

**Panelists:**

Sherrill Clark  
Susan E. Jacquet  
Patrick Leung  
Nicole Willis

*Please note: The following is a direct transcription and has not been edited.*

---

Patrick Leung: I asked to chair this session. I'm from University of Houston, Texas, professor and also Chair of the Texas Title IV-E Evaluation Committee in Texas. We have 30 universities that with Title IV-E funding in Texas. I'm going to be one of the presenters as well as well as doing another job to Chair this session. What my plan is that I will start by now, sharply at 2:00 and then my colleague Professor whereas will be co-presenting with me and I will introduce her in a minute and after the 30 minutes, if you all want to question then I will turn next to California and then from California, you hear from another 30 minutes and then we will have common question, discussion together, because we work together. We actually go by on the phone and conference for now. We saw each of the slides, so this is the go, okay.

So as I mentioned I'm in Texas and I'm – in Texas for 21 years and I came from Hawaii, Iowa, Ohio, Louisiana and... all around. Many states. But I am pleased to be here. My wish was happy lifetime in child welfare over the last 25 years as a professor. On my left hand side is Dr Nicole Willis, Dr. Willis is currently assistant professor at Texas – Southern Texas University in Houston, focus with like child welfare, domestic violence and other many pieces of issues School of Social Work is one of her area as now and she will talk about – the second part of the paper. And then on my other side is that Dr. Sherrill Clark. She is the Program Evaluation Specialist at the California Social Work Education Center, University of California, Berkeley. She would come back and disseminate herself of the evaluation of Title IV-E program to professionalize the child welfare services and retain child welfare social workers in California through the Title IV-E program.

Now I see her very frequently, the last time I saw her was in Galveston on the beach, well we had the Title IV-E conference there and there were over 200 people there. And on my far left is Dr. Susan Jacquet so he's the data management specialist for the California state in Berkley Dr. Jacquet manages the student information system database at the university and a graduate for the Title IV-E and mental health type and program. Dr. Jacquet also worked with Dr. Clark on the research component including ongoing surveys of California, MSW students and graduates and the developments of new research initiatives are now come for child welfare and efficacy of the Title IV-E program. Let's give all of them a big hand.

Can you hear me well?

Male Speaker 2: Yes.

Female Speaker 1: Yes.

Female Speaker 2: Yes.

Male Speaker 1: Okay. I think the audio is turned on, but I don't have a signal, but I'm going to read according to the instruction, okay. It says press the [indiscernible] [00:3:18] after the IV company has turned on the recorder and before the beginning of the presentation. So, I'm going to read. As a reminder, the audio for this session will be digitally recorded and once formatted for accessibility standards will be made available through the summit website. In lieu of written consent, participants will ask questions or provide comments during the session we'll be giving the permission or consent to this recording. If you have any questions about this recording, please feel free to talk with one of the summit support staff. So I assume this is kind of an IRB consent information – procedure.

Okay, the presentation there are two parts there. One is focusing on the problem definition that you review and there's a framework on the studying of number one, which is about motivation and turnover retention based on the dissertation that the Nicole finished. She actually finished her Ph.D last May almost – is a secret, okay congratulations. Anyway, I'm very happy that she accepted a job as starting assistant professor, and on the other hand I chaired her dissertation. And the database that she used is very enriched. I was the originator of the database to address Title IV-E relate to case outcome. I believe that is the one of the first study in the country. I gave the presentation. So this study is based on the database.

The second study, that will be from California, study two, will be Career Path Retrospective Study. And also study three is also from California, Public Child Welfare Workforce Study. So after we have done part one and part two, we'll go to question and discussions, okay.

And then the first study is from Texas. Basically, they used child protection, [indiscernible] [00:5:33] kids and it lost momentum. We have a high turnover of child case workers. Now, it is a very challenging question, what is the meaning of turnover, okay. Although I prepare – we prepared our PowerPoint for the presentation but I always come up with questions. On what is the meaning of turnover, okay? In one of the report that I did, in 2008, when I evaluated the State of Texas foster care system, we found that the meaning of turnover is not the staff quitting. We also need to think about the 'c' class worker, they are being transferred. When I say transferred, transfer from CPS to non-daily CPS work they're still in the system, so are we losing them? Yes, we do because they are no longer practitioner; they might for most as an administrator between the department but not working CPS.

So given that information is that, it can – the rate could be very alarming. In some cases, the rate would be as high as 54% in 2008, in the State of Texas, based on the study that I

## Session 5.15 – Varying Perspectives on Retention in Public Child Welfare

did. So I just want to alert you that some of the problems regarding the child welfare issue, that turnover is very high and given the case load is very high too. So the problem do exist that case worker is a shortage in the State of Texas.

And here is the problem definition. Well, we talk about the definition of turnover, but what does it mean by retention, okay. Do they work there, for how long, that become retention so different state has different definition. Some suggestions would be it takes about two years before a worker can be well trained, okay. Now, if they are well trained they are gone then is that considered as good or bad, so we don't know, how about four years, So how many years, so that becomes an issue.

Case worker turnover rate range from 30% to 41%, that does not even include the transfer rate that I just mentioned. Is anyone saying transfer that means, transferred from one department to another unit, not doing the same job that the person is doing. It costs State of Texas \$56 million every year, so the issue is that that, how do we save this position, how do we reduce the turnover rate and make the retention rate much higher. And then as you see the diagram here, the child protection will be working on different units there. Investigation, adoption, family based services, and that child welfare rely on this components.

Now, since California is working with us on the presentation, we want to get so here what is going on? We have the family review there. If you look at this criteria there, based on the child and family service review outcome, as a matter of fact, Jong and Cheryl and Susan and others I think, we were just with Anna, Lisa, we are talking about that family service review as a comparison. What standard do we use? What commonality do we have to compare across different states? We were, you'll make discussion how do we coordinate the entire nation to looking into child and family service review.

So if you look at Texas, well, I want to say, if you look at all of them, there is only one area that we are probably at the passing mark, okay, which is the second in child. We see appropriate service for educational need, 97.1%. And I'm very happy that to say this is only one that we are good but the other, we didn't pass. I'm not saying I'm happy, I'm just mean to say in contrast compared to California. California did much better than we do in Texas given the fact that they also have a budget constraint and their score you look at is certainly higher than us.

Speaking of this is that we're trying – in another meeting we had, we're trying to look into outcome. The child and family services review standard are being revised. Last – In Tampa I was in for the SWAT Conference. They are talking politics and on two years to get it revised. So we are looking into that.

And then for turnover, we have desirable, undesirable and then preventable. Where was unpreventable? And I know that, some people may want to quit the job because it's unpreventable. The reason it is unpreventable because the worker maybe ill, the worker maybe not able to do – perform job, the worker transferred to somewhere else due to family reasons. Desirable that means sometimes, the worker is not a good worker and

therefore, you want the worker to be going away. Undesirable, it means that those who supposed to be there but they quit the job. In the study that I had is very interesting earlier I presented in Galveston in this May is that, those who get the MSW degree are more likely to stay longer on the job than those who don't, so because they have more competent, they have skills, they are more competent. And then those who get MSW or BSW, are more likely to stay long – are more likely to stay longer on the job compared to those who don't have the degree as well. So that's a very interesting study. The older they are for example, the more likely they stay on the job longer. So that's another factor. I just want to mention some of the information there. And then we're also looking into motivation and how do external and internal factor will be related to motivation.

Here is a list of the literature that have done with many variables. The demographic variable, the job satisfaction, training, salary, promotion, professional development, professionalization, economy, case load, stress, support that relate to retention and turnover. Additionally, motivation to work and training are also highly related to those two factors there. What can be done to retain child welfare workers, is our question? And Title IV-E that many of the – you are familiar with it, is that it does relate to retention and turnover. There are positive impact and no impact and they are hard of finding. For example, the positive impact study in the literature are employment links, okay. They tend to stay there longer. This is my study, the second one, the child welfare outcomes. The study I did is that in my earlier study, I had found that those who are in Title IV-E met three of the six review outcomes compared to those who don't have Title IV-E. So for those who are interested in that study, let me know after my presentation – at the end of the session, I'm very happy to send you my PowerPoint on that as well. And also IV-E degrees as well that has an impact on turnover and then there is no impact and hard of finding that is cited here on this slide.

Motivation also relate to retention and turnover. The variable that we want to explore is age and public sector has committed to work, perception of agency value, worker motivation related by behavior, motivation related to high the input activity, absent for safe level of organizational support and team welfare, reward, trust promotion et cetera, that all might be related to the motivation as well as to the retention turnover.

And here is a theoretical framework. The framework is that, well you have personal, professional shelf, okay. You also have resources from the agency. You also have agency demands that might have impact on the worker and then the question is that, do they stay or will they go away? So, of course those who are not motivated disengaged are more likely to be – not retained as well.

We have several purpose of our study, okay. The issue in study where that, it would just simplicize about the issues, there are variation among different Title IV-E program and that lack of consensus regarding retained and for the social activists very little framework, okay and then for motivation type of study mostly by the business factor. Our study methodology is that we had a sample of 610 subjects in our study. Now that is basically out of a total of 1,000 – over 1,000 subject that we surveyed but we exclude

some of those, they are not workers. For example, we exclude CS, supervisor, director, administrator, so finally we sort out the information and then kept 610 out of a 1,000 subjects based on the survey in the State of Texas.

And we also had a questionnaire. We used SurveyMonkey and surveyed the workers. At that time, they were employed there and we sent out a total of 2,000 workers email and then they responded to the survey and then we got a very good response, about 50%, very alarming in terms of response rate. It is very easy click, click, correct and then – and they also provide quantitative and qualitative information, okay. This study we'll be focusing on some quantitative and primary qualitative research data. And the instrument is 40 items instrument and also it went for IRB. The research design is a multi-book post-test only design with the content analysis and we also used multiple regression.

We have three research questions. Research question number one, how does the level of motivation to work affects CPS case workers intend to remain employed in and intend to leave the agency, okay? And then we have two sub-questions. What are the differences and similarity between case worker with low motivation to work and those with high motivation to work in terms of reasons to stay employed as CPS? Part B, what are the differences and similarities between case worker with low motivation to work and those with high motivation to work in terms of reason why a case worker might leave CPS? And we have those items there that measure those variables that is listed on the slide.

The second question is how does Title IV-E training affect CPS case worker's intent to remain employed in and intend to leave the agency? There are two components in it. A] What are the differences and similarities between Title IV-E trained case worker and non-Title IV-E retained case worker in terms of reasons to stay employed at CPS and what are the differences and similarities between IV-E trained case workers and non-Title IV-E trained case worker in terms of reason why a case worker might leave CPS? I want to tell is that when I collected data, the data was so much, actually my machined crashed and then I complained to my supervisor and finally, he bought me a – at that time it was a 8 Gig memory, memory, I'm not talking about storage, okay. I'm talking about 8 Gig memory. So I got a new computer, I'm still using it. I'm very happy because the project that has effect on me personally because I cumulate a computer to work on that. And finally, the research question is that, what impact do demographic personnel such as age, gender, commitment to CPS, professional such as training, degree, licensing, license, years of social work, service experience, CPS tenure and practice skills and organization factors have on CPS case workers motivation to work? And of course, we they have offices I have just said that they will have an impact to demographic variables, will have an impact. And also the organization factor will have the strongest impact on motivation to work.

And I'm going to go for number three, this one first and then I will let Nicole to go for number one and number two. You know how strong we are because she's qualitative I'm quantitative, okay, so we work together really well. Okay, here is a standard regression that I mentioned earlier. The variable is that our Title IV-E training, yes or no, is a variable, degree, social work non-social work, license dummy variable one, zero and

## Session 5.15 – Varying Perspectives on Retention in Public Child Welfare

years of social service experience, CPS tenure, and also the level of skills is a self-imported skill, okay based on one to five. And then the organization variable that we had was supervisor support as well as co-worker support and also with the job demand there. You can see the structure here as they support there.

And then this is now a research question I just mentioned it and a hypothesis. And here is the outcome that we have on this – on this outcome based on the standard regression model and you can see that the variables that included in the multiple regression analysis, we found three that are statistically significant. One is practice skill, the highest skill they have, the high the motivation. So motivation is the dependent variable, okay. And these variables are the independent variables. Age, the older they are, the more motivated it becomes stay in the job. And finally, collegial support, the more the support they have, the higher the motivation to work there. And the other variable even though they were not statistically significant, however, they contribute to the overall equation. If you look at the bottom, the R<sup>2</sup> is about 16.4%, or the R<sup>2</sup> equal to 0.164 that signify it contributes 16.4% of the variances accounted for by the variables.

So even though it's not extremely high, but I think it actually informs us there's some information, we should learn from that based on the finding. Practice skills, age and collegial support that will, that are related to motivation to work.

With that I will, going to turn the microphone to Nicole. Nicole.

Nicole Willis: Thanks, Dr. Leung So, I'm going to go ahead and give you an overview of the qualitative side of this research. Again, you were interested in looking at what factors impact motivation to work? Motivation to work being, more important and more relevant to public child welfare on an organizational level than job satisfaction, even though job satisfaction is often cited in the literature as one of either the predictive variables or the criterion variable. Now you can be satisfied with the job, they are not like energy action job right, so we thought motivation to work was a better variable to look at. So taking it from there we also wanted to take motivation to work and see how those levels, high and low now impact intent to remain employed and intent to leave. And again we're not looking at actual behavior, but intent and a lot of the research shows that intent is a big predictor of behavior, okay.

So, this first question where again we're looking at high and low levels of motivation to work and those impacts similarities and differences unintentionally manipulated and intent to leave and what I did to determine who was high and low, was low motivation was I listed more reference method for cost for us. So basically, from this item that, you get a score up to 20 in terms of motivation level and I cut out the 67% that were below on standard deviation of the mean and the mode on standard deviation of the means to the endpoints, both high and low.

So you have 152 people as low motivation to work levels, 318 as high motivation to work levels and you can see that now the red numbers in the boxes exceed the numbers of participants and then qualitative research, basically what that means was our participants

had a lot to say. So one person, if you talk about salary and hours and workload which is always a good thing for qualitative researches because the more people say, the more we have to work less.

So what I'm going to do, there is a lot of data here and I have just a few minutes, I'd like to highlight some of the interesting findings. As I was doing this qualitative content analysis, you can see under the low motivation column, you have the number of responses and consent of those responses. Under the high motivation you the same thing. Now talk a little bit about some of the similarities that they have and this will take type variance and systems theory and social exchange theory which are our framework. And basically, systems theory recognizes that public child welfare is a large system but it's comprised of separate and interdependent parts. The social exchange theory, what that says is behavior in any relationship is motivated by minimizing cost and maximizing rewards and within that process, there is exchanges, right between the case worker and the organization the case worker is supervisor and those exchanges are appraised over time in terms of fairness, right. So for any relationship to continue to exist, cost benefit ratio has to be provided, that's more favorable than the alternative situation, alternative in public child welfare meaning another job, more or less, okay.

So some of the themes that emerged from the content analysis supported that theoretical framework, in common, we see again a variety of different themes that fit into the different systems as well as different exchanges that will impact intent to leave or intent to stay. So, in common the participants start to like our personal support, the agency, the characteristics of the agency environment, the climate, professional factors, financial factors and a lot talk about feasibility, right, where else can I go, this is all I do that kind of thing. So let me highlight and this is the reasons to stay employed between low motivated and high motivated workers. Some of the differences included the high motivated workers talked a little bit more about wanting to stay in order to help kids and families, wanting to stay because it gave them a little bit more sense of competency and purpose and wanting to stay in order to improve the organization, not just the lives of the kids, not just to improve their skills but to improve the overall organization.

In terms of the low motivated workers and I thought this was pretty interesting and I'd like to talk about this in discussion at our third part of the presentation is that lower motivated workers were staying more for stability. Now think what that means. We all talk about money saving job there's nothing that's predictable, you know how much you are going to get paid, you know what you're going to do, but is that necessarily a good thing. When you think about the business world and a lot of motivation toward researches done in the more competitive business world, you are always looking behind it because there is total control about your job you need to have sales up, you need to do this math but public child welfare is a very different environment. So how do we work around not creating too much stability but having enough stability to provide quality, uninterrupted services to children and family, so that's kind of a tricky question.

And then we'll also – what's interesting was that the lower motivated workers talk about staying because they just didn't have another choice to leave, right. And then that's the

part of our framework about alternatives. It's not just about what the agency offers but what is offered elsewhere. It's kind of like a baseball thing so if the pitcher watches he's on a bat, but you also have to keep your eye on the run around first base, so it makes things very tricky in terms of looking at evaluating the system. Now in terms of low and high motivation differences and reasons to leave, there are some interesting differences. Low motivated workers talked about leaving more stress and burnout while the high motivated workers talked about wanting to leave because their skills are not matching their roles they can't like sub-size their competency levels. Now that's another interesting part to keep in mind for discussion.

Pay was obviously a big thing and I think a lot of the research shows that pay is not comparable to the work that they do. Currently, in the Houston Independent School District, a teacher makes about 10,000 to 15,000 more from the vouchers than a child protective services worker does. And also the Houston Independent School District takes into account the years of experience and degree in terms of your pay scale, in child protective services that doesn't count, okay. So again with the social exchange theory, I give you a master's degree and level of skills but I'm not giving that reciprocal pay, so where does that leave us, right, another question to consider.

And differences continue. It was interesting that those who are high motivated said they were more likely to leave because of better salaries elsewhere, okay, again that's the attractiveness of other agencies than the low motivated workers and they were more likely to leave for advancement opportunities and more autonomy, again higher motivated maybe higher skills and meeting that fits not necessarily that blanket salary, so that's something I think we really have to consider.

For the second question, I'm going to run through this Title IV-E training. Looking at the difference between those with IV-E training and those without in terms of what reasons would they have to leave and what reasons will they have to stay. And again, you tell by the number of the responses, these guys have a lot to say as well which means good for research, a lot of extra working for me. So in terms of reasons to stay, there are some differences dramatically between the IV-E workers and the non-IV-E workers. Interesting enough, the IV-E workers talked more about wanting to stay to improve the agency than likely saw from the high motivated workers and enjoyment of the job duties that they have. They also value more of the positive work environment as reasons to stay and also valued being able to gain more knowledge and skills on the job, right, with each year, they get better and better in what they do.

In terms of financial reasons, the non-Title IV-E said that they were more likely to stay because of the money, because of the insurance benefits and the retirement benefits and also some other differences were interesting. I particularly thought goals was an interesting thing for Title IV-E. Again, when we're looking at goodness of it and social exchange, here we are training providing enriched curriculum advance skills and then what happens when you place somebody who's highly trained in a position who is not able to exercise those skills and whose goals don't match up with the role that they're

placed in. So I thought this was an interesting finding with the IV-E people. They said one reason they would leave is because it didn't match up with their goals, right.

Stress and burnout, non-Title IV-E workers were more likely to leave because of that. Pay again was a big deal and IV-E workers were more likely to leave for pay again because maybe they are appraised what they're giving not in that cost benefit ratio of what they're getting. Skills and education another one Title IV-E get extra training and the workload the non-Title IV-E people were more likely to talk about leaving because of the size of the workload. So what is this have to do with – what are the implications, why is this important to look at? And I think from our study and again this is just based on the data that found through our quantitative and qualitative analysis, that maybe it would be who wants to recruit more older adults and a lot of the literature shows that older adults are less likely to leave, will be motivated by salary and things like that, so that might be one technique.

Also in order to retain again the desirable types of retention that the people that – are really productive maybe the public child welfare system needs to consider ongoing professional development that's very intense, role appropriate in order to decrease turnover rates and the biggie, biggie, biggie showed in literature, showed in our study was how important collegial support was. Supervisor support, co-worker support and that often tends to be a buffer burnout.

In terms of IV-E practice and policy again, with the social exchange theory, you have a worker that says I bring to the table this MSW degree, I bring to the table these experiences and skills but yet when I'm getting back the cost, the workload is not commensurate with my experience. So I know back in 2006, one of the ways that the system addressed salary was that, okay we want your investigations, we're going to give you \$5,000 bonus, but this is a blanket thing. And instead of having it a little bit on the service, it didn't make any – it didn't make any impact that they offered this \$5,000 because again, what's important is perception and appraisal. Now if these case workers are perceiving a mismatch between what they're giving and what they're getting, then that \$5,000 blanket is not going to make a difference. So I think we have to pay more attention to that type to relationship the cost benefit ratio and then the goodness that fit we talked about.

And in terms of research again like Dr. Leung mentioned, you know after all this research and orderable, what is retention look like? Is it consider retention after one year, after two years? It's basically defined as a long-term continuous employment but that's not very specific. If we pay to construct, we really have to have a better definition, so we know the reduction a bit and we're not trying to measure. I think also we have to focus not just on turnover itself, we saw in the newspaper alarming 20% turnover, 30% turnover. That includes unavoidable, that includes desirables, peoples that are appropriate for work and I think instead of grouping all those people together we really need to focus our resources on the preventable kinds of turnover. Looking more at factors impacting motivation to work again, are regression equation, those different predictive variables only account for about 17% of the variance in motivation to work.

## Session 5.15 – Varying Perspectives on Retention in Public Child Welfare

What happens – where did the other 80% come from? And I think that's a lot looking into and we need more Title VI research again, especially with the goodness that fit these.

And then I think the biggie that I wanted to give before I turn it over to our colleagues in California is, when we think about turnover, in terms of quantity, 30%, 40%, we think of it as a bad thing, right and we think of it quantitatively. But let me ask you I'm going to leave you with this question, can you apply turnover and still have little interruption of services and high quality services? And maybe it's not the quantity of turnover we should be focusing on, but the process of turnover. It's kind of like a 400 yard dash, right. Somebody who runs a 400 yard dash let's say in 30 seconds, may run against a team of four people where they pass off the baton and they run through the same kind of time, you know why is that? They have 4 turnovers, it's the process of turning over and I think maybe instead of focusing on the quantity of turnover, we really need to focus on the quality, the process of turnover and I think our resources are spent there, then we won't be so misled by the big numbers of turnover.

Patrick Leung: Well, thank you. Thank you very much.

Nicole Willis: Thank you.

Patrick Leung: And our next presenter will be Dr. Clark and Dr. Jacquet, they were looking into the experiences in California.

Sherrill Clark: And I did a very non-green thing, I made copies of this.

Female Speaker 1: Making us all happy.

Sherrill Clark: Right, right, right and doing the unexpected for somebody from California.

Female Speaker 1: Going against the stereotype.

Sherrill Clark: Yes. So as you can – as you can see from the title of our presentation, we kind of skewed it to trying to get you all to think about what exactly retention means and how much was enough – do that right. And just a little bit about what CalSWEC is? CalSWEC, the California Social Work Education Center is a coalition of 21 credited schools of social work and social welfare in California where the oldest I think coalition since 1993, we've graduated over 4,500 graduates. We also have six BASW programs which started in 2006 that program and we've graduated 268 of those persons. Susan and I are kind of in-charge of divining and dividing and deciding and designing the evaluation for this program. And as you can well appreciate, we have 21 schools and they're all doing things differently, it's kind of a – it's like trying to change the tires on a moving car as you go along.

## Session 5.15 – Varying Perspectives on Retention in Public Child Welfare

But our main assumptions, really kind of stem from four questions. Is the curriculum being taught? If the curriculum is being taught, are the students learning it? And if they're learning it, are they able to practice what they learned? And if they can practice what they've learned, does it actually make a difference in the outcomes for children and families? And we've gotten – we've gotten to question number three, the leap from question three to question four is very difficult to find out. We also are mandated by our contract basically with the welfares and the state to find out if we're making any headway with increasing the numbers of the MSW students graduates in the public child welfare work force and so when we started off in '93, 21% of the work force had MSWs. Now it's about 36% or 37%, okay. But not only do we want to know if we've increased the number, we also want to know if they have stayed in public child welfare and if they're actually able to professionalize the practice and effect policy and so on, okay.

We used a version of social exchange theory that Nicole as well described social exchange theory. We used a version of it called perceived organizational support, which is how an individual person perceives the organization as supporting him or her. And this happens when the employee believes that the organization actually values his or her contribution. Now the sticker in social exchange theory really is how do you measure value? Nobody's ever really been able to figure that out except in based on things like turnover rates. If I give you my professional skills and you don't recognize me well enough for either through salary or some other kind of means of recognizing me, you don't give me value back, I'm going to leave, but you should be aware of the fact that it's very sticky to find that, okay.

What we had hypothesized is that developmental experiences – look up that one, that one? Okay. Supervisor support and collegial support is part of the exchange that we found that are graduates are part interested in but we have also come to realize that developmental experiences and mentoring, being able to mentor the people, promotions being able to laterally transfer, which is another way of saying internal turnover or turnover to another unit can be looked at – viewed upon very favorably in terms of an exchange, okay. Developmental experiences in this case with this specialized group of IV-E, MSW graduates is a form of professional recognition for them.

And then just to briefly go over these, you have this on your handout, are research questions. We have a study that goes out to 10 plus years we can track people and Susan is basically responsible for that Dr. Jacquet is essentially responsible for developing that student and graduate database system without which you can't really do any of this retention stuff. But the main question that we're trying to find out the answer to is, are the graduates still working in child welfare? Are they being retained? And through the years, we've had doctoral students look at this information. We've looked at this information and these are the examples of the variables that not only we but other researchers have looked at. These are the organizational variables and then here are some individual variables that also interact to affect retention.

Now in California, legislatively we are supposed to have 50% of all of our ER, emergency response and family maintenance and family verification welfares are

## Session 5.15 – Varying Perspectives on Retention in Public Child Welfare

supposed to have MSWs or the equivalent. That's what the legislation says. All the adoption workers are supposed to have master's degrees or the equivalent and the supervisors, 100% of the supervisors are also supposed to have MSW. So how do we figure that out? Well we have to do, this is the first study that I'm going to report and we have to do workforce study. And we've conducted this five times. We're doing it, we're right in the middle of it now. I'm answering emails from counties that want to get the questionnaire, oh, and that's the other thing in California. It's a state supervised county administered system which means we have 58 different ways of doing things, which you sorted it out too.

Okay, so it's starting this week and it's the basis for determining whether or not we're making any progress and professionalizing the child welfare workforce and increasing retention and we are the only ones that do this and complete it. So, oops, okay. So, the last time we did this, we found out from the counties that they are over 13,000 people working in child welfare in California, most of whom are in LA, about 40%, 45% because that's where most of the population is. And out of that there were just over 11,000 what I call professional child welfare staff, that's excluding the clerical but not excluding social welfare – child welfare assistants, okay. Most of the people who responded to the survey, respond as generalists. In other words, they carry families and children in a number of different service unit areas and this has increased over the years. It used to be more specialized. I'm an ER worker or I'm a family reunification worker but now, it just seems to be front-end and back-end services; front-end being intake kinds of things and back-end being continuing services.

Okay. Out of the responses that we got, the average age was slightly more than 42 years, that's including the supervisors, managers and administrators. The average length of time in the current position was just under five years. The average length of time working in the county agency was just over nine years and the average length of time working in the field of child welfare was a little over 10 years. And again the way we defined, I'm not going to report the turnover statistics. If anybody wants them, I can give you them but they are out of date by now. Well this was 2008 but we have them that, there is internal turnover and that workers go from adoptions to emergency response and they are laterally transferring most of them feel very positive about that kind of transfer, some of them would rather not have that happen. I think the key is whether or not it's voluntary; again that's the exchange part. There is internal within the agency and when I say within the agency that means that a child welfare worker can go to mental health and that's internal turnover too.

There is also external turnover which in California means you can go to another public child welfare county agency which is still counted as retained in the public system which is where it differs from like a state system, where you only have one place to go really. But you still have training implications and you still have implications for your clients and the families.

All right, there is two surveys; one is an agency called the agency characteristic survey and one is called the individual worker survey. The agency characteristic survey gives

## Session 5.15 – Varying Perspectives on Retention in Public Child Welfare

that population statistic that I was giving you in the last slide and the individual worker survey is the one that gives the educational levels of the workers and their individual data. We found that the human resources departments aren't necessarily connected to child welfare and even if they were, they might not necessarily have the latest up-to-date information about how – whether a worker has a particular degree or not.

What's interesting about California is that, 28% of the respondents and this is IV-E and non-IV-E, this is everybody, used a language besides English on the job. Oh and I guess I should back track and say that California hires anybody and I don't mean that in a pejorative sense but you can't just be walking down the street and get hired in a child welfare job but there are BAs and BSWs, MAs, MSWs and if you can pass the civil service exam, well they'll hire you, but you don't necessarily have to have specialized training before you'll come on to the job. We do have a standardized core which all new hired – newly hired child welfare workers get and that's our CalSWEC's in service arm that coordinates that and they are five regional training academies that deliver it in the state, and what's called the inter-university consortium in LA.

Okay. Most of respondents to the survey were CalSWEC recipients, No that's not true. Anyway this is how, this is how it boils down. You can kind of see that one of the things that attracted me to this particular slide is that you can see that a general baccalaureate without a social work degree is 27% of the population of the respondents and the master's degree in social work is about a third. So what you have is, you have a situation where you've got specialized master's degrees on one hand and generalized baccalaureate degrees on the other hand and your – the training system is trying to train all of them at the same time, so that presents a little bit of an issue. And now I'll turn it over to Susan. And there are some people who have less than a baccalaureate degree.

Susan Jacquet: The training program that, Sherrill mentioned is the first point in which we're able to learn about this about this, our assumption about whether the IV-E folks are prepared for the work in child welfare, that in the training there is also an evaluation element and which collects demographic information including whether the – the trainee is a IV-E student in the level of education that they have. In the fall of, a year ago 2010, we added questions to that demographic questionnaire really evaluation about career goals, job expectations and social commitment because we – this is the place that we can compare the IV-E students with the non-IV-E students and I'll talk about that in just a minute, but we also in the evaluation, there is knowledge test and this graph is one of the – it's just one of the training classes conducted over one year's time. There are a total of 743 in that cohort of trainees and you can see by the red borders of the pre-test that the IV-E trainees who are on the left came in to the training with a greater amount of knowledge than the non-IV-E folks.

They also in the green part the post-test left the training with a greater amount of knowledge than the non-IV-E folks. So it sort of validates our assumption that the IV-E folks are going to be prepared, that's what you would hope because we just spent two years of training them but our training academy is also doing a good a job. The difference between the two programs, one is based on theoretical research in education, where we

focused on research and theory. The training is specific to the job, so we were delighted with these results. However, this was only one class and there are different variables that have – that alter the results depending on who is training them, depending on the year, the cohort or the module, because there are some modules that the IV-E folks are unfamiliar with because it's not – it's training specific or it's practice specific.

Okay. Our next point of evaluation is our three year post work obligation study. That's what we call our retention study. This is after the IV-E graduates have completed their work obligation. One of our doctoral students, who worked with us published her dissertation on the retention study and she used data from the original retention study of '96 through 2008, there were a total of 22 – almost 2,300 who were eligible for the study and we had a response rate of 49%. She used logistic regression with stayers and leavers as the dependent variable. She looked at worker characteristics, extrinsic job factors and intrinsic job factors and then with also responses to the job. Those who stayed differed significantly on worker characteristics, one being of mixed ethnicity and cohort. Part of the goal of CalSWEC is to train a diverse group of MSWs that would match the diverse mix of clients in child welfare. And so it was nice to know that the IV-E or that the stayers were of a greater diversity.

There was also those folks who as students were also county workers, however in the final model of that, that dropped down and the worker characteristics, at least one variable from each of the main categories of that predicted retention in extrinsic– I have trouble with that word, extrinsic job factor, salary, hours and supervisor support predicted retention. In the intrinsic job factors, level of success and response to job factors especially client related stress, predicted retention. Burnout – cohort burnout specifically emotional exhaustion and then visit related –client visit related stress, were associated with leavers. Supervisor support increased the odds of several of the job satisfaction variables and peer support increased the odds of various job related satisfaction including satisfaction with clients, personal growth and office factors.

We've now also completed a five to ten year retrospective study of all the graduates who in by 2008 had graduated at least five years prior to or had – yeah, had graduated at least five years earlier. The response rate for this study was only 30 – almost 35% which wasn't as high as we wanted but we thought that's not too bad or at least those were the folks that we could locate but some of those folks had graduated 15 years earlier. We ended up with 401 usable surveys out of 502, a lot of it was people – it was a very long survey and some of them had dropped off mid survey. These respondents in comparison to the population from the workforce itself, there were more representative racially and ethnically of the child welfare families, there were more bilingual workers. The age of the IV-E graduates is a bit younger and the length of tenure in child welfare is slightly longer. You have to remember that some of our IV-E grads were workers before they entered the workforce –the program. The IV-E graduate's career paths were examined over 14 years and we've focused on -- for this one, we focused on first position in child welfare and then also how long they stayed in child welfare itself.

## Session 5.15 – Varying Perspectives on Retention in Public Child Welfare

I'm going to skip over one of these, we did find that perceived organizational support did predict retention or tenure in public child welfare. Some of the main things was training. Those who had training more than twice a year, those – were amongst those who stayed longer, support for the clinical license and holding a supervisory position. Let's see, I'm not going to talk about the link but, because I wanted to show you one and following up on those is the upper line here on the top one indicates that those with training more than twice a year and this is in a survival analysis, they stayed longer than those without – who did not have training and getting support for licensures the bottom one, and those folks stayed longer, the difference in years. And then finally, this one – this is the supervisory – those with supervisory positions stayed longer.

We were curious about those folks who had stayed more than 10 years and this is where Sherrill is going to take over, we did find 32 of them and 13 had interviewed, so she is going to give the qualitative data. The 32 people who stayed longer than 10 years, this is stayed longer than 10 years in one position like direct service worker or supervisor and most of them were are actually direct services workers and they stayed from the beginning from when they graduated and till the time that they were surveyed and we were very curious about who were these people who didn't move anywhere. So, out of the 30 that we looked at, these were the characteristics, most of them – some of the things that we found that were surprising. 90% of them were full-time students, about 27% I think county employees while in school, not all of our folks in IV-E have been county employees while in school and it looks like some of them actually left the county to take on a full-time school, because our part time program is all county employees.

Less than a quarter – all right, less than a quarter were not born in the U.S, but half of them are bilingual and if you can remember those stats that we've talked about a little bit earlier, that's almost double the bilingual population in the whole child welfare population. They seemed to be a little bit younger at least when they started, when they graduated they were younger. The model time enjoyed was 12 years. Most of lived and worked in the same county and it was – as I said before, 87% of them remained in direct service positions.

Female Speaker 4: Did you look at marital status?

Susan Jacquet: That was from – that was from the – pardon me?

Female Speaker 4: Did you look at marital status?

Susan Jacquet: We did look at marital status. I don't have that, almost five year. I'm not sure we actually looked at that. We have that information in the student database but I'm not sure we looked at it with this particular study. We caught on the long term retained people compared to the entire retrospective sample. The long term retained are not different from the rest of the sample by their race, gender, age, their county employee status or their licensure status I might present that stat to specially county welfare directors, they say well, we thought that by supporting them to get their license they would be off and doing private practice, well the truth of it is, is that private practice is

very impractical in these – in this day and age and anybody who does have a private practice, they're only having a little bit of it, okay.

They are bilingual. They weren't born in the United States, that's how that differs and they weren't citizens when entered school. Okay, so you see the stats about the developmental opportunities. Field instruction didn't pan out because people are sometimes supported for being field instructors and sometimes not, so it tends to be kind of a wash. The questions in the telephone interview, the three letter in bold are the ones that I'm going to concentrate on and I've already been given the end signal but I'm sort of into the mid of my presentation at this point, sorry. Go back.

I asked them whether or not they could give an example of a success that was – that they've had in their careers and I tended to get two different kinds of answers. One answer had to do with what this has done for me. The other answer tended to be, well my families did this, my families did that client oriented. We asked them whether or not they could use their position – in their position they could use their professional skills to influence policy or practice. And then we asked them to give us an example. Okay, so here are some of the responses. That's an example of a success related client goals and you can take a look at that. This person was Asian-American person, bilingual, didn't belong to any professional organizations. Her original goals were to be licensed but once she realized that she didn't need a license to keep that job that she really liked a lot. She didn't bother to get it, okay.

So here is another one. This is an issue of practicing professional skills related to client goals. Very focused on what is the nature of the work. And this person was – another person, not born in the United States, bilingual. Success related to professional goals, this is a quote from a person who found – defined success as meeting professional goals and these are the things that here she is proud of and this is – the original goals were just to get a job and keep the job, okay. This person also related her success related to professional goals, I upgraded my skills, I couldn't have stayed in the field for so long and this person was a stakeholder. We had – in California, we had a state-wide committee called by the director of social services for three years back in 2000 and this person was a line worker who was actually called up to represent her county and line workers basically at the state-wide policy and influencing body and she felt that this work– gave her a lot of recognition and recognition is actually the key value here for the exchange.

Male Speaker 1: Two more minutes?

Susan Jacquet: Two more minutes, okay. These are the characteristics of the long-term retained workers. We picked out three models. We picked out – we decided that they fell into being mentors and these are their characteristics. The second model is the personal professional model, which these folks are professionals but they also relate their successes and goals back to themselves in what they've achieved. And these are the folks who are reliable to say, well, I couldn't have gotten an MSW at all if it weren't for IV-E and the collegial environment. They also enjoy the job the way it is. So, okay and then

that's an example. Okay. Then they are client focused long-term retained workers would rather work with clients, they're not interested in promotions or professional organizations or anything else, related to indirect kinds of services and that's an example of somebody who is client focused and his or her characteristics, now the need of this is, how much retention is enough, and that may be a kind of an iconoclastic question, but if we have any time left, that's the thing that I kind of wanted to discuss with all of you. Would you retain the workers that I'm going to show you on the next two slides or not? If not, would you consider IV-E education a failure if you weren't going to retain these folks? And if you think it's not failure and if you want to retain them, what kinds of incentives would you offer them or could you offer them to stay.

How many people here are administrative people? Okay. So you make some decisions about these kinds of things in your agencies. This person is saying, it's taxing work, it's not monetarily satisfying. I'm very glad to be a social worker. I don't really like it anymore, but I'm not trying to do anything else. So would you retain that person or not. Here are some characteristics of that person. That might give you a clue what kinds of incentives would be available – would be valued by this person. Okay, here is another one. I never intended, to have a career as a child and family services worker, I wanted to be a therapist but I needed the IV-E money. This is a person who ended up staying for 13 years. So is IV-E a failure in that case? If you wanted to retain that person what would you do? After those changes in her position, she stayed in the continuing services position with after a seven month leave, which I think was her pregnancy maternity leave, so that's the other thing to consider. The work life balance issues and then return to a 32 hour position and stay there for 10 years.

So that's it.

Patrick Leung: Great, thank you very much. I think that when I was listening I told about something. In the meantime, I saw some variables that has triggered my mind to tell you a story. Several years ago, my wife conducted a training in – for CPS and workers were stressed and then she used a technique called acupressure to help the workers to release their stress, so you saw this stress is a factor. So well, what was it really that stress causes a lot of problems? One of the problem is that the – after the stress, the worker could not go to bathroom and then she said, I'm going to show you how to find a pressure point and press it so you can go to bathroom, and after all the steps and then at the end of the session, the line was long outside the bathroom and it's really working. So I would like to ask you would you like to know those acupressure points if we do, please stand up. I want you all to stand up before we ask questions, okay. Please stand.

Okay, on your fingers here, you just stand up, use your fingers, your thumb here, and press here, okay. I'm serious, you may go to the bathroom, okay. You got to do it, okay. So if you massage here it's a little stiff there. If you feel stiff, that means you touch it. Press it for about 10 seconds, okay. That helps to release the stress. One, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten and do the same thing for the other acupressure

## Session 5.15 – Varying Perspectives on Retention in Public Child Welfare

point here. So for the time of demonstration I want you all not to go the bathroom, will you please sit down, okay.

We have 15 minutes for questions, okay before you go. I don't know where you're going, but anyway the question I have is that, what variable will motivate worker to work that I'm here? Secondly, what are the differences between Title IV-E and non-Title IV-E? Third question is that retention, what make to retain our workers? And then finally the question is that how much retention is enough? So I'll just open up this for questions and your thought. Any question for the presenters. Yes please, come forward.

Female Speaker 5: I really – I really liked your variable about age that the older more experienced workers perhaps have higher retention rate. I think there might be a heart sore, because I think there is a stereo type that child welfare workers tend to be younger, it's – very physically demanding job that type of thing. So has anybody had any experience, anybody here, selling the case for more – I mean to say more experienced workers to be working more on the frontline and then how did that go?

Patrick Leung: Any comments from the audience or the panel? Sherrill?

Sherrill Clark: One of the things in – that I found in admissions to social work school now is that, most of the people who are recruited for any field in social work are a little bit older than they used to be. The average age is about 27. Now, they used to be younger than that. So you have to have – you have to come with some experience in some field of social work before you can actually get in to the program and then to get the IV-E, you have to have some experience in child welfare, so that kind of by definition makes people a little bit older not that much older, but a little bit older.

Patrick Leung: Joan.

Speaker 6: I actually had a question related to that the whole idea of the older worker, because I wasn't quite sure if the people in IV-E that you were doing the study on were people who were already employed workers who were, already had quite a lot of seniority were closing to retirement and such. Because I think some of the work at Charlie Araback and Brendan McGowan [phonetic] [01:16:25] down in New York City I mean that's what they've seen and that was the sort of a situation in Kansas when they privatized and they got all the workers with flock to the privatized agencies and they all stayed with the government because they already had time in, so that's a little different and if people were already employed then it's people who were new to the field because other research kind of shows the – it's the younger people who gravitate to child welfare, but if you look at the NASW workforce study about social workers there's people who gravitate to child welfare early in their social work career, tend to move to other fields and – or they tend to leave ---

Sherrill Clark: Right.

## Session 5.15 – Varying Perspectives on Retention in Public Child Welfare

Female Speaker 7: Then it tends to be – it attracts the newbies and that’s where you get your feet wet and then you move on. In Maryland, if you ask a whole roomful of social workers in the training, how many worked in child welfare? 75% will raise their hand. How many still work there? The number’s very small. So it’s how do you in fact attract older if in fact that’s related to retention, how do you recruit more seasoned, mature people, I don’t know.

Patrick Leung: Yes. Let me just reframe that, of course I will come back to you, yes the fact that, there is instead an inter-action effect between age and those who are currently employed in terms of retention, that’s her question. I think it’s a very good one, yeah. Thank you.

Female Speaker 8: We’ve heard earlier in the primary about the importance of relationship with the worker and the family and the child. Did any of you calculate retention from the family perspective? In other words, how many people that the family had to relate to? So I understand what you are all saying about some rules for CPS, through adoption okay our investment in the midst of agency is still there. But from the family perspective, that’s the alternative.

Sherrill Clark: Right. And that’s why we measured it – that’s why we measured it the way we did. That’s why we counted internal turnover because if you move from one unit to another, it not only has training implications it’s also a loss for the family and children, exactly.

Female Speaker 8: Unless you do it from client driven as opposed to an organizational, I think uses a different set of data and somebody said more important set of data for the outcomes that they are trying to achieve.

Nicole Willis: And I think too, all of these questions kind of point that how complex turnover is and sometimes when we simplify it, we see it in the paper. We don’t fully understand how complex it is. We could have in the earlier instance, a worker who is not qualified and turnover for them to the family, the meaning of that person leaving might not be bad, right. So I think more research has to focus more on these specific types of complex, the different pieces of turnover, than just turnover in general.

Female Speaker 7: That was one of my questions. I wanted to know if you could speak more about the process turnover, you mentioned something about the process of turnover and wanted to see the variables and elements of that?

Nicole Willis: Right. In general turnover – the studies on turnover they can be either process models or content models.

Female Speaker 6: Okay.

Nicole Willis: So process models look at how somebody leaves, so it could be in a thought perception an appraisal are very important from the workers perspective. It could

## Session 5.15 – Varying Perspectives on Retention in Public Child Welfare

be dissatisfaction with supervision, and then thoughts about leaving, looking at alternative agencies and then actually leaving, so that would be sort of a process model. Content models focus on why people leave and that was more the focus of our study.

Male Speaker 1: Yes.

Female Speaker 9: I think that's so interesting Nicole and I never thought about this before when we talk about the process though from the client perspective as well, because in some agencies, like when I left my directorial position, I was able to tell my clients that talk about – I was even able to say your new worker will be so and so and in a couple of cases that were the real messy ones, I was able to bring the new worker on as I insisted with my agency this case can sit until – that whole process and I worked at – this was private child welfare agency, so I was able to do that. My guess is like with other places where a person's case may well get shifted to another worker or may sit on the shelf and that kind of turnover is really terrible and you don't see any real discussion of that in the literature and what that means from a client impact. And I have to think about at level.

Female Speaker 6: Yeah literally organizational issue in some states you cannot post a job until it's empty.

Female Speaker 9: Exactly, yeah.

Female Speaker 6: So then by definition I'm going to have six, to eight months and because somebody is recruited higher, trained and placed. In that intervening time, those cases are carried by the supervisor or spread out among workers, who are already overburdened, so basically doesn't take care.

Female Speaker 9: Right. So that when we talk about – I mean when you think about business turnover, it doesn't really matter who sells, but not in the single it doesn't have the same cost that our worker turnover does, so it is interesting.

Patrick Leung: I think there are two questions there, the gentleman here and then ---.

Male Speaker 1: I'm Steve Priester I work for one of the national resource centers and this is Susan Savage who works for the Missouri's children division. So for three years, two of the national resource centers worked with Missouri to develop and implement a comprehensive strategic plan to improve child welfare supervision and then to support supervisors. Missouri participated in the Survey of Organization Excellence, we had data pre and post and we – the data showed that the year following implementation with strategic by four variables improved but tough to read worker retention and worker satisfaction.

Patrick Leung: Yes.

## Session 5.15 – Varying Perspectives on Retention in Public Child Welfare

Female Speaker 10: Just international I think turnover is deleterious to work with client where I think it takes a huge pull on the organization that I think we – your supervisor and you can as well done a great deal time and energy in the worker , I think it's very difficult and that people coming and going and I think it affects people who've been there a long time start investing in those, like I don't find any a division, start investing in relationships with those young people who can really benefit with their mentoring and.....

Patrick Leung: Sherrill you have a response?

Sherrill Clark: Yeah I was just going to say it's interesting that this – to me that this conversation is focusing on turnover rather than retention which I think that you can do some things about retention but you can't necessarily do anything about turnover because as in the GIO report in 2003, the most frequently cited reasons for leaving are personal reasons and there is not a whole lot that an administrator can actually do about that. But there are things that you can do to try to retain people and I think if behooves us to take a look at how much retention is enough, I don't how else to say it. It may just be that that turnover is unavoidable and that we need to learn how to, as we sort of saying, we need to learn how to prepare people with that.

You know frankly though, some of the clients that I talked to have basically said they expect their social workers to turn over and to leave them. The kids in out of home care actually are more concerned with their foster parents staying with them rather than their workers.

Female Speaker 10: But we will catch up in the long run having the same college worker for that young person and I think is huge.

Sherrill Clark: I think the key equivocal word there though is quality and I think that you have to look at that.

Patrick Leung: I have two questions here and you first and then Joann.

Female Speaker 8: You had mentioned in the first study I think you said that California was a nine to eight and there is some times discussion about the change in the demographics of the workforce. From the first study to your 2008, did you see real changes with trends in terms of the workforce?

Sherrill Clark: In the general overall workforce, well the first year's study.

Female Speaker 8: Part of your study.

Sherrill Clark: Yeah. The first time that we did that study was in '92 and the methods were different. The one in '98 was when they started becoming more comparable and we didn't see any changes in the ethnic makeup of the overall population. We did see changes in the ethnic makeup of the IV-E graduates, that the IV-E graduates were maybe two-thirds minority, one-third white, and the rest of the population were two-thirds white

and one-third minority. But the other surprising thing and this may just be California is that the IV-E graduates are by far more bilingual than everybody else and in terms of our very small sample of the people who stayed a very long time, they are more non-native people, who are not born here and bilingual.

Patrick Leung: Joan.

Female Speaker 9: I guess a few things again. One is there are other studies that have looked at retention, have also looked at opportunities as well as the issues that these people have with their jobs. If you look at the New York state study, they found that in high turnover and low turnover counties, one of the characteristics was in low turnover counties because we will have lots of places to fill, and then also a big part of a difference in terms of people who are newer to the United States may see themselves with very less options or may see the job as being better than are other people may see it being in terms of some of the issue or the impact on clients, University of Southern Maine has a really good video that has been shown in some of the workforce meetings that kids who grow in foster care are talking about the impact of workers which is good and the study the that just begun all did in Milwaukee where they tied number of placements to worker turnover, so there are some factors there to look at. And I want you to talk a little about this whole idea of in terms of how long are you supposed to stay in a job? How long has many of us and some of us know...

You've been in the same field for a long time in terms of how many of these meetings we've been at together but we've been certainly in different places in that process some of us and the sort of idea of retention, when it came out in one your examples that if you had really good training and experience as a child welfare worker and after doing that for 10 years or whatever, you go and work for a mental health program or you hang out your own shingle and you're going to be serving the same IV-E eligible kids or whatever you wanted to find it and you have a sort of knowledge and you become a sort of a go to place so all these kids have these mental health needs that you need people who have been knowledgeable about the system and knowledge about health people care to serve, that's still retention in my head is one thing. We haven't really lost them and the other piece is there's great discrepancies between what is acceptable as – where do you need to be placed. Some place you have to go anywhere in the state as part of your payback some place is in 30 miles, some places it's only a public agency, some relevant schools, it's private agencies, it's a house sort of thing, so we don't need to have a time and definition of what you're requirement is if your – had your education supported to where you need to pay that back and then if the agency can make exceptions because in your ability to address, California, someone would say, okay, we'll still count you as you to make your payback.

Patrick Leung: I think it's a good question, I want to leave this to you to think about it at home, okay. With that I want to thank the panel to make the presentation.