

# Statewide Evaluation Results 2016-2017: Healthy Families Oregon Status Report Tables

*Submitted to:*

Oregon Early Learning Division  
700 Summer Street NE, Ste. 350  
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 2016-17 .....	1
Table 1b. Healthy Families Oregon Service Delivery Indicators 2016-17 .....	4
Table 2. Healthy Families Oregon Outcome Indicators 2016-17 .....	7
Table 3a. Screening and Initial Interest in Healthy Families Oregon Service 2016-17 Cohort (CE 1-1.C).....	10
Table 3b. Service Offer: Healthy Families Oregon 2016-17 Cohort.....	13
Table 3c. Reported Location of Screen 2016-2017 .....	16
Table 4. Receipt and Acceptance of Healthy Families Oregon 2016-17 Cohort (CE 1-2.A) .....	19
Table 5. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service: Race/Ethnicity 2016-17 Cohort (CE 1-2.B, CE 5-4.B) .....	22
Table 6. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service: Demographic Factors 2016-17 Cohort (CE 1-2.B, CE 5-4.B).....	25
Table 7. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service: Demographic Factors 2016-17 Cohort (CE 1-2.B, CE 5-4.B).....	28
Table 8. Retention Rates for Families Newly Enrolled 2014-15 (CE 3-4.B).....	31
Table 9. Retention Rates for Families Newly Enrolled 2015-16 (CE 3-4.B).....	34
Table 10a. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Race/Ethnicity for Families Enrolled 2015-16 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B).....	37
Table 10b. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Spoken Language for Families Enrolled 2015-16 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B) .....	40
Table 11a. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Demographic Factors for Families Enrolled 2015-16 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B) .....	43
Table 11b. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Demographic Factors for Families Enrolled 2015-16 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B) .....	46
Table 12. Participant Reasons for Exiting Program Prior to Program Completion (CE 3-4.B) .....	49
Table 13a. Parent Survey (Kempe) Risk Factors for One or Both Parents/Caregivers in Intensive Service: Childrearing Characteristics.....	52
Table 13b. Parent Survey (Kempe) Risk Factors for One or Both Parents/Caregivers in Intensive Service .....	55
Table 13c. Parent Survey (Kempe) Risk Factors for One or Both Parents/Caregivers in Intensive Service .....	58
Table 14. Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families: Race/Ethnicity.....	61
Table 15a. NBQ Risks and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families.....	64

Table 15b. NBQ Risks and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families.....	67
Table 15c. NBQ Risks and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families .....	70
Table 15d. NBQ Risks and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families .....	73
Table 16. Health Care for Intensive Service Families: Health Care Provider & Well-Child Check-Ups.....	76
Table 17a. Health Care for Intensive Service Families: Health Insurance.....	79
Table 17b. Health Care for Intensive Service Families: Use of Emergency Room in Past 6 Months	82
Table 18a. Comparison of Prenatal Care and Smoke Exposure for Families Served Pre- & Postnatal.....	85
Table 18b. Comparison of Health Outcomes for Families Served Pre- & Postnatal.....	88
Table 19. Prenatal Care for Subsequent Births.....	91
Table 20a. HOME Observation/Score .....	94
Table 20b. Developmental Screening .....	97
Table 21. Developmental Screening (ASQ) Results & Subsequent Actions.....	100
Table 22. Social Emotional Developmental Screening (ASQ-SE) Results & Subsequent Actions ...	103
Table 23. Connection to Essential Resources for Intensive Service Families .....	106
Table 24a. Family Outcomes and Life Events at 6 Months.....	109
Table 24b. Family Outcomes and Life Events at 12 Months.....	112
Table 25a. Promotion of Positive Parenting Skills & Helping Children Learn .....	115
Table 25b. Promotion of Positive Parenting Skills & Helping Children Learn.....	118
Table 26a. Ratings of Home Visitor Helpfulness.....	121
Table 26b. Ratings of Home Visitor Helpfulness.....	124
Table 27a. Cultural Competency & Strength Orientation of Home Visitors 2016-17 (CE 5-4.B)....	127
Table 27b. Cultural Competency & Strength Orientation of Home Visitors 2016-17 (CE 5-4.B)....	130

**Table 1a. Healthy Families Oregon Service Delivery Indicators 2016-17**

Program/County	Number Births FY 2016-17	Number (%) Births Screened	Service Delivery Indicator #1	Service Delivery Indicator #2	Service Delivery Indicator #3			
			Number (%) Screened Prenatally or Within 2 Weeks of Birth <sup>1</sup>	Number (%) Receiving First HV Within 3 Months of Birth <sup>2</sup>	% Families with 75% or More of Expected Home Visits Completed <sup>3</sup>			
					Qtr 2 2017	Qtr 3 2017	Qtr 4 2017	Qtr 1 2018
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	2,225	199 (9%)	180 (90%)	10 (100%)	70%	57%	64%	69%
Benton	739	77 (10%)	65 (84%)	3 (100%)	--	--	--	--
Linn	1,486	122 (8%)	115 (94%)	7 (100%)	--	--	--	--
<b>Clackamas</b>	4,173	588 (14%)	522 (89%)	1 (100%)	71%	61%	68%	74%
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	901	155 (17%)	117 (75%)	22 (71%)	92%	85%	71%	90%
Clatsop	409	90 (22%)	69 (77%)	8 (47%)	--	--	--	--
Columbia	492	65 (13%)	48 (74%)	14 (100%)	--	--	--	--
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	778	32 (4%)	19 (59%)	1 (100%)	75%	80%	70%	84%
Coos	595	15 (3%)	9 (60%)	1 (100%)	--	--	--	--
Curry	183	17 (9%)	10 (59%)	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	2,357	587 (25%)	573 (98%)	6 (86%)	77%	86%	85%	79%
Crook	261	70 (27%)	68 (97%)	4 (100%)	--	--	--	--
Deschutes	1,813	459 (25%)	447 (97%)	--	--	--	--	--
Jefferson	283	58 (20%)	58 (100%)	2 (67%)	--	--	--	--
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	1,944	423 (22%)	404 (96%)	27 (90%)	85%	86%	98%	81%
Douglas	1,094	303 (28%)	297 (98%)	8 (89%)	--	--	--	--
Klamath	775	109 (14%)	100 (92%)	17 (94%)	--	--	--	--
Lake	75	11 (15%)	7 (64%)	2 (67%)	--	--	--	--

<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. For FY 2016-2017, these numbers are low due to lack of Enrollment/First Home Visit Date accurately entered in CLARA.

<sup>3</sup> 75% of families received 75% or more of their expected home visits \*each quarter\* adequately meets the Performance Standard. These data are provided via self-report from program managers.


**Table 1a. Healthy Families Oregon Service Delivery Indicators 2016-17**

Program/County	Number Births FY 2016-17	Number (%) Births Screened	Service Delivery Indicator #1	Service Delivery Indicator #2	Service Delivery Indicator #3			
			Number (%) Screened Prenatally or Within 2 Weeks of Birth <sup>1</sup>	Number (%) Receiving First HV Within 3 Months of Birth <sup>2</sup>	% Families with 75% or More of Expected Home Visits Completed <sup>3</sup>			
					Qtr 2 2017	Qtr 3 2017	Qtr 4 2017	Qtr 1 2018
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	139	26 (19%)	24 (92%)	7 (88%)	65%	69%	71%	77%
<b>Grant</b>	64	16 (25%)	16 (100%)	6 (100%)	--	--	--	--
<b>Harney</b>	75	10 (13%)	8 (80%)	1 (50%)	--	--	--	--
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	625	178 (28%)	143 (80%)	1 (100%)	70%	78%	69%	77%
<b>Gilliam</b>	18	5 (28%)	4 (80%)	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Hood River</b>	248	104 (42%)	83 (80%)	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Sherman</b>	21	3 (14%)	3 (100%)	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Wasco</b>	327	61 (19%)	51 (84%)	1 (100%)	--	--	--	--
<b>Wheeler</b>	11	5 (45%)	2 (40%)	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	3,178	725 (23%)	698 (96%)	19 (100%)	94%	78%	83%	83%
<b>Jackson</b>	2,296	342 (15%)	322 (94%)	5 (100%)	--	--	--	--
<b>Josephine</b>	882	383 (43%)	376 (98%)	14 (100%)	--	--	--	--
<b>Lane</b>	3,488	1,096 (31%)	1,071 (98%)	28 (88%)	85%	82%	84%	87%
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	5,316	818 (15%)	778 (95%)	3 (100%)	64%	54%	56%	74%
<b>Marion</b>	4,426	743 (17%)	703 (95%)	2 (100%)	--	--	--	--
<b>Polk</b>	890	75 (8%)	75 (100%)	1 (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. For FY 2016-2017, these numbers are low due to lack of Enrollment/First Home Visit Date accurately entered in CLARA.

<sup>3</sup> 75% of families received 75% or more of their expected home visits adequately meets the Performance Standard. These data are provided via self-report from program managers.

**Table 1a. Healthy Families Oregon Service Delivery Indicators 2016-17**

Program/County	Number Births FY 2016-17	Number (%) Births Screened	Service Delivery Indicator #1	Service Delivery Indicator #2	Service Delivery Indicator #3			
			Number (%) Screened Prenatally or Within 2 Weeks of Birth <sup>1</sup>	Number (%) Receiving First HV Within 3 Months of Birth <sup>2</sup>	% Families with 75% or More of Expected Home Visits Completed <sup>3</sup>			
					Qtr 2 2017	Qtr 3 2017	Qtr 4 2017	Qtr 1 2018
<b>Multnomah</b>	8,774	1,476 (17%)	1,346 (91%)	525 (96%)	80%	76%	75%	81%
<b>Tillamook</b>	244	59 (24%)	50 (85%)	12 (100%)	85%	65%	79%	-- <sup>4</sup>
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	1,416	384 (27%)	361 (94%)	14 (64%)	54%	63%	63%	87%
<b>Morrow</b>	157	43 (27%)	42 (98%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--
<b>Umatilla</b>	952	269 (28%)	256 (95%)	7 (64%)	--	--	--	--
<b>Union</b>	307	72 (23%)	63 (88%)	7 (70%)	--	--	--	--
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	640	65 (10%)	51 (78%)	3 (75%)	76%	64%	55%	91%
<b>Baker</b>	163	32 (20%)	23 (72%)	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Malheur</b>	412	20 (5%)	16 (80%)	2 (67%)	--	--	--	--
<b>Wallowa</b>	65	13 (20%)	12 (92%)	1 (100%)	--	--	--	--
<b>Washington</b>	6,865	245 (4%)	199 (81%)	5 (71%)	86%	87%	79%	91%
<b>Yamhill</b>	1,125	52 (5%)	29 (56%)	15 (100%)	68%	72%	80%	88%
<b>State</b>	<b>44,595</b>	<b>7,108 (16%)</b>	<b>6,565 (92%)</b>	<b>699 (93%)</b>	--	--	--	-- <sup>5</sup>

<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. For FY 2016-2017, these numbers are low due to lack of Enrollment/First Home Visit Date accurately entered in CLARA.

<sup>3</sup> 75% of families received 75% or more of their expected home visits adequately meets the Performance Standard. These data are provided via self-report from program managers.

<sup>4</sup> 2018 Quarter 1 data for Tillamook County is combined with Clatsop/Columbia

<sup>5</sup> Statewide rate of HVC is not available for this period.

**Table 1b. Healthy Families Oregon Service Delivery Indicators 2016-17**

	Service Delivery Indicator #4	Service Delivery Indicator #5	Service Delivery Indicator #8	Service Delivery Indicator #9
<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) IS Families Engaged in Services for 90 Days or Longer (2016-17) <sup>6</sup>	Number (%) Families Remaining in IS for 12 Months or Longer (enrolled 2015-16) <sup>7</sup>	Age Appropriate ASQ Screening <sup>8</sup>	Percentage of Depression Screenings <sup>9</sup>
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	31 (97%)	13 (72%)	29 (64%)	16 (48%)
<b>Benton</b>	7 (88%)	5 (71%)	14 (64%)	5 (71%)
<b>Linn</b>	24 (100%)	8 (73%)	15 (65%)	11 (42%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	--	13 (62%)	70 (83%)	40 (95%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	19 (90%)	9 (75%)	53 (93%)	47 (100%)
<b>Clatsop</b>	8 (89%)	9 (75%)	--	--
<b>Columbia</b>	11 (92%)	--	--	--
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	1 (100%)	--	17 (89%)	12 (80%)
<b>Coos</b>	1 (100%)	--	--	--
<b>Curry</b>	--	--	--	--
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	6 (100%)	4 (100%)	68 (75%)	47 (98%)
<b>Crook</b>	1 (100%)	--	4 (40%)	4 (100%)
<b>Deschutes</b>	--	1 (100%)	54 (82%)	40 (98%)
<b>Jefferson</b>	5 (100%)	3 (100%)	10 (67%)	3 (100%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	17 (94%)	13 (100%)	62 (83%)	48 (96%)
<b>Douglas</b>	3 (100%)	2 (100%)	25 (83%)	23 (92%)
<b>Klamath</b>	13 (93%)	11 (100%)	37 (84%)	--
<b>Lake</b>	1 (100%)	--	0 (0%)	--

<sup>6</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.

<sup>7</sup> To adequately meet the Performance Standard, 50-64% of families must remain in Intensive Service for 12 months or longer.

<sup>8</sup> For 2018, 90% of children receiving two TIMELY developmental screenings each year adequately meets the Performance Standard.

<sup>9</sup> For 2018, 80-94% of families screened for depression prenatally (when served prenatally) and within 90 days of birth meets the Performance Standard.

**Table 1b. Healthy Families Oregon Service Delivery Indicators 2016-17**

	Service Delivery Indicator #4	Service Delivery Indicator #5	Service Delivery Indicator #8	Service Delivery Indicator #9
<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) IS Families Engaged in Services for 90 Days or Longer (2016-17) <sup>6</sup>	Number (%) Families Remaining in IS for 12 Months or Longer (enrolled 2015-16) <sup>7</sup>	Age Appropriate ASQ Screening <sup>8</sup>	Percentage of Depression Screenings <sup>9</sup>
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	3 (100%)	4 (57%)	8 (67%)	1 (50%)
<b>Grant</b>	2 (100%)	2 (50%)	--	--
<b>Harney</b>	1 (100%)	2 (67%)	--	--
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	--	--	37 (77%)	23 (92%)
<b>Gilliam</b>	--	--	--	--
<b>Hood River</b>	--	--	--	--
<b>Sherman</b>	--	--	--	--
<b>Wasco</b>	--	--	--	--
<b>Wheeler</b>	--	--	--	--
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	12 (75%)	16 (64%)	68 (86%)	70 (81%)
<b>Jackson</b>	3 (100%)	10 (67%)	18 (86%)	--
<b>Josephine</b>	9 (69%)	6 (60%)	50 (86%)	--
<b>Lane</b>	28 (78%)	20 (71%)	68 (78%)	55 (89%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	2 (100%)	8 (89%)	159 (72%)	100 (96%)
<b>Marion</b>	1 (100%)	7 (88%)	--	--
<b>Polk</b>	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	--	--

<sup>6</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.

<sup>7</sup> To adequately meet the Performance Standard, 50-64% of families must remain in Intensive Service for 12 months or longer.

<sup>8</sup> For 2018, 90% of children receiving two TIMELY developmental screenings each year adequately meets the Performance Standard.

<sup>9</sup> For 2018, 80-94% of families screened for depression prenatally (when served prenatally) and within 90 days of birth meets the Performance Standard.

**Table 1b. Healthy Families Oregon Service Delivery Indicators 2016-17**

	Service Delivery Indicator #4	Service Delivery Indicator #5	Service Delivery Indicator #8	Service Delivery Indicator #9
<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) IS Families Engaged in Services for 90 Days or Longer (2016-17) <sup>6</sup>	Number (%) Families Remaining in IS for 12 Months or Longer (enrolled 2015-16) <sup>7</sup>	Age Appropriate ASQ Screening <sup>8</sup>	Percentage of Depression Screenings <sup>9</sup>
<b>Multnomah</b>	341 (97%)	387 (90%)	231 (65%)	84 (99%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	8 (89%)	4 (67%)	17 (77%)	20 (95%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	8 (89%)	7 (41%)	31 (66%)	13 (87%)
<b>Morrow</b>	11 (79%)	2 (50%)	--	--
<b>Umatilla</b>	0 (0%)	5 (56%)	--	--
<b>Union</b>	7 (88%)	0 (0%)	--	--
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	4 (80%)	0 (0%)	25 (66%)	26 (93%)
<b>Baker</b>	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	--	--
<b>Malheur</b>	--	0 (0%)	--	--
<b>Wallowa</b>	1 (100%)	--	--	--
<b>Washington</b>	0 (0%)	--	69 (58%)	62 (90%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	11 (100%)	9 (90%)	25 (64%)	14 (82%)
<b>State</b>	<b>491 (94%)</b>	<b>507 (84%)</b>	<b>1,037 (72%)</b>	<b>678 (91%)</b>

<sup>6</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.

<sup>7</sup> To adequately meet the Performance Standard, 50-64% of families must remain in Intensive Service for 12 months or longer.

<sup>8</sup> For 2018, 90% of children receiving two TIMELY developmental screenings each year adequately meets the Performance Standard.

<sup>9</sup> For 2018, 80-94% of families screened for depression prenatally (when served prenatally) and within 90 days of birth meets the Performance Standard.

**Table 2. Healthy Families Oregon Outcome Indicators 2016-17**

	Outcome Indicator #1	Outcome Indicator #2		Outcome Indicator #3	Outcome Indicator #4	Outcome Indicator #5	Outcome Indicator #6
<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) Children with Primary Care Provider <sup>10</sup>	Number (%) Children with Up-to-Date Immunizations <sup>11</sup>	Number (%) of 2-Year-Olds with Up-to-Date Immunizations	Number (%) Parents Reading to Child 3x Per Week or More <sup>12</sup>	Number (%) Parents Reporting Positive Parent-Child Interactions <sup>13</sup>	Number (%) Parents with Reporting Reduced Parenting Stress <sup>14</sup>	Number (%) Parents Reporting HFA Oregon Helped with Social Support <sup>15</sup>
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	48 (86%)	41 (91%)	20 (87%)	43 (93%)	43 (93%)	19 (73%)	27 (87%)
<b>Benton</b>	22 (92%)	22 (96%)	12 (92%)	23 (100%)	23 (100%)	9 (90%)	15 (94%)
<b>Linn</b>	26 (81%)	19 (86%)	8 (80%)	20 (87%)	20 (87%)	10 (63%)	12 (80%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	95 (81%)	81 (88%)	32 (89%)	84 (89%)	88 (94%)	53 (60%)	72 (90%)
<b>Columbia &amp;</b>	86 (85%)	61 (87%)	23 (79%)	69 (99%)	70 (100%)	40 (63%)	41 (87%)
<b>Clatsop</b>	45 (75%)	35 (80%)	14 (70%)	45 (100%)	45 (100%)	29 (73%)	18 (75%)
<b>Columbia</b>	41 (100%)	26 (100%)	9 (100%)	24 (96%)	25 (100%)	11 (46%)	23 (100%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	21 (91%)	11 (73%)	6 (75%)	11 (85%)	13 (100%)	5 (63%)	7 (70%)
<b>Coos</b>	11 (92%)	4 (80%)	3 (100%)	3 (75%)	4 (100%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)
<b>Curry</b>	10 (91%)	7 (70%)	3 (60%)	8 (89%)	9 (100%)	4 (67%)	7 (88%)
<b>Crook,</b>	123 (91%)	74 (76%)	33 (72%)	93 (95%)	96 (98%)	51 (65%)	85 (97%)
<b>Crook</b>	10 (77%)	8 (80%)	1 (33%)	8 (89%)	9 (100%)	2 (33%)	8 (100%)
<b>Deschutes</b>	96 (91%)	53 (72%)	24 (69%)	71 (96%)	72 (97%)	40 (67%)	67 (99%)
<b>Jefferson</b>	17 (100%)	13 (100%)	8 (100%)	14 (93%)	15 (100%)	9 (75%)	10 (83%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	82 (94%)	57 (80%)	27 (84%)	60 (86%)	64 (91%)	33 (67%)	62 (94%)
<b>Douglas</b>	37 (93%)	23 (77%)	12 (80%)	24 (86%)	23 (82%)	17 (71%)	23 (88%)
<b>Klamath</b>	45 (96%)	34 (83%)	15 (88%)	36 (86%)	41 (98%)	16 (64%)	39 (98%)
<b>Lake</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

<sup>10</sup> 80-94% of children with a primary care provider meets the Performance Standard.<sup>11</sup> 80-89% of children with up-to-date immunizations meets the Performance Standard.<sup>12</sup> 80-89% of parents who report they read to their children 3 times a week or more (reported on the My Parenting Experience Survey) meets the Performance Standard.<sup>13</sup> 80-89% of parents reporting positive parent-child interactions meets the Performance Standard.<sup>14</sup> 50-64% of parents reporting reduced parenting stress meets the Performance Standard.<sup>15</sup> 80-89% of parents reporting Healthy Families Oregon helped with social support meets the Performance Standard.

**Table 2. Healthy Families Oregon Outcome Indicators 2016-17**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Outcome Indicator #1</b> <b>Number (%) Children with Primary Care Provider<sup>10</sup></b>	<b>Outcome Indicator #2</b> <b>Number (%) Children with Up-to-Date Immunizations<sup>11</sup></b>	<b>Outcome Indicator #3</b> <b>Number (%) of 2-Year-Olds with Up-to-Date Immunizations</b>	<b>Outcome Indicator #4</b> <b>Number (%) Parents Reading to Child 3x Per Week or More<sup>12</sup></b>	<b>Outcome Indicator #4</b> <b>Number (%) Parents Reporting Positive Parent-Child Interactions<sup>13</sup></b>	<b>Outcome Indicator #5</b> <b>Number (%) Parents with Reporting Reduced Parenting Stress<sup>14</sup></b>	<b>Outcome Indicator #6</b> <b>Number (%) Parents Reporting HFA Oregon Helped with Social Support<sup>15</sup></b>
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	14 (100%)	11 (85%)	6 (86%)	13 (100%)	13 (100%)	6 (50%)	10 (83%)
<b>Grant</b>	6 (100%)	4 (80%)	3 (75%)	5 (100%)	5 (100%)	2 (50%)	4 (100%)
<b>Harney</b>	8 (100%)	7 (88%)	3 (100%)	8 (100%)	8 (100%)	4 (50%)	6 (75%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	86 (98%)	63 (89%)	21 (91%)	67 (96%)	69 (99%)	45 (67%)	58 (92%)
<b>Gilliam</b>	4 (80%)	2 (67%)	1 (100%)	3 (100%)	3 (100%)	1 (33%)	1 (100%)
<b>Hood River</b>	45 (100%)	33 (92%)	11 (100%)	35 (100%)	34 (97%)	26 (76%)	30 (94%)
<b>Sherman</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Wasco</b>	34 (100%)	26 (90%)	8 (80%)	25 (89%)	28 (100%)	16 (59%)	26 (96%)
<b>Wheeler</b>	3 (75%)	2 (67%)	1 (100%)	4 (100%)	4 (100%)	2 (67%)	1 (33%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	117 (91%)	69 (80%)	18 (69%)	74 (88%)	80 (95%)	49 (64%)	68 (93%)
<b>Jackson</b>	64 (90%)	33 (72%)	11 (65%)	40 (89%)	43 (96%)	24 (62%)	37 (88%)
<b>Josephine</b>	53 (91%)	36 (90%)	7 (78%)	34 (87%)	37 (95%)	25 (68%)	31 (100%)
<b>Lane</b>	151 (82%)	117 (84%)	64 (83%)	125 (91%)	129 (94%)	68 (55%)	116 (96%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	230 (77%)	199 (85%)	79 (90%)	182 (81%)	202 (90%)	133 (71%)	179 (87%)
<b>Marion</b>	210 (77%)	184 (85%)	73 (90%)	169 (82%)	184 (89%)	123 (71%)	165 (87%)
<b>Polk</b>	20 (83%)	15 (83%)	6 (86%)	13 (72%)	18 (100%)	10 (71%)	14 (88%)

<sup>10</sup> 80-94% of children with a primary care provider meets the Performance Standard.

<sup>11</sup> 80-89% of children with up-to-date immunizations meets the Performance Standard.

<sup>12</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>13</sup> 80-89% of parents reporting positive parent-child interactions meets the Performance Standard.

<sup>14</sup> 50-64% of parents reporting reduced parenting stress meets the Performance Standard.

<sup>15</sup> 80-89% of parents reporting Healthy Families Oregon helped with social support meets the Performance Standard.

**Table 2. Healthy Families Oregon Outcome Indicators 2016-17**

	Outcome Indicator #1	Outcome Indicator #2		Outcome Indicator #3	Outcome Indicator #4	Outcome Indicator #5	Outcome Indicator #6
<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) Children with Primary Care Provider <sup>10</sup>	Number (%) Children with Up-to-Date Immunizations <sup>11</sup>	Number (%) of 2-Year-Olds with Up-to-Date Immunizations	Number (%) Parents Reading to Child 3x Per Week or More <sup>12</sup>	Number (%) Parents Reporting Positive Parent-Child Interactions <sup>13</sup>	Number (%) Parents with Reporting Reduced Parenting Stress <sup>14</sup>	Number (%) Parents Reporting HFA Oregon Helped with Social Support <sup>15</sup>
<b>Multnomah</b>	455 (81%)	333 (86%)	199 (87%)	360 (93%)	362 (94%)	203 (65%)	244 (88%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	26 (63%)	25 (83%)	14 (88%)	26 (90%)	27 (93%)	16 (73%)	28 (97%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, Morrow</b>	33 (65%)	32 (84%)	17 (94%)	33 (92%)	34 (94%)	13 (72%)	29 (94%)
	6 (67%)	4 (80%)	3 (100%)	4 (100%)	4 (100%)	2 (67%)	1 (100%)
<b>Umatilla</b>	21 (62%)	25 (86%)	14 (93%)	25 (89%)	26 (93%)	11 (85%)	24 (96%)
<b>Union</b>	6 (75%)	3 (75%)	--	4 (100%)	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	4 (80%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	54 (96%)	45 (96%)	17 (89%)	42 (98%)	42 (98%)	30 (77%)	23 (85%)
	26 (100%)	22 (96%)	6 (86%)	20 (100%)	20 (100%)	14 (74%)	14 (93%)
<b>Malheur</b>	23 (92%)	20 (100%)	11 (100%)	19 (100%)	18 (95%)	14 (82%)	5 (63%)
<b>Wallowa</b>	5 (100%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	3 (75%)	4 (100%)	2 (67%)	4 (100%)
<b>Washington</b>	135 (73%)	124 (89%)	66 (92%)	125 (89%)	130 (93%)	72 (61%)	119 (93%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	41 (89%)	29 (78%)	13 (76%)	34 (92%)	36 (97%)	24 (71%)	34 (97%)
<b>State</b>	<b>1,797 (83%)</b>	<b>1,372 (85%)</b>	<b>655 (86%)</b>	<b>1,441 (91%)</b>	<b>1,498 (94%)</b>	<b>860 (65%)</b>	<b>1,202 (91%)</b>

<sup>10</sup> 80-94% of children with a primary care provider meets the Performance Standard.<sup>11</sup> 80-89% of children with up-to-date immunizations meets the Performance Standard.<sup>12</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>13</sup> 80-89% of parents reporting positive parent-child interactions meets the Performance Standard.<sup>14</sup> 50-64% of parents reporting reduced parenting stress meets the Performance Standard.<sup>15</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 2016-17 Cohort (CE 1-1.C)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Screened #	Missing Screening Result #	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 # <sup>16</sup>
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	188	3	69 (37%)	116 (63%)	112 (98%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	2 (0%)
Benton	71	1	37 (53%)	33 (47%)	31 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (0%)
Linn	117	2	32 (28%)	83 (72%)	81 (98%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	127	33	6 (6%)	88 (94%)	54 (61%)	2 (2%)	30 (34%)	2 (2%)	0 (0%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	157	2	16 (10%)	139 (90%)	118 (85%)	3 (2%)	15 (11%)	3 (2%)	0 (0%)
Clatsop	90	2	14 (16%)	74 (84%)	69 (93%)	1 (1%)	3 (4%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)
Columbia	67	0	2 (3%)	65 (97%)	49 (75%)	2 (3%)	12 (18%)	2 (3%)	0 (0%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	30	0	4 (13%)	26 (87%)	20 (95%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	5 (0%)
Coos	15	0	1 (7%)	14 (93%)	10 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (0%)
Curry	15	0	3 (20%)	12 (80%)	10 (91%)	0 (0%)	1 (9%)	0 (0%)	1 (0%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	428	2	145 (34%)	281 (66%)	270 (99%)	0 (0%)	1 (0%)	3 (1%)	7 (0%)
Crook	50	0	6 (12%)	44 (88%)	38 (97%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	5 (0%)
Deschutes	346	1	129 (37%)	216 (63%)	213 (99%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (1%)	1 (0%)
Jefferson	32	1	10 (32%)	21 (68%)	19 (95%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	1 (0%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	397	10	195 (50%)	192 (50%)	116 (61%)	10 (5%)	42 (22%)	22 (12%)	2 (0%)
Douglas	279	6	173 (63%)	100 (37%)	40 (40%)	7 (7%)	33 (33%)	19 (19%)	1 (0%)
Klamath	109	3	21 (20%)	85 (80%)	69 (82%)	3 (4%)	9 (11%)	3 (4%)	1 (0%)
Lake	9	1	1 (13%)	7 (88%)	7 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

<sup>16</sup> Note that occurrences with small numbers may be denoted as 0% due to rounding.

**Table 3a. Screening and Initial Interest in Healthy Families Oregon Service 2016-17 Cohort (CE 1-1.C)**

<b>Program/County</b>	<b>Screened #</b>	<b>Missing Screening Result #</b>	<b>Negative # (%)</b>	<b>Positive (including clinical pos) # (%)</b>	<b>Positive Screen Interest:</b>				
					<b>Interested, if available # (%)</b>	<b>Not interested, too busy # (%)</b>	<b>Not interested, Service not needed # (%)</b>	<b>Not interested, other # (%)</b>	<b>Missing interest info #<sup>16</sup></b>
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	24	0	10 (42%)	14 (58%)	13 (93%)	0 (0%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Grant</b>	16	0	7 (44%)	9 (56%)	8 (89%)	0 (0%)	1 (11%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Harney</b>	8	0	3 (38%)	5 (63%)	5 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	170	17	58 (38%)	95 (62%)	76 (80%)	3 (3%)	12 (13%)	4 (4%)	0 (0%)
<b>Gilliam</b>	5	0	3 (60%)	2 (40%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Hood River</b>	101	9	44 (48%)	48 (52%)	36 (75%)	3 (6%)	8 (17%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)
<b>Sherman</b>	3	1	2 (100%)	0 (0%)					0 (0%)
<b>Wasco</b>	57	7	9 (18%)	41 (82%)	35 (85%)	0 (0%)	3 (7%)	3 (7%)	0 (0%)
<b>Wheeler</b>	4	0	0 (0%)	4 (100%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	692	2	212 (31%)	478 (69%)	476 (100%)	1 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Jackson</b>	315	1	105 (33%)	209 (67%)	209 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Josephine</b>	377	1	107 (28%)	269 (72%)	267 (99%)	1 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Lane</b>	1,101	1	441 (40%)	659 (60%)	325 (49%)	6 (1%)	275 (42%)	53 (8%)	0 (0%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	830	71	6 (1%)	753 (99%)	753 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Marion</b>	754	62	6 (1%)	686 (99%)	686 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Polk</b>	76	9	0 (0%)	67 (100%)	67 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

<sup>16</sup> Note that occurrences with small numbers may be denoted as 0% due to rounding.

**Table 3a. Screening and Initial Interest in Healthy Families Oregon Service 2016-17 Cohort (CE 1-1.C)**

Program/County	Screened #	Missing Screening Result #	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 # <sup>16</sup>
<b>Multnomah</b>	1,484	29	183 (13%)	1,272 (87%)	732 (58%)	11 (1%)	138 (11%)	389 (31%)	2 (0%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	58	0	8 (14%)	50 (86%)	38 (76%)	2 (4%)	7 (14%)	3 (6%)	0 (0%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	244	2	73 (30%)	169 (70%)	155 (92%)	2 (1%)	6 (4%)	6 (4%)	0 (0%)
<b>Morrow</b>	26	1	7 (28%)	18 (72%)	16 (89%)	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)
<b>Umatilla</b>	154	0	39 (25%)	115 (75%)	108 (94%)	1 (1%)	2 (2%)	4 (3%)	0 (0%)
<b>Union</b>	64	1	27 (43%)	36 (57%)	31 (86%)	1 (3%)	3 (8%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	44	2	5 (12%)	37 (88%)	33 (89%)	0 (0%)	3 (8%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)
<b>Baker</b>	19	0	2 (11%)	17 (89%)	17 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Malheur</b>	18	2	3 (19%)	13 (81%)	9 (69%)	0 (0%)	3 (23%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)
<b>Wallowa</b>	7	0	0 (0%)	7 (100%)	7 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Washington</b>	211	12	23 (12%)	176 (88%)	164 (93%)	4 (2%)	6 (3%)	2 (1%)	0 (0%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	54	1	5 (9%)	48 (91%)	47 (98%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>State</b>	<b>6,239</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>1,459 (24%)</b>	<b>4,593 (76%)</b>	<b>3,502 (77%)</b>	<b>44 (1%)</b>	<b>539 (12%)</b>	<b>490 (11%)</b>	<b>18 (0%)</b>

<sup>16</sup> Note that occurrences with small numbers may be denoted as 0% due to rounding.

**Table 3b. Service Offer: Healthy Families Oregon 2016-17 Cohort**

Program/County	HV Offered # (%)	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>	63 (72%)	24 (28%)	25	0 (0%)	4 (17%)	18 (75%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (8%)
<b>Benton</b>	21 (84%)	4 (16%)	6	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Linn</b>	42 (68%)	20 (32%)	19	0 (0%)	3 (15%)	15 (75%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (10%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	27 (52%)	25 (48%)	2	1 (4%)	16 (64%)	6 (24%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (8%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	49 (49%)	52 (51%)	17	3 (6%)	8 (15%)	32 (62%)	4 (8%)	0 (0%)	5 (10%)
<b>Clatsop</b>	24 (40%)	36 (60%)	9	2 (6%)	0 (0%)	26 (72%)	4 (11%)	0 (0%)	4 (11%)
<b>Columbia</b>	25 (61%)	16 (39%)	8	1 (6%)	8 (50%)	6 (38%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (6%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	16 (100%)	0 (0%)	4	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Coos</b>	9 (100%)	0 (0%)	1	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Curry</b>	7 (100%)	0 (0%)	3	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	96 (44%)	120 (56%)	54	3 (3%)	43 (36%)	58 (48%)	0 (0%)	8 (7%)	8 (7%)
<b>Crook</b>	15 (44%)	19 (56%)	4	2 (11%)	3 (16%)	10 (53%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (21%)
<b>Deschutes</b>	76 (47%)	87 (53%)	50	1 (1%)	29 (33%)	45 (52%)	0 (0%)	8 (9%)	4 (5%)
<b>Jefferson</b>	5 (26%)	14 (74%)	0	0 (0%)	11 (79%)	3 (21%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	94 (83%)	19 (17%)	3	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	17 (89%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)
<b>Douglas</b>	24 (60%)	16 (40%)	0	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	15 (94%)	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)
<b>Klamath</b>	64 (96%)	3 (4%)	2	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)
<b>Lake</b>	6 (100%)	0 (0%)	1	--	--	--	--	--	--


**Table 3b. Service Offer: Healthy Families Oregon 2016-17 Cohort**

Program/County	HV Offered # (%)	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>	12 (92%)	1 (8%)	0	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Grant</b>	8 (100%)	0 (0%)	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Harney</b>	4 (80%)	1 (20%)	0	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	54 (77%)	16 (23%)	6	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	6 (38%)	4 (25%)	3 (19%)	2 (13%)
<b>Gilliam</b>	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Hood River</b>	26 (87%)	4 (13%)	6	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (50%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)
<b>Sherman</b>	--	--	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Wasco</b>	23 (66%)	12 (34%)	0	0 (0%)	1 (8%)	4 (33%)	3 (25%)	2 (17%)	2 (17%)
<b>Wheeler</b>	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	125 (41%)	178 (59%)	173	0 (0%)	75 (42%)	96 (54%)	0 (0%)	3 (2%)	4 (2%)
<b>Jackson</b>	61 (60%)	41 (40%)	107	0 (0%)	21 (51%)	19 (46%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)
<b>Josephine</b>	64 (32%)	137 (68%)	66	0 (0%)	54 (39%)	77 (56%)	0 (0%)	2 (1%)	4 (3%)
<b>Lane</b>	100 (31%)	225 (69%)	0	0 (0%)	114 (51%)	100 (44%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	11 (5%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	124 (22%)	440 (78%)	189	33 (8%)	95 (22%)	298 (68%)	1 (0%)	3 (1%)	10 (2%)
<b>Marion</b>	114 (22%)	416 (78%)	156	33 (8%)	92 (22%)	278 (67%)	1 (0%)	3 (1%)	9 (2%)
<b>Polk</b>	10 (29%)	24 (71%)	33	0 (0%)	3 (13%)	20 (83%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)

**Table 3b. Service Offer: Healthy Families Oregon 2016-17 Cohort**

<i>Program/County</i>	HV Offered # (%)	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>	593 (81%)	137 (19%)	2	44 (32%)	79 (58%)	7 (5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (5%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	34 (92%)	3 (8%)	1	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	42 (28%)	109 (72%)	4	4 (4%)	38 (35%)	35 (32%)	0 (0%)	2 (2%)	30 (28%)
<b>Morrow</b>	4 (27%)	11 (73%)	1	0 (0%)	4 (36%)	3 (27%)	0 (0%)	1 (9%)	3 (27%)
<b>Umatilla</b>	24 (23%)	81 (77%)	3	4 (5%)	28 (35%)	25 (31%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	23 (28%)
<b>Union</b>	14 (45%)	17 (55%)	0	0 (0%)	6 (35%)	7 (41%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (24%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	29 (91%)	3 (9%)	1	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)
<b>Baker</b>	13 (81%)	3 (19%)	1	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)
<b>Malheur</b>	9 (100%)	0 (0%)	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Wallowa</b>	7 (100%)	0 (0%)	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Washington</b>	141 (86%)	23 (14%)	0	0 (0%)	21 (91%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	30 (65%)	16 (35%)	1	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	11 (69%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (31%)
<b>State</b>	<b>1,629 (54%)</b>	<b>1,391 (46%)</b>	<b>482</b>	<b>88 (6%)</b>	<b>494 (36%)</b>	<b>691 (50%)</b>	<b>9 (1%)</b>	<b>21 (2%)</b>	<b>88 (6%)</b>

**Table 3c. Reported Location of Screen 2016-2017**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Hospital # (%)</b>	<b>Health Clinic # (%)</b>	<b>Parent Home # (%)</b>	<b>Phone # (%)</b>	<b>Other # (%)</b>
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	157 (84%)	1 (1%)	3 (2%)	24 (13%)	2 (1%)
<b>Benton</b>	52 (73%)	0 (0%)	3 (4%)	15 (21%)	1 (1%)
<b>Linn</b>	105 (91%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	9 (8%)	1 (1%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	69 (54%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	55 (43%)	2 (2%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	57 (36%)	0 (0%)	2 (1%)	90 (57%)	8 (5%)
<b>Clatsop</b>	56 (62%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	32 (36%)	2 (2%)
<b>Columbia</b>	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	2 (3%)	58 (87%)	6 (9%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	6 (20%)	0 (0%)	14 (47%)	0 (0%)	10 (33%)
<b>Coos</b>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	9 (60%)	0 (0%)	6 (40%)
<b>Curry</b>	6 (40%)	0 (0%)	5 (33%)	0 (0%)	4 (27%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	402 (94%)	6 (1%)	7 (2%)	11 (3%)	2 (0%)
<b>Crook</b>	47 (94%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (4%)	1 (2%)
<b>Deschutes</b>	328 (95%)	1 (0%)	7 (2%)	9 (3%)	1 (0%)
<b>Jefferson</b>	27 (84%)	5 (16%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	343 (87%)	12 (3%)	14 (4%)	15 (4%)	10 (3%)
<b>Douglas</b>	256 (93%)	6 (2%)	1 (0%)	3 (1%)	10 (4%)
<b>Klamath</b>	85 (78%)	5 (5%)	7 (6%)	12 (11%)	0 (0%)
<b>Lake</b>	2 (22%)	1 (11%)	6 (67%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

**Table 3c. Reported Location of Screen 2016-2017**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Hospital # (%)</b>	<b>Health Clinic # (%)</b>	<b>Parent Home # (%)</b>	<b>Phone # (%)</b>	<b>Other # (%)</b>
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	7 (29%)	0 (0%)	5 (21%)	6 (25%)	6 (25%)
<b>Grant</b>	3 (19%)	0 (0%)	5 (31%)	2 (13%)	6 (38%)
<b>Harney</b>	4 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (50%)	0 (0%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	2 (1%)	74 (44%)	8 (5%)	78 (46%)	6 (4%)
<b>Gilliam</b>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (100%)	0 (0%)
<b>Hood River</b>	0 (0%)	39 (39%)	5 (5%)	52 (51%)	5 (5%)
<b>Sherman</b>	0 (0%)	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)
<b>Wasco</b>	2 (4%)	33 (60%)	1 (2%)	18 (33%)	1 (2%)
<b>Wheeler</b>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	0 (0%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	642 (93%)	2 (0%)	3 (0%)	33 (5%)	12 (2%)
<b>Jackson</b>	270 (86%)	2 (1%)	3 (1%)	29 (9%)	11 (3%)
<b>Josephine</b>	372 (99%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (1%)	1 (0%)
<b>Lane</b>	1,030 (94%)	1 (0%)	1 (0%)	62 (6%)	7 (1%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	775 (93%)	0 (0%)	1 (0%)	47 (6%)	7 (1%)
<b>Marion</b>	704 (93%)	0 (0%)	1 (0%)	43 (6%)	6 (1%)
<b>Polk</b>	71 (93%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (5%)	1 (1%)

**Table 3c. Reported Location of Screen 2016-2017**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Hospital # (%)</b>	<b>Health Clinic # (%)</b>	<b>Parent Home # (%)</b>	<b>Phone # (%)</b>	<b>Other # (%)</b>
<b>Multnomah</b>	1,201 (81%)	12 (1%)	20 (1%)	240 (16%)	9 (1%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	2 (3%)	7 (12%)	0 (0%)	43 (74%)	6 (10%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	175 (72%)	9 (4%)	1 (0%)	31 (13%)	28 (11%)
<b>Morrow</b>	11 (42%)	7 (27%)	1 (4%)	3 (12%)	4 (15%)
<b>Umatilla</b>	118 (77%)	2 (1%)	0 (0%)	13 (8%)	21 (14%)
<b>Union</b>	46 (72%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	15 (23%)	3 (5%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	15 (34%)	6 (14%)	13 (30%)	0 (0%)	10 (23%)
<b>Baker</b>	12 (63%)	0 (0%)	2 (11%)	0 (0%)	5 (26%)
<b>Malheur</b>	3 (17%)	3 (17%)	9 (50%)	0 (0%)	3 (17%)
<b>Wallowa</b>	0 (0%)	3 (43%)	2 (29%)	0 (0%)	2 (29%)
<b>Washington</b>	11 (5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	161 (76%)	39 (18%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	4 (7%)	43 (80%)	6 (11%)
<b>State</b>	4,895 (79%)	130 (2%)	97 (2%)	939 (15%)	170 (3%)

**Table 4. Receipt and Acceptance of Healthy Families Oregon 2016-17 Cohort (CE 1-2.A)**

<b>Program/County</b>	<b>Accepted # (%)</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)</b>
						<b>Yes # (%)</b>	<b>No # (%)</b>	
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	34 (56%)	7 (11%)	20 (33%)	0 (0%)	2 (0%)	18 (53%)	16 (47%)	114
<b>Benton</b>	11 (58%)	3 (16%)	5 (26%)	0 (0%)	2 (0%)	5 (45%)	6 (55%)	46
<b>Linn</b>	23 (55%)	4 (10%)	15 (36%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	13 (57%)	10 (43%)	68
<b>Clackamas</b>	23 (85%)	2 (7%)	2 (7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	23 (100%)	0 (0%)	123
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	43 (88%)	3 (6%)	2 (4%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	43 (100%)	0 (0%)	114
<b>Clatsop</b>	19 (79%)	3 (13%)	2 (8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	19 (100%)	0 (0%)	65
<b>Columbia</b>	24 (96%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	24 (100%)	0 (0%)	49
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	16 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	11 (69%)	5 (31%)	26
<b>Coos</b>	9 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (56%)	4 (44%)	13
<b>Curry</b>	7 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (86%)	1 (14%)	13
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	53 (55%)	17 (18%)	17 (18%)	9 (9%)	0 (0%)	47 (89%)	6 (11%)	152
<b>Crook</b>	7 (47%)	3 (20%)	4 (27%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	6 (86%)	1 (14%)	16
<b>Deschutes</b>	42 (55%)	14 (18%)	13 (17%)	7 (9%)	0 (0%)	39 (93%)	3 (7%)	116
<b>Jefferson</b>	4 (80%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	20
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	61 (65%)	3 (3%)	18 (19%)	12 (13%)	0 (0%)	51 (84%)	10 (16%)	134
<b>Douglas</b>	22 (92%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	19 (86%)	3 (14%)	47
<b>Klamath</b>	33 (52%)	3 (5%)	17 (27%)	11 (17%)	0 (0%)	26 (79%)	7 (21%)	81
<b>Lake</b>	6 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (100%)	0 (0%)	6

**Table 4. Receipt and Acceptance of Healthy Families Oregon 2016-17 Cohort (CE 1-2.A)**

Program/County	Accepted # (%)	Declined, too busy # (%)	Declined, service not needed # (%)	Declined, other # (%)	Missing Acceptance Info #	Received HV		Total families with HV (regardless of first HV date)
						Yes # (%)	No # (%)	
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	9 (82%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (18%)	1 (0%)	8 (89%)	1 (11%)	24
Grant	7 (88%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (13%)	0 (0%)	6 (86%)	1 (14%)	15
Harney	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	1 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	9
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	30 (57%)	8 (15%)	12 (23%)	3 (6%)	1 (0%)	21 (70%)	9 (30%)	98
Gilliam	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	5
Hood River	17 (68%)	2 (8%)	5 (20%)	1 (4%)	1 (0%)	11 (65%)	6 (35%)	46
Sherman	--	--	--	--	0 (0%)	--	--	--
Wasco	9 (39%)	6 (26%)	6 (26%)	2 (9%)	0 (0%)	7 (78%)	2 (22%)	42
Wheeler	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	5
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	79 (64%)	10 (8%)	30 (24%)	5 (4%)	1 (0%)	68 (86%)	11 (14%)	149
Jackson	43 (72%)	1 (2%)	13 (22%)	3 (5%)	1 (0%)	39 (91%)	4 (9%)	83
Josephine	36 (56%)	9 (14%)	17 (27%)	2 (3%)	0 (0%)	29 (81%)	7 (19%)	66
<b>Lane</b>	68 (68%)	10 (10%)	18 (18%)	4 (4%)	0 (0%)	67 (99%)	1 (1%)	209
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	105 (85%)	4 (3%)	12 (10%)	3 (2%)	0 (0%)	89 (85%)	16 (15%)	335
Marion	97 (85%)	4 (4%)	11 (10%)	2 (2%)	0 (0%)	82 (85%)	15 (15%)	308
Polk	8 (80%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	7 (88%)	1 (13%)	27

**Table 4. Receipt and Acceptance of Healthy Families Oregon 2016-17 Cohort (CE 1-2.A)**

<b>Program/County</b>	<b>Accepted # (%)</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)</b>
						<b>Yes # (%)</b>	<b>No # (%)</b>	
<b>Multnomah</b>	570 (97%)	2 (0%)	18 (3%)	0 (0%)	3 (0%)	501 (88%)	69 (12%)	1,285
<b>Tillamook</b>	23 (70%)	0 (0%)	3 (9%)	7 (21%)	1 (0%)	23 (100%)	0 (0%)	52
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	22 (52%)	4 (10%)	14 (33%)	2 (5%)	0 (0%)	21 (95%)	1 (5%)	79
<b>Morrow</b>	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	13
<b>Umatilla</b>	12 (50%)	4 (17%)	7 (29%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	11 (92%)	1 (8%)	47
<b>Union</b>	9 (64%)	0 (0%)	4 (29%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	9 (100%)	0 (0%)	19
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	25 (89%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	2 (7%)	1 (0%)	20 (80%)	5 (20%)	65
<b>Baker</b>	11 (92%)	0 (0%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)	1 (0%)	9 (82%)	2 (18%)	28
<b>Malheur</b>	9 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (78%)	2 (22%)	29
<b>Wallowa</b>	5 (71%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (29%)	0 (0%)	4 (80%)	1 (20%)	8
<b>Washington</b>	137 (97%)	2 (1%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	60 (44%)	77 (56%)	210
<b>Yamhill</b>	18 (60%)	8 (27%)	2 (7%)	2 (7%)	0 (0%)	16 (89%)	2 (11%)	68
<b>State</b>	<b>1,316 (81%)</b>	<b>80 (5%)</b>	<b>170 (11%)</b>	<b>53 (3%)</b>	<b>10 (0%)</b>	<b>1,087 (83%)</b>	<b>229 (17%)</b>	<b>3,237</b>

**Table 5. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service: Race/Ethnicity 2016-17 Cohort<sup>17</sup> (CE 1-2.B, CE 5-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Hispanic/Latino Families Offered Intensive Service	Number (%) of Hispanic/Latino Families Accepting Intensive Service	Number of White Families Offered Intensive Service	Number (%) of White Families Accepting Intensive Service	Number of Other Race/Ethnicity Families <sup>18</sup> Offered Intensive Service	Number (%) of Other Race/Ethnicity Families Accepting Intensive Service
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	23	11 (48%)	32	9 (28%)	8	1 (13%)
Benton	6	5 (83%)	12	3 (25%)	3	0 (0%)
Linn	17	6 (35%)	20	6 (30%)	5	1 (20%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	7	6 (86%)	14	12 (86%)	6	5 (83%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	8	8 (100%)	36	30 (83%)	5	5 (100%)
Clatsop	5	5 (100%)	17	12 (71%)	2	2 (100%)
Columbia	3	3 (100%)	19	18 (95%)	3	3 (100%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	2	2 (100%)	7	5 (71%)	7	4 (57%)
Coos	2	2 (100%)	3	2 (67%)	4	1 (25%)
Curry	0	--	4	3 (75%)	3	3 (100%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	5	3 (60%)	74	40 (54%)	17	7 (41%)
Crook	0	--	13	5 (38%)	2	1 (50%)
Deschutes	5	3 (60%)	57	33 (58%)	14	6 (43%)
Jefferson	0	--	4	2 (50%)	1	0 (0%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	7	3 (43%)	67	38 (57%)	20	11 (55%)
Douglas	0	--	18	14 (78%)	6	5 (83%)
Klamath	7	3 (43%)	44	19 (43%)	13	5 (38%)
Lake	0	--	5	5 (100%)	1	1 (100%)

<sup>17</sup> Acceptance is defined as receiving a first home visit (visit (as entered as enrollment in CLARA).

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

**Table 5. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service: Race/Ethnicity 2016-17 Cohort<sup>17</sup> (CE 1-2.B, CE 5-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Hispanic/Latino Families Offered Intensive Service	Number (%) of Hispanic/Latino Families Accepting Intensive Service	Number of White Families Offered Intensive Service	Number (%) of White Families Accepting Intensive Service	Number of Other Race/Ethnicity Families <sup>18</sup> Offered Intensive Service	Number (%) of Other Race/Ethnicity Families Accepting Intensive Service
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	1	1 (100%)	7	3 (43%)	4	4 (100%)
<b>Grant</b>	0	--	5	3 (60%)	3	3 (100%)
<b>Harney</b>	1	1 (100%)	2	0 (0%)	1	1 (100%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	30	14 (47%)	19	7 (37%)	5	0 (0%)
<b>Gilliam</b>	0	--	2	1 (50%)	0	--
<b>Hood River</b>	21	11 (52%)	4	0 (0%)	1	0 (0%)
<b>Sherman</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Wasco</b>	9	3 (33%)	11	4 (36%)	3	0 (0%)
<b>Wheeler</b>	0	--	2	2 (100%)	1	0 (0%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	9	6 (67%)	91	47 (52%)	25	15 (60%)
<b>Jackson</b>	6	6 (100%)	40	24 (60%)	15	9 (60%)
<b>Josephine</b>	3	0 (0%)	51	23 (45%)	10	6 (60%)
<b>Lane</b>	12	11 (92%)	76	47 (62%)	12	9 (75%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	78	57 (73%)	29	16 (55%)	17	16 (94%)
<b>Marion</b>	75	55 (73%)	25	14 (56%)	14	13 (93%)
<b>Polk</b>	3	2 (67%)	4	2 (50%)	3	3 (100%)

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

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

**Table 5. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service: Race/Ethnicity 2016-17 Cohort<sup>17</sup> (CE 1-2.B, CE 5-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Hispanic/Latino Families Offered Intensive Service	Number (%) of Hispanic/Latino Families Accepting Intensive Service	Number of White Families Offered Intensive Service	Number (%) of White Families Accepting Intensive Service	Number of Other Race/Ethnicity Families <sup>18</sup> Offered Intensive Service	Number (%) of Other Race/Ethnicity Families Accepting Intensive Service
<b>Multnomah</b>	159	146 (92%)	175	147 (84%)	259	222 (86%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	5	4 (80%)	24	16 (67%)	5	3 (60%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	9	3 (33%)	26	13 (50%)	7	5 (71%)
<b>Morrow</b>	3	0 (0%)	1	1 (100%)	0	--
<b>Umatilla</b>	6	3 (50%)	14	6 (43%)	4	2 (50%)
<b>Union</b>	0	--	11	6 (55%)	3	3 (100%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	6	5 (83%)	20	13 (65%)	3	3 (100%)
<b>Baker</b>	2	1 (50%)	9	7 (78%)	2	2 (100%)
<b>Malheur</b>	4	4 (100%)	4	2 (50%)	1	1 (100%)
<b>Wallowa</b>	0	--	7	4 (57%)	0	--
<b>Washington</b>	70	35 (50%)	45	14 (31%)	26	11 (42%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	8	6 (75%)	20	15 (75%)	2	2 (100%)
<b>State</b>	<b>439</b>	<b>321 (73%)</b>	<b>762</b>	<b>472 (62%)</b>	<b>428</b>	<b>323 (75%)</b>

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

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

**Table 6. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service: Demographic Factors 2016-17 Cohort (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>	15 (35%)	6 (33%)	7 (37%)	14 (32%)	20 (33%)	1 (50%)
<b>Benton</b>	6 (38%)	2 (67%)	5 (50%)	3 (27%)	8 (38%)	--
<b>Linn</b>	9 (33%)	4 (27%)	2 (22%)	11 (33%)	12 (30%)	1 (50%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	17 (81%)	5 (100%)	7 (88%)	16 (84%)	21 (84%)	2 (100%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	36 (86%)	7 (100%)	15 (100%)	28 (82%)	42 (91%)	1 (33%)
<b>Clatsop</b>	14 (74%)	5 (100%)	8 (100%)	11 (69%)	19 (83%)	0 (0%)
<b>Columbia</b>	22 (96%)	2 (100%)	7 (100%)	17 (94%)	23 (100%)	1 (50%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	10 (67%)	1 (100%)	3 (100%)	8 (62%)	11 (73%)	0 (0%)
<b>Coos</b>	4 (50%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	4 (50%)	5 (63%)	0 (0%)
<b>Curry</b>	6 (86%)	--	2 (100%)	4 (80%)	6 (86%)	--
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	50 (52%)	--	9 (41%)	41 (55%)	49 (54%)	1 (17%)
<b>Crook</b>	6 (40%)	--	1 (33%)	5 (42%)	6 (40%)	--
<b>Deschutes</b>	42 (55%)	--	8 (44%)	34 (59%)	41 (58%)	1 (20%)
<b>Jefferson</b>	2 (40%)	--	0 (0%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	0 (0%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	49 (56%)	0 (0%)	11 (55%)	41 (55%)	48 (55%)	4 (67%)
<b>Douglas</b>	18 (78%)	--	2 (67%)	17 (81%)	18 (78%)	1 (100%)
<b>Klamath</b>	25 (42%)	0 (0%)	7 (47%)	20 (41%)	24 (41%)	3 (60%)
<b>Lake</b>	6 (100%)	--	2 (100%)	4 (100%)	6 (100%)	--

**Table 6. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service: Demographic Factors 2016-17 Cohort (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>	7 (64%)	1 (100%)	3 (60%)	5 (71%)	8 (67%)	--
<b>Grant</b>	6 (75%)	--	2 (67%)	4 (80%)	6 (75%)	--
<b>Harney</b>	1 (33%)	1 (100%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	2 (50%)	--
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	10 (31%)	10 (53%)	11 (52%)	10 (32%)	21 (40%)	0 (0%)
<b>Gilliam</b>	1 (50%)	--	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	1 (50%)	--
<b>Hood River</b>	2 (20%)	9 (56%)	6 (67%)	5 (31%)	11 (42%)	--
<b>Sherman</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Wasco</b>	5 (29%)	1 (33%)	4 (40%)	3 (25%)	7 (32%)	0 (0%)
<b>Wheeler</b>	2 (67%)	--	1 (100%)	1 (50%)	2 (67%)	--
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	64 (53%)	1 (100%)	19 (51%)	48 (55%)	62 (54%)	6 (55%)
<b>Jackson</b>	36 (62%)	1 (100%)	12 (71%)	26 (60%)	33 (66%)	6 (55%)
<b>Josephine</b>	28 (45%)	--	7 (35%)	22 (50%)	29 (45%)	--
<b>Lane</b>	62 (66%)	3 (75%)	17 (77%)	50 (64%)	62 (67%)	5 (71%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	36 (69%)	37 (77%)	32 (73%)	57 (71%)	86 (74%)	3 (38%)
<b>Marion</b>	30 (68%)	36 (78%)	29 (74%)	53 (71%)	79 (74%)	3 (43%)
<b>Polk</b>	6 (75%)	1 (50%)	3 (60%)	4 (80%)	7 (78%)	0 (0%)

**Table 6. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service: Demographic Factors 2016-17 Cohort (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>	329 (86%)	91 (92%)	149 (87%)	366 (87%)	499 (87%)	16 (76%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	20 (67%)	3 (75%)	13 (81%)	10 (56%)	22 (69%)	1 (50%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	19 (53%)	2 (40%)	2 (40%)	19 (51%)	19 (48%)	2 (100%)
<b>Morrow</b>	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	1 (25%)	--
<b>Umatilla</b>	9 (43%)	2 (67%)	1 (100%)	10 (43%)	9 (41%)	2 (100%)
<b>Union</b>	9 (64%)	--	1 (33%)	8 (73%)	9 (64%)	--
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	20 (71%)	1 (100%)	6 (75%)	15 (71%)	19 (70%)	2 (100%)
<b>Baker</b>	10 (77%)	--	1 (100%)	9 (75%)	10 (77%)	--
<b>Malheur</b>	6 (75%)	1 (100%)	3 (75%)	4 (80%)	5 (71%)	2 (100%)
<b>Wallowa</b>	4 (57%)	--	2 (67%)	2 (50%)	4 (57%)	--
<b>Washington</b>	27 (34%)	27 (54%)	28 (54%)	32 (36%)	59 (43%)	1 (33%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	20 (77%)	3 (75%)	11 (79%)	12 (75%)	22 (79%)	1 (50%)
<b>State</b>	<b>791 (66%)</b>	<b>198 (74%)</b>	<b>343 (71%)</b>	<b>772 (68%)</b>	<b>1,070 (69%)</b>	<b>46 (58%)</b>

**Table 7. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service: Demographic Factors 2016-17 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>	14 (35%)	7 (30%)	13 (37%)	5 (29%)	14 (33%)	7 (33%)
Benton	6 (43%)	2 (29%)	5 (63%)	2 (33%)	3 (33%)	5 (42%)
Linn	8 (31%)	5 (31%)	8 (30%)	3 (27%)	11 (33%)	2 (22%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	12 (80%)	11 (92%)	9 (90%)	12 (92%)	4 (100%)	18 (86%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	29 (91%)	14 (82%)	23 (85%)	16 (89%)	17 (94%)	24 (83%)
Clatsop	13 (81%)	6 (75%)	14 (78%)	4 (80%)	3 (100%)	16 (76%)
Columbia	16 (100%)	8 (89%)	9 (100%)	12 (92%)	14 (93%)	8 (100%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	8 (100%)	3 (38%)	10 (91%)	0 (0%)	4 (57%)	7 (78%)
Coos	2 (100%)	3 (43%)	5 (100%)	0 (0%)	2 (40%)	3 (75%)
Curry	6 (100%)	0 (0%)	5 (83%)	--	2 (100%)	4 (80%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	37 (59%)	13 (39%)	36 (67%)	9 (33%)	12 (55%)	37 (51%)
Crook	5 (45%)	1 (25%)	4 (57%)	2 (29%)	2 (50%)	4 (36%)
Deschutes	31 (63%)	11 (41%)	31 (67%)	6 (35%)	8 (53%)	33 (55%)
Jefferson	1 (33%)	1 (50%)	1 (100%)	1 (33%)	2 (67%)	0 (0%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	31 (49%)	21 (68%)	19 (48%)	25 (61%)	22 (67%)	30 (49%)
Douglas	10 (71%)	9 (90%)	4 (80%)	10 (83%)	10 (91%)	9 (69%)
Klamath	15 (35%)	12 (57%)	11 (35%)	13 (48%)	9 (47%)	18 (40%)
Lake	6 (100%)	--	4 (100%)	2 (100%)	3 (100%)	3 (100%)

**Table 7. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service: Demographic Factors 2016-17 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>	5 (56%)	3 (100%)	5 (63%)	3 (75%)	3 (60%)	5 (71%)
<b>Grant</b>	3 (60%)	3 (100%)	4 (67%)	2 (100%)	3 (60%)	3 (100%)
<b>Harney</b>	2 (50%)	--	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	--	2 (50%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	13 (38%)	8 (40%)	11 (34%)	7 (39%)	11 (29%)	10 (63%)
<b>Gilliam</b>	1 (50%)	--	1 (50%)	--	1 (50%)	--
<b>Hood River</b>	4 (29%)	7 (58%)	4 (29%)	6 (55%)	6 (33%)	5 (63%)
<b>Sherman</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Wasco</b>	6 (40%)	1 (13%)	5 (36%)	0 (0%)	4 (24%)	3 (50%)
<b>Wheeler</b>	2 (67%)	--	1 (50%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	54 (59%)	14 (41%)	34 (54%)	25 (58%)	19 (58%)	49 (53%)
<b>Jackson</b>	30 (70%)	9 (50%)	17 (61%)	16 (70%)	12 (52%)	27 (71%)
<b>Josephine</b>	24 (50%)	5 (31%)	17 (49%)	9 (45%)	7 (70%)	22 (41%)
<b>Lane</b>	55 (65%)	12 (75%)	39 (67%)	17 (61%)	17 (71%)	50 (67%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	45 (75%)	44 (69%)	33 (66%)	45 (75%)	8 (62%)	80 (73%)
<b>Marion</b>	42 (76%)	40 (68%)	30 (67%)	42 (75%)	8 (67%)	73 (73%)
<b>Polk</b>	3 (60%)	4 (80%)	3 (60%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	7 (78%)

**Table 7. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service: Demographic Factors 2016-17 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>	299 (87%)	216 (86%)	157 (85%)	329 (89%)	84 (82%)	427 (88%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	15 (68%)	8 (67%)	18 (69%)	3 (60%)	17 (61%)	3 (100%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	12 (46%)	9 (56%)	8 (38%)	6 (60%)	10 (53%)	11 (48%)
<b>Morrow</b>	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	--	0 (0%)	1 (50%)
<b>Umatilla</b>	8 (44%)	3 (50%)	6 (40%)	3 (60%)	5 (50%)	6 (43%)
<b>Union</b>	3 (50%)	6 (75%)	1 (50%)	3 (60%)	5 (71%)	4 (57%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	14 (70%)	7 (78%)	11 (73%)	4 (50%)	10 (67%)	11 (79%)
<b>Baker</b>	8 (80%)	2 (67%)	4 (67%)	3 (75%)	1 (100%)	9 (75%)
<b>Malheur</b>	3 (75%)	4 (80%)	5 (83%)	0 (0%)	5 (71%)	2 (100%)
<b>Wallowa</b>	3 (50%)	1 (100%)	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	4 (57%)	--
<b>Washington</b>	32 (36%)	28 (54%)	31 (41%)	18 (49%)	29 (38%)	29 (49%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	16 (76%)	7 (78%)	12 (67%)	6 (86%)	11 (85%)	12 (71%)
<b>State</b>	<b>691 (68%)</b>	<b>425 (70%)</b>	<b>469 (64%)</b>	<b>530 (75%)</b>	<b>292 (59%)</b>	<b>810 (73%)</b>

**Table 8. Retention Rates<sup>19</sup> for Families Newly Enrolled 2014-15 (CE 3-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of <u>New IS</u> Families Enrolled in FY 2014-15 <sup>20</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>	36	26 (72%)	25 (69%)	21 (58%)	17 (47%)	14 (39%)	13
<b>Benton</b>	14	11 (79%)	10 (71%)	9 (64%)	7 (50%)	6 (43%)	11
<b>Linn</b>	22	15 (68%)	15 (68%)	12 (55%)	10 (45%)	8 (36%)	14
<b>Clackamas</b>	48	33 (69%)	30 (63%)	27 (56%)	22 (46%)	19 (40%)	13
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	26	24 (92%)	24 (92%)	24 (92%)	21 (81%)	20 (77%)	16
<b>Clatsop</b>	20	19 (95%)	19 (95%)	19 (95%)	18 (90%)	18 (90%)	17
<b>Columbia</b>	6	5 (83%)	5 (83%)	5 (83%)	3 (50%)	2 (33%)	16
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	16	13 (81%)	13 (81%)	10 (63%)	8 (50%)	8 (50%)	10
<b>Coos</b>	7	6 (86%)	6 (86%)	4 (57%)	3 (43%)	3 (43%)	10
<b>Curry</b>	9	7 (78%)	7 (78%)	6 (67%)	5 (56%)	5 (56%)	11
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	47	33 (70%)	29 (62%)	27 (57%)	26 (55%)	25 (53%)	13
<b>Crook</b>	6	4 (67%)	4 (67%)	3 (50%)	3 (50%)	3 (50%)	6
<b>Deschutes</b>	34	23 (68%)	19 (56%)	18 (53%)	17 (50%)	16 (47%)	13
<b>Jefferson</b>	7	6 (86%)	6 (86%)	6 (86%)	6 (86%)	6 (86%)	
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	36	28 (78%)	26 (72%)	18 (50%)	15 (42%)	13 (36%)	10
<b>Douglas</b>	18	14 (78%)	12 (67%)	9 (50%)	7 (39%)	6 (33%)	10
<b>Klamath</b>	17	13 (76%)	13 (76%)	9 (53%)	8 (47%)	7 (41%)	12
<b>Lake</b>	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	9

<sup>19</sup> Healthy Families America suggests using the first and last home visit dates to calculate retention. In the event of incomplete data, the date of the exit form was substituted when the last home visit date was missing.

<sup>20</sup> Healthy Families America recommends calculating retention rates based on earlier enrollment years. Therefore, this table presents retention rates for all families enrolled in FY 2014-15. Enrollment is based on the number of families receiving a first home visit during FY 2014-15.

**Table 8. Retention Rates<sup>19</sup> for Families Newly Enrolled 2014-15 (CE 3-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of <u>New IS</u> Families Enrolled in FY 2014-15 <sup>20</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	4 (80%)	4 (80%)	4 (80%)	4 (80%)	4 (80%)	31
<b>Grant</b>	3	2 (67%)	2 (67%)	2 (67%)	2 (67%)	2 (67%)	31
<b>Harney</b>	2	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	--
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	27	24 (89%)	23 (85%)	17 (63%)	11 (41%)	10 (37%)	14
<b>Gilliam</b>	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	--
<b>Hood River</b>	14	13 (93%)	12 (86%)	9 (64%)	4 (29%)	4 (29%)	12
<b>Sherman</b>	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7
<b>Wasco</b>	10	8 (80%)	8 (80%)	6 (60%)	5 (50%)	4 (40%)	19
<b>Wheeler</b>	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	--
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	80	48 (60%)	44 (55%)	34 (43%)	28 (35%)	27 (34%)	11
<b>Jackson</b>	63	36 (57%)	33 (52%)	28 (44%)	23 (37%)	22 (35%)	12
<b>Josephine</b>	17	12 (71%)	11 (65%)	6 (35%)	5 (29%)	5 (29%)	8
<b>Lane</b>	76	60 (79%)	58 (76%)	43 (57%)	37 (49%)	35 (46%)	13
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	143	92 (64%)	86 (60%)	71 (50%)	54 (38%)	47 (33%)	13
<b>Marion</b>	16	8 (50%)	7 (44%)	5 (31%)	4 (25%)	4 (25%)	15
<b>Polk</b>	234	184 (79%)	174 (74%)	149 (64%)	130 (56%)	114 (49%)	15

<sup>19</sup> Healthy Families America suggests using the first and last home visit dates to calculate retention. In the event of incomplete data, the date of the exit form was substituted when the last home visit date was missing.

<sup>20</sup> Healthy Families America recommends calculating retention rates based on earlier enrollment years. Therefore, this table presents retention rates for all families enrolled in FY 2014-15. Enrollment is based on the number of families receiving a first home visit during FY 2014-15.

**Table 8. Retention Rates<sup>19</sup> for Families Newly Enrolled 2014-15 (CE 3-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of <u>New IS</u> Families Enrolled in FY 2014-15 <sup>20</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>Multnomah</b>	234	184 (79%)	174 (74%)	149 (64%)	130 (56%)	114 (49%)	15
<b>Tillamook</b>	26	16 (62%)	15 (58%)	15 (58%)	9 (35%)	7 (27%)	16
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	43	32 (74%)	29 (67%)	26 (60%)	24 (56%)	23 (53%)	9
<b>Morrow</b>	15	11 (73%)	11 (73%)	11 (73%)	11 (73%)	11 (73%)	27
<b>Umatilla</b>	25	20 (80%)	17 (68%)	14 (56%)	12 (48%)	12 (48%)	7
<b>Union</b>	3	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	11
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	31	24 (77%)	22 (71%)	19 (61%)	19 (61%)	17 (55%)	14
<b>Baker</b>	6	6 (100%)	5 (83%)	5 (83%)	5 (83%)	4 (67%)	20
<b>Malheur</b>	22	16 (73%)	15 (68%)	12 (55%)	12 (55%)	11 (50%)	11
<b>Wallowa</b>	3	2 (67%)	2 (67%)	2 (67%)	2 (67%)	2 (67%)	--
<b>Washington</b>	95	57 (60%)	53 (56%)	42 (44%)	33 (35%)	31 (33%)	12
<b>Yamhill</b>	24	20 (83%)	17 (71%)	16 (67%)	15 (63%)	15 (63%)	11
<b>State</b>	<b>1,009</b>	<b>726 (72%)</b>	<b>679 (67%)</b>	<b>568 (56%)</b>	<b>477 (47%)</b>	<b>433 (43%)</b>	<b>13</b>

<sup>19</sup> Healthy Families America suggests using the first and last home visit dates to calculate retention. In the event of incomplete data, the date of the exit form was substituted when the last home visit date was missing.

<sup>20</sup> Healthy Families America recommends calculating retention rates based on earlier enrollment years. Therefore, this table presents retention rates for all families enrolled in FY 2014-15. Enrollment is based on the number of families receiving a first home visit during FY 2014-15.

**Table 9. Retention Rates for Families Newly Enrolled 2015-16 (CE 3-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of <u>New</u> IS Families Enrolled in FY 2015-16 <sup>21</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>	18	15 (83%)	14 (78%)	13 (72%)	5
Benton	7	6 (86%)	6 (86%)	5 (71%)	4
Linn	11	9 (82%)	8 (73%)	8 (73%)	6
<b>Clackamas</b>	21	18 (86%)	16 (76%)	13 (62%)	8
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	12	11 (92%)	11 (92%)	9 (75%)	7
Clatsop	12	11 (92%)	11 (92%)	9 (75%)	7
Columbia	0	--	--	--	--
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	0	--	--	--	--
Coos	0	--	--	--	--
Curry	0	--	--	--	--
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	4	4 (100%)	4 (100%)	4 (100%)	--
Crook	0	--	--	--	--
Deschutes	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	--
Jefferson	3	3 (100%)	3 (100%)	3 (100%)	--
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	13	13 (100%)	13 (100%)	13 (100%)	--
Douglas	2	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	--
Klamath	11	11 (100%)	11 (100%)	11 (100%)	--
Lake	0	--	--	--	--

<sup>21</sup> Healthy Families America recommends calculating retention rates based on earlier enrollment years. Therefore, this table presents retention rates for all families enrolled in FY 2015-16. Enrollment is based on the number of families receiving a first home visit during FY 2015-16.

**Table 9. Retention Rates for Families Newly Enrolled 2015-16 (CE 3-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of <u>New</u> IS Families Enrolled in FY 2015-16 <sup>21</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>	7	5 (71%)	5 (71%)	4 (57%)	7
<b>Grant</b>	4	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	1
<b>Harney</b>	3	3 (100%)	3 (100%)	2 (67%)	12
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	0	--	--	--	--
<b>Gilliam</b>	0	--	--	--	--
<b>Hood River</b>	0	--	--	--	--
<b>Sherman</b>	0	--	--	--	--
<b>Wasco</b>	0	--	--	--	--
<b>Wheeler</b>	0	--	--	--	--
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	25	24 (96%)	20 (80%)	16 (64%)	9
<b>Jackson</b>	15	15 (100%)	13 (87%)	10 (67%)	10
<b>Josephine</b>	10	9 (90%)	7 (70%)	6 (60%)	6
<b>Lane</b>	28	26 (93%)	24 (86%)	20 (71%)	7
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	9	9 (100%)	8 (89%)	8 (89%)	4
<b>Marion</b>	8	8 (100%)	7 (88%)	7 (88%)	4
<b>Polk</b>	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	--

<sup>21</sup> Healthy Families America recommends calculating retention rates based on earlier enrollment years. Therefore, this table presents retention rates for all families enrolled in FY 2015-16. Enrollment is based on the number of families receiving a first home visit during FY 2015-16.

**Table 9. Retention Rates for Families Newly Enrolled 2015-16 (CE 3-4.B)**

<b>Program/County</b>	<b>Number of <u>New</u> IS Families Enrolled in FY 2015-16<sup>21</sup></b>	<b>Number (%) Still Enrolled 3 Months Later</b>	<b>Number (%) Still Enrolled 6 Months Later</b>	<b>Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later</b>	<b>Of Those Exited, Average Number of Months in Program</b>
<b>Multnomah</b>	429	417 (97%)	403 (94%)	387 (90%)	<b>9</b>
<b>Tillamook</b>	6	5 (83%)	5 (83%)	4 (67%)	<b>4</b>
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	17	11 (65%)	11 (65%)	7 (41%)	<b>5</b>
<b>Morrow</b>	4	3 (75%)	3 (75%)	2 (50%)	4
<b>Umatilla</b>	9	7 (78%)	7 (78%)	5 (56%)	7
<b>Union</b>	4	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	4
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	2	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4
<b>Baker</b>	1	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5
<b>Malheur</b>	1	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3
<b>Wallowa</b>	0	--	--	--	--
<b>Washington</b>	0	--	--	--	--
<b>Yamhill</b>	10	10 (100%)	9 (90%)	9 (90%)	12
<b>State</b>	<b>601</b>	<b>569 (95%)</b>	<b>543 (90%)</b>	<b>507 (84%)</b>	<b>8</b>

<sup>21</sup> Healthy Families America recommends calculating retention rates based on earlier enrollment years. Therefore, this table presents retention rates for all families enrolled in FY 2015-16. Enrollment is based on the number of families receiving a first home visit during FY 2015-16.

**Table 10a. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Race/Ethnicity for Families Enrolled 2015-16 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Hispanic/ Latino Families Enrolled in FY 2015-16	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number of White Families Enrolled in FY 2015-16	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number of Other Race Families <sup>22</sup> Enrolled in FY 2015-16	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	7	5 (71%)	8	6 (75%)	3	2 (67%)
<b>Benton</b>	3	2 (67%)	2	1 (50%)	2	2 (100%)
<b>Linn</b>	4	3 (75%)	6	5 (83%)	1	0 (0%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	9	5 (56%)	7	5 (71%)	5	3 (60%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	2	1 (50%)	10	8 (80%)	0	--
<b>Clatsop</b>	2	1 (50%)	10	8 (80%)	0	--
<b>Columbia</b>	0	--	0	--	0	--
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	0	--	0	--	0	--
<b>Coos</b>	0	--	0	--	0	--
<b>Curry</b>	0	--	0	--	0	--
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	2	2 (100%)	1	1 (100%)	1	1 (100%)
<b>Crook</b>	0	--	0	--	0	--
<b>Deschutes</b>	0	--	1	1 (100%)	0	--
<b>Jefferson</b>	2	2 (100%)	0	--	1	1 (100%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	2	2 (100%)	10	10 (100%)	1	1 (100%)
<b>Douglas</b>	0	--	2	2 (100%)	0	--
<b>Klamath</b>	2	2 (100%)	8	8 (100%)	1	1 (100%)
<b>Lake</b>	0	--	0	--	0	--

<sup>22</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 2015-16 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Hispanic/ Latino Families Enrolled in FY 2015-16	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number of White Families Enrolled in FY 2015-16	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number of Other Race Families <sup>22</sup> Enrolled in FY 2015-16	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	0	--	6	4 (67%)	1	0 (0%)
Grant	0	--	4	2 (50%)	0	--
Harney	0	--	2	2 (100%)	1	0 (0%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	0	--	0	--	0	--
Gilliam	0	--	0	--	0	--
Hood River	0	--	0	--	0	--
Sherman	0	--	0	--	0	--
Wasco	0	--	0	--	0	--
Wheeler	0	--	0	--	0	--
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	5	2 (40%)	19	13 (68%)	1	1 (100%)
Jackson	5	2 (40%)	9	7 (78%)	1	1 (100%)
Josephine	0	--	10	6 (60%)	0	--
<b>Lane</b>	5	5 (100%)	21	14 (67%)	2	1 (50%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	6	5 (83%)	3	3 (100%)	0	--
Marion	5	4 (80%)	3	3 (100%)	0	--
Polk	1	1 (100%)	0	--	0	--

<sup>22</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 2015-16 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Hispanic/ Latino Families Enrolled in FY 2015-16	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number of White Families Enrolled in FY 2015-16	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number of Other Race Families <sup>22</sup> Enrolled in FY 2015-16	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later
<b>Multnomah</b>	125	119 (95%)	142	129 (91%)	162	139 (86%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	2	0 (0%)	3	3 (100%)	1	1 (100%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	6	4 (67%)	10	3 (30%)	1	0 (0%)
<b>Morrow</b>	3	2 (67%)	1	0 (0%)	0	--
<b>Umatilla</b>	3	2 (67%)	6	3 (50%)	0	--
<b>Union</b>	0	--	3	0 (0%)	1	0 (0%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	1	0 (0%)	1	0 (0%)	0	--
<b>Baker</b>	0	--	1	0 (0%)	0	--
<b>Malheur</b>	1	0 (0%)	0	--	0	--
<b>Wallowa</b>	0	--	0	--	0	--
<b>Washington</b>	0	--	0	--	0	--
<b>Yamhill</b>	3	2 (67%)	5	5 (100%)	2	2 (100%)
<b>State</b>	175	152 (87%)	246	204 (83%)	180	151 (84%)

<sup>22</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>23</sup> for Families Enrolled 2015-16 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Spanish Speaking Households Enrolled in FY 2015-16	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number of English Speaking Households Enrolled in FY 2015-16	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	5	3 (60%)	11	8 (73%)
Benton	3	2 (67%)	3	2 (67%)
Linn	2	1 (50%)	8	6 (75%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	7	5 (71%)	11	7 (64%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	0	--	12	9 (75%)
Clatsop	0	--	12	9 (75%)
Columbia	0	--	0	--
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	0	--	0	--
Coos	0	--	0	--
Curry	0	--	0	--
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	2	2 (100%)	2	2 (100%)
Crook	0	--	0	--
Deschutes	0	--	1	1 (100%)
Jefferson	2	2 (100%)	1	1 (100%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	0	--	11	11 (100%)
Douglas	0	--	2	2 (100%)
Klamath	0	--	9	9 (100%)
Lake	0	--	0	--

<sup>23</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>23</sup> for Families Enrolled 2015-16 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Spanish Speaking Households Enrolled in FY 2015-16	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number of English Speaking Households Enrolled in FY 2015-16	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	0	--	7	4 (57%)
<b>Grant</b>	0	--	4	2 (50%)
<b>Harney</b>	0	--	3	2 (67%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	0	--	0	--
<b>Gilliam</b>	0	--	0	--
<b>Hood River</b>	0	--	0	--
<b>Sherman</b>	0	--	0	--
<b>Wasco</b>	0	--	0	--
<b>Wheeler</b>	0	--	0	--
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	1	1 (100%)	24	15 (63%)
<b>Jackson</b>	1	1 (100%)	14	9 (64%)
<b>Josephine</b>	0	--	10	6 (60%)
<b>Lane</b>	5	5 (100%)	23	15 (65%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	3	2 (67%)	6	6 (100%)
<b>Marion</b>	3	2 (67%)	5	5 (100%)
<b>Polk</b>	0	--	1	1 (100%)

<sup>23</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>23</sup> for Families Enrolled 2015-16 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B)**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Spanish Speaking Households Enrolled in FY 2015-16	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number of English Speaking Households Enrolled in FY 2015-16	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later
<b>Multnomah</b>	90	87 (97%)	270	239 (89%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	1	0 (0%)	5	4 (80%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	2	1 (50%)	12	4 (33%)
<b>Morrow</b>	1	0 (0%)	1	0 (0%)
<b>Umatilla</b>	1	1 (100%)	7	4 (57%)
<b>Union</b>	0	--	4	0 (0%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	0	--	2	0 (0%)
<b>Baker</b>	0	--	1	0 (0%)
<b>Malheur</b>	0	--	1	0 (0%)
<b>Wallowa</b>	0	--	0	--
<b>Washington</b>	0	--	0	--
<b>Yamhill</b>	1	0 (0%)	8	8 (100%)
<b>State</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>106 (91%)</b>	<b>404</b>	<b>332 (82%)</b>

<sup>23</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 for Families Enrolled 2015-16 (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>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	3 (75%)	10 (71%)	7 (78%)	6 (67%)	7 (58%)
Benton	2 (100%)	3 (60%)	3 (75%)	2 (67%)	3 (60%)
Linn	1 (50%)	7 (78%)	4 (80%)	4 (67%)	4 (57%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	6 (67%)	7 (58%)	6 (60%)	7 (64%)	6 (60%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	5 (71%)	4 (80%)	7 (70%)	2 (100%)	7 (78%)
Clatsop	5 (71%)	4 (80%)	7 (70%)	2 (100%)	7 (78%)
Columbia	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	--	--	--	--	--
Coos	--	--	--	--	--
Curry	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	--	4 (100%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	3 (100%)
Crook	--	--	--	--	--
Deschutes	--	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	--	1 (100%)
Jefferson	--	3 (100%)	1 (100%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	4 (100%)	9 (100%)	6 (100%)	7 (100%)	4 (100%)
Douglas	2 (100%)	--	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	--
Klamath	2 (100%)	9 (100%)	5 (100%)	6 (100%)	4 (100%)
Lake	--	--	--	--	--

**Table 11a. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Demographic Factors for Families Enrolled 2015-16 (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>	1 (50%)	3 (60%)	2 (67%)	2 (50%)	2 (67%)
<b>Grant</b>	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)
<b>Harney</b>	--	2 (67%)	--	2 (67%)	--
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Gilliam</b>	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Hood River</b>	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Sherman</b>	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Wasco</b>	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Wheeler</b>	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	8 (89%)	8 (50%)	10 (67%)	6 (60%)	7 (70%)
<b>Jackson</b>	6 (86%)	4 (50%)	7 (64%)	3 (75%)	2 (67%)
<b>Josephine</b>	2 (100%)	4 (50%)	3 (75%)	3 (50%)	5 (71%)
<b>Lane</b>	5 (71%)	15 (71%)	15 (65%)	5 (100%)	13 (72%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	4 (100%)	4 (80%)	5 (100%)	3 (75%)	3 (75%)
<b>Marion</b>	3 (100%)	4 (80%)	4 (100%)	3 (75%)	2 (67%)
<b>Polk</b>	1 (100%)	--	1 (100%)	--	1 (100%)

**Table 11a. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Demographic Factors for Families Enrolled 2015-16 (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>Multnomah</b>	127 (93%)	258 (89%)	223 (90%)	164 (91%)	151 (96%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	2 (67%)	1 (50%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	2 (50%)	5 (38%)	5 (50%)	2 (29%)	2 (40%)
<b>Morrow</b>	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)
<b>Umatilla</b>	0 (0%)	5 (63%)	4 (67%)	1 (33%)	1 (50%)
<b>Union</b>	--	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	--	0 (0%)
<b>Baker</b>	--	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	--	0 (0%)
<b>Malheur</b>	0 (0%)	--	0 (0%)	--	0 (0%)
<b>Wallowa</b>	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Washington</b>	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Yamhill</b>	2 (67%)	7 (100%)	6 (86%)	3 (100%)	4 (80%)
<b>State</b>	<b>169 (87%)</b>	<b>335 (83%)</b>	<b>297 (84%)</b>	<b>209 (85%)</b>	<b>211 (86%)</b>

**Table 11b. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Demographic Factors for Families Enrolled 2015-16 (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>	5 (100%)	1 (50%)	12 (75%)	9 (82%)	4 (57%)
<b>Benton</b>	2 (100%)	1 (100%)	4 (67%)	3 (100%)	2 (50%)
<b>Linn</b>	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	8 (80%)	6 (75%)	2 (67%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	5 (71%)	--	13 (62%)	3 (43%)	10 (71%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	1 (50%)	--	9 (75%)	2 (100%)	7 (70%)
<b>Clatsop</b>	1 (50%)	--	9 (75%)	2 (100%)	7 (70%)
<b>Columbia</b>	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Coos</b>	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Curry</b>	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	--	--	4 (100%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)
<b>Crook</b>	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Deschutes</b>	--	--	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	--
<b>Jefferson</b>	--	--	3 (100%)	1 (100%)	2 (100%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	8 (100%)	--	13 (100%)	1 (100%)	12 (100%)
<b>Douglas</b>	2 (100%)	--	2 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
<b>Klamath</b>	6 (100%)	--	11 (100%)	--	11 (100%)
<b>Lake</b>	--	--	--	--	--

**Table 11b. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Demographic Factors for Families Enrolled 2015-16 (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 (67%)	0 (0%)	4 (67%)
<b>Grant</b>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)	--	2 (50%)
<b>Harney</b>	2 (100%)	--	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Gilliam</b>	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Hood River</b>	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Sherman</b>	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Wasco</b>	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Wheeler</b>	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	5 (83%)	--	16 (64%)	0 (0%)	16 (70%)
<b>Jackson</b>	5 (83%)	--	10 (67%)	0 (0%)	10 (77%)
<b>Josephine</b>	--	--	6 (60%)	--	6 (60%)
<b>Lane</b>	4 (67%)	--	20 (71%)	2 (67%)	17 (71%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	5 (100%)	2 (100%)	6 (86%)	4 (100%)	4 (80%)
<b>Marion</b>	5 (100%)	2 (100%)	5 (83%)	3 (100%)	4 (80%)
<b>Polk</b>	--	--	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	--

**Table 11b. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Demographic Factors for Families Enrolled 2015-16 (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>	175 (86%)	12 (100%)	375 (90%)	51 (91%)	331 (90%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	1 (100%)	--	3 (60%)	2 (100%)	2 (50%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	4 (67%)	--	7 (41%)	2 (50%)	5 (38%)
<b>Morrow</b>	1 (100%)	--	2 (50%)	--	2 (50%)
<b>Umatilla</b>	3 (60%)	--	5 (56%)	2 (67%)	3 (50%)
<b>Union</b>	--	--	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	--	--	0 (0%)	--	0 (0%)
<b>Baker</b>	--	--	0 (0%)	--	0 (0%)
<b>Malheur</b>	--	--	0 (0%)	--	0 (0%)
<b>Wallowa</b>	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Washington</b>	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Yamhill</b>	1 (100%)	2 (100%)	7 (88%)	1 (50%)	8 (100%)
<b>State</b>	216 (85%)	17 (89%)	489 (84%)	79 (81%)	422 (85%)

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

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Exiting Families in FY 2015-16	Median <sup>25</sup> Age of Child at Exit (In Months)	Number (%) that Reached the Age Limit of the Program	Number (%) Moved, Unable to Locate	Number (%) Parent Declined Further Service <sup>26</sup>	Number (%) Families Moved Out of County	Other Reason <sup>27</sup>
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	26	15	5 (19%)	3 (12%)	11 (42%)	4 (15%)	3 (12%)
<b>Benton</b>	10	13	2 (20%)	1 (10%)	3 (30%)	3 (30%)	1 (10%)
<b>Linn</b>	16	15	3 (19%)	2 (13%)	8 (50%)	1 (6%)	2 (13%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	46	19	11 (24%)	0 (0%)	21 (46%)	9 (20%)	5 (11%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	7	18	3 (43%)	1 (14%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (43%)
<b>Clatsop</b>	1	37	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Columbia</b>	6	15	2 (33%)	1 (17%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (50%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	8	21	0 (0%)	1 (13%)	1 (13%)	0 (0%)	6 (75%)
<b>Coos</b>	5	18	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (100%)
<b>Curry</b>	3	25	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	38	15	9 (24%)	3 (8%)	14 (37%)	5 (13%)	7 (18%)
<b>Crook</b>	5	16	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	2 (40%)	0 (0%)	2 (40%)
<b>Deschutes</b>	29	12	5 (17%)	3 (10%)	12 (41%)	4 (14%)	5 (17%)
<b>Jefferson</b>	4	36	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	34	16	8 (24%)	4 (12%)	9 (26%)	6 (18%)	7 (21%)
<b>Douglas</b>	20	19	6 (30%)	4 (20%)	5 (25%)	3 (15%)	2 (10%)
<b>Klamath</b>	13	15	2 (15%)	0 (0%)	3 (23%)	3 (23%)	5 (38%)
<b>Lake</b>	1	13	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

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

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

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

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

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

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Exiting Families in FY 2015-16	Median <sup>25</sup> Age of Child at Exit (In Months)	Number (%) that Reached the Age Limit of the Program	Number (%) Moved, Unable to Locate	Number (%) Parent Declined Further Service <sup>26</sup>	Number (%) Families Moved Out of County	Other Reason <sup>27</sup>
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	5	34	2 (40%)	0 (0%)	3 (60%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Grant</b>	3	34	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Harney</b>	2	29	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	33	18	9 (27%)	1 (3%)	12 (36%)	8 (24%)	3 (9%)
<b>Gilliam</b>	1	27	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Hood River</b>	21	16	5 (24%)	0 (0%)	8 (38%)	6 (29%)	2 (10%)
<b>Sherman</b>	1	8	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
<b>Wasco</b>	9	18	4 (44%)	0 (0%)	3 (33%)	2 (22%)	0 (0%)
<b>Wheeler</b>	1	29	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	60	9	7 (12%)	13 (22%)	20 (33%)	3 (5%)	17 (28%)
<b>Jackson</b>	33	10	6 (18%)	10 (30%)	9 (27%)	2 (6%)	6 (18%)
<b>Josephine</b>	27	9	1 (4%)	3 (11%)	11 (41%)	1 (4%)	11 (41%)
<b>Lane</b>	56	14	17 (30%)	17 (30%)	13 (23%)	8 (14%)	1 (2%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	112	7	13 (12%)	25 (22%)	54 (48%)	13 (12%)	7 (6%)
<b>Marion</b>	99	7	11 (11%)	24 (24%)	47 (47%)	13 (13%)	4 (4%)
<b>Polk</b>	13	7	2 (15%)	1 (8%)	7 (54%)	0 (0%)	3 (23%)

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

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

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

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

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

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Exiting Families in FY 2015-16	Median <sup>25</sup> Age of Child at Exit (In Months)	Number (%) that Reached the Age Limit of the Program	Number (%) Moved, Unable to Locate	Number (%) Parent Declined Further Service <sup>26</sup>	Number (%) Families Moved Out of County	Other Reason <sup>27</sup>
<b>Multnomah</b>	199	16	61 (31%)	35 (18%)	38 (19%)	28 (14%)	37 (19%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	21	16	5 (24%)	3 (14%)	9 (43%)	2 (10%)	2 (10%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	19	5	1 (5%)	9 (47%)	7 (37%)	2 (11%)	0 (0%)
<b>Morrow</b>	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Umatilla</b>	15	7	0 (0%)	8 (53%)	5 (33%)	2 (13%)	0 (0%)
<b>Union</b>	4	3	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	2 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	12	8	3 (25%)	2 (17%)	4 (33%)	2 (17%)	1 (8%)
<b>Baker</b>	4	28	2 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)
<b>Malheur</b>	8	7	1 (13%)	2 (25%)	4 (50%)	1 (13%)	0 (0%)
<b>Wallowa</b>	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Washington</b>	67	17	15 (22%)	19 (28%)	21 (31%)	10 (15%)	2 (3%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	16	15	5 (31%)	4 (25%)	3 (19%)	4 (25%)	0 (0%)
<b>State</b>	<b>759</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>174 (23%)</b>	<b>140 (18%)</b>	<b>240 (32%)</b>	<b>104 (14%)</b>	<b>101 (13%)</b>

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

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

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

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

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

Program/County	Number of Completed Family Assessments	High Stress Family Assessment	Number (%) Lacking Nurturing Parents (history of maltreatment, corporal punishment, emotional abuse/neglect)		Number (%) with Substance Abuse, Mental Illness, or Criminal History		Substance Abuse	Mental Illness	Criminal History
			Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe			
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	60 (53%)	47 (78%)	15 (25%)	35 (58%)	17 (29%)	29 (49%)	27 (45%)	39 (65%)	18 (30%)
<b>Benton</b>	27 (59%)	19 (70%)	6 (22%)	14 (52%)	11 (42%)	9 (35%)	9 (33%)	17 (63%)	7 (26%)
<b>Linn</b>	33 (49%)	28 (85%)	9 (27%)	21 (64%)	6 (18%)	20 (61%)	18 (55%)	22 (67%)	11 (33%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	111 (90%)	103 (93%)	4 (4%)	99 (89%)	31 (28%)	65 (59%)	59 (53%)	66 (59%)	40 (36%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	97 (85%)	76 (78%)	13 (13%)	71 (73%)	22 (23%)	55 (57%)	53 (55%)	48 (49%)	45 (46%)
<b>Clatsop</b>	57 (88%)	41 (72%)	10 (18%)	39 (68%)	13 (23%)	32 (56%)	26 (46%)	28 (49%)	24 (42%)
<b>Columbia</b>	40 (82%)	35 (88%)	3 (8%)	32 (80%)	9 (23%)	23 (58%)	27 (68%)	20 (50%)	21 (53%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	5 (19%)	3 (60%)	0 (0%)	3 (60%)	0 (0%)	2 (40%)	2 (40%)	1 (20%)	1 (20%)
<b>Coos</b>	1 (8%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
<b>Curry</b>	4 (31%)	2 (50%)	0 (0%)	2 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	96 (63%)	82 (85%)	12 (13%)	70 (74%)	19 (20%)	60 (63%)	50 (52%)	50 (52%)	42 (44%)
<b>Crook</b>	9 (56%)	9 (100%)	0 (0%)	9 (100%)	2 (22%)	7 (78%)	5 (56%)	7 (78%)	2 (22%)
<b>Deschutes</b>	71 (61%)	58 (82%)	6 (9%)	53 (77%)	14 (20%)	46 (65%)	36 (51%)	36 (51%)	35 (49%)
<b>Jefferson</b>	16 (80%)	15 (94%)	6 (38%)	8 (50%)	3 (19%)	7 (44%)	9 (56%)	7 (44%)	5 (31%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	104 (78%)	95 (91%)	6 (6%)	92 (88%)	18 (17%)	76 (73%)	72 (69%)	72 (69%)	58 (56%)
<b>Douglas</b>	42 (89%)	42 (100%)	0 (0%)	42 (100%)	5 (12%)	35 (83%)	32 (76%)	29 (69%)	18 (43%)
<b>Klamath</b>	56 (69%)	48 (86%)	6 (11%)	46 (82%)	13 (23%)	36 (64%)	36 (64%)	39 (70%)	37 (66%)
<b>Lake</b>	6 (100%)	5 (83%)	0 (0%)	4 (67%)	0 (0%)	5 (83%)	4 (67%)	4 (67%)	3 (50%)

<sup>28</sup> Parent Survey risk factors are scored by the Home Visitor as 0 (not present), 5 (mild) or 10 (severe) and entered into the statewide data system. High stress assessments are those in which either parent's score is 40 or higher.

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

Program/County	Number of Completed Family Assessments	High Stress Family Assessment	Number (%) Lacking Nurturing Parents (history of maltreatment, corporal punishment, emotional abuse/neglect)		Number (%) with Substance Abuse, Mental Illness, or Criminal History		Substance Abuse	Mental Illness	Criminal History
			Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe			
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	13 (54%)	10 (77%)	2 (15%)	11 (85%)	1 (8%)	8 (62%)	8 (62%)	7 (54%)	7 (54%)
<b>Grant</b>	8 (53%)	6 (75%)	1 (13%)	7 (88%)	0 (0%)	5 (63%)	5 (63%)	4 (50%)	4 (50%)
<b>Harney</b>	5 (56%)	4 (80%)	1 (20%)	4 (80%)	1 (20%)	3 (60%)	3 (60%)	3 (60%)	3 (60%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	76 (78%)	70 (92%)	9 (12%)	64 (86%)	24 (32%)	33 (45%)	34 (45%)	35 (46%)	19 (25%)
<b>Gilliam</b>	2 (40%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)
<b>Hood River</b>	37 (80%)	35 (95%)	4 (11%)	32 (89%)	13 (36%)	9 (25%)	13 (35%)	9 (24%)	4 (11%)
<b>Sherman</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Wasco</b>	32 (76%)	30 (94%)	4 (13%)	27 (87%)	7 (23%)	21 (68%)	18 (56%)	23 (72%)	9 (28%)
<b>Wheeler</b>	5 (100%)	4 (80%)	1 (20%)	4 (80%)	2 (40%)	3 (60%)	2 (40%)	2 (40%)	5 (100%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	120 (81%)	101 (84%)	13 (11%)	95 (80%)	24 (20%)	68 (57%)	55 (46%)	48 (40%)	42 (35%)
<b>Jackson</b>	67 (81%)	56 (84%)	7 (11%)	51 (77%)	12 (18%)	37 (55%)	27 (40%)	26 (39%)	22 (33%)
<b>Josephine</b>	53 (80%)	45 (85%)	6 (11%)	44 (83%)	12 (23%)	31 (60%)	28 (53%)	22 (42%)	20 (38%)
<b>Lane</b>	164 (78%)	147 (90%)	13 (8%)	138 (85%)	26 (16%)	119 (73%)	110 (67%)	110 (67%)	64 (39%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	252 (75%)	173 (69%)	46 (19%)	151 (61%)	63 (25%)	107 (43%)	91 (36%)	110 (44%)	75 (30%)
<b>Marion</b>	236 (77%)	159 (67%)	45 (19%)	138 (60%)	58 (25%)	100 (43%)	84 (36%)	100 (42%)	67 (28%)
<b>Polk</b>	16 (59%)	14 (88%)	1 (6%)	13 (81%)	5 (31%)	7 (44%)	7 (44%)	10 (63%)	8 (50%)

<sup>28</sup> Parent Survey risk factors are scored by the Home Visitor as 0 (not present), 5 (mild) or 10 (severe) and entered into the statewide data system. High stress assessments are those in which either parent's score is 40 or higher.

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

Program/County	Number of Completed Family Assessments	High Stress Family Assessment	Number (%) Lacking Nurturing Parents (history of maltreatment, corporal punishment, emotional abuse/neglect)		Number (%) with Substance Abuse, Mental Illness, or Criminal History		Substance Abuse	Mental Illness	Criminal History
			Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe			
Multnomah	381 (30%)	270 (71%)	72 (19%)	230 (61%)	98 (26%)	147 (39%)	128 (34%)	148 (39%)	88 (23%)
Tillamook	46 (88%)	36 (78%)	6 (13%)	34 (76%)	16 (36%)	15 (34%)	20 (43%)	16 (35%)	18 (39%)
Umatilla, Union, & Morrow	52 (66%)	39 (75%)	8 (15%)	40 (77%)	6 (12%)	34 (65%)	23 (44%)	25 (48%)	22 (42%)
Morrow	3 (23%)	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)
Umatilla	36 (77%)	25 (69%)	6 (17%)	26 (72%)	4 (11%)	20 (56%)	13 (36%)	13 (36%)	16 (44%)
Union	13 (68%)	12 (92%)	2 (15%)	11 (85%)	2 (15%)	11 (85%)	9 (69%)	12 (92%)	4 (31%)
Wallowa, Baker, & Malheur	49 (75%)	38 (78%)	9 (18%)	35 (71%)	10 (20%)	27 (55%)	28 (57%)	21 (43%)	22 (45%)
Baker	26 (93%)	24 (92%)	3 (12%)	21 (81%)	4 (15%)	19 (73%)	20 (77%)	13 (50%)	15 (58%)
Malheur	16 (55%)	7 (44%)	5 (31%)	8 (50%)	6 (38%)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)	4 (25%)	2 (13%)
Wallowa	7 (88%)	7 (100%)	1 (14%)	6 (86%)	0 (0%)	7 (100%)	7 (100%)	4 (57%)	5 (71%)
Washington	145 (69%)	94 (65%)	18 (13%)	103 (72%)	37 (26%)	58 (41%)	28 (19%)	63 (43%)	34 (23%)
Yamhill	21 (31%)	20 (95%)	2 (10%)	17 (81%)	2 (10%)	16 (80%)	14 (67%)	16 (76%)	11 (52%)
State	1,792 (55%)	1,404 (78%)	248 (14%)	1,288 (73%)	414 (23%)	919 (52%)	802 (45%)	875 (49%)	606 (34%)

<sup>28</sup> Parent Survey risk factors are scored by the Home Visitor as 0 (not present), 5 (mild) or 10 (severe) and entered into the statewide data system. High stress assessments are those in which either parent's score is 40 or higher.

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

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) with Previous or Current Child Welfare Involvement		<i>Prior Child Welfare Involvement</i>	<i>Current Child Welfare Involvement</i>	Number (%) with Isolation, Low Self-Esteem		Number (%) with Multiple Stressors	
	Mild	Severe			Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	6 (10%)	4 (7%)	8 (13%)	1 (2%)	17 (28%)	28 (47%)	19 (32%)	32 (53%)
<b>Benton</b>	3 (12%)	1 (4%)	2 (7%)	1 (4%)	6 (22%)	12 (44%)	12 (44%)	12 (44%)
<b>Linn</b>	3 (9%)	3 (9%)	6 (18%)	0 (0%)	11 (33%)	16 (48%)	7 (21%)	20 (61%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	12 (11%)	8 (7%)	12 (11%)	9 (8%)	38 (35%)	55 (50%)	32 (29%)	65 (59%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	10 (10%)	22 (23%)	23 (24%)	18 (19%)	30 (31%)	31 (32%)	47 (48%)	35 (36%)
<b>Clatsop</b>	8 (14%)	8 (14%)	9 (16%)	9 (16%)	14 (25%)	18 (32%)	30 (53%)	16 (28%)
<b>Columbia</b>	2 (5%)	14 (35%)	14 (35%)	9 (23%)	16 (40%)	13 (33%)	17 (43%)	19 (48%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (60%)	1 (20%)	2 (40%)	2 (40%)
<b>Coos</b>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
<b>Curry</b>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	2 (50%)	1 (25%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	12 (13%)	14 (15%)	19 (20%)	11 (11%)	27 (29%)	52 (55%)	26 (28%)	58 (62%)
<b>Crook</b>	0 (0%)	2 (22%)	2 (22%)	0 (0%)	2 (22%)	6 (67%)	1 (11%)	7 (78%)
<b>Deschutes</b>	9 (13%)	10 (14%)	14 (20%)	8 (11%)	20 (29%)	36 (52%)	21 (30%)	40 (57%)
<b>Jefferson</b>	3 (19%)	2 (13%)	3 (19%)	3 (19%)	5 (31%)	10 (63%)	4 (27%)	11 (73%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	16 (15%)	24 (23%)	31 (30%)	17 (16%)	21 (20%)	60 (58%)	19 (18%)	66 (63%)
<b>Douglas</b>	9 (21%)	9 (21%)	11 (26%)	6 (14%)	6 (14%)	34 (81%)	5 (12%)	35 (83%)
<b>Klamath</b>	7 (13%)	12 (21%)	17 (30%)	10 (18%)	15 (27%)	24 (43%)	12 (21%)	29 (52%)
<b>Lake</b>	0 (0%)	3 (50%)	3 (50%)	1 (17%)	0 (0%)	2 (33%)	2 (33%)	2 (33%)

<sup>29</sup> Parent Survey risk factors are scored by the Home Visitor as 0 (not present), 5 (mild) or 10 (severe) and entered into the statewide data system. High stress assessments are those in which either parent's score is 40 or higher.

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

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) with Previous or Current Child Welfare Involvement		<i>Prior Child Welfare Involvement</i>	<i>Current Child Welfare Involvement</i>	Number (%) with Isolation, Low Self-Esteem		Number (%) with Multiple Stressors	
	Mild	Severe			Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	0 (0%)	4 (31%)	1 (8%)	3 (23%)	3 (23%)	7 (54%)	3 (25%)	7 (58%)
<b>Grant</b>	0 (0%)	3 (38%)	1 (13%)	2 (25%)	2 (25%)	4 (50%)	2 (25%)	5 (63%)
<b>Harney</b>	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	3 (60%)	1 (25%)	2 (50%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	7 (9%)	9 (12%)	11 (14%)	7 (9%)	35 (47%)	34 (45%)	25 (33%)	47 (62%)
<b>Gilliam</b>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)
<b>Hood River</b>	1 (3%)	2 (6%)	2 (5%)	1 (3%)	20 (54%)	16 (43%)	14 (38%)	23 (62%)
<b>Sherman</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Wasco</b>	4 (13%)	6 (19%)	7 (22%)	5 (16%)	13 (42%)	16 (52%)	8 (25%)	22 (69%)
<b>Wheeler</b>	2 (40%)	1 (20%)	2 (40%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	2 (40%)	2 (40%)	1 (20%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	12 (10%)	22 (18%)	20 (17%)	6 (5%)	32 (27%)	49 (41%)	50 (42%)	58 (49%)
<b>Jackson</b>	6 (9%)	13 (19%)	8 (12%)	5 (7%)	19 (29%)	26 (39%)	19 (28%)	39 (58%)
<b>Josephine</b>	6 (11%)	9 (17%)	12 (23%)	1 (2%)	13 (25%)	23 (43%)	31 (60%)	19 (37%)
<b>Lane</b>	20 (12%)	30 (18%)	34 (21%)	24 (15%)	40 (24%)	96 (59%)	46 (28%)	99 (60%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	19 (8%)	31 (12%)	32 (13%)	11 (4%)	87 (35%)	91 (36%)	86 (34%)	110 (44%)
<b>Marion</b>	18 (8%)	29 (12%)	29 (12%)	9 (4%)	80 (34%)	83 (35%)	79 (34%)	102 (43%)
<b>Polk</b>	1 (6%)	2 (13%)	3 (19%)	2 (13%)	7 (44%)	8 (50%)	7 (44%)	8 (50%)

<sup>29</sup> Parent Survey risk factors are scored by the Home Visitor as 0 (not present), 5 (mild) or 10 (severe) and entered into the statewide data system. High stress assessments are those in which either parent's score is 40 or higher.

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

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) with Previous or Current Child Welfare Involvement		<i>Prior Child Welfare Involvement</i>	<i>Current Child Welfare Involvement</i>	Number (%) with Isolation, Low Self-Esteem		Number (%) with Multiple Stressors	
	Mild	Severe			Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe
<b>Multnomah</b>	24 (6%)	32 (8%)	35 (9%)	22 (6%)	128 (34%)	172 (45%)	125 (33%)	201 (53%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	5 (11%)	5 (11%)	8 (17%)	4 (9%)	12 (26%)	22 (48%)	15 (33%)	23 (50%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	11 (21%)	13 (25%)	19 (37%)	5 (10%)	19 (37%)	22 (42%)	22 (42%)	24 (46%)
<b>Morrow</b>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	2 (67%)
<b>Umatilla</b>	11 (31%)	6 (17%)	12 (33%)	4 (11%)	13 (36%)	15 (42%)	19 (53%)	12 (33%)
<b>Union</b>	0 (0%)	7 (54%)	7 (54%)	1 (8%)	6 (46%)	5 (38%)	2 (15%)	10 (77%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	5 (10%)	10 (20%)	8 (16%)	8 (16%)	17 (35%)	17 (35%)	21 (43%)	17 (35%)
<b>Baker</b>	5 (19%)	8 (31%)	6 (23%)	8 (31%)	6 (23%)	11 (42%)	13 (50%)	8 (31%)
<b>Malheur</b>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	11 (69%)	0 (0%)	7 (44%)	3 (19%)
<b>Wallowa</b>	0 (0%)	2 (29%)	2 (29%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (86%)	1 (14%)	6 (86%)
<b>Washington</b>	11 (8%)	11 (8%)	8 (6%)	5 (3%)	48 (34%)	50 (35%)	59 (41%)	49 (34%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	1 (5%)	3 (14%)	3 (14%)	1 (5%)	4 (19%)	16 (76%)	7 (33%)	13 (62%)
<b>State</b>	<b>171 (10%)</b>	<b>242 (14%)</b>	<b>272 (15%)</b>	<b>152 (8%)</b>	<b>561 (31%)</b>	<b>803 (45%)</b>	<b>604 (34%)</b>	<b>906 (51%)</b>

<sup>29</sup> Parent Survey risk factors are scored by the Home Visitor as 0 (not present), 5 (mild) or 10 (severe) and entered into the statewide data system. High stress assessments are those in which either parent's score is 40 or higher.

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

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) with Potential for Violence		Number (%) with Unrealistic Expectations of Infant		Number (%) with Plans for Severe Discipline for Infant		Number (%) with Negative Perception of Infant		Number (%) with Bonding/Attachment Issues	
	Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	4 (7%)	10 (18%)	15 (25%)	9 (15%)	12 (21%)	2 (4%)	10 (18%)	6 (11%)	25 (42%)	14 (24%)
<b>Benton</b>	1 (4%)	4 (17%)	7 (26%)	7 (26%)	5 (21%)	0 (0%)	6 (25%)	3 (13%)	8 (30%)	6 (22%)
<b>Linn</b>	3 (9%)	6 (19%)	8 (24%)	2 (6%)	7 (22%)	2 (6%)	4 (13%)	3 (10%)	17 (53%)	8 (25%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	27 (25%)	21 (19%)	52 (47%)	10 (9%)	20 (18%)	7 (6%)	19 (17%)	3 (3%)	72 (65%)	12 (11%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	13 (13%)	19 (20%)	33 (34%)	9 (9%)	17 (18%)	3 (3%)	14 (15%)	0 (0%)	53 (55%)	9 (9%)
<b>Clatsop</b>	7 (12%)	9 (16%)	17 (30%)	3 (5%)	6 (11%)	3 (5%)	9 (16%)	0 (0%)	27 (47%)	6 (11%)
<b>Columbia</b>	6 (15%)	10 (25%)	16 (40%)	6 (15%)	11 (28%)	0 (0%)	5 (13%)	0 (0%)	26 (65%)	3 (8%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	2 (40%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	2 (40%)
<b>Coos</b>	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
<b>Curry</b>	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	12 (13%)	23 (24%)	35 (37%)	11 (12%)	13 (14%)	7 (7%)	17 (18%)	4 (4%)	61 (64%)	12 (13%)
<b>Crook</b>	1 (11%)	3 (33%)	4 (44%)	1 (11%)	3 (38%)	1 (13%)	2 (22%)	0 (0%)	7 (78%)	0 (0%)
<b>Deschutes</b>	7 (10%)	15 (21%)	15 (21%)	10 (14%)	8 (11%)	4 (6%)	10 (14%)	3 (4%)	47 (67%)	6 (9%)
<b>Jefferson</b>	4 (25%)	5 (31%)	16 (100%)	0 (0%)	2 (13%)	2 (13%)	5 (31%)	1 (6%)	7 (44%)	6 (38%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	14 (13%)	33 (32%)	25 (24%)	12 (12%)	17 (17%)	15 (15%)	10 (10%)	4 (4%)	75 (72%)	14 (13%)
<b>Douglas</b>	6 (14%)	17 (40%)	10 (24%)	5 (12%)	12 (29%)	8 (19%)	5 (12%)	3 (7%)	30 (71%)	7 (17%)
<b>Klamath</b>	8 (14%)	13 (23%)	14 (25%)	7 (13%)	5 (9%)	6 (11%)	5 (9%)	1 (2%)	41 (73%)	6 (11%)
<b>Lake</b>	0 (0%)	3 (50%)	1 (17%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (17%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (67%)	1 (17%)

<sup>30</sup> Parent Survey risk factors are scored by the Home Visitor as 0 (not present), 5 (mild) or 10 (severe) and entered into the statewide data system. High stress assessments are those in which either parent's score is 40 or higher.

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

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) with Potential for Violence		Number (%) with Unrealistic Expectations of Infant		Number (%) with Plans for Severe Discipline for Infant		Number (%) with Negative Perception of Infant		Number (%) with Bonding/Attachment Issues	
	Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	2 (15%)	2 (15%)	5 (38%)	1 (8%)	6 (46%)	1 (8%)	3 (23%)	1 (8%)	9 (69%)	1 (8%)
<b>Grant</b>	0 (0%)	1 (13%)	2 (25%)	1 (13%)	3 (38%)	1 (13%)	2 (25%)	1 (13%)	5 (63%)	1 (13%)
<b>Harney</b>	2 (40%)	1 (20%)	3 (60%)	0 (0%)	3 (60%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	4 (80%)	0 (0%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	4 (5%)	8 (11%)	51 (69%)	3 (4%)	8 (11%)	2 (3%)	27 (37%)	6 (8%)	40 (53%)	6 (8%)
<b>Gilliam</b>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)
<b>Hood River</b>	0 (0%)	2 (6%)	26 (72%)	1 (3%)	5 (14%)	1 (3%)	17 (47%)	3 (8%)	18 (49%)	2 (5%)
<b>Sherman</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Wasco</b>	3 (10%)	6 (19%)	23 (74%)	2 (6%)	2 (6%)	1 (3%)	10 (33%)	3 (10%)	18 (56%)	3 (9%)
<b>Wheeler</b>	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (40%)	1 (20%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	11 (9%)	19 (16%)	45 (38%)	10 (8%)	16 (13%)	11 (9%)	15 (13%)	1 (1%)	60 (50%)	11 (9%)
<b>Jackson</b>	6 (9%)	14 (21%)	30 (45%)	3 (4%)	9 (13%)	5 (7%)	10 (15%)	0 (0%)	35 (52%)	6 (9%)
<b>Josephine</b>	5 (9%)	5 (9%)	15 (28%)	7 (13%)	7 (13%)	6 (12%)	5 (10%)	1 (2%)	25 (47%)	5 (9%)
<b>Lane</b>	29 (18%)	35 (21%)	80 (49%)	20 (12%)	15 (9%)	10 (6%)	24 (15%)	5 (3%)	100 (61%)	30 (18%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	15 (6%)	42 (17%)	103 (42%)	15 (6%)	26 (11%)	8 (3%)	16 (7%)	3 (1%)	154 (61%)	25 (10%)
<b>Marion</b>	14 (6%)	36 (16%)	96 (42%)	14 (6%)	21 (9%)	8 (4%)	16 (7%)	3 (1%)	148 (63%)	22 (9%)
<b>Polk</b>	1 (6%)	6 (38%)	7 (47%)	1 (7%)	5 (31%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (38%)	3 (19%)

<sup>30</sup> Parent Survey risk factors are scored by the Home Visitor as 0 (not present), 5 (mild) or 10 (severe) and entered into the statewide data system. High stress assessments are those in which either parent's score is 40 or higher.

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

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) with Potential for Violence		Number (%) with Unrealistic Expectations of Infant		Number (%) with Plans for Severe Discipline for Infant		Number (%) with Negative Perception of Infant		Number (%) with Bonding/Attachment Issues	
	Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe
<b>Multnomah</b>	28 (7%)	67 (18%)	113 (30%)	17 (4%)	41 (11%)	22 (6%)	38 (10%)	12 (3%)	150 (39%)	63 (17%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	1 (2%)	4 (9%)	13 (30%)	6 (14%)	7 (17%)	1 (2%)	6 (14%)	2 (5%)	22 (49%)	6 (13%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	10 (20%)	16 (32%)	19 (38%)	5 (10%)	7 (14%)	8 (16%)	12 (24%)	1 (2%)	30 (58%)	3 (6%)
<b>Morrow</b>	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)
<b>Umatilla</b>	5 (14%)	11 (31%)	15 (43%)	3 (9%)	5 (14%)	6 (17%)	12 (33%)	1 (3%)	22 (61%)	0 (0%)
<b>Union</b>	4 (33%)	5 (42%)	3 (25%)	2 (17%)	2 (18%)	2 (18%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	8 (62%)	1 (8%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	5 (10%)	15 (31%)	8 (16%)	2 (4%)	6 (12%)	4 (8%)	7 (17%)	0 (0%)	32 (65%)	3 (6%)
<b>Baker</b>	3 (12%)	11 (42%)	5 (19%)	1 (4%)	3 (12%)	3 (12%)	2 (8%)	0 (0%)	18 (69%)	2 (8%)
<b>Malheur</b>	2 (13%)	1 (6%)	3 (19%)	0 (0%)	2 (13%)	0 (0%)	5 (56%)	0 (0%)	8 (50%)	1 (6%)
<b>Wallowa</b>	0 (0%)	3 (43%)	0 (0%)	1 (14%)	1 (14%)	1 (14%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (86%)	0 (0%)
<b>Washington</b>	10 (7%)	19 (14%)	43 (30%)	11 (8%)	13 (9%)	8 (6%)	6 (4%)	3 (2%)	74 (52%)	9 (6%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	3 (15%)	4 (20%)	6 (29%)	5 (24%)	2 (10%)	4 (20%)	4 (19%)	1 (5%)	11 (52%)	7 (33%)
<b>State</b>	190 (11%)	337 (19%)	647 (37%)	146 (8%)	226 (13%)	114 (6%)	229 (13%)	52 (3%)	969 (54%)	227 (13%)

<sup>30</sup> Parent Survey risk factors are scored by the Home Visitor as 0 (not present), 5 (mild) or 10 (severe) and entered into the statewide data system. High stress assessments are those in which either parent's score is 40 or higher.

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

<i>Program/County</i>	Total Number of Intensive Service Families with Race/Ethnicity Information <sup>31</sup>	Number (%) African American	Number (%) Hispanic/Latino	Number (%) Asian	Number (%) American Indian	Number (%) White	Number (%) Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	Number (%) Multiracial	Number (%) Other	Number (%) Unreported
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	114	0 (0%)	36 (32%)	4 (4%)	2 (2%)	61 (54%)	1 (1%)	6 (5%)	1 (1%)	3 (3%)
Benton	46	0 (0%)	16 (35%)	4 (9%)	1 (2%)	22 (48%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)
Linn	68	0 (0%)	20 (29%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	39 (57%)	0 (0%)	5 (7%)	1 (1%)	2 (3%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	123	2 (2%)	39 (32%)	2 (2%)	1 (1%)	59 (48%)	1 (1%)	16 (13%)	2 (2%)	1 (1%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	114	0 (0%)	18 (16%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	82 (72%)	0 (0%)	9 (8%)	0 (0%)	5 (4%)
Clatsop	65	0 (0%)	14 (22%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	43 (66%)	0 (0%)	4 (6%)	0 (0%)	4 (6%)
Columbia	49	0 (0%)	4 (8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	39 (80%)	0 (0%)	5 (10%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	26	1 (4%)	4 (15%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	12 (46%)	0 (0%)	7 (27%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)
Coos	13	1 (8%)	2 (15%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (54%)	0 (0%)	3 (23%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Curry	13	0 (0%)	2 (15%)	0 (0%)	1 (8%)	5 (38%)	0 (0%)	4 (31%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	152	1 (1%)	26 (17%)	1 (1%)	2 (1%)	103 (68%)	2 (1%)	11 (7%)	0 (0%)	6 (4%)
Crook	16	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	14 (88%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Deschutes	116	0 (0%)	20 (17%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	80 (69%)	2 (2%)	8 (7%)	0 (0%)	5 (4%)
Jefferson	20	0 (0%)	6 (30%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	9 (45%)	0 (0%)	3 (15%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	134	1 (1%)	12 (9%)	1 (1%)	3 (2%)	93 (69%)	0 (0%)	21 (16%)	0 (0%)	3 (2%)
Douglas	47	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	37 (79%)	0 (0%)	7 (15%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)
Klamath	81	1 (1%)	11 (14%)	0 (0%)	3 (4%)	51 (63%)	0 (0%)	13 (16%)	0 (0%)	2 (2%)
Lake	6	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (83%)	0 (0%)	1 (17%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

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

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

<i>Program/County</i>	Total Number of Intensive Service Families with Race/Ethnicity Information <sup>31</sup>	Number (%) African American	Number (%) Hispanic/Latino	Number (%) Asian	Number (%) American Indian	Number (%) White	Number (%) Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	Number (%) Multiracial	Number (%) Other	Number (%) Unreported
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	24	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	2 (8%)	18 (75%)	0 (0%)	3 (13%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Grant</b>	15	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	12 (80%)	0 (0%)	3 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Harney</b>	9	0 (0%)	1 (11%)	0 (0%)	2 (22%)	6 (67%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	98	0 (0%)	56 (57%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	28 (29%)	0 (0%)	6 (6%)	1 (1%)	7 (7%)
<b>Gilliam</b>	5	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Hood River</b>	46	0 (0%)	40 (87%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	4 (9%)
<b>Sherman</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Wasco</b>	42	0 (0%)	15 (36%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	19 (45%)	0 (0%)	4 (10%)	1 (2%)	3 (7%)
<b>Wheeler</b>	5	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (60%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	149	1 (1%)	14 (9%)	1 (1%)	2 (1%)	112 (75%)	1 (1%)	13 (9%)	2 (1%)	3 (2%)
<b>Jackson</b>	83	1 (1%)	14 (17%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	56 (67%)	1 (1%)	7 (8%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)
<b>Josephine</b>	66	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	56 (85%)	0 (0%)	6 (9%)	1 (2%)	2 (3%)
<b>Lane</b>	209	3 (1%)	39 (19%)	2 (1%)	1 (0%)	142 (68%)	2 (1%)	13 (6%)	2 (1%)	5 (2%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	335	7 (2%)	211 (63%)	4 (1%)	4 (1%)	68 (20%)	5 (1%)	23 (7%)	3 (1%)	10 (3%)
<b>Marion</b>	308	7 (2%)	198 (64%)	2 (1%)	3 (1%)	61 (20%)	5 (2%)	20 (6%)	3 (1%)	9 (3%)
<b>Polk</b>	27	0 (0%)	13 (48%)	2 (7%)	1 (4%)	7 (26%)	0 (0%)	3 (11%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)

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

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

<i>Program/County</i>	Total Number of Intensive Service Families with Race/Ethnicity Information <sup>31</sup>	Number (%) African American	Number (%) Hispanic/Latino	Number (%) Asian	Number (%) American Indian	Number (%) White	Number (%) Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	Number (%) Multiracial	Number (%) Other	Number (%) Unreported
<b>Multnomah</b>	1,285	161 (13%)	364 (28%)	122	11 (1%)	383 (30%)	30 (2%)	134 (10%)	57 (4%)	23 (2%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	52	0 (0%)	19 (37%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	28 (54%)	0 (0%)	3 (6%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	79	0 (0%)	30 (38%)	0 (0%)	2 (3%)	39 (49%)	0 (0%)	7 (9%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)
<b>Morrow</b>	13	0 (0%)	9 (69%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (23%)	0 (0%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Umatilla</b>	47	0 (0%)	21 (45%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	21 (45%)	0 (0%)	5 (11%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Union</b>	19	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (11%)	15 (79%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	65	1 (2%)	13 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	47 (72%)	0 (0%)	4 (6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Baker</b>	28	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	23 (82%)	0 (0%)	3 (11%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Malheur</b>	29	0 (0%)	12 (41%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	16 (55%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Wallowa</b>	8	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	8 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Washington</b>	210	6 (3%)	119 (57%)	5 (2%)	4 (2%)	51 (24%)	0 (0%)	12 (6%)	8 (4%)	5 (2%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	68	0 (0%)	20 (29%)	0 (0%)	3 (4%)	40 (59%)	1 (1%)	2 (3%)	2 (3%)	0 (0%)
<b>State</b>	<b>3,237</b>	<b>184 (6%)</b>	<b>1,021 (32%)</b>	<b>143 (4%)</b>	<b>38 (1%)</b>	<b>1,366 (42%)</b>	<b>43 (1%)</b>	<b>290 (9%)</b>	<b>80 (2%)</b>	<b>72 (2%)</b>

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

**Table 15a. NBQ Risks and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families<sup>32</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	Average Number of NBQ (V2) Risks <sup>33</sup>	Average Number of NBQ (V1) RFs <sup>34</sup>	Number (%) with 1 Risk	Number (%) with 2 Risks	Number (%) with 3 Risks	Number (%) with 4 Risks	Number (%) with 5+ Risks	Number (%) of English Speaking Households	Number (%) of Spanish Speaking Households	Number (%) of Other Language Households
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	3.2	3.5	19 (17%)	26 (24%)	19 (17%)	19 (17%)	26 (24%)	77 (73%)	26 (25%)	2 (2%)
<b>Benton</b>	3.2	3.5	8 (18%)	8 (18%)	9 (20%)	10 (23%)	9 (20%)	27 (68%)	11 (28%)	2 (5%)
<b>Linn</b>	3.2	3.4	11 (17%)	18 (28%)	10 (15%)	9 (14%)	17 (26%)	50 (77%)	15 (23%)	0 (0%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	4.7	3.4	5 (4%)	16 (13%)	26 (21%)	27 (22%)	49 (40%)	80 (77%)	23 (22%)	1 (1%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	4.0	3.8	6 (5%)	24 (21%)	21 (18%)	29 (25%)	34 (30%)	94 (85%)	17 (15%)	0 (0%)
<b>Clatsop</b>	3.4	3.4	5 (8%)	18 (28%)	13 (20%)	17 (26%)	12 (18%)	48 (77%)	14 (23%)	0 (0%)
<b>Columbia</b>	4.6	4.9	1 (2%)	6 (12%)	8 (16%)	12 (24%)	22 (45%)	46 (94%)	3 (6%)	0 (0%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	3.4	3.2	4 (15%)	8 (31%)	5 (19%)	1 (4%)	8 (31%)	23 (96%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)
<b>Coos</b>	3.2	3.5	3 (23%)	3 (23%)	2 (15%)	1 (8%)	4 (31%)	11 (92%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)
<b>Curry</b>	3.6	3.0	1 (8%)	5 (38%)	3 (23%)	0 (0%)	4 (31%)	12 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	3.7	3.2	12 (8%)	43 (28%)	31 (21%)	25 (17%)	40 (26%)	134 (96%)	5 (4%)	0 (0%)
<b>Crook</b>	3.5	3.8	2 (13%)	2 (13%)	6 (38%)	2 (13%)	4 (25%)	15 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Deschutes</b>	3.8	3.0	8 (7%)	35 (30%)	24 (21%)	19 (16%)	30 (26%)	106 (97%)	3 (3%)	0 (0%)
<b>Jefferson</b>	3.3	3.7	2 (11%)	6 (32%)	1 (5%)	4 (21%)	6 (32%)	13 (87%)	2 (13%)	0 (0%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	4.4	4.0	6 (4%)	15 (11%)	37 (28%)	23 (17%)	53 (40%)	123 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Douglas</b>	4.5	3.9	0 (0%)	7 (15%)	17 (36%)	9 (19%)	14 (30%)	46 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Klamath</b>	4.4	4.1	6 (7%)	8 (10%)	18 (22%)	13 (16%)	36 (44%)	71 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Lake</b>	4.7	--	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (33%)	1 (17%)	3 (50%)	6 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

<sup>32</sup> Families in intensive service could have been screened using either NBQ Version 1 or Version 2 (depending on when they enrolled in services), therefore data from both versions are presented.

<sup>33</sup> Programs began using Version 2 of the NBQ in July 2015. Version 2 has a maximum of 15 scored risk indicators

<sup>34</sup> Version 1 of the NBQ (in use through June 2015) had a maximum of 10 scored risk indicators.

**Table 15a. NBQ Risks and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families<sup>32</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	Average Number of NBQ (V2) Risks <sup>33</sup>	Average Number of NBQ (V1) RFs <sup>34</sup>	Number (%) with 1 Risk	Number (%) with 2 Risks	Number (%) with 3 Risks	Number (%) with 4 Risks	Number (%) with 5+ Risks	Number (%) of English Speaking Households	Number (%) of Spanish Speaking Households	Number (%) of Other Language Households
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	3.7	2.7	3 (13%)	4 (17%)	6 (26%)	4 (17%)	6 (26%)	23 (96%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)
<b>Grant</b>	3.7	1.7	3 (21%)	2 (14%)	2 (14%)	4 (29%)	3 (21%)	15 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Harney</b>	3.7	3.7	0 (0%)	2 (22%)	4 (44%)	0 (0%)	3 (33%)	8 (89%)	1 (11%)	0 (0%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	3.2	3.1	11 (12%)	25 (27%)	27 (29%)	13 (14%)	18 (19%)	49 (60%)	33 (40%)	0 (0%)
<b>Gilliam</b>	3.5	3.0	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	2 (40%)	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	5 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Hood River</b>	3.0	3.1	5 (12%)	12 (28%)	14 (33%)	4 (9%)	8 (19%)	11 (30%)	26 (70%)	0 (0%)
<b>Sherman</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Wasco</b>	3.2	3.1	6 (15%)	11 (27%)	10 (24%)	6 (15%)	8 (20%)	29 (81%)	7 (19%)	0 (0%)
<b>Wheeler</b>	3.6	--	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	2 (40%)	1 (20%)	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	3.5	3.5	8 (5%)	42 (28%)	45 (30%)	23 (15%)	31 (21%)	140 (97%)	3 (2%)	1 (1%)
<b>Jackson</b>	3.7	3.6	5 (6%)	21 (25%)	21 (25%)	13 (16%)	23 (28%)	76 (95%)	3 (4%)	1 (1%)
<b>Josephine</b>	3.2	3.3	3 (5%)	21 (32%)	24 (36%)	10 (15%)	8 (12%)	64 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Lane</b>	4.6	3.2	3 (1%)	54 (26%)	37 (18%)	47 (22%)	68 (33%)	176 (90%)	19 (10%)	1 (1%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	4.2	3.4	12 (4%)	77 (23%)	74 (22%)	63 (19%)	109 (33%)	129 (51%)	123 (48%)	3 (1%)
<b>Marion</b>	4.2	3.4	11 (4%)	68 (22%)	68 (22%)	60 (19%)	101 (33%)	115 (49%)	117 (50%)	3 (1%)
<b>Polk</b>	4.0	3.2	1 (4%)	9 (33%)	6 (22%)	3 (11%)	8 (30%)	14 (70%)	6 (30%)	0 (0%)

<sup>32</sup> Because families in intensive service could have been screened using either NBQ Version 1 or Version 2 (depending on when they enrolled in services), data from both versions are presented.

<sup>33</sup> Programs began using Version 2 of the NBQ in July 2015. Version 2 has a maximum of 15 scored risk indicators

<sup>34</sup> Version 1 of the NBQ (in use through June 2015) had a maximum of 10 scored risk indicators.

**Table 15a. NBQ Risks and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families<sup>32</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	Average Number of NBQ (V2) Risks <sup>33</sup>	Average Number of NBQ (V1) RFs <sup>34</sup>	Number (%) with 1 Risk	Number (%) with 2 Risks	Number (%) with 3 Risks	Number (%) with 4 Risks	Number (%) with 5+ Risks	Number (%) of English Speaking Households	Number (%) of Spanish Speaking Households	Number (%) of Other Language Households
<b>Multnomah</b>	4.5	3.6	24 (2%)	158 (12%)	284 (22%)	277 (22%)	537 (42%)	755 (70%)	226 (21%)	97 (9%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	3.1	3.2	8 (16%)	13 (25%)	7 (14%)	14 (27%)	9 (18%)	33 (67%)	16 (33%)	0 (0%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, Morrow</b>	4.2	2.9	7 (9%)	18 (23%)	19 (24%)	11 (14%)	24 (30%)	49 (71%)	20 (29%)	0 (0%)
<b>Umatilla</b>	3.7	2.0	4 (31%)	5 (38%)	0 (0%)	1 (8%)	3 (23%)	3 (27%)	8 (73%)	0 (0%)
<b>Union</b>	3.8	3.3	2 (4%)	10 (21%)	17 (36%)	9 (19%)	9 (19%)	27 (69%)	12 (31%)	0 (0%)
<b>Union</b>	5.2	--	1 (5%)	3 (16%)	2 (11%)	1 (5%)	12 (63%)	19 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	3.6	2.6	4 (6%)	18 (29%)	15 (24%)	10 (16%)	15 (24%)	62 (95%)	3 (5%)	0 (0%)
<b>Baker</b>	3.8	3.5	1 (4%)	9 (32%)	6 (21%)	4 (14%)	8 (29%)	28 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Malheur</b>	3.3	1.8	3 (12%)	8 (31%)	6 (23%)	5 (19%)	4 (15%)	26 (90%)	3 (10%)	0 (0%)
<b>Wallowa</b>	4.1	4.0	0 (0%)	1 (13%)	3 (38%)	1 (13%)	3 (38%)	8 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Washington</b>	3.6	3.3	11 (5%)	51 (25%)	65 (31%)	37 (18%)	44 (21%)	84 (48%)	81 (47%)	9 (5%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	4.2	3.3	2 (3%)	12 (18%)	17 (25%)	16 (24%)	21 (31%)	54 (89%)	7 (11%)	0 (0%)
<b>State</b>	4.2	3.4	145 (5%)	604 (19%)	735 (23%)	639 (20%)	1,092 (34%)	2,085 (74%)	604 (22%)	114 (4%)

<sup>32</sup> Because families in intensive service could have been screened using either NBQ Version 1 or Version 2 (depending on when they enrolled in services), data from both versions are presented.

<sup>33</sup> Programs began using Version 2 of the NBQ in July 2015. Version 2 has a maximum of 15 scored risk indicators

<sup>34</sup> Version 1 of the NBQ (in use through June 2015) had a maximum of 10 scored risk indicators.

**Table 15b. NBQ Risks and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families<sup>35</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) Teen Mothers (17 or younger)	Number (%) Single Mothers	Number (%) Less Than HS Education	Number (%) Late Prenatal Care	Number (%) Lack of Comprehensive Prenatal Care	Number (%) Unemployed Parent (s)
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	3 (3%)	74 (66%)	35 (31%)	17 (16%)	3 (3%)	22 (29%)
<b>Benton</b>	1 (2%)	28 (61%)	10 (22%)	12 (26%)	2 (6%)	6 (23%)
<b>Linn</b>	2 (3%)	46 (70%)	25 (37%)	5 (8%)	1 (2%)	16 (31%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	9 (7%)	87 (71%)	48 (39%)	31 (26%)	6 (6%)	33 (49%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	4 (4%)	75 (66%)	34 (30%)	22 (19%)	8 (9%)	29 (40%)
<b>Clatsop</b>	0 (0%)	37 (57%)	17 (27%)	12 (19%)	5 (9%)	9 (23%)
<b>Columbia</b>	4 (8%)	38 (78%)	17 (35%)	10 (20%)	3 (9%)	20 (61%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	2 (8%)	19 (73%)	7 (27%)	4 (16%)	1 (6%)	3 (19%)
<b>Coos</b>	0 (0%)	11 (85%)	5 (38%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	3 (33%)
<b>Curry</b>	2 (15%)	8 (62%)	2 (15%)	4 (33%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	6 (4%)	120 (79%)	36 (24%)	25 (17%)	3 (2%)	21 (24%)
<b>Crook</b>	0 (0%)	12 (75%)	3 (19%)	3 (19%)	0 (0%)	2 (18%)
<b>Deschutes</b>	4 (3%)	90 (78%)	26 (23%)	14 (12%)	3 (3%)	15 (22%)
<b>Jefferson</b>	2 (10%)	18 (90%)	7 (35%)	8 (44%)	0 (0%)	4 (44%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	10 (7%)	111 (83%)	57 (43%)	20 (15%)	7 (6%)	50 (59%)
<b>Douglas</b>	2 (4%)	39 (83%)	18 (38%)	9 (19%)	4 (9%)	16 (73%)
<b>Klamath</b>	8 (10%)	68 (84%)	39 (48%)	9 (12%)	3 (4%)	32 (56%)
<b>Lake</b>	0 (0%)	4 (67%)	0 (0%)	2 (33%)	0 (0%)	2 (33%)

<sup>35</sup> These data are based on families who were screened using either NBQ Version 1 or Version 2.

**Table 15b. NBQ Risks and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families<sup>35</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) Teen Mothers (17 or younger)	Number (%) Single Mothers	Number (%) Less Than HS Education	Number (%) Late Prenatal Care	Number (%) Lack of Comprehensive Prenatal Care	Number (%) Unemployed Parent (s)
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	2 (8%)	13 (54%)	8 (35%)	6 (25%)	2 (10%)	6 (38%)
<b>Grant</b>	2 (13%)	8 (53%)	5 (33%)	2 (13%)	1 (7%)	3 (27%)
<b>Harney</b>	0 (0%)	5 (56%)	3 (38%)	4 (44%)	1 (14%)	3 (60%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	7 (7%)	54 (56%)	44 (45%)	11 (12%)	5 (9%)	24 (41%)
<b>Gilliam</b>	0 (0%)	4 (80%)	2 (40%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	2 (50%)
<b>Hood River</b>	5 (11%)	21 (48%)	27 (60%)	3 (7%)	2 (8%)	14 (54%)
<b>Sherman</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Wasco</b>	2 (5%)	27 (64%)	14 (33%)	6 (15%)	2 (9%)	5 (22%)
<b>Wheeler</b>	0 (0%)	2 (40%)	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	1 (25%)	3 (60%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	6 (4%)	101 (68%)	34 (23%)	26 (18%)	7 (5%)	43 (41%)
<b>Jackson</b>	6 (7%)	54 (66%)	21 (25%)	18 (22%)	5 (7%)	26 (48%)
<b>Josephine</b>	0 (0%)	47 (71%)	13 (20%)	8 (12%)	2 (3%)	17 (33%)
<b>Lane</b>	12 (6%)	154 (74%)	40 (19%)	34 (17%)	8 (4%)	33 (29%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	18 (5%)	227 (68%)	147 (44%)	96 (29%)	24 (8%)	99 (45%)
<b>Marion</b>	17 (6%)	210 (69%)	136 (45%)	90 (29%)	23 (9%)	93 (46%)
<b>Polk</b>	1 (4%)	17 (63%)	11 (41%)	6 (22%)	1 (4%)	6 (33%)

<sup>35</sup> These data are based on families who were screened using either NBQ Version 1 or Version 2.

**Table 15b. NBQ Risks and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families<sup>35</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) Teen Mothers (17 or younger)	Number (%) Single Mothers	Number (%) Less Than HS Education	Number (%) Late Prenatal Care	Number (%) Lack of Comprehensive Prenatal Care	Number (%) Unemployed Parent (s)
<b>Multnomah</b>	41 (3%)	866 (68%)	538 (42%)	289 (23%)	80 (6%)	603 (62%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	2 (4%)	27 (54%)	20 (39%)	10 (23%)	3 (15%)	4 (15%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	5 (7%)	55 (70%)	35 (45%)	19 (26%)	2 (4%)	15 (39%)
<b>Morrow</b>	0 (0%)	4 (31%)	6 (55%)	4 (33%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)
<b>Umatilla</b>	5 (11%)	36 (77%)	21 (45%)	12 (27%)	1 (3%)	9 (39%)
<b>Union</b>	0 (0%)	15 (79%)	8 (42%)	3 (17%)	1 (6%)	5 (45%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	7 (11%)	46 (71%)	21 (32%)	12 (19%)	6 (15%)	11 (31%)
<b>Baker</b>	2 (7%)	23 (82%)	5 (18%)	6 (21%)	5 (21%)	5 (31%)
<b>Malheur</b>	4 (14%)	18 (62%)	11 (38%)	4 (14%)	1 (8%)	3 (20%)
<b>Wallowa</b>	1 (13%)	5 (63%)	5 (63%)	2 (25%)	0 (0%)	3 (60%)
<b>Washington</b>	5 (2%)	126 (61%)	72 (35%)	41 (22%)	22 (14%)	41 (38%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	4 (6%)	48 (71%)	19 (28%)	13 (21%)	3 (6%)	12 (32%)
<b>State</b>	<b>143 (4%)</b>	<b>2,203 (68%)</b>	<b>1,195 (37%)</b>	<b>676 (22%)</b>	<b>190 (7%)</b>	<b>1,049 (49%)</b>

<sup>35</sup> These data are based on families who were screened using either NBQ Version 1 or Version 2.

**Table 15c. NBQ Risks and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families<sup>36</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) Difficulty Paying for Expenses	Number (%) Depression Indicated	Number (%) Relationship Problems	Number (%) Substance Abuse Issues	Number (%) At or Below Poverty Level <sup>37</sup>
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	60 (55%)	23 (20%)	30 (27%)	12 (11%)	26 (90%)
<b>Benton</b>	30 (65%)	7 (15%)	12 (26%)	3 (7%)	8 (80%)
<b>Linn</b>	30 (47%)	16 (24%)	18 (27%)	9 (13%)	18 (95%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	97 (80%)	42 (34%)	48 (39%)	12 (10%)	42 (78%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	106 (93%)	20 (18%)	35 (31%)	17 (15%)	70 (77%)
<b>Clatsop</b>	61 (94%)	12 (18%)	17 (27%)	7 (11%)	40 (70%)
<b>Columbia</b>	45 (92%)	8 (16%)	18 (37%)	10 (20%)	30 (88%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	15 (60%)	6 (24%)	6 (23%)	2 (8%)	12 (100%)
<b>Coos</b>	6 (50%)	2 (15%)	3 (23%)	0 (0%)	6 (100%)
<b>Curry</b>	9 (69%)	4 (33%)	3 (23%)	2 (15%)	6 (100%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	115 (76%)	33 (22%)	34 (24%)	23 (16%)	82 (84%)
<b>Crook</b>	13 (81%)	5 (31%)	2 (14%)	2 (13%)	9 (82%)
<b>Deschutes</b>	91 (78%)	25 (22%)	29 (26%)	18 (16%)	63 (84%)
<b>Jefferson</b>	11 (55%)	3 (15%)	3 (15%)	3 (16%)	10 (83%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	94 (71%)	34 (26%)	45 (34%)	29 (22%)	61 (97%)
<b>Douglas</b>	35 (74%)	12 (26%)	16 (35%)	8 (17%)	33 (94%)
<b>Klamath</b>	53 (66%)	21 (26%)	27 (34%)	20 (26%)	28 (100%)
<b>Lake</b>	6 (100%)	1 (17%)	2 (33%)	1 (17%)	--

<sup>36</sup> These data are based on families who were screened using either NBQ Version 1 or Version 2.

<sup>37</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 Risks and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families<sup>36</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) Difficulty Paying for Expenses	Number (%) Depression Indicated	Number (%) Relationship Problems	Number (%) Substance Abuse Issues	Number (%) At or Below Poverty Level <sup>37</sup>
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	14 (58%)	6 (25%)	4 (17%)	3 (13%)	10 (77%)
<b>Grant</b>	9 (60%)	5 (33%)	2 (13%)	1 (7%)	4 (67%)
<b>Harney</b>	5 (56%)	1 (11%)	2 (25%)	2 (22%)	6 (86%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	52 (55%)	16 (16%)	23 (24%)	4 (4%)	41 (84%)
<b>Gilliam</b>	5 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	2 (50%)
<b>Hood River</b>	21 (49%)	7 (16%)	8 (19%)	1 (2%)	14 (74%)
<b>Sherman</b>	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Wasco</b>	24 (57%)	8 (19%)	13 (31%)	2 (5%)	22 (100%)
<b>Wheeler</b>	2 (40%)	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	3 (75%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	97 (66%)	25 (17%)	32 (21%)	26 (18%)	99 (87%)
<b>Jackson</b>	52 (63%)	17 (20%)	20 (24%)	12 (15%)	58 (88%)
<b>Josephine</b>	45 (69%)	8 (12%)	12 (18%)	14 (21%)	41 (85%)
<b>Lane</b>	185 (89%)	57 (27%)	91 (44%)	25 (12%)	107 (80%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	261 (78%)	64 (19%)	77 (23%)	29 (9%)	180 (91%)
<b>Marion</b>	240 (78%)	58 (19%)	72 (23%)	25 (8%)	165 (92%)
<b>Polk</b>	21 (78%)	6 (22%)	5 (19%)	4 (15%)	15 (83%)

<sup>36</sup> These data are based on families who were screened using either NBQ Version 1 or Version 2.<sup>37</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 Risks and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families<sup>36</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) Difficulty Paying for Expenses	Number (%) Depression Indicated	Number (%) Relationship Problems	Number (%) Substance Abuse Issues	Number (%) At or Below Poverty Level <sup>37</sup>
<b>Multnomah</b>	1,132 (89%)	506 (40%)	249 (20%)	124 (10%)	397 (86%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	32 (64%)	12 (24%)	14 (27%)	3 (6%)	16 (62%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	59 (75%)	14 (18%)	24 (30%)	12 (15%)	32 (91%)
<b>Morrow</b>	10 (77%)	2 (15%)	4 (31%)	0 (0%)	5 (71%)
<b>Umatilla</b>	33 (70%)	7 (15%)	9 (19%)	6 (13%)	22 (96%)
<b>Union</b>	16 (84%)	5 (26%)	11 (58%)	6 (32%)	5 (100%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	47 (73%)	12 (18%)	14 (22%)	9 (14%)	40 (85%)
<b>Baker</b>	21 (75%)	4 (14%)	5 (18%)	8 (29%)	24 (92%)
<b>Malheur</b>	21 (72%)	6 (21%)	6 (21%)	0 (0%)	12 (71%)
<b>Wallowa</b>	5 (71%)	2 (25%)	3 (38%)	1 (13%)	4 (100%)
<b>Washington</b>	150 (73%)	52 (25%)	50 (24%)	9 (4%)	119 (80%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	47 (69%)	21 (31%)	27 (40%)	13 (19%)	18 (95%)
<b>State</b>	<b>2,563 (80%)</b>	<b>943 (29%)</b>	<b>803 (25%)</b>	<b>352 (11%)</b>	<b>1,352 (85%)</b>

<sup>36</sup> These data are based on families who were screened using either NBQ Version 1 or Version 2.

<sup>37</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 Risks and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families <sup>38</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>	7 (8%)	12 (24%)	7 (8%)	23 (27%)	27 (24%)
<b>Benton</b>	4 (14%)	4 (25%)	3 (10%)	11 (39%)	10 (22%)
<b>Linn</b>	3 (5%)	8 (23%)	4 (7%)	12 (21%)	17 (25%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	3 (4%)	18 (22%)	14 (17%)	42 (49%)	23 (19%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	6 (7%)	19 (22%)	18 (21%)	27 (31%)	14 (12%)
<b>Clatsop</b>	3 (7%)	8 (19%)	7 (16%)	11 (25%)	7 (11%)
<b>Columbia</b>	3 (8%)	11 (26%)	11 (26%)	16 (38%)	7 (14%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	3 (17%)	3 (16%)	4 (20%)	3 (16%)	5 (19%)
<b>Coos</b>	2 (20%)	2 (18%)	2 (18%)	0 (0%)	3 (23%)
<b>Curry</b>	1 (13%)	1 (13%)	2 (22%)	3 (38%)	2 (15%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	6 (6%)	11 (18%)	24 (23%)	49 (46%)	16 (11%)
<b>Crook</b>	1 (8%)	1 (20%)	3 (25%)	8 (67%)	0 (0%)
<b>Deschutes</b>	5 (6%)	10 (20%)	20 (24%)	38 (46%)	15 (13%)
<b>Jefferson</b>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (9%)	3 (27%)	1 (5%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	7 (7%)	5 (5%)	40 (40%)	34 (34%)	16 (12%)
<b>Douglas</b>	1 (3%)	1 (3%)	9 (30%)	14 (47%)	7 (15%)
<b>Klamath</b>	4 (6%)	3 (5%)	28 (44%)	18 (28%)	7 (9%)
<b>Lake</b>	2 (33%)	1 (17%)	3 (50%)	2 (33%)	2 (33%)

<sup>38</sup> These data are based on families who were screened using NBQ Version 2 only.

**Table 15d. NBQ Risks and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families <sup>38</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>	1 (6%)	3 (18%)	3 (17%)	7 (39%)	2 (8%)
<b>Grant</b>	1 (8%)	3 (25%)	2 (17%)	4 (33%)	1 (7%)
<b>Harney</b>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (17%)	3 (50%)	1 (11%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	4 (6%)	7 (12%)	13 (19%)	13 (20%)	16 (16%)
<b>Gilliam</b>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)
<b>Hood River</b>	2 (6%)	1 (4%)	7 (23%)	4 (13%)	10 (22%)
<b>Sherman</b>	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Wasco</b>	2 (9%)	3 (12%)	5 (19%)	8 (30%)	4 (10%)
<b>Wheeler</b>	0 (0%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	1 (20%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	13 (11%)	11 (10%)	17 (14%)	52 (41%)	16 (11%)
<b>Jackson</b>	9 (14%)	6 (11%)	15 (23%)	28 (42%)	14 (17%)
<b>Josephine</b>	4 (7%)	5 (9%)	2 (3%)	24 (41%)	2 (3%)
<b>Lane</b>	12 (9%)	10 (8%)	20 (16%)	88 (68%)	65 (31%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	28 (12%)	34 (16%)	47 (20%)	65 (27%)	88 (27%)
<b>Marion</b>	24 (11%)	31 (16%)	46 (21%)	58 (26%)	79 (26%)
<b>Polk</b>	4 (21%)	3 (16%)	1 (5%)	7 (33%)	9 (35%)

<sup>38</sup> These data are based on families who were screened using NBQ Version 2 only.

**Table 15d. NBQ Risks and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families <sup>38</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>	111 (10%)	116 (14%)	156 (15%)	543 (51%)	182 (14%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	4 (14%)	4 (22%)	2 (7%)	11 (35%)	12 (24%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	3 (5%)	8 (23%)	15 (26%)	15 (26%)	18 (23%)
<b>Morrow</b>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (17%)	4 (31%)
<b>Umatilla</b>	2 (6%)	4 (24%)	5 (16%)	3 (9%)	11 (23%)
<b>Union</b>	1 (5%)	4 (31%)	10 (53%)	11 (58%)	3 (16%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	1 (2%)	1 (3%)	9 (20%)	10 (23%)	3 (5%)
<b>Baker</b>	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	7 (35%)	4 (20%)	2 (7%)
<b>Malheur</b>	0 (0%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	3 (18%)	1 (3%)
<b>Wallowa</b>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (29%)	3 (43%)	0 (0%)
<b>Washington</b>	13 (10%)	9 (9%)	21 (16%)	34 (26%)	51 (25%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	8 (17%)	6 (16%)	14 (29%)	21 (45%)	14 (21%)
<b>State</b>	<b>230 (10%)</b>	<b>277 (14%)</b>	<b>424 (18%)</b>	<b>1,037 (43%)</b>	<b>568 (18%)</b>

<sup>38</sup> These data are based on families who were screened using NBQ Version 2 only.

**Table 16. Health Care for Intensive Service Families<sup>39</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>	59	48 (86%)	60	60 (100%)	45	43 (96%)
<b>Benton</b>	24	22 (92%)	25	25 (100%)	23	22 (96%)
<b>Linn</b>	35	26 (81%)	35	35 (100%)	22	21 (95%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	119	95 (81%)	119	114 (96%)	90	80 (89%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	102	86 (85%)	102	100 (99%)	70	65 (93%)
<b>Clatsop</b>	61	45 (75%)	61	59 (98%)	44	39 (89%)
<b>Columbia</b>	41	41 (100%)	41	41 (100%)	26	26 (100%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	23	21 (91%)	24	24 (100%)	14	13 (93%)
<b>Coos</b>	12	11 (92%)	12	12 (100%)	5	4 (80%)
<b>Curry</b>	11	10 (91%)	12	12 (100%)	9	9 (100%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	136	123 (91%)	136	135 (99%)	95	79 (83%)
<b>Crook</b>	14	10 (77%)	14	14 (100%)	10	10 (100%)
<b>Deschutes</b>	105	96 (91%)	105	104 (99%)	73	58 (79%)
<b>Jefferson</b>	17	17 (100%)	17	17 (100%)	12	11 (92%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	87	82 (94%)	86	85 (99%)	71	56 (79%)
<b>Douglas</b>	40	37 (93%)	40	40 (100%)	30	24 (80%)
<b>Klamath</b>	47	45 (96%)	46	45 (98%)	41	32 (78%)
<b>Lake</b>	0	--	0	--	0	--

<sup>39</sup> Health outcomes are tracked by the Home Visitors and reported at 6-month intervals on the Family Update form. Outcome information is taken from the most recent form for each child.

**Table 16. Health Care for Intensive Service Families<sup>39</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>	14	14 (100%)	14	14 (100%)	13	11 (85%)
<b>Grant</b>	6	6 (100%)	6	6 (100%)	5	4 (80%)
<b>Harney</b>	8	8 (100%)	8	8 (100%)	8	7 (88%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	92	86 (98%)	92	92 (100%)	69	63 (91%)
<b>Gilliam</b>	5	4 (80%)	5	5 (100%)	3	3 (100%)
<b>Hood River</b>	45	45 (100%)	45	45 (100%)	36	35 (97%)
<b>Sherman</b>	0	--	0	--	0	--
<b>Wasco</b>	38	34 (100%)	38	38 (100%)	27	24 (89%)
<b>Wheeler</b>	4	3 (75%)	4	4 (100%)	3	1 (33%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	131	117 (91%)	131	128 (98%)	87	78 (90%)
<b>Jackson</b>	72	64 (90%)	72	69 (97%)	47	41 (87%)
<b>Josephine</b>	59	53 (91%)	59	59 (100%)	40	37 (93%)
<b>Lane</b>	189	151 (82%)	189	186 (98%)	137	118 (86%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	306	230 (77%)	306	302 (100%)	230	206 (90%)
<b>Marion</b>	282	210 (77%)	282	278 (100%)	212	191 (90%)
<b>Polk</b>	24	20 (83%)	24	24 (100%)	18	15 (83%)

<sup>39</sup> Health outcomes are tracked by the Home Visitors and reported at 6-month intervals on the Family Update form. Outcome information is taken from the most recent form for each child.

**Table 16. Health Care for Intensive Service Families<sup>39</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>	562	455 (81%)	564	548 (98%)	386	360 (93%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	44	26 (63%)	44	41 (100%)	30	28 (93%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	51	33 (65%)	52	48 (92%)	37	35 (95%)
<b>Morrow</b>	9	6 (67%)	9	7 (78%)	5	4 (80%)
<b>Umatilla</b>	34	21 (62%)	35	33 (94%)	28	27 (96%)
<b>Union</b>	8	6 (75%)	8	8 (100%)	4	4 (100%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	56	54 (96%)	56	53 (95%)	47	46 (98%)
<b>Baker</b>	26	26 (100%)	26	26 (100%)	23	23 (100%)
<b>Malheur</b>	25	23 (92%)	25	22 (88%)	20	19 (95%)
<b>Wallowa</b>	5	5 (100%)	5	5 (100%)	4	4 (100%)
<b>Washington</b>	186	135 (73%)	185	184 (99%)	140	136 (97%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	48	41 (89%)	48	48 (100%)	37	33 (89%)
<b>State</b>	<b>2,205</b>	<b>1,797 (83%)</b>	<b>2,208</b>	<b>2,162 (98%)</b>	<b>1,598</b>	<b>1,450 (91%)</b>

<sup>39</sup> Health outcomes are tracked by the Home Visitors and reported at 6-month intervals on the Family Update form. Outcome information is taken from the most recent form for each child.

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

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Children with Health Insurance Information (Family Update)	Number (%) with Private Insurance	Number (%) with OHP	Number (%) with No Insurance	Number of Children Lacking Health Insurance at time of NBQ	Number (%) of These Children with Health Insurance at Most Recent Follow-Up
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	45	3 (7%)	41 (91%)	1 (2%)	2	2 (100%)
<b>Benton</b>	23	0 (0%)	22 (96%)	1 (4%)	1	1 (100%)
<b>Linn</b>	22	3 (14%)	19 (86%)	0 (0%)	1	1 (100%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	91	12 (13%)	79 (87%)	0 (0%)	8	8 (100%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	69	7 (10%)	62 (90%)	0 (0%)	7	7 (100%)
<b>Clatsop</b>	43	4 (9%)	39 (91%)	0 (0%)	4	4 (100%)
<b>Columbia</b>	26	3 (12%)	23 (88%)	0 (0%)	3	3 (100%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	15	2 (13%)	12 (80%)	1 (7%)	2	2 (100%)
<b>Coos</b>	5	0 (0%)	4 (80%)	1 (20%)	0	--
<b>Curry</b>	10	2 (20%)	8 (80%)	0 (0%)	2	2 (100%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	98	5 (5%)	92 (94%)	1 (1%)	5	5 (100%)
<b>Crook</b>	10	0 (0%)	10 (100%)	0 (0%)	0	--
<b>Deschutes</b>	75	4 (5%)	70 (93%)	1 (1%)	3	3 (100%)
<b>Jefferson</b>	13	1 (8%)	12 (92%)	0 (0%)	2	2 (100%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	71	5 (7%)	65 (92%)	1 (1%)	0	--
<b>Douglas</b>	30	3 (10%)	27 (90%)	0 (0%)	0	--
<b>Klamath</b>	41	2 (5%)	38 (93%)	1 (2%)	0	--
<b>Lake</b>	--	--	--	--	0	--

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

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Children with Health Insurance Information (Family Update)	Number (%) with Private Insurance	Number (%) with OHP	Number (%) with No Insurance	Number of Children Lacking Health Insurance at time of NBQ	Number (%) of These Children with Health Insurance at Most Recent Follow-Up
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	13	4 (31%)	9 (69%)	0 (0%)	1	1 (100%)
<b>Grant</b>	5	2 (40%)	3 (60%)	0 (0%)	1	1 (100%)
<b>Harney</b>	8	2 (25%)	6 (75%)	0 (0%)	0	--
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	71	1 (1%)	69 (97%)	1 (1%)	3	3 (100%)
<b>Gilliam</b>	3	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	1	1 (100%)
<b>Hood River</b>	36	0 (0%)	35 (97%)	1 (3%)	0	--
<b>Sherman</b>	--	--	--	--	0	--
<b>Wasco</b>	29	1 (3%)	28 (97%)	0 (0%)	2	2 (100%)
<b>Wheeler</b>	3	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	0	--
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	87	3 (3%)	83 (95%)	1 (1%)	1	0 (0%)
<b>Jackson</b>	47	1 (2%)	45 (96%)	1 (2%)	1	0 (0%)
<b>Josephine</b>	40	2 (5%)	38 (95%)	0 (0%)	0	--
<b>Lane</b>	139	13 (9%)	125 (90%)	1 (1%)	2	2 (100%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	237	5 (2%)	232 (98%)	0 (0%)	12	12 (100%)
<b>Marion</b>	218	3 (1%)	215 (99%)	0 (0%)	12	12 (100%)
<b>Polk</b>	19	2 (11%)	17 (89%)	0 (0%)	0	--

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

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Children with Health Insurance Information (Family Update)	Number (%) with Private Insurance	Number (%) with OHP	Number (%) with No Insurance	Number of Children Lacking Health Insurance at time of NBQ	Number (%) of These Children with Health Insurance at Most Recent Follow-Up
<b>Multnomah</b>	390	27 (7%)	361 (93%)	2 (1%)	11	11 (100%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	30	3 (10%)	27 (90%)	0 (0%)	6	6 (100%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	38	4 (11%)	34 (89%)	0 (0%)	4	4 (100%)
<b>Morrow</b>	5	1 (20%)	4 (80%)	0 (0%)	0	--
<b>Umatilla</b>	29	2 (7%)	27 (93%)	0 (0%)	4	4 (100%)
<b>Union</b>	4	1 (25%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	0	--
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	47	4 (9%)	43 (91%)	0 (0%)	1	1 (100%)
<b>Baker</b>	23	1 (4%)	22 (96%)	0 (0%)	1	1 (100%)
<b>Malheur</b>	20	3 (15%)	17 (85%)	0 (0%)	0	--
<b>Wallowa</b>	4	0 (0%)	4 (100%)	<b>0 (0%)</b>	0	--
<b>Washington</b>	139	13 (9%)	126 (91%)	0 (0%)	16	16 (100%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	37	3 (8%)	34 (92%)	0 (0%)	0	--
<b>State</b>	<b>1,617</b>	<b>114 (7%)</b>	<b>1,494 (92%)</b>	<b>9 (1%)</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>80 (99%)</b>

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

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of Children Reporting ER Use During Last 6 Months	Average Number Child ER Visits During Last 6 Months <sup>40</sup>	Average Number Child ER Visits During Last 6 Months <sup>41</sup>	Number (%) of Mothers Reporting ER Use During Last 6 Months	Average Number Mother ER Visits During Last 6 Months <sup>42</sup>	Average Number Mother ER Visits During Last 6 Months <sup>43</sup>
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	8 (18%)	2	0.27	7 (16%)	2	0.27
<b>Benton</b>	2 (9%)	2	0.14	1 (5%)	2	0.09
<b>Linn</b>	6 (27%)	2	0.41	6 (27%)	2	0.45
<b>Clackamas</b>	14 (15%)	1	0.16	7 (8%)	1	0.08
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	14 (20%)	1	0.25	12 (17%)	1	0.20
<b>Clatsop</b>	12 (28%)	1	0.35	10 (23%)	1	0.23
<b>Columbia</b>	2 (8%)	1	0.08	2 (8%)	2	0.15
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	1 (7%)	1	0.07	1 (7%)	2	0.14
<b>Coos</b>	0 (0%)		0.00	1 (20%)	2	0.40
<b>Curry</b>	1 (10%)	1	0.10	0 (0%)	--	0.00
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	24 (25%)	1	0.29	14 (15%)	3	0.45
<b>Crook</b>	6 (60%)	1	0.70	0 (0%)	--	0.00
<b>Deschutes</b>	16 (22%)	1	0.26	11 (15%)	2	0.29
<b>Jefferson</b>	2 (15%)	1	0.15	3 (23%)	7	1.69
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	24 (34%)	2	0.72	23 (33%)	2	0.69
<b>Douglas</b>	10 (33%)	2	0.70	8 (28%)	1	0.28
<b>Klamath</b>	14 (34%)	2	0.73	15 (37%)	3	0.98
<b>Lake</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--

<sup>40</sup> Of families reporting child had at least one ER visit in the past 6 months.

<sup>41</sup> Of all families responding to the ER use question (including those with no use) in the past 6 months.

<sup>42</sup> Of mothers reporting they had at least one ER visit in the past 6 months.

<sup>43</sup> Of mothers responding to the ER use question (including those with no use) in the past 6 months.

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

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of Children Reporting ER Use During Last 6 Months	Average Number Child ER Visits During Last 6 Months <sup>40</sup>	Average Number Child ER Visits During Last 6 Months <sup>41</sup>	Number (%) of Mothers Reporting ER Use During Last 6 Months	Average Number Mother ER Visits During Last 6 Months <sup>42</sup>	Average Number Mother ER Visits During Last 6 Months <sup>43</sup>
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	4 (31%)	1	0.38	2 (15%)	3	0.38
<b>Grant</b>	1 (20%)	1	0.20	0 (0%)	--	0.00
<b>Harney</b>	3 (38%)	1	0.50	2 (25%)	3	0.63
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	14 (21%)	1	0.22	11 (16%)	1	0.18
<b>Gilliam</b>	0 (0%)		0.00	1 (33%)	1	0.33
<b>Hood River</b>	5 (15%)	1	0.15	2 (6%)	2	0.09
<b>Sherman</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Wasco</b>	8 (29%)	1	0.29	8 (29%)	1	0.29
<b>Wheeler</b>	1 (33%)	2	0.67	0 (0%)		0.00
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	16 (18%)	1	0.22	21 (24%)	3	0.68
<b>Jackson</b>	12 (26%)	1	0.32	12 (26%)	4	0.94
<b>Josephine</b>	4 (10%)	1	0.10	9 (23%)	2	0.38
<b>Lane</b>	20 (14%)	1	0.19	19 (14%)	2	0.21
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	30 (13%)	1	0.18	19 (8%)	1	0.11
<b>Marion</b>	28 (13%)	1	0.19	14 (7%)	1	0.09
<b>Polk</b>	2 (11%)	1	0.11	5 (28%)	1	0.28

<sup>40</sup> Of families reporting child had at least one ER visit in the past 6 months.<sup>41</sup> Of all families responding to the ER use question (including those with no use) in the past 6 months.<sup>42</sup> Of mothers reporting they had at least one ER visit in the past 6 months.<sup>43</sup> Of mothers responding to the ER use question (including those with no use) in the past 6 months.

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

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of Children Reporting ER Use During Last 6 Months	Average Number Child ER Visits During Last 6 Months <sup>40</sup>	Average Number Child ER Visits During Last 6 Months <sup>41</sup>	Number (%) of Mothers Reporting ER Use During Last 6 Months	Average Number Mother ER Visits During Last 6 Months <sup>42</sup>	Average Number Mother ER Visits During Last 6 Months <sup>43</sup>
<b>Multnomah</b>	84 (22%)	2	0.46	54 (14%)	2	0.24
<b>Tillamook</b>	7 (24%)	3	0.76	4 (14%)	2	0.32
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	4 (11%)	2	0.24	3 (8%)	2	0.18
<b>Morrow</b>	1 (20%)	3	0.60	1 (20%)	3	0.60
<b>Umatilla</b>	1 (3%)	2	0.07	1 (3%)	1	0.03
<b>Union</b>	2 (50%)	2	1.00	1 (25%)	3	0.75
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	6 (13%)	1	0.17	6 (13%)	1	0.17
<b>Baker</b>	2 (9%)	1	0.09	3 (13%)	1	0.17
<b>Malheur</b>	2 (10%)	2	0.20	2 (10%)	2	0.15
<b>Wallowa</b>	2 (50%)	1	0.50	1 (25%)	1	0.25
<b>Washington</b>	25 (18%)	2	0.31	16 (12%)	1	0.15
<b>Yamhill</b>	10 (28%)	1	0.33	11 (31%)	1	0.42
<b>State</b>	<b>305 (19%)</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.31</b>	<b>230 (14%)</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.26</b>

<sup>40</sup> Of families reporting child had at least one ER visit in the past 6 months.

<sup>41</sup> Of all families responding to the ER use question (including those with no use) in the past 6 months.

<sup>42</sup> Of mothers reporting they had at least one ER visit in the past 6 months.

<sup>43</sup> Of mothers responding to the ER use question (including those with no use) in the past 6 months.

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

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) with Early Prenatal Care on Intake		Number (%) Children with Passive Smoke Exposure	
	First HV Prenatal Service <sup>44</sup>	First HV Postnatal Service <sup>45</sup>	First HV Prenatal Service	First HV Postnatal Service
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	5 (71%)	19 (86%)	2 (25%)	1 (5%)
<b>Benton</b>	2 (67%)	6 (75%)	2 (50%)	1 (13%)
<b>Linn</b>	3 (75%)	13 (93%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	2 (67%)	44 (85%)	0 (0%)	4 (8%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	5 (83%)	45 (82%)	1 (20%)	16 (29%)
<b>Clatsop</b>	2 (67%)	31 (79%)	0 (0%)	13 (33%)
<b>Columbia</b>	3 (100%)	14 (88%)	1 (50%)	3 (19%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	2 (100%)	--	0 (0%)	--
<b>Coos</b>	--	--	--	--
<b>Curry</b>	2 (100%)	--	0 (0%)	--
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	3 (75%)	37 (82%)	1 (20%)	9 (20%)
<b>Crook</b>	1 (100%)	3 (50%)	0 (0%)	2 (33%)
<b>Deschutes</b>	1 (50%)	24 (92%)	1 (33%)	5 (20%)
<b>Jefferson</b>	1 (100%)	10 (77%)	0 (0%)	2 (15%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	5 (63%)	28 (85%)	2 (25%)	10 (30%)
<b>Douglas</b>	1 (50%)	17 (85%)	1 (50%)	7 (35%)
<b>Klamath</b>	4 (67%)	11 (85%)	1 (17%)	3 (23%)
<b>Lake</b>	--	--	--	--

<sup>44</sup> Prenatal service families are those families who were both screened prenatally and began intensive service prenatally (as determined by the first home visit date occurring before the birth of the baby).

<sup>45</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>44</sup>	First HV Postnatal Service <sup>45</sup>	First HV Prenatal Service	First HV Postnatal Service
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	--	9 (75%)	--	2 (18%)
<b>Grant</b>	--	6 (100%)	--	1 (20%)
<b>Harney</b>	--	3 (50%)	--	1 (17%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	6 (86%)	13 (93%)	0 (0%)	2 (14%)
<b>Gilliam</b>	--	1 (100%)	--	0 (0%)
<b>Hood River</b>	5 (83%)	4 (80%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Sherman</b>	--	--	--	--
<b>Wasco</b>	1 (100%)	8 (100%)	0 (0%)	2 (25%)
<b>Wheeler</b>	--	--	--	--
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	3 (100%)	45 (85%)	1 (33%)	10 (19%)
<b>Jackson</b>	3 (100%)	20 (77%)	1 (33%)	4 (15%)
<b>Josephine</b>	--	25 (93%)	--	6 (22%)
<b>Lane</b>	8 (100%)	90 (84%)	3 (33%)	18 (17%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	22 (92%)	39 (74%)	1 (4%)	7 (13%)
<b>Marion</b>	22 (92%)	35 (71%)	1 (4%)	6 (12%)
<b>Polk</b>	--	4 (100%)	--	1 (25%)

<sup>44</sup> Prenatal service families are those families who were both screened prenatally and began intensive service prenatally (as determined by the first home visit date occurring before the birth of the baby).

<sup>45</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>44</sup>	First HV Postnatal Service <sup>45</sup>	First HV Prenatal Service	First HV Postnatal Service
<b>Multnomah</b>	8 (100%)	359 (84%)	0 (0%)	58 (13%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	13 (93%)	11 (79%)	3 (21%)	1 (7%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	4 (80%)	21 (78%)	0 (0%)	8 (30%)
<b>Morrow</b>	1 (50%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Umatilla</b>	2 (100%)	15 (75%)	0 (0%)	5 (25%)
<b>Union</b>	1 (100%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	3 (75%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	4 (80%)	10 (77%)	2 (40%)	7 (54%)
<b>Baker</b>	4 (100%)	4 (80%)	1 (25%)	4 (80%)
<b>Malheur</b>	0 (0%)	6 (75%)	1 (100%)	3 (38%)
<b>Wallowa</b>	--	--	--	--
<b>Washington</b>	5 (100%)	47 (82%)	0 (0%)	4 (7%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	4 (100%)	21 (95%)	2 (50%)	4 (18%)
<b>State</b>	<b>99 (88%)</b>	<b>838 (83%)</b>	<b>18 (16%)</b>	<b>161 (16%)</b>

<sup>44</sup> Prenatal service families are those families who were both screened prenatally and began intensive service prenatally (as determined by the first home visit date occurring before the birth of the baby).

<sup>45</sup> Postnatal service families are those families who began intensive service after the birth of the baby (the first home visit date is after the baby's date of birth).

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

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of Babies with Primary Health Care Providers		Number (%) of Mothers Breastfeeding		Number (%) of Babies Born Premature	
	First HV Prenatal Service	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>	8 (100%)	22 (100%)	6 (75%)	13 (59%)	0 (0%)	2 (10%)
<b>Benton</b>	4 (100%)	8 (100%)	2 (50%)	6 (75%)	0 (0%)	1 (14%)
<b>Linn</b>	4 (100%)	14 (100%)	4 (100%)	7 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (7%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	3 (100%)	46 (90%)	3 (100%)	39 (76%)	0 (0%)	5 (10%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	6 (100%)	54 (98%)	5 (83%)	40 (73%)	0 (0%)	10 (19%)
<b>Clatsop</b>	3 (100%)	38 (97%)	2 (67%)	28 (72%)	0 (0%)	8 (21%)
<b>Columbia</b>	3 (100%)	16 (100%)	3 (100%)	12 (75%)	0 (0%)	2 (13%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	2 (100%)	--	1 (50%)	--	0 (0%)	--
<b>Coos</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Curry</b>	2 (100%)	--	1 (50%)	--	0 (0%)	--
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	5 (100%)	44 (98%)	4 (80%)	30 (67%)	1 (20%)	4 (10%)
<b>Crook</b>	1 (100%)	6 (100%)	1 (100%)	4 (67%)	0 (0%)	1 (17%)
<b>Deschutes</b>	3 (100%)	25 (96%)	2 (67%)	16 (62%)	1 (33%)	2 (8%)
<b>Jefferson</b>	1 (100%)	13 (100%)	1 (100%)	10 (77%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	8 (100%)	32 (100%)	7 (88%)	20 (63%)	1 (13%)	5 (16%)
<b>Douglas</b>	2 (100%)	20 (100%)	1 (50%)	11 (58%)	1 (50%)	3 (16%)
<b>Klamath</b>	6 (100%)	12 (100%)	6 (100%)	9 (69%)	0 (0%)	2 (15%)
<b>Lake</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of Babies with Primary Health Care Providers		Number (%) of Mothers Breastfeeding		Number (%) of Babies Born Premature	
	First HV Prenatal Service	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>	--	12 (100%)	--	5 (42%)	--	1 (8%)
<b>Grant</b>	--	6 (100%)	--	3 (50%)	--	0 (0%)
<b>Harney</b>	--	6 (100%)	--	2 (33%)	--	1 (17%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	7 (100%)	14 (100%)	6 (86%)	11 (79%)	0 (0%)	1 (7%)
<b>Gilliam</b>	--	1 (100%)	--	0 (0%)	--	0 (0%)
<b>Hood River</b>	6 (100%)	5 (100%)	6 (100%)	5 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Sherman</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Wasco</b>	1 (100%)	8 (100%)	0 (0%)	6 (75%)	0 (0%)	1 (13%)
<b>Wheeler</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	3 (100%)	50 (94%)	3 (100%)	33 (63%)	1 (33%)	7 (13%)
<b>Jackson</b>	3 (100%)	23 (88%)	3 (100%)	13 (52%)	1 (33%)	5 (20%)
<b>Josephine</b>	--	27 (100%)	--	20 (74%)	--	2 (7%)
<b>Lane</b>	9 (100%)	107 (99%)	7 (88%)	83 (77%)	2 (22%)	10 (10%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	24 (100%)	54 (100%)	20 (87%)	39 (74%)	0 (0%)	8 (16%)
<b>Marion</b>	24 (100%)	50 (100%)	20 (87%)	36 (73%)	0 (0%)	6 (13%)
<b>Polk</b>	--	4 (100%)	--	3 (75%)	--	2 (50%)

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

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of Babies with Primary Health Care Providers		Number (%) of Mothers Breastfeeding		Number (%) of Babies Born Premature	
	First HV Prenatal Service	First HV Postnatal Service	First HV Prenatal Service	First HV Postnatal Service	First HV Prenatal Service	First HV Postnatal Service
<b>Multnomah</b>	8 (100%)	412 (96%)	8 (100%)	327 (76%)	1 (13%)	44 (10%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	13 (100%)	15 (100%)	11 (79%)	11 (73%)	1 (8%)	3 (21%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	5 (83%)	23 (92%)	5 (83%)	18 (69%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Morrow</b>	1 (50%)	3 (100%)	1 (50%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Umatilla</b>	3 (100%)	16 (89%)	3 (100%)	12 (63%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Union</b>	1 (100%)	4 (100%)	1 (100%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	5 (100%)	13 (100%)	5 (100%)	5 (38%)	1 (20%)	2 (15%)
<b>Baker</b>	4 (100%)	5 (100%)	4 (100%)	2 (40%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)
<b>Malheur</b>	1 (100%)	8 (100%)	1 (100%)	3 (38%)	0 (0%)	2 (25%)
<b>Wallowa</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Washington</b>	5 (100%)	56 (98%)	5 (100%)	45 (79%)	0 (0%)	2 (4%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	4 (100%)	19 (90%)	4 (100%)	16 (73%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)
<b>State</b>	<b>115 (99%)</b>	<b>973 (97%)</b>	<b>100 (87%)</b>	<b>735 (73%)</b>	<b>8 (7%)</b>	<b>105 (11%)</b>

**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>	43	35 (81%)	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Benton	14	9 (64%)	0	--	--
Linn	29	26 (90%)	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	118	97 (82%)	3	3 (100%)	3 (100%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	98	78 (80%)	0	--	--
Clatsop	58	45 (78%)	0	--	--
Columbia	40	33 (83%)	0	--	--
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	16	15 (94%)	0	--	--
Coos	9	9 (100%)	0	--	--
Curry	7	6 (86%)	0	--	--
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	129	115 (89%)	1	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Crook	13	9 (69%)	1	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Deschutes	101	94 (93%)	0	--	--
Jefferson	15	12 (80%)	0	--	--
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	65	57 (88%)	3	2 (67%)	3 (100%)
Douglas	34	30 (88%)	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Klamath	31	27 (87%)	2	1 (50%)	2 (100%)
Lake	0	--	--	--	--

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

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Intensive Service Families with Information on Prenatal Care (All Families)	Number (%) with Adequate Prenatal Care for Initial Pregnancy (All Families)	Number of Intensive Service Families with Second Pregnancy	Number (%) with Adequate Prenatal Care for Initial Pregnancy (Families with Subsequent Birth)	Number (%) with Adequate Prenatal Care for Second Pregnancy
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	14	10 (71%)	1	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
<b>Grant</b>	6	6 (100%)	0	--	--
<b>Harney</b>	8	4 (50%)	1	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	92	85 (92%)	2	2 (100%)	2 (100%)
<b>Gilliam</b>	5	5 (100%)	0	--	--
<b>Hood River</b>	45	42 (93%)	0	--	--
<b>Sherman</b>	0	--	0	--	--
<b>Wasco</b>	38	35 (92%)	2	2 (100%)	2 (100%)
<b>Wheeler</b>	4	3 (75%)	0	--	--
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	128	111 (87%)	3	2 (67%)	3 (100%)
<b>Jackson</b>	70	58 (83%)	2	1 (50%)	2 (100%)
<b>Josephine</b>	58	53 (91%)	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
<b>Lane</b>	176	142 (81%)	4	4 (100%)	4 (100%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	296	235 (79%)	14	12 (86%)	14 (100%)
<b>Marion</b>	273	216 (79%)	13	11 (85%)	13 (100%)
<b>Polk</b>	23	19 (83%)	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)

**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>Multnomah</b>	528	443 (84%)	15	14 (93%)	15 (100%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	40	35 (88%)	0	--	--
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	38	31 (82%)	1	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
<b>Morrow</b>	7	6 (86%)	0	--	--
<b>Umatilla</b>	25	20 (80%)	1	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
<b>Union</b>	6	5 (83%)	0	--	--
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	52	44 (85%)	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
<b>Baker</b>	26	22 (85%)	0	--	--
<b>Malheur</b>	22	18 (82%)	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
<b>Wallowa</b>	4	4 (100%)	0	--	--
<b>Washington</b>	170	148 (87%)	4	4 (100%)	4 (100%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	47	44 (94%)	3	3 (100%)	3 (100%)
<b>State</b>	<b>2,050</b>	<b>1,725 (84%)</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>48 (86%)</b>	<b>56 (100%)</b>

**Table 20a. HOME Observation/Score**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number of Families with HOME<sup>46</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>	21	18 (86%)	19 (79%)
<b>Benton</b>	12	10 (83%)	13 (87%)
<b>Linn</b>	9	8 (89%)	6 (67%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	60	49 (82%)	51 (75%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	34	31 (91%)	40 (89%)
<b>Clatsop</b>	21	18 (86%)	25 (86%)
<b>Columbia</b>	13	13 (100%)	15 (94%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	5	4 (80%)	4 (80%)
<b>Coos</b>	1	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Curry</b>	4	4 (100%)	4 (100%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	65	51 (78%)	52 (79%)
<b>Crook</b>	5	5 (100%)	4 (80%)
<b>Deschutes</b>	49	40 (82%)	38 (78%)
<b>Jefferson</b>	11	6 (55%)	10 (83%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	33	24 (73%)	31 (65%)
<b>Douglas</b>	16	11 (69%)	15 (71%)
<b>Klamath</b>	17	13 (76%)	16 (59%)
<b>Lake</b>	0	--	--

<sup>46</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 Observation/Score

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Families with HOME <sup>46</sup> Score Information (at 12 Months)	Number (%) of Families with “Good” or Higher HOME Score (at 12 Months)	Number (%) of parents Reading (at Least) Daily to Child (at 12 Months)
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	10	7 (70%)	3 (33%)
<b>Grant</b>	5	3 (60%)	0 (0%)
<b>Harney</b>	5	4 (80%)	3 (60%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	49	43 (88%)	44 (81%)
<b>Gilliam</b>	3	2 (67%)	3 (100%)
<b>Hood River</b>	22	21 (95%)	22 (88%)
<b>Sherman</b>	0	--	--
<b>Wasco</b>	21	18 (86%)	16 (70%)
<b>Wheeler</b>	3	2 (67%)	3 (100%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	50	42 (84%)	35 (74%)
<b>Jackson</b>	26	23 (88%)	22 (85%)
<b>Josephine</b>	24	19 (79%)	13 (62%)
<b>Lane</b>	89	82 (92%)	80 (70%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	146	109 (75%)	87 (57%)
<b>Marion</b>	136	101 (74%)	80 (58%)
<b>Polk</b>	10	8 (80%)	7 (54%)

<sup>46</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 Observation/Score**

<i>Program/County</i>	<b>Number of Families with HOME<sup>46</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>	256	226 (88%)	185 (72%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	19	17 (89%)	9 (45%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	22	16 (73%)	13 (57%)
<b>Morrow</b>	4	2 (50%)	2 (67%)
<b>Umatilla</b>	18	14 (78%)	10 (53%)
<b>Union</b>	0	--	1 (100%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	25	24 (96%)	20 (69%)
<b>Baker</b>	10	10 (100%)	9 (69%)
<b>Malheur</b>	13	12 (92%)	10 (71%)
<b>Wallowa</b>	2	2 (100%)	1 (50%)
<b>Washington</b>	97	90 (93%)	66 (69%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	29	24 (83%)	22 (73%)
<b>State</b>	<b>1,010</b>	<b>857 (85%)</b>	<b>761 (70%)</b>

<sup>46</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. Developmental Screening<sup>47</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Children Eligible for a Developmental Screening	Number (%) of Eligible Children with at Least One Developmental Screening	Number (%) Children with a Diagnosed Developmental Delay <sup>48</sup>	Percentage of Children with a Diagnosed Developmental Delay Receiving Early Intervention Services
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	54	44 (81%)	3 (10%)	2 (67%)
<b>Benton</b>	23	20 (87%)	2 (15%)	1 (50%)
<b>Linn</b>	31	24 (77%)	1 (6%)	1 (100%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	94	93 (99%)	4 (5%)	3 (75%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	67	63 (94%)	1 (2%)	1 (100%)
<b>Clatsop</b>	--	--	--	--
<b>Columbia</b>	--	--	--	--
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	24	22 (92%)	3 (25%)	3 (100%)
<b>Coos</b>	--	--	--	--
<b>Curry</b>	--	--	--	--
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	101	95 (94%)	9 (10%)	9 (100%)
<b>Crook</b>	12	10 (83%)	2 (20%)	2 (100%)
<b>Deschutes</b>	74	71 (96%)	2 (3%)	2 (100%)
<b>Jefferson</b>	15	14 (93%)	5 (31%)	5 (100%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	91	84 (92%)	3 (6%)	3 (100%)
<b>Douglas</b>	39	36 (92%)	0 (0%)	--
<b>Klamath</b>	49	46 (94%)	3 (14%)	3 (100%)
<b>Lake</b>	3	2 (67%)	--	--

<sup>47</sup> Intensive Service children are screened for normal growth and development using the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ).

<sup>48</sup> Note that these diagnoses are not provided by Healthy Families Oregon staff.

**Table 20b. Developmental Screening<sup>47</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Children Eligible for a Developmental Screening	Number (%) of Eligible Children with at Least One Developmental Screening	Number (%) Children with a Diagnosed Developmental Delay <sup>48</sup>	Percentage of Children with a Diagnosed Developmental Delay Receiving Early Intervention Services
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	12	11 (92%)	1 (9%)	1 (100%)
Grant	--	--	--	--
Harney	--	--	--	--
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	49	49 (100%)	0 (0%)	--
Gilliam	--	--	--	--
Hood River	--	--	--	--
Sherman	--	--	--	--
Wasco	--	--	--	--
Wheeler	--	--	--	--
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	95	92 (97%)	1 (1%)	1 (100%)
Jackson	22	21 (95%)	0 (0%)	--
Josephine	73	71 (97%)	1 (2%)	1 (100%)
<b>Lane</b>	108	98 (91%)	4 (4%)	4 (100%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	247	228 (92%)	8 (4%)	6 (75%)
Marion	--	--	--	--
Polk	--	--	--	--

<sup>47</sup> Intensive Service children are screened for normal growth and development using the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ).

<sup>48</sup> Note that these diagnoses are not provided by Healthy Families Oregon staff.

**Table 20b. Developmental Screening<sup>47</sup>**

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Children Eligible for a Developmental Screening	Number (%) of Eligible Children with at Least One Developmental Screening	Number (%) Children with a Diagnosed Developmental Delay <sup>48</sup>	Percentage of Children with a Diagnosed Developmental Delay Receiving Early Intervention Services
<b>Multnomah</b>	402	372 (93%)	18 (6%)	17 (94%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	28	26 (93%)	1 (4%)	1 (100%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	54	45 (83%)	1 (4%)	1 (100%)
<b>Morrow</b>	--	--	--	--
<b>Umatilla</b>	--	--	--	--
<b>Union</b>	--	--	--	--
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	55	49 (89%)	0 (0%)	--
<b>Baker</b>	--	--	--	--
<b>Malheur</b>	--	--	--	--
<b>Wallowa</b>	--	--	--	--
<b>Washington</b>	135	126 (93%)	8 (7%)	6 (75%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	46	43 (93%)	0 (0%)	--
<b>State</b>	<b>1,662</b>	<b>1,540 (93%)</b>	<b>65 (5%)</b>	<b>58 (89%)</b>

<sup>47</sup> Intensive Service children are screened for normal growth and development using the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ).<sup>48</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>49</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 (%) of Families Declining Early Intervention Services	Total Number (%) Receiving at Least ONE Follow-Up Service or Action
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	35 (80%)	3 (7%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)
<b>Benton</b>	18 (90%)	1 (5%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
<b>Linn</b>	17 (71%)	2 (8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	77 (83%)	4 (4%)	2 (50%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	3 (75%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	56 (89%)	2 (3%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
<b>Clatsop</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Columbia</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	13 (59%)	2 (9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
<b>Coos</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Curry</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	80 (84%)	2 (2%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
<b>Crook</b>	4 (40%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
<b>Deschutes</b>	69 (97%)	1 (1%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
<b>Jefferson</b>	7 (50%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	79 (94%)	1 (1%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
<b>Douglas</b>	33 (92%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Klamath</b>	44 (96%)	1 (2%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
<b>Lake</b>	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--

<sup>49</sup> Typical development and early intervention are measured using the Ages and States Questionnaire and are reported on the Family Update form completed by the Healthy Families Oregon Home Visitor. For FY 16-17 these data were reported via Excel spreadsheets maintained by the program.

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

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) with Typical Development <sup>49</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 (%) of Families Declining Early Intervention Services	Total Number (%) Receiving at Least ONE Follow-Up Service or Action
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	5 (45%)	2 (18%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
<b>Grant</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Harney</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	39 (80%)	6 (12%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Gilliam</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Hood River</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Sherman</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Wasco</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Wheeler</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	67 (73%)	5 (5%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	4 (80%)	0 (0%)	5 (100%)
<b>Jackson</b>	17 (81%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Josephine</b>	50 (70%)	5 (7%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	4 (80%)	0 (0%)	5 (100%)
<b>Lane</b>	88 (90%)	5 (5%)	4 (80%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	4 (80%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	168 (74%)	21 (9%)	7 (33%)	3 (14%)	5 (24%)	6 (29%)	15 (71%)
<b>Marion</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Polk</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

<sup>49</sup> Typical development and early intervention are measured using the Ages and States Questionnaire and are reported on the Family Update form completed by the Healthy Families Oregon Home Visitor. For FY 16-17 these data were reported via Excel spreadsheets maintained by the program.

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

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) with Typical Development <sup>49</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 (%) of Families Declining Early Intervention Services	Total Number (%) Receiving at Least ONE Follow-Up Service or Action
<b>Multnomah</b>	317 (86%)	18 (5%)	5 (28%)	1 (6%)	4 (22%)	7 (39%)	10 (56%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	20 (77%)	2 (8%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	35 (78%)	3 (7%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	2 (67%)
<b>Morrow</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Umatilla</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Union</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	37 (76%)	3 (6%)	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)
<b>Baker</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Malheur</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Wallowa</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Washington</b>	--	--	--	--	--	1 (14%)	6 (86%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	39 (91%)	2 (5%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
<b>State</b>	<b>1,263 (82%)</b>	<b>88 (6%)</b>	<b>29 (33%)</b>	<b>9 (10%)</b>	<b>25 (28%)</b>	<b>18 (20%)</b>	<b>63 (72%)</b>

<sup>49</sup> Typical development and early intervention are measured using the Ages and States Questionnaire and are completed by the Healthy Families Oregon Home Visitor. For FY 16-17 these data were reported via Excel spreadsheets maintained by the program.

**Table 22. Social Emotional Developmental Screening (ASQ-SE) Results & Subsequent Actions<sup>50</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>	33 (87%)	1 (3%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
<b>Benton</b>	20 (95%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Linn</b>	13 (76%)	1 (6%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	78 (94%)	3 (4%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	65 (96%)	2 (3%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
<b>Clatsop</b>	41 (95%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
<b>Columbia</b>	24 (96%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	11 (92%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
<b>Coos</b>	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
<b>Curry</b>	8 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	87 (94%)	5 (5%)	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	2 (40%)
<b>Crook</b>	10 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Deschutes</b>	64 (91%)	5 (7%)	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	2 (40%)
<b>Jefferson</b>	13 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	55 (85%)	4 (6%)	3 (75%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	4 (100%)
<b>Douglas</b>	23 (85%)	1 (4%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
<b>Klamath</b>	32 (84%)	3 (8%)	2 (67%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)
<b>Lake</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

<sup>50</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>50</sup>**

Program/County	Number (%) Scoring Typical on Most Recent ASQ-SE	Number (%) with Delay Indicated on Most Recent (ASQ-SE)	Of those with delays indicated (note that multiple actions can be taken):						
			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>	11 (92%)	1 (8%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
<b>Grant</b>	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
<b>Harney</b>	8 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	62 (98%)	1 (2%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
<b>Gilliam</b>	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Hood River</b>	33 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Sherman</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Wasco</b>	25 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Wheeler</b>	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	71 (91%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
<b>Jackson</b>	40 (95%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
<b>Josephine</b>	31 (86%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Lane</b>	125 (95%)	2 (2%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	201 (94%)	4 (2%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	2 (50%)
<b>Marion</b>	188 (95%)	3 (2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)
<b>Polk</b>	13 (81%)	1 (6%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)

<sup>50</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>50</sup>**

			<i>Of those with delays indicated (note that multiple actions can be taken):</i>						
<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) Scoring Typical on Most Recent ASQ-SE	Number (%) with Delay Indicated on Most Recent (ASQ-SE)	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>	347 (94%)	10 (3%)	5 (50%)	3 (30%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (40%)	0 (0%)	7 (70%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	26 (90%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	33 (92%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Morrow</b>	5 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Umatilla</b>	24 (89%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Union</b>	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	43 (98%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
<b>Baker</b>	20 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Malheur</b>	19 (95%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
<b>Wallowa</b>	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Washington</b>	120 (93%)	2 (2%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	35 (97%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>State</b>	<b>1,403 (93%)</b>	<b>39 (3%)</b>	<b>16 (41%)</b>	<b>16 (41%)</b>	<b>1 (3%)</b>	<b>1 (3%)</b>	<b>14 (36%)</b>	<b>0 (0%)</b>	<b>29 (74%)</b>

<sup>50</sup> The Home Visitor provides ASQ-SE information on the Family Update form.

**Table 23. Connection to Essential Resources for Intensive Service Families**

Program/County	Number Needing and Connected to Service at 6 Months (% Connected)							
	Drug/Alcohol		Domestic Violence		Public Health Nursing		TANF	
	Number Referred	Number (%) Connected	Number Referred	Number (%) Connected	Number Referred	Number (%) Connected	Number Referred	Number (%) Connected
<b>Benton &amp; Linn</b>	0	--	1	1 (100%)	1	1 (100%)	0	--
Benton	0	--	1	1 (100%)	1	1 (100%)	0	--
Linn	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--
<b>Clackamas</b>	2	0 (0%)	5	1 (25%)	6	6 (100%)	10	5 (56%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	2	2 (100%)	3	1 (33%)	0	--	6	4 (67%)
Clatsop	0	--	0	--	0	--	1	1 (100%)
Columbia	2	2 (100%)	3	1 (33%)	0	--	5	3 (60%)
<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	4 (80%)	4	4 (100%)	1	1 (100%)	8	8 (100%)
Crook	0	--	0	--	1	1 (100%)	1	1 (100%)
Deschutes	4	3 (75%)	4	4 (100%)	0	--	6	6 (100%)
Jefferson	1	1 (100%)	0	--	0	--	1	1 (100%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	6	6 (100%)	6	4 (67%)	3	3 (100%)	14	13 (93%)
Douglas	3	3 (100%)	3	2 (67%)	0	--	3	2 (67%)
Klamath	3	3 (100%)	3	2 (67%)	3	3 (100%)	11	11 (100%)
Lake	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--

**Table 23. Connection to Essential Resources for Intensive Service Families**

<i>Program/County</i>	<i>Number Needing and Connected to Service at 6 Months (% Connected)</i>							
	<b>Drug/Alcohol</b>		<b>Domestic Violence</b>		<b>Public Health Nursing</b>		<b>TANF</b>	
	<b>Number Referred</b>	<b>Number (%) Connected</b>	<b>Number Referred</b>	<b>Number (%) Connected</b>	<b>Number Referred</b>	<b>Number (%) Connected</b>	<b>Number Referred</b>	<b>Number (%) Connected</b>
<b>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	1	0 (0%)	0	--	3	2 (67%)	2	2 (100%)
<b>Grant</b>	0	--	0	--	3	2 (67%)	0	--
<b>Harney</b>	1	0 (0%)	0	--	0	--	2	2 (100%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	3	1 (33%)	4	1 (25%)	11	11 (100%)	3	3 (100%)
<b>Gilliam</b>	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--
<b>Hood River</b>	1	1 (100%)	0	--	7	7 (100%)	1	1 (100%)
<b>Sherman</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Wasco</b>	2	0 (0%)	4	1 (25%)	4	4 (100%)	2	2 (100%)
<b>Wheeler</b>	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	3	2 (67%)	3	2 (67%)	0	--	4	2 (50%)
<b>Jackson</b>	2	2 (100%)	2	1 (50%)	0	--	2	2 (100%)
<b>Josephine</b>	1	0 (0%)	1	1 (100%)	0	--	2	0 (0%)
<b>Lane</b>	2	1 (50%)	6	5 (83%)	1	0 (0%)	11	5 (45%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	3	1 (33%)	5	3 (60%)	4	4 (80%)	12	12 (75%)
<b>Marion</b>	3	1 (33%)	5	3 (60%)	1	3 (75%)	4	8 (67%)
<b>Polk</b>	0	--	0	--	5	1 (100%)	16	4 (100%)

**Table 23. Connection to Essential Resources for Intensive Service Families**

<i>Program/County</i>	<i>Number Needing and Connected to Service at 6 Months (% Connected)</i>							
	<b>Drug/Alcohol</b>		<b>Domestic Violence</b>		<b>Public Health Nursing</b>		<b>TANF</b>	
	<b>Number Referred</b>	<b>Number (%) Connected</b>	<b>Number Referred</b>	<b>Number (%) Connected</b>	<b>Number Referred</b>	<b>Number (%) Connected</b>	<b>Number Referred</b>	<b>Number (%) Connected</b>
<b>Multnomah</b>	5	3 (60%)	8	5 (63%)	4	3 (75%)	25	17 (71%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	2	1 (50%)	1	1 (100%)	1	1 (100%)	6	4 (67%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	0	--	0	--	0	--	2	2 (100%)
<b>Morrow</b>	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--
<b>Umatilla</b>	0	--	0	--	0	--	1	1 (100%)
<b>Union</b>	0	--	0	--	0	--	1	1 (100%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	1	1 (100%)	4	3 (75%)	2	1 (50%)	2	2 (100%)
<b>Baker</b>	1	1 (100%)	3	2 (67%)	2	1 (50%)	2	2 (100%)
<b>Malheur</b>	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--
<b>Wallowa</b>	0	--	1	1 (100%)	0	--	0	--
<b>Washington</b>	1	0 (0%)	3	1 (33%)	4	2 (67%)	7	6 (86%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	0	--	3	2 (67%)	6	4 (80%)	4	0 (0%)
<b>State</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>22 (61%)</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>34 (62%)</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>39 (85%)</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>85 (73%)</b>

**Table 24a. Family Outcomes and Life Events at 6 Months<sup>51</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>	4 (11%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)
Benton	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)
Linn	4 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	14 (15%)	1 (1%)	2 (2%)	3 (3%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	10 (14%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)
Clatsop	6 (14%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)
Columbia	4 (15%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	2 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Coos	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Curry	2 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	35 (38%)	4 (4%)	10 (11%)	1 (1%)
Crook	5 (56%)	0 (0%)	3 (33%)	0 (0%)
Deschutes	25 (36%)	4 (6%)	6 (9%)	1 (2%)
Jefferson	5 (38%)	0 (0%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	23 (35%)	3 (5%)	4 (6%)	3 (5%)
Douglas	12 (44%)	0 (0%)	3 (11%)	2 (7%)
Klamath	11 (29%)	3 (8%)	1 (3%)	1 (3%)
Lake	--	--	--	--

<sup>51</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>51</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>	3 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Grant</b>	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Harney</b>	2 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	10 (14%)	3 (4%)	1 (1%)	2 (3%)
<b>Gilliam</b>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Hood River</b>	5 (14%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Sherman</b>	--	--	--	--
<b>Wasco</b>	4 (14%)	2 (7%)	1 (3%)	2 (7%)
<b>Wheeler</b>	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	28 (33%)	1 (1%)	7 (8%)	5 (6%)
<b>Jackson</b>	23 (52%)	0 (0%)	7 (16%)	5 (11%)
<b>Josephine</b>	5 (13%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Lane</b>	30 (22%)	0 (0%)	5 (4%)	4 (3%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	47 (21%)	6 (3%)	4 (2%)	6 (3%)
<b>Marion</b>	45 (22%)	6 (3%)	4 (2%)	5 (2%)
<b>Polk</b>	2 (11%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)

<sup>51</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>51</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>	70 (19%)	3 (1%)	13 (4%)	4 (1%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	6 (21%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	6 (22%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)
<b>Morrow</b>	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Umatilla</b>	3 (15%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Union</b>	2 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	13 (29%)	0 (0%)	4 (9%)	2 (5%)
<b>Baker</b>	6 (27%)	0 (0%)	4 (18%)	1 (5%)
<b>Malheur</b>	6 (32%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (6%)
<b>Wallowa</b>	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Washington</b>	19 (15%)	0 (0%)	3 (2%)	3 (2%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	10 (28%)	1 (3%)	2 (6%)	2 (6%)
<b>State</b>	<b>330 (22%)</b>	<b>23 (2%)</b>	<b>59 (4%)</b>	<b>37 (2%)</b>

<sup>51</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>52</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>	3 (20%)	0 (0%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)
Benton	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Linn	3 (33%)	0 (0%)	1 (11%)	1 (11%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	12 (34%)	1 (3%)	2 (6%)	0 (0%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	6 (25%)	0 (0%)	2 (8%)	0 (0%)
Clatsop	4 (24%)	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)
Columbia	2 (29%)	0 (0%)	1 (14%)	0 (0%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Coos	--	--	--	--
Curry	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	17 (40%)	3 (7%)	3 (7%)	1 (2%)
Crook	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)
Deschutes	10 (33%)	2 (7%)	1 (3%)	1 (3%)
Jefferson	5 (56%)	1 (11%)	1 (11%)	0 (0%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	5 (17%)	2 (7%)	2 (7%)	1 (3%)
Douglas	3 (18%)	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)
Klamath	2 (17%)	2 (17%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)
Lake	--	--	--	--

<sup>52</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>52</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>	2 (29%)	0 (0%)	1 (14%)	1 (14%)
<b>Grant</b>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Harney</b>	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	1 (33%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	3 (13%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	3 (13%)
<b>Gilliam</b>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Hood River</b>	2 (18%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (9%)
<b>Sherman</b>	--	--	--	--
<b>Wasco</b>	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	2 (20%)
<b>Wheeler</b>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	10 (59%)	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)
<b>Jackson</b>	6 (60%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)
<b>Josephine</b>	4 (57%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Lane</b>	16 (24%)	1 (2%)	3 (5%)	1 (2%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	27 (39%)	2 (3%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)
<b>Marion</b>	24 (38%)	2 (3%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)
<b>Polk</b>	3 (60%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

<sup>52</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>52</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>	61 (32%)	2 (1%)	7 (4%)	2 (1%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	5 (36%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	1 (9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)
<b>Morrow</b>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Umatilla</b>	1 (11%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (13%)
<b>Union</b>	--	--	--	--
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	6 (35%)	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)
<b>Baker</b>	3 (43%)	0 (0%)	1 (14%)	0 (0%)
<b>Malheur</b>	2 (22%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Wallowa</b>	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Washington</b>	8 (13%)	3 (5%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	5 (33%)	0 (0%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)
<b>State</b>	<b>190 (30%)</b>	<b>15 (2%)</b>	<b>26 (4%)</b>	<b>14 (2%)</b>

<sup>52</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>53</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>	38	25 (66%)	23	14 (61%)
Benton	15	11 (73%)	14	9 (64%)
Linn	23	14 (61%)	9	5 (56%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	89	76 (85%)	68	51 (75%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	66	47 (71%)	41	30 (73%)
Clatsop	43	29 (67%)	28	19 (68%)
Columbia	23	18 (78%)	13	11 (85%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	10	7 (70%)	5	3 (60%)
Coos	2	2 (100%)	1	1 (100%)
Curry	8	5 (63%)	4	2 (50%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	89	63 (71%)	65	52 (80%)
Crook	8	4 (50%)	5	4 (80%)
Deschutes	68	46 (68%)	48	38 (79%)
Jefferson	13	13 (100%)	12	10 (83%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	62	44 (71%)	48	37 (77%)
Douglas	25	17 (68%)	21	18 (86%)
Klamath	37	27 (73%)	27	19 (70%)
Lake	0	--	0	--

<sup>53</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>53</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>	12	8 (67%)	9	5 (56%)
<b>Grant</b>	4	3 (75%)	4	2 (50%)
<b>Harney</b>	8	5 (63%)	5	3 (60%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	69	40 (58%)	53	36 (68%)
<b>Gilliam</b>	3	3 (100%)	3	3 (100%)
<b>Hood River</b>	34	20 (59%)	24	17 (71%)
<b>Sherman</b>	0	--	0	--
<b>Wasco</b>	29	16 (55%)	23	14 (61%)
<b>Wheeler</b>	3	1 (33%)	3	2 (67%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	80	51 (64%)	47	29 (62%)
<b>Jackson</b>	42	27 (64%)	26	19 (73%)
<b>Josephine</b>	38	24 (63%)	21	10 (48%)
<b>Lane</b>	131	92 (70%)	113	85 (75%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	199	125 (63%)	152	102 (67%)
<b>Marion</b>	183	115 (63%)	139	91 (65%)
<b>Polk</b>	16	10 (63%)	13	11 (85%)

<sup>53</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>53</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>	334	189 (57%)	253	141 (56%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	25	15 (60%)	20	12 (60%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	23	14 (61%)	23	13 (57%)
<b>Morrow</b>	3	3 (100%)	3	1 (33%)
<b>Umatilla</b>	17	9 (53%)	19	12 (63%)
<b>Union</b>	3	2 (67%)	1	0 (0%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	40	32 (80%)	29	23 (79%)
<b>Baker</b>	19	14 (74%)	13	10 (77%)
<b>Malheur</b>	17	16 (94%)	14	11 (79%)
<b>Wallowa</b>	4	2 (50%)	2	2 (100%)
<b>Washington</b>	124	87 (70%)	95	64 (67%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	35	28 (80%)	30	25 (83%)
<b>State</b>	<b>1,426</b>	<b>943 (66%)</b>	<b>1,074</b>	<b>722 (67%)</b>

<sup>53</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>54</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>	37	19 (51%)	23	13 (57%)
Benton	14	8 (57%)	14	9 (64%)
Linn	23	11 (48%)	9	4 (44%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	88	61 (69%)	66	44 (67%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	64	34 (53%)	38	25 (66%)
Clatsop	42	19 (45%)	27	16 (59%)
Columbia	22	15 (68%)	11	9 (82%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	9	4 (44%)	5	3 (60%)
Coos	2	1 (50%)	1	1 (100%)
Curry	7	3 (43%)	4	2 (50%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	85	49 (58%)	63	45 (71%)
Crook	8	3 (38%)	4	2 (50%)
Deschutes	64	38 (59%)	48	33 (69%)
Jefferson	13	8 (62%)	11	10 (91%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	60	39 (65%)	47	34 (72%)
Douglas	24	16 (67%)	21	16 (76%)
Klamath	36	23 (64%)	26	18 (69%)
Lake	0	--	0	--

<sup>54</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>54</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>	12	8 (67%)	8	4 (50%)
<b>Grant</b>	4	4 (100%)	3	2 (67%)
<b>Harney</b>	8	4 (50%)	5	2 (40%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	61	34 (56%)	49	29 (59%)
<b>Gilliam</b>	2	1 (50%)	3	2 (67%)
<b>Hood River</b>	28	21 (75%)	22	16 (73%)
<b>Sherman</b>	0	--	0	--
<b>Wasco</b>	28	11 (39%)	21	10 (48%)
<b>Wheeler</b>	3	1 (33%)	3	1 (33%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	80	37 (46%)	47	24 (51%)
<b>Jackson</b>	42	22 (52%)	26	15 (58%)
<b>Josephine</b>	38	15 (39%)	21	9 (43%)
<b>Lane</b>	125	71 (57%)	111	64 (58%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	195	107 (55%)	148	84 (57%)
<b>Marion</b>	180	97 (54%)	135	74 (55%)
<b>Polk</b>	15	10 (67%)	13	10 (77%)

<sup>54</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>54</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>	321	163 (51%)	232	126 (54%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	25	14 (56%)	18	12 (67%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	23	11 (48%)	23	12 (52%)
<b>Morrow</b>	3	2 (67%)	3	2 (67%)
<b>Umatilla</b>	17	7 (41%)	19	10 (53%)
<b>Union</b>	3	2 (67%)	1	0 (0%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	39	27 (69%)	29	17 (59%)
<b>Baker</b>	18	14 (78%)	13	8 (62%)
<b>Malheur</b>	17	12 (71%)	14	8 (57%)
<b>Wallowa</b>	4	1 (25%)	2	1 (50%)
<b>Washington</b>	119	69 (58%)	91	59 (65%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	33	17 (52%)	29	19 (66%)
<b>State</b>	<b>1,376</b>	<b>764 (56%)</b>	<b>1,027</b>	<b>614 (60%)</b>

<sup>54</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>55</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>	35	34 (97%)	31	27 (87%)	46	46 (100%)
<b>Benton</b>	19	19 (100%)	16	15 (94%)	24	24 (100%)
<b>Linn</b>	16	15 (94%)	15	12 (80%)	22	22 (100%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	79	78 (99%)	80	72 (90%)	90	90 (100%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	38	38 (100%)	47	41 (87%)	69	69 (100%)
<b>Clatsop</b>	20	20 (100%)	24	18 (75%)	44	44 (100%)
<b>Columbia</b>	18	18 (100%)	23	23 (100%)	25	25 (100%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	9	9 (100%)	10	7 (70%)	12	12 (100%)
<b>Coos</b>	3	3 (100%)	2	0 (0%)	4	4 (100%)
<b>Curry</b>	6	6 (100%)	8	7 (88%)	8	8 (100%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp;</b>	61	59 (97%)	88	85 (97%)	97	96 (99%)
<b>Crook</b>	4	3 (75%)	8	8 (100%)	9	9 (100%)
<b>Deschutes</b>	46	45 (98%)	68	67 (99%)	73	72 (99%)
<b>Jefferson</b>	11	11 (100%)	12	10 (83%)	15	15 (100%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	63	63 (100%)	66	62 (94%)	70	70 (100%)
<b>Douglas</b>	24	24 (100%)	26	23 (88%)	29	29 (100%)
<b>Klamath</b>	39	39 (100%)	40	39 (98%)	41	41 (100%)
<b>Lake</b>	0	--	0	--	0	--

<sup>55</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>55</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>	5	5 (100%)	12	10 (83%)	13	13 (100%)
<b>Grant</b>	2	2 (100%)	4	4 (100%)	5	5 (100%)
<b>Harney</b>	3	3 (100%)	8	6 (75%)	8	8 (100%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	56	56 (100%)	63	58 (92%)	70	70 (100%)
<b>Gilliam</b>	2	2 (100%)	1	1 (100%)	3	3 (100%)
<b>Hood River</b>	30	30 (100%)	32	30 (94%)	34	34 (100%)
<b>Sherman</b>	0	--	0	--	0	--
<b>Wasco</b>	21	21 (100%)	27	26 (96%)	29	29 (100%)
<b>Wheeler</b>	3	3 (100%)	3	1 (33%)	4	4 (100%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	51	49 (96%)	73	68 (93%)	83	83 (100%)
<b>Jackson</b>	30	29 (97%)	42	37 (88%)	45	45 (100%)
<b>Josephine</b>	21	20 (95%)	31	31 (100%)	38	38 (100%)
<b>Lane</b>	86	75 (87%)	121	116 (96%)	134	133 (99%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	199	195 (98%)	205	179 (87%)	222	221 (100%)
<b>Marion</b>	182	179 (98%)	189	165 (87%)	204	204 (100%)
<b>Polk</b>	17	16 (94%)	16	14 (88%)	18	17 (94%)

<sup>55</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>55</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>	262	250 (95%)	276	244 (88%)	365	365 (100%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	24	24 (100%)	29	28 (97%)	29	29 (100%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	21	21 (100%)	31	29 (94%)	37	36 (97%)
<b>Morrow</b>	2	2 (100%)	1	1 (100%)	4	4 (100%)
<b>Umatilla</b>	17	17 (100%)	25	24 (96%)	28	27 (96%)
<b>Union</b>	2	2 (100%)	5	4 (80%)	5	5 (100%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	19	17 (89%)	27	23 (85%)	42	42 (100%)
<b>Baker</b>	11	10 (91%)	15	14 (93%)	20	20 (100%)
<b>Malheur</b>	5	4 (80%)	8	5 (63%)	18	18 (100%)
<b>Wallowa</b>	3	3 (100%)	4	4 (100%)	4	4 (100%)
<b>Washington</b>	96	93 (97%)	128	119 (93%)	137	137 (100%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	32	32 (100%)	35	34 (97%)	37	37 (100%)
<b>State</b>	<b>1,136</b>	<b>1,098 (97%)</b>	<b>1,322</b>	<b>1,202 (91%)</b>	<b>1,553</b>	<b>1,549 (100%)</b>

<sup>55</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>56</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>	41	41 (100%)	25	22 (88%)
Benton	22	22 (100%)	11	9 (82%)
Linn	19	19 (100%)	14	13 (93%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	84	81 (96%)	57	47 (82%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	60	60 (100%)	32	30 (94%)
Clatsop	37	37 (100%)	18	16 (89%)
Columbia	23	23 (100%)	14	14 (100%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	10	10 (100%)	5	5 (100%)
Coos	4	4 (100%)	2	2 (100%)
Curry	6	6 (100%)	3	3 (100%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	87	87 (100%)	52	48 (92%)
Crook	9	9 (100%)	4	3 (75%)
Deschutes	66	66 (100%)	39	37 (95%)
Jefferson	12	12 (100%)	9	8 (89%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	65	65 (100%)	55	52 (95%)
Douglas	26	26 (100%)	23	22 (96%)
Klamath	39	39 (100%)	32	30 (94%)
Lake	0	--	0	--

<sup>56</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>56</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>Grant &amp; Harney</b>	11	11 (100%)	3	2 (67%)
<b>Grant</b>	4	4 (100%)	1	1 (100%)
<b>Harney</b>	7	7 (100%)	2	1 (50%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	62	62 (100%)	42	35 (83%)
<b>Gilliam</b>	3	3 (100%)	0	--
<b>Hood River</b>	30	30 (100%)	25	22 (88%)
<b>Sherman</b>	0	--	0	--
<b>Wasco</b>	26	26 (100%)	15	11 (73%)
<b>Wheeler</b>	3	3 (100%)	2	2 (100%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	70	70 (100%)	42	38 (90%)
<b>Jackson</b>	39	39 (100%)	22	20 (91%)
<b>Josephine</b>	31	31 (100%)	20	18 (90%)
<b>Lane</b>	120	117 (98%)	58	47 (81%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	207	204 (99%)	143	106 (74%)
<b>Marion</b>	189	186 (98%)	132	98 (74%)
<b>Polk</b>	18	18 (100%)	11	8 (73%)

<sup>56</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>56</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>	309	304 (98%)	197	166 (84%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	27	26 (96%)	14	13 (93%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	32	32 (100%)	20	16 (80%)
<b>Morrow</b>	3	3 (100%)	1	1 (100%)
<b>Umatilla</b>	24	24 (100%)	17	14 (82%)
<b>Union</b>	5	5 (100%)	2	1 (50%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	36	36 (100%)	19	17 (89%)
<b>Baker</b>	19	19 (100%)	9	9 (100%)
<b>Malheur</b>	13	13 (100%)	7	5 (71%)
<b>Wallowa</b>	4	4 (100%)	3	3 (100%)
<b>Washington</b>	109	109 (100%)	75	65 (87%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	34	34 (100%)	26	21 (81%)
<b>State</b>	<b>1,364</b>	<b>1,349 (99%)</b>	<b>865</b>	<b>730 (84%)</b>

<sup>56</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>57</sup> 2016-17 (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>	36 (77%)	46 (98%)	14 (100%)	41 (87%)
<b>Benton</b>	18 (75%)	23 (96%)	7 (100%)	21 (88%)
<b>Linn</b>	18 (78%)	23 (100%)	7 (100%)	20 (87%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	87 (95%)	90 (98%)	30 (94%)	84 (91%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	63 (91%)	65 (96%)	19 (100%)	64 (93%)
<b>Clatsop</b>	39 (89%)	41 (93%)	13 (100%)	39 (89%)
<b>Columbia</b>	24 (96%)	24 (100%)	6 (100%)	25 (100%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	12 (100%)	12 (100%)	5 (100%)	9 (75%)
<b>Coos</b>	4 (100%)	4 (100%)	1 (100%)	3 (75%)
<b>Curry</b>	8 (100%)	8 (100%)	4 (100%)	6 (75%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	89 (92%)	93 (97%)	39 (95%)	92 (95%)
<b>Crook</b>	6 (67%)	8 (100%)	2 (100%)	9 (100%)
<b>Deschutes</b>	68 (93%)	70 (96%)	29 (94%)	68 (93%)
<b>Jefferson</b>	15 (100%)	15 (100%)	8 (100%)	15 (100%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	59 (84%)	67 (96%)	29 (100%)	65 (93%)
<b>Douglas</b>	27 (93%)	28 (97%)	16 (100%)	27 (93%)
<b>Klamath</b>	32 (78%)	39 (95%)	13 (100%)	38 (93%)
<b>Lake</b>	--	--	--	--

<sup>57</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>57</sup> 2016-17 (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 (85%)	13 (100%)	6 (86%)	12 (92%)
<b>Grant</b>	3 (60%)	5 (100%)	4 (100%)	5 (100%)
<b>Harney</b>	8 (100%)	8 (100%)	2 (67%)	7 (88%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	62 (87%)	67 (94%)	18 (100%)	66 (93%)
<b>Gilliam</b>	3 (100%)	3 (100%)	1 (100%)	2 (67%)
<b>Hood River</b>	30 (86%)	32 (91%)	10 (100%)	33 (94%)
<b>Sherman</b>	--	--	--	--
<b>Wasco</b>	25 (86%)	28 (97%)	6 (100%)	27 (93%)
<b>Wheeler</b>	4 (100%)	4 (100%)	1 (100%)	4 (100%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	71 (85%)	82 (98%)	16 (100%)	74 (88%)
<b>Jackson</b>	39 (87%)	45 (100%)	13 (100%)	43 (96%)
<b>Josephine</b>	32 (82%)	37 (95%)	3 (100%)	31 (79%)
<b>Lane</b>	110 (81%)	128 (95%)	60 (97%)	119 (88%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	196 (87%)	220 (98%)	50 (93%)	193 (86%)
<b>Marion</b>	180 (87%)	202 (98%)	46 (92%)	178 (86%)
<b>Polk</b>	16 (89%)	18 (100%)	4 (100%)	15 (83%)

<sup>57</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>57</sup> 2016-17 (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>	321 (87%)	359 (97%)	124 (86%)	332 (90%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	25 (86%)	29 (100%)	12 (92%)	28 (97%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	32 (84%)	38 (100%)	12 (92%)	35 (92%)
<b>Morrow</b>	3 (75%)	4 (100%)	1 (50%)	4 (100%)
<b>Umatilla</b>	25 (86%)	29 (100%)	11 (100%)	27 (93%)
<b>Union</b>	4 (80%)	5 (100%)	--	4 (80%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	34 (79%)	42 (98%)	13 (100%)	41 (95%)
<b>Baker</b>	17 (81%)	20 (95%)	5 (100%)	21 (100%)
<b>Malheur</b>	14 (78%)	18 (100%)	8 (100%)	16 (89%)
<b>Wallowa</b>	3 (75%)	4 (100%)	--	4 (100%)
<b>Washington</b>	120 (86%)	132 (95%)	50 (96%)	123 (88%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	34 (89%)	36 (95%)	16 (100%)	35 (92%)
<b>State</b>	<b>1,362 (87%)</b>	<b>1,519 (97%)</b>	<b>513 (94%)</b>	<b>1,413 (90%)</b>

<sup>57</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>58</sup> 2016-17 (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>	44 (94%)	46 (98%)	47 (100%)	45 (96%)
<b>Benton</b>	23 (96%)	23 (96%)	24 (100%)	24 (100%)
<b>Linn</b>	21 (91%)	23 (100%)	23 (100%)	21 (91%)
<b>Clackamas</b>	87 (95%)	88 (96%)	89 (97%)	88 (96%)
<b>Columbia &amp; Clatsop</b>	65 (94%)	68 (99%)	69 (100%)	68 (99%)
<b>Clatsop</b>	43 (98%)	43 (98%)	44 (100%)	43 (98%)
<b>Columbia</b>	22 (88%)	25 (100%)	25 (100%)	25 (100%)
<b>Coos &amp; Curry</b>	12 (100%)	11 (92%)	12 (100%)	11 (92%)
<b>Coos</b>	4 (100%)	3 (75%)	4 (100%)	4 (100%)
<b>Curry</b>	8 (100%)	8 (100%)	8 (100%)	7 (88%)
<b>Crook, Deschutes, &amp; Jefferson</b>	90 (93%)	95 (98%)	96 (99%)	94 (97%)
<b>Crook</b>	8 (89%)	9 (100%)	9 (100%)	9 (100%)
<b>Deschutes</b>	68 (93%)	72 (99%)	73 (100%)	70 (96%)
<b>Jefferson</b>	14 (93%)	14 (93%)	14 (93%)	15 (100%)
<b>Douglas, Klamath, &amp; Lake</b>	65 (93%)	70 (100%)	69 (99%)	69 (99%)
<b>Douglas</b>	26 (90%)	29 (100%)	29 (100%)	29 (100%)
<b>Klamath</b>	39 (95%)	41 (100%)	40 (98%)	40 (98%)
<b>Lake</b>	--	--	--	--

<sup>58</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>58</sup> 2016-17 (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>	12 (92%)	13 (100%)	12 (92%)	13 (100%)
<b>Grant</b>	4 (80%)	5 (100%)	5 (100%)	5 (100%)
<b>Harney</b>	8 (100%)	8 (100%)	7 (88%)	8 (100%)
<b>Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, &amp; Wheeler</b>	68 (96%)	68 (96%)	67 (94%)	68 (96%)
<b>Gilliam</b>	3 (100%)	3 (100%)	3 (100%)	3 (100%)
<b>Hood River</b>	32 (91%)	33 (94%)	32 (91%)	34 (97%)
<b>Sherman</b>	--	--	--	--
<b>Wasco</b>	29 (100%)	28 (97%)	28 (97%)	27 (93%)
<b>Wheeler</b>	4 (100%)	4 (100%)	4 (100%)	4 (100%)
<b>Josephine &amp; Jackson</b>	78 (93%)	80 (95%)	84 (100%)	83 (99%)
<b>Jackson</b>	42 (93%)	44 (98%)	45 (100%)	45 (100%)
<b>Josephine</b>	36 (92%)	36 (92%)	39 (100%)	38 (97%)
<b>Lane</b>	120 (89%)	128 (95%)	131 (97%)	128 (95%)
<b>Marion &amp; Polk</b>	202 (90%)	215 (96%)	221 (98%)	217 (96%)
<b>Marion</b>	184 (89%)	197 (96%)	203 (98%)	200 (97%)
<b>Polk</b>	18 (100%)	18 (100%)	18 (100%)	17 (94%)

<sup>58</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>58</sup> 2016-17 (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>	344 (93%)	355 (97%)	362 (98%)	355 (97%)
<b>Tillamook</b>	29 (100%)	29 (100%)	28 (97%)	28 (97%)
<b>Umatilla, Union, &amp; Morrow</b>	37 (97%)	37 (97%)	38 (100%)	37 (97%)
<b>Morrow</b>	4 (100%)	4 (100%)	4 (100%)	4 (100%)
<b>Umatilla</b>	28 (97%)	28 (97%)	29 (100%)	29 (100%)
<b>Union</b>	5 (100%)	5 (100%)	5 (100%)	4 (80%)
<b>Wallowa, Baker, &amp; Malheur</b>	42 (98%)	42 (98%)	43 (100%)	43 (100%)
<b>Baker</b>	21 (100%)	21 (100%)	21 (100%)	21 (100%)
<b>Malheur</b>	17 (94%)	17 (94%)	18 (100%)	18 (100%)
<b>Wallowa</b>	4 (100%)	4 (100%)	4 (100%)	4 (100%)
<b>Washington</b>	130 (94%)	136 (99%)	135 (97%)	137 (99%)
<b>Yamhill</b>	38 (100%)	37 (97%)	37 (97%)	38 (100%)
<b>State</b>	<b>1,463 (93%)</b>	<b>1,518 (97%)</b>	<b>1,540 (98%)</b>	<b>1,522 (97%)</b>

<sup>58</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.”