

# Statewide Evaluation Results 2015-2016: Healthy Families Oregon Status Report Tables

*Submitted to:*

**Miriam Calderon**

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

*Submitted by:*

**NPC Research**

Portland, OR



July 2017



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 2015-16 .....	1
Table 1b. Healthy Families Oregon Service Delivery Indicators 2015-16 .....	4
Table 2. Healthy Families Oregon Performance Outcome Indicators 2015-16 .....	7
Table 3a. Screening and Initial Interest in Healthy Families Oregon Service 2015-16 Cohort (CE 1-1.C).....	10
Table 3b. Service Offer: Healthy Families Oregon 2015-16 Cohort.....	13
Table 4. Receipt and Acceptance of Healthy Families Oregon 2015-16 Cohort (CE 1-2.A) .....	16
Table 5. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service: Race/Ethnicity 2015-16 Cohort (CE 1-2.B, CE 5-4.B) .....	19
Table 6. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service: Demographic Factors 2015-16 Cohort (CE 1-2.B, CE 5-4.B) .....	22
Table 7. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service: Demographic Factors 2015-16 Cohort (CE 1-2.B, CE 5-4.B) .....	25
Table 8. Retention Rates for Families Newly Enrolled 2012-13 (CE 3-4.B).....	28
Table 9. Retention Rates for Families Newly Enrolled 2014-15 (CE 3-4.B).....	31
Table 10a. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Race/Ethnicity for Families Enrolled 2014-15 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B) .....	34
Table 10b. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Spoken Language for Families Enrolled 2014-15 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B) .....	37
Table 11a. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Demographic Factors for Families Enrolled 2014-15 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B).....	40
Table 11b. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Demographic Factors for Families Enrolled 2014-15 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B).....	43
Table 12. Participant Reasons for Exiting Program Prior to Program Completion (CE 3-4.B) .....	46
Table 13a. Parent Survey (Kempe) Risk Factors for One or Both Parents/Caregivers in Intensive Service: Childrearing Characteristics.....	49
Table 13b. Parent Survey (Kempe) Risk Factors for One or Both Parents/Caregivers in Intensive Service .....	52
Table 13c. Parent Survey (Kempe) Risk Factors for One or Both Parents/Caregivers in Intensive Service .....	55
Table 14. Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families: Race/Ethnicity.....	58
Table 15a. NBQ Risk Factors and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families.....	61
Table 15b. NBQ Risk Factors and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families .....	64



Table 15c. NBQ Risk Factors and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families.....	67
Table 15d. NBQ Risk Factors and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families .....	70
Table 16. Health Care for Intensive Service Families: Health Care Provider & Well-Child Check-Ups .....	73
Table 17a. Health Care for Intensive Service Families: Health Insurance.....	76
Table 17b. Health Care for Intensive Service Families: Use of Emergency Room in Past 6 Months.....	79
Table 18a. Comparison of Prenatal Care and Smoke Exposure for Families Served Pre- & Postnatal .....	82
Table 18b. Comparison of Health Outcomes for Families Served Pre- & Postnatal.....	85
Table 19. Prenatal Care for Subsequent Births.....	88
Table 20a. HOME Score and Development Screening.....	91
Table 20b. HOME Score and Development Screening.....	94
Table 21. Developmental Screening (ASQ) Results & Subsequent Actions .....	97
Table 22. Social Emotional Developmental Screening (ASQ-SE) Results & Subsequent Actions ...	100
Table 23. Connection to Essential Resources for Intensive Service Families .....	103
.Table 24a. Family Outcomes and Life Events at 6 Months.....	106
Table 24b. Family Outcomes and Life Events at 12 Months.....	109
Table 25a. Promotion of Positive Parenting Skills & Helping Children Learn .....	112
Table 25b. Promotion of Positive Parenting Skills & Helping Children Learn.....	115
Table 26a. Ratings of Home Visitor Helpfulness .....	118
Table 26b. Ratings of Home Visitor Helpfulness.....	121
Table 27a. Cultural Competency & Strength Orientation of Home Visitors 2015-16 (CE 5-4.B)....	124
Table 27b. Cultural Competency & Strength Orientation of Home Visitors 2015-16 (CE 5-4.B)....	127

**Table 1a. Healthy Families Oregon Service Delivery Indicators 2015-16**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number Births FY 2015-16</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 (2015-16)<sup>4</sup></b>
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	2,302	214	200 (93%)	12 (55%)		15 (100%)
Benton	759	73	64 (88%)	4 (50%)		10 (100%)
Linn	1,543	141	136 (96%)	8 (57%)		5 (100%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	4,254	769	699 (91%)	30 (86%)		40 (87%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	951	130	102 (78%)	19 (83%)		28 (100%)
Clatsop	411	66	58 (88%)	14 (93%)		19 (100%)
Columbia	540	64	44 (69%)	5 (63%)		9 (100%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	805	10	7 (70%)	1 (100%)		3 (100%)
Coos	641	3	1 (33%)	1 (100%)		1 (100%)
Curry	164	7	6 (86%)	--		2 (100%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	2,240	377	363 (96%)	36 (95%)		42 (89%)
Crook	223	40	35 (88%)	6 (100%)		5 (63%)
Deschutes	1,733	283	278 (98%)	28 (93%)		36 (95%)
Jefferson	284	54	50 (93%)	2 (100%)		1 (100%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	1,989	450	428 (95%)	9 (75%)		18 (86%)
Douglas	1,075	302	296 (98%)	3 (60%)		8 (100%)
Klamath	839	142	126 (89%)	6 (86%)		10 (77%)
Lake	75	6	6 (100%)	--		--

<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. It is possible that home visit dates for FY15-16 are under-reported. Data from HVC's were unavailable for this analysis, therefore first home visit was taken from enrollment date in CLARA. If the enrollment data was missing, the Family Intake date as substituted.

<sup>3</sup> 75% of families received 75% or more of their expected home visits adequately meets the Performance Standard. However, these data were unavailable for analysis.

<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 2015-16**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number Births FY 2015-16</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 (2015-16)<sup>4</sup></b>
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	138	22	14 (64%)	2 (33%)		9 (100%)
Grant	57	16	11 (69%)	1 (25%)		5 (100%)
Harney	81	6	3 (50%)	1 (50%)		4 (100%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	673	225	199 (88%)	20 (83%)		34 (97%)
Gilliam	15	11	5 (45%)	1 (100%)		1 (100%)
Hood River	295	97	86 (89%)	15 (88%)		18 (95%)
Sherman	17	3	3 (100%)	--		--
Wasco	332	107	100 (93%)	4 (67%)		14 (100%)
Wheeler	14	7	5 (71%)	--		1 (100%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	3,188	669	646 (97%)	34 (83%)		43 (88%)
Jackson	2,342	377	364 (97%)	16 (80%)		25 (96%)
Josephine	846	292	282 (97%)	18 (86%)		18 (78%)
<b>Lane</b>	3,518	827	790 (96%)	30 (65%)		55 (93%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	450	22	6 (27%)	14 (74%)		17 (94%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	5,431	921	900 (98%)	61 (54%)		120 (83%)
Marion	4,484	812	792 (98%)	54 (55%)		108 (83%)
Polk	947	109	108 (99%)	7 (54%)		12 (80%)

<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. It is possible that home visit dates for FY15-16 are under-reported. Data from HVC's were unavailable for this analysis, therefore first home visit was taken from enrollment date in CLARA. If the enrollment data was missing, the Family Intake date as substituted.

<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 2015-16**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number Births FY 2015-16</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 (2015-16)<sup>4</sup></b>
<b>Multnomah</b>	9,072	1,703	1,604 (94%)	110 (72%)		180 (97%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	261	74	60 (81%)	11 (85%)		14 (82%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	1,485	371	324 (87%)	5 (100%)		6 (100%)
Morrow	175	57	41 (72%)	--		--
Umatilla	1,001	251	230 (92%)	3 (100%)		4 (100%)
Union	309	63	53 (84%)	2 (100%)		2 (100%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	658	63	59 (94%)	18 (95%)		20 (100%)
Baker	142	<b>22</b>	21 (95%)	6 (86%)		6 (100%)
Malheur	451	<b>27</b>	24 (89%)	11 (100%)		12 (100%)
Wallowa	65	<b>14</b>	14 (100%)	1 (100%)		2 (100%)
<b>Washington</b>	7,030	<b>369</b>	305 (83%)	28 (58%)		59 (89%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	1,179	98	79 (81%)	12 (92%)		18 (100%)
<b>State</b>	<b>45,626</b>	<b>7,314</b>	<b>6,785 (93%)</b>	<b>452 (72%)</b>		<b>721 (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. It is possible that home visit dates for FY15-16 are under-reported. Data from HVC's were unavailable for this analysis, therefore first home visit was taken from enrollment date in CLARA. If the enrollment data was missing, the Family Intake date as substituted.

<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 2015-16**

	Service Delivery Indicator #5	Service Delivery Indicator #6	Service Delivery Indicator #7 <sup>5</sup>		Service Delivery Indicator #8	Service Delivery Indicator #9	
<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) Families Remaining in IS for 12 Months or Longer (enrolled 2014-15) <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>	Percentage of Depression Screenings <sup>9</sup>	Depression Screening Occurring with Families within 90 Days of Birth <sup>10</sup>
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	22 (54%)				--		1 (10%)
Benton	9 (60%)						0 (0%)
Linn	13 (50%)						1 (50%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	28 (53%)				--	39 (75%)	41 (77%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	23 (92%)				3 (60%)		24 (77%)
Clatsop	9 (100%)						18 (86%)
Columbia	14 (88%)						6 (60%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	10 (63%)						2 (33%)
Coos	4 (57%)						1 (100%)
Curry	6 (67%)						1 (20%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	29 (58%)				54 (82%)	37 (82%)	45 (80%)
Crook	4 (57%)						4 (67%)
Deschutes	19 (51%)						38 (84%)
Jefferson	6 (100%)						3 (60%)

<sup>5</sup> Cash/match data were not analyzed for the FY2015-2016 period.<sup>6</sup> To adequately meet the Service Delivery Standard, 50-64% of families must remain in Intensive Service for 12 months or longer.<sup>7</sup> Avg. caseload points of 25-30 (max 25 families) per 1.0 FTE adequately meets the Service Delivery Standard. However, these data were unavailable for analyses during FY 15-16.<sup>8</sup> 100% of children receiving two TIMELY developmental screenings each year adequately meets the Performance Standard. Only programs submitting ASQ data on Excel Spreadsheets during FY15-16 are included in this analyses. Additional ASQ data on the full sample can be found in Tables 20b and 21.<sup>9</sup> To meet the Service Delivery Indicator, 100% of families should have depression screenings prenatally (when served prenatally) and within 90 days of birth. Only programs submitting ASQ data on Excel spreadsheets during FY15-16 are included in this analysis.<sup>10</sup> The proportion of families receiving at least ONE depression screening before the child turned 90-days old is included for comparison. This count includes data submitted on Excel Spreadsheets (used in calculating Service Delivery Indicator #9), and data submitted on the Family Intake form.



**Table 1b. Healthy Families Oregon Service Delivery Indicators 2015-16**

	Service Delivery Indicator #5	Service Delivery Indicator #6	Service Delivery Indicator #7 <sup>5</sup>		Service Delivery Indicator #8	Service Delivery Indicator #9	
<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) Families Remaining in IS for 12 Months or Longer (enrolled 2014-15) <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>	Percentage of Depression Screenings <sup>9</sup>	Depression Screening Occurring with Families within 90 Days of Birth <sup>10</sup>
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	18 (51%)				51 (81%)	35 (64%)	51 (78%)
Douglas	9 (47%)						12 (63%)
Klamath	9 (56%)						39 (85%)
Lake	--						5 (45%)
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	3 (75%)				8 (73%)	4 (40%)	3 (50%)
Grant	1 (50%)						2 (40%)
Harney	2 (100%)						23 (64%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	16 (62%)						2 (100%)
Gilliam	1 (50%)						14 (78%)
Hood River	9 (64%)						7 (47%)
Sherman	--						0 (0%)
Wasco	6 (60%)						29 (58%)
Wheeler	--						18 (64%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	39 (43%)				48 (87%)	13 (68%)	11 (50%)
Jackson	29 (43%)						34 (51%)
Josephine	10 (45%)						24 (77%)
<b>Lane</b>	43 (52%)				80 (78%)	28 (45%)	18 (86%)

<sup>5</sup> Cash/match data were not analyzed for the FY2015-2016 period.

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

<sup>7</sup> Avg. caseload points of 25-30 (max 25 families) per 1.0 FTE adequately meets the Service Delivery Standard. However, these data were unavailable for analyses during FY 15-16.

<sup>8</sup> 100% of children receiving two TIMELY developmental screenings each year adequately meets the Performance Standard. Only programs submitting ASQ data on Excel Spreadsheets during FY15-16 are included in this analyses. Additional ASQ data on the full sample can be found in Tables 20b and 21.

<sup>9</sup> To meet the Service Delivery Indicator, 100% of families should have depression screenings prenatally (when served prenatally) and within 90 days of birth. Only programs submitting ASQ data on Excel spreadsheets during FY15-16 are included in this analysis.

<sup>10</sup> The proportion of families receiving at least ONE depression screening before the child turned 90-days old is included for comparison. This count includes data submitted on Excel Spreadsheets (used in calculating Service Delivery Indicator #9), and data submitted on the Family Intake form.

**Table 1b. Healthy Families Oregon Service Delivery Indicators 2015-16**

	Service Delivery Indicator #5	Service Delivery Indicator #6	Service Delivery Indicator #7 <sup>5</sup>		Service Delivery Indicator #8	Service Delivery Indicator #9	
<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) Families Remaining in IS for 12 Months or Longer (enrolled 2014-15) <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>	Percentage of Depression Screenings <sup>9</sup>	Depression Screening Occurring with Families within 90 Days of Birth <sup>10</sup>
<b>Lincoln</b>	9 (75%)				9 (69%)		9 (43%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	76 (47%)				137 (69%)	75 (51%)	100 (58%)
Marion	69 (48%)						90 (59%)
Polk	7 (39%)						10 (50%)
<b>Multnomah</b>	142 (65%)				209 (64%)	79 (52%)	140 (50%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	16 (62%)				24 (86%)	13 (93%)	18 (95%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	28 (62%)				20 (49%)	4 (29%)	7 (39%)
Morrow	12 (75%)						0 (0%)
Umatilla	13 (54%)						3 (30%)
Union	3 (60%)						4 (67%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	22 (65%)				25 (78%)	13 (68%)	18 (75%)
Baker	--						7 (64%)
Malheur	14 (58%)						8 (89%)
Wallowa	8 (80%)						3 (75%)
<b>Washington</b>	43 (43%)						32 (49%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	16 (73%)						7 (35%)
<b>State</b>	<b>583 (56%)</b>				<b>668 (71%)</b>	<b>340 (58%)</b>	<b>586 (58%)</b>

<sup>5</sup> Cash/match data were not analyzed for the FY2015-2016 period.

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

<sup>7</sup> Avg. caseload points of 25-30 (max 25 families) per 1.0 FTE adequately meets the Service Delivery Standard. However, these data were unavailable for analyses during FY 15-16.

<sup>8</sup> 100% of children receiving two TIMELY developmental screenings each year adequately meets the Performance Standard. Only programs submitting ASQ data on Excel Spreadsheets during FY15-16 are included in this analyses. Additional ASQ data on the full sample can be found in Tables 20b and 21.

<sup>9</sup> To meet the Service Delivery Indicator, 100% of families should have depression screenings prenatally (when served prenatally) and within 90 days of birth. Only programs submitting ASQ data on Excel spreadsheets during FY15-16 are included in this analysis.

<sup>10</sup> The proportion of families receiving at least ONE depression screening before the child turned 90-days old is included for comparison. This count includes data submitted on Excel Spreadsheets (used in calculating Service Delivery Indicator #9), and data submitted on the Family Intake form.

**Table 2. Healthy Families Oregon Performance Outcome Indicators 2015-16**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Outcome Indicator #1  Number (%) Children with Primary Care Provider<sup>11</sup></b>	<b>Outcome Indicator #2  Number (%) Children with Up- to-Date Immunizations<sup>12</sup></b>	<b>Outcome Indicator #3  Number (%) Parents Reading to Child 3x Per Week or More<sup>13</sup></b>	<b>Outcome Indicator #4  Number (%) Parents Reporting Positive Parent-Child Interactions<sup>14</sup></b>	<b>Outcome Indicator #5  Number (%) Parents with Reporting Reduced Parenting Stress<sup>15</sup></b>	<b>Outcome Indicator #6  Number (%) Parents Reporting HFA Oregon Helped with Social Support<sup>16</sup></b>
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	53 (100%)	32 (78%)	37 (97%)	36 (95%)	20 (83%)	22 (88%)
Benton	31 (100%)	18 (78%)	20 (100%)	20 (100%)	8 (80%)	12 (100%)
Linn	22 (100%)	14 (78%)	17 (94%)	16 (89%)	12 (86%)	10 (77%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	122 (97%)	89 (88%)	84 (89%)	85 (90%)	56 (65%)	78 (93%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	69 (99%)	43 (93%)	44 (100%)	44 (100%)	31 (74%)	29 (91%)
Clatsop	47 (98%)	27 (90%)	28 (100%)	28 (100%)	21 (81%)	17 (94%)
Columbia	22 (100%)	16 (100%)	16 (100%)	16 (100%)	10 (63%)	12 (86%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	15 (83%)	6 (67%)	9 (82%)	10 (91%)	5 (100%)	7 (100%)
Coos	1 (100%)	--	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	--	1 (100%)
Curry	14 (82%)	6 (67%)	8 (80%)	9 (90%)	5 (100%)	6 (100%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	149 (99%)	81 (79%)	90 (95%)	93 (98%)	45 (64%)	85 (96%)
Crook	19 (100%)	9 (75%)	11 (92%)	12 (100%)	3 (50%)	8 (80%)
Deschutes	106 (98%)	57 (80%)	64 (97%)	65 (98%)	32 (62%)	63 (98%)
Jefferson	24 (100%)	15 (79%)	15 (88%)	16 (94%)	10 (83%)	14 (93%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	128 (100%)	63 (81%)	71 (91%)	74 (95%)	38 (72%)	61 (98%)
Douglas	56 (100%)	30 (73%)	37 (95%)	38 (97%)	20 (69%)	28 (97%)
Klamath	71 (100%)	32 (89%)	34 (87%)	36 (92%)	18 (75%)	33 (100%)
Lake	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	--	--	--	--

<sup>11</sup> 80-94% of children with a primary care provider meets the Performance Standard.<sup>12</sup> 80-89% of children with up-to-date immunizations meets the Performance Standard.<sup>13</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>14</sup> 80-89% of parents reporting positive parent-child interactions meets the Performance Standard.<sup>15</sup> 50-64% of parents reporting reduced parenting stress meets the Performance Standard.<sup>16</sup> 80-89% of parents reporting Healthy Families Oregon helped with social support meets the Performance Standard.

**Table 2. Healthy Families Oregon Performance Outcome Indicators 2015-16**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Outcome Indicator #1  Number (%) Children with Primary Care Provider<sup>11</sup></b>	<b>Outcome Indicator #2  Number (%) Children with Up- to-Date Immunizations<sup>12</sup></b>	<b>Outcome Indicator #3  Number (%) Parents Reading to Child 3x Per Week or More<sup>13</sup></b>	<b>Outcome Indicator #4  Number (%) Parents Reporting Positive Parent-Child Interactions<sup>14</sup></b>	<b>Outcome Indicator #5  Number (%) Parents with Reporting Reduced Parenting Stress<sup>15</sup></b>	<b>Outcome Indicator #6  Number (%) Parents Reporting HFA Oregon Helped with Social Support<sup>16</sup></b>
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	25 (93%)	15 (75%)	19 (95%)	19 (95%)	8 (57%)	14 (100%)
Grant	10 (83%)	3 (43%)	7 (88%)	7 (88%)	3 (50%)	7 (100%)
Harney	15 (100%)	12 (92%)	12 (100%)	12 (100%)	5 (63%)	7 (100%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	96 (99%)	67 (96%)	64 (97%)	66 (100%)	38 (63%)	56 (98%)
Gilliam	4 (100%)	3 (75%)	4 (100%)	4 (100%)	2 (50%)	2 (100%)
Hood River	53 (100%)	36 (100%)	35 (95%)	37 (100%)	23 (70%)	33 (100%)
Sherman	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	--
Wasco	36 (97%)	25 (93%)	22 (100%)	22 (100%)	11 (55%)	19 (95%)
Wheeler	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	1 (50%)	2 (100%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	129 (96%)	77 (82%)	82 (88%)	88 (95%)	46 (56%)	66 (92%)
Jackson	72 (92%)	39 (75%)	47 (87%)	51 (94%)	23 (51%)	37 (86%)
Josephine	57 (100%)	38 (90%)	35 (90%)	37 (95%)	23 (62%)	29 (100%)
<b>Lane</b>	186 (99%)	128 (85%)	132 (91%)	139 (96%)	74 (56%)	124 (95%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	47 (98%)	32 (89%)	32 (97%)	33 (100%)	16 (73%)	23 (88%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	325 (98%)	212 (90%)	168 (82%)	190 (93%)	108 (66%)	160 (89%)
Marion	290 (98%)	189 (90%)	151 (82%)	170 (92%)	96 (66%)	141 (89%)
Polk	35 (100%)	23 (96%)	17 (81%)	20 (95%)	12 (71%)	19 (95%)

<sup>11</sup> 80-94% of children with a primary care provider meets the Performance Standard.

<sup>12</sup> 80-89% of children with up-to-date immunizations meets the Performance Standard.

<sup>13</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>14</sup> 80-89% of parents reporting positive parent-child interactions meets the Performance Standard.

<sup>15</sup> 50-64% of parents reporting reduced parenting stress meets the Performance Standard.

<sup>16</sup> 80-89% of parents reporting Healthy Families Oregon helped with social support meets the Performance Standard.

**Table 2. Healthy Families Oregon Performance Outcome Indicators 2015-16**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Outcome Indicator #1  Number (%) Children with Primary Care Provider<sup>11</sup></b>	<b>Outcome Indicator #2  Number (%) Children with Up- to-Date Immunizations<sup>12</sup></b>	<b>Outcome Indicator #3  Number (%) Parents Reading to Child 3x Per Week or More<sup>13</sup></b>	<b>Outcome Indicator #4  Number (%) Parents Reporting Positive Parent-Child Interactions<sup>14</sup></b>	<b>Outcome Indicator #5  Number (%) Parents with Reporting Reduced Parenting Stress<sup>15</sup></b>	<b>Outcome Indicator #6  Number (%) Parents Reporting HFA Oregon Helped with Social Support<sup>16</sup></b>
<b>Multnomah</b>	583 (97%)	385 (84%)	376 (91%)	384 (93%)	233 (67%)	257 (91%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	53 (96%)	39 (91%)	38 (90%)	39 (93%)	19 (63%)	33 (94%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	68 (97%)	40 (91%)	35 (88%)	37 (93%)	13 (62%)	27 (93%)
Morrow	15 (94%)	10 (100%)	9 (90%)	10 (100%)	4 (44%)	6 (100%)
Umatilla	42 (98%)	24 (86%)	20 (87%)	20 (87%)	7 (78%)	17 (100%)
Union	11 (100%)	6 (100%)	6 (86%)	7 (100%)	2 (67%)	4 (67%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	57 (100%)	35 (80%)	39 (93%)	41 (98%)	22 (65%)	22 (85%)
Baker	18 (100%)	9 (60%)	14 (93%)	15 (100%)	8 (57%)	11 (92%)
Malheur	33 (100%)	22 (92%)	20 (91%)	21 (95%)	11 (65%)	7 (70%)
Wallowa	6 (100%)	4 (80%)	5 (100%)	5 (100%)	3 (100%)	4 (100%)
<b>Washington</b>	204 (100%)	146 (91%)	136 (93%)	140 (96%)	80 (63%)	119 (90%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	55 (100%)	37 (86%)	40 (95%)	41 (98%)	26 (72%)	36 (92%)
<b>State</b>	<b>2,364 (98%)</b>	<b>1,527 (86%)</b>	<b>1,496 (91%)</b>	<b>1,559 (95%)</b>	<b>878 (65%)</b>	<b>1,219 (92%)</b>

<sup>11</sup> 80-94% of children with a primary care provider meets the Performance Standard.<sup>12</sup> 80-89% of children with up-to-date immunizations meets the Performance Standard.<sup>13</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>14</sup> 80-89% of parents reporting positive parent-child interactions meets the Performance Standard.<sup>15</sup> 50-64% of parents reporting reduced parenting stress meets the Performance Standard.<sup>16</sup> 80-89% of parents reporting Healthy Families Oregon helped with social support meets the Performance Standard.

**Table 3a. Screening and Initial Interest in Healthy Families Oregon Service 2015-16 Cohort (CE 1-1.C)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Screened #	Missing Screening Result <sup>17</sup> #	Negative # (%)	Positive (including clinical pos.) # (%)	Positive Screen Interest:				
					Interested, if available # (%)	Not interested, too busy # (%)	Not interested, Service not needed # (%)	Not interested, other # (%)	Missing interest info #
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	222	7	87 (40%)	128 (60%)	96 (80%)	2 (2%)	19 (16%)	3 (3%)	8
Benton	77	3	39 (53%)	35 (47%)	29 (88%)	1 (3%)	1 (3%)	2 (6%)	2
Linn	145	4	48 (34%)	93 (66%)	67 (77%)	1 (1%)	18 (21%)	1 (1%)	6
<b>Clackamas</b>	777	8	319 (41%)	450 (59%)	289 (65%)	8 (2%)	130 (29%)	17 (4%)	6
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	132	2	15 (12%)	115 (88%)	92 (88%)	3 (3%)	7 (7%)	2 (2%)	11
Clatsop	67	1	8 (12%)	58 (88%)	48 (91%)	1 (2%)	3 (6%)	1 (2%)	5
Columbia	65	1	7 (11%)	57 (89%)	44 (86%)	2 (4%)	4 (8%)	1 (2%)	6
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	11	0	2 (18%)	9 (82%)	6 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3
Coos	3	0	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1
Curry	8	0	2 (25%)	6 (75%)	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	384	6	149 (39%)	229 (61%)	170 (77%)	1 (0%)	38 (17%)	12 (5%)	8
Crook	40	0	10 (25%)	30 (75%)	22 (79%)	1 (4%)	5 (18%)	0 (0%)	2
Deschutes	285	3	121 (43%)	161 (57%)	119 (75%)	0 (0%)	30 (19%)	9 (6%)	3
Jefferson	59	3	18 (32%)	38 (68%)	29 (83%)	0 (0%)	3 (9%)	3 (9%)	3
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	456	12	226 (51%)	218 (49%)	100 (65%)	5 (3%)	25 (16%)	23 (15%)	65
Douglas	305	12	190 (65%)	103 (35%)	18 (39%)	2 (4%)	16 (35%)	10 (22%)	57
Klamath	145	0	32 (22%)	113 (78%)	81 (77%)	3 (3%)	9 (9%)	12 (11%)	8
Lake	6	0	4 (67%)	2 (33%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0

<sup>17</sup> For approximately 6 months of the FY15-16 data collection period, programs did not have access to an on-line data system to enter data. The lack of a data system (including the automated process of checking for form completeness) may account for the amount of missing data seen at various decision making points in the screening process.

**Table 3a. Screening and Initial Interest in Healthy Families Oregon Service 2015-16 Cohort (CE 1-1.C)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Screened #	Missing Screening Result <sup>17</sup> #	Negative # (%)	Positive (including clinical pos.) # (%)	Positive Screen Interest:				
					Interested, if available # (%)	Not interested, too busy # (%)	Not interested, Service not needed # (%)	Not interested, other # (%)	Missing interest info #
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	23	0	6 (26%)	17 (74%)	15 (88%)	0 (0%)	2 (12%)	0 (0%)	0
Grant	17	0	5 (29%)	12 (71%)	11 (92%)	0 (0%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)	0
Harney	6	0	1 (17%)	5 (83%)	4 (80%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	0
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam,</b>	233	17	59 (27%)	157 (73%)	130 (90%)	4 (3%)	7 (5%)	3 (2%)	13
Gilliam	11	0	2 (18%)	9 (82%)	6 (86%)	0 (0%)	1 (14%)	0 (0%)	2
Hood River	99	13	24 (28%)	62 (72%)	43 (81%)	3 (6%)	4 (8%)	3 (6%)	9
Sherman	3	0	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	0
Wasco	113	4	27 (25%)	82 (75%)	78 (98%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	2
Wheeler	7	0	3 (43%)	4 (57%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	677	9	309 (46%)	359 (54%)	269 (83%)	3 (1%)	38 (12%)	14 (4%)	35
Jackson	384	1	181 (47%)	202 (53%)	140 (77%)	1 (1%)	32 (18%)	9 (5%)	20
Josephine	293	8	128 (45%)	157 (55%)	129 (91%)	2 (1%)	6 (4%)	5 (4%)	15
<b>Lane</b>	832	71	215 (28%)	546 (72%)	273 (50%)	8 (1%)	221 (41%)	42 (8%)	2
<b>Lincoln</b>	22	0	2 (9%)	20 (91%)	19 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	958	94	7 (1%)	857 (99%)	836 (98%)	4 (0%)	7 (1%)	3 (0%)	7
Marion	847	82	6 (1%)	759 (99%)	739 (98%)	4 (1%)	6 (1%)	3 (0%)	7
Polk	111	12	1 (1%)	98 (99%)	97 (99%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	0

<sup>17</sup> For approximately 6 months of the FY15-16 data collection period, programs did not have access to an on-line data system to enter data. The lack of a data system (including the automated process of checking for form completeness) may account for the amount of missing data seen at various decision making points in the screening process.

**Table 3a. Screening and Initial Interest in Healthy Families Oregon Service 2015-16 Cohort (CE 1-1.C)**

Program/County	Screened #	Missing Screening Result <sup>17</sup> #	Negative # (%)	Positive (including clinical pos.) # (%)	Positive Screen Interest:				
					Interested, if available # (%)	Not interested, too busy # (%)	Not interested, Service not needed # (%)	Not interested, other # (%)	Missing interest info #
<b>Multnomah</b>	1,713	5	445 (26%)	1,263 (74%)	665 (53%)	17 (1%)	293 (23%)	272 (22%)	16
<b>Tillamook</b>	78	0	14 (18%)	64 (82%)	46 (72%)	3 (5%)	10 (16%)	5 (8%)	0
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	379	13	122 (33%)	244 (67%)	198 (82%)	6 (2%)	30 (12%)	8 (3%)	2
Morrow	60	0	16 (27%)	44 (73%)	30 (70%)	2 (5%)	9 (21%)	2 (5%)	1
Umatilla	256	10	87 (35%)	159 (65%)	136 (86%)	4 (3%)	14 (9%)	5 (3%)	0
Union	63	3	19 (32%)	41 (68%)	32 (80%)	0 (0%)	7 (18%)	1 (3%)	1
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	63	0	15 (24%)	48 (76%)	37 (82%)	0 (0%)	5 (11%)	3 (7%)	3
Baker	22	0	6 (27%)	16 (73%)	14 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2
Malheur	27	0	4 (15%)	23 (85%)	18 (82%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	3 (14%)	1
Wallowa	14	0	5 (36%)	9 (64%)	5 (56%)	0 (0%)	4 (44%)	0 (0%)	0
<b>Washington</b>	385	17	85 (23%)	283 (77%)	254 (90%)	7 (2%)	20 (7%)	1 (0%)	1
<b>Yamhill</b>	99	4	39 (41%)	56 (59%)	45 (83%)	0 (0%)	8 (15%)	1 (2%)	2
<b>State</b>	<b>7,444</b>	<b>265</b>	<b>2,116 (29%)</b>	<b>5,063 (71%)</b>	<b>3,540 (73%)</b>	<b>71 (1%)</b>	<b>860 (18%)</b>	<b>409 (8%)</b>	<b>183</b>

<sup>17</sup> For approximately 6 months of the FY15-16 data collection period, programs did not have access to an on-line data system to enter data. The lack of a data system (including the automated process of checking for form completeness) may account for the amount of missing data seen at various decision making points in the screening process.



**Table 3b. Service Offer: Healthy Families Oregon 2015-16 Cohort**

<i>Program/County</i>	HV Offered # (%) <sup>18</sup>	HV Not Offered # (%)	Missing Offer Info #	Not Offered, Caseload Full		Not Offered, Other			
				Didn't meet local priority criteria # (%)	Program at capacity # (%)	Could not locate family # (%)	Family moved out of state # (%)	Family involved in other HV program # (%)	Other # (%)
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	60 (76%)	19 (24%)	17	2 (11%)	3 (16%)	14 (74%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Benton	24 (86%)	4 (14%)	1	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Linn	36 (71%)	15 (29%)	16	2 (13%)	2 (13%)	11 (73%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	72 (29%)	174 (71%)	43	16 (9%)	117 (67%)	34 (20%)	0 (0%)	3 (2%)	4 (2%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	37 (48%)	40 (52%)	15	7 (18%)	11 (28%)	13 (33%)	6 (15%)	0 (0%)	3 (8%)
Clatsop	25 (58%)	18 (42%)	5	4 (22%)	3 (17%)	8 (44%)	3 (17%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Columbia	12 (35%)	22 (65%)	10	3 (14%)	8 (36%)	5 (23%)	3 (14%)	0 (0%)	3 (14%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	2	--	--	--	--	--	--
Coos	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
Curry	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	2	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	76 (58%)	55 (42%)	39	3 (5%)	9 (16%)	21 (38%)	0 (0%)	5 (9%)	17 (31%)
Crook	9 (82%)	2 (18%)	11	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)
Deschutes	57 (60%)	38 (40%)	24	0 (0%)	2 (5%)	15 (39%)	0 (0%)	4 (11%)	17 (45%)
Jefferson	10 (40%)	15 (60%)	4	3 (20%)	7 (47%)	5 (33%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	66 (71%)	27 (29%)	7	1 (4%)	4 (15%)	10 (37%)	5 (19%)	1 (4%)	6 (22%)
Douglas	8 (50%)	8 (50%)	2	0 (0%)	3 (38%)	3 (38%)	0 (0%)	1 (13%)	1 (13%)
Klamath	58 (75%)	19 (25%)	4	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	7 (37%)	5 (26%)	0 (0%)	5 (26%)
Lake	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--

<sup>18</sup> It is possible the number of families offered services is higher. A large number of families were missing service offer information in the state data system. It is likely that a percentage of those families with missing information actually were offered services.

**Table 3b. Service Offer: Healthy Families Oregon 2015-16 Cohort**

Program/County	HV Offered # (%) <sup>18</sup>	HV Not Offered # (%)	Missing Offer Info #	Not Offered, Caseload Full		Not Offered, Other			
				Didn't meet local priority criteria # (%)	Program at capacity # (%)	Could not locate family # (%)	Family moved out of state # (%)	Family involved in other HV program # (%)	Other # (%)
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	14 (93%)	1 (7%)	0	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Grant	11 (100%)	0 (0%)	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
Harney	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	0	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam,</b>	48 (51%)	47 (49%)	35	0 (0%)	3 (6%)	31 (66%)	5 (11%)	3 (6%)	5 (11%)
Gilliam	2 (33%)	4 (67%)	0	0 (0%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)
Hood River	17 (68%)	8 (32%)	18	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (75%)	0 (0%)	1 (13%)	1 (13%)
Sherman	--	--	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
Wasco	27 (44%)	34 (56%)	17	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	24 (71%)	5 (15%)	2 (6%)	3 (9%)
Wheeler	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	0	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	51 (47%)	58 (53%)	160	0 (0%)	38 (66%)	9 (16%)	1 (2%)	4 (7%)	6 (10%)
Jackson	28 (50%)	28 (50%)	84	0 (0%)	19 (68%)	2 (7%)	1 (4%)	2 (7%)	4 (14%)
Josephine	23 (43%)	30 (57%)	76	0 (0%)	19 (63%)	7 (23%)	0 (0%)	2 (7%)	2 (7%)
<b>Lane</b>	130 (48%)	143 (52%)	0	0 (0%)	49 (34%)	87 (61%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	6 (4%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	19 (100%)	0 (0%)	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	31 (7%)	441 (93%)	364	31 (7%)	45 (10%)	270 (61%)	3 (1%)	3 (1%)	89 (20%)
Marion	26 (6%)	410 (94%)	303	30 (7%)	44 (11%)	244 (60%)	3 (1%)	3 (1%)	86 (21%)
Polk	5 (14%)	31 (86%)	61	1 (3%)	1 (3%)	26 (84%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (10%)

<sup>18</sup> It is possible the number of families offered services is higher. A large number of families were missing service offer information in the state data system. It is likely that a percentage of those families with missing information actually were offered services.

**Table 3b. Service Offer: Healthy Families Oregon 2015-16 Cohort**

<i>Program/County</i>	HV Offered # (%) <sup>18</sup>	HV Not Offered # (%)	Missing Offer Info #	Not Offered, Caseload Full		Not Offered, Other			
				Didn't meet local priority criteria # (%)	Program at capacity # (%)	Could not locate family # (%)	Family moved out of state # (%)	Family involved in other HV program # (%)	Other # (%)
<b>Multnomah</b>	403 (83%)	83 (17%)	179	9 (11%)	50 (60%)	10 (12%)	2 (2%)	8 (10%)	4 (5%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	28 (68%)	13 (32%)	5	0 (0%)	1 (8%)	10 (77%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)	1 (8%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	63 (37%)	109 (63%)	26	1 (1%)	18 (17%)	20 (18%)	0 (0%)	4 (4%)	66 (61%)
Morrow	12 (50%)	12 (50%)	6	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (17%)	0 (0%)	3 (25%)	7 (58%)
Umatilla	34 (28%)	88 (72%)	14	1 (1%)	18 (20%)	18 (20%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	50 (57%)
Union	17 (65%)	9 (35%)	6	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	9 (100%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	29 (83%)	6 (17%)	2	0 (0%)	1 (17%)	4 (67%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (17%)
Baker	11 (79%)	3 (21%)	0	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)
Malheur	14 (88%)	2 (13%)	2	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Wallowa	4 (80%)	1 (20%)	0	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Washington</b>	233 (92%)	20 (8%)	1	1 (5%)	10 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	8 (40%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	32 (74%)	11 (26%)	2	0 (0%)	7 (64%)	3 (27%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (9%)
<b>State</b>	<b>1,396 (53%)</b>	<b>1,247 (47%)</b>	<b>897</b>	<b>71 (6%)</b>	<b>366 (29%)</b>	<b>537 (43%)</b>	<b>24 (2%)</b>	<b>32 (3%)</b>	<b>217 (17%)</b>

<sup>18</sup> It is possible the number of families offered services is higher. A large number of families were missing service offer information in the state data system. It is likely that a percentage of those families with missing information actually were offered services.

**Table 4. Receipt and Acceptance of Healthy Families Oregon 2015-16 Cohort (CE 1-2.A)**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Accepted # (%)<sup>19</sup></b>	<b>Declined, too busy # (%)</b>	<b>Declined, service not needed # (%)</b>	<b>Declined, other # (%)</b>	<b>Missing Acceptance Info #</b>	<b>Received HV</b>		<b>Total families with HV (regardless of first HV date)<sup>20</sup></b>
						<b>Yes # (%)</b>	<b>No # (%)</b>	
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	36 (68%)	5 (9%)	4 (8%)	8 (15%)	3	35 (97%)	1 (3%)	103
Benton	18 (86%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	2	18 (100%)	0 (0%)	52
Linn	18 (56%)	4 (13%)	3 (9%)	7 (22%)	1	17 (94%)	1 (6%)	51
<b>Clackamas</b>	11 (18%)	6 (10%)	25 (40%)	20 (32%)	8	11 (100%)	0 (0%)	151
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	30 (88%)	2 (6%)	1 (3%)	1 (3%)	2	30 (100%)	0 (0%)	95
Clatsop	21 (91%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	2	21 (100%)	0 (0%)	65
Columbia	9 (82%)	1 (9%)	0 (0%)	1 (9%)	0	9 (100%)	0 (0%)	30
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	34
Coos	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	10
Curry	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	24
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	45 (61%)	4 (5%)	8 (11%)	17 (23%)	0	44 (98%)	1 (2%)	182
Crook	5 (56%)	1 (11%)	1 (11%)	2 (22%)	0	5 (100%)	0 (0%)	24
Deschutes	33 (59%)	2 (4%)	6 (11%)	15 (27%)	0	32 (97%)	1 (3%)	126
Jefferson	7 (78%)	1 (11%)	1 (11%)	0 (0%)	0	7 (100%)	0 (0%)	32
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	42 (78%)	1 (2%)	2 (4%)	9 (17%)	9	37 (88%)	5 (12%)	188
Douglas	5 (83%)	0 (0%)	1 (17%)	0 (0%)	0	5 (100%)	0 (0%)	64
Klamath	33 (78%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	9 (18%)	9	33 (87%)	5 (13%)	123
Lake	--	--	--	--	0	--	--	1

<sup>19</sup> It is likely that this number is lower than the actual number of families who accepted service. There were a number of screening forms entered into the state data system without a response to this item. Therefore, it is possible a percentage of those families actually accepted. Additionally, the current data system does not allow for transfer of families between programs, so it is possible that families who exited one program and re-enrolled in a different program may be double counted.

<sup>20</sup> The number of families designated as receiving service this FY is higher than prior years. Because actual home visit data was unavailable for analysis this FY, the evaluation team proxied service by including families who received service prior years, but did not have any exit information. It is possible some of those families should have been exit programs, but weren't, thus increasing this count.

**Table 4. Receipt and Acceptance of Healthy Families Oregon 2015-16 Cohort (CE 1-2.A)**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Accepted # (%)<sup>19</sup></b>	<b>Declined, too busy # (%)</b>	<b>Declined, service not needed # (%)</b>	<b>Declined, other # (%)</b>	<b>Missing Acceptance Info #</b>	<b>Received HV</b>		<b>Total families with HV (regardless of first HV date)<sup>20</sup></b>
						<b>Yes # (%)</b>	<b>No # (%)</b>	
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	14 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0	14 (100%)	0 (0%)	37
Grant	11 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0	11 (100%)	0 (0%)	19
Harney	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	18
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam,</b>	28 (60%)	4 (9%)	10 (21%)	5 (11%)	0	28 (100%)	0 (0%)	118
Gilliam	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	5
Hood River	12 (71%)	1 (6%)	2 (12%)	2 (12%)	0	12 (100%)	0 (0%)	59
Sherman	--	--	--	--	0	--	--	1
Wasco	12 (46%)	3 (12%)	8 (31%)	3 (12%)	0	12 (100%)	0 (0%)	49
Wheeler	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	4
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	35 (73%)	3 (6%)	2 (4%)	8 (17%)	3	33 (94%)	2 (6%)	151
Jackson	24 (92%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	2	22 (92%)	2 (8%)	91
Josephine	11 (50%)	2 (9%)	1 (5%)	8 (36%)	1	11 (100%)	0 (0%)	60
<b>Lane</b>	68 (52%)	19 (15%)	25 (19%)	18 (14%)	1	68 (100%)	0 (0%)	215
<b>Lincoln</b>	17 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1	17 (100%)	0 (0%)	55
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	1 (4%)	6 (22%)	18 (67%)	2 (7%)	3	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	397
Marion	1 (5%)	5 (24%)	14 (67%)	1 (5%)	3	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	360
Polk	--	1 (20%)	4 (80%)	0 (0%)	0	--	--	37

<sup>19</sup> It is likely that this number is lower than the actual number of families who accepted service. There were a number of screening forms entered into the state data system without a response to this item. Therefore, it is possible a percentage of those families actually accepted. Additionally, the current data system does not allow for transfer of families between programs, so it is possible that families who exited one program and re-enrolled in a different program may be double counted.

<sup>20</sup> The number of families designated as receiving service this FY is higher than prior years. Because actual home visit data was unavailable for analysis this FY, the evaluation team proxied service by including families who received service prior years, but did not have any exit information. It is possible some of those families should have been exit programs, but weren't, thus increasing this count.

**Table 4. Receipt and Acceptance of Healthy Families Oregon 2015-16 Cohort (CE 1-2.A)**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Accepted # (%)<sup>19</sup></b>	<b>Declined, too busy # (%)</b>	<b>Declined, service not needed # (%)</b>	<b>Declined, other # (%)</b>	<b>Missing Acceptance Info #</b>	<b>Received HV</b>		<b>Total families with HV (regardless of first HV date)<sup>20</sup></b>
						<b>Yes # (%)</b>	<b>No # (%)</b>	
<b>Multnomah</b>	144 (99%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	257	131 (91%)	13 (9%)	794
<b>Tillamook</b>	17 (61%)	3 (11%)	4 (14%)	4 (14%)	0	17 (100%)	0 (0%)	74
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	30 (51%)	7 (12%)	18 (31%)	4 (7%)	0	30 (100%)	0 (0%)	119
Morrow	7 (64%)	1 (9%)	2 (18%)	1 (9%)	0	7 (100%)	0 (0%)	27
Umatilla	15 (45%)	4 (12%)	11 (33%)	3 (9%)	1	15 (100%)	0 (0%)	71
Union	8 (53%)	2 (13%)	5 (33%)	0 (0%)	0	8 (100%)	0 (0%)	21
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	27 (96%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	1	26 (96%)	1 (4%)	78
Baker	9 (90%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	1	9 (100%)	0 (0%)	22
Malheur	14 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0	14 (100%)	0 (0%)	45
Wallowa	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	11
<b>Washington</b>	178 (96%)	3 (2%)	2 (1%)	2 (1%)	2	142 (80%)	36 (20%)	307
<b>Yamhill</b>	21 (70%)	3 (10%)	1 (3%)	5 (17%)	0	21 (100%)	0 (0%)	71
<b>State</b>	<b>748 (72%)</b>	<b>66 (6%)</b>	<b>122 (12%)</b>	<b>104 (10%)</b>	<b>290</b>	<b>689 (92%)</b>	<b>59 (8%)</b>	<b>3,169</b>

<sup>19</sup> It is likely that this number is lower than the actual number of families who accepted service. There were a number of screening forms entered into the state data system without a response to this item. Therefore, it is possible a percentage of those families actually accepted. Additionally, the current data system does not allow for transfer of families between programs, so it is possible that families who exited one program and re-enrolled in a different program may be double counted.

<sup>20</sup> The number of families designated as receiving service this FY is higher than prior years. Because actual home visit data was unavailable for analysis this FY, the evaluation team proxied service by including families who received service prior years, but did not have any exit information. It is possible some of those families should have been exit programs, but weren't, thus increasing this count.

**Table 5. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service: Race/Ethnicity 2015-16 Cohort<sup>21</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>22</sup> Offered Intensive Service</b>	<b>Number (%) of Other Race/Ethnicity Families Accepting Intensive Service</b>
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	32	19 (59%)	16	12 (75%)	8	4 (50%)
Benton	12	10 (83%)	7	5 (71%)	4	3 (75%)
Linn	20	9 (45%)	9	7 (78%)	4	1 (25%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	41	5 (12%)	17	4 (24%)	10	2 (20%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	28	25 (89%)	4	4 (100%)	3	0 (0%)
Clatsop	18	17 (94%)	3	3 (100%)	3	0 (0%)
Columbia	10	8 (80%)	1	1 (100%)	0	--
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	2	2 (100%)	0	--	2	2 (100%)
Coos	1	1 (100%)	0	--	1	1 (100%)
Curry	1	1 (100%)	0	--	1	1 (100%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	51	28 (55%)	15	11 (73%)	7	4 (57%)
Crook	6	4 (67%)	2	0 (0%)	1	1 (100%)
Deschutes	42	23 (55%)	9	7 (78%)	5	2 (40%)
Jefferson	3	1 (33%)	4	4 (100%)	1	1 (100%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	40	22 (55%)	7	6 (86%)	15	9 (60%)
Douglas	5	4 (80%)	0	--	1	1 (100%)
Klamath	36	19 (53%)	7	6 (86%)	14	8 (57%)
Lake	--	--	--	--	--	--

<sup>21</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. It is possible that numbers in this table are higher than the acceptance numbers in the screening tables, because these data also include any family who received a first home visit this year, regardless of the acceptance information on their screening form.

<sup>22</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 data and/or those families declining to report race/ethnicity).

**Table 5. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service: Race/Ethnicity 2015-16 Cohort<sup>21</sup> (CE 1-2.B, CE 5-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of White Families Offered Intensive Service	Number (%) of White Families Accepting Intensive Service	Number of Hispanic/Latino Families Offered Intensive Service	Number (%) of Hispanic/Latino Families Accepting Intensive Service	Number of Other Race/Ethnicity Families <sup>22</sup> Offered Intensive Service	Number (%) of Other Race/Ethnicity Families Accepting Intensive Service
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	13	13 (100%)	0	--	1	1 (100%)
Grant	11	11 (100%)	0	--	0	--
Harney	2	2 (100%)	0	--	1	1 (100%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	17	7 (41%)	22	15 (68%)	6	4 (67%)
Gilliam	2	2 (100%)	0	--	0	--
Hood River	0	--	16	11 (69%)	0	--
Sherman	--	--	--	--	--	--
Wasco	15	5 (33%)	6	4 (67%)	4	2 (50%)
Wheeler	0	--	0	--	2	2 (100%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	36	24 (67%)	11	7 (64%)	3	1 (33%)
Jackson	15	13 (87%)	10	7 (70%)	2	1 (50%)
Josephine	21	11 (52%)	1	0 (0%)	1	0 (0%)
<b>Lane</b>	94	47 (50%)	20	12 (60%)	14	6 (43%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	7	7 (100%)	6	6 (100%)	4	4 (100%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	7	0 (0%)	19	1 (5%)	4	0 (0%)
Marion	3	0 (0%)	17	1 (6%)	4	0 (0%)
Polk	3	0 (0%)	2	0 (0%)	0	--

<sup>21</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. It is possible that numbers in this table are higher than the acceptance numbers in the screening tables, because these data also include any family who received a first home visit this year, regardless of the acceptance information on their screening form.

<sup>22</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 data and/or those families declining to report race/ethnicity).



**Table 5. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service: Race/Ethnicity 2015-16 Cohort<sup>21</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>22</sup> Offered Intensive Service</b>	<b>Number (%) of Other Race/Ethnicity Families Accepting Intensive Service</b>
<b>Multnomah</b>	130	36 (28%)	100	30 (30%)	165	65 (39%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	20	11 (55%)	7	5 (71%)	1	1 (100%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	30	14 (47%)	20	12 (60%)	9	4 (44%)
Morrow	3	1 (33%)	7	5 (71%)	1	1 (100%)
Umatilla	18	8 (44%)	13	7 (54%)	3	0 (0%)
Union	10	5 (50%)	0	--	5	3 (60%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	18	15 (83%)	11	11 (100%)	0	--
Baker	11	9 (82%)	0	--	0	--
Malheur	3	3 (100%)	11	11 (100%)	0	--
Wallowa	4	3 (75%)	0	--	0	--
<b>Washington</b>	47	37 (79%)	105	79 (75%)	35	26 (74%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	17	12 (71%)	10	6 (60%)	2	2 (100%)
<b>State</b>	<b>630</b>	<b>324 (51%)</b>	<b>390</b>	<b>221 (57%)</b>	<b>289</b>	<b>135 (47%)</b>

<sup>21</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. It is possible that numbers in this table are higher than the acceptance numbers in the screening tables, because these data also include any family who received a first home visit this year, regardless of the acceptance information on their screening form.

<sup>22</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 data and/or those families declining to report race/ethnicity).

**Table 6. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service: Demographic Factors 2015-16 Cohort<sup>23</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>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	22 (54%)	9 (90%)	8 (62%)	27 (64%)	28 (65%)	7 (54%)
Benton	11 (73%)	5 (83%)	5 (71%)	13 (81%)	15 (75%)	3 (100%)
Linn	11 (42%)	4 (100%)	3 (50%)	14 (54%)	13 (57%)	4 (40%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	8 (14%)	3 (27%)	4 (22%)	7 (13%)	9 (17%)	2 (11%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	27 (82%)	3 (100%)	13 (87%)	17 (81%)	29 (85%)	1 (50%)
Clatsop	19 (83%)	2 (100%)	10 (83%)	11 (85%)	20 (87%)	1 (50%)
Columbia	8 (80%)	1 (100%)	3 (100%)	6 (75%)	9 (82%)	--
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	3 (100%)	--	--	4 (100%)	4 (100%)	--
Coos	1 (100%)	--	--	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	--
Curry	2 (100%)	--	--	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	--
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	36 (55%)	4 (80%)	10 (59%)	34 (60%)	39 (62%)	5 (45%)
Crook	4 (50%)	--	3 (100%)	2 (33%)	5 (71%)	0 (0%)
Deschutes	29 (56%)	1 (50%)	6 (50%)	26 (59%)	28 (58%)	4 (50%)
Jefferson	3 (60%)	3 (100%)	1 (50%)	6 (86%)	6 (75%)	1 (100%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	33 (58%)	--	5 (63%)	32 (58%)	26 (59%)	11 (58%)
Douglas	5 (83%)	--	1 (100%)	4 (80%)	4 (80%)	1 (100%)
Klamath	29 (56%)	--	4 (57%)	29 (57%)	23 (58%)	10 (56%)
Lake	--	--	--	--	--	--

<sup>23</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). Demographic information is collected on or at the time of the NBQ and entered into the statewide data system by program staff. It is possible that numbers in this table are higher than the acceptance numbers in the screening tables, because these data also include any family who received a first home visit this year, regardless of the acceptance information on their screening form.

**Table 6. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service: Demographic Factors 2015-16 Cohort<sup>23</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>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	14 (100%)	--	5 (100%)	9 (100%)	11 (100%)	3 (100%)
Grant	11 (100%)	--	4 (100%)	7 (100%)	8 (100%)	3 (100%)
Harney	3 (100%)	--	1 (100%)	2 (100%)	3 (100%)	--
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	16 (53%)	9 (69%)	15 (63%)	12 (55%)	20 (56%)	8 (73%)
Gilliam	2 (100%)	--	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Hood River	4 (67%)	7 (70%)	5 (56%)	6 (86%)	6 (55%)	6 (100%)
Sherman	--	--	--	--	--	--
Wasco	8 (40%)	2 (67%)	7 (58%)	5 (36%)	11 (50%)	1 (25%)
Wheeler	2 (100%)	--	2 (100%)	--	2 (100%)	--
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	29 (62%)	4 (100%)	10 (67%)	23 (64%)	28 (61%)	5 (100%)
Jackson	18 (75%)	4 (100%)	8 (73%)	14 (82%)	20 (77%)	2 (100%)
Josephine	11 (48%)	--	2 (50%)	9 (47%)	8 (40%)	3 (100%)
<b>Lane</b>	57 (48%)	8 (80%)	18 (51%)	50 (52%)	56 (53%)	12 (48%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	11 (100%)	5 (100%)	13 (93%)	4 (100%)	16 (94%)	1 (100%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)
Marion	1 (9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)
Polk	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	--	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

<sup>23</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). Demographic information is collected on or at the time of the NBQ and entered into the statewide data system by program staff. It is possible that numbers in this table are higher than the acceptance numbers in the screening tables, because these data also include any family who received a first home visit this year, regardless of the acceptance information on their screening form.

**Table 6. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service: Demographic Factors 2015-16 Cohort<sup>23</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>Multnomah</b>	92 (33%)	20 (32%)	34 (30%)	96 (34%)	113 (32%)	18 (35%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	13 (59%)	3 (75%)	9 (82%)	8 (47%)	16 (73%)	1 (17%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	19 (48%)	7 (64%)	8 (42%)	22 (55%)	24 (48%)	6 (67%)
Morrow	1 (33%)	3 (75%)	3 (75%)	4 (57%)	6 (60%)	1 (100%)
Umatilla	10 (42%)	4 (57%)	4 (40%)	11 (46%)	12 (41%)	3 (60%)
Union	8 (57%)	--	1 (20%)	7 (70%)	6 (50%)	2 (67%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	24 (89%)	2 (100%)	7 (100%)	19 (86%)	16 (89%)	10 (91%)
Baker	9 (82%)	--	3 (100%)	6 (75%)	9 (90%)	0 (0%)
Malheur	12 (100%)	2 (100%)	4 (100%)	10 (100%)	6 (100%)	8 (100%)
Wallowa	3 (75%)	--	--	3 (75%)	1 (50%)	2 (100%)
<b>Washington</b>	69 (66%)	64 (86%)	43 (83%)	98 (73%)	123 (78%)	19 (63%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	16 (70%)	3 (75%)	4 (100%)	17 (65%)	17 (65%)	4 (100%)
<b>State</b>	<b>490 (50%)</b>	<b>144 (63%)</b>	<b>206 (55%)</b>	<b>480 (51%)</b>	<b>575 (52%)</b>	<b>114 (51%)</b>

<sup>23</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). Demographic information is collected on or at the time of the NBQ and entered into the statewide data system by program staff. It is possible that numbers in this table are higher than the acceptance numbers in the screening tables, because these data also include any family who received a first home visit this year, regardless of the acceptance information on their screening form.

**Table 7. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service<sup>24</sup>: Demographic Factors 2015-16 Cohort (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>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	20 (61%)	13 (62%)	19 (63%)	16 (62%)	24 (62%)	11 (69%)
Benton	12 (80%)	5 (71%)	10 (83%)	8 (73%)	11 (73%)	7 (100%)
Linn	8 (44%)	8 (57%)	9 (50%)	8 (53%)	13 (54%)	4 (44%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	7 (19%)	4 (13%)	3 (11%)	8 (19%)	5 (16%)	6 (15%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	24 (86%)	6 (75%)	17 (77%)	13 (93%)	10 (71%)	19 (90%)
Clatsop	18 (90%)	3 (60%)	14 (82%)	7 (88%)	7 (70%)	13 (93%)
Columbia	6 (75%)	3 (100%)	3 (60%)	6 (100%)	3 (75%)	6 (86%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	3 (100%)	1 (100%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	1 (100%)	2 (100%)
Coos	2 (100%)	--	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Curry	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	--	1 (100%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	31 (63%)	13 (52%)	25 (57%)	19 (63%)	9 (56%)	32 (58%)
Crook	4 (67%)	1 (33%)	4 (50%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	5 (71%)
Deschutes	24 (63%)	8 (44%)	17 (57%)	15 (58%)	6 (67%)	24 (53%)
Jefferson	3 (60%)	4 (100%)	4 (67%)	3 (100%)	3 (60%)	3 (100%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	22 (55%)	15 (68%)	15 (56%)	22 (63%)	13 (65%)	24 (56%)
Douglas	3 (75%)	2 (100%)	2 (67%)	3 (100%)	2 (100%)	3 (75%)
Klamath	20 (54%)	13 (65%)	14 (56%)	19 (59%)	11 (61%)	22 (55%)
Lake	--	--	--	--	--	--

<sup>24</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). Demographic information is collected on or at the time of the NBQ and entered into the statewide data system by program staff. It is possible that numbers in this table are higher than the acceptance numbers in the screening tables, because these data also include any family who received a first home visit this year, regardless of the acceptance information on their screening form.

**Table 7. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service<sup>24</sup>: Demographic Factors 2015-16 Cohort (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>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	8 (100%)	6 (100%)	8 (100%)	6 (100%)	6 (100%)	7 (100%)
Grant	7 (100%)	4 (100%)	7 (100%)	4 (100%)	4 (100%)	6 (100%)
Harney	1 (100%)	2 (100%)	1 (100%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	1 (100%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	14 (50%)	14 (74%)	14 (54%)	14 (67%)	22 (56%)	5 (83%)
Gilliam	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	2 (100%)	--
Hood River	2 (40%)	10 (83%)	7 (64%)	5 (83%)	10 (77%)	2 (67%)
Sherman	--	--	--	--	--	--
Wasco	9 (45%)	3 (50%)	6 (43%)	6 (50%)	8 (36%)	3 (100%)
Wheeler	2 (100%)	--	--	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	--
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	18 (53%)	15 (88%)	14 (58%)	19 (70%)	6 (75%)	27 (63%)
Jackson	13 (72%)	9 (90%)	7 (58%)	15 (94%)	5 (83%)	17 (77%)
Josephine	5 (31%)	6 (86%)	7 (58%)	4 (36%)	1 (50%)	10 (48%)
<b>Lane</b>	56 (51%)	12 (57%)	43 (54%)	25 (48%)	15 (63%)	51 (49%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	14 (93%)	3 (100%)	13 (100%)	4 (80%)	3 (100%)	14 (93%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)
Marion	0 (0%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)	1 (8%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)
Polk	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	--	0 (0%)

<sup>24</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). Demographic information is collected on or at the time of the NBQ and entered into the statewide data system by program staff. It is possible that numbers in this table are higher than the acceptance numbers in the screening tables, because these data also include any family who received a first home visit this year, regardless of the acceptance information on their screening form.

**Table 7. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service<sup>24</sup>: Demographic Factors 2015-16 Cohort (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>Multnomah</b>	74 (31%)	57 (36%)	44 (34%)	87 (32%)	16 (25%)	114 (34%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	9 (50%)	8 (80%)	9 (69%)	8 (53%)	12 (60%)	5 (83%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	13 (39%)	16 (64%)	9 (33%)	21 (66%)	16 (64%)	14 (41%)
Morrow	3 (60%)	3 (60%)	2 (33%)	5 (100%)	4 (50%)	3 (100%)
Umatilla	6 (30%)	9 (64%)	5 (33%)	10 (53%)	8 (57%)	7 (35%)
Union	4 (44%)	4 (67%)	2 (33%)	6 (67%)	4 (100%)	4 (36%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	14 (82%)	12 (100%)	14 (88%)	12 (92%)	18 (95%)	8 (80%)
Baker	8 (80%)	1 (100%)	6 (86%)	3 (75%)	4 (100%)	5 (71%)
Malheur	6 (100%)	8 (100%)	8 (100%)	6 (100%)	11 (100%)	3 (100%)
Wallowa	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	3 (75%)	--
<b>Washington</b>	84 (72%)	57 (83%)	71 (76%)	71 (76%)	73 (78%)	63 (75%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	16 (67%)	5 (83%)	7 (78%)	14 (67%)	6 (67%)	15 (71%)
<b>State</b>	<b>427 (50%)</b>	<b>258 (55%)</b>	<b>327 (54%)</b>	<b>362 (50%)</b>	<b>256 (59%)</b>	<b>417 (48%)</b>

<sup>24</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). Demographic information is collected on or at the time of the NBQ and entered into the statewide data system by program staff. It is possible that numbers in this table are higher than the acceptance numbers in the screening tables, because these data also include any family who received a first home visit this year, regardless of the acceptance information on their screening form.

**Table 8. Retention Rates<sup>25</sup> for Families Newly Enrolled 2012-13 (CE 3-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of <u>New IS</u> Families Enrolled in FY 2012-13 <sup>26</sup>	Number (%) Still Enrolled 3 Months Later	Number (%) Still Enrolled 6 Months Later	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) Still Enrolled 18 Months Later	Number (%) Still Enrolled 24 Months Later	Of Those Exited, Average Number of Months in Program
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	22	19 (86%)	18 (82%)	15 (68%)	13 (59%)	11 (50%)	10
Benton	14	13 (93%)	13 (93%)	12 (86%)	10 (71%)	9 (64%)	14
Linn	8	6 (75%)	5 (63%)	3 (38%)	3 (38%)	2 (25%)	8
<b>Clackamas</b>	55	49 (89%)	42 (76%)	29 (53%)	23 (42%)	21 (38%)	11
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	19	19 (100%)	16 (84%)	14 (74%)	11 (58%)	9 (47%)	11
Clatsop	7	7 (100%)	7 (100%)	7 (100%)	6 (86%)	5 (71%)	17
Columbia	12	12 (100%)	9 (75%)	7 (58%)	5 (42%)	4 (33%)	10
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	15	15 (100%)	13 (87%)	8 (53%)	4 (27%)	2 (13%)	13
Coos	10	10 (100%)	8 (80%)	6 (60%)	3 (30%)	2 (20%)	14
Curry	5	5 (100%)	5 (100%)	2 (40%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	12
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	69	62 (90%)	51 (74%)	43 (62%)	34 (49%)	28 (41%)	11
Crook	7	6 (86%)	5 (71%)	5 (71%)	4 (57%)	3 (43%)	14
Deschutes	56	50 (89%)	41 (73%)	34 (61%)	26 (46%)	21 (38%)	10
Jefferson	6	6 (100%)	5 (83%)	4 (67%)	4 (67%)	4 (67%)	7
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	46	41 (89%)	36 (78%)	27 (59%)	20 (43%)	17 (37%)	10
Douglas	29	26 (90%)	23 (79%)	18 (62%)	14 (48%)	12 (41%)	10
Klamath	17	15 (88%)	13 (76%)	9 (53%)	6 (35%)	5 (29%)	9
Lake	0	--	--	--	--	--	--

<sup>25</sup> Healthy Families America suggests using the first and last home visit dates to calculate retention. In the HFO sample, a number of exit forms were missing the last home visit date, so for all retention analyses, the date of the exit form was substituted when the last home visit date was missing.

<sup>26</sup> Healthy Families America recommends calculating retention rates based on earlier enrollment years. Therefore, this table presents retention rates for all families enrolled (receiving a first home visit) in FY 2012-13.



**Table 8. Retention Rates<sup>25</sup> for Families Newly Enrolled 2012-13 (CE 3-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of <u>New IS</u> Families Enrolled in FY 2012-13 <sup>26</sup>	Number (%) Still Enrolled 3 Months Later	Number (%) Still Enrolled 6 Months Later	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) Still Enrolled 18 Months Later	Number (%) Still Enrolled 24 Months Later	Of Those Exited, Average Number of Months in Program
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	5	3 (60%)	3 (60%)	3 (60%)	3 (60%)	3 (60%)	15
Grant	5	3 (60%)	3 (60%)	3 (60%)	3 (60%)	3 (60%)	15
Harney	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	19	17 (89%)	15 (79%)	12 (63%)	12 (63%)	11 (58%)	13
Gilliam	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6
Hood River	10	9 (90%)	9 (90%)	9 (90%)	9 (90%)	8 (80%)	20
Sherman	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	12
Wasco	6	5 (83%)	3 (50%)	2 (33%)	2 (33%)	2 (33%)	5
Wheeler	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	26
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	52	35 (67%)	26 (50%)	16 (31%)	11 (21%)	9 (17%)	7
Jackson	30	22 (73%)	13 (43%)	7 (23%)	5 (17%)	5 (17%)	7
Josephine	22	13 (59%)	13 (59%)	9 (41%)	6 (27%)	4 (18%)	8
<b>Lane</b>	68	52 (76%)	45 (66%)	34 (50%)	31 (46%)	29 (43%)	7
<b>Lincoln</b>	14	13 (93%)	11 (79%)	10 (71%)	7 (50%)	5 (36%)	13
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	108	88 (81%)	73 (68%)	48 (44%)	39 (36%)	35 (32%)	9
Marion	98	80 (82%)	65 (66%)	44 (45%)	36 (37%)	33 (34%)	9
Polk	10	8 (80%)	8 (80%)	4 (40%)	3 (30%)	2 (20%)	9

<sup>25</sup> Healthy Families America suggests using the first and last home visit dates to calculate retention. In the HFO sample, a number of exit forms were missing the last home visit date, so for all retention analyses, the date of the exit form was substituted when the last home visit date was missing.

<sup>26</sup> Healthy Families America recommends calculating retention rates based on earlier enrollment years. Therefore, this table presents retention rates for all families enrolled (receiving a first home visit) in FY 2012-13.

**Table 8. Retention Rates<sup>25</sup> 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>26</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>Multnomah</b>	169	152 (90%)	129 (76%)	97 (57%)	78 (46%)	63 (37%)	10
<b>Tillamook</b>	26	26 (100%)	21 (81%)	16 (62%)	13 (50%)	10 (38%)	13
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	30	29 (97%)	25 (83%)	17 (57%)	10 (33%)	8 (27%)	11
Morrow	8	7 (88%)	5 (63%)	4 (50%)	3 (38%)	3 (38%)	6
Umatilla	18	18 (100%)	17 (94%)	11 (61%)	6 (33%)	4 (22%)	14
Union	4	4 (100%)	3 (75%)	2 (50%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	10
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	33	30 (91%)	28 (85%)	19 (58%)	15 (45%)	11 (33%)	11
Baker	7	7 (100%)	7 (100%)	4 (57%)	3 (43%)	3 (43%)	10
Malheur	22	21 (95%)	19 (86%)	15 (68%)	12 (55%)	8 (36%)	13
Wallowa	4	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4
<b>Washington</b>	81	72 (89%)	62 (77%)	50 (62%)	42 (52%)	36 (44%)	12
<b>Yamhill</b>	15	14 (93%)	12 (80%)	8 (53%)	5 (33%)	4 (27%)	13
<b>State</b>	<b>846</b>	<b>736 (87%)</b>	<b>626 (74%)</b>	<b>466 (55%)</b>	<b>371 (44%)</b>	<b>312 (37%)</b>	<b>10</b>

<sup>25</sup> Healthy Families America suggests using the first and last home visit dates to calculate retention. In the HFO sample, a number of exit forms were missing the last home visit date, so for all retention analyses, the date of the exit form was substituted when the last home visit date was missing.

<sup>26</sup> Healthy Families America recommends calculating retention rates based on earlier enrollment years. Therefore, this table presents retention rates for all families enrolled (receiving a first home visit) in FY 2012-13.

**Table 9. Retention Rates for Families Newly Enrolled 2014-15 (CE 3-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of <u>New</u> IS Families Enrolled in FY 2014-15 <sup>27</sup>	Number (%) Still Enrolled 3 Months Later	Number (%) Still Enrolled 6 Months Later	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Of Those Exited, Average Number of Months in Program
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	40	33 (83%)	28 (70%)	22 (55%)	7
Benton	14	13 (93%)	11 (79%)	9 (64%)	4
Linn	26	20 (77%)	17 (65%)	13 (50%)	7
<b>Clackamas</b>	45	39 (87%)	34 (76%)	26 (58%)	8
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	27	27 (100%)	26 (96%)	25 (93%)	10
Clatsop	21	21 (100%)	21 (100%)	20 (95%)	9
Columbia	6	6 (100%)	5 (83%)	5 (83%)	10
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	16	15 (94%)	14 (88%)	10 (63%)	8
Coos	7	7 (100%)	7 (100%)	4 (57%)	9
Curry	9	8 (89%)	7 (78%)	6 (67%)	7
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	51	44 (86%)	32 (63%)	30 (59%)	4
Crook	7	5 (71%)	5 (71%)	4 (57%)	3
Deschutes	37	32 (86%)	21 (57%)	20 (54%)	4
Jefferson	7	7 (100%)	6 (86%)	6 (86%)	5
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	37	32 (86%)	27 (73%)	18 (49%)	7
Douglas	19	15 (79%)	13 (68%)	9 (47%)	7
Klamath	17	16 (94%)	13 (76%)	9 (53%)	7
Lake	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	9

<sup>27</sup> Healthy Families America recommends calculating retention rates based on earlier enrollment years. Therefore, this table presents retention rates for all families enrolled (receiving a first home visit) in FY 2013-14.

**Table 9. Retention Rates for Families Newly Enrolled 2014-15 (CE 3-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of <u>New</u> IS Families Enrolled in FY 2014-15 <sup>27</sup>	Number (%) Still Enrolled 3 Months Later	Number (%) Still Enrolled 6 Months Later	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Of Those Exited, Average Number of Months in Program
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	5	4 (80%)	4 (80%)	4 (80%)	1
Grant	3	2 (67%)	2 (67%)	2 (67%)	1
Harney	2	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	--
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	26	25 (96%)	23 (88%)	16 (62%)	10
Gilliam	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	--
Hood River	14	13 (93%)	12 (86%)	9 (64%)	11
Sherman	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	7
Wasco	10	10 (100%)	9 (90%)	6 (60%)	9
Wheeler	0	--	--	--	--
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	90	74 (82%)	52 (58%)	39 (43%)	6
Jackson	68	56 (82%)	37 (54%)	29 (43%)	6
Josephine	22	18 (82%)	15 (68%)	10 (45%)	8
<b>Lane</b>	81	75 (93%)	64 (79%)	43 (53%)	8
<b>Lincoln</b>	13	12 (92%)	10 (77%)	9 (69%)	7
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	164	131 (80%)	107 (65%)	77 (47%)	6
Marion	147	119 (81%)	99 (67%)	72 (49%)	6
Polk	17	12 (71%)	8 (47%)	5 (29%)	5

<sup>27</sup> Healthy Families America recommends calculating retention rates based on earlier enrollment years. Therefore, this table presents retention rates for all families enrolled (receiving a first home visit) in FY 2013-14.

**Table 9. Retention Rates for Families Newly Enrolled 2014-15 (CE 3-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of <u>New</u> IS Families Enrolled in FY 2014-15 <sup>27</sup>	Number (%) Still Enrolled 3 Months Later	Number (%) Still Enrolled 6 Months Later	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Of Those Exited, Average Number of Months in Program
<b>Multnomah</b>	225	201 (89%)	175 (78%)	143 (64%)	<b>6</b>
<b>Tillamook</b>	27	23 (85%)	18 (67%)	17 (63%)	<b>9</b>
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	47	41 (87%)	34 (72%)	30 (64%)	<b>6</b>
Morrow	16	14 (88%)	13 (81%)	12 (75%)	4
Umatilla	25	22 (88%)	17 (68%)	14 (56%)	5
Union	6	5 (83%)	4 (67%)	4 (67%)	10
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	33	28 (85%)	23 (70%)	21 (64%)	<b>4</b>
Baker	5	5 (100%)	4 (80%)	4 (80%)	6
Malheur	24	19 (79%)	16 (67%)	14 (58%)	4
Wallowa	4	4 (100%)	3 (75%)	3 (75%)	3
<b>Washington</b>	96	83 (86%)	64 (67%)	43 (45%)	<b>7</b>
<b>Yamhill</b>	22	20 (91%)	17 (77%)	15 (68%)	<b>5</b>
<b>State</b>	<b>1,045</b>	<b>907 (87%)</b>	<b>752 (72%)</b>	<b>588 (56%)</b>	<b>7</b>

<sup>27</sup> Healthy Families America recommends calculating retention rates based on earlier enrollment years. Therefore, this table presents retention rates for all families enrolled (receiving a first home visit) in FY 2013-14.

**Table 10a. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Race/Ethnicity for Families Enrolled 2014-15 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number of Hispanic/ Latino Families Enrolled in FY 2014-15</b>	<b>Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later</b>	<b>Number of White Families Enrolled in FY 2014-15</b>	<b>Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later</b>	<b>Number of Other Race Families<sup>28</sup> Enrolled in FY 2014-15</b>	<b>Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later</b>
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	4	2 (50%)	28	15 (54%)	8	5 (63%)
Benton	1	0 (0%)	10	7 (70%)	3	2 (67%)
Linn	3	2 (67%)	18	8 (44%)	5	3 (60%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	15	8 (53%)	20	11 (55%)	10	7 (70%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	7	7 (100%)	14	12 (86%)	6	6 (100%)
Clatsop	6	6 (100%)	10	9 (90%)	5	5 (100%)
Columbia	1	1 (100%)	4	3 (75%)	1	1 (100%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	2	2 (100%)	11	7 (64%)	3	1 (33%)
Coos	0	--	7	4 (57%)	0	--
Curry	2	2 (100%)	4	3 (75%)	3	1 (33%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	6	3 (50%)	32	16 (50%)	13	11 (85%)
Crook	0	--	7	4 (57%)	0	--
Deschutes	4	1 (25%)	23	10 (43%)	10	9 (90%)
Jefferson	2	2 (100%)	2	2 (100%)	3	2 (67%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	1	0 (0%)	32	17 (53%)	4	1 (25%)
Douglas	0	--	19	9 (47%)	0	--
Klamath	0	--	13	8 (62%)	4	1 (25%)
Lake	1	0 (0%)	0	--	0	--

<sup>28</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 2014-15 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number of Hispanic/ Latino Families Enrolled in FY 2014-15</b>	<b>Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later</b>	<b>Number of White Families Enrolled in FY 2014-15</b>	<b>Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later</b>	<b>Number of Other Race Families<sup>28</sup> Enrolled in FY 2014-15</b>	<b>Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later</b>
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	0	--	5	4 (80%)	0	--
Grant	0	--	3	2 (67%)	0	--
Harney	0	--	2	2 (100%)	0	--
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	12	7 (58%)	6	3 (50%)	8	6 (75%)
Gilliam	0	--	1	1 (100%)	0	--
Hood River	10	6 (60%)	2	1 (50%)	2	2 (100%)
Sherman	0	--	1	0 (0%)	0	--
Wasco	2	1 (50%)	2	1 (50%)	6	4 (67%)
Wheeler	0	--	0	--	0	--
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	10	5 (50%)	64	28 (44%)	16	6 (38%)
Jackson	10	5 (50%)	49	22 (45%)	9	2 (22%)
Josephine	0	--	15	6 (40%)	7	4 (57%)
<b>Lane</b>	13	7 (54%)	53	27 (51%)	15	9 (60%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	8	7 (88%)	2	0 (0%)	3	2 (67%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	91	40 (44%)	40	20 (50%)	33	17 (52%)
Marion	84	39 (46%)	34	18 (53%)	29	15 (52%)
Polk	7	1 (14%)	6	2 (33%)	4	2 (50%)

<sup>28</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 2014-15 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number of Hispanic/ Latino Families Enrolled in FY 2014-15</b>	<b>Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later</b>	<b>Number of White Families Enrolled in FY 2014-15</b>	<b>Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later</b>	<b>Number of Other Race Families<sup>28</sup> Enrolled in FY 2014-15</b>	<b>Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later</b>
<b>Multnomah</b>	62	39 (63%)	54	37 (69%)	109	67 (61%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	12	8 (67%)	11	7 (64%)	4	2 (50%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	27	19 (70%)	12	7 (58%)	8	4 (50%)
Morrow	13	10 (77%)	3	2 (67%)	0	--
Umatilla	14	9 (64%)	6	4 (67%)	5	1 (20%)
Union	0	--	3	1 (33%)	3	3 (100%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	12	6 (50%)	18	13 (72%)	3	2 (67%)
Baker	0	--	4	3 (75%)	1	1 (100%)
Malheur	12	6 (50%)	10	7 (70%)	2	1 (50%)
Wallowa	0	--	4	3 (75%)	0	--
<b>Washington</b>	49	20 (41%)	29	13 (45%)	18	10 (56%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	9	6 (67%)	11	7 (64%)	2	2 (100%)
<b>State</b>	<b>340</b>	<b>186 (55%)</b>	<b>442</b>	<b>244 (55%)</b>	<b>263</b>	<b>158 (60%)</b>

<sup>28</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 Spoken Language<sup>29</sup> for Families Enrolled 2014-15 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Spanish Speaking Households Enrolled in FY 2014-15	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number of English Speaking Households Enrolled in FY 2014-15	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	3	2 (67%)	31	16 (52%)
Benton	0	--	10	6 (60%)
Linn	3	2 (67%)	21	10 (48%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	6	3 (50%)	26	14 (54%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	7	7 (100%)	14	13 (93%)
Clatsop	7	7 (100%)	10	9 (90%)
Columbia	0	--	4	4 (100%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	0	--	14	9 (64%)
Coos	0	--	7	4 (57%)
Curry	0	--	7	5 (71%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	1	0 (0%)	40	22 (55%)
Crook	0	--	7	4 (57%)
Deschutes	1	0 (0%)	31	16 (52%)
Jefferson	0	--	2	2 (100%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	1	0 (0%)	36	18 (50%)
Douglas	0	--	19	9 (47%)
Klamath	0	--	17	9 (53%)
Lake	1	0 (0%)	0	--

<sup>29</sup> Sample sizes were not sufficient for analysis of acceptance rates for other individual language groups.

**Table 10b. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Spoken Language<sup>29</sup> for Families Enrolled 2014-15 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Spanish Speaking Households Enrolled in FY 2014-15	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number of English Speaking Households Enrolled in FY 2014-15	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	0	--	5	4 (80%)
Grant	0	--	3	2 (67%)
Harney	0	--	2	2 (100%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	3	2 (67%)	11	8 (73%)
Gilliam	0	--	1	1 (100%)
Hood River	2	1 (50%)	4	3 (75%)
Sherman	0	--	1	0 (0%)
Wasco	1	1 (100%)	5	4 (80%)
Wheeler	0	--	0	--
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	1	0 (0%)	74	31 (42%)
Jackson	1	0 (0%)	55	23 (42%)
Josephine	0	--	19	8 (42%)
<b>Lane</b>	5	3 (60%)	64	33 (52%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	7	7 (100%)	3	0 (0%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	41	22 (54%)	60	27 (45%)
Marion	39	22 (56%)	50	24 (48%)
Polk	2	0 (0%)	10	3 (30%)

<sup>29</sup> Sample sizes were not sufficient for analysis of acceptance rates for other individual language groups.

**Table 10b. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Spoken Language<sup>29</sup> for Families Enrolled 2014-15 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Spanish Speaking Households Enrolled in FY 2014-15	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number of English Speaking Households Enrolled in FY 2014-15	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later
<b>Multnomah</b>	22	15 (68%)	97	56 (58%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	9	7 (78%)	13	8 (62%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	17	12 (71%)	15	7 (47%)
Morrow	10	8 (80%)	3	2 (67%)
Umatilla	7	4 (57%)	8	3 (38%)
Union	0	--	4	2 (50%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	4	3 (75%)	20	14 (70%)
Baker	0	--	5	4 (80%)
Malheur	4	3 (75%)	11	7 (64%)
Wallowa	0	--	4	3 (75%)
<b>Washington</b>	18	9 (50%)	32	13 (41%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	2	2 (100%)	13	9 (69%)
<b>State</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>94 (64%)</b>	<b>568</b>	<b>302 (53%)</b>

<sup>29</sup> Sample sizes were not sufficient for analysis of acceptance rates for other individual language groups.

**Table 11a. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Demographic Factors<sup>30</sup> for Families Enrolled 2014-15 (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>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	7 (88%)	15 (48%)	20 (57%)	2 (40%)	6 (55%)
Benton	1 (100%)	8 (62%)	9 (64%)	--	1 (33%)
Linn	6 (86%)	7 (39%)	11 (52%)	2 (40%)	5 (63%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	8 (62%)	18 (56%)	20 (59%)	6 (55%)	13 (65%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	7 (88%)	18 (95%)	16 (89%)	9 (100%)	11 (92%)
Clatsop	5 (100%)	15 (94%)	14 (93%)	6 (100%)	9 (90%)
Columbia	2 (67%)	3 (100%)	2 (67%)	3 (100%)	2 (100%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	4 (67%)	6 (60%)	6 (55%)	4 (80%)	4 (57%)
Coos	1 (50%)	3 (60%)	2 (50%)	2 (67%)	0 (0%)
Curry	3 (75%)	3 (60%)	4 (57%)	2 (100%)	4 (67%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	5 (56%)	25 (60%)	19 (58%)	9 (56%)	12 (52%)
Crook	1 (100%)	3 (50%)	2 (67%)	2 (50%)	0 (0%)
Deschutes	3 (43%)	17 (57%)	12 (50%)	6 (55%)	10 (53%)
Jefferson	1 (100%)	5 (83%)	5 (83%)	1 (100%)	2 (100%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	3 (100%)	15 (44%)	9 (38%)	9 (75%)	3 (33%)
Douglas	1 (100%)	8 (44%)	3 (27%)	6 (86%)	1 (20%)
Klamath	2 (100%)	7 (47%)	6 (50%)	3 (60%)	2 (67%)
Lake	--	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	--	0 (0%)

<sup>30</sup> Demographic indicators for these analyses are taken from the NBQ.

**Table 11a. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Demographic Factors<sup>30</sup> for Families Enrolled 2014-15 (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>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	2 (100%)	2 (67%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
Grant	1 (100%)	1 (50%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
Harney	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	--	--
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	2 (33%)	14 (70%)	14 (70%)	2 (33%)	7 (50%)
Gilliam	--	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	--	1 (100%)
Hood River	2 (50%)	7 (70%)	8 (80%)	1 (25%)	4 (50%)
Sherman	0 (0%)	--	--	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Wasco	0 (0%)	6 (67%)	5 (56%)	1 (100%)	2 (50%)
Wheeler	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	8 (57%)	31 (41%)	23 (41%)	16 (47%)	12 (43%)
Jackson	7 (58%)	22 (39%)	16 (42%)	13 (43%)	8 (50%)
Josephine	1 (50%)	9 (45%)	7 (39%)	3 (75%)	4 (33%)
<b>Lane</b>	17 (74%)	26 (45%)	35 (51%)	8 (62%)	27 (56%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	3 (60%)	6 (75%)	3 (43%)	5 (100%)	4 (67%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	22 (54%)	55 (45%)	42 (46%)	32 (46%)	39 (53%)
Marion	20 (56%)	52 (47%)	37 (47%)	32 (48%)	36 (56%)
Polk	2 (40%)	3 (25%)	5 (36%)	0 (0%)	3 (30%)

<sup>30</sup> Demographic indicators for these analyses are taken from the NBQ.

**Table 11a. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Demographic Factors<sup>30</sup> for Families Enrolled 2014-15 (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>Multnomah</b>	51 (71%)	92 (61%)	74 (59%)	69 (70%)	62 (63%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	3 (60%)	14 (64%)	9 (56%)	8 (73%)	9 (69%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	10 (67%)	19 (63%)	16 (59%)	13 (72%)	18 (75%)
Morrow	7 (88%)	4 (67%)	6 (67%)	5 (83%)	11 (85%)
Umatilla	3 (50%)	11 (58%)	6 (50%)	8 (67%)	6 (75%)
Union	0 (0%)	4 (80%)	4 (67%)	--	1 (33%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	6 (67%)	15 (63%)	14 (70%)	7 (54%)	13 (65%)
Baker	1 (100%)	3 (75%)	3 (75%)	1 (100%)	2 (100%)
Malheur	4 (57%)	10 (59%)	10 (71%)	4 (40%)	11 (61%)
Wallowa	1 (100%)	2 (67%)	1 (50%)	2 (100%)	--
<b>Washington</b>	15 (56%)	28 (41%)	30 (48%)	11 (35%)	25 (49%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	4 (67%)	11 (69%)	13 (81%)	2 (33%)	11 (85%)
<b>State</b>	<b>177 (65%)</b>	<b>410 (53%)</b>	<b>366 (55%)</b>	<b>212 (58%)</b>	<b>278 (59%)</b>

<sup>30</sup> Demographic indicators for these analyses are taken from the NBQ.

**Table 11b. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Demographic Factors<sup>31</sup> for Families Enrolled 2014-15 (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>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	16 (55%)	0 (0%)	22 (56%)	17 (55%)	4 (50%)
Benton	8 (73%)	--	9 (64%)	6 (60%)	3 (75%)
Linn	8 (44%)	0 (0%)	13 (52%)	11 (52%)	1 (25%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	13 (52%)	3 (38%)	23 (62%)	7 (50%)	19 (61%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	14 (93%)	1 (100%)	24 (92%)	8 (100%)	17 (89%)
Clatsop	11 (100%)	--	20 (95%)	5 (100%)	15 (94%)
Columbia	3 (75%)	1 (100%)	4 (80%)	3 (100%)	2 (67%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	6 (67%)	1 (50%)	9 (64%)	4 (80%)	6 (67%)
Coos	4 (67%)	0 (0%)	4 (67%)	2 (67%)	2 (50%)
Curry	2 (67%)	1 (100%)	5 (63%)	2 (100%)	4 (80%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	18 (64%)	5 (100%)	24 (53%)	11 (50%)	18 (64%)
Crook	4 (80%)	1 (100%)	3 (50%)	2 (50%)	2 (67%)
Deschutes	10 (56%)	3 (100%)	16 (48%)	6 (43%)	13 (59%)
Jefferson	4 (80%)	1 (100%)	5 (83%)	3 (75%)	3 (100%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	15 (54%)	1 (33%)	17 (50%)	6 (55%)	12 (46%)
Douglas	8 (57%)	1 (50%)	8 (47%)	3 (60%)	6 (43%)
Klamath	7 (50%)	0 (0%)	9 (56%)	3 (60%)	6 (50%)
Lake	--	--	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	--

<sup>31</sup> Demographic indicators for these analyses are taken from the NBQ.

**Table 11b. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Demographic Factors<sup>31</sup> for Families Enrolled 2014-15 (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>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	4 (100%)
Grant	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
Harney	2 (100%)	--	2 (100%)	--	2 (100%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	9 (75%)	1 (50%)	14 (61%)	12 (63%)	4 (57%)
Gilliam	--	--	--	1 (100%)	--
Hood River	5 (83%)	1 (50%)	8 (67%)	9 (69%)	0 (0%)
Sherman	--	--	0 (0%)	--	0 (0%)
Wasco	4 (67%)	--	6 (60%)	2 (40%)	4 (80%)
Wheeler	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	27 (44%)	2 (25%)	36 (44%)	7 (26%)	31 (51%)
Jackson	21 (40%)	1 (14%)	28 (46%)	6 (24%)	22 (54%)
Josephine	6 (60%)	1 (100%)	8 (40%)	1 (50%)	9 (45%)
<b>Lane</b>	16 (48%)	1 (25%)	41 (58%)	11 (50%)	32 (54%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	5 (71%)	--	8 (67%)	2 (67%)	7 (70%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	38 (42%)	5 (33%)	72 (49%)	32 (52%)	43 (43%)
Marion	36 (43%)	5 (36%)	67 (52%)	32 (54%)	38 (44%)
Polk	2 (29%)	0 (0%)	5 (31%)	0 (0%)	5 (33%)

<sup>31</sup> Demographic indicators for these analyses are taken from the NBQ.



**Table 11b. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Demographic Factors<sup>31</sup> for Families Enrolled 2014-15 (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>Multnomah</b>	81 (64%)	9 (53%)	131 (65%)	22 (56%)	117 (64%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	8 (57%)	1 (50%)	15 (65%)	9 (60%)	8 (67%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	12 (52%)	1 (25%)	23 (64%)	17 (65%)	11 (58%)
Morrow	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	9 (82%)	9 (75%)	3 (75%)
Umatilla	8 (47%)	1 (33%)	12 (57%)	7 (54%)	6 (55%)
Union	3 (100%)	--	2 (50%)	1 (100%)	2 (50%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	8 (62%)	1 (33%)	20 (67%)	12 (67%)	9 (60%)
Baker	2 (67%)	--	4 (80%)	2 (67%)	2 (100%)
Malheur	3 (50%)	0 (0%)	14 (64%)	8 (62%)	6 (55%)
Wallowa	3 (75%)	1 (100%)	2 (67%)	2 (100%)	1 (50%)
<b>Washington</b>	18 (40%)	4 (40%)	39 (46%)	22 (46%)	21 (46%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	4 (44%)	1 (50%)	14 (70%)	7 (64%)	8 (73%)
<b>State</b>	<b>310 (54%)</b>	<b>37 (42%)</b>	<b>536 (58%)</b>	<b>206 (54%)</b>	<b>371 (57%)</b>

<sup>31</sup> Demographic indicators for these analyses are taken from the NBQ.

**Table 12. Participant Reasons for Exiting Program Prior to Program Completion<sup>32</sup> (CE 3-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Exiting Families in FY 2014-15	Median <sup>33</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>34</sup>	Number (%) Families Moved Out of County	Other Reason <sup>35</sup>
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	25	11	5 (20%)	2 (8%)	3 (12%)	11 (44%)	4 (16%)
Benton	12	16	3 (25%)	1 (8%)	2 (17%)	5 (42%)	1 (8%)
Linn	13	9	2 (15%)	1 (8%)	1 (8%)	6 (46%)	3 (23%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	53	14	14 (26%)	0 (0%)	26 (49%)	10 (19%)	3 (6%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	19	10	3 (16%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	10 (53%)	4 (21%)
Clatsop	5	10	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	3 (60%)
Columbia	14	10	3 (21%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	9 (64%)	1 (7%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	14	14	0 (0%)	5 (36%)	0 (0%)	6 (43%)	3 (21%)
Coos	4	12	0 (0%)	2 (50%)	0 (0%)	2 (50%)	0 (0%)
Curry	10	15	0 (0%)	3 (30%)	0 (0%)	4 (40%)	3 (30%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	46	12	8 (17%)	4 (9%)	14 (30%)	11 (24%)	9 (20%)
Crook	4	20	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)
Deschutes	35	10	2 (6%)	3 (9%)	13 (37%)	9 (26%)	8 (23%)
Jefferson	7	39	5 (71%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (14%)	1 (14%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	52	12	15 (29%)	11 (21%)	9 (17%)	9 (17%)	8 (15%)
Douglas	31	18	12 (39%)	4 (13%)	7 (23%)	4 (13%)	4 (13%)
Klamath	21	9	3 (14%)	7 (33%)	2 (10%)	5 (24%)	4 (19%)
Lake	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

<sup>32</sup> Reasons for exiting home visiting services are reported on the family's exit form completed by the home visitor and maintained in spreadsheets at the program-level.

<sup>33</sup> The median, the middle value in a series of numbers arranged from smallest to largest, is less sensitive to outliers compared to the mean, and is a more meaningful statistic for this type of analysis.

<sup>34</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>35</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>32</sup> (CE 3-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Exiting Families in FY 2014-15	Median <sup>33</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>34</sup>	Number (%) Families Moved Out of County	Other Reason <sup>35</sup>
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	1	37	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Grant	1	37	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Harney	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	20	36	10 (50%)	0 (0%)	5 (25%)	4 (20%)	1 (5%)
Gilliam	1	15	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Hood River	9	38	8 (89%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (11%)	0 (0%)
Sherman	1	12	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
Wasco	9	7	2 (22%)	0 (0%)	5 (56%)	2 (22%)	0 (0%)
Wheeler	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	66	6	7 (11%)	21 (32%)	16 (24%)	6 (9%)	16
Jackson	47	5	2 (4%)	15 (32%)	12 (26%)	5 (11%)	13 (28%)
Josephine	19	23	5 (26%)	6 (32%)	4 (21%)	1 (5%)	3 (16%)
<b>Lane</b>	58	14	18 (31%)	8 (14%)	16 (28%)	8 (14%)	8 (14%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	26	30	8 (31%)	1 (4%)	9 (35%)	2 (8%)	6 (23%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	129	9	19 (15%)	22 (17%)	45 (35%)	16 (12%)	27 (21%)
Marion	112	9	16 (14%)	18 (16%)	39 (35%)	13 (12%)	26 (23%)
Polk	17	10	3 (18%)	4 (24%)	6 (35%)	3 (18%)	1 (6%)

<sup>32</sup> Reasons for exiting home visiting services are reported on the family's exit form completed by the home visitor and maintained in spreadsheets at the program-level.<sup>33</sup> The median, the middle value in a series of numbers arranged from smallest to largest, is less sensitive to outliers compared to the mean, and is a more meaningful statistic for this type of analysis.<sup>34</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>35</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>32</sup> (CE 3-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number of Exiting Families in FY 2014-15</b>	<b>Median<sup>33</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>34</sup></b>	<b>Number (%) Families Moved Out of County</b>	<b>Other Reason<sup>35</sup></b>
<b>Multnomah</b>	190	20	51 (27%)	35 (18%)	49 (26%)	34 (18%)	21 (11%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	26	14	4 (15%)	5 (19%)	6 (23%)	4 (15%)	7 (27%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	42	16	5 (12%)	11 (26%)	18 (43%)	5 (12%)	3 (7%)
Morrow	9	10	2 (22%)	0 (0%)	4 (44%)	1 (11%)	2 (22%)
Umatilla	21	11	1 (5%)	11 (52%)	5 (24%)	3 (14%)	1 (5%)
Union	12	28	2 (17%)	0 (0%)	9 (75%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	42	17	2 (5%)	2 (5%)	24 (57%)	9 (21%)	5 (12%)
Baker	9	11	1 (11%)	2 (22%)	2 (22%)	3 (33%)	1 (11%)
Malheur	29	23	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	20 (69%)	5 (17%)	3 (10%)
Wallowa	4	6	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (50%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)
<b>Washington</b>	82	12	23 (28%)	1 (1%)	23 (28%)	8 (10%)	27 (33%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	19	25	6 (32%)	3 (16%)	7 (37%)	2 (11%)	1 (5%)
<b>State</b>	<b>910</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>199 (22%)</b>	<b>132 (15%)</b>	<b>271 (30%)</b>	<b>155 (17%)</b>	<b>153 (17%)</b>

<sup>32</sup> Reasons for exiting home visiting services are reported on the family's exit form completed by the home visitor and maintained in spreadsheets at the program-level.

<sup>33</sup> The median, the middle value in a series of numbers arranged from smallest to largest, is less sensitive to outliers compared to the mean, and is a more meaningful statistic for this type of analysis.

<sup>34</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>35</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>36</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>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	39 (38%)	26 (67%)	7 (18%)	24 (62%)	10 (26%)	17 (44%)	17 (44%)	17 (44%)	10 (26%)
Benton	19 (37%)	11 (58%)	3 (16%)	11 (58%)	5 (26%)	7 (37%)	6 (32%)	6 (32%)	4 (21%)
Linn	20 (39%)	15 (75%)	4 (20%)	13 (65%)	5 (25%)	10 (50%)	11 (55%)	11 (55%)	6 (30%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	127 (84%)	116 (91%)	4 (4%)	102 (89%)	34 (29%)	64 (55%)	60 (47%)	69 (54%)	36 (28%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	69 (73%)	59 (86%)	9 (15%)	48 (80%)	18 (29%)	32 (51%)	36 (52%)	28 (41%)	29 (42%)
Clatsop	47 (72%)	38 (81%)	5 (13%)	33 (83%)	8 (18%)	24 (55%)	22 (47%)	20 (43%)	19 (40%)
Columbia	22 (73%)	21 (95%)	4 (20%)	15 (75%)	10 (53%)	8 (42%)	14 (64%)	8 (36%)	10 (45%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	17 (50%)	14 (82%)	2 (12%)	12 (71%)	3 (18%)	11 (65%)	13 (76%)	3 (18%)	8 (47%)
Coos	6 (60%)	5 (83%)	0 (0%)	6 (100%)	1 (17%)	5 (83%)	6 (100%)	3 (50%)	3 (50%)
Curry	11 (46%)	9 (82%)	2 (18%)	6 (55%)	2 (18%)	6 (55%)	7 (64%)	0 (0%)	5 (45%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	86 (47%)	74 (86%)	11 (14%)	50 (66%)	16 (21%)	50 (64%)	32 (37%)	34 (40%)	30 (35%)
Crook	13 (54%)	12 (92%)	0 (0%)	10 (83%)	4 (33%)	7 (58%)	3 (23%)	9 (69%)	6 (46%)
Deschutes	54 (43%)	44 (81%)	8 (16%)	32 (64%)	10 (19%)	34 (65%)	20 (37%)	17 (31%)	18 (33%)
Jefferson	19 (59%)	18 (95%)	3 (21%)	8 (57%)	2 (14%)	9 (64%)	9 (47%)	8 (42%)	6 (32%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	94 (50%)	88 (94%)	8 (9%)	78 (88%)	20 (22%)	62 (70%)	63 (67%)	57 (61%)	51 (54%)
Douglas	38 (59%)	36 (95%)	2 (5%)	35 (92%)	7 (18%)	28 (74%)	25 (66%)	20 (53%)	18 (47%)
Klamath	56 (46%)	52 (93%)	6 (12%)	43 (84%)	13 (25%)	34 (67%)	38 (68%)	37 (66%)	33 (59%)
Lake	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

<sup>36</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>36</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>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	20 (54%)	15 (75%)	4 (21%)	14 (74%)	5 (26%)	9 (47%)	10 (50%)	9 (45%)	7 (35%)
Grant	8 (42%)	5 (63%)	0 (0%)	7 (100%)	1 (14%)	3 (43%)	3 (38%)	3 (38%)	3 (38%)
Harney	12 (67%)	10 (83%)	4 (33%)	7 (58%)	4 (33%)	6 (50%)	7 (58%)	6 (50%)	4 (33%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	82 (69%)	78 (95%)	10 (14%)	61 (82%)	29 (38%)	34 (45%)	38 (46%)	29 (35%)	17 (21%)
Gilliam	2 (40%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)
Hood River	45 (76%)	44 (98%)	6 (15%)	34 (83%)	18 (43%)	14 (33%)	19 (42%)	11 (24%)	6 (13%)
Sherman	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Wasco	31 (63%)	30 (97%)	3 (11%)	24 (89%)	8 (29%)	18 (64%)	16 (52%)	16 (52%)	8 (26%)
Wheeler	3 (75%)	3 (100%)	1 (33%)	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	88 (58%)	81 (92%)	7 (9%)	67 (86%)	15 (19%)	48 (61%)	53 (60%)	36 (41%)	41 (47%)
Jackson	57 (63%)	52 (91%)	1 (2%)	45 (94%)	9 (18%)	34 (67%)	35 (61%)	24 (42%)	28 (49%)
Josephine	31 (52%)	29 (94%)	6 (20%)	22 (73%)	6 (21%)	14 (50%)	18 (58%)	12 (39%)	13 (42%)
<b>Lane</b>	153 (71%)	136 (89%)	12 (9%)	111 (85%)	25 (18%)	99 (72%)	101 (66%)	99 (65%)	66 (43%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	19 (35%)	13 (68%)	4 (21%)	13 (68%)	10 (53%)	5 (26%)	5 (26%)	3 (16%)	5 (26%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	283 (71%)	200 (71%)	30 (13%)	156 (67%)	69 (27%)	105 (41%)	111 (39%)	115 (41%)	94 (33%)
Marion	260 (72%)	182 (70%)	28 (13%)	143 (67%)	63 (27%)	98 (41%)	102 (39%)	103 (40%)	84 (32%)
Polk	23 (62%)	18 (78%)	2 (11%)	13 (72%)	6 (30%)	7 (35%)	9 (39%)	12 (52%)	10 (43%)

<sup>36</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>36</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>Multnomah</b>	379 (48%)	276 (73%)	63 (18%)	212 (62%)	85 (24%)	148 (42%)	134 (36%)	146 (39%)	95 (25%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	47 (64%)	43 (91%)	5 (13%)	29 (74%)	14 (36%)	18 (46%)	18 (38%)	14 (29%)	17 (35%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	34 (29%)	19 (56%)	9 (26%)	14 (41%)	11 (32%)	11 (32%)	8 (24%)	8 (24%)	9 (26%)
Morrow	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Umatilla	29 (41%)	16 (55%)	8 (28%)	12 (41%)	10 (34%)	9 (31%)	6 (21%)	7 (24%)	7 (24%)
Union	5 (24%)	3 (60%)	1 (20%)	2 (40%)	1 (20%)	2 (40%)	2 (40%)	1 (20%)	2 (40%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	47 (60%)	39 (83%)	4 (10%)	32 (80%)	13 (30%)	24 (55%)	24 (51%)	19 (40%)	20 (43%)
Baker	19 (86%)	18 (95%)	0 (0%)	15 (83%)	4 (21%)	13 (68%)	13 (68%)	10 (53%)	11 (58%)
Malheur	19 (42%)	12 (63%)	3 (20%)	11 (73%)	7 (44%)	4 (25%)	3 (16%)	5 (26%)	3 (16%)
Wallowa	9 (82%)	9 (100%)	1 (14%)	6 (86%)	2 (22%)	7 (78%)	8 (89%)	4 (44%)	6 (67%)
<b>Washington</b>	82 (27%)	48 (59%)	10 (12%)	52 (64%)	18 (22%)	35 (43%)	28 (34%)	31 (38%)	28 (34%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	19 (27%)	17 (89%)	2 (13%)	12 (75%)	1 (6%)	15 (88%)	14 (74%)	14 (74%)	10 (53%)
<b>State</b>	<b>1,685 (53%)</b>	<b>1,342 (80%)</b>	<b>201 (13%)</b>	<b>1,087 (72%)</b>	<b>396 (25%)</b>	<b>787 (50%)</b>	<b>765 (45%)</b>	<b>731 (43%)</b>	<b>573 (34%)</b>

<sup>36</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>37</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>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	3 (8%)	4 (10%)	5 (13%)	3 (8%)	13 (34%)	13 (34%)	12 (31%)	22 (56%)
Benton	1 (5%)	2 (11%)	2 (11%)	1 (5%)	8 (42%)	4 (21%)	7 (37%)	8 (42%)
Linn	2 (10%)	2 (10%)	3 (15%)	2 (10%)	5 (26%)	9 (47%)	5 (25%)	14 (70%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	14 (12%)	8 (7%)	14 (11%)	7 (6%)	37 (33%)	59 (53%)	34 (30%)	61 (54%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	8 (13%)	11 (18%)	12 (17%)	15 (22%)	18 (30%)	23 (38%)	35 (60%)	17 (29%)
Clatsop	8 (19%)	8 (19%)	8 (17%)	11 (23%)	8 (19%)	16 (37%)	25 (63%)	10 (25%)
Columbia	0 (0%)	3 (17%)	4 (18%)	4 (18%)	10 (56%)	7 (39%)	10 (56%)	7 (39%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	1 (6%)	3 (19%)	2 (12%)	2 (12%)	7 (41%)	7 (41%)	6 (35%)	8 (47%)
Coos	0 (0%)	2 (40%)	1 (17%)	1 (17%)	2 (33%)	3 (50%)	2 (33%)	3 (50%)
Curry	1 (9%)	1 (9%)	1 (9%)	1 (9%)	5 (45%)	4 (36%)	4 (36%)	5 (45%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	8 (10%)	9 (12%)	15 (17%)	7 (8%)	26 (34%)	40 (52%)	28 (36%)	44 (57%)
Crook	1 (8%)	2 (17%)	3 (23%)	0 (0%)	5 (42%)	6 (50%)	4 (33%)	7 (58%)
Deschutes	5 (10%)	5 (10%)	9 (17%)	5 (9%)	16 (31%)	26 (51%)	21 (40%)	27 (52%)
Jefferson	2 (14%)	2 (14%)	3 (16%)	2 (11%)	5 (36%)	8 (57%)	3 (23%)	10 (77%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	11 (12%)	20 (22%)	22 (23%)	21 (22%)	30 (34%)	46 (52%)	23 (26%)	57 (65%)
Douglas	6 (16%)	6 (16%)	2 (5%)	7 (18%)	11 (29%)	23 (61%)	9 (24%)	27 (71%)
Klamath	5 (10%)	14 (27%)	20 (36%)	14 (25%)	19 (37%)	23 (45%)	14 (28%)	30 (60%)
Lake	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

<sup>37</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>37</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>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	4 (21%)	12 (63%)	3 (16%)	13 (68%)
Grant	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (14%)	4 (57%)	1 (13%)	5 (63%)
Harney	0 (0%)	1 (9%)	1 (8%)	1 (8%)	3 (25%)	8 (67%)	2 (18%)	8 (73%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	7 (9%)	7 (9%)	12 (15%)	4 (5%)	34 (44%)	39 (51%)	19 (25%)	55 (71%)
Gilliam	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)
Hood River	1 (2%)	2 (5%)	3 (7%)	1 (2%)	20 (48%)	22 (52%)	11 (26%)	31 (74%)
Sherman	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
Wasco	2 (7%)	5 (17%)	5 (16%)	3 (10%)	12 (41%)	15 (52%)	5 (17%)	23 (79%)
Wheeler	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	9 (11%)	17 (22%)	14 (16%)	14 (16%)	21 (27%)	49 (63%)	23 (30%)	48 (62%)
Jackson	9 (18%)	12 (24%)	11 (19%)	13 (23%)	10 (20%)	33 (67%)	12 (26%)	32 (68%)
Josephine	0 (0%)	5 (17%)	3 (10%)	1 (3%)	11 (38%)	16 (55%)	11 (37%)	16 (53%)
<b>Lane</b>	11 (8%)	19 (14%)	26 (17%)	18 (12%)	29 (21%)	77 (56%)	42 (30%)	81 (58%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	2 (11%)	12 (63%)	0 (0%)	10 (53%)	1 (5%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	18 (7%)	31 (12%)	31 (11%)	15 (5%)	87 (36%)	93 (38%)	84 (34%)	109 (44%)
Marion	17 (7%)	31 (13%)	29 (11%)	15 (6%)	77 (34%)	86 (38%)	73 (32%)	101 (45%)
Polk	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	2 (9%)	0 (0%)	10 (56%)	7 (39%)	11 (55%)	8 (40%)

<sup>37</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>37</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>Multnomah</b>	20 (6%)	26 (7%)	32 (8%)	25 (7%)	137 (39%)	150 (43%)	115 (33%)	189 (54%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	3 (8%)	5 (13%)	6 (13%)	2 (4%)	14 (36%)	21 (54%)	12 (30%)	25 (63%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	4 (12%)	5 (15%)	4 (12%)	4 (12%)	11 (32%)	9 (26%)	13 (38%)	10 (29%)
Morrow	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Umatilla	4 (14%)	4 (14%)	3 (10%)	4 (14%)	10 (34%)	7 (24%)	12 (41%)	7 (24%)
Union	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	2 (40%)	1 (20%)	3 (60%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	6 (14%)	8 (19%)	6 (13%)	11 (23%)	20 (47%)	14 (33%)	18 (43%)	16 (38%)
Baker	3 (16%)	5 (26%)	3 (16%)	7 (37%)	6 (33%)	7 (39%)	8 (47%)	6 (35%)
Malheur	1 (6%)	2 (13%)	2 (11%)	2 (11%)	11 (65%)	3 (18%)	8 (50%)	4 (25%)
Wallowa	2 (29%)	1 (14%)	1 (11%)	2 (22%)	3 (38%)	4 (50%)	2 (22%)	6 (67%)
<b>Washington</b>	6 (7%)	5 (6%)	4 (5%)	4 (5%)	27 (33%)	27 (33%)	33 (41%)	31 (39%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	0 (0%)	3 (19%)	2 (11%)	1 (5%)	4 (24%)	9 (53%)	4 (25%)	11 (69%)
<b>State</b>	<b>130 (8%)</b>	<b>183 (12%)</b>	<b>208 (12%)</b>	<b>156 (9%)</b>	<b>531 (35%)</b>	<b>688 (45%)</b>	<b>514 (34%)</b>	<b>798 (52%)</b>

<sup>37</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>38</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>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	3 (8%)	5 (13%)	13 (33%)	1 (3%)	7 (18%)	0 (0%)	6 (16%)	0 (0%)	23 (59%)	2 (5%)
Benton	2 (11%)	0 (0%)	6 (32%)	1 (5%)	2 (11%)	0 (0%)	3 (16%)	0 (0%)	9 (47%)	1 (5%)
Linn	1 (5%)	5 (25%)	7 (35%)	0 (0%)	5 (26%)	0 (0%)	3 (17%)	0 (0%)	14 (70%)	1 (5%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	25 (22%)	22 (19%)	47 (48%)	10 (10%)	16 (15%)	7 (7%)	12 (12%)	4 (4%)	65 (55%)	18 (15%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	7 (12%)	11 (18%)	19 (35%)	3 (5%)	6 (11%)	2 (4%)	10 (19%)	0 (0%)	32 (56%)	4 (7%)
Clatsop	4 (10%)	7 (17%)	11 (28%)	2 (5%)	4 (10%)	2 (5%)	7 (18%)	0 (0%)	19 (48%)	4 (10%)
Columbia	3 (16%)	4 (21%)	8 (53%)	1 (7%)	2 (13%)	0 (0%)	3 (21%)	0 (0%)	13 (76%)	0 (0%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	3 (18%)	3 (18%)	5 (29%)	1 (6%)	3 (18%)	2 (12%)	2 (12%)	2 (12%)	6 (35%)	6 (35%)
Coos	1 (17%)	1 (17%)	3 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (17%)	1 (17%)	2 (33%)	0 (0%)	3 (50%)	2 (33%)
Curry	2 (18%)	2 (18%)	2 (18%)	1 (9%)	2 (18%)	1 (9%)	0 (0%)	2 (18%)	3 (27%)	4 (36%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	19 (24%)	12 (15%)	30 (41%)	5 (7%)	10 (14%)	7 (9%)	14 (18%)	4 (5%)	42 (53%)	9 (11%)
Crook	5 (42%)	3 (25%)	5 (45%)	1 (9%)	1 (9%)	4 (36%)	1 (9%)	2 (18%)	5 (42%)	0 (0%)
Deschutes	6 (11%)	6 (11%)	11 (23%)	4 (8%)	7 (14%)	1 (2%)	7 (14%)	1 (2%)	31 (58%)	6 (11%)
Jefferson	8 (57%)	3 (21%)	14 (100%)	0 (0%)	2 (14%)	2 (14%)	6 (40%)	1 (7%)	6 (43%)	3 (21%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	10 (11%)	29 (33%)	33 (39%)	6 (7%)	14 (17%)	13 (16%)	9 (10%)	3 (3%)	57 (64%)	17 (19%)
Douglas	3 (8%)	13 (34%)	11 (30%)	3 (8%)	10 (29%)	8 (23%)	4 (11%)	2 (5%)	26 (68%)	6 (16%)
Klamath	7 (14%)	16 (31%)	22 (47%)	3 (6%)	4 (9%)	5 (11%)	5 (10%)	1 (2%)	31 (61%)	11 (22%)
Lake	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

<sup>38</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>38</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>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	3 (16%)	4 (21%)	6 (35%)	1 (6%)	4 (22%)	1 (6%)	3 (17%)	0 (0%)	10 (53%)	1 (5%)
Grant	1 (14%)	1 (14%)	4 (57%)	0 (0%)	1 (14%)	1 (14%)	1 (14%)	0 (0%)	5 (71%)	0 (0%)
Harney	2 (17%)	3 (25%)	2 (20%)	1 (10%)	3 (27%)	0 (0%)	2 (18%)	0 (0%)	5 (42%)	1 (8%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	3 (4%)	12 (16%)	45 (62%)	7 (10%)	8 (11%)	4 (5%)	32 (44%)	7 (10%)	44 (55%)	8 (10%)
Gilliam	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)
Hood River	1 (2%)	4 (10%)	25 (61%)	3 (7%)	4 (10%)	3 (7%)	19 (46%)	4 (10%)	23 (52%)	6 (14%)
Sherman	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Wasco	1 (4%)	8 (29%)	18 (69%)	4 (15%)	4 (15%)	1 (4%)	11 (44%)	3 (12%)	18 (60%)	2 (7%)
Wheeler	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)	0 (0%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	4 (5%)	31 (38%)	28 (38%)	4 (5%)	11 (15%)	5 (7%)	10 (14%)	1 (1%)	45 (56%)	13 (16%)
Jackson	4 (7%)	24 (44%)	17 (39%)	2 (5%)	6 (14%)	3 (7%)	5 (11%)	1 (2%)	29 (56%)	5 (10%)
Josephine	0 (0%)	7 (25%)	11 (38%)	2 (7%)	5 (17%)	2 (7%)	5 (18%)	0 (0%)	16 (55%)	8 (28%)
<b>Lane</b>	21 (15%)	25 (18%)	60 (47%)	12 (9%)	13 (10%)	11 (9%)	15 (12%)	5 (4%)	86 (61%)	22 (16%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	2 (11%)	1 (5%)	11 (58%)	2 (11%)	4 (21%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	17 (89%)	0 (0%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	19 (8%)	45 (18%)	86 (41%)	15 (7%)	22 (10%)	6 (3%)	20 (10%)	1 (0%)	161 (59%)	32 (12%)
Marion	18 (8%)	39 (17%)	82 (42%)	15 (8%)	19 (10%)	6 (3%)	19 (10%)	1 (1%)	152 (61%)	30 (12%)
Polk	1 (5%)	6 (32%)	4 (27%)	0 (0%)	3 (17%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	9 (43%)	2 (10%)

<sup>38</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>38</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>Multnomah</b>	37 (11%)	71 (20%)	103 (31%)	16 (5%)	44 (13%)	15 (5%)	44 (13%)	10 (3%)	172 (48%)	61 (17%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	2 (5%)	6 (15%)	9 (24%)	7 (18%)	3 (8%)	3 (8%)	8 (22%)	2 (6%)	19 (48%)	10 (25%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	2 (6%)	5 (15%)	12 (35%)	3 (9%)	11 (32%)	1 (3%)	6 (18%)	0 (0%)	17 (50%)	2 (6%)
Morrow	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Umatilla	1 (3%)	5 (17%)	11 (38%)	1 (3%)	9 (31%)	1 (3%)	6 (21%)	0 (0%)	16 (55%)	1 (3%)
Union	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	2 (40%)	2 (40%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	1 (20%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	5 (11%)	12 (27%)	12 (33%)	3 (8%)	4 (11%)	6 (17%)	10 (28%)	0 (0%)	23 (52%)	5 (11%)
Baker	3 (16%)	9 (47%)	7 (50%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	5 (38%)	2 (13%)	0 (0%)	8 (44%)	4 (22%)
Malheur	2 (13%)	0 (0%)	3 (20%)	0 (0%)	2 (13%)	0 (0%)	7 (54%)	0 (0%)	9 (53%)	0 (0%)
Wallowa	0 (0%)	3 (33%)	2 (29%)	2 (29%)	2 (29%)	1 (14%)	1 (14%)	0 (0%)	6 (67%)	1 (11%)
<b>Washington</b>	9 (11%)	11 (14%)	19 (25%)	6 (8%)	5 (7%)	3 (4%)	4 (5%)	0 (0%)	52 (65%)	0 (0%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	1 (6%)	4 (24%)	5 (31%)	1 (6%)	1 (7%)	2 (13%)	2 (13%)	1 (7%)	9 (50%)	3 (17%)
<b>State</b>	<b>175 (11%)</b>	<b>309 (20%)</b>	<b>543 (38%)</b>	<b>103 (7%)</b>	<b>186 (13%)</b>	<b>89 (6%)</b>	<b>208 (15%)</b>	<b>40 (3%)</b>	<b>880 (56%)</b>	<b>213 (13%)</b>

<sup>38</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>39</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>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	103	0 (0%)	24 (23%)	5 (5%)	1 (1%)	57 (55%)	0 (0%)	4 (4%)	2 (2%)	10 (10%)
Benton	52	0 (0%)	10 (19%)	4 (8%)	1 (2%)	26 (50%)	0 (0%)	2 (4%)	0 (0%)	9 (17%)
Linn	51	0 (0%)	14 (27%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	31 (61%)	0 (0%)	2 (4%)	2 (4%)	1 (2%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	151	5 (3%)	49 (32%)	2 (1%)	0 (0%)	59 (39%)	1 (1%)	14 (9%)	2 (1%)	19 (13%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	95	0 (0%)	13 (14%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	59 (62%)	0 (0%)	2 (2%)	0 (0%)	21 (22%)
Clatsop	65	0 (0%)	11 (17%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	36 (55%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	17 (26%)
Columbia	30	0 (0%)	2 (7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	23 (77%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	4 (13%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	34	0 (0%)	2 (6%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	14 (41%)	0 (0%)	3 (9%)	0 (0%)	14 (41%)
Coos	10	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (70%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	2 (20%)
Curry	24	0 (0%)	2 (8%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	7 (29%)	0 (0%)	2 (8%)	0 (0%)	12 (50%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	182	1 (1%)	31 (17%)	1 (1%)	2 (1%)	97 (53%)	1 (1%)	12 (7%)	0 (0%)	37 (20%)
Crook	24	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	15 (63%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (29%)
Deschutes	126	1 (1%)	21 (17%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	72 (57%)	1 (1%)	9 (7%)	0 (0%)	22 (17%)
Jefferson	32	0 (0%)	9 (28%)	0 (0%)	2 (6%)	10 (31%)	0 (0%)	3 (9%)	0 (0%)	8 (25%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	188	1 (1%)	11 (6%)	0 (0%)	5 (3%)	91 (48%)	0 (0%)	18 (10%)	0 (0%)	62 (33%)
Douglas	64	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	40 (63%)	0 (0%)	4 (6%)	0 (0%)	18 (28%)
Klamath	123	0 (0%)	9 (7%)	0 (0%)	5 (4%)	51 (41%)	0 (0%)	14 (11%)	0 (0%)	44 (36%)
Lake	1	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

<sup>39</sup> Not all families reported race/ethnicity information; race/ethnicity information is self-reported by the parent on the NBQ.

**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>39</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>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	37	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (5%)	28 (76%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	6 (16%)
Grant	19	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	15 (79%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (16%)
Harney	18	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	13 (72%)	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	3 (17%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	118	0 (0%)	56 (47%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	33 (28%)	0 (0%)	7 (6%)	1 (1%)	20 (17%)
Gilliam	5	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (80%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)
Hood River	59	0 (0%)	41 (69%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (12%)	0 (0%)	2 (3%)	0 (0%)	9 (15%)
Sherman	1	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Wasco	49	0 (0%)	15 (31%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	19 (39%)	0 (0%)	4 (8%)	1 (2%)	10 (20%)
Wheeler	4	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	2 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	151	0 (0%)	14 (9%)	0 (0%)	3 (2%)	112 (74%)	1 (1%)	5 (3%)	1 (1%)	15 (10%)
Jackson	91	0 (0%)	14 (15%)	0 (0%)	2 (2%)	62 (68%)	1 (1%)	2 (2%)	0 (0%)	10 (11%)
Josephine	60	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	50 (83%)	0 (0%)	3 (5%)	1 (2%)	5 (8%)
<b>Lane</b>	215	3 (1%)	40 (19%)	1 (0%)	1 (0%)	136 (63%)	1 (0%)	11 (5%)	1 (0%)	21 (10%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	55	1 (2%)	18 (33%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	13 (24%)	0 (0%)	5 (9%)	0 (0%)	18 (33%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	397	6 (2%)	205 (52%)	2 (1%)	6 (2%)	87 (22%)	7 (2%)	21 (5%)	2 (1%)	61 (15%)
Marion	360	5 (1%)	195 (54%)	2 (1%)	4 (1%)	74 (21%)	7 (2%)	20 (6%)	2 (1%)	51 (14%)
Polk	37	1 (3%)	10 (27%)	0 (0%)	2 (5%)	13 (35%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	10 (27%)

<sup>39</sup> Not all families reported race/ethnicity information; race/ethnicity information is self-reported by the parent on the NBQ.

**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>39</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>Multnomah</b>	794	93 (12%)	184 (23%)	95	7 (1%)	189 (24%)	11 (1%)	56 (7%)	35 (4%)	124 (16%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	74	0 (0%)	24 (32%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	28 (38%)	0 (0%)	4 (5%)	1 (1%)	16 (22%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	119	0 (0%)	42 (35%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	44 (37%)	1 (1%)	4 (3%)	1 (1%)	27 (23%)
Morrow	27	0 (0%)	18 (67%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (15%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	4 (15%)
Umatilla	71	0 (0%)	23 (32%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	30 (42%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	17 (24%)
Union	21	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	10 (48%)	1 (5%)	2 (10%)	1 (5%)	6 (29%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	78	0 (0%)	20 (26%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	46 (59%)	0 (0%)	2 (3%)	0 (0%)	9 (12%)
Baker	22	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	19 (86%)	0 (0%)	2 (9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Malheur	45	0 (0%)	19 (42%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	19 (42%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (13%)
Wallowa	11	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	8 (73%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (27%)
<b>Washington</b>	307	4 (1%)	162 (53%)	5 (2%)	2 (1%)	73 (24%)	3 (1%)	20 (7%)	11 (4%)	27 (9%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	71	0 (0%)	20 (28%)	0 (0%)	2 (3%)	32 (45%)	1 (1%)	3 (4%)	1 (1%)	12 (17%)
<b>State</b>	<b>3,169</b>	<b>114 (4%)</b>	<b>915 (29%)</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>34 (1%)</b>	<b>1,198 (38%)</b>	<b>27 (1%)</b>	<b>192 (6%)</b>	<b>58 (2%)</b>	<b>519 (16%)</b>

<sup>39</sup> Not all families reported race/ethnicity information; race/ethnicity information is self-reported by the parent on the NBQ.



**Table 15a. NBQ Risk Factors and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families<sup>40</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	Average Number of NBQ (V2) RFs <sup>41</sup>	Average Number of NBQ (V1) RFs <sup>42</sup>	Number (%) with 1 RF	Number (%) with 2 RFs	Number (%) with 3 RFs	Number (%) with 4 RFs	Number (%) with 5+ RFs	Number (%) of English Speaking Households	Number (%) of Spanish Speaking Households	Number (%) of Other Language Households
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	3.4	3.3	5 (5%)	23 (22%)	19 (18%)	23 (22%)	23 (22%)	65 (78%)	16 (19%)	2 (2%)
Benton	3.1	3.3	2 (4%)	11 (21%)	9 (17%)	10 (19%)	11 (21%)	29 (73%)	9 (23%)	2 (5%)
Linn	3.5	3.3	3 (6%)	12 (24%)	10 (20%)	13 (25%)	12 (24%)	36 (84%)	7 (16%)	0 (0%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	5.1	3.5	1 (1%)	21 (14%)	23 (15%)	36 (24%)	54 (36%)	80 (78%)	21 (21%)	1 (1%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	4.5	3.4	0 (0%)	16 (17%)	14 (15%)	20 (21%)	28 (29%)	62 (83%)	13 (17%)	0 (0%)
Clatsop	3.8	3.3	0 (0%)	14 (22%)	11 (17%)	15 (23%)	13 (20%)	37 (76%)	12 (24%)	0 (0%)
Columbia	5.8	3.7	0 (0%)	2 (7%)	3 (10%)	5 (17%)	15 (50%)	25 (96%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	4.8	3.3	2 (6%)	4 (12%)	5 (15%)	3 (9%)	6 (18%)	17 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Coos	2.5	4.2	0 (0%)	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	7 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Curry	7.0	2.8	2 (8%)	2 (8%)	3 (13%)	1 (4%)	4 (17%)	10 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp;</b>	3.7	3.1	15 (8%)	32 (18%)	39 (21%)	34 (19%)	32 (18%)	126 (95%)	7 (5%)	0 (0%)
Crook	2.6	3.4	2 (8%)	5 (21%)	7 (29%)	2 (8%)	3 (13%)	16 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Deschutes	4.0	2.9	12 (10%)	24 (19%)	27 (21%)	24 (19%)	22 (17%)	96 (96%)	4 (4%)	0 (0%)
Jefferson	3.8	3.6	1 (3%)	3 (9%)	5 (16%)	8 (25%)	7 (22%)	14 (82%)	3 (18%)	0 (0%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp;</b>	5.0	4.0	3 (2%)	13 (7%)	31 (16%)	25 (13%)	58 (31%)	117 (99%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)
Douglas	4.6	3.9	1 (2%)	7 (11%)	14 (22%)	9 (14%)	16 (25%)	44 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Klamath	5.1	4.0	2 (2%)	6 (5%)	16 (13%)	16 (13%)	42 (34%)	73 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Lake	--	3.0	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)

<sup>40</sup> Because families in intensive service could have been screened using either NBQ Version 1 or Version 2 (depending on when they enrolled in service), data from both versions are presented.

<sup>41</sup> Programs began using Version 2 of the NBQ in July 2015. Version 2 has a maximum of 15 scored risk factors/indicators.

<sup>42</sup> Version 1 of the NBQ (in use through June 2015) had a maximum of 10 scored risk factors/indicators.

**Table 15a. NBQ Risk Factors and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families<sup>40</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Average Number of NBQ (V2) RFs<sup>41</sup></b>	<b>Average Number of NBQ (V1) RFs<sup>42</sup></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>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	3.4	3.6	4 (11%)	5 (14%)	4 (11%)	9 (24%)	8 (22%)	31 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Grant	2.9	3.0	3 (16%)	3 (16%)	2 (11%)	5 (26%)	2 (11%)	16 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Harney	4.8	3.9	1 (6%)	2 (11%)	2 (11%)	4 (22%)	6 (33%)	15 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	3.3	3.1	6 (5%)	32 (27%)	23 (19%)	21 (18%)	21 (18%)	51 (63%)	30 (37%)	0 (0%)
Gilliam	4.0	2.0	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	2 (40%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Hood River	3.2	3.2	1 (2%)	16 (27%)	11 (19%)	14 (24%)	10 (17%)	15 (41%)	22 (59%)	0 (0%)
Sherman	--	1.0	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Wasco	3.2	3.1	3 (6%)	16 (33%)	8 (16%)	7 (14%)	8 (16%)	27 (77%)	8 (23%)	0 (0%)
Wheeler	5.0	3.0	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (50%)	0 (0%)	2 (50%)	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	3.8	3.8	5 (3%)	26 (17%)	36 (24%)	26 (17%)	47 (31%)	128 (96%)	5 (4%)	0 (0%)
Jackson	4.0	4.2	4 (4%)	14 (15%)	14 (15%)	14 (15%)	37 (41%)	73 (94%)	5 (6%)	0 (0%)
Josephine	3.6	3.3	1 (2%)	12 (20%)	22 (37%)	12 (20%)	10 (17%)	55 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Lane</b>	4.6	3.3	3 (1%)	44 (20%)	45 (21%)	47 (22%)	62 (29%)	161 (88%)	22 (12%)	1 (1%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	3.0	3.2	4 (7%)	7 (13%)	16 (29%)	6 (11%)	7 (13%)	19 (56%)	15 (44%)	0 (0%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	4.6	3.6	2 (1%)	72 (18%)	73 (18%)	75 (19%)	129 (32%)	137 (55%)	111 (44%)	2 (1%)
Marion	4.6	3.6	2 (1%)	61 (17%)	66 (18%)	72 (20%)	120 (33%)	119 (52%)	107 (47%)	2 (1%)
Polk	4.3	2.9	0 (0%)	11 (30%)	7 (19%)	3 (8%)	9 (24%)	18 (82%)	4 (18%)	0 (0%)

<sup>40</sup> Because families in intensive service could have been screened using either NBQ Version 1 or Version 2 (depending on when they enrolled in service), data from both versions are presented.

<sup>41</sup> Programs began using Version 2 of the NBQ in July 2015. Version 2 has a maximum of 15 scored risk factors/indicators.

<sup>42</sup> Version 1 of the NBQ (in use through June 2015) had a maximum of 10 scored risk factors/indicators.

**Table 15a. NBQ Risk Factors and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families<sup>40</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Average Number of NBQ (V2) RFs<sup>41</sup></b>	<b>Average Number of NBQ (V1) RFs<sup>42</sup></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>Multnomah</b>	4.7	3.5	11 (1%)	98 (12%)	174 (22%)	170 (21%)	241 (30%)	358 (69%)	98 (19%)	65 (12%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	3.6	3.3	2 (3%)	13 (18%)	21 (28%)	9 (12%)	15 (20%)	33 (63%)	18 (35%)	1 (2%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	4.7	2.9	5 (4%)	29 (24%)	19 (16%)	16 (13%)	25 (21%)	51 (67%)	24 (32%)	1 (1%)
Morrow	3.9	2.2	5 (19%)	10 (37%)	3 (11%)	2 (7%)	3 (11%)	4 (25%)	12 (75%)	0 (0%)
Umatilla	4.1	3.3	0 (0%)	15 (21%)	14 (20%)	12 (17%)	14 (20%)	34 (76%)	11 (24%)	0 (0%)
Union	6.3	2.1	0 (0%)	4 (19%)	2 (10%)	2 (10%)	8 (38%)	13 (87%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	4.0	3.2	5 (6%)	12 (15%)	17 (22%)	13 (17%)	21 (27%)	60 (94%)	4 (6%)	0 (0%)
Baker	3.6	3.3	2 (9%)	3 (14%)	6 (27%)	2 (9%)	8 (36%)	22 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Malheur	4.0	2.9	3 (7%)	7 (16%)	10 (22%)	8 (18%)	9 (20%)	30 (88%)	4 (12%)	0 (0%)
Wallowa	5.3	3.7	0 (0%)	2 (18%)	1 (9%)	3 (27%)	4 (36%)	8 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Washington</b>	3.8	3.3	7 (2%)	66 (21%)	72 (23%)	68 (22%)	71 (23%)	111 (51%)	99 (46%)	6 (3%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	4.3	3.3	0 (0%)	14 (20%)	15 (21%)	16 (23%)	16 (23%)	42 (84%)	8 (16%)	0 (0%)
<b>State</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>80 (3%)</b>	<b>527 (17%)</b>	<b>646 (20%)</b>	<b>617 (19%)</b>	<b>864 (27%)</b>	<b>1,649 (74%)</b>	<b>492 (22%)</b>	<b>79 (4%)</b>

<sup>40</sup> Because families in intensive service could have been screened using either NBQ Version 1 or Version 2 (depending on when they enrolled in service), data from both versions are presented.

<sup>41</sup> Programs began using Version 2 of the NBQ in July 2015. Version 2 has a maximum of 15 scored risk factors/indicators.

<sup>42</sup> Version 1 of the NBQ (in use through June 2015) had a maximum of 10 scored risk factors/indicators.

**Table 15b. NBQ Risk Factors and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families<sup>43</sup>**

<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>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	12 (13%)	70 (74%)	27 (29%)	13 (14%)	3 (4%)	50 (52%)
Benton	3 (7%)	30 (65%)	9 (20%)	9 (20%)	1 (3%)	24 (52%)
Linn	9 (18%)	40 (82%)	18 (37%)	4 (9%)	2 (6%)	26 (52%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	25 (19%)	96 (71%)	49 (36%)	33 (25%)	3 (3%)	80 (59%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	5 (6%)	51 (65%)	23 (29%)	16 (21%)	6 (10%)	42 (54%)
Clatsop	1 (2%)	32 (60%)	14 (27%)	9 (18%)	3 (7%)	23 (43%)
Columbia	4 (15%)	19 (73%)	9 (35%)	7 (27%)	3 (16%)	19 (76%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	1 (5%)	12 (57%)	6 (29%)	7 (39%)	5 (36%)	11 (52%)
Coos	0 (0%)	6 (75%)	3 (38%)	1 (14%)	2 (33%)	6 (75%)
Curry	1 (8%)	6 (46%)	3 (23%)	6 (55%)	3 (38%)	5 (38%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	11 (7%)	115 (75%)	38 (25%)	30 (20%)	6 (5%)	74 (49%)
Crook	2 (11%)	11 (58%)	6 (32%)	6 (32%)	1 (8%)	7 (37%)
Deschutes	6 (6%)	85 (78%)	24 (23%)	18 (17%)	4 (4%)	51 (47%)
Jefferson	3 (12%)	19 (76%)	8 (32%)	6 (25%)	1 (5%)	16 (64%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	25 (20%)	114 (88%)	51 (39%)	24 (19%)	12 (10%)	82 (63%)
Douglas	7 (15%)	41 (87%)	16 (34%)	9 (19%)	6 (14%)	27 (57%)
Klamath	18 (23%)	72 (88%)	35 (43%)	14 (18%)	6 (8%)	55 (67%)
Lake	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

<sup>43</sup> These data are based on families who were screened using either NBQ Version 1 or Version 2.

**Table 15b. NBQ Risk Factors and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families<sup>43</sup>**

<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>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	4 (13%)	17 (55%)	10 (33%)	7 (23%)	2 (10%)	16 (52%)
Grant	3 (19%)	9 (56%)	6 (38%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	6 (38%)
Harney	1 (7%)	8 (53%)	4 (29%)	6 (40%)	2 (22%)	10 (67%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	19 (18%)	68 (65%)	44 (42%)	14 (14%)	3 (6%)	50 (48%)
Gilliam	1 (25%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)
Hood River	15 (28%)	34 (65%)	28 (53%)	7 (14%)	1 (4%)	28 (53%)
Sherman	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Wasco	3 (7%)	30 (70%)	13 (30%)	6 (15%)	2 (12%)	17 (40%)
Wheeler	0 (0%)	2 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (100%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	10 (7%)	106 (76%)	48 (35%)	34 (25%)	8 (6%)	86 (61%)
Jackson	4 (5%)	62 (75%)	31 (37%)	25 (31%)	6 (9%)	55 (66%)
Josephine	6 (11%)	44 (77%)	17 (30%)	9 (16%)	2 (4%)	31 (54%)
<b>Lane</b>	18 (9%)	150 (75%)	34 (17%)	35 (18%)	5 (3%)	84 (42%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	3 (8%)	19 (48%)	12 (31%)	6 (15%)	2 (6%)	16 (40%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	49 (14%)	258 (74%)	151 (43%)	114 (33%)	30 (10%)	193 (55%)
Marion	46 (14%)	235 (74%)	142 (45%)	104 (33%)	29 (11%)	179 (56%)
Polk	3 (10%)	23 (77%)	9 (30%)	10 (34%)	1 (3%)	14 (47%)

<sup>43</sup> These data are based on families who were screened using either NBQ Version 1 or Version 2.

**Table 15b. NBQ Risk Factors and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families<sup>43</sup>**

<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>Multnomah</b>	59 (9%)	465 (67%)	274 (39%)	156 (23%)	34 (5%)	414 (59%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	4 (7%)	37 (63%)	26 (43%)	16 (29%)	4 (12%)	26 (43%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	14 (16%)	64 (67%)	40 (45%)	23 (26%)	4 (7%)	50 (53%)
Morrow	2 (10%)	10 (43%)	11 (55%)	4 (18%)	0 (0%)	8 (35%)
Umatilla	10 (19%)	42 (76%)	24 (45%)	17 (34%)	3 (8%)	33 (61%)
Union	2 (13%)	12 (71%)	5 (31%)	2 (13%)	1 (8%)	9 (53%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	17 (24%)	53 (74%)	30 (42%)	17 (24%)	4 (11%)	33 (46%)
Baker	2 (9%)	16 (73%)	5 (23%)	4 (18%)	2 (11%)	12 (55%)
Malheur	12 (30%)	29 (73%)	17 (43%)	12 (31%)	1 (7%)	12 (31%)
Wallowa	3 (38%)	8 (80%)	8 (80%)	1 (11%)	1 (25%)	9 (90%)
<b>Washington</b>	33 (12%)	199 (70%)	96 (35%)	62 (23%)	31 (16%)	150 (53%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	7 (12%)	46 (75%)	15 (25%)	13 (22%)	3 (7%)	28 (46%)
<b>State</b>	<b>316 (12%)</b>	<b>1,940 (71%)</b>	<b>974 (36%)</b>	<b>620 (23%)</b>	<b>165 (7%)</b>	<b>1,485 (54%)</b>

<sup>43</sup> These data are based on families who were screened using either NBQ Version 1 or Version 2.

**Table 15c. NBQ Risk Factors and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families<sup>44</sup>**

<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<sup>45</sup></b>
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	60 (63%)	24 (25%)	28 (29%)	5 (5%)	28 (88%)
Benton	34 (74%)	10 (22%)	13 (28%)	1 (2%)	17 (85%)
Linn	26 (52%)	14 (28%)	15 (30%)	4 (8%)	11 (92%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	108 (81%)	43 (32%)	49 (37%)	12 (9%)	43 (81%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	74 (94%)	21 (27%)	27 (35%)	13 (16%)	44 (76%)
Clatsop	51 (96%)	13 (25%)	16 (31%)	6 (11%)	31 (72%)
Columbia	23 (88%)	8 (31%)	11 (42%)	7 (27%)	13 (87%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	17 (81%)	3 (14%)	8 (38%)	3 (14%)	9 (82%)
Coos	5 (63%)	2 (25%)	4 (50%)	1 (13%)	--
Curry	12 (92%)	1 (8%)	4 (31%)	2 (15%)	9 (82%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	113 (74%)	31 (21%)	32 (23%)	18 (13%)	85 (79%)
Crook	13 (68%)	3 (17%)	2 (12%)	1 (5%)	13 (81%)
Deschutes	82 (75%)	20 (19%)	26 (26%)	15 (15%)	59 (77%)
Jefferson	18 (72%)	8 (32%)	4 (16%)	2 (8%)	13 (93%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	95 (73%)	34 (26%)	47 (36%)	26 (20%)	94 (97%)
Douglas	39 (83%)	10 (21%)	16 (34%)	6 (13%)	44 (96%)
Klamath	55 (67%)	24 (29%)	31 (38%)	20 (25%)	49 (98%)
Lake	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)

<sup>44</sup> These data are based on families who were screened using either NBQ Version 1 or Version 2.<sup>45</sup> Poverty level is not a risk item on the NBQ, but is collected on the Family Intake form. It is included here as an additional variable of interest.

**Table 15c. NBQ Risk Factors and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families<sup>44</sup>**

<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<sup>45</sup></b>
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	22 (71%)	9 (30%)	9 (30%)	3 (10%)	20 (91%)
Grant	9 (56%)	5 (31%)	3 (19%)	0 (0%)	10 (83%)
Harney	13 (87%)	4 (29%)	6 (43%)	3 (20%)	10 (100%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	63 (62%)	18 (17%)	24 (24%)	6 (6%)	43 (83%)
Gilliam	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)
Hood River	30 (59%)	11 (21%)	8 (16%)	2 (4%)	24 (83%)
Sherman	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Wasco	27 (64%)	7 (16%)	13 (31%)	4 (10%)	16 (94%)
Wheeler	2 (50%)	0 (0%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	106 (77%)	24 (17%)	52 (37%)	25 (18%)	112 (93%)
Jackson	63 (78%)	19 (23%)	35 (43%)	16 (20%)	68 (96%)
Josephine	43 (75%)	5 (9%)	17 (30%)	9 (16%)	44 (90%)
<b>Lane</b>	184 (92%)	63 (31%)	85 (42%)	17 (9%)	121 (81%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	29 (73%)	11 (28%)	11 (29%)	2 (5%)	36 (90%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	282 (80%)	72 (21%)	71 (20%)	25 (7%)	207 (92%)
Marion	261 (81%)	66 (21%)	66 (21%)	23 (7%)	185 (93%)
Polk	21 (70%)	6 (20%)	5 (17%)	2 (7%)	22 (81%)

<sup>44</sup> These data are based on families who were screened using either NBQ Version 1 or Version 2.

<sup>45</sup> Poverty level is not a risk item on the NBQ, but is collected on the Family Intake form. It is included here as an additional variable of interest.



**Table 15c. NBQ Risk Factors and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families<sup>44</sup>**

<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<sup>45</sup></b>
<b>Multnomah</b>	623 (90%)	260 (38%)	154 (23%)	60 (9%)	413 (87%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	45 (76%)	11 (18%)	14 (23%)	3 (5%)	24 (71%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	60 (65%)	19 (20%)	22 (23%)	5 (5%)	33 (80%)
Morrow	15 (68%)	3 (13%)	5 (22%)	0 (0%)	9 (60%)
Umatilla	35 (65%)	8 (15%)	7 (13%)	2 (4%)	22 (92%)
Union	10 (59%)	8 (47%)	10 (59%)	3 (18%)	2 (100%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	53 (75%)	10 (14%)	17 (24%)	7 (10%)	38 (86%)
Baker	16 (73%)	4 (18%)	6 (27%)	4 (18%)	16 (89%)
Malheur	31 (78%)	4 (10%)	9 (23%)	2 (5%)	18 (82%)
Wallowa	6 (67%)	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	1 (10%)	4 (100%)
<b>Washington</b>	201 (71%)	65 (23%)	55 (20%)	13 (5%)	138 (83%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	43 (73%)	16 (26%)	22 (36%)	10 (16%)	19 (95%)
<b>State</b>	<b>2,178 (80%)</b>	<b>734 (27%)</b>	<b>727 (27%)</b>	<b>253 (9%)</b>	<b>1,507 (86%)</b>

<sup>44</sup> These data are based on families who were screened using either NBQ Version 1 or Version 2.<sup>45</sup> Poverty level is not a risk item on the NBQ, but is collected on the Family Intake form. It is included here as an additional variable of interest.

**Table 15d. NBQ Risk Factors and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families**<sup>46</sup>

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) Parenting 3 or more children under age 5	Number (%) Parenting a special needs child	Number (%) families with unstable housing	Number (%) parents reporting anxiety	Number (%) parents with fewer than 2 social supports
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	4 (8%)	5 (19%)	6 (12%)	12 (25%)	14 (15%)
Benton	1 (5%)	1 (13%)	2 (10%)	7 (37%)	6 (13%)
Linn	3 (11%)	4 (22%)	4 (13%)	5 (17%)	8 (16%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	2 (4%)	10 (18%)	11 (20%)	31 (55%)	24 (18%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	2 (5%)	11 (29%)	9 (24%)	13 (33%)	12 (15%)
Clatsop	1 (4%)	6 (24%)	2 (8%)	7 (27%)	7 (13%)
Columbia	1 (8%)	5 (38%)	7 (54%)	6 (46%)	5 (19%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)
Coos	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Curry	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (8%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	3 (5%)	4 (10%)	14 (23%)	21 (35%)	15 (10%)
Crook	0 (0%)	1 (14%)	0 (0%)	4 (44%)	0 (0%)
Deschutes	2 (5%)	3 (11%)	11 (27%)	15 (37%)	12 (11%)
Jefferson	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	3 (30%)	2 (20%)	3 (12%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	5 (9%)	2 (4%)	26 (49%)	18 (33%)	13 (10%)
Douglas	1 (8%)	0 (0%)	3 (33%)	6 (60%)	6 (13%)
Klamath	4 (9%)	2 (5%)	23 (52%)	12 (27%)	7 (9%)
Lake	--	--	--	--	0 (0%)

<sup>46</sup> These data reflect the new risk indicators added to Version 2 of the NBQ.

**Table 15d. NBQ Risk Factors and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families<sup>46</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) Parenting 3 or more children under age 5	Number (%) Parenting a special needs child	Number (%) families with unstable housing	Number (%) parents reporting anxiety	Number (%) parents with fewer than 2 social supports
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	0 (0%)	1 (7%)	2 (14%)	6 (43%)	1 (3%)
Grant	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	3 (30%)	0 (0%)
Harney	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	3 (75%)	1 (7%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	3 (7%)	6 (15%)	7 (16%)	3 (7%)	12 (11%)
Gilliam	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)
Hood River	2 (10%)	0 (0%)	3 (15%)	1 (5%)	7 (13%)
Sherman	--	--	--	--	0 (0%)
Wasco	1 (6%)	3 (17%)	4 (22%)	2 (11%)	2 (5%)
Wheeler	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (50%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	4 (8%)	1 (2%)	6 (12%)	21 (40%)	13 (9%)
Jackson	3 (10%)	0 (0%)	6 (22%)	11 (37%)	13 (16%)
Josephine	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	10 (45%)	0 (0%)
<b>Lane</b>	6 (9%)	4 (6%)	11 (16%)	42 (63%)	45 (23%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	1 (5%)	1 (8%)	2 (11%)	6 (32%)	11 (28%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	21 (14%)	7 (5%)	39 (25%)	42 (27%)	96 (28%)
Marion	19 (14%)	6 (5%)	38 (27%)	39 (27%)	87 (27%)
Polk	2 (14%)	1 (9%)	1 (7%)	3 (21%)	9 (31%)

<sup>46</sup> These data reflect the new risk indicators added to Version 2 of the NBQ.

**Table 15d. NBQ Risk Factors and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families**<sup>46</sup>

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) Parenting 3 or more children under age 5	Number (%) Parenting a special needs child	Number (%) families with unstable housing	Number (%) parents reporting anxiety	Number (%) parents with fewer than 2 social supports
<b>Multnomah</b>	29 (10%)	32 (13%)	50 (17%)	139 (46%)	114 (17%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	2 (12%)	3 (27%)	4 (20%)	4 (20%)	10 (17%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	2 (6%)	3 (14%)	5 (16%)	11 (34%)	18 (20%)
Morrow	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (14%)	4 (17%)
Umatilla	1 (7%)	2 (20%)	2 (13%)	2 (13%)	8 (16%)
Union	1 (10%)	1 (14%)	3 (30%)	8 (80%)	6 (35%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	2 (7%)	0 (0%)	2 (7%)	5 (19%)	5 (7%)
Baker	2 (20%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	3 (30%)	2 (9%)
Malheur	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (14%)	3 (8%)
Wallowa	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Washington</b>	8 (6%)	10 (10%)	26 (18%)	30 (21%)	54 (19%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	1 (4%)	1 (8%)	5 (22%)	8 (36%)	16 (27%)
<b>State</b>	<b>96 (8%)</b>	<b>102 (11%)</b>	<b>226 (20%)</b>	<b>412 (35%)</b>	<b>474 (17%)</b>

<sup>46</sup> These data reflect the new risk indicators added to Version 2 of the NBQ.

**Table 16. Health Care for Intensive Service Families<sup>47</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>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	53	38 (75%)	53	53 (100%)	42	40 (95%)
Benton	31	18 (62%)	31	31 (100%)	24	23 (96%)
Linn	22	20 (91%)	22	22 (100%)	18	17 (94%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	126	94 (75%)	126	122 (97%)	99	85 (86%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	71	52 (75%)	71	69 (99%)	46	45 (98%)
Clatsop	49	31 (65%)	49	47 (98%)	30	29 (97%)
Columbia	22	21 (100%)	22	22 (100%)	16	16 (100%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	18	12 (71%)	18	15 (83%)	9	8 (89%)
Coos	1	1 (100%)	1	1 (100%)	0	--
Curry	17	11 (69%)	17	14 (82%)	9	8 (89%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	151	128 (86%)	152	149 (99%)	98	85 (87%)
Crook	19	17 (89%)	19	19 (100%)	12	12 (100%)
Deschutes	108	88 (83%)	109	106 (98%)	69	59 (86%)
Jefferson	24	23 (96%)	24	24 (100%)	17	14 (82%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	129	119 (93%)	129	128 (100%)	77	64 (83%)
Douglas	56	51 (91%)	56	56 (100%)	39	31 (79%)
Klamath	72	68 (96%)	72	71 (100%)	37	32 (86%)
Lake	1	0 (0%)	1	1 (100%)	1	1 (100%)

<sup>47</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 submitted to the evaluation team for each child.

**Table 16. Health Care for Intensive Service Families<sup>47</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>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	27	25 (93%)	27	25 (93%)	20	15 (75%)
Grant	12	10 (83%)	12	10 (83%)	7	2 (29%)
Harney	15	15 (100%)	15	15 (100%)	13	13 (100%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	97	94 (97%)	97	96 (99%)	66	60 (91%)
Gilliam	4	3 (75%)	4	4 (100%)	4	4 (100%)
Hood River	53	53 (100%)	53	53 (100%)	35	35 (100%)
Sherman	1	1 (100%)	1	1 (100%)	1	1 (100%)
Wasco	37	36 (97%)	37	36 (97%)	24	19 (79%)
Wheeler	2	1 (50%)	2	2 (100%)	2	1 (50%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	136	119 (89%)	135	129 (96%)	93	82 (88%)
Jackson	78	65 (84%)	78	72 (92%)	52	44 (85%)
Josephine	58	54 (95%)	57	57 (100%)	41	38 (93%)
<b>Lane</b>	187	152 (82%)	188	186 (99%)	146	129 (88%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	48	36 (75%)	48	47 (98%)	35	35 (100%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	332	262 (82%)	332	325 (98%)	230	210 (91%)
Marion	297	234 (82%)	297	290 (98%)	206	186 (90%)
Polk	35	28 (82%)	35	35 (100%)	24	24 (100%)

<sup>47</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 submitted to the evaluation team for each child.

**Table 16. Health Care for Intensive Service Families<sup>47</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>Multnomah</b>	596	488 (82%)	599	583 (97%)	448	419 (94%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	56	31 (56%)	56	53 (96%)	42	36 (86%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	70	54 (79%)	70	68 (97%)	42	39 (93%)
Morrow	16	11 (73%)	16	15 (94%)	9	9 (100%)
Umatilla	43	35 (83%)	43	42 (98%)	28	25 (89%)
Union	11	8 (73%)	11	11 (100%)	5	5 (100%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	55	53 (96%)	57	57 (100%)	44	43 (98%)
Baker	18	18 (100%)	18	18 (100%)	15	15 (100%)
Malheur	31	29 (94%)	33	33 (100%)	24	23 (96%)
Wallowa	6	6 (100%)	6	6 (100%)	5	5 (100%)
<b>Washington</b>	205	151 (74%)	205	204 (100%)	159	153 (96%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	57	45 (79%)	56	55 (100%)	43	39 (91%)
<b>State</b>	<b>2,414</b>	<b>1,953 (82%)</b>	<b>2,419</b>	<b>2,364 (98%)</b>	<b>1,739</b>	<b>1,587 (91%)</b>

<sup>47</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 submitted to the evaluation team 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 <sup>48</sup>
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	40	1 (3%)	39 (98%)	0 (0%)	3	3 (100%)
Benton	23	0 (0%)	23 (100%)	0 (0%)	2	2 (100%)
Linn	17	1 (6%)	16 (94%)	0 (0%)	1	1 (100%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	99	12 (12%)	86 (87%)	1 (1%)	8	7 (100%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	46	4 (9%)	42 (91%)	0 (0%)	9	5 (100%)
Clatsop	30	2 (7%)	28 (93%)	0 (0%)	6	4 (100%)
Columbia	16	2 (13%)	14 (88%)	0 (0%)	3	1 (100%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	9	2 (22%)	7 (78%)	1 (1%)	3	1 (100%)
Coos	--	--	--	--	0	--
Curry	9	2 (22%)	7 (78%)	0 (0%)	3	1 (100%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	102	7 (7%)	94 (92%)	1 (1%)	9	6 (100%)
Crook	12	0 (0%)	12 (100%)	0 (0%)	0	--
Deschutes	71	5 (7%)	65 (92%)	1 (1%)	6	3 (100%)
Jefferson	19	2 (11%)	17 (89%)	0 (0%)	3	3 (100%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	79	6 (8%)	72 (91%)	1 (1%)	1	1 (100%)
Douglas	41	4 (10%)	36 (88%)	1 (2%)	0	--
Klamath	37	2 (5%)	35 (95%)	0 (0%)	1	1 (100%)
Lake	1	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0	--

<sup>48</sup> Fifty-six (56) families in service who indicated their child did not have health insurance on the NBQ did not have most recent insurance information submitted on a Family Intake or other evaluation form submitted by the time of analyses.



**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 <sup>48</sup>
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	20	3 (15%)	17 (85%)	0 (0%)	3	--
Grant	7	1 (14%)	6 (86%)	0 (0%)	2	--
Harney	13	2 (15%)	11 (85%)	0 (0%)	1	--
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	70	1 (1%)	69 (99%)	0 (0%)	5	4 (100%)
Gilliam	4	1 (25%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	1	1 (100%)
Hood River	36	0 (0%)	36 (100%)	0 (0%)	2	2 (100%)
Sherman	1	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0	--
Wasco	27	0 (0%)	27 (100%)	0 (0%)	2	1 (100%)
Wheeler	2	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0	--
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	94	2 (2%)	91 (97%)	1 (1%)	2	2 (100%)
Jackson	52	1 (2%)	50 (96%)	1 (2%)	2	2 (100%)
Josephine	42	1 (2%)	41 (98%)	0 (0%)	0	--
<b>Lane</b>	150	18 (12%)	131 (87%)	1 (1%)	3	3 (100%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	36	3 (8%)	33 (92%)	0 (0%)	2	2 (100%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	236	5 (2%)	228 (97%)	3 (1%)	17	12 (100%)
Marion	212	4 (2%)	205 (97%)	3 (1%)	16	12 (100%)
Polk	24	1 (4%)	23 (96%)	0 (0%)	1	--

<sup>48</sup> Fifty-six (56) families in service who indicated their child did not have health insurance on the NBQ did not have most recent insurance information submitted on a Family Intake or other evaluation form submitted by the time of analyses.

**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 <sup>48</sup>
<b>Multnomah</b>	456	27 (6%)	425 (93%)	4 (1%)	19	14 (100%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	43	3 (7%)	39 (91%)	1 (2%)	8	8 (100%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	45	7 (16%)	38 (84%)	0 (0%)	17	7 (100%)
Morrow	10	0 (0%)	10 (100%)	0 (0%)	5	2 (100%)
Umatilla	29	7 (24%)	22 (76%)	0 (0%)	11	4 (100%)
Union	6	0 (0%)	6 (100%)	0 (0%)	1	1 (100%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	44	7 (16%)	37 (84%)	0 (0%)	1	1 (100%)
Baker	15	3 (20%)	12 (80%)	0 (0%)	0	--
Malheur	24	4 (17%)	20 (83%)	0 (0%)	0	--
Wallowa	5	0 (0%)	5 (100%)	<b>0 (0%)</b>	1	1 (100%)
<b>Washington</b>	162	17 (10%)	145 (90%)	<b>0 (0%)</b>	34	13 (100%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	43	5 (12%)	38 (88%)	0 (0%)	2	1 (100%)
<b>State</b>	<b>1,774</b>	<b>130 (7%)</b>	<b>1,631 (92%)</b>	<b>13 (1%)</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>90 (100%)</b>

<sup>48</sup> Fifty-six (56) families in service who indicated their child did not have health insurance on the NBQ did not have most recent insurance information submitted on a Family Intake or other evaluation form submitted by the time of analyses.

**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>49</sup>	Average Number Child ER Visits During Last 6 Months <sup>50</sup>	Number (%) of Mothers Reporting ER Use During Last 6 Months	Average Number Mother ER Visits During Last 6 Months <sup>51</sup>	Average Number Mother ER Visits During Last 6 Months <sup>52</sup>
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	3 (7%)	1	0.10	2 (5%)	2	0.10
Benton	2 (8%)	2	0.13	0 (0%)	--	0.00
Linn	1 (6%)	1	0.06	2 (11%)	2	0.22
<b>Clackamas</b>	12 (13%)	2	0.23	6 (6%)	2	0.10
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	9 (20%)	1	0.30	5 (11%)	5	0.60
Clatsop	9 (32%)	1	0.46	4 (14%)	6	0.83
Columbia	0 (0%)	--	0.00	1 (6%)	3	0.19
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	0 (0%)	--	0.00	1 (11%)	31 <sup>53</sup>	3.44
Coos	--	--	--	--	--	--
Curry	0 (0%)	--	0.00	1 (11%)	31	3.44
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	16 (17%)	2	0.28	9 (10%)	1	0.14
Crook	4 (33%)	1	0.33	2 (17%)	2	0.25
Deschutes	10 (16%)	2	0.25	4 (6%)	1	0.08
Jefferson	2 (11%)	3	0.33	3 (16%)	2	0.26
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	28 (37%)	2	0.62	20 (27%)	2	0.52
Douglas	14 (35%)	2	0.60	12 (31%)	2	0.46
Klamath	13 (37%)	2	0.63	7 (20%)	3	0.57
Lake	1 (100%)	1	1.00	1 (100%)	1	1.00

<sup>49</sup> Of families reporting child had at least one ER visit in the past 6 months.<sup>50</sup> Of all families responding to the ER use question (including those with no use) in the past 6 months.<sup>51</sup> Of mothers reporting they had at least one ER visit in the past 6 months.<sup>52</sup> Of mothers responding to the ER use question (including those with no use) in the past 6 months.<sup>53</sup> The evaluation team made a decision in prior years to code the number of ER visits in the last 6 months as “missing” if it exceeded 35 (as we assumed those were likely data entry errors). This count, while high, fell within our threshold. It’s possible that this is a data entry error, or a family that had high ER use need.

**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>49</sup>	Average Number Child ER Visits During Last 6 Months <sup>50</sup>	Number (%) of Mothers Reporting ER Use During Last 6 Months	Average Number Mother ER Visits During Last 6 Months <sup>51</sup>	Average Number Mother ER Visits During Last 6 Months <sup>52</sup>
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	4 (27%)	2	0.40	5 (33%)	2	0.80
Grant	2 (29%)	1	0.29	1 (14%)	3	0.43
Harney	2 (25%)	2	0.50	4 (50%)	2	1.13
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	15 (23%)	2	0.42	6 (10%)	1	0.11
Gilliam	0 (0%)	--	0.00	1 (25%)	1	0.25
Hood River	7 (20%)	1	0.23	2 (6%)	2	0.09
Sherman	1 (100%)	1	1.00	0 (0%)	--	0.00
Wasco	6 (26%)	3	0.70	3 (13%)	1	0.13
Wheeler	1 (50%)	2	1.00	0 (0%)	--	0.00
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	16 (19%)	1	0.22	15 (17%)	3	0.58
Jackson	10 (20%)	1	0.24	9 (18%)	5	0.82
Josephine	6 (17%)	1	0.19	6 (17%)	2	0.25
<b>Lane</b>	26 (17%)	1	0.21	27 (18%)	2	0.31
<b>Lincoln</b>	8 (23%)	1	0.31	10 (29%)	2	0.51
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	37 (17%)	2	0.38	21 (10%)	2	0.18
Marion	29 (15%)	2	0.36	15 (8%)	2	0.13
Polk	8 (35%)	2	0.57	6 (27%)	2	0.59

<sup>49</sup> Of families reporting child had at least one ER visit in the past 6 months.

<sup>50</sup> Of all families responding to the ER use question (including those with no use) in the past 6 months.

<sup>51</sup> Of mothers reporting they had at least one ER visit in the past 6 months.

<sup>52</sup> Of mothers responding to the ER use question (including those with no use) in the past 6 months.

<sup>53</sup> The evaluation team made a decision in prior years to code the number of ER visits in the last 6 months as “missing” if it exceeded 35 (as we assumed those were likely data entry errors). This count, while high, fell within our threshold. It’s possible that this is a data entry error, or a family that had high ER use need.

**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>49</sup>	Average Number Child ER Visits During Last 6 Months <sup>50</sup>	Number (%) of Mothers Reporting ER Use During Last 6 Months	Average Number Mother ER Visits During Last 6 Months <sup>51</sup>	Average Number Mother ER Visits During Last 6 Months <sup>52</sup>
<b>Multnomah</b>	106 (25%)	2	0.51	61 (14%)	2	0.32
<b>Tillamook</b>	13 (30%)	2	0.56	7 (17%)	2	0.31
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	8 (22%)	2	0.44	5 (14%)	1	0.14
Morrow	3 (30%)	1	0.40	1 (10%)	1	0.10
Umatilla	4 (19%)	3	0.48	2 (9%)	1	0.09
Union	1 (20%)	2	0.40	2 (40%)	1	0.40
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	8 (20%)	2	0.40	5 (12%)	1	0.15
Baker	2 (14%)	4	0.50	3 (21%)	1	0.21
Malheur	4 (17%)	2	0.30	2 (8%)	2	0.13
Wallowa	2 (67%)	1	0.67	0 (0%)	--	0.00
<b>Washington</b>	27 (18%)	2	0.29	13 (9%)	1	0.11
<b>Yamhill</b>	9 (22%)	1	0.29	8 (20%)	1	0.25
<b>State</b>	<b>345 (21%)</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.37</b>	<b>226 (14%)</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.29</b>

<sup>49</sup> Of families reporting child had at least one ER visit in the past 6 months.<sup>50</sup> Of all families responding to the ER use question (including those with no use) in the past 6 months.<sup>51</sup> Of mothers reporting they had at least one ER visit in the past 6 months.<sup>52</sup> Of mothers responding to the ER use question (including those with no use) in the past 6 months.<sup>53</sup> The evaluation team made a decision in prior years to code the number of ER visits in the last 6 months as “missing” if it exceeded 35 (as we assumed those were likely data entry errors). This count, while high, fell within our threshold. It’s possible that this is a data entry error, or a family that had high ER use need.

**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 <sup>54</sup>	First HV Postnatal Service <sup>55</sup>	First HV Prenatal Service	First HV Postnatal Service
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	--	37 (88%)	--	5 (11%)
Benton	--	19 (83%)	--	3 (13%)
Linn	--	18 (95%)	--	2 (10%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	0 (0%)	93 (84%)	0 (0%)	9 (8%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	--	44 (77%)	--	15 (26%)
Clatsop	--	30 (81%)	--	9 (24%)
Columbia	--	14 (70%)	--	6 (30%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	1 (100%)	5 (50%)	0 (0%)	3 (30%)
Coos	--	1 (100%)	--	0 (0%)
Curry	1 (100%)	4 (44%)	0 (0%)	3 (33%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	3 (100%)	107 (84%)	0 (0%)	23 (18%)
Crook	2 (100%)	7 (50%)	0 (0%)	3 (21%)
Deschutes	1 (100%)	87 (89%)	0 (0%)	19 (20%)
Jefferson	--	13 (87%)	--	1 (7%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	4 (57%)	65 (79%)	2 (25%)	26 (32%)
Douglas	1 (100%)	37 (86%)	1 (100%)	16 (37%)
Klamath	3 (50%)	27 (71%)	1 (14%)	10 (26%)
Lake	--	1 (100%)	--	0 (0%)

<sup>54</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). It is possible that the data for FY15-16 undercounts prenatal service due to insufficient information on prenatal visits. Specifically, data from Home Visit Completion records were unavailable for use in these analyses, and for a period of time during the FY, the state data system did not allow programs to complete entry and obtain ID numbers, on children served prenatally.

<sup>55</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 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 <sup>54</sup>	First HV Postnatal Service <sup>55</sup>	First HV Prenatal Service	First HV Postnatal Service
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	3 (100%)	18 (82%)	1 (33%)	4 (19%)
Grant	--	12 (100%)	--	3 (27%)
Harney	3 (100%)	6 (60%)	1 (33%)	1 (10%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	3 (100%)	76 (92%)	0 (0%)	7 (8%)
Gilliam	--	3 (100%)	--	0 (0%)
Hood River	2 (100%)	41 (89%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)
Sherman	--	1 (100%)	--	1 (100%)
Wasco	1 (100%)	29 (94%)	0 (0%)	5 (16%)
Wheeler	--	2 (100%)	--	0 (0%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	1 (50%)	100 (83%)	0 (0%)	36 (30%)
Jackson	1 (50%)	54 (78%)	0 (0%)	23 (33%)
Josephine	--	46 (88%)	--	13 (25%)
<b>Lane</b>	4 (100%)	138 (82%)	0 (0%)	38 (23%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	--	33 (85%)	--	2 (5%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	5 (71%)	217 (75%)	1 (14%)	30 (10%)
Marion	5 (83%)	195 (75%)	1 (17%)	25 (10%)
Polk	0 (0%)	22 (76%)	0 (0%)	5 (17%)

<sup>54</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). It is possible that the data for FY15-16 undercounts prenatal service due to insufficient information on prenatal visits. Specifically, data from Home Visit Completion records were unavailable for use in these analyses, and for a period of time during the FY, the state data system did not allow programs to complete entry and obtain ID numbers, on children served prenatally.

<sup>55</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 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 <sup>54</sup>	First HV Postnatal Service <sup>55</sup>	First HV Prenatal Service	First HV Postnatal Service
<b>Multnomah</b>	2 (50%)	427 (83%)	0 (0%)	55 (11%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	2 (100%)	41 (87%)	1 (50%)	3 (6%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	5 (71%)	35 (85%)	0 (0%)	3 (7%)
Morrow	1 (50%)	11 (92%)	0 (0%)	1 (8%)
Umatilla	3 (100%)	19 (83%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)
Union	1 (50%)	5 (83%)	0 (0%)	1 (17%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	4 (100%)	34 (77%)	1 (25%)	16 (36%)
Baker	2 (100%)	13 (81%)	0 (0%)	7 (44%)
Malheur	--	19 (73%)	--	8 (31%)
Wallowa	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)
<b>Washington</b>	2 (100%)	152 (84%)	0 (0%)	15 (8%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	3 (100%)	40 (91%)	1 (33%)	9 (20%)
<b>State</b>	<b>42 (79%)</b>	<b>1,662 (82%)</b>	<b>7 (13%)</b>	<b>299 (15%)</b>

<sup>54</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). It is possible that the data for FY15-16 undercounts prenatal service due to insufficient information on prenatal visits. Specifically, data from Home Visit Completion records were unavailable for use in these analyses, and for a period of time during the FY, the state data system did not allow programs to complete entry and obtain ID numbers, on children served prenatally.

<sup>55</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<sup>56</sup>**

<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	First HV Postnatal Service	First HV Prenatal Service	First HV Postnatal Service	First HV Prenatal Service	First HV Postnatal Service
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	--	45 (100%)	--	32 (70%)	--	6 (14%)
Benton	--	24 (100%)	--	18 (72%)	--	5 (22%)
Linn	--	21 (100%)	--	14 (67%)	--	1 (5%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	1 (100%)	102 (94%)	1 (100%)	79 (73%)	0 (0%)	10 (9%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	--	56 (98%)	--	39 (68%)	--	10 (18%)
Clatsop	--	36 (97%)	--	26 (70%)	--	8 (22%)
Columbia	--	20 (100%)	--	13 (65%)	--	2 (10%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	0 (0%)	9 (90%)	1 (100%)	3 (30%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Coos	--	1 (100%)	--	1 (100%)	--	0 (0%)
Curry	0 (0%)	8 (89%)	1 (100%)	2 (22%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	2 (100%)	122 (97%)	3 (100%)	86 (69%)	1 (33%)	16 (13%)
Crook	1 (100%)	14 (100%)	2 (100%)	12 (86%)	1 (50%)	1 (7%)
Deschutes	1 (100%)	93 (96%)	1 (100%)	63 (65%)	0 (0%)	13 (14%)
Jefferson	--	15 (100%)	--	11 (79%)	--	2 (17%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	7 (100%)	80 (98%)	5 (63%)	50 (63%)	0 (0%)	7 (9%)
Douglas	1 (100%)	41 (95%)	1 (100%)	25 (60%)	0 (0%)	3 (7%)
Klamath	6 (100%)	38 (100%)	4 (57%)	25 (68%)	0 (0%)	4 (11%)
Lake	--	1 (100%)	--	0 (0%)	--	0 (0%)

<sup>56</sup> As noted in table 18a, the count of families in prenatal service is likely lower than actual. For comparisons of this data to prior years, programs should look at percentages rather than the actual number of families.

**Table 18b. Comparison of Health Outcomes for Families Served Pre- & Postnatal<sup>56</sup>**

<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	First HV Postnatal Service	First HV Prenatal Service	First HV Postnatal Service	First HV Prenatal Service	First HV Postnatal Service
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	3 (100%)	21 (95%)	1 (50%)	12 (55%)	0 (0%)	2 (10%)
Grant	--	11 (92%)	--	6 (50%)	--	1 (8%)
Harney	3 (100%)	10 (100%)	1 (50%)	6 (60%)	0 (0%)	1 (11%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	3 (100%)	83 (100%)	3 (100%)	68 (82%)	0 (0%)	9 (11%)
Gilliam	--	3 (100%)	--	1 (33%)	--	1 (33%)
Hood River	2 (100%)	46 (100%)	2 (100%)	43 (93%)	0 (0%)	2 (4%)
Sherman	--	1 (100%)	--	1 (100%)	--	0 (0%)
Wasco	1 (100%)	31 (100%)	1 (100%)	23 (74%)	0 (0%)	5 (16%)
Wheeler	--	2 (100%)	--	0 (0%)	--	1 (50%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	2 (100%)	115 (95%)	2 (100%)	83 (69%)	0 (0%)	20 (17%)
Jackson	2 (100%)	63 (91%)	2 (100%)	44 (65%)	0 (0%)	12 (18%)
Josephine	--	52 (100%)	--	39 (74%)	--	8 (16%)
<b>Lane</b>	5 (100%)	167 (99%)	3 (75%)	113 (68%)	2 (40%)	18 (11%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	--	38 (97%)	--	28 (72%)	--	5 (13%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	7 (100%)	286 (100%)	5 (83%)	209 (74%)	0 (0%)	28 (10%)
Marion	6 (100%)	257 (100%)	4 (80%)	191 (75%)	0 (0%)	22 (9%)
Polk	1 (100%)	29 (100%)	1 (100%)	18 (62%)	0 (0%)	6 (21%)

<sup>56</sup> As noted in table 18a, the count of families in prenatal service is likely lower than actual. For comparisons of this data to prior years, programs should look at percentages rather than the actual number of families.

**Table 18b. Comparison of Health Outcomes for Families Served Pre- & Postnatal<sup>56</sup>**

<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	First HV Postnatal Service	First HV Prenatal Service	First HV Postnatal Service	First HV Prenatal Service	First HV Postnatal Service
<b>Multnomah</b>	4 (100%)	500 (96%)	3 (75%)	391 (75%)	0 (0%)	46 (9%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	2 (100%)	44 (94%)	1 (50%)	32 (67%)	0 (0%)	6 (13%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	6 (86%)	39 (98%)	6 (86%)	33 (79%)	2 (29%)	3 (8%)
Morrow	1 (50%)	12 (100%)	1 (50%)	7 (58%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)
Umatilla	3 (100%)	21 (95%)	3 (100%)	20 (83%)	1 (33%)	1 (4%)
Union	2 (100%)	6 (100%)	2 (100%)	6 (100%)	1 (50%)	1 (17%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	4 (100%)	44 (100%)	3 (75%)	25 (57%)	1 (25%)	5 (11%)
Baker	2 (100%)	16 (100%)	2 (100%)	9 (56%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)
Malheur	--	26 (100%)	--	14 (54%)	--	5 (19%)
Wallowa	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	1 (50%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Washington</b>	2 (100%)	178 (98%)	1 (50%)	133 (73%)	0 (0%)	12 (7%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	2 (100%)	41 (95%)	1 (33%)	33 (75%)	1 (33%)	3 (7%)
<b>State</b>	<b>50 (96%)</b>	<b>1,970 (97%)</b>	<b>39 (75%)</b>	<b>1,449 (72%)</b>	<b>7 (13%)</b>	<b>206 (10%)</b>

<sup>56</sup> As noted in table 18a, the count of families in prenatal service is likely lower than actual. For comparisons of this data to prior years, programs should look at percentages rather than the actual number of families.

**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>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	42	37 (88%)	2	--	1 (50%)
Benton	23	19 (83%)	2	--	1 (50%)
Linn	19	18 (95%)	0	--	--
<b>Clackamas</b>	112	93 (83%)	6	3 (75%)	6 (100%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	66	48 (73%)	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Clatsop	44	34 (77%)	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Columbia	22	14 (64%)	0	--	--
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	14	8 (57%)	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Coos	1	1 (100%)	0	--	--
Curry	13	7 (54%)	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	133	111 (83%)	7	4 (80%)	5 (83%)
Crook	16	9 (56%)	0	--	--
Deschutes	100	89 (89%)	5	3 (75%)	4 (80%)
Jefferson	17	13 (76%)	2	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	111	91 (82%)	4	2 (67%)	3 (100%)
Douglas	48	42 (88%)	3	1 (50%)	2 (100%)
Klamath	62	48 (77%)	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Lake	1	1 (100%)	0	--	--

**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>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	25	21 (84%)	1	--	--
Grant	12	12 (100%)	0	--	--
Harney	13	9 (69%)	1	--	--
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	87	80 (92%)	5	4 (100%)	2 (67%)
Gilliam	4	4 (100%)	1	1 (100%)	--
Hood River	48	43 (90%)	2	2 (100%)	1 (100%)
Sherman	1	1 (100%)	0	--	--
Wasco	32	30 (94%)	2	1 (100%)	1 (50%)
Wheeler	2	2 (100%)	0	--	--
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	126	103 (82%)	5	5 (100%)	3 (100%)
Jackson	74	57 (77%)	3	3 (100%)	3 (100%)
Josephine	52	46 (88%)	2	2 (100%)	--
<b>Lane</b>	173	143 (83%)	8	4 (67%)	6 (86%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	40	34 (85%)	1	--	1 (100%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	301	225 (75%)	15	10 (91%)	8 (89%)
Marion	270	202 (75%)	14	10 (91%)	8 (89%)
Polk	31	23 (74%)	1	--	--

**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>Multnomah</b>	542	445 (82%)	32	23 (79%)	27 (96%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	51	45 (88%)	2	1 (50%)	1 (100%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	52	42 (81%)	4	4 (100%)	4 (100%)
Morrow	15	13 (87%)	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Umatilla	29	23 (79%)	3	3 (100%)	3 (100%)
Union	8	6 (75%)	0	--	--
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	49	39 (80%)	2	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
Baker	18	15 (83%)	0	--	--
Malheur	27	20 (74%)	2	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
Wallowa	4	4 (100%)	0	--	--
<b>Washington</b>	185	155 (84%)	11	7 (88%)	11 (100%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	48	44 (92%)	1	--	1 (100%)
<b>State</b>	<b>2,157</b>	<b>1,764 (82%)</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>69 (81%)</b>	<b>83 (93%)</b>

**Table 20a. HOME Score and Development Screening**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number of Families with HOME<sup>57</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>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	20	18 (90%)	21 (78%)
Benton	10	8 (80%)	11 (85%)
Linn	10	10 (100%)	10 (71%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	52	45 (87%)	50 (76%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	21	19 (90%)	27 (90%)
Clatsop	12	10 (83%)	17 (85%)
Columbia	9	9 (100%)	10 (100%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	5	5 (100%)	8 (100%)
Coos	0	--	--
Curry	5	5 (100%)	8 (100%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	54	44 (81%)	52 (85%)
Crook	6	4 (67%)	7 (88%)
Deschutes	38	34 (89%)	36 (88%)
Jefferson	10	6 (60%)	9 (75%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	36	30 (83%)	42 (84%)
Douglas	20	17 (85%)	23 (82%)
Klamath	16	13 (81%)	19 (86%)
Lake	0	--	--

<sup>57</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**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number of Families with HOME<sup>57</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>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	13	10 (77%)	8 (53%)
Grant	6	4 (67%)	3 (38%)
Harney	7	6 (86%)	5 (71%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	37	35 (95%)	39 (83%)
Gilliam	2	2 (100%)	2 (100%)
Hood River	20	19 (95%)	24 (89%)
Sherman	0	--	--
Wasco	14	14 (100%)	12 (71%)
Wheeler	1	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	41	36 (88%)	32 (76%)
Jackson	20	17 (85%)	17 (81%)
Josephine	21	19 (90%)	15 (71%)
<b>Lane</b>	92	83 (90%)	77 (71%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	19	10 (53%)	10 (63%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	99	81 (82%)	55 (51%)
Marion	92	74 (80%)	53 (54%)
Polk	7	7 (100%)	2 (25%)

<sup>57</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**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number of Families with HOME<sup>57</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>Multnomah</b>	229 (86%)	229 (86%)	199 (68%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	18 (86%)	18 (86%)	16 (62%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	22	15 (68%)	11 (55%)
Morrow	4	3 (75%)	3 (75%)
Umatilla	17	12 (71%)	7 (47%)
Union	1	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	19	17 (89%)	14 (58%)
Baker	5	4 (80%)	4 (50%)
Malheur	10	9 (90%)	7 (58%)
Wallowa	4	4 (100%)	3 (75%)
<b>Washington</b>	89	81 (91%)	66 (73%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	24	23 (96%)	17 (71%)
<b>State</b>	<b>929</b>	<b>799 (86%)</b>	<b>744 (71%)</b>

<sup>57</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>58</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number of Children Eligible for a Developmental Screening<sup>59</sup></b>	<b>Number (%) of Eligible Children with at Least One Developmental Screening</b>	<b>Number (%) Children with a Diagnosed Developmental Delay<sup>60</sup></b>	<b>Percentage of Children with a Diagnosed Developmental Delay Receiving Early Intervention Services</b>
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	57	36 (63%)	3 (10%)	3 (100%)
Benton	32	19 (59%)	2 (14%)	2 (100%)
Linn	25	17 (68%)	1 (7%)	1 (100%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	131	89 (68%)	8 (12%)	8 (100%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	79	38 (48%)	3 (11%)	2 (67%)
Clatsop	52	23 (44%)	3 (19%)	2 (67%)
Columbia	27	15 (56%)	0 (0%)	--
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	22	7 (32%)	0 (0%)	--
Coos	7	0 (0%)	--	--
Curry	15	7 (47%)	0 (0%)	--
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	149	104 (70%)	7 (10%)	7 (100%)
Crook	18	10 (56%)	1 (13%)	1 (100%)
Deschutes	107	78 (73%)	4 (8%)	4 (100%)
Jefferson	24	16 (67%)	2 (15%)	2 (100%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	144	81 (56%)	6 (12%)	6 (100%)
Douglas	53	36 (68%)	2 (7%)	2 (100%)
Klamath	90	44 (49%)	4 (17%)	4 (100%)
Lake	1	1 (100%)	--	--

<sup>58</sup> Children receiving home visits are screened for typical growth and development using the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ). The most recent screening results during the FY15-16 data collection period were either reported on Excel files maintained by programs, or on the Family Update form.

<sup>59</sup> Eligible children include anyone 2 months or older (for programs submitting data on Excel files), or children 6 months or older (for programs submitting data on the Family Update form).

<sup>60</sup> Note that these diagnoses are not provided by Healthy Families Oregon staff.

**Table 20b. HOME Score and Development Screening<sup>58</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Children Eligible for a Developmental Screening <sup>59</sup>	Number (%) of Eligible Children with at Least One Developmental Screening	Number (%) Children with a Diagnosed Developmental Delay <sup>60</sup>	Percentage of Children with a Diagnosed Developmental Delay Receiving Early Intervention Services
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	28	22 (79%)	3 (21%)	3 (100%)
Grant	14	11 (79%)	2 (29%)	2 (100%)
Harney	14	11 (79%)	1 (14%)	1 (100%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	101	60 (59%)	2 (4%)	2 (100%)
Gilliam	3	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	--
Hood River	52	32 (62%)	0 (0%)	--
Sherman	1	1 (100%)	--	--
Wasco	42	22 (52%)	2 (13%)	2 (100%)
Wheeler	3	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	--
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	129	91 (71%)	1 (2%)	1 (100%)
Jackson	80	51 (64%)	1 (4%)	1 (100%)
Josephine	49	40 (82%)	0 (0%)	--
<b>Lane</b>	193	149 (77%)	9 (8%)	9 (100%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	43	32 (74%)	3 (43%)	3 (100%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	350	213 (61%)	9 (7%)	9 (100%)
Marion	317	193 (61%)	8 (7%)	8 (100%)
Polk	33	20 (61%)	1 (10%)	1 (100%)

<sup>58</sup> Children receiving home visits are screened for typical growth and development using the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ). The most recent screening results during the FY15-16 data collection period were either reported on Excel files maintained by programs, or on the Family Update form.

<sup>59</sup> Eligible children include anyone 2 months or older (for programs submitting data on Excel files), or children 6 months or older (for programs submitting data on the Family Update form).

<sup>60</sup> Note that these diagnoses are not provided by Healthy Families Oregon staff.

**Table 20b. HOME Score and Development Screening<sup>58</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number of Children Eligible for a Developmental Screening<sup>59</sup></b>	<b>Number (%) of Eligible Children with at Least One Developmental Screening</b>	<b>Number (%) Children with a Diagnosed Developmental Delay<sup>60</sup></b>	<b>Percentage of Children with a Diagnosed Developmental Delay Receiving Early Intervention Services</b>
<b>Multnomah</b>	599	401 (67%)	25 (8%)	24 (96%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	54	41 (76%)	4 (13%)	3 (75%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	65	37 (57%)	0 (0%)	--
Morrow	15	8 (53%)	0 (0%)	--
Umatilla	41	24 (59%)	0 (0%)	--
Union	9	5 (56%)	0 (0%)	--
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	62	45 (73%)	3 (11%)	3 (100%)
Baker	19	15 (79%)	1 (13%)	1 (100%)
Malheur	35	24 (69%)	2 (13%)	2 (100%)
Wallowa	8	6 (75%)	0 (0%)	--
<b>Washington</b>	196	151 (77%)	6 (5%)	5 (83%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	57	37 (65%)	3 (12%)	3 (100%)
<b>State</b>	<b>2,459</b>	<b>1,634 (66%)</b>	<b>95 (8%)</b>	<b>91 (96%)</b>

<sup>58</sup> Children receiving home visits are screened for typical growth and development using the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ). The most recent screening results during the FY15-16 data collection period were either reported on Excel files maintained by programs, or on the Family Update form.

<sup>59</sup> Eligible children include anyone 2 months or older (for programs submitting data on Excel files), or children 6 months or older (for programs submitting data on the Family Update form).

<sup>60</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 “Typical” Development <sup>61</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>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	24 (67%)	2 (6%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
Benton	12 (63%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--
Linn	12 (71%)	2 (12%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	59 (66%)	12 (13%)	1 (8%)	5 (42%)	3 (25%)	2 (17%)	2 (17%)	10 (83%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	30 (77%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Clatsop	16 (67%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Columbia	14 (93%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	4 (57%)	1 (14%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Coos	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Curry	4 (57%)	1 (14%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	73 (82%)	7 (8%)	2 (29%)	3 (43%)	3 (43%)	2 (29%)	0 (0%)	7 (100%)
Crook	7 (70%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Deschutes	55 (85%)	4 (6%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (100%)
Jefferson	11 (79%)	2 (14%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	71 (88%)	4 (5%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	2 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	2 (50%)
Douglas	30 (83%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Klamath	40 (91%)	3 (7%)	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)
Lake	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--

<sup>61</sup> Typical development and early intervention are measured using the Ages and States Questionnaire (ASQ). For FY 15-16 these data were either reported via Excel spreadsheets maintained by the program, or 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 "Typical" Development <sup>61</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>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	13 (72%)	3 (17%)	1 (33%)	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)
Grant	5 (71%)	2 (29%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)
Harney	8 (73%)	1 (9%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	50 (83%)	2 (3%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	2 (100%)
Gilliam	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Hood River	29 (91%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--
Sherman	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--
Wasco	16 (73%)	1 (5%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Wheeler	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	84 (88%)	2 (2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)
Jackson	45 (83%)	2 (4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)
Josephine	39 (93%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Lane</b>	122 (84%)	8 (6%)	3 (38%)	3 (38%)	1 (13%)	1 (13%)	0 (0%)	7 (88%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	24 (73%)	5 (15%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (80%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (80%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	182 (76%)	20 (8%)	1 (5%)	2 (10%)	8 (40%)	5 (29%)	5 (25%)	14 (70%)
Marion	164 (76%)	18 (8%)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)	8 (44%)	5 (33%)	5 (28%)	13 (72%)
Polk	18 (78%)	2 (9%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)

<sup>61</sup> Typical development and early intervention are measured using the Ages and States Questionnaire (ASQ). For FY 15-16 these data were either reported via Excel spreadsheets maintained by the program, or 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 “Typical” Development <sup>61</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>Multnomah</b>	24 (73%)	31 (8%)	9 (29%)	12 (39%)	12 (39%)	7 (23%)	1 (3%)	28 (90%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	26 (60%)	8 (19%)	4 (50%)	3 (38%)	3 (38%)	4 (50%)	2 (25%)	8 (100%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	27 (87%)	1 (3%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Morrow	8 (89%)	1 (11%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Umatilla	16 (89%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--
Union	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	37 (82%)	3 (7%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)
Baker	13 (87%)	2 (13%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
Malheur	18 (75%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Wallowa	6 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Washington</b>	130 (86%)	7 (5%)	1 (14%)	4 (57%)	0 (0%)	1 (14%)	0 (0%)	6 (86%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	30 (81%)	4 (11%)	3 (75%)	2 (50%)	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	4 (100%)
<b>State</b>	<b>1,319 (80%)</b>	<b>121 (7%)</b>	<b>29 (24%)</b>	<b>42 (35%)</b>	<b>44 (36%)</b>	<b>28 (24%)</b>	<b>14 (12%)</b>	<b>103 (85%)</b>

<sup>61</sup> Typical development and early intervention are measured using the Ages and States Questionnaire (ASQ). For FY 15-16 these data were either reported via Excel spreadsheets maintained by the program, or 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>62</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) Scoring "Typical" 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>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	31 (94%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Benton	17 (94%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Linn	14 (93%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Clackamas</b>	88 (93%)	4 (4%)	1 (25%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (100%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	43 (96%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Clatsop	27 (93%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Columbia	16 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	8 (89%)	1 (11%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Coos	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Curry	8 (89%)	1 (11%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	82 (91%)	5 (6%)	3 (60%)	3 (60%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (60%)	1 (20%)	5 (100%)
Crook	8 (80%)	2 (20%)	2 (100%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	2 (100%)
Deschutes	57 (93%)	3 (5%)	1 (33%)	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)
Jefferson	17 (89%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	71 (95%)	2 (3%)	2 (100%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
Douglas	37 (93%)	1 (3%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Klamath	33 (97%)	1 (3%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Lake	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

<sup>62</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>62</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) Scoring "Typical" 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>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	16 (94%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Grant	5 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Harney	11 (92%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	66 (97%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Gilliam	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hood River	35 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Sherman	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Wasco	25 (96%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Wheeler	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	79 (98%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Jackson	39 (95%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Josephine	40 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Lane</b>	141 (95%)	2 (1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	1 (50%)	2 (100%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	32 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	196 (95%)	7 (3%)	2 (29%)	0 (0%)	1 (14%)	0 (0%)	5 (71%)	1 (14%)	6 (86%)
Marion	179 (96%)	5 (3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (80%)	1 (20%)	4 (80%)
Polk	17 (85%)	2 (10%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)

<sup>62</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>62</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) Scoring "Typical" 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>Multnomah</b>	413 (94%)	10 (2%)	1 (10%)	4 (40%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	4 (40%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	37 (88%)	4 (10%)	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	4 (100%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	40 (98%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Morrow	10 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Umatilla	25 (96%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Union	5 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	39 (95%)	2 (5%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)
Baker	12 (92%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Malheur	23 (96%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Wallowa	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Washington</b>	143 (94%)	4 (3%)	1 (25%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	4 (100%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	41 (95%)	2 (5%)	2 (100%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
<b>State</b>	<b>1,566 (94%)</b>	<b>46 (3%)</b>	<b>15 (33%)</b>	<b>18 (39%)</b>	<b>6 (13%)</b>	<b>0 (0%)</b>	<b>18 (39%)</b>	<b>3 (7%)</b>	<b>37 (80%)</b>

<sup>62</sup> The Home Visitor provides ASQ-SE information on the Family Update form.

**Table 23. Connection to Essential Resources for Intensive Service Families<sup>63</sup>***Number Needing and Connected to Service at 6 Months (% Connected)*

	Drug/Alcohol		Domestic Violence		Public Health Nursing		TANF	
<i>Program/County</i>	Number Referred	Number (%) Connected	Number Referred	Number (%) Connected	Number Referred	Number (%) Connected	Number Referred	Number (%) Connected
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	0	--	1	1 (100%)	0	--	2	2 (100%)
Benton	0	--	1	1 (100%)	0	--	2	2 (100%)
Linn	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--
<b>Clackamas</b>	1	0 (0%)	5	2 (50%)	7	6 (86%)	10	7 (70%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	0	--	1	0 (0%)	0	--	2	1 (50%)
Clatsop	0	--	0	--	0	--	1	1 (100%)
Columbia	0	--	1	0 (0%)	0	--	1	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>	5	3 (60%)	4	3 (75%)	0	--	10	6 (86%)
Crook	0	--	1	0 (0%)	0	--	2	--
Deschutes	5	3 (60%)	3	3 (100%)	0	--	4	3 (100%)
Jefferson	0	--	0	--	0	--	4	3 (75%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	4	3 (75%)	3	3 (100%)	2	2 (100%)	12	12 (100%)
Douglas	1	1 (100%)	2	2 (100%)	0	--	3	3 (100%)
Klamath	3	2 (67%)	1	1 (100%)	2	2 (100%)	8	8 (100%)
Lake	0	--	0	--	0	--	1	1 (100%)

<sup>63</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>63</sup>**
*Number Needing and Connected to Service at 6 Months (% Connected)*

	Drug/Alcohol		Domestic Violence		Public Health Nursing		TANF	
<i>Program/County</i>	Number Referred	Number (%) Connected	Number Referred	Number (%) Connected	Number Referred	Number (%) Connected	Number Referred	Number (%) Connected
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	1	0 (0%)	1	--	4	3 (75%)	4	3 (75%)
Grant	0	--	0	--	4	3 (75%)	1	0 (0%)
Harney	1	0 (0%)	1	--	0	--	3	3 (100%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	4	4 (100%)	4	1 (25%)	14	13 (93%)	8	8 (100%)
Gilliam	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--
Hood River	4	4 (100%)	0	--	12	11 (92%)	5	5 (100%)
Sherman	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--
Wasco	0	--	4	1 (25%)	2	2 (100%)	3	3 (100%)
Wheeler	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	5	4 (80%)	7	5 (71%)	0	--	7	5 (100%)
Jackson	4	3 (75%)	3	1 (33%)	0	--	7	5 (100%)
Josephine	1	1 (100%)	4	4 (100%)	0	--	0	--
<b>Lane</b>	3	2 (100%)	8	5 (83%)	1	0 (0%)	12	3 (25%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	0	--	1	0 (0%)	3	3 (100%)	5	2 (40%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	0	--	8	6 (75%)	7	4 (57%)	12	8 (73%)
Marion	0	--	7	5 (71%)	4	1 (25%)	10	7 (70%)
Polk	0	--	1	1 (100%)	3	3 (100%)	2	1 (100%)

<sup>63</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>63</sup>***Number Needing and Connected to Service at 6 Months (% Connected)*

	Drug/Alcohol		Domestic Violence		Public Health Nursing		TANF	
<i>Program/County</i>	Number Referred	Number (%) Connected	Number Referred	Number (%) Connected	Number Referred	Number (%) Connected	Number Referred	Number (%) Connected
<b>Multnomah</b>	6	5 (83%)	24	12 (55%)	13	12 (92%)	32	18 (64%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	1	--	0	--	2	1 (50%)	5	4 (80%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	0	--	0	--	0	--	1	--
Morrow	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--
Umatilla	0	--	0	--	0	--	1	--
Union	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	1	1 (100%)	5	4 (80%)	3	2 (67%)	2	2 (100%)
Baker	1	1 (100%)	3	2 (67%)	3	2 (67%)	1	1 (100%)
Malheur	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--
Wallowa	0	--	2	2 (100%)	0	--	1	1 (100%)
<b>Washington</b>	0	--	2	1 (50%)	4	2 (67%)	9	7 (88%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	2	0 (0%)	4	3 (75%)	6	3 (60%)	2	0 (0%)
<b>State</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>22 (71%)</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>46 (64%)</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>51 (80%)</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>88 (72%)</b>

<sup>63</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>64</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>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	2 (6%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)
Benton	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)
Linn	2 (13%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	17 (19%)	3 (3%)	1 (1%)	4 (4%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	9 (21%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)
Clatsop	4 (15%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)
Columbia	5 (31%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Coos	--	--	--	--
Curry	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	29 (34%)	4 (5%)	5 (6%)	2 (2%)
Crook	6 (55%)	0 (0%)	2 (18%)	0 (0%)
Deschutes	17 (28%)	4 (7%)	2 (3%)	2 (4%)
Jefferson	6 (40%)	0 (0%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	21 (31%)	3 (4%)	7 (10%)	1 (1%)
Douglas	13 (36%)	1 (3%)	6 (17%)	0 (0%)
Klamath	8 (26%)	2 (6%)	1 (3%)	1 (3%)
Lake	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

<sup>64</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>64</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>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	5 (29%)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)
Grant	1 (17%)	1 (17%)	1 (17%)	0 (0%)
Harney	4 (36%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	19 (29%)	2 (3%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)
Gilliam	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Hood River	13 (38%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Sherman	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Wasco	6 (25%)	2 (8%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)
Wheeler	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	28 (32%)	1 (1%)	10 (11%)	5 (6%)
Jackson	20 (42%)	1 (2%)	8 (17%)	3 (6%)
Josephine	8 (21%)	0 (0%)	2 (5%)	2 (5%)
<b>Lane</b>	24 (17%)	0 (0%)	2 (1%)	4 (3%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	8 (26%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	44 (21%)	8 (4%)	4 (2%)	4 (2%)
Marion	41 (22%)	7 (4%)	4 (2%)	4 (2%)
Polk	3 (14%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

<sup>64</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>64</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>Multnomah</b>	85 (21%)	6 (1%)	14 (3%)	4 (1%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	7 (18%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	1 (3%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	2 (6%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	2 (6%)
Morrow	2 (22%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Umatilla	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	2 (11%)
Union	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	11 (28%)	0 (0%)	5 (13%)	2 (5%)
Baker	5 (36%)	0 (0%)	4 (29%)	0 (0%)
Malheur	6 (27%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)
Wallowa	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)
<b>Washington</b>	25 (17%)	1 (1%)	3 (2%)	2 (1%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	12 (29%)	1 (2%)	2 (5%)	3 (8%)
<b>State</b>	<b>349 (22%)</b>	<b>31 (2%)</b>	<b>57 (4%)</b>	<b>36 (2%)</b>

<sup>64</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>65</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of Families Reporting a New Job	Number (%) of Families Reporting Having Obtained a GED or Having Graduated from School	Number (%) of Families Reporting the Discontinuation of TANF	Number (%) of Child Welfare Reports Made by Home Visitor
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	9 (33%)	2 (7%)	2 (7%)	1 (4%)
Benton	2 (18%)	1 (9%)	1 (9%)	0 (0%)
Linn	7 (44%)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	25 (36%)	4 (6%)	2 (3%)	1 (1%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	10 (31%)	1 (3%)	3 (9%)	0 (0%)
Clatsop	5 (25%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)
Columbia	5 (42%)	1 (8%)	2 (17%)	0 (0%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	3 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Coos	--	--	--	--
Curry	3 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	23 (32%)	5 (7%)	3 (4%)	2 (3%)
Crook	3 (43%)	0 (0%)	1 (14%)	0 (0%)
Deschutes	15 (29%)	3 (6%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)
Jefferson	5 (38%)	2 (15%)	1 (8%)	1 (8%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	12 (22%)	4 (7%)	4 (7%)	1 (2%)
Douglas	5 (16%)	0 (0%)	3 (10%)	1 (3%)
Klamath	7 (30%)	4 (17%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)
Lake	--	--	--	--

<sup>65</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>65</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of Families Reporting a New Job	Number (%) of Families Reporting Having Obtained a GED or Having Graduated from School	Number (%) of Families Reporting the Discontinuation of TANF	Number (%) of Child Welfare Reports Made by Home Visitor
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	5 (36%)	0 (0%)	2 (14%)	2 (14%)
Grant	1 (14%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Harney	4 (57%)	0 (0%)	2 (29%)	2 (29%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	8 (17%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	3 (7%)
Gilliam	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Hood River	6 (22%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)
Sherman	--	--	--	--
Wasco	2 (12%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	2 (12%)
Wheeler	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	19 (44%)	0 (0%)	6 (14%)	2 (5%)
Jackson	9 (43%)	0 (0%)	5 (24%)	2 (10%)
Josephine	10 (45%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)
<b>Lane</b>	28 (25%)	2 (2%)	3 (3%)	2 (2%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	8 (38%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	41 (32%)	4 (3%)	2 (2%)	1 (1%)
Marion	38 (32%)	4 (3%)	2 (2%)	1 (1%)
Polk	3 (30%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

<sup>65</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>65</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>Multnomah</b>	98 (30%)	9 (3%)	12 (4%)	5 (2%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	11 (38%)	1 (3%)	2 (7%)	1 (3%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	6 (27%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (10%)
Morrow	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Umatilla	5 (29%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (13%)
Union	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	9 (35%)	0 (0%)	2 (8%)	0 (0%)
Baker	3 (38%)	0 (0%)	1 (13%)	0 (0%)
Malheur	4 (29%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Wallowa	2 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)
<b>Washington</b>	21 (20%)	5 (5%)	0 (0%)	4 (4%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	10 (38%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)
<b>State</b>	<b>346 (30%)</b>	<b>38 (3%)</b>	<b>45 (4%)</b>	<b>28 (2%)</b>

<sup>65</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>66</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>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	29	17 (59%)	26	22 (85%)
Benton	12	6 (50%)	12	11 (92%)
Linn	17	11 (65%)	14	11 (79%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	88	77 (88%)	65	53 (82%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	41	33 (80%)	26	20 (77%)
Clatsop	27	22 (81%)	19	15 (79%)
Columbia	14	11 (79%)	7	5 (71%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	8	7 (88%)	7	5 (71%)
Coos	1	1 (100%)	0	--
Curry	7	6 (86%)	7	5 (71%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	82	62 (76%)	60	48 (80%)
Crook	9	8 (89%)	8	7 (88%)
Deschutes	59	42 (71%)	40	31 (78%)
Jefferson	14	12 (86%)	12	10 (83%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	64	46 (72%)	50	42 (84%)
Douglas	32	22 (69%)	28	22 (79%)
Klamath	32	24 (75%)	22	20 (91%)
Lake	0	--	0	--

<sup>66</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>66</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>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	16	13 (81%)	15	12 (80%)
Grant	6	5 (83%)	8	6 (75%)
Harney	10	8 (80%)	7	6 (86%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	62	42 (68%)	44	28 (64%)
Gilliam	4	4 (100%)	2	2 (100%)
Hood River	34	22 (65%)	25	17 (68%)
Sherman	1	0 (0%)	0	--
Wasco	21	14 (67%)	16	9 (56%)
Wheeler	2	2 (100%)	1	0 (0%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	86	62 (72%)	42	32 (76%)
Jackson	48	35 (73%)	21	18 (86%)
Josephine	38	27 (71%)	21	14 (67%)
<b>Lane</b>	139	104 (75%)	107	84 (79%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	27	20 (74%)	16	12 (75%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	182	127 (70%)	108	76 (70%)
Marion	162	118 (73%)	100	69 (69%)
Polk	20	9 (45%)	8	7 (88%)

<sup>66</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>66</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>Multnomah</b>	364	231 (63%)	287	169 (59%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	34	14 (41%)	25	14 (56%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	29	21 (72%)	20	13 (65%)
Morrow	10	10 (100%)	4	3 (75%)
Umatilla	13	9 (69%)	15	9 (60%)
Union	6	2 (33%)	1	1 (100%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	36	28 (78%)	24	19 (79%)
Baker	14	11 (79%)	8	7 (88%)
Malheur	18	14 (78%)	12	9 (75%)
Wallowa	4	3 (75%)	4	3 (75%)
<b>Washington</b>	131	96 (73%)	89	58 (65%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	38	32 (84%)	24	23 (96%)
<b>State</b>	<b>1,456</b>	<b>1,032 (71%)</b>	<b>1,035</b>	<b>730 (71%)</b>

<sup>66</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>67</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>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	29	15 (52%)	26	17 (65%)
Benton	12	6 (50%)	12	9 (75%)
Linn	17	9 (53%)	14	8 (57%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	87	68 (78%)	62	46 (74%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	38	24 (63%)	23	18 (78%)
Clatsop	26	16 (62%)	18	14 (78%)
Columbia	12	8 (67%)	5	4 (80%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	7	5 (71%)	7	4 (57%)
Coos	1	1 (100%)	0	--
Curry	6	4 (67%)	7	4 (57%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	78	51 (65%)	57	37 (65%)
Crook	9	7 (78%)	7	4 (57%)
Deschutes	55	37 (67%)	39	25 (64%)
Jefferson	14	7 (50%)	11	8 (73%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	61	40 (66%)	46	34 (74%)
Douglas	31	18 (58%)	27	18 (67%)
Klamath	30	22 (73%)	19	16 (84%)
Lake	0	--	0	--

<sup>67</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>67</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>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	16	10 (63%)	14	9 (64%)
Grant	6	5 (83%)	7	6 (86%)
Harney	10	5 (50%)	7	3 (43%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	52	37 (71%)	39	29 (74%)
Gilliam	3	2 (67%)	2	1 (50%)
Hood River	27	22 (81%)	21	19 (90%)
Sherman	1	0 (0%)	0	--
Wasco	19	11 (58%)	15	9 (60%)
Wheeler	2	2 (100%)	1	0 (0%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	84	53 (63%)	42	27 (64%)
Jackson	48	32 (67%)	21	14 (67%)
Josephine	36	21 (58%)	21	13 (62%)
<b>Lane</b>	130	82 (63%)	100	62 (62%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	25	20 (80%)	15	11 (73%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	174	105 (60%)	102	62 (61%)
Marion	155	94 (61%)	94	56 (60%)
Polk	19	11 (58%)	8	6 (75%)

<sup>67</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>67</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>Multnomah</b>	347	187 (54%)	267	163 (61%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	33	17 (52%)	20	13 (65%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	29	20 (69%)	20	11 (55%)
Morrow	10	9 (90%)	4	3 (75%)
Umatilla	13	9 (69%)	15	7 (47%)
Union	6	2 (33%)	1	1 (100%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	35	23 (66%)	24	18 (75%)
Baker	13	9 (69%)	8	6 (75%)
Malheur	18	11 (61%)	12	8 (67%)
Wallowa	4	3 (75%)	4	4 (100%)
<b>Washington</b>	127	81 (64%)	83	50 (60%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	36	24 (67%)	24	17 (71%)
<b>State</b>	<b>1,388</b>	<b>862 (62%)</b>	<b>971</b>	<b>628 (65%)</b>

<sup>67</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>68</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>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	24	22 (92%)	25	22 (88%)	34	34 (100%)
Benton	15	15 (100%)	12	12 (100%)	17	17 (100%)
Linn	9	7 (78%)	13	10 (77%)	17	17 (100%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	80	77 (96%)	84	78 (93%)	92	92 (100%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	32	32 (100%)	32	29 (91%)	42	42 (100%)
Clatsop	21	21 (100%)	18	17 (94%)	26	26 (100%)
Columbia	11	11 (100%)	14	12 (86%)	16	16 (100%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	6	6 (100%)	7	7 (100%)	10	10 (100%)
Coos	1	1 (100%)	1	1 (100%)	1	1 (100%)
Curry	5	5 (100%)	6	6 (100%)	9	9 (100%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp;</b>	68	67 (99%)	89	85 (96%)	94	93 (99%)
Crook	8	8 (100%)	10	8 (80%)	10	10 (100%)
Deschutes	51	50 (98%)	64	63 (98%)	68	67 (99%)
Jefferson	9	9 (100%)	15	14 (93%)	16	16 (100%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	66	66 (100%)	62	61 (98%)	74	74 (100%)
Douglas	32	32 (100%)	29	28 (97%)	40	40 (100%)
Klamath	34	34 (100%)	33	33 (100%)	34	34 (100%)
Lake	0	--	0	--	0	--

<sup>68</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>68</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>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	10	10 (100%)	14	14 (100%)	16	16 (100%)
Grant	4	4 (100%)	7	7 (100%)	7	7 (100%)
Harney	6	6 (100%)	7	7 (100%)	9	9 (100%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	53	52 (98%)	57	56 (98%)	63	63 (100%)
Gilliam	1	1 (100%)	2	2 (100%)	4	4 (100%)
Hood River	32	31 (97%)	33	33 (100%)	34	34 (100%)
Sherman	1	1 (100%)	0	--	1	1 (100%)
Wasco	18	18 (100%)	20	19 (95%)	22	22 (100%)
Wheeler	1	1 (100%)	2	2 (100%)	2	2 (100%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	65	65 (100%)	72	66 (92%)	90	90 (100%)
Jackson	39	39 (100%)	43	37 (86%)	50	50 (100%)
Josephine	26	26 (100%)	29	29 (100%)	40	40 (100%)
<b>Lane</b>	90	78 (87%)	130	124 (95%)	140	140 (100%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	15	15 (100%)	26	23 (88%)	31	31 (100%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	176	169 (96%)	179	160 (89%)	193	192 (99%)
Marion	156	150 (96%)	159	141 (89%)	173	173 (100%)
Polk	20	19 (95%)	20	19 (95%)	20	19 (95%)

<sup>68</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>68</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>Multnomah</b>	305	294 (96%)	283	257 (91%)	395	394 (100%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	36	35 (97%)	35	33 (94%)	42	42 (100%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp;</b>	22	21 (95%)	29	27 (93%)	41	41 (100%)
Morrow	6	6 (100%)	6	6 (100%)	11	11 (100%)
Umatilla	14	13 (93%)	17	17 (100%)	23	23 (100%)
Union	2	2 (100%)	6	4 (67%)	7	7 (100%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp;</b>	14	12 (86%)	26	22 (85%)	42	41 (98%)
Baker	6	5 (83%)	12	11 (92%)	15	14 (93%)
Malheur	6	5 (83%)	10	7 (70%)	22	22 (100%)
Wallowa	2	2 (100%)	4	4 (100%)	5	5 (100%)
<b>Washington</b>	107	105 (98%)	132	119 (90%)	141	140 (99%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	32	31 (97%)	39	36 (92%)	41	41 (100%)
<b>State</b>	<b>1,201</b>	<b>1,157 (96%)</b>	<b>1,321</b>	<b>1,219 (92%)</b>	<b>1,581</b>	<b>1,576 (100%)</b>

<sup>68</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>69</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Families Needing Help with Emotional Issues	Number (%) Reporting Home Visitor “Helped a Little or a Lot” with Emotional Issues	Number of Families Needing Help with Education	Number (%) Reporting Home Visitor “Helped a Little or a Lot” with Education
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	30	30 (100%)	19	16 (84%)
Benton	17	17 (100%)	10	8 (80%)
Linn	13	13 (100%)	9	8 (89%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	84	82 (98%)	65	58 (89%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	35	35 (100%)	22	20 (91%)
Clatsop	23	23 (100%)	15	13 (87%)
Columbia	12	12 (100%)	7	7 (100%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	7	7 (100%)	6	5 (83%)
Coos	0	--	0	--
Curry	7	7 (100%)	6	5 (83%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	82	81 (99%)	53	51 (96%)
Crook	9	8 (89%)	7	7 (100%)
Deschutes	61	61 (100%)	35	33 (94%)
Jefferson	12	12 (100%)	11	11 (100%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	67	66 (99%)	55	52 (95%)
Douglas	34	33 (97%)	28	25 (89%)
Klamath	33	33 (100%)	27	27 (100%)
Lake	0	--	0	--

<sup>69</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>69</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>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	15	15 (100%)	9	8 (89%)
Grant	7	7 (100%)	4	4 (100%)
Harney	8	8 (100%)	5	4 (80%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	62	62 (100%)	41	37 (90%)
Gilliam	4	4 (100%)	1	1 (100%)
Hood River	34	34 (100%)	25	23 (92%)
Sherman	1	1 (100%)	1	1 (100%)
Wasco	21	21 (100%)	13	11 (85%)
Wheeler	2	2 (100%)	1	1 (100%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	74	74 (100%)	57	55 (96%)
Jackson	42	42 (100%)	32	30 (94%)
Josephine	32	32 (100%)	25	25 (100%)
<b>Lane</b>	133	128 (96%)	75	59 (79%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	26	25 (96%)	18	16 (89%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	175	171 (98%)	135	99 (73%)
Marion	157	153 (97%)	122	89 (73%)
Polk	18	18 (100%)	13	10 (77%)

<sup>69</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>69</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>Multnomah</b>	330	324 (98%)	214	185 (86%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	38	37 (97%)	21	18 (86%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	32	32 (100%)	22	19 (86%)
Morrow	10	10 (100%)	8	8 (100%)
Umatilla	16	16 (100%)	11	8 (73%)
Union	6	6 (100%)	3	3 (100%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	33	32 (97%)	12	8 (67%)
Baker	12	11 (92%)	3	2 (67%)
Malheur	17	17 (100%)	8	5 (63%)
Wallowa	4	4 (100%)	1	1 (100%)
<b>Washington</b>	111	110 (99%)	83	76 (92%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	39	38 (97%)	24	20 (83%)
<b>State</b>	<b>1,373</b>	<b>1,349 (98%)</b>	<b>931</b>	<b>802 (86%)</b>

<sup>69</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>70</sup> 2015-16 (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>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	24 (71%)	33 (97%)	9 (100%)	27 (79%)
Benton	10 (59%)	16 (94%)	4 (100%)	15 (88%)
Linn	14 (82%)	17 (100%)	5 (100%)	12 (71%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	75 (81%)	91 (98%)	33 (97%)	90 (97%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	36 (84%)	40 (93%)	11 (100%)	39 (91%)
Clatsop	23 (85%)	24 (89%)	6 (100%)	25 (93%)
Columbia	13 (81%)	16 (100%)	5 (100%)	14 (88%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	8 (80%)	10 (100%)	2 (100%)	6 (60%)
Coos	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	--	0 (0%)
Curry	7 (78%)	9 (100%)	2 (100%)	6 (67%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	72 (77%)	90 (96%)	37 (95%)	86 (91%)
Crook	8 (80%)	10 (100%)	3 (100%)	10 (100%)
Deschutes	49 (73%)	64 (94%)	25 (96%)	60 (88%)
Jefferson	15 (94%)	16 (100%)	9 (90%)	16 (100%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	56 (75%)	74 (100%)	27 (100%)	65 (87%)
Douglas	29 (73%)	39 (100%)	13 (100%)	33 (83%)
Klamath	27 (77%)	35 (100%)	14 (100%)	32 (91%)
Lake	--	--	--	--

<sup>70</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>70</sup> 2015-16 (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>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	11 (65%)	17 (100%)	5 (100%)	16 (94%)
Grant	4 (57%)	7 (100%)	4 (100%)	6 (86%)
Harney	7 (70%)	10 (100%)	1 (100%)	10 (100%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	59 (92%)	63 (98%)	24 (100%)	61 (95%)
Gilliam	4 (100%)	4 (100%)	2 (100%)	3 (75%)
Hood River	33 (94%)	35 (100%)	13 (100%)	35 (100%)
Sherman	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	--	0 (0%)
Wasco	19 (86%)	21 (95%)	9 (100%)	21 (95%)
Wheeler	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	--	2 (100%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	73 (81%)	85 (94%)	20 (95%)	87 (97%)
Jackson	38 (76%)	47 (94%)	10 (91%)	49 (98%)
Josephine	35 (88%)	38 (95%)	10 (100%)	38 (95%)
<b>Lane</b>	120 (85%)	136 (96%)	44 (94%)	122 (87%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	27 (87%)	30 (97%)	12 (92%)	29 (94%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	151 (77%)	187 (96%)	40 (95%)	162 (83%)
Marion	135 (77%)	169 (97%)	35 (95%)	146 (83%)
Polk	16 (80%)	18 (95%)	5 (100%)	16 (80%)

<sup>70</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>70</sup> 2015-16 (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>Multnomah</b>	333 (84%)	384 (97%)	103 (85%)	353 (89%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	34 (83%)	41 (100%)	11 (100%)	40 (95%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	37 (90%)	41 (100%)	2 (100%)	36 (88%)
Morrow	11 (100%)	11 (100%)	1 (100%)	11 (100%)
Umatilla	19 (83%)	23 (100%)	1 (100%)	20 (87%)
Union	7 (100%)	7 (100%)	--	5 (71%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	26 (62%)	39 (93%)	12 (100%)	40 (95%)
Baker	8 (53%)	14 (93%)	6 (100%)	14 (93%)
Malheur	15 (68%)	20 (91%)	5 (100%)	21 (95%)
Wallowa	3 (60%)	5 (100%)	1 (100%)	5 (100%)
<b>Washington</b>	120 (83%)	137 (95%)	45 (100%)	126 (88%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	33 (79%)	40 (95%)	9 (100%)	36 (86%)
<b>State</b>	<b>1,295 (81%)</b>	<b>1,538 (97%)</b>	<b>446 (94%)</b>	<b>1,421 (89%)</b>

<sup>70</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>71</sup> 2015-16 (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>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	31 (91%)	30 (88%)	34 (100%)	31 (94%)
Benton	16 (94%)	15 (88%)	17 (100%)	15 (94%)
Linn	15 (88%)	15 (88%)	17 (100%)	16 (94%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	89 (96%)	88 (95%)	92 (99%)	91 (98%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	39 (91%)	41 (95%)	42 (98%)	43 (100%)
Clatsop	26 (96%)	25 (93%)	26 (96%)	27 (100%)
Columbia	13 (81%)	16 (100%)	16 (100%)	16 (100%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	8 (80%)	10 (100%)	10 (100%)	10 (100%)
Coos	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Curry	7 (78%)	9 (100%)	9 (100%)	9 (100%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	83 (88%)	93 (99%)	92 (98%)	92 (98%)
Crook	9 (90%)	10 (100%)	10 (100%)	10 (100%)
Deschutes	59 (87%)	67 (99%)	66 (97%)	66 (97%)
Jefferson	15 (94%)	16 (100%)	16 (100%)	16 (100%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	68 (91%)	74 (99%)	74 (99%)	73 (97%)
Douglas	35 (88%)	39 (98%)	40 (100%)	38 (95%)
Klamath	33 (94%)	35 (100%)	34 (97%)	35 (100%)
Lake	--	--	--	--

<sup>71</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>71</sup> 2015-16 (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>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	15 (88%)	16 (94%)	16 (94%)	17 (100%)
Grant	6 (86%)	7 (100%)	6 (86%)	7 (100%)
Harney	9 (90%)	9 (90%)	10 (100%)	10 (100%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	62 (97%)	64 (100%)	64 (100%)	64 (100%)
Gilliam	4 (100%)	4 (100%)	4 (100%)	4 (100%)
Hood River	34 (97%)	35 (100%)	35 (100%)	35 (100%)
Sherman	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Wasco	21 (95%)	22 (100%)	22 (100%)	22 (100%)
Wheeler	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	88 (99%)	86 (96%)	90 (100%)	89 (100%)
Jackson	49 (98%)	48 (96%)	50 (100%)	49 (100%)
Josephine	39 (100%)	38 (95%)	40 (100%)	40 (100%)
<b>Lane</b>	125 (89%)	135 (96%)	136 (96%)	137 (97%)
<b>Lincoln</b>	28 (90%)	29 (94%)	31 (100%)	30 (97%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	172 (89%)	178 (92%)	187 (96%)	185 (95%)
Marion	154 (88%)	159 (91%)	168 (96%)	167 (95%)
Polk	18 (95%)	19 (95%)	19 (95%)	18 (95%)

<sup>71</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>71</sup> 2015-16 (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>Multnomah</b>	369 (93%)	381 (97%)	391 (98%)	386 (98%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	41 (98%)	42 (100%)	42 (100%)	42 (100%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	37 (90%)	40 (98%)	40 (98%)	41 (100%)
Morrow	11 (100%)	11 (100%)	11 (100%)	11 (100%)
Umatilla	19 (83%)	22 (96%)	23 (100%)	23 (100%)
Union	7 (100%)	7 (100%)	6 (86%)	7 (100%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	35 (83%)	39 (93%)	42 (100%)	40 (95%)
Baker	14 (93%)	14 (93%)	15 (100%)	15 (100%)
Malheur	16 (73%)	20 (91%)	22 (100%)	20 (91%)
Wallowa	5 (100%)	5 (100%)	5 (100%)	5 (100%)
<b>Washington</b>	131 (91%)	138 (97%)	142 (99%)	140 (97%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	40 (95%)	39 (93%)	42 (100%)	42 (100%)
<b>State</b>	<b>1,461 (92%)</b>	<b>1,523 (96%)</b>	<b>1,567 (98%)</b>	<b>1,553 (98%)</b>

<sup>71</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.”