

NATIONAL CHILD WELFARE WORKFORCE INSTITUTE (NCWWI) COMPREHENSIVE ORGANIZATIONAL HEALTH ASSESSMENT (2014-2019)

NDACAN Dataset Number 246 USER'S GUIDE



National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect
Bronfenbrenner Center for Translational Research
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York 14850
607-255-7799
ndacan@cornell.edu
www.ndacan.acf.hhs.gov

Initial release: 9/29/2021

Last Revision: 9/29/2021

National Child Welfare Workforce Institute Comprehensive Organizational Health Assessment

DATA COLLECTED BY

Robin Leake, PhD
Butler Institute for Families
University of Denver

Shauna L. Rienks, PhD
Butler Institute for Families
University of Denver

Anna de Guzman, M.A.
Butler Institute for Families
University of Denver

Amy S. He, PhD
Butler Institute for Families
University of Denver

Mary Jo Stahlschmidt, PhD
Butler Institute for Families
University of Denver

FUNDED BY

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), Administration for Children and
Families (ACF), Children's Bureau (CB)

DISTRIBUTED BY

National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect

USER'S GUIDE WRITTEN BY

Holly M. Larrabee, MSHP
National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect
in collaboration with
Mary Jo Stahlschmidt, PhD,
Butler Institute for Families, University of Denver

©2021 National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect

Table of Contents

NATIONAL CHILD WELFARE WORKFORCE INSTITUTE (NCWWI) COMPREHENSIVE ORGANIZATIONAL HEALTH ASSESSMENT (2014-2019)	1
DATA COLLECTED BY.....	2
FUNDED BY	2
DISTRIBUTED BY	2
USER’S GUIDE WRITTEN BY	2
PREFACE	5
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF SOURCE	5
PUBLICATION SUBMISSION REQUIREMENT	5
ABSTRACT	6
STUDY OVERVIEW	7
Study Identification.....	7
Purpose of the Study	7
Study Design.....	7
Date(s) of Data Collection	8
Geographic Area	8
Unit of Observation.....	8
Sample.....	8
Data Collection Procedures.....	9
Response Rates	9
Sources of Information	10
Type of Data Collected	10
Measures	10
Related Publications and Final Reports	26
Analytic Considerations.....	26
Confidentiality Protection.....	26
Extent of Collection	27
Extent of Processing	27
Acronyms and Abbreviations	27
DATA FILE INFORMATION	28
File Specifications.....	28
Data File Notes	28

PREFACE

The data for *National Child Welfare Workforce Institute Comprehensive Organizational Health Assessment* have been given to the National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect (NDACAN) for public distribution by Robin Leake, Shauna L Rienks, Anna de Guzman, Amy S He and Mary Jo Stahlschmidt. Funding for the project was provided by U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), Administration for Children and Families (ACF), Children's Bureau (CB) (Award Number(s): 90CT0145/02).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF SOURCE

Authors should acknowledge the National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect (NDACAN) and the original collector(s) of the data when publishing manuscripts that use data provided by the Archive. Users of these data are urged to follow some adaptation of the statement below.

The data used in this publication were made available by the National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, and have been used with permission. Data from *National Child Welfare Workforce Institute Comprehensive Organizational Health Assessment* were originally collected by: Robin Leake, Shauna L Rienks, Anna de Guzman, Amy S He and Mary Jo Stahlschmidt. Funding for the project was provided by U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), Administration for Children and Families (ACF), Children's Bureau (CB) (Award Number(s): 90CT0145/02). The collector(s) of the original data, the funder(s), NDACAN, Cornell University and their agents or employees bear no responsibility for the analyses or interpretations presented here.

The bibliographic citation for this data collection is:

Leake, R., Rienks, S.L., de Guzman, A., He, A.S., & Stahlschmidt, M.J. (2021). *National Child Welfare Workforce Institute Comprehensive Organizational Health Assessment* [Dataset].
Doi: <https://doi.org/10.34681/qfeh-dg67>

PUBLICATION SUBMISSION REQUIREMENT

In accordance with the terms of the *Data License* for this dataset, users of these data are required to notify the National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect of any published work or report based wholly or in part on these data. A copy of any completed manuscript, thesis abstract, or reprint should be emailed to NDACANsupport@cornell.edu. Such copies will be used to provide our funding agency with essential information about the use of NDACAN resources and to facilitate the exchange of information about research activities among data users and contributors.

ABSTRACT

The growing complexities of child welfare work require the skills of a high-performing and effective workforce that not only has the competencies to do this difficult work, but the resiliency to thrive in a high-pressure agency environment. The National Child Welfare Workforce Institute (NCWWI) is funded by the Children's Bureau to increase child welfare practice effectiveness through workforce systems development, organizational interventions, and change leadership. The data archived here come from the NCWWI Workforce Excellence (WE) initiative. As part of the initiative, child welfare staff from three sites completed a baseline and follow-up Comprehensive Organizational Health Assessment (COHA) to identify critical workforce strengths and challenges. The first site included a county-administered public child welfare system in a large, urban metropolitan area. The other two sites were state-administered public child welfare systems in two Midwestern states.

Baseline assessments contained approximately 307 items, though the number of items displayed to respondents depended on skip logic, which was based on position and whether the respondent worked directly with families. Between July 2014 and July 2015, 2,832 participants completed the baseline COHA survey. At follow-up (approximately three years later), three measures from the baseline COHA were dropped and four new measures were added. Follow-up assessments contained approximately 340 items, and the number of items displayed to respondents depended on the same skip logic used in the baseline assessment. Between November 2017 and February 2019, 2,912 participants completed the follow-up assessment. A total of 1,034 participants completed both assessments. Items in the baseline and follow-up COHA covered individual-level factors (burnout, coping strategies, exposure to violence, intent to stay, job satisfaction, job stress, secondary trauma, self-efficacy, and time pressure), unit-level factors (peer support, supervision, professional sharing/support, team cohesion, and shared vision), organization-level factors (inclusivity, leadership, learning culture, organizational climate, organizational bias, physical environment, professional development and preparation for work, readiness for change, and workplace prejudice and discrimination) and community-level factors (public perceptions of child welfare, inter-professional collaboration, and community resources).

STUDY OVERVIEW

Study Identification

National Child Welfare Workforce Institute Comprehensive Organizational Health Assessment

Investigator(s):

Robin Leake, PhD
Butler Institute for Families
University of Denver

Shauna L. Rienks, PhD
Butler Institute for Families
University of Denver

Anna de Guzman, M.A.
Butler Institute for Families
University of Denver

Amy S. He, PhD
Butler Institute for Families
University of Denver

Mary Jo Stahlschmidt, PhD
Butler Institute for Families
University of Denver

Funded By:

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), Administration for Children and Families (ACF), Children's Bureau (CB)

Award Number(s):

90CT0145/02

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the Comprehensive Organizational Health Assessment was to identify critical workforce strengths and challenges. The first site included a county-administered public child welfare system in a large, urban metropolitan area. The other two sites were state-administered public child welfare systems in two Midwestern states.

Study Design

The study from which these data are drawn used pre-test/post-test design. In preparation for an initiative to improve child welfare workforce health and functioning, the COHA baseline

assessment was administered across three sites (one urban county-administered child welfare agency and two Midwestern, state-administered child welfare agencies, here renamed Site A, Site B, and Site C to protect participant anonymity) to identify critical workforce strengths and challenges. Data from the baseline assessments were used to advance and integrate multiple complimentary change initiatives to address identified challenges. The COHA measured individual-level factors (burnout, coping strategies, exposure to violence, intent to stay, job satisfaction, job stress, secondary trauma, self-efficacy, job satisfaction, intent to stay, secondary trauma, burnout, coping skills, and time pressure), unit-level factors (peer support, supervision, professional sharing/support, team cohesion, and shared vision), organization-level factors (inclusivity, leadership, learning culture, psychological organizational climate, leadership, organizational bias, physical environment, professional development and preparation for work, inclusivity, readiness for change, and workplace prejudice and discrimination) and community-level factors (public perceptions of child welfare, inter-professional collaboration, and community resources). Targeted change initiatives were then implemented. Approximately 3-3.5 years after baseline administration, a follow-up COHA was administered to participants at the same sites to examine changes in organizational health and functioning.

Date(s) of Data Collection

July 2014 - January 2019

Geographic Area

The geographic areas to which the data are relevant: public child welfare systems in one west-coast, urban county-administered child welfare agency and two Midwestern, state-administered child welfare agencies.

Unit of Observation

Individual employees in public child welfare systems from the participating agencies in one west-coast, urban county-administered child welfare agency and two Midwestern, state-administered child welfare agencies.

Sample

The inclusion criterion for this assessment was that participants must have been employed in one of the public child welfare agencies that were part of the National Child Welfare Workforce Institute Workforce Excellence project. Only those participants who agreed to have their data used for research purposes are included in this sample. The population of inference was public child welfare staff including caseworkers, supervisors, managers, directors, and others such as clerical staff, resource developers, and those working in adoptions. Participants completed baseline and follow-up administrations of the Comprehensive Organizational Health Assessment (COHA). The baseline COHA was completed by 2,832 participants and the follow-up COHA was completed by 2,912; 1,034 completed both. At both administrations, participants had worked in child welfare an average of just over four and a half years. At baseline, roughly 75% indicated that they worked directly with children and families while about 78% of follow-up

respondents reported working with families. Other sample characteristics can be found in the table below.

Description of the NCWWI COHA Sample

Characteristic		Baseline (N=2,832)	Follow-up (N=2,912)
Position	Caseworker	1,995 (70.4%)	1,979 (68.0%)
	Supervisor	493 (17.4%)	490 (16.8%)
	Manager/Director/Deputy Director	194 (6.9%)	122 (4.2%)
	Other	150 (5.3%)	321 (11.0%)
Highest Education Degree	High school diploma	9 (0.3%)	74 (2.9%)
	Associates degree	11 (0.4%)	36 (1.5%)
	Bachelor's degree	1,870 (71.1%)	1,730 (68.7%)
	Master's degree	653 (24.8%)	595 (23.6%)
	Other	88 (3.3%)	83 (3.3%)
Has BSW or MSW		665 (25.3%)	604 (23.9%)
Gender	Female	2,250 (85.7%)	2,133 (84.6%)
	Male	374 (14.3%)	353 (14.0%)
	Prefer not to say	0 (0%)	36 (1.4%)
Race/Ethnicity	Black or African American	325 (12.4%)	299 (11.9%)
	White or Caucasian	2,100 (80.2%)	1,955 (78.0%)
	Other	193 (7.4%)	252 (10.1%)

Data Collection Procedures

Data for the baseline and follow-up COHAs were collected via online surveys through Qualtrics Research Suite. Child welfare staff were sent an email that contained their unique link to the online survey. Each participant was provided with the option to participate or not and those who chose to participate were then asked if they agreed to have their data used for research purposes. Following initial survey administration, three reminder emails were sent at weekly intervals to encourage participation. All responses were kept confidential by researchers, and individuals' identifying information was replaced with ID numbers so as not to link back to the staff member.

Response Rates

Baseline: 4,250 staff members were invited to participate, 2,976 responded (70%) and 2,884 (68%) agreed to have their data used for research purposes. Fifty-two of these cases were from a small private agency and were deleted from the archival dataset to protect confidentiality. Follow-up: 5,623 staff members were invited to participate, 3,125 (56%) responded and 2,969

(53%) agreed to have their data used for research purposes. Fifty-four of these cases were from a small private agency and were deleted from the archival dataset to protect confidentiality. Three additional cases were deleted based on gender to protect confidentiality. The sample sizes, means, and standard deviations reported below were calculated for respondents who answered 75% or more of the items on any given measure.

Sources of Information

Data were collected through the National Child Welfare Workforce Institute Comprehensive Organizational Health Assessment survey administered to employees in the public child welfare system.

Type of Data Collected

Survey

Measures

Community Resources

This scale measures staff satisfaction with relationships with community providers and the extent to which families have access to community resources, such as: prevention services, substance abuse intervention, mental health services, and domestic violence intervention, and services related to housing, transportation, and basic needs. The follow-up COHA added four items to assess satisfaction with services for post-adoption, foster parents, affordable childcare, and language interpretation. It used a 5-point agreement scale and “N/A” option.

Baseline:

$n = 2378$

$M(SD) = 3.47(0.70)$

$\alpha = .86$

Follow-up:

$n = 2243$

$M(SD) = 3.55(0.68)$

$\alpha = .90$

Butler Institute for Families (2009). *Community Resources [unpublished measure]*. Denver, CO: University of Denver.

Copenhagen Burnout Inventory

Caseworkers, supervisors, and other staff who worked directly with children and families completed the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (CBI). The scale’s developers recommend coding each item on a scale from 0-100 and taking the mean for the total scale. Means greater than 50 generally reflect relatively high levels of burnout symptoms. The measure uses a 5-point

frequency scale with N/A option to capture CW staff's experience with symptoms of physical and psychological exhaustion. For this study, we used two distinct scales at both baseline and follow-up: client-related burnout (six items) and work-related burnout (7 items).

Baseline Client-Related

$N = 2196$

$M(SD) = 41.42(19.80)$

$\alpha = .89$

Baseline Work-Related

$n = 2251$

$M(SD) = 56.44(21.63)$

$\alpha = .90$

Follow-up Client-Related

$n = 205$

$M(SD) = 41.34(19.31)$

$\alpha = .88$

Follow-up Work-Related

$n = 2553$

$M(SD) = 50.03(21.54)$

$\alpha = .91$

Kristensen, T. S., Borritz, M., Villadsen, E., & Christensen, K. B. (2005). The Copenhagen Burnout Inventory: A new tool for the assessment of burnout. *Work & Stress, 19*(3), 192-207. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370500297720>

Coping Strategies

The coping scale was administered to supervisors and caseworkers and measures their use of coping strategies to prevent burnout and/or secondary trauma. The scale consists of 15 items. It used a 5-point frequency scale with "N/A" option.

Baseline:

$n = 1600$

$M(SD) = 3.28(0.80)$

$\alpha = .80$

Follow-up:

$n = 1656$

$M(SD) = 3.30(0.79)$

$\alpha = .89$

Butler Institute for Families (2009). *Coping Strategies [unpublished measure]*. Denver, CO: University of Denver.

Inclusivity

The COHA Inclusivity scale measured the extent to which child welfare staff believe their agencies engage in inclusive practices. It consisted of four items and used a 5-point agreement scale with “N/A” option.

Baseline:

$n = 2759$

$M(SD) = 3.58(0.83)$

$\alpha = .87$

Follow-up:

$n = 2418$

$M(SD) = 3.63(0.72)$

$\alpha = .91$

Butler Institute for Families (2009). *Inclusivity [unpublished measure]*. Denver, CO: University of Denver.

Inter-professional Collaboration

Caseworkers and supervisors completed this measure at follow-up only. It measured their perceptions of the frequency and quality of collaboration with service providers and court professionals. Participants were presented with a list of service providers and asked which they interacted with most frequently. They used a 5-point agreement scale with N/A option to indicate agreement with seven items. The same procedure was then used to rate relationships with court professionals.

Follow-up Service Providers:

$n = 1716$

$M(SD) = 3.98(0.63)$

$\alpha = .93$

Follow-up Court Professionals:

$n = 1738$

$M(SD) = 3.83(0.77)$

$\alpha = .95$

Phillips, J. D. (2017). Brief measure of *inter-professional collaboration [unpublished measure]*. Denver, CO: University of Denver.

Job Stress [adapted from TCU CJ Organizational Readiness for Change Program Staff Version]

This scale measured a participant’s reports of stress and job pressure. It used a 5-point agreement scale with N/A option and included five items at baseline and follow-up.

Baseline:

$n = 2605$

$M(SD) = 3.85(0.88)$

$\alpha = .88$

Follow-up

$n = 2557$

$M(SD) = 3.64(0.77)$

$\alpha = .85$

Butler Institute for Families (2009). *Job Stress [adapted from TCU CJ Organizational Readiness for Change Program Staff Version]*. Denver, CO: University of Denver.

Institute of Behavioral Research (2004). *TCU CJ Organizational Readiness for Change Program Staff Version (TCU CJ ORC-S)*. Fort Worth, TX: Texas Christian University, Institute of Behavioral Research.

Leadership

The Leadership scale measured a child welfare professional's perceptions of agency leadership practices. The measure included 18 items and used a 5-point agreement scale with an N/A option.

Baseline:

$n = 2584$

$M(SD) = 3.38(0.80)$

$\alpha = .96$

Follow-up:

$n = 2625$

$M(SD) = 3.55(0.82)$

$\alpha = .97$

Butler Institute for Families (2014). *Leadership [unpublished measure]*. Denver, CO: University of Denver.

Learning Culture

The Learning Culture scale measured a child welfare professional's perception of how the organization and their colleagues promote and engage in professional learning activities. The measure included 11 items and used a 5-point frequency scale with an N/A option.

Baseline:

$n = 2552$

$M(SD) = 3.06(0.97)$

$\alpha = .93$

Follow-up:

$n = 2564$

$M(SD) = 3.41(1.0)$

$\alpha = .94$

Butler Institute for Families (2014). *Learning Culture [unpublished measure]*. Denver, CO: University of Denver.

NCWWI COHA Exposure to Violence [adapted from Exposure to Violence]

This scale was completed by staff working directly with children and families at the follow-up administration only and only for Sites 2 and 3. The COHA used a modified, six-item version of McPhaul and colleagues' scale to measure child welfare workers' experience of violence or threats on the job in the past six months using a yes/no response format for which responses were summed.

McPhaul, K., Lipsomb, J., & Johnson, J. (2010). Assessing risk for violence on home health visits. *Home Healthcare Nurse, 28*(5), 278-289. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1097/NHH.0b013e3181dbc07b>

Butler Institute for Families (2018). *NCWWI COHA Exposure to Violence [adapted from Exposure to Violence]*. Denver, CO: University of Denver.

NCWWI COHA Intent to Stay

This scale measured a child welfare professional's intention to remain in their current job at their agency and in the field of child welfare related to their commitment to staying and constraints that prevent leaving. It used a 5-point agreement scale and N/A option, as well as some follow-up questions about why they stay, how long they expect to stay, and how often they've thought about or taken action on trying to leave.

Baseline Overall Intent to Stay at Agency:

$n=2581$

$M(SD)=3.21(0.77)$

$\alpha=.77$

Follow-up Overall Intent to Stay at Agency:

$n=2501$

$M(SD)= 3.38(0.69)$

$\alpha=.73$

Baseline Commitment to Agency:

$n=2645$

$M(SD)= 3.52(0.98)$

$\alpha=.88$

Follow-up Commitment to Agency:

$n=2614$

$M(SD)= 3.72(0.94)$

$\alpha=.88$

Baseline Constraint to Agency:

$n=2621$

$M(SD)= 2.90(0.72)$
 $\alpha=.44$

Follow-up Constraint to Agency:
 $n=2545$
 $M(SD)= 3.03(0.72)$
 $\alpha=.51$

Baseline Overall Intent to Stay in Child Welfare:
 $n=2585$
 $M(SD)= 3.20(0.63)$
 $\alpha=.72$

Follow-up Constraint to Agency:
 $n=2339$
 $M(SD)= 3.27(0.62)$
 $\alpha=.69$

Baseline Commitment to Child Welfare:
 $n=2616$
 $M(SD)= 3.47(0.76)$
 $\alpha=.76$

Follow-up Commitment to Child Welfare:
 $n=2374$
 $M(SD)= 3.57(0.75)$
 $\alpha=.73$

Baseline Constraint to Child Welfare:
 $n=2637$
 $M(SD)= 2.85(0.76)$
 $\alpha=.50$

Follow-up Constraint to Child Welfare:
 $n=2383$
 $M(SD)= 2.89(0.76)$
 $\alpha=.50$

Butler Institute for Families (2014). *NCWWI COHA Intent to Stay [unpublished measure]*.
Denver, CO: University of Denver.

NCWWI COHA Job Satisfaction [adapted from Workforce Retention Survey and Job Satisfaction Survey]

This six-item scale included items from the Workforce Retention Survey Instrument and the Job Satisfaction Survey and measured a child welfare professional's overall job satisfaction in terms of personal and relational fulfillment. It used a 5-point agreement scale and N/A option.

Baseline

$n=2649$

$M(SD)=3.59(0.76)$

$\alpha=.85$

Follow-up

$n=2620$

$M(SD)=3.85(0.74)$

$\alpha=.87$

New York Social Work Education Consortium (2001). *Workforce Retention Survey Instrument*. Albany, NY: New York Social Work Education Consortium.

Spector, P. E. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the job satisfaction survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 13(6), 693-713.

Butler Institute for Families (2009). *Job Satisfaction [adapted from Workforce Retention Survey and Job Satisfaction Survey]*. Denver, CO: University of Denver.

NCWWI COHA Organizational Bias [Adapted from Diverse Learning Environment Core Survey]

This measure was used at follow-up only and only for Sites 2 and 3. It measured two dimensions of organizational bias, witnessing bias and experiencing bias. Using yes/no options, participants indicated whether they had witnessed or experienced nine types of bias in the workplace. Responses were summed.

Witnessing Bias

$n=2197$

$M=0.42$

Experiencing Bias

$n=2095$

$M=1.02$

Higher Education Research Institute (2013). *Diverse Learning Environment, Core Survey [unpublished measure]*. Los Angeles, CA: Higher Education Research Institute.

Butler Institute for Families (2018). *NCWWI COHA Organizational Bias [Adapted from Diverse Learning Environment Core Survey]*. Denver, CO: University of Denver.

NCWWI COHA Peer Support [Adapted from Psychosocial Working Conditions Questionnaire]

At baseline, the peer support measure included two subscales: support from co-workers (“Perceived” 7 items on a 5-point agreement scale) and the extent to which peer support is “reciprocal” (7 items on a 5-point frequency scale); as well as nine follow-up questions about reasons for not seeking peer support. At follow-up, peer support was re-conceptualized as “operational support” (5 items) and “social-emotional support” (5 items). Follow-up scales used a 5-point r agreement scale with N/A option.

Baseline Reciprocal:

$n = 2412$

$M(SD) = 3.79(0.83)$

$\alpha = .87$

Baseline Perceived:

$n = 2400$

$M(SD) = 4.16(0.67)$

$\alpha = .93$

Follow-up Operational:

$n = 2362$

$M(SD) = 4.25(0.64)$

$\alpha = .92$

Follow-up Social/Emotional:

$n = 2383$

$M(SD) = 4.25(0.64)$

$\alpha = .93$

Butler Institute for Families (2017). *NCWWI COHA Peer Support [Adapted from Psychosocial Working Conditions Questionnaire]*. Denver, CO: University of Denver.

Widerszal-Bazyl, M. & Cieslak, M. (2000). Monitoring psychosocial stress at work: Development of the Psychosocial Working Conditions Questionnaire. *International Journal of Occupational Safety and Ergonomics*, 6, 59-70. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10803548.2000.11105108>

NCWWI COHA Supervision for Frontline Staff

This measure used a 5-point agreement scale with N/A option to capture a front-line professional’s perception of their supervisor’s knowledge, skills, and support. At baseline, each subscale was measured with six items for a total of 18. At follow-up, the total number of items was reduced to eight.

Baseline Overall Supervision:

$n = 1543$

$M(SD) = 4.02(0.74)$

$\alpha=.97$

Baseline Knowledge:

$n = 1734$

$M(SD) = 4.30(0.67)$

$\alpha=.96$

Baseline Support:

$n = 1669$

$M(SD) = 3.88(0.91)$

$\alpha=.94$

Baseline Skill:

$n = 1764$

$M(SD) = 3.91(0.92)$

$\alpha=.95$

Follow-up Overall Supervision:

$n = 1560$

$M(SD) = 3.98(0.91)$

$\alpha=.96$

Butler Institute for Families (2014). *NCWWI COHA Supervision for Frontline Staff [unpublished measure]*. Denver, CO: University of Denver.

NCWWI COHA Supervision for Managers

This scale measured middle managers' perceptions of their direct supervisor's support and skills using a 5-point agreement scale with N/A option. It included 22 items at baseline and was reduced to 14 at follow-up.

Baseline Total:

$n = 145$

$M(SD) = 3.87(0.73)$

$\alpha=.97$

Follow-up Total:

$n = 123$

$M(SD) = 4.00(0.72)$

$\alpha=.96$

Butler Institute for Families (2014). *NCWWI COHA Supervision for Managers [unpublished measure]*. Denver, CO: University of Denver.

NCWWI COHA Supervision for Supervisors

The Supervision for Supervisors scale was completed by supervisors and measured their perceptions of their immediate supervisor's knowledge, support, and skill, using a 5-point

agreement scale with N/A option. At baseline, the scale contained 17 items. At follow-up, it was reduced to 14 items.

Baseline Total:

$n = 342$

$M(SD) = 3.82(0.68)$

$\alpha = .96$

Follow-up Total:

$n = 341$

$M(SD) = 3.90(0.72)$

$\alpha = .95$

Butler Institute for Families (2014). *NCWWI COHA Supervision for Supervisors [unpublished measure]*. Denver, CO: University of Denver.

NCWWI COHA Workplace Prejudice and Discrimination [Adapted from Workplace Prejudice and Discrimination Inventory]

This measure was modified from James and colleagues' Workplace Prejudice and Discrimination Inventory. It was used at follow-up only. It contained 16 items and used a 5-point agreement scale with N/A option to measure a participant's perceptions of race and ethnicity dynamics at their workplace.

Follow-up:

$n = 2200$

$M(SD) = 2.09(0.72)$

$\alpha = .93$

James, K., Lovato, C., & Cropanzano, R. (1994). Correlational and known-group comparison validation of a workplace prejudice/discrimination inventory. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 24*(17), 1573-1592. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1994.tb01563.x>

Butler Institute for Families (2017). *NCWWI COHA Workplace Prejudice and Discrimination [Adapted from Workplace Prejudice and Discrimination Inventory]*. Denver, CO: University of Denver.

Organizational Climate [Adapted from CRISO Psychological Climate Questionnaire]

This scale contained a total of 32 items across eight subscales and measured a child welfare professional's perception about their work and organizational environment using a 5-point agreement scale with N/A option. The subscales included clarity, conflict, importance, autonomy, challenge, innovation, justice, and support.

Baseline Overall Climate:

$n = 2423$

$M(SD) = 3.48(0.54)$

$\alpha = .93$

Baseline Clarity:

$n = 2683$

$M(SD) = 3.74(0.73)$

$\alpha = .78$

Baseline Conflict:

$n = 2677$

$M(SD) = 3.04(0.84)$

$\alpha = .80$

Baseline Importance:

$n = 2662$

$M(SD) = 4.20(0.57)$

$\alpha = .76$

Baseline Autonomy:

$n = 2651$

$M(SD) = 3.31(0.82)$

$\alpha = .85$

Baseline Challenge:

$n = 2661$

$M(SD) = 4.21(0.60)$

$\alpha = .78$

Baseline Innovation:

$n = 2620$

$M(SD) = 3.25(0.84)$

$\alpha = .87$

Baseline Justice:

$n = 2651 M(SD) = 3.17(0.89)$

$\alpha = .90$

Baseline Support:

$n = 2682$

$M(SD) = 2.97(0.98)$

$\alpha = .92$

Follow-up Overall Climate:

$n = 2485$

$M(SD) = 3.64(0.57)$

$\alpha = .94$

Follow-up Clarity:

$n = 2704$

$M(SD) = 3.82(0.74)$
 $\alpha = .77$

Follow-up Conflict:
 $n = 2681$
 $M(SD) = 2.81(0.86)$
 $\alpha = .80$

Follow-up Autonomy:
 $n = 2681$
 $M(SD) = 3.49(0.81)$
 $\alpha = .86$

Follow-up Importance:
 $n = 2686$
 $M(SD) = 4.19(0.60)$
 $\alpha = .76$

Follow-up Challenge:
 $n = 2697$
 $M(SD) = 4.23(0.62)$
 $\alpha = .82$

Follow-up Innovation:
 $n = 2650$
 $M(SD) = 3.47(0.85)$
 $\alpha = .88$

Follow-up Justice:
 $n = 2675$
 $M(SD) = 3.39(0.91)$
 $\alpha = .91$

Follow-up Support:
 $n = 2719$
 $M(SD) = 3.32(0.99)$
 $\alpha = .92$

Butler Institute for Families (2009). *NCWWI COHA Organizational Climate [Adapted from CRISO Psychological Climate Questionnaire]*. Denver, CO: University of Denver.

Gagnon, S., Paquet, M., Courcy, F., & Parker, C. (2009). Measurement and management of work climate: Cross-validation of the CRISO Psychological Climate Questionnaire. *Healthcare Management Forum*, 22(1), 57-65. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0840-4704\(10\)60294-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0840-4704(10)60294-3)

Physical Environment Survey Instrument

The physical environment tool included 15 items at baseline and 16 items at follow-up. It used a 5-point satisfaction scale with N/A option to measure a child welfare professional's satisfaction with various aspects of their physical work environment (e.g., safety, privacy).

Baseline:

$n = 1688$

$M(SD) = 3.44(0.60)$

$\alpha = .87$

Follow-up:

$n = 1741$

$M(SD) = 3.54(0.61)$

$\alpha = .89$

New York Social Work Education Consortium (2001). *Physical Environment Survey Instrument*. Albany, NY: New York Social Work Education Consortium.

Professional Development and Preparation for Work

Caseworkers completed this 14-item measure, which used a 5-point agreement scale with N/A option to measure their perceptions of training and development opportunities at work. At follow-up, the measure included two additional items about opportunities for mentoring and coaching.

Baseline:

$n = 2492$

$M(SD) = 3.50(0.61)$

$\alpha = .90$

Follow-up:

$n = 1745$

$M(SD) = 3.66(0.64)$

$\alpha = .91$

Butler Institute for Families (2009). *Professional Development and Preparation for Work [unpublished measure]*. Denver, CO: University of Denver.

Professional Sharing and Support

The Professional Sharing and Support subscale measured a child welfare professional's perception of the sharing of information and support among colleagues in their unit. It included 4 items and used a 5-point agreement scale with an N/A option. It was only administered at baseline.

Professional Sharing and Support Baseline:

$n = 2568$

$M(SD) = 4.17(0.65)$

$\alpha = .94$

Ellett, A. J., Ellett, C. D., & Rugutt, J. K. (2003). *A study of personal and organizational factors contributing to employee retention and turnover in child welfare in Georgia [unpublished manuscript]*.

Public Perceptions of Child Welfare Scale

This 14-item scale used a 5-point agreement scale with N/A option to measure a professional's perceptions of how their work is regarded by the public.

Baseline:

$n = 2537$

$M(SD) = 3.01(.54)$

$\alpha = .78$

Follow-up:

$n = 2431$

$M(SD) = 3.04(0.56)$

$\alpha = .79$

Auerbach, C., Zeitlin, W., Augsberger, A., Lawrence, C. K., & Claiborne, N. (2016). Societal factors impacting child welfare: Re-validating the Perceptions of Child Welfare Scale. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 62, 65-71. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2016.01.020>

Readiness for Change

The Readiness for Change scale measured a child welfare professional's perception about practices in their organization that promote an environment suitable for change using a 5-point frequency scale. It contained 10 items at baseline and seven at follow-up.

Baseline:

$n = 2611$

$M(SD) = 2.98(1.03)$

$\alpha = .94$

Follow-up:

$n = 2691$

$M(SD) = 3.09(0.98)$

$\alpha = .93$

Butler Institute for Families (2009). *Readiness for Change [unpublished measure]*. Denver, CO: University of Denver.

Secondary Traumatic Stress Scale

This measure was completed by caseworkers, supervisors, and others working directly with children and families. It measured the degree to which child welfare staff experience symptoms

of secondary trauma. The scale contained 17 items and used a 5-point frequency scale with N/A option plus five follow-up questions related to their own and clients' experiences of trauma.

Baseline

$n = 2091$
 $M(SD) = 40.55(14.51)$
 $\alpha = .94$

Follow-up

$n = 1951$
 $M(SD) = 39.94(14.44)$
 $\alpha = .95$

Bride, B.E., Robinson, M.R., Yegidis, & Figley, C.R. (2004). Development and validation of the Secondary Traumatic Stress Scale. *Research on Social Work Practice, 14*, 27-35. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049731503254106>

Self-efficacy

The self-efficacy scale included 5 items at baseline and follow-up. It used a 5-point agreement scale with N/A option to measure a child welfare professional's perception of their own ability to perform their work.

Baseline:

$n = 2647$
 $M(SD) = 4.12(0.56)$
 $\alpha = .87$

Follow-up:

$n = 2639$
 $M(SD) = 4.20(0.57)$
 $\alpha = .89$

TCU Institute of Behavioral Research (n.d.). *Self-efficacy [unpublished measure]*. Fort Worth, TX: TCU Institute of Behavioral Research.

Shared Vision [Adapted from Professional Organizational Culture Questionnaire-Social Work]

This four-item scale used a 5-point agreement scale to measure a child welfare professional's perception of their unit's cohesion in terms of organizational vision. This scale was used at baseline only.

Baseline

$n = 2451$
 $M(SD) = 3.61(0.68)$
 $\alpha = .85$

Ellett, A. (2009). Intentions to remain employed in child welfare: The role of human caring, self-efficacy beliefs, and professional organizational culture. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 31(1), 78-88. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2008.07.002>

Butler Institute for Families (2009). *Shared Vision [Adapted from Professional Organizational Culture Questionnaire-Social Work]*. Denver, CO: University of Denver.

Supervision Quality and Frequency

This eight-item measure used 5-point agreement and satisfaction scales, and a 6-point frequency scale with N/A option to capture a professional's perception of the frequency of supervision and satisfaction with the quality of supervision.

Butler Institute for Families (2014). *Supervision Quality and Frequency [unpublished measure]*. Denver, CO: University of Denver.

Team Cohesion [Adapted from Physical Environment Survey Instrument]

This scale contained nine items and was used at baseline only. It used a 5-point agreement scale with N/A option to measure a professional's perception of teamwork and collaboration within their unit.

Baseline
 $n = 2451$
 $M(SD) = 3.60(0.71)$
 $\alpha = .94$

New York Social Work Education Consortium (2001). *Physical Environment Survey Instrument*. Albany, NY: New York Social Work Education Consortium.

Butler Institute for Families (2009). *Team Cohesion [Adapted from Physical Environment Survey Instrument]*. Denver, CO: University of Denver.

Time Pressure

The time pressure scale contained five items and used a 5-point frequency scale and N/A option to measure a child welfare professional's perception of their experience with time pressure and its impact on their work.

Baseline:
 $n = 2593$
 $M(SD) = 3.85(1.13)$
 $\alpha = .95$

Follow-up:
 $n = 2523$
 $M(SD) = 3.29(1.20)$
 $\alpha = .95$

Butler Institute for Families (2011). *Time Pressure [unpublished measure]*. Denver, CO: University of Denver.

Related Publications and Final Reports

Users are strongly encouraged to review published works, based upon these data, before doing analyses. To view a complete list of publications for this dataset, please visit our online citations collection called “canDL” at:

<https://www.zotero.org/groups/421939/candl/tags/246-NCWWI/library> or go to the [child abuse and neglect Digital Library \(canDL\) NDACAN webpage](#).

Analytic Considerations

Analysts should note that although two time points were measured, not all participants from the first time point will have data for the second time point. Also, there are participants who completed the second time point but have no data for the first time point. One reason for this is because the study team sought to canvas an entire agency at both time points which means that employees no longer working at the agency would not have been solicited to complete the survey at the second data collection time point and those who started working at the agency after the first data collection effort, would not have data for the first data collection time point. The variable "bothtimes" will assist in determining which participants responded to both data collection time points.

Due to measures taken to protect participant confidentiality, it may not be possible to fully replicate findings from published reports and articles based upon the NCWWI data collection effort.

Analysts should also note that some measures were not used at both timepoints and some measures that were used at both timepoints were modified based on psychometric analyses conducted on the baseline data.

Confidentiality Protection

This dataset has been de-identified by the data contributor, in consultation with NDACAN, prior to archiving. All primary identifiers have been removed and secondary identifiers have also been deleted or recoded to significantly reduce or eliminate disclosure risk. Site identifiers have been removed from the dataset. Users of this dataset are prohibited from attempting to re-identify any site.

Fifty-two baseline and fifty-four follow-up participants were from a small private agency and were deleted from the archival dataset to protect participant confidentiality. Three additional cases were deleted to protect the respondent confidentiality based on the respondent's self-identified gender identity.

Analysts should note that response options presented in the COHA survey instrument may not match data appearing in the data file. In order to protect participant confidentiality, demographic

variables were recoded or deleted from the data file. Continuous variables representing age were recoded to categorical values capturing age ranges. Variables capturing years of service information were partially categorized. Educational attainment variables were recoded. Race variables were collapsed into three race categories: Black or African American, White or Caucasian, or other. Job or position titles or descriptions were recoded.

Extent of Collection

This dataset contains a User's Guide, Codebook, COHA survey instrument, a variable recodes document (named “Variable-recodes”), and one data file named "DS246_NCWWI" in file formats native to SPSS(.sav), Stata(.dta), and SAS(.sas7bdat) as well as import program files for SAS(.sas), SPSS(.sps), and Stata(.do) to read in the text(.dat) data file, and one tab-delimited (.tab) data file for use with spreadsheet programs.

Extent of Processing

The data contributor conducted all data recodes and deletions prior to depositing the data with NDACAN. NDACAN created the User's Guide, Codebook, and data files formatted for SAS, SPSS, Stata, and a text and a tab-delimited data file.

Acronyms and Abbreviations

The following abbreviations and acronyms are used in this document:

Acronym/abbreviation	Definition/meaning
ACF	Administration for Children and Families
canDL	child abuse and neglect Digital Library
CB	Children's Bureau
COHA	Comprehensive Organizational Health Assessment
DHHS	U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
NCWWI	National Child Welfare Workforce Institute
NDACAN	National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect
R	R open source statistical software program
SPSS	IBM SPSS Statistics - software program
SAS	SAS statistical software program
Stata	Stata statistical software program
WE	National Child Welfare Workforce Institute - Workforce Excellence

DATA FILE INFORMATION

File Specifications

There is one data file containing 928 variables and 4,710 records.

Data File Notes

A value of -99 designates a missing data point where a person qualified to receive to a question but did not respond.

**Technical support for this dataset is provided by NDACAN.
Please send your inquiries to NDACANsupport@cornell.edu**