



# The Florida Senate

*Interim Project Report 2003-110*

*January 2003*

---

Children and Families Committee

Senator James E. "Jim" King, Jr., President

---

## **RETENTION OF PROTECTIVE INVESTIGATORS AND PROTECTIVE INVESTIGATIVE SUPERVISORS**

### **SUMMARY**

Protective Investigators are leaving at a much higher rate than most state employees and most child protection staff in other states. This turnover of Protective Investigators diminishes the quantity of investigations that can be completed and threatens the quality of the investigations, and in turn, the assurances that the children are safe. The Protective Investigative Supervisor position is no longer considered appealing to Protective Investigators, thus eroding the base of competent supervisors with a strong foundation in protective investigations.

Substantial research exists on this issue and points to a myriad of factors that contribute to child protection staff leaving. An examination of Florida's Protective Investigators that consisted of surveying the current Protective Investigators both in the Department of Children and Families and in the sheriffs' offices, conducting focus groups and telephone interviews, and surveying former Protective Investigators and Protective Investigator Supervisors has narrowed the focus to those factors which most significantly influence this state's staff to leave. The most predominate factor that causes Protective Investigators to leave is the caseload and workload which, when combined, result in a job that is impossible to do. The shouldering of the burden of child safety without support, recognition and appreciation from the administration also influences staffs' decision to leave, as does the lack of overtime and pay that reflects experience and longevity, hiring people who are not well suited for the job, inadequate preparation for the job, and a lack of services for the families that keep them in the system longer and returning back for further investigation.

Addressing the problem of the turnover of the Protective Investigators and stability of the Protective Investigative Supervisors has received considerable attention from the department and the sheriffs' offices. The examination conducted through this interim project provides the opportunity to continue this effort from a broader systemic perspective. Strategies developed with the assistance of stakeholders and experts include developing a tiered investigation process that recognizes the differences among reports, exploring the scope of work required and identifying efficiencies, providing for enhanced minimum hiring requirements to improve the "fit" with the job, re-examining and developing a full training plan, and examining the impact of services to families on the workload and subsequent reports into the system.

### **BACKGROUND**

Considerable attention has been focused in Florida, as well as other states, on the ability of the child protection system to adequately respond to the abuse and neglect of children. Some of the problems being experienced have been attributed to the turnover of child protection staff. When child protection staff leave, lost is the knowledge and the expertise the staff had attained in making recommendations about the families where abuse and neglect have been reported. It takes time for newly hired staff to gain this knowledge and experience.<sup>1</sup> While the vacant positions are being filled and hired staff trained, existing workers must assume a greater portion of the workload. This increased workload means these existing staff cannot continue to perform the necessary quality of work. It increases their intolerance of undesirable working conditions, resulting in quality staff leaving. These departures create a cycle that continues and compounds the inadequacies in the

system and further erodes staffs' desire to remain in the position.

Child protection staff in Florida include different designations of counselors based on the functions performed, such as protective investigators, protective services counselors, foster care counselors and adoption counselors. The focus of this interim project is on the Protective Investigators (PIs) and the Protective Investigators' supervisors (PI Supervisors). Protective investigators are critical to the work of child protection, responsible for conducting the protective investigations of known or suspected child abuse, neglect or abandonment, as set forth in ch. 39, F.S. The Department of Children and Families operates the protective investigation service, except in five counties where the sheriff's office has assumed this function (Broward, Manatee, Pinellas, Pasco and Seminole counties).

The national turnover rate for child protection service workers is averaging between 15.6 percent and 19.9 percent based on the Child Welfare League of America 2001 Salary Survey and the Child Welfare Work Survey conducted in 2000.<sup>2</sup> Florida's turnover rate for all of its Family Services Counselors, i.e. child protection services staff, was significantly higher at 32.5 percent during FY 1999-2000 and 24.2 percent for FY 2000-2001<sup>3</sup>. Further, in comparison with this state's overall average rate of separations from state government which ranged from 9.46 percent to 13.52 percent for calendar years 1999 through 2001, this level is particularly high. In each of these 3 years, the Family Services Counselor classification was in the state's top ten classes with the highest separation rates.<sup>4</sup>

There are also other indicators of the extent to which PIs are cycling in and out of the position. The average vacancy rate nationally for child protective service workers was reported by the Child Welfare Workforce Survey as 9.3 percent in September 2000 and 8.5 percent by the 2001 Salary Study.<sup>5</sup> The average vacancy rate in Florida for PIs is ranging from 9.82 percent and 10.01 percent between April and September 2002, with a temporary increase to 13.5 percent and 16.13 percent in June and July 2002.<sup>6</sup>

In addition, an analysis by the department revealed that 49 percent of the PIs had been on the job less than a year in April, 2001.<sup>7</sup> This percentage had decreased, but only slightly, to 41.2 percent in September 2002.<sup>8</sup>

Turnover of PIs negatively impacts the quality and timeliness in which these child abuse investigative activities are conducted, as is indicative of the

department's performance relative to state and federal standards, and as noted in at least one quality assurance review of a prominent child death. The investigation by the department into the death of Joshua Saccone in 2000 found that several of the PIs and PI Supervisors involved in the child's abuse investigation were relatively inexperienced, including several with less than a year experience, one who had completed the training less than 2 months before the report was received, and one supervisor who had been in the supervisory position for 6 days.<sup>9</sup> In the federal Child and Family Services Review conducted in 2001, Florida was found not to be in substantial compliance on one of the safety related outcomes. Specifically, the timeliness of initiating the investigations was rated as needing improvement, including making face-to-face contacts with children, and stakeholders cited the high level of worker turnover and the backlog it creates as a reason.<sup>10</sup>

The timeliness of initiating child abuse investigative activities is also one focus of legislative performance measures and an area in which the department has not achieved the legislatively established standard. In examining the department's performance across the last 4 years, commencing investigations within 24 hours has never been met. More disturbing is the fact that there are victims who are not seen until 8 days or later.<sup>11</sup> In addition, fewer investigations are completed within the statutorily required 60 days now than 4 years ago.<sup>12</sup> While this performance can be attributed, in part, to an increase in number of reports and number of children entering the system,<sup>13</sup> funding for additional protective investigative staff has been appropriated to attempt to accommodate these increases. Even with the additional staff, problems apparently continue to exist in completing the required tasks in a timely manner. This could be due to a number of factors; however, it is likely that staffing issues such as the number of protective investigator positions available or the number of staff in place actually handling the investigations or both, has contributed.

In examining the problem of turnover and how to improve retention, the question becomes why some child protection staff leave and why some stay. From the answers to these questions solutions can be identified to increase the number of staff who stay in the position. A number of studies have been undertaken that examine child protection staff and factors that influence their decisions to remain in the position or to leave. One such study grouped the factors into three major categories: personal factors that are related to the caseworkers themselves; work factors

that are related to the type and characteristics of the work; and agency factors that stem from the organization, its structure and operation.<sup>14</sup> The most prevalent factors that have been found in the various studies to influence whether child protection staff remain in their position or leave have been identified below and categorized into these three groups:

- Personal factors: educational background, including whether the degree is in a child welfare related field; prior experience in child welfare; length of time on the job; the motivation and values of the individuals, such as their sense of commitment to work with and help children and families; the expectation and feeling that individuals can make a difference; and their interaction with and respect and support from colleagues.
- Work factors: caseload; workload; paperwork; job demands; safety of the worker; resources available in the community for the families; liability; and stress, burnout and emotional exhaustion.
- Agency factors: supportive supervisors, administrative support, rewards for longevity, appreciation for the work performed, opportunities for training, advancement opportunities, and the adequacy of the salary and benefits.<sup>15</sup>

The information gleaned from these studies provides a foundation from which to determine how to reverse the migration of quality staff out of these most critical positions. However, these studies also reveal the many dimensions and factors involved in this problem. An examination of the factors that are particular to Florida's Protective Investigators is necessary in order to determine the strategies that would have the greatest impact on the problem.

## METHODOLOGY

The approach used in conducting this interim project incorporated quantitative and qualitative information gathering activities. Specifically, a review of the literature on retention and turnover in the child welfare system was conducted. To capture the perspectives of child protection staff who were currently in the positions, data was compiled from a survey conducted by the Department of Children and Families of its Family Services Counselors, including Protective Investigators, regarding retention issues. This same survey was used in the five counties in which the protective investigation functions are performed by the sheriffs' offices to provide a basis of comparison in examining the issues. Responses to this survey included 217 PIs from the department and 172 PIs

from the sheriffs' offices.

Focus groups were conducted with PIs and PI Supervisors in five areas of the state: the department's Districts 1, 7, and 12, and the Pasco County and Pinellas County Sheriffs' Offices. A total of 76 PIs and 37 PI Supervisors participated in the focus groups. To supplement the focus groups, telephone interviews were conducted in other geographic areas with the same basic questions. Eight PIs and three PI Supervisors were interviewed by phone from the department's Districts 4, 11, and 15, as well as the Broward County Sheriff's Office. An exit interview survey developed and implemented by the department in July 2002 was sent to PIs and PI Supervisors who had been identified by the districts as leaving the department between January and March 2002. A total of 24 responses was received, 20 from PIs and 4 from PI Supervisors.

Finally, an advisory committee comprised of key stakeholders in the system and experts on the issues was used to provide guidance in the design of the project and develop strategies that would address this issue.

## FINDINGS

The compilation and analysis of the data and perspectives gathered provided a comprehensive view of the Protective Investigators and Protective Investigator Supervisors and the factors that are contributing most significantly to the stability of these positions.

### *PROTECTIVE INVESTIGATORS*

**Caseload and Workload:** The factors that appear to most strongly influence PIs' decision or desire to leave were caseload and workload related issues. Basically, these factors center around the high number of cases for which a PI is responsible, combined with the extensive scope of work that is required for each case. These issues can be divided into the following categories: caseload, work/tasks required for each case, and the hours necessary to complete these tasks.

*Caseload:* The number of cases for which the PIs are responsible clearly contributes to the turnover of the PIs in Florida. The Child Welfare League of America recommends a caseload of 12 cases per counselor.<sup>16</sup> The national average for child protective service workers' actual caseload of 17 families per worker only slightly exceeds the recommended standard.<sup>17</sup>

However, the caseload of PIs in Florida is much higher, averaging 41 cases per PI in the department and 31 cases for sheriffs' PIs, with some staff reporting caseloads as high as 80 to 100.<sup>18</sup>

While increases in the number of reports received results in higher caseloads for the PIs, the turnover of the PIs also contributes. As PIs leave, existing PIs must assume the new cases that would have been assigned to the now vacant position. The Legislature has allocated positions for protective investigative staff to reduce the caseload. However, there are reports that these positions are not always used by the districts for this function which continues higher caseloads. Reducing the caseload was identified by 89 percent of the current department PIs and 92 percent of the sheriffs' PIs as a factor that would help retain employees.

*Work/Tasks Required for Each Case:* The amount of work required to be performed by the PI, especially when combined with the high caseloads, is probably the most significant factor contributing to PIs leaving. Workload assigned was identified more frequently than any other issue by former department PIs and PI Supervisors as either the "principal" or a "significant" factor in their leaving the department. Also, the focus group participants consistently reported that the series of investigative and administrative activities required for every child abuse report resulted in a substantial workload for the PIs. The administrative portion of these activities were considered to far outweigh the investigative functions and, in the mind of the PIs, resulted in a sense that child safety was secondary to meeting required time lines and administrative tasks.

Focus group participants reported that much of this workload stems from reports that may not warrant a child protective investigation, or, at least, the amount of time currently devoted to the reports. Protective Investigators and their supervisors strongly pointed to the need to re-examine the situations that should be accepted as reports. Some reports received are for child abuse incidents that occurred several years ago and often have been previously investigated resulting in either duplicative investigative activities or investigations of situations where the child is no longer in danger of abuse. Protective Investigators are also required to respond to certain emergency requests for services where abuse has not been alleged. While often necessary, the appropriateness of PIs responding to some of these requests, such as TANF non-compliance cases, has been questioned. A number of the child abuse reports accepted for investigation are in reality

outside the jurisdiction of the child protective system because the abuse occurred in another state. Institutional child abuse reports from Department of Juvenile Justice and child care facilities are also outside the jurisdiction of the PIs because the abuse was not committed by a caregiver and the authority of the PIs is limited to actions that can be taken with a parent or caretaker. Also, regarding institutional child abuse reports, the statute requires that all of these reports be responded to immediately, resulting in a shorter window for commencement than the nature and severity of the report may warrant and compounding the amount of work that must be completed within a given time frame.

There was generally a sense among the focus group participants that the PIs have been made responsible for far too many of the tasks that are necessary in the handling of abuse reports and for a wider scope of family problems than truly is within the realm of child protection. These issues are sufficiently compelling to warrant an examination of the types of reports accepted for investigation and the tasks required of PIs. However, this examination must be conducted from the context of not endangering children, as could happen if children who are truly in danger of abuse are excluded from the investigative process.

*Hours:* The PIs in the focus group identified the extensive hours required to perform the job as an important factor contributing to staff leaving the position. A range of 50 to 60 hours a week was reported as the time required for the job and often actually worked, which was consistent with the survey results.<sup>19</sup> High caseloads combined with the work/tasks required on each case was cited as the reason for the level of hours required. Focus group participants spoke strongly to the tremendous toll these hours take on the personal or family life of the staff.

Aggravating this need to work 50 to 60 hours to complete the required tasks is the fact that often the overtime allowed is limited. While some PIs reported being able to work the amount of overtime necessary to complete the required work, many PIs stated they were very limited in the amount of overtime they were permitted to work. Most PIs reported being able to work only an average of 5 hours of overtime every 2 weeks, after which they are required to "flex out" and not continue the work on their cases.

**Salary:** Issues related to pay received considerable attention in the surveys and focus groups. The issues identified most frequently in the focus groups included

the adequacy of the salary in comparison to the responsibilities required, the lack of pay differential to reflect performance, new PIs making virtually the same as PIs who have been in the position for some time, and the limited overtime available to work the hours required to complete the investigative tasks required. Of these issues, most pressing was the lack of overtime and the inability to increase the salary with experience and longevity. Consistent with the focus groups, the survey of current PIs attributed a great deal of importance to yearly salary increases which would enable investigators' pay to reflect length of service and experience. When asked which incentives would help retain employees, yearly salary increases received the highest percentage of agreement, over 95 percent, from both the department and sheriffs' PIs.

The results of the surveys support the dissatisfaction that many PIs have with their pay. However, the level of dissatisfaction and the influence the basic salary level has in PIs' decisions to leave do not appear to be as significant as other factors. Fifty-eight percent of the current department PIs and 35 percent of the sheriffs' PIs were not satisfied with their pay. However, the amount of base pay was identified by only 46 percent of the former department protective investigative staff completing the survey as either "the principal factor" or "a significant factor" for leaving, and only 30 percent of the former department employees accepted a position with a higher rate of pay.

While the salary level is not a major factor for protective investigative staff leaving, the research shows that the adequacy of the pay is an issue that continues to surface and influences staff's decisions to stay when combined with other aspects of the job.<sup>20</sup> In comparing Florida's salary to national salary averages for child protection staff, Florida's starting salary of \$27,064 to \$28,489 for a PI is comparable to the national average of \$28,795.<sup>21</sup> Of the four sheriffs' offices from which salary information was requested, one started PIs at close to the level of the department's starting salary. The other sheriffs' offices started their PIs at between \$29,723 and \$31,649.

However, the department's average salary for protective investigators after completing certification is less than the national average, unless the individual has been in the position or with the agency for some time. The national average for child protection staff is \$33,169.<sup>22</sup> While, the average salary of the staff who have been in the PI position or with the department 5 years or more is \$34,745, the salary of those who

have been in the position 1 to 3 years is \$30,405 and \$31,456 for 3 to 5 years. The PIs see very little salary related incentive for staying in their job and gaining experience when PIs with no experience and those with several years of experience are making virtually the same salary.

**Supervision:** The literature indicates that good supportive supervision helps to make the job bearable and manageable and strongly influences a staff person's decision to remain in the position.<sup>23</sup> For the most part, respondents to the surveys and participants in the focus groups were positive about their supervisors. Over 77 percent of both the department and sheriffs' PIs felt supported by their supervisor and considered their supervisors quite competent in doing the job. In addition, over 73 percent of both the department PIs and sheriffs' PIs reported that their input and opinions were solicited by their supervisor. There was a much lower percentage of PIs agreeing that improving supervisory oversight would help employee retention, in comparison to other factors identified, which is reflective of the level of approval for the supervisors.

However, both the focus groups and survey of former department protective investigative staff clearly show that there is still a large number of poor supervisors who are not supportive, do not provide guidance, and do not assist the PIs in meeting their work requirements. Respondents to the former department employee survey were much more critical of the supervisors than the survey of current department employees. While a majority of the former protective investigative staff rated their supervisor as "good" or "excellent" in their expertise in the work and following policies and procedures, an almost equal number rated their supervisor as "poor" in listening and communicating, willingness to correct/admit mistakes, supporting training and development, managing work, facilitating change, and providing feedback and recognition.

**Management:** Lack of administrative support and recognition for the work performed was evident in both the focus groups and surveys and appeared to contribute to the burden the department PIs felt in performance of their job. Of particular interest is that these issues were not as significant for the sheriffs' PIs. The department and sheriffs' PIs were similar in the high number responding to the survey who considered being recognized or rewarded for accomplishment and productivity as important and in the only 52 percent who felt their work was appreciated. However, in the

focus groups the perspective of the PIs was that the department does not provide positive reinforcement, recognize accomplishments, support the work of protective investigation, or shield the front-line staff from the pressures of the media. The primary management issue identified by the sheriffs' office PIs was the high expectation for a difficult job. The protective investigative staff at the department felt solely responsible for child safety and solely accountable for every problem that arises. While sheriffs' PIs strongly felt the responsibility for each child's life, there was not the sense of singly bearing that responsibility.

This perception of limited support and appreciation was also evident in the level of respect and support reported by current PIs responding to the survey. The high level of respect and support PIs felt from co-workers was expressed to a lesser extent for higher level management and administration. However, there was a substantial difference between department and sheriffs' PIs. Only 20 percent of the department PIs felt respected and supported by department headquarters and only 28 percent by the district Family Safety Program Office. In comparison, 31 percent of the sheriffs' PIs felt supported and respected by their child protective services headquarters and 42 percent felt respected and supported by their mid-managers. Probably more revealing is that 70 percent of the former department protective investigative staff identified poor morale and 48 percent identified insufficient job recognition as either a "principal" or "significant" factor in leaving.

**Hiring and Training:** Hiring staff with the abilities and expectations required for the job and fully preparing them for the responsibilities are important prerequisites to retaining quality PIs. However, the demand to get positions filled and taking cases quickly may have outweighed the value of more selective hiring and dedicated time to training. Basically, it appears that people are being hired who should not be PIs and the new PIs are being placed in the PI role unprepared. Some people do not understand what the job really entails, some have no human service or any post-college work experience, and some do not have the characteristics and abilities to perform the work.

Further, it appears that the training for PIs may not adequately prepare them for the job. Most of the focus group participants thought the Professional Development Center classroom training should focus more on the tangible aspects of the job, such as policy, legal/court requirements, paperwork, and computer

programs, but more importantly, they thought the training that was really needed to most effectively prepare PIs for the job was stronger on-the-job or field training. The survey of current PIs did not provide as clear a direction regarding the training, since approximately the same percentage of PIs thought the training adequately prepared them as those who did not. However, 65 percent to 75 percent of the PIs thought that enhancing training would help employee retention. In addition, 46 percent of the former department protective investigative staff identified inadequate training to do their job as "a significant" or "the principal" factor for leaving. While not overwhelming, the training clearly needs to be improved and enhanced.

**Advancement Opportunities:** While only occasionally identified by the focus groups, advancement opportunities were important to the PIs responding to both surveys. The incentive of advancement opportunities was in the top 10 incentives identified by current PIs as helping with employee retention. Forty-two percent of both department and sheriff PIs did not think there were opportunities for promotion at their current jobs.

**Pressure/Stress of the Job/Liability:** The focus group participants frequently pointed to the tremendous stress they were under in their job as a PI. This stress was created in part by the responsibility the PI has for a child's life but was enhanced by the combination of all the requirements of the job which are not doable and their inability to do the quality of work necessary. The result can be missing something in the investigation and, in turn, the death of a child. The PIs fear seeing their case in the media, and the department PIs, in particular, fear being fired for any errors found in their work.

**Services for Families:** The focus groups reported that there was a lack of services for families that is increasing the workload of the PIs, in terms of tasks required to locate available services and extending the length of time the cases are open and in the families returning through the child protection system.

#### ***PROTECTIVE INVESTIGATOR SUPERVISOR***

The factors identified most frequently by the Protective Investigator Supervisors for why it is difficult to recruit and retain supervisors in this position were as follows:

- Many PI Supervisors earn less than the PIs they supervise because they do not receive the salary additives, such as mentor pay and overtime.

Experiencing a reduction in pay is the primary reason given for PIs not moving into the supervisor position. This may, in part, be due to the actual salary level of the supervisors. When compared to the national averages, the starting salary of Florida's supervisors at \$31,178 to \$33,304 and basic salary level of \$38,640, is much less than the national average of \$37,907 starting salary and \$44,444 basic salary level.<sup>24</sup>

- The workload of the PIs creates a workload problem for the supervisors. Addressing the PIs' workload would relieve the supervisors of a great deal of their workload problem.
- Supervisors do not have control over who is hired as a PI. Protective Investigators are hired by administration and often are perceived to be not qualified. However, the supervisors are held accountable for the work of their staff even though they have little or no role in their selection.
- There is a strong sense of liability on the part of the PI Supervisors. Unlike PIs who are responsible for the children in their own caseloads, the supervisor is responsible for every child in every worker's caseload. This sense of liability is compounded by the historical actions of the department, including the perception that supervisors are fired because of the actions of the PIs.
- There is little recognition for the good that is accomplished by the protective investigation staff; however, the media and policymakers hold the staff responsible for every child that dies.

## CONCLUSION

Most Protective Investigators and Protective Investigator Supervisors love the job of protective investigation and are committed to helping children and families, whether it is bringing a child to safety or providing the family with the tools necessary to stabilize and reverse a dysfunctional situation. However, PIs are leaving the job and they are not moving into the supervisory role that will build a base of quality supervision, not because of the basic job of child abuse investigation, but because the job has become almost impossible to do.

The department, as well as the sheriffs' offices have been fully aware of the problem of turnover in this position and its implications. Each has undertaken a number of initiatives to reverse this trend, both at a state and local level, including modifying hiring practices, creating a certification program, restructuring the units, and local monitoring of the turnover issues.

This assessment of Florida's PIs and their reasons for leaving has gleaned a number of the most significant contributing factors. Resolving the issue of turnover of the PIs and the stability of the PI Supervisors will require a multifaceted approach and continuous effort over an extended period of time. Below are the predominant actions that will continue the efforts to stem the loss of quality Protective Investigators.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

- Provide for a two tiered protective investigation process that allows for a less extensive investigation under specified conditions.
- Explore how or whether certain allegations should be investigated and the process for minimizing duplicative investigative activities.
- Provide for the examination of how institutional child abuse reports should be investigated and sanctioned.
- Eliminate the statutory requirement that institutional child abuse reports receive an "immediate" response.
- Provide for the examination of the functions and tasks of the Protective Investigator to determine the process that would most effectively accomplish the investigation, assure the safety of the child and provide for the efficient use of time.
- Prohibit districts from utilizing positions allocated for PIs or PI Supervisors for any other positions.
- Require a minimum level of experience in human services for the PI position.
- Provide for PI Supervisors to have direct involvement in the hiring decisions for the PIs for their units.
- Require that new hires for the Protective Investigator position shadow a PI prior to entering the training program.
- Direct the Department of Children and Families to develop a plan to address the training needs of newly hired PIs that ensures they are prepared upon being required to assume a full caseload and provides for an implementation phase-in.
- Direct OPPAGA to conduct a study of the impact of services to families on the workload of the PI and safety outcome of the children and identify services that have the greatest impact.
- Require the department to examine and develop a plan for how to build communication and involvement in decision making with front-line staff and promote non-monetary recognition.
- Direct the department to examine the allegation matrix to identify refinements that would reduce



the number of abuse reports accepted that do not meet the statutory definition.

- Establish a workgroup to examine the feasibility of an alternative response system for responding to low risk abuse and neglect reports and develop a plan for implementing a system in Florida.

<sup>1</sup> Balfour, Danny and Neff, Donna, *Predicting and Managing Turnover in Human Services Agencies: A Case Study of an Organization in Crisis*, Public Personnel Management, Vol. 22, No. 3, Fall 1993, p. 474.

<sup>2</sup> Schmitt, Barbara, October 9, 2002, Presentation of *Child Welfare League of America, 2001 Salary Study*, To be published January 2003, and Cyphers, Gary, *Report from the Child Welfare Workforce Survey: State and County Data Findings*, American Public Human Services Association, Child Welfare League of America, and Alliance for Children and Families, May 2001, p. 2.

<sup>3</sup> Department of Children and Families (DCF) Turnover chart with the districts entering into the services contracts with CBCs excluded (Districts 5, 6, 8, and 12 for FY 1999-2000 and Districts 1, 5, 6, 8, and 12 for FY 2000-2001).

<sup>4</sup> *Annual Workforce Reports for 1999, 2000, and 2001*, Department of Management Services (DMS), pages 34, 34 and 36 respectively. Note: DMS does not include individuals accepting employment in other state agencies which is included in DCF turnover data. However, DMS reports similar separation rates 21.3 percent to 31.95 percent for this classification.

<sup>5</sup> Cyphers, *Supra*, p. 11, and Schmitt, *Supra*.

<sup>6</sup> DCF's Situation Reports for April 24 and July 24, 2002.

<sup>7</sup> DCF's *Quality Improvement and Control (QIC) Story of Family Services Counselors*, June 2001, p. 7.

<sup>8</sup> Percentage extracted from a run of all Protective Investigator positions on September 17, 2002 provided by the department. Note, that neither the 2001 QIC Story or the September 2002 percentages subtract new positions allocated during the year.

<sup>9</sup> DCF memo dated October 10, 2000, *Quality Assurance Review of the Joshua Saccone Child Death*, p. 20.

<sup>10</sup> *Child and Family Services Review, Final Assessment, Florida*, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, August 2001, p. 5.

<sup>11</sup> *Examination of Child Protection Investigation Performance Measures*, Senate Committee on Children and Families, October 22, 2001 and FY 2001-2002 data provided by the department.

<sup>12</sup> Investigations completed within 60 days totaled 79.9 percent in FY 1998-1999 and 42.7 percent in FY 2001-2002. *Examination of Child Protection Investigation Performance Measures*, Senate Committee on Children and Families, October 22, 2001 and FY 2001-2002 data provided by the department.

<sup>13</sup> Between FY 1998-1999 and FY 2000-2001 the number of reports increased 38 percent and the number of alleged victims increased 68.6 percent. *Examination of Child*

*Protection Investigation Performance Measures*, Senate Committee on Children and Families, October 22, 2001.

<sup>14</sup> Bernotavicz, Freda, *Retention of Child Welfare Caseworkers, A Report*, National Child Welfare Resource Center for Organizational Improvement, p. 2.

<sup>15</sup> Bernotavicz, *Supra*; Balfour and Neff, *Supra*; Vinokur-Kaplan, Diane, *Job Satisfaction Among Social Workers in Public and Voluntary Child Welfare Agencies*, Child Welfare League of America, 1991; Cicero-Reese, Bessie and Clark, Phyllis, *Research Findings Suggest Why Child Welfare Workers Stay on the Job*, Partnership for Child Welfare Newsletter, February 1998; Rycraft, Joan, *The Party Isn't Over: The Agency Role in the Retention of Public Child Welfare Caseworkers*, National Association of Social Workers, 1994; Newman, Murray A., Sanderson, Marsha R., and Manning, Wilma, *Social Workers Have More Staying Power in Children's Protective Services ... At Least in the Texas Panhandle*, unpublished manuscript through Protective Services Training Institute, 1995; *When Workers Can't Take it Anymore*, Child Protection Connection, Vol IV, Issue 2; *The Child Welfare Workforce Challenge: Results from a Preliminary Study*, Presented at Finding Better Ways 2001, Dallas, Texas, Study conducted by Alliance for Children and Families, American Public Human Services Association and Child Welfare League of America, May 2001; Jayaratne, Srinkia and Chess, Wayne A., *Job Satisfaction, Burnout, and Turnover: A National Study*, National Association of Social Workers, 1984; *Social Worker Retention*, Children's Services Practice Notes, North Carolina Division of Social Services and the University of North Carolina, Vol. 4, No. 3; Dickinson, Nancy and Perry, Robin, *Factors Influencing the Retention of Specially Educated Public Child Welfare Workers*, Submitted for review to the Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment; and Daly, Donna, Dudley, Donald, Finnegan, Dan, Jones, Loring, and Christiansen, Leif, *Staffing Child Welfare Services in the New Millennium*, Network for Excellence in Human Services, 2001.

<sup>16</sup> *Recommended Caseload/Workload Standards*, Child Welfare League of America, June 2000, and telephone conversation with Pamela Day, Director of CWLA Child Welfare Services and Standards confirming that the 12 cases applies to any point in time.

<sup>17</sup> *The Child Welfare Workforce Challenge: Results from a Preliminary Study*, *Supra*, p. 15.

<sup>18</sup> PI Surveys and focus groups conducted by the department and Senate staff.

<sup>19</sup> Responses to survey of current DCF and sheriffs' PIs found the hours needed to complete the job averaged 56.7 for department PIs and 52.3 for the sheriffs' PIs.

<sup>20</sup> Samantrai, Krishna, *Factors in the Decision to Leave: Retaining Social Workers with MSWs in Public Child Welfare*, National Association of Social Workers, 1992, p. 456.

<sup>21</sup> Schmitt, *Supra*.

<sup>22</sup> Schmitt, *Supra*.

<sup>23</sup> Rycraft, *Supra*, p. 78.

<sup>24</sup> Schmitt, *Supra*.