

FLASH SURVEY #1

CPS Worker and Supervisor Training Topics Survey

Kristen Slack

Yonah Drazen

UW-Madison
School of
Social Work



WCWPDS
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK
UW-MADISON



October 4, 2016

The University of Wisconsin-Madison Survey Center (UWSC) was hired by the Division of Safety and Permanence within the Department of Children and Families to conduct a series of brief surveys of the child welfare workforce. The purpose of these surveys is to identify strengths and challenges faced by the child welfare workforce in Wisconsin. Input from these surveys will help the Department of Children and Families and counties partner in their efforts to continually improve upon policy, process and practice standards, as well as training and technical assistance.

Responses from the surveys are submitted to a centralized database managed by UWSC, where they are combined with the answers from all respondents. All answers are confidential—none of the survey responses are linked to identifying information (e.g., names, worker ID numbers). These surveys are intended to be very brief (e.g., 10 minutes or less), and are designed to gauge workforce knowledge of a particular issue or topic, professional needs and challenges, and strengths and gaps in practice and policy areas.

This initial Flash Survey served several purposes. First, DCF wanted to conduct a pilot test to determine whether there was sufficient response to justify using such surveys as a continuous quality improvement (CQI) feedback mechanism. Second, feedback from the child welfare workforce on training needs will assist WCWPDS in identifying training priorities for the next several years. This first flash survey is called the **Flash Survey on Training Needs**.

The survey was sent electronically by the University of Wisconsin-Madison Survey Center on Aug 20, 2015 to 2,129 email addresses representing frontline workers and supervisors (1,776 frontline workers and 353 supervisors) with job responsibilities in child protective services. Of those, 58 emails bounced back as invalid. A reminder email went out on Sept 2nd to 1,501 email addresses from whom no response had yet been received. The survey response window closed on Sept 17th. The final sample file included 837 workers and 179 supervisors (total N=1,016), for an overall response rate of 49.1%.

Additional surveys were sent to Tribal Child Welfare Leadership, and to County Human Service Directors. Seven tribal child welfare directors and 52 county directors responded. These surveys asked about the same training topics, but from a leadership vantage point—i.e., what training topics does the county and tribal leadership feel their workforces need? Results from these additional surveys further inform efforts to set a training agenda, since child welfare leadership may feel that their staff needs are different than the staff identify for themselves.

¹ The child welfare leadership within the Tribes requested a separate report specific to the findings on training needs reported by this group of individuals.

RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS

Table 1 shows the composition of the survey respondents. In total, a little more than 1,000 people responded, the vast majority of whom were frontline workers, and about one-fifth supervisors. Among agency types, more than three-quarters of respondents were county employees and about 12% were private agency staff. A little less than 30% of respondents had between 1 and 4 years of child welfare experience, about 20% had between 5 and 10 years, and a relatively large 44% of respondents reported more than 10 years of experience in the field. About one quarter of workers reported a decade or more of experience in their current position, 20% between 5 and 10 years, and about 40% reported 1-4 years of tenure in their current position.

The majority of respondents have both a social work degree and license, and about 20% reported having neither. About 10% each reported having a social work license or a degree (but not both). Turning to education level, most respondents reported having a bachelor’s degree (but no graduate degree), and about a third reported having a master’s degree or higher. A small fraction of respondents reported attaining less than a bachelor’s degree.

Among county population categories, respondents are somewhat evenly distributed, though there are fewer respondents from the smaller population counties. Finally, training regions are not as evenly distributed as counties. The Northern and Southeast counties have the fewest respondents, while the remaining areas have a similar number of respondents.

The Flash Survey on Training Needs asked questions about six different “blocks” of training topics: practice challenges, foundational child welfare practice, skills development needs, leadership and supervision (asked of supervisors only), placement and out-of-home care practice, and child welfare populations. Within each block of training topics, respondents were asked to select up to five topics on which they desire more training. Results are reported across subgroups of respondents (e.g., worker type and sector, years of child welfare experience, training regions).

The top five training topics are indicated in yellow or blue highlighting in the following tables. Yellow highlighting indicates that across all subgroups in a given table, there was agreement that the topic was in the top five. Blue highlighting indicates that at least one subgroup, the topic ranked in the top five. The percentage of respondents who indicated a preference for each topic is presented, along with the rank, in parentheses, for that topic (1 indicates the highest level of preference).

A final set of tables indicates the mode of training delivery preferred by the workforce, according to various workforce characteristics.

TABLE 1. RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS (N=1,016)

Position	Supervisors	179	17.6%
	Frontline Workers	837	82.4%
Agency Type	County Human Services	807	79.4%
	Private Agency	124	12.2%
	State	85	8.4%
Child Welfare Experience	Less than 1 Year	71	7.01%
	1-4 Years	277	27.34%
	5-10 Years	218	21.52%
	More than 10 Years	447	44.13%
Current Position	Less than 1 Year	166	16.40%
	1-4 Years	418	41.30%
	5-10 Years	189	18.68%
	More than 10 Years	239	23.62%
Social Work Degree / License	Neither	166	17.38%
	Degree, No License	113	11.83%
	License, No degree	98	10.26%
	Both	578	60.52%
Education Level	Less than Bachelor	32	3.31%
	Bachelor	606	62.73%
	Master or higher	328	33.95%
County Population	Small	121	11.91%
	Medium	207	20.37%
	Large	264	25.98%
	Extra Large	213	20.96%
	Milwaukee	211	20.77%
Training Region	Northern	96	9.45%
	Northeast	270	26.57%
	Southern	181	17.81%
	Southeast	78	7.68%
	Western	180	17.72%
	Milwaukee	211	20.77%

PRACTICE CHALLENGES

Table 2A depicts the breakdown in training topic preference related to practice challenges first by supervisors vs. frontline staff (to the left of the vertical line, and then by job sector (county, private agency, or state). Regardless of the worker job function or job sector, mental illness/mental health issues and substance abuse issues were consistently ranked far above other topics. Supervisors and frontline staff also agreed on the need for training related to cognitive impairments and learning disabilities, and parenting strengths and challenges. Supervisors ranked domestic violence in the top 5, whereas frontline staff ranked sexual abuse in the top 5. In terms of job sector, there was less consistency in training topic preferences. County staff ranked neglect, cognitive impairments and learning disabilities, and parenting strengths and challenges in the top 5, whereas private agencies and state workers ranked sexual abuse, domestic violence, and human and sex trafficking of youth in the top 5.

TABLE 2A. Practice Challenge Items						
Question (#)	Percent (Rank)					
	Supervisors	Frontline	County HS	Private	State CW	
Mental illness/mental health issues (4)	70.95% (1)	81.72% (1)	82.28% (1)	81.19% (1)	77.14% (1)	
Substance abuse (5)	63.69% (2)	68.82% (2)	70.12% (2)	63.37% (2)	64.29% (2)	
Sexual abuse (6)	25.70% (9)	39.19% (5)	38.59% (6)	43.56% (5)	38.57% (5)	
Neglect (7)	30.73% (6)	36.92% (7)	39.49% (5)	26.73% (9)	27.14% (9)	
Cognitive impairments and learning disabilities (8)	41.90% (4)	39.90% (4)	39.79% (4)	42.57% (6)	37.14% (6)	
Emotional abuse (9)	26.26% (8)	31.78% (8)	32.88% (8)	24.75% (10)	31.43% (7)	
Domestic violence (10)	37.43% (5)	38.11% (6)	33.03% (7)	58.42% (3)	57.14% (4)	
Poverty stressors (11)	23.46% (10)	31.06% (10)	31.23% (9)	32.67% (8)	27.14% (9)	
Parenting strengths and challenges (13)	46.93% (3)	46.83% (3)	49.55% (3)	40.59% (7)	30.00% (8)	
Human and sex trafficking of youth (14)	28.49% (7)	31.18% (9)	25.68% (10)	48.51% (4)	58.57% (3)	
N	179	837	807	124	85	

Table 2B shows that across all categories of child welfare experience, workers indicated interest in training regarding mental illness/mental health issues, substance abuse, and parenting strengths and challenges. Outside of this shared interest, workers with more than ten years of experience in the field reported interest in cognitive impairments and learning disabilities and emotional abuse, while the groups with less experience reported interest in sexual abuse, neglect, and domestic violence.

TABLE 2B. Practice Challenge Items, by Years of Child Welfare Experience					
Question (#)	Percent (Rank)				
	< 1 Year	1 - 4 Years	5-10 Years	> 10 Years	
Mental illness/mental health issues (4)	77.46% (1)	80.51% (1)	77.98% (1)	81.21% (1)	
Substance abuse (5)	60.56% (2)	71.84% (2)	69.27% (2)	66.44% (2)	
Sexual abuse (6)	43.66% (5)	44.40% (4)	38.53% (5)	30.43% (7)	
Neglect (7)	43.66% (5)	38.63% (6)	42.20% (4)	29.98% (9)	
Cognitive impairments and learning disabilities (8)	38.03% (7)	37.91% (7)	34.40% (7)	44.97% (4)	
Emotional abuse (9)	35.21% (9)	28.88% (9)	30.28% (9)	31.77% (5)	
Domestic violence (10)	52.11% (4)	46.57% (3)	38.53% (5)	30.20% (8)	
Poverty stressors (11)	38.03% (7)	28.52% (10)	31.65% (8)	28.19% (10)	
Parenting strengths and challenges (13)	53.52% (3)	41.52% (5)	44.50% (3)	50.34% (3)	
Human and sex trafficking of youth (14)	33.80% (10)	31.77% (8)	28.44% (10)	30.87% (6)	
N	71	277	218	447	

Table 2C shows a similar pattern of interest to table 2B. Each of the groups of workers were interested in training on mental illness/mental health issues, substance abuse, and parenting strengths and challenges. The remaining categories were less consistent. All but those with ten years of experience in their current position indicated an interest in training on domestic violence.

TABLE 2C. Practice Challenge Items, by Years in Current Position								
Question (#)	Percent (Rank)							
	< 1 Year		1 - 4 Years		5-10 Years		> 10 Years	
Mental illness/mental health issues (4)	79.52%	(1)	80.62%	(1)	77.78%	(1)	81.17%	(1)
Substance abuse (5)	62.05%	(2)	73.21%	(2)	69.84%	(2)	61.92%	(2)
Sexual abuse (6)	42.17%	(5)	39.47%	(5)	35.45%	(7)	30.13%	(7)
Neglect (7)	37.35%	(7)	39.00%	(6)	40.74%	(4)	25.94%	(9)
Cognitive impairments and learning disabilities (8)	39.16%	(6)	37.80%	(7)	35.45%	(7)	49.79%	(4)
Emotional abuse (9)	31.93%	(9)	28.47%	(10)	35.98%	(5)	30.54%	(6)
Domestic violence (10)	44.58%	(4)	43.54%	(3)	35.98%	(5)	25.94%	(9)
Poverty stressors (11)	28.31%	(10)	30.14%	(9)	33.86%	(9)	27.20%	(8)
Parenting strengths and challenges (13)	50.00%	(3)	41.63%	(4)	50.26%	(3)	51.88%	(3)
Human and sex trafficking of youth (14)	33.13%	(8)	32.06%	(8)	22.75%	(10)	33.47%	(5)
N	166		418		189		239	

Those with 4 or fewer years of experience indicated an interest in sexual abuse, and those with 5-10 years' experience were interested in emotional abuse. Finally, those with 10 years or more in their position were interested in human trafficking, and cognitive impairments.

In table 2D, we see that workers across the spectrum of social work degree and licensure are interested in mental illness/mental health issues and substance abuse. All but those with neither licensure nor social work degree are interested in cognitive impairments and learning disabilities, and domestic violence. Those with neither are interested in neglect, while no other groups share this interest.

TABLE 2D. Practice Challenge Items, by Social Work Degree and Licensure Status								
Question (#)	Percent (Rank)							
	Neither	Degree & No License		No Degree & License		Both		
Mental illness/mental health issues (4)	77.71%	(1)	84.96%	(1)	83.67%	(1)	83.22%	(1)
Substance abuse (5)	64.46%	(2)	73.45%	(2)	65.31%	(2)	72.49%	(2)
Sexual abuse (6)	41.57%	(4)	45.13%	(5)	36.73%	(6)	34.60%	(7)
Neglect (7)	40.36%	(5)	33.63%	(8)	34.69%	(7)	36.85%	(6)
Cognitive impairments and learning disabilities (8)	38.55%	(6)	46.02%	(4)	45.92%	(4)	41.18%	(4)
Emotional abuse (9)	36.14%	(10)	23.89%	(10)	32.65%	(8)	31.66%	(8)
Domestic violence (10)	37.35%	(8)	48.67%	(3)	38.78%	(5)	38.06%	(5)
Poverty stressors (11)	38.55%	(6)	30.09%	(9)	26.53%	(10)	30.10%	(9)
Parenting strengths and challenges (13)	50.60%	(3)	40.71%	(6)	48.98%	(3)	48.96%	(3)
Human and sex trafficking of youth (14)	36.75%	(9)	38.05%	(7)	28.57%	(9)	28.37%	(10)
N	166		113		98		578	

Those with no license were both interested in training regarding sexual abuse, and all but those with a social work degree and no license were interested in parenting strengths and challenges.

Among those who have completed foundation training, table 2E shows that all are interested in training regarding mental illness/mental health issues, substance abuse, and parenting strengths and challenges. Those who were exempt and completed foundation training were interested in sexual abuse training, and those for whom training is incomplete were interested in neglect. Finally, all but those who completed foundation training were interested in training regarding cognitive impairments and learning disabilities.

TABLE 2E. Practice Challenge Items, by Completion of Foundation Training								
Question (#)	Percent (Rank)							
	Complete	Incomplete		Exempt				
Mental illness/mental health issues (4)	80.53%	(1)	80.70%	(1)	78.64%	(1)		
Substance abuse (5)	71.53%	(2)	66.23%	(2)	52.43%	(2)		
Sexual abuse (6)	38.79%	(5)	32.89%	(8)	34.95%	(5)		
Neglect (7)	36.87%	(7)	35.96%	(5)	31.07%	(6)		
Cognitive impairments and learning disabilities (8)	38.50%	(6)	41.67%	(4)	51.46%	(3)		
Emotional abuse (9)	31.86%	(9)	30.26%	(9)	27.18%	(9)		
Domestic violence (10)	42.18%	(4)	33.77%	(7)	22.33%	(10)		
Poverty stressors (11)	28.32%	(10)	34.65%	(6)	30.10%	(7)		
Parenting strengths and challenges (13)	45.58%	(3)	53.95%	(3)	42.72%	(4)		
Human and sex trafficking of youth (14)	32.15%	(8)	28.51%	(10)	28.16%	(8)		
N	166		113		98			

Table 2F shows that workers across the spectrum of education level are interested in training regarding mental illness/mental health issues, substance abuse, cognitive impairments and learning disabilities, and parenting strengths and challenges. In addition, those with a master's degree or higher were interested in neglect, those with a bachelor's degree were interested in sexual abuse training, and those with a degree lower than a bachelor were interested in domestic violence training.

TABLE 2F. Practice Challenge Items, by Education Level						
Question (#)	Percent (Rank)					
	< Bachelor		Bachelor's Degree		Master's or higher	
Mental illness/mental health issues (4)	70.95%	(1)	81.72%	(1)	82.28%	(1)
Substance abuse (5)	63.69%	(2)	68.82%	(2)	70.12%	(2)
Sexual abuse (6)	25.70%	(9)	39.19%	(5)	38.59%	(6)
Neglect (7)	30.73%	(6)	36.92%	(7)	39.49%	(5)
Cognitive impairments and learning disabilities (8)	41.90%	(4)	39.90%	(4)	39.79%	(4)
Emotional abuse (9)	26.26%	(8)	31.78%	(8)	32.88%	(8)
Domestic violence (10)	37.43%	(5)	38.11%	(6)	33.03%	(7)
Poverty stressors (11)	23.46%	(10)	31.06%	(10)	31.23%	(9)
Parenting strengths and challenges (13)	46.93%	(3)	46.83%	(3)	49.55%	(3)
Human and sex trafficking of youth (14)	28.49%	(7)	31.18%	(9)	25.68%	(10)
N	32		608		328	

Table 2G shows variation across training regions. All regions include mental illness/mental health issues, substance abuse, and parenting strengths and challenges in their top 5 training choices. All but Milwaukee are interested in sexual abuse training, and parenting strengths and challenges. The western region includes neglect in its top 5, as do the northern and northeast regions. All but the northern and western regions include cognitive impairments and learning disabilities in the top 5. Finally, Milwaukee includes human trafficking and domestic violence in its top 5, while others do not.

TABLE 2G. Practice Challenge Items, by Training Region												
Question (#)	Percent (Rank)											
	Northern	Northeast	Southern	Southeast	Western	Milwaukee						
Mental illness/mental health issues (4)	75.00%	(2)	79.63%	(1)	83.43%	(1)	80.77%	(1)	81.67%	(1)	77.25%	(1)
Substance abuse (5)	79.17%	(1)	69.26%	(2)	66.85%	(2)	74.36%	(2)	67.78%	(2)	59.72%	(3)
Sexual abuse (6)	34.38%	(5)	34.44%	(5)	37.02%	(5)	33.33%	(5)	42.22%	(5)	37.44%	(6)
Neglect (7)	52.08%	(4)	34.44%	(5)	36.46%	(6)	29.49%	(7)	42.78%	(4)	26.07%	(10)
Cognitive impairments and learning disabilities (8)	30.21%	(6)	42.22%	(4)	48.07%	(3)	39.74%	(4)	33.89%	(7)	41.23%	(5)
Emotional abuse (9)	30.21%	(6)	30.00%	(8)	33.70%	(7)	28.21%	(9)	32.78%	(8)	28.91%	(9)
Domestic violence (10)	28.13%	(8)	28.89%	(10)	30.94%	(9)	29.49%	(7)	41.67%	(6)	60.19%	(2)
Poverty stressors (11)	25.00%	(9)	31.11%	(7)	30.94%	(9)	30.77%	(6)	28.89%	(9)	29.38%	(8)
Parenting strengths and challenges (13)	57.29%	(3)	47.04%	(3)	47.51%	(4)	53.85%	(3)	50.56%	(3)	35.55%	(7)
Human and sex trafficking of youth (14)	11.46%	(10)	29.26%	(9)	31.49%	(8)	28.21%	(9)	16.67%	(10)	53.55%	(4)
N	96		270		181		78		180		211	

Table 2H shows that counties of all sizes included mental illness/mental health issues and substance abuse training in their top 5. All but the small counties included cognitive impairments and learning disabilities, and all but Milwaukee included parenting strengths and challenges. Small, medium, and large counties included neglect in their top 5, and small counties included domestic violence. Human trafficking of youth training was included in the top 5 for Milwaukee and the extra large counties.

TABLE 2H. Practice Challenge Items, by County Population Size						
Question (#)	Percent (Rank)					
	Small	Medium	Large	Extra Large	Milwaukee	
Mental illness/mental health issues (4)	73.55% (1)	80.68% (1)	81.44% (1)	83.10% (1)	77.25% (1)	
Substance abuse (5)	72.73% (2)	63.29% (2)	73.48% (2)	70.89% (2)	59.72% (3)	
Sexual abuse (6)	37.19% (6)	37.68% (6)	36.36% (6)	35.68% (6)	37.44% (6)	
Neglect (7)	41.32% (4)	45.89% (4)	39.39% (5)	28.17% (10)	26.07% (10)	
Cognitive impairments and learning disabilities (8)	28.93% (9)	41.55% (5)	40.53% (4)	44.13% (3)	41.23% (5)	
Emotional abuse (9)	33.88% (7)	36.23% (7)	28.03% (9)	29.11% (9)	28.91% (9)	
Domestic violence (10)	38.84% (5)	33.82% (8)	29.55% (7)	30.05% (8)	60.19% (2)	
Poverty stressors (11)	33.06% (8)	27.05% (9)	28.41% (8)	32.39% (7)	29.38% (8)	
Parenting strengths and challenges (13)	47.11% (3)	50.24% (3)	57.58% (3)	41.31% (4)	35.55% (7)	
Human and sex trafficking of youth (14)	14.05% (10)	17.39% (10)	26.14% (10)	36.15% (5)	53.55% (4)	
N	121	207	264	213	211	

County Directors were also asked to select the top five practice challenges training topics on which they felt their staff could benefit from additional training. The top five training topics selected by county directors were mental illness/mental health issues (77%), substance abuse (73%), parenting strengths and challenges (56%), poverty stressors (46%), and neglect (38%).

FOUNDATIONAL CHILD WELFARE PRACTICE

Table 3A shows that across all types of workers, there was broad agreement in interest in several training topics. These include intergenerational maltreatment, attachment disorders, child maltreatment prevention, and trauma informed practice. Supervisors and frontline workers also all included the science of addiction in their top 5. Across different sectors there was some difference here. County and private agency workers included science of addiction in the top 5, but state workers included the effect of psychotropic medications in the top 5.

TABLE 3A. Foundational Child Welfare Practice Items by Position and Sector						
Question (#)	Percent (Rank)					
	Supervisors	Frontline	County HS	Private	State CW	
Family systems theory (4)	34.08% (7)	31.30% (8)	30.93% (8)	30.69% (8)	35.71% (7)	
Brain development (5)	35.20% (6)	31.78% (7)	33.63% (7)	24.75% (10)	24.29% (9)	
The science of addiction (6)	48.04% (4)	44.09% (5)	45.50% (5)	41.58% (5)	34.29% (8)	
Stages of child development (7)	17.88% (10)	24.37% (9)	22.52% (9)	27.72% (9)	37.14% (6)	
The effects of psychotropic medications (8)	34.08% (7)	42.05% (6)	42.04% (6)	40.59% (6)	44.29% (5)	
Understanding and addressing grief and loss (9)	18.44% (9)	22.94% (10)	21.32% (10)	33.66% (7)	22.86% (10)	
Intergenerational maltreatment (10)	51.40% (3)	54.24% (3)	54.05% (3)	59.41% (2)	48.57% (2)	
Attachment disorders (11)	45.81% (5)	56.39% (2)	57.36% (2)	55.45% (3)	48.57% (2)	
What works in child maltreatment prevention (12)	54.75% (2)	51.14% (4)	51.50% (4)	52.48% (4)	45.71% (4)	
Trauma-informed practice (14)	65.36% (1)	65.35% (1)	63.51% (1)	73.27% (1)	71.43% (1)	
N	179	837	807	124	85	

Table 3B shows that across years of child welfare experience, there was broad agreement as to training topics. Workers at all experience levels included intergenerational maltreatment, attachment disorders, child maltreatment prevention, and trauma informed practice in their top 5 training choices. All but those with less than 1 year of experience included science of addiction in their top 5, but those with less than one year included brain development in their top 5.

TABLE 3B. Foundational Child Welfare Practice Items, by Years of CW Experience					
Question (#)	Percent (Rank)				
	< 1 Year	1 - 4 Years	5-10 Years	> 10 Years	
Family systems theory (4)	33.80% (7)	29.96% (8)	35.32% (7)	31.10% (8)	
Brain development (5)	39.44% (5)	26.71% (9)	32.11% (8)	35.12% (7)	
The science of addiction (6)	36.62% (6)	46.21% (5)	42.66% (5)	46.53% (5)	
Stages of child development (7)	30.99% (9)	31.77% (7)	24.77% (9)	15.88% (10)	
The effects of psychotropic medications (8)	32.39% (8)	42.24% (6)	40.37% (6)	41.39% (6)	
Understanding and addressing grief and loss (9)	16.90% (10)	24.91% (10)	18.81% (10)	23.04% (9)	
Intergenerational maltreatment (10)	53.52% (3)	54.87% (3)	54.59% (2)	52.80% (2)	
Attachment disorders (11)	53.52% (3)	59.93% (1)	54.13% (3)	51.90% (3)	
What works in child maltreatment prevention (12)	63.38% (2)	53.79% (4)	54.13% (3)	47.87% (4)	
Trauma-informed practice (14)	67.61% (1)	59.93% (1)	66.06% (1)	68.23% (1)	
N	71	277	218	447	

Table 3C shows that when considering training choices by years in current position, each group included the science of addiction, intergenerational maltreatment, attachment disorders, and trauma informed practice in its top 5. All but those with 10 years of experience included child maltreatment prevention in their top 5, while this group included effects of psychotropic medication in its top 5.

TABLE 3C. Foundational Child Welfare Practice Items, by Years in Current Position				
Question (#)	Percent (Rank)			
	< 1 Year	1 - 4 Years	5-10 Years	> 10 Years
Family systems theory (4)	27.11% (9)	33.97% (7)	34.92% (8)	28.87% (8)
Brain development (5)	31.93% (7)	28.47% (8)	35.98% (7)	37.24% (7)
The science of addiction (6)	40.96% (5)	46.17% (5)	46.56% (5)	44.35% (4)
Stages of child development (7)	28.92% (8)	28.23% (9)	17.99% (10)	15.06% (10)
The effects of psychotropic medications (8)	36.14% (6)	41.63% (6)	39.15% (6)	43.51% (5)
Understanding and addressing grief and loss (9)	19.28% (10)	23.44% (10)	19.58% (9)	24.27% (9)
Intergenerational maltreatment (10)	52.41% (4)	55.74% (2)	55.56% (3)	50.21% (3)
Attachment disorders (11)	59.04% (2)	53.83% (4)	57.14% (2)	51.46% (2)
What works in child maltreatment prevention (12)	58.43% (3)	55.02% (3)	53.44% (4)	41.00% (6)
Trauma-informed practice (14)	66.87% (1)	61.72% (1)	74.60% (1)	64.02% (1)
N	166	418	189	239

Regardless of holding social work degree and license, workers of all types included intergenerational maltreatment, attachment disorders, child maltreatment prevention, and trauma informed practice in the top 5 training categories, as shown in table 3D. Workers who had either both or neither degree or license included science of addiction in their top 5, while those with one or the other included effects of psychotropic medication in their top 5.

TABLE 3D. Foundational Child Welfare Practice Items, by Social Work Degree and Licensure				
Question (#)	Percent (Rank)			
	Neither	Degree & No License	No Degree & License	Both
Family systems theory (4)	35.54% (7)	41.59% (6)	32.65% (7)	30.45% (8)
Brain development (5)	33.13% (8)	28.32% (9)	32.65% (7)	34.60% (7)
The science of addiction (6)	41.57% (5)	41.59% (6)	39.80% (6)	49.83% (5)
Stages of child development (7)	29.52% (9)	32.74% (8)	21.43% (9)	20.93% (10)
The effects of psychotropic medications (8)	36.75% (6)	47.79% (5)	44.90% (5)	42.73% (6)
Understanding and addressing grief and loss (9)	23.49% (10)	23.89% (10)	21.43% (9)	22.84% (9)
Intergenerational maltreatment (10)	54.22% (3)	53.10% (2)	57.14% (3)	56.40% (3)
Attachment disorders (11)	57.23% (2)	52.21% (3)	52.04% (4)	57.09% (2)
What works in child maltreatment prevention (12)	52.41% (4)	52.21% (3)	59.18% (2)	53.46% (4)
Trauma-informed practice (14)	62.05% (1)	65.49% (1)	68.37% (1)	69.03% (1)
N	166	113	98	578

Table 3E shows that regardless of whether workers had completed foundation training, all included intergenerational maltreatment, attachment disorders, child maltreatment prevention, and trauma informed practice in the top 5 choices for training. Those who were exempt from training included effects of psychotropic medication and brain development in their top 5, while all others included the science of addiction.

TABLE 3E. Foundational Child Welfare Practice Items, by Foundation Training Completion				
Question (#)	Percent (Rank)			
	Complete	Incomplete	Exempt	
Family systems theory (4)	31.12% (8)	32.89% (7)	35.92% (7)	
Brain development (5)	31.86% (7)	29.39% (8)	44.66% (4)	
The science of addiction (6)	47.35% (5)	42.98% (5)	34.95% (8)	
Stages of child development (7)	22.12% (10)	26.32% (9)	25.24% (9)	
The effects of psychotropic medications (8)	42.48% (6)	38.16% (6)	36.89% (5)	
Understanding and addressing grief and loss (9)	23.01% (9)	19.74% (10)	23.30% (10)	
Intergenerational maltreatment (10)	56.49% (2)	50.00% (4)	47.57% (2)	
Attachment disorders (11)	54.28% (3)	60.53% (2)	46.60% (3)	
What works in child maltreatment prevention (12)	53.24% (4)	55.70% (3)	36.89% (5)	
Trauma-informed practice (14)	67.70% (1)	61.40% (1)	63.11% (1)	
N	678	228	103	

In table 3F, we see that regardless of education type, there was significant agreement as to preferred training categories. All workers included the science of addiction, intergenerational maltreatment, attachment disorders, child maltreatment prevention, and trauma informed practice in their top 5. In addition, those with less than a bachelor's degree included effects of psychotropic medication in the top 5.

TABLE 3F. Foundational Child Welfare Practice Items, by Education Level						
Question (#)	Percent (Rank)					
	< Bachelor		Bachelor's Degree		Master's or higher	
Family systems theory (4)	28.13%	(8)	33.00%	(8)	32.93%	(8)
Brain development (5)	31.25%	(7)	33.33%	(7)	33.84%	(7)
The science of addiction (6)	43.75%	(5)	45.71%	(5)	48.17%	(5)
Stages of child development (7)	18.75%	(10)	25.74%	(9)	21.04%	(10)
The effects of psychotropic medications (8)	43.75%	(5)	40.10%	(6)	45.73%	(6)
Understanding and addressing grief and loss (9)	21.88%	(9)	20.96%	(10)	26.52%	(9)
Intergenerational maltreatment (10)	59.38%	(1)	55.61%	(3)	55.49%	(3)
Attachment disorders (11)	46.88%	(4)	56.60%	(2)	56.71%	(2)
What works in child maltreatment prevention (12)	50.00%	(3)	52.81%	(4)	55.49%	(3)
Trauma-informed practice (14)	56.25%	(2)	66.17%	(1)	71.34%	(1)
N	32		608		328	

Table 3G shows that across training regions, all workers were interested in intergenerational maltreatment, attachment disorders, child maltreatment prevention, and trauma informed practice. Workers from the southern region and Milwaukee indicated interest in the effects of psychotropic medication, while workers from the remaining areas included the science of addiction in their top 5.

TABLE 3G. Foundational Child Welfare Practice Items, by Training Region						
Question (#)	Percent (Rank)					
	Northern	Northeast	Southern	Southeast	Western	Milwaukee
Family systems theory (4)	23.96% (8)	28.89% (8)	28.18% (8)	43.59% (7)	36.67% (6)	33.65% (7)
Brain development (5)	30.21% (7)	38.89% (7)	33.70% (7)	23.08% (8)	33.89% (7)	26.07% (10)
The science of addiction (6)	60.42% (2)	44.07% (5)	40.33% (6)	53.85% (3)	45.56% (5)	38.39% (6)
Stages of child development (7)	15.63% (9)	19.63% (10)	26.52% (9)	23.08% (8)	22.22% (9)	29.38% (8)
The effects of psychotropic medications (8)	37.50% (6)	43.70% (6)	41.44% (5)	48.72% (6)	32.22% (8)	41.71% (5)
Understanding and addressing grief and loss (9)	15.63% (9)	22.59% (9)	21.55% (10)	17.95% (10)	21.11% (10)	27.49% (9)
Intergenerational maltreatment (10)	54.17% (4)	55.93% (2)	49.17% (4)	53.85% (3)	55.56% (3)	53.08% (2)
Attachment disorders (11)	57.29% (3)	52.59% (3)	61.33% (2)	55.13% (2)	52.78% (4)	51.18% (3)
What works in child maltreatment prevention (12)	52.08% (5)	50.00% (4)	49.72% (3)	51.28% (5)	58.89% (2)	49.76% (4)
Trauma-informed practice (14)	68.75% (1)	57.41% (1)	67.40% (1)	60.26% (1)	68.89% (1)	71.09% (1)
N	96	270	181	78	180	211

Similar to the training regions, table 3H shows that workers from all county sizes included intergenerational maltreatment, attachment disorders, child maltreatment prevention, and trauma informed practice in their top 5 training categories. Those from the largest counties, the extra large counties and Milwaukee area, included the effects of psychotropic medication in their responses, while those from the small, medium, and large counties included the science of addiction.

TABLE 3H. Foundational Child Welfare Practice Items, by County Population Size						
Question (#)	Percent (Rank)					
	Small	Medium	Large	Extra Large	Western	
Family systems theory (4)	31.40% (8)	32.37% (7)	32.95% (8)	28.17% (8)	33.65% (7)	
Brain development (5)	34.71% (7)	31.40% (8)	33.71% (7)	36.62% (7)	26.07% (10)	
The science of addiction (6)	48.76% (4)	41.55% (5)	51.14% (5)	44.13% (6)	38.39% (6)	
Stages of child development (7)	25.62% (9)	21.26% (9)	19.70% (9)	22.07% (9)	29.38% (8)	
The effects of psychotropic medications (8)	36.36% (6)	36.71% (6)	39.77% (6)	46.95% (4)	41.71% (5)	
Understanding and addressing grief and loss (9)	23.97% (10)	19.32% (10)	19.32% (10)	22.07% (9)	27.49% (9)	
Intergenerational maltreatment (10)	55.37% (3)	53.62% (4)	57.20% (2)	49.30% (3)	53.08% (2)	
Attachment disorders (11)	48.76% (4)	58.45% (2)	57.20% (2)	53.99% (2)	51.18% (3)	
What works in child maltreatment prevention (12)	56.20% (2)	54.59% (3)	53.03% (4)	46.95% (4)	49.76% (4)	
Trauma-informed practice (14)	57.85% (1)	62.32% (1)	66.67% (1)	65.26% (1)	71.09% (1)	
<i>N</i>	121	207	264	213	211	

The top training topics selected by county directors are trauma-informed practice (75%), intergenerational maltreatment (60%), child maltreatment prevention (58%), attachment disorders (52%), and the science of addiction (51%).

SKILLS DEVELOPMENT

Responses to skill development training topics by worker type are summarized on table 4A. All workers were interested in conflict negotiation and de-escalating crisis situations. Both frontline workers and supervisors indicated an interest in cross-systems collaboration, but across sector, state workers did not share this interest. Frontline workers and those from county and private agencies included secondary traumatic stress in their top 5. Supervisors included leadership skills and effective documentation in their top 5, but this was not shared across any other groups. Frontline workers, state workers, and private sector workers reported an interest in court testimony and preparation; finally, county workers indicated an interest in developing interviewing skills.

Question (#)	Percent (Rank)				
	Supervisors	Frontline	County HS	Private	State CW
Leadership skills (4)	46.37% (1)	19.47% (10)	18.17% (11)	23.76% (9)	25.71% (10)
Time management (6)	28.49% (9)	24.49% (8)	22.07% (9)	29.70% (8)	40.00% (3)
Court testimony and preparation (7)	29.61% (7)	41.10% (5)	38.74% (6)	54.46% (2)	44.29% (2)
Enhancing interviewing skills (9)	29.05% (8)	38.71% (6)	39.64% (5)	31.68% (6)	40.00% (3)
Effective documentation and case notes (10)	40.22% (5)	35.01% (7)	35.74% (7)	31.68% (6)	32.86% (6)
Conflict negotiations (11)	45.25% (2)	46.48% (2)	47.30% (2)	48.51% (4)	35.71% (5)
Enhancing communication skills (12)	26.82% (10)	23.54% (9)	24.32% (8)	12.87% (12)	31.43% (8)
Effectively working with Coordinated Service Teams (13)	15.08% (11)	19.00% (11)	18.47% (10)	19.80% (10)	22.86% (11)
Cross-systems collaboration with schools, mental health providers, and corrections staff (17)	42.46% (4)	45.88% (3)	47.00% (3)	49.50% (3)	30.00% (9)
De-escalating crisis situations (18)	43.02% (3)	55.44% (1)	56.01% (1)	55.45% (1)	50.00% (1)
Assessing and addressing secondary traumatic stress (19)	39.11% (6)	41.82% (4)	41.74% (4)	48.51% (4)	32.86% (6)
Providing active efforts in ICWA cases (21)	10.06% (12)	13.74% (12)	12.76% (12)	16.83% (11)	18.57% (12)
N	179	837	807	124	85

Table 4B shows that across years of child welfare experience, all workers were interested in conflict negotiations, cross-system collaboration, and de-escalating crisis situations. Those with fewer than 10 years of experience included court testimony and interviewing skills in their top 5, while those with 5 years or more experience included secondary traumatic stress. Those with 10 or more years included effective documentation with case notes as well.

Question (#)	Percent (Rank)			
	< 1 Year	1 - 4 Years	5-10 Years	> 10 Years
Leadership skills (4)	21.13% (10)	17.69% (10)	27.06% (10)	27.52% (7)
Time management (6)	21.13% (10)	25.63% (8)	29.36% (8)	23.71% (9)
Court testimony and preparation (7)	66.20% (2)	59.21% (1)	35.78% (5)	24.16% (8)
Enhancing interviewing skills (9)	43.66% (3)	46.21% (3)	32.11% (7)	32.89% (6)
Effective documentation and case notes (10)	36.62% (7)	41.16% (6)	32.57% (6)	34.45% (5)
Conflict negotiations (11)	43.66% (3)	46.21% (3)	50.00% (2)	45.19% (4)
Enhancing communication skills (12)	26.76% (8)	20.94% (9)	28.44% (9)	23.71% (9)
Effectively working with Coordinated Service Teams (13)	25.35% (9)	14.80% (12)	17.89% (11)	19.46% (11)
Cross-systems collaboration with schools, mental health providers, and corrections staff (17)	40.85% (5)	46.21% (3)	44.50% (3)	45.86% (3)
De-escalating crisis situations (18)	69.01% (1)	55.96% (2)	55.05% (1)	48.55% (1)
Assessing and addressing secondary traumatic stress (19)	38.03% (6)	32.49% (7)	42.66% (4)	46.76% (2)
Providing active efforts in ICWA cases (21)	16.90% (12)	15.16% (11)	12.39% (12)	11.63% (12)
N	71	277	218	447

Table 4C shows that workers across all categories of job tenure included conflict negotiations, cross-system collaboration, and de-escalating crisis situations in their top 5 training choices of skill development. Those with 5 or more years were interested in secondary traumatic stress and effective documentation and case notes, while those with less than 5 years were interested in court testimony and effective interviewing skills.

TABLE 4C. Skill Development Items, by Years in Current Position				
Question (#)	Percent (Rank)			
	< 1 Year	1 - 4 Years	5-10 Years	> 10 Years
Leadership skills (4)	21.69% (10)	24.88% (9)	31.22% (8)	19.67% (10)
Time management (6)	25.30% (9)	28.23% (8)	25.40% (9)	20.08% (9)
Court testimony and preparation (7)	56.02% (2)	46.89% (3)	33.86% (7)	17.99% (11)
Enhancing interviewing skills (9)	44.58% (5)	39.47% (5)	34.92% (6)	29.71% (6)
Effective documentation and case notes (10)	37.95% (6)	37.80% (6)	38.10% (5)	30.13% (5)
Conflict negotiations (11)	46.39% (4)	47.37% (2)	44.97% (4)	46.03% (2)
Enhancing communication skills (12)	27.11% (8)	22.97% (10)	22.75% (10)	25.10% (7)
Effectively working with Coordinated Service Teams (13)	16.27% (11)	18.42% (11)	14.29% (11)	23.01% (8)
Cross-systems collaboration with schools, mental health providers, and corrections staff (17)	46.99% (3)	42.82% (4)	49.21% (2)	45.61% (3)
De-escalating crisis situations (18)	56.63% (1)	53.83% (1)	52.91% (1)	50.63% (1)
Assessing and addressing secondary traumatic stress (19)	37.35% (7)	37.32% (7)	48.68% (3)	45.61% (3)
Providing active efforts in ICWA cases (21)	16.27% (11)	14.83% (12)	11.64% (12)	9.21% (12)
N	71	277	218	447

Across those with a social work degree and licensure, all workers indicated an interest in conflict negotiations, cross-system collaboration, and de-escalating crisis situations. Those with both degree and licensure indicated an interest in interviewing skills and secondary traumatic stress. Workers with a license indicated an interest in effective documentation and court testimony, as did those with a degree but no license. Those with neither license nor degree indicated an interest in court testimony and secondary trauma.

TABLE 4D. Skill Development Items, by Social Work Degree and Licensure				
Question (#)	Percent (Rank)			
	Neither	Degree & No License	No Degree & License	Both
Leadership skills (4)	25.30% (10)	25.66% (8)	29.59% (8)	24.39% (10)
Time management (6)	28.31% (9)	25.66% (8)	28.57% (9)	24.91% (9)
Court testimony and preparation (7)	37.35% (5)	53.98% (2)	38.78% (5)	39.45% (6)
Enhancing interviewing skills (9)	31.33% (7)	38.05% (6)	31.63% (7)	41.87% (5)
Effective documentation and case notes (10)	31.33% (7)	40.71% (5)	48.98% (1)	36.68% (7)
Conflict negotiations (11)	51.20% (2)	45.13% (3)	38.78% (5)	48.62% (2)
Enhancing communication skills (12)	32.53% (6)	15.93% (12)	17.35% (10)	25.78% (8)
Effectively working with Coordinated Service Teams (13)	21.08% (11)	22.12% (10)	15.31% (12)	18.17% (11)
Cross-systems collaboration with schools, mental health providers, and corrections staff (17)	45.78% (3)	45.13% (3)	48.98% (1)	48.10% (3)
De-escalating crisis situations (18)	57.83% (1)	55.75% (1)	47.96% (3)	55.54% (1)
Assessing and addressing secondary traumatic stress (19)	44.58% (4)	37.17% (7)	41.84% (4)	43.77% (4)
Providing active efforts in ICWA cases (21)	9.64% (12)	16.81% (11)	16.33% (11)	13.67% (12)
N	166	113	98	578

Table 4E shows that all workers, regardless of completing foundation training, were interested in secondary traumatic stress, conflict negotiations, cross-system collaboration, and de-escalating crisis situations. In addition, those exempt from foundation training were interested in enhancing interviewing skills, and those who had or had not completed training were interested in court testimony preparation.

TABLE 4E. Skill Development Items, by Foundation Training Completion			
Question (#)	Percent (Rank)		
	Complete	Incomplete	Exempt
Leadership skills (4)	28.32% (8)	14.04% (12)	21.36% (8)
Time management (6)	26.99% (9)	23.68% (9)	18.45% (9)
Court testimony and preparation (7)	41.30% (5)	43.86% (3)	16.50% (11)
Enhancing interviewing skills (9)	36.43% (7)	39.04% (6)	38.83% (4)
Effective documentation and case notes (10)	38.35% (6)	32.46% (7)	30.10% (7)
Conflict negotiations (11)	48.08% (2)	43.86% (3)	42.72% (2)
Enhancing communication skills (12)	22.27% (10)	26.32% (8)	33.01% (6)
Effectively working with Coordinated Service Teams (13)	17.11% (11)	22.81% (10)	17.48% (10)
Cross-systems collaboration with schools, mental health providers, and corrections staff (17)	45.87% (3)	46.05% (2)	42.72% (2)
De-escalating crisis situations (18)	52.21% (1)	57.02% (1)	55.34% (1)
Assessing and addressing secondary traumatic stress (19)	43.51% (4)	39.47% (5)	33.98% (5)
Providing active efforts in ICWA cases (21)	14.31% (12)	14.47% (11)	2.91% (12)
N	678	228	103

Table 4F shows that all workers, regardless of education level, were interested in secondary traumatic stress, conflict negotiations, cross-system collaboration, and de-escalating crisis situations. Those with a bachelor's degree or higher were interested in court testimony, and those with less than a bachelor's degree were interested in enhancing interviewing skills.

TABLE 4F. Skill Development Items, by Education Level			
Question (#)	Percent (Rank)		
	< Bachelor	Bachelor's Degree	Master's or higher
Leadership skills (4)	18.75% (11)	23.27% (10)	29.27% (8)
Time management (6)	28.13% (7)	26.07% (8)	25.91% (9)
Court testimony and preparation (7)	21.88% (8)	42.08% (5)	39.63% (5)
Enhancing interviewing skills (9)	37.50% (5)	38.61% (7)	38.41% (6)
Effective documentation and case notes (10)	21.88% (8)	39.44% (6)	35.06% (7)
Conflict negotiations (11)	43.75% (3)	46.20% (3)	51.52% (2)
Enhancing communication skills (12)	34.38% (6)	24.26% (9)	25.30% (10)
Effectively working with Coordinated Service Teams (13)	21.88% (8)	19.97% (11)	16.77% (11)
Cross-systems collaboration with schools, mental health providers, and corrections staff (17)	43.75% (3)	48.51% (2)	45.12% (3)
De-escalating crisis situations (18)	53.13% (1)	53.14% (1)	58.54% (1)
Assessing and addressing secondary traumatic stress (19)	50.00% (2)	42.57% (4)	43.60% (4)
Providing active efforts in ICWA cases (21)	9.38% (12)	14.03% (12)	13.41% (12)
N	32	608	328

Workers from all parts of the state were interested in conflict negotiations, cross-system collaboration, and de-escalating crisis situations, as shown in table 4G. All but those in the northern region included secondary traumatic stress in their top 5. Workers in the Milwaukee, northern, and northeastern regions included court testimony in their top 5. Workers in the southern and southeast regions indicated an interest in interviewing skills, while those in the western and northern region indicated an interest in effective documentation and case notes.

Question (#)	Percent (Rank)					
	Northern	Northeast	Southern	Southeast	Western	Milwaukee
Leadership skills (4)	27.08% (8)	20.00% (11)	22.10% (10)	25.64% (7)	23.33% (9)	30.33% (9)
Time management (6)	25.00% (9)	22.59% (8)	25.97% (9)	21.79% (10)	21.11% (10)	32.70% (6)
Court testimony and preparation (7)	40.63% (4)	40.74% (4)	36.46% (6)	25.64% (7)	35.56% (7)	46.45% (2)
Enhancing interviewing skills (9)	34.38% (7)	35.93% (6)	39.23% (5)	42.31% (5)	40.56% (6)	32.70% (6)
Effective documentation and case notes (10)	43.75% (3)	31.11% (7)	33.15% (7)	32.05% (6)	48.33% (2)	31.75% (8)
Conflict negotiations (11)	47.92% (2)	48.15% (2)	46.41% (3)	51.28% (2)	42.78% (4)	44.08% (3)
Enhancing communication skills (12)	18.75% (11)	20.37% (9)	29.83% (8)	24.36% (9)	28.33% (8)	22.75% (10)
Effectively working with Coordinated Service Teams (13)	20.83% (10)	20.37% (9)	19.34% (11)	14.10% (11)	14.44% (12)	18.48% (12)
Cross-systems collaboration with schools, mental health providers, and corrections staff (17)	40.63% (4)	45.93% (3)	51.38% (2)	44.87% (3)	44.44% (3)	42.18% (4)
De-escalating crisis situations (18)	55.21% (1)	52.96% (1)	56.35% (1)	57.69% (1)	48.89% (1)	52.13% (1)
Assessing and addressing secondary traumatic stress (19)	36.46% (6)	39.26% (5)	43.65% (4)	43.59% (4)	42.78% (4)	42.18% (4)
Providing active efforts in ICWA cases (21)	15.63% (12)	11.85% (12)	6.08% (12)	10.26% (12)	15.00% (11)	18.96% (11)
N	96	270	181	78	180	211

Among county sizes, all groups ranked conflict negotiations, cross-system collaboration, and de-escalating crisis situations in the top 5. All but those in the small population counties indicated an interest in secondary traumatic stress. Workers in all but the “large” counties ranked court testimony and preparation in the top 5, and those from the large and extra large counties included enhancing interviewing skills in the top 5. Finally, workers in the small counties included effective documentation and case notes in their top 5.

Question (#)	Percent (Rank)				
	Small	Medium	Large	Extra Large	Western
Leadership skills (4)	23.14% (8)	23.67% (10)	23.86% (8)	19.72% (11)	30.33% (9)
Time management (6)	23.14% (8)	26.09% (9)	21.97% (10)	22.07% (9)	32.70% (6)
Court testimony and preparation (7)	46.28% (3)	43.00% (3)	31.44% (7)	33.33% (5)	46.45% (2)
Enhancing interviewing skills (9)	37.19% (6)	40.10% (6)	40.91% (4)	33.33% (5)	32.70% (6)
Effective documentation and case notes (10)	47.11% (2)	39.61% (7)	35.98% (6)	30.05% (7)	31.75% (8)
Conflict negotiations (11)	46.28% (3)	43.00% (3)	49.24% (2)	47.89% (2)	44.08% (3)
Enhancing communication skills (12)	23.14% (8)	27.05% (8)	23.86% (8)	23.47% (8)	22.75% (10)
Effectively working with Coordinated Service Teams (13)	21.49% (11)	12.56% (11)	18.94% (11)	21.13% (10)	18.48% (12)
Cross-systems collaboration with schools, mental health providers, and corrections staff (17)	45.45% (5)	49.76% (2)	43.56% (3)	46.01% (4)	42.18% (4)
De-escalating crisis situations (18)	57.02% (1)	53.14% (1)	52.27% (1)	53.52% (1)	52.13% (1)
Assessing and addressing secondary traumatic stress (19)	33.06% (7)	41.55% (5)	40.15% (5)	46.48% (3)	42.18% (4)
Providing active efforts in ICWA cases (21)	9.09% (12)	11.59% (12)	13.26% (12)	10.80% (12)	18.96% (11)
N	121	207	264	213	211

County directors ranked the following topics in the top 5: de-escalating crisis situations (62%), cross-systems collaboration (58%), assessing/addressing secondary trauma (52%), effective documentation and case notes (48%), and court testimony and preparation (42%).

PLACEMENT AND OUT-OF-HOME CARE PRACTICE

Table 5A shows that across all worker types, all included effective practice at child removal and placement in their top 5 choices. Among frontline workers and supervisors, all ranked meaningful supervised visits, preparing children for reunification, and cross-system collaboration in the top 5. Supervisors ranked effective concurrent planning practices in the top 5, while frontline workers instead chose court preparation and testimony. Across sectors, county workers ranked meaningful supervised visits highly. State workers included recruitment and selection of foster families, and private agency workers ranked preparing children for adoption and guardianship and court preparation in the top 5. County and private agency workers were both interested in preparing youth for independent living, and both county and state workers were interested in cross-system collaboration.

TABLE 5A. Out-of-Home Care Items by Position and Sector

Question (#)	Percent (Rank)									
	Supervisors		Frontline		County HS		Private		State CW	
Recruitment and selection of foster families (4)	29.05%	(6)	21.51%	(12)	19.97%	(12)	23.76%	(12)	32.86%	(5)
Effective practice at child removal and placement (5)	45.25%	(2)	47.55%	(1)	47.60%	(2)	44.55%	(1)	51.43%	(1)
Meaningful supervised visits (6)	48.04%	(1)	43.85%	(2)	48.80%	(1)	32.67%	(7)	12.86%	(11)
Effective concurrent planning practices (7)	31.28%	(5)	21.74%	(11)	21.62%	(11)	30.69%	(8)	10.00%	(13)
Effective practice at case closure (8)	14.53%	(12)	14.46%	(13)	13.96%	(13)	14.85%	(13)	18.57%	(9)
Navigating the TPR process (9)	27.37%	(7)	26.64%	(8)	24.02%	(8)	44.55%	(1)	25.71%	(7)
Effective practice with adoptive families (10)	11.73%	(14)	9.92%	(14)	9.46%	(14)	12.87%	(14)	10.00%	(13)
Preparing children and youth for adoption and subsidized guardianship (11)	17.32%	(10)	24.73%	(9)	23.12%	(10)	43.56%	(3)	12.86%	(11)
Preparing children and youth for reunification (12)	37.43%	(3)	39.55%	(3)	42.04%	(3)	36.63%	(6)	20.00%	(8)
Preparing youth for independent living (13)	17.32%	(10)	29.15%	(6)	28.83%	(5)	40.59%	(4)	15.71%	(10)
Cross-systems collaboration with schools, mental health, and corrections (14)	34.08%	(4)	29.99%	(4)	29.88%	(4)	25.74%	(9)	37.14%	(3)
Engaging and working with foster/kinship providers (15)	26.26%	(8)	24.73%	(9)	23.27%	(9)	25.74%	(9)	37.14%	(3)
Court preparation and testimony (17)	22.35%	(9)	29.39%	(5)	27.78%	(6)	40.59%	(4)	28.57%	(6)
Personal safety (18)	13.97%	(13)	28.08%	(7)	27.33%	(7)	24.75%	(11)	40.00%	(2)
N	179		837		807		124		85	

Table 5B shows that by experience in the field, all workers ranked effective practice at child removal and placement, meaningful supervised visits, and preparing children and youth for reunification in their top 5. All but those with more than 10 years of experience ranked navigating the TPR process highly. Those with fewer than 5 years in the field included court preparation and testimony in the top 5, and those with 5 or more years included cross-system collaboration. Finally, those with 5-10 years in the field ranked recruitment and selection of foster families in the top 5.

TABLE 5B. Out-of-Home Care Items, by Years of Child Welfare Experience				
Question (#)	Percent (Rank)			
	< 1 Year	1 - 4 Years	5-10 Years	> 10 Years
Recruitment and selection of foster families (4)	12.68% (13)	20.22% (11)	27.98% (5)	23.71% (7)
Effective practice at child removal and placement (5)	61.97% (1)	56.68% (1)	45.87% (1)	39.82% (3)
Meaningful supervised visits (6)	38.03% (5)	45.85% (2)	43.58% (2)	45.64% (1)
Effective concurrent planning practices (7)	16.90% (11)	20.22% (11)	19.27% (12)	28.64% (6)
Effective practice at case closure (8)	15.49% (12)	15.52% (13)	17.43% (13)	12.30% (13)
Navigating the TPR process (9)	45.07% (3)	33.21% (5)	27.98% (5)	19.46% (11)
Effective practice with adoptive families (10)	5.63% (14)	7.94% (14)	13.30% (14)	10.96% (14)
Preparing children and youth for adoption and subsidized guardianship (11)	25.35% (8)	28.52% (8)	22.48% (11)	20.58% (10)
Preparing children and youth for reunification (12)	39.44% (4)	37.91% (4)	36.24% (3)	41.61% (2)
Preparing youth for independent living (13)	18.31% (10)	23.83% (10)	26.15% (7)	31.10% (5)
Cross-systems collaboration with schools, mental health, and corrections (14)	28.17% (6)	27.44% (9)	31.65% (4)	32.89% (4)
Engaging and working with foster/kinship providers (15)	28.17% (6)	30.32% (6)	23.85% (10)	21.92% (9)
Court preparation and testimony (17)	52.11% (2)	40.79% (3)	24.77% (9)	18.34% (12)
Personal safety (18)	25.35% (8)	30.32% (6)	26.15% (7)	22.60% (8)
N	71	277	218	447

Table 5C shows that across tenure in current position, all workers included effective practice at child removal and placement, meaningful supervised visits, and preparing children and youth for reunification. Those with less than one year in their positions ranked navigating the TPR process and court preparation in the top 5. All but those with less than one year were interested in cross-system collaboration, and those with 5 or more years in their current job ranked preparing youth for independent living in their top 5.

TABLE 5C. Out-of-Home Care Items, by Years in Current Position				
Question (#)	Percent (Rank)			
	< 1 Year	1 - 4 Years	5-10 Years	> 10 Years
Recruitment and selection of foster families (4)	23.49% (9)	23.68% (11)	26.98% (6)	17.99% (10)
Effective practice at child removal and placement (5)	57.23% (1)	50.48% (1)	47.62% (2)	34.73% (3)
Meaningful supervised visits (6)	45.78% (2)	44.50% (2)	48.68% (1)	41.00% (1)
Effective concurrent planning practices (7)	19.88% (12)	21.53% (12)	26.98% (6)	26.78% (6)
Effective practice at case closure (8)	16.27% (13)	15.79% (13)	13.76% (13)	11.72% (13)
Navigating the TPR process (9)	42.17% (4)	30.14% (6)	22.22% (12)	13.81% (12)
Effective practice with adoptive families (10)	8.43% (14)	10.53% (14)	11.11% (14)	10.46% (14)
Preparing children and youth for adoption and subsidized guardianship (11)	24.10% (8)	25.36% (9)	22.75% (11)	20.08% (9)
Preparing children and youth for reunification (12)	37.35% (5)	39.47% (3)	40.21% (3)	39.75% (2)
Preparing youth for independent living (13)	21.69% (11)	24.16% (10)	31.75% (5)	32.22% (4)
Cross-systems collaboration with schools, mental health, and corrections (14)	28.31% (6)	31.34% (5)	32.80% (4)	30.13% (5)
Engaging and working with foster/kinship providers (15)	23.49% (9)	29.19% (7)	23.28% (10)	20.50% (8)
Court preparation and testimony (17)	42.77% (3)	32.30% (4)	23.81% (9)	14.23% (11)
Personal safety (18)	25.30% (7)	27.27% (8)	26.98% (6)	22.18% (7)
N	166	418	189	239

Table 5D shows that among workers, sorted by social work degree and licensure, all ranked effective practice at child removal and placement, meaningful supervised visits, and preparing children and youth for reunification in their top 5. Workers with neither a social work degree nor a license included preparing youth for independent living and personal safety in their top 5. Workers with only a social work degree or only a license indicated an interest in navigating the TPR process. Workers with a license all indicated an interest in cross collaboration, and workers with a degree all indicated an interest in court preparation and testimony.

TABLE 5D. Out-of-Home Care Items, by Social Work Degree and Licensure Status							
Question (#)	Percent (Rank)						
	Neither		Degree & No License		No Degree & License		Both
Recruitment and selection of foster families (4)	22.29%	(11)	31.86%	(9)	24.49%	(8)	22.66% (11)
Effective practice at child removal and placement (5)	35.54%	(3)	53.98%	(1)	51.02%	(1)	52.25% (1)
Meaningful supervised visits (6)	49.40%	(1)	38.05%	(2)	43.88%	(2)	48.44% (2)
Effective concurrent planning practices (7)	16.27%	(13)	17.70%	(12)	25.51%	(7)	27.85% (6)
Effective practice at case closure (8)	17.47%	(12)	11.50%	(13)	16.33%	(12)	14.71% (13)
Navigating the TPR process (9)	26.51%	(9)	37.17%	(3)	33.67%	(4)	25.61% (9)
Effective practice with adoptive families (10)	10.84%	(14)	10.62%	(14)	11.22%	(14)	9.86% (14)
Preparing children and youth for adoption and subsidized guardianship (11)	27.71%	(7)	32.74%	(7)	24.49%	(8)	21.97% (12)
Preparing children and youth for reunification (12)	45.78%	(2)	37.17%	(3)	39.80%	(3)	40.83% (3)
Preparing youth for independent living (13)	31.93%	(5)	35.40%	(6)	23.47%	(11)	26.47% (8)
Cross-systems collaboration with schools, mental health, and corrections (14)	31.93%	(5)	30.97%	(10)	31.63%	(5)	32.35% (4)
Engaging and working with foster/kinship providers (15)	27.71%	(7)	32.74%	(7)	24.49%	(8)	25.09% (10)
Court preparation and testimony (17)	24.10%	(10)	37.17%	(3)	27.55%	(6)	29.93% (5)
Personal safety (18)	33.73%	(4)	23.01%	(11)	16.33%	(12)	27.16% (7)
N	166		113		98		578

Regardless of whether workers completed foundation training, table 5E shows that all workers ranked effective practice at child removal and placement, meaningful supervised visits, and preparing children and youth for reunification in their top 5 training topics. Workers who were either exempt or had yet to complete training indicated an interest in preparing youth for independent living. Workers who were not exempt from training ranked court preparation and testimony in their top 5. Finally, workers who were either exempted or had completed foundation training indicated an interest in cross-systems collaboration.

TABLE 5E. Out-of-Home Care Items, by Completion of Foundation Training			
Question (#)	Percent (Rank)		
	Complete	Incomplete	Exempt
Recruitment and selection of foster families (4)	25.96% (9)	14.47% (13)	22.33% (7)
Effective practice at child removal and placement (5)	51.18% (1)	46.49% (1)	25.24% (5)
Meaningful supervised visits (6)	46.31% (2)	44.74% (2)	35.92% (2)
Effective concurrent planning practices (7)	22.71% (12)	25.88% (8)	24.27% (6)
Effective practice at case closure (8)	15.04% (13)	15.35% (12)	9.71% (14)
Navigating the TPR process (9)	28.17% (6)	28.95% (6)	14.56% (11)
Effective practice with adoptive families (10)	11.36% (14)	6.58% (14)	11.65% (13)
Preparing children and youth for adoption and subsidized guardianship (11)	24.78% (10)	21.93% (10)	19.42% (9)
Preparing children and youth for reunification (12)	37.91% (3)	42.98% (3)	41.75% (1)
Preparing youth for independent living (13)	24.78% (10)	32.46% (4)	32.04% (3)
Cross-systems collaboration with schools, mental health, and corrections (14)	33.04% (4)	26.32% (7)	27.18% (4)
Engaging and working with foster/kinship providers (15)	26.84% (8)	21.93% (10)	21.36% (8)
Court preparation and testimony (17)	29.79% (5)	29.39% (5)	16.50% (10)
Personal safety (18)	27.73% (7)	25.00% (9)	14.56% (11)
N	678	228	103

Training topics by education level were more varied than other breakdowns. Table 5F shows that all workers were interested in meaningful supervised visits and preparing youth for independent living. Workers with a bachelor's degree or higher were interested in effective practice at child removal and placement and cross-systems collaboration, while those with a master's degree included navigating the TPR process in their top 5. Those with less than a bachelor's degree ranked preparing youth for adoption, engaging and working with foster and kinship providers, and personal safety in their top 5.

TABLE 5F. Out-of-Home Care Items, by Education Level						
Question (#)	Percent (Rank)					
	< Bachelor		Bachelor's Degree		Master's or higher	
Recruitment and selection of foster families (4)	15.63%	(8)	22.61%	(12)	27.13%	(10)
Effective practice at child removal and placement (5)	9.38%	(12)	51.98%	(1)	48.48%	(1)
Meaningful supervised visits (6)	65.63%	(1)	46.70%	(2)	44.82%	(2)
Effective concurrent planning practices (7)	12.50%	(9)	25.25%	(8)	24.39%	(12)
Effective practice at case closure (8)	9.38%	(12)	14.03%	(13)	17.38%	(13)
Navigating the TPR process (9)	12.50%	(9)	26.73%	(7)	31.40%	(4)
Effective practice with adoptive families (10)	3.13%	(14)	9.41%	(14)	13.72%	(14)
Preparing children and youth for adoption and subsidized guardianship (11)	31.25%	(4)	22.77%	(11)	26.83%	(11)
Preparing children and youth for reunification (12)	50.00%	(2)	41.58%	(3)	38.72%	(3)
Preparing youth for independent living (13)	18.75%	(7)	29.04%	(6)	27.44%	(9)
Cross-systems collaboration with schools, mental health, and corrections (14)	21.88%	(6)	33.00%	(4)	31.40%	(4)
Engaging and working with foster/kinship providers (15)	31.25%	(4)	24.42%	(10)	28.66%	(6)
Court preparation and testimony (17)	12.50%	(9)	31.02%	(5)	28.66%	(6)
Personal safety (18)	37.50%	(3)	25.25%	(8)	28.35%	(8)
N	32		608		328	

Table 5G shows that there is not a great deal of consensus regarding training topics in this category across region. All regions ranked effective practice at child removal and placement in the top 5. All regions but Milwaukee included meaningful supervised visits and preparing children for reunification in the top 5, and all but the Northern region included cross-systems collaboration in their top 5. Outside of this broader agreement, Milwaukee included engaging and working with foster/kinship providers. The southern and western regions both included effective concurrent planning practices in their top 5. Milwaukee and the northern region both ranked navigating the TPR process highly, and the northeast region included personal safety in its top 5. Finally, the western and Milwaukee regions included court preparation and testimony in their top 5.

TABLE 5G. Out-of-Home Care Items, by Training Region							
Question (#)	Percent (Rank)						
	Northern	Northeast	Southern	Southeast	Western	Milwaukee	
Recruitment and selection of foster families (4)	20.83% (10)	20.00% (11)	19.34% (12)	29.49% (6)	23.33% (9)	27.49% (10)	
Effective practice at child removal and placement (5)	45.83% (3)	42.96% (2)	49.17% (2)	43.59% (2)	53.89% (1)	46.92% (1)	
Meaningful supervised visits (6)	47.92% (1)	49.26% (1)	50.83% (1)	50.00% (1)	52.22% (2)	23.22% (11)	
Effective concurrent planning practices (7)	23.96% (8)	17.78% (12)	24.86% (10)	32.05% (4)	28.89% (5)	21.33% (12)	
Effective practice at case closure (8)	23.96% (8)	10.00% (14)	12.15% (13)	14.10% (13)	15.56% (13)	17.06% (13)	
Navigating the TPR process (9)	33.33% (4)	22.59% (8)	25.97% (8)	23.08% (10)	24.44% (8)	33.18% (2)	
Effective practice with adoptive families (10)	8.33% (14)	12.96% (13)	6.08% (14)	8.97% (14)	8.89% (14)	12.80% (14)	
Preparing children and youth for adoption and subsidized guardianship (11)	18.75% (12)	21.85% (10)	19.89% (11)	24.36% (8)	22.78% (10)	30.81% (6)	
Preparing children and youth for reunification (12)	46.88% (2)	40.00% (3)	41.99% (3)	43.59% (2)	40.00% (3)	29.86% (7)	
Preparing youth for independent living (13)	17.71% (13)	27.78% (5)	27.62% (6)	28.21% (7)	27.22% (7)	29.38% (8)	
Cross-systems collaboration with schools, mental health, and corrections (14)	30.21% (6)	30.37% (4)	28.73% (5)	30.77% (5)	31.67% (4)	32.23% (4)	
Engaging and working with foster/kinship providers (15)	20.83% (10)	22.22% (9)	29.28% (4)	17.95% (11)	22.78% (10)	31.28% (5)	
Court preparation and testimony (17)	31.25% (5)	27.78% (5)	25.41% (9)	16.67% (12)	28.89% (5)	33.18% (2)	
Personal safety (18)	26.04% (7)	27.78% (5)	26.52% (7)	24.36% (8)	17.78% (12)	28.91% (9)	
N	96	270	181	78	180	211	

Table 5H shows a similar pattern across county populations as table 5G. Counties of all sizes ranked effective practice at child removal in their top 5, but no others were shared across all county sizes. All but Milwaukee county ranked meaningful supervised visits and preparing children for reunification in the top 5. Large and extra large counties indicated an interest in preparing youth for independence living and cross-systems collaboration, and Milwaukee county shared interest in the latter topic. Milwaukee, small, and medium counties ranked court preparation in the top 5, and finally, medium counties included personal safety in the top 5.

TABLE 5H. Out-of-Home Care Items, by County Population Size						
Question (#)	Percent (Rank)					
	Small	Medium	Large	Extra Large	Western	
Recruitment and selection of foster families (4)	24.79% (9)	24.64% (8)	20.83% (9)	17.84% (12)	27.49% (10)	
Effective practice at child removal and placement (5)	55.37% (1)	48.79% (2)	48.48% (2)	39.44% (3)	46.92% (1)	
Meaningful supervised visits (6)	50.41% (2)	58.45% (1)	49.62% (1)	42.72% (2)	23.22% (11)	
Effective concurrent planning practices (7)	26.45% (8)	21.74% (9)	26.14% (6)	22.07% (10)	21.33% (12)	
Effective practice at case closure (8)	11.57% (14)	14.49% (13)	15.91% (13)	11.74% (13)	17.06% (13)	
Navigating the TPR process (9)	35.54% (4)	27.05% (7)	20.08% (10)	23.47% (9)	33.18% (2)	
Effective practice with adoptive families (10)	12.40% (13)	6.76% (14)	9.09% (14)	11.27% (14)	12.80% (14)	
Preparing children and youth for adoption and subsidized guardianship (11)	16.53% (11)	21.26% (11)	19.70% (11)	26.76% (7)	30.81% (6)	
Preparing children and youth for reunification (12)	42.15% (3)	39.13% (3)	39.77% (3)	46.01% (1)	29.86% (7)	
Preparing youth for independent living (13)	19.83% (10)	20.29% (12)	28.03% (5)	34.27% (4)	29.38% (8)	
Cross-systems collaboration with schools, mental health, and corrections (14)	29.75% (6)	28.99% (6)	32.20% (4)	29.58% (5)	32.23% (4)	
Engaging and working with foster/kinship providers (15)	28.10% (7)	21.74% (9)	19.70% (11)	26.76% (7)	31.28% (5)	
Court preparation and testimony (17)	33.06% (5)	31.40% (4)	25.76% (7)	20.19% (11)	33.18% (2)	
Personal safety (18)	14.05% (12)	29.47% (5)	22.35% (8)	29.11% (6)	28.91% (9)	
N	121	207	264	213	211	

The top five training topics identified by county directors were: preparing children and youth for reunification (60%), meaningful supervised visits (52%), effective practice at child removal and placement (50%), cross-systems collaboration with schools, mental health and corrections (46%), recruitment and selection of foster families (42%).

CHILD WELFARE POPULATIONS

Table 6A shows that workers of all types indicated broad agreement across training types in the populations category. All workers ranked the same topics in the top 5: culturally competent engagement strategies, engaging and working with fathers, effective practice with teenaged children in foster care, effective practice with ambivalent clients, and effective practice with substance-exposed infants and their caregivers.

TABLE 6A. Child Welfare Population Items, by Position and Sector						
Question (#)	Percent (Rank)					
	Supervisors	Frontline	County HS	Private	State CW	
Effective practice under the Indian Child Welfare Act (4)	18.44% (10)	18.88% (10)	17.27% (10)	23.76% (10)	27.14% (7)	
Culturally competent engagement strategies (5)	31.28% (5)	31.30% (5)	29.73% (5)	36.63% (5)	38.57% (5)	
Effective practice with LGBT youth (6)	19.55% (9)	21.62% (8)	19.22% (9)	27.72% (8)	35.71% (6)	
Engaging and working with fathers (7)	49.72% (3)	47.19% (4)	45.80% (4)	53.47% (3)	51.43% (2)	
Effective practice with teenage children in foster care (8)	45.81% (4)	48.98% (3)	45.95% (3)	68.32% (1)	50.00% (4)	
Finding and engaging kinship networks (9)	27.93% (6)	25.81% (7)	26.13% (7)	30.69% (7)	15.71% (9)	
Effective practice with resistant or ambivalent clients (10)	64.25% (1)	70.49% (1)	72.67% (1)	60.40% (2)	64.29% (1)	
Effective practice with sibling groups (11)	24.02% (8)	27.84% (6)	28.38% (6)	32.67% (6)	15.71% (9)	
Engaging with foster care providers (12)	25.14% (7)	21.51% (9)	20.87% (8)	27.72% (8)	18.57% (8)	
Effective practice with substance-exposed infants and their caregivers (13)	51.96% (2)	51.49% (2)	52.40% (2)	45.54% (4)	51.43% (2)	
N	179	837	807	124	85	

Training preferences among workers by experience follows a very similar pattern to that by worker type. All workers included culturally competent engagement strategies, engaging and working with fathers, effective practice with teenaged children in foster care, effective practice with ambivalent clients, and effective practice with substance-exposed infants and their caregivers in their top 5.

TABLE 6B. Child Welfare Population Items, by Years of Child Welfare Experience					
Question (#)	Percent (Rank)				
	< 1 Year	1 - 4 Years	5-10 Years	> 10 Years	
Effective practice under the Indian Child Welfare Act (4)	22.54% (7)	22.02% (9)	19.72% (10)	15.88% (10)	
Culturally competent engagement strategies (5)	30.99% (5)	31.41% (5)	30.28% (5)	31.99% (5)	
Effective practice with LGBT youth (6)	22.54% (7)	19.86% (10)	20.64% (9)	22.37% (8)	
Engaging and working with fathers (7)	54.93% (2)	48.74% (4)	53.67% (3)	43.18% (4)	
Effective practice with teenage children in foster care (8)	49.30% (4)	56.32% (2)	43.58% (4)	46.09% (3)	
Finding and engaging kinship networks (9)	14.08% (10)	26.35% (7)	27.52% (7)	27.29% (6)	
Effective practice with resistant or ambivalent clients (10)	73.24% (1)	74.01% (1)	65.14% (1)	68.23% (1)	
Effective practice with sibling groups (11)	30.99% (5)	29.96% (6)	28.44% (6)	24.16% (7)	
Engaging with foster care providers (12)	19.72% (9)	24.55% (8)	22.02% (8)	21.25% (9)	
Effective practice with substance-exposed infants and their caregivers (13)	54.93% (2)	54.87% (3)	55.96% (2)	47.20% (2)	
N	71	277	218	447	

Table 6C shows the same pattern of interest across workers sorted by years in their current position. Workers of all tenures included culturally competent engagement strategies, engaging and working with fathers, effective practice with teenaged children in foster care, effective practice with ambivalent clients, and effective practice with substance-exposed infants and their caregivers in their top 5.

TABLE 6C. Child Welfare Population Items, by Years in Current Position				
Question (#)	Percent (Rank)			
	< 1 Year	1 - 4 Years	5-10 Years	> 10 Years
Effective practice under the Indian Child Welfare Act (4)	23.49% (7)	21.77% (10)	18.52% (10)	10.88% (10)
Culturally competent engagement strategies (5)	33.13% (5)	30.86% (5)	32.80% (5)	30.13% (5)
Effective practice with LGBT youth (6)	22.29% (8)	22.01% (9)	19.58% (9)	20.92% (8)
Engaging and working with fathers (7)	48.80% (4)	50.72% (4)	48.68% (3)	41.00% (3)
Effective practice with teenage children in foster care (8)	55.42% (3)	50.96% (2)	47.09% (4)	41.00% (3)
Finding and engaging kinship networks (9)	21.69% (9)	26.56% (7)	29.10% (6)	26.36% (6)
Effective practice with resistant or ambivalent clients (10)	70.48% (1)	70.81% (1)	70.37% (1)	66.53% (1)
Effective practice with sibling groups (11)	28.92% (6)	28.95% (6)	27.51% (7)	22.59% (7)
Engaging with foster care providers (12)	21.69% (9)	24.64% (8)	24.87% (8)	16.32% (9)
Effective practice with substance-exposed infants and their caregivers (13)	57.83% (2)	50.96% (2)	52.91% (2)	48.12% (2)
N	166	418	189	239

Table 6D shows that regardless of training completion, workers shared training preferences in the area of populations, as above. All workers included in their top 5 culturally competent engagement strategies, engaging and working with fathers, effective practice with teenaged children in foster care, effective practice with ambivalent clients, and effective practice with substance-exposed infants and their caregivers.

TABLE 6D. Child Welfare Population Items, by Completion of Foundation Training			
Question (#)	Percent (Rank)		
	Complete	Incomplete	Exempt
Effective practice under the Indian Child Welfare Act (4)	21.09% (10)	17.98% (10)	6.80% (10)
Culturally competent engagement strategies (5)	31.71% (5)	30.70% (5)	32.04% (5)
Effective practice with LGBT youth (6)	21.98% (9)	18.86% (8)	23.30% (8)
Engaging and working with fathers (7)	50.59% (3)	44.74% (4)	37.86% (4)
Effective practice with teenage children in foster care (8)	49.85% (4)	49.12% (2)	40.78% (3)
Finding and engaging kinship networks (9)	26.84% (7)	25.88% (6)	24.27% (7)
Effective practice with resistant or ambivalent clients (10)	71.83% (1)	70.61% (1)	55.34% (1)
Effective practice with sibling groups (11)	28.76% (6)	23.68% (7)	26.21% (6)
Engaging with foster care providers (12)	23.30% (8)	18.86% (8)	23.30% (8)
Effective practice with substance-exposed infants and their caregivers (13)	54.72% (2)	48.25% (3)	41.75% (2)
N	678	228	103

Table 6E shows that workers across the spectrum of licensure and social work degree status also have the same pattern of top training topics in this area: culturally competent engagement strategies, engaging and working with fathers, effective practice with teenaged children in foster care, effective practice with ambivalent clients, and effective practice with substance-exposed infants and their caregivers.

TABLE 6E. Child Welfare Population Items, by Social Work Degree and Licensure Status				
Question (#)	Percent (Rank)			
	Neither	Degree & No License	No Degree & License	Both
Effective practice under the Indian Child Welfare Act (4)	15.06% (10)	24.78% (8)	19.39% (9)	19.55% (10)
Culturally competent engagement strategies (5)	35.54% (5)	28.32% (5)	33.67% (5)	32.70% (5)
Effective practice with LGBT youth (6)	22.29% (9)	27.43% (6)	16.33% (10)	22.66% (8)
Engaging and working with fathers (7)	54.22% (2)	58.41% (2)	51.02% (2)	47.40% (4)
Effective practice with teenage children in foster care (8)	53.61% (3)	57.52% (3)	51.02% (2)	48.62% (3)
Finding and engaging kinship networks (9)	23.49% (8)	24.78% (8)	32.65% (6)	28.37% (7)
Effective practice with resistant or ambivalent clients (10)	63.25% (1)	72.57% (1)	79.59% (1)	74.57% (1)
Effective practice with sibling groups (11)	33.13% (6)	15.93% (10)	25.51% (7)	29.93% (6)
Engaging with foster care providers (12)	28.31% (7)	27.43% (6)	21.43% (8)	21.45% (9)
Effective practice with substance-exposed infants and their caregivers (13)	50.00% (4)	57.52% (3)	46.94% (4)	55.88% (2)
N	166	113	98	578

Table 6F shows the same pattern of training preferences as shown in previous tables. Workers ranked, regardless of their training status, culturally competent engagement strategies, engaging and working with fathers, effective practice with teenaged children in foster care, effective practice with ambivalent clients, and effective practice with substance-exposed infants and their caregivers in their top 5 choices.

TABLE 6F. Child Welfare Population Items, by Completion of Foundation Training			
Question (#)	Percent (Rank)		
	Complete	Incomplete	Exempt
Effective practice under the Indian Child Welfare Act (4)	21.09% (10)	17.98% (10)	6.80% (10)
Culturally competent engagement strategies (5)	31.71% (5)	30.70% (5)	32.04% (5)
Effective practice with LGBT youth (6)	21.98% (9)	18.86% (8)	23.30% (8)
Engaging and working with fathers (7)	50.59% (3)	44.74% (4)	37.86% (4)
Effective practice with teenage children in foster care (8)	49.85% (4)	49.12% (2)	40.78% (3)
Finding and engaging kinship networks (9)	26.84% (7)	25.88% (6)	24.27% (7)
Effective practice with resistant or ambivalent clients (10)	71.83% (1)	70.61% (1)	55.34% (1)
Effective practice with sibling groups (11)	28.76% (6)	23.68% (7)	26.21% (6)
Engaging with foster care providers (12)	23.30% (8)	18.86% (8)	23.30% (8)
Effective practice with substance-exposed infants and their caregivers (13)	54.72% (2)	48.25% (3)	41.75% (2)
N	678	228	103

Table 6G shows that there was not such complete agreement across training regions as there was across other breakouts of worker types. While all worker groups agreed on engaging and working with fathers, effective practice with teenaged children in foster care, effective practice with ambivalent clients, and effective practice with substance-exposed infants and their caregivers, two of the regions (southeast and western) did not rank culturally competent engagement practice in the top 5. In its place, the southeast region ranked finding and engaging kinship networks, and the western region ranked effective practice with sibling groups in the top 5.

TABLE 6G. Child Welfare Population Items, by Training Region

Question (#)	Percent (Rank)					
	Northern	Northeast	Southern	Southeast	Western	Milwaukee
Effective practice under the Indian Child Welfare Act (4)	22.92% (8)	14.44% (10)	8.29% (10)	11.54% (10)	26.67% (7)	27.49% (7)
Culturally competent engagement strategies (5)	31.25% (5)	28.89% (5)	34.81% (5)	26.92% (6)	27.22% (6)	36.49% (5)
Effective practice with LGBT youth (6)	11.46% (10)	19.26% (9)	21.55% (9)	23.08% (8)	16.11% (10)	31.75% (6)
Engaging and working with fathers (7)	42.71% (4)	43.70% (3)	46.41% (4)	44.87% (4)	51.67% (3)	53.55% (3)
Effective practice with teenage children in foster care (8)	56.25% (2)	42.22% (4)	46.96% (3)	50.00% (2)	41.11% (4)	59.72% (2)
Finding and engaging kinship networks (9)	30.21% (6)	27.04% (6)	26.52% (6)	28.21% (5)	25.00% (8)	23.22% (8)
Effective practice with resistant or ambivalent clients (10)	71.88% (1)	69.63% (1)	75.14% (1)	66.67% (1)	73.89% (1)	60.19% (1)
Effective practice with sibling groups (11)	26.04% (7)	27.04% (6)	25.41% (8)	25.64% (7)	35.00% (5)	23.22% (8)
Engaging with foster care providers (12)	21.88% (9)	22.59% (8)	26.52% (6)	15.38% (9)	19.44% (9)	22.75% (10)
Effective practice with substance-exposed infants and their caregivers (13)	55.21% (3)	49.26% (2)	49.17% (2)	50.00% (2)	61.11% (2)	47.39% (4)
N	96	270	181	78	180	211

Across county populations, top 5 preferences followed a similar pattern as did those across training regions. Here, each group of counties included engaging and working with fathers, effective practice with teenaged children in foster care, effective practice with ambivalent clients, and effective practice with substance-exposed infants and their caregivers in the top 5 training choices. Extra large and Milwaukee counties ranked culturally competent engagement highly. Small and large counties ranked finding and engaging kinship networks in the top 5, and finally, medium counties included effective practice with sibling groups.

TABLE 5H. Out-of-Home Care Items, by County Population Size

Question (#)	Percent (Rank)				
	Small	Medium	Large	Extra Large	Western
Effective practice under the Indian Child Welfare Act (4)	22.31% (9)	18.36% (9)	15.15% (9)	13.15% (10)	27.49% (7)
Culturally competent engagement strategies (5)	24.79% (7)	21.74% (7)	31.06% (6)	39.44% (4)	36.49% (5)
Effective practice with LGBT youth (6)	12.40% (10)	14.01% (10)	19.32% (8)	25.35% (8)	31.75% (6)
Engaging and working with fathers (7)	42.98% (4)	51.69% (3)	48.86% (3)	38.97% (5)	53.55% (3)
Effective practice with teenage children in foster care (8)	49.59% (3)	41.55% (4)	45.83% (4)	46.48% (2)	59.72% (2)
Finding and engaging kinship networks (9)	27.27% (5)	19.81% (8)	32.58% (5)	26.76% (6)	23.22% (8)
Effective practice with resistant or ambivalent clients (10)	74.38% (1)	73.43% (1)	71.59% (1)	69.01% (1)	60.19% (1)
Effective practice with sibling groups (11)	26.45% (6)	36.23% (5)	26.89% (7)	23.00% (9)	23.22% (8)
Engaging with foster care providers (12)	24.79% (7)	24.15% (6)	15.15% (9)	26.76% (6)	22.75% (10)
Effective practice with substance-exposed infants and their caregivers (13)	61.16% (2)	59.90% (2)	51.52% (2)	42.25% (3)	47.39% (4)
N	121	207	264	213	211

County directors ranked these topics in the top 5: effective practice with resistant or ambivalent clients (77%), engaging and working with fathers (69%), effective practice with substance-exposed infants and their caregivers (63%), effective practice with teenage children in foster care (44%), and finding and engaging kinship networks (40%).

SUPERVISION AND LEADERSHIP (SUPERVISORS ONLY)

Table 7A shows the training topics most highly ranked by supervisors. These include assessing and evaluating performance, recruiting the right child welfare staff, engaging and motivating others, gathering and using data to inform worker practice, and developing and coaching staff.

TABLE 7A. Supervisor Professional Development Items	
	Percent (Rank)
Question (#)	Supervisors
Assess and evaluate performance (4)	48.60% (3)
Recruit, interview, and select the right child welfare staff (5)	41.90% (4)
Engage and motivate others (6)	49.16% (2)
Gather and use data to inform worker practice (7)	35.75% (5)
Mediation and conflict management skills (8)	33.52% (7)
Recognizing burnout and secondary traumatic stress (9)	30.17% (10)
Managing people (10)	30.73% (9)
Leadership skills (11)	31.84% (8)
Supervising child sexual abuse cases (12)	11.73% (11)
Developing and coaching staff (13)	50.84% (1)
Managing diversity (14)	5.59% (12)
Supervising safety (15)	34.64% (6)
N	179

Table 7B shows that when considering supervisor topics by years of child welfare experience, there are similar patterns of interest. All supervisors remained interested in assessing and evaluating performance, recruiting the right child welfare staff, engaging and motivating others, and developing and coaching staff. Only those with 5 or more years indicated interest in gathering and using data to inform practice. A number of other topics tied in the top 5 for those with fewer than 4 years of experience, including mediating conflict, recognizing burnout and STS, managing people, and supervising sexual abuse cases.

TABLE 4B. Skill Development Items, by Years of Child Welfare Experience			
	Percent (Rank)		
Question (#)	1 - 4 Years	5-10 Years	> 10 Years
Assess and evaluate performance (4)	18.18% (4)	40.63% (4)	54.14% (1)
Recruit, interview, and select the right child welfare staff (5)	18.18% (4)	46.88% (2)	43.61% (4)
Engage and motivate others (6)	36.36% (1)	46.88% (2)	51.88% (3)
Gather and use data to inform worker practice (7)	0.00% (11)	40.63% (4)	38.35% (5)
Mediation and conflict management skills (8)	36.36% (1)	34.38% (7)	33.83% (9)
Recognizing burnout and secondary traumatic stress (9)	18.18% (4)	37.50% (6)	30.08% (10)
Managing people (10)	18.18% (4)	21.88% (10)	34.59% (8)
Leadership skills (11)	9.09% (9)	28.13% (9)	35.34% (7)
Supervising child sexual abuse cases (12)	27.27% (3)	3.13% (11)	12.78% (11)
Developing and coaching staff (13)	18.18% (4)	53.13% (1)	54.14% (1)
Managing diversity (14)	0.00% (11)	3.13% (11)	6.77% (12)
Supervising safety (15)	9.09% (9)	34.38% (7)	37.59% (6)
N	11	32	133

When considering supervisors by years in current position, table 7C shows that the most prominent topics were assessing and evaluating performance, recruiting the right child welfare staff, and engaging and motivating others. Those with less than one year in their current position included an interest in managing people. Those with 1-4 years in their current position included mediating conflict and recognizing burnout. Those with less than 10 years in their position indicated an interest in developing and coaching staff.

TABLE 7C. Supervisor Items, by Years in Current Position								
Question (#)	Percent (Rank)							
	< 1 Year		1 - 4 Years		5-10 Years		> 10 Years	
Assess and evaluate performance (4)	55.00%	(1)	40.98%	(4)	51.06%	(3)	56.25%	(1)
Recruit, interview, and select the right child welfare staff (5)	50.00%	(2)	44.26%	(3)	42.55%	(5)	37.50%	(4)
Engage and motivate others (6)	35.00%	(5)	49.18%	(2)	61.70%	(2)	45.83%	(2)
Gather and use data to inform worker practice (7)	45.00%	(4)	31.15%	(9)	48.94%	(4)	27.08%	(8)
Mediation and conflict management skills (8)	25.00%	(9)	39.34%	(5)	27.66%	(9)	37.50%	(4)
Recognizing burnout and secondary traumatic stress (9)	30.00%	(8)	39.34%	(5)	27.66%	(9)	22.92%	(10)
Managing people (10)	35.00%	(5)	36.07%	(7)	29.79%	(8)	25.00%	(9)
Leadership skills (11)	25.00%	(9)	29.51%	(10)	34.04%	(6)	37.50%	(4)
Supervising child sexual abuse cases (12)	15.00%	(11)	9.84%	(11)	4.26%	(11)	20.83%	(11)
Developing and coaching staff (13)	50.00%	(2)	50.82%	(1)	70.21%	(1)	35.42%	(7)
Managing diversity (14)	5.00%	(12)	6.56%	(12)	2.13%	(12)	8.33%	(12)
Supervising safety (15)	35.00%	(5)	32.79%	(8)	34.04%	(6)	39.58%	(3)
N	20		61		47		48	

Supervisors, when sorted by holding a social work degree and license, indicated interest in engaging and motivating others, and developing and coaching staff. Those with a license or both ranked assessing and evaluating performance and recruiting the right child welfare staff, the latter of which has shared with those with a degree but no license. Those with no degree indicated an interest in gathering data to inform practice and recognizing burnout and STS. Those with a degree but no license ranked managing people high, and those with a license but no degree ranked leadership skills highly. Finally, those with neither degree nor license ranked leadership skills highly.

TABLE 7D. Supervisor Items, by Social Work Degree and Licensure Status								
Question (#)	Percent (Rank)							
	Neither	Degree & No License	No Degree & License	Both				
Assess and evaluate performance (4)	22.22%	(9)	16.67%	(9)	55.00%	(1)	60.00%	(1)
Recruit, interview, and select the right child welfare staff (5)	27.78%	(7)	50.00%	(4)	55.00%	(1)	48.70%	(4)
Engage and motivate others (6)	66.67%	(1)	50.00%	(4)	45.00%	(4)	53.91%	(3)
Gather and use data to inform worker practice (7)	33.33%	(4)	50.00%	(4)	30.00%	(8)	41.74%	(5)
Mediation and conflict management skills (8)	44.44%	(2)	33.33%	(7)	25.00%	(10)	36.52%	(7)
Recognizing burnout and secondary traumatic stress (9)	33.33%	(4)	66.67%	(1)	30.00%	(8)	33.04%	(9)
Managing people (10)	22.22%	(9)	66.67%	(1)	40.00%	(6)	32.17%	(10)
Leadership skills (11)	33.33%	(4)	16.67%	(9)	45.00%	(4)	34.78%	(8)
Supervising child sexual abuse cases (12)	16.67%	(11)	0.00%	(11)	0.00%	(12)	15.65%	(11)
Developing and coaching staff (13)	44.44%	(2)	66.67%	(1)	50.00%	(3)	59.13%	(2)
Managing diversity (14)	16.67%	(11)	0.00%	(11)	5.00%	(11)	5.22%	(12)
Supervising safety (15)	27.78%	(7)	33.33%	(7)	35.00%	(7)	40.87%	(6)
N	18		6		20		115	

Supervisors showed more agreement across foundation training, as shown on table 7E. The vast majority of supervisors have completed this training. Supervisors all ranked assessing and evaluating performance, recruiting the right child welfare staff, engaging and motivating others, and developing and coaching staff in the top 5. Supervisors who had completed training also ranked supervising safety highly.

TABLE 7E. Supervisor Items, by Completion of Foundation Training						
Question (#)	Percent (Rank)					
	Complete		Incomplete		Exempt	
Assess and evaluate performance (4)	53.23%	(3)	43.75%	(2)	43.75%	(2)
Recruit, interview, and select the right child welfare staff (5)	48.39%	(4)	37.50%	(4)	28.13%	(5)
Engage and motivate others (6)	54.84%	(2)	31.25%	(5)	46.88%	(1)
Gather and use data to inform worker practice (7)	40.32%	(6)	43.75%	(2)	21.88%	(10)
Mediation and conflict management skills (8)	35.48%	(8)	18.75%	(7)	40.63%	(3)
Recognizing burnout and secondary traumatic stress (9)	33.06%	(10)	31.25%	(5)	25.00%	(8)
Managing people (10)	35.48%	(8)	18.75%	(7)	25.00%	(8)
Leadership skills (11)	36.29%	(7)	18.75%	(7)	28.13%	(5)
Supervising child sexual abuse cases (12)	11.29%	(11)	6.25%	(11)	18.75%	(11)
Developing and coaching staff (13)	57.26%	(1)	50.00%	(1)	37.50%	(4)
Managing diversity (14)	5.65%	(12)	12.50%	(10)	3.13%	(12)
Supervising safety (15)	41.94%	(5)	6.25%	(11)	28.13%	(5)
N	124		16		32	

Table 7F shows that all but two supervisors have a bachelor's degree or higher. All supervisors included ranked assessing and evaluating performance, recruiting the right child welfare staff, engaging and motivating others, and developing and coaching staff in the top 5. Supervisors with a master's degree or higher ranked recognizing burnout in the top 5, while those with a bachelor's degree ranked gathering data to inform practice in the top 5.

TABLE 7F. Supervisor Items, by Education Level						
Question (#)	Percent (Rank)					
	< Bachelor		Bachelor's Degree		Master's or higher	
Assess and evaluate performance (4)	100.00%	(1)	60.94%	(1)	46.88%	(4)
Recruit, interview, and select the right child welfare staff (5)	50.00%	(2)	42.19%	(4)	48.96%	(3)
Engage and motivate others (6)	50.00%	(2)	53.13%	(3)	54.17%	(2)
Gather and use data to inform worker practice (7)	0.00%	(6)	40.63%	(5)	39.58%	(6)
Mediation and conflict management skills (8)	0.00%	(6)	35.94%	(7)	37.50%	(7)
Recognizing burnout and secondary traumatic stress (9)	50.00%	(2)	18.75%	(10)	42.71%	(5)
Managing people (10)	0.00%	(6)	31.25%	(9)	35.42%	(9)
Leadership skills (11)	0.00%	(6)	35.94%	(7)	34.38%	(10)
Supervising child sexual abuse cases (12)	0.00%	(6)	15.63%	(11)	11.46%	(11)
Developing and coaching staff (13)	0.00%	(6)	59.38%	(2)	55.21%	(1)
Managing diversity (14)	0.00%	(6)	6.25%	(12)	6.25%	(12)
Supervising safety (15)	50.00%	(2)	39.06%	(6)	37.50%	(7)
N	2		64		96	

Table 7G shows the training interests of supervisors by region. Supervisors from all regions ranked engaging and motivating others and developing and coaching staff in their top 5. Supervisors from the northern, north-east and southern regions ranked assessing and evaluating performance in the top 5. Those from Milwaukee, the northern, southeast, and western regions indicating interest in recruiting the right child welfare staff. Supervisors in the northern, southern region, and Milwaukee ranked mediation and conflict management in the top 5. Milwaukee supervisors indicated interest in recognizing burnout and STS and managing people.

TABLE 7G. Supervisor Items, by Training Region						
Question (#)	Percent (Rank)					
	Northern	Northeast	Southern	Southeast	Western	Milwaukee
Assess and evaluate performance (4)	54.55% (2)	46.34% (2)	51.52% (1)	43.75% (6)	58.62% (1)	39.47% (7)
Recruit, interview, and select the right child welfare staff (5)	54.55% (2)	31.71% (6)	33.33% (6)	56.25% (1)	48.28% (4)	42.11% (4)
Engage and motivate others (6)	40.91% (5)	51.22% (1)	42.42% (3)	50.00% (3)	48.28% (4)	57.89% (1)
Gather and use data to inform worker practice (7)	31.82% (6)	46.34% (2)	30.30% (9)	56.25% (1)	34.48% (6)	23.68% (9)
Mediation and conflict management skills (8)	50.00% (4)	29.27% (9)	36.36% (4)	6.25% (10)	27.59% (8)	42.11% (4)
Recognizing burnout and secondary traumatic stress (9)	31.82% (6)	19.51% (10)	33.33% (6)	31.25% (7)	20.69% (10)	44.74% (3)
Managing people (10)	27.27% (8)	31.71% (6)	30.30% (9)	18.75% (8)	24.14% (9)	42.11% (4)
Leadership skills (11)	22.73% (9)	41.46% (5)	33.33% (6)	18.75% (8)	31.03% (7)	31.58% (8)
Supervising child sexual abuse cases (12)	18.18% (11)	14.63% (11)	15.15% (11)	6.25% (10)	0.00% (12)	13.16% (11)
Developing and coaching staff (13)	63.64% (1)	46.34% (2)	48.48% (2)	50.00% (3)	55.17% (2)	47.37% (2)
Managing diversity (14)	9.09% (12)	7.32% (12)	3.03% (12)	6.25% (10)	3.45% (11)	5.26% (12)
Supervising safety (15)	22.73% (9)	31.71% (6)	36.36% (4)	50.00% (3)	51.72% (3)	23.68% (9)
N	22	41	33	16	29	38

Table 7H shows the training preferences of supervisors across county size. Supervisors all included engaging and motivating others and developing and coaching staff in the top 5. All but those from the small counties ranked recruiting the right child welfare staff in the top 5. Milwaukee supervisors ranked recognizing burnout and STS and managing people in their top 5. Supervisors from medium and large counties ranked supervising safety highly. Those from both small and extra large counties ranked gathering and using data to inform worker practice in the top 5, and small, medium, and Milwaukee counties included mediation and conflict management. Finally, Supervisors from large counties ranked leadership skills in the top 5.

TABLE 4H. Skill Development Items, by County Population Size						
Question (#)	Percent (Rank)					
	Small	Medium	Large	Extra Large	Western	
Assess and evaluate performance (4)	54.55% (1)	74.19% (1)	41.46% (6)	38.89% (4)	39.47% (7)	
Recruit, interview, and select the right child welfare staff (5)	33.33% (6)	41.94% (4)	48.78% (3)	41.67% (3)	42.11% (4)	
Engage and motivate others (6)	45.45% (2)	48.39% (3)	48.78% (3)	44.44% (2)	57.89% (1)	
Gather and use data to inform worker practice (7)	39.39% (4)	35.48% (7)	41.46% (6)	38.89% (4)	23.68% (9)	
Mediation and conflict management skills (8)	36.36% (5)	38.71% (5)	24.39% (10)	27.78% (9)	42.11% (4)	
Recognizing burnout and secondary traumatic stress (9)	30.30% (7)	19.35% (10)	29.27% (8)	25.00% (10)	44.74% (3)	
Managing people (10)	21.21% (8)	29.03% (8)	29.27% (8)	30.56% (7)	42.11% (4)	
Leadership skills (11)	21.21% (8)	25.81% (9)	46.34% (5)	30.56% (7)	31.58% (8)	
Supervising child sexual abuse cases (12)	21.21% (8)	12.90% (11)	7.32% (11)	5.56% (12)	13.16% (11)	
Developing and coaching staff (13)	42.42% (3)	51.61% (2)	56.10% (1)	55.56% (1)	47.37% (2)	
Managing diversity (14)	6.06% (12)	0.00% (12)	4.88% (12)	11.11% (11)	5.26% (12)	
Supervising safety (15)	21.21% (8)	38.71% (5)	51.22% (2)	36.11% (6)	23.68% (9)	
N	121	207	264	213	211	

County directors and tribal child welfare directors were asked to identify training topics that they felt would benefit their supervisors. County directors ranked the following topics in the top 5: developing and coaching staff (69%), leadership skills (48%), recognizing burnout and secondary traumatic stress (46%), engaging and motivating others (44%), and gathering and using data to inform worker practice (44%).

RECOMMENDATIONS ON ADDITIONAL TRAINING TOPICS

The survey included an open ended section asking county directors what additional training topics would be important but were not included on the survey. County child welfare directors suggested that future training options include:

- Managing stress and burnout
- Community engagement
- Prevention and brief interventions
- Cultural competence
- Work with involuntary clients
- Trauma, including the trauma of entering out-of-home care, and
- Training on updates to statutes and state standards for practice.
- Training on working with tribal courts
- Leadership skills (particularly for supervisors)
- Case goal development and writing
- Managing high caseloads, and
- Issues affecting rural counties.

MODE OF TRAINING PREFERENCES

Tables 8A – 8H describe the results of a question about what mode of training workers and supervisors would prefer. They were given three options. The first option was traditional, classroom training, with an in-person instructor. The second was online-only instruction, and third option was a hybrid model which included both in-person and online instruction. For each option, respondents would select an answer from 1 – 5, with 1 indicating that respondent would not like that mode of training at all, and 5 indicating the respondent would extremely like that mode of training.

Each table below shows the same breakout of worker types as the tables regarding training topics above. However, both workers and supervisors, across all tables, had the same pattern of training preferences. In-person, classroom training remains the favorite choice, with an average response of about 4. Hybrid modes were a close second, with about an average score of 3.4. Finally, on-line only was a third choice, with an average score of less than 3. The precise average scores, by groups, are below.

TABLE 8A. How much would you like training to be delivered by the following methods?					
	Supervisors	Frontline	County HS	Private	State CW
Classroom average:	4.06	4.02	4.10	3.72	3.79
Online average:	2.87	2.71	2.71	2.93	2.65
Hybrid average:	3.68	3.22	3.26	3.36	3.49

TABLE 8B. How much would you like training to be delivered by the following methods? By Years of Child Welfare Experience				
	< 1 Year	1 - 4 Years	5-10 Years	> 10 Years
Classroom average:	4.03	3.94	4.02	4.09
Online average:	2.91	2.75	2.69	2.72
Hybrid average:	3.43	3.31	3.15	3.34
<i>N</i>	71	277	218	477

TABLE 8C. How much would you like training to be delivered by the following methods? By SW Degree and Licensure				
	Neither	Degree & No License	No Degree & License	Both
Classroom average:	3.85	3.84	4.11	4.12
Online average:	2.82	2.90	2.70	2.66
Hybrid average:	3.36	3.43	3.26	3.25
<i>N</i>	166	113	98	578

TABLE 8D. How much would you like training to be delivered by the following methods? By Years in Current Position				
	< 1 Year	1 - 4 Years	5-10 Years	> 10 Years
Classroom average:	3.99	3.96	4.13	4.10
Online average:	2.82	2.75	2.73	2.65
Hybrid average:	3.42	3.36	3.21	3.15
<i>N</i>	166	418	189	239

TABLE 8E. How much would you like training to be delivered by the following methods? By Completion of Foundation Training By Years in Current Position			
	Complete	Incomplete	Exempt
Classroom average:	4.07	3.97	3.89
Online average:	2.72	2.75	2.82
Hybrid average:	3.27	3.34	3.39
<i>N</i>	678	228	103

TABLE 8F. How much would you like training to be delivered by the following methods? By Education Level			
	<Bachelor	Bachelor's Degree	Master's or higher
Classroom average:	3.89	4.08	4.00
Online average:	2.67	2.72	2.76
Hybrid average:	3.19	3.28	3.31
<i>N</i>	32	608	328

TABLE 8G. How much would you like training to be delivered by the following methods? By Training Region						
	Northern	Northeast	Southern	Southeast	Western	Milwaukee
Classroom average:	4.09	4.10	4.10	3.86	4.24	3.73
Online average:	2.89	2.57	2.76	2.94	2.67	2.83
Hybrid average:	3.34	3.19	3.27	3.36	3.26	3.43
<i>N</i>	96	270	181	78	180	211

TABLE 8H. How much would you like training to be delivered by the following methods? By County Population Size					
	Small	Medium	Large	Extra Large	Milwaukee
Classroom average:	4.07	4.17	4.13	4.04	3.73
Online average:	2.84	2.67	2.78	2.60	2.83
Hybrid average:	3.30	3.32	3.31	3.11	3.43
<i>N</i>	121	207	264	213	211

CONCLUSIONS AND NEXT STEPS

Summary of Findings

There are a few main takeaways from the results of the survey. First, workers and supervisors consistently expressed training interest in some of the largest challenges in child welfare work. These include mental illness and substance use disorders, working with resistant clients, and managing conflict situations.

Second, there is substantial agreement in the rankings across different job functions, education levels, child welfare career and current position tenure, degree and licensure statuses, and to some extent, region and county sizes. The most agreement was identified in the blocks on foundational child welfare practice and child welfare populations.

Third, worker and county administrator perspectives did not always align. County Directors may observe needs in their staff that staff members themselves do not see, and vice versa, so both sources of information should be carefully considered in setting training agendas.

Some topics not ranked in the top 5 may still necessitate training, given statutory changes or state or county-level initiatives.

Finally, questions on preferred mode of training generated answers that consistently favored in-person and hybrid training. However, it is unclear whether respondents feel different training topics may lend themselves to different training modes. For example, while foundation training may be best delivered in an in-person setting, an annual update to standards might be best delivered on-line or using a hybrid approach.

How are survey results being used?

The results from the Flash Survey on Training Needs were used by the WCWPDS, in combination with the participant feedback received by the regional training partnerships following training sessions offered in 2015, in the development of the 2016-17 Special Skills and Topics training schedule (<http://wcwpds.wisc.edu/class-schedule.htm>) that is available to county child welfare staff in the 71 counties outside of Milwaukee. The Milwaukee Child Welfare Partnership provides training to Milwaukee child welfare staff. Since the majority of new child welfare staff in Milwaukee spend their first 1-2 years completing the required Worker Foundation training, the Special Skills and Topics training plan was focused primarily upon the needs expressed by those staff who had completed Foundation training. However, additional topics were selected based upon the regional priorities identified within the Flash Survey and more general survey participant feedback.

Mental illness/mental health issues, substance abuse, trauma informed practice, and court/legal topics were the top identified training needs from the Flash Survey and participant feedback following training sessions. To meet these needs, multiple sessions of the following training topics were scheduled in 2016-17:

Mental illness/mental health issues

- Childhood and Adolescent Disorders
- The Impact of Suicide on Youth and Families: The Ones We Miss
- Creative Case Planning for Parents with Personality Disorders

Substance abuse

- Addiction and the Family: A Lifetime of Trauma
- Perinatal Substance Abuse: What Child Welfare Professionals Need to Know

Trauma Informed Practice

- Trauma Informed Practice
- The Neurobiology of Case Planning
- Secondary Traumatic Stress and the Child Welfare Professional
- Using Our Trauma Lens

Court-Related Topics

- Effective Courtroom Preparation and Presentation
- Termination of Parental Rights
- Child Forensic Interviews: Best Practice Guidelines

In addition to the above listed topics, DCF 56 Training, Family Finding Training, SAFE Training, Permanency Roundtable Values training, and the Overview of Child Sexual Abuse training continue to be regularly offered. All training sessions are posted in PDS Online.