

**Child Welfare Training Assessment/Family Support Training Assessment
On-line Training Evaluation System
Report for Pilot-Testing
January 1 – July 8, 2004**

**Dana Sullivan, MSW, Ph.D.
Assistant Research Professor
Kent School of Social Work
University of Louisville
September 15, 2004**

Table 1. Participation Rates

Instrument	Administrations	Number Sent	Number Participated	Response Rate
Worker Pre-Training Questionnaire (All Divisions)	Total: 18 P&P=7* AMA=4 Food Benefits=5 KTAP=2	Total: 229 P&P= 86 AMA= 54 Food Benefits= 53 KTAP= 36	Total: 64 P&P= 26 AMA= 13 Food Benefits= 20 KTAP= 2 Anonymous/Unknown=3	29%
Protection and Permanency Course I Pre-test (knowledge)	5 (the April 2004 course was cancelled)	50	35	70%
Protection and Permanency Course I Post-test (knowledge)	4	48	21	44%
Protection and Permanency Course II Pre-test (knowledge)	2 (missed January 2004 cohort and the April 2004 course was cancelled)	34	12	35%
Protection and Permanency Course II Post-test (knowledge)	3	46	11	24%
Worker Post-Training Questionnaire (All Divisions)	Total: 14 P&P=7* AMA=3 Food Benefits=3 KTAP=1	Total: 190 P&P=94 AMA=41 Food Benefits=35 KTAP=20	Total: 12 P&P=5 AMA=2 Food Benefits=4 KTAP=1	Less than 1%

*For Protection and Permanency Academy Course II, the worker pre-training questionnaire (all divisions) is sent again for PCWCP students to participate since they did not attend Course II. Therefore, there is some duplication when this instrument is sent.

Predictor Variables

Table 2. Working Pre-Training Questionnaire (All Divisions)

Item	Range, Mean, and Standard Deviation	Description	Interpretation
Age	M = 33.5 (SD =8.5) P&P Only: M = 32 (SD = 8.3) Family Support Only: M = 34.6 (SD = 8.6)	Age of trainee	The mean age of the workers in the sample is about 34 years old. P&P workers tended to be only slightly younger than Family Support workers.
Length of employment with Cabinet (in months)	M = 25.78 months (SD = 50.5), Range = 0 -226 months P&P Only: M = 2.3 (SD = 3.2), Range = 0-14 Family Support Only: M =42.31 (SD – 60.9), Range 0 – 226 months	Length of time worked in months	P&P workers in the sample had been employed a much shorter period of time before attending their training than the Family Support workers.
Training Transfer Inventory: Team Learning Conditions Subscale	M = 50.2 (SD = 12.2) Total possible score=150 Actual Range =13-69	Measures degree of support for learning workers feel from their team (31 items, scale 1-5, with a higher score indicating a more consistent feeling	This is a moderately low score, which means that the team is not as supportive an environment for learning as possible.

		of support for training from the team.	Perhaps the implementation of skills learned in training is not encouraged and knowledge may not be shared within the team. The score indicates a low feeling of support for training from the team.
Supervisory Training Support	M = 66 (SD =12.9) Total possible score=85 Actual Range = 29-85	Measures degree of training support by supervisor	This score is moderately high, indicating that a fairly high degree of support is felt from the supervisor regarding the implementation of the training.
Learning Readiness Subscales: Life skills Self-directedness Support of learning Confidence in learning Composite Score	Cannot analyze, some items from B were missing from instrument and database download; will be reported next quarter	Measures readiness of trainee for learning	
Big 5 personality scale: 40 total items, range per item = 1-5 with 1=strongly disagree and 5=strongly agree Subscales:			
<i>Extraversion</i> (8 items)	3.4 (SD = .72) Range= 1.3-4.9	Personality measure	32% of the sample were below 3 and 68% were above 3. This indicates that 2/3 of the sample rated themselves as extraverted.

<i>Agreeableness</i> <i>(8 items)</i>	4.3 (SD = .59) Range = 1.38-5		Only 3.5% of the sample was below 3, so 97% of the sample rated themselves as being very agreeable.
<i>Conscientiousness</i> <i>(8 items)</i>	4.1 (SD = .60) Range = 2-4		7% of the sample fell below a 3 on this trait. 93% of the sample rated themselves as being highly conscientious.
<i>Neuroticism</i> <i>(8 items)</i>	2.3 (SD = .64) Range = 1.13 - 3.8		88% of the sample rated themselves below a 3 on the trait of neuroticism, so that only 12% rated themselves high on this trait.
<i>Openness to new experiences</i> <i>(8 items)</i>	3.7 (SD = .51) Range = 2.25 -5		Only 9% rated themselves below 3 on this trait. 91% rated themselves as being open to new experiences.
<i>Attachment scale</i> <i>Subscales: anxiety and avoidance</i>	<i>Anxiety:</i> M = 11.4 (SD = 4.3), Total possible score=40, Actual Range = 7-25; <i>Avoidance:</i> M = 14.4 (SD = 55.6), Total possible score = 35, Actual range = 8-28	Measures trainee attachment style , higher numbers indicate a higher score on the style of attachment	The scores were low in anxiety and avoidance indicating that the workers in the sample had moderately secure attachment style. They are more avoidant than anxious regarding client relationships, meaning that if attachment issues are present, it is

			more likely a failure to attach rather than an anxious style of attachment.
Empathy Scale	Subscales: mothers, other perpetrators, and children	Reported only for Protection and Permanency workers due to their working with perpetrators.	These data need to be gathered on a larger sample to determine norms.
Empathy scale— <i>mothers</i>	Distressed: M = 25.1 (SD = 3.1), Total possible score = 40 Actual range = 18-31 Empathy M = 28.5 (SD = 4.2) Total possible score = 40 Actual range = 21-36 Angry: M = 14.6 (SD = 3.4) Total possible score = 25 Actual range = 7-20	Measures emotions toward different parties involved in casework, higher numbers indicate a higher score on the particular trait.	Distress and anger toward mothers were both rated moderately. Empathy was higher than both of these. They experience similar levels of distress and anger toward mothers, but have higher levels of empathy than either distress or anger toward mothers.
Empathy scale— <i>other perpetrators</i>	Distressed: M = 25.7 (SD = 4.6) Total possible score = 40 Actual range = 12-35 Empathy: M = 21.7 (SD = 4.9) Total possible score = 40 Actual range = 10-30 Angry: M = 16.4		They have similar levels of distress and anger toward perpetrators, but lower levels of empathy toward them than toward the mothers.

	(SD = 3.5) Total possible score = 40 Actual range = 8-24		
Empathy scale— <i>children</i>	Distressed: M = 24.5 (SD = 3.9) Total possible score = 40 Actual range = 14-30 Empathy: M = 28.9 (SD = 4.6) Total possible score = 40 Actual range = 20-37 Angry: M = 13.7 (SD = 4.02) Total possible score = 25 Actual range = 5-20		These data indicate that workers may not be differentiating between members of the family in terms of their emotional response to them. They do report lower levels of empathy toward the perpetrator yet anger and distress are about the same for all the subscales. More data need to be gathered on this scale. Generalizations do not need to be made due to the first testing of these scales.

Table 3a. Educational Background: Protection and Permanency (n = 25)

Degree	Percentage of sample
High School	4%
Associate's Degree	0%
BSW	28%
BA other field	44%
MSW	16%
MA other field	8%

A little less than half of the P&P workers held Bachelor's degrees in other fields. The next most frequently occurring degree was the BSW. Only 16% had MSW degrees.

Table 3b. Educational Background: Family Support (n = 38)

Degree	Percentage of sample
High School	27%
Associate's Degree	40%
BSW	3%
BA other field	30%
MSW	0%
MA other field	0%

Forty percent of the Family Support workers in the sample had an Associate's degree, while 30% had a Bachelor's degree. This demonstrates the commitment to learning within this organization.

Table 4. Ethnic Origin (n = 64)

Ethnicity	Percentage of sample
Caucasian	87%
African American	11%
Other	2%

Table 5. Gender (n = 64)

Gender	Percentage of sample
Female	87%
Male	13%

Level 1 Evaluation: Trainee Reactions

Table 6. Worker Post-Questionnaire (All Divisions) (n = 11)

(all questions are based on a 1-5 scale, with 5 being the most favorable response)

Item	Mean (Standard Deviation)
Level of instruction	3.36 (1.0)
Amount of material covered	3.7 (1.7)
Use of role playing/practice exercises- Were they helpful?	3.5 (.82)
Use of role playing/practice exercises- Were they practical?	3.6 (1.03)
Use of handouts- Were they helpful?	4.36 (.67)
Use of handouts-	4.33 (.89)

Were they practical?	
Use of lecturing- Was it helpful?	3.2 (1.4)
Use of lecturing-Was it practical?	2.9 (1.3)
Likely to use knowledge	4.18 (1.1)
Overall rating of training- practical	3.09 (1.1)
Overall rating of training- importance	4.2 (.75)
Overall rating of training- increased knowledge	3.5 (1.2)
Overall rating of training- increased skill	3.17 (.93)
Overall rating of training- increased confidence in casework	3.1 (1.1)

Discussion of Trainee Reactions

Those who completed the post-test evaluating the overall training rated the overall importance of the training and the increase in knowledge after attending training as high. Their overall rating of casework confidence was 3.1 of 5, which indicates a moderately high feeling of increased confidence back on the job.

The participants in this sample found the use of handouts as most helpful and practical and the use of lecturing as least helpful and practical. This is an area of concern, though the response rate is low. More data needs to be gathered to get a more accurate picture of trainee reactions to training, including lecturing.

Level 2 Knowledge Tests

(future reports will correlate these scores with supervisor satisfaction of training, do not have enough supervisor data to complete for this report)

Table 7. Protection and Permanency Academy Course I (January – June 2004)

(excluding unfinished tests)

74 item test

Class Average Pre-test (Standard Deviation) (n = 35)	48 (65%) (SD = 11.5), range = 11-63 (15% -85%)
Class Average Post-test (Standard Deviation) (n = 14, had to exclude 7 unfinished tests)	59 (80%) (SD = 3.5), range = 51-63 (69% - 85%)
Change in score from pre- to post test (Δ)	+11 (+15%)

These scores are the same range of scores and change that have been found over time (approximately 10 years). It is interesting to note that these scores have stayed consistent even though this training is now a course for MSW credit.

Table 8. Protection and Permanency Academy Course II (January – June 2004)

32 item test

Class Average Pre-test (Standard Deviation) (n = 11, excluded one unfinished test)	12 (40)% (SD = 2.4) , range = 8-16
Class Average Post-test (Standard Deviation) (n = 11)	25 (77%) (SD = 2.6), range 21-20
Change in score from pre- to post test (Δ)	+ 13 (+33%)

- Eleven participants completed both the pre- and post-tests for Course I.
- Six participants completed both the pre- and post-tests for Course II.
- Only two participants completed all four tests.

Table 9. Food Benefits (administered on Blackboard)

43 item test

January 2004 cohort (Trainer: Fox)

Class Average Pre-test (n = 13, excluded 1 unfinished test)	26 (60%) (Range = 47% - 86%)
Class Average Post-test (n = 12)	40 (93%) (Range = 65% - 100%)
Change in score from pre- to post test (Δ)	+14 (+33%)

January – February 2004 cohort (Trainer: Parker)

Class Average Pre-test (n = 10)	23 (53%) (Range = 35% - 56%)
Class Average Post-test (n = 9)	39 (92%) (Range = 88% - 100%)
Change in score from pre- to post test (Δ)	+16 (+39%)

February – March 2004 cohort (Fox)

Class Average Pre-test (n = 13)	27 (63%) (Range = 47% - 78%)
Class Average Post-test	Do not have these post-tests
Change in score from pre- to post test (Δ)	Could not calculate

March – April 2004 cohort (Parker)

Class Average Pre-test (n = 5)	27 (64%) (Range = 63% - 70%)
Class Average Post-test (n = 5)	39 (91%) (Range = 86% - 95%)
Change in score from pre- to post test (Δ)	+12 (+27%)

Food Benefits Level 2 Knowledge Tests (continued)

April – May 2004 cohort (Fox)

Class Average Pre-test (n = 7)	23 (54%) (Range = 30% - 65%)
Class Average Post-test (n = 5)	38 (88%) (Range = 77% - 100%)
Change in score from pre- to post test (Δ)	+15 (+34%)

June – July 2004 cohort (Fox)

Class Average Pre-test (n = 13)	24 (58%) (Range = 37% - 79%)
Class Average Post-test (n = 5)	33 (78%) (Range = 72% - 98%)
Change in score from pre- to post test (Δ)	+9 (+20%)

July – August 2004 cohort (Parker)

Class Average Pre-test (n = 7)	27 (62%) (Range = 49% - 72%)
Class Average Post-test (n =)	36 (84%) (Range = 72% - 93%)
Change in score from pre- to post test (Δ)	+9 (+12%)

August – September 2004 cohort (Fox)

Class Average Pre-test (n = 16)	21 (49%) (Range = 33% - 67%)
Class Average Post-test	Not yet administered
Change in score from pre- to post test (Δ)	Not applicable

Each class consistently scores higher on the post-test than on the pre-test. Each group showed gains in knowledge upon completion of the training, across cohorts and trainers.

Table 10. Adult Medical (administered on Blackboard)

53 item test

January – March 2004 cohort

Class Average Pre-test (n = 7)	36 (69%) (Range = 47% - 81%)
Class Average Post-test (n = 9, excluded 1 unfinished test)	38 (75%) (Range 66% - 85%)
Change in score from pre- to post test (Δ)	+2 (+6%)

February – April 2004 cohort

Class Average Pre-test (n = 13)	38 (72%) (Range = 55% - 79%)
Class Average Post-test (n = 18)	42 (80%) (Range 72% - 87%)
Change in score from pre- to post test (Δ)	+4 (+12%)

Adult Medical Level 2 Knowledge Tests (continued)

April – June 2004 cohort

Class Average Pre-test (n = 12)	35 (65%) (Range = 49% - 81%)
Class Average Post-test (n = 15)	41 (78%) (Range 68% - 87%)
Change in score from pre- to post test (Δ)	+6 (+13%)

June 2004 cohort (no post-tests available)

Class Average Pre-test (n = 14)	34 (65%) (Range = 51% - 75%)
Class Average Post-test	Do not have these post-tests
Change in score from pre- to post test (Δ)	Not applicable

July – August 2004 cohort

Class Average Pre-test (n = 11)	37 (69%) (Range = 57% - 81%)
Class Average Post-test (n = 18)	39 (73%) (Range 60% - 91%)
Change in score from pre- to post test (Δ)	+2 (+4%)

August 2004 cohort (not yet taken the post-test)

Class Average Pre-test (n = 3)	33 (63%) (Range = 57% - 81%)
Class Average Post-test	Not yet taken
Change in score from pre- to post test (Δ)	Not applicable

Each group shows a gain in knowledge from pre- to post-test. This is a 53-item test. Perhaps the test needs to be refined to ensure that it reflects the current training curriculum.

Table 11. K-TAP (administered on Blackboard)

40 item test

May -- June 2004 cohort (pilot of test)

Class Average Pre-test (n = 17)	26 (65%) (Range = 45 - 80%)
Class Average Post-test (n = 12)	35 (87%) (Range = 60% - 100%)
Change in score from pre- to post test (Δ)	+9 (22%)

June – July 2004 cohort

Class Average Pre-test (n = 15)	22 (58%) (Range = 23% - 80%)
Class Average Post-test (n = 5)	32 (81%) (Range = 65% - 93%)
Change in score from pre- to post test (Δ)	+10 (+23%)

K-TAP Level 2 Knowledge Tests (continued)

July – August 2004 cohort

Class Average Pre-test (n = 14)	29 (72%) (Range = 63% - 85%)
Class Average Post-test (n = 11)	33 (83%) (Range = 73% - 98%)
Change in score from pre- to post test (Δ)	+4 (+11%)

August - 2004 cohort

Class Average Pre-test (n = 8)	28 (71%) (Range = 43% - 83%)
Class Average Post-test	Not yet administered
Change in score from pre- to post test (Δ)	N/A

This test began in May 2004. Each cohort shows a consistent gain in knowledge from pre- to post-test. Further testing of the instrument needs to be done to ensure it captures the core content of the curriculum.

Level 3: Transfer (Worker and Supervisor) scores will be presented in future reports. These measures are taken at three months post-training. At this report, there is not enough data to perform the analysis (correlation between learning and transfer, correlation between worker ratings of transfer and supervisor ratings of transfer). Supervisor satisfaction with training and correlations between learning and transfer will also be reported after more data are gathered.