Healthy Start of Oregon 2004-2005 Status Report

Submitted to:

Mickey Lansing, Executive Director
Oregon Commission on Children and Families
530 Center St. NE, Suite 405
Salem, OR 97301

Submitted by:

Beth L. Green, Ph.D.
Juliette R. Mackin, Ph.D.
Jerod M. Tarte, M.A.
Jodi Brekhus, M.S.
Ashley Andrews

March 2006

NPC RESEARCH
4380 SW Macadam Ave., Suite 530
Portland, OR 97239
(503) 243-2436
www.npcresearch.com

Healthy Start
2004-2005 Status Report

Beth L. Green, Ph.D.

Juliette R. Mackin, Ph.D.

Jerod M. Tarte, M.A.

Jodi Brekhus, M.S.

Ashley Andrews

NPC Research
healthystart@npcresearch.com

March 2006

Research designed to promote effective decision-making by policymakers at the national, state and community levels

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Healthy Start Status Report would not be possible without collaboration and coordination from a number of agencies and individuals. First and foremost are the staff members at the Oregon Commission on Children and Families (OCCF), the local commissions, and local Healthy Start programs. Their continuing commitment to results-based accountability has made a statewide system for charting the progress of Healthy Start a reality. We are grateful to the Department of Human Services, Office of Family Health, and the staff in local Health Departments for their help in coordinating the statewide data system. Many thanks also go to staff at the Department of Human Services, Office of Children, Adults, and Families for their help constructing data related to child maltreatment.

Staff members and volunteers spend long hours collecting information and "doing the paperwork." We are particularly grateful for their dedication and commitment to the evaluation process. Further, this report would not have been possible without the interest and involvement of Healthy Start's families. The families deserve special recognition for their willingness to cooperate and answer a multitude of questions. The input of staff, volunteers, and families at the all the Healthy Start sites is extremely valuable and deeply appreciated.

Special thanks to the 34 Healthy Start programs in the following counties that were included in this year's status report:

Benton County
Clackamas County
Clatsop County
Columbia County
Coos County
Crook County
Curry County
Deschutes County
Douglas County
Gilliam County
Grant County
Harney County
Hood River County
Jackson County
Jefferson County
Josephine County
Klamath County
Lake County
Lane County
Lincoln County
Linn County
Malheur County
Marion County
Morrow County
Multnomah County
Polk County
Sherman County
Tillamook County
Umatilla County
Union County
Wallowa County
Wasco County
Washington County
Yamhill County

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary I
Outcomes for Children and Families I
Reducing Risk Factors for Child Maltreatment I
Promoting Healthy Development I
Promoting School Readiness II
Supporting Family Self-Sufficiency II
Program Implementation & Service Delivery III
Conclusion IV
Healthy Start Status Report 2004-2005 1
Outcomes for Children and Families, FY 2004-05 2
Risk Factors for Child Maltreatment 2
School Readiness Outcomes 2
Connecting Families with Resources 4
Parent Satisfaction 4
Program Implementation & Service Delivery Results 5
Voluntary Services to All First-Time Parents 5
Effective Screening to Identify Higher-Risk Families 5
Who are Healthy Start Families? 6
Engaging Families in Services 6
Who Declines Intensive Services? 7
Who Drops Out of Intensive Services? 7
The Need for Healthy Start is Great 8
Summary & Conclusions 8
Healthy Start Outcomes 8
Screening and Assessment System 8
Engagement and Retention 9
Quality Assurance and Technical Assistance Process 9
Conclusions 10
References 12
Appendix A: Healthy Start of Oregon 2004-2005 Status Report Data Tables 25

List of Tables

Table A. Progress Towards Selected HFA Critical Elements — FY 2004-2005 14
Table 1: Identification of Target Population: Screening 26
Table 2: Identification of Target Population: Assessment 28
Table 3: Identification of Target Population: Declines & Other Contacts 30
Table 4: Identification of Target Population: Healthy Start Contact Rate Summary 32

Table 5: Demographics of Screened Families: Race/Ethnicity 34

Table 6: Demographics of Screened Families: Language, Teen and Single Parents, & Education Level 36

Table 7: Risk Factors at Screening: Health Insurance & Health Care..... 38

Table 8: Risk Factors at Screening: Employment, Income, Mental Health, Substance Use, & Marital Problems..... 40

Table 9: Time to Screen..... 42

Table 10: Time to Assessment..... 44

Table 11: Acceptance of Intensive Service..... 46

Table 12: Level of Healthy Start Service..... 48

Table 13: Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families: Race/Ethnicity 50

Table 14: Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families: Language, Teen and Single Parents, & Education Level 52

Table 15: NBQ Risk Factors of Intensive Service Families: Health Insurance & Health Care ... 54

Table 16: NBQ Risk Factors of Intensive Service Families: Employment, Income, Mental Health, Substance Use, & Marital Problems 56

Table 17: Kempe Risk Factors of Intensive Service Mothers: Parent/Caregiver Characteristics 58

Table 18: Kempe Risk Factors of Intensive Service Mothers: Childrearing Characteristics 60

Table 19: Kempe Risk Factors of Intensive Service Fathers: Parent/Caregiver Characteristics.. 62

Table 20: Kempe Risk Factors of Intensive Service Fathers: Childrearing Characteristics..... 64

Table 21: Demographic Characteristics of Families Declining Intensive Service: Race/Ethnicity 66

Table 22: Demographic Characteristics Of Families Declining Intensive Service: Language, Teen Parents, Marital Status, Education, & Employment 68

Table 23: Participant Engagement and Retention..... 70

Table 24: Intensive Service Families by Birth Year..... 72

Table 25: Demographic Characteristics of Exited Families: Race/Ethnicity 74

Table 26: Demographic Characteristics of Exited Families: Language, Marital Status, Age, & Education 76

Table 27: Participant Reasons for Exiting Program Prior to Program Completion..... 78

Table 28: Health Care for Intensive Service Families: Health Care Provider & Well-child Check-ups 80

Table 29: Health Care for Intensive Service Families: Use of Emergency Room 82

Table 30: Health Care for Intensive Service Children: Immunizations..... 84

Table 31: Prenatal Care for Subsequent Births..... 86

Table 32: Child Growth and Development (ASQ) 88

Table 33: Connection to Essential Resources for Intensive Service Families 90
Table 34: Promotion of Positive Parenting Skills & Helping Children Learn 92
Table 35: Promotion of Positive Parent-Child Interaction, HOME Outcomes, & Reading 94
Table 36: Cultural Competency & Strength Orientation of Home Visitors 96
Table 37: Staff Skills & Child Focused Behavior of Home Visitors 98
Table 38: Ratings of Home Visitor Helpfulness 100
Table 39: Parent Stress, Parent Satisfaction with Healthy Start, & Income Change 102
Table 40: Healthy Start Home Visitor Reports of DHS Child Welfare Services, Reports, & Investigations 104
Table 41: Healthy Start Home Visitor Reports of DHS Open Cases, Child Removals, & Other Reports 106

Parents Tell Us "The Best Thing About Healthy Start is…."

This year, we received more than 2,000 comments from parents about the Healthy Start program. Here are just a few examples of the "best thing about Healthy Start:"

"[Healthy Start] really helped me through difficult times with my child and my own behaviors. Helped me have a better understanding of what it takes to be a father and why my child reacts the way she does."

"Everything - we love having [Our Worker] come visit, and all of the wonderful help she has provided for our family."

"I think the best thing about Healthy Start is that they make parenting so much easier and help first time parents understand what it means to be a good parent. Also what it takes and what the baby needs at that time."

"I think it is a wonderful program that helps parents feel comfortable with parenting…educating us in how to teach, play and even feed our child. You are also teaching us how to be better parents."

The best thing about Healthy Start is… "Healthy Start is the books, the information about development, the advice, and the help they offer me."

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Healthy Start is Oregon's largest child abuse prevention program, screening over 7,000 families and providing evidence-based home visiting services to 4,394 children at risk for maltreatment statewide in FY 2004-05. Outcomes for families receiving home visiting are tracked annually through an ongoing evaluation conducted by an external evaluator, NPC Research. Additionally, during FY 2004-05, Oregon's Healthy Start program continued its efforts to obtain a statewide program credential from Healthy Families America (HFA). This credential involves documenting the use of a comprehensive set of research-based program practices, including evidence-based home visiting procedures, rigorous training and supervision supports, and effective program management and administration processes.

Although the evaluation does not provide data that speaks to all of the HFA standards, results this year found that at a statewide level, Oregon's Healthy Start met or exceeded HFA standards in all but two of the areas in which evaluation data were available. In tandem with the positive outcome findings, this suggests that Oregon's Healthy Start programs are providing effective services for Oregon's most at-risk children. Outcome and implementation results from FY 2004-05 are summarized below, and more detailed information is provided in the full report (available at: www.oregon.gov/OCCF).

Outcomes for Children and Families

REDUCING RISK FACTORS FOR CHILD MALTREATMENT

Research shows that helping parents to develop skills to better support their children's development and reducing parents' levels of stress are critical to reducing the likelihood of child maltreatment. Healthy Start's results compare favorably to other research with higher-risk families:

- Healthy Start workers report that 82% of Healthy Start's higher-risk families consistently engaged in positive, supportive interactions with their children.
- 84% of higher-risk families report that they have improved their parenting skills, and
- Almost half (50%) of higher-risk parents reported a decrease in parenting-related stress from the time of the child's birth to the 6-month birthday, a time when parents generally experience highly elevated levels of parenting-related stress.

PROMOTING HEALTHY DEVELOPMENT

Oregon's Healthy Start program is highly successful in promoting positive health outcomes for children and adults, and greatly exceeds Healthy Families America standards on these issues:

- 98% of Healthy Start's children from families receiving Intensive Service had a primary health care provider,

which greatly exceeds the Healthy Families America standard of 80%. In addition, 73% of caregivers had a primary health provider.

- 91% of Intensive Service mothers received early & comprehensive prenatal care for their second pregnancies, while only 30% had early & comprehensive prenatal care for their first pregnancies.
- 93% of children were receiving regular well-child check-ups, compared to only 84% of young children nationally (Child Trends, 2004).
- 97% of Healthy Start children had health insurance, compared to 85% of low-income children nationally.
- 94% of Healthy Start's 2-year-olds were fully immunized, compared to 72% of all Oregon 2-year-olds (U. S. NIS-3, 2003), and greatly exceeding the HFA standard of 80%. Nationally, about 76% of children from low-income households were fully immunized by age 3 (Child Trends, 2004).
- Just over half of Healthy Start Intensive Service children received regular developmental screening during FY 2004-05. Most (90%) of these children showed normal growth and development, and 96% of Healthy Start Intensive Service children with identified developmental delays were linked to early intervention services.

PROMOTING SCHOOL READINESS

Oregon's Healthy Start program is also extremely successful in helping parents to provide children with supportive early literacy environments, one of the keys to helping children be prepared to enter and succeed in school:

- After 12 months of Intensive Service, 77% of Healthy Start's higher-risk families were creating learning environments for their young children that were rated as "well above average" by their home visitor, as indicated by the Home Observation Measure of the Environment (Bradley & Caldwell, 1994). This percentage is higher than results found in other, comparable populations.
- By age 2, 85% of Healthy Start Intensive Service parents reported reading to their children three times per week or more; nationally, only about 64% of higher-risk families read to their young children three or more times per week (Nord, Lennon, Liu, & Chandler, 1999).

SUPPORTING FAMILY SELF-SUFFICIENCY

Healthy Start's higher-risk families often need a variety of supports to help them meet their basic needs, and frequently set goals related to improving their self-sufficiency. Last year:

- After 6 months of Intensive Services, many Healthy Start families had been connected to services they needed. Of those families indicating each of the following needs, 66% were connected to housing assistance, 59% were connected to language classes, 38% were connected to education assistance, and 20% were connected to job training and employment services.
- Fully one-third (33%) of parents reported their family income situation had improved over the past 6 months (only 13% reported a decrease in income), and 33% of families reported that at least one of the primary caregivers gained employment over the first 6 months of their child's life.

Program Implementation & Service Delivery

Healthy Start continues to increase the effectiveness of its system for contacting and offering services to first-time parents:

- A total of 10,135 families, 59% of eligible births, were identified and offered Healthy Start services during FY 2004-05 and 41% (7,022 families) agreed to participate in the screening *and* the program's evaluation.
- Most screening (82%) took place prenatally or during the first 2 weeks after the baby's birth. Early screening and engagement of families in services is critical to program success. Further, although Healthy Start is completely voluntary, most families agree to participate. Only 9% of families contacted declined to receive information about Healthy Start at the initial point of contact.

Healthy Start's screening and assessment system effectively identified families and children at greatest risk for poor outcomes:

- Of those families screened, 69% screened at higher risk.
- Assessing all higher-risk families remains a challenge. Of those families who screened at higher risk, 44% were assessed using the Kempe Family Stress Interview. Of those assessed, 94% were found to be eligible for Intensive Home Visiting Services.

Healthy Start is successfully engaging higher-risk families with Intensive Services:

- Families receiving Intensive Services are significantly more likely to be teen parents, unemployed, and have financial difficulties than families who were screened but did not participate in the home-visiting component. 81% of Healthy Start Intensive Service mothers and fathers grew up in homes with at least one parent who had problems with substance abuse, mental health, and/or criminal involvement and 89% reported a history of child abuse.
- Healthy Start has a very low rate of refusals and early program dropout for its Intensive Service component. 86% of eligible families agreed to participate in Intensive Services, and 89% of families who accepted Intensive Services received at least 3 months of service. Just over half of Intensive Service families (52%) remained in service for longer than 1 year.

The need for Intensive Home Visiting Services may be greater than the ability of Healthy Start to provide them:

- Only 44% (2,059) of families who scored at higher risk on the screening tool were assessed for eligibility for home visiting. Given the high rate of positive assessments (94%), it is likely that many of these additional 2,059 families would have been eligible for Intensive Services if resources had been available to assess them.

Finally, it is important to note that parents are almost universally positive about the services that Healthy Start provides:

- 88% of parents reported being satisfied with Healthy Start services, with close to 100% responding that Healthy Start "helped a lot" by providing parenting information. Parents reported that their home visitor "helped a lot" with obtaining basic resources (88%), dealing with emotional issues (91%), and encouraging the development of positive relationships with family or friends (85%). Parents also reported that the services provided by the program are cultur-

ally competent (98%) and help them to build on their family's strengths (95%).

Conclusion

Outcomes for Oregon's Healthy Start program are consistently positive across a variety of domains known to be important to supporting children's healthy development and reducing the risk for child maltreatment. Further, the program is showing considerable success, at least at the state level, at meeting the standards set by Healthy Families America. Meeting these standards is necessary in order for Healthy Start to obtain an HFA credential, which will ensure that all programs across the state are implementing high quality home visiting services for families at risk. Continued technical support and assistance to the local program sites will help ensure consistency in implementing these "best practice" standards so that all of Oregon's children can have a "healthy start."

HEALTHY START STATUS REPORT 2004-2005

In 1993, the Oregon Legislature created the Healthy Start program with a mandate to provide universal, voluntary services to all first-time parents in the state of Oregon (ORS-417.795). The Healthy Start mission is to "promote and support positive parenting and healthy growth and development for all Oregon parents and their first-born children." Healthy Start operates on the research-based premise that while all new families can use information, education, and support when a baby is born, individual families differ in the type and intensity of support that is needed. Thus, Healthy Start strives to offer all first-time parents a range of services appropriate to their needs, ranging from information and educational materials (Universal Basic Services) to longer-term more intensive home visiting services (Intensive Services) that continue throughout the early childhood years.

Healthy Start Goals

Healthy Start aims to establish an early childhood system to nurture all families and children. It accomplishes this objective by systematic identification of all first-birth families, providing information and short-term support to all lower-risk families, and providing family support and long-term home visits to higher risk families.

The ultimate goals of Healthy Start are to: (1) reduce the incidence of child abuse and neglect among Healthy Start families; and (2) improve the school readiness of children participating in Healthy Start. To do this, Healthy Start builds on research that shows that home visiting is most effective:

1. When services are provided to families most at-risk for negative child outcomes; *and*
2. When high-quality intensive services are provided to families for a period of several years.

Healthy Start works to enhance family functioning, parent-child interactions, and child growth and development.

Healthy Families America Credentialing

During FY 2004-05, Oregon's Healthy Start program embarked on the groundbreaking process of being credentialed through the national Healthy Families America (HFA) initiative. This rigorous process will ensure that all of Oregon's Healthy Start programs are implementing programs that align with evidence-based best practices for early childhood home visiting programs.

A recent study of more than 1,100 randomized parents found the HFA model to be effective in improving parenting and child outcomes (Mitchell-Herzfeld et al., 2005). HFA is now officially considered to be an evidence-based promising practice (Rand, www.promisingpractices.net). To achieve an HFA credential, all programs must submit extensive documentation showing that they are in alignment with credentialing guidelines. A random sample of 13 sites received 2- to 3-day site visits from HFA credentialing reviewers.

Additionally, the program's central office at the Oregon Commission on Children and Families (OCCF) also received a site visit and a detailed review of their training, technical assistance, evaluation, quality assurance, and administrative systems.

As of November 2005, all 36 program sites had completed site self-assessments and submitted those materials either to HFA as part of the credentialing process or to OCCF as part of quality assurance efforts. All sites received feedback initially from the Healthy Start Quality Assurance Committee and the 13 visited sites also received feedback from

HFA peer reviewers after the site visits. The next step will be a review of the Oregon programs' work by the National Healthy Families America Credentialing Panel, made up of experts, researchers, and program staff from across the country. When completed (probably by April 2007), HFA credentialing will ensure that Oregon's Healthy Start program meets the highest research-based standards for home visiting services to parents and their children.

This year's status report, in a departure from previous Healthy Start evaluation documents, reviews the data describing Healthy Start's progress in meeting the Healthy Families America performance standards. See the attached chart "Progress Towards Selected HFA Critical Elements." For each of the twelve HFA critical elements, we provide the county-level data in Tables 1-41.

Outcomes for Children and Families, FY 2004-05

A series of outcome indicators measure Healthy Start's statewide annual progress toward two key Oregon Benchmarks: reduced incidence of child maltreatment and improved school readiness. The analyses of child maltreatment data will be conducted in Spring 2006, and will be described in a separate report. Below are the highlights of results of other outcomes for FY 2004-05. This annual report of outcomes fulfills HFA Critical Element GA-5.A, which requires at least annual review and analysis of progress towards program goals and objectives.

RISK FACTORS FOR CHILD MALTREATMENT

In order to reduce rates of child maltreatment, the Healthy Start program targets several risk factors that have been found to be associated with higher incidence of child abuse and neglect (Cicchetti & Toth, 2000), including poor parenting skills and parent stress. These results are summarized below. Additionally, in July 2004, we began collecting Healthy Start workers' reports of families' involvement with child welfare services. This information is provided for descriptive purposes only in Tables 40 & 41.

Positive Parenting

Positive, supportive interactions increase children's well being and are related to reductions in child maltreatment (Shonkoff & Phillips, 2000). HFA Standards require that the program have a comprehensive approach to promoting parenting skills and positive parent-child interactions (Critical Element 6-4, see Tables 34 & 35). Information from Healthy Start's Intensive Service families in FY 2004-05 found that by the time children are 6 months of age:

- 84% of higher-risk families reported improved parenting skills.
- 66% of higher-risk families reported improved ability to help their child.
- 82% of higher-risk families were rated by their Healthy Start workers as consistently engaging in positive, supportive interactions with their children.
- Almost half (48%) of higher-risk Intensive Service parents reported a decrease in parenting-related stress from the time of the child's birth to the 6-month birthday (see Table 39).

SCHOOL READINESS OUTCOMES

Three primary outcomes related to school readiness are tracked: (1) children's health, (2) children's growth and development, and (3) the ability of parents to provide developmentally supportive environments for their children. These results are presented below.

Health Outcomes

Impressive health outcomes are reported for Healthy Start families. Workers reported that children living in higher-risk Intensive Service families are **receiving regular health**

care and immunizations (see Tables 28 & 30).

- 98% of children living in higher-risk Intensive Service families of children have a **primary health care provider,** which greatly exceeds the Healthy Families America standard (7-1C) of 80%. In addition, 73% of the parents have a primary health care provider (see Table 28).
- 93% of children living in higher-risk Intensive Service families received **well-child check-ups** (see Table 28). National data report that only 84% of children under age 6 nationally received a well-child visit during the past year (Child Trends, 2004). For poor children this rate is even lower (81%).
- Healthy Start workers reported that 94% of these children were **fully immunized** by age 2 (see Table 30). In contrast, only 72% of all Oregon 2-year-olds were fully immunized in 2003, as reported by the U. S. National Immunization Survey (NIS, 2004). Nationally, about 81% of children were fully immunized by age 3, although rates for poor children are lower (76%; Child Trends, 2004). This result greatly exceeds the HFA Standard of 80% (7-2B).
- Only 2% of Intensive Service families reported regular use of emergency room services for routine health care, compared to 3% in FY 2003-04 (see Table 29).
- 97% of Healthy Start children had health insurance, compared to 85% of low-income children nationally (Table 29).
- Intensive Service mothers were more likely to receive prenatal care for subsequent pregnancies (91% compared to 30% for their first pregnancies, see Table 31).

66% of Healthy Start Intensive Service parents reported reading to their children at least daily, higher than the national average.

Healthy Growth and Development

HFA standards (6-5B, 6-7B, & 6-7C) require regular developmental screening using a standardized tool and appropriate documentation and referral for children with identified delays. Healthy Start programs use the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ), administered at specific age-based intervals, to monitor children's development (see Table 32). However, in FY 2004-05, only 56% of all children who were eligible for an ASQ screening had results reported to the evaluation. Of those children whose results were reported, a large majority (90%) of these children showed patterns of normal growth and development.

Further, those children with identified developmental delays were appropriately linked to early intervention. Almost all (96%) Healthy Start Intensive Service children with identified developmental delays had been linked to early intervention services.

In addition to the ASQ, programs use the Ages and Stages Social-Emotional Scale (ASQ-SE) to screen children for developmental delays. Families are eligible for the ASQ-SE when the babies reach 6 months of age. Of the 2,418 eligible families, 839 or 35% reported ASQ-SE results to the evaluation team. Only 40% of screened children had normal ASQ-SE scores. This result indicates that there is a potentially large group of children in need of services to support social-emotional development.

Early Literacy and Learning

Family literacy activities are strong predictors of school readiness, and the absence of these activities is one key reason that children from poor families are at risk of school failure. Healthy Start families, however, are showing quite positive outcomes in this area (Shonkoff & Phillips, 2000).

First, after 12 months of Intensive Service, 77% of Healthy Start's higher-risk families are creating learning environments for their young children that were rated as "well above average" by their home visitor, as indicated by the scoring criteria for the Home Observation Measure of the Environment (Bradley & Caldwell, 1984) (see Table 35). This result compares favorably with findings from other, comparable populations (e.g., Caldwell & Bradley, 1994).

Second, by age 2, 85% of higher-risk Intensive Service families report reading to their children at least three times per week (see Table 35). This is a key indicator of a positive early literacy environment. Nationally, only about two-thirds (64%) of higher-risk families read to their young children three or more times per week (Nord, Lennon, Liu, & Chandler, 1999).

Connecting Families with Resources

HFA Critical Element 7-3.A. states that the program must show evidence that it is successfully connecting families to appropriate resources and referral sources. On the Family Intake and Update forms, Family Support Workers report families' need for a variety of services, and whether these needs are met. The most frequently reported needs are listed below, along with the percent of families who were successfully connected to the appropriate service by 6 months (see Table 33). These data suggest the need for improvement in the ability to connect families to some of these resources, in particular, dental insurance.

- Housing Assistance (66% connected)
- Language Classes (59% connected)
- Education Assistance (38% connected)
- Job Training & Employment Services (20% connected)
- Dental Insurance (5% connected)

Healthy Start also appears to be supporting parents in reaching self-sufficiency. In addition, 33% of parents reported that their family income situation had improved over the previous 6 months, while half (54%) said it stayed the same, and 13% said it worsened (see Table 39).

Thirty-three percent of families reported that at least one of the primary caregivers gained employment over the first 6 months of their child's life, not including mothers returning to work after a maternity leave. Parents reported their employment status at screening and at the 6-month Family Update.

Parent Satisfaction

HFA requires that Healthy Start have a mechanism in place for parents to provide input into the program. In fulfillment of this standard (GA-3.), programs request that parents complete a survey that includes questions about their relationship with the Family Support Worker and their satisfaction with program services. Results indicate that parents are almost universally pleased with the services they receive from Healthy Start. Overall, 88% of parents reported being satisfied with Healthy Start services (see Table 39). Almost all of the Intensive Service parents (close to 100% of the parents responding) reported that Healthy Start "helped a lot" with parenting information. Also, parents reported that their home visitor "helped a lot" with obtaining basic resources (88%), dealing with emotional issues (91%), and encouraging the development of positive relationships with family or friends (85%) (see Table 38).

"Healthy Start gives all the first-time mothers a chance to be good mothers. And helps them learn to be independent and resourceful."

- Healthy Start Parent

Almost all parents responding rated their Healthy Start workers as being culturally competent (76% strongly agreed and 22% agreed) and having a strengths orientation (55% strongly agreed and 40% agreed) (see Table 36). They also strongly agreed (61%) or agreed (36%) that staff had appropriate skills and are child focused (69% strongly agreed and 29% agreed) (see Table 37).

Almost 2,000 parents surveyed added handwritten comments describing the benefits of Healthy Start for their families. Parents reported that the emotional support and information provided by home visitors are invaluable. Several parents commented that without Healthy Start, they would not be making good choices for their children.

Program Implementation & Service Delivery Results

Program implementation and service delivery success are monitored using a series of indicators that measure the success of the assessment system, the number of families served, and the type and length of service received.

Healthy Start successfully contacted over 10,000 families representing 59% of eligible births in FY 2004-05.

Voluntary Services to All First-Time Parents

Healthy Start continues to increase the effectiveness of its system for contacting and offering services to first-time parents. Healthy Start programs successfully screened 41% of eligible births statewide, a rate comparable to FY 2003-04 (see Table 1).

A total of 10,135 families or 59% of eligible births were identified and offered Healthy Start services during FY 2004-05 (see Table 4). This number exceeds the contact rate for FY 2003-04. Only 9% of all families offered services declined Healthy Start at the initial point of contact (i.e., were not interested in receiving any information about Healthy Start). 76% or 7,022 families were screened. An additional 252 families (3%) received only prenatal services from Healthy Start (see Table 3).

Effective Screening to Identify Higher-Risk Families

Healthy Start's screening and assessment system strives to identify families and children at greatest risk for negative outcomes, including child maltreatment and poor school performance.

Using the New Baby Questionnaire (NBQ), 7,022 families were screened for risk characteristics and offered appropriate services. A few families (133, 2% of those screened) declined to participate in the evaluation and thus information about the characteristics and status of these families is not available. Almost all screening (82%) took place prenatally or within two weeks of the child's birth (see Table 9). The percentage of screening occurring within this required HFA timeframe almost doubled since FY 2003-04, when 50% of families were screened within 2 weeks after the baby's birth.

Of those families screened, 69% (4,736 families) screened at higher risk. 44% (2,059) of these families received further assessment with the Kempe Family Stress Interview (see Table 2). This tool identifies sources of stress, strengths, and support for families. 94% (1,937) of those interviewed reported significant risk factors for negative child outcomes, and thus were eligible for Intensive Services. 39% of Kempe assessments were completed within 2 weeks of the baby's birth, which does not meet the HFA standard (see Table 10). However, the acceptance rate for Healthy Start Intensive Services was quite high: 86% of eligible families (1,656) accepted Healthy Start Intensive Services (see Table 11).

WHO ARE HEALTHY START FAMILIES?

Universal Basic Services

Universal Basic Services (screening, referrals, and parenting information) are offered to all families. The Healthy Start screening process identifies those families with significant risk factors who may be eligible for Intensive Services. Of the 7,022 families with available information in FY 2004-05, 53% of mothers were not employed, 23% reported symptoms of depression, 21% had received late prenatal care and 15% reported having difficulty most of the time paying for basic living expenses (see Tables 7-8).

> ***The best thing about Healthy Start is…*** **"The wonderful support and advice, information. Knowing that if I do have questions or a problem, that help is just a phone call away."**
>
> ***– Healthy Start Parent***

Intensive Services

In FY 2004-05, about 4,380 families received Intensive Services. HFA standards (5-1.) require programs to maintain a description of the current service population that addresses cultural, racial/ethnic, and linguistic characteristics. As shown in Tables 5-6 & 13-14, families who participated in Healthy Start's Intensive Service component were significantly more likely to be Hispanic, teen parents, unemployed, and to have financial difficulties compared to families who received only Universal Basic Services. Intensive Service families were 53% Caucasian, 35% Hispanic, 4% Asian/Pacific Islander, 2% African American, and 3% multiracial. About one-third indicated Spanish as the primary language spoken at home, while an additional 3% indicated that a language other than English or Spanish was the primary language. A significant number of Intensive Service mothers (19%) were under 18 years of age.

75% of Intensive Service mothers reported being unemployed, and 42% indicated a risk for maternal depression (see Table 16). About one-third of Intensive Service mothers indicated that they had late or no prenatal care with their first pregnancy. 10% indicated they had no health insurance (see Table 15).

A large proportion of Healthy Start Intensive Service parents reported having experienced very serious issues as children. Most strikingly, 79% of Healthy Start Intensive Service mothers and 81% of fathers grew up in homes with at least one parent who had problems with substance abuse, mental health, and/or criminal involvement (see Tables 17 & 19). Almost all (89% of mothers and 85% of fathers) reported a childhood history of abuse. 21% of mothers and 17% of fathers reported having current or previous history with the child welfare system as adults. 90% of mothers and 88% of fathers reported they had problems bonding with their new infants (see Tables 18 & 20). Furthermore, almost all mothers (95%) and most fathers (81%) reported feeling isolated with a lack of available social support, poor coping skills, or low self-esteem.

Families are only eligible for Intensive Services if they have at least three risk factors on the Kempe Assessment (see Tables 17-20). The results described above suggest that Intensive Service families are, in fact, at quite high risk for negative family outcomes including child maltreatment (Shonkoff & Phillips, 2000).

ENGAGING FAMILIES IN SERVICES

Research shows that engaging and retaining higher risk families in intensive high-quality home visiting services is the key to positive program outcomes (Sweet & Appelbaum, 2004; Olds, Henderson, Kitzman, Eckenrode, Cole & Tatelbaum, 1999). Healthy Start continues to show considerable success with en-

gaging higher-risk families in Intensive Services (see also Tables 11 & 23):

- 86% of families who were eligible for Intensive Services agreed to participate.
- 89% of families who accepted Intensive Services received at least 3 months of service.
- 90% of Intensive Service families received their first home visit within 3 months of the baby's birth, which surpasses the HFA standard (1-3.).

Providing an adequate number of visits during this critical early period is an area that needs additional improvement statewide: the median number of visits per month during the family's first 6 months of service was 2.3 (HFA requires weekly visits [at least 3 per month] during the first 6 months of service). About 52% of families remained in service for longer than 1 year during FY 2004-05 (see Table 23). While HFA does not designate a certain retention rate that programs must meet, research clearly shows that the benefits for families increase with longer duration of home visiting services (Gomby, et al., 1999).

Pursuing HFA Credentialing has the potential to greatly increase the level and consistency of quality across Healthy Start program sites.

Who Declines Intensive Services?

HFA standards require programs to review who declines Intensive Services. We compared the ethnic, linguistic, marital, education, and employment status of families who accepted Intensive Services vs. those who declined (see also Tables 13-14 & 21-22). Results[1] suggest that Hispanic/Latino families were somewhat less likely to decline to participate (about 7%) compared to White/ Caucasian families (16%). Similarly, families in which Spanish is the primary language spoken in the home were somewhat less likely to decline Intensive Services (7%), whereas English-speaking families were more likely to decline (14%). Additionally, mothers employed full time were more likely to decline Intensive Service (21% of full-time employed mothers vs. 10% of unemployed mothers,), while mothers with less than a high school education were somewhat less likely to decline participation in Intensive Service (7% vs. 18%;). There were no significant differences between families accepting and declining Intensive Services in terms of their marital status.

Who Drops Out of Intensive Services?

HFA Critical Element 3-4.B. calls for programs to analyze "who drops out of the program and why." To begin to answer this question, data were collected about the reasons families exited the program (as reported by Family Support Workers, see Table 27). We also compared families who exited to those who remained in Intensive Services in terms of demographic characteristics (see Tables 25 & 26).

Results suggested that the most frequent reason for leaving Intensive Services was families moving or unable to be contacted for other reasons (23%); parents too busy (18%); or simply losing interest in the program (15%).

Analyses comparing exiting families to non-exiting families showed that Hispanic/Latino families (as well as families in which Spanish is the primary language spoken at home) were somewhat more likely to exit, compared

[1] Hispanic compared to Caucasian families: Chi-squared analyses: $X^2(5)=49.29$, $p<.001$; English-speaking compared to Spanish-speaking: $X^2(1)=25.69$, $p<.001$; Employed full-time compared to unemployed: $X^2(3)=29.05$, $p<.001$; Less than a high school education compared to high school or greater: $X^2(1)=22.34$, $p<.001$.

to Caucasian and English-speaking families[2]. About 25% of Hispanic/Latino families exited prior to completing the program, compared to 19% of Caucasian families. Additionally, single mothers, mothers who were unemployed, and mothers who had less than a high school education were significantly more likely to exit prior to completion compared to married, employed, and more educated mothers.

Taken together, these results suggest that while those families with potentially greater need (less educated, minority, non-English speaking, and unemployed mothers) were more likely to agree to participate in Healthy Start's Intensive Services, these families were also somewhat more likely to exit the program prior to the child reaching 3 years of age. This finding is consistent with other research (e.g., Raikes et al., in press) that suggests demographic risk is significantly associated with difficulties in engaging parents in long-term home-visiting services.

Table 24 illustrates the pattern of retention of families as their children grow older. As expected, the program primarily serves families with very young children. 42% of Intensive Service families served during FY 2004-05 had children born during the fiscal year. 31% of families had children born the previous fiscal year (2003-04) and 15% of families had children born in FY 2002-03.

> ***The best thing about Healthy Start is…*** **"Having someone personal to work with who cares for someone like me who doesn't really have a support system."**
>
> ***– Healthy Start Parent***

THE NEED FOR HEALTHY START IS GREAT

The need for intensive home visiting services continues to exceed the capacity of Healthy Start to provide them. Specifically, of the 4,736 families who scored at higher risk on the screening tool, only 2,059 could be assessed (44%). Given the high rate of positive assessments (94%) it is likely that many of the 2,059 families would have been eligible for Intensive Services, if resources had been available to serve them.

Summary & Conclusions

HEALTHY START OUTCOMES

The outcome evaluation clearly shows that children and families benefit from Healthy Start services. Families who have engaged in Intensive Service home visiting show positive outcomes in a variety of key domains, including parent-child interactions, health and health care (including immunizations), parenting skills, and healthy child development. Healthy Start appears to be effective in supporting the development of positive home environments for children and supporting parents to engage in important early-literacy activities such as reading frequently to their children.

Data from national studies of higher-risk families indicate that the results for families participating in Healthy Start are better than would be expected, especially in terms of child health, immunizations, and early literacy activities.

SCREENING AND ASSESSMENT SYSTEM

Healthy Start builds on family strengths, implementing a legislative philosophy designed to create wellness for all Oregon children and families. Information from participating counties shows family interest in and need for Healthy Start service is substantial. It is important for Healthy Start to continue to provide *a continuum of service*, ranging from non-stigmatizing screening and referral to long-term support services beginning prena-

[2] Hispanic compared to Caucasian and Spanish-speaking compared to English-speaking: $X^2(5)=40.67$, $X^2(1)=26.86$ both $p<.001$.

tally and continuing through the early childhood years. Programs vary considerably in their ability to identify and screen first-birth families. Less than 10% of families declined initial contact with the Healthy Start program. While this finding seems to indicate that Healthy Start is perceived as voluntary, it also suggests that programs may need to continue to examine their techniques for approaching and engaging families initially, so that families in need do not "slip through the cracks." Balancing consistent, comprehensive outreach within the context of a voluntary program will continue to be a challenge.

Further, while the program as a whole offered services to 59% of eligible families, county rates ranged from 12% to 100%. Healthy Start State staff members have focused technical assistance to help local programs establish linkages with key partners (such as hospital systems and physicians) to ensure successful screening processes. Currently, however, the statewide screening rate does not meet the HFA standards.

Additionally, counties vary considerably in the rates with which families screened at higher risk are reached in order to complete the second phase of the eligibility process (the Kempe Assessment), ranging from 25% to 100%. Program sites frequently note the lack of resources for assessing all potentially eligible families as a challenge.

"I could not have made it through my domestic violence drama without my FSW."

– Healthy Start Parent

Engagement and Retention

Healthy Start continues to do a good job in engaging and serving families who are at higher risk for negative child outcomes. Over half of the families were enrolled for at least a year, and most families were successfully screened in the critical early weeks of the child's development.

Higher-risk families have stressful lives that put parents and children at risk for poor outcomes. Multiple risk factors create an "environment of risk" that substantially reduces the chances for children's healthy development and school success. Healthy Start clearly does a good job engaging highest-risk families in the initial period of their participation; however, longer term retention rates for higher-risk families were somewhat lower than for families who, at least based on their demographic characteristics, may be at lower risk. Mothers who were single, unemployed, or who had less than a high school education were more likely to exit the program early. This is an area that needs further attention and improvement in 2005-06.

Quality Assurance and Technical Assistance Process

In addition, this year brought expansion of Healthy Start's quality assurance effort, including increased training and technical assistance for direct service staff, program supervisors and managers. The quality assurance effort included program preparation of Site Self-Assessments as part of the Healthy Families America (HFA) credentialing process, demonstrating that program administration, staff supervision, and direct interactions with families are aligned with HFA's research-based 12 critical elements for effective home visiting practice. Credentialing will help to ensure consistency and quality in the services delivered across the state in terms of key program elements: outreach, screening and assessment, frequency and intensity of home visits, staff training and supervision, and program administration and evaluation.

Reviews of the home visiting research have consistently found that high-quality, intensive home visiting services delivered to those most in need are the most likely to show

positive effects (Gomby, et al., 1999; Raikes, et al., 2005). Engaging in the credentialing effort is a systematic way to improve the quality of implementation of Healthy Start services across the program sites.

CONCLUSIONS

Results show a number of areas in which Oregon's Healthy Start program has had considerable success. Outcomes for families participating in Intensive Services are generally quite positive across a variety of domains that have been shown in the research literature to be important predictors of child maltreatment, school readiness, and longer-term outcomes such as school success, criminality, and teenaged pregnancy (Shonkoff & Phillips, 2000). These results suggest that the core elements of Healthy Start's home visiting programs are working to support families to be successful.

A review of Table A (the summary of progress towards HFA standards) shows that of the 21 HFA standards that are monitored by the evaluation[3], the statewide Healthy Start program meets or exceeds the performance standard for each area with two exceptions: identifying 75% of the target population and assessing families within 2 weeks of birth. A few other areas suggest some need for improvement, in particular connecting families with needed resources and engaging those most in need of services. These results suggest that challenges remain in terms of continuing to build effective systems for identifying and contacting families, screening and assessing them, and retaining participating families in services.

> **"It's like having someone who cares to be a part of your life for three years, someone who doesn't judge you, who is just there to help you and care for you. You can't beat that."**
>
> ***– Healthy Start Parent***

Variability in terms of service delivery and implementation across programs is large, and continued technical assistance is needed for those whose implementation of Healthy Start is poor. Programs need to develop effective systems uniting community partners in a shared effort to support families with Healthy Start and other community services. Among smaller, more rural counties, establishing an infrastructure to identify and engage families is challenging, reflected in relatively low rates of offering services to families among many of the minimum grant counties that strive to provide services to all families (not just first-birth families).

Along these lines, the credentialing process has assisted programs in working to address many of these challenges. Although in itself credentialing has required a considerable investment of program resources, the payoff in terms of greater consistency and quality of services is likely to be worth the effort. Research on home visiting programs shows these services *can* work; however, the quality and intensity of services must be held at high levels. The credentialing process, which is based on extensive reviews of the home visiting research literature, clearly defines quality indicators that must be achieved *statewide* in order for a credential to be awarded. Efforts to obtain the HFA credential should continue to be supported.

Further, home visiting services that are delivered in conjunction with other community supports such as specialized services for serious issues (e.g., substance abuse, domestic violence, mental illness), high quality daycare or preschool, early intervention, health care providers, and other resources are generally acknowledged to create the best outcomes for children. Healthy Start needs to

[3] Additional HFA standards are monitored by the program but are not part of data submitted to the evaluation.

improve its ability to successfully connect families with needed resources. This outcome requires community-wide work in building collaborations to provide these services to families. Healthy Start needs to partner with other agencies and providers, and to continue to diversify and leverage funding. This will require widespread backing for an effective system of supports for children and families, within which Healthy Start can play an important, but not isolated, role.

The Healthy Start program overall provides important resources to families at the birth of their first child. It continues to demonstrate positive outcomes for families at risk, by supporting the development of positive home environments, early literacy activities, health care, and positive parent-child interactions, all of which are critical to prevention of child abuse.

REFERENCES

Bradley, B. M. & Caldwell, R. H. (1984). The HOME inventory and family demographics. *Developmental Psychology, 20,* 315-320.

Caldwell. B. M., & Bradley, R. H. (1994). Environmental issues in developmental follow-up research. In S. L. Friedman & H. C. Haywood, Eds., *Developmental follow-up: Concepts, domains, and methods*, pp. 235-256. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Child Trends. (2004). *Early Child Development in Social Context: A Chartbook*. Child Trends and Center for Child Health Research.

Cicchetti, D & Toth, S. L. (2000). Child maltreatment in the early years of life. In J. D. Osofsky & H. E. Fitzgerald, Eds., *WAIMH Handbook of Infant Mental Health, Vol. 4: Infant Mental Health in Groups at High Risk*, p. 255-294. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York.

Gomby, D. S., Culross, P. L., & Behrman, R. E. (1999). Home visiting: Recent program evaluations—analysis and recommendations. *Future of Children, 9,* 16.

Mitchell-Herzfeld, S., Izzo, C., Greene, R., Lee, E., and Lowenfels, A. (2005). *Evaluation of Healthy Families New York (HFNY): First Year Program Impacts*. Report to the Governor and Legislature from Healthy Families New York.

National Immunization Survey-3, July 30, 2004. http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtlm/mm5329a3.htm.

Nord, C. W., Lennon, J., Liu, B., & Chandler, K. (1999). Home literacy activities and signs of children's emerging literacy, 1993 and 1999. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, NCES 2001-026.

Olds, Henderson, Kitzman, Eckenrode, Cole & Tatelbaum, 1999.

Raikes, H., Green, B.L., Atwater, J., & Constantine, J. (in press). Involvement in Early Head Start home visiting services: Demographic predictors and relations to child and family outcomes. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*

Shonkoff, J. P., & Phillips, E. A. (2000). National research council and institute of medicine. *From neurons to neighborhoods: The science of early childhood development.* Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Sweet, M. A., & Appelbaum, M. I. (2004). Is home visiting an effective strategy? A meta-analytic review of home visitor programs for families with young children. *Child Development.* San Diego, CA: University of California.

Table A. Progress Towards Selected HFA Critical Elements — FY 2004-2005

HFA Element	Source of Data [1]	Statewide Results	HFA Standard
HFA Element for which the evaluation provides data	**Origin of the data (such as specific items on specific forms)**	**Statewide result for the corresponding HFA element, and the table where this information can be found for individual counties**	**HFA standard for the element**
1-1.A. Description of target population	Data from Oregon Department of Human Services Web site (http://oregon.gov/DHS/ph/chs/data/ytd/fstbirth.html).	**Table 1:** • 16,811 first births in the 28 counties funded to serve first births • 266 births in 8 counties funded to serve all-births • State total births for target population = 17,077	The program has a description of the target population and identified organizations within the community in which the target population can be found, which, while sufficient for its needs could be more comprehensive (are comprehensive and up to date).
	Data from the Oregon Department of Human Services Web site.	• http://oregon.gov/DHS/ph/chs/data/birth/race/2004/	(Same as above)
1-1.B. Identification of target population	Clients with a New Baby Questionnaire submitted to NPC Research with a screening date between July 1, 2004, and June 30, 2005, plus the program counts of the number of families who are screened but decline to participate in the evaluation are counted in the screening rate.	**Table 4** • 10,135 families screened and/or offered service (59% of eligible)	The system of organizational agreements enables the program to identify at least 75% of the participants in the target population for screening or assessment.
	Program counts of the total number of families who refuse the screening are counted as being offered services.	**Table 1:** • 7,022 (41% of eligible) families screened	

[1] Item numbers reflect the most recent form revisions (July 1, 2004).

HFA Element	Source of Data [1]	Statewide Results	HFA Standard
HFA Element for which the evaluation provides data	**Origin of the data (such as specific items on specific forms)**	**Statewide result for the corresponding HFA element, and the table where this information can be found for individual counties**	**HFA standard for the element**
1-1.B. (cont.) Identification of target population	Number of families offered service is the sum of screened families plus additional contacts. Kempe Scoring Sheets received by NPC Research are counted as assessed (if the accompanying screen is "high risk").	**Table 2:** • 2,059 (44% of eligible) families assessed	
1-1.D. Screenings/ Assessment to determine eligibility for services occur prenatally or within first two weeks of birth of the baby	Screen date is taken from the New Baby Questionnaire (Item 1). Date of birth is taken from the New Baby Questionnaire (Item 2), or in cases in which birth date is missing, the Family Intake form (Item 11). Time to screen is calculated as the number of days between birth date and screening date.	**Table 9:** • 1,633 (25%) screened prenatally • 3,871 (57%) screened within 2 weeks of birth • 1,242 (18%) screened after two weeks Overall: 82% screened at or before 2 weeks of age Median time to screen = 2 days	80% of eligibility screenings or assessments occur either prenatally or within the first two weeks after the baby's birth.
	Assessment date is taken from the Kempe Scoring Sheet. Date of Birth is taken from the New Baby Questionnaire (Item 2), or in cases in which birth date is missing, the Family Intake form (Item 11). Time to assessment is calculated as the number of days between birth date and assessment date.	**Table 10:** • 449 (16%) assessed prenatally • 619 (22%) assessed within 2 weeks of birth • 1,709 (62%) assessed other times Overall: 39% assessed at or before 2 weeks of age Median time to assessment = 26 days	80% of eligibility screenings or assessments occur either prenatally or within the first two weeks after the baby's birth.

HFA Element	Source of Data [1]	Statewide Results	HFA Standard
HFA Element for which the evaluation provides data	**Origin of the data (such as specific items on specific forms)**	**Statewide result for the corresponding HFA element, and the table where this information can be found for individual counties**	**HFA standard for the element**
1-2.A. Acceptance rate of participants	Healthy Start Intensive Service "Accepted" by parent, from Kempe Scoring Sheet (Item B).	**Table 11:** • 1,656 (86%) of eligible families accepted service at the time of assessment	The program defines, measures and monitors its acceptance rate and evidence indicates acceptance rates are measured in a consistent manner and at least yearly.
1-2.B. Analysis of who refused the program and why (of those eligible)	Healthy Start Intensive Service "Declined" by parent, from Kempe Scoring Sheet (Item B). Demographic data are obtained from the New Baby Questionnaire [mother's age (#6a), ethnicity (#7), language spoken at home (#10), marital status (#12), education level (#14), and employment status (#15)].	**Tables 13 & 21:** Percentage of each ethnic group of those who declined [vs. those who accepted]: • African American (<1% declined vs. 2% accepted) • Hispanic (20% declined vs. 35% accepted) • Asian/Pacific Islander (1% vs. 4%) • American Indian (2% vs. 1%) • Caucasian (70% vs. 53%) • Hawaiian (0% vs. <1%) • Multiracial (5% vs. 3%) **Tables 14 & 22:** Language spoken at home of those who declined [vs. those accepting]: • English speaking household (82% vs. 67%) • Spanish speaking household (18% vs. 30%) Marital status of those who declined: • Married: 16% declined vs. 84% accepted • Single: 12% declined vs. 88% accepted	The program annually analyzes who refused the program and why. This analysis relies on demographic and informal sources to identify those who refused (ideally, the analysis also addresses programmatic, demographic, social and other factors).

HFA Element	Source of Data [1]	Statewide Results	HFA Standard
HFA Element for which the evaluation provides data	**Origin of the data (such as specific items on specific forms)**	**Statewide result for the corresponding HFA element, and the table where this information can be found for individual counties**	**HFA standard for the element**
1-2.B. (cont.) Analysis of who refused the program and why (of those eligible)		Education level of those who declined: • 33% less than high school education declined (vs. 47% of those accepting) Employment status of those who declined: • 62% unemployed (vs. 75% of those accepting) • 18% full time employed (vs. 9% of those accepting)	
1-3. First home visit occurs prenatally or within 3 months of the birth of the baby	Date of first home visit is on the Family Intake Form (item 2), or if missing, is taken from the Exit Form. Baby's birth date comes from the New Baby Questionnaire (item 2) or the Family Intake form (item 11). Time to first visit is calculated as the number of days between first home visit date and baby's birth date.	**Table 11:** • 90% (1,117 families) received first visit prenatally or within 3 months of the birth of the baby	80% of first home visits occur within the first three months after the birth of the baby.
3-4.A. Participant retention rate	Date of first home visit is on the Family Intake Form (item 2), or if missing, is taken from the Exit form. Date of last home visit is on the Exit Form. Reasons for leaving are taken from the Exit Form. Intensive Service clients without an Exit Form are coded as "still in service."	**Table 23:** • 12% stayed fewer than 3 months (never engaged) Note**:** The following calculation reflects only those participants who began service at least 12 months prior to June 30, 2005. • 52% participated in 12 months of service or less • 48% participated in more than 12 months of service	The program defines, measures, and monitors its retention rate, and evidence indicates retention rates are measured in a consistent manner and at least yearly (more than once a year).

HFA Element	Source of Data [1]	Statewide Results	HFA Standard
HFA Element for which the evaluation provides data	**Origin of the data (such as specific items on specific forms)**	**Statewide result for the corresponding HFA element, and the table where this information can be found for individual counties**	**HFA standard for the element**
3-4.B. Analysis of which families drop out of the program and why	Reasons for leaving are taken from the Exit Form. Demographic Characteristics of exited families are taken from the New Baby Questionnaire (Items 6b, 7, 10, 12, and 14).	**Table 27:** Of those who exited: • 12% Creative Outreach ended • 11% moved, unable to contact family • 15% parent no longer interested • 18% parent too busy • 12% moved out of county • 3% child removed from custody • 30% other exit reasons **Table 25:** Of those who exited *[compared to those who remained]*: • African American (2%) [2%] • Hispanic (31%) [35%] • Asian/Pacific Islander (2%) [4%] • American Indian (1%) [1%] • Caucasian (58%) [53%] • Hawaiian (1%) [<1%] • Multiracial (3%) [3%] • Other (<1%) [1%] **Table 26:** Of those who exited [compared to those who remained]: • English speaking household (81%) [67%] • Spanish speaking household (18%) [30%] • Other language household (1%) [3%]	The program annually analyzes who drops out of the program and why. Analysis relies on demographic and informal sources to identify those who dropped out (ideally analysis also addresses programmatic, demographic, social and other factors).

HFA Element	Source of Data [1]	Statewide Results	HFA Standard
HFA Element for which the evaluation provides data	**Origin of the data (such as specific items on specific forms)**	**Statewide result for the corresponding HFA element, and the table where this information can be found for individual counties**	**HFA standard for the element**
4-2B. Participants remain on most intensive home visitation level	Level of service and number of face-to-face visits are taken from the Family Update form, Version 3 (Version 4 has the number of site visits on the Exit form).	**Table 11:** The median number of home visits per month for the first six months of service (e.g., families on Level 1) was 2.3 (that is, 50% of families received more than 2.3 and 50% received fewer)	Participants are offered at least weekly home visits for the first six months after the birth of the baby. Participants receive 75% of the appropriate number of home visits based on service level (e.g., 3 per month for Level 1).
5-1. Description of current service population	Demographic data is taken either from the New Baby Questionnaire (# 6b (age), 7 (ethnicity), &10 (language spoken at home). **Additional data** describing the current service population is presented in Tables 5 & 6 (screened families) and 12 & 13 (Intensive Service families).	**Table 5:** **<u>All Screened Families:</u>** • African American (2%) • Hispanic (22%) • Asian (4%) • American Indian (1%) • Caucasian (64%) • Hawaiian (<1%) • Multiracial (5%) • Other (1%) **Table 6:** • English spoken at home (78%) • Spanish spoken at home (18%) • Other language spoken at home (4%) • Teen Mothers (10%)	Program has a description of the current service population that addresses cultural characteristics, racial/ethnic characteristics, and linguistic characteristics.

HFA Element	Source of Data [1]	Statewide Results	HFA Standard
HFA Element for which the evaluation provides data	**Origin of the data (such as specific items on specific forms)**	**Statewide result for the corresponding HFA element, and the table where this information can be found for individual counties**	**HFA standard for the element**
5-1. Description of current service population		**Table 13:** **<u>Intensive Service Families:</u>** • African American (2%) • Hispanic (35%) • Asian (4%) • American Indian (1%) • Caucasian (53%) • Hawaiian (<1%) • Multiracial (3%)	
5-4.B. Culturally competent practices/services, including participant input	Most recent responses on Parent Survey II (#9).	**Table 14:** • English spoken at home (67%) • Spanish spoken at home (30%) • Other language spoken at home (3%) • Teen Mothers (19%)	The program reviews its practices for cultural competency and includes direct input form the participants on (at least) 3 of the following: culturally sensitive practice, materials, communication, and staff-participant interaction. Review could be more comprehensive.
6-2A-C. The home visitor and participant collaborate to identify participant strengths, competencies, needs, services to help address those needs, and goals for home visitation	Most recent responses on Parent Survey II, #9. Ratings of staff strength orientation are assessed by parent responses to: My home visitor (1) Lets me decide what goals I want to work toward, (2) Sees strengths in myself I didn't know I had, (3) helps me use my own skills and resources to solve problems, and (4) helps me learn new skills. Answers are averaged to create a "strengths orientation" subscale.	**Table 36:** Ratings by parents of extent to which staff have a strengths orientation: • 55% strongly agree (40% agree, and 4% are not sure if) staff have a strengths orientation	The home visitor and participant collaborate to identify participant strengths and competencies, assess participants' needs, and set goals for home visitation.

HFA Element	Source of Data [1]	Statewide Results	HFA Standard
HFA Element for which the evaluation provides data	**Origin of the data (such as specific items on specific forms)**	**Statewide result for the corresponding HFA element, and the table where this information can be found for individual counties**	**HFA standard for the element**
6-4. Program promotes positive parenting skills, parent-child interaction, and knowledge of child development	Most recent responses on Parent Survey II # 5a & 5c. Most recent response on Parent Survey II #4. Cumulative HOME score at 12 and 24 months (#1 to 4#5).	**Table 34:** • 84% of parents reported improved parenting skills at both 6 and 12 months • 66% of parents reported improved ability to help their child at 6 months, and 69% at 12 months **Table 35:** • 82% were rated by Family Support Worker as having positive parent-child interactions at both 6 and 12 months • 77% of families had a "good" or higher score on the HOME at 12 months; 80% of families had a "good" or higher score on the HOME at 24 months	Standards related to worker provision of information. Data suggest positive outcomes in the parenting domain.
6-5.B. Use of standardized developmental screen/tool to monitor child development	Most recent response on Family Update (#36b). Note: This information is based on the Family Support Worker's most recent administration of the ASQ.	**Table 32:** • 90% of children were within the "normal" range of development • 56% of all age-eligible children received at least one ASQ assessment	The program uses a standardized developmental tool at specified intervals to monitor child development for target children in the program unless developmentally inappropriate.
6-7.B. & 6-7.C. Documentation of children suspected of having a developmental delay, program follows through with appropriate referrals/ services	Most recent responses on Family Update (#33, 35).	**Table 32:** • 49 children had an identified developmental delay; 96% of these children were reported as receiving early intervention services	Consistent evidence that the program routinely tracks target children suspected of having a developmental delay.

HFA Element	Source of Data [1]	Statewide Results	HFA Standard
HFA Element for which the evaluation provides data	**Origin of the data (such as specific items on specific forms)**	**Statewide result for the corresponding HFA element, and the table where this information can be found for individual counties**	**HFA standard for the element**
7-1.C. Participating children have a medical provider	Most recent response on Family Update (Primary caregiver = #28, well-child check-ups = #21, emergency room for routine care = #23).	**Table 28 & 29:** • 98% of children have health care provider • 93% received well-child check-ups • 2% frequently use emergency room for routine care, 22% used it once or twice	80% of target children have a medical/health care provider.
7-2.B. Immunizations for participating children are up to date	Most recent response on Family Update (Up to date immunizations = #20a). Calculations for up to date immunizations by age 2 are based on responses to #20a for all target children 2 years or older (as calculated by date of birth and date of Family Update).	**Table 30:** • 93% of children had up to date immunizations; 6% had some immunizations, but not up to date • 94% reported to be fully immunized by age 2	80% of target children have up-to-date immunizations.
7-3.A. Program connects participants to appropriate referral sources and services	Family Support Workers ratings on the 6-month Family Update #11 (Version 4).	**Table 33:** Percent who needed and were connected with service at 6 months: • Dental Insurance (5%) • Education Assistance (38%) • Language Classes (59%) • Housing Assistance (66%) • Job Training (20%)	Isolated instances found when participants needing referral were not connected to appropriate services in the community.
GA-3. Program has mechanism in place for families to provide formalized input into program	The family provides ratings of satisfaction with staff on the Parent Survey II (Version 3: #9a-n; Version 4 will only assess Empowerment Approach and Cultural Competency, #9 a-h).	**Table 37:** Strength-based Practice (Empowerment Approach) • 55% strongly agree • 40% agree • 4% not sure	The program has mechanisms for participants to provide input to the program and at least includes participant satisfaction surveys.

HFA Element	Source of Data [1]	Statewide Results	HFA Standard
HFA Element for which the evaluation provides data	**Origin of the data (such as specific items on specific forms)**	**Statewide result for the corresponding HFA element, and the table where this information can be found for individual counties**	**HFA standard for the element**
GA-3. Program has mechanism in place for families to provide formalized input into program	On the Parent Survey II, families can write comments about the program including: (1) What do you think is the best thing about Healthy Start? (2) How could Healthy Start be better? (3) Is there anything else you want to tell us?	**Staff Skills:** • 61% strongly agree • 36% agree • 2% not sure **Cultural Competency:** • 76% strongly agree • 22% agree • 2% not sure **Child Focused:** • 69% strongly agree • 29% agree • 1% not sure Parent open-ended feedback will be compiled, with identifying information removed, and electronically sent to programs	
GA-5.A. Program routinely reviews progress towards its program goals and objectives	Annual status report (this document).	• NA Not needed for the local programs but may be good for the state to have	The program conducts an analysis of program goals and objectives at least annually.

APPENDIX A: HEALTHY START OF OREGON 2004-2005 STATUS REPORT DATA TABLES

Table 1: Identification of Target Population: Screening

County	Birth Rate[1] (From Vital Statistics[2])	Number Screened[3] (and Sent to Evaluation)	Number of Families Screened, But Declining to Share Information with the Evaluation[4]	Percent Refused Evaluation	Total Families Screened	Percent Screened of Eligible Births
Benton	325	261	2	1%	263	81%
Clackamas	1,437	525	2	<1%	527	37%
Clatsop	149	20	27	57%	47	32%
Columbia	132	32	4	11%	36	27%
Coos	207	17	0	0%	17	8%
Crook	82	49	0	0%	49	60%
Curry[5]	59	59	0	0%	59	100%
Deschutes	679	400	0	0%	400	59%
Douglas	388	255	1	<1%	256	66%
Gilliam	14	5	0	0%	5	36%
Grant	52	4	2	33%	6	12%
Harney	68	8	0	0%	8	12%
Hood River	110	47	0	0%	47	43%
Jackson	822	265	26	9%	291	35%
Jefferson	91	28	0	0%	28	31%
Josephine	318	166	9	5%	175	55%
Klamath	306	100	7	7%	107	35%
Lake	56	4	0	0%	4	7%
Lane	1,404	382	0	0%	382	27%
Lincoln	178	140	7	5%	147	83%
Linn	495	257	14	5%	271	55%
Malheur	134	26	0	0%	26	19%

[1] Birth rates for Healthy Start programs reflect first births; with the exception of some minimum grant counties with funds to serve all births. These counties include: Gilliam, Grant, Harney, Lake, Sherman, and Wallowa.
[2] Birth statistics are obtained from the Office of Family Health, Vital Statistics Web site (http://oregon.gov/DHS/ph/chs/data/birth/birthdata.shtml).
[3] Screened families are those with a completed New Baby Questionnaire.
[4] This information is submitted to the evaluation annually from Program Managers/Supervisors.
[5] The number of first births for Curry County has been adjusted from Vital Statistics to account for the first-birth families being served in their county that gave birth in California hospitals.

County	Birth Rate[1] (From Vital Statistics[2])	Number Screened[3] (and Sent to Evaluation)	Number of Families Screened, But Declining to Share Information with the Evaluation[4]	Percent Refused Evaluation	Total Families Screened	Percent Screened of Eligible Births
Marion	1,581	843	5	1%	848	54%
Morrow	43	37	0	0%	37	86%
Multnomah	3,851	1757	0	0%	1,757	46%
Polk	268	128	0	0%	128	48%
Sherman	10	3	0	0%	3	30%
Tillamook	105	36	0	0%	36	34%
Umatilla	227	105	0	0%	105	46%
Union	95	68	0	0%	68	72%
Wallowa	66	17	1	6%	18	27%
Wasco	85	49	1	2%	50	59%
Washington	2,899	661	17	3%	678	23%
Yamhill	400	135	8	6%	143	36%
State	**17,077**	**6,889**	**133**	**2%**	**7,022**	**41%**

[1] Birth rates for Healthy Start programs reflect first births; with the exception of some minimum grant counties with funds to serve all births. These counties include: Gilliam, Grant, Harney, Lake, Sherman, and Wallowa.
[2] Birth statistics are obtained from the Office of Family Health, Vital Statistics Web site (http://oregon.gov/DHS/ph/chs/data/birth/birthdata.shtml).
[3] Screened families are those with a completed New Baby Questionnaire.
[4] This information is submitted to the evaluation annually from Program Managers/Supervisors.

Table 2: Identification of Target Population: Assessment

County	Number of High-risk Screens (at Least 1 RF)	Percent of Screens That Were High Risk	Number of Kempe Assessments[6] Conducted on High-risk Screens	Percent of High-risk Screens with Kempe Assessments
Benton	118	45%	68	58%
Clackamas	404	77%	151	37%
Clatsop	17	85%	11	65%
Columbia	28	88%	23	82%
Coos	16	94%	8	50%
Crook	37	76%	20	54%
Curry[7]	46	78%	17	37%
Deschutes	214	54%	100	47%
Douglas	176	69%	50	28%
Gilliam	3	60%	2	67%
Grant	3	75%	2	67%
Harney	8	100%	7	88%
Hood River	33	70%	30	91%
Jackson	210	79%	90	43%
Jefferson	26	93%	21	81%
Josephine	107	65%	63	59%
Klamath	66	66%	28	42%
Lake	3	75%	1	33%
Lane	250	65%	172	69%
Lincoln	114	81%	61	54%
Linn	181	70%	88	49%
Malheur	21	81%	19	91%
Marion	616	73%	261	42%
Morrow	27	73%	14	52%
Multnomah	1,156	66%	286	25%
Polk	84	66%	45	54%

[6] The Kempe Family Stress Inventory (KFSI), conducted by trained assessment workers, measures family stress levels. Stress is assessed in ten categories, with total scores ranging from 0-100. Families with scores of 25 or higher are eligible for Intensive Services.

[7] The number of first births for Curry County has been adjusted from Vital Statistics to account for the first-birth families being served in their county that gave birth in California hospitals.

County	Number of High-risk Screens (at Least 1 RF)	Percent of Screens That Were High Risk	Number of Kempe Assessments[6] Conducted on High-risk Screens	Percent of High-risk Screens with Kempe Assessments
Sherman	2	67%	2	100%
Tillamook	29	81%	18	62%
Umatilla	76	72%	29	38%
Union	48	71%	23	48%
Wallowa	13	77%	7	54%
Wasco	38	78%	31	82%
Washington	455	69%	261	57%
Yamhill	111	82%	50	45%
State	**4,736**	**69%**	**2,059**	**44%**

[6] The Kempe Family Stress Inventory (KFSI), conducted by trained assessment workers, measures family stress levels. Stress is assessed in ten categories, with total scores ranging from 0-100. Families with scores of 25 or higher are eligible for Intensive Services.

Table 3: Identification of Target Population: Declines & Other Contacts

County	Number of Families who Declined Healthy Start Information	Percent of Those Contacts Who Declined Healthy Start Information	Number of Families who Signed a Pre-Consent But Were Not Screened	Number of Families Receiving Healthy Start Information but Declined Screening	Percent of Those Agreeing to Healthy Start Who Declined Screening	Number of Families who Exited Service Prenatally (Before an ID Number Could Be Obtained)	Other Contacts
Benton	0	0%	0	6	2%	0	0
Clackamas	185	21%	130	26	4%	18	0
Clatsop	8	9%	27	8	10%	0	0
Columbia	8	15%	5	1	2%	2	0
Coos	0	0%	15	14	27%	5	0
Crook	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0
Curry	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0
Deschutes	138	26%	0	2	0%	0	0
Douglas	0	0%	1	11	4%	3	0
Gilliam	0	0%	2	0	0%	0	0
Grant	11	31%	8	7	29%	1	2
Harney	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0
Hood River	13	15%	25	0	0%	3	0
Jackson	51	8%	202	67	11%	36	0
Jefferson	22	32%	19	0	0%	0	0
Josephine	0	0%	30	35	13%	0	23
Klamath	13	6%	40	45	23%	1	0
Lake	1	9%	5	1	10%	0	0
Lane	17	3%	95	56	11%	0	0
Lincoln	7	3%	0	31	15%	23	0
Linn	14	4%	16	13	4%	11	0
Malheur	1	1%	11	28	33%	21	0
Marion	229	20%	47	1	0%	39	0
Morrow	0	0%	4	1	2%	0	0
Multnomah	0	0%	0	373	17%	11	0
Polk	45	25%	3	1	1%	3	0

County	Number of Families who Declined Healthy Start Information	Percent of Those Contacts Who Declined Healthy Start Information	Number of Families who Signed a Pre-Consent But Were Not Screened	Number of Families Receiving Healthy Start Information but Declined Screening	Percent of Those Agreeing to Healthy Start Who Declined Screening	Number of Families who Exited Service Prenatally (Before an ID Number Could Be Obtained)	Other Contacts
Sherman	0	0%	1	0	0%	0	0
Tillamook	0	0%	5	1	2%	0	0
Umatilla	40	20%	18	37	23%	0	0
Union	2	3%	0	3	4%	0	0
Wallowa	4	15%	2	1	5%	1	0
Wasco	0	0%	20	2	3%	6	0
Washington	292	23%	212	14	1%	65	0
Yamhill	12	3%	9	179	54%	3	0
State	**920**	**9%**	**952**	**964**	**10%**	**252**	**25**

Table 4: Identification of Target Population: Healthy Start Contact Rate Summary

County	Total Number of Additional Contacts[8]	Total Number Contacted (Screened + Additional Contacts)	Percent of Eligible Births Contacted
Benton	6	269	83%
Clackamas	359	886	62%
Clatsop	43	90	60%
Columbia	16	52	39%
Coos	34	51	25%
Crook	0	49	60%
Curry	0	59	100%
Deschutes	140	540	80%
Douglas	15	271	70%
Gilliam	2	7	50%
Grant	29	35	67%
Harney	0	8	12%
Hood River	41	88	80%
Jackson	356	647	79%
Jefferson	41	69	76%
Josephine	88	263	83%
Klamath	99	206	67%
Lake	7	11	20%
Lane	168	550	39%
Lincoln	61	208	100%[9]
Linn	54	325	66%
Malheur	61	87	65%
Marion	316	1,164	74%
Morrow	5	42	98%
Multnomah	384	2,141	56%
Polk	52	180	67%
Sherman	1	4	40%

[8] Additional contacts are submitted to the evaluation annually by Program Managers/Supervisors.
[9] The percent of families contacted exceeds 100%, so it is likely that some families contacted for services were not residents of Lincoln County at the time of the baby's birth.

County	Total Number of Additional Contacts[8]	Total Number Contacted (Screened + Additional Contacts)	Percent of Eligible Births Contacted
Tillamook	6	42	40%
Umatilla	95	200	88%
Union	5	73	77%
Wallowa	8	26	39%
Wasco	28	78	92%
Washington	583	1,261	43%
Yamhill	203	346	87%
State	**3,113**	**10,135**	**59%**

8 Additional contacts are submitted to the evaluation annually by Program Managers/Supervisors.

Table 5: Demographics of Screened Families: Race/Ethnicity[10]

County	Number of Screened Families[11]	Percent African American	Percent Hispanic	Percent Asian/Pacific Islander	Percent American Indian	Percent Caucasian	Percent Hawaiian	Percent Multiracial[12]	Percent Other	Percent Unreported
Benton	261	0%	10%	11%	0%	72%	0%	5%	2%	0%
Clackamas	525	1%	18%	4%	2%	70%	0%	4%	< 1%	< 1%
Clatsop	20	0%	21%	0%	5%	74%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Columbia	32	0%	6%	3%	0%	81%	0%	9%	0%	0%
Coos	17	0%	6%	0%	0%	88%	0%	6%	0%	0%
Crook	49	0%	24%	0%	0%	70%	0%	4%	0%	2%
Curry	59	0%	5%	0%	3%	78%	0%	14%	0%	0%
Deschutes	400	< 1%	7%	< 1%	0%	75%	0%	1%	< 1%	15%
Douglas	255	0%	3%	2%	< 1%	81%	0%	13%	0%	< 1%
Gilliam	5	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Grant	4	0%	25%	0%	0%	75%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Harney	8	0%	0%	0%	0%	88%	0%	13%	0%	0%
Hood River	47	0%	57%	2%	0%	34%	0%	4%	2%	0%
Jackson	265	< 1%	24%	2%	< 1%	63%	< 1%	5%	2%	4%
Jefferson	28	0%	59%	0%	0%	33%	0%	7%	0%	0%
Josephine	166	0%	4%	< 1%	1%	88%	0%	5%	0%	1%
Klamath	100	3%	11%	1%	1%	73%	0%	8%	1%	2%
Lake	4	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Lane	382	1%	12%	4%	1%	71%	0%	8%	< 1%	3%
Lincoln	140	0%	23%	2%	2%	67%	< 1%	5%	0%	< 1%
Linn	257	0%	12%	< 1%	0%	82%	0%	4%	< 1%	< 1%
Malheur	26	0%	61%	0%	0%	39%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Marion	843	1%	36%	2%	< 1%	54%	0%	4%	1%	< 1%
Morrow	37	0%	49%	0%	0%	49%	0%	0%	0%	3%
Multnomah	1,757	7%	18%	7%	< 1%	61%	< 1%	4%	1%	< 1%
Polk	128	< 1%	27%	< 1%	2%	65%	0%	4%	< 1%	< 1%
Sherman	3	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Tillamook	36	0%	28%	0%	0%	69%	0%	0%	3%	0%
Umatilla	105	1%	31%	0%	3%	59%	0%	4%	0%	2%

[10] Demographic information is compiled from primary caregiver's responses on the New Baby Questionnaire.
[11] Only families who agreed to share information with the evaluation are included in these analyses. 133 total families (2%) declined to participate in the evaluation.
[12] Families categorized as "Multiracial" identified more than one race/ethnicity on the New Baby Questionnaire.

County	Number of Screened Families[11]	Percent African American	Percent Hispanic	Percent Asian/Pacific Islander	Percent American Indian	Percent Caucasian	Percent Hawaiian	Percent Multiracial[12]	Percent Other	Percent Unreported
Union	68	2%	2%	3%	3%	87%	2%	2%	2%	0%
Wallowa	17	0%	6%	0%	0%	82%	0%	12%	0%	0%
Wasco	49	0%	20%	2%	0%	69%	0%	6%	0%	2%
Washington	661	< 1%	44%	8%	< 1%	42%	0%	3%	< 1%	1%
Yamhill	135	0%	24%	< 1%	< 1%	69%	0%	4%	< 1%	0%
State	**6,889**	**2%**	**22%**	**4%**	**< 1%**	**64%**	**< 1%**	**5%**	**< 1%**	**2%**

[10] Demographic information is compiled from primary caregiver's responses on the New Baby Questionnaire.
[11] Only families who agreed to share information with the evaluation are included in these analyses. 133 total families (2%) declined to participate in the evaluation.
[12] Families categorized as "Multiracial" identified more than one race/ethnicity on the New Baby Questionnaire.

Table 6: Demographics of Screened Families:[13] Language, Teen and Single Parents, & Education Level

County	Percent English Speaking Household	Percent Spanish Speaking Household	Percent Other Language Household	Percent Teen Mothers	Percent Single Mothers	Percent Less Than High School Education
Benton	81%	9%	10%	2%	27%	8%
Clackamas	80%	18%	3%	9%	55%	26%
Clatsop	79%	21%	0%	21%	67%	58%
Columbia	100%	0%	0%	13%	68%	34%
Coos	94%	6%	0%	18%	87%	35%
Crook	78%	22%	0%	7%	51%	35%
Curry	97%	2%	2%	9%	52%	25%
Deschutes	95%	5%	0%	9%	38%	16%
Douglas	98%	1%	< 1%	9%	48%	19%
Gilliam	80%	0%	20%	0%	40%	40%
Grant	75%	25%	0%	0%	67%	25%
Harney	100%	0%	0%	13%	63%	25%
Hood River	47%	47%	6%	13%	42%	42%
Jackson	81%	18%	< 1%	11%	64%	35%
Jefferson	42%	58%	0%	19%	52%	59%
Josephine	98%	< 1%	1%	7%	50%	21%
Klamath	91%	7%	2%	8%	43%	20%
Lake	100%	0%	0%	0%	50%	0%
Lane	89%	9%	2%	12%	52%	23%
Lincoln	80%	20%	< 1%	9%	67%	38%
Linn	89%	10%	1%	10%	51%	25%
Malheur	70%	30%	0%	22%	82%	57%
Marion	71%	27%	< 1%	13%	54%	36%
Morrow	61%	39%	0%	24%	48%	58%
Multnomah	76%	15%	9%	8%	49%	24%
Polk	76%	23%	2%	13%	45%	24%
Sherman	100%	0%	0%	0%	33%	33%
Tillamook	75%	25%	0%	27%	61%	42%
Umatilla	71%	29%	0%	10%	57%	35%
Union	96%	2%	3%	8%	51%	25%
Wallowa	100%	0%	0%	0%	29%	0%

[13] Demographic information is compiled from primary caregiver's responses on the New Baby Questionnaire.

County	Percent English Speaking Household	Percent Spanish Speaking Household	Percent Other Language Household	Percent Teen Mothers	Percent Single Mothers	Percent Less Than High School Education
Wasco	82%	16%	2%	12%	50%	31%
Washington	55%	40%	5%	13%	49%	39%
Yamhill	81%	19%	0%	13%	61%	39%
State	**78%**	**18%**	**4.0%**	**10%**	**50%**	**28%**

[13] Demographic information is compiled from primary caregiver's responses on the New Baby Questionnaire.

Table 7: Risk Factors at Screening: Health Insurance & Health Care

County	Number of Moms with Health Insurance Information	Percent with No Health Insurance	Number of Babies With Health Insurance Information	Percent with No Health Insurance	Number with Time to Prenatal Care Information	Percent with Late Prenatal Care (More Than 12 Weeks or Not at All)	Number with Amount of Prenatal Care Visit Information	Percent with Less Than 5 Prenatal Care Visits
Benton	259	2%	255	2%	254	11%	259	<1%
Clackamas	523	6%	516	6%	525	24%	509	2%
Clatsop	19	21%	16	13%	19	42%	19	0%
Columbia	31	0%	32	3%	31	16%	31	7%
Coos	17	0%	17	0%	17	29%	17	6%
Crook	46	4%	46	9%	44	16%	45	0%
Curry	58	5%	58	7%	58	22%	58	3%
Deschutes	380	3%	379	1%	373	11%	316	<1%
Douglas	243	2%	243	2%	243	20%	243	2%
Gilliam	5	0%	5	0%	5	20%	5	20%
Grant	4	0%	4	0%	4	50%	4	0%
Harney	8	25%	8	0%	8	13%	8	0%
Hood River	46	9%	44	25%	47	11%	47	2%
Jackson	252	25%	234	30%	251	23%	245	4%
Jefferson	26	9%	27	4%	26	19%	27	0%
Josephine	163	1%	163	<1%	163	23%	161	4%
Klamath	100	2%	98	7%	98	10%	98	1%
Lake	4	0%	4	0%	4	<1%	4	0%
Lane	377	2%	378	1%	375	21%	360	<1%
Lincoln	136	15%	131	18%	131	20%	126	4%
Linn	247	8%	234	10%	246	15%	225	3%
Malheur	23	9%	23	4%	23	30%	23	4%
Marion	828	5%	823	5%	822	22%	828	4%
Morrow	33	15%	32	9%	33	49%	33	3%
Multnomah	1,736	2%	1,718	2%	1,728	23%	1,719	2%
Polk	128	5%	122	4%	125	24%	125	2%
Sherman	3	0%	3	0%	3	<1%%	3	0%
Tillamook	36	3%	36	3%	35	17%	36	6%
Umatilla	101	4%	101	1%	100	16%	100	3%
Union	67	3%	66	3%	67	22%	67	2%
Wallowa	17	6%	16	0%	17	18%	17	6%

County	Number of Moms with Health Insurance Information	Percent with No Health Insurance	Number of Babies With Health Insurance Information	Percent with No Health Insurance	Number with Time to Prenatal Care Information	Percent with Late Prenatal Care (More Than 12 Weeks or Not at All)	Number with Amount of Prenatal Care Visit Information	Percent with Less Than 5 Prenatal Care Visits
Wasco	49	2%	49	0%	49	14%	49	2%
Washington	651	17%	607	11%	649	26%	643	2%
Yamhill	134	5%	130	6%	133	22%	134	<1%
State	**6,750**	**6%**	**6,618**	**5%**	**6,706**	**21%**	**6,584**	**2%**

Table 8: Risk Factors at Screening: Employment, Income, Mental Health, Substance Use, & Marital Problems

County	Number with Mother's Employment Information	Percent Not Employed	Number with Basic Living Expenses Information	Percent with Difficulty Most of the Time Paying for Basic Expenses	Number with Depression Information	Percent with Depression Symptoms	Number with Drug/Alcohol Information	Percent Asked to Cut Down on Drug/Alcohol Use	Number with Marital Problem Information	Percent with Some or Serious Problems
Benton	256	41%	259	4%	256	9%	257	<1%	253	3%
Clackamas	520	44%	520	19%	494	32%	495	1%	517	16%
Clatsop	19	84%	19	32%	18	44%	18	6%	19	16%
Columbia	32	72%	32	22%	31	45%	31	0%	32	31%
Coos	17	82%	16	0%	16	25%	15	7%	14	43%
Crook	45	60%	46	20%	44	16%	45	0%	44	16%
Curry	58	64%	58	22%	52	2%	52	2%	57	9%
Deschutes	371	35%	371	13%	352	34%	355	12%	359	18%
Douglas	243	64%	243	17%	239	16%	238	2%	241	12%
Gilliam	5	60%	5	0%	5	0%	5	0%	5	0%
Grant	4	50%	4	0%	3	100%	3	0%	4	50%
Harney	8	63%	8	38%	8	38%	8	13%	8	38%
Hood River	47	70%	46	9%	44	14%	46	2%	46	17%
Jackson	253	51%	251	21%	229	24%	233	3%	250	14%
Jefferson	27	70%	26	15%	26	54%	26	0%	27	30%
Josephine	164	59%	164	15%	156	19%	158	3%	163	7%
Klamath	97	42%	99	13%	98	16%	99	0%	98	14%
Lake	4	50%	4	25%	4	25%	4	0%	4	0%
Lane	378	60%	375	10%	371	25%	368	4%	370	18%
Lincoln	137	49%	137	22%	134	25%	132	2%	134	18%
Linn	248	51%	242	15%	243	27%	240	3%	244	16%
Malheur	23	74%	23	13%	19	26%	17	0%	23	9%
Marion	823	55%	829	13%	806	24%	794	2%	818	12%
Morrow	33	76%	33	12%	31	42%	31	3%	33	12%
Multnomah	1,730	52%	1,731	15%	1,694	17%	1,686	2%	1723	8%
Polk	124	48%	125	10%	116	22%	113	<1%	125	13%
Sherman	3	67%	3	0%	1	0%	1	0%	3	0%
Tillamook	36	61%	36	3%	29	24%	29	0%	36	28%
Umatilla	102	56%	99	6%	97	21.6%	98	0%	101	10%
Union	67	42%	67	9%	66	15%	66	0%	66	8%

County	Number with Mother's Employment Information	Percent Not Employed	Number with Basic Living Expenses Information	Percent with Difficulty Most of the Time Paying for Basic Expenses	Number with Depression Information	Percent with Depression Symptoms	Number with Drug/Alcohol Information	Percent Asked to Cut Down on Drug/Alcohol Use	Number with Marital Problem Information	Percent with Some or Serious Problems
Wallowa	17	53%	17	24%	10	20%	10	0%	17	29%
Wasco	49	59%	49	10%	37	35%	37	0%	48	15%
Washington	651	62%	646	17%	517	32%	518	1%	637	17%
Yamhill	132	59%	135	17%	129	29%	130	2%	133	12%
State	**6,723**	**53%**	**6,718**	**15%**	**6,375**	**23%**	**6,358**	**2%**	**6,652**	**13%**

Table 9: Time to Screen[14]

County	Number Screened (and Sent to Evaluation)	Number Screened Prenatally	Percent Screened Prenatally	Number Screened Birth - 2 Weeks	Percent Screened Birth - 2 Weeks	Percent Screened Prenatally - 2 Weeks (HFA Standard)	Number Screened Other Times[15]	Percent Screened Other Times	Median[16] Days to Screen
Benton	261	36	14%	220	84%	98%	5	2%	1.0
Clackamas	525	143	27%	204	39%	66%	176	34%	11.0
Clatsop	20	4	21%	6	32%	53%	9	47%	22.0
Columbia	32	20	63%	3	9%	72%	9	28%	20.0
Coos	17	6	35%	5	29%	65%	6	35%	26.0
Crook	49	6	13%	24	52%	65%	16	35%	10.0
Curry	59	20	35%	6	10%	45%	32	55%	23.5
Deschutes	400	297	76%	38	10%	86%	55	14%	16.0
Douglas	255	34	14%	187	77%	91%	21	9%	1.0
Gilliam	5	0	0%	0	0%	0%	5	100%	35.0
Grant	4	2	50%	0	0%	50%	2	50%	49.5
Harney	8	0	0%	1	13%	13%	7	88%	32.5
Hood River	47	16	35%	10	22%	57%	20	44%	21.0
Jackson	265	143	57%	75	30%	86%	35	14%	2.0
Jefferson	28	1	4%	10	37%	41%	16	59%	20.0
Josephine	166	33	20%	121	74%	94%	10	6%	2.0
Klamath	100	17	17%	74	74%	91%	9	9%	2.0
Lake	4	0	0%	2	50%	50%	2	50%	20.5
Lane	382	10	3%	288	76%	78%	82	22%	2.0
Lincoln	140	87	63%	37	27%	90%	14	10%	3.5
Linn	257	133	53%	107	43%	95%	12	5%	2.0
Malheur	26	5	22%	5	22%	43%	13	57%	23.5
Marion	843	108	13%	671	80%	93%	51	6%	1.0
Morrow	37	2	6%	18	55%	61%	13	39%	12.0
Multnomah	1757	209	12%	1,382	80%	92%	143	8%	1.0
Polk	128	18	14%	103	81%	95%	7	6%	1.0
Sherman	3	1	33%	0	0%	33%	2	67%	19.0

[14] Time to screen is calculated by subtracting the screening date on the New Baby Questionnaire from the baby's birth date.
[15] Other screening times may include either families interviewed after 2 weeks past the baby's birth or screening forms submitted with a missing screening date.
[16] The "median" is a statistical measure of the score that occurs about the 50th percentile. The median is less sensitive to outliers, as compared to the "mean," and is a more meaningful statistic for this type of analysis.

County	Number Screened (and Sent to Evaluation)	Number Screened Prenatally	Percent Screened Prenatally	Number Screened Birth - 2 Weeks	Percent Screened Birth - 2 Weeks	Percent Screened Prenatally - 2 Weeks (HFA Standard)	Number Screened Other Times[15]	Percent Screened Other Times	Median[16] Days to Screen
Tillamook	36	4	11%	26	72%	83%	6	17%	3.0
Umatilla	105	2	2%	61	60%	62%	38	38%	12.0
Union	68	12	18%	53	79%	97%	2	3%	1.0
Wallowa	17	5	29%	3	18%	47%	9	53%	51.5
Wasco	49	25	51%	8	16%	67%	16	33%	18.0
Washington	661	233	36%	41	6%	42%	377	58%	28.0
Yamhill	135	31	23%	82	61%	84%	22	16%	2.0
State	**6,889**	**1,663**	**25%**	**3,871**	**57%**	**82%**	**1,242**	**18%**	**2.0**

[14] Time to screen is calculated by subtracting the screening date on the New Baby Questionnaire from the baby's birth date.
[15] Other screening times may include either families interviewed after 2 weeks past the baby's birth or screening forms submitted with a missing screening date.
[16] The "median" is a statistical measure of the score that occurs about the 50th percentile. The median is less sensitive to outliers, as compared to the "mean", and is a more meaningful statistic for this type of analysis.

Table 10: Time to Assessment[17]

County	Number of Kempe Assessments Conducted on High-risk Screens [18]	Number Assessed Prenatally	Percent Assessed Prenatally	Number Assessed Birth - 2 Weeks	Percent Assessed Birth - 2 Weeks	Percent Assessed Prenatally - 2 Weeks (HFA Standard)	Number Assessed Other Times	Percent Assessed Other Times	Median[19] Days to Assessment
Benton	68	4	5%	13	17%	22%	60	78%	20.0
Clackamas	151	13	8%	35	22%	30%	115	71%	25.0
Clatsop	11	2	18%	2	18%	36%	7	64%	22.0
Columbia	23	14	58%	3	13%	71%	7	29%	28.5
Coos	8	4	50%	1	13%	63%	3	38%	24.0
Crook	20	2	8%	5	21%	29%	17	71%	21.5
Curry	17	1	7%	0	0%	7%	14	93%	28.5
Deschutes	100	5	4%	55	48%	53%	54	47%	14.0
Douglas	50	9	9%	8	8%	17%	86	84%	40.5
Gilliam	2	0	0%	0	0%	0%	2	100%	158.5
Grant	2	2	67%	0	0%	67%	1	33%	54.0
Harney	7	1	14%	1	14%	29%	5	71%	35.0
Hood River	30	13	39%	5	15%	55%	15	46%	23.0
Jackson	90	49	40%	21	17%	57%	52	43%	21.0
Jefferson	21	1	4%	3	13%	17%	19	83%	33.5
Josephine	63	15	22%	38	55%	77%	16	23%	3.5
Klamath	28	4	13%	11	36%	48%	16	52%	19.0
Lake	1	0	0%	0	0%	0%	2	100%	25.5
Lane	172	4	2%	121	67%	69%	56	31%	4.0
Lincoln	61	23	37%	2	3%	40%	37	60%	28.0
Linn	88	16	11%	14	9%	20%	119	80%	37.0
Malheur	19	1	5%	6	27%	32%	15	68%	26.0
Marion	261	27	5%	32	6%	11%	493	89%	40.0

[17] Time to assessment is calculated by subtracting the assessment date on the Kempe Family Stress Inventory Scoring Sheet from the baby's birth date on the New Baby Questionnaire.
[18] Occasionally, Kempe assessments are submitted on families who do not have high risk screens. As a result, the number of assessments on high risk screens may be lower than the total number of assessments received.
[19] The "median" is a statistical measure of the score that occurs about the 50th percentile. The median is less sensitive to outliers, as compared to the "mean," and is a more meaningful statistic for this type of analysis.

County	Number of Kempe Assessments Conducted on High-risk Screens [18]	Number Assessed Prenatally	Percent Assessed Prenatally	Number Assessed Birth - 2 Weeks	Percent Assessed Birth - 2 Weeks	Percent Assessed Prenatally - 2 Weeks (HFA Standard)	Number Assessed Other Times	Percent Assessed Other Times	Median[19] Days to Assessment
Morrow	14	1	5%	6	32%	37%	12	63%	19.5
Multnomah	286	53	12%	172	38%	50%	223	50%	17.0
Polk	45	8	18%	3	7%	25%	33	75%	23.0
Sherman	2	1	50%	0	0%	50%	1	50%	21.0
Tillamook	18	0	0%	8	44%	44%	10	56%	19.0
Umatilla	29	1	3%	23	58%	60%	16	40%	14.0
Union	23	0	0%	14	34%	34%	27	66%	28.0
Wallowa	7	3	38%	0	0%	38%	5	63%	79.0
Wasco	31	15	47%	4	13%	59%	13	41%	23.0
Washington	261	149	54%	5	2%	56%	121	44%	32.0
Yamhill	50	8	15%	8	15%	30%	37	70%	28.0
State	**2,059**	**449**	**16%**	**619**	**22%**	**39%**	**1,709**	**62%**	**26.0**

[17] Time to screen is calculated by subtracting the screening date on the New Baby Questionnaire from the baby's birth date.
[18] Other screening times may include either families interviewed after 2 weeks past the baby's birth or screening forms submitted with a missing screening date.
[19] The "median" is a statistical measure of the score that occurs about the 50th percentile. The median is less sensitive to outliers, as compared to the "mean," and is a more meaningful statistic for this type of analysis.

Table 11: Acceptance of Intensive Service

County	Number of Families Eligible for Intensive Service[20]	Number of Families with Positive Kempes Accepting Intensive Service at Time of Kempe	Percent Accepting Intensive Service at Time of Kempe	Number of Families with First Home Visit Information[21]	Number of Intensive Service Families Receiving First Home Visit Prenatally or Within 3 Months of the Birth of the Baby	Percent of Intensive Service Families Receiving First Home Visit Prenatally or Within 3 Months	Median Visits Per Month/ First 6 Months
Benton	39	26	67%	30	28	96%	3.3
Clackamas	135	123	91%	131	81	89%	2.0
Clatsop	10	10	100%	10	8	100%	2.2
Columbia	22	21	96%	24	21	95%	2.2
Coos	7	7	100%	8	7	71%	1.5
Crook	24	21	88%	24	14	93%	2.7
Curry	16	11	69%	13	11	91%	2.3
Deschutes	90	76	84%	73	66	96%	2.5
Douglas	82	53	65%	55	52	87%	2.0
Gilliam	2	2	100%	3	2	100%	N/A
Grant	3	3	100%	4	3	100%	1.6
Harney	4	4	100%	6	3	100%	1.8
Hood River	11	10	91%	11	10	100%	3.3
Jackson	97	74	76%	79	56	91%	2.7
Jefferson	23	23	100%	25	23	96%	2.3
Josephine	60	59	98%	63	45	98%	2.3
Klamath	25	24	96%	24	18	100%	2.2
Lake	2	0	0%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Lane	156	144	92%	151	110	93%	2.4
Lincoln	48	38	79%	39	31	90%	2.1
Linn	35	22	63%	24	18	78%	2.8
Malheur	20	20	100%	23	23	91%	1.3
Marion	281	236	84%	250	132	77%	2.0

[20] Families are theoretically eligible for Intensive Service if they have both a high-risk screen and a high-stress Kempe.
[21] Some families accept intensive services after initially declining the service, due to changes in how the parent perceives need and/or parental availability/schedule to receive visits. Also, some families that accepted home visitation services toward the end of the fiscal year might not have had first home visit information submitted (on the Family Intake) at the time these analyses were conducted.

County	Number of Families Eligible for Intensive Service[20]	Number of Families with Positive Kempes Accepting Intensive Service at Time of Kempe	Percent Accepting Intensive Service at Time of Kempe	Number of Families with First Home Visit Information[21]	Number of Intensive Service Families Receiving First Home Visit Prenatally or Within 3 Months of the Birth of the Baby	Percent of Intensive Service Families Receiving First Home Visit Prenatally or Within 3 Months	Median Visits Per Month/ First 6 Months
Morrow	16	15	94%	17	12	100%	2.7
Multnomah	260	241	93%	274	197	90%	1.8
Polk	53	36	68%	37	29	93%	2.1
Sherman	2	2	100%	1	1	100%	N/A
Tillamook	23	18	78%	15	14	93%	2.8
Umatilla	46	22	48%	13	13	100%	1.8
Union	13	11	85%	12	11	92%	2.6
Wallowa	7	6	86%	N/A	N/A	N/A	1.7
Wasco	17	15	88%	13	9	69%	2.2
Washington	271	265	98%	162	153	94%	2.3
Yamhill	37	18	49%	20	17	85%	2.0
State	**1,937**	**1,656**	**86%**	**1,236**	**1,117**	**90%**	**2.3**

[20] Families are theoretically eligible for Intensive Service if they have both a high-risk screen and a high-stress Kempe.
[21] Some families accept Intensive Services after initially declining the service due to changes in how the parent perceives need and/or parental availability/schedule to receive visits. Also, some families that accepted home visitation services toward the end of the fiscal year might not have had first home visit information submitted (on the Family Intake) at the time these analyses were conducted.

Table 12: Level of Healthy Start Service

County	Total Healthy Start Children	Total Basic Service Children	Percent Basic Service Children	Total Intensive Service Children	Percent Intensive Service Children	Total Prenatal Exits	Percent Prenatal Exits	Number of Families Screened, but Declining to Share Information with the Evaluation	Percent of Families Screened, but Declining to Share Information with the Evaluation
Benton	300	231	77%	67	22%	0	0%	2	<1%
Clackamas	738	399	54%	319	43%	18	2%	2	<1%
Clatsop	70	10	14%	33	47%	0	0%	27	39%
Columbia	55	9	16%	40	73%	2	4%	4	7%
Coos	35	9	26%	21	60%	5	14%	0	0%
Crook	76	25	33%	51	67%	0	0%	0	0%
Curry	69	46	67%	23	33%	0	0%	0	0%
Deschutes	511	327	64%	184	36%	0	0%	0	0%
Douglas	336	200	60%	132	39%	3	<1%	1	<1%
Gilliam	6	2	33%	4	67%	0	0%	0	0%
Grant	17	0	0%	14	82%	1	6%	2	12%
Harney	24	4	17%	20	83%	0	0%	0	0%
Hood River	92	36	39%	53	58%	3	3%	0	0%
Jackson	582	190	33%	330	57%	36	6%	26	4%
Jefferson	47	3	6%	44	94%	0	0%	0	0%
Josephine	220	105	48%	106	48%	0	0%	9	4%
Klamath	145	76	52%	61	42%	1	<1%	7	5%
Lake	12	4	33%	8	67%	0	0%	0	0%
Lane	657	237	36%	420	64%	0	0%	0	0%
Lincoln	195	101	52%	64	33%	23	12%	7	4%
Linn	325	234	72%	66	20%	11	3%	14	4%
Malheur	64	4	6%	39	61%	21	33%	0	0%
Marion	1091	597	55%	450	41%	39	4%	5	<1%
Morrow	53	21	40%	32	60%	0	0%	0	0%
Multnomah	2160	1488	69%	661	31%	11	<1%	0	0%
Polk	187	93	50%	91	49%	3	2%	0	0%
Sherman	10	1	10%	9	90%	0	0%	0	0%
Tillamook	82	18	22%	64	78%	0	0%	0	0%
Umatilla	176	81	46%	95	54%	0	0%	0	0%
Union	97	55	57%	42	43%	0	0%	0	0%

County	Total Healthy Start Children	Total Basic Service Children	Percent Basic Service Children	Total Intensive Service Children	Percent Intensive Service Children	Total Prenatal Exits	Percent Prenatal Exits	Number of Families Screened, but Declining to Share Information with the Evaluation	Percent of Families Screened, but Declining to Share Information with the Evaluation
Wallowa	24	11	46%	11	46%	1	4%	1	4%
Wasco	87	28	32%	52	60%	6	7%	1	1%
Washington	1154	389	34%	683	59%	65	6%	17	1%
Yamhill	212	110	52%	91	43%	3	1%	8	4%
State	**9909**	**5,144**	**52%**	**4,380**	**44%**	**252**	**3%**	**133**	**1%**

Table 13: Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families: Race/Ethnicity

County	Total Number of Intensive Service Families	Percent African American	Percent Hispanic	Percent Asian/Pacific Islander	Percent American Indian	Percent Caucasian	Percent Hawaiian	Percent Multiracial	Percent Other	Percent Unreported
Benton	67	0%	37%	3%	0%	53%	0%	2%	5%	0%
Clackamas	319	<1%	25%	4%	2%	64%	2%	2%	<1%	0%
Clatsop	33	0%	41%	0%	3%	55%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Columbia	40	3%	0%	0%	0%	77%	0%	17%	0%	3%
Coos	21	0%	5%	0%	0%	95%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Crook	51	0%	21%	2%	0%	71%	0%	5%	0%	2%
Curry	23	0%	6%	0%	0%	83 %	0%	11%	0%	0%
Deschutes	184	<1%	13%	0%	1%	78%	1%	2%	<1%	4%
Douglas	132	0%	7%	<1%	<1%	85 %	0%	5%	<1%	<1%
Gilliam	4	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Grant	14	0%	13%	0%	0%	88%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Harney	20	0%	0%	0%	0%	92%	0%	8%	0%	0%
Hood River	53	0%	68%	2%	0%	30%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Jackson	330	2%	25%	<1%	2%	65%	<1%	3%	0%	2%
Jefferson	44	0%	61%	0%	0%	33%	0%	6%	0%	0%
Josephine	106	2%	3%	0%	0%	86%	0%	6%	1%	2%
Klamath	61	4%	17%	2%	11%	57%	0%	8%	2%	0%
Lake	8	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Lane	420	2%	20%	5%	<1%	67%	<1%	4%	0%	2%
Lincoln	64	0%	38%	0%	3%	48%	2%	8%	0%	0%
Linn	66	0%	41%	0%	0%	57%	0%	2%	0%	0%
Malheur	39	0%	50%	3%	0%	47%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Marion	450	<1%	58%	2%	<1%	36%	<1%	2%	<1%	0%
Morrow	32	0%	63%	4%	0%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Multnomah	661	10%	34%	12%	<1%	40%	0%	3%	<1%	<1%
Polk	91	0%	42%	1%	0%	53%	%	3%	0%	1%
Sherman	9	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Tillamook	64	0%	29%	0%	0%	69%	0%	0%	2%	0%
Umatilla	95	0%	33%	0%	1%	63%	0%	3%	0%	0%
Union	42	3%	0%	3%	0%	90%	3%	0%	0%	0%
Wallowa	11	0%	0%	0%	0%	80%	0%	20%	0%	0%

County	Total Number of Intensive Service Families	Percent African American	Percent Hispanic	Percent Asian/Pacific Islander	Percent American Indian	Percent Caucasian	Percent Hawaiian	Percent Multiracial	Percent Other	Percent Unreported
Wasco	52	0%	25%	4%	0%	63%	0%	6%	0%	2%
Washington	683	1%	64%	5%	<1%	27%	<1%	2%	<1%	<1%
Yamhill	91	0%	35%	1%	1%	55%	0%	7%	0%	0%
State	**4,380**	**2%**	**35%**	**4%**	**1%**	**53%**	**<1%**	**3%**	<1%	**<1%**

Table 14: Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families: Language, Teen and Single Parents, & Education Level

County	Percent English Speaking Household	Percent Spanish Speaking Household	Percent Other Language Household	Percent Teen Mothers	Percent Single Mothers	Percent Less Than High School Education
Benton	64%	34%	2%	5%	72%	30%
Clackamas	75%	24%	1%	19%	70%	38%
Clatsop	55%	45%	0%	22%	84%	67%
Columbia	100%	0%	0%	26%	76%	45%
Coos	95%	5%	0%	17%	53%	18%
Crook	84%	16%	0%	9%	68%	27%
Curry	94%	6%	0%	6%	79%	27%
Deschutes	91%	9%	0%	34%	83%	60%
Douglas	92%	7%	<1%	12%	65%	37%
Gilliam	75%	0%	25%	0%	75%	75%
Grant	88%	13%	0%	13%	86%	33%
Harney	100%	0%	0%	42%	78%	13%
Hood River	30%	70%	0%	25%	63%	65%
Jackson	80%	20%	<1%	14%	75%	51%
Jefferson	44%	56%	0%	18%	52%	54%
Josephine	98%	2%	0%	16%	85%	38%
Klamath	85%	11%	4%	28%	73%	55%
Lake	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%	50%
Lane	81%	17%	2%	18%	75%	38%
Lincoln	66%	34%	0%	16%	83%	59%
Linn	65%	35%	0%	10%	63%	40%
Malheur	77%	23%	0%	20%	85%	48%
Marion	51%	48%	<1%	19%	74%	53%
Morrow	54%	46%	0%	33%	60%	63%
Multnomah	60%	29%	12%	20%	74%	52%
Polk	66%	33%	1%	19%	68%	31%
Sherman	100%	0%	0%	0%	57%	50%
Tillamook	77%	24%	0%	10%	58%	38%
Umatilla	75%	25%	0%	31%	73%	67%
Union	96.8%	0%	3%	16%	89%	47%
Wallowa	100%	0%	0%	0%	86%	22%

County	Percent English Speaking Household	Percent Spanish Speaking Household	Percent Other Language Household	Percent Teen Mothers	Percent Single Mothers	Percent Less Than High School Education
Wasco	73%	27%	0%	17%	78%	50%
Washington	40%	57%	3%	18%	70%	57%
Yamhill	70%	30%	0%	25%	81%	60%
State	**67%**	**30%**	**3%**	**19%**	**73%**	**48%**

Table 15: NBQ Risk Factors of Intensive Service Families: Health Insurance & Health Care

County	Number of Moms with Health Insurance Information	Percent with No Health Insurance	Number of Babies with Health Insurance Information	Percent with No Health Insurance	Number with Time to Prenatal Care Information	Percent with Late Prenatal Care (More Than 12 Weeks or Not at All)	Number with Amount of Prenatal Care Visit Information	Percent with Less Than 5 Visits
Benton	41	5%	39	2%	41	22%	40	3%
Clackamas	156	11%	154	8%	159	40%	153	2%
Clatsop	12	25%	10	20%	12	50%	12	0%
Columbia	30	%	30	3%	31	26%	30	7%
Coos	11	0%	11	0%	11	46%	10	0%
Crook	30	3%	30	7%	30	17%	30	0%
Curry	16	12%	16	19%	16	25%	16	0%
Deschutes	99	8%	99	4%	100	26%	89	3%
Douglas	65	3%	63	5%	67	33%	65	8%
Gilliam	4	25%	4	0%	4	25%	4	25%
Grant	6	0%	6	0%	6	50%	6	0%
Harney	8	13%	7	0%	9	22%	7	0%
Hood River	17	18%	16	31%	18	28%	17	0%
Jackson	88	17%	81	19%	115	37%	86	5%
Jefferson	25	4%	26	4%	26	19%	26	0%
Josephine	94	4%	94	1%	96	42%	92	5%
Klamath	34	6%	32	10%	35	20%	34	0%
Lake	4	25%	4	25%	4	0%	4	0%
Lane	190	4%	190	2%	193	39%	179	3%
Lincoln	55	18%	53	15%	55	26%	50	4%
Linn	30	10%	28	7%	30	10%	26	4%
Malheur	23	17%	23	9%	23	26%	23	4%
Marion	312	11%	307	9%	327	36%	300	6%
Morrow	16	25%	16	13%	16	69%	15	0%
Multnomah	361	3%	353	4%	376	3%	357	4%
Polk	47	6%	44	2%	52	42%	47	2%
Sherman	2	0%	2	0%	2	0%	2	0%
Tillamook	26	12%	26	0%	32	31%	26	4%
Umatilla	31	3%	31	3%	34	32%	31	0%
Union	15	7%	15	0%	17	35%	15	7%
Wallowa	9	0%	8	0%	9	11%	8	0%

County	Number of Moms with Health Insurance Information	Percent with No Health Insurance	Number of Babies with Health Insurance Information	Percent with No Health Insurance	Number with Time to Prenatal Care Information	Percent with Late Prenatal Care (More Than 12 Weeks or Not at All)	Number with Amount of Prenatal Care Visit Information	Percent with Less Than 5 Visits
Wasco	28	4%	28	0%	29	21%	28	2%
Washington	331	23%	289	17%	343	39%	323	2%
Yamhill	44	7%	42	5%	49	31%	43	2%
State	**2,260**	**10%**	**2,177**	**8%**	**2,367**	**34%**	**2,194**	**4%**

Table 16: NBQ Risk Factors of Intensive Service Families: Employment, Income, Mental Health, Substance Use, & Marital Problems

County	Number with Mother's Employment Information	Percent Not Employed	Number with Basic Living Expenses Information	Percent Difficulty Most of the Time Paying for Basic Expenses	Number with Depression Information	Percent with Depression Symptoms	Number with Drug/Alcohol Information	Percent Asked to Cut Down on Drug/Alcohol Use	Number with Marital Problem Information	Percent with Some or Serious Problems
Benton	41	59%	40	8%	39	31%	41	2%	40	13%
Clackamas	156	66%	153	36%	147	53%	148	3%	152	23%
Clatsop	12	83%	12	50%	12	50%	12	17%	12	33%
Columbia	31	74%	31	23%	30	47%	30	0%	31	39%
Coos	11	91%	10	0%	11	36%	11	9%	9	22%
Crook	30	70%	30	17%	29	10%	30	0%	30	20%
Curry	16	75%	16	56%	15	47%	15	7%	16	25%
Deschutes	97	79%	98	32%	95	65%	94	33%	94	55%
Douglas	65	86%	64	33%	64	27%	62	3%	65	28%
Gilliam	4	25%	4	0%	4	0%	4	0%	4	0%
Grant	6	67%	6	17%	5	100%	5	0%	6	50%
Harney	8	38%	8	25%	8	38%	8	13%	8	50%
Hood River	17	88%	16	6%	17	41%	17	12%	17	41%
Jackson	89	70%	87	23%	83	37%	85	2%	87	18%
Jefferson	26	69%	26	15%	25	56%	25	0%	26	27%
Josephine	95	90%	95	32%	94	35%	95	6%	93	15%
Klamath	33	73%	33	18%	32	41%	31	0%	32	38%
Lake	4	50%	4	50%	4	25%	4	0%	4	50%
Lane	191	73%	190	24%	187	50%	187	11%	187	35%
Lincoln	55	71%	54	30%	53	38%	53	4%	55	31%
Linn	31	71%	30	30%	29	35%	29	7%	28	36%
Malheur	23	70%	23	13%	19	42%	18	0%	23	17%
Marion	314	74%	305	23%	291	39%	284	3%	298	20%
Morrow	16	88%	16	6%	16	19%	16	6%	16	13%
Multnomah	362	77%	361	30%	358	33%	354	3%	357	22%
Polk	46	63%	45	13%	44	46%	43	2%	46	28%
Sherman	2	50%	2	0%	0	N/A	0	N/A	2	0%
Tillamook	26	65%	26	12%	24	50%	24	0%	25	36%
Umatilla	31	84%	30	13%	31	32%	31	3%	31	16%

County	Number with Mother's Employment Information	Percent Not Employed	Number with Basic Living Expenses Information	Percent Difficulty Most of the Time Paying for Basic Expenses	Number with Depression Information	Percent with Depression Symptoms	Number with Drug/Alcohol Information	Percent Asked to Cut Down on Drug/Alcohol Use	Number with Marital Problem Information	Percent with Some or Serious Problems
Union	15	67%	15	27%	15	33%	15	0%	15	20%
Wallowa	9	78%	9	11%	7	14%	7	0%	9	44%
Wasco	28	82%	28	21%	24	58%	24	0%	27	30%
Washington	330	79%	330	27%	266	51%	268	3%	326	25%
Yamhill	44	71%	43	33%	44	48%	44	7%	44	32%
State	**2,264**	**75%**	**2,240**	**26%**	**2,122**	**42%**	**2,114**	**5%**	**2,215**	**26%**

Table 17: Kempe Risk Factors of Intensive Service Mothers: Parent/Caregiver Characteristics

County	Childhood History of Abuse or Neglect	#	Substance Abuse, Mental Illness, or Criminal History	#	Previous or Current Child Welfare Involvement	#	Isolation, Low Self-Esteem	#	Multiple Stressors	#	Potential for Violence	#
Benton	98%	48	73%	40	15%	20	90%	49	96%	51	32%	22
Clackamas	87%	253	77%	220	11%	127	92%	279	96%	280	30%	142
Clatsop	94%	16	71%	14	25%	12	100%	23	100%	23	29%	7
Columbia	96%	26	100%	28	40%	5	96%	24	100%	31	50%	8
Coos	100%	15	86%	14	30%	10	79%	19	100%	18	50%	10
Crook	94%	34	80%	30	21%	14	97%	32	97%	31	71%	14
Curry	94%	18	100%	15	50%	2	100%	18	100%	20	50%	2
Deschutes	84%	135	93%	165	21%	73	96%	160	99%	172	28%	78
Douglas	95%	86	94%	77	35%	40	95%	96	100%	103	46%	46
Gilliam	100%	3	100%	1	100%	2	100%	3	100%	2	100%	1
Grant	100%	7	100%	9	100%	4	100%	8	100%	9	60%	5
Harney	100%	12	100%	11	80%	5	92%	12	100%	11	25%	4
Hood River	83%	41	38%	39	12%	33	96%	45	79%	43	21%	33
Jackson	93%	164	86%	135	9%	56	91%	163	98%	171	53%	77
Jefferson	89%	28	76%	17	25%	8	96%	28	97%	29	45%	11
Josephine	100%	81	99%	71	40%	5	99%	89	100%	91	75%	12
Klamath	90%	41	89%	37	33%	24	100%	43	91%	44	50%	22
Lake	0%	1	0%	1	0%	1	0%	1	100%	1	0%	1
Lane	70%	286	70%	279	18%	193	93%	367	99%	373	23%	180
Lincoln	100%	47	98%	41	80%	10	96%	52	100%	56	92%	13
Linn	89%	44	74%	39	17%	18	88%	40	94%	49	26%	19
Malheur	93%	14	83%	12	50%	4	100%	17	94%	18	71%	7
Marion	97%	273	85%	172	33%	52	99%	350	99%	345	48%	77
Morrow	95%	22	83%	12	50%	8	95%	22	90%	21	50%	10
Multnomah	92%	400	81%	308	29%	120	95%	427	97%	462	41%	144
Polk	90%	69	86%	58	30%	23	90%	71	99%	77	41%	37
Sherman	33%	3	100%	3	0%	2	75%	4	100%	4	33%	3
Tillamook	95%	40	64%	28	28%	25	93%	45	98%	46	14%	21
Umatilla	78%	55	63%	52	8%	38	98%	62	98%	62	30%	40
Union	88%	25	85%	20	47%	17	100%	30	97%	30	39%	18

County	Childhood History of Abuse or Neglect	#	Substance Abuse, Mental Illness, or Criminal History	#	Previous or Current Child Wel-fare In-volvement	#	Isolation, Low Self-Esteem	#	Multiple Stressors	#	Potential for Vio-lence	#
Wallowa	100%	11	100%	8	100%	2	100%	9	100%	11	100%	2
Wasco	98%	40	81%	37	18%	17	95%	42	100%	40	42%	24
Washington	92%	493	64%	336	10%	199	94%	494	93%	520	44%	277
Yamhill	81%	63	69%	61	17%	35	91%	68	91%	66	23%	35
State	**89%**	**2,894**	**79%**	**2,390**	**21%**	**1,204**	**95%**	**3,192**	**97%**	**3,310**	**38%**	**1,402**

Table 18: Kempe Risk Factors of Intensive Service Mothers: Childrearing Characteristics

County	Unrealistic Expectations of Infant	#	Plans Severe Discipline for Infant	#	Negative Perception of Infant	#	Bonding/ Attachment Issues	#
Benton	48%	27	38%	24	45%	29	86%	44
Clackamas	74%	212	31%	137	49%	169	84%	256
Clatsop	93%	14	50%	6	56%	9	94%	16
Columbia	90%	21	83%	6	57%	7	96%	28
Coos	88%	16	45%	11	10%	10	79%	19
Crook	79%	29	88%	24	53%	19	90%	30
Curry	91%	11	80%	5	100%	4	100%	13
Deschutes	35%	75	32%	77	27%	79	98%	167
Douglas	76%	68	49%	43	46%	50	86%	85
Gilliam	100%	2	NA	NA	100%	1	100%	3
Grant	83%	6	33%	3	33%	3	100%	6
Harney	0%	3	0%	3	0%	3	89%	9
Hood River	34%	32	24%	29	9%	32	66%	41
Jackson	68%	114	55%	80	46%	87	93%	149
Jefferson	93%	30	55%	11	46%	13	73%	22
Josephine	92%	65	71%	17	92%	24	100%	83
Klamath	60%	30	18%	17	41%	22	97%	34
Lake	100%	1	0%	1	100%	1	100%	1
Lane	81%	302	25%	171	69%	264	89%	344
Lincoln	86%	22	40%	5	70%	10	98%	47
Linn	93%	43	41%	22	42%	24	83%	42
Malheur	71%	7	33%	3	80%	10	95%	21
Marion	96%	322	51%	84	78%	148	97%	289
Morrow	89%	19	60%	10	75%	20	89%	18
Multnomah	76%	288	46%	152	57%	180	89%	404
Polk	86%	66	47%	38	47%	38	89%	66
Sherman	67%	3	67%	3	33%	3	75%	4
Tillamook	71%	24	19%	21	46%	35	74%	39
Umatilla	78%	60	6%	35	42%	45	90%	61
Union	63%	24	35%	17	52%	21	67%	24
Wallowa	100%	5	NA	NA	100%	3	100%	10

County	Unrealistic Expectations of Infant	#	Plans Severe Discipline for Infant	#	Negative Perception of Infant	#	Bonding/ Attachment Issues	#
Wasco	89%	28	54%	24	33%	24	89%	38
Washington	78%	458	52%	292	26%	229	88%	460
Yamhill	67%	45	18%	33	51%	53	88%	64
State	**78%**	**2,472**	**42%**	**1,404**	**51%**	**1,669**	**90%**	**2,937**

Table 19: Kempe Risk Factors of Intensive Service Fathers: Parent/Caregiver Characteristics

County	Childhood History of Abuse or Neglect	#	Substance Abuse, Mental Illness, or Criminal History	#	Previous or Current Child Welfare Involvement	#	Isolation, Low Self-Esteem	#	Multiple Stressors	#	Potential for Violence	#
Benton	100%	21	82%	33	0%	15	91%	22	100%	22	40%	15
Clackamas	86%	132	76%	163	16%	93	71%	133	89%	159	33%	119
Clatsop	91%	11	89%	9	30%	10	88%	16	100%	14	50%	8
Columbia	93%	15	100%	22	0%	3	85%	13	100%	20	57%	7
Coos	82%	11	92%	13	13%	8	55%	11	100%	12	43%	7
Crook	100%	26	90%	29	23%	13	74%	27	87%	31	62%	21
Curry	100%	10	100%	14	0%	1	89%	9	100%	10	50%	2
Deschutes	30%	77	56%	102	12%	67	42%	83	71%	100	30%	71
Douglas	92%	50	96%	57	28%	29	87%	54	99%	72	57%	30
Gilliam	100%	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	100%	1	100%	1	NA	NA
Grant	100%	5	100%	8	100%	2	100%	4	100%	6	75%	4
Harney	70%	10	100%	8	0%	1	70%	10	91%	11	33%	3
Hood River	88%	24	44%	34	4%	24	37%	27	65%	23	18%	28
Jackson	89%	91	86%	113	17%	47	80%	94	88%	116	55%	62
Jefferson	92%	13	83%	18	25%	8	84%	19	96%	23	58%	12
Josephine	100%	25	98%	45	40%	5	95%	21	94%	33	63%	8
Klamath	71%	21	80%	20	15%	13	83%	18	71%	21	67%	15
Lake	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Lane	68%	97	62%	97	21%	87	87%	133	96%	161	33%	92
Lincoln	100%	30	100%	40	57%	7	93%	29	100%	40	94%	17
Linn	79%	19	81%	27	30%	10	85%	13	89%	18	36%	14
Malheur	83%	6	86%	7	0%	1	75%	4	92%	12	75%	4
Marion	95%	160	90%	155	23%	30	97%	194	96%	229	42%	45
Morrow	100%	5	82%	11	100%	5	86%	7	88%	8	60%	5
Multnomah	87%	206	83%	227	19%	81	80%	207	91%	262	49%	122
Polk	90%	42	84%	50	13%	16	89%	44	92%	53	36%	25
Sherman	100%	4	100%	3	0%	1	75%	4	100%	5	50%	2
Tillamook	100%	7	58%	12	25%	16	70%	10	92%	13	21%	14
Umatilla	91%	23	76%	33	4%	28	67%	21	91%	23	56%	25
Union	93%	15	89%	18	23%	13	94%	18	95%	19	38%	13

County	Childhood History of Abuse or Neglect	#	Substance Abuse, Mental Illness, or Criminal History	#	Previous or Current Child Welfare Involvement	#	Isolation, Low Self-Esteem	#	Multiple Stressors	#	Potential for Violence	#
Wallowa	100%	2	100%	2	100%	1	100%	2	100%	4	100%	2
Wasco	95%	20	90%	29	14%	14	76%	25	93%	29	57%	23
Washington	87%	361	81%	341	9%	160	83%	321	91%	390	48%	237
Yamhill	75%	28	67%	39	14%	21	78%	40	75%	28	29%	24
State	**85%**	**1,569**	**81%**	**1,779**	**17%**	**830**	**81%**	**1,634**	**91%**	**1,968**	**44%**	**1,076**

Table 20: Kempe Risk Factors of Intensive Service Fathers: Childrearing Characteristics

County	Unrealistic Expectations of Infant	#	Plans Severe Discipline for Infant	#	Negative Perception of Infant	#	Bonding/ Attachment Issues	#
Benton	43%	7	45%	11	50%	6	87%	31
Clackamas	60%	83	29%	80	26%	76	81%	208
Clatsop	67%	9	50%	4	50%	6	92%	13
Columbia	100%	6	100%	1	NA	NA	96%	23
Coos	89%	9	50%	8	13%	8	67%	15
Crook	79%	19	67%	12	45%	11	87%	31
Curry	88%	8	67%	3	67%	3	100%	13
Deschutes	6%	63	18%	71	7%	60	96%	156
Douglas	81%	32	50%	26	32%	25	85%	68
Gilliam	100%	1	NA	NA	100%	1	100%	2
Grant	100%	2	100%	2	33%	3	100%	5
Harney	0%	1	0%	1	0%	1	86%	7
Hood River	33%	9	11%	18	8%	25	68%	37
Jackson	46%	35	58%	40	28%	32	92%	133
Jefferson	88%	16	50%	8	30%	10	71%	17
Josephine	89%	19	40%	5	100%	5	100%	38
Klamath	31%	13	8%	12	10%	10	91%	22
Lake	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Lane	77%	100	34%	64	51%	84	84%	170
Lincoln	71%	7	33%	3	40%	5	97%	35
Linn	56%	9	56%	9	17%	6	82%	33
Malheur	0%	1	50%	2	67%	3	92%	13
Marion	96%	90	54%	28	52%	29	98%	265
Morrow	80%	5	NA	NA	80%	5	100%	9
Multnomah	72%	129	43%	83	44%	84	85%	275
Polk	85%	33	60%	20	39%	18	89%	61
Sherman	100%	2	67%	3	33%	3	100%	5
Tillamook	60%	5	14%	7	13%	8	85%	33
Umatilla	59%	17	25%	16	47%	19	88%	34
Union	50%	14	30%	10	58%	12	46%	13
Wallowa	100%	2	100%	2	100%	1	100%	4

County	Unrealistic Expectations of Infant	#	Plans Severe Discipline for Infant	#	Negative Perception of Infant	#	Bonding/ Attachment Issues	#
Wasco	80%	10	67%	12	15%	13	86%	36
Washington	74%	186	55%	166	16%	119	89%	408
Yamhill	33%	15	0%	17	29%	21	85%	48
State	**68%**	**957**	**42%**	**744**	**32%**	**712**	**88%**	**2,261**

Table 21: Demographic Characteristics of Families Declining Intensive Service: Race/Ethnicity

County	Number of Eligible Families Declining HS Intensive Service	Percent African American	Percent Hispanic	Percent Asian/Pacific Islander	Percent American Indian	Percent Caucasian	Percent Hawaiian	Percent Multiracial	Percent Other	Percent Unreported
Benton	13	0%	23%	8%	0%	62%	0%	8%	0%	0%
Clackamas	12	0%	25%	8%	0%	50%	0%	17%	0%	0%
Clatsop	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Columbia	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Coos	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Crook	3	0%	0%	0%	0%	67%	0%	0%	0%	33%
Curry	5	0%	0%	0%	40%	60%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Deschutes	14	0%	8%	0%	0%	92%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Douglas	29	0%	0%	0%	3%	83%	0%	14%	0%	0%
Gilliam	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grant	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Harney	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hood River	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Jackson	23	0%	0%	0%	0%	91%	0%	0%	0%	9%
Jefferson	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Josephine	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%
Klamath	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Lake	2	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Lane	12	0%	0%	0%	8%	67%	0%	17%	0%	8%
Lincoln	10	0%	10%	0%	0%	90%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Linn	13	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Malheur	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Marion	45	0%	55%	0%	0%	43%	0%	2%	0%	0%
Morrow	1	0%	100%	0%	0%	0.0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Multnomah	19	5%	26%	0%	0%	68%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Polk	17	0%	24%	0%	0%	71%	0%	6%	0%	0%
Sherman	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Tillamook	5	0%	20%	0%	0%	80%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Umatilla	24	0%	17%	0%	8%	67%	0%	4%	0%	4%
Union	2	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%

County	Number of Eligible Families Declining HS Intensive Service	Percent African American	Percent Hispanic	Percent Asian/Pacific Islander	Percent American Indian	Percent Caucasian	Percent Hawaiian	Percent Multiracial	Percent Other	Percent Unreported
Wallowa	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Wasco	2	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Washington	6	0%	83%	0%	0%	17%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Yamhill	19	0%	26%	5%	0%	68%	0%	0%	0%	0%
State	**281**	**<1%**	**20%**	**1%**	**2%**	**70%**	**0%**	**5%**	**0%**	**2%**

Table 22: Demographic Characteristics Of Families Declining Intensive Service: Language, Teen Parents, Marital Status, Education, & Employment

County	Percent English Speaking Household	Percent Spanish Speaking Household	Percent Other Language Household	Percent Teen Mothers	Percent Single Parent	Percent Less Than HS Education	Percent Unemployed
Benton	77%	15%	8%	8%	44%	8%	54%
Clackamas	83%	17%	0%	42%	80%	50%	58%
Clatsop	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Columbia	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%
Coos	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Crook	100%	0%	0%	0%	33%	33%	67%
Curry	100%	0%	0%	0%	60%	40%	80%
Deschutes	92%	8%	0%	9%	83%	25%	83%
Douglas	100%	0%	0%	10%	58%	10%	66%
Gilliam	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Harney	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hood River	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%	0.0%
Jackson	100%	0%	0%	9%	64%	22%	57%
Jefferson	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Josephine	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Klamath	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
Lake	100%	0%	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%
Lane	100%	0%	0%	8%	92%	25%	75%
Lincoln	90%	10%	0%	10%	90%	30%	40%
Linn	100%	0%	0%	8%	82%	23%	62%
Malheur	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Marion	50%	50%	0%	23%	66%	52%	74%
Morrow	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Multnomah	74%	21%	5%	47%	80%	47%	78%
Polk	82%	18%	0%	6%	47%	24%	53%
Sherman	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Tillamook	80%	20%	0%	60%	80%	60%	60%
Umatilla	83%	17%	0%	9%	88%	42%	46%
Union	100%	0%	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%
Wallowa	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Wasco	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%	50%	100%

County	Percent English Speaking Household	Percent Spanish Speaking Household	Percent Other Language Household	Percent Teen Mothers	Percent Single Parent	Percent Less Than HS Education	Percent Unemployed
Washington	17%	83%	0%	33%	60%	50%	83%
Yamhill	79%	21%	0%	11%	63%	42%	47%
State	**82%**	**18%**	**<1%**	**16%**	**70%**	**33%**	**62%**

Table 23: Participant Engagement and Retention

County	Number of IS Families Staying Fewer Than 3 Months	Percent of IS Families Staying Fewer Than 3 Months	Median Months of Service for Families Staying Fewer Than 3 Months	Number of IS Families Engaged at Least 3 Months	Percent of Families Engaged at Least 3 Months	Median Months of Service for Families Staying Engaged at Least 3 Months[22]	Number of Families That Could Have Been Engaged 12 Months or More	Percent of Families Engaged After 12 Months
Benton	7	10%	1.4	60	90%	10.1	62	44%
Clackamas	27	9%	2.3	290	91%	9.5	241	59%
Clatsop	3	9%	1.2	30	91%	10.3	20	60%
Columbia	2	5%	1.1	38	95%	11.3	35	23%
Coos	1	5%	25.8	20	95%	6.9	20	55%
Crook	2	4%	2.5	49	96%	7.9	37	43%
Curry	0	0%	N/A	23	100%	8.0	19	42%
Deschutes	20	11%	1.3	163	89%	10.7	159	50%
Douglas	17	13%	1.1	113	87%	7.0	122	44%
Gilliam	0	0%	N/A	4	100%	5.6	3	33%
Grant	1	7%	0.0	13	93%	10.6	10	50%
Harney	2	11%	N/A	17	89%	17.1	13	69%
Hood River	1	2%	N/A	52	98%	22.0	47	70%
Jackson	55	17%	1.4	272	83%	29.2	224	64%
Jefferson	9	20%	1.5	35	80%	2.2	41	32%
Josephine	19	18%	1.5	87	82%	9.2	82	29%
Klamath	17	28%	1.4	44	72%	7.1	37	41%
Lake	2	25%	0.5	6	75%	24.1	9	44%
Lane	41	10%	1.9	372	90%	13.6	332	59%
Lincoln	8	13%	1.3	56	88%	5.4	59	27%
Linn	8	12%	0.5	58	88%	15.1	53	60%
Malheur	2	5%	1.0	37	95%	5.0	35	26%
Marion	82	18%	2.1	367	82%	8.1	273	38%
Morrow	1	3%	0.0	31	97%	4.9	26	27%
Multnomah	53	8%	1.3	608	92%	12.6	524	48%
Polk	6	7%	1.9	82	93%	12.2	77	58%
Sherman	0	0%	N/A	9	100%	15.3	6	83%
Tillamook	2	3%	2.4	60	97%	15.4	52	71%

[22] If date of first home visit was missing, birth date of child was substituted in these analyses.

County	Number of IS Families Staying Fewer Than 3 Months	Percent of IS Families Staying Fewer Than 3 Months	Median Months of Service for Families Staying Fewer Than 3 Months	Number of IS Families Engaged at Least 3 Months	Percent of Families Engaged at Least 3 Months	Median Months of Service for Families Staying Engaged at Least 3 Months[22]	Number of Families That Could Have Been Engaged 12 Months or More	Percent of Families Engaged After 12 Months
Umatilla	20	21%	4.6	74	79%	19.8	61	71%
Union	5	12%	2.9	36	88%	14.0	40	48%
Wallowa	1	9%	N/A	10	91%	10.2	2	100%
Wasco	2	4%	2.5	50	96%	10.6	38	55%
Washington	75	11%	1.1	604	89%	11.3	480	57%
Yamhill	7	8%	0.5	84	92%	14.5	75	67%
State	**498**	**11%**	**1.5**	**3,854**	**89%**	**11.1**	**3,314**	**52%**

[22] If date of first home visit was missing, birth date of child was substituted in these analyses.

Table 24: Intensive Service Families by Birth Year

County	Total Intensive Service FY 2004-05	Born FY 99-00, or earlier	Born FY 00-01	Born FY 01-02	Born FY 02-03	Born FY 03-04	Born FY 04-05
Benton	64	0%	2%	3%	8%	41%	47%
Clackamas	311	3%	5%	9%	18%	23%	42%
Clatsop	30	17%	3%	10%	17%	20%	33%
Columbia	37	0%	0%	3%	3%	30%	65%
Coos	20	0%	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%
Crook	49	0%	2%	0%	8%	41%	49%
Curry	22	0%	0%	5%	5%	32%	59%
Deschutes	181	4%	2%	6%	15%	33%	40%
Douglas	130	1%	1%	14%	15%	27%	42%
Gilliam	4	0%	0%	0%	0%	25%	75%
Grant	13	0%	0%	0%	15%	54%	31%
Harney	20	0%	5%	10%	20%	35%	30%
Hood River	51	8%	14%	12%	16%	29%	22%
Jackson	325	7%	9%	9%	16%	34%	24%
Jefferson	43	0%	0%	7%	9%	26%	58%
Josephine	103	1%	2%	0%	4%	32%	61%
Klamath	58	0%	0%	9%	19%	31%	41%
Lake	8	0%	0%	0%	25%	75%	0%
Lane	401	2%	2%	11%	20%	27%	38%
Lincoln	63	0%	0%	0%	2%	37%	62%
Linn	66	3%	2%	11%	14%	35%	36%
Malheur	35	0%	0%	0%	11%	23%	66%
Marion	427	1%	<1%	5%	9%	26%	59%
Morrow	32	0%	0%	0%	13%	34%	53%
Multnomah	634	0%	<1%	1%	16%	40%	43%
Polk	91	2%	0%	9%	14%	34%	41%
Sherman	8	13%	0%	0%	38%	25%	25%
Tillamook	62	6%	10%	10%	19%	26%	29%
Umatilla	93	0%	12%	10%	19%	32%	27%
Union	42	2%	0%	12%	17%	38%	31%
Wallowa	11	0%	0%	9%	0%	36%	55%

County	Total Intensive Service FY 2004-05	Born FY 99-00, or earlier	Born FY 00-01	Born FY 01-02	Born FY 02-03	Born FY 03-04	Born FY 04-05
Wasco	48	0%	4%	10%	15%	27%	44%
Washington	666	1%	1%	10%	19%	26%	42%
Yamhill	89	0%	12%	6%	17%	37%	28%
State	**4,237**	**2%**	**3%**	**7%**	**15%**	**31%**	**42%**

Table 25: Demographic Characteristics of Exited Families: Race/Ethnicity

County	Number of Exited Families	Percent African American	Percent Hispanic	Percent Asian/Pacific Islander	Percent American Indian	Percent Caucasian	Percent Hawaiian	Percent Multiracial	Percent Other	Percent Unreported
Benton	20	0%	27%	9%	0%	59%	0%	0%	5%	0%
Clackamas	116	0%	21%	2%	3%	71%	2%	1%	<1%	0%
Clatsop	6	0%	46%	0%	0%	55%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Columbia	19	5%	0%	0%	0%	85%	0%	10%	0%	0%
Coos	7	0%	0%	0%	0%	92%	0%	8%	0%	0%
Crook	21	0%	26%	5%	0%	63%	0%	0%	0%	5%
Curry	7	0%	0%	0%	0%	80%	0%	20%	0%	0%
Deschutes	84	1%	11%	1%	2%	77%	2%	4%	0%	3%
Douglas	65	0%	6%	2%	2%	84%	0%	5%	2%	0%
Gilliam	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Grant	9	0%	20%	0%	0%	80%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Harney	8	0%	0%	0%	0%	86%	0%	14%	0%	0%
Hood River	20	0%	67%	0%	0%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Jackson	126	<1%	19%	1%	1%	73%	<1%	3%	0%	1%
Jefferson	25	0%	67%	0%	0%	29%	0%	5%	0%	0%
Josephine	38	2%	8%	2%	0%	81%	0%	6%	0%	2%
Klamath	17	0%	17%	0%	17%	63%	0%	4%	0%	0%
Lake	4	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Lane	230	2%	16%	3%	<1%	72%	<1%	5%	0%	2%
Lincoln	22	0%	23%	0%	4%	58%	4%	12%	0%	0%
Linn	22	0%	32%	0%	0%	68%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Malheur	14	0%	77%	0%	0%	23%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Marion	186	<1%	56%	2%	1%	36%	<1%	3%	<1%	0%
Morrow	15	0%	38%	6%	0%	56%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Multnomah	259	12%	32%	10%	<1%	42%	0%	2%	1%	<1%
Polk	37	0%	33%	2%	0%	62%	0%	2%	0%	2%
Sherman	3	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	%
Tillamook	11	0%	27%	0%	0%	73%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Umatilla	26	0%	34%	0%	3%	63%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Union	27	0%	0%	5%	0%	91%	5%	0%	0%	0%
Wallowa	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

County	Number of Exited Families	Percent African American	Percent Hispanic	Percent Asian/Pacific Islander	Percent American Indian	Percent Caucasian	Percent Hawaiian	Percent Multiracial	Percent Other	Percent Unreported
Wasco	15	0%	28%	0%	0%	72%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Washington	217	1%	55%	5%	<1%	38%	<1%	<1%	0%	0%
Yamhill	22	0%	32%	3%	0%	58%	0%	7%	0%	0%
State	**1,699**	**2%**	**31%**	**3%**	**1%**	**58%**	**<1%**	**3%**	**<1%**	**<1%**

Table 26: Demographic Characteristics of Exited Families: Language[23], Marital Status, Age, & Education

County	Percent English Speaking Household	Percent Spanish Speaking Household	Percent Other Language Household	Percent Single Mother	Average Age of Mother	Percent Less Than HS Education
Benton	73%	20%	7%	74%	20.0	33%
Clackamas	72%	27%	1%	66%	23.3	34%
Clatsop	100%	0%	0%	100%	22.5	57%
Columbia	100%	0%	0%	82%	22.0	55%
Coos	100%	0%	0%	58%	19.6	17%
Crook	67%	33%	0%	50%	21.0	32%
Curry	100%	0%	0%	67%	N/A	20%
Deschutes	91%	9%	0%	85%	20.7	58%
Douglas	91%	6%	3%	73%	22.3	30%
Gilliam	0%	0%	100%	100%	N/A	0%
Grant	67%	33%	0%	86%	20.5	60%
Harney	100%	0%	0%	100%	18.0	27%
Hood River	83%	17%	0%	71%	20.0	83%
Jackson	95%	5%	0%	72%	20.6	50%
Jefferson	29%	71%	0%	47%	23.7	52%
Josephine	96%	2%	2%	77%	20.7	42%
Klamath	82%	18%	0%	79%	19.4	67%
Lake	100%	0%	0%	80%	26.0	20%
Lane	89%	11%	0%	75%	22.5	35%
Lincoln	76%	24%	0%	88%	23.0	54%
Linn	85%	15%	0%	80%	20.1	44%
Malheur	67%	33%	0%	85%	19.5	69%
Marion	52%	47%	<1%	74%	20.9	60%
Morrow	78%	22%	0%	80%	23.7	56%
Multnomah	62%	30%	8%	79%	22.4	52%
Polk	80%	17%	3%	65%	21.8	36%
Sherman	N/A	N/A	N/A	67%	23.7	0%
Tillamook	75%	25%	0%	78%	20.7	44%
Umatilla	64%	36%	0%	73%	21.5	69%

[23] For this table, language is taken only from the New Baby Questionnaire.

County	Percent English Speaking Household	Percent Spanish Speaking Household	Percent Other Language Household	Percent Single Mother	Average Age of Mother	Percent Less Than HS Education
Union	89%	0%	11%	80%	21.5	30%
Wallowa	100%	0%	0%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Wasco	64%	36%	0%	78%	19.6	56%
Washington	48%	48%	5%	69%	21.8	55%
Yamhill	87%	13%	0%	69%	21.7	67%
State	**71%**	**26%**	**2%**	**74%**	**21.7**	**48%**

Table 27: Participant Reasons for Exiting Program Prior to Program Completion[24]

County	Number of Exiting Families	Percent Creative Outreach Ended	Percent Moved, Unable to Locate	Percent Parent No Longer Interested in Service	Percent Parent Too Busy for Home Visits	Percent Families Moved out of County	Percent Child Removed from Parent Custody	Percent Other
Benton	20	5%	10%	15%	20%	35%	5%	10%
Clackamas	116	18%	5%	6%	13%	10%	3%	45%
Clatsop	6	17%	17%	0%	33%	17%	0%	17%
Columbia	19	11%	0%	5%	58%	10%	0%	16%
Coos	7	14%	0%	29%	14%	0%	29%	14%
Crook	21	0%	38%	29%	19%	0%	0%	14%
Curry	7	57%	0%	0%	14%	29%	0%	0%
Deschutes	84	12%	20%	7%	13%	18%	7%	23%
Douglas	65	3%	12%	17%	26%	12%	6%	23%
Gilliam	1	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Grant	9	22%	22%	0%	0%	22%	11%	22%
Harney	8	0%	0%	13%	0%	50%	0%	38%
Hood River	20	5%	5%	25%	20%	25%	0%	20%
Jackson	126	12%	5%	22%	19%	8%	2%	33%
Jefferson	25	4%	16%	28%	40%	4%	0%	8%
Josephine	38	11%	18%	18%	3%	13%	3%	34%
Klamath	17	12%	12%	0%	41%	6%	12%	18%
Lake	4	0%	0%	25%	25%	25%	0%	25%
Lane	230	5%	9%	10%	10%	7%	4%	55%
Lincoln	22	36%	0%	13%	14%	13%	9%	14%
Linn	22	18%	9%	0%	23%	23%	5%	23%
Malheur	14	29%	21%	0%	21%	21%	0%	7%
Marion	186	12%	11%	10%	18%	10%	1%	38%
Morrow	15	40%	0%	13%	0%	33%	0%	13%
Multnomah	259	5%	10%	16%	26%	12%	<1%	31%
Polk	37	14%	8%	5%	0%	22%	5%	46%
Sherman	3	33%	0%	33%	0%	33%	0%	0%
Tillamook	11	0%	18%	0%	46%	10%	0%	27%
Umatilla	26	15%	12%	19%	8%	4%	4%	39%
Union	27	7%	7%	30%	22%	11%	0%	22%

[25] Reasons for exiting Intensive Services are reported on the family's Exit Form completed by the home visitor.

County	Number of Exiting Families	Percent Creative Outreach Ended	Percent Moved, Unable to Locate	Percent Parent No Longer Interested in Service	Percent Parent Too Busy for Home Visits	Percent Families Moved out of County	Percent Child Removed from Parent Custody	Percent Other
Wallowa	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Wasco	15	27%	7%	13%	20%	7%	13%	13%
Washington	217	23%	16%	24%	14%	15%	<1%	8%
Yamhill	22	14%	5%	32%	23%	0%	5%	23%
State	**1,699**	**12%**	**11%**	**15%**	**18%**	**12%**	**3%**	**30%**

[25] Reasons for exiting Intensive Services are reported on the family's Exit Form completed by the home visitor.

Table 28: Health Care for Intensive Service Families:[25] Health Care Provider & Well-child Check-ups

County	Number of Parents with Primary Health Care Provider Information	Percent of Parents with a Primary Health Care provider	Number of Children with Primary Health Care Provider Information	Percent of Children with a Primary Health Care Provider	Number of Children with Well-Child Check-Up Information	Percent of Children Receiving Regular Well-Child Check-Ups
Benton	39	62%	38	100%	38	90%
Clackamas	227	74%	209	93%	208	92%
Clatsop	25	56%	23	87%	23	91%
Columbia	19	79%	15	100%	14	93%
Coos	15	100%	13	100%	13	100%
Crook	31	94%	28	93%	27	100%
Curry	18	89%	18	100%	18	94%
Deschutes	135	87%	130	98%	128	93%
Douglas	88	68%	80	98%	78	89%
Gilliam	3	67%	3	100%	3	100%
Grant	9	78%	8	100%	8	88%
Harney	10	100%	10	100%	10	90%
Hood River	40	93%	37	97%	37	95%
Jackson	187	79%	161	99%	162	93%
Jefferson	20	65%	17	82%	17	82%
Josephine	61	87%	55	100%	55	93%
Klamath	29	62%	25	100%	25	100%
Lake	2	100%	2	100%	2	100%
Lane	276	74%	262	100%	261	96%
Lincoln	44	75%	38	100%	38	97%
Linn	50	58%	45	100%	45	98%
Malheur	25	88%	21	100%	22	99%
Marion	226	71%	193	98%	190	94%
Morrow	20	95%	19	100%	19	63%
Multnomah	381	71%	351	97%	350	94%
Polk	68	78%	61	100%	62	81%
Sherman	7	57%	6	100%	6	100%
Tillamook	51	90%	48	96%	47	96%
Umatilla	42	69%	34	100%	34	85%

[26] 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 report for each child.

County	Number of Parents with Primary Health Care Provider Information	Percent of Parents with a Primary Health Care provider	Number of Children with Primary Health Care Provider Information	Percent of Children with a Primary Health Care Provider	Number of Children with Well-Child Check-Up Information	Percent of Children Receiving Regular Well-Child Check-Ups
Union	27	74%	25	100%	25	96%
Wallowa	2	100%	2	100%	2	100%
Wasco	36	81%	33	97%	33	85%
Washington	365	59%	334	96%	338	94%
Yamhill	72	76%	60	100%	59	83%
State	**2,650**	**73%**	**2,404**	**98%**	**2,397**	**93%**

[26] Health outcomes are tracked by the home visitors and reported at 6-month intervals on the Family Update form completed by the Healthy Start home visitor. Outcome information is taken from the most recent report for each child.

Table 29: Health Care for Intensive Service Families: Use of Emergency Room

County	Number of Children with Health Insurance Information[26]	Percent with Private Insurance	Percent with OHP	Percent with No Insurance	Number of Children with Emergency Room Information	Percent of Families Frequently Using the Emergency Room for Routine Care	Percent of Families who Have Used the Emergency Room for Routine Care Once or Twice
Benton	38	18%	76%	5%	35	0%	17%
Clackamas	212	26%	68%	6%	189	1%	16%
Clatsop	23	4%	87%	8%	22	0%	18%
Columbia	15	13%	87%	0%	13	0%	15%
Coos	13	8%	85%	8%	12	0%	42%
Crook	28	11%	75%	7%	28	0%	32%
Curry	18	22%	78%	0%	15	0%	13%
Deschutes	128	12%	87%	2%	122	2%	15%
Douglas	81	16%	82%	1%	68	6%	37%
Gilliam	3	33%	67%	0%	3	33%	33%
Grant	8	0%	100%	0%	8	13%	50%
Harney	10	70%	30%	0%	10	0%	60%
Hood River	38	5%	90%	3%	34	0%	12%
Jackson	184	9%	88%	3%	156	5%	29%
Jefferson	17	18%	71%	12%	15	0%	20%
Josephine	58	7%	88%	5%	39	0%	23%
Klamath	26	12%	89%	0%	24	4%	33%
Lake	2	0%	100%	0%	2	0%	50%
Lane	266	18%	77%	3%	249	4%	21%
Lincoln	38	11%	84%	0%	30	0%	23%
Linn	45	18%	80%	0%	43	2%	14%
Malheur	22	5%	91%	5%	19	0%	16%
Marion	194	12%	88%	1%	164	2%	23%
Morrow	19	5%	84%	11%	16	6%	0%
Multnomah	353	19%	77%	3%	323	3%	16%
Polk	62	16%	81%	2%	59	0%	31%
Sherman	6	0%	100%	0%	4	0%	20%

[27] The insurance type 'other' represents less than 1% of the sample and is not included in this table.

County	Number of Children with Health Insurance Information[26]	Percent with Private Insurance	Percent with OHP	Percent with No Insurance	Number of Children with Emergency Room Information	Percent of Families Frequently Using the Emergency Room for Routine Care	Percent of Families who Have Used the Emergency Room for Routine Care Once or Twice
Tillamook	49	8%	90%	2%	45	0%	33%
Umatilla	42	7%	86%	7%	33	3%	24%
Union	26	35%	58%	8%	23	0%	30%
Wallowa	2	0%	100%	0%	2	0%	50%
Wasco	32	6%	94%	0%	29	3%	45%
Washington	353	14%	82%	4%	319	3%	20%
Yamhill	65	9%	88%	3%	56	0%	21%
State	**2,476**	**15%**	**81%**	**3%**	**2,209**	**2%**	**22%**

[27] The insurance type 'other' represents less than 1% of the sample and is not included in this table.

Table 30: Health Care for Intensive Service Children:[27] Immunizations

County	Number of Children With Immunization Information	Percent of Children With Up-To-Date Immunizations	Percent of Children With Some Immunizations, But Not Up-To-Date	Number of Children With Immunization Information at Age 2	Percent of Children Fully Immunized by Age 2
Benton	38	97%	3%	7	100%
Clackamas	208	93%	6%	79	92%
Clatsop	23	78%	13%	10	70%
Columbia	15	100%	0%	2	100%
Coos	13	100%	0%	3	100%
Crook	28	100%	0%	4	100%
Curry	18	89%	6%	2	50%
Deschutes	128	92%	7%	39	100%
Douglas	79	87%	11%	27	89%
Gilliam	3	100%	0%	1	100%
Grant	8	100%	0%	1	100%
Harney	10	90%	10%	5	100%
Hood River	37	95%	5%	18	94%
Jackson	162	94%	6%	41	95%
Jefferson	17	88%	12%	4	75%
Josephine	55	93%	6%	1	100%
Klamath	25	100%	0%	6	100%
Lake	2	100%	0%	N/A	N/A
Lane	260	97%	2%	102	98%
Lincoln	38	92%	5%	2	100%
Linn	45	93%	7%	15	80%
Malheur	22	96%	5%	1	100%
Marion	192	95%	4%	48	100%
Morrow	19	90%	11%	1	100%
Multnomah	349	91%	7%	64	91%
Polk	61	90%	9%	17	94%
Sherman	6	100%	0%	3	100%
Tillamook	48	94%	6%	18	94%
Umatilla	34	97%	3%	8	100%
Union	25	96%	4%	5	100%

[28] Health outcomes are tracked by the home visitors and reported at 6-month intervals on the Family Update form completed by the Healthy Start home visitor. Outcome information is taken from the most recent report for each child.

County	Number of Children With Immunization Information	Percent of Children With Up-To-Date Immunizations	Percent of Children With Some Immunizations, But Not Up-To-Date	Number of Children With Immunization Information at Age 2	Percent of Children Fully Immunized by Age 2
Wallowa	2	100%	0%	1	100%
Wasco	33	91%	9%	10	90%
Washington	338	93%	6%	90	94%
Yamhill	58	91%	9%	16	75%
State	**2,399**	**93%**	**6%**	**651**	**94%**

[28] Health outcomes are tracked by the home visitors and reported at 6-month intervals on the Family Update form completed by the Healthy Start home visitor. Outcome information is taken from the most recent report for each child.

Table 31: Prenatal Care for Subsequent Births

County	Intensive Service Families with Information on Prenatal Care	Early, Comprehensive Prenatal Care for Initial Pregnancy	Intensive Service Families with New Pregnancy	Early Prenatal Care for Initial Pregnancy	Early Prenatal Care for New Pregnancy	Percent Change[28]
Benton	41	78%	3	33%	67%	100%
Clackamas	159	60%	11	36%	91%	150%
Clatsop	12	50%	2	100%	50%	-50%
Columbia	31	74%	2	100%	100%	0%
Coos	11	55%	2	0%	100%	*
Crook	30	83%	NA	NA	NA	NA
Curry	16	75%	2	0%	50%	*
Deschutes	100	74%	6	17%	100%	500%
Douglas	67	67%	5	0%	100%	*
Gilliam	4	75%	NA	NA	NA	NA
Grant	6	50%	NA	NA	NA	NA
Harney	9	78%	2	0%	100%	*
Hood River	18	72%	2	0%	100%	*
Jackson	115	63%	12	25%	100%	300%
Jefferson	26	81%	NA	NA	NA	NA
Josephine	96	58%	1	100%	100%	0%
Klamath	35	80%	2	0%	100%	*
Lake	4	100%	NA	NA	NA	NA
Lane	193	61%	14	36%	86%	140%
Lincoln	55	75%	2	0%	100%	*
Linn	30	90%	5	40%	100%	150%
Malheur	23	74%	4	25%	100%	300%
Marion	326	64%	8	25%	100%	300%
Morrow	16	31%	NA	NA	NA	NA
Multnomah	376	66%	16	31%	100%	220%
Polk	52	58%	1	0%	100%	*
Sherman	2	100%	NA	NA	NA	NA
Tillamook	32	69%	3	33%	100%	200%
Umatilla	34	68%	2	0%	50%	*
Union	17	65%	1	100%	100%	0%

[29] Asterisks indicate no families had subsequent births, therefore, percent change could not be calculated.

County	Intensive Service Families with Information on Prenatal Care	Early, Comprehensive Prenatal Care for Initial Pregnancy	Intensive Service Families with New Pregnancy	Early Prenatal Care for Initial Pregnancy	Early Prenatal Care for New Pregnancy	Percent Change[28]
Wallowa	9	89%	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wasco	29	79%	4	0%	75%	*
Washington	343	61%	11	45%	73%	60%
Yamhill	49	69%	3	67%	100%	50%
State	**2,366**	**66%**	**126**	**30%**	**91%**	**203%**

[29] Asterisks indicate no families had subsequent births, therefore, percent change could not be calculated.

Table 32: Child Growth and Development (ASQ)

County	Number of Children Eligible for a Developmental Screening	Number of Children with at Least One Developmental Screening	Number of Children without a Developmental Screen	Percent of Eligible Children with at Least One Developmental Screening	Percent with Normal Development[29] at Most Recent Developmental Screening	Number of Children with an Identified Developmental Delay	Percent of Children with an Identified Developmental Delay	Percentage of Children with an Identified Developmental Delay Receiving Early Intervention Services[30]
Benton	65	38	27	59%	95%	0	0%	N/A
Clackamas	302	203	99	67%	88%	8	4%	100%
Clatsop	31	20	11	65%	80%	1	5%	100%
Columbia	36	15	21	42%	100%	0	0%	N/A
Coos	20	13	7	65%	92%	0	0%	N/A
Crook	49	28	21	57%	100%	0	0%	N/A
Curry	23	18	5	78%	89%	0	0%	N/A
Deschutes	175	128	47	73%	88%	5	4%	100%
Douglas	129	63	66	49%	91%	1	2%	100%
Gilliam	4	3	1	75%	100%	0	0%	N/A
Grant	11	8	3	73%	100%	0	0%	N/A
Harney	20	10	10	50%	80%	0	0%	N/A
Hood River	50	36	14	72%	83%	1	3%	100%
Jackson	323	162	161	50%	88%	2	1%	100%
Jefferson	42	17	25	41%	88%	0	0%	N/A
Josephine	101	52	49	52%	100%	0	0%	N/A
Klamath	57	25	32	44%	88%	0	0%	N/A
Lake	8	2	6	25%	100%	0	0%	N/A
Lane	401	261	140	65%	89%	7	3%	100%
Lincoln	58	38	20	66%	95%	0	0%	N/A
Linn	63	44	19	70%	77%	1	2%	100%
Malheur	36	20	16	56%	90%	0	0%	N/A
Marion	432	192	240	44%	89%	4	2%	80%
Morrow	31	18	13	58%	100%	0	0%	N/A
Multnomah	622	336	286	54%	91%	6	2%	100%

[30] Normal development and early intervention are reported on the Family Update form completed by the Healthy Start home visitor.
[31] Intensive Service children are screened for normal growth and development at 4, 8, 12, 18, 24, 30, 36, 48, and 60 months of age using the Ages and Stages Questionnaire. The most recent screening data are reported on the Family Update form.

County	Number of Children Eligible for a Developmental Screening	Number of Children with at Least One Developmental Screening	Number of Children without a Developmental Screen	Percent of Eligible Children with at Least One Developmental Screening	Percent with Normal Development[29] at Most Recent Developmental Screening	Number of Children with an Identified Developmental Delay	Percent of Children with an Identified Developmental Delay	Percentage of Children with an Identified Developmental Delay Receiving Early Intervention Services[30]
Polk	90	61	29	68%	93%	0	0%	N/A
Sherman	6	6	0	100%	83%	1	17%	100%
Tillamook	62	38	24	61%	92%	2	5%	100%
Umatilla	93	33	60	36%	82%	1	3%	100%
Union	42	24	18	57%	96%	0	0%	N/A
Wallowa	11	1	10	9%	100%	0	0%	N/A
Wasco	48	31	17	65%	94%	1	3%	100%
Washington	658	333	325	51%	90%	7	2%	100%
Yamhill	89	60	29	68%	90%	1	2%	50%
State	**4,188**	**2,337**	**1,851**	**56%**	**90%**	**49**	**2%**	**96%**

[30] Normal development and early intervention are reported on the Family Update form completed by the Healthy Start home visitor.
[31] Intensive Service children are screened from normal growth and development at 4, 8, 12, 18, 24, 30, 36, 48, and 60 months of age using the Ages and Stages Questionnaire. The most recent screening data are reported on the Family Update form.

Table 33: Connection to Essential Resources for Intensive Service Families[31]

County	Number Needing Dental Insurance at 6 Months	Percent Connected with Dental Insurance at 6 Months	Number Needing Education Assistance at 6 Months	Percent Connected with Education Assistance at 6 Months	Number Needing Language Classes at 6 Months	Percent Connected with Language Classes at 6 Months	Number Needing Housing Assistance at 6 Months	Percent Connected with Housing Assistance at 6 Months	Number Needing Job Training at 6 Months	Percent Connected with Job Training at 6 Months
Benton	4	100%	4	50%	3	67%	3	67%	6	17%
Clackamas	5	0%	6	17%	2	100%	9	56%	11	0%
Clatsop	2	0%	0	N/A	0	N/A	3	100%	2	0%
Columbia	1	0%	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Coos	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	1	0%
Crook	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Curry	0	N/A	1	100%	0	N/A	0	N/A	1	100%
Deschutes	0	N/A	5	40%	0	N/A	6	67%	5	40%
Douglas	0	N/A	1	0%	0	N/A	1	100%	3	0%
Gilliam	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Grant	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Harney	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Hood River	4	0%	3	33%	3	67%	4	50%	3	33%
Jackson	3	33%	9	33%	5	20%	4	75%	8	50%
Jefferson	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Josephine	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	1	100%	0	N/A
Klamath	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Lake	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Lane	13	0%	5	40%	2	0%	10	50%	10	30%
Lincoln	2	0%	4	25%	2	100%	3	100%	2	50%
Linn	0	N/A	2	50%	1	0%	1	0%	1	100%
Malheur	0	N/A	1	100%	0	N/A	2	100%	2	50%
Marion	3	33%	4	75%	7	86%	6	83%	4	0%
Morrow	1	0%	0	N/A	1	0%	0	N/A	2	0%
Multnomah	21	5%	19	37%	18	56%	8	38%	31	13%
Polk	2	0%	3	0%	1	100%	6	83%	4	0%
Sherman	1	0%	0	N/A	0	N/A	1	0%	0	N/A
Tillamook	2	0%	1	0%	1	0%	3	67%	3	0%

[32] Numbers refer to home visitor ratings of (1) whether or not the family had a need for the resource on the 6-month Family Update form conducted during FY 2004-05, and (2) whether or not the home visitor reported she/he gave the family information about the service or connected the family to the service.

County	Number Needing Dental Insurance at 6 Months	Percent Connected with Dental Insurance at 6 Months	Number Needing Education Assistance at 6 Months	Percent Connected with Education Assistance at 6 Months	Number Needing Language Classes at 6 Months	Percent Connected with Language Classes at 6 Months	Number Needing Housing Assistance at 6 Months	Percent Connected with Housing Assistance at 6 Months	Number Needing Job Training at 6 Months	Percent Connected with Job Training at 6 Months
Umatilla	1	0%	1	100%	1	100%	1	100%	1	100%
Union	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	1	0%
Wallowa	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Wasco	1	0%	2	50%	0	N/A	2	50%	3	0%
Washington	5	0%	15	33%	15	53%	9	67%	15	20%
Yamhill	2	50%	1	100%	3	100%	3	100%	2	50%
State	**78**	**5%**	**87**	**38%**	**65**	**59%**	**86**	**66%**	**121**	**20%**

[32] Numbers refer to home visitor ratings of (1) whether or not the family had a need for the resource on the 6-month Family Update form conducted during FY 2004-05, and (2) whether or not the home visitor reported she/he gave the family information about the service or connected the family to the service.

Table 34: Promotion of Positive Parenting Skills & Helping Children Learn

County	Number Reporting Parenting Skills Information (at 6 Months)	Percent Reporting Improved Parenting Skills (at 6 Months)	Number Reporting Parenting Skills Information (at 12 Months)	Percent Reporting Improved Parenting Skills (at 12 Months)	Number Reporting Ability to Help Their Child Learn Information (at 6 Months)	Percent Reporting Improved Ability to Help Their Child Learn (at 6 Months)	Number Reporting Ability to Help Their Child Learn Information (at 12 Months)	Percent Reporting Improved Ability to Help Their Child Learn (at 12 Months)
Benton	31	94%	21	91%	31	65%	20	70%
Clackamas	138	83%	114	85%	135	66%	111	75%
Clatsop	16	88%	13	69%	16	81%	13	62%
Columbia	15	93%	9	78%	15	87%	9	56%
Coos	8	63%	9	78%	8	50%	8	63%
Crook	20	80%	12	83%	18	61%	12	67%
Curry	12	75%	9	89%	11	64%	9	67%
Deschutes	90	90%	75	89%	90	77%	75	76%
Douglas	32	88%	22	96%	31	68%	22	77%
Gilliam	2	50%	1	100%	2	50%	1	100%
Grant	4	50%	8	63%	4	50%	8	38%
Harney	1	0%	3	67%	1	0%	3	33%
Hood River	24	83%	26	92%	24	79%	25	80%
Jackson	124	82%	76	82%	120	64%	75	60%
Jefferson	14	79%	11	91%	14	50%	11	73%
Josephine	44	89%	22	86%	43	67%	21	48%
Klamath	19	90%	15	80%	19	79%	15	67%
Lake	3	100%	N/A	N/A	3	100%	N/A	N/A
Lane	176	88%	147	87%	176	67%	143	70%
Lincoln	32	88%	12	75%	31	65%	12	58%
Linn	27	74%	25	80%	26	54%	25	68%
Malheur	11	90%	6	50%	11	50%	6	0%
Marion	133	82%	99	84%	129	63%	96	69%
Morrow	15	87%	9	100%	15	60%	9	89%
Multnomah	261	85%	192	81%	250	68%	186	65%
Polk	37	78%	32	78%	37	54%	32	66%
Sherman	2	100%	4	100%	2	50%	4	25%
Tillamook	32	75%	21	57%	32	56%	20	45%
Umatilla	20	65%	19	90%	20	65%	19	79%
Union	23	83%	15	93%	23	61%	15	80%

County	Number Reporting Parenting Skills Information (at 6 Months)	Percent Reporting Improved Parenting Skills (at 6 Months)	Number Reporting Parenting Skills Information (at 12 Months)	Percent Reporting Improved Parenting Skills (at 12 Months)	Number Reporting Ability to Help Their Child Learn Information (at 6 Months)	Percent Reporting Improved Ability to Help Their Child Learn (at 6 Months)	Number Reporting Ability to Help Their Child Learn Information (at 12 Months)	Percent Reporting Improved Ability to Help Their Child Learn (at 12 Months)
Wallowa	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Wasco	23	78%	18	83%	23	65%	18	78%
Washington	212	83%	171	88%	205	65%	163	75%
Yamhill	53	85%	38	90%	52	71%	38	74%
State	**1,654**	**84%**	**1,254**	**84%**	**1,617**	**66%**	**1,224**	**69%**

Table 35: Promotion of Positive Parent-Child Interaction, HOME Outcomes, & Reading

County	Number Reporting Parent-Child Interactions Information (at 6 Months)	Percent Reporting Positive Parent-Child Interactions (at 6 Months)	Number Reporting Parent-Child Interactions Information (at 12 Months)	Percent Reporting Positive Parent-Child Interactions (at 12 Months)	Number of Families with HOME[32] Score Information (at 12 Months)	Percent of Families with "Good" or Higher HOME Score (at 12 Months)	Number of Families with HOME Score Information (at 24 Months)	Percent of Families with "Good" or Higher HOME Score (at 24 Months)	Number of Families with Reading Information	Percent of Families That Read 3+ Times/Week
Benton	31	87%	22	73%	21	81%	8	63%	39	92%
Clackamas	170	80%	123	76%	111	78%	56	8%	164	87%
Clatsop	18	89%	13	100%	15	73%	8	88%	16	88%
Columbia	11	74%	5	80%	7	100%	1	100%	18	94%
Coos	6	50%	9	78%	6	67%	3	100%	11	73%
Crook	23	97%	12	100%	7	29%	1	0%	25	84%
Curry	13	92%	7	100%	9	100%	2	100%	18	78%
Deschutes	102	81%	77	79%	84	81%	34	85%	101	88%
Douglas	55	82%	44	82%	45	80%	18	72%	46	80%
Gilliam	2	100%	N/A	N/A	1	100%	1	100%	3	100%
Grant	3	100%	7	57%	6	67%	1	100%	9	100%
Harney	3	33%	6	50%	8	63%	4	25%	5	100%
Hood River	23	83%	26	85%	21	76%	17	88%	34	91%
Jackson	142	64%	92	64%	86	83%	27	89%	120	89%
Jefferson	12	92%	10	80%	7	100%	4	75%	17	77%
Josephine	32	84%	19	84%	20	85%	1	100%	50	90%
Klamath	20	90%	14	79%	16	88%	4	75%	25	88%
Lake	2	50%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	100%
Lane	201	86%	169	84%	155	81%	75	81%	235	89%
Lincoln	28	71%	14	64%	18	72%	2	100%	32	91%
Linn	35	91%	28	93%	26	89%	10	90%	36	86%
Malheur	12	92%	9	100%	6	50%	1	0%	16	88%
Marion	126	75%	78	77%	81	77%	36	83%	175	85%
Morrow	16	88%	4	75%	7	14%	1	100%	17	77%
Multnomah	276	87%	204	92%	180	70%	49	67%	323	82%
Polk	52	73%	38	79%	42	100%	17	94%	53	81%

[33] Family effectiveness as the child's first teacher is measured by the Home Observation 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 falling at the 75th percentile or higher (above average) for the normative population.

County	Number Reporting Parent-Child Interactions Information (at 6 Months)	Percent Reporting Positive Parent-Child Interactions (at 6 Months)	Number Reporting Parent-Child Interactions Information (at 12 Months)	Percent Reporting Positive Parent-Child Interactions (at 12 Months)	Number of Families with HOME[32] Score Information (at 12 Months)	Percent of Families with "Good" or Higher HOME Score (at 12 Months)	Number of Families with HOME Score Information (at 24 Months)	Percent of Families with "Good" or Higher HOME Score (at 24 Months)	Number of Families with Reading Information	Percent of Families That Read 3+ Times/Week
Sherman	2	50%	4	50%	2	100%	2	100%	6	83%
Tillamook	39	74%	33	70%	27	59%	13	62%	31	77%
Umatilla	25	64%	25	68%	19	53%	8	63%	24	88%
Union	21	91%	15	87%	16	81%	4	100%	25	100%
Wallowa	1	0%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	100%
Wasco	24	96%	14	100%	20	85%	8	75%	29	86%
Washington	252	90%	198	86%	185	73%	68	77%	279	79%
Yamhill	54	80%	36	72%	31	84%	14	100%	55	82%
State	**1,832**	**82%**	**1,355**	**82%**	**1,285**	**77%**	**498**	**80%**	**2,041**	**85%**

[33] Family effectiveness as child's first teacher is measured by the Home Observation 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 falling at the 75th percentile or higher (above average) for the normative population.

Table 36: Cultural Competency & Strength Orientation of Home Visitors[33]

County	Number of Families Responding to Cultural Competency Items[34]	Percent of Families who Strongly Agree Staff are Culturally Competent	Percent of Families who Agree Staff are Culturally Competent	Percent of Families who are Not Sure if Staff are Culturally Competent	Number of Families Responding to Strength Orientation Items[35]	Percent of Families who Strongly Agree Staff Have a Strengths Orientation	Percent of Families who Agree Staff Have a Strengths Orientation	Percent of Families who are Not Sure if Staff Have a Strengths Orientation
Benton	36	69%	25%	6%	36	61%	36%	3%
Clackamas	150	65%	33%	<1%	160	46%	45%	8%
Clatsop	15	100%	0%	0%	20	45%	40%	15%
Columbia	16	94%	6%	0%	16	44%	50%	6%
Coos	9	78%	22%	0%	9	67%	33%	0%
Crook	24	67%	25%	4%	24	75%	21%	0%
Curry	14	79%	21%	0%	14	64%	29%	7%
Deschutes	93	86%	12%	1%	101	66%	30%	2%
Douglas	38	79%	18%	3%	41	66%	32%	2%
Gilliam	2	100%	0%	0%	2	50%	50%	0%
Grant	8	63%	38%	0%	8	63%	38%	0%
Harney	4	75%	25%	0%	5	40%	60%	0%
Hood River	31	61%	39%	0%	31	36%	65%	0%
Jackson	116	79%	20%	<1%	139	45%	50%	5%
Jefferson	14	64%	29%	7%	15	53%	40%	7%
Josephine	42	83%	14%	2%	45	53%	31%	13%
Klamath	22	91%	9%	0%	23	48%	48%	4%
Lake	2	100%	0%	0%	2	50%	50%	0%
Lane	224	80%	19%	<1%	228	64%	33%	3%
Lincoln	27	78%	19%	4%	27	56%	33%	7%
Linn	36	81%	19%	0%	37	62%	38%	0%
Malheur	8	88%	13%	0%	8	75%	25%	0%
Marion	144	74%	25%	<1%	150	66%	31%	3%
Morrow	12	83%	17%	0%	12	67%	33%	0%

[34] The family describes Culturally Competent and Strength-based Practice/Service on the Parent Survey II. Ratings are described by the parent as (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) not sure, (4) disagree, (5) strongly disagree.

[35] Ratings of staff cultural competency are assessed by parent responses to: My home visitor (1) respects my family's race, culture, and/or religious beliefs, and (2) provides materials for my child that positively reflect our cultural background.

[36] Ratings of staff strength orientation are assessed by parent responses to: My home visitor (1) Lets me decide what goals I want to work toward, (2) Sees strengths in myself I didn't know I had, (3) helps me use my own skills and resources to solve problems, and (4) helps me learn new skills.

County	Number of Families Responding to Cultural Competency Items[34]	Percent of Families who Strongly Agree Staff are Culturally Competent	Percent of Families who Agree Staff are Culturally Competent	Percent of Families who are Not Sure if Staff are Culturally Competent	Number of Families Responding to Strength Orientation Items[35]	Percent of Families who Strongly Agree Staff Have a Strengths Orientation	Percent of Families who Agree Staff Have a Strengths Orientation	Percent of Families who are Not Sure if Staff Have a Strengths Orientation
Multnomah	288	72%	26%	1%	289	49%	45%	4%
Polk	46	80%	20%	0%	46	76%	24%	0%
Sherman	4	50%	50%	0%	4	50%	50%	0%
Tillamook	31	71%	23%	7%	38	55%	40%	5%
Umatilla	21	71%	29%	0%	26	31%	69%	0%
Union	24	92%	8%	0%	25	72%	24%	4%
Wallowa	1	0%	100%	0%	1	100%	0%	0%
Wasco	26	73%	15%	8%	26	58%	31%	8%
Washington	249	72%	24%	3%	266	50%	43%	6%
Yamhill	55	80%	18%	2%	56	54%	45%	2%
State	**1,832**	**76%**	**22%**	**2%**	**1,930**	**55%**	**40%**	**4%**

[34] The family describes cultural Competent and Strength Bases Practice/Service on the Parent Survey II. Ratings are described by parent as (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) not sure, (4) disagree, (5) strongly disagree.
[35] Ratings of staff cultural competency are assessed by parent responses to: My home visitor (1) respects my family's race, culture, and/or religious beliefs, and (2) provides materials for my child that positively reflect our cultural background.
[36] Ratings of staff strength orientation are assessed by parent responses to: My home visitor (1) Lets me decide what goals I want to work toward, (2) Sees strengths in myself I didn't know I had, (3) helps me use my own skills and resources to solve problems, and (4) helps me learn new skills.

Table 37: Staff Skills & Child Focused Behavior of Home Visitors[36]

County	Number of Families Responding to Staff Skills Items[37]	Percent of Families who Strongly Agree Staff Have Appropriate Skills	Percent of Families who Agree Staff Have Appropriate Skills	Percent of Families who are Not Sure if Staff Have Appropriate Skills	Number of Families Responding to Child Focused Items[38]	Percent of Families who Strongly Agree Staff are Child Focused	Percent of Families who Agree Staff are Child Focused	Percent of Families who are Not Sure if Staff are Child Focused
Benton	36	58%	42%	0%	36	67%	28%	6%
Clackamas	151	53%	44%	1%	150	63%	35%	<1%
Clatsop	15	73%	27%	0%	15	80%	20%	0%
Columbia	16	56%	38%	6%	16	63%	31%	6%
Coos	9	56%	44%	0%	9	44%	56%	0%
Crook	24	63%	33%	0%	24	79%	17%	0%
Curry	14	57%	43%	0%	14	86%	14%	0%
Deschutes	93	77%	20%	0%	93	81%	17%	1%
Douglas	37	78%	22%	0%	37	87%	14%	0%
Gilliam	2	50%	50%	0%	2	100%	0%	0%
Grant	8	63%	38%	0%	8	63%	38%	0%
Harney	4	25%	75%	0%	4	75%	25%	0%
Hood River	31	32%	68%	0%	31	29%	71%	0%
Jackson	116	58%	41%	2%	116	64%	35%	2%
Jefferson	14	57%	43%	0%	14	64%	36%	0%
Josephine	42	69%	29%	2%	42	74%	24%	2%
Klamath	22	73%	23%	5%	22	82%	18%	0%
Lake	2	100%	0%	0%	2	100%	0%	0%
Lane	224	70%	28%	1%	224	77%	21%	2%
Lincoln	27	63%	30%	7%	27	74%	22%	4%
Linn	36	69%	31%	0%	36	70%	31%	0%
Malheur	8	75%	25%	0%	8	100%	0%	0%
Marion	144	69%	31%	0%	144	74%	26%	0%
Morrow	12	58%	42%	0%	12	83%	17%	0%

[37] The family describes Culturally Competent and Strength-based Practice/Service on the Parent Survey II. Ratings are described by parent as (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) not sure, (4) disagree, (5) strongly disagree.

[38] Ratings of staff skills are assessed by parent responses to: My home visitor (1) gives me choices in the kinds of services that she or he can help me get, (2) helps me in the decisions I make about myself and my family (3) respects me as a parent, even if she or he disagrees with me, (4) gives me information that is easy to understand, (5) helps me find a solution if I have a problem, and (6) communicates clearly with me.

[39] Ratings of staff child-focused practice are assessed by parent response to: My home visitor (1) seeks my input when assessing my child, and (2) helps me think about what I want in the long term for myself and my child.

County	Number of Families Responding to Staff Skills Items[37]	Percent of Families who Strongly Agree Staff Have Appropriate Skills	Percent of Families who Agree Staff Have Appropriate Skills	Percent of Families who are Not Sure if Staff Have Appropriate Skills	Number of Families Responding to Child Focused Items[38]	Percent of Families who Strongly Agree Staff are Child Focused	Percent of Families who Agree Staff are Child Focused	Percent of Families who are Not Sure if Staff are Child Focused
Multnomah	288	52%	44%	3%	287	60%	37%	2%
Polk	46	74%	26%	0%	46	83%	17%	0%
Sherman	4	50%	25%	25%	4	50%	25%	25%
Tillamook	31	65%	36%	0%	31	71%	26%	3%
Umatilla	21	43%	57%	0%	21	52%	48%	0%
Union	24	79%	13%	8%	24	79%	21%	0%
Wallowa	1	100%	0%	0%	1	0%	100%	0%
Wasco	26	69%	27%	0%	26	69%	27%	0%
Washington	249	56%	39%	3%	248	64%	32%	2%
Yamhill	55	58%	40%	2%	55	71%	29%	0%
State	**1,832**	**61%**	**36%**	**2%**	**1,829**	**69%**	**29%**	**1%**

[37] The family describes Culturally Competent and Strength-based Practice/Service on the Parent Survey II. Ratings are described by parent as (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) not sure, (4) disagree, (5) strongly disagree.
[38] Ratings of staff skills are assessed by parent responses to: My home visitor (1) gives me choices in the kinds of services that she or he can help me get, (2) helps me in the decisions I make about myself and my family (3) respects me as a parent, even if she or he disagrees with me, (4) gives me information that is easy to understand, (5) helps me find a solution if I have a problem, and (6) communicates clearly with me.
[39] Ratings of staff child-focused practice are assessed by parent response to: My home visitor (1) seeks my input when assessing my child, and (2) helps me think about what I want in the long term for myself and my child.

Table 38: Ratings of Home Visitor Helpfulness[39]

County	Number Reporting Home Visitor Helped with Basic Resources	Percent Reporting Home Visitor "Helped a Little or a Lot" with Basic Resources	Number Reporting Home Visitor Helped with Social Support	Percent Reporting Home Visitor "Helped a Little or a Lot" with Social Support	Number Reporting Home Visitor Helped with Parenting Information	Percent Reporting Home Visitor "Helped a Little or a Lot" with Parenting Information	Number Reporting Home Visitor Helped with Emotional Issues	Percent Reporting Home Visitor "Helped a Little or a Lot" with Emotional Issues	Number Reporting Home Visitor Helped with Education	Percent Reporting Home Visitor "Helped a Little or a Lot" with Education
Benton	22	82%	27	82%	39	95%	22	86%	22	41%
Clackamas	103	88%	91	75%	157	100%	105	86%	77	68%
Clatsop	13	100%	7	86 %	15	100%	7	100%	11	91%
Columbia	13	85%	8	100%	16	100%	7	100%	11	91%
Coos	5	80%	3	67%	10	100%	6	100%	1	100%
Crook	10	100%	5	40%	25	100%	10	100%	4	100%
Curry	15	93%	13	92%	16	100%	14	93%	9	89%
Deschutes	69	93%	61	95%	99	100%	66	94%	65	95%
Douglas	24	71%	22	82%	44	100%	24	96%	24	88%
Gilliam	1	100%	2	100%	3	100%	3	100%	2	100%
Grant	6	83%	4	100%	9	100%	6	100%	5	100%
Harney	1	100%	1	0%	5	100%	5	100%	1	100%
Hood River	30	87%	20	75%	34	100%	22	91%	30	90%
Jackson	67	85%	38	87%	117	100%	53	91%	62	68%
Jefferson	11	73%	8	63%	13	92%	8	88%	6	17%
Josephine	36	94%	18	78%	49	100%	21	91%	17	77%
Klamath	10	70%	15	87%	24	100%	18	78%	12	33%
Lake	3	67%	2	100%	3	100%	2	100%	2	50%
Lane	146	90%	114	83%	224	100%	142	96%	115	82%
Lincoln	24	79%	10	80%	30	100%	11	73%	13	77%
Linn	19	68%	21	91%	35	100%	22	91%	16	69%
Malheur	5	100%	8	88%	15	100%	7	100%	7	29%
Marion	121	93%	91	93%	170	99%	91	97%	95	90%
Morrow	10	70%	11	73%	17	100%	9	78%	6	83%
Multnomah	255	89%	147	89%	315	100%	163	88%	199	80%
Polk	40	90%	38	92%	51	100%	40	95%	38	84%

[40] Ratings are taken from the family's last completed Parent Survey II. "How much, if at all, has Healthy Start helped you" items are rated as 1= helped a lot, 2 = helped a little, 3 = hasn't helped.

County	Number Reporting Home Visitor Helped with Basic Resources	Percent Reporting Home Visitor "Helped a Little or a Lot" with Basic Resources	Number Reporting Home Visitor Helped with Social Support	Percent Reporting Home Visitor "Helped a Little or a Lot" with Social Support	Number Reporting Home Visitor Helped with Parenting Information	Percent Reporting Home Visitor "Helped a Little or a Lot" with Parenting Information	Number Reporting Home Visitor Helped with Emotional Issues	Percent Reporting Home Visitor "Helped a Little or a Lot" with Emotional Issues	Number Reporting Home Visitor Helped with Education	Percent Reporting Home Visitor "Helped a Little or a Lot" with Education
Sherman	4	100%	2	50%	6	100%	4	100%	3	100%
Tillamook	24	96%	19	95%	31	100%	22	81%	9	78%
Umatilla	13	62%	9	78%	23	100%	12	58%	12	58%
Union	8	100%	5	80%	25	100%	8	100%	7	100%
Wallowa	1	100%	1	100%	1	100%	1	100%	1	0%
Wasco	18	89%	17	77%	28	100%	17	88%	13	54%
Washington	204	86%	160	82%	264	99%	151	87%	166	64%
Yamhill	46	89%	32	97%	54	100%	37	97%	34	79%
State	**1,377**	**88%**	**1,030**	**85%**	**1,967**	**100%**	**1,136**	**91%**	**1,095**	**76%**

[40] Ratings are taken from the family's last completed Parent Survey II. "How much, if at all, has Healthy Start helped you" items are rated as 1= helped a lot, 2 = helped a little, 3 = hasn't helped.

Table 39: Parent Stress, Parent Satisfaction with Healthy Start, & Income Change

County	Number with Parenting Stress Information	Percent Reduction in Parents' Stress	Number with "Parent Satisfaction with Service" Information	Percent of Parents Satisfied with Service	Number of Parents with Income Information	Percent of Parents Reporting their Income Change as "Improved"
Benton	28	54%	38	84%	38	50%
Clackamas	130	47%	158	84%	203	25%
Clatsop	16	44%	16	94%	17	29%
Columbia	12	42%	18	83%	14	21%
Coos	7	86%	10	90%	13	23%
Crook	18	17%	24	83%	28	29%
Curry	9	44%	18	83%	18	50%
Deschutes	83	34%	100	90%	121	40%
Douglas	26	39%	45	91%	79	27%
Gilliam	2	100%	3	100%	3	0%
Grant	4	100%	9	89%	8	13%
Harney	1	100%	4	100%	9	33%
Hood River	22	55%	33	94%	36	44%
Jackson	116	52%	119	90%	132	39%
Jefferson	11	55%	16	94%	17	12%
Josephine	35	43%	51	78%	52	40%
Klamath	18	33%	23	91%	24	13%
Lake	3	33%	2	100%	2	50%
Lane	165	46%	235	91%	258	24%
Lincoln	26	62%	32	84%	38	45%
Linn	26	73%	36	81%	41	39%
Malheur	9	44%	10	90%	21	10%
Marion	112	49%	168	91%	180	32%
Morrow	11	27%	17	94%	19	53%
Multnomah	232	41%	313	90%	348	33%
Polk	34	65%	50	94%	61	41%
Sherman	2	50%	4	100%	6	67%
Tillamook	32	63%	31	87%	46	41%
Umatilla	19	63%	22	91%	29	52%
Union	22	59%	25	96%	23	52%
Wallowa	N/A	N/A	1	100%	2	0%

County	Number with Parenting Stress Information	Percent Reduction in Parents' Stress	Number with "Parent Satisfaction with Service" Information	Percent of Parents Satisfied with Service	Number of Parents with Income Information	Percent of Parents Reporting their Income Change as "Improved"
Wasco	21	57%	29	76%	33	21%
Washington	197	50%	267	85%	321	36%
Yamhill	52	56%	55	93%	59	34%
State	**1,501**	**48%**	**1,982**	**88%**	**2,299**	**33%**

Table 40: Healthy Start Home Visitor Reports of DHS Child Welfare Services, Reports, & Investigations[40]

County	Family Update Item #12: Total Families with Information	Item #12: Number (%) of Families Receiving Services from DHS Child Welfare	Family Update Item #13: Total Families with Information	Item #13: Number (%) of Families in which Worker Made a Report to DHS Child Welfare	Item #15: Total Families with Information	Item #15: Number (%) of Families with a DHS Investigation
Benton	35	1 (3%)	38	1 (3%)	35	1 (3%)
Clackamas	170	7 (4%)	195	10 (5%)	170	8 (5%)
Clatsop	15	2 (13%)	17	1 (6%)	14	1 (7%)
Columbia	14	1 (7%)	15	1 (7%)	13	0 (0%)
Coos	8	1 (13%)	12	1 (8%)	8	2 (25%)
Crook	21	4 (19%)	21	0 (0%)	20	0 (0%)
Curry	17	0 (0%)	17	0 (0%)	17	1 (6%)
Deschutes	107	4 (4%)	118	5 (4%)	105	3 (3%)
Douglas	57	5 (9%)	74	1 (1%)	56	6 (11%)
Gilliam	3	1 (33%)	3	0 (0%)	3	0 (0%)
Grant	8	5 (63%)	8	0 (0%)	8	2 (25%)
Harney	8	1 (13%)	9	2 (22%)	8	1 (13%)
Hood River	32	4 (13%)	34	1 (3%)	28	1 (4%)
Jackson	110	3 (3%)	125	4 (3%)	109	9 (8%)
Jefferson	13	0 (0%)	14	0 (0%)	13	1 (8%)
Josephine	49	0 (0%)	52	0 (0%)	50	0 (0%)
Klamath	24	5 (21%)	24	0 (0%)	23	2 (9%)
Lake	1	0 (0%)	1	0 (0%)	1	0 (0%)
Lane	220	13 (6%)	250	8 (3%)	220	11 (5%)
Lincoln	37	4 (11%)	38	0 (0%)	37	3 (8%)
Linn	39	1 (3%)	39	0 (0%)	38	1 (3%)
Malheur	18	0 (0%)	22	0 (0%)	17	0 (0%)
Marion	165	8 (5%)	177	4 (2%)	163	7 (4%)
Morrow	13	3 (23%)	18	1 (6%)	13	3 (23%)
Multnomah	307	12 (4%)	333	10 (3%)	297	9 (3%)
Polk	56	1 (2%)	61	0 (0%)	56	1 (2%)
Sherman	3	1 (33%)	3	0 (0%)	3	0 (0%)
Tillamook	36	0 (0%)	39	1 (3%)	36	0 (0%)
Umatilla	20	3 (15%)	27	0 (0%)	20	1 (5%)

[41] Information was collected from the Healthy Start home visitor on the most recent administration of the Family Update form. This information is self-reported and has not been verified through the Oregon Department of Human Services.

County	Family Update Item #12: Total Families with Information	Item #12: Number (%) of Families Receiving Services from DHS Child Welfare	Family Update Item #13: Total Families with Information	Item #13: Number (%) of Families in which Worker Made a Report to DHS Child Welfare	Item #15: Total Families with Information	Item #15: Number (%) of Families with a DHS Investigation
Union	16	0 (0%)	17	0 (0%)	16	0 (0%)
Wallowa	0	N/A	2	1 (50%)	0	N/A
Wasco	28	1 (4%)	29	0 (0%)	28	5 (18%)
Washington	272	11 (4%)	306	6 (2%)	268	5 (2%)
Yamhill	55	4 (7%)	58	4 (7%)	55	6 (11%)
State	**1,977**	**106 (5.36%)**	**2,196**	**62 (2.82%)**	**1,948**	**90 (4.62%)**

[41] Information was collected from the Healthy Start home visitor on the most recent administration of the Family Update form. This information is self-reported and has not been verified through the Oregon Department of Human Services.

Table 41: Healthy Start Home Visitor Reports of DHS Open Cases, Child Removals, & Other Reports[41]

County	Family Update Item #16: Total Families with Information	Item #16: Number (%) of Families with New Open DHS Case in the Past 6 Months	Family Update Item #17: Total Families with Information	Item #17: Number (%) of Families with Information	Family Update Item #18: Total Families with Information	Item #18: Number (%) of Families with Other DHS Welfare Reports
Benton	35	2 (6%)	33	1 (3%)	35	1 (3%)
Clackamas	170	7 (4%)	161	5 (3%)	171	2 (1%)
Clatsop	15	2 (13%)	15	1 (7%)	15	0 (0%)
Columbia	13	0 (0%)	10	0 (0%)	14	2 (14%)
Coos	8	0 (0%)	8	0 (0%)	8	1 (13%)
Crook	20	2 (10%)	17	0 (0%)	20	0 (0%)
Curry	17	1 (6%)	16	0 (0%)	17	1 (6%)
Deschutes	105	2 (2%)	99	2 (2%)	104	6 (6%)
Douglas	56	4 (7%)	52	0 (0%)	57	3 (5%)
Gilliam	3	0 (0%)	3	0 (0%)	3	0 (0%)
Grant	8	2 (25%)	8	2 (25%)	8	1 (13%)
Harney	8	1 (13%)	8	1 (13%)	8	0 (0%)
Hood River	29	1 (3%)	26	1 (4%)	30	3 (10%)
Jackson	110	3 (3%)	95	2 (2%)	110	2 (2%)
Jefferson	13	1 (8%)	12	1 (8%)	13	0 (0%)
Josephine	49	0 (0%)	48	0 (0%)	48	0 (0%)
Klamath	23	7 (30%)	23	2 (9%)	24	0 (0)%
Lake	1	0 (0%)	1	0 (0%)	1	0 (0%)
Lane	219	7 (3%)	203	2 (<1%)	220	7 (3%)
Lincoln	37	4 (11%)	35	1 (3%)	37	1 (3%)
Linn	34	1 (3%)	32	1 (3%)	39	0 (0%)
Malheur	18	0 (0%)	17	0 (0%)	17	0 (0%)
Marion	152	3 (2%)	145	1 (<1%)	161	3 (2%)
Morrow	13	1 (8%)	13	1 (8%)	13	0 (0%)
Multnomah	295	6 (2%)	283	0 (0%)	301	3 (1%)
Polk	50	1 (2%)	48	0 (0%)	55	0 (0%)
Sherman	3	0 (0%)	3	0 (0%)	3	0 (0%)
Tillamook	36	0 (0%)	35	0 (0%)	35	1 (3%)
Umatilla	20	1 (5%)	18	1 (6%)	20	0 (0%)

[42] Information was collected from the Healthy Start home visitor on the most recent administration of the Family Update form. This information is self-reported and has not been verified through the Oregon Department of Human Services.

County	Family Update Item #16: Total Families with Information	Item #16: Number (%) of Families with New Open DHS Case in the Past 6 Months	Family Update Item #17: Total Families with Information	Item #17: Number (%) of Families with Information	Family Update Item #18: Total Families with Information	Item #18: Number (%) of Families with Other DHS Welfare Reports
Union	16	0 (0%)	16	0 (0%)	16	0 (0%)
Wallowa	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Wasco	28	0 (0%)	27	0 (0%)	28	1 (4%)
Washington	270	5 (2%)	256	5 (2%)	272	5 (2%)
Yamhill	55	5 (9%)	53	3 (6%)	55	2 (4%)
State	**1,929**	**69 (3.57%)**	**1,819**	**33 (1.8%)**	**1,958**	**45 (2.29%)**

[42] Information was collected from the Healthy Start home visitor on the most recent administration of the Family Update form. This information is self-reported and has not been verified through the Oregon Department of Human Services.