permanent placement for the child, caseworkers reported that they were pursuing adoption by the child’s current foster family (25.9%), pursuing reunification (21.2%), anticipating that the child will remain with the current foster family in long-term foster care (13.7%), discussing legal guardianship with the child’s current foster family (12.25%) or taking some “other” action (20.9%).

EXHIBITS

Exhibit 1. Child Characteristics at Wave 2

	<i>N</i>	Total	
		<i>%</i>	<i>SE</i>
Total	5,261	100.0	
Gender			
Male	2,703	50.9	1.5
Female	2,558	49.1	1.5
Age (years)			
1–2	2,385	12.8	0.8
3–5	816	23.1	1.3
6–10	1,001	30.0	1.0
11–17	1,058	34.2	1.2
Race/ethnicity			
Black	1,657	22.5	2.7
White	1,767	41.2	4.1
Hispanic	1,460	29.0	3.8
Other	356	7.3	1.1
Setting			
In-home	3,592	85.5	1.1
Formal kin care	414	2.4	0.4
Informal kin care	486	8.3	0.9
Foster care	690	2.9	0.3
Group home or residential program	50	0.5	0.1
Other out-of-home	24	0.4	0.2
Insurance status			
Private	505	15.0	1.1
Public	4,141	75.0	1.5
Other	73	2.3	0.5
Uninsured	233	7.7	0.8

Note: All analyses were on weighted NSCAW II Wave 2 data; *Ns* are unweighted and, therefore, direct percentages cannot be calculated by hand. Reported *Ns* vary slightly across analyses because of missing data in some variable categories.

^a “Private” includes children who had any private insurance plan at the time of interview either obtained through an employer or purchased directly. “Public” includes children who did not have private coverage at the time of interview, but who had Medicaid and/or a State Children’s Health Insurance Plan (SCHIP). “Other” includes children who did not have private insurance or Medicaid (or other public coverage) at the time of interview, but who have any other type of insurance, including coverage through a military health plan. “Uninsured” includes children not covered at the time of interview under private, public, or other insurance. “Uninsured” also includes children only covered through the Indian Health Service (n=4).

Exhibit 2. Caseworker Characteristics at Wave 2

	<i>N</i>	Total	
		%	<i>SE</i>
Total	2,828	100.0	0.0
Gender			
Male	359	16.8	3.2
Female	2,469	83.2	3.2
Age (years)			
< 25	119	2.5	0.6
25–34	1,170	49.1	2.8
35–44	626	22.2	2.6
45–54	422	17.9	2.5
> 54	228	8.3	1.9
Race/ethnicity			
Black	788	21.9	3.9
White	1,313	56.4	5.0
Hispanic	454	19.5	4.0
Other	96	2.2	0.6
Education			
Less than bachelor's degree	30	0.7	0.4
Bachelor's in social work	568	23.1	3.3
Other bachelor's degree	1,234	50.8	4.7
Master's in social work	499	14.3	2.3
Other master's degree	324	11.1	1.9
PhD or other doctoral degree	11	0.1	0.0
Salary			
Less than \$19,999 ^a	—	—	—
\$20,000–29,999	182	6.3	1.6
\$30,000–39,999	1,255	45.7	5.4
\$40,000–49,999	518	24.0	3.3
\$50,000–59,999	395	14.7	2.6
\$60,000–69,999	208	5.0	1.6
More than \$70,000	138	4.3	1.6
Work unit			
Intake—investigations only	90	13.7	2.8
Intake—investigation through dependency	145	7.8	2.0
Unit providing ongoing services	2,547	78.5	3.6

Note: All analyses were on weighted NSCAW II Wave 2 data; *N*s are unweighted and, therefore, direct percentages cannot be calculated by hand. Reported *N*s vary slightly across analyses because of missing data in some variable categories.

^a Estimates specific to caseworkers who reported an annual salary less than \$19,999 were not included in this exhibit because there were fewer than 10 cases in this subpopulation.

Exhibit 3. Caseload and Employment Characteristics by Caseworker Report at Wave 2

	<i>N</i>	Total		
		Mean	<i>SE</i>	Median
Caseload characteristics				
Number of children receiving in-home prevention services	2,617	11.2	0.8	5.0
Number of children in out-of-home placement	2,626	10.9	1.1	7.0
Number of children receiving in-home services after returning from out-of-home placement	2,631	3.0	0.4	0.0
Supervision and training				
Hours of contact with supervisor per week	2,639	7.1	1.1	3.0
Hours of training on ethnic/cultural issues—past 12 months	2,571	7.4	0.6	4.0
Employment tenure				
Years in child welfare system	2,667	8.0	0.6	5.0
Years in agency	2,666	6.0	0.4	4.0

Note: All analyses were on weighted NSCAW II Wave 2 data; *Ns* are unweighted and, therefore, direct percentages cannot be calculated by hand. Reported *Ns* vary slightly across analyses because of missing data in some variable categories.

Exhibit 4. Caregiver Service Needs, Referrals, and Receipt by Caseworker Report at Wave 2

Type of Service	In-Home Caregivers									Current Reunification Caregivers									Reunification Effort Caregivers								
	Needed			Referred			Received ^a			Needed			Referred			Received ^a			Needed			Referred			Received ^a		
	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE
Mental health	1,424	39.2 ^b	3.1	1,427	35.6 ^c	2.6	500	83.5	4.9	515	64.0	6.8	513	62.8	6.8	342	81.9	6.3	553	52.5	5.6	543	61.5	6.1	351	67.9	5.6
Substance use	1,438	24.7 ^d	2.4	1,429	23.3 ^c	2.2	448	86.4	4.6	516	64.8	5.2	512	61.8	5.9	295	77.8	7.5	566	58.3	6.8	557	58.5	6.4	348	65.0	6.8
Financial assistance/ income support	1,406	42.9	4.8	1,407	31.7	2.9	481	88.9	2.8	503	49.9	9.0	487	33.6	6.7	151	87.0	4.1	528	43.7	6.8	512	27.0	4.1	164	46.3 ^f	9.5
Domestic violence	1,418	26.3	3.0	1,421	27.8	3.2	344	87.7 ^g	3.6	511	28.9	6.1	509	28.5	5.5	200	62.6 ^h	8.2	531	34.5	5.4	549	30.8	5.2	170	36.3	9.0
Housing assistance	1,426	18.4 ⁱ	2.6	1,420	14.1 ^j	2.1	251	63.7	7.2	510	40.6	7.2	502	28.4	6.0	178	42.2	9.3	546	36.5	5.8	531	31.6	5.8	164	46.5	11.3
Employment	1,412	22.0 ^k	3.1	1,415	17.7	2.6	214	71.8	9.1	503	49.3	8.7	495	34.1	7.6	154	74.2	7.8	534	40.5	6.5	516	26.8	5.7	133	37.7 ^l	8.3
Legal aid	1,411	17.6 ^m	3.0	1,427	11.1	2.3	185	73.5	8.2	507	41.5	8.6	508	15.7	4.2	99	70.8	16.3	535	41.2	6.9	545	25.1	5.5	116	84.2	6.5
Health problem	1,419	6.6	1.3	1,420	3.2	1.0	37	98.3	1.8	509	10.7	4.0	512	2.3	1.0	18	95.2	3.5	541	6.8	1.7	544	3.8	1.2	27	76.8	9.9

Note: All analyses were on weighted NSCAW II Wave 2 data; *N*s are unweighted and, therefore, direct percentages cannot be calculated by hand. Reported *N*s vary slightly across analyses because of missing data in some variable categories. Pearson χ^2 tests for cluster samples were used for significance tests. Asterisks indicate statistical significance (* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$).

- ^a Caseworkers are asked about service receipt only when a service referral is reported. The “Received” category represents the subset of caregivers who were referred to a service and who received that service.
- ^b Caseworkers were significantly less likely to report need for mental health services among in-home caregivers than among current reunification caregivers ($p < .01$) and caregivers where there was a plan to reunify but efforts failed ($p < .05$).
- ^c Caseworkers were significantly less likely to report referring in-home caregivers to mental health services than current reunification caregivers ($p < .01$) and caregivers where there was a plan to reunify but efforts failed ($p < .01$).
- ^d Caseworkers were significantly less likely to need for substance use services among in-home caregivers than among current reunification caregivers ($p < .001$) and caregivers where there was a plan to reunify but efforts failed ($p < .001$).
- ^e Caseworkers were significantly less likely to report referring in-home caregivers for substance use services than current reunification caregivers ($p < .001$) and caregivers where there was a plan to reunify but efforts failed ($p < .001$).

- ^f Caseworkers were significantly less likely to report receipt of financial assistance/income support among caregivers where there was a plan to reunify but efforts failed than among in-home caregivers ($p < .01$) and current reunification caregivers ($p < .01$).
- ^g Caseworkers were significantly more likely to report receipt of domestic violence services among in-home caregivers than among current reunification caregivers ($p < .05$) and caregivers where there was a plan to reunify but efforts failed ($p < .01$).
- ^h Caseworkers were significantly more likely to report receipt of domestic violence services among current reunification caregivers than among caregivers where there was a plan to reunify but efforts failed ($p < .05$).
- ⁱ Caseworkers were significantly less likely to report need for housing assistance among in-home caregivers than among current reunification caregivers ($p < .01$) and caregivers where there was a plan to reunify but efforts failed ($p < .01$).
- ^j Caseworkers were significantly less likely to report referring in-home caregivers to housing assistance services than current reunification caregivers ($p < .05$) and caregivers where there was a plan to reunify but efforts failed ($p < .05$).
- ^k Caseworkers were significantly less likely to report need employment assistance services among in-home caregivers than current reunification caregivers ($p < .01$) and caregivers where there was a plan to reunify but efforts failed ($p < .01$).
- ^l Caseworkers were significantly less likely to report receipt of employment assistance services among caregivers where there was a plan to reunify but efforts failed than among in-home caregivers ($p < .05$) and current reunification caregivers ($p < .05$).
- ^m Caseworkers were significantly less likely to need for legal aid among in-home caregivers than among current reunification caregivers ($p < .01$) and caregivers where there was a plan to reunify but efforts failed ($p < .001$).

Exhibit 5. Family Preservation Services Received by Caseworker Report at Wave 2

Type of Service	In-Home Caregiver Received			Current Reunification Caregiver Received			Reunification Effort Caregiver Received		
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>SE</i>	<i>N</i>	%	<i>SE</i>	<i>N</i>	%	<i>SE</i>
Parenting skills training	1,419	55.1	3.8	514	72.2	5.6	556	50.5	6.6
Individual counseling for caregiver	1,409	53.5	3.5	512	69.3 ^a	6.6	552	65.6	6.5
Nonintensive in-home services (e.g., monitoring visits)	1,432	44.7 ^b	4.2	517	73.8	3.5	569	65.1	5.7
Job training/searching ^c	331	47.7	8.1	253	60.7	8.1	251	47.2	9.2
Family counseling	1,400	47.3	3.6	511	36.9	7.4	551	34.3	6.4
In-home services to prevent out-of-home placement	1,416	37.5	3.7	496	34.6	6.9	561	32.5	6.9
Emergency financial assistance	1,395	18.8	2.5	506	21.5	5.6	532	20.5	4.8
In-home family preservation /reunification services	1,428	17.3	3.0	506	19.6	5.3	566	12.0	3.7
Respite care for the child	1,416	8.0	1.9	510	15.9	4.9	566	15.3	4.9

Note: All analyses were on weighted NSCAW II Wave 2 data; *Ns* are unweighted and, therefore, direct percentages cannot be calculated by hand. Reported *Ns* vary slightly across analyses because of missing data in some variable categories. Pearson χ^2 tests for cluster samples were used for significance tests. Asterisks indicate statistical significance (* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$).

^a Caseworkers were significantly more likely to report receipt of individual counseling for parents/guardians among current reunification caregivers than among in-home caregivers ($p < .05$).

^b Caseworkers were significantly less likely to report receipt of nonintensive in-home services among in-home caregivers than among current reunification caregivers ($p < .001$) and caregivers where there was a plan to reunify but efforts failed ($p < .01$).

Exhibit 6. Duration in Weeks of Caregiver and Family Services Received by Caseworker Report at Wave 2

Number of Weeks	In-Home Caregiver Received			Current Reunification Caregiver Received			Prior Reunification Caregiver (Efforts Made) Received		
	<i>N</i>	Mean (Median)	<i>SE</i>	<i>N</i>	Mean (Median)	<i>SE</i>	<i>N</i>	Mean (Median)	<i>SE</i>
Nonintensive in-home services (e.g., monitoring visits)	736	43.0 (36)	2.9	376	49.1 (46)	4.0	330	61.6 ^a (52)	4.7
In-home services to prevent out-of-home placement	493	37.2 (26)	3.3	118	43.0 (44)	4.2	92	41.5 (39)	8.6
In-home family preservation /reunification services	202	36.4 (26)	5.3	97	43.3 (29)	7.5	65	49.5 (35)	9.6
Individual counseling for caregiver	730	33.5 (26)	2.8	332	36.4 (26)	4.0	263	37.9 (26)	4.6
Family counseling	545	29.2 (22)	2.3	160	22.8 (10)	2.5	117	34.9 (17)	7.8
Parenting skills training	794	21.3 (13)	2.0	349	18.3 (10)	2.5	239	25.8 (13)	4.3
Respite care	126	13.4 (6)	2.8	65	11.9 (3)	3.8	53	38.5 (3)	22.3

Note: All analyses were on weighted NSCAW II Wave 2 data; *Ns* are unweighted and, therefore, direct percentages cannot be calculated by hand. Reported *Ns* vary slightly across analyses because of missing data in some variable categories. Pearson χ^2 tests for cluster samples were used for significance tests. Asterisks indicate statistical significance (**p* < .05, ***p* < .01, ****p* < .001).

^a Caseworkers were significantly more likely to report a longer duration of nonintensive in-home services receipt among caregivers where there was a plan to reunify but efforts failed than among in-home caregivers (*p* < .01).

Exhibit 7. Child Service Need, Referral, and Receipt by Caseworker Report at Wave 2

Number of Weeks	Needed Service			Referred to Service			Received Service ^a		
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>SE</i>	<i>N</i>	%	<i>SE</i>	<i>N</i>	%	<i>SE</i>
Routine check-up/immunizations	2,786	69.0	3.2	2,805	68.5	3.2	2,355	99.4	0.3
Dental	1,647	57.6	3.5	1,681	46.0	3.5	975	97.5	0.9
Independent living training	292	32.5	5.0	291	32.3	5.1	126	89.9	3.5
Screening for learning or developmental disability	2,773	26.8	2.6	2,786	24.8	2.5	1,081	88.0	3.0
Emotional/behavioral/attention problem	2,793	43.0	2.6	2,805	38.6	3.0	737	94.8	1.5
Vision	2,729	22.7	2.3	2,771	17.4	2.5	622	96.7	1.9
Hearing	2,727	17.8	1.9	2,769	12.5	2.2	536	95.4	2.6
Health problem	2,782	15.8	1.9	2,795	11.2	1.4	505	98.7	1.0
Special education	2,794	20.3	2.4	2,800	11.4	1.7	238	96.8	1.1
Substance use	556	11.1	2.8	554	9.3	2.7	43	90.8	3.2
Delinquency	2,815	7.0	1.2	2,818	5.1	1.0	81	94.9	2.6

Note: All analyses were on weighted NSCAW II Wave 2 data; *Ns* are unweighted and, therefore, direct percentages cannot be calculated by hand. Reported *Ns* vary slightly across analyses because of missing data in some variable categories.

^a Caseworkers are asked about service receipt only when a service referral is reported. The “Received” category represents the subset of children who were referred to a service and who received that service.

Exhibit 8. Most Recent Meeting with Caseworker Among Children 11 to 17 Years Old by Child Report

Child and investigation characteristics	N	Child's most recent meeting with caseworker					
		1 month or less		1 to 6 months		More than 6 months	
		%	SE	%	SE	%	SE
Total	486	24.7	3.2	34.7	3.4	40.7	4.6
Age (years)							
11–13	202	23.2	5.4	35.9	6.1	40.8	8.0
14–17	284	25.9	4.3	33.6	4.2	40.5	5.7
Race/ethnicity *							
Black	144	25.0	7.3	35.1	8.1	39.9	9.7
White	157	33.2	6.3	39.2	6.3	27.6	5.5
Hispanic	131	9.5	2.9	34.5	6.1	55.9 ^a	6.9
Other	52	39.9	10.0	20.9	8.4	39.2	10.4
Setting ***							
In-home	296	19.2	3.5	33.6	4.1	47.3	5.2
Formal kin care	33	69.3	15.3	25.2	13.1	5.5	4.1
Informal kin care	44	29.2	11.6	49.9	12.9	20.9	8.8
Foster care	79	60.7 ^b	9.7	37.7 ^c	9.7	1.6	1.2
Group home or residential treatment program ^d	30	64.3 ^d	15.3	35.7	15.3	0.0	0.0
Investigation outcome							
Substantiated	160	24.6	5.8	45.0	8.6	30.4	9.1
Indicated	66	42.8	13.6	34.1	10.9	23.1	6.8
Unsubstantiated	141	21.0	3.7	34.9	5.7	44.1	6.5
Number of service needs identified							
None	28	40.9	15.0	29.3	12.9	29.8	17.4
1–2	50	21.9	10.7	53.7	13.9	24.4	10.3
3–4	104	55.5	9.4	31.0	8.6	13.5	6.7
5 or more	120	43.1	9.2	51.7	9.8	5.3	2.3

Note: All analyses were on weighted NSCAW II Wave 2 data; *Ns* are unweighted and, therefore, direct percentages cannot be calculated by hand. Reported *Ns* vary slightly across analyses because of missing data in some variable categories. Pearson χ^2 tests for cluster samples were used for significance tests. Asterisks indicate statistical significance (***) $p < .001$. An asterisk in a column applies to the subsequent results for the covariate. This exhibit includes only the subgroup of children 11 to 17 years old who indicated that they had met with a caseworker within the past 18 months. Children whose most recent meeting with a caseworker was more than 6 months ago served as the reference group in this analysis.

- ^a Hispanic children were significantly more likely to report having met with a caseworker *more than 6 months* ago than to have met with a caseworker within *1 month or less* when compared to White children ($p < .01$), Black children ($p < .05$), or children of “Other” race/ethnicity ($p < .05$).
- ^b Children in foster care were significantly more likely to report having met with a caseworker *within 1 month or less* than to have met with a caseworker *more than 6 months* ago when compared to children living in-home ($p < .001$) or children living in informal kin care ($p < .05$).
- ^c Children in foster care were significantly more likely to report having met with a caseworker *1 to 6 months* ago than to have met with a caseworker *more than 6 months* ago when compared to children living in-home ($p < .01$).
- ^d Children in group homes or residential programs were significantly more likely to report having met with a caseworker *within 1 month or less* than to have met with a caseworker *more than 6 months* ago when compared to children living in-home ($p < .01$) or children living in informal kin care ($p < .01$).

Exhibit 9. Number of Different Caseworkers in Past 18 months Among Children 11 to 17 Years Old by Child Report

Child and investigation characteristics	N	Number of caseworkers spoken with in past 18 months			
		1 or 2		3 or more	
		%	SE	%	SE
Total	497	75.2	3.7	24.8	3.7
Age (years)					
11–13	207	74.0	4.3	26.0	4.3
14–17	290	76.0	5.6	24.0	5.6
Race/ethnicity					
Black	148	82.2	5.9	17.8	5.9
White	163	71.8	7.0	28.2	7.0
Hispanic	133	77.1	7.3	22.9	7.3
Other	52	67.1	10.2	32.9	10.2
Setting					
In-home	310	77.5	4.3	22.5	4.3
Formal kin care	31	64.6	10.8	35.5	10.8
Informal kin care	48	70.5	7.4	29.5	7.4
Foster care	77	56.5	10.5	43.5	10.5
Group home or residential treatment program	28	57.0	19.6	43.0	19.6
Investigation outcome					
Substantiated	161	67.1	6.8	32.9	6.8
Indicated	70	81.7	5.8	18.3	5.8
Unsubstantiated	146	75.1	5.7	24.9	5.7
Number of service needs identified					
None	28	79.5	9.2	20.5	9.2
1–2	47	64.7	15.0	35.3	15.0
3–4	105	62.3	11.3	37.7	11.3
5 or more	118	62.3	11.1	37.7	11.1

Note: All analyses were on weighted NSCAW II Wave 2 data; *Ns* are unweighted and, therefore, direct percentages cannot be calculated by hand. Reported *Ns* vary slightly across analyses because of missing data in some variable categories. Pearson χ^2 tests for cluster samples were used for significance tests. This exhibit includes only the subgroup of children 11 to 17 years old who indicated that they had met with a caseworker within the past 18 months.

Exhibit 10. Most Recent Verbal Contact with Caseworker by In-Home Parent Report

Child and investigation characteristics	N	Most recent verbal contact with caseworker					
		1 month or less		1 to 6 months		More than 6 months	
		%	SE	%	SE	%	SE
Total	2,048	28.9	2.0	41.4	2.8	29.7	2.0
Child age (years)							
1–2	973	22.2	2.5	44.9	4.4	32.9	4.6
3–5	301	32.1	4.9	35.6	5.9	32.3	5.3
6–10	398	31.9	3.7	41.9	4.4	26.2	3.8
11–17	376	26.4	3.2	44.1	4.9	29.5	3.7
Child race/ethnicity							
Black	618	30.9	4.8	35.5	4.7	33.6	4.2
White	715	29.8	2.9	42.1	3.4	28.1	2.7
Hispanic	571	24.6	4.7	47.7	6.1	27.8	4.8
Other	135	33.0	7.2	31.2	7.1	35.8	8.2
Parent gender							
Male	215	25.5	6.7	50.2	7.4	24.3	6.4
Female	1,833	29.3	1.9	40.4	2.8	30.3	2.0
Parent age (years)							
19 and under	45	8.7	4.5	32.7	19.1	58.5	20.5
20–29	710	30.3	4.5	44.3	4.5	25.4	3.8
30–49	1,068	28.7	2.6	37.6	3.2	33.8	2.8
50–59	164	28.3	8.1	53.6	8.8	18.1	6.2
60 and older	60	21.5	9.6	58.8	15.8	19.8	15.1
Parent race/ethnicity							
Black	540	30.4	4.7	35.0	4.9	34.6	4.6
White	910	30.1	2.6	42.4	3.6	27.5	2.4
Hispanic	468	25.2	6.1	44.8	6.9	30.0	5.4
Other	125	28.4	6.5	40.2	9.2	31.4	7.7
Investigation outcome							
Substantiated	795	31.5	4.2	37.5	4.5	31.0	5.2
Indicated	348	45.7	9.4	35.4	7.6	18.9	5.6
Unsubstantiated	479	26.9	2.7	44.3	4.0	28.7	2.7

(continued)

Exhibit 10. Most Recent Verbal Contact with Caseworker by In-Home Parent Report (continued)

Child and investigation characteristics	N	Most recent verbal contact with caseworker					
		1 month or less		1 to 6 months		More than 6 months	
		%	SE	%	SE	%	SE
Number of child service needs identified							
None	122	35.5	7.2	36.8	6.7	27.7	8.1
1–2	511	37.1	5.9	44.2	6.1	18.7	18.7
3–4	346	53.7	6.2	27.0	6.1	19.3	19.3
5 or more	199	56.1	6.8	24.3	5.4	19.6	19.6
Number of caregiver service needs identified							
None	264	30.4	5.8	41.3	7.0	28.3	6.1
1–2	344	53.4	8.4	28.5	8.2	18.1	4.3
3–4	302	42.3	5.9	33.3	4.8	24.4	5.0
5 or more	220	59.2	8.0	29.8	7.1	10.9	4.3

Note: All analyses were on weighted NSCAW II Wave 2 data; *Ns* are unweighted and, therefore, direct percentages cannot be calculated by hand. Reported *Ns* vary slightly across analyses because of missing data in some variable categories. Pearson χ^2 tests for cluster samples were used for significance tests. Asterisks indicate statistical significance (** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$). An asterisk in a column applies to the subsequent results for the covariate. The parent that the child was living with at the time of the Wave 2 interview was asked about last verbal contact with a caseworker. This exhibit includes only the subgroup of parents who indicated that they had talked with a caseworker since the baseline interview date, or approximately 18 months prior to the Wave 2 interview.

Exhibit 11. Number of Different Caseworkers Spoken with Since Baseline Interview by In-Home Parent Report

	<i>N</i>	Number of caseworkers spoken with since baseline interview			
		1 or 2		3 or more	
		%	<i>SE</i>	%	<i>SE</i>
Total	2,067	73.7	2.7	26.3	2.7
Child age (years)					
1–2	983	73.1	4.2	26.9	4.2
3–5	306	71.9	5.8	28.1	5.8
6–10	401	76.8	3.5	23.2	3.5
11–17	377	72.5	3.8	27.5	3.8
Child race/ethnicity					
Black	629	81.5	3.7	18.5	3.7
White	720	72.2	3.3	27.8	3.3
Hispanic	574	70.2	5.1	29.8	5.1
Other	135	71.1	8.8	28.9	8.8
Parent gender					
Male	215	65.6	8.1	34.4	8.1
Female	1,852	74.5	2.5	25.5	2.5
Parent age (years)				*	
19 and under	46	92.7	4.2	7.3	4.2
20–29	726	76.5	3.7	23.5	3.7
30–49	1,071	72.8	3.2	27.2	3.2
50–59	164	55.4	10.4	44.6	10.4
60 and older	59	91.6	3.2	8.4 ^a	3.2
Parent race/ethnicity					
Black	552	82.5	4.1	17.6	4.1
White	919	72.4	3.2	27.6	3.2
Hispanic	466	66.9	6.3	33.1	6.3
Other	125	78.4	6.9	21.6	6.9
Investigation outcome					
Substantiated	798	66.1	5.4	33.9	5.4
Indicated	354	75.2	6.0	24.8	6.0
Unsubstantiated	487	74.8	3.5	25.2	3.5
Number of child service needs identified					
None	122	55.2	10.4	44.9	10.4
1–2	516	63.7	6.6	36.3	6.6
3–4	345	58.6	5.1	41.4	5.1
5 or more	199	70.0	7.3	30.0	7.3
Number of caregiver service needs identified					
None	264	67.4	7.2	32.6	7.2
1–2	346	65.5	8.5	34.5	8.5
3–4	302	61.2	5.7	38.8	5.7
5 or more	222	54.0	9.7	46.0	9.7

Note: All analyses were on weighted NSCAW II Wave 2 data; *Ns* are unweighted and, therefore, direct percentages cannot be calculated by hand. Reported *Ns* vary slightly across analyses because of missing data in some variable categories. Pearson χ^2 tests for cluster samples were used for significance tests. Asterisks indicate statistical significance (** $p < .01$). An asterisk in a column applies to the subsequent results for the covariate. The parent with whom the child was living at the time of the baseline interview was asked about the number of different caseworkers. This exhibit includes only the subgroup of parents who indicated that they had talked with a caseworker since the baseline interview date, or approximately 18 months prior to the Wave 2 interview.

^a Parents who were 60 years old or older were significantly less likely to have met with three or more caseworkers since the baseline interview than parents who were 20 to 29 years old ($p < .05$), 30 to 49 years old ($p < .05$), or 50 to 59 years old ($p < .01$).

REFERENCES

- Achenbach, T. M., & Rescorla, L. A. (2001). *Manual for the ASEBA School-Age Forms and Profiles*. Burlington, VT: University of Vermont, Research Center for Children, Youth & Families.
- Briere, J. (1996). *Trauma Symptom Checklist for Children: Professional manual*. Lutz, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Child Welfare League of America (1998). *Standards of excellence for services for abuse or neglected children and their families*. Washington, DC: Child Welfare League of America, Inc.
- Kaufman, A. S., & Kaufman, N. L. (2004). *Kaufman Assessment Battery for Children manual* (2nd ed.). Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Service.
- Knight, J. R., Sherritt, L., Shrier, L. A., Harris, S. K., & Chang, G. (2002). Validity of the CRAFFT substance abuse screening test among adolescent clinic patients. *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine*, 156(6), 607–614.
- Kohl, P. L., Barth, R. P., Hazen, A. L., & Landsverk, J. A. (2005). Child welfare as a gateway to domestic violence services. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 27(11), 1203–1221.
- Kovacs, M. (1992). *Children's Depression Inventory*. North Tonawanda, NY: Multi-Health Systems.
- Newborg, J. (2005). *Battelle Developmental Inventory, Second Edition: Examiner's manual*. Itasca, IL: Riverside.
- Sparrow, S. S., Carter, A. S., & Cicchetti, D. V. (1993). *Vineland screener: overview reliability, validity, administration and scoring*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Child Study Center.
- Wilson, E., Dolan, M., Smith, K., Casanueva, C., & Ringeisen, H. (2012). *NSCAW child well-being spotlight: caregivers of children who remain in-home after a maltreatment investigation need services*. OPRE Report #2012-XX, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- Zimmerman, I. L., Steiner, V. G., & Pond, R. E. (1992). *PLS-3: Preschool Language Scale-3*. San Antonio, TX: The Psychological Corporation.

APPENDIX

Derived Variables. Following is a descriptive list of the variables derived for the NSCAW II Wave 2 Report: Children and Families Receiving Child Welfare Services Post-Baseline.

- *Setting.* The setting variable includes six levels: in-home, formal kin care, informal kin care, foster care, group home/residential program, or other out of home. *In-home* caregivers include living situations where the primary caregiver is either a biological, adoptive, or stepmother/father. *Formal kin care* includes situations where the primary caregiver has a kin relationship to the child and where the caregiver is receiving payments from the child welfare system. Informal kin care is where the primary caregiver has a kin relationship to the child, but is not receiving payments from the child welfare system. Foster care indicates that the child primary caregiver was identified as a foster parent. Group home/residential program indicates that a child was currently living in a group home or residential facility. *Other out of home* includes situations where the primary caregiver was identified as “other nonrelative” and where the primary caregiver was not receiving foster parent payments.
- *Child Insurance Status.* Child insurance status includes four types: *private*, *public*, *other*, and *uninsured*. *Private* includes children who have any private insurance plan obtained through an employer or purchased directly. *Public* includes children covered by Medicaid or any other state-sponsored programs. *Other* includes children who do not have private insurance or Medicaid (or other public coverage), but who have any other type of insurance, including coverage through a military health plan. *Uninsured* includes children who were not covered at the time of interview under private, public, or other insurance. Consistent with the National Health Interview Survey insurance status categories, *uninsured* also includes children only covered through the Indian Health Service (n=4).
- *Caseworker Salary:* Services caseworkers were asked to report their annual income or to select from a list of income categories. For the purpose of this report, salary values less than \$12,000 and more than \$300,000 annually were coded as missing. Additionally, caseworkers who did not provide their salary amount, but who indicated that their salary was in the range of \$50,000 or more were placed in the \$50,000 to \$59,999 category.
- *Caseworker Hours of Contact with Supervisor:* Caseworkers were asked to report the number of hours spent with a supervisor weekly or monthly. For the purpose of this report, values of over 60 hours per week were coded as missing.
- *Risk of Behavioral/Emotional Problem.* Children 1.5 to 17 years old were considered to be at risk for a behavioral/emotional problems if either (1) a caregiver reported an elevated score (>1.5 standard deviations above the mean) on the Total Problems, Internalizing, or Externalizing scales of the CBCL (Achenbach & Rescorla, 2001); (2) an adolescent reported an elevated score (>1.5 standard deviations above the mean) on the Total Problems, Internalizing, or Externalizing scales of the YSR

(Achenbach & Rescorla, 2001); (3) a teacher reported an elevated score (>1.5 standard deviations above the mean) on the Total Problems, Internalizing, or Externalizing scales of the TRF (Achenbach & Rescorla, 2001); (4) a clinically significant score was obtained on the Children's Depression Inventory (CDI) (Kovacs, 1992), or (5) a clinically significant score was obtained on the PTSD scale of the Trauma Symptoms Checklist (Briere, 1996).

- *Developmental Need.* Developmental problems were defined based on young children having a diagnosed mental or medical condition that has a high probability of resulting in developmental delay (e.g., Down syndrome) and/or being 2 standard deviations below the mean in at least one developmental area or 1.5 standard deviations below the mean in two areas. Areas included cognitive development based on the BDI, communication development based on the PLS-3, and adaptive development based on the Vineland Daily Living Skills.
- *Risk of a Substance Abuse Problem.* Children 11 to 17 years old were considered to be at risk for a substance abuse problem if a child reported a total score of 2 or more on the CRAFFT (Car, Relax, Alone, Forget, Friends, Trouble) substance abuse screening test ([CRAFFT; Knight et al., 2002](#)). A CRAFFT total score of 2 or more is highly correlated with having a substance-related diagnosis and the need for substance abuse treatment.