

Snapshot of the Child Welfare Workforce from 2021 to 2022:

NSCAW III Child Welfare Workforce Study Design, Data Collection, and Sample Characteristics

OPRE Report #2024-025 April 2024



Snapshot of the Child Welfare Workforce from 2021 to 2022: NSCAW III Child Welfare Workforce Study Design, Data Collection, and Sample Characteristics

OPRE Report #2024-025

April 2024

Jenna Montgomery Armstrong, Marianne Kluckman, Heather Ringeisen, and Melissa Dolan,
RTI International

Mary McCarthy, The University at Albany

Submitted to:

Mary Bruce Webb (OPRE-COR), Project Officer
Christine Fortunato (OPRE-co-COR), Project Officer
Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation
Administration for Children and Families
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
<https://www.acf.hhs.gov/opre>

Contract Number: HHSP233201500039I

Project Director: Melissa Dolan
RTI International
3040 E. Cornwallis Road
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

This report is in the public domain. Permission to reproduce is not necessary. Suggested citation: Armstrong, J.M., McCarthy, M., Kluckman, M., Ringeisen, H., & Dolan, M. (2024). *Snapshot of the Child Welfare Workforce from 2021 to 2022: NSCAW III Child Welfare Workforce Study Design, Data Collection, and Sample Characteristics*. OPRE Report #2024-025. Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Disclaimer

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

This report and other reports sponsored by the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation are available at
www.acf.hhs.gov/opre

Subscribe to OPRE News and Follow OPRE on Social Media



Acknowledgments

We would like to thank the NSCAW III participating child welfare agencies and agency personnel whose time and contributions made this study possible. We would also like to acknowledge the advisors involved with NSCAW III who provided their support, expertise, and guidance to this effort. These advisors are listed in the table below. The views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of these advisors.

Anita Barbee	University of Louisville
Julie Breedlove	Public Knowledge, LLC
Nancy Dickinson	University of Maryland
Christine Fortunato	Administration for Children and Families
Jacquelyn Gross	VPD Government Solutions
John Halloran	University of Chicago
Amy He	University of Denver
Laura Hoard	Administration for Children and Families
Cara Kelly	Administration for Children and Families
Warren Ludwig	University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Mary McCarthy	University at Albany
Cynthia Osborne	University of Texas
Michael Shaver	Brightpoint
Mark Testa	University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Mary Bruce Webb	Administration for Children and Families
Rebecca Wells	University of Texas
Tamarie Willis	Society for Research in Child Development

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	vi
Purpose	vi
Background on NSCAW III.....	vi
Overview NSCAW III Child Welfare Workforce Study	vi
Key Findings	vii
Design and Methods	vii
Introduction	1
Methods	2
Sampling.....	2
Surveys	3
Data Collection.....	5
Analysis	6
Descriptive Findings	6
Agency Characteristics.....	6
Demographic Characteristics.....	7
Summary.....	7
Accessing Data for Secondary Analysis.....	8
Exhibits	9
References	15

Tables

Number		Page
<u>Table 1.</u>	<u>Research Areas, Constructs, and Respondents for Project Developed</u>	
	<u>Items</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>Table 2.</u>	<u>Standardized Scales Adapted for Use in Survey Items</u>	<u>5</u>

Exhibits

Number	Page
<u>Exhibit 1. Agency Director, Supervisor, and Caseworker Demographic Characteristics.....</u>	<u>9</u>
<u>Exhibit 2. Educational and Time in Role of Child Welfare Workforce Characteristics</u>	<u>13</u>

Executive Summary

Purpose

This report introduces the Child Welfare Workforce Study, conducted as part of the third cohort of the National Survey of Child and Adolescent Well-Being (NSCAW III). The Child Welfare Workforce study explores characteristics and activities of the child welfare workforce from 2021-2022, during the COVID-19 pandemic, participating in NSCAW III. This report describes the sample design, instrumentation, data collection methods, and demographic characteristics of workforce participants.

Background on NSCAW III

NSCAW is a nationally representative, longitudinal survey of children and families who came in contact with the child welfare system (CWS). The goal of the study is to provide information on a range of fundamental questions about the outcomes of children involved with the CWS. The study also provides insight on the interplay between the characteristics of children and families, their experiences with the CWS, service needs and receipt, and well-being outcomes.

The study is sponsored by the Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation (OPRE), Administration for Children and Families (ACF), U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), in collaboration with ACF's Children's Bureau, and led by RTI International. The study is currently authorized by Social Security Act § 429 [42 U.S.C. 628b].

Overview NSCAW III Child Welfare Workforce Study

The NSCAW III Child Welfare Workforce Study provides a unique snapshot of the United States child welfare workforce in 2021 to 2022 during the COVID-19 pandemic. This study sought to better understand four topic areas relevant to the child welfare system (CWS) context: workforce characteristics and competencies; recruitment, hiring, and onboarding; training and professional development; and organizational factors. These priorities were informed by the body of literature on factors known to influence practice within the child welfare workforce (de Guzman et al., 2020; DePanfilis & Zlotnik, 2008; Edwards & Wildeman, 2018; Gomez et al., 2010; Leake et al., 2017; Radey & Wilke, 2018).

This report provides details about the NSCAW III Child Welfare Workforce design and methods. This report also includes descriptive findings on agency characteristics and demographic characteristics of caseworkers, supervisors, and agency directors. The exhibits in this report present representative estimates of approximately 74% of public child welfare agencies/agency directors, 77% of child welfare supervisors, and 82% of caseworkers in the United States. The descriptive statistics (percentages, standard errors, and confidence intervals) are based on weighted NSCAW III workforce data.

Key Findings

- The NSCAW III Child Welfare Workforce Study includes 48 agency directors, 126 supervisors, and 183 caseworkers.
- Most participating child welfare agencies are in non-metro areas (77.3%) and are state administered (65.5%).
- Most agency directors (77.3%), supervisors (80.9%), and caseworkers (83%) who participated are female.
- More caseworkers (20.5%) identified as Black or African American as compared to supervisors (14.0%) and agency directors (14.3%).
- Nearly one-fifth of caseworkers (18%), 11.7% of supervisors, and 13.5% of agency directors are Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino.

Design and Methods

The study collected information from 48 agency directors, 126 supervisors, and 183 caseworkers during the follow-up wave of NSCAW III from January 2021 to June 2022. The study sample is intended to be representative of public child welfare agencies that were able to participate in NSCAW III. Due to state confidentiality statutes and agency refusals the sample is representative of about 74% of child welfare agencies/agency directors, 77% of child welfare supervisors, and 82% of caseworkers in the United States.

Unique but complementary surveys were created for agency directors, supervisors, and caseworkers which covered four main research categories outlined previously (i.e., workforce characteristics and competencies, recruitment, hiring, and onboarding; training and professional development; and organizational factors). Surveys included a mix of project developed items and standardized scales.

Introduction

This report provides an overview of the Child Welfare Workforce Study, carried out as part of the third cohort of the National Survey of Child and Adolescent Well-Being (NSCAW III-see Box 1 for more details). The NSCAW III Child Welfare Workforce Study explores characteristics and activities of the child welfare workforce from 2021 to 2022, during the COVID-19 pandemic, within 61 nationally representative agencies that participated in NSCAW III. This report describes the sample design, instrumentation, data collection methods, and demographic characteristics of workforce participants. In addition to describing core contextual aspects of the child welfare workforce, study timing allowed for the inclusion of research questions about the policy and practice impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic. A full list of NSCAW III Workforce product topics are included in Box 2.

The NSCAW III Child Welfare Workforce Study sought to better understand four topic areas relevant to the child welfare system (CWS) context: workforce characteristics and competencies; recruitment, hiring, and onboarding; training and professional development; and organizational factors. These priorities were informed by the body of literature on factors known to influence practice within the child welfare workforce (de Guzman et al., 2020; DePanfilis & Zlotnik, 2008; Edwards & Wildeman, 2018; Gomez et al., 2010; Leake et al., 2017; Radey & Wilke, 2018).

The NSCAW III Child Welfare Workforce Study sought to address the following research questions across the four main topic areas:

Child Welfare Workforce Characteristics and Competencies

- What are the demographic and educational characteristics of the child welfare workforce, including caseworkers, supervisors, and agency directors?
- What are the primary roles and responsibilities of the child welfare workforce?
- What personal characteristics and competencies (knowledge, skills, and abilities) do child welfare staff members possess and/or demonstrate?

Box 1. NSCAW Overview

The National Survey of Child and Adolescent Well-Being (NSCAW) is the only source of nationally representative, longitudinal data on the well-being of children and families involved with the child welfare system (CWS). The study is sponsored by the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation (OPRE), Administration for Children and Families (ACF), U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). There have been three cohorts to date. The 3rd cohort (NSCAW III) began in 2017 and data collection is currently ongoing as of November 2023. Additional information on NSCAW III is available in the [NSCAW III Baseline Report: Introduction to NSCAW III](#).

Box 2. Additional Topics in the NSCAW III Child Welfare Workforce Study Series

- Caseworker Well-being
- Caseworker Recruitment, Hiring, and Promotion
- Caseworker Training and Professional Development
- COVID-19 and Child Welfare Workforce Practices
- Child Welfare Organizational Culture and Climate

Recruitment, Hiring, and Onboarding

- What strategies are used to recruit caseworkers? What competencies do agency directors and supervisors think are important in hiring decisions? How long does it take to hire new employees? In what onboarding activities do jurisdictions engage once caseworkers are hired?
- What training and/or education did child welfare staff possess when they were hired? Did their education include any courses in child welfare?
- What recruitment practices do agencies use to attract and hire child welfare candidates? What onboarding practices do agencies have for new child welfare workers?

Training and Professional Development

- What types of training and professional development opportunities are offered to child welfare staff? What factors influence child welfare staff's abilities to engage in training and professional development opportunities?
- What training and professional development opportunities do child welfare staff engage? How does this training and professional development influence job satisfaction, retention, turnover, increased knowledge, and practice?

Organizational Factors

- What is the public child welfare agency landscape? This includes (but is not limited to) the number of child welfare staff, caseload size, turnover rates, ratio of supervisors to workers, vacancy rates, salary levels and benefits, and union/non-union.
- To what extent are public-private child welfare partnerships taking place? What is the extent of privatization and contracting out?
- What is the organizational culture and climate within public child welfare agencies? How do organizational culture and climate influence workforce issues, including role conflict, burnout, turnover, supervision, caseload/workload, or education and training requirements?
- How do child welfare staff's perspectives about organizational culture and climate influence workforce issues?
- How has the COVID-19 pandemic potentially influenced the work of child welfare staff?

Methods

Sampling

The sample for the workforce data collection effort was derived from the 61 nationally representative child welfare agencies participating in NSCAW III. Sampling for the workforce data collection effort followed a nested design beginning with all agency directors from

participating NSCAW III baseline agencies. Directors who agreed to participate in the workforce survey identified agency supervisors, and up to four supervisors were randomly selected and asked to participate. Finally, participating supervisors provided a list of caseworker supervisees to the study team. Up to four caseworkers for each supervisor were randomly selected and invited to participate. The nested sampling allows for agency director, supervisor and/or caseworker perceptions within and across agencies to be compared.

If a sampled supervisor or caseworker did not complete a survey, another supervisor or caseworker from the same agency was randomly selected, if available. If no agency-level replacement was available or if an agency-level replacement did not complete a survey, a study-level replacement was selected from the overall sample of supervisors and caseworkers.

This resulted in a total sample of 61 agency directors, 195 supervisors, and 348 caseworkers for this workforce data collection effort. Each sample had some level of non-response resulting in a smaller number of completed surveys. Response rates were 79% (N=48) for agency directors, 73% (N=126) for supervisors, and 65% (N=183) for caseworkers.

This sample is intended to be representative of public child welfare agencies that were able to participate in NSCAW III. Specifically, agencies located in states that do not prohibit the release of child maltreatment records with identifiable information, or in states that had multiple agencies refuse to participate. The resulting sample is representative of about 74% of child welfare agencies/agency directors, 77% of child welfare supervisors, and 82% of caseworkers in the United States. Sampling weights were developed for each of the workforce samples (i.e., agency directors, supervisors, and caseworkers) which can be analyzed independently or jointly, depending on the research question.

Surveys

Unique but complementary surveys were created for agency directors, supervisors, and caseworkers. Surveys were developed in collaboration with expert consultants and covered the four main research question categories outlined above (i.e., workforce characteristics and competencies; recruitment, hiring, and onboarding; training and professional development; and organizational factors) and included a mix of project-developed items and standardized scales. [Table 1](#) contains information regarding the project-developed questions for each respondent type to assess workforce characteristics and competencies; recruitment, hiring, and onboarding; training and professional development; and organizational factors. [Table 2](#) contains standardized scales used in the supervisor and/or caseworker survey. The agency director survey took an average of 75 minutes to complete and could be completed via telephone or in-person. The supervisor survey took an average of 51 minutes to complete while the caseworker survey took an average of 56 minutes to complete. Both surveys could be completed online or via telephone interview.

Table 1. Research Areas, Constructs, and Respondents for Project Developed Items

Construct	Respondent		
	Agency Director	Supervisor	Caseworker
Workforce Characteristics and Competencies			
Title and function within agency; Primary roles and responsibilities; Demographics; CWS experience; Tenure; Prior CWS experience when hired; promotions	✓	✓	✓
Personal Characteristics and Competencies; Caseworker Competencies		✓	✓
Recruitment, Hiring, and Onboarding			
Recruitment and onboarding practices	✓	✓	✓
New employee mentoring; Pre-service training		✓	✓
Training and Professional Development			
Training budget and resources; Types of training offered and format of training	✓		
Caseworker training and professional development opportunities; Required vs. optional opportunities; Frequency and availability of opportunities; Mode and location; Evaluation of knowledge/practice application		✓	
Perceived sufficiency/adequacy of available training; Factors/barriers that influence; Perceived impact of training on increased knowledge and job satisfaction; Casework preparedness			✓
Organizational Factors			
Responsibilities and purview of the CW agency; Agency structure and organization; Contractual arrangements with private child welfare agencies; Relationships with state's central administration; Workforce policies	✓		
Type and frequency of interactions with caseworkers; Frequency and content of staff meetings; Future career plans		✓	
Physical safety of caseworkers and workers compensation claims		✓	✓
Salary level and benefits; Union/non-union status; Intent to stay/leave the agency			✓
Potential Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on policies and practice	✓	✓	✓

Table 2. Standardized Scales Adapted for Use in Survey Items

Scale	Construct	Respondent	
		Supervisor	Caseworker
Items adapted from the Leader-Member Exchange 7 (LMX7; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995)	Quality of relationship with supervisor	✓	✓
Work-related burnout subscale from the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (CBI; Kristensen et al., 2005)	Work-related stress and burnout	✓	
Items adapted from the Mastery of Work subscale of the General Nordic Questionnaire for Psychological and Social Factors at Work (QPSNordic; Elo et al., 2000)	Job satisfaction/ Mastery of work		✓
Modified version of the Supervision subscale from the Comprehensive Organizational Health Assessment (COHA; Potter et al., 2016)	Supervisory support	✓	✓
Kessler Psychological Distress Scale (K6; Kessler et al., 2003)	Psychological distress	✓	✓
Secondary Traumatic Stress Scale (STSS; Bride et al., 2004)	Secondary traumatic stress		✓
Organizational Social Context (OSC; Glisson et al., 2008)	Organizational culture and climate		✓

Most survey items were closed-ended questions with multiple choice response options. However, a small set of items were open-ended and allowed the respondents to provide verbatim responses and short descriptions for an “other” response. Responses from open-ended items were coded using conventional content analysis which started with the identification of common themes that were eventually refined into categories. Once categories were created, coders individually coded each response into relevant categories. A second coder independently rated 79% of the agency director survey responses and 100% of the supervisor and caseworker responses. Any discrepancies between the two coders were discussed until consensus was reached on a best fit category. Coded data was then sent to a senior member of the project team who reviewed and made final adjudication decisions on any remaining coding conflicts. Overall, agreement was reached on 92.83% of the coded agency director data, 97.35% of the coded supervisor data, and 97% of the coded caseworker data.

Data Collection

Data were collected during the follow-up wave of NSCAW III to minimize burden on agencies, leverage existing agency relationships, and utilize ongoing field interviewing resources. Data

collection with agency directors began in January 2021 and concluded in August 2021. Data collection with supervisors and caseworkers began in March 2021 and concluded in June 2022. Agency director surveys were completed via phone with the field interviewer recording responses on paper and pencil and, more rarely, in-person. Caseworker and supervisor surveys were completed via telephone and/or web with the most sensitive items (e.g., secondary trauma, burnout) administered via web only. This data was collected during the COVID-19 pandemic and should be interpreted within this historical context as it is possible this context influenced response rates or sampling (e.g., respondents may have taken on caregiving responsibilities, may not have had adequate time to complete the survey, or may have been experiencing elevated levels of stress related to the pandemic).

Analysis

This report summarizes the results of descriptive analyses to characterize the NSCAW Workforce Study sample. Descriptive analyses in this report include univariate methods to estimate proportions and their associated standard errors. Standard errors estimate the magnitude of uncertainty there is in estimates and are related to margins of error. All analyses used agency, supervisor, or caseworker weights.

Descriptive Findings

The findings included in this report provide a description of the NSCAW III Child Welfare Workforce Study sample. Descriptive characteristics are shown for all three survey respondent groups (i.e., agency director, supervisor, caseworker). The characteristics of participating agencies are also shown. Agency characteristics are derived from the agency director survey. Respondent demographic characteristics, education, and time in role are self-reported by participating agency directors, supervisors, and caseworkers.

Agency Characteristics

All participating agencies were public child welfare agencies, however, 64.9%¹ of agencies partner with private agencies to carry out some caseworker activities. These activities included but were not limited to: CPS investigations; in-home reunification or other in-home services; case management; foster and adoptive home recruitment, training, licensure, and supervision; or group care or residential treatment services. Most of the participating agencies were in non-metro areas (77.3%²) with 22.7%³ located in metro areas. Regarding the administration of

¹ 64.9% (N=39; SE: 13.3, 95% CI 38.0-91.7) of agency directors reported their agency partners with private agencies to carry out caseworker activities.

² 77.3% (N=13; SE: 8.1; 95% CI 61.0-93.7) of agencies were in non-metro areas. Metro and non-metro status was derived using the 2013 rural-urban continuum codes from the Economic Research Service of the USDA ([USDA ERS - Documentation](#)).

³ 22.7%+ (N=35; SE: 8.1+; 95% CI 6.3-39.0+) of agencies were in metro areas. Metro and non-metro status was derived using the 2013 rural-urban continuum codes from the Economic Research Service of the USDA ([USDA ERS - Documentation](#)).

services, 65.5%⁴ of participating agencies were state-administered, with one-third (34.5%⁵) being county-administered.

Demographic Characteristics

The demographic characteristics of participating agency directors, supervisors, and caseworkers are shown in [Exhibit 1](#). Most agency directors (77.3%), supervisors (80.9%), and caseworkers (83%) who participated are female⁶. On average, agency directors were older (M=51 years) than supervisors (M=42.4 years) and caseworkers (M=37.9 years). More caseworkers (20.5%) identified as Black or African American as compared to supervisors (14.0%) and agency directors (14.3%). Nearly one-fifth of caseworkers (18%), 11.7% of supervisors, and 13.5% of agency directors identified as Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino.

The educational background and time in role of participating agency directors, supervisors, and caseworkers are summarized in [Exhibit 2](#). Most caseworkers (78.9%), supervisors (69.3%), and agency directors (68.9%) reported a bachelor's degree as their highest degree earned. Among workers with a college degree or higher, almost half (46.6%) of agency directors, 39.6% of supervisors, and 30.7% of caseworkers had a bachelor's or higher degree in social work. Caseworkers reported an average time in their role of 6.1 years (range from 0.2 to 45 years), supervisors reported 6 years (range from 0.1 to 30 years), and agency directors reported 5.5 years (range from 0.1 to 20 years). The most prominent primary roles or job responsibilities reported by caseworkers were conducting Child Protective Service investigations or assessments (42.7%⁷) and providing ongoing case management (42.7%⁸). The remaining caseworkers reported providing in-home services (4.3%⁹) or "other" (10.3%¹⁰) as their primary role or job responsibility.

Summary

The NSCAW III Child Welfare Workforce Study provides a unique snapshot of the United States child welfare workforce in 2021 to 2022 during the COVID-19 pandemic. The study will help characterize the child welfare workforce with a focus on work culture, climate, training, hiring and retention at an organizational level along with staff demographics and worker and

⁴ 65.5% (N=30; SE: 12.5; 95% CI 40.3-90.7) of agencies were state-administered agencies.

⁵ 34.5% (N=18; SE: 12.5; 95% CI 9.3-59.7) of agencies were county-administered agencies. This estimate is slightly higher than the 18% of CWS systems that are classified as county-administered nationally because county-administered agencies were slightly overrepresented in our eligible sample.

⁶ Respondents were asked "what is your sex" and selected from two answer options of *male* or *female*.

⁷ 42.7% (N=86; SE: 5.7; 95% CI 31.5-53.9) of caseworkers reported "CPS investigations or assessments" as their primary job responsibility.

⁸ 42.7% (N=67; SE: 5.6; 95% CI 31.6-53.8) of caseworkers reported "providing ongoing case management" as their primary job responsibility.

⁹ 4.3%+ (N=7; SE: 2.1+; 95% CI 0.2-8.4+) of caseworkers reported "in-home services" as their primary job responsibility.

¹⁰ 10.3%+ (N=23; SE: 3.0+; 95% CI 4.3-16.4+) of caseworkers reported "other" as their primary job responsibility. Examples of "other" responsibilities provided by caseworkers via an open-ended response option included foster care, finding potential placements, recruitment/training of foster parents, court related activities, permanency planning, and various supervisory tasks.

supervisor perspectives on their work and workplace. It provides new data researchers can explore to better understand the strengths and challenges of the child welfare workforce. The timing of the study allowed for the collection of specific items related to the pandemic but could have also impacted some of the workers' responses on other constructs (i.e., mental health and well-being).

Accessing Data for Secondary Analysis

Data from this NSCAW III Child Welfare Workforce Study will be archived in [NDACAN](#). Detailed information about the survey design, manuals, and codebooks will be available for restricted release download to researchers who are approved to use the data.

Exhibits

Exhibit 1. Agency Director, Supervisor, and Caseworker Demographic Characteristics

Characteristic	Caseworkers (N=183)				Supervisors (N=126)				Agency Directors (N=48)			
	N	Weighted %	SE	95% CI	N	Weighted %	SE	95% CI	N	Weighted %	SE	95% CI
Total	183	100.0	-	-	126	100.0	-	-	48	100.0	-	-
Sex	183				126				48			
Male	26	17.0	4.3	(8.6, 25.4)	18	19.1†	5.4†	(8.4, 29.7)†	7	22.7†	11.9†	(0.0, 46.5)†
Female	157	83.0	4.3	(74.6, 91.4)	108	80.9	5.4	(70.3, 91.6)	41	77.3	11.9	(53.5, 100.0)
Age¹	182				123				46			
30 and under	55	28.9	4.9	(19.2, 38.5)	6	9.6†	4.3†	(1.0, 18.1)†	--	--	--	--
31-40	54	33.4	5.9	(21.7, 45.1)	36	37.6	6.5	(24.8, 50.4)	4	8.7†	5.4†	(0.0, 19.6)†
41-50	51	24.1	4.4	(15.4, 32.8)	48	32.9	6.0	(20.9, 44.9)	18	43.6†	13.8†	(15.7, 71.5)†
51+	22	13.6†	3.5†	(6.8, 20.5)†	33	19.9	4.3	(11.4, 28.5)	23	46.5†	13.6†	(19.0, 74.0)†
Ethnicity: Expanded Categories²	183				125				48			
Mexican	27	7.2	1.7	(3.9, 10.5)	12	4.3†	1.5†	(1.4, 7.2)†	--	--	--	--
Puerto Rican	7	3.3†	1.9†	(0.0, 7.1)†	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Cuban	--	--	--	--	0				--	--	--	--
Another Hispanic, Latino/a, or Spanish origin	6	6.0†	3.7†	(0.0, 13.3)†	7	5.8†	3.5†	(0.0, 12.8)†	--	--	--	--
Not Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino	141	82.0	4.3	(73.4, 90.6)	104	88.3	3.9	(80.6, 96.1)	40	86.5	10.3	(65.7, 100.0)

Snapshot of the Child Welfare Workforce from 2021 to 2022:
NSCAW III Child Welfare Workforce Study Design, Data Collection, and Sample Characteristics

Characteristic	Caseworkers (N=183)				Supervisors (N=126)				Agency Directors (N=48)			
	N	Weighted %	SE	95% CI	N	Weighted %	SE	95% CI	N	Weighted %	SE	95% CI
Ethnicity: Combined Categories³	183				125				48			
Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino	42	18.0	4.3	(9.4, 26.6)	21	11.7†	3.9†	(3.9, 19.4)†	8	13.5†	10.3†	(0.0, 34.3)†
Not Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino	141	82.0	4.3	(73.4, 90.6)	104	88.3	3.9	(80.6, 96.1)	40	86.5	10.3	(65.7, 100.0)
Race Selected: One race alone or in combination⁴												
American Indian or Alaskan native alone or in combination	11	6.5†	2.3†	(2.0, 11.0)†	7	11.9†	4.9†	(2.2, 21.7)†	--	--	--	--
Asian Indian alone or in combination	--	--	--	--	0				0			
Black or African American alone or in combination	65	25.1	4.1	(16.9, 33.2)	32	14.8	3.1	(8.6, 21.0)	11	14.3†	7.0†	(0.1, 28.5)†
Chinese alone or in combination	--	--	--	--	0				--	--	--	--
Filipino alone or in combination	--	--	--	--	0				0			
Guamanian or Chamorro alone or in combination	--	--	--	--	0				0			
Japanese alone or in combination	--	--	--	--	0				0			
Korean alone or in combination	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0			
Native Hawaiian alone or in combination	--	--	--	--	0				0			
Other Asian alone or in combination	--	--	--	--	0				0			
Other Pacific Islander alone or in combination	--	--	--	--	0				0			
Samoan alone or in combination	--	--	--	--	0				0			

Snapshot of the Child Welfare Workforce from 2021 to 2022:
NSCAW III Child Welfare Workforce Study Design, Data Collection, and Sample Characteristics

Characteristic	Caseworkers (N=183)				Supervisors (N=126)				Agency Directors (N=48)			
	N	Weighted %	SE	95% CI	N	Weighted %	SE	95% CI	N	Weighted %	SE	95% CI
Vietnamese alone or in combination	--	--	--	--	0				0			
White alone or in combination	111	73.4	4.2	(65.0, 81.7)	89	82.6	3.9	(74.8, 90.3)	32	85.3	7.1	(71.1, 99.6)
Race Selected: One race and two or more races⁵	178				122				47			
American Indian or Alaskan native	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Black or African American	57	20.5	3.6	(13.4, 27.6)	30	14.0	3.1	(8.0, 20.1)	11	14.3†	7.1†	(0.1, 28.5)†
Chinese	--	--	--	--	0				--	--	--	--
Filipino	--	--	--	--	0				0			
Korean	0				--	--	--	--	0			
Other Asian	--	--	--	--	0				0			
Other Pacific Islander	--	--	--	--	0				0			
White	100	67.0	4.8	(57.5, 76.4)	83	73.2	5.4	(62.5, 83.9)	32	85.4	7.1	(71.2, 99.7)
Two or more races	14	8.0†	2.7†	(2.6, 13.4)†	6	9.3†	4.4†	(0.7, 18.0)†	0			
Race and Ethnicity Combinations⁶	183				125				48			
Mexican and White	21	6.2†	1.6†	(3.1, 9.3)†	10	4.0†	1.4†	(1.1, 6.8)†	--	--	--	--
Cuban, Puerto Rican, another Spanish, Hispanic or Latino and White	8	7.6†	3.8†	(0.0, 15.2)†	--	--	--	--	4	12.0†	10.4†	(0.0, 32.8)†
Not Spanish, Hispanic or Latino and Black or African American	52	17.5	3.1	(11.5, 23.6)	27	12.0	2.8	(6.5, 17.5)	11	14.3†	7.0†	(0.1, 28.5)†
Not Spanish, Hispanic or Latino and Two or more races	12	7.5†	2.7†	(2.2, 12.8)†	6	9.3†	4.4†	(0.7, 18.0)†	0			

Characteristic	Caseworkers (N=183)				Supervisors (N=126)				Agency Directors (N=48)			
	N	Weighted %	SE	95% CI	N	Weighted %	SE	95% CI	N	Weighted %	SE	95% CI
Not Spanish, Hispanic or Latino and White	71	52.5	5.6	(41.5, 63.6)	67	63.3	6.0	(51.3, 75.2)	26	72.1	11.7	(48.7, 95.5)
Hispanic, Spanish, or Latino and all other races or combinations of races	13	4.2†	2.0†	(0.3, 8.2)†	6	2.4†	1.3†	(0.0, 4.9)†	--	--	--	--
Not Hispanic, Spanish, or Latino and all other races or combinations of races	6	4.4†	2.1†	(0.3, 8.5)†	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Note: Information in this exhibit is based on caseworker, supervisor, and agency director self-report. All analyses were on weighted NSCAW III workforce data; *N*s are unweighted and, therefore, direct percentages cannot be calculated by hand. Reported *N*s vary slightly across analyses because of missing data in some variable categories. Cells are suppressed (--) based on cell count less than or equal to 5 caseworkers or supervisors and a cell count less than or equal to 3 agency directors (CMS, 2020).

† Indicates unreliable estimate based on a relative standard error (RSE; Parseh & Asplund, 2022) greater than or equal to 25 (CDC, 2022; Klein et al., 2002). RSE is defined as 100% times the estimated standard error of the point estimate, divided by the point estimate.

¹ Caseworkers had an average age of 37.9 years and age range from 23 to 64 years. Supervisors had an average age of 42.4 years and age range from 26 to 69 years. Agency directors had an average age of 51.0 years and age range from 30 to 73 years.

² Respondents were asked “Are you of Hispanic, Latino/a or Spanish origin?” Response options were 1 No, not Hispanic, Latino/a, or Spanish origin, 2 Yes, Cuban, 3 Yes, Mexican, Mexican-American, Chicano/a, 4 Yes, Puerto Rican, and 5 Yes, Another Hispanic, Latino/a, or Spanish origin. Respondents could select all that apply but no respondents selected more than one ethnicity. Ethnicity- and race-derived variables follows the guidance at [Race and Ethnicity Flexibilities \(whitehouse.gov\)](https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2020/05/14/fact-sheet-ethnicity-and-race-derived-variables/) and [U.S. HHS Implementation Guidance on Data Collection Standards for Race, Ethnicity, Sex, Primary Language, and Disability Status](https://www.hhs.gov/implementation/guidance/data-collection-standards-for-race-ethnicity-sex-primary-language-and-disability-status/).

³ Response options were 1 No, not Hispanic, Latino/a, or Spanish origin, 2 Yes, Cuban, 3 Yes, Mexican, Mexican-American, Chicano/a, 4 Yes, Puerto Rican, and 5 Yes, Another Hispanic, Latino/a, or Spanish origin. This is the aggregate variable representing two categories of Yes or No. Ethnicity-derived variables follows the guidance at [Race and Ethnicity Flexibilities \(whitehouse.gov\)](https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2020/05/14/fact-sheet-ethnicity-and-race-derived-variables/) and [U.S. HHS Implementation Guidance on Data Collection Standards for Race, Ethnicity, Sex, Primary Language, and Disability Status](https://www.hhs.gov/implementation/guidance/data-collection-standards-for-race-ethnicity-sex-primary-language-and-disability-status/).

⁴ This category will total to over 100% due to participants ability to “select all that apply” in response to this question, in alignment with Ethnicity- and race-derived variables at [Race and Ethnicity Flexibilities \(whitehouse.gov\)](https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2020/05/14/fact-sheet-ethnicity-and-race-derived-variables/) and [U.S. HHS Implementation Guidance on Data Collection Standards for Race, Ethnicity, Sex, Primary Language, and Disability Status](https://www.hhs.gov/implementation/guidance/data-collection-standards-for-race-ethnicity-sex-primary-language-and-disability-status/).

⁵ These categories are mutually exclusive. Referred to as One Race and Two or More Races at [Race and Ethnicity Flexibilities \(whitehouse.gov\)](https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2020/05/14/fact-sheet-ethnicity-and-race-derived-variables/).

⁶ This is derived by combining responses to the race and ethnicity questions asked. Categories are mutually exclusive and determined by caseworker groupings with a total N>5. The *Hispanic, Spanish, or Latino and all other races or combinations of races* also includes respondents who identified as Hispanic, Spanish, or Latino and did not select a race.

Exhibit 2. Educational and Time in Role of Child Welfare Workforce Characteristics

Characteristic	Caseworkers (N=183)				Supervisors (N=126)				Agency Directors (N=48)			
	N	Weighted %	SE	95% CI	N	Weighted %	SE	95% CI	N	Weighted %	SE	95% CI
Total	183	100.0	-	-	126	100.0	-	-	48	100.0	-	-
Time in Role¹	182				126				47			
Less than 1 year	16	7.9†	2.6†	(2.8, 13.1)†	7	2.9†	1.2†	(0.5, 5.4)†	7	21.5†	12.8†	(0.0, 47.4)†
1-2 years	37	21.1	4.3	(12.7, 29.5)	23	25.4	6.2	(13.2, 37.7)	19	19.6†	9.7†	(0.2, 39.0)†
3-5 years	56	34.7	5.9	(23.1, 46.3)	38	34.0	6.3	(21.6, 46.4)	10	24.4†	10.5†	(3.3, 45.5)†
6-10 years	36	21.6	4.8	(12.2, 31.0)	25	20.1	4.8	(10.6, 29.7)	4	4.0†	3.5†	(0.0, 11.0)†
11-15 years	12	4.6†	2.2†	(0.1, 9.0)†	20	11.5†	3.3†	(4.9, 18.0)†	5	27.5†	13.3†	(0.8, 54.3)†
16+ years	25	10.1†	2.6†	(5.0, 15.3)†	13	6.0†	1.9†	(2.3, 9.8)†	--	--	--	--
Highest Degree, Diploma, or Certificate	183				126				48			
HS, GED, associate's	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0			
Bachelor's	134	78.9	4.3	(70.5, 87.3)	76	69.3	5.4	(58.6, 80.1)	18	68.9	11.5	(45.9, 92.0)
Master's	42	18.1	4.1	(10.1, 26.1)	46	28.7	5.3	(18.1, 39.3)	25	20.7†	8.6†	(3.4, 38.0)†
Graduate or professional	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	5	10.4†	8.7†	(0.0, 28.0)†
Degree in Social Work²	178				124				45			
Yes	65	30.7	5.0	(20.8, 40.6)	58	39.6	6.2	(27.4, 51.9)	27	46.6†	14.0†	(18.4, 74.7)†
No	113	69.3	5.0	(59.4, 79.2)	66	60.4	6.2	(48.1, 72.6)	18	53.4†	14.0†	(25.3, 81.6)†

Note: Information in this exhibit is based on caseworker, supervisor, and agency director self-report. All analyses were on weighted NSCAW III workforce data; *N*s are unweighted and, therefore, direct percentages cannot be calculated by hand. Reported *N*s vary slightly across analyses because of missing data in some variable categories. Cells are suppressed (--) based on cell count less than or equal to 5 caseworkers or supervisors and a cell count less than or equal to 3 agency directors (CMS, 2020).

† Indicates unreliable estimate based on a relative standard error (RSE; Parseh & Asplund, 2022) greater than or equal to 25 (CDC, 2022; Klein et al., 2002). RSE is defined as 100% times the estimated standard error of the point estimate, divided by the point estimate.

¹ Caseworkers had an average time in their role of 6.1 years (median=4.0 years) and time in role ranged from 0.2 to 45.0 years. Supervisors had an average time in their role of 6.0 years (median=4.0 years) and time in role ranged from 0.1 to 30.0 years. Agency directors had an average time in their role of 5.5 years (median=4 .0) and time in role ranged from 0.1 to 20.0 years.

² This represents workers with a bachelors, masters, or graduate degree.

References

- Bride, B. E., Robinson, M. M., Yegidis, B., & Figley, C. R. (2004, 2004/01/01). Development and Validation of the Secondary Traumatic Stress Scale. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 14(1), 27-35.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1049731503254106>
- CDC. (2022). *Suppression of rates and counts*.
https://www.cdc.gov/cancer/uscs/technical_notes/stat_methods/suppression.htm
- CMS. (2020). *CMS Cell Suppression Policy*. <https://www.hhs.gov/guidance/document/cms-cell-suppression-policy>
- de Guzman, A., Carver-Roberts, T., Leake, R., & Rienks, S. (2020, 2020/01/01). Retention of child welfare workers: staying strategies and supports. *Journal of Public Child Welfare*, 14(1), 60-79.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15548732.2019.1683121>
- DePanfilis, D., & Zlotnik, J. L. (2008). Retention of front-line staff in child welfare: A systematic review of research. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 30(9), 995-1008.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2007.12.017>
- Edwards, F., & Wildeman, C. (2018). Characteristics of the front-line child welfare workforce. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 89, 13-26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2018.04.013>
- Elo, A.-L., Dallner, M., Gamberale, F., Hottinen, V., Knardahl, S., Lindström, K., Skogstad, A., & Ørhede, E. (2000). Validation of the Nordic Questionnaire for Psychological and Social Factors at Work—QPSNordic. In *Innovative theories, tools, and practices in work and organizational psychology*. (pp. 47-57). Hogrefe & Huber Publishers.
- Glisson, C., Landsverk, J., Schoenwald, S., Kelleher, K., Hoagwood, K. E., Mayberg, S., & Green, P. (2008, Mar). Assessing the organizational social context (OSC) of mental health services: implications for research and practice. *Adm Policy Ment Health*, 35(1-2), 98-113.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-007-0148-5>
- Gomez, R. J., Travis, D. J., Ayers-Lopez, S., & Schwab, A. J. (2010). In search of innovation: A national qualitative analysis of child welfare recruitment and retention efforts. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 32(5), 664-671. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2010.01.001>
- Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995, 1995/06/01/). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6(2), 219-247.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843\(95\)90036-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(95)90036-5)
- Kessler, R. C., Barker, P. R., Colpe, L. J., Epstein, J. F., Gfroerer, J. C., Hiripi, E., Howes, M. J., Normand, S. L., Manderscheid, R. W., Walters, E. E., & Zaslavsky, A. M. (2003, Feb). Screening for serious mental illness in the general population. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*, 60(2), 184-189.
<https://doi.org/10.1001/archpsyc.60.2.184>
- Klein, R. J., Proctor, S. E., Boudreault, M. A., & Turczyn, K. M. (2002). Healthy People 2010 criteria for data suppression. *Statistical notes*, 24, 1-12.

- Kristensen, T. S., Borritz, M., Villadsen, E., & Christensen, K. B. (2005, 2005/07/01). The Copenhagen Burnout Inventory: A new tool for the assessment of burnout. *Work & Stress*, 19(3), 192-207. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370500297720>
- Leake, R., Rienks, S., & Obermann, A. (2017, 2017/10/20). A Deeper Look at Burnout in the Child Welfare Workforce. *Human Service Organizations: Management, Leadership & Governance*, 41(5), 492-502. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23303131.2017.1340385>
- Parseh, M., & Asplund, F. (2022). New needs to consider during accident analysis: Implications of autonomous vehicles with collision reconfiguration systems. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, 173, 106704.
- Potter, C. C., Leake, R., Longworth-Reed, L., Altschul, I., & Rienks, S. (2016, 2016/02/01/). Measuring organizational health in child welfare agencies. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 61, 31-39. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2015.11.002>
- Radey, M., & Wilke, D. J. (2018). Client-Perpetrated Violence Among Frontline Child Welfare Workers. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 36(11-12), NP6260-NP6280. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260518812792>