

# Statewide Evaluation Results 2014-2015: Healthy Families Oregon Status Report Tables

*Submitted to:*

**Megan Irwin**

Early Learning Systems Director  
Oregon Early Learning Division  
775 Summer Street NE, Ste. 300  
Salem, OR 97301

*Submitted by:*

**NPC Research**

Portland, OR



**NOTE:**

Service Delivery Indicator #3 (Table 1a), Service Delivery Indicator #6 (Table 1b), and Average Monthly Caseload (Table 4b) will not be available until existing program data is uploaded to the new data system. An updated/final version of these tables with those data should be available Spring 2016.

February 2016



NPC Research  
5100 SW Macadam Ave., Ste. 575  
Portland, OR 97239  
(503) 243-2436  
[www.npcresearch.com](http://www.npcresearch.com)



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table 1a. Healthy Families Oregon Service Delivery Indicators 2014-15 .....	1
Table 1b. Healthy Families Oregon Service Delivery Indicators 2014-15 .....	4
Table 2. Healthy Families Oregon Outcome Indicators 2014-15 .....	7
Table 3a. Initial Interest in Healthy Families Oregon Service 2014-15 Cohort (CE 1-1.C) .....	10
Table 3b. Initial Interest in Healthy Families Oregon Service 2014-15 Cohort.....	13
Table 4a. Receipt of Healthy Families Oregon Service and Acceptance Rate 2014-15 Cohort (CE 1-2.A) .....	16
Table 4b. Receipt of Healthy Families Oregon Service and Acceptance Rate 2014-15 Cohort (CE 1-2.A) .....	19
Table 4c. Reasons Parents Decline Home Visiting Services – No First Home Visit 2014-15 Cohort (CE 1-1.E) .....	22
Table 5. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service: Race/Ethnicity 2014-15 Cohort (CE 1-2.B, CE 5-4.B) .....	25
Table 6. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service: Demographic Factors 2014-15 Cohort (CE 1-2.B, CE 5-4.B).....	28
Table 7. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service: Demographic Factors 2014-15 Cohort (CE 1-2.B, CE 5-4.B).....	31
Table 8. Retention Rates for Families Newly Enrolled 2012-13 (CE 3-4.B).....	34
Table 9. Retention Rates for Families Newly Enrolled 2013-14 (CE 3-4.B).....	37
Table 10a. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Race/Ethnicity for Families Enrolled 2013-14 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B).....	40
Table 10b. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Race/Ethnicity for Families Enrolled 2013-14 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B).....	43
Table 11a. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Demographic Factors for Families Enrolled 2013-14 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B) .....	46
Table 11b. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Demographic Factors for Families Enrolled 2013-14 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B) .....	49
Table 12. Participant Reasons for Exiting Program Prior to Program Completion (CE 3-4.B) .....	52
Table 13a. Parent Survey (Kempe) Risk Factors for One or Both Parents/Caregivers in Intensive Service: Childrearing Characteristics .....	55
Table 13b. Parent Survey (Kempe) Risk Factors for One or Both Parents/Caregivers in Intensive Service .....	58



Table 13c. Parent Survey (Kempe) Risk Factors for One or Both Parents/Caregivers in Intensive Service .....	61
Table 14. Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families: Race/Ethnicity.....	64
Table 15a. NBQ Risk Factors and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families.....	67
Table 15b. NBQ Risk Factors and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families .....	70
Table 15c. NBQ Risk Factors and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families.....	73
Table 16. Health Care for Intensive Service Families: Health Care Provider & Well-Child Check-Ups.....	76
Table 17a. Health Care for Intensive Service Families: Health Insurance.....	79
Table 17b. Health Care for Intensive Service Families: Use of Emergency Room in Past 6 Months .....	82
Table 18a. Comparison of Prenatal Care and Smoke Exposure for Families Served Pre- & Postnatal.....	85
Table 18b. Comparison of Health Outcomes for Families Served Pre- & Postnatal.....	88
Table 19. Prenatal Care for Subsequent Births .....	91
Table 20a. HOME Score and Development Screening .....	94
Table 20b. HOME Score and Development Screening.....	97
Table 21. Developmental Screening (ASQ) Results & Subsequent Actions .....	100
Table 22. Social Emotional Developmental Screening (ASQ-SE) Results & Subsequent Actions .....	103
Table 23. Connection to Essential Resources for Intensive Service Families .....	106
Table 24a. Family Outcomes and Life Events at 6 Months .....	109
Table 24b. Family Outcomes and Life Events at 12 Months.....	112
Table 25a. Promotion of Positive Parenting Skills & Helping Children Learn .....	115
Table 25b. Promotion of Positive Parenting Skills & Helping Children Learn .....	118
Table 26a. Ratings of Home Visitor Helpfulness.....	121
Table 26b. Ratings of Home Visitor Helpfulness.....	124
Table 27a. Cultural Competency & Strength Orientation of Home Visitors 2014-15 (CE 5-4.B).....	127
Table 27b. Cultural Competency & Strength Orientation of Home Visitors 2014-15 (CE 5-4.B).....	130

**Table 1a. Healthy Families Oregon Service Delivery Indicators 2014-15**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number Births FY 2014-15</b>	<b>Number (%) Births Screened</b>	<b>Service Delivery Indicator #1  Number (%) Screened Prenatally or Within 2 Weeks of Birth<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Service Delivery Indicator #2  Number (%) Receiving First HV Within 3 Months of Birth<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Service Delivery Indicator #3  % Families with 75% or More of Expected Home Visits Completed<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>Service Delivery Indicator #4  Number (%) IS Families Engaged in Services for 90 Days or Longer (2014-15)<sup>4</sup></b>
<b>Baker, Malheur &amp; Wallowa</b>	193	106 (55%)	88 (83%)	30 (94%)		28 (90%)
Baker	158	0	--	5 (100%)		4 (100%)
Malheur	31	60 (*)	45 (75%)	21 (95%)		19 (86%)
Wallowa	4	46 (*)	43 (93%)	4 (80%)		5 (100%)
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	2,185	249 (11%)	237 (95%)	29 (85%)		37 (93%)
Benton	719	87 (12%)	78 (90%)	12 (80%)		14 (100%)
Linn	1,466	162 (11%)	159 (98%)	17 (89%)		23 (88%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	4,127	708 (17%)	642 (91%)	34 (89%)		45 (94%)
<b>Clatsop &amp; Columbia</b>	960	93 (10%)	70 (76%)	31 (100%)		27 (96%)
Clatsop	426	14 (3%)	11 (79%)	21 (100%)		20 (95%)
Columbia	534	79 (15%)	59 (76%)	10 (100%)		7 (100%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	782	16 (2%)	5 (36%)	7 (54%)		15 (94%)
Coos	607	5 (1%)	1 (20%)	2 (40%)		7 (100%)
Curry	175	11 (6%)	4 (44%)	5 (63%)		8 (89%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	2,324	171 (7%)	149 (88%)	44 (88%)		43 (88%)
Crook	223	14 (6%)	9 (64%)	6 (86%)		4 (67%)
Deschutes	1,812	134 (7%)	125 (94%)	32 (89%)		32 (89%)
Jefferson	289	23 (8%)	15 (65%)	6 (86%)		7 (100%)

\* Counties with more than 100% births screened likely misattributed families to another county in their region.

<sup>1</sup> 80-94% of screens completed prenatally or within 2 weeks of birth adequately meets the Performance Standard.

<sup>2</sup> 80-94% of first home visits completed prenatally or within 3 months of birth adequately meets the Performance Standard.

<sup>3</sup> 75% of families received 75% or more of their expected home visits adequately meets the Performance Standard. However, these data are unavailable until previously collected information is uploaded into the new HFO data management system.

<sup>4</sup> 75-89% of Intensive Service families engaging in services for 90 days or longer (based on date of first home visit) adequately meets the Performance Standard.

**Table 1a. Healthy Families Oregon Service Delivery Indicators 2014-15**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number Births FY 2014-15</b>	<b>Number (%) Births Screened</b>	<b>Service Delivery Indicator #1  Number (%) Screened Prenatally or Within 2 Weeks of Birth<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Service Delivery Indicator #2  Number (%) Receiving First HV Within 3 Months of Birth<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Service Delivery Indicator #3  % Families with 75% or More of Expected Home Visits Completed<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>Service Delivery Indicator #4  Number (%) IS Families Engaged in Services for 90 Days or Longer (2014-15)<sup>4</sup></b>
<b>Douglas, Klamath &amp; Lake</b>	2,013	349 (17%)	336 (97%)	37 (90%)		36 (92%)
Douglas	1,117	202 (18%)	200 (99%)	21 (100%)		18 (90%)
Klamath	813	147 (18%)	136 (94%)	16 (80%)		18 (95%)
Lake	83	0 (0%)	--	--		--
<b>Gilliam, Hood River, Sherman, Wasco &amp; Wheeler</b>	645	220 (34%)	187 (87%)	26 (100%)		27 (100%)
Gilliam	17	9 (53%)	5 (56%)	1 (100%)		1 (100%)
Hood River	294	79 (27%)	67 (85%)	14 (100%)		14 (100%)
Sherman	21	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)		1 (100%)
Wasco	305	131 (43%)	115 (90%)	9 (100%)		10 (100%)
Wheeler	8	0 (0%)	--	1 (100%)		1 (100%)
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	163	18 (11%)	15 (83%)	4 (80%)		4 (80%)
Grant	68	14 (21%)	13 (93%)	3 (100%)		2 (67%)
Harney	95	4 (4%)	2 (50%)	1 (50%)		2 (100%)
<b>Jackson &amp; Josephine</b>	3,190	658 (21%)	602 (91%)	66 (87%)		76 (87%)
Jackson	2,318	451 (19%)	412 (91%)	44 (83%)		54 (84%)
Josephine	872	207 (24%)	190 (92%)	22 (96%)		22 (96%)

<sup>1</sup> 80-94% of screens completed prenatally or within 2 weeks of birth adequately meets the Performance Standard.<sup>2</sup> 80-94% of first home visits completed prenatally or within 3 months of birth adequately meets the Performance Standard.<sup>3</sup> 75% of families received 75% or more of their expected home visits adequately meets the Performance Standard. However, these data are unavailable until previously collected information is uploaded into the new HFO data management system.<sup>4</sup> 75-89% of Intensive Service families engaging in services for 90 days or longer (based on date of first home visit) adequately meets the Performance Standard.

**Table 1a. Healthy Families Oregon Service Delivery Indicators 2014-15**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number Births FY 2014-15</b>	<b>Number (%) Births Screened</b>	<b>Service Delivery Indicator #1  Number (%) Screened Prenatally or Within 2 Weeks of Birth<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Service Delivery Indicator #2  Number (%) Receiving First HV Within 3 Months of Birth<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Service Delivery Indicator #3  % Families with 75% or More of Expected Home Visits Completed<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>Service Delivery Indicator #4  Number (%) IS Families Engaged in Services for 90 Days or Longer (2014-15)<sup>4</sup></b>
<b>Lane</b>	3,703	778 (21%)	736 (95%)	73 (94%)		78 (95%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	421	29 (7%)	17 (59%)	11 (100%)		14 (93%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	5,217	1,139 (22%)	1,106 (98%)	127 (90%)		142 (86%)
Marion	4,396	1,009 (23%)	980 (98%)	116 (90%)		126 (86%)
Polk	821	130 (16%)	126 (98%)	11 (92%)		16 (80%)
<b>Morrow, Umatilla &amp; Union</b>	1,472	353 (24%)	291 (85%)	41 (95%)		41 (93%)
Morrow	165	99 (60%)	64 (70%)	14 (93%)		15 (88%)
Umatilla	1,015	186 (18%)	166 (91%)	24 (96%)		23 (96%)
Union	292	68 (23%)	61 (90%)	3 (100%)		3 (100%)
<b>Multnomah</b>	9,449	2,141 (23%)	2,049 (96%)	181 (89%)		217 (94%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	241	82 (34%)	60 (79%)	17 (85%)		23 (85%)
<b>Washington</b>	7,042	441 (6%)	336 (79%)	54 (83%)		88 (90%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	1,084	130 (12%)	97 (75%)	18 (90%)		22 (92%)
<b>State</b>	<b>45,620</b>	<b>7,681 (17%)</b>	<b>7,023 (92%)</b>	<b>830 (90%)</b>		<b>963 (91%)</b>

<sup>1</sup> 80-94% of screens completed prenatally or within 2 weeks of birth adequately meets the Performance Standard.

<sup>2</sup> 80-94% of first home visits completed prenatally or within 3 months of birth adequately meets the Performance Standard.

<sup>3</sup> 75% of families received 75% or more of their expected home visits adequately meets the Performance Standard. However, these data are unavailable until previously collected information is uploaded into the new HFO data management system.

<sup>4</sup> 75-89% of Intensive Service families engaging in services for 90 days or longer (based on date of first home visit) adequately meets the Performance Standard.

**Table 1b. Healthy Families Oregon Service Delivery Indicators 2014-15**

<i>Program/County</i>	Service Delivery Indicator #5 Number (%) Families Remaining in IS for 12 Months or Longer (enrolled 2013-14) <sup>6</sup>	Service Delivery Indicator #6 Caseload Points Per Home Visitor <sup>7</sup>	Service Delivery Indicator #7 <sup>5</sup>		Service Delivery Indicator #8 Age Appropriate ASQ Screening <sup>8</sup>
			At least 5% Cash	Min. 25% Match	
<b>Baker, Malheur &amp; Wallowa</b>	17 (53%)				27 (46%)
Baker	2 (33%)				8 (44%)
Malheur	15 (68%)		30%	31%	19 (50%)
Wallowa	0 (0%)		92%	92%	0 (0%)
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	15 (68%)				4 (9%)
Benton	12 (86%)		22%	26%	0 (0%)
Linn	3 (38%)		26%	26%	4 (20%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	29 (52%)		13%	28%	51 (53%)
<b>Clatsop &amp; Columbia</b>	13 (65%)				11 (34%)
Clatsop	7 (100%)				3 (30%)
Columbia	6 (46%)		7%	25%	8 (36%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	8 (53%)				1 (3%)
Coos	6 (60%)		30%	30%	0 (0%)
Curry	2 (40%)		30%	30%	1 (5%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	42 (64%)				32 (29%)
Crook	6 (75%)		25%	25%	3 (20%)
Deschutes	32 (62%)		16%	20%	20 (25%)
Jefferson	4 (67%)		34%	38%	9 (53%)

<sup>5</sup> Please note that cash/match data were collected on programs during FY 2014-15 that may not necessarily map onto the current program/regional structure described in this report. Cash/match data reported at the regional level are listed under the region's fiscal lead.

<sup>6</sup> To adequately meet the Performance Standard, 50-64% of families must remain in Intensive Service for 12 months or longer.

<sup>7</sup> Average caseload points of 25-30 (max 25 families) per 1.0 FTE adequately meets the Performance Standard. However, these data are unavailable until previously collected information is uploaded into the new HFO data management system.

<sup>8</sup> 100% of children receiving two developmental screenings each year adequately meets the Performance Standard.



**Table 1b. Healthy Families Oregon Service Delivery Indicators 2014-15**

<i>Program/County</i>	Service Delivery Indicator #5	Service Delivery Indicator #6	Service Delivery Indicator #7 <sup>5</sup>		Service Delivery Indicator #8
	Number (%) Families Remaining in IS for 12 Months or Longer (enrolled 2013-14) <sup>6</sup>	Caseload Points Per Home Visitor <sup>7</sup>	At least 5% Cash	Min. 25% Match	Age Appropriate ASQ Screening <sup>8</sup>
<b>Douglas, Klamath &amp; Lake</b>	27 (63%)				30 (31%)
Douglas	16 (67%)		44%	44%	20 (39%)
Klamath	11 (58%)		34%	41%	10 (22%)
Lake	--		--	--	--
<b>Gilliam, Hood River, Sherman, Wasco &amp; Wheeler</b>	12 (63%)				30 (59%)
Gilliam	0 (0%)		58%	65%	1 (50%)
Hood River	9 (90%)		55%	57%	20 (74%)
Sherman	0 (0%)				1 (50%)
Wasco	2 (33%)				7 (39%)
Wheeler	1 (100%)				1 (50%)
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	5 (83%)				3 (23%)
Grant	3 (75%)		85%	89%	3 (50%)
Harney	2 (100%)		26%	26%	0 (0%)
<b>Jackson &amp; Josephine</b>	16 (29%)				17 (20%)
Jackson	7 (22%)		34%	39%	9 (18%)
Josephine	9 (39%)		76%	77%	8 (22%)

<sup>5</sup> Please note that cash/match data were collected on programs during FY 2014-15 that may not necessarily map onto the current program/regional structure described in this report. Cash/match data reported at the regional level are listed under the region's fiscal lead.

<sup>6</sup> To adequately meet the Performance Standard, 50-64% of families must remain in Intensive Service for 12 months or longer.

<sup>7</sup> Average caseload points of 25-30 (max 25 families) per 1.0 FTE adequately meets the Performance Standard. However, these data are unavailable until previously collected information is uploaded into the new HFO data management system.

<sup>8</sup> 100% of children receiving two developmental screenings each year adequately meets the Performance Standard.

**Table 1b. Healthy Families Oregon Service Delivery Indicators 2014-15**

<i>Program/County</i>	Service Delivery Indicator #5 Number (%) Families Remaining in IS for 12 Months or Longer (enrolled 2013-14) <sup>6</sup>	Service Delivery Indicator #6 Caseload Points Per Home Visitor <sup>7</sup>	Service Delivery Indicator #7 <sup>5</sup>		Service Delivery Indicator #8 Age Appropriate ASQ Screening <sup>8</sup>
			At least 5% Cash	Min. 25% Match	
<b>Lane</b>	36 (51%)		27%	31%	56 (51%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	10 (67%)		86%	91%	9 (23%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	44 (40%)				46 (23%)
Marion	39 (40%)		34%	41%	38 (23%)
Polk	5 (42%)		72%	79%	8 (29%)
<b>Morrow, Umatilla &amp; Union</b>	15 (48%)				1 (1%)
Morrow	4 (50%)		136%	136%	1 (6%)
Umatilla	10 (53%)		13%	23%	0 (0%)
Union	1 (25%)		32%	36%	0 (0%)
<b>Multnomah</b>	98 (56%)		34%	38%	147 (39%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	17 (63%)		45%	45%	13 (28%)
<b>Washington</b>	47 (61%)		19%	26%	57 (39%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	9 (56%)		43%	56%	11 (29%)
<b>State</b>	<b>460 (54%)</b>		<b>43%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>546 (33%)</b>

<sup>5</sup> Please note that cash/match data were collected on programs during FY 2014-15 that may not necessarily map onto the current program/regional structure described in this report. Cash/match data reported at the regional level are listed under the region's fiscal lead.

<sup>6</sup> To adequately meet the Performance Standard, 50-64% of families must remain in Intensive Service for 12 months or longer.

<sup>7</sup> Average caseload points of 25-30 (max 25 families) per 1.0 FTE adequately meets the Performance Standard. However, these data are unavailable until previously collected information is uploaded into the new HFO data management system.

<sup>8</sup> 100% of children receiving two developmental screenings each year adequately meets the Performance Standard.

**Table 2. Healthy Families Oregon Outcome Indicators 2014-15**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Outcome Indicator #1  Number (%) Children with Primary Care Provider<sup>9</sup></b>	<b>Outcome Indicator #2  Number (%) Children with Up- to-Date Immunizations<sup>10</sup></b>	<b>Outcome Indicator #3  Number (%) Parents Reading to Child 3x Per Week or More<sup>11</sup></b>	<b>Outcome Indicator #4  Number (%) Parents Reporting Positive Parent-Child Interactions<sup>12</sup></b>	<b>Outcome Indicator #5  Number (%) Parents with Reporting Reduced Parenting Stress<sup>13</sup></b>	<b>Outcome Indicator #6  Number (%) Parents Reporting HFA Oregon Helped with Social Support<sup>14</sup></b>
<b>Baker, Malheur &amp; Wallowa</b>	77 (100%)	54 (90%)	50 (89%)	53 (95%)	29 (62%)	30 (88%)
Baker	22 (100%)	14 (88%)	15 (88%)	16 (94%)	9 (56%)	15 (100%)
Malheur	50 (100%)	37 (93%)	32 (91%)	33 (94%)	17 (61%)	12 (75%)
Wallowa	5 (100%)	3 (75%)	3 (75%)	4 (100%)	3 (100%)	3 (100%)
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	61 (100%)	34 (89%)	38 (95%)	39 (98%)	21 (75%)	29 (91%)
Benton	30 (100%)	16 (89%)	19 (100%)	19 (100%)	6 (60%)	17 (100%)
Linn	31 (100%)	18 (90%)	19 (90%)	20 (95%)	15 (83%)	12 (80%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	123 (98%)	85 (81%)	94 (88%)	98 (92%)	61 (63%)	82 (89%)
<b>Clatsop &amp; Columbia</b>	52 (100%)	29 (94%)	31 (100%)	31 (100%)	21 (72%)	22 (96%)
Clatsop	28 (100%)	13 (87%)	15 (100%)	15 (100%)	11 (79%)	9 (100%)
Columbia	24 (100%)	16 (100%)	16 (100%)	16 (100%)	10 (67%)	13 (93%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	16 (84%)	4 (100%)	7 (78%)	8 (89%)	3 (75%)	6 (67%)
Coos	2 (100%)	--	--	--	--	0 (0%)
Curry	14 (82%)	4 (100%)	7 (78%)	8 (89%)	3 (75%)	6 (86%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	124 (97%)	75 (85%)	79 (95%)	80 (98%)	44 (66%)	74 (97%)
Crook	14 (100%)	7 (70%)	10 (100%)	10 (100%)	4 (57%)	6 (75%)
Deschutes	91 (96%)	54 (86%)	56 (95%)	56 (97%)	31 (65%)	54 (100%)
Jefferson	19 (100%)	14 (93%)	13 (93%)	14 (100%)	9 (75%)	14 (100%)

<sup>9</sup> 80-94% of children with a primary care provider meets the Performance Standard.<sup>10</sup> 80-89% of children with up-to-date immunizations meets the Performance Standard.<sup>11</sup> 80-89% of parents who report they read to their children 3 times a week or more (as reported on the Parent Survey) meets the Performance Standard.<sup>12</sup> 80-89% of parents reporting positive parent-child interactions meets the Performance Standard.<sup>13</sup> 50-64% of parents reporting reduced parenting stress meets the Performance Standard.<sup>14</sup> 80-89% of parents reporting Healthy Families Oregon helped with social support meets the Performance Standard.

**Table 2. Healthy Families Oregon Outcome Indicators 2014-15**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Outcome Indicator #1  Number (%) Children with Primary Care Provider<sup>9</sup></b>	<b>Outcome Indicator #2  Number (%) Children with Up- to-Date Immunizations<sup>10</sup></b>	<b>Outcome Indicator #3  Number (%) Parents Reading to Child 3x Per Week or More<sup>11</sup></b>	<b>Outcome Indicator #4  Number (%) Parents Reporting Positive Parent-Child Interactions<sup>12</sup></b>	<b>Outcome Indicator #5  Number (%) Parents with Reporting Reduced Parenting Stress<sup>13</sup></b>	<b>Outcome Indicator #6  Number (%) Parents Reporting HFA Oregon Helped with Social Support<sup>14</sup></b>
<b>Douglas, Klamath &amp; Lake</b>	120 (98%)	63 (85%)	68 (91%)	72 (96%)	45 (79%)	57 (97%)
Douglas	60 (97%)	34 (81%)	39 (95%)	39 (95%)	27 (75%)	26 (93%)
Klamath	60 (100%)	29 (91%)	29 (85%)	33 (97%)	18 (86%)	31 (100%)
Lake	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Gilliam, Hood River, Sherman, Wasco &amp; Wheeler</b>	71 (100%)	48 (92%)	53 (96%)	54 (98%)	35 (69%)	44 (94%)
Gilliam	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Hood River	40 (100%)	30 (97%)	30 (94%)	32 (100%)	21 (70%)	28 (100%)
Sherman	3 (100%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	1 (50%)	1 (100%)
Wasco	24 (100%)	13 (81%)	17 (100%)	16 (94%)	12 (71%)	13 (87%)
Wheeler	2 (100%)	1 (100%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (50%)
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	14 (93%)	10 (83%)	12 (100%)	12 (100%)	6 (60%)	8 (100%)
Grant	7 (88%)	6 (86%)	7 (100%)	7 (100%)	4 (57%)	5 (100%)
Harney	7 (100%)	4 (80%)	5 (100%)	5 (100%)	2 (67%)	3 (100%)
<b>Jackson &amp; Josephine</b>	133 (99%)	66 (88%)	66 (89%)	70 (95%)	40 (62%)	62 (98%)
Jackson	82 (99%)	29 (81%)	29 (81%)	35 (97%)	16 (55%)	28 (97%)
Josephine	51 (100%)	37 (95%)	37 (97%)	35 (92%)	24 (67%)	34 (100%)

<sup>9</sup> 80-94% of children with a primary care provider meets the Oregon Performance Standard.

<sup>10</sup> 80-89% of children with up-to-date immunizations meets the Oregon Performance Standard.

<sup>11</sup> 80-89% of parents who report they read to their children 3 times a week or more (as reported on the Parent Survey) meets the Oregon Performance Standard.

<sup>12</sup> 80-89% of parents reporting positive parent-child interactions meets the Oregon Performance Standard.

<sup>13</sup> 50-64% of parents reporting reduced parenting stress meets the Oregon Performance Standard.

<sup>14</sup> 80-89% of parents reporting Healthy Families Oregon helped with social support meets the Oregon Performance Standard.

**Table 2. Healthy Families Oregon Outcome Indicators 2014-15**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Outcome Indicator #1  Number (%) Children with Primary Care Provider<sup>9</sup></b>	<b>Outcome Indicator #2  Number (%) Children with Up- to-Date Immunizations<sup>10</sup></b>	<b>Outcome Indicator #3  Number (%) Parents Reading to Child 3x Per Week or More<sup>11</sup></b>	<b>Outcome Indicator #4  Number (%) Parents Reporting Positive Parent-Child Interactions<sup>12</sup></b>	<b>Outcome Indicator #5  Number (%) Parents with Reporting Reduced Parenting Stress<sup>13</sup></b>	<b>Outcome Indicator #6  Number (%) Parents Reporting HFA Oregon Helped with Social Support<sup>14</sup></b>
<b>Lane</b>	170 (100%)	119 (89%)	114 (88%)	120 (92%)	71 (59%)	112 (96%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	45 (98%)	33 (87%)	38 (97%)	39 (100%)	19 (59%)	26 (79%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	264 (99%)	154 (92%)	127 (81%)	141 (91%)	88 (65%)	115 (88%)
Marion	234 (98%)	135 (91%)	111 (80%)	123 (90%)	78 (66%)	100 (88%)
Polk	30 (100%)	19 (100%)	16 (89%)	18 (100%)	10 (59%)	15 (88%)
<b>Morrow, Umatilla &amp; Union</b>	77 (99%)	37 (84%)	40 (95%)	41 (98%)	20 (67%)	25 (86%)
Morrow	21 (100%)	13 (100%)	13 (100%)	13 (100%)	7 (64%)	7 (100%)
Umatilla	36 (97%)	13 (76%)	14 (88%)	15 (94%)	8 (80%)	10 (83%)
Union	20 (100%)	11 (79%)	13 (100%)	13 (100%)	5 (56%)	8 (80%)
<b>Multnomah</b>	535 (98%)	344 (85%)	340 (92%)	352 (96%)	214 (66%)	253 (94%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	54 (98%)	35 (85%)	35 (88%)	37 (93%)	25 (74%)	36 (100%)
<b>Washington</b>	202 (100%)	135 (93%)	125 (93%)	126 (94%)	74 (65%)	106 (92%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	52 (100%)	31 (82%)	31 (89%)	32 (91%)	21 (72%)	27 (90%)
<b>State</b>	<b>2,190 (99%)</b>	<b>1,356 (87%)</b>	<b>1,348 (91%)</b>	<b>1,405 (95%)</b>	<b>837 (66%)</b>	<b>1,114 (93%)</b>

<sup>9</sup> 80-94% of children with a primary care provider meets the Oregon Performance Standard.<sup>10</sup> 80-89% of children with up-to-date immunizations meets the Oregon Performance Standard.<sup>11</sup> 80-89% of parents who report they read to their children 3 times a week or more (as reported on the Parent Survey) meets the Oregon Performance Standard.<sup>12</sup> 80-89% of parents reporting positive parent-child interactions meets the Oregon Performance Standard.<sup>13</sup> 50-64% of parents reporting reduced parenting stress meets the Oregon Performance Standard.<sup>14</sup> 80-89% of parents reporting Healthy Families Oregon helped with social support meets the Oregon Performance Standard.

**Table 3a. Initial Interest in Healthy Families Oregon Service 2014-15 Cohort (CE 1-1.C)**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number of Families Eligible for Intensive Service: High Risk Screen (% of All Screens)</b>	<b>Total (% of Eligible) Not Offered Intensive Service at Time of Screen</b>	<i>Number (% of Not Offered) Not Offered: Already Enrolled in Another Service</i>	<i>Number (% of Not Offered) Not Offered: NBQ was Incorrectly Scored as Negative</i>	<i>Number (% of Not Offered): Referred to Another Non-HFO Service</i>	<b>Total (% of Eligible) Offered Intensive Service (at Time of Screening)</b>
<b>Baker, Malheur &amp; Wallowa</b>	64 (65%)	9 (14%)	3 (33%)	6 (67%)	0 (0%)	55 (86%)
Baker	5 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	5 (100%)
Malheur	36 (62%)	9 (25%)	3 (33%)	6 (67%)	0 (0%)	27 (75%)
Wallowa	23 (66%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	23 (100%)
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	128 (57%)	5 (4%)	0 (0%)	4 (80%)	1 (20%)	123 (96%)
Benton	38 (51%)	2 (5%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	36 (95%)
Linn	90 (59%)	3 (3%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	87 (97%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	377 (56%)	15 (4%)	1 (7%)	13 (87%)	1 (7%)	362 (96%)
<b>Clatsop &amp; Columbia</b>	79 (86%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	78 (99%)
Clatsop	24 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	24 (100%)
Columbia	55 (81%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	54 (98%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	13 (87%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	13 (100%)
Coos	5 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	5 (100%)
Curry	8 (80%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	8 (100%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	128 (83%)	5 (4%)	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	3 (60%)	123 (96%)
Crook	12 (92%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	11 (92%)
Deschutes	97 (80%)	1 (1%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	96 (99%)
Jefferson	19 (95%)	3 (16%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	2 (67%)	16 (84%)

**Table 3a. Initial Interest in Healthy Families Oregon Service 2014-15 Cohort (CE 1-1.C)**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number of Families Eligible for Intensive Service: High Risk Screen (% of All Screens)</b>	<b>Total (% of Eligible) Not Offered Intensive Service at Time of Screen</b>	<i>Number (% of Not Offered) Not Offered: Already Enrolled in Another Service</i>	<i>Number (% of Not Offered) Not Offered: NBQ was Incorrectly Scored as Negative</i>	<i>Number (% of Not Offered): Referred to Another Non-HFO Service</i>	<b>Total (% of Eligible) Offered Intensive Service (at Time of Screening)</b>
<b>Douglas, Klamath &amp; Lake</b>	198 (68%)	36 (18%)	7 (19%)	22 (61%)	7 (19%)	162 (82%)
Douglas	104 (72%)	14 (13%)	5 (36%)	6 (43%)	3 (21%)	90 (87%)
Klamath	94 (64%)	22 (23%)	2 (9%)	16 (73%)	4 (18%)	72 (77%)
Lake	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Gilliam, Hood River, Sherman, Wasco &amp; Wheeler</b>	137 (64%)	4 (3%)	1 (25%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	133 (97%)
Gilliam	6 (75%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	6 (100%)
Hood River	43 (56%)	2 (5%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	41 (95%)
Sherman	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	1 (100%)
Wasco	86 (68%)	2 (2%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	84 (98%)
Wheeler	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	1 (100%)
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	12 (86%)	3 (25%)	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	9 (75%)
Grant	8 (80%)	3 (38%)	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	5 (63%)
Harney	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	4 (100%)
<b>Jackson &amp; Josephine</b>	359 (67%)	41 (11%)	0 (0%)	20 (49%)	21 (51%)	318 (89%)
Jackson	236 (71%)	16 (7%)	0 (0%)	16 (100%)	0 (0%)	220 (93%)
Josephine	123 (61%)	25 (20%)	0 (0%)	4 (16%)	21 (84%)	98 (80%)

**Table 3a. Initial Interest in Healthy Families Oregon Service 2014-15 Cohort (CE 1-1.C)**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number of Families Eligible for Intensive Service: High Risk Screen (% of All Screens)</b>	<b>Total (% of Eligible) Not Offered Intensive Service at Time of Screen</b>	<i>Number (% of Not Offered) Not Offered: Already Enrolled in Another Service</i>	<i>Number (% of Not Offered) Not Offered: NBQ was Incorrectly Scored as Negative</i>	<i>Number (% of Not Offered): Referred to Another Non-HFO Service</i>	<b>Total (% of Eligible) Offered Intensive Service (at Time of Screening)</b>
<b>Lane</b>	471 (61%)	35 (7%)	17 (49%)	18 (51%)	0 (0%)	436 (93%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	16 (67%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	15 (94%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	919 (84%)	152 (17%)	1 (1%)	23 (15%)	128 (84%)	767 (83%)
Marion	817 (84%)	141 (17%)	0 (0%)	20 (14%)	121 (86%)	676 (83%)
Polk	102 (83%)	11 (11%)	1 (9%)	3 (27%)	7 (64%)	91 (89%)
<b>Morrow, Umatilla &amp; Union</b>	200 (67%)	41 (21%)	6 (15%)	10 (24%)	25 (61%)	159 (80%)
Morrow	64 (67%)	11 (17%)	0 (0%)	7 (64%)	4 (36%)	53 (83%)
Umatilla	119 (78%)	28 (24%)	4 (14%)	3 (11%)	21 (75%)	91 (76%)
Union	17 (33%)	2 (12%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	15 (88%)
<b>Multnomah</b>	1,377 (64%)	207 (15%)	91 (44%)	115 (56%)	1 (0%)	1,170 (85%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	48 (79%)	4 (8%)	0 (0%)	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	44 (92%)
<b>Washington</b>	301 (74%)	16 (5%)	1 (6%)	15 (94%)	0 (0%)	285 (95%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	80 (64%)	8 (10%)	1 (13%)	6 (75%)	1 (13%)	72 (90%)
<b>State</b>	<b>4,907 (68%)</b>	<b>583 (12%)</b>	<b>132 (23%)</b>	<b>262 (45%)</b>	<b>189 (32%)</b>	<b>4,324 (88%)</b>



**Table 3b. Initial Interest in Healthy Families Oregon Service 2014-15 Cohort**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Total (% of Offered at Screen) Declined At Screen</b>	<b>Number (% of Declined) Declined: Too Busy</b>	<b>Number (% of Declined) Declined: Feels Services Not Needed</b>	<b>Number (% of Declined) Declined: Other</b>
<b>Baker, Malheur &amp; Wallowa</b>	15	1 (7%)	11 (73%)	3 (20%)
Baker	--	--	--	--
Malheur	9	1 (11%)	8 (89%)	0 (0%)
Wallowa	6	0 (0%)	3 (50%)	3 (50%)
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	62	0 (0%)	8 (13%)	54 (87%)
Benton	13	0 (0%)	4 (31%)	9 (69%)
Linn	49	0 (0%)	4 (8%)	45 (92%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	99	3 (3%)	84 (85%)	12 (12%)
<b>Clatsop &amp; Columbia</b>	4	0 (0%)	3 (75%)	1 (25%)
Clatsop	--	--	--	--
Columbia	4	0 (0%)	3 (75%)	1 (25%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	--	--	--	--
Coos	--	--	--	--
Curry	--	--	--	--
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	7	0 (0%)	4 (57%)	3 (43%)
Crook	1	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
Deschutes	--	--	--	--
Jefferson	6	0 (0%)	3 (50%)	3 (50%)

**Table 3b. Initial Interest in Healthy Families Oregon Service 2014-15 Cohort**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Total (% of Offered at Screen) Declined At Screen</b>	<b>Number (% of Declined) Declined: Too Busy</b>	<b>Number (% of Declined) Declined: Feels Services Not Needed</b>	<b>Number (% of Declined) Declined: Other</b>
<b>Douglas, Klamath &amp; Lake</b>	90	16 (18%)	28 (31%)	46 (51%)
Douglas	61	12 (20%)	16 (26%)	33 (54%)
Klamath	29	4 (14%)	12 (41%)	13 (45%)
Lake	--	--	--	--
<b>Gilliam, Hood River, Sherman, Wasco &amp; Wheeler</b>	21	3 (14%)	13 (62%)	5 (24%)
Gilliam	5	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	3 (60%)
Hood River	6	0 (0%)	5 (83%)	1 (17%)
Sherman	1	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
Wasco	9	2 (22%)	6 (67%)	1 (11%)
Wheeler	--	--	--	--
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	1	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
Grant	1	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
Harney	--	--	--	--
<b>Jackson &amp; Josephine</b>	97	3 (3%)	10 (10%)	84 (87%)
Jackson	32	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	32 (100%)
Josephine	65	3 (5%)	10 (15%)	52 (80%)

**Table 3b. Initial Interest in Healthy Families Oregon Service 2014-15 Cohort**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Total (% of Offered at Screen) Declined At Screen</b>	<b>Number (% of Declined) Declined: Too Busy</b>	<b>Number (% of Declined) Declined: Feels Services Not Needed</b>	<b>Number (% of Declined) Declined: Other</b>
<b>Lane</b>	216	11 (5%)	181 (84%)	24 (11%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	1	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	51	1 (2%)	13 (25%)	37 (73%)
Marion	49	1 (2%)	13 (27%)	35 (71%)
Polk	2	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
<b>Morrow, Umatilla &amp; Union</b>	32	3 (9%)	14 (44%)	15 (47%)
Morrow	22	2 (9%)	8 (36%)	12 (55%)
Umatilla	8	1 (13%)	5 (63%)	2 (25%)
Union	2	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)
<b>Multnomah</b>	564	0 (0%)	562 (100%)	2 (0%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	2	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)
<b>Washington</b>	8	1 (13%)	3 (38%)	4 (50%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	12	1 (8%)	2 (17%)	9 (75%)
<b>State</b>	<b>1,282</b>	<b>44 (3%)</b>	<b>938 (73%)</b>	<b>300 (23%)</b>

**Table 4a. Receipt of Healthy Families Oregon Service and Acceptance Rate 2014-15 Cohort (CE 1-2.A)**

<i><b>Program/County</b></i>	<i><b>Total Interested in Service (% of Those Offered at Screen)</b></i>	<i><b>Number (% of interested) Not Offered at Follow Up: Caseload Full</b></i>	<i><b>Number (% of Interested) Not Offered at Follow Up: Didn't Meet Local Eligibility</b></i>	<i><b>Number (% of Interested) Not Offered at Follow Up: Unable to Contact</b></i>
<b>Baker, Malheur &amp; Wallowa</b>	40 (73%)	--	--	--
Baker	5 (100%)	--	--	--
Malheur	18 (67%)	--	--	--
Wallowa	17 (74%)	--	--	--
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	61 (50%)	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)
Benton	23 (64%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)
Linn	38 (44%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	263 (73%)	66 (64%)	0 (0%)	37 (36%)
<b>Clatsop &amp; Columbia</b>	74 (95%)	23 (92%)	0 (0%)	2 (8%)
Clatsop	24 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Columbia	50 (93%)	23 (96%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	13 (100%)	--	--	--
Coos	5 (100%)	--	--	--
Curry	8 (100%)	--	--	--
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	116 (94%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	9 (100%)
Crook	10 (91%)	--	--	--
Deschutes	96 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	8 (100%)
Jefferson	10 (63%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)

**Table 4a. Receipt of Healthy Families Oregon Service and Acceptance Rate 2014-15 Cohort (CE 1-2.A)**

<b>Program/County</b>	<b>Total Interested in Service (% of Those Offered at Screen)</b>	<i>Number (% of interested) Not Offered at Follow Up: Caseload Full</i>	<i>Number (% of Interested) Not Offered at Follow Up: Didn't Meet Local Eligibility</i>	<i>Number (% of Interested) Not Offered at Follow Up: Unable to Contact</i>
<b>Douglas, Klamath &amp; Lake</b>	72 (44%)	5 (83%)	0 (0%)	1 (17%)
Douglas	29 (32%)	5 (83%)	0 (0%)	1 (17%)
Klamath	43 (60%)	--	--	--
Lake	--	--	--	--
<b>Gilliam, Hood River, Sherman, Wasco &amp; Wheeler</b>	112 (84%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	18 (100%)
Gilliam	1 (17%)	--	--	--
Hood River	35 (85%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	8 (100%)
Sherman	0 (0%)	--	--	--
Wasco	75 (89%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	10 (100%)
Wheeler	1 (100%)	--	--	--
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	8 (89%)	--	--	--
Grant	4 (80%)	--	--	--
Harney	4 (100%)	--	--	--
<b>Jackson &amp; Josephine</b>	221 (69%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
Jackson	188 (85%)	--	--	--
Josephine	33 (34%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)

**Table 4a. Receipt of Healthy Families Oregon Service and Acceptance Rate 2014-15 Cohort (CE 1-2.A)**

<i><b>Program/County</b></i>	<i><b>Total Interested in Service (% of Those Offered at Screen)</b></i>	<i><b>Number (% of interested) Not Offered at Follow Up: Caseload Full</b></i>	<i><b>Number (% of Interested) Not Offered at Follow Up: Didn't Meet Local Eligibility</b></i>	<i><b>Number (% of Interested) Not Offered at Follow Up: Unable to Contact</b></i>
<b>Lane</b>	220 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	52 (100%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	14 (93%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	716 (93%)	0 (0%)	1 (0%)	310 (100%)
Marion	627 (93%)	0 (0%)	1 (0%)	272 (100%)
Polk	89 (98%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	38 (100%)
<b>Morrow, Umatilla &amp; Union</b>	127 (80%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	20 (95%)
Morrow	31 (58%)	--	--	--
Umatilla	83 (91%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	18 (95%)
Union	13 (87%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
<b>Multnomah</b>	606 (52%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	50 (100%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	42 (95%)	0 (0%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)
<b>Washington</b>	277 (97%)	0 (0%)	14 (26%)	39 (74%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	60 (83%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
<b>State</b>	<b>3,042 (70%)</b>	<b>98 (15%)</b>	<b>17 (3%)</b>	<b>545 (83%)</b>

**Table 4b. Receipt of Healthy Families Oregon Service and Acceptance Rate 2014-15 Cohort (CE 1-2.A)**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Total Interested <u>and</u> Offered at Follow Up</b>	<b>Number (% of Offered and Interested in Service at Screening) Received First Home Visit (Accepted Services)</b>	<b>Total Receiving Home Visits This FY (Regardless of First Home Visit Date)<sup>15</sup></b>	<b>Average Monthly Caseload*</b>
<b>Baker, Malheur &amp; Wallowa</b>	40	28 (70%)	94	
Baker	5	5 (100%)	22	
Malheur	18	18 (100%)	62	
Wallowa	17	5 (29%)	10	
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	58	32 (55%)	82	
Benton	21	14 (67%)	40	
Linn	37	18 (49%)	42	
<b>Clackamas</b>	160	39 (24%)	131	
<b>Clatsop &amp; Columbia</b>	49	31 (63%)	62	
Clatsop	23	21 (91%)	31	
Columbia	26	10 (38%)	31	
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	13	13 (100%)	42	
Coos	5	5 (100%)	16	
Curry	8	8 (100%)	26	
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	107	47 (44%)	146	
Crook	10	7 (70%)	20	
Deschutes	88	33 (38%)	105	
Jefferson	9	7 (78%)	21	

\* These data are unavailable until previously collected information is uploaded into the new HFO data management system.

<sup>15</sup> Total number of families receiving home visits this fiscal year includes any family who received at least one home visit between July 2014 and June 2015, regardless of the month/year they originally entered Healthy Families Oregon Services.

**Table 4b. Receipt of Healthy Families Oregon Service and Acceptance Rate 2014-15 Cohort (CE 1-2.A)**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Total Interested <u>and</u> Offered at Follow Up</b>	<b>Number (% of Offered and Interested in Service at Screening) Received First Home Visit (Accepted Services)</b>	<b>Total Receiving Home Visits This FY (Regardless of First Home Visit Date)<sup>15</sup></b>	<b>Average Monthly Caseload*</b>
<b>Douglas, Klamath &amp; Lake</b>	66	39 (59%)	138	
Douglas	23	21 (91%)	68	
Klamath	43	18 (42%)	70	
Lake	--	--	--	
<b>Gilliam, Hood River, Sherman, Wasco &amp; Wheeler</b>	94	25 (27%)	77	
Gilliam	1	1 (100%)	3	
Hood River	27	14 (52%)	43	
Sherman	--	--	3	
Wasco	65	9 (14%)	26	
Wheeler	1	1 (100%)	2	
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	8	5 (63%)	18	
Grant	4	3 (75%)	9	
Harney	4	2 (50%)	9	
<b>Jackson &amp; Josephine</b>	219	75 (34%)	162	
Jackson	188	53 (28%)	105	
Josephine	31	22 (71%)	57	

\* These data are unavailable until previously collected information is uploaded into the new HFO data management system.

<sup>15</sup> Total number of families receiving home visits this fiscal year includes any family who received at least one home visit between July 2014 and June 2015, regardless of the month/year they originally entered Healthy Families Oregon Services.



**Table 4b. Receipt of Healthy Families Oregon Service and Acceptance Rate 2014-15 Cohort (CE 1-2.A)**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Total Interested <u>and</u> Offered at Follow Up</b>	<b>Number (% of Offered and Interested in Service at Screening) Received First Home Visit (Accepted Services)</b>	<b>Total Receiving Home Visits This FY (Regardless of First Home Visit Date)<sup>15</sup></b>	<b>Average Monthly Caseload*</b>
<b>Lane</b>	168	76 (45%)	187	
<b>Lincoln</b>	12	10 (83%)	48	
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	405	138 (34%)	322	
Marion	354	125 (35%)	284	
Polk	51	13 (25%)	38	
<b>Morrow, Umatilla &amp; Union</b>	106	40 (38%)	107	
Morrow	31	12 (39%)	30	
Umatilla	64	25 (39%)	56	
Union	11	3 (27%)	21	
<b>Multnomah</b>	556	199 (36%)	583	
<b>Tillamook</b>	38	18 (47%)	67	
<b>Washington</b>	224	63 (28%)	224	
<b>Yamhill</b>	59	20 (34%)	59	
<b>State</b>	<b>2,382</b>	<b>898 (38%)</b>	<b>2,549</b>	

\* These data are unavailable until previously collected information is uploaded into the new HFO data management system.

<sup>15</sup> Total number of families receiving home visits this fiscal year includes any family who received at least one home visit between July 2014 and June 2015, regardless of the month/year they originally entered Healthy Families Oregon Services.

**Table 4c. Reasons Parents Decline Home Visiting Services – No First Home Visit 2014-15 Cohort (CE 1-1.E)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (% of Interested & Offered) Did Not Receive First Home Visit	Number (% of Not Receiving 1 <sup>st</sup> HV) Family Moved	Number (% of Not Receiving 1 <sup>st</sup> HV) Home Visit Scheduled: Unable to Complete	Number (% of Not Receiving 1 <sup>st</sup> HV) Declined: Too Busy	Number (% of Not Receiving 1 <sup>st</sup> HV) Declined: Feels Services Not Needed	Number (% of Not Receiving 1 <sup>st</sup> HV) Declined: Other	Number (% of Not Receiving 1 <sup>st</sup> HV) No Exit Information <sup>16</sup>
<b>Baker, Malheur &amp; Wallowa</b>	12 (30%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	12 (100%)
Baker	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--
Malheur	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--
Wallowa	12 (71%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	12 (100%)
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	26 (45%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	25 (96%)
Benton	7 (33%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (100%)
Linn	19 (51%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	18 (95%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	121 (76%)	7 (6%)	0 (0%)	3 (2%)	30 (25%)	4 (3%)	77 (64%)
<b>Clatsop &amp; Columbia</b>	18 (37%)	3 (17%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	13 (72%)
Clatsop	2 (9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
Columbia	16 (62%)	3 (19%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	11 (69%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--
Coos	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--
Curry	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	60 (56%)	2 (3%)	3 (5%)	1 (2%)	2 (3%)	14 (23%)	38 (63%)
Crook	3 (30%)	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)
Deschutes	55 (63%)	1 (2%)	2 (4%)	1 (2%)	2 (4%)	14 (25%)	35 (64%)
Jefferson	2 (22%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)

<sup>16</sup> These families had no exit information entered in the statewide data system and had no additional evaluation data (Family Intake, Update, etc.) indicating a home visit took place.

**Table 4c. Reasons Parents Decline Home Visiting Services – No First Home Visit 2014-15 Cohort (CE 1-1.E)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (% of Interested & Offered) Did Not Receive First Home Visit	Number (% of Not Receiving 1 <sup>st</sup> HV) Family Moved	Number (% of Not Receiving 1 <sup>st</sup> HV) Home Visit Scheduled: Unable to Complete	Number (% of Not Receiving 1 <sup>st</sup> HV) Declined: Too Busy	Number (% of Not Receiving 1 <sup>st</sup> HV) Declined: Feels Services Not Needed	Number (% of Not Receiving 1 <sup>st</sup> HV) Declined: Other	Number (% of Not Receiving 1 <sup>st</sup> HV) No Exit Information <sup>16</sup>
<b>Douglas, Klamath &amp; Lake</b>	27 (41%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	26 (96%)
Douglas	2 (9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)
Klamath	25 (58%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	25 (100%)
Lake	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Gilliam, Hood River, Sherman, Wasco &amp; Wheeler</b>	69 (73%)	4 (6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	5 (7%)	59 (86%)
Gilliam	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hood River	13 (48%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	12 (92%)
Sherman	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Wasco	56 (86%)	3 (5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	5 (9%)	47 (84%)
Wheeler	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	3 (38%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)
Grant	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Harney	2 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
<b>Jackson &amp; Josephine</b>	144 (66%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	144 (100%)
Jackson	135 (72%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	135 (100%)
Josephine	9 (29%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	9 (100%)

<sup>16</sup> These families had no exit information entered in the statewide data system and had no additional evaluation data (Family Intake, Update, etc.) indicating a home visit took place.

**Table 4c. Reasons Parents Decline Home Visiting Services – No First Home Visit 2014-15 Cohort (CE 1-1.E)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (% of Interested & Offered) Did Not Receive First Home Visit	Number (% of Not Receiving 1 <sup>st</sup> HV) Family Moved	Number (% of Not Receiving 1 <sup>st</sup> HV) Home Visit Scheduled: Unable to Complete	Number (% of Not Receiving 1 <sup>st</sup> HV) Declined: Too Busy	Number (% of Not Receiving 1 <sup>st</sup> HV) Declined: Feels Services Not Needed	Number (% of Not Receiving 1 <sup>st</sup> HV) Declined: Other	Number (% of Not Receiving 1 <sup>st</sup> HV) No Exit Information <sup>16</sup>
<b>Lane</b>	92 (55%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	13 (14%)	16 (17%)	3 (3%)	59 (64%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	2 (17%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	267 (66%)	1 (0%)	1 (0%)	9 (3%)	79 (30%)	8 (3%)	169 (63%)
Marion	229 (65%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (3%)	63 (28%)	6 (3%)	153 (67%)
Polk	38 (75%)	1 (3%)	1 (3%)	2 (5%)	16 (42%)	2 (5%)	16 (42%)
<b>Morrow, Umatilla &amp; Union</b>	66 (62%)	4 (6%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	12 (18%)	1 (2%)	47 (71%)
Morrow	19 (61%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	19 (100%)
Umatilla	39 (61%)	4 (10%)	1 (3%)	1 (3%)	9 (23%)	1 (3%)	23 (59%)
Union	8 (73%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (38%)	0 (0%)	5 (63%)
<b>Multnomah</b>	357 (64%)	5 (1%)	2 (1%)	9 (3%)	29 (8%)	7 (2%)	305 (85%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	20 (53%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (10%)	17 (85%)
<b>Washington</b>	161 (72%)	4 (2%)	3 (2%)	9 (6%)	21 (13%)	6 (4%)	118 (73%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	39 (66%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	39 (100%)
<b>State</b>	<b>1,484 (62%)</b>	<b>31 (2%)</b>	<b>12 (1%)</b>	<b>45 (3%)</b>	<b>192 (13%)</b>	<b>53 (4%)</b>	<b>1,151 (78%)</b>

<sup>16</sup> These families had no exit information entered in the statewide data system and had no additional evaluation data (Family Intake, Update, etc.) indicating a home visit took place.

**Table 5. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service: Race/Ethnicity 2014-15 Cohort<sup>17</sup> (CE 1-2.B, CE 5-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number of White Families Offered Intensive Service</b>	<b>Number (%) of White Families Accepting Intensive Service</b>	<b>Number of Hispanic/Latino Families Offered Intensive Service</b>	<b>Number (%) of Hispanic/Latino Families Accepting Intensive Service</b>	<b>Number of Other Race/Ethnicity Families<sup>18</sup> Offered Intensive Service</b>	<b>Number (%) of Other Race/Ethnicity Families Accepting Intensive Service</b>
<b>Baker, Malheur &amp; Wallowa</b>	25	14 (56%)	11	11 (100%)	4	3 (75%)
Baker	5	5 (100%)	0	--	0	--
Malheur	5	5 (100%)	11	11 (100%)	2	2 (100%)
Wallowa	15	4 (27%)	0	--	2	1 (50%)
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	38	24 (63%)	8	3 (38%)	12	5 (42%)
Benton	15	11 (73%)	2	1 (50%)	4	2 (50%)
Linn	23	13 (57%)	6	2 (33%)	8	3 (38%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	78	17 (22%)	50	14 (28%)	32	8 (25%)
<b>Clatsop &amp; Columbia</b>	32	18 (56%)	8	7 (88%)	9	6 (67%)
Clatsop	13	11 (85%)	6	6 (100%)	4	4 (100%)
Columbia	19	7 (37%)	2	1 (50%)	5	2 (40%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	9	9 (100%)	1	1 (100%)	3	3 (100%)
Coos	5	5 (100%)	0	--	0	--
Curry	4	4 (100%)	1	1 (100%)	3	3 (100%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	72	30 (42%)	12	5 (42%)	23	12 (52%)
Crook	9	7 (78%)	0	--	1	0 (0%)
Deschutes	61	21 (34%)	8	3 (38%)	19	9 (47%)
Jefferson	2	2 (100%)	4	2 (50%)	3	3 (100%)

<sup>17</sup> Acceptance is defined as receiving a first home visit (either as indicated on a Family Intake form sent to NPC or a first home visit entered in the statewide data system). Race/ethnicity is indicated on the NBQ and entered into the statewide data system by program staff.

<sup>18</sup> Sample sizes were not sufficient for an analysis of acceptance rates for other individual racial/ethnic groups. Other racial/ethnic groups included: African American, American Indian, Asian, Multiracial, and Other (including missing).

**Table 5. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service: Race/Ethnicity 2014-15 Cohort<sup>17</sup> (CE 1-2.B, CE 5-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number of White Families Offered Intensive Service</b>	<b>Number (%) of White Families Accepting Intensive Service</b>	<b>Number of Hispanic/Latino Families Offered Intensive Service</b>	<b>Number (%) of Hispanic/Latino Families Accepting Intensive Service</b>	<b>Number of Other Race/Ethnicity Families<sup>18</sup> Offered Intensive Service</b>	<b>Number (%) of Other Race/Ethnicity Families Accepting Intensive Service</b>
<b>Douglas, Klamath &amp; Lake</b>	48	33 (69%)	3	1 (33%)	15	5 (33%)
Douglas	21	20 (95%)	1	1 (100%)	1	0 (0%)
Klamath	27	13 (48%)	2	0 (0%)	14	5 (36%)
Lake	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Gilliam, Hood River, Sherman, Wasco &amp; Wheeler</b>	39	5 (13%)	38	12 (32%)	17	8 (47%)
Gilliam	1	1 (100%)	0	--	0	--
Hood River	2	2 (100%)	0	10 (50%)	5	2 (40%)
Sherman	--	--	--	--	--	--
Wasco	36	2 (6%)	18	2 (11%)	11	5 (45%)
Wheeler	0	--	0	--	1	1 (100%)
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	6	5 (83%)	0	--	2	0 (0%)
Grant	3	3 (100%)	0	--	1	0 (0%)
Harney	3	2 (67%)	0	--	1	0 (0%)
<b>Jackson &amp; Josephine</b>	158	57 (36%)	23	9 (39%)	38	9 (24%)
Jackson	134	41 (31%)	23	9 (39%)	31	3 (10%)
Josephine	24	16 (67%)	0	--	7	6 (86%)

<sup>17</sup> Acceptance is defined as receiving a first home visit (either as indicated on a Family Intake form sent to NPC or a first home visit entered in the statewide data system). Race/ethnicity is indicated on the NBQ and entered into the statewide data system by program staff.

<sup>18</sup> Sample sizes were not sufficient for an analysis of acceptance rates for other individual racial/ethnic groups. Other racial/ethnic groups included: African American, American Indian, Asian, Multiracial, and Other (including missing).

**Table 5. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service: Race/Ethnicity 2014-15 Cohort<sup>17</sup> (CE 1-2.B, CE 5-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number of White Families Offered Intensive Service</b>	<b>Number (%) of White Families Accepting Intensive Service</b>	<b>Number of Hispanic/Latino Families Offered Intensive Service</b>	<b>Number (%) of Hispanic/Latino Families Accepting Intensive Service</b>	<b>Number of Other Race/Ethnicity Families<sup>18</sup> Offered Intensive Service</b>	<b>Number (%) of Other Race/Ethnicity Families Accepting Intensive Service</b>
<b>Lane</b>	112	51 (46%)	21	9 (43%)	35	16 (46%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	2	1 (50%)	6	6 (100%)	4	3 (75%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	117	31 (26%)	182	77 (42%)	106	30 (28%)
Marion	93	28 (30%)	168	70 (42%)	93	27 (29%)
Polk	24	3 (13%)	14	7 (50%)	13	3 (23%)
<b>Morrow, Umatilla &amp; Union</b>	42	11 (26%)	51	24 (47%)	13	5 (38%)
Morrow	7	3 (43%)	22	9 (41%)	2	0 (0%)
Umatilla	27	6 (22%)	29	15 (52%)	8	4 (50%)
Union	8	2 (25%)	0	--	3	1 (33%)
<b>Multnomah</b>	173	48 (28%)	136	53 (39%)	247	98 (40%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	17	8 (47%)	14	7 (50%)	7	3 (43%)
<b>Washington</b>	86	21 (24%)	102	34 (33%)	36	8 (22%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	36	9 (25%)	20	9 (45%)	3	2 (67%)
<b>State</b>	<b>1,090</b>	<b>392 (36%)</b>	<b>686</b>	<b>282 (41%)</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>224 (37%)</b>

<sup>17</sup> Acceptance is defined as receiving a first home visit (either as indicated on a Family Intake form sent to NPC or a first home visit entered in the statewide data system). Race/ethnicity is indicated on the NBQ and entered into the statewide data system by program staff.

<sup>18</sup> Sample sizes were not sufficient for an analysis of acceptance rates for other individual racial/ethnic groups. Other racial/ethnic groups included: African American, American Indian, Asian, Multiracial, and Other (including missing).

**Table 6. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service: Demographic Factors 2014-15 Cohort<sup>19</sup> (CE 1-2.B, CE 5-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of English Speaking Households Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) of Spanish Speaking Households Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) of Married Mothers Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) of Single Mothers Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) of Non- Teen Mothers Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) of Teen Mothers Accepting Intensive Service
<b>Baker, Malheur &amp; Wallowa</b>	17 (63%)	3 (100%)	6 (86%)	22 (67%)	25 (68%)	3 (100%)
Baker	5 (100%)	--	--	5 (100%)	5 (100%)	--
Malheur	7 (100%)	3 (100%)	4 (100%)	14 (100%)	16 (100%)	2 (100%)
Wallowa	5 (33%)	--	2 (67%)	3 (21%)	4 (25%)	1 (100%)
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	27 (61%)	2 (40%)	3 (33%)	29 (59%)	31 (56%)	1 (33%)
Benton	11 (69%)	--	1 (33%)	13 (72%)	14 (67%)	--
Linn	16 (57%)	2 (40%)	2 (33%)	16 (52%)	17 (50%)	1 (33%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	24 (24%)	3 (23%)	9 (33%)	30 (23%)	32 (25%)	7 (29%)
<b>Clatsop &amp; Columbia</b>	18 (51%)	6 (100%)	11 (92%)	20 (54%)	30 (65%)	1 (50%)
Clatsop	12 (86%)	6 (100%)	4 (80%)	17 (94%)	21 (91%)	--
Columbia	6 (29%)	--	7 (100%)	3 (16%)	9 (39%)	1 (50%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	12 (100%)	--	5 (100%)	8 (100%)	12 (100%)	1 (100%)
Coos	5 (100%)	--	2 (100%)	3 (100%)	5 (100%)	--
Curry	7 (100%)	--	3 (100%)	5 (100%)	7 (100%)	1 (100%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	37 (40%)	1 (100%)	5 (42%)	42 (44%)	40 (43%)	7 (54%)
Crook	7 (70%)	--	0 (0%)	7 (78%)	5 (71%)	2 (67%)
Deschutes	28 (35%)	1 (100%)	4 (40%)	29 (37%)	29 (36%)	4 (50%)
Jefferson	2 (100%)	--	1 (100%)	6 (75%)	6 (86%)	1 (50%)

<sup>19</sup> Acceptance rates and demographics are indicated on the New Baby Questionnaire.



**Table 6. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service: Demographic Factors 2014-15 Cohort<sup>19</sup> (CE 1-2.B, CE 5-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of English Speaking Households Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) of Spanish Speaking Households Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) of Married Mothers Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) of Single Mothers Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) of Non- Teen Mothers Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) of Teen Mothers Accepting Intensive Service
<b>Douglas, Klamath &amp; Lake</b>	38 (60%)	--	5 (50%)	34 (61%)	36 (63%)	3 (38%)
Douglas	20 (91%)	--	2 (67%)	19 (95%)	20 (91%)	1 (100%)
Klamath	18 (44%)	--	3 (43%)	15 (42%)	16 (46%)	2 (29%)
Lake	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Gilliam, Hood River, Sherman, Wasco &amp; Wheeler</b>	9 (19%)	3 (19%)	6 (25%)	19 (27%)	22 (27%)	2 (20%)
Gilliam	1 (100%)	--	--	1 (100%)	--	--
Hood River	4 (80%)	2 (20%)	4 (29%)	10 (77%)	12 (50%)	2 (67%)
Sherman	--	--	--	--	--	--
Wasco	4 (10%)	1 (17%)	1 (11%)	8 (14%)	9 (16%)	0 (0%)
Wheeler	--	--	1 (100%)	--	1 (100%)	--
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	5 (63%)	--	2 (50%)	3 (75%)	4 (57%)	1 (100%)
Grant	3 (75%)	--	1 (100%)	2 (67%)	2 (67%)	1 (100%)
Harney	2 (50%)	--	1 (33%)	1 (100%)	2 (50%)	--
<b>Jackson &amp; Josephine</b>	63 (35%)	1 (20%)	11 (31%)	64 (35%)	68 (34%)	6 (40%)
Jackson	43 (29%)	1 (20%)	9 (26%)	44 (29%)	48 (28%)	5 (38%)
Josephine	20 (69%)	--	2 (100%)	20 (69%)	20 (71%)	1 (50%)

<sup>19</sup> Acceptance rates and demographics are indicated on the New Baby Questionnaire.

**Table 6. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service: Demographic Factors 2014-15 Cohort<sup>19</sup> (CE 1-2.B, CE 5-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of English Speaking Households Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) of Spanish Speaking Households Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) of Married Mothers Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) of Single Mothers Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) of Non- Teen Mothers Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) of Teen Mothers Accepting Intensive Service
<b>Lane</b>	63 (46%)	4 (50%)	21 (62%)	55 (41%)	67 (46%)	3 (33%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	2 (50%)	6 (100%)	3 (100%)	7 (78%)	9 (82%)	--
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	47 (29%)	34 (54%)	38 (40%)	100 (32%)	125 (34%)	10 (36%)
Marion	41 (31%)	31 (53%)	33 (38%)	92 (35%)	112 (35%)	10 (40%)
Polk	6 (19%)	3 (75%)	5 (56%)	8 (19%)	13 (27%)	0 (0%)
<b>Morrow, Umatilla &amp; Union</b>	14 (29%)	16 (52%)	12 (43%)	26 (35%)	34 (37%)	3 (38%)
Morrow	3 (43%)	8 (47%)	5 (38%)	5 (33%)	9 (32%)	--
Umatilla	8 (24%)	8 (57%)	6 (43%)	19 (38%)	22 (40%)	3 (43%)
Union	3 (33%)	--	1 (100%)	2 (20%)	3 (30%)	0 (0%)
<b>Multnomah</b>	87 (31%)	23 (38%)	64 (39%)	134 (35%)	188 (36%)	9 (45%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	9 (43%)	6 (55%)	1 (11%)	17 (61%)	16 (50%)	1 (20%)
<b>Washington</b>	20 (21%)	16 (36%)	18 (35%)	45 (26%)	56 (28%)	6 (33%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	11 (28%)	2 (67%)	6 (33%)	14 (34%)	18 (33%)	2 (50%)
<b>State</b>	<b>503 (36%)</b>	<b>126 (46%)</b>	<b>226 (41%)</b>	<b>669 (37%)</b>	<b>813 (38%)</b>	<b>66 (38%)</b>

<sup>19</sup> Acceptance rates and demographics are indicated on the New Baby Questionnaire.

**Table 7. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service: Demographic Factors 2014-15 Cohort<sup>20</sup> (CE 1-2.B, CE 5-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number (%) Mothers with At Least a High School Education Accepting Intensive Service</b>	<b>Number (%) Mothers with Less Than a High School Education Accepting Intensive Service</b>	<b>Number (%) of Employed Parents Accepting Intensive Service</b>	<b>Number (%) of Unemployed Parents Accepting Intensive Service</b>	<b>Number (%) of Prenatal Screens Accepting Intensive Service</b>	<b>Number (%) of Postnatal Screens Accepting Intensive Service</b>
<b>Baker, Malheur &amp; Wallowa</b>	14 (64%)	14 (78%)	12 (60%)	14 (78%)	14 (88%)	14 (58%)
Baker	3 (100%)	2 (100%)	1 (100%)	4 (100%)	1 (100%)	4 (100%)
Malheur	8 (100%)	10 (100%)	11 (100%)	5 (100%)	10 (100%)	8 (100%)
Wallowa	3 (27%)	2 (33%)	0 (0%)	5 (56%)	3 (60%)	2 (17%)
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	27 (61%)	5 (36%)	8 (38%)	24 (65%)	23 (52%)	9 (64%)
Benton	14 (82%)	0 (0%)	2 (40%)	12 (75%)	9 (64%)	5 (71%)
Linn	13 (48%)	5 (50%)	6 (38%)	12 (57%)	14 (47%)	4 (57%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	30 (28%)	9 (17%)	17 (25%)	21 (24%)	14 (15%)	24 (38%)
<b>Clatsop &amp; Columbia</b>	22 (67%)	9 (56%)	12 (63%)	19 (63%)	8 (67%)	23 (62%)
Clatsop	15 (94%)	6 (86%)	9 (90%)	12 (92%)	4 (67%)	17 (100%)
Columbia	7 (41%)	3 (33%)	3 (33%)	7 (41%)	4 (67%)	6 (30%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	9 (100%)	4 (100%)	5 (100%)	8 (100%)	2 (100%)	9 (100%)
Coos	3 (100%)	2 (100%)	1 (100%)	4 (100%)	1 (100%)	4 (100%)
Curry	6 (100%)	2 (100%)	4 (100%)	4 (100%)	1 (100%)	5 (100%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	28 (38%)	18 (56%)	20 (41%)	27 (47%)	21 (66%)	26 (35%)
Crook	2 (50%)	5 (83%)	2 (67%)	5 (71%)	5 (71%)	2 (67%)
Deschutes	20 (32%)	12 (50%)	16 (36%)	17 (39%)	12 (60%)	21 (31%)
Jefferson	6 (100%)	1 (50%)	2 (100%)	5 (83%)	4 (80%)	3 (75%)

<sup>20</sup> The number of families accepting service and family demographics are indicated on the New Baby Questionnaire and entered into the statewide data system by program staff.

**Table 7. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service: Demographic Factors 2014-15 Cohort<sup>20</sup> (CE 1-2.B, CE 5-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) Mothers with At Least a High School Education Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) Mothers with Less Than a High School Education Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) of Employed Parents Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) of Unemployed Parents Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) of Prenatal Screens Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) of Postnatal Screens Accepting Intensive Service
<b>Douglas, Klamath &amp; Lake</b>	22 (58%)	16 (59%)	9 (43%)	29 (66%)	13 (62%)	26 (59%)
Douglas	11 (92%)	9 (90%)	5 (83%)	15 (94%)	7 (88%)	14 (93%)
Klamath	11 (42%)	7 (41%)	4 (27%)	14 (50%)	6 (46%)	12 (41%)
Lake	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Gilliam, Hood River, Sherman, Wasco &amp; Wheeler</b>	20 (41%)	5 (11%)	14 (35%)	11 (20%)	19 (24%)	6 (43%)
Gilliam	1 (100%)	--	1 (100%)	--	1 (100%)	--
Hood River	10 (77%)	4 (29%)	8 (73%)	6 (38%)	13 (54%)	1 (33%)
Sherman	--	--	--	--	--	--
Wasco	8 (24%)	1 (3%)	4 (15%)	5 (13%)	5 (9%)	4 (40%)
Wheeler	1 (100%)	--	1 (100%)	--	--	1 (100%)
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	3 (60%)	1 (50%)	2 (50%)	3 (75%)	1 (50%)	4 (67%)
Grant	2 (67%)	1 (100%)	2 (67%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	2 (67%)
Harney	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)
<b>Jackson &amp; Josephine</b>	45 (35%)	30 (34%)	21 (25%)	54 (40%)	22 (47%)	53 (31%)
Jackson	28 (27%)	25 (31%)	9 (13%)	44 (36%)	21 (47%)	32 (22%)
Josephine	17 (71%)	5 (71%)	12 (71%)	10 (71%)	1 (50%)	21 (72%)

<sup>20</sup> The number of families accepting service and family demographics are indicated on the New Baby Questionnaire and entered into the statewide data system by program staff.

**Table 7. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service: Demographic Factors 2014-15 Cohort<sup>20</sup> (CE 1-2.B, CE 5-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number (%) Mothers with At Least a High School Education Accepting Intensive Service</b>	<b>Number (%) Mothers with Less Than a High School Education Accepting Intensive Service</b>	<b>Number (%) of Employed Parents Accepting Intensive Service</b>	<b>Number (%) of Unemployed Parents Accepting Intensive Service</b>	<b>Number (%) of Prenatal Screens Accepting Intensive Service</b>	<b>Number (%) of Postnatal Screens Accepting Intensive Service</b>
<b>Lane</b>	65 (48%)	11 (33%)	41 (47%)	34 (43%)	20 (45%)	56 (45%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	5 (83%)	5 (83%)	5 (100%)	5 (71%)	1 (33%)	9 (100%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	78 (34%)	57 (34%)	68 (35%)	70 (34%)	44 (42%)	93 (31%)
Marion	69 (35%)	53 (35%)	60 (35%)	65 (36%)	42 (43%)	83 (33%)
Polk	9 (26%)	4 (24%)	8 (31%)	5 (21%)	2 (29%)	10 (23%)
<b>Morrow, Umatilla &amp; Union</b>	22 (36%)	17 (39%)	20 (35%)	20 (41%)	22 (38%)	18 (39%)
Morrow	7 (44%)	5 (33%)	10 (36%)	2 (67%)	8 (40%)	4 (44%)
Umatilla	12 (33%)	12 (44%)	8 (35%)	17 (41%)	13 (36%)	12 (43%)
Union	3 (33%)	0 (0%)	2 (33%)	1 (20%)	1 (50%)	2 (22%)
<b>Multnomah</b>	110 (33%)	89 (40%)	88 (35%)	111 (37%)	30 (38%)	169 (36%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	10 (50%)	8 (44%)	8 (44%)	10 (50%)	9 (38%)	9 (75%)
<b>Washington</b>	42 (28%)	21 (29%)	30 (32%)	33 (27%)	25 (19%)	38 (44%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	15 (35%)	5 (31%)	11 (35%)	9 (33%)	10 (42%)	10 (29%)
<b>State</b>	<b>567 (38%)</b>	<b>324 (37%)</b>	<b>391 (36%)</b>	<b>502 (39%)</b>	<b>298 (36%)</b>	<b>596 (39%)</b>

<sup>20</sup> The number of families accepting service and family demographics are indicated on the New Baby Questionnaire and entered into the statewide data system by program staff.

**Table 8. Retention Rates for Families Newly Enrolled 2012-13 (CE 3-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number of <u>New</u> IS Families Enrolled in FY 2012-13<sup>21</sup></b>	<b>Number (%) Still Enrolled 3 Months Later</b>	<b>Number (%) Still Enrolled 6 Months Later</b>	<b>Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later</b>	<b>Number (%) Still Enrolled 18 Months Later</b>	<b>Number (%) Still Enrolled 24 Months Later</b>	<b>Of Those Exited, Average Number of Months in Program</b>
<b>Baker, Malheur &amp; Wallowa</b>	57	50 (88%)	47 (82%)	28 (49%)	19 (33%)	14 (25%)	14
Baker	10	8 (80%)	8 (80%)	7 (70%)	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	10
Malheur	43	38 (88%)	36 (84%)	20 (47%)	16 (37%)	12 (28%)	15
Wallowa	4	4 (100%)	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	9
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	29	24 (83%)	19 (66%)	10 (34%)	6 (21%)	4 (14%)	9
Benton	11	8 (73%)	6 (55%)	2 (18%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7
Linn	18	16 (89%)	13 (72%)	8 (44%)	6 (33%)	4 (22%)	10
<b>Clackamas</b>	54	50 (93%)	43 (80%)	30 (56%)	21 (39%)	17 (31%)	13
<b>Clatsop &amp; Columbia</b>	7	7 (100%)	7 (100%)	5 (71%)	4 (57%)	4 (57%)	11
Clatsop	3	3 (100%)	3 (100%)	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	14
Columbia	4	4 (100%)	4 (100%)	3 (75%)	3 (75%)	3 (75%)	6
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	10	9 (90%)	5 (50%)	4 (40%)	3 (30%)	2 (20%)	10
Coos	4	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5
Curry	6	6 (100%)	4 (67%)	4 (67%)	3 (50%)	2 (33%)	14
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	54	50 (93%)	43 (80%)	28 (52%)	19 (35%)	15 (28%)	11
Crook	8	8 (100%)	7 (88%)	5 (63%)	2 (25%)	2 (25%)	12
Deschutes	38	36 (95%)	30 (79%)	18 (47%)	12 (32%)	8 (21%)	12
Jefferson	8	6 (75%)	6 (75%)	5 (63%)	5 (63%)	5 (63%)	3

<sup>21</sup> Healthy Families America recommends calculating retention rates based on earlier enrollment years. Therefore, this table presents retention rates for all families enrolled in FY 2012-13. Enrollment is based on the number of families receiving a first home visit during FY 2012-13.

**Table 8. Retention Rates for Families Newly Enrolled 2012-13 (CE 3-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number of <u>New</u> IS Families Enrolled in FY 2012-13<sup>21</sup></b>	<b>Number (%) Still Enrolled 3 Months Later</b>	<b>Number (%) Still Enrolled 6 Months Later</b>	<b>Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later</b>	<b>Number (%) Still Enrolled 18 Months Later</b>	<b>Number (%) Still Enrolled 24 Months Later</b>	<b>Of Those Exited, Average Number of Months in Program</b>
<b>Douglas, Klamath &amp; Lake</b>	52	46 (88%)	42 (81%)	34 (65%)	27 (52%)	23 (44%)	12
Douglas	25	19 (76%)	17 (68%)	12 (48%)	10 (40%)	8 (32%)	10
Klamath	27	27 (100%)	25 (93%)	22 (81%)	17 (63%)	15 (56%)	14
Lake	0	--	--	--	--	--	12
<b>Gilliam, Hood River, Sherman, Wasco &amp; Wheeler</b>	30	28 (93%)	25 (83%)	21 (70%)	16 (53%)	15 (50%)	6
Gilliam	4	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	12
Hood River	14	14 (100%)	13 (93%)	9 (64%)	9 (64%)	9 (64%)	.
Sherman	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	13
Wasco	11	11 (100%)	9 (82%)	9 (82%)	5 (45%)	4 (36%)	12
Wheeler	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	7	4 (57%)	4 (57%)	4 (57%)	2 (29%)	2 (29%)	4
Grant	4	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	1
Harney	3	2 (67%)	2 (67%)	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	7
<b>Jackson &amp; Josephine</b>	50	42 (84%)	36 (72%)	24 (48%)	18 (36%)	13 (26%)	10
Jackson	39	33 (85%)	28 (72%)	17 (44%)	12 (31%)	10 (26%)	10
Josephine	11	9 (82%)	8 (73%)	7 (64%)	6 (55%)	3 (27%)	12

<sup>21</sup> Healthy Families America recommends calculating retention rates based on earlier enrollment years. Therefore, this table presents retention rates for all families enrolled in FY 2012-13. Enrollment is based on the number of families receiving a first home visit during FY 2012-13.

**Table 8. Retention Rates for Families Newly Enrolled 2012-13 (CE 3-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number of <u>New</u> IS Families Enrolled in FY 2012-13<sup>21</sup></b>	<b>Number (%) Still Enrolled 3 Months Later</b>	<b>Number (%) Still Enrolled 6 Months Later</b>	<b>Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later</b>	<b>Number (%) Still Enrolled 18 Months Later</b>	<b>Number (%) Still Enrolled 24 Months Later</b>	<b>Of Those Exited, Average Number of Months in Program</b>
<b>Lane</b>	57	51 (89%)	41 (72%)	32 (56%)	26 (46%)	22 (39%)	10
<b>Lincoln</b>	22	21 (95%)	18 (82%)	13 (59%)	11 (50%)	8 (36%)	17
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	89	73 (82%)	58 (65%)	44 (49%)	28 (31%)	24 (27%)	11
Marion	76	62 (82%)	49 (64%)	38 (50%)	26 (34%)	22 (29%)	11
Polk	13	11 (85%)	9 (69%)	6 (46%)	2 (15%)	2 (15%)	8
<b>Morrow, Umatilla &amp; Union</b>	28	25 (89%)	17 (61%)	9 (32%)	5 (18%)	2 (7%)	10
Morrow	6	6 (100%)	3 (50%)	1 (17%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	8
Umatilla	17	15 (88%)	10 (59%)	5 (29%)	3 (18%)	2 (12%)	10
Union	5	4 (80%)	4 (80%)	3 (60%)	2 (40%)	0 (0%)	14
<b>Multnomah</b>	212	188 (89%)	164 (77%)	133 (63%)	108 (51%)	92 (43%)	12
<b>Tillamook</b>	20	17 (85%)	15 (75%)	13 (65%)	11 (55%)	10 (50%)	16
<b>Washington</b>	81	78 (96%)	67 (83%)	49 (60%)	39 (48%)	32 (40%)	12
<b>Yamhill</b>	10	9 (90%)	9 (90%)	7 (70%)	7 (70%)	6 (60%)	14
<b>State</b>	<b>869</b>	<b>772 (89%)</b>	<b>660 (76%)</b>	<b>488 (56%)</b>	<b>370 (43%)</b>	<b>305 (35%)</b>	<b>12</b>

<sup>21</sup> Healthy Families America recommends calculating retention rates based on earlier enrollment years. Therefore, this table presents retention rates for all families enrolled in FY 2012-13. Enrollment is based on the number of families receiving a first home visit during FY 2012-13.



**Table 9. Retention Rates for Families Newly Enrolled 2013-14 (CE 3-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number of New IS Families Enrolled in FY 2013-14<sup>22</sup></b>	<b>Number (%) Still Enrolled 3 Months Later</b>	<b>Number (%) Still Enrolled 6 Months Later</b>	<b>Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later</b>	<b>Of Those Exited, Average Number of Months in Program</b>
<b>Baker, Malheur &amp; Wallowa</b>	32	29 (91%)	27 (84%)	17 (53%)	10
Baker	6	6 (100%)	6 (100%)	2 (33%)	10
Malheur	22	21 (95%)	19 (86%)	15 (68%)	12
Wallowa	4	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	0 (0%)	4
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	22	19 (86%)	18 (82%)	15 (68%)	6
Benton	14	13 (93%)	13 (93%)	12 (86%)	8
Linn	8	6 (75%)	5 (63%)	3 (38%)	5
<b>Clackamas</b>	56	50 (89%)	43 (77%)	29 (52%)	7
<b>Clatsop &amp; Columbia</b>	20	19 (95%)	16 (80%)	13 (65%)	9
Clatsop	7	7 (100%)	7 (100%)	7 (100%)	17
Columbia	13	12 (92%)	9 (69%)	6 (46%)	8
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	15	15 (100%)	13 (87%)	8 (53%)	10
Coos	10	10 (100%)	8 (80%)	6 (60%)	11
Curry	5	5 (100%)	5 (100%)	2 (40%)	10
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	66	60 (91%)	49 (74%)	42 (64%)	7
Crook	8	7 (88%)	6 (75%)	6 (75%)	8
Deschutes	52	47 (90%)	38 (73%)	32 (62%)	7
Jefferson	6	6 (100%)	5 (83%)	4 (67%)	7

<sup>22</sup> Healthy Families America recommends calculating retention rates based on earlier enrollment years. Therefore, this table presents retention rates for all families enrolled in FY 2013-14. Enrollment is based on the number of families receiving a first home visit during FY 2013-14.

**Table 9. Retention Rates for Families Newly Enrolled 2013-14 (CE 3-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number of New IS Families Enrolled in FY 2013-14<sup>22</sup></b>	<b>Number (%) Still Enrolled 3 Months Later</b>	<b>Number (%) Still Enrolled 6 Months Later</b>	<b>Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later</b>	<b>Of Those Exited, Average Number of Months in Program</b>
<b>Douglas, Klamath &amp; Lake</b>	43	39 (91%)	35 (81%)	27 (63%)	8
Douglas	24	22 (92%)	20 (83%)	16 (67%)	8
Klamath	19	17 (89%)	15 (79%)	11 (58%)	8
Lake	0	--	--	--	5
<b>Gilliam, Hood River, Sherman, Wasco &amp; Wheeler</b>	19	17 (89%)	15 (79%)	12 (63%)	6
Gilliam	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1
Hood River	10	9 (90%)	9 (90%)	9 (90%)	12
Sherman	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	5
Wasco	6	5 (83%)	3 (50%)	2 (33%)	.*
Wheeler	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	3
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	6	5 (83%)	5 (83%)	5 (83%)	3
Grant	4	3 (75%)	3 (75%)	3 (75%)	.*
Harney	2	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	6
<b>Jackson &amp; Josephine</b>	55	37 (67%)	26 (47%)	16 (29%)	5
Jackson	32	24 (75%)	13 (41%)	7 (22%)	6
Josephine	23	13 (57%)	13 (57%)	9 (39%)	8

<sup>22</sup> Healthy Families America recommends calculating retention rates based on earlier enrollment years. Therefore, this table presents retention rates for all families enrolled in FY 2013-14. Enrollment is based on the number of families receiving a first home visit during FY 2013-14.

\*Data were not available to calculate the average months in program for these families.

**Table 9. Retention Rates for Families Newly Enrolled 2013-14 (CE 3-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number of New IS Families Enrolled in FY 2013-14<sup>22</sup></b>	<b>Number (%) Still Enrolled 3 Months Later</b>	<b>Number (%) Still Enrolled 6 Months Later</b>	<b>Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later</b>	<b>Of Those Exited, Average Number of Months in Program</b>
<b>Lane</b>	70	54 (77%)	47 (67%)	36 (51%)	4
<b>Lincoln</b>	15	13 (87%)	11 (73%)	10 (67%)	10
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	109	88 (81%)	71 (65%)	44 (40%)	6
Marion	97	78 (80%)	62 (64%)	39 (40%)	6
Polk	12	10 (83%)	9 (75%)	5 (42%)	10
<b>Morrow, Umatilla &amp; Union</b>	31	29 (94%)	24 (77%)	15 (48%)	9
Morrow	8	7 (88%)	5 (63%)	4 (50%)	6
Umatilla	19	19 (100%)	17 (89%)	10 (53%)	10
Union	4	3 (75%)	2 (50%)	1 (25%)	10
<b>Multnomah</b>	175	151 (86%)	127 (73%)	98 (56%)	7
<b>Tillamook</b>	27	27 (100%)	21 (78%)	17 (63%)	10
<b>Washington</b>	77	69 (90%)	58 (75%)	47 (61%)	7
<b>Yamhill</b>	16	15 (94%)	13 (81%)	9 (56%)	8
<b>State</b>	<b>854</b>	<b>736 (86%)</b>	<b>619 (72%)</b>	<b>460 (54%)</b>	<b>7</b>

<sup>22</sup> Healthy Families America recommends calculating retention rates based on earlier enrollment years. Therefore, this table presents retention rates for all families enrolled in FY 2013-14. Enrollment is based on the number of families receiving a first home visit during FY 2013-14.

**Table 10a. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Race/Ethnicity for Families Enrolled 2013-14 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Hispanic/ Latino Families Enrolled in FY 2013-14	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number of White Families Enrolled in FY 2013-14	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number of Other Race Families <sup>23</sup> Enrolled in FY 2013- 14	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later
<b>Baker, Malheur &amp; Wallowa</b>	10	6 (60%)	19	9 (47%)	3	2 (67%)
Baker	0	--	3	0 (0%)	3	2 (67%)
Malheur	10	6 (60%)	12	9 (75%)	0	--
Wallowa	0	--	4	0 (0%)	0	--
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	5	4 (80%)	12	7 (58%)	5	4 (80%)
Benton	3	3 (100%)	6	5 (83%)	5	4 (80%)
Linn	2	1 (50%)	6	2 (33%)	0	--
<b>Clackamas</b>	15	9 (60%)	30	15 (50%)	11	5 (45%)
<b>Clatsop &amp; Columbia</b>	0	--	17	13 (76%)	3	0 (0%)
Clatsop	0	--	7	7 (100%)	0	--
Columbia	0	--	10	6 (60%)	3	0 (0%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	1	1 (100%)	8	5 (63%)	6	2 (33%)
Coos	1	1 (100%)	6	4 (67%)	3	1 (33%)
Curry	0	--	2	1 (50%)	3	1 (33%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	11	8 (73%)	45	28 (62%)	10	6 (60%)
Crook	1	1 (100%)	5	4 (80%)	2	1 (50%)
Deschutes	8	6 (75%)	37	22 (59%)	7	4 (57%)
Jefferson	2	1 (50%)	3	2 (67%)	1	1 (100%)

<sup>23</sup> Sample sizes were not sufficient for analysis of acceptance rates for other individual racial/ethnic groups.

**Table 10a. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Race/Ethnicity for Families Enrolled 2013-14 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Hispanic/ Latino Families Enrolled in FY 2013-14	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number of White Families Enrolled in FY 2013-14	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number of Other Race Families <sup>23</sup> Enrolled in FY 2013- 14	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later
<b>Douglas, Klamath &amp; Lake</b>	4	2 (50%)	30	18 (60%)	9	7 (78%)
Douglas	1	1 (100%)	21	13 (62%)	2	2 (100%)
Klamath	3	1 (33%)	9	5 (56%)	7	5 (71%)
Lake	0	--	0	--	0	--
<b>Gilliam, Hood River, Sherman, Wasco &amp; Wheeler</b>	9	7 (78%)	8	4 (50%)	2	1 (50%)
Gilliam	0	--	1	0 (0%)	0	--
Hood River	6	6 (100%)	3	2 (67%)	1	1 (100%)
Sherman	0	--	1	0 (0%)	0	--
Wasco	3	1 (33%)	2	1 (50%)	1	0 (0%)
Wheeler	0	--	1	1 (100%)	0	--
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	0	--	4	3 (75%)	2	2 (100%)
Grant	0	--	4	3 (75%)	0	--
Harney	0	--	0	--	2	2 (100%)
<b>Jackson &amp; Josephine</b>	5	0 (0%)	42	14 (33%)	8	2 (25%)
Jackson	4	0 (0%)	22	6 (27%)	6	1 (17%)
Josephine	1	0 (0%)	20	8 (40%)	2	1 (50%)

<sup>23</sup> Sample sizes were not sufficient for analysis of acceptance rates for other individual racial/ethnic groups.

**Table 10a. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Race/Ethnicity for Families Enrolled 2013-14 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Hispanic/ Latino Families Enrolled in FY 2013-14	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number of White Families Enrolled in FY 2013-14	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number of Other Race Families <sup>23</sup> Enrolled in FY 2013- 14	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later
<b>Lane</b>	13	6 (46%)	44	24 (55%)	13	6 (46%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	2	1 (50%)	11	7 (64%)	2	2 (100%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	57	22 (39%)	35	15 (43%)	17	7 (41%)
Marion	54	22 (41%)	28	11 (39%)	15	6 (40%)
Polk	3	0 (0%)	7	4 (57%)	2	1 (50%)
<b>Morrow, Umatilla &amp; Union</b>	9	6 (67%)	18	9 (50%)	4	0 (0%)
Morrow	6	4 (67%)	1	0 (0%)	1	0 (0%)
Umatilla	3	2 (67%)	14	8 (57%)	2	0 (0%)
Union	0	--	3	1 (33%)	1	0 (0%)
<b>Multnomah</b>	29	22 (76%)	71	38 (54%)	75	38 (51%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	8	6 (75%)	12	5 (42%)	7	6 (86%)
<b>Washington</b>	43	29 (67%)	17	10 (59%)	17	8 (47%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	5	3 (60%)	8	4 (50%)	3	2 (67%)
<b>State</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>132 (58%)</b>	<b>431</b>	<b>228 (53%)</b>	<b>197</b>	<b>100 (51%)</b>

<sup>23</sup> Sample sizes were not sufficient for analysis of acceptance rates for other individual racial/ethnic groups.

**Table 10b. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Race/Ethnicity for Families Enrolled 2013-14 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Spanish Speaking Households Enrolled in FY 2013-14	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number of English Speaking Households Enrolled in FY 2013-14	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later
<b>Baker, Malheur &amp; Wallowa</b>	3	2 (67%)	23	12 (52%)
Baker	0	--	6	2 (33%)
Malheur	3	2 (67%)	13	10 (77%)
Wallowa	0	--	4	0 (0%)
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	4	4 (100%)	13	7 (54%)
Benton	3	3 (100%)	6	5 (83%)
Linn	1	1 (100%)	7	2 (29%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	5	4 (80%)	35	17 (49%)
<b>Clatsop &amp; Columbia</b>	1	1 (100%)	17	12 (71%)
Clatsop	1	1 (100%)	6	6 (100%)
Columbia	0	--	11	6 (55%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	0	--	12	5 (42%)
Coos	0	--	8	4 (50%)
Curry	0	--	4	1 (25%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	0	--	58	36 (62%)
Crook	0	--	6	4 (67%)
Deschutes	0	--	48	29 (60%)
Jefferson	0	--	4	3 (75%)

**Table 10b. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Race/Ethnicity for Families Enrolled 2013-14 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Spanish Speaking Households Enrolled in FY 2013-14	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number of English Speaking Households Enrolled in FY 2013-14	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later
<b>Douglas, Klamath &amp; Lake</b>	0	--	36	24 (67%)
Douglas	0	--	23	15 (65%)
Klamath	0	--	13	9 (69%)
Lake	0	--	0	--
<b>Gilliam, Hood River, Sherman, Wasco &amp; Wheeler</b>	4	3 (75%)	11	5 (45%)
Gilliam	0	--	1	0 (0%)
Hood River	3	3 (100%)	4	3 (75%)
Sherman	0	--	1	0 (0%)
Wasco	1	0 (0%)	4	1 (25%)
Wheeler	0	--	1	1 (100%)
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	0	--	5	4 (80%)
Grant	0	--	4	3 (75%)
Harney	0	--	1	1 (100%)
<b>Jackson &amp; Josephine</b>	2	0 (0%)	48	15 (31%)
Jackson	2	0 (0%)	25	6 (24%)
Josephine	0	--	23	9 (39%)



**Table 10b. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Race/Ethnicity for Families Enrolled 2013-14 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Spanish Speaking Households Enrolled in FY 2013-14	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number of English Speaking Households Enrolled in FY 2013-14	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later
<b>Lane</b>	5	4 (80%)	53	28 (53%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	1	1 (100%)	13	9 (69%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	11	5 (45%)	49	17 (35%)
Marion	11	5 (45%)	41	14 (34%)
Polk	0	--	8	3 (38%)
<b>Morrow, Umatilla &amp; Union</b>	4	3 (75%)	20	10 (50%)
Morrow	4	3 (75%)	1	0 (0%)
Umatilla	0	--	16	9 (56%)
Union	0	--	3	1 (33%)
<b>Multnomah</b>	8	8 (100%)	107	48 (45%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	6	5 (83%)	16	8 (50%)
<b>Washington</b>	16	14 (88%)	26	15 (58%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	3	2 (67%)	11	5 (45%)
<b>State</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>56 (77%)</b>	<b>553</b>	<b>277 (50%)</b>

**Table 11a. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Demographic Factors for Families Enrolled 2013-14 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of Married Mothers Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) of Single Mothers Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) of Mothers with At Least a High School Education Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) of Mothers with Less Than a High School Education Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) of Employed Parents Still Enrolled 12 Months Later
<b>Baker, Malheur &amp; Wallowa</b>	4 (57%)	13 (52%)	12 (67%)	5 (36%)	8 (50%)
Baker	0 (0%)	2 (50%)	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)
Malheur	4 (100%)	11 (61%)	11 (85%)	4 (44%)	8 (80%)
Wallowa	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	6 (86%)	9 (64%)	11 (73%)	3 (60%)	7 (64%)
Benton	6 (86%)	6 (100%)	8 (89%)	3 (100%)	6 (86%)
Linn	--	3 (38%)	3 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	11 (85%)	18 (42%)	16 (43%)	13 (68%)	13 (50%)
<b>Clatsop &amp; Columbia</b>	5 (83%)	8 (57%)	10 (67%)	2 (50%)	3 (60%)
Clatsop	4 (100%)	3 (100%)	6 (100%)	--	3 (100%)
Columbia	1 (50%)	5 (45%)	4 (44%)	2 (50%)	0 (0%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	0 (0%)	8 (57%)	6 (60%)	2 (40%)	1 (100%)
Coos	0 (0%)	6 (67%)	5 (83%)	1 (25%)	1 (100%)
Curry	--	2 (40%)	1 (25%)	1 (100%)	--
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	10 (71%)	30 (60%)	33 (66%)	6 (46%)	23 (72%)
Crook	1 (100%)	4 (67%)	4 (100%)	1 (33%)	4 (100%)
Deschutes	8 (73%)	23 (58%)	27 (64%)	3 (38%)	18 (69%)
Jefferson	1 (50%)	3 (75%)	2 (50%)	2 (100%)	1 (50%)

**Table 11a. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Demographic Factors for Families Enrolled 2013-14 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of Married Mothers Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) of Single Mothers Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) of Mothers with At Least a High School Education Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) of Mothers with Less Than a High School Education Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) of Employed Parents Still Enrolled 12 Months Later
<b>Douglas, Klamath &amp; Lake</b>	4 (100%)	21 (58%)	14 (67%)	11 (58%)	9 (60%)
Douglas	2 (100%)	13 (62%)	13 (76%)	2 (33%)	8 (67%)
Klamath	2 (100%)	8 (53%)	1 (25%)	9 (69%)	1 (33%)
Lake	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Gilliam, Hood River, Sherman, Wasco &amp; Wheeler</b>	3 (60%)	9 (64%)	7 (58%)	5 (71%)	7 (64%)
Gilliam	--	0 (0%)	--	0 (0%)	--
Hood River	3 (100%)	6 (86%)	5 (83%)	4 (100%)	6 (86%)
Sherman	0 (0%)	--	0 (0%)	--	0 (0%)
Wasco	0 (0%)	2 (40%)	1 (25%)	1 (50%)	1 (33%)
Wheeler	--	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	--	--
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	2 (100%)	2 (67%)	2 (100%)	2 (67%)	2 (67%)
Grant	2 (100%)	1 (50%)	1 (100%)	2 (67%)	1 (50%)
Harney	--	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	--	1 (100%)
<b>Jackson &amp; Josephine</b>	3 (27%)	12 (29%)	10 (33%)	4 (19%)	5 (31%)
Jackson	1 (20%)	5 (21%)	4 (27%)	2 (14%)	2 (33%)
Josephine	2 (33%)	7 (41%)	6 (40%)	2 (29%)	3 (30%)

**Table 11a. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Demographic Factors for Families Enrolled 2013-14 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number (%) of Married Mothers Still Enrolled 12 Months Later</b>	<b>Number (%) of Single Mothers Still Enrolled 12 Months Later</b>	<b>Number (%) of Mothers with At Least a High School Education Still Enrolled 12 Months Later</b>	<b>Number (%) of Mothers with Less Than a High School Education Still Enrolled 12 Months Later</b>	<b>Number (%) of Employed Parents Still Enrolled 12 Months Later</b>
<b>Lane</b>	7 (64%)	27 (48%)	26 (55%)	8 (42%)	13 (50%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	3 (75%)	7 (64%)	9 (69%)	1 (50%)	6 (75%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	11 (55%)	33 (37%)	33 (43%)	11 (33%)	15 (39%)
Marion	11 (61%)	28 (35%)	28 (43%)	11 (34%)	12 (40%)
Polk	0 (0%)	5 (50%)	5 (45%)	0 (0%)	3 (38%)
<b>Morrow, Umatilla &amp; Union</b>	3 (75%)	12 (46%)	8 (53%)	6 (46%)	4 (36%)
Morrow	1 (100%)	3 (43%)	0 (0%)	3 (60%)	2 (67%)
Umatilla	2 (100%)	8 (50%)	7 (64%)	3 (43%)	2 (33%)
Union	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Multnomah</b>	25 (58%)	73 (56%)	66 (56%)	32 (56%)	31 (56%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	7 (78%)	9 (53%)	11 (69%)	5 (50%)	8 (62%)
<b>Washington</b>	12 (71%)	33 (58%)	30 (67%)	10 (42%)	15 (65%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	1 (50%)	7 (54%)	7 (64%)	1 (25%)	2 (50%)
<b>State</b>	<b>117 (65%)</b>	<b>331 (51%)</b>	<b>311 (57%)</b>	<b>127 (47%)</b>	<b>172 (55%)</b>

**Table 11b. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Demographic Factors for Families Enrolled 2013-14 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of Unemployed Parents Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) of Teen Mothers Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) of Non- Teen Mothers Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) of Families Screened Prenatally Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) of Families Screened After Birth Still Enrolled 12 Months Later
<b>Baker, Malheur &amp; Wallowa</b>	6 (46%)	2 (40%)	15 (56%)	6 (43%)	11 (61%)
Baker	2 (50%)	--	2 (33%)	0 (0%)	2 (50%)
Malheur	4 (44%)	2 (40%)	13 (76%)	6 (60%)	9 (75%)
Wallowa	--	--	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	8 (80%)	1 (50%)	14 (74%)	9 (64%)	6 (86%)
Benton	6 (100%)	1 (100%)	11 (92%)	7 (88%)	5 (100%)
Linn	2 (50%)	0 (0%)	3 (43%)	2 (33%)	1 (50%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	16 (53%)	6 (67%)	23 (49%)	17 (61%)	12 (43%)
<b>Clatsop &amp; Columbia</b>	10 (67%)	--	13 (65%)	3 (38%)	10 (83%)
Clatsop	4 (100%)	--	7 (100%)	1 (100%)	6 (100%)
Columbia	6 (55%)	--	6 (46%)	2 (29%)	4 (67%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	7 (50%)	1 (100%)	7 (54%)	4 (67%)	4 (44%)
Coos	5 (56%)	1 (100%)	5 (63%)	4 (67%)	2 (50%)
Curry	2 (40%)	--	2 (40%)	--	2 (40%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	16 (53%)	2 (33%)	38 (67%)	4 (67%)	36 (62%)
Crook	1 (33%)	1 (50%)	4 (80%)	2 (67%)	3 (75%)
Deschutes	12 (52%)	0 (0%)	31 (65%)	2 (67%)	29 (60%)
Jefferson	3 (75%)	1 (100%)	3 (75%)	--	4 (67%)

**Table 11b. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Demographic Factors for Families Enrolled 2013-14 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of Unemployed Parents Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) of Teen Mothers Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) of Non- Teen Mothers Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) of Families Screened Prenatally Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) of Families Screened After Birth Still Enrolled 12 Months Later
<b>Douglas, Klamath &amp; Lake</b>	15 (63%)	5 (63%)	20 (63%)	9 (60%)	16 (64%)
Douglas	6 (60%)	1 (50%)	14 (67%)	3 (60%)	12 (67%)
Klamath	9 (64%)	4 (67%)	6 (55%)	6 (60%)	4 (57%)
Lake	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Gilliam, Hood River, Sherman, Wasco &amp; Wheeler</b>	5 (63%)	2 (67%)	10 (63%)	9 (75%)	3 (43%)
Gilliam	0 (0%)	--	0 (0%)	--	0 (0%)
Hood River	3 (100%)	2 (100%)	7 (88%)	8 (89%)	1 (100%)
Sherman	--	--	0 (0%)	--	0 (0%)
Wasco	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	2 (40%)	1 (33%)	1 (33%)
Wheeler	1 (100%)	--	1 (100%)	--	1 (100%)
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	2 (100%)	--	4 (80%)	2 (67%)	2 (100%)
Grant	2 (100%)	--	3 (75%)	2 (67%)	1 (100%)
Harney	--	--	1 (100%)	--	1 (100%)
<b>Jackson &amp; Josephine</b>	10 (29%)	2 (29%)	13 (30%)	4 (22%)	11 (32%)
Jackson	4 (18%)	1 (33%)	5 (19%)	4 (24%)	2 (17%)
Josephine	6 (46%)	1 (25%)	8 (44%)	0 (0%)	9 (41%)

**Table 11b. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Demographic Factors for Families Enrolled 2013-14 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of Unemployed Parents Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) of Teen Mothers Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) of Non- Teen Mothers Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) of Families Screened Prenatally Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) of Families Screened After Birth Still Enrolled 12 Months Later
<b>Lane</b>	21 (51%)	3 (27%)	31 (57%)	14 (44%)	20 (59%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	4 (57%)	0 (0%)	10 (71%)	4 (67%)	6 (67%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	28 (41%)	8 (38%)	36 (41%)	11 (34%)	33 (43%)
Marion	26 (40%)	8 (40%)	31 (40%)	11 (38%)	28 (41%)
Polk	2 (50%)	0 (0%)	5 (45%)	0 (0%)	5 (56%)
<b>Morrow, Umatilla &amp; Union</b>	9 (53%)	1 (25%)	13 (52%)	8 (50%)	7 (50%)
Morrow	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	2 (40%)	3 (60%)	1 (33%)
Umatilla	8 (67%)	0 (0%)	10 (63%)	5 (50%)	5 (63%)
Union	1 (50%)	--	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)
<b>Multnomah</b>	67 (57%)	7 (44%)	91 (58%)	3 (33%)	95 (58%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	7 (58%)	0 (0%)	16 (67%)	8 (50%)	8 (80%)
<b>Washington</b>	30 (59%)	4 (27%)	40 (70%)	27 (60%)	18 (62%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	6 (55%)	0 (0%)	8 (62%)	3 (60%)	5 (50%)
<b>State</b>	<b>267 (53%)</b>	<b>44 (39%)</b>	<b>402 (56%)</b>	<b>145 (51%)</b>	<b>303 (55%)</b>

**Table 12. Participant Reasons for Exiting Program Prior to Program Completion<sup>24</sup> (CE 3-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Exiting Families in FY 2013-14	Median <sup>25</sup> Age of Child at Exit (In Months)	Number (%) that Reached the Age Limit of the Program	Number (%) Moved, Unable to Locate	Number (%) Parent Declined Further Service <sup>26</sup>	Number (%) Families Moved Out of County	Other Reason <sup>27</sup>
<b>Baker, Malheur &amp; Wallowa</b>	46	8	3 (7%)	5 (11%)	19 (41%)	8 (17%)	11 (24%)
Baker	10	9	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	3 (30%)	3 (30%)	3 (30%)
Malheur	31	6	3 (10%)	4 (13%)	13 (42%)	5 (16%)	6 (19%)
Wallowa	5	16	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (60%)	0 (0%)	2 (40%)
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	46	21	8 (17%)	0 (0%)	21 (46%)	7 (15%)	10 (22%)
Benton	16	27	3 (19%)	0 (0%)	6 (38%)	4 (25%)	3 (19%)
Linn	30	21	5 (17%)	0 (0%)	15 (50%)	3 (10%)	7 (23%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	67	13	13 (19%)	2 (3%)	29 (43%)	16 (24%)	7 (10%)
<b>Clatsop &amp; Columbia</b>	16	19	5 (31%)	2 (13%)	1 (6%)	7 (44%)	1 (6%)
Clatsop	5	19	2 (40%)	2 (40%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)
Columbia	11	17	3 (27%)	0 (0%)	1 (9%)	6 (55%)	1 (9%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	5	7	0 (0%)	3 (60%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	1 (20%)
Coos	3	7	0 (0%)	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)
Curry	2	10	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	72	17	16 (22%)	10 (14%)	21 (29%)	19 (26%)	6 (8%)
Crook	11	16	2 (18%)	1 (9%)	6 (55%)	2 (18%)	0 (0%)
Deschutes	53	16	10 (19%)	8 (15%)	15 (28%)	14 (26%)	6 (11%)
Jefferson	8	32	4 (50%)	1 (13%)	0 (0%)	3 (38%)	0 (0%)

<sup>24</sup> Reasons for exiting Intensive Services are reported on the family's Exit Form completed by the home visitor and entered into the statewide data system.

<sup>25</sup> The "median" is the middle value in a series of numbers arranged from smallest to largest. The median is less sensitive to outliers compared to the "mean", and is a more meaningful statistic for this type of analysis.

<sup>26</sup> "Decline Further Service" includes: (1) Parent no longer interested, (2) parent too busy, and (3) home visitor left, parent decided not to remain in program.

<sup>27</sup> "Other Reason" includes: (1) Child removed from custody, (2) home visitor had safety concerns visiting the family, (3) the family transferred to a non-HFO program, and (4) other.



**Table 12. Participant Reasons for Exiting Program Prior to Program Completion<sup>24</sup> (CE 3-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Exiting Families in FY 2013-14	Median <sup>25</sup> Age of Child at Exit (In Months)	Number (%) that Reached the Age Limit of the Program	Number (%) Moved, Unable to Locate	Number (%) Parent Declined Further Service <sup>26</sup>	Number (%) Families Moved Out of County	Other Reason <sup>27</sup>
<b>Douglas, Klamath &amp; Lake</b>	43	16	9 (21%)	4 (9%)	17 (40%)	9 (21%)	4 (9%)
Douglas	27	17	5 (19%)	2 (7%)	14 (52%)	3 (11%)	3 (11%)
Klamath	16	16	4 (25%)	2 (13%)	3 (19%)	6 (38%)	1 (6%)
Lake	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Gilliam, Hood River, Sherman, Wasco &amp; Wheeler</b>	25	26	10 (40%)	0 (0%)	3 (12%)	10 (40%)	2 (8%)
Gilliam	3	37	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)	0 (0%)
Hood River	9	37	5 (56%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (44%)	0 (0%)
Sherman	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
Wasco	13	25	4 (31%)	0 (0%)	3 (23%)	4 (31%)	2 (15%)
Wheeler	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	7	15	1 (14%)	1 (14%)	2 (29%)	3 (43%)	0 (0%)
Grant	3	8	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)	0 (0%)
Harney	4	31	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	2 (50%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)
<b>Jackson &amp; Josephine</b>	68	11	11 (16%)	10 (15%)	16 (24%)	7 (10%)	24 (35%)
Jackson	46	11	7 (15%)	9 (20%)	8 (17%)	4 (9%)	18 (39%)
Josephine	22	10	4 (18%)	1 (5%)	8 (36%)	3 (14%)	6 (27%)

<sup>24</sup> Reasons for exiting Intensive Services are reported on the family's Exit Form completed by the home visitor and entered into the statewide data system.

<sup>25</sup> The "median" is the middle value in a series of numbers arranged from smallest to largest. The median is less sensitive to outliers compared to the "mean", and is a more meaningful statistic for this type of analysis.

<sup>26</sup> "Decline Further Service" includes: (1) Parent no longer interested, (2) parent too busy, and (3) home visitor left, parent decided not to remain in program.

<sup>27</sup> "Other Reason" includes: (1) Child removed from custody, (2) home visitor had safety concerns visiting the family, (3) the family transferred to a non-HFO program, and (4) other.

**Table 12. Participant Reasons for Exiting Program Prior to Program Completion<sup>24</sup> (CE 3-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number of Exiting Families in FY 2013-14</b>	<b>Median<sup>25</sup> Age of Child at Exit (In Months)</b>	<b>Number (%) that Reached the Age Limit of the Program</b>	<b>Number (%) Moved, Unable to Locate</b>	<b>Number (%) Parent Declined Further Service<sup>26</sup></b>	<b>Number (%) Families Moved Out of County</b>	<b>Other Reason<sup>27</sup></b>
<b>Lane</b>	77	17	25 (32%)	11 (14%)	21 (27%)	9 (12%)	11 (14%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	31	17	7 (23%)	6 (19%)	3 (10%)	13 (42%)	2 (6%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	107	10	15 (14%)	14 (13%)	43 (40%)	21 (20%)	14 (13%)
Marion	94	11	14 (15%)	11 (12%)	41 (44%)	18 (19%)	10 (11%)
Polk	13	10	1 (8%)	3 (23%)	2 (15%)	3 (23%)	4 (31%)
<b>Morrow, Umatilla &amp; Union</b>	38	15	5 (13%)	6 (16%)	19 (50%)	5 (13%)	3 (8%)
Morrow	13	16	4 (31%)	0 (0%)	3 (23%)	4 (31%)	2 (15%)
Umatilla	20	14	1 (5%)	5 (25%)	13 (65%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)
Union	5	15	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	3 (60%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)
<b>Multnomah</b>	187	15	40 (21%)	27 (14%)	58 (31%)	40 (21%)	22 (12%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	18	8	6 (33%)	3 (17%)	4 (22%)	5 (28%)	0 (0%)
<b>Washington</b>	118	21	31 (26%)	6 (5%)	45 (38%)	17 (14%)	19 (16%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	18	34	8 (44%)	3 (17%)	2 (11%)	3 (17%)	2 (11%)
<b>State</b>	<b>989</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>213 (22%)</b>	<b>113 (11%)</b>	<b>324 (33%)</b>	<b>200 (20%)</b>	<b>139 (14%)</b>

<sup>24</sup> Reasons for exiting Intensive Services are reported on the family's Exit Form completed by the home visitor and entered into the statewide data system.

<sup>25</sup> The "median" is the middle value in a series of numbers arranged from smallest to largest. The median is less sensitive to outliers compared to the "mean", and is a more meaningful statistic for this type of analysis.

<sup>26</sup> "Decline Further Service" includes: (1) Parent no longer interested, (2) parent too busy, and (3) home visitor left, parent decided not to remain in program.

<sup>27</sup> "Other Reason" includes: (1) Child removed from custody, (2) home visitor had safety concerns visiting the family, (3) the family transferred to a non-HFO program, and (4) other.

**Table 13a. Parent Survey (Kempe) Risk Factors<sup>28</sup> for One or Both Parents/Caregivers in Intensive Service: Childrearing Characteristics**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number of Completed Family Assessments</b>	<b>High Stress Family Assessment</b>	<b>Number (%) Lacking Nurturing Parents (history of maltreatment, corporal punishment, emotional abuse/neglect)</b>		<b>Number (%) with Substance Abuse, Mental Illness, or Criminal History</b>		<i>Substance Abuse</i>	<i>Mental Illness</i>	<i>Criminal History</i>
			<b>Mild</b>	<b>Severe</b>	<b>Mild</b>	<b>Severe</b>			
<b>Baker, Malheur &amp; Wallowa</b>	50 (53%)	39 (78%)	11 (22%)	31 (62%)	16 (32%)	26 (52%)	24 (48%)	16 (32%)	15 (30%)
Baker	20 (91%)	17 (85%)	4 (20%)	15 (75%)	3 (15%)	16 (80%)	12 (60%)	10 (50%)	12 (60%)
Malheur	21 (34%)	13 (62%)	6 (29%)	8 (38%)	9 (43%)	5 (24%)	6 (29%)	3 (14%)	0 (0%)
Wallowa	9 (90%)	9 (100%)	1 (11%)	8 (89%)	4 (44%)	5 (56%)	6 (67%)	3 (33%)	3 (33%)
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	52 (63%)	37 (71%)	9 (17%)	34 (65%)	13 (25%)	25 (48%)	23 (44%)	21 (40%)	12 (23%)
Benton	24 (60%)	15 (63%)	4 (17%)	14 (58%)	5 (21%)	11 (46%)	9 (38%)	5 (21%)	5 (21%)
Linn	28 (67%)	22 (79%)	5 (18%)	20 (71%)	8 (29%)	14 (50%)	14 (50%)	16 (57%)	7 (25%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	119 (91%)	104 (87%)	6 (5%)	98 (82%)	40 (34%)	54 (45%)	45 (38%)	51 (43%)	26 (22%)
<b>Clatsop &amp; Columbia</b>	55 (89%)	47 (85%)	15 (27%)	37 (67%)	23 (42%)	18 (33%)	21 (38%)	16 (29%)	15 (27%)
Clatsop	28 (90%)	23 (82%)	6 (21%)	21 (75%)	6 (21%)	11 (39%)	8 (29%)	7 (25%)	9 (32%)
Columbia	27 (87%)	24 (89%)	9 (33%)	16 (59%)	17 (63%)	7 (26%)	13 (48%)	9 (33%)	6 (22%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	25 (60%)	22 (88%)	2 (8%)	19 (76%)	4 (16%)	18 (72%)	20 (80%)	5 (20%)	14 (56%)
Coos	10 (63%)	9 (90%)	0 (0%)	10 (100%)	1 (10%)	9 (90%)	10 (100%)	3 (30%)	4 (40%)
Curry	15 (58%)	13 (87%)	2 (13%)	9 (60%)	3 (20%)	9 (60%)	10 (67%)	2 (13%)	10 (67%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	67 (46%)	48 (72%)	14 (21%)	35 (52%)	17 (25%)	30 (45%)	16 (24%)	10 (15%)	9 (13%)
Crook	10 (50%)	7 (70%)	0 (0%)	6 (60%)	3 (30%)	4 (40%)	4 (40%)	4 (40%)	4 (40%)
Deschutes	42 (40%)	28 (67%)	10 (24%)	22 (52%)	11 (26%)	20 (48%)	5 (12%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)
Jefferson	15 (71%)	13 (87%)	4 (27%)	7 (47%)	3 (20%)	6 (40%)	7 (47%)	5 (33%)	5 (33%)

<sup>28</sup> Parent Survey risk factors are scored by the Home Visitor as 0 (not present), 5 (mild) or 10 (severe) and entered into the statewide data system.

**Table 13a. Parent Survey (Kempe) Risk Factors<sup>28</sup> for One or Both Parents/Caregivers in Intensive Service: Childrearing Characteristics**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number of Completed Family Assessments</b>	<b>High Stress Family Assessment</b>	<b>Number (%) Lacking Nurturing Parents (history of maltreatment, corporal punishment, emotional abuse/neglect)</b>		<b>Number (%) with Substance Abuse, Mental Illness, or Criminal History</b>		<i>Substance Abuse</i>	<i>Mental Illness</i>	<i>Criminal History</i>
			<b>Mild</b>	<b>Severe</b>	<b>Mild</b>	<b>Severe</b>			
<b>Douglas, Klamath &amp; Lake</b>	99 (72%)	93 (94%)	7 (7%)	86 (88%)	22 (22%)	67 (68%)	62 (63%)	56 (57%)	41 (41%)
Douglas	51 (75%)	50 (98%)	4 (8%)	46 (92%)	10 (20%)	36 (71%)	31 (61%)	26 (51%)	17 (33%)
Klamath	48 (69%)	43 (90%)	3 (6%)	40 (83%)	12 (25%)	31 (65%)	31 (66%)	30 (63%)	24 (50%)
Lake	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Gilliam, Hood River, Sherman, Wasco &amp; Wheeler</b>	70 (91%)	65 (93%)	11 (16%)	48 (72%)	24 (35%)	29 (42%)	26 (37%)	24 (34%)	16 (23%)
Gilliam	2 (67%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	2 (100%)	1 (50%)
Hood River	39 (91%)	39 (100%)	7 (18%)	29 (74%)	13 (33%)	16 (41%)	13 (33%)	12 (31%)	5 (13%)
Sherman	3 (100%)	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)	2 (67%)	1 (33%)
Wasco	24 (92%)	22 (92%)	3 (14%)	16 (76%)	7 (30%)	12 (52%)	10 (42%)	8 (33%)	9 (38%)
Wheeler	2 (100%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	9 (50%)	6 (67%)	4 (44%)	4 (44%)	3 (33%)	5 (56%)	7 (78%)	5 (56%)	2 (22%)
Grant	2 (22%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)
Harney	7 (78%)	5 (71%)	3 (43%)	3 (43%)	2 (29%)	4 (57%)	5 (71%)	3 (43%)	2 (29%)
<b>Jackson &amp; Josephine</b>	95 (59%)	89 (94%)	13 (14%)	76 (80%)	15 (16%)	63 (67%)	66 (69%)	38 (40%)	42 (44%)
Jackson	52 (50%)	48 (92%)	3 (6%)	45 (87%)	6 (12%)	39 (75%)	40 (77%)	22 (42%)	26 (50%)
Josephine	43 (75%)	41 (95%)	10 (23%)	31 (72%)	9 (21%)	24 (57%)	26 (60%)	16 (37%)	16 (37%)

<sup>28</sup> Parent Survey risk factors are scored by the Home Visitor as 0 (not present), 5 (mild) or 10 (severe) and entered into the statewide data system.

**Table 13a. Parent Survey (Kempe) Risk Factors<sup>28</sup> for One or Both Parents/Caregivers in Intensive Service: Childrearing Characteristics**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number of Completed Family Assessments</b>	<b>High Stress Family Assessment</b>	<b>Number (%) Lacking Nurturing Parents (history of maltreatment, corporal punishment, emotional abuse/neglect)</b>		<b>Number (%) with Substance Abuse, Mental Illness, or Criminal History</b>		<i>Substance Abuse</i>	<i>Mental Illness</i>	<i>Criminal History</i>
			<b>Mild</b>	<b>Severe</b>	<b>Mild</b>	<b>Severe</b>			
<b>Lane</b>	153 (82%)	134 (88%)	12 (8%)	127 (83%)	29 (19%)	105 (69%)	95 (63%)	91 (59%)	57 (37%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	44 (92%)	34 (77%)	8 (18%)	34 (77%)	20 (45%)	16 (36%)	11 (25%)	8 (18%)	10 (23%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	244 (76%)	169 (69%)	29 (12%)	157 (65%)	66 (28%)	93 (39%)	93 (38%)	83 (34%)	80 (33%)
Marion	224 (79%)	152 (68%)	26 (12%)	144 (65%)	58 (26%)	84 (38%)	83 (37%)	71 (32%)	69 (31%)
Polk	20 (53%)	17 (85%)	3 (15%)	13 (65%)	8 (42%)	9 (47%)	10 (50%)	12 (60%)	11 (55%)
<b>Morrow, Umatilla &amp; Union</b>	54 (50%)	37 (69%)	10 (19%)	30 (57%)	18 (33%)	18 (33%)	16 (30%)	15 (28%)	13 (24%)
Morrow	2 (7%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Umatilla	39 (70%)	27 (69%)	8 (21%)	23 (61%)	13 (33%)	13 (33%)	11 (28%)	13 (33%)	9 (23%)
Union	13 (62%)	9 (69%)	2 (15%)	7 (54%)	4 (31%)	5 (38%)	5 (38%)	2 (15%)	4 (31%)
<b>Multnomah</b>	416 (71%)	310 (75%)	63 (15%)	273 (66%)	91 (22%)	184 (44%)	153 (37%)	160 (39%)	108 (26%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	56 (84%)	50 (89%)	8 (15%)	40 (73%)	23 (42%)	22 (40%)	25 (45%)	14 (25%)	20 (36%)
<b>Washington</b>	121 (54%)	73 (60%)	15 (12%)	77 (64%)	32 (26%)	53 (44%)	47 (39%)	45 (37%)	46 (38%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	24 (41%)	22 (92%)	1 (4%)	19 (79%)	0 (0%)	22 (92%)	15 (63%)	19 (79%)	13 (54%)
<b>State</b>	<b>1,753 (69%)</b>	<b>1,379 (79%)</b>	<b>238 (14%)</b>	<b>1,225 (70%)</b>	<b>456 (26%)</b>	<b>848 (49%)</b>	<b>765 (44%)</b>	<b>677 (39%)</b>	<b>539 (31%)</b>

<sup>28</sup> Parent Survey risk factors are scored by the Home Visitor as 0 (not present), 5 (mild) or 10 (severe) and entered into the statewide data system.

**Table 13b. Parent Survey (Kempe) Risk Factors<sup>29</sup> for One or Both Parents/Caregivers in Intensive Service**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) with Previous or Current Child Welfare Involvement		<i>Prior Child Welfare Involvement</i>	<i>Current Child Welfare Involvement</i>	Number (%) with Isolation, Low Self-Esteem		Number (%) with Multiple Stressors	
	Mild	Severe			Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe
<b>Baker, Malheur &amp; Wallowa</b>	7 (14%)	7 (14%)	9 (18%)	9 (18%)	23 (46%)	17 (34%)	19 (38%)	22 (44%)
Baker	5 (25%)	4 (20%)	4 (20%)	5 (25%)	7 (35%)	10 (50%)	4 (20%)	11 (55%)
Malheur	1 (5%)	2 (10%)	4 (19%)	2 (10%)	11 (52%)	3 (14%)	12 (57%)	5 (24%)
Wallowa	1 (11%)	1 (11%)	1 (11%)	2 (22%)	5 (56%)	4 (44%)	3 (33%)	6 (67%)
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	3 (6%)	3 (6%)	4 (8%)	3 (6%)	20 (39%)	20 (39%)	19 (37%)	28 (54%)
Benton	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	13 (54%)	5 (21%)	10 (42%)	11 (46%)
Linn	2 (7%)	2 (7%)	3 (11%)	2 (7%)	7 (26%)	15 (56%)	9 (32%)	17 (61%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	13 (11%)	4 (3%)	6 (5%)	8 (7%)	38 (32%)	55 (47%)	41 (34%)	56 (47%)
<b>Clatsop &amp; Columbia</b>	4 (7%)	7 (13%)	5 (9%)	7 (13%)	25 (45%)	17 (31%)	32 (58%)	19 (35%)
Clatsop	3 (11%)	5 (18%)	3 (11%)	4 (14%)	6 (21%)	12 (43%)	17 (61%)	9 (32%)
Columbia	1 (4%)	2 (7%)	2 (7%)	3 (11%)	19 (70%)	5 (19%)	15 (56%)	10 (37%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	1 (4%)	7 (29%)	5 (20%)	4 (16%)	9 (36%)	12 (48%)	8 (32%)	13 (52%)
Coos	0 (0%)	3 (33%)	3 (30%)	1 (10%)	4 (40%)	4 (40%)	5 (50%)	3 (30%)
Curry	1 (7%)	4 (27%)	2 (13%)	3 (20%)	5 (33%)	8 (53%)	3 (20%)	10 (67%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	9 (13%)	2 (3%)	3 (4%)	2 (3%)	23 (34%)	27 (40%)	30 (45%)	31 (46%)
Crook	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	6 (60%)	4 (40%)	3 (30%)	5 (50%)
Deschutes	5 (12%)	2 (5%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	11 (26%)	16 (38%)	24 (57%)	15 (36%)
Jefferson	3 (20%)	0 (0%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	6 (40%)	7 (47%)	3 (20%)	11 (73%)

<sup>29</sup> Parent Survey risk factors are scored by the Home Visitor as 0 (not present), 5 (mild) or 10 (severe) and entered into the statewide data system.

**Table 13b. Parent Survey (Kempe) Risk Factors<sup>29</sup> for One or Both Parents/Caregivers in Intensive Service**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number (%) with Previous or Current Child Welfare Involvement</b>		<i>Prior Child Welfare Involvement</i>	<i>Current Child Welfare Involvement</i>	<b>Number (%) with Isolation, Low Self-Esteem</b>		<b>Number (%) with Multiple Stressors</b>	
	<b>Mild</b>	<b>Severe</b>			<b>Mild</b>	<b>Severe</b>	<b>Mild</b>	<b>Severe</b>
<b>Douglas, Klamath &amp; Lake</b>	14 (14%)	15 (15%)	18 (18%)	21 (21%)	33 (33%)	49 (49%)	26 (26%)	68 (69%)
Douglas	10 (20%)	3 (6%)	4 (8%)	7 (14%)	20 (39%)	23 (45%)	15 (29%)	34 (67%)
Klamath	4 (8%)	12 (25%)	14 (29%)	14 (30%)	13 (27%)	26 (54%)	11 (23%)	34 (71%)
Lake	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Gilliam, Hood River, Sherman, Wasco &amp; Wheeler</b>	5 (7%)	8 (11%)	9 (13%)	6 (9%)	26 (37%)	40 (57%)	18 (26%)	50 (72%)
Gilliam	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)
Hood River	1 (3%)	2 (5%)	3 (8%)	1 (3%)	14 (36%)	25 (64%)	8 (21%)	31 (79%)
Sherman	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)
Wasco	2 (8%)	5 (21%)	4 (17%)	4 (17%)	8 (33%)	14 (58%)	5 (22%)	18 (78%)
Wheeler	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	0 (0%)	1 (11%)	1 (11%)	0 (0%)	2 (22%)	5 (56%)	1 (11%)	8 (89%)
Grant	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
Harney	0 (0%)	1 (14%)	1 (14%)	0 (0%)	2 (29%)	4 (57%)	1 (14%)	6 (86%)
<b>Jackson &amp; Josephine</b>	12 (13%)	22 (23%)	15 (16%)	23 (24%)	31 (33%)	50 (53%)	30 (32%)	59 (63%)
Jackson	9 (17%)	15 (29%)	11 (21%)	20 (38%)	14 (27%)	28 (55%)	15 (29%)	34 (67%)
Josephine	3 (7%)	7 (16%)	4 (9%)	3 (7%)	17 (40%)	22 (51%)	15 (35%)	25 (58%)

<sup>29</sup> Parent Survey risk factors are scored by the Home Visitor as 0 (not present), 5 (mild) or 10 (severe) and entered into the statewide data system.

**Table 13b. Parent Survey (Kempe) Risk Factors<sup>29</sup> for One or Both Parents/Caregivers in Intensive Service**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) with Previous or Current Child Welfare Involvement		<i>Prior Child Welfare Involvement</i>	<i>Current Child Welfare Involvement</i>	Number (%) with Isolation, Low Self-Esteem		Number (%) with Multiple Stressors	
	Mild	Severe			Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe
<b>Lane</b>	11 (7%)	16 (11%)	20 (13%)	16 (10%)	41 (27%)	79 (52%)	46 (30%)	87 (57%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	2 (5%)	2 (5%)	0 (0%)	3 (7%)	17 (39%)	11 (25%)	18 (41%)	14 (32%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	14 (6%)	30 (12%)	26 (11%)	13 (5%)	88 (36%)	85 (35%)	83 (35%)	107 (45%)
Marion	13 (6%)	30 (13%)	26 (12%)	13 (6%)	79 (35%)	78 (35%)	76 (35%)	96 (44%)
Polk	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	9 (45%)	7 (35%)	7 (35%)	11 (55%)
<b>Morrow, Umatilla &amp; Union</b>	4 (7%)	7 (13%)	5 (9%)	5 (9%)	20 (37%)	14 (26%)	20 (37%)	21 (39%)
Morrow	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)
Umatilla	4 (10%)	6 (15%)	4 (10%)	5 (13%)	16 (41%)	11 (28%)	15 (38%)	14 (36%)
Union	0 (0%)	1 (8%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)	4 (31%)	2 (15%)	4 (31%)	7 (54%)
<b>Multnomah</b>	23 (6%)	25 (6%)	24 (6%)	27 (7%)	164 (39%)	175 (42%)	147 (35%)	215 (52%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	4 (7%)	8 (14%)	6 (11%)	4 (7%)	18 (32%)	27 (48%)	20 (36%)	33 (59%)
<b>Washington</b>	4 (3%)	7 (6%)	5 (4%)	6 (5%)	33 (27%)	49 (40%)	49 (41%)	44 (37%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	1 (4%)	2 (8%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	4 (17%)	12 (50%)	3 (13%)	19 (79%)
<b>State</b>	<b>131 (7%)</b>	<b>173 (10%)</b>	<b>162 (9%)</b>	<b>158 (9%)</b>	<b>615 (35%)</b>	<b>744 (43%)</b>	<b>610 (35%)</b>	<b>894 (51%)</b>

<sup>29</sup> Parent Survey risk factors are scored by the Home Visitor as 0 (not present), 5 (mild) or 10 (severe) and entered into the statewide data system.



**Table 13c. Parent Survey (Kempe) Risk Factors<sup>30</sup> for One or Both Parents/Caregivers in Intensive Service**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) with Potential for Violence		Number (%) with Unrealistic Expectations of Infant		Number (%) with Plans for Severe Discipline for Infant		Number (%) with Negative Perception of Infant		Number (%) with Bonding/Attachment Issues	
	Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe
<b>Baker, Malheur &amp; Wallowa</b>	6 (12%)	10 (20%)	16 (32%)	3 (6%)	5 (10%)	6 (12%)	10 (20%)	0 (0%)	31 (62%)	6 (12%)
Baker	5 (25%)	6 (30%)	8 (40%)	1 (5%)	2 (10%)	3 (15%)	2 (10%)	0 (0%)	12 (60%)	5 (25%)
Malheur	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	5 (24%)	0 (0%)	2 (10%)	1 (5%)	7 (33%)	0 (0%)	13 (62%)	0 (0%)
Wallowa	1 (11%)	3 (33%)	3 (33%)	2 (22%)	1 (11%)	2 (22%)	1 (11%)	0 (0%)	6 (67%)	1 (11%)
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	5 (10%)	5 (10%)	19 (37%)	4 (8%)	11 (22%)	0 (0%)	9 (18%)	0 (0%)	29 (56%)	4 (8%)
Benton	3 (13%)	0 (0%)	8 (33%)	2 (8%)	2 (8%)	0 (0%)	3 (13%)	0 (0%)	11 (46%)	2 (8%)
Linn	2 (7%)	5 (18%)	11 (39%)	2 (7%)	9 (33%)	0 (0%)	6 (24%)	0 (0%)	18 (64%)	2 (7%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	15 (13%)	26 (22%)	53 (45%)	11 (9%)	15 (13%)	9 (8%)	15 (13%)	4 (3%)	67 (56%)	18 (15%)
<b>Clatsop &amp; Columbia</b>	9 (16%)	9 (16%)	20 (36%)	4 (7%)	4 (8%)	4 (8%)	14 (25%)	0 (0%)	35 (64%)	4 (7%)
Clatsop	3 (11%)	4 (14%)	7 (25%)	1 (4%)	2 (7%)	2 (7%)	7 (25%)	0 (0%)	16 (57%)	3 (11%)
Columbia	6 (22%)	5 (19%)	13 (48%)	3 (11%)	2 (8%)	2 (8%)	7 (26%)	0 (0%)	19 (70%)	1 (4%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	3 (12%)	7 (28%)	8 (32%)	2 (8%)	5 (20%)	2 (8%)	2 (8%)	2 (8%)	12 (48%)	6 (24%)
Coos	2 (20%)	1 (10%)	6 (60%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)	6 (60%)	2 (20%)
Curry	1 (7%)	6 (40%)	2 (13%)	1 (7%)	4 (27%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (14%)	6 (40%)	4 (27%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	10 (15%)	10 (15%)	24 (36%)	0 (0%)	4 (6%)	5 (8%)	11 (17%)	1 (2%)	42 (63%)	7 (10%)
Crook	2 (20%)	3 (30%)	5 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	6 (60%)	0 (0%)
Deschutes	2 (5%)	5 (12%)	5 (12%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	2 (5%)	6 (15%)	0 (0%)	27 (64%)	4 (10%)
Jefferson	6 (40%)	2 (13%)	14 (93%)	0 (0%)	2 (13%)	2 (13%)	4 (27%)	1 (7%)	9 (60%)	3 (20%)

<sup>30</sup> Parent Survey risk factors are scored by the Home Visitor as 0 (not present), 5 (mild) or 10 (severe) and entered into the statewide data system.

**Table 13c. Parent Survey (Kempe) Risk Factors<sup>30</sup> for One or Both Parents/Caregivers in Intensive Service**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) with Potential for Violence		Number (%) with Unrealistic Expectations of Infant		Number (%) with Plans for Severe Discipline for Infant		Number (%) with Negative Perception of Infant		Number (%) with Bonding/Attachment Issues	
	Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe
<b>Douglas, Klamath &amp; Lake</b>	9 (9%)	28 (29%)	42 (43%)	7 (7%)	23 (23%)	14 (14%)	14 (14%)	4 (4%)	66 (67%)	18 (18%)
Douglas	3 (6%)	10 (20%)	15 (30%)	3 (6%)	14 (27%)	9 (18%)	7 (14%)	3 (6%)	40 (78%)	7 (14%)
Klamath	6 (13%)	18 (39%)	27 (56%)	4 (8%)	9 (19%)	5 (11%)	7 (15%)	1 (2%)	26 (54%)	11 (23%)
Lake	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Gilliam, Hood River, Sherman, Wasco &amp; Wheeler</b>	3 (4%)	14 (21%)	39 (59%)	7 (11%)	10 (15%)	3 (5%)	26 (39%)	7 (10%)	38 (55%)	12 (17%)
Gilliam	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)
Hood River	2 (5%)	6 (15%)	23 (61%)	3 (8%)	5 (13%)	2 (5%)	12 (32%)	5 (13%)	20 (51%)	8 (21%)
Sherman	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)	0 (0%)
Wasco	1 (5%)	7 (32%)	12 (57%)	4 (19%)	4 (19%)	1 (5%)	11 (50%)	2 (9%)	15 (65%)	3 (13%)
Wheeler	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	0 (0%)	2 (22%)	2 (22%)	1 (11%)	1 (11%)	0 (0%)	1 (11%)	0 (0%)	2 (22%)	1 (11%)
Grant	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)
Harney	0 (0%)	1 (14%)	1 (14%)	1 (14%)	1 (14%)	0 (0%)	1 (14%)	0 (0%)	1 (14%)	1 (14%)
<b>Jackson &amp; Josephine</b>	6 (6%)	28 (30%)	32 (35%)	4 (4%)	12 (13%)	11 (12%)	14 (15%)	3 (3%)	59 (63%)	19 (20%)
Jackson	6 (12%)	20 (39%)	15 (29%)	2 (4%)	5 (10%)	5 (10%)	6 (12%)	2 (4%)	33 (65%)	7 (14%)
Josephine	0 (0%)	8 (19%)	17 (41%)	2 (5%)	7 (17%)	6 (14%)	8 (19%)	1 (2%)	26 (60%)	12 (28%)

<sup>30</sup> Parent Survey risk factors are scored by the Home Visitor as 0 (not present), 5 (mild) or 10 (severe) and entered into the statewide data system.

**Table 13c. Parent Survey (Kempe) Risk Factors<sup>30</sup> for One or Both Parents/Caregivers in Intensive Service**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) with Potential for Violence		Number (%) with Unrealistic Expectations of Infant		Number (%) with Plans for Severe Discipline for Infant		Number (%) with Negative Perception of Infant		Number (%) with Bonding/Attachment Issues	
	Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe
<b>Lane</b>	21 (14%)	30 (20%)	72 (47%)	16 (11%)	21 (14%)	13 (9%)	24 (16%)	5 (3%)	96 (63%)	24 (16%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	5 (11%)	7 (16%)	18 (41%)	4 (9%)	6 (14%)	3 (7%)	5 (11%)	1 (2%)	31 (70%)	4 (9%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	20 (8%)	38 (16%)	95 (40%)	19 (8%)	17 (7%)	12 (5%)	28 (12%)	4 (2%)	154 (63%)	26 (11%)
Marion	16 (7%)	33 (15%)	87 (40%)	19 (9%)	14 (7%)	12 (6%)	27 (13%)	3 (1%)	143 (64%)	25 (11%)
Polk	4 (20%)	5 (25%)	8 (40%)	0 (0%)	3 (15%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	11 (55%)	1 (5%)
<b>Morrow, Umatilla &amp; Union</b>	6 (11%)	5 (9%)	21 (39%)	6 (11%)	17 (31%)	3 (6%)	8 (15%)	0 (0%)	29 (54%)	5 (9%)
Morrow	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)
Umatilla	3 (8%)	5 (13%)	16 (41%)	3 (8%)	14 (36%)	2 (5%)	8 (21%)	0 (0%)	20 (51%)	4 (10%)
Union	2 (17%)	0 (0%)	3 (23%)	3 (23%)	3 (23%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (54%)	1 (8%)
<b>Multnomah</b>	44 (11%)	84 (20%)	142 (34%)	23 (6%)	49 (12%)	26 (6%)	58 (14%)	11 (3%)	227 (55%)	61 (15%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	6 (11%)	10 (18%)	15 (28%)	9 (17%)	6 (11%)	5 (9%)	9 (17%)	3 (6%)	31 (55%)	13 (23%)
<b>Washington</b>	9 (8%)	19 (16%)	28 (23%)	9 (7%)	9 (7%)	4 (3%)	6 (5%)	2 (2%)	77 (64%)	6 (5%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	0 (0%)	4 (17%)	2 (8%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	11 (46%)	7 (29%)
<b>State</b>	<b>177 (10%)</b>	<b>336 (19%)</b>	<b>648 (37%)</b>	<b>130 (8%)</b>	<b>216 (13%)</b>	<b>120 (7%)</b>	<b>255 (15%)</b>	<b>47 (3%)</b>	<b>1,037 (59%)</b>	<b>241 (14%)</b>

<sup>30</sup> Parent Survey risk factors are scored by the Home Visitor as 0 (not present), 5 (mild) or 10 (severe) and entered into the statewide data system.

**Table 14. Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families: Race/Ethnicity**

<i>Program/County</i>	Total Number of Intensive Service Families with Race/Ethnicity Information <sup>31</sup>	Number (%) African American	Number (%) Hispanic/Latino	Number (%) Asian	Number (%) American Indian	Number (%) Caucasian	Number (%) Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	Number (%) Multiracial	Number (%) Other	Number (%) Unreported
<b>Baker, Malheur &amp; Wallowa</b>	94	0 (0%)	26 (28%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	54 (57%)	0 (0%)	6 (6%)	0 (0%)	7 (7%)
Baker	22	0 (0%)	2 (9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	16 (73%)	0 (0%)	4 (18%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Malheur	62	0 (0%)	24 (39%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	29 (47%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	7 (11%)
Wallowa	10	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	9 (90%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	82	0 (0%)	14 (17%)	3 (4%)	0 (0%)	52 (63%)	0 (0%)	3 (4%)	3 (4%)	7 (9%)
Benton	40	0 (0%)	9 (23%)	2 (5%)	0 (0%)	22 (55%)	0 (0%)	2 (5%)	0 (0%)	5 (13%)
Linn	42	0 (0%)	5 (12%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	30 (71%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	3 (7%)	2 (5%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	131	2 (2%)	43 (33%)	2 (2%)	0 (0%)	66 (50%)	1 (1%)	8 (6%)	1 (1%)	8 (6%)
<b>Clatsop &amp; Columbia</b>	62	0 (0%)	9 (15%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	41 (66%)	0 (0%)	5 (8%)	0 (0%)	6 (10%)
Clatsop	31	0 (0%)	8 (26%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	18 (58%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	4 (13%)
Columbia	31	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	23 (74%)	0 (0%)	4 (13%)	0 (0%)	2 (6%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	42	0 (0%)	3 (7%)	0 (0%)	2 (5%)	24 (57%)	0 (0%)	6 (14%)	1 (2%)	6 (14%)
Coos	16	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	12 (75%)	0 (0%)	2 (13%)	0 (0%)	1 (6%)
Curry	26	0 (0%)	2 (8%)	0 (0%)	2 (8%)	12 (46%)	0 (0%)	4 (15%)	1 (4%)	5 (19%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	146	1 (1%)	28 (19%)	0 (0%)	2 (1%)	86 (59%)	1 (1%)	11 (8%)	0 (0%)	17 (12%)
Crook	20	0 (0%)	2 (10%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	13 (65%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (25%)
Deschutes	105	1 (1%)	16 (15%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	66 (63%)	1 (1%)	9 (9%)	0 (0%)	11 (10%)
Jefferson	21	0 (0%)	10 (48%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	7 (33%)	0 (0%)	2 (10%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)

<sup>31</sup> Not all families reported race/ethnicity information.

**Table 14. Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families: Race/Ethnicity**

<i>Program/County</i>	Total Number of Intensive Service Families with Race/Ethnicity Information <sup>31</sup>	Number (%) African American	Number (%) Hispanic/Latino	Number (%) Asian	Number (%) American Indian	Number (%) Caucasian	Number (%) Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	Number (%) Multiracial	Number (%) Other	Number (%) Unreported
<b>Douglas, Klamath &amp; Lake</b>	138	1 (1%)	8 (6%)	0 (0%)	4 (3%)	87 (63%)	0 (0%)	12 (9%)	1 (1%)	25 (18%)
Douglas	68	1 (1%)	2 (3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	54 (79%)	0 (0%)	3 (4%)	0 (0%)	8 (12%)
Klamath	70	0 (0%)	6 (9%)	0 (0%)	4 (6%)	33 (47%)	0 (0%)	9 (13%)	1 (1%)	17 (24%)
Lake	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Gilliam, Hood River, Sherman, Wasco &amp; Wheeler</b>	77	0 (0%)	29 (38%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	27 (35%)	0 (0%)	6 (8%)	1 (1%)	13 (17%)
Gilliam	3	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Hood River	43	0 (0%)	24 (56%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	7 (16%)	0 (0%)	2 (5%)	0 (0%)	9 (21%)
Sherman	3	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Wasco	26	0 (0%)	5 (19%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	13 (50%)	0 (0%)	4 (15%)	0 (0%)	4 (15%)
Wheeler	2	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	18	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	14 (78%)	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	2 (11%)
Grant	9	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (11%)	7 (78%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (11%)
Harney	9	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (78%)	0 (0%)	1 (11%)	0 (0%)	1 (11%)
<b>Jackson &amp; Josephine</b>	162	2 (1%)	12 (7%)	0 (0%)	2 (1%)	122 (75%)	1 (1%)	12 (7%)	1 (1%)	10 (6%)
Jackson	105	1 (1%)	12 (11%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	77 (73%)	1 (1%)	8 (8%)	0 (0%)	5 (5%)
Josephine	57	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	45 (79%)	0 (0%)	4 (7%)	1 (2%)	5 (9%)

<sup>31</sup> Not all families reported race/ethnicity information.

**Table 14. Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families: Race/Ethnicity**

<i>Program/County</i>	Total Number of Intensive Service Families with Race/Ethnicity Information <sup>31</sup>	Number (%) African American	Number (%) Hispanic/Latino	Number (%) Asian	Number (%) American Indian	Number (%) Caucasian	Number (%) Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	Number (%) Multiracial	Number (%) Other	Number (%) Unreported
<b>Lane</b>	187	5 (3%)	36 (19%)	2 (1%)	3 (2%)	120 (64%)	1 (1%)	10 (5%)	2 (1%)	8 (4%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	48	0 (0%)	14 (29%)	0 (0%)	2 (4%)	23 (48%)	0 (0%)	5 (10%)	0 (0%)	4 (8%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	322	3 (1%)	167 (52%)	2 (1%)	4 (1%)	91 (28%)	5 (2%)	17 (5%)	3 (1%)	30 (9%)
Marion	284	3 (1%)	157 (55%)	2 (1%)	2 (1%)	72 (25%)	5 (2%)	17 (6%)	2 (1%)	24 (8%)
Polk	38	0 (0%)	10 (26%)	0 (0%)	2 (5%)	19 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	6 (16%)
<b>Morrow, Umatilla &amp; Union</b>	107	2 (2%)	46 (43%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	43 (40%)	2 (2%)	4 (4%)	1 (1%)	9 (8%)
Morrow	30	0 (0%)	23 (77%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (17%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (7%)
Umatilla	56	2 (4%)	23 (41%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	27 (48%)	0 (0%)	2 (4%)	0 (0%)	2 (4%)
Union	21	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	11 (52%)	2 (10%)	2 (10%)	1 (5%)	5 (24%)
<b>Multnomah</b>	583	62 (11%)	131 (22%)	85	3 (1%)	173 (30%)	7 (1%)	47 (8%)	24 (4%)	51 (9%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	67	0 (0%)	23 (34%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	29 (43%)	0 (0%)	6 (9%)	1 (1%)	7 (10%)
<b>Washington</b>	224	2 (1%)	118 (53%)	3 (1%)	1 (0%)	53 (24%)	2 (1%)	17 (8%)	2 (1%)	26 (12%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	59	0 (0%)	16 (27%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	27 (46%)	1 (2%)	4 (7%)	0 (0%)	10 (17%)
<b>State</b>	<b>2,549</b>	<b>80 (3%)</b>	<b>723 (28%)</b>	<b>98 (4%)</b>	<b>28 (1%)</b>	<b>1,132 (44%)</b>	<b>21 (1%)</b>	<b>180 (7%)</b>	<b>41 (2%)</b>	<b>246 (10%)</b>

<sup>31</sup> Not all families reported race/ethnicity information.

**Table 15a. NBQ Risk Factors and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Average Number of NBQ RFs</b>	<b>Number (%) with 1 RF</b>	<b>Number (%) with 2 RFs</b>	<b>Number (%) with 3 RFs</b>	<b>Number (%) with 4 RFs</b>	<b>Number (%) with 5+ RFs</b>	<b>Number (%) of English Speaking Households</b>	<b>Number (%) of Spanish Speaking Households</b>	<b>Number (%) of Other Language Households</b>
<b>Baker, Malheur &amp; Wallowa</b>	3.0	9 (10%)	16 (18%)	24 (27%)	17 (19%)	15 (17%)	66 (93%)	5 (7%)	0 (0%)
Baker	3.3	2 (9%)	3 (14%)	7 (32%)	4 (18%)	5 (23%)	22 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Malheur	2.8	6 (11%)	12 (21%)	13 (23%)	12 (21%)	7 (12%)	34 (87%)	5 (13%)	0 (0%)
Wallowa	3.6	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	4 (40%)	1 (10%)	3 (30%)	10 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	3.2	6 (8%)	23 (29%)	22 (28%)	12 (15%)	15 (19%)	56 (82%)	11 (16%)	1 (1%)
Benton	3.2	2 (5%)	12 (32%)	10 (27%)	7 (19%)	6 (16%)	22 (73%)	7 (23%)	1 (3%)
Linn	3.2	4 (10%)	11 (27%)	12 (29%)	5 (12%)	9 (22%)	34 (89%)	4 (11%)	0 (0%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	3.5	1 (1%)	30 (23%)	40 (31%)	32 (25%)	27 (21%)	76 (81%)	17 (18%)	1 (1%)
<b>Clatsop &amp; Columbia</b>	3.6	2 (3%)	11 (18%)	16 (26%)	13 (21%)	17 (28%)	44 (83%)	9 (17%)	0 (0%)
Clatsop	3.4	1 (3%)	5 (17%)	11 (37%)	8 (27%)	5 (17%)	18 (67%)	9 (33%)	0 (0%)
Columbia	3.8	1 (3%)	6 (19%)	5 (16%)	5 (16%)	12 (39%)	26 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	3.6	2 (5%)	7 (18%)	7 (18%)	12 (32%)	9 (24%)	32 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Coos	3.8	0 (0%)	4 (25%)	3 (19%)	4 (25%)	5 (31%)	14 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Curry	3.5	2 (9%)	3 (14%)	4 (18%)	8 (36%)	4 (18%)	18 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	3.2	15 (11%)	31 (22%)	42 (30%)	28 (20%)	23 (17%)	112 (97%)	4 (3%)	0 (0%)
Crook	3.4	2 (12%)	1 (6%)	6 (35%)	5 (29%)	3 (18%)	15 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Deschutes	3.0	12 (12%)	28 (28%)	30 (30%)	18 (18%)	13 (13%)	89 (98%)	2 (2%)	0 (0%)
Jefferson	3.8	1 (5%)	2 (10%)	6 (29%)	5 (24%)	7 (33%)	8 (80%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)

**Table 15a. NBQ Risk Factors and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Average Number of NBQ RFs</b>	<b>Number (%) with 1 RF</b>	<b>Number (%) with 2 RFs</b>	<b>Number (%) with 3 RFs</b>	<b>Number (%) with 4 RFs</b>	<b>Number (%) with 5+ RFs</b>	<b>Number (%) of English Speaking Households</b>	<b>Number (%) of Spanish Speaking Households</b>	<b>Number (%) of Other Language Households</b>
<b>Douglas, Klamath &amp; Lake</b>	4.0	5 (4%)	14 (12%)	30 (25%)	24 (20%)	46 (39%)	107 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Douglas	3.8	2 (3%)	8 (13%)	23 (37%)	11 (18%)	18 (29%)	58 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Klamath	4.2	3 (5%)	6 (11%)	7 (12%)	13 (23%)	28 (49%)	49 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Lake	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Gilliam, Hood River, Sherman, Wasco &amp; Wheeler</b>	3.1	4 (5%)	26 (35%)	16 (22%)	18 (24%)	10 (14%)	34 (72%)	13 (28%)	0 (0%)
Gilliam	2.7	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Hood River	3.3	0 (0%)	15 (37%)	7 (17%)	13 (32%)	6 (15%)	11 (52%)	10 (48%)	0 (0%)
Sherman	1.7	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Wasco	3.1	1 (4%)	9 (36%)	7 (28%)	5 (20%)	3 (12%)	16 (84%)	3 (16%)	0 (0%)
Wheeler	2.5	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	3.1	2 (12%)	6 (38%)	1 (6%)	5 (31%)	2 (12%)	16 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Grant	3.3	1 (12%)	4 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (12%)	2 (25%)	8 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Harney	3.0	1 (12%)	2 (25%)	1 (12%)	4 (50%)	0 (0%)	8 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Jackson &amp; Josephine</b>	4.1	3 (2%)	19 (12%)	35 (22%)	47 (30%)	53 (34%)	138 (99%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)
Jackson	4.5	3 (3%)	7 (7%)	13 (13%)	32 (31%)	47 (46%)	86 (99%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)
Josephine	3.3	0 (0%)	12 (22%)	22 (40%)	15 (27%)	6 (11%)	52 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)



**Table 15a. NBQ Risk Factors and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Average Number of NBQ RFs</b>	<b>Number (%) with 1 RF</b>	<b>Number (%) with 2 RFs</b>	<b>Number (%) with 3 RFs</b>	<b>Number (%) with 4 RFs</b>	<b>Number (%) with 5+ RFs</b>	<b>Number (%) of English Speaking Households</b>	<b>Number (%) of Spanish Speaking Households</b>	<b>Number (%) of Other Language Households</b>
<b>Lane</b>	3.5	3 (2%)	51 (28%)	50 (27%)	37 (20%)	43 (23%)	145 (90%)	14 (9%)	2 (1%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	2.9	5 (11%)	14 (30%)	15 (33%)	6 (13%)	6 (13%)	30 (71%)	12 (29%)	0 (0%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	3.5	5 (2%)	82 (27%)	86 (28%)	57 (18%)	79 (26%)	120 (65%)	65 (35%)	0 (0%)
Marion	3.6	5 (2%)	66 (24%)	78 (28%)	54 (20%)	72 (26%)	99 (61%)	62 (39%)	0 (0%)
Polk	3.0	0 (0%)	16 (47%)	8 (24%)	3 (9%)	7 (21%)	21 (88%)	3 (12%)	0 (0%)
<b>Morrow, Umatilla &amp; Union</b>	3.1	11 (11%)	25 (25%)	25 (25%)	21 (21%)	15 (15%)	48 (63%)	26 (34%)	2 (3%)
Morrow	2.8	4 (14%)	10 (36%)	5 (18%)	7 (25%)	2 (7%)	5 (24%)	16 (76%)	0 (0%)
Umatilla	3.5	3 (5%)	11 (20%)	13 (24%)	14 (25%)	12 (22%)	33 (77%)	10 (23%)	0 (0%)
Union	2.4	4 (25%)	4 (25%)	7 (44%)	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	10 (83%)	0 (0%)	2 (17%)
<b>Multnomah</b>	3.5	20 (4%)	125 (22%)	156 (28%)	124 (22%)	131 (24%)	295 (78%)	42 (11%)	41 (11%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	3.4	2 (3%)	13 (21%)	23 (37%)	10 (16%)	15 (24%)	35 (69%)	15 (29%)	1 (2%)
<b>Washington</b>	3.3	9 (4%)	48 (23%)	65 (31%)	49 (23%)	40 (19%)	68 (57%)	48 (40%)	3 (3%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	3.4	1 (2%)	14 (26%)	11 (21%)	16 (30%)	11 (21%)	36 (88%)	5 (12%)	0 (0%)
<b>State</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>105 (4%)</b>	<b>555 (23%)</b>	<b>664 (27%)</b>	<b>528 (22%)</b>	<b>557 (23%)</b>	<b>1,458 (81%)</b>	<b>287 (16%)</b>	<b>51 (3%)</b>

**Table 15b. NBQ Risk Factors and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number (%) Teen Mothers (17 or younger)</b>	<b>Number (%) Single Mothers</b>	<b>Number (%) Less Than HS Education</b>	<b>Number (%) Late Prenatal Care</b>	<b>Number (%) Lack of Comprehensive Prenatal Care</b>	<b>Number (%) Unemployed Parent (s)</b>
<b>Baker, Malheur &amp; Wallowa</b>	12 (13%)	66 (74%)	31 (35%)	18 (21%)	5 (6%)	38 (47%)
Baker	3 (14%)	18 (82%)	7 (32%)	2 (9%)	2 (9%)	13 (62%)
Malheur	8 (14%)	41 (72%)	20 (35%)	13 (23%)	1 (2%)	19 (38%)
Wallowa	1 (10%)	7 (70%)	4 (40%)	3 (33%)	2 (20%)	6 (60%)
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	2 (3%)	58 (74%)	12 (16%)	18 (23%)	3 (4%)	45 (58%)
Benton	1 (3%)	27 (73%)	5 (14%)	10 (27%)	0 (0%)	23 (62%)
Linn	1 (2%)	31 (76%)	7 (17%)	8 (20%)	3 (8%)	22 (54%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	20 (15%)	95 (73%)	38 (29%)	39 (31%)	2 (2%)	73 (57%)
<b>Clatsop &amp; Columbia</b>	4 (7%)	39 (65%)	16 (27%)	12 (20%)	6 (10%)	40 (67%)
Clatsop	0 (0%)	21 (70%)	7 (24%)	4 (13%)	3 (10%)	18 (60%)
Columbia	4 (13%)	18 (60%)	9 (30%)	8 (27%)	3 (10%)	22 (73%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	3 (8%)	29 (76%)	11 (29%)	8 (24%)	6 (17%)	26 (68%)
Coos	2 (12%)	14 (88%)	6 (38%)	2 (13%)	3 (19%)	14 (88%)
Curry	1 (5%)	15 (68%)	5 (23%)	6 (33%)	3 (15%)	12 (55%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	14 (10%)	113 (81%)	38 (28%)	31 (23%)	4 (3%)	70 (51%)
Crook	4 (24%)	13 (76%)	9 (53%)	5 (29%)	0 (0%)	9 (53%)
Deschutes	5 (5%)	83 (82%)	22 (22%)	20 (20%)	3 (3%)	46 (46%)
Jefferson	5 (25%)	17 (81%)	7 (33%)	6 (29%)	1 (6%)	15 (71%)

**Table 15b. NBQ Risk Factors and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number (%) Teen Mothers (17 or younger)</b>	<b>Number (%) Single Mothers</b>	<b>Number (%) Less Than HS Education</b>	<b>Number (%) Late Prenatal Care</b>	<b>Number (%) Lack of Comprehensive Prenatal Care</b>	<b>Number (%) Unemployed Parent (s)</b>
<b>Douglas, Klamath &amp; Lake</b>	21 (18%)	104 (87%)	56 (47%)	32 (28%)	14 (12%)	82 (70%)
Douglas	6 (10%)	56 (90%)	23 (38%)	18 (29%)	10 (16%)	39 (65%)
Klamath	15 (27%)	48 (84%)	33 (58%)	14 (27%)	4 (7%)	43 (75%)
Lake	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Gilliam, Hood River, Sherman, Wasco &amp; Wheeler</b>	11 (15%)	53 (72%)	25 (34%)	10 (14%)	0 (0%)	36 (49%)
Gilliam	0 (0%)	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)
Hood River	9 (22%)	29 (71%)	16 (39%)	7 (18%)	0 (0%)	19 (46%)
Sherman	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Wasco	2 (8%)	20 (80%)	6 (24%)	2 (8%)	0 (0%)	15 (60%)
Wheeler	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	1 (6%)	8 (50%)	4 (27%)	3 (19%)	1 (6%)	9 (56%)
Grant	1 (12%)	4 (50%)	4 (50%)	1 (12%)	0 (0%)	5 (62%)
Harney	0 (0%)	4 (50%)	0 (0%)	2 (25%)	1 (12%)	4 (50%)
<b>Jackson &amp; Josephine</b>	17 (11%)	133 (85%)	60 (38%)	54 (35%)	10 (6%)	110 (70%)
Jackson	13 (13%)	86 (84%)	48 (47%)	42 (42%)	8 (8%)	80 (78%)
Josephine	4 (8%)	47 (85%)	12 (22%)	12 (23%)	2 (4%)	30 (55%)

**Table 15b. NBQ Risk Factors and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number (%) Teen Mothers (17 or younger)</b>	<b>Number (%) Single Mothers</b>	<b>Number (%) Less Than HS Education</b>	<b>Number (%) Late Prenatal Care</b>	<b>Number (%) Lack of Comprehensive Prenatal Care</b>	<b>Number (%) Unemployed Parent (s)</b>
<b>Lane</b>	15 (9%)	137 (74%)	39 (21%)	42 (23%)	4 (2%)	96 (52%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	3 (7%)	33 (72%)	11 (24%)	6 (13%)	3 (7%)	21 (46%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	48 (16%)	235 (76%)	123 (40%)	102 (33%)	31 (10%)	185 (60%)
Marion	44 (16%)	209 (76%)	116 (43%)	95 (35%)	30 (11%)	170 (62%)
Polk	4 (12%)	26 (76%)	7 (21%)	7 (21%)	1 (3%)	15 (44%)
<b>Morrow, Umatilla &amp; Union</b>	14 (15%)	67 (68%)	36 (38%)	21 (24%)	8 (9%)	47 (50%)
Morrow	4 (17%)	15 (54%)	13 (50%)	5 (23%)	1 (4%)	8 (31%)
Umatilla	9 (16%)	43 (78%)	22 (42%)	14 (28%)	7 (13%)	35 (67%)
Union	1 (6%)	9 (56%)	1 (7%)	2 (12%)	0 (0%)	4 (25%)
<b>Multnomah</b>	47 (9%)	397 (71%)	202 (36%)	110 (21%)	19 (3%)	325 (59%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	7 (11%)	46 (73%)	25 (40%)	19 (30%)	4 (6%)	28 (45%)
<b>Washington</b>	25 (12%)	159 (75%)	66 (33%)	57 (27%)	31 (15%)	117 (56%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	6 (11%)	42 (79%)	18 (34%)	12 (23%)	2 (4%)	28 (53%)
<b>State</b>	<b>270 (11%)</b>	<b>1,814 (75%)</b>	<b>811 (34%)</b>	<b>594 (25%)</b>	<b>153 (6%)</b>	<b>1,376 (57%)</b>

**Table 15c. NBQ Risk Factors and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number (%) Difficulty Paying for Expenses</b>	<b>Number (%) Depression Indicated</b>	<b>Number (%) Relationship Problems</b>	<b>Number (%) Substance Abuse Issues</b>	<b>Number (%) At or Below Poverty Level</b>
<b>Baker, Malheur &amp; Wallowa</b>	63 (72%)	17 (19%)	14 (16%)	2 (2%)	48 (87%)
Baker	16 (76%)	7 (32%)	3 (14%)	1 (5%)	18 (95%)
Malheur	39 (68%)	8 (14%)	8 (14%)	1 (2%)	26 (81%)
Wallowa	8 (80%)	2 (20%)	3 (30%)	0 (0%)	4 (100%)
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	57 (74%)	27 (35%)	20 (26%)	6 (8%)	34 (81%)
Benton	29 (81%)	11 (30%)	8 (22%)	3 (8%)	20 (80%)
Linn	28 (68%)	16 (39%)	12 (29%)	3 (7%)	14 (82%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	110 (85%)	29 (22%)	48 (37%)	2 (2%)	45 (85%)
<b>Clatsop &amp; Columbia</b>	58 (97%)	19 (32%)	18 (30%)	7 (12%)	34 (81%)
Clatsop	29 (97%)	11 (37%)	7 (23%)	1 (3%)	18 (72%)
Columbia	29 (97%)	8 (27%)	11 (37%)	6 (20%)	16 (94%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	31 (82%)	7 (18%)	14 (38%)	3 (8%)	9 (75%)
Coos	10 (62%)	3 (19%)	6 (38%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)
Curry	21 (95%)	4 (18%)	8 (38%)	2 (10%)	9 (75%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	109 (78%)	31 (23%)	23 (19%)	10 (8%)	78 (80%)
Crook	13 (76%)	1 (6%)	2 (12%)	2 (12%)	11 (85%)
Deschutes	78 (77%)	23 (23%)	18 (21%)	7 (8%)	54 (77%)
Jefferson	18 (86%)	7 (33%)	3 (14%)	1 (5%)	13 (87%)

**Table 15c. NBQ Risk Factors and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number (%) Difficulty Paying for Expenses</b>	<b>Number (%) Depression Indicated</b>	<b>Number (%) Relationship Problems</b>	<b>Number (%) Substance Abuse Issues</b>	<b>Number (%) At or Below Poverty Level</b>
<b>Douglas, Klamath &amp; Lake</b>	86 (72%)	30 (25%)	38 (32%)	15 (13%)	96 (95%)
Douglas	50 (81%)	11 (18%)	16 (26%)	8 (13%)	52 (95%)
Klamath	36 (63%)	19 (33%)	22 (39%)	7 (12%)	44 (96%)
Lake	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Gilliam, Hood River, Sherman, Wasco &amp; Wheeler</b>	56 (78%)	18 (24%)	18 (25%)	4 (6%)	44 (81%)
Gilliam	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)
Hood River	32 (80%)	13 (32%)	7 (18%)	3 (8%)	28 (85%)
Sherman	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)
Wasco	18 (75%)	5 (20%)	9 (36%)	1 (4%)	14 (93%)
Wheeler	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	13 (81%)	5 (31%)	6 (40%)	0 (0%)	12 (92%)
Grant	6 (75%)	3 (38%)	2 (25%)	0 (0%)	7 (88%)
Harney	7 (88%)	2 (25%)	4 (57%)	0 (0%)	5 (100%)
<b>Jackson &amp; Josephine</b>	130 (84%)	37 (24%)	65 (42%)	21 (14%)	116 (93%)
Jackson	82 (82%)	32 (32%)	47 (47%)	18 (18%)	75 (94%)
Josephine	48 (87%)	5 (9%)	18 (33%)	3 (5%)	41 (91%)

**Table 15c. NBQ Risk Factors and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number (%) Difficulty Paying for Expenses</b>	<b>Number (%) Depression Indicated</b>	<b>Number (%) Relationship Problems</b>	<b>Number (%) Substance Abuse Issues</b>	<b>Number (%) At or Below Poverty Level</b>
<b>Lane</b>	166 (91%)	56 (31%)	72 (39%)	8 (4%)	119 (82%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	34 (74%)	12 (26%)	11 (25%)	1 (2%)	32 (78%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	243 (79%)	61 (20%)	55 (18%)	10 (3%)	171 (90%)
Marion	218 (79%)	54 (20%)	48 (18%)	6 (2%)	156 (90%)
Polk	25 (74%)	7 (21%)	7 (21%)	4 (12%)	15 (88%)
<b>Morrow, Umatilla &amp; Union</b>	69 (73%)	21 (21%)	23 (24%)	4 (4%)	37 (76%)
Morrow	20 (77%)	3 (11%)	8 (30%)	0 (0%)	10 (50%)
Umatilla	36 (68%)	15 (28%)	11 (21%)	3 (6%)	22 (92%)
Union	13 (81%)	3 (19%)	4 (25%)	1 (6%)	5 (100%)
<b>Multnomah</b>	508 (92%)	185 (34%)	132 (24%)	35 (6%)	397 (86%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	48 (77%)	15 (24%)	20 (32%)	3 (5%)	24 (75%)
<b>Washington</b>	158 (76%)	56 (27%)	38 (18%)	5 (2%)	143 (81%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	38 (73%)	16 (30%)	15 (28%)	5 (9%)	19 (90%)
<b>State</b>	<b>1,977 (82%)</b>	<b>642 (27%)</b>	<b>630 (26%)</b>	<b>141 (6%)</b>	<b>1,458 (85%)</b>

**Table 16. Health Care for Intensive Service Families<sup>32</sup>: Health Care Provider & Well-Child Check-Ups**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Caregivers with Primary Health Care Provider Information	Number (%) of Caregivers with a Primary Health Care Provider	Number of Children with Primary Health Care Provider Information	Number (%) of Children with a Primary Health Care Provider	Number of Children with Well-Child Check-Up Information	Number (%) of Children Receiving Regular Well-Child Check-Ups
<b>Baker, Malheur &amp; Wallowa</b>	77	72 (94%)	77	77 (100%)	60	59 (98%)
Baker	22	22 (100%)	22	22 (100%)	16	16 (100%)
Malheur	50	45 (90%)	50	50 (100%)	40	39 (98%)
Wallowa	5	5 (100%)	5	5 (100%)	4	4 (100%)
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	61	47 (80%)	61	61 (100%)	38	36 (95%)
Benton	30	18 (64%)	30	30 (100%)	18	17 (94%)
Linn	31	29 (94%)	31	31 (100%)	20	19 (95%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	126	100 (80%)	125	123 (98%)	103	92 (89%)
<b>Clatsop &amp; Columbia</b>	52	46 (88%)	52	52 (100%)	30	30 (100%)
Clatsop	28	22 (79%)	28	28 (100%)	15	15 (100%)
Columbia	24	24 (100%)	24	24 (100%)	15	15 (100%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	18	12 (75%)	19	16 (84%)	4	4 (100%)
Coos	1	1 (100%)	2	2 (100%)	0	--
Curry	17	11 (73%)	17	14 (82%)	4	4 (100%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	129	101 (81%)	129	124 (97%)	85	76 (89%)
Crook	14	12 (86%)	14	14 (100%)	10	9 (90%)
Deschutes	96	70 (77%)	96	91 (96%)	62	56 (90%)
Jefferson	19	19 (100%)	19	19 (100%)	13	11 (85%)

<sup>32</sup> Health outcomes are tracked by the Home Visitors and reported at 6-month intervals on the Family Update form. Outcome information is taken from the most recent form for each child.



**Table 16. Health Care for Intensive Service Families<sup>32</sup>: Health Care Provider & Well-Child Check-Ups**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Caregivers with Primary Health Care Provider Information	Number (%) of Caregivers with a Primary Health Care Provider	Number of Children with Primary Health Care Provider Information	Number (%) of Children with a Primary Health Care Provider	Number of Children with Well-Child Check-Up Information	Number (%) of Children Receiving Regular Well-Child Check-Ups
<b>Douglas, Klamath &amp; Lake</b>	123	113 (93%)	123	120 (98%)	76	63 (83%)
Douglas	62	55 (89%)	62	60 (97%)	42	34 (81%)
Klamath	61	58 (97%)	61	60 (100%)	34	29 (85%)
Lake	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Gilliam, Hood River, Sherman, Wasco &amp; Wheeler</b>	71	68 (96%)	71	71 (100%)	51	48 (94%)
Gilliam	2	1 (50%)	2	2 (100%)	2	2 (100%)
Hood River	40	39 (98%)	40	40 (100%)	31	31 (100%)
Sherman	3	3 (100%)	3	3 (100%)	2	2 (100%)
Wasco	24	24 (100%)	24	24 (100%)	15	12 (80%)
Wheeler	2	1 (50%)	2	2 (100%)	1	1 (100%)
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	15	14 (93%)	15	14 (93%)	12	11 (92%)
Grant	8	7 (88%)	8	7 (88%)	7	6 (86%)
Harney	7	7 (100%)	7	7 (100%)	5	5 (100%)
<b>Jackson &amp; Josephine</b>	134	125 (93%)	134	133 (99%)	75	66 (88%)
Jackson	83	77 (93%)	83	82 (99%)	36	30 (83%)
Josephine	51	48 (94%)	51	51 (100%)	39	36 (92%)

<sup>32</sup> Health outcomes are tracked by the Home Visitors and reported at 6-month intervals on the Family Update form. Outcome information is taken from the most recent form for each child.

**Table 16. Health Care for Intensive Service Families<sup>32</sup>: Health Care Provider & Well-Child Check-Ups**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Caregivers with Primary Health Care Provider Information	Number (%) of Caregivers with a Primary Health Care Provider	Number of Children with Primary Health Care Provider Information	Number (%) of Children with a Primary Health Care Provider	Number of Children with Well-Child Check-Up Information	Number (%) of Children Receiving Regular Well-Child Check-Ups
<b>Lane</b>	170	138 (82%)	170	170 (100%)	132	120 (91%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	45	38 (84%)	46	45 (98%)	36	34 (94%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	269	215 (81%)	269	264 (99%)	161	147 (91%)
Marion	239	191 (81%)	239	234 (98%)	142	129 (91%)
Polk	30	24 (80%)	30	30 (100%)	19	18 (95%)
<b>Morrow, Umatilla &amp; Union</b>	78	63 (84%)	78	77 (99%)	41	38 (93%)
Morrow	21	20 (100%)	21	21 (100%)	12	12 (100%)
Umatilla	37	31 (89%)	37	36 (97%)	15	14 (93%)
Union	20	12 (60%)	20	20 (100%)	14	12 (86%)
<b>Multnomah</b>	543	454 (84%)	545	535 (98%)	396	367 (93%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	55	35 (64%)	55	54 (98%)	40	36 (90%)
<b>Washington</b>	203	149 (74%)	203	202 (100%)	144	138 (96%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	53	46 (87%)	53	52 (100%)	36	33 (92%)
<b>State</b>	<b>2,222</b>	<b>1,836 (84%)</b>	<b>2,225</b>	<b>2,190 (99%)</b>	<b>1,520</b>	<b>1,398 (92%)</b>

<sup>32</sup> Health outcomes are tracked by the Home Visitors and reported at 6-month intervals on the Family Update form. Outcome information is taken from the most recent form for each child.

**Table 17a. Health Care for Intensive Service Families: Health Insurance**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Children with Health Insurance Information (Family Update)	Number (%) with Private Insurance	Number (%) with OHP	Number (%) with No Insurance	Number of Children Lacking Health Insurance at time of NBQ	Number (%) of These Children with Health Insurance at Most Recent Follow-Up
<b>Baker, Malheur &amp; Wallowa</b>	59	13 (22%)	46 (78%)	0 (0%)	1	1 (100%)
Baker	16	1 (6%)	15 (94%)	0 (0%)	1	1 (100%)
Malheur	39	12 (31%)	27 (69%)	0 (0%)	0	0 (0%)
Wallowa	4	0 (0%)	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	0	0 (0%)
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	38	1 (3%)	37 (97%)	0 (0%)	3	3 (100%)
Benton	19	0 (0%)	19 (100%)	0 (0%)	2	2 (100%)
Linn	19	1 (5%)	18 (95%)	0 (0%)	1	1 (100%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	104	16 (15%)	88 (85%)	0 (0%)	10	10 (100%)
<b>Clatsop &amp; Columbia</b>	31	2 (6%)	29 (94%)	0 (0%)	3	3 (100%)
Clatsop	15	2 (13%)	13 (87%)	0 (0%)	2	2 (100%)
Columbia	16	0 (0%)	16 (100%)	0 (0%)	1	1 (100%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	4	0 (0%)	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	0	0 (0%)
Coos	--	--	--	--	0	0 (0%)
Curry	4	0 (0%)	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	0	0 (0%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	90	5 (6%)	85 (94%)	0 (0%)	4	4 (100%)
Crook	10	0 (0%)	10 (100%)	0 (0%)	0	0 (0%)
Deschutes	65	4 (6%)	61 (94%)	0 (0%)	2	2 (100%)
Jefferson	15	1 (7%)	14 (93%)	0 (0%)	2	2 (100%)

**Table 17a. Health Care for Intensive Service Families: Health Insurance**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Children with Health Insurance Information (Family Update)	Number (%) with Private Insurance	Number (%) with OHP	Number (%) with No Insurance	Number of Children Lacking Health Insurance at time of NBQ	Number (%) of These Children with Health Insurance at Most Recent Follow-Up
<b>Douglas, Klamath &amp; Lake</b>	76	3 (4%)	73 (96%)	0 (0%)	2	2 (100%)
Douglas	41	2 (5%)	39 (95%)	0 (0%)	1	1 (100%)
Klamath	35	1 (3%)	34 (97%)	0 (0%)	1	1 (100%)
Lake	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Gilliam, Hood River, Sherman, Wasco &amp; Wheeler</b>	52	1 (2%)	50 (96%)	1 (2%)	4	4 (100%)
Gilliam	2	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0	0 (0%)
Hood River	31	0 (0%)	30 (97%)	1 (3%)	2	2 (100%)
Sherman	2	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	1	1 (100%)
Wasco	16	0 (0%)	16 (100%)	0 (0%)	1	1 (100%)
Wheeler	1	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0	0 (0%)
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	12	3 (25%)	9 (75%)	0 (0%)	0	0 (0%)
Grant	7	1 (14%)	6 (86%)	0 (0%)	0	0 (0%)
Harney	5	2 (40%)	3 (60%)	0 (0%)	0	0 (0%)
<b>Jackson &amp; Josephine</b>	77	1 (1%)	76 (99%)	0 (0%)	2	2 (100%)
Jackson	38	0 (0%)	38 (100%)	0 (0%)	2	2 (100%)
Josephine	39	1 (3%)	38 (97%)	0 (0%)	0	0 (0%)

**Table 17a. Health Care for Intensive Service Families: Health Insurance**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number of Children with Health Insurance Information (Family Update)</b>	<b>Number (%) with Private Insurance</b>	<b>Number (%) with OHP</b>	<b>Number (%) with No Insurance</b>	<b>Number of Children Lacking Health Insurance at time of NBQ</b>	<b>Number (%) of These Children with Health Insurance at Most Recent Follow-Up</b>
<b>Lane</b>	133	15 (11%)	118 (89%)	0 (0%)	2	2 (100%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	38	6 (16%)	31 (82%)	1 (3%)	4	3 (75%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	166	6 (4%)	159 (96%)	1 (1%)	9	9 (100%)
Marion	147	4 (3%)	142 (97%)	1 (1%)	9	9 (100%)
Polk	19	2 (11%)	17 (89%)	0 (0%)	0	0 (0%)
<b>Morrow, Umatilla &amp; Union</b>	44	5 (11%)	39 (89%)	0 (0%)	7	7 (100%)
Morrow	13	0 (0%)	13 (100%)	0 (0%)	2	2 (100%)
Umatilla	17	3 (18%)	14 (82%)	0 (0%)	4	4 (100%)
Union	14	2 (14%)	12 (86%)	0 (0%)	1	1 (100%)
<b>Multnomah</b>	404	31 (8%)	372 (92%)	1 (0%)	18	18 (100%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	41	4 (10%)	37 (90%)	0 (0%)	7	7 (100%)
<b>Washington</b>	146	20 (14%)	126 (86%)	0 (0%)	9	9 (100%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	38	3 (8%)	35 (92%)	0 (0%)	3	3 (100%)
<b>State</b>	<b>1,553</b>	<b>135 (9%)</b>	<b>1,414 (91%)</b>	<b>4 (0%)</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>87 (99%)</b>

**Table 17b. Health Care for Intensive Service Families: Use of Emergency Room in Past 6 Months**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of Children Reporting ER Use During Last 6 Months	Average Number Child ER Visits During Last 6 Months <sup>33</sup>	Average Number Child ER Visits During Last 6 Months <sup>34</sup>	Number (%) of Mothers Reporting ER Use During Last 6 Months	Average Number Mother ER Visits During Last 6 Months <sup>35</sup>	Average Number Mother ER Visits During Last 6 Months <sup>36</sup>
<b>Baker, Malheur &amp; Wallowa</b>	11 (20%)	1	.30	8 (15%)	2	.22
Baker	2 (15%)	2	.23	2 (15%)	1	.15
Malheur	8 (21%)	2	.31	6 (15%)	2	.26
Wallowa	1 (50%)	1	.50	0 (0%)	--	0.00
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	2 (6%)	1	.06	1 (3%)	3	.08
Benton	2 (12%)	1	.13	0 (0%)	--	0.00
Linn	0 (0%)	2	0.00	1 (5%)	3	.15
<b>Clackamas</b>	18 (17%)	1	.28	6 (6%)	6	.34
<b>Clatsop &amp; Columbia</b>	4 (13%)	2	.19	2 (6%)	4	.26
Clatsop	3 (20%)	2	.33	1 (7%)	7	.47
Columbia	1 (6%)	1	.06	1 (6%)	1	.06
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	0 (0%)	--	0.00	1 (25%)	1	.25
Coos	0 (0%)	--	--	0 (0%)	--	--
Curry	0 (0%)	--	0.00	1 (25%)	1	.25
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	14 (17%)	3	.56	11 (13%)	2	.25
Crook	1 (12%)	1	.13	2 (20%)	2	.30
Deschutes	10 (17%)	4	.68	7 (12%)	2	.18
Jefferson	3 (21%)	1	.29	2 (13%)	4	.47

<sup>33</sup> Of families reporting child had at least one ER visit in the past 6 months.

<sup>34</sup> Of all families responding to the ER use question (including those with no use) in the past 6 months.

<sup>35</sup> Of mothers reporting they had at least one ER visit in the past 6 months.

<sup>36</sup> Of mothers responding to the ER use question (including those with no use) in the past 6 months.

**Table 17b. Health Care for Intensive Service Families: Use of Emergency Room in Past 6 Months**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of Children Reporting ER Use During Last 6 Months	Average Number Child ER Visits During Last 6 Months <sup>33</sup>	Average Number Child ER Visits During Last 6 Months <sup>34</sup>	Number (%) of Mothers Reporting ER Use During Last 6 Months	Average Number Mother ER Visits During Last 6 Months <sup>35</sup>	Average Number Mother ER Visits During Last 6 Months <sup>36</sup>
<b>Douglas, Klamath &amp; Lake</b>	26 (35%)	2	.86	22 (30%)	3	.93
Douglas	14 (33%)	2	.52	11 (26%)	3	.86
Klamath	12 (38%)	4	1.31	11 (34%)	3	1.03
Lake	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Gilliam, Hood River, Sherman, Wasco &amp; Wheeler</b>	10 (20%)	2	.37	9 (18%)	3	.54
Gilliam	0 (0%)	--	0.00	0 (0%)	--	0.00
Hood River	5 (17%)	1	.23	5 (17%)	4	.76
Sherman	1 (50%)	1	.50	1 (50%)	2	1.00
Wasco	4 (25%)	3	.69	3 (19%)	1	.19
Wheeler	0 (0%)	--	0.00	0 (0%)	--	0.00
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	6 (75%)	1	1.00	0 (0%)	--	0.00
Grant	6 (86%)	1	1.14	0 (0%)	--	0.00
Harney	0 (0%)	--	0.00	0 (0%)	--	0.00
<b>Jackson &amp; Josephine</b>	17 (24%)	2	.42	15 (21%)	2	.51
Jackson	11 (29%)	1	.37	6 (16%)	2	.32
Josephine	6 (18%)	3	.48	9 (26%)	3	.74

<sup>33</sup> Of families reporting child had at least one ER visit in the past 6 months.<sup>34</sup> Of all families responding to the ER use question (including those with no use) in the past 6 months.<sup>35</sup> Of mothers reporting they had at least one ER visit in the past 6 months.<sup>36</sup> Of mothers responding to the ER use question (including those with no use) in the past 6 months.

**Table 17b. Health Care for Intensive Service Families: Use of Emergency Room in Past 6 Months**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of Children Reporting ER Use During Last 6 Months	Average Number Child ER Visits During Last 6 Months <sup>33</sup>	Average Number Child ER Visits During Last 6 Months <sup>34</sup>	Number (%) of Mothers Reporting ER Use During Last 6 Months	Average Number Mother ER Visits During Last 6 Months <sup>35</sup>	Average Number Mother ER Visits During Last 6 Months <sup>36</sup>
<b>Lane</b>	28 (22%)	2	.48	23 (18%)	2	.36
<b>Lincoln</b>	8 (23%)	2	.43	2 (6%)	2	.11
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	33 (21%)	3	.55	22 (14%)	2	.22
Marion	29 (21%)	3	.59	17 (12%)	1	.16
Polk	4 (21%)	1	.21	5 (26%)	2	.63
<b>Morrow, Umatilla &amp; Union</b>	11 (31%)	2	.58	6 (17%)	1	.17
Morrow	1 (8%)	1	.08	1 (8%)	1	.08
Umatilla	4 (33%)	2	.75	2 (17%)	1	.17
Union	6 (50%)	2	.92	3 (25%)	1	.25
<b>Multnomah</b>	84 (23%)	3	.57	59 (16%)	2	.40
<b>Tillamook</b>	6 (15%)	2	.28	7 (18%)	2	.33
<b>Washington</b>	37 (26%)	2	.66	22 (16%)	2	.32
<b>Yamhill</b>	9 (24%)	1	.29	4 (11%)	1	.13
<b>State</b>	<b>324 (22%)</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>.50</b>	<b>220 (15%)</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>.35</b>

<sup>33</sup> Of families reporting child had at least one ER visit in the past 6 months.

<sup>34</sup> Of all families responding to the ER use question (including those with no use) in the past 6 months.

<sup>35</sup> Of mothers reporting they had at least one ER visit in the past 6 months.

<sup>36</sup> Of mothers responding to the ER use question (including those with no use) in the past 6 months.



**Table 18a. Comparison of Prenatal Care and Smoke Exposure for Families Served Pre- & Postnatal**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) with Early Prenatal Care on Intake		Number (%) Children with Passive Smoke Exposure	
	First HV Prenatal Service	First HV Postnatal Service	First HV Prenatal Service	First HV Postnatal Service
<b>Baker, Malheur &amp; Wallowa</b>	16 (76%)	39 (78%)	5 (24%)	17 (34%)
Baker	6 (86%)	13 (87%)	2 (29%)	6 (40%)
Malheur	8 (67%)	25 (76%)	2 (17%)	10 (30%)
Wallowa	2 (100%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	2 (100%)	47 (92%)	0 (0%)	6 (12%)
Benton	1 (100%)	23 (96%)	0 (0%)	2 (8%)
Linn	1 (100%)	24 (89%)	0 (0%)	4 (14%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	5 (83%)	89 (81%)	0 (0%)	12 (11%)
<b>Clatsop &amp; Columbia</b>	7 (70%)	31 (79%)	1 (10%)	8 (21%)
Clatsop	0 (0%)	21 (84%)	0 (0%)	6 (24%)
Columbia	7 (78%)	10 (71%)	1 (11%)	2 (14%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	3 (75%)	8 (62%)	1 (25%)	5 (38%)
Coos	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)
Curry	3 (75%)	7 (64%)	1 (25%)	4 (36%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	7 (78%)	96 (86%)	0 (0%)	16 (14%)
Crook	2 (67%)	6 (60%)	0 (0%)	2 (20%)
Deschutes	5 (83%)	75 (88%)	0 (0%)	13 (15%)
Jefferson	0 (0%)	15 (88%)	0 (0%)	1 (6%)

**Table 18a. Comparison of Prenatal Care and Smoke Exposure for Families Served Pre- & Postnatal**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) with Early Prenatal Care on Intake		Number (%) Children with Passive Smoke Exposure	
	First HV Prenatal Service	First HV Postnatal Service	First HV Prenatal Service	First HV Postnatal Service
<b>Douglas, Klamath &amp; Lake</b>	17 (68%)	71 (82%)	9 (35%)	23 (26%)
Douglas	2 (67%)	46 (87%)	1 (33%)	16 (30%)
Klamath	15 (68%)	25 (74%)	8 (35%)	7 (21%)
Lake	--	--	--	--
<b>Gilliam, Hood River, Sherman, Wasco &amp; Wheeler</b>	21 (88%)	41 (98%)	2 (8%)	5 (12%)
Gilliam	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)
Hood River	12 (80%)	21 (95%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)
Sherman	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)
Wasco	9 (100%)	13 (100%)	1 (11%)	2 (15%)
Wheeler	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	6 (100%)	9 (100%)	1 (17%)	4 (44%)
Grant	2 (100%)	6 (100%)	0 (0%)	3 (50%)
Harney	4 (100%)	3 (100%)	1 (25%)	1 (33%)
<b>Jackson &amp; Josephine</b>	8 (62%)	81 (71%)	5 (38%)	37 (32%)
Jackson	8 (62%)	44 (66%)	5 (38%)	24 (35%)
Josephine	0 (0%)	37 (79%)	0 (0%)	13 (27%)

**Table 18a. Comparison of Prenatal Care and Smoke Exposure for Families Served Pre- & Postnatal**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) with Early Prenatal Care on Intake		Number (%) Children with Passive Smoke Exposure	
	First HV Prenatal Service	First HV Postnatal Service	First HV Prenatal Service	First HV Postnatal Service
<b>Lane</b>	18 (95%)	118 (82%)	5 (26%)	29 (21%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	0 (0%)	35 (83%)	0 (0%)	5 (12%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	32 (82%)	156 (73%)	5 (13%)	26 (12%)
Marion	30 (83%)	139 (73%)	4 (11%)	21 (11%)
Polk	2 (67%)	17 (74%)	1 (33%)	5 (22%)
<b>Morrow, Umatilla &amp; Union</b>	13 (93%)	45 (79%)	0 (0%)	2 (4%)
Morrow	3 (100%)	13 (72%)	0 (0%)	1 (6%)
Umatilla	8 (89%)	19 (79%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Union	2 (100%)	13 (87%)	0 (0%)	1 (7%)
<b>Multnomah</b>	15 (94%)	413 (81%)	4 (24%)	56 (11%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	10 (67%)	34 (89%)	1 (7%)	9 (23%)
<b>Washington</b>	19 (90%)	133 (79%)	0 (0%)	12 (7%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	12 (92%)	28 (88%)	4 (31%)	7 (23%)
<b>State</b>	<b>211 (82%)</b>	<b>1,474 (80%)</b>	<b>43 (16%)</b>	<b>279 (15%)</b>

**Table 18b. Comparison of Health Outcomes for Families Served Pre- & Postnatal**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of Babies with Primary Health Care Providers		Number (%) of Mothers Breastfeeding		Number (%) of Babies Born Premature	
	First HV Prenatal Service <sup>37</sup>	First HV Postnatal Service <sup>38</sup>	First HV Prenatal Service	First HV Postnatal Service	First HV Prenatal Service	First HV Postnatal Service
<b>Baker, Malheur &amp; Wallowa</b>	21 (100%)	49 (98%)	14 (67%)	29 (58%)	2 (10%)	7 (14%)
Baker	7 (100%)	14 (93%)	7 (100%)	8 (53%)	1 (14%)	2 (13%)
Malheur	12 (100%)	33 (100%)	6 (50%)	20 (61%)	1 (8%)	5 (15%)
Wallowa	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	3 (100%)	54 (100%)	4 (100%)	37 (70%)	0 (0%)	10 (19%)
Benton	2 (100%)	25 (100%)	2 (100%)	20 (80%)	0 (0%)	7 (29%)
Linn	1 (100%)	29 (100%)	2 (100%)	17 (61%)	0 (0%)	3 (10%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	6 (100%)	107 (96%)	4 (67%)	78 (70%)	0 (0%)	14 (13%)
<b>Clatsop &amp; Columbia</b>	10 (100%)	40 (100%)	8 (80%)	29 (73%)	0 (0%)	8 (20%)
Clatsop	1 (100%)	25 (100%)	1 (100%)	20 (80%)	0 (0%)	6 (24%)
Columbia	9 (100%)	15 (100%)	7 (78%)	9 (60%)	0 (0%)	2 (13%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	3 (75%)	11 (85%)	2 (50%)	4 (31%)	1 (25%)	4 (33%)
Coos	--	2 (100%)	--	1 (50%)	--	2 (100%)
Curry	3 (75%)	9 (82%)	2 (50%)	3 (27%)	1 (25%)	2 (20%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	10 (100%)	106 (96%)	8 (80%)	78 (71%)	1 (10%)	9 (9%)
Crook	3 (100%)	10 (100%)	2 (67%)	8 (80%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)
Deschutes	7 (100%)	79 (95%)	6 (86%)	57 (69%)	1 (14%)	6 (7%)
Jefferson	--	17 (100%)	--	13 (76%)	--	2 (14%)

<sup>37</sup> Prenatal service families are those families who were both screened prenatally and began intensive service prenatally (as determined by the first home visit date occurring before the birth of the baby).

<sup>38</sup> Postnatal service families are those families who began intensive service after the birth of the baby (the first home visit date is after the baby's date of birth).

**Table 18b. Comparison of Health Outcomes for Families Served Pre- & Postnatal**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of Babies with Primary Health Care Providers		Number (%) of Mothers Breastfeeding		Number (%) of Babies Born Premature	
	First HV Prenatal Service <sup>37</sup>	First HV Postnatal Service <sup>38</sup>	First HV Prenatal Service	First HV Postnatal Service	First HV Prenatal Service	First HV Postnatal Service
<b>Douglas, Klamath &amp; Lake</b>	25 (100%)	85 (98%)	12 (50%)	54 (63%)	1 (4%)	9 (11%)
Douglas	3 (100%)	51 (96%)	1 (50%)	33 (63%)	1 (33%)	4 (8%)
Klamath	22 (100%)	34 (100%)	11 (50%)	21 (62%)	0 (0%)	5 (15%)
Lake	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Gilliam, Hood River, Sherman, Wasco &amp; Wheeler</b>	24 (100%)	42 (100%)	22 (92%)	34 (81%)	1 (4%)	4 (10%)
Gilliam	--	2 (100%)	--	1 (50%)	--	2 (100%)
Hood River	15 (100%)	22 (100%)	15 (100%)	21 (95%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)
Sherman	--	3 (100%)	--	2 (67%)	--	0 (0%)
Wasco	9 (100%)	13 (100%)	7 (78%)	9 (69%)	1 (11%)	1 (8%)
Wheeler	--	2 (100%)	--	1 (50%)	--	0 (0%)
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	6 (100%)	8 (89%)	4 (80%)	5 (56%)	0 (0%)	1 (13%)
Grant	2 (100%)	5 (83%)	2 (100%)	2 (33%)	0 (0%)	1 (17%)
Harney	4 (100%)	3 (100%)	2 (67%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Jackson &amp; Josephine</b>	12 (92%)	114 (98%)	12 (92%)	65 (57%)	3 (23%)	21 (19%)
Jackson	12 (92%)	66 (97%)	12 (92%)	33 (49%)	3 (23%)	13 (20%)
Josephine	--	48 (100%)	--	32 (67%)	--	8 (17%)

<sup>37</sup> Prenatal service families are those families who were both screened prenatally and began intensive service prenatally (as determined by the first home visit date occurring before the birth of the baby).

<sup>38</sup> Postnatal service families are those families who began intensive service after the birth of the baby (the first home visit date is after the baby's date of birth).

**Table 18b. Comparison of Health Outcomes for Families Served Pre- & Postnatal**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of Babies with Primary Health Care Providers		Number (%) of Mothers Breastfeeding		Number (%) of Babies Born Premature	
	First HV Prenatal Service <sup>37</sup>	First HV Postnatal Service <sup>38</sup>	First HV Prenatal Service	First HV Postnatal Service	First HV Prenatal Service	First HV Postnatal Service
<b>Lane</b>	18 (100%)	144 (100%)	15 (94%)	98 (69%)	1 (6%)	18 (13%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	--	42 (98%)	--	30 (70%)	--	5 (12%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	39 (100%)	211 (99%)	29 (78%)	149 (72%)	3 (8%)	27 (13%)
Marion	36 (100%)	188 (98%)	26 (76%)	136 (73%)	3 (9%)	25 (13%)
Polk	3 (100%)	23 (100%)	3 (100%)	13 (59%)	0 (0%)	2 (10%)
<b>Morrow, Umatilla &amp; Union</b>	15 (100%)	54 (98%)	12 (80%)	41 (72%)	2 (14%)	3 (6%)
Morrow	3 (100%)	18 (100%)	2 (67%)	13 (72%)	0 (0%)	1 (6%)
Umatilla	10 (100%)	21 (95%)	8 (80%)	19 (79%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)
Union	2 (100%)	15 (100%)	2 (100%)	9 (60%)	1 (50%)	2 (13%)
<b>Multnomah</b>	16 (100%)	500 (97%)	13 (76%)	359 (70%)	0 (0%)	39 (8%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	14 (100%)	38 (97%)	13 (87%)	27 (69%)	0 (0%)	5 (14%)
<b>Washington</b>	20 (100%)	164 (98%)	18 (86%)	124 (73%)	0 (0%)	10 (6%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	12 (100%)	31 (100%)	11 (85%)	17 (53%)	1 (8%)	2 (7%)
<b>State</b>	<b>254 (99%)</b>	<b>1,800 (98%)</b>	<b>201 (79%)</b>	<b>1,258 (69%)</b>	<b>16 (6%)</b>	<b>196 (11%)</b>

<sup>37</sup> Prenatal service families are those families who were both screened prenatally and began intensive service prenatally (as determined by the first home visit date occurring before the birth of the baby).

<sup>38</sup> Postnatal service families are those families who began intensive service after the birth of the baby (the first home visit date is after the baby's date of birth).

**Table 19. Prenatal Care for Subsequent Births**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Intensive Service Families with Information on Prenatal Care (All Families)	Number (%) with Adequate Prenatal Care for Initial Pregnancy (All Families)	Number of Intensive Service Families with Second Pregnancy	Number (%) with Adequate Prenatal Care for Initial Pregnancy (Families with Subsequent Birth)	Number (%) with Adequate Prenatal Care for Second Pregnancy
<b>Baker, Malheur &amp; Wallowa</b>	71	55 (77%)	8	7 (88%)	8 (100%)
Baker	22	19 (86%)	3	2 (67%)	3 (100%)
Malheur	45	33 (73%)	5	5 (100%)	5 (100%)
Wallowa	4	3 (75%)	0	--	--
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	53	49 (92%)	2	2 (100%)	2 (100%)
Benton	25	24 (96%)	2	2 (100%)	2 (100%)
Linn	28	25 (89%)	0	--	--
<b>Clackamas</b>	116	94 (81%)	8	8 (100%)	8 (100%)
<b>Clatsop &amp; Columbia</b>	49	38 (78%)	0	--	--
Clatsop	26	21 (81%)	0	--	--
Columbia	23	17 (74%)	0	--	--
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	17	11 (65%)	0	--	--
Coos	2	1 (50%)	0	--	--
Curry	15	10 (67%)	0	--	--
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	121	103 (85%)	3	3 (100%)	3 (100%)
Crook	13	8 (62%)	0	--	--
Deschutes	91	80 (88%)	3	3 (100%)	3 (100%)
Jefferson	17	15 (88%)	0	--	--

**Table 19. Prenatal Care for Subsequent Births**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Intensive Service Families with Information on Prenatal Care (All Families)	Number (%) with Adequate Prenatal Care for Initial Pregnancy (All Families)	Number of Intensive Service Families with Second Pregnancy	Number (%) with Adequate Prenatal Care for Initial Pregnancy (Families with Subsequent Birth)	Number (%) with Adequate Prenatal Care for Second Pregnancy
<b>Douglas, Klamath &amp; Lake</b>	112	88 (79%)	2	2 (100%)	2 (100%)
Douglas	56	48 (86%)	0	--	--
Klamath	56	40 (71%)	2	2 (100%)	2 (100%)
Lake	--	--	0	--	--
<b>(Gilliam, Hood River, Sherman, Wasco &amp; Wheeler)</b>	66	62 (94%)	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Gilliam	2	2 (100%)	0	--	--
Hood River	37	33 (89%)	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Sherman	3	3 (100%)	0	--	--
Wasco	22	22 (100%)	0	--	--
Wheeler	2	2 (100%)	0	--	--
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	15	15 (100%)	0	--	--
Grant	8	8 (100%)	0	--	--
Harney	7	7 (100%)	0	--	--
<b>Jackson &amp; Josephine</b>	127	89 (70%)	4	3 (75%)	4 (100%)
Jackson	80	52 (65%)	2	1 (50%)	2 (100%)
Josephine	47	37 (79%)	2	2 (100%)	2 (100%)



**Table 19. Prenatal Care for Subsequent Births**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number of Intensive Service Families with Information on Prenatal Care (All Families)</b>	<b>Number (%) with Adequate Prenatal Care for Initial Pregnancy (All Families)</b>	<b>Number of Intensive Service Families with Second Pregnancy</b>	<b>Number (%) with Adequate Prenatal Care for Initial Pregnancy (Families with Subsequent Birth)</b>	<b>Number (%) with Adequate Prenatal Care for Second Pregnancy</b>
<b>Lane</b>	164	136 (83%)	9	6 (67%)	8 (89%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	42	35 (83%)	4	4 (100%)	4 (100%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	252	188 (75%)	12	9 (75%)	9 (75%)
Marion	226	169 (75%)	11	8 (73%)	8 (73%)
Polk	26	19 (73%)	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
<b>Morrow, Umatilla &amp; Union</b>	71	58 (82%)	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Morrow	21	16 (76%)	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Umatilla	33	27 (82%)	0	--	--
Union	17	15 (88%)	0	--	--
<b>Multnomah</b>	529	429 (81%)	21	17 (81%)	20 (95%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	53	44 (83%)	2	2 (100%)	2 (100%)
<b>Washington</b>	189	152 (80%)	7	4 (57%)	6 (86%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	45	40 (89%)	3	3 (100%)	2 (67%)
<b>State</b>	<b>2,092</b>	<b>1,686 (81%)</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>72 (83%)</b>	<b>80 (92%)</b>

**Table 20a. HOME Score and Development Screening<sup>39</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number of Families with HOME<sup>40</sup> Score Information (at 12 Months)</b>	<b>Number (%) of Families with “Good” or Higher HOME Score (at 12 Months)</b>	<b>Number (%) of parents Reading (at Least) Daily to Child (at 12 Months)</b>
<b>Baker, Malheur &amp; Wallowa</b>	29	27 (93%)	27 (68%)
Baker	8	7 (88%)	7 (50%)
Malheur	20	19 (95%)	19 (76%)
Wallowa	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	23	21 (91%)	20 (77%)
Benton	11	9 (82%)	10 (83%)
Linn	12	12 (100%)	10 (71%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	56	47 (84%)	48 (73%)
<b>Clatsop &amp; Columbia</b>	10	10 (100%)	19 (95%)
Clatsop	2	2 (100%)	7 (88%)
Columbia	8	8 (100%)	12 (100%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	2	2 (100%)	5 (100%)
Coos	0	--	--
Curry	2	2 (100%)	5 (100%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	42	34 (81%)	41 (79%)
Crook	7	5 (71%)	7 (88%)
Deschutes	24	23 (96%)	26 (81%)
Jefferson	11	6 (55%)	8 (67%)

<sup>39</sup> Intensive Service children are screened for normal growth and development at 4, 8, 12, 18, 24, 30, 36, 48, and 60 months of age using the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ). The most recent screening results are reported on the Family Update form.

<sup>40</sup> The Home Observation measures family effectiveness as the child’s first teacher for Measurement of Environment (HOME). The HOME combines a semi-structured parent interview with direct observation of the home environment and is conducted annually starting when the child is 12 months of age. Percentages for “good” or higher refer to families with total scores on the HOME reaching the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile or higher (above average) for the normative population as established by the tools and developers.

**Table 20a. HOME Score and Development Screening<sup>39</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number of Families with HOME<sup>40</sup> Score Information (at 12 Months)</b>	<b>Number (%) of Families with “Good” or Higher HOME Score (at 12 Months)</b>	<b>Number (%) of parents Reading (at Least) Daily to Child (at 12 Months)</b>
<b>Douglas, Klamath &amp; Lake</b>	31	27 (87%)	34 (72%)
Douglas	21	18 (86%)	21 (70%)
Klamath	10	9 (90%)	13 (76%)
Lake	--	--	--
<b>Gilliam, Hood River, Sherman, Wasco &amp; Wheeler</b>	33	33 (100%)	36 (86%)
Gilliam	1	1 (100%)	2 (100%)
Hood River	19	19 (100%)	23 (96%)
Sherman	2	2 (100%)	2 (100%)
Wasco	11	11 (100%)	8 (62%)
Wheeler	0	--	1 (100%)
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	7	7 (100%)	4 (50%)
Grant	4	4 (100%)	2 (40%)
Harney	3	3 (100%)	2 (67%)
<b>Jackson &amp; Josephine</b>	36	32 (89%)	30 (79%)
Jackson	13	10 (77%)	10 (77%)
Josephine	23	22 (96%)	20 (80%)

<sup>39</sup> Intensive Service children are screened for normal growth and development at 4, 8, 12, 18, 24, 30, 36, 48, and 60 months of age using the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ). The most recent screening results are reported on the Family Update form.

<sup>40</sup> The Home Observation measures family effectiveness as the child’s first teacher for Measurement of Environment (HOME). The HOME combines a semi-structured parent interview with direct observation of the home environment and is conducted annually starting when the child is 12 months of age. Percentages for “good” or higher refer to families with total scores on the HOME reaching the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile or higher (above average) for the normative population as established by the tools and developers.

**Table 20a. HOME Score and Development Screening<sup>39</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number of Families with HOME<sup>40</sup> Score Information (at 12 Months)</b>	<b>Number (%) of Families with “Good” or Higher HOME Score (at 12 Months)</b>	<b>Number (%) of parents Reading (at Least) Daily to Child (at 12 Months)</b>
<b>Lane</b>	71	62 (87%)	55 (68%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	20	16 (80%)	21 (81%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	78	68 (87%)	48 (56%)
Marion	67	57 (85%)	45 (61%)
Polk	11	11 (100%)	3 (27%)
<b>Morrow, Umatilla &amp; Union</b>	17	15 (88%)	14 (78%)
Morrow	4	4 (100%)	4 (100%)
Umatilla	3	2 (67%)	2 (50%)
Union	10	9 (90%)	8 (80%)
<b>Multnomah</b>	232	191 (82%)	184 (71%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	20	18 (90%)	16 (70%)
<b>Washington</b>	78	69 (88%)	61 (73%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	19	17 (89%)	13 (62%)
<b>State</b>	<b>804</b>	<b>696 (87%)</b>	<b>676 (72%)</b>

<sup>39</sup> Intensive Service children are screened for normal growth and development at 4, 8, 12, 18, 24, 30, 36, 48, and 60 months of age using the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ). The most recent screening results are reported on the Family Update form.

<sup>40</sup> The Home Observation measures family effectiveness as the child’s first teacher for Measurement of Environment (HOME). The HOME combines a semi-structured parent interview with direct observation of the home environment and is conducted annually starting when the child is 12 months of age. Percentages for “good” or higher refer to families with total scores on the HOME reaching the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile or higher (above average) for the normative population as established by the tools and developers.

**Table 20b. HOME Score and Development Screening<sup>41</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number of Children Eligible for a Developmental Screening<sup>42</sup></b>	<b>Number (%) of Eligible Children with at Least One Developmental Screening</b>	<b>Number (%) Children with a Diagnosed Developmental Delay<sup>43</sup></b>	<b>Percentage of Children with a Diagnosed Developmental Delay Receiving Early Intervention Services</b>
<b>Baker, Malheur &amp;</b>	66	59 (89%)	4 (9%)	3 (75%)
Baker	18	16 (89%)	0 (0%)	--
Malheur	44	39 (89%)	4 (13%)	3 (75%)
Wallowa	4	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	--
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	57	37 (65%)	2 (8%)	2 (100%)
Benton	30	17 (57%)	1 (8%)	1 (100%)
Linn	27	20 (74%)	1 (8%)	1 (100%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	114	102 (89%)	7 (10%)	7 (100%)
<b>Clatsop &amp; Columbia</b>	41	31 (76%)	1 (5%)	1 (100%)
Clatsop	19	15 (79%)	1 (14%)	1 (100%)
Columbia	22	16 (73%)	0 (0%)	--
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	35	4 (11%)	0 (0%)	--
Coos	13	0 (0%)	(0%)	--
Curry	22	4 (18%)	0 (0%)	--
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp;</b>	107	87 (81%)	3 (5%)	3 (100%)
Crook	14	10 (71%)	1 (12%)	1 (100%)
Deschutes	76	62 (82%)	1 (2%)	1 (100%)
Jefferson	17	15 (88%)	1 (8%)	1 (100%)

<sup>41</sup> Intensive Service children are screened for normal growth and development at 4, 8, 12, 18, 24, 30, 36, 48, and 60 months of age using the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ). The most recent screening results are reported on the Family Update form.

<sup>42</sup> Eligible children include anyone 6 months or older (the Family Update form is the first opportunity the Healthy Families Oregon Home Visitor has to report ASQ scores).

<sup>43</sup> Note that these diagnoses are not provided by Healthy Families Oregon staff.

**Table 20b. HOME Score and Development Screening<sup>41</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number of Children Eligible for a Developmental Screening<sup>42</sup></b>	<b>Number (%) of Eligible Children with at Least One Developmental Screening</b>	<b>Number (%) Children with a Diagnosed Developmental Delay<sup>43</sup></b>	<b>Percentage of Children with a Diagnosed Developmental Delay Receiving Early Intervention Services</b>
<b>Douglas, Klamath &amp;</b>	107	76 (71%)	1 (2%)	1 (100%)
Douglas	53	42 (79%)	0 (0%)	--
Klamath	54	34 (63%)	1 (5%)	1 (100%)
Lake	--	--	--	--
<b>Gilliam, Hood River, Sherman, Wasco &amp;</b>	57	51 (89%)	2 (5%)	2 (100%)
Gilliam	2	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	--
Hood River	34	31 (91%)	1 (4%)	1 (100%)
Sherman	2	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	--
Wasco	17	15 (88%)	1 (8%)	1 (100%)
Wheeler	2	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	--
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	16	12 (75%)	1 (12%)	1 (100%)
Grant	8	7 (88%)	1 (20%)	1 (100%)
Harney	8	5 (62%)	0 (0%)	--
<b>Jackson &amp; Josephine</b>	94	74 (79%)	1 (2%)	1 (100%)
Jackson	53	35 (66%)	0 (0%)	--
Josephine	41	39 (95%)	1 (4%)	1 (100%)

<sup>41</sup> Intensive Service children are screened for normal growth and development at 4, 8, 12, 18, 24, 30, 36, 48, and 60 months of age using the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ). The most recent screening results are reported on the Family Update form.

<sup>42</sup> Eligible children include anyone 6 months or older (the Family Update form is the first opportunity the Healthy Families Oregon Home Visitor has to report ASQ scores).

<sup>43</sup> Note that these diagnoses are not provided by Healthy Families Oregon staff.

**Table 20b. HOME Score and Development Screening<sup>41</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number of Children Eligible for a Developmental Screening<sup>42</sup></b>	<b>Number (%) of Eligible Children with at Least One Developmental Screening</b>	<b>Number (%) Children with a Diagnosed Developmental Delay<sup>43</sup></b>	<b>Percentage of Children with a Diagnosed Developmental Delay Receiving Early Intervention Services</b>
<b>Lane</b>	144	128 (89%)	5 (6%)	5 (100%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	43	37 (86%)	5 (28%)	5 (100%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	210	155 (74%)	5 (5%)	5 (100%)
Marion	184	136 (74%)	4 (4%)	4 (100%)
Polk	26	19 (73%)	1 (8%)	1 (100%)
<b>Morrow, Umatilla &amp;</b>	80	41 (51%)	0 (0%)	--
Morrow	19	12 (63%)	0 (0%)	--
Umatilla	42	15 (36%)	0 (0%)	--
Union	19	14 (74%)	0 (0%)	--
<b>Multnomah</b>	450	394 (88%)	23 (8%)	21 (91%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	51	41 (80%)	1 (3%)	1 (100%)
<b>Washington</b>	171	141 (82%)	8 (8%)	8 (100%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	48	37 (77%)	3 (12%)	2 (67%)
<b>State</b>	<b>1,891</b>	<b>1,507 (80%)</b>	<b>72 (7%)</b>	<b>68 (94%)</b>

<sup>41</sup> Intensive Service children are screened for normal growth and development at 4, 8, 12, 18, 24, 30, 36, 48, and 60 months of age using the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ). The most recent screening results are reported on the Family Update form.

<sup>42</sup> Eligible children include anyone 6 months or older (the Family Update form is the first opportunity the Healthy Families Oregon Home Visitor has to report ASQ scores).

<sup>43</sup> Note that these diagnoses are not provided by Healthy Families Oregon staff.

**Table 21. Developmental Screening (ASQ) Results & Subsequent Actions**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) with Normal Development <sup>44</sup> at Most Recent Developmental Screening	Number (%) of Children with Delays Indicated on Most Recent ASQ	<i>Of those with delays indicated (note that multiple actions can be taken):</i>					
			Number (%) Referred to Early Intervention	Number (%) Connected to Early Intervention Services	Number (%) Given Information/Support for Child's Development	Number (%) Receiving "Other" Action	Number (%) of Families Declining Early Intervention Services	Total Number (%) Receiving at Least ONE Follow-Up Service or Action
<b>Baker, Malheur &amp; Wallowa</b>	49 (83%)	3 (5%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	3 (100%)
Baker	14 (88%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--
Malheur	31 (79%)	3 (8%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	3 (100%)
Wallowa	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	32 (86%)	2 (5%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	2 (100%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
Benton	14 (82%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Linn	18 (90%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	77 (75%)	11 (11%)	1 (9%)	2 (18%)	4 (36%)	1 (9%)	3 (27%)	8 (73%)
<b>Clatsop &amp; Columbia</b>	29 (94%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--
Clatsop	14 (93%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--
Columbia	15 (94%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Coos	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--
Curry	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	72 (83%)	3 (3%)	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)
Crook	5 (50%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Deschutes	58 (94%)	1 (2%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Jefferson	9 (60%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)

<sup>44</sup> Normal development and early intervention are measured using the Ages and States Questionnaire and are reported on the Family Update form completed by the Healthy Families Oregon Home Visitor.



**Table 21. Developmental Screening (ASQ) Results & Subsequent Actions**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) with Normal Development <sup>44</sup> at Most Recent Developmental Screening	Number (%) of Children with Delays Indicated on Most Recent ASQ	<i>Of those with delays indicated (note that multiple actions can be taken):</i>					
			Number (%) Referred to Early Intervention	Number (%) Connected to Early Intervention Services	Number (%) Given Information/ Support for Child's Development	Number (%) Receiving "Other" Action	Number (%) of Families Declining Early Intervention Services	Total Number (%) Receiving at Least ONE Follow-Up Service or Action
<b>Douglas, Klamath &amp; Lake</b>	64 (84%)	4 (5%)	1 (25%)	2 (50%)	3 (75%)	2 (50%)	0 (0%)	4 (100%)
Douglas	33 (79%)	3 (7%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)
Klamath	31 (91%)	1 (3%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Lake	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Gilliam, Hood River, Sherman, Wasco &amp; Wheeler</b>	44 (86%)	3 (6%)	3 (100%)	2 (67%)	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)
Gilliam	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hood River	26 (84%)	1 (3%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Sherman	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--
Wasco	13 (87%)	2 (13%)	2 (100%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
Wheeler	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	10 (83%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--
Grant	6 (86%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--
Harney	4 (80%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Jackson &amp; Josephine</b>	69 (93%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Jackson	32 (91%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--
Josephine	37 (95%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)

<sup>44</sup> Normal development and early intervention are measured using the Ages and States Questionnaire and are reported on the Family Update form completed by the Healthy Families Oregon Home Visitor.

**Table 21. Developmental Screening (ASQ) Results & Subsequent Actions**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) with Normal Development <sup>44</sup> at Most Recent Developmental Screening	Number (%) of Children with Delays Indicated on Most Recent ASQ	<i>Of those with delays indicated (note that multiple actions can be taken):</i>					
			Number (%) Referred to Early Intervention	Number (%) Connected to Early Intervention Services	Number (%) Given Information/Support for Child's Development	Number (%) Receiving "Other" Action	Number (%) of Families Declining Early Intervention Services	Total Number (%) Receiving at Least ONE Follow-Up Service or Action
<b>Lane</b>	96 (75%)	12 (9%)	5 (42%)	5 (42%)	1 (8%)	2 (17%)	0 (0%)	12 (100%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	27 (73%)	3 (8%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	131 (85%)	3 (2%)	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)
Marion	114 (84%)	3 (2%)	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)
Polk	17 (89%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Morrow, Umatilla &amp; Union</b>	34 (83%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
Morrow	12 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--
Umatilla	10 (67%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
Union	12 (86%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Multnomah</b>	322 (82%)	31 (8%)	9 (29%)	15 (48%)	10 (32%)	5 (16%)	0 (0%)	30 (97%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	26 (63%)	8 (20%)	4 (50%)	1 (12%)	4 (50%)	6 (75%)	2 (25%)	7 (88%)
<b>Washington</b>	124 (88%)	8 (6%)	4 (50%)	3 (38%)	3 (38%)	1 (12%)	0 (0%)	8 (100%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	29 (78%)	5 (14%)	3 (60%)	2 (40%)	4 (80%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	5 (100%)
<b>State</b>	<b>1,238 (82%)</b>	<b>99 (7%)</b>	<b>34 (34%)</b>	<b>37 (37%)</b>	<b>39 (39%)</b>	<b>25 (25%)</b>	<b>8 (8%)</b>	<b>92 (93%)</b>

<sup>44</sup> Normal development and early intervention are measured using the Ages and States Questionnaire and are reported on the Family Update form completed by the Healthy Families Oregon Home Visitor.

**Table 22. Social Emotional Developmental Screening (ASQ-SE) Results & Subsequent Actions<sup>45</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) Scoring Normal on Most Recent ASQ-SE	Number (%) with Delay Indicated on Most Recent (ASQ-SE)	<i>Of those with delays indicated (note that multiple actions can be taken):</i>						
			Number (%) Referred to Early Intervention	Number (%) Connected to Early Intervention	Number (%) Referred to Other Mental Health Services	Number (%) Connected to Other Mental Health Services	Number (%) Giving Information/ Support for Child's Development	Number (%) Declined Additional Services	Total Number (%) Receiving at Least ONE Follow-Up Service or Action
<b>Baker, Malheur &amp; Wallowa</b>	59 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Baker	16 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Malheur	40 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Wallowa	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	36 (97%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Benton	16 (94%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Linn	20 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Clackamas</b>	92 (92%)	6 (6%)	1 (17%)	1 (17%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (17%)	0 (0%)	3 (50%)
<b>Clatsop &amp; Columbia</b>	29 (94%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Clatsop	15 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Columbia	14 (88%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Coos	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Curry	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	74 (95%)	2 (3%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
Crook	7 (78%)	1 (11%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Deschutes	53 (98%)	1 (2%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Jefferson	14 (93%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

<sup>45</sup> The Home Visitor provides ASQ-SE information on the Family Update form.

**Table 22. Social Emotional Developmental Screening (ASQ-SE) Results & Subsequent Actions<sup>45</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) Scoring Normal on Most Recent ASQ-SE	Number (%) with Delay Indicated on Most Recent (ASQ-SE)	<i>Of those with delays indicated (note that multiple actions can be taken):</i>						
			Number (%) Referred to Early Intervention	Number (%) Connected to Early Intervention	Number (%) Referred to Other Mental Health Services	Number (%) Connected to Other Mental Health Services	Number (%) Giving Information/ Support for Child's Development	Number (%) Declined Additional Services	Total Number (%) Receiving at Least ONE Follow-Up Service or Action
<b>Douglas, Klamath &amp; Lake</b>	73 (97%)	1 (1%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Douglas	41 (98%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Klamath	32 (97%)	1 (3%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Lake	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Gilliam, Hood River, Sherman, Wasco &amp; Wheeler</b>	49 (98%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Gilliam	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hood River	30 (97%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Sherman	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Wasco	15 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Wheeler	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	11 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Grant	6 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Harney	5 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Jackson &amp; Josephine</b>	66 (97%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Jackson	28 (93%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Josephine	38 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

<sup>45</sup> The Home Visitor provides ASQ-SE information on the Family Update form.

**Table 22. Social Emotional Developmental Screening (ASQ-SE) Results & Subsequent Actions<sup>45</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) Scoring Normal on Most Recent ASQ-SE	Number (%) with Delay Indicated on Most Recent (ASQ-SE)	<i>Of those with delays indicated (note that multiple actions can be taken):</i>						
			Number (%) Referred to Early Intervention	Number (%) Connected to Early Intervention	Number (%) Referred to Other Mental Health Services	Number (%) Connected to Other Mental Health Services	Number (%) Giving Information/ Support for Child's Development	Number (%) Declined Additional Services	Total Number (%) Receiving at Least ONE Follow-Up Service or Action
<b>Lane</b>	115 (92%)	5 (4%)	2 (40%)	1 (20%)	2 (40%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	4 (80%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	32 (86%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	148 (97%)	3 (2%)	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)
Marion	132 (99%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Polk	16 (89%)	2 (11%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
<b>Morrow, Umatilla &amp; Union</b>	38 (97%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Morrow	12 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Umatilla	13 (93%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Union	13 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Multnomah</b>	363 (95%)	10 (3%)	1 (10%)	6 (60%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	7 (70%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	41 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Washington</b>	136 (99%)	2 (1%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	33 (92%)	1 (3%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
<b>State</b>	<b>1,399 (96%)</b>	<b>31 (2%)</b>	<b>10 (32%)</b>	<b>11 (35%)</b>	<b>4 (13%)</b>	<b>1 (3%)</b>	<b>8 (26%)</b>	<b>0 (0%)</b>	<b>24 (77%)</b>

<sup>45</sup> The Home Visitor provides ASQ-SE information on the Family Update form.

**Table 23. Connection to Essential Resources for Intensive Service Families<sup>46</sup>**
*Number Needing and Connected to Service at 6 Months (% Connected)*

<i>Program/County</i>	Drug/Alcohol		Domestic Violence		Public Health Nursing		TANF	
	Number Referred	Number (%) Connected	Number Referred	Number (%) Connected	Number Referred	Number (%) Connected	Number Referred	Number (%) Connected
<b>Baker, Malheur &amp; Wallowa</b>	1	1 (100%)	3	2 (67%)	4	0 (0%)	4	2 (67%)
Baker	1	1 (100%)	2	1 (50%)	4	0 (0%)	2	1 (100%)
Malheur	0	--	0	--	0	--	2	1 (50%)
Wallowa	0	--	1	1 (100%)	0	--	0	--
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	1	--	0	--	0	--	2	2 (100%)
Benton	1	--	0	--	0	--	2	2 (100%)
Linn	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--
<b>Clackamas</b>	0	--	5	4 (80%)	7	6 (86%)	8	4 (67%)
<b>Clatsop &amp; Columbia</b>	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--
Clatsop	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--
Columbia	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--
Coos	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--
Curry	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	3	2 (67%)	3	2 (67%)	0	--	11	6 (75%)
Crook	0	--	0	--	0	--	2	0 (0%)
Deschutes	3	2 (67%)	3	2 (67%)	0	--	5	3 (75%)
Jefferson	0	--	0	--	0	--	4	3 (75%)

<sup>46</sup> Note. The prior FY2013-14 reported referrals only. In the data above, not every family receiving a referral had information about whether or not a connection to services was made.

**Table 23. Connection to Essential Resources for Intensive Service Families<sup>46</sup>***Number Needing and Connected to Service at 6 Months (% Connected)*

<i>Program/County</i>	Drug/Alcohol		Domestic Violence		Public Health Nursing		TANF	
	Number Referred	Number (%) Connected	Number Referred	Number (%) Connected	Number Referred	Number (%) Connected	Number Referred	Number (%) Connected
<b>Douglas, Klamath &amp; Lake</b>	3	1 (50%)	5	3 (100%)	0	--	9	6 (86%)
Douglas	1	0 (0%)	1	0 (0%)	0	--	2	1 (50%)
Klamath	2	1 (50%)	4	3 (100%)	0	--	7	5 (100%)
Lake	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--
<b>Gilliam, Hood River, Sherman, Wasco &amp; Wheeler</b>	4	3 (75%)	3	0 (0%)	17	13 (93%)	10	8 (100%)
Gilliam	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--
Hood River	4	3 (75%)	1	0 (0%)	15	11 (92%)	7	5 (100%)
Sherman	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--
Wasco	0	--	2	0 (0%)	2	2 (100%)	3	3 (100%)
Wheeler	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	0	--	1	0 (0%)	4	3 (75%)	1	0 (0%)
Grant	0	--	0	--	4	3 (75%)	1	0 (0%)
Harney	0	--	1	0 (0%)	0	--	0	--
<b>Jackson &amp; Josephine</b>	6	5 (83%)	9	6 (75%)	0	--	9	5 (100%)
Jackson	6	5 (83%)	4	2 (50%)	0	--	8	5 (100%)
Josephine	0	--	5	4 (100%)	0	--	1	0 (0%)

<sup>46</sup> Note. The prior FY2013-14 reported referrals only. In the data above, not every family receiving a referral had information about whether or not a connection to services was made.

**Table 23. Connection to Essential Resources for Intensive Service Families<sup>46</sup>**
*Number Needing and Connected to Service at 6 Months (% Connected)*

<i>Program/County</i>	Drug/Alcohol		Domestic Violence		Public Health Nursing		TANF	
	Number Referred	Number (%) Connected	Number Referred	Number (%) Connected	Number Referred	Number (%) Connected	Number Referred	Number (%) Connected
<b>Lane</b>	3	2 (100%)	6	4 (100%)	1	0 (0%)	9	2 (22%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	1	0 (0%)	2	0 (0%)	3	3 (100%)	6	2 (40%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	2	0 (0%)	5	5 (100%)	7	2 (29%)	13	8 (80%)
Marion	2	0 (0%)	3	3 (100%)	6	1 (17%)	11	7 (78%)
Polk	0	--	2	2 (100%)	1	1 (100%)	2	1 (100%)
<b>Morrow, Umatilla &amp; Union</b>	0	--	0	--	0	--	2	1 (100%)
Morrow	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--
Umatilla	0	--	0	--	0	--	2	1 (100%)
Union	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--
<b>Multnomah</b>	4	4 (100%)	24	15 (65%)	22	15 (79%)	32	18 (67%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	2	0 (0%)	0	--	3	1 (33%)	3	3 (100%)
<b>Washington</b>	0	--	0	--	6	3 (60%)	10	7 (78%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	3	0 (0%)	2	2 (100%)	10	4 (44%)	6	4 (80%)
<b>State</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>18 (64%)</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>43 (72%)</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>50 (68%)</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>78 (72%)</b>

<sup>46</sup> Note. The prior FY2013-14 reported referrals only. In the data above, not every family receiving a referral had information about whether or not a connection to services was made.



**Table 24a. Family Outcomes and Life Events at 6 Months<sup>47</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number (%) of Families Reporting a New Job</b>	<b>Number (%) of Families Reporting Having Obtained a GED or Having Graduated from School</b>	<b>Number (%) of Families Reporting the Discontinuation of TANF</b>	<b>Number (%) of Child Welfare Reports Made by Home Visitor</b>
<b>Baker, Malheur &amp; Wallowa</b>	12 (21%)	0 (0%)	2 (3%)	1 (2%)
Baker	6 (38%)	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)
Malheur	6 (16%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	1 (3%)
Wallowa	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	7 (21%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)
Benton	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Linn	6 (30%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	19 (19%)	3 (3%)	2 (2%)	4 (4%)
<b>Clatsop &amp; Columbia</b>	6 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Clatsop	2 (13%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Columbia	4 (27%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Coos	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Curry	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	27 (33%)	4 (5%)	3 (4%)	2 (2%)
Crook	4 (44%)	0 (0%)	2 (22%)	0 (0%)
Deschutes	17 (28%)	3 (5%)	1 (2%)	2 (3%)
Jefferson	6 (43%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

<sup>47</sup> Family outcomes and events are reported by the Home Visitor on the Family Update form. Percentages are calculated based on the number of families with valid Family Update information for each item.

**Table 24a. Family Outcomes and Life Events at 6 Months<sup>47</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number (%) of Families Reporting a New Job</b>	<b>Number (%) of Families Reporting Having Obtained a GED or Having Graduated from School</b>	<b>Number (%) of Families Reporting the Discontinuation of TANF</b>	<b>Number (%) of Child Welfare Reports Made by Home Visitor</b>
<b>Douglas, Klamath &amp; Lake</b>	18 (26%)	3 (4%)	8 (12%)	2 (3%)
Douglas	13 (33%)	0 (0%)	8 (21%)	0 (0%)
Klamath	5 (17%)	3 (10%)	0 (0%)	2 (7%)
Lake	--	--	--	--
<b>Gilliam, Hood River, Sherman, Wasco &amp; Wheeler</b>	15 (31%)	2 (4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Gilliam	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Hood River	10 (34%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Sherman	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Wasco	5 (31%)	2 (12%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Wheeler	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	2 (20%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)
Grant	1 (14%)	1 (14%)	1 (14%)	0 (0%)
Harney	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Jackson &amp; Josephine</b>	13 (18%)	0 (0%)	7 (10%)	8 (11%)
Jackson	6 (17%)	0 (0%)	4 (11%)	4 (12%)
Josephine	7 (19%)	0 (0%)	3 (8%)	4 (11%)

<sup>47</sup> Family outcomes and events are reported by the Home Visitor on the Family Update form. Percentages are calculated based on the number of families with valid Family Update information for each item.

**Table 24a. Family Outcomes and Life Events at 6 Months<sup>47</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number (%) of Families Reporting a New Job</b>	<b>Number (%) of Families Reporting Having Obtained a GED or Having Graduated from School</b>	<b>Number (%) of Families Reporting the Discontinuation of TANF</b>	<b>Number (%) of Child Welfare Reports Made by Home Visitor</b>
<b>Lane</b>	29 (22%)	1 (1%)	4 (3%)	3 (2%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	7 (23%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	36 (24%)	4 (3%)	4 (3%)	3 (2%)
Marion	34 (25%)	3 (2%)	4 (3%)	3 (2%)
Polk	2 (11%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Morrow, Umatilla &amp; Union</b>	3 (8%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)
Morrow	2 (18%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Umatilla	0 (0%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	1 (7%)
Union	1 (9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Multnomah</b>	81 (22%)	8 (2%)	14 (4%)	4 (1%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	12 (30%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	2 (5%)
<b>Washington</b>	31 (24%)	1 (1%)	4 (3%)	1 (1%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	7 (21%)	1 (3%)	2 (6%)	0 (0%)
<b>State</b>	<b>325 (23%)</b>	<b>29 (2%)</b>	<b>54 (4%)</b>	<b>31 (2%)</b>

<sup>47</sup> Family outcomes and events are reported by the Home Visitor on the Family Update form. Percentages are calculated based on the number of families with valid Family Update information for each item.

**Table 24b. Family Outcomes and Life Events at 12 Months<sup>48</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number (%) of Families Reporting a New Job</b>	<b>Number (%) of Families Reporting Having Obtained a GED or Having Graduated from School</b>	<b>Number (%) of Families Reporting the Discontinuation of TANF</b>	<b>Number (%) of Child Welfare Reports Made by Home Visitor</b>
<b>Baker, Malheur &amp; Wallowa</b>	6 (14%)	0 (0%)	2 (5%)	0 (0%)
Baker	3 (25%)	0 (0%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)
Malheur	3 (10%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Wallowa	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	9 (36%)	2 (8%)	2 (8%)	0 (0%)
Benton	3 (25%)	1 (8%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)
Linn	6 (46%)	1 (8%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	20 (29%)	2 (3%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)
<b>Clatsop &amp; Columbia</b>	5 (26%)	1 (5%)	2 (11%)	0 (0%)
Clatsop	2 (29%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Columbia	3 (25%)	1 (8%)	2 (17%)	0 (0%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)
Coos	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Curry	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	22 (37%)	4 (7%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)
Crook	3 (38%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Deschutes	13 (33%)	2 (5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Jefferson	6 (46%)	2 (15%)	1 (8%)	1 (8%)

<sup>48</sup> Family outcomes and events are reported by the Home Visitor on the Family Update form. Percentages are calculated based on the number of families with valid Family Update information for each item.

**Table 24b. Family Outcomes and Life Events at 12 Months<sup>48</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number (%) of Families Reporting a New Job</b>	<b>Number (%) of Families Reporting Having Obtained a GED or Having Graduated from School</b>	<b>Number (%) of Families Reporting the Discontinuation of TANF</b>	<b>Number (%) of Child Welfare Reports Made by Home Visitor</b>
<b>Douglas, Klamath &amp; Lake</b>	6 (12%)	5 (10%)	3 (6%)	1 (2%)
Douglas	2 (6%)	0 (0%)	2 (6%)	0 (0%)
Klamath	4 (21%)	5 (26%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)
Lake	--	--	--	--
<b>Gilliam, Hood River, Sherman, Wasco &amp; Wheeler</b>	10 (24%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)
Gilliam	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Hood River	8 (32%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Sherman	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Wasco	1 (8%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)	1 (8%)
Wheeler	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	3 (38%)	0 (0%)	1 (12%)	0 (0%)
Grant	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Harney	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)
<b>Jackson &amp; Josephine</b>	12 (29%)	2 (5%)	4 (10%)	3 (7%)
Jackson	4 (27%)	1 (7%)	4 (27%)	2 (13%)
Josephine	8 (30%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)

<sup>48</sup> Family outcomes and events are reported by the Home Visitor on the Family Update form. Percentages are calculated based on the number of families with valid Family Update information for each item.

**Table 24b. Family Outcomes and Life Events at 12 Months<sup>48</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number (%) of Families Reporting a New Job</b>	<b>Number (%) of Families Reporting Having Obtained a GED or Having Graduated from School</b>	<b>Number (%) of Families Reporting the Discontinuation of TANF</b>	<b>Number (%) of Child Welfare Reports Made by Home Visitor</b>
<b>Lane</b>	16 (19%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	7 (26%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	31 (29%)	3 (3%)	2 (2%)	2 (2%)
Marion	28 (30%)	3 (3%)	2 (2%)	2 (2%)
Polk	3 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Morrow, Umatilla &amp; Union</b>	5 (23%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)
Morrow	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Umatilla	2 (40%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)
Union	3 (27%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Multnomah</b>	86 (29%)	17 (6%)	15 (5%)	4 (1%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	10 (34%)	1 (3%)	1 (3%)	1 (3%)
<b>Washington</b>	21 (21%)	2 (2%)	0 (0%)	3 (3%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	5 (22%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)
<b>State</b>	<b>275 (26%)</b>	<b>42 (4%)</b>	<b>37 (4%)</b>	<b>20 (2%)</b>

<sup>48</sup> Family outcomes and events are reported by the Home Visitor on the Family Update form. Percentages are calculated based on the number of families with valid Family Update information for each item.

**Table 25a. Promotion of Positive Parenting Skills & Helping Children Learn<sup>49</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number Reporting Parenting Skills Information (at 6 months)	Number (%) Reporting Improved Parenting Skills (at 6 months)	Number Reporting Parenting Skills Information (at 12 months)	Number (%) Reporting Improved Parenting Skills (at 12 months)
<b>Baker, Malheur &amp; Wallowa</b>	50	35 (70%)	40	34 (85%)
Baker	16	11 (69%)	14	12 (86%)
Malheur	30	21 (70%)	25	21 (84%)
Wallowa	4	3 (75%)	1	1 (100%)
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	31	21 (68%)	25	21 (84%)
Benton	11	6 (55%)	11	11 (100%)
Linn	20	15 (75%)	14	10 (71%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	101	87 (86%)	65	52 (80%)
<b>Clatsop &amp; Columbia</b>	30	24 (80%)	17	14 (82%)
Clatsop	15	14 (93%)	8	6 (75%)
Columbia	15	10 (67%)	9	8 (89%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	4	2 (50%)	5	5 (100%)
Coos	0	0 (0%)	0	0 (0%)
Curry	4	2 (50%)	5	5 (100%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	78	62 (79%)	52	42 (81%)
Crook	8	8 (100%)	8	6 (75%)
Deschutes	57	43 (75%)	32	26 (81%)
Jefferson	13	11 (85%)	12	10 (83%)

<sup>49</sup> The primary caregiver rates their parenting skills and ability to help their child learn on the 6- and 12-month Parent Surveys. Percentages are calculated based on the number of caregivers with information for each item.

**Table 25a. Promotion of Positive Parenting Skills & Helping Children Learn<sup>49</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number Reporting Parenting Skills Information (at 6 months)	Number (%) Reporting Improved Parenting Skills (at 6 months)	Number Reporting Parenting Skills Information (at 12 months)	Number (%) Reporting Improved Parenting Skills (at 12 months)
<b>Douglas, Klamath &amp; Lake</b>	63	53 (84%)	47	37 (79%)
Douglas	38	31 (82%)	30	22 (73%)
Klamath	25	22 (88%)	17	15 (88%)
Lake	--	--	--	--
<b>Gilliam, Hood River, Sherman, Wasco &amp; Wheeler</b>	51	41 (80%)	42	26 (62%)
Gilliam	1	1 (100%)	2	2 (100%)
Hood River	30	26 (87%)	24	16 (67%)
Sherman	2	2 (100%)	2	2 (100%)
Wasco	17	11 (65%)	13	5 (38%)
Wheeler	1	1 (100%)	1	1 (100%)
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	10	9 (90%)	7	6 (86%)
Grant	7	6 (86%)	4	4 (100%)
Harney	3	3 (100%)	3	2 (67%)
<b>Jackson &amp; Josephine</b>	66	50 (76%)	37	29 (78%)
Jackson	30	23 (77%)	13	13 (100%)
Josephine	36	27 (75%)	24	16 (67%)

<sup>49</sup> The primary caregiver rates their parenting skills and ability to help their child learn on the 6- and 12-month Parent Surveys. Percentages are calculated based on the number of caregivers with information for each item.



**Table 25a. Promotion of Positive Parenting Skills & Helping Children Learn<sup>49</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number Reporting Parenting Skills Information (at 6 months)</b>	<b>Number (%) Reporting Improved Parenting Skills (at 6 months)</b>	<b>Number Reporting Parenting Skills Information (at 12 months)</b>	<b>Number (%) Reporting Improved Parenting Skills (at 12 months)</b>
<b>Lane</b>	128	100 (78%)	79	68 (86%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	32	27 (84%)	25	19 (76%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	142	96 (68%)	86	67 (78%)
Marion	124	83 (67%)	75	58 (77%)
Polk	18	13 (72%)	11	9 (82%)
<b>Morrow, Umatilla &amp; Union</b>	33	29 (88%)	18	12 (67%)
Morrow	11	11 (100%)	4	3 (75%)
Umatilla	12	10 (83%)	4	2 (50%)
Union	10	8 (80%)	10	7 (70%)
<b>Multnomah</b>	329	229 (70%)	252	174 (69%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	36	16 (44%)	21	10 (48%)
<b>Washington</b>	117	81 (69%)	81	58 (72%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	30	23 (77%)	21	20 (95%)
<b>State</b>	<b>1,331</b>	<b>985 (74%)</b>	<b>920</b>	<b>694 (75%)</b>

<sup>49</sup> The primary caregiver rates their parenting skills and ability to help their child learn on the 6- and 12-month Parent Surveys. Percentages are calculated based on the number of caregivers with information for each item.

**Table 25b. Promotion of Positive Parenting Skills & Helping Children Learn<sup>50</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number Reporting Ability to Help Their Child Learn Information (at 6 months)	Number (%) Reporting Improved Ability to Help Their Child Learn (at 6 months)	Number Reporting Ability to Help Their Child Learn Information (at 12 months)	Number (%) Reporting Improved Ability to Help Their Child Learn (at 12 months)
<b>Baker, Malheur &amp; Wallowa</b>	48	30 (62%)	39	30 (77%)
Baker	14	10 (71%)	13	9 (69%)
Malheur	30	17 (57%)	25	20 (80%)
Wallowa	4	3 (75%)	1	1 (100%)
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	31	22 (71%)	24	13 (54%)
Benton	11	8 (73%)	10	6 (60%)
Linn	20	14 (70%)	14	7 (50%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	101	76 (75%)	62	41 (66%)
<b>Clatsop &amp; Columbia</b>	30	19 (63%)	16	13 (81%)
Clatsop	15	11 (73%)	8	6 (75%)
Columbia	15	8 (53%)	8	7 (88%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	4	2 (50%)	5	4 (80%)
Coos	0	0 (0%)	0	0 (0%)
Curry	4	2 (50%)	5	4 (80%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	74	50 (68%)	48	30 (62%)
Crook	8	7 (88%)	6	3 (50%)
Deschutes	53	36 (68%)	31	20 (65%)
Jefferson	13	7 (54%)	11	7 (64%)

<sup>50</sup> The primary caregiver rates their parenting skills and ability to help their child learn on the 6- and 12-month Parent Surveys. Percentages are calculated based on the number of caregivers with information for each item.

**Table 25b. Promotion of Positive Parenting Skills & Helping Children Learn<sup>50</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number Reporting Ability to Help Their Child Learn Information (at 6 months)	Number (%) Reporting Improved Ability to Help Their Child Learn (at 6 months)	Number Reporting Ability to Help Their Child Learn Information (at 12 months)	Number (%) Reporting Improved Ability to Help Their Child Learn (at 12 months)
<b>Douglas, Klamath &amp; Lake</b>	61	45 (74%)	43	31 (72%)
Douglas	37	27 (73%)	29	20 (69%)
Klamath	24	18 (75%)	14	11 (79%)
Lake	--	--	--	--
<b>Gilliam, Hood River, Sherman, Wasco &amp; Wheeler</b>	45	37 (82%)	36	28 (78%)
Gilliam	1	1 (100%)	2	2 (100%)
Hood River	27	25 (93%)	19	16 (84%)
Sherman	1	1 (100%)	2	1 (50%)
Wasco	15	9 (60%)	12	8 (67%)
Wheeler	1	1 (100%)	1	1 (100%)
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	10	7 (70%)	6	4 (67%)
Grant	7	6 (86%)	3	3 (100%)
Harney	3	1 (33%)	3	1 (33%)
<b>Jackson &amp; Josephine</b>	63	44 (70%)	35	24 (69%)
Jackson	30	21 (70%)	13	10 (77%)
Josephine	33	23 (70%)	22	14 (64%)

<sup>50</sup> The primary caregiver rates their parenting skills and ability to help their child learn on the 6- and 12-month Parent Surveys. Percentages are calculated based on the number of caregivers with information for each item.

**Table 25b. Promotion of Positive Parenting Skills & Helping Children Learn<sup>50</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number Reporting Ability to Help Their Child Learn Information (at 6 months)</b>	<b>Number (%) Reporting Improved Ability to Help Their Child Learn (at 6 months)</b>	<b>Number Reporting Ability to Help Their Child Learn Information (at 12 months)</b>	<b>Number (%) Reporting Improved Ability to Help Their Child Learn (at 12 months)</b>
<b>Lane</b>	120	78 (65%)	71	52 (73%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	32	23 (72%)	24	16 (67%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	135	77 (57%)	79	52 (66%)
Marion	118	65 (55%)	69	44 (64%)
Polk	17	12 (71%)	10	8 (80%)
<b>Morrow, Umatilla &amp; Union</b>	33	27 (82%)	16	8 (50%)
Morrow	11	11 (100%)	4	3 (75%)
Umatilla	12	9 (75%)	4	2 (50%)
Union	10	7 (70%)	8	3 (38%)
<b>Multnomah</b>	312	173 (55%)	230	148 (64%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	35	16 (46%)	9	9 (50%)
<b>Washington</b>	114	71 (62%)	57	57 (72%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	29	19 (66%)	21	15 (71%)
<b>State</b>	<b>1,277</b>	<b>816 (64%)</b>	<b>852</b>	<b>575 (67%)</b>

<sup>50</sup> The primary caregiver rates their parenting skills and ability to help their child learn on the 6- and 12-month Parent Surveys. Percentages are calculated based on the number of caregivers with information for each item.

**Table 26a. Ratings of Home Visitor Helpfulness<sup>51</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Families Needing Help with Basic Resources	Number (%) Reporting Home Visitor “Helped a Little or a Lot” with Basic Resources	Number of Families Needing Help with Social Support	Number (%) Reporting Home Visitor “Helped a Little or a Lot” with Social Support	Number of Families Needing Help with Parenting Information	Number (%) Reporting Home Visitor “Helped a Little or a Lot” with Parenting Information
<b>Baker, Malheur &amp;</b>	18	18 (100%)	34	30 (88%)	56	56 (100%)
Baker	8	8 (100%)	15	15 (100%)	16	16 (100%)
Malheur	8	8 (100%)	16	12 (75%)	36	36 (100%)
Wallowa	2	2 (100%)	3	3 (100%)	4	4 (100%)
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	23	22 (96%)	32	29 (91%)	38	38 (100%)
Benton	13	13 (100%)	17	17 (100%)	17	17 (100%)
Linn	10	9 (90%)	15	12 (80%)	21	21 (100%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	81	81 (100%)	92	82 (89%)	100	100 (100%)
<b>Clatsop &amp; Columbia</b>	21	21 (100%)	23	22 (96%)	30	30 (100%)
Clatsop	8	8 (100%)	9	9 (100%)	14	14 (100%)
Columbia	13	13 (100%)	14	13 (93%)	16	16 (100%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	9	9 (100%)	9	6 (67%)	10	10 (100%)
Coos	2	2 (100%)	2	0 (0%)	2	2 (100%)
Curry	7	7 (100%)	7	6 (86%)	8	8 (100%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp;</b>	62	61 (98%)	76	74 (97%)	82	82 (100%)
Crook	8	7 (88%)	8	6 (75%)	9	9 (100%)
Deschutes	42	42 (100%)	54	54 (100%)	59	59 (100%)
Jefferson	12	12 (100%)	14	14 (100%)	14	14 (100%)

<sup>51</sup> Ratings are taken from the family’s last completed Parent Survey II-B. “Please tell us whether Healthy Families has helped your family with the following issues” items are rated as “Visitor has helped a lot” “Helped a little”, “Hasn’t helped yet” and “We don’t need help from visitor.” Percentages are calculated based on the number of families reporting “helped a lot” and “helped a little.”

**Table 26a. Ratings of Home Visitor Helpfulness<sup>51</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Families Needing Help with Basic Resources	Number (%) Reporting Home Visitor “Helped a Little or a Lot” with Basic Resources	Number of Families Needing Help with Social Support	Number (%) Reporting Home Visitor “Helped a Little or a Lot” with Social Support	Number of Families Needing Help with Parenting Information	Number (%) Reporting Home Visitor “Helped a Little or a Lot” with Parenting Information
<b>Douglas, Klamath &amp; Lake</b>	57	57 (100%)	59	57 (97%)	73	73 (100%)
Douglas	28	28 (100%)	28	26 (93%)	41	41 (100%)
Klamath	29	29 (100%)	31	31 (100%)	32	32 (100%)
Lake	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Gilliam, Hood River, Sherman, Wasco &amp;</b>	41	41 (100%)	47	44 (94%)	53	53 (100%)
Gilliam	1	1 (100%)	1	1 (100%)	2	2 (100%)
Hood River	24	24 (100%)	28	28 (100%)	30	30 (100%)
Sherman	2	2 (100%)	1	1 (100%)	2	2 (100%)
Wasco	13	13 (100%)	15	13 (87%)	17	17 (100%)
Wheeler	1	1 (100%)	2	1 (50%)	2	2 (100%)
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	5	5 (100%)	8	8 (100%)	10	10 (100%)
Grant	4	4 (100%)	5	5 (100%)	7	7 (100%)
Harney	1	1 (100%)	3	3 (100%)	3	3 (100%)
<b>Jackson &amp; Josephine</b>	55	54 (98%)	63	62 (98%)	74	74 (100%)
Jackson	27	27 (100%)	29	28 (97%)	35	35 (100%)
Josephine	28	27 (96%)	34	34 (100%)	39	39 (100%)

<sup>51</sup> Ratings are taken from the family’s last completed Parent Survey II-B. “Please tell us whether Healthy Families has helped your family with the following issues” items are rated as “Visitor has helped a lot” “Helped a little”, “Hasn’t helped yet” and “We don’t need help from visitor.” Percentages are calculated based on the number of families reporting “helped a lot” and “helped a little.”

**Table 26a. Ratings of Home Visitor Helpfulness<sup>51</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number of Families Needing Help with Basic Resources</b>	<b>Number (%) Reporting Home Visitor “Helped a Little or a Lot” with Basic Resources</b>	<b>Number of Families Needing Help with Social Support</b>	<b>Number (%) Reporting Home Visitor “Helped a Little or a Lot” with Social Support</b>	<b>Number of Families Needing Help with Parenting Information</b>	<b>Number (%) Reporting Home Visitor “Helped a Little or a Lot” with Parenting Information</b>
<b>Lane</b>	89	79 (89%)	117	112 (96%)	126	126 (100%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	23	22 (96%)	33	26 (79%)	39	39 (100%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	138	133 (96%)	131	115 (88%)	155	154 (99%)
Marion	122	118 (97%)	114	100 (88%)	137	136 (99%)
Polk	16	15 (94%)	17	15 (88%)	18	18 (100%)
<b>Morrow, Umatilla &amp;</b>	20	19 (95%)	29	25 (86%)	41	41 (100%)
Morrow	7	7 (100%)	7	7 (100%)	13	13 (100%)
Umatilla	7	6 (86%)	12	10 (83%)	16	16 (100%)
Union	6	6 (100%)	10	8 (80%)	12	12 (100%)
<b>Multnomah</b>	281	273 (97%)	270	253 (94%)	363	362 (100%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	34	34 (100%)	36	36 (100%)	39	39 (100%)
<b>Washington</b>	100	99 (99%)	115	106 (92%)	130	130 (100%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	25	24 (96%)	30	27 (90%)	35	35 (100%)
<b>State</b>	<b>1,082</b>	<b>1,052 (97%)</b>	<b>1,204</b>	<b>1,114 (93%)</b>	<b>1,454</b>	<b>1,452 (100%)</b>

<sup>51</sup> Ratings are taken from the family’s last completed Parent Survey II-B. “Please tell us whether Healthy Families has helped your family with the following issues” items are rated as “Visitor has helped a lot” “Helped a little”, “Hasn’t helped yet” and “We don’t need help from visitor.” Percentages are calculated based on the number of families reporting “helped a lot” and “helped a little.”

**Table 26b. Ratings of Home Visitor Helpfulness<sup>52</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number of Families Needing Help with Emotional Issues</b>	<b>Number (%) Reporting Home Visitor “Helped a Little or a Lot” with Emotional Issues</b>	<b>Number of Families Needing Help with Education</b>	<b>Number (%) Reporting Home Visitor “Helped a Little or a Lot” with Education</b>
<b>Baker, Malheur &amp; Wallowa</b>	41	40 (98%)	19	16 (84%)
Baker	11	10 (91%)	8	7 (88%)
Malheur	26	26 (100%)	10	8 (80%)
Wallowa	4	4 (100%)	1	1 (100%)
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	27	26 (96%)	22	20 (91%)
Benton	14	14 (100%)	12	11 (92%)
Linn	13	12 (92%)	10	9 (90%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	89	87 (98%)	67	60 (90%)
<b>Clatsop &amp; Columbia</b>	25	25 (100%)	20	20 (100%)
Clatsop	12	12 (100%)	9	9 (100%)
Columbia	13	13 (100%)	11	11 (100%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	10	9 (90%)	7	6 (86%)
Coos	2	2 (100%)	2	1 (50%)
Curry	8	7 (88%)	5	5 (100%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	69	69 (100%)	54	50 (93%)
Crook	8	8 (100%)	8	6 (75%)
Deschutes	49	49 (100%)	34	32 (94%)
Jefferson	12	12 (100%)	12	12 (100%)

<sup>52</sup> Ratings are taken from the family’s last completed Parent Survey II-B. “Please tell us whether Healthy Families has helped your family with the following issues” items are rated as “Visitor has helped a lot” “Helped a little”, “Hasn’t helped yet” and “We don’t need help from visitor.” Percentages are calculated based on the number of families reporting “helped a lot” and “helped a little.”



**Table 26b. Ratings of Home Visitor Helpfulness<sup>52</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number of Families Needing Help with Emotional Issues</b>	<b>Number (%) Reporting Home Visitor “Helped a Little or a Lot” with Emotional Issues</b>	<b>Number of Families Needing Help with Education</b>	<b>Number (%) Reporting Home Visitor “Helped a Little or a Lot” with Education</b>
<b>Douglas, Klamath &amp; Lake</b>	61	60 (98%)	42	38 (90%)
Douglas	31	30 (97%)	22	18 (82%)
Klamath	30	30 (100%)	20	20 (100%)
Lake	--	--	--	--
<b>Gilliam, Hood River, Sherman, Wasco &amp; Wheeler</b>	51	51 (100%)	38	36 (95%)
Gilliam	2	2 (100%)	2	2 (100%)
Hood River	30	30 (100%)	23	23 (100%)
Sherman	2	2 (100%)	1	1 (100%)
Wasco	15	15 (100%)	11	9 (82%)
Wheeler	2	2 (100%)	1	1 (100%)
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	9	9 (100%)	7	6 (86%)
Grant	7	7 (100%)	6	5 (83%)
Harney	2	2 (100%)	1	1 (100%)
<b>Jackson &amp; Josephine</b>	62	62 (100%)	52	51 (98%)
Jackson	30	30 (100%)	24	24 (100%)
Josephine	32	32 (100%)	28	27 (96%)

<sup>52</sup> Ratings are taken from the family’s last completed Parent Survey II-B. “Please tell us whether Healthy Families has helped your family with the following issues” items are rated as “Visitor has helped a lot” “Helped a little”, “Hasn’t helped yet” and “We don’t need help from visitor.” Percentages are calculated based on the number of families reporting “helped a lot” and “helped a little.”

**Table 26b. Ratings of Home Visitor Helpfulness<sup>52</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number of Families Needing Help with Emotional Issues</b>	<b>Number (%) Reporting Home Visitor “Helped a Little or a Lot” with Emotional Issues</b>	<b>Number of Families Needing Help with Education</b>	<b>Number (%) Reporting Home Visitor “Helped a Little or a Lot” with Education</b>
<b>Lane</b>	110	108 (98%)	67	54 (81%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	32	32 (100%)	26	23 (88%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	136	134 (99%)	114	89 (78%)
Marion	119	117 (98%)	101	80 (79%)
Polk	17	17 (100%)	13	9 (69%)
<b>Morrow, Umatilla &amp; Union</b>	30	30 (100%)	26	24 (92%)
Morrow	11	11 (100%)	10	10 (100%)
Umatilla	10	10 (100%)	7	6 (86%)
Union	9	9 (100%)	9	8 (89%)
<b>Multnomah</b>	307	300 (98%)	220	198 (90%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	34	34 (100%)	20	18 (90%)
<b>Washington</b>	110	104 (95%)	77	66 (86%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	33	32 (97%)	19	15 (79%)
<b>State</b>	<b>1,236</b>	<b>1,212 (98%)</b>	<b>897</b>	<b>790 (88%)</b>

<sup>52</sup> Ratings are taken from the family’s last completed Parent Survey II-B. “Please tell us whether Healthy Families has helped your family with the following issues” items are rated as “Visitor has helped a lot” “Helped a little”, “Hasn’t helped yet” and “We don’t need help from visitor.” Percentages are calculated based on the number of families reporting “helped a lot” and “helped a little.”

**Table 27a. Cultural Competency & Strength Orientation of Home Visitors<sup>53</sup> 2014-15 (CE 5-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Encouraged Them to Think About Their Culture	Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Respected Their Family's Culture and/or Religious Beliefs	Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Provided Materials in Their Preferred Language	Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Helps Them to See Strengths They Didn't Know They Had
<b>Baker, Malheur &amp; Wallowa</b>	45 (79%)	54 (95%)	15 (100%)	50 (88%)
Baker	10 (59%)	15 (88%)	4 (100%)	14 (82%)
Malheur	32 (89%)	35 (97%)	10 (100%)	32 (89%)
Wallowa	3 (75%)	4 (100%)	1 (100%)	4 (100%)
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	27 (71%)	36 (95%)	10 (100%)	30 (79%)
Benton	10 (59%)	15 (88%)	4 (100%)	16 (94%)
Linn	17 (81%)	21 (100%)	6 (100%)	14 (67%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	83 (81%)	99 (97%)	32 (100%)	91 (89%)
<b>Clatsop &amp; Columbia</b>	29 (94%)	31 (100%)	8 (100%)	29 (94%)
Clatsop	14 (93%)	15 (100%)	2 (100%)	15 (100%)
Columbia	15 (94%)	16 (100%)	6 (100%)	14 (88%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	8 (80%)	9 (90%)	1 (100%)	9 (90%)
Coos	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
Curry	6 (75%)	7 (88%)	1 (100%)	7 (88%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	63 (77%)	80 (98%)	21 (100%)	74 (90%)
Crook	5 (56%)	8 (89%)	3 (100%)	9 (100%)
Deschutes	45 (76%)	58 (98%)	10 (100%)	52 (88%)
Jefferson	13 (93%)	14 (100%)	8 (100%)	13 (93%)

<sup>53</sup> The family reports their perceptions of Culturally Competent and Strength-based Practice/Service on the Parent Survey II-B on multiple items using the Strengths-Based Practices Inventory (Green, Tarte, & McAllister, 2004). Parents indicate "Yes," "No," or "Not Sure" for each item. These data represent information from the most recent available survey completed by the parent. Percentages are calculated based on the number of families reporting "Yes."

**Table 27a. Cultural Competency & Strength Orientation of Home Visitors<sup>53</sup> 2014-15 (CE 5-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Encouraged Them to Think About Their Culture	Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Respected Their Family's Culture and/or Religious Beliefs	Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Provided Materials in Their Preferred Language	Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Helps Them to See Strengths They Didn't Know They Had
<b>Douglas, Klamath &amp; Lake</b>	54 (73%)	69 (93%)	23 (96%)	66 (89%)
Douglas	30 (73%)	39 (95%)	14 (93%)	36 (88%)
Klamath	24 (73%)	30 (91%)	9 (100%)	30 (91%)
Lake	--	--	--	--
<b>Gilliam, Hood River, Sherman, Wasco &amp; Wheeler</b>	51 (96%)	52 (98%)	25 (100%)	50 (94%)
Gilliam	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	1 (100%)	2 (100%)
Hood River	30 (100%)	30 (100%)	16 (100%)	30 (100%)
Sherman	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	1 (100%)	2 (100%)
Wasco	16 (94%)	17 (100%)	7 (100%)	15 (88%)
Wheeler	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	5 (50%)	10 (100%)	2 (100%)	7 (70%)
Grant	3 (43%)	7 (100%)	2 (100%)	4 (57%)
Harney	2 (67%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)
<b>Jackson &amp; Josephine</b>	57 (77%)	69 (93%)	23 (100%)	68 (92%)
Jackson	24 (69%)	31 (89%)	11 (100%)	32 (91%)
Josephine	33 (85%)	38 (97%)	12 (100%)	36 (92%)

<sup>53</sup> The family reports their perceptions of Culturally Competent and Strength-based Practice/Service on the Parent Survey II-B on multiple items using the Strengths-Based Practices Inventory (Green, Tarte, & McAllister, 2004). Parents indicate "Yes," "No," or "Not Sure" for each item. These data represent information from the most recent available survey completed by the parent. Percentages are calculated based on the number of families reporting "Yes."

**Table 27a. Cultural Competency & Strength Orientation of Home Visitors<sup>53</sup> 2014-15 (CE 5-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Encouraged Them to Think About Their Culture</b>	<b>Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Respected Their Family's Culture and/or Religious Beliefs</b>	<b>Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Provided Materials in Their Preferred Language</b>	<b>Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Helps Them to See Strengths They Didn't Know They Had</b>
<b>Lane</b>	103 (81%)	125 (98%)	39 (100%)	113 (89%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	31 (79%)	39 (100%)	14 (100%)	36 (92%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	128 (83%)	149 (96%)	33 (97%)	136 (88%)
Marion	115 (84%)	132 (96%)	29 (97%)	121 (88%)
Polk	13 (72%)	17 (94%)	4 (100%)	15 (83%)
<b>Morrow, Umatilla &amp; Union</b>	35 (85%)	41 (100%)	4 (100%)	36 (88%)
Morrow	13 (100%)	13 (100%)	3 (100%)	13 (100%)
Umatilla	12 (75%)	16 (100%)	0 (0%)	12 (75%)
Union	10 (83%)	12 (100%)	1 (100%)	11 (92%)
<b>Multnomah</b>	291 (80%)	350 (96%)	110 (88%)	323 (89%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	28 (72%)	36 (92%)	6 (100%)	35 (90%)
<b>Washington</b>	104 (79%)	128 (97%)	46 (100%)	121 (92%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	25 (71%)	30 (86%)	11 (92%)	30 (86%)
<b>State</b>	<b>1,167 (80%)</b>	<b>1,407 (96%)</b>	<b>423 (96%)</b>	<b>1,304 (89%)</b>

<sup>53</sup> The family reports their perceptions of Culturally Competent and Strength-based Practice/Service on the Parent Survey II-B on multiple items using the Strengths-Based Practices Inventory (Green, Tarte, & McAllister, 2004). Parents indicate "Yes," "No," or "Not Sure" for each item. These data represent information from the most recent available survey completed by the parent. Percentages are calculated based on the number of families reporting "Yes."

**Table 27b. Cultural Competency & Strength Orientation of Home Visitors<sup>54</sup> 2014-15 (CE 5-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Helped Them Use Their Own Skills and Resources to Solve Problems	Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Worked With Them to Meet Their Needs	Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Helped Them to See They Are Good Parents	Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Encouraged Them to Think About Their Own Personal Goals or Dreams
<b>Baker, Malheur &amp; Wallowa</b>	53 (93%)	56 (98%)	57 (100%)	55 (96%)
Baker	16 (94%)	16 (94%)	17 (100%)	17 (100%)
Malheur	33 (92%)	36 (100%)	36 (100%)	34 (94%)
Wallowa	4 (100%)	4 (100%)	4 (100%)	4 (100%)
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	32 (84%)	34 (89%)	38 (100%)	35 (95%)
Benton	16 (94%)	17 (100%)	17 (100%)	15 (94%)
Linn	16 (76%)	17 (81%)	21 (100%)	20 (95%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	93 (92%)	98 (97%)	100 (99%)	95 (95%)
<b>Clatsop &amp; Columbia</b>	31 (100%)	31 (100%)	31 (100%)	31 (100%)
Clatsop	15 (100%)	15 (100%)	15 (100%)	15 (100%)
Columbia	16 (100%)	16 (100%)	16 (100%)	16 (100%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	10 (100%)	10 (100%)	10 (100%)	10 (100%)
Coos	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)
Curry	8 (100%)	8 (100%)	8 (100%)	8 (100%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	73 (89%)	82 (100%)	80 (98%)	80 (98%)
Crook	8 (89%)	9 (100%)	9 (100%)	9 (100%)
Deschutes	51 (86%)	59 (100%)	57 (97%)	58 (98%)
Jefferson	14 (100%)	14 (100%)	14 (100%)	13 (93%)

<sup>54</sup> The family reports their perceptions of Culturally Competent and Strength-based Practice/Service on the Parent Survey II-B on multiple items using the Strengths-Based Practices Inventory (Green, Tarte, & McAllister, 2004). Parents indicate “Yes,” “No,” or “Not Sure” for each item. These data represent information from the most recent available survey completed by the parent. Percentages are calculated based on the number of families reporting “Yes.”

**Table 27b. Cultural Competency & Strength Orientation of Home Visitors<sup>54</sup> 2014-15 (CE 5-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Helped Them Use Their Own Skills and Resources to Solve Problems</b>	<b>Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Worked With Them to Meet Their Needs</b>	<b>Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Helped Them to See They Are Good Parents</b>	<b>Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Encouraged Them to Think About Their Own Personal Goals or Dreams</b>
<b>Douglas, Klamath &amp; Lake</b>	66 (89%)	68 (92%)	73 (99%)	70 (95%)
Douglas	36 (88%)	36 (88%)	41 (100%)	38 (93%)
Klamath	30 (91%)	32 (97%)	32 (97%)	32 (97%)
Lake	--	--	--	--
<b>Gilliam, Hood River, Sherman, Wasco &amp; Wheeler</b>	52 (98%)	52 (98%)	52 (98%)	51 (96%)
Gilliam	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)
Hood River	30 (100%)	30 (100%)	30 (100%)	30 (100%)
Sherman	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)
Wasco	16 (94%)	17 (100%)	17 (100%)	16 (94%)
Wheeler	2 (100%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	9 (90%)	10 (100%)	9 (90%)	10 (100%)
Grant	6 (86%)	7 (100%)	6 (86%)	7 (100%)
Harney	3 (100%)	3 (100%)	3 (100%)	3 (100%)
<b>Jackson &amp; Josephine</b>	71 (97%)	70 (95%)	74 (100%)	71 (97%)
Jackson	34 (97%)	34 (97%)	35 (100%)	33 (97%)
Josephine	37 (97%)	36 (92%)	39 (100%)	38 (97%)

<sup>54</sup> The family reports their perceptions of Culturally Competent and Strength-based Practice/Service on the Parent Survey II-B on multiple items using the Strengths-Based Practices Inventory (Green, Tarte, & McAllister, 2004). Parents indicate “Yes,” “No,” or “Not Sure” for each item. These data represent information from the most recent available survey completed by the parent. Percentages are calculated based on the number of families reporting “Yes.”

**Table 27b. Cultural Competency & Strength Orientation of Home Visitors<sup>54</sup> 2014-15 (CE 5-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Helped Them Use Their Own Skills and Resources to Solve Problems</b>	<b>Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Worked With Them to Meet Their Needs</b>	<b>Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Helped Them to See They Are Good Parents</b>	<b>Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Encouraged Them to Think About Their Own Personal Goals or Dreams</b>
<b>Lane</b>	109 (86%)	120 (96%)	125 (98%)	125 (98%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	38 (97%)	39 (100%)	39 (100%)	39 (100%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	146 (94%)	146 (94%)	150 (97%)	149 (96%)
Marion	130 (95%)	128 (93%)	132 (96%)	131 (96%)
Polk	16 (89%)	18 (100%)	18 (100%)	18 (100%)
<b>Morrow, Umatilla &amp; Union</b>	34 (83%)	38 (93%)	40 (100%)	41 (100%)
Morrow	13 (100%)	13 (100%)	13 (100%)	13 (100%)
Umatilla	10 (62%)	14 (88%)	15 (100%)	16 (100%)
Union	11 (92%)	11 (92%)	12 (100%)	12 (100%)
<b>Multnomah</b>	339 (93%)	353 (97%)	357 (98%)	351 (97%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	35 (90%)	39 (100%)	39 (100%)	39 (100%)
<b>Washington</b>	122 (93%)	127 (96%)	130 (98%)	128 (98%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	32 (91%)	31 (89%)	35 (100%)	35 (100%)
<b>State</b>	<b>1,345 (92%)</b>	<b>1,404 (96%)</b>	<b>1,439 (99%)</b>	<b>1,415 (97%)</b>

<sup>54</sup> The family reports their perceptions of Culturally Competent and Strength-based Practice/Service on the Parent Survey II-B on multiple items using the Strengths-Based Practices Inventory (Green, Tarte, & McAllister, 2004). Parents indicate “Yes,” “No,” or “Not Sure” for each item. These data represent information from the most recent available survey completed by the parent. Percentages are calculated based on the number of families reporting “Yes.”