



# Workforce Recruitment and Retention

## In this section:

- **Virginia's Child Welfare Workforce: Opportunities for Recruiting, Retaining, Developing and Elevating Critical Roles**
- **Training Services Model Assessment and Recommendations (Butler Institute for Families)**
- **Family Services Training Model Comparisons**
- **Virginia's IV-E Child Welfare Stipend Program & Child Welfare Employee Education Assistance Program**
- **COMPASS Mobile Application flier**
- **COMPASS FlexDictate flier**
- **Tables: Benefit Programs, Family Services and Self-Sufficiency Occupational Groups (Workforce Turnover Data)**

## Facts about Virginia's Child Welfare Workforce

- Virginia experiences staffing challenges familiar to jurisdictions across the country, including debilitating turnover rates, barriers to staff growth and development, and negative public perceptions of child welfare work.
- The statewide turnover rate for Virginia's entry level child welfare positions (Family Services Specialist I) reached 41.6% in calendar year 2016-17.
- Currently, an entry level caseworker position in some areas of the state can pay as little as \$29,000.
- Child welfare workers are exposed on a daily basis to trauma, violence and stressors that can lead to secondary traumatic stress (STS) and burnout. STS carries myriad negative repercussions for employees, and places workers at greater risk of leaving the organization.
- In August, 2017, The Virginia Department of Social Services (VDSS) contracted with The University of Denver, Butler Institute for Families to assess their Family Services training model, conduct a nationwide scan of training systems, and make recommendations to improve their training system for child welfare and adult services staff. Findings are included in this section.

# Virginia's Child Welfare Workforce: Opportunities for Recruiting, Retaining, Developing and Elevating Critical Roles

---

The recruitment, retention, and development of child welfare workers and the general elevation of child welfare as a profession are crucial components in efforts to improve outcomes for Virginia's children and families. Virginia experiences challenges familiar to jurisdictions across the country, including debilitating turnover rates, barriers to staff growth and development, and negative public perceptions of child welfare work. While challenges loom large, also clearly evident are Virginia's opportunities to address workforce needs through unique strengths and community partnerships.

## Challenges and Approaches

***An overarching goal of elevating the child welfare workforce in Virginia is critical.*** Public perception of the profession, when positive, can correlate with greater applicant pools, enabling selective, "good-fit" recruitment of top tier students and prospective professionals. Elevation of the profession can be accomplished a multi-pronged approach, including re-professionalizing the workforce through Social Work degree attainment opportunities; public relations and media/messaging initiatives; and, realistic representation of day-to-day child welfare work for public audiences and prospective professionals.

1. Re-professionalizing the workforce includes ensuring front line workers and supervisors hold relevant Social Work degrees, as retention<sup>1</sup> and certain case outcomes<sup>2</sup> improve with this specialized training.
  - a. Enlarge an existing Virginia Department of Social Services (VDSS)-offered, local department of social services (LDSS)-supported funding opportunity for current employees to obtain Master of Social Work (MSW) degrees while continuing to work in their agencies. *Increase state match funds to support additional slots available for employees to receive reimbursement-based MSW funding via Title IV-E training funds.*
  - b. Expand VDSS' Title IV-E Child Welfare Stipend Program (CWSP) capacity in future years to recruit, train and prepare more future child welfare professionals through university-agency partnerships. Bachelor of Social Work (BSW) and Master of Social Work (MS) graduates agree to work in LDSS foster care/adoption roles for one to three years in exchange for financial support and targeted workforce preparation. *Increase stipend slots and number of partner universities to include additional Schools of Social Work, increasing the number of graduates annually who enter the workforce well-prepared and committed to fulfilling a legally binding work term commitment.*
2. Media highlights and proactive social media/traditional news outlet features to spotlight agencies and families, touting positive experiences and framing agency goals and mission. *Increase emphasis on public relations-oriented initiatives to control and frame messaging around child welfare as a profession.*
3. Realistic job previews made available online to the public, illustrating the nuanced and challenging day-to-day experiences and skillsets of public child welfare workers. These video-based resources serve to educate the public and provide real-world knowledge to prospective professionals and

---

<sup>1</sup> Madden, E.E., Scannapieco, M., & Painter, K. (2014). An examination of retention and length of employment among public child welfare workers. *Children and Youth Services Review, 4*, 37-44.

<sup>2</sup> Leung, P. & Willis, N. (2012). The impact of title IV-E training on case outcomes for children serviced by CPS. *Journal of Family Strengths, 12*(1).

students who may be considering entering the field. *Support funding to design and create this resource.*

**Recruiting, retaining and developing the workforce ties back to organizational factors.** The statewide turnover rate for Virginia’s entry level child welfare positions (“Family Services Specialist I”) reached 41.6% in calendar year 2016-17<sup>3</sup>. The Institute for the Advancement of Social Work Research (IASWR) published a report based on a national survey of child welfare workforce literature discussing factors which boost retention in the child welfare workforce. The IASWR reported that numerous organizational factors<sup>4</sup> consistently and significantly contribute to child welfare worker retention, including:

- \* Better salary;
- \* Supervisory support;
- \* Reasonable workload;
- \* Coworker support;
- \* Opportunities for advancement; and,
- \* Organizational commitment and valuing of employees.

### Virginia’s Opportunities to Respond to Workforce Needs

1. **Increase baseline salaries for caseworkers.** Currently, an entry level caseworker position in some areas of the state can pay as little as \$29,000. *Increase baseline salaries for Family Services Specialists to sustain a living wage for employees providing critical community services.*
2. **Address worker/supervisor support and organizational climate needs.** Child welfare workers are exposed on a daily basis to trauma, violence and stressors<sup>5</sup> that can lead to secondary traumatic stress (STS) and burnout<sup>6</sup>. STS carries myriad negative repercussions for employees, and places workers at greater risk of leaving the organization<sup>7</sup>. Supportive and educational groups as well as trauma-informed organizational environments can help combat the effects of exposure to trauma.
  - **Actively address secondary traumatic stress (STS) in the child welfare workforce.** Actively addressing STS among child welfare workers is crucial in promoting greater job satisfaction, efficacy, and retention, and can be accomplished in part by the following:
    - a. **Coworker support:** Provide extra-professional supportive opportunities. A primary element in increased retention, formalizing co-worker support could create infrastructure for a supportive model to expand to all regions of the state.
      - **Pilot a worker support group aimed at reducing the effects of secondary traumatic stress and related burnout, facilitated by licensed clinician(s).** Develop a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with university/community partner to host and facilitate this clinically-oriented support group in one targeted state region, offering in-person and virtual attendance options. *Secure state funding to support the pilot.*

<sup>3</sup> The Butler Institute for Families, University of Denver, for the Virginia Department of Social Services (December 2017). *Training Services Model Assessment and Recommendations Executive Summary.*

<sup>4</sup> Zlotnik, J. L., DePanfilis, D., Daining, C., & Lane, M. M. (2005). Factors Influencing Retention of Child Welfare Staff: A Systematic Review of Research. Institute for the Advancement of Social Work Research in collaboration with University of Maryland School of Social Work.

<sup>5</sup> ACS-NYU Children’s Trauma Institute. (2012). *Addressing Secondary Traumatic Stress Among Child Welfare Staff: A Practice Brief.* New York: NYU Langone Medical Center.

<sup>6</sup> ACS-NYU Children’s Trauma Institute. (2012). *Addressing Secondary Traumatic Stress Among Child Welfare Staff: A Practice Brief.* New York: NYU Langone Medical Center.

<sup>7</sup> ACS-NYU Children’s Trauma Institute. (2012). *Addressing Secondary Traumatic Stress Among Child Welfare Staff: A Practice Brief.* New York: NYU Langone Medical Center.

- b. **Supervisory support:** Effective and supportive supervision is another central factor in retaining child welfare workers. Development of LDSS supervisors' skillsets and caseworkers' ability to effectively utilize supervisory opportunities can bolster retention and worker effectiveness.
  - **Pilot a worker/supervisor group aimed at developing reflective supervisory skills and effective use of supervision.** Develop MOA with partner university/community partner to facilitate this learning-oriented group in one targeted state region, offering in-persona and virtual attendance options. *Secure state funding to support the pilot.*

Pilot study results would be analyzed based on regional staff participation and employment/retention data, to determine which venue provides the greatest efficacy in supporting retention. VDSS could implement statewide interventions based on the results, after controlling for other factors known to boost retention, including workers' receipt of targeted Title IV-E-training (via stipend programs). *State funds could support the financial impact associated with conducting exploratory and descriptive research activities.*

- c. **Create and sustain trauma-informed agencies:** Encourage LDSS to utilize community-based consultants (i.e. Trauma-Informed Community Networks/Trauma-Informed Leadership Teams) to assess organizational environment, make recommendations for changes, and support implementation of trauma-informed agency recommendations to improve LDSS working conditions and worker perceptions of organizational safety and supportiveness. *State funds could support consultation fees and/or financial incentives for LDSS who engage in these efforts.*

5. Offer a variety of opportunities for advancement. Advancement opportunities serve to *develop* and *retain* current employees.

- a. **Implement child welfare leadership-track education and support opportunities:** Currently, Virginia's Title IV-E stipend program is limited to training direct service practitioners entering foster care and adoption roles. VDSS designed a hybrid-model leadership-track program in partnership with state universities' Schools of Social Work, to provide education and support to existing LDSS employees pursuing a MSW degree.
  - The leadership track creates "ambassadors" who re-enter the field with the professional background and training plus developed personal qualities necessary to affect positive change and represent VDSS initiatives in local and regional agencies throughout the Commonwealth.
  - The model is poised for implementation on a pilot basis, in partnership with a state university School of Social Work, if a funding source is secured. *Identify a funding source for the leadership-track educational development partnership.*
- b. **Establish a clear career ladder for all Family Services Specialists and Supervisors:** Career ladder establishment is currently in exploration and development stages at VDSS. A clear path toward advancement boosts perceptions of the career as a profession plus aids in retention, employee growth and development.



# **Training Services Model Assessment and Recommendations Executive Summary**

In August, 2017, The Virginia Department of Social Services (VDSS) contracted with The University of Denver, Butler Institute for Families to assess their Family Services training model, conduct a nationwide scan of training systems, and make recommendations to improve their training system for child welfare and adult services staff.

## **Methods:**

Over the course of four months, multiple items were reviewed and activities conducted to collect information, including:

1. Review of Virginia documents including: VA Family Services Training System Task Force Report; 2016 Local Social Services Training Needs Assessment; Virginia's Five-Year State Plan for Child and Family Services (2015), training section; Virginia Child and Family Services Review (CFSR)
2. Training System Self-Assessment performed by a VDSS leadership team
3. Staff surveys sent to 2,717 VDSS staff with a 52% response rate
4. Thirteen listening sessions in five regions with a total of 147 participants
5. Online survey to state child welfare and adult training systems located throughout the United States
6. Telephone interviews with representatives from child welfare and adult training systems located throughout the United States

An Advisory Team consisting of VDSS staff from child welfare and adult services and representatives from agency leadership partnered with Butler to assist with study implementation. Significant highlights are presented in this Executive Summary.

## **Training System Leadership Self-Assessment:**

Participants at the August project kick-off meeting were asked to complete the self-assessment to determine their understanding of whether various dimensions of effective training systems were present, or not, in the VDSS training system. Dimensions included training management, infrastructure, trainer management, instructional design, transfer of learning, and training evaluation. The self-assessments indicated wide variability in whether the training systems have or do not have various aspects of effective training programs in place.

## **Adult Services and Child Welfare Staff Survey:**

All VDSS staff were invited to complete the Virginia Child Welfare and Adult Services Training Assessment Survey and ultimately 52% (1,420 out of 2,717) of all staff completed the survey. Items focused on Virginia's child welfare and adult services staff satisfaction with training, support

received, and perceived quality of the training in their department. Survey response means ranged from 2.97 (Regional trainings are offered frequently enough to meet my needs) to 4.28 (I am informed about training opportunities) with most item means in the 3.0–4.0 range (1 to 5 on a 5-point agreement scale). Correlations conducted between the training scale mean and demographic variables (region, program, gender, degree, field of study, years in position) did not produce significant results, indicating a consistency of responses across all demographics. A factor analysis found that the factors of Agency Support, Training Experience, and Transfer of Learning explained 59% of the variance.

## Regional Listening Sessions:

A series of listening sessions were held in each region of the state as well as with agency trainers and local agency leadership, resulting in a total of 147 individual participants. Areas explored included participant perception of the effectiveness, availability, and quality of training of the current training model, as well as participant suggestions for improving training delivery. The following themes emerged from the sessions:

- 1) A need for training that prepares new workers to do the job
- 2) A desire for on-the-job support for new workers
- 3) A request for more trainings to be held locally and with more frequency
- 4) A desire for classroom training that focuses on application and skills practice
- 5) A need to eliminate the major barrier to training participation, which is caseload demands and job expectations
- 6) A need for more attention placed on training for adult services and adult protective services staff
- 7) A request that training registration and administration should be user friendly and individualized

## National Scan Online Survey to Other Training Systems:

VDSS was also interested in learning about how other states structured and managed their training system in order to determine optimal practices. Twenty-one states were identified to contact, and ultimately, a total of 19 states or county/city training systems participated in either the online survey and/or the telephone interviews. Adult services and child welfare systems were kept separate in the analysis to more accurately reflect the reality of each training system. The online survey contained questions about their training structure, duration, staff who receive training, transfer of learning, and training evaluation, among other dimensions. Significant findings are presented below.

### Child Welfare

- 56% of systems had a state-administered system
- The workforce has an average of 4,429 staff
- 88% of systems had a child welfare stipend program
- 63% of systems use an academy format for new worker training
- Within their training array, 18% of offerings are conducted virtually
- 45% of systems certify new workers and supervisors

- New workers receive an average of 34 days of training, while supervisors receive 27 days
- 47% of staff is carrying caseloads while attending training
- 100% of states conduct training satisfaction surveys while 43% conduct skill evaluations

## Adult Services

- 50% of systems had a state-administered system
- The workforce has an average of 439 staff
- Within their training array, 31% of offerings are conducted virtually
- 20% of systems certify their new workers
- New workers and supervisors receive an average of 7 days of new worker training
- 58% of staff are carrying caseloads while attending training
- 53% of states conduct training satisfaction surveys while 33% conduct skill evaluations

## National Scan Interviews:

Telephone interviews were also conducted with representatives from the training systems in order to provide more contextual information about training system structure, certification information, trainer management, training system strengths/challenges, and evaluation efforts, among others. A total of 19 interviews were conducted for child welfare training systems and 14 for adult services training systems. Major themes are discussed below.

## Child Welfare

- A majority of states employs a state-university partnership model where the states contract with the university to support and provide training
- Major strengths of the training system are experienced trainers who come from the field and strong partnerships with universities
- Major challenges include high staff turnover in states, a lack of resources, and the inhibiting structure of state-supervised, county-administered systems.
- More than three-quarters of the states surveyed employs an academy approach
- Several of the states have simulation labs associated with their academy
- Most of the agencies recruit their trainers through direct networking; in terms of qualifications, almost all states require child welfare experience in the field and a minimum of a bachelor's degree
- Approaches to trainer preparation vary widely from a trainer academy to shadowing

## Adult Services

- More than half of the states administer their own training, while about a third partner with a university and/or vendors to provide training
- Major strengths of the training system are experienced trainers from the field and support from agency leadership
- Major challenges include lack of fiscal resources, distance to attend training, and high staff turnover
- About a third of states used an academy approach, though many states do have mandated training requirements

- Most states reported recruiting trainers from the field; trainer preparation ranges from an academy-like onboarding process to none at all
- About a third of the states use a curriculum template, while others do not employ formal curriculum
- Most states conduct satisfaction-level evaluation, while a third do no evaluation at all

The interviews produced rich information, which can be found in more detail in the report. Many states also shared multiple documents, including training requirements flyers, course descriptions, curriculum templates, training evaluation instruments, and many more. All of these materials are listed in Appendix B and are sorted by state and document type. All documents are shared with explicit permission by the participating states.

## Recommendations:

Based upon the findings from Virginia's training system assessment and noteworthy approaches uncovered in the national scan, the following recommendations are offered:

- Integrate a practice model and race equity in all training
- Implement a rigorous approach to curriculum development
- Recruit trainers with recent or current field or subject matter experience
- Increase frequency and depth of ongoing, refresher, and booster training
- Implement practical, doable, and meaningful transfer of learning strategies
- Engage in training partnerships
- Use an academy approach to training
- Employ hybrid training approaches
- Secure comprehensive training system software
- Evaluate training for outcomes
- Conduct worker and supervisor certification
- Adopt a comprehensive workforce development framework

## Forecasted Resources and Next Steps:

An effective training model requires substantial investment. It is recommended that a significant investment be made in a new training model to bring it to national standards. The current Advisory Team, with leadership support, can provide oversight for moving forward.





## FAMILY SERVICES TRAINING MODEL COMPARISONS

### Current Training System

Training system is a 30 year old competency-based system for both child welfare and adult services supervisors and caseworkers. Competency-based training is supported by a definable list of competencies that are a statement of knowledge and skill required for workers to do a job task effectively. All new Family Services Specialist attend Pre-service Training which consists of mandated CORE training requirements for each program area and recommended for other staff that needs to develop fundamental knowledge and skills necessary for best practice. These training opportunities are accomplished in both classroom and online courses to meet the critical needs of the workforce. Family Services Specialists has a two year completion requirement and classes are scheduled quarterly on a rotating regional schedule. Training is held at each of the five regional training centers located at each of the regional offices, with one extra classroom located in Newport News. Transfer of learning (TOL) supervisor guides are emailed to each supervisor following each classroom completion so supervisors can reinforce and monitor new skills developed in the classroom to on the job. There currently is no evaluation and certification process to evaluate the knowledge, skills, and abilities of workers and supervisors beyond a classroom satisfaction survey. Unfortunately, child welfare workers are not staying in their positions long enough to complete the two year training program due to high turnover rates.

### **VLDSS Turnover Rates:**

**Small Agencies:** Supervisor: 26.1%

FSS I: 61.1%

FSS II 21.5%

FSS III 42.1%

FSS IV 20%

**Medium Agencies:** Supervisor: 12.6%

FSS I 50%

FSS II 31.7%

FSS III 22.2%

FSS IV 17.8%

**Large Agencies:** Supervisor: 22.3%

FSS I 28.9%

FSS II 21.5%

FSS III 10%,

FSS IV 16.9%

### Butler Study Academy Model Recommendations

In August 2017, The Virginia Department of Social Services (VDSS) contracted with The University of Denver, Butler Institute for Families to assess their Family Services training model, conduct a nationwide scan of training systems, and make recommendations to improve their training system for child welfare and adult services staff.

#### **Key Butler Study Recommendations:**

1. Use an Academy Approach to Training
2. Integrate a Practice Model and Race Equity Lens Into All Training Modules
3. Implement a Rigorous Approach to Curriculum Development
4. Recruit Trainers with Recent or Current Field or Subject Matter Expertise
5. Increase Frequency and Depth of Ongoing/Refresher/Booster Training
6. Implement Practical, Doable, and Meaningful Transfer of Learning (TOL) Strategies
7. Engage in Training Partnerships
8. Employ Hybrid Training Approaches
9. Evaluate for Outcomes
10. Secure Comprehensive Training Software
11. Conduct Worker and Supervisor Certification
12. Adopt Workforce Development Framework

The Services Training Model Implementation Team will develop strategic plan to implement Academy Model.

### **New Academy Training Model:**

**Academy Length:** 16 Week Academy with 10 weeks CORE, 6 weeks Program Specific with no caseload until completion of Program Specific agency mentors assigned.

**Annual Academy Schedules:** set quarterly and monthly class rotations in regions

**Leadership Institute:** Supervisors/Managers & Mentors Training, Transfer of Learning (TOL), Recruitment & Retention of Talent, Onboarding, Use of Data & Compliance Monitoring, Online courses completed prior to attending the Academy, KSA evaluation/certification

**Portfolio Development:** Individual development plans (IDP) to track learning and identify strengths and challenges, testing simulation proficiencies and evaluation.

**Coaching:** Lead simulation labs to measure skills and follow on the job with supervisors to assist with TOL



## FAMILY SERVICES TRAINING MODEL COMPARISONS

### Current Training System

#### **Tracking Completion Data:**

Agency tracks, new hires as of May, 2018 tracked in Learning Management System (COVLC) where data completion reports are monitored

#### **Staffing:**

**1** Training Manager

**1** Trainer/LMS Supervisor

**3** Curriculum developers – 1 CPS, 1 Permanency (FC, Adoption, Prevention), 1 ADS/Supervisor

**1** eLearning Coordinator

**1** Administrative Staff

**1** LMS Registrar (contractor)

**17** Part-time trainers statewide

**1** Part-time AS/APS curriculum developer (DARS)

#### **Training Courses:**

**53** classroom

**88** online modules

**4** online modules on VDSS Public Website

**Federally Mandated Training Courses (APS, CPS, Foster Care, Adoption)**

**4** Mandated Reporter courses – APS/CPS

**31** classroom courses (5 ADS, 18 CPS, 18 FC, 18 Adoption)

### Butler Study Academy Model Recommendations

#### **New Academy Training Model: (Cont)**

**Certification Process:** Self-assessments and testing for successful training completion evaluations and set career ladders based on proficiency for professional development

**Simulation Labs** – demonstration of proficiencies and evaluation of skills to transfer to OTJ

**Robust Training Evaluation:** Multi-level KSA assessments and program evaluation to assess ROI

#### **Additional Staff Required:**

**10** Full Time Best Practice Coaches (1 supervisor) – staff Simulation Labs and facilitate/evaluate TOL with agency supervisors to insure OTJ proficiency

**1** LMS Coordinator – required training console set to monitor and track all training

**6** Curriculum Developers (Adoption, Supervisor/Coaching, Prevention and Resource Families, Specialty Topics – Substance Use, Mental Health, Trauma, Protective Capacity, Advanced/Ongoing/Refresher Training, Technology (Convert courses for tablets, Bar Codes used to download handouts to reduce costs and staff time)

**2** eLearning Instructional Designers – new courses, course updates, 508 Accessibility Compliance

**5** Regional Support Staff at each training center

**5** LMS Registrars – new regional support staff role, monitor regional LDSS training needs and evaluations

**15** Full Time trainers statewide, use PT Trainers for program and specialty topics for less costs

**\*Partner with University** or Research and Planning for robust evaluation beyond surveys

#### **Additional Training Courses:**

Additional CORE classroom skills – Engagement, Interviewing, Assessment, Case Planning, Safety, Documentation, Trauma, Worker Safety

**Additional** online modules

**Additional** online modules on VDSS Public Website

**Federally Mandated Training Courses (APS, CPS, FC, Adoption, Prevention)**

**5** Mandated Reporter courses –

APS/CPS/Prevention/Medical

**31** classroom courses (ADS, CPS, FC, Adoption, Prevention)



## FAMILY SERVICES TRAINING MODEL COMPARISONS

### Current Training System

#### Federally Mandated Training Courses (APS, CPS, Foster Care, Adoption) (cont)

**5** two-day cohort Supervisor Series includes Trauma

**6** Annual Subject Matter Expert Workshops/Webinars – required 24 continuing education hours

**1** State Hotline Training – APS/CPS

Specialty Courses (job specific):

- **16** eLearning courses
- **2** Coaching courses
- **1** Training for Trainers – 3 days
- **3** new Blended courses – eLearning/classroom
  
- **28** FSWEB – recorded webinars

#### SFY18 Classroom Course Completions:

**614** Training events

**8567** Completions

New Workers: (FY18 new worker completions)

- ADS – **137** (14 sessions)
- CPS – **358** (23 sessions)
- Foster Care – **275** (20 sessions)
- Adoption – **186** (14 sessions)

**TOTAL: 861 New workers trained per year**

As of 4/30/18 number of filled positions were:

- **FSS I – 248**
- **FSS II – 1159**
- **FSS III – 685**
- **FSS IV – 251**
- **FSS Supervisor – 421**
- **FSS Manager – 36**

### Butler Study Academy Model Recommendations

#### Federally Mandated Training Courses

#### (APS, CPS, FC, Adoption, Prevention) (cont)

**5** two-day cohort Supervisor Series includes Trauma, additional online courses, regional cohort workshops

**Additional/Advanced** Annual Subject Matter Expert Workshops/Webinars – required 24 continuing education hours

**Advanced** State Hotline Training – APS/CPS

Specialty Courses (job specific):

- **Additional** eLearning courses
- **Advanced** Coaching courses
- **2** Training for Trainers and Advanced Trainer
- **Additional** new Blended courses – eLearning/classroom
- **Additional** FSWEB – recorded webinars



## Virginia's IV-E Child Welfare Stipend Program & Child Welfare Employee Education Assistance Program

---

The Virginia Department of Social Services (VDSS) offers two specific training programs to support the professionalization and increased retention of our child welfare workforce: the Child Welfare Stipend Program (CWSP) and Child Welfare Employee Education Assistance Program (CWEEAP). Both programs are administered through VDSS in partnership with five public state universities and funded through a state match plus federal funds via Title IV-E of the Social Security Act.

### Why Utilize a Stipend Program to Address Child Welfare Workforce Needs?

National research shows that:

- IV-E stipend programs are effective in recruiting and retaining child welfare workers.<sup>1</sup>
- Caseworkers with a degree in social work and/or recipients of Title IV-E stipends were more likely to remain employed in their agencies.<sup>2</sup>
- IV-E graduates report having effective skills, the ability to change their agency from within, increased knowledge/ethics, coping skills and assertiveness.<sup>3</sup>
- IV-E trained workers exhibited better case outcomes compared with non-IV-E trained workers in two realms<sup>4</sup>:
  - Reduction in length of time to achieve reunification; and,
  - Reduction in length of time to achieve adoption.

Virginia's CWSP and CWEEAP recipients receive:

- Targeted child welfare coursework;
  - LDSS field placements;
  - State foster care training;
  - Auxiliary topical seminars reflecting regional child welfare workforce needs; and
  - Financial support.
- In exchange for financial support and specialized training, graduates commit to working in foster care/adoption in a LDSS for a term equal to that of the funding received (typically 1-3 years).
- CWSP offers an annual maximum of 82 stipend slots for full-time students, including new and returning students.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 & Youth Services Review*, 32(5), 664-671.

<sup>2</sup> Madden, E.E., Scannapieco, M., & Painter, K. (2014). An examination of retention and length of employment among public child welfare workers. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 4, 37-44.

<sup>3</sup> Scannapieco, M., & Connell-Corrick, K. (2003). Do collaborations with schools of social work make a difference for the field of child welfare? Practice, retention and curriculum. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 7(1), 35-51.

<sup>4</sup> Leung, P. & Willis, N. (2012). The impact of title IV-E training on case outcomes for children serviced by CPS. *Journal of Family Strengths*, 12(1).

- CWEEAP offers annual maximum of 10 reimbursement-based funding slots for part-time students (full-time LDSS employees), including new and returning students.
- Twenty-two students graduated in 2018; 43 students will graduate in 2019.

### Current Limitations and Opportunities

While the CWSP and CWEEAP are able to produce a significant number of professionally prepared graduates each year, there is still need for expanded pools of qualified applicants to fill child welfare vacancies across the state. It is important that our programs retain the current levels of selectivity and commitment to enrolling good-fit candidates across partner universities while being responsive to LDSS workforce deficits. Through utilization of existing program infrastructure and partnerships, there are additional opportunities to explore in order to increase the impact and efficacy of Virginia's child welfare workforce recruitment, development and retention efforts. Recommendations include the following:

- **Increase the number of CWEEAP slots offered annually to full-time LDSS employees enrolled in a part-time MSW program.** CWEEAP expansion contributes to the greater professionalization of our child welfare workforce while ensuring retention of more employees in their agencies, during and following academic program participation.
  - Provides a streamlined, cost-effective expansion option as no administrative and overhead costs are required. This program operates on a strictly tuition and fees-reimbursement basis.
  - Offering 15 additional CWEEAP slots for a total of 25 requires an approximate \$68,000 in additional state funds.
- **Expand the CWSP to include additional partner universities thereby increasing full-time BSW/MSW stipend slot capacity.** Expansion of the CWSP to include additional partners and more full-time BSW/MSW slots addresses the need for increased capacity and geographical reach.
  - Extends partnerships to Christopher Newport, James Madison, Longwood and Virginia State Universities.
  - Increases maximum stipend slot capacity by 31, for a total of 113 across the state annually.
  - Expands stipend program reach to communities where LDSS positions are hard to fill, and chronic vacancies and turnover issues persist.
  - Requires an estimated increase of \$280,000 in state funds to provide the necessary match to access federal IV-E dollars.
- **Incentivize rural LDSS employment through enhanced stipends.** Offering enhanced stipends to graduates who commit to filling positions in rural agencies addresses turnover issues and chronic vacancies which are a constant barrier to effective service provision in certain communities. Additional state funds could supplement federal funds to increase financial support for graduates committed to working in targeted agencies.
- **Create stipends for Child Protective Services (CPS) investigations positions.** Current federal IV-E funding parameters prohibit CPS investigations from inclusion as qualifying work-repayment positions for IV-E stipend graduates. Creation of CPS-specific stipends using state funds assists in filling CPS investigations positions typically afflicted with high turnover rates.

# COMPASS

**C**OMPASS is Virginia's response to new Comprehensive Child Welfare Information System (CCWIS) federal regulations. COMPASS represents Virginia's Comprehensive Permanency Assessment and Safety System. Beginning in 2016, Virginia Department of Social Services (VDSS) embarked on a multi-year project to modernize the department's child welfare information systems. VDSS is committed to providing staff with innovative, integrated, and web-based tools needed to provide effective child welfare services thereby accelerating service delivery and improving outcomes.

## Mobile Application

The first COMPASS project is a mobile application, which will be connected to Virginia's current case management system, which was acquired in Virginia in 1999. When the case management system is replaced with a more modernized system, the application will be integrated into the new system.

The mobile application will be provided in late 2019 to all case carrying Family Services Specialists and Supervisors who manage protective, prevention and permanency caseloads in child welfare. This innovative technology will maximize their time away from the office, which will accelerate service delivery and improve outcomes for children and families. The mobile application will be on iPads that can be used in both an online and offline mode. Key features include the ability to enter new case notes and read and edit ones from the case management system; Structure Decision Making (SDM) assessment tools to include: complete risk, safety, family strengths and needs, and family reunification assessments; access and update demographic and relationships; and complete forms from a 'Form library'. The mobility application will also include system generated reminders, the ability to upload pictures and other documents, take worker notes and etc.

While workers will have access to this information through a mobile application, Supervisors, Managers, regional and state staff will have access to this vital information through an online portal, which will be accessible from their desktop computers.

## Vision for COMPASS

VDSS' overall vision for the COMPASS program is to:

- Meet the diverse needs of front-line workers, state and local leadership, children, alumni, families and community supports.
- Utilize innovative technology to facilitate case management and real-time reporting capabilities to achieve timely permanency and ensure the safety and well-being of children in the Commonwealth.
- Maximize the interoperability of existing and future systems that intersect with COMPASS to optimize service delivery, reduce duplicative efforts and capture the story of children and families served.

# COMPASS

**C**OMPASS is Virginia's response to new Comprehensive Child Welfare Information System (CCWIS) federal regulations. COMPASS represents Virginia's Comprehensive Permanency Assessment and Safety System. Beginning in 2016, Virginia Department of Social Services (VDSS) embarked on a multi-year project to modernize the department's child welfare information systems. VDSS is committed to providing staff with innovative, integrated, and web-based tools needed to provide effective child welfare services thereby accelerating service delivery and improving outcomes.

## FlexDictate

VDSS provides FlexDictate a Transcription Service to all family services specialists who manage caseloads in child welfare and adult protective services in Virginia. Based upon feedback from supervisors and family services specialists, VDSS identified the need for additional tools to assist workers in the field and in the office. The vision is for staff to use transcription to capture case notes and spend less time on paperwork and fewer nights/weekends working. Utilizing FlexDictate will allow staff to spend more time with families and children leading to greater outcomes of safety, permanency and well-being.

With this service, family services specialists dictate notes from their case visits via telephone to FlexDictate. This service is available 24 hours a day, 365 days per year. The transcribed notes are returned to the worker by email. Workers are notified via email that the transcription is available, and via a secure website, the worker copies the transcribed notes to place in the electronic system of record. Results indicate that staff who utilized the service, found it saved them time from returning to the office and typing notes, and allowed them more time to spend with clients. Their stress levels were reduced and satisfaction with the job was enhanced.

FlexDictate is a tool used to ensure that the case record is in compliance with mandatory guidance and program requirements such as response times, mandatory contacts, and timely data entry.

## Vision for COMPASS

VDSS' overall vision for the COMPASS program is to:

- Meet the diverse needs of front-line workers, state and local leadership, children, alumni, families and community supports.
- Utilize innovative technology to facilitate case management and real-time reporting capabilities to achieve timely permanency and ensure the safety and well-being of children in the Commonwealth.
- Maximize the interoperability of existing and future systems that intersect with COMPASS to optimize service delivery, reduce duplicative efforts and capture the story of children and families served.

## Tables: Benefit Programs, Family Services and Self-Sufficiency Occupational Groups

**Table 1. VLDSS workforce turnover**

<b>Turnover</b>	<b>CY12-13</b>	<b>CY13-14</b>	<b>CY14-15</b>	<b>CY15-16</b>	<b>CY16-17</b>
Number of filled positions	5,653	5,680	5,842	5,907	5,855
Number of Separations	965	980	1,068	1,169	1,185
<b>Turnover rate</b>	<b>17.1%</b>	<b>17.3%</b>	<b>18.3%</b>	<b>19.8%</b>	<b>20.2%</b>

**Table 2. Direct Support and Indirect Support Workforce Turnover Rates**

<b>Worker Type</b>	<b>CY12-13</b>	<b>CY13-14</b>	<b>CY14-15</b>	<b>CY15-16</b>	<b>CY16-17</b>
Direct	17.7%	17.7%	18.7%	20.6%	20.5%
Indirect	13.0%	14.3%	15.6%	14.7%	18.7%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>17.1%</b>	<b>17.3%</b>	<b>18.3%</b>	<b>19.8%</b>	<b>20.2%</b>

**Table 3. VLDSS Class Size Turnover Rates**

<b>Agency Size</b>	<b>CY12-13</b>	<b>CY13-14</b>	<b>CY14-15</b>	<b>CY15-16</b>	<b>CY16-17</b>
Small	15.0%	20.6%	21.1%	23.8%	21.6%
Mid-range	16.6%	17.6%	18.8%	21.0%	21.6%
Large	17.4%	16.8%	17.8%	18.9%	19.5%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>17.1%</b>	<b>17.3%</b>	<b>18.3%</b>	<b>19.8%</b>	<b>20.2%</b>

**Table 4. DSS Regional Workforce Turnover**

<b>DSS Regions</b>	<b>CY12-13</b>	<b>CY13-14</b>	<b>CY14-15</b>	<b>CY15-16</b>	<b>CY16-17</b>
Central	23.2%	21.8%	22.5%	24.0%	21.3%
Eastern	15.9%	17.4%	17.9%	17.4%	21.3%
Northern	16.5%	14.8%	16.3%	18.9%	17.9%
Piedmont	16.2%	17.4%	19.0%	20.6%	20.6%
Western	13.8%	16.5%	17.4%	20.8%	21.6%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>17.1%</b>	<b>17.3%</b>	<b>18.3%</b>	<b>19.8%</b>	<b>20.2%</b>

**Table 5. Workforce turnover by region and class size**

<b>DSS Regions</b>	<b>CY12-13</b>	<b>CY13-14</b>	<b>CY14-15</b>	<b>CY15-16</b>	<b>CY16-17</b>
<b>Central</b>	<b>23.2%</b>	<b>21.8%</b>	<b>22.5%</b>	<b>24.0%</b>	<b>21.3%</b>
Small	17.7%	22.0%	24.2%	22.6%	18.6%
Mid-range	21.2%	26.1%	23.8%	28.0%	21.1%
Large	25.3%	20.6%	21.7%	23.1%	22.2%
<b>Eastern</b>	<b>15.9%</b>	<b>17.4%</b>	<b>17.9%</b>	<b>17.4%</b>	<b>21.3%</b>
Small	0.0%	16.7%	10.0%	15.8%	15.0%
Mid-range	14.7%	16.5%	18.7%	20.1%	20.3%
Large	16.5%	17.6%	17.8%	16.7%	21.7%
<b>Northern</b>	<b>16.5%</b>	<b>14.8%</b>	<b>16.3%</b>	<b>18.9%</b>	<b>17.9%</b>
Small	14.8%	15.9%	21.5%	22.7%	29.4%
Mid-range	20.2%	14.9%	16.2%	22.0%	22.1%



Large	15.5%	14.7%	16.0%	17.7%	16.0%
<b>Piedmont</b>	<b>16.2%</b>	<b>17.4%</b>	<b>19.0%</b>	<b>20.6%</b>	<b>20.6%</b>
Small	18.8%	29.2%	27.1%	22.0%	29.4%
Mid-range	15.4%	18.4%	19.2%	19.0%	20.0%
Large	16.3%	16.2%	18.4%	21.2%	20.3%
<b>Western</b>	<b>13.8%</b>	<b>16.5%</b>	<b>17.4%</b>	<b>20.8%</b>	<b>21.6%</b>
Small	7.0%	14.9%	8.3%	33.3%	15.2%
Mid-range	14.7%	17.0%	18.9%	19.5%	23.2%
Large	11.7%	13.3%	11.9%	21.7%	12.1%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>17.1%</b>	<b>17.3%</b>	<b>18.3%</b>	<b>19.8%</b>	<b>20.2%</b>

**Table 6. Workforce Turnover Rates By Occupational Title**

<b>Occupational Title</b>	<b>CY12-13</b>	<b>CY13-14</b>	<b>CY14-15</b>	<b>CY15-16</b>	<b>CY16-17</b>
Benefit Programs Manager	19.0%	9.1%	31.8%	13.6%	20.8%
Benefit Programs Specialist I	18.1%	21.8%	22.7%	24.8%	26.0%
Benefit Programs Specialist II	18.9%	18.5%	20.6%	21.1%	19.4%
Benefit Programs Specialist III	13.9%	12.7%	12.8%	16.9%	11.4%
Benefit Programs Specialist IV	12.5%	16.7%	14.8%	12.9%	13.3%
Benefit Programs Supervisor	10.9%	14.6%	15.4%	14.0%	17.5%
Family Services Manager	23.1%	19.4%	20.7%	13.8%	21.6%
Family Services Specialist I	25.1%	24.0%	24.9%	34.1%	41.6%
Family Services Specialist II	19.3%	18.9%	22.0%	24.4%	24.2%
Family Services Specialist III	18.7%	18.6%	18.8%	18.9%	20.4%
Family Services Specialist IV	13.4%	16.1%	10.0%	15.7%	17.1%
Family Services Supervisor	14.4%	14.3%	13.7%	15.8%	20.4%
Self-Sufficiency Manager	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	25.0%	33.3%
Self-Sufficiency Specialist I	21.4%	11.8%	25.0%	32.1%	17.4%
Self-Sufficiency Specialist II	10.6%	12.2%	7.9%	8.8%	19.9%
Self-Sufficiency Specialist III	8.9%	20.9%	10.2%	10.4%	19.6%
Self-Sufficiency Specialist IV	0.0%	21.1%	11.1%	4.8%	0.0%
Self-Sufficiency Supervisor	10.0%	6.7%	28.6%	12.0%	3.3%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>17.1%</b>	<b>17.3%</b>	<b>18.3%</b>	<b>19.8%</b>	<b>20.2%</b>

**Table 6.1. Workforce Turnover Rates By Occupational Title – Small Agencies**

<b>Occupational Title</b>	<b>CY12-13</b>	<b>CY13-14</b>	<b>CY14-15</b>	<b>CY15-16</b>	<b>CY16-17</b>
Benefit Programs Manager	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Benefit Programs Specialist I	20.0%	14.8%	25.9%	31.4%	20.6%
Benefit Programs Specialist II	15.9%	17.0%	24.5%	19.4%	14.3%
Benefit Programs Specialist III	13.0%	16.7%	0.0%	24.0%	24.0%
Benefit Programs Specialist IV	0.0%	16.7%	14.3%	0.0%	14.3%
Benefit Programs Supervisor	10.7%	25.9%	8.0%	17.9%	12.0%
Family Services Manager	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Family Services Specialist I	11.1%	30.0%	22.2%	46.7%	61.1%
Family Services Specialist II	15.5%	23.1%	26.2%	30.9%	21.5%

Family Services Specialist III	10.0%	33.3%	23.5%	13.3%	42.1%
Family Services Specialist IV	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	0.0%	20.0%
Family Services Supervisor	15.8%	15.0%	9.5%	17.4%	26.1%
Self-Sufficiency Manager	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Self-Sufficiency Specialist I	NA	33.3%	25.0%	60.0%	0.0%
Self-Sufficiency Specialist II	25.0%	42.9%	25.0%	0.0%	14.3%
Self-Sufficiency Specialist III	33.3%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Self-Sufficiency Specialist IV	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Self-Sufficiency Supervisor	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>Overall</b>	<b>15.0%</b>	<b>20.6%</b>	<b>21.1%</b>	<b>23.8%</b>	<b>21.6%</b>

**Table 6.2. Workforce Turnover Rates By Occupational Title – Medium Agencies**

<b>Occupational Title</b>	<b>CY12-13</b>	<b>CY13-14</b>	<b>CY14-15</b>	<b>CY15-16</b>	<b>CY16-17</b>
Benefit Programs Manager	16.7%	14.3%	28.6%	0.0%	11.1%
Benefit Programs Specialist I	15.1%	23.1%	27.0%	28.7%	27.9%
Benefit Programs Specialist II	17.0%	19.5%	19.2%	18.7%	16.7%
Benefit Programs Specialist III	14.3%	10.7%	10.2%	10.7%	10.2%
Benefit Programs Specialist IV	15.0%	20.7%	21.9%	12.5%	17.0%
Benefit Programs Supervisor	4.3%	14.9%	20.0%	10.8%	15.6%
Family Services Manager	50.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%
Family Services Specialist I	29.4%	29.1%	39.1%	45.8%	50.0%
Family Services Specialist II	21.2%	17.4%	17.9%	27.7%	31.7%
Family Services Specialist III	20.5%	14.4%	20.8%	24.1%	22.2%
Family Services Specialist IV	9.1%	16.7%	13.2%	14.9%	17.8%
Family Services Supervisor	10.0%	18.4%	12.4%	23.9%	12.6%
Self-Sufficiency Manager	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Self-Sufficiency Specialist I	33.3%	0.0%	14.3%	26.7%	16.7%
Self-Sufficiency Specialist II	5.3%	11.7%	5.4%	3.8%	16.7%
Self-Sufficiency Specialist III	7.7%	8.3%	11.8%	15.0%	10.5%
Self-Sufficiency Specialist IV	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Self-Sufficiency Supervisor	0.0%	14.3%	20.0%	0.0%	12.5%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>16.6%</b>	<b>17.6%</b>	<b>18.8%</b>	<b>21.0%</b>	<b>21.6%</b>

**Table 6.3. Workforce Turnover Rates By Occupational Title – Large Agencies**

<b>Occupational Title</b>	<b>CY12-13</b>	<b>CY13-14</b>	<b>CY14-15</b>	<b>CY15-16</b>	<b>CY16-17</b>
Benefit Programs Manager	20.0%	6.7%	33.3%	21.4%	26.7%
Benefit Programs Specialist I	21.4%	22.7%	16.9%	15.2%	24.7%
Benefit Programs Specialist II	20.2%	18.1%	20.8%	22.3%	21.1%
Benefit Programs Specialist III	13.7%	13.2%	14.2%	19.0%	11.3%
Benefit Programs Specialist IV	11.8%	10.5%	4.5%	16.7%	6.9%
Benefit Programs Supervisor	13.7%	13.2%	14.3%	14.9%	18.8%
Family Services Manager	0.0%	18.5%	24.0%	16.0%	22.6%
Family Services Specialist I	12.5%	18.9%	10.0%	20.2%	28.9%
Family Services Specialist II	11.8%	18.9%	23.2%	22.3%	21.5%

Family Services Specialist III	6.9%	19.4%	18.0%	17.4%	19.0%
Family Services Specialist IV	0.0%	16.4%	9.0%	16.4%	16.9%
Family Services Supervisor	13.0%	12.8%	14.5%	13.1%	22.3%
Self-Sufficiency Manager	18.2%	33.3%	0.0%	33.3%	50.0%
Self-Sufficiency Specialist I	15.9%	12.5%	33.3%	25.0%	25.0%
Self-Sufficiency Specialist II	22.2%	11.0%	8.0%	10.8%	21.3%
Self-Sufficiency Specialist III	19.0%	28.6%	6.9%	7.7%	26.7%
Self-Sufficiency Specialist IV	18.5%	17.6%	11.8%	5.6%	0.0%
Self-Sufficiency Supervisor	14.7%	4.3%	30.4%	15.8%	0.0%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>17.4%</b>	<b>16.8%</b>	<b>17.8%</b>	<b>18.9%</b>	<b>19.5%</b>

**Table 7. Employee Annual Base Salary**

	<b>CY12-13</b>	<b>CY13-14</b>	<b>CY14-15</b>	<b>CY15-16</b>	<b>CY16-17</b>
Valid	5,653	5,680	5,842	5,907	5,855
Missing	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	\$44,295.40	\$44,902.86	\$45,361.86	\$46,320.09	\$46,912.37
Median	\$40,836.72	\$41,565.36	\$42,011.52	\$43,069.31	\$43,860.00
Mode	\$27,366.00	\$28,187.00	\$27,366.00	\$27,366.00	\$27,366.00
Std. Deviation	\$14,549.52	\$14,724.53	\$15,012.16	\$15,186.04	\$15,473.65
Minimum	\$5,569.00	\$5,680.38	\$5,737.18	\$5,852.60	\$5,852.60
Maximum	\$133,405.30	\$136,740.40	\$138,500.00	\$145,587.20	\$145,455.10
Percentiles					
25	\$33,720.00	\$34,266.45	\$34,393.00	\$35,758.00	\$35,962.61
50	\$40,836.72	\$41,565.36	\$42,011.52	\$43,069.31	\$43,860.00
75	\$50,668.42	\$51,592.58	\$52,393.00	\$53,637.00	\$54,670.00
95	\$73,740.71	\$73,964.09	\$74,633.00	\$76,116.89	\$77,111.39

**Table 8. Salary Percentile and Turnover Rates**

<b>Salary percentile Rank</b>	<b>CY12-13</b>	<b>CY13-14</b>	<b>CY14-15</b>	<b>CY15-16</b>	<b>CY16-17</b>
25 <sup>th</sup> percentile and lower	21.3%	20.6%	24.1%	24.8%	26.8%
26 <sup>th</sup> to 50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	15.6%	18.0%	17.9%	21.1%	19.4%
51 <sup>th</sup> to 75 <sup>th</sup> percentile	16.8%	15.6%	16.9%	17.0%	18.8%
76 <sup>th</sup> to 95 <sup>th</sup> percentile	14.9%	15.3%	13.9%	16.2%	15.8%
96 <sup>th</sup> percentile and higher	13.1%	13.4%	15.8%	16.9%	16.4%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>17.1%</b>	<b>17.3%</b>	<b>18.3%</b>	<b>19.8%</b>	<b>20.2%</b>

**Table 9. LDSS Staff Turnover Rates by Region and Salary Percentiles**

<b>Region/Salary percentile Rank</b>	<b>CY12-13</b>	<b>CY13-14</b>	<b>CY14-15</b>	<b>CY15-16</b>	<b>CY16-17</b>
<b>Central</b>					
25 <sup>th</sup> percentile and lower	27.4%	20.4%	30.0%	34.6%	25.6%
26 <sup>th</sup> to 50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	23.9%	24.7%	26.3%	26.2%	22.1%
51 <sup>th</sup> to 75 <sup>th</sup> percentile	18.3%	19.6%	17.5%	19.4%	21.0%
76 <sup>th</sup> to 95 <sup>th</sup> percentile	25.2%	22.4%	15.6%	14.6%	15.4%

96 <sup>th</sup> percentile and higher	29.4%	23.1%	33.3%	22.2%	20.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23.2%</b>	<b>21.8%</b>	<b>22.5%</b>	<b>24.0%</b>	<b>21.3%</b>
<b>Eastern</b>					
25 <sup>th</sup> percentile and lower	22.9%	24.9%	26.5%	21.8%	30.7%
26 <sup>th</sup> to 50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	14.4%	17.2%	17.9%	19.0%	19.5%
51 <sup>th</sup> to 75 <sup>th</sup> percentile	14.0%	14.4%	13.3%	15.1%	17.3%
76 <sup>th</sup> to 95 <sup>th</sup> percentile	13.5%	14.1%	15.8%	14.0%	21.4%
96 <sup>th</sup> percentile and higher	17.4%	17.4%	14.8%	15.4%	34.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15.9%</b>	<b>17.4%</b>	<b>17.9%</b>	<b>17.4%</b>	<b>21.3%</b>
<b>Northern</b>					
25 <sup>th</sup> percentile and lower	24.5%	19.2%	19.1%	29.1%	33.6%
26 <sup>th</sup> to 50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	20.0%	15.8%	14.6%	18.6%	20.4%
51 <sup>th</sup> to 75 <sup>th</sup> percentile	20.8%	15.3%	22.1%	19.4%	20.5%
76 <sup>th</sup> to 95 <sup>th</sup> percentile	13.0%	14.0%	13.0%	17.2%	13.5%
96 <sup>th</sup> percentile and higher	11.5%	12.5%	15.1%	17.2%	14.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>16.5%</b>	<b>14.8%</b>	<b>16.3%</b>	<b>18.9%</b>	<b>17.9%</b>
<b>Piedmont</b>					
25 <sup>th</sup> percentile and lower	19.6%	20.5%	26.2%	23.7%	25.2%
26 <sup>th</sup> to 50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	11.8%	17.0%	14.6%	20.4%	17.1%
51 <sup>th</sup> to 75 <sup>th</sup> percentile	16.3%	12.9%	14.2%	16.4%	18.1%
76 <sup>th</sup> to 95 <sup>th</sup> percentile	15.7%	14.4%	9.3%	17.6%	15.0%
96 <sup>th</sup> percentile and higher	NA	NA	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>16.2%</b>	<b>17.4%</b>	<b>19.0%</b>	<b>20.6%</b>	<b>20.6%</b>
<b>Western</b>					
25 <sup>th</sup> percentile and lower	17.5%	17.4%	18.4%	22.2%	24.3%
26 <sup>th</sup> to 50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	8.4%	13.7%	14.5%	23.0%	18.0%
51 <sup>th</sup> to 75 <sup>th</sup> percentile	11.7%	16.9%	17.9%	9.7%	13.7%
76 <sup>th</sup> to 95 <sup>th</sup> percentile	5.9%	22.7%	23.8%	16.7%	37.5%
96 <sup>th</sup> percentile and higher	NA	NA	NA	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>13.8%</b>	<b>16.5%</b>	<b>17.4%</b>	<b>20.8%</b>	<b>21.6%</b>