

NEW JERSEY
TASK FORCE ON CHILD ABUSE
AND NEGLECT
CITIZEN REVIEW PANEL
ANNUAL REPORT
June 30, 2006

Table of Contents

	Page
I. Summary of Recommendations	3
II. Introduction	6
III. NJEA Survey Instrument	14
IV. CRP Recommendation Response Tracking Chart	15
V. NJEA Survey Results	18
VI. NJEA Survey Executive Summary	33
VII. CRP Questionnaire for SCR	35
VIII. CRP Directory	37

**NEW JERSEY TASK FORCE ON CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT
CITIZEN REVIEW PANEL
2005-2006 REPORT**

SUMMARY OF RECCOMENDATIONS

- 1. The State must respond to Citizen Review Panel (CRP) Annual Reports within six months of receipt according to Federal CAPTA Guidelines.**

As of June 2006 we have still not received a written response for the 2004-2005 Annual Report. Responses in prior years have also been late. We recommend that administrative changes be made to ensure a timely response. We also recommend that the Governor, Commissioner of Human Services, and Commissioner of the Department of Education meet with the CRPs to respond to the recommendations.

- 2. The CRP recommends that the State prioritize quality assurance for the State Central Registry.**

The CRP requests the State Central Registry's (SCR) quality assurance measurement tools, reports, and data for review. The CRP remains concerned about the functioning of the SCR. In as much, we wish to review the quality assurance program. We also recommend a clear process be developed to handle the growing number of Child Welfare cases being reported.

- 3. The CRP requires support for necessary public outreach required by CAPTA.**

The CRP recommends the development of one website for all three CRPs. This website should be separate from DHS, DYFS, or any other State entity. This website should be easily accessed by citizens interested in obtaining information about the CRPs, annual reports and dates and locations of meetings that are open to the public. The CRP recommends that funding and technical assistance be provided for the development of this website and its maintenance, as well as other public outreach initiatives. The suggested URL for the CRPs' website is: www.njcitizenreviewpanels.com.

- 4. The CRP recommends that the state amend its policy regarding Kinship Legal Guardian subsidies, specifically by increasing the dollar amount received by KLGs finalized before July 1, 2004 (\$250) to the amount received by those finalized after July 1, 2004.**

During public testimony this panel heard from grandparents providing kinship care who lost their subsidies because they were finalized as Kinship Legal

Guardians before July 1, 2004. Approximately 250 families have been affected by this policy. The CRP recommends immediate action to reinstate the subsidy for these families.

5. The CRP recommends that the State increase communication and collaboration at all levels between the Division of Youth and Family Services and the Department of Education:

- a. The CRP recommends increasing the communication and cross training between the Division of Youth and Family Services and the Department of Education. Inasmuch, the CRP recommends the reestablishment of the State-level DOE/DYFS liaison and that a list of district DOE/DYFS liaisons be compiled and made available to all schools.
- b. The CRP recommends that the DHS and DOE collect data and report on all suspected abuse and neglect calls originating from schools. If such information exists, the CRP requests it for review.
- c. The CRP recommends that the DHS and DOE collect data, report on, and monitor the mandatory child abuse and neglect training received by all teachers to ensure that 100% of New Jersey's teachers and school personnel are receiving professional training to safeguard our children. If such information exists, the CRP requests it for review.
- d. The CRP cites: N.J.A.C. 6A:16-11.2 (a) (6) requires that districts provide annual delivery of information and in-service training to school personnel concerning child abuse or neglect, instructional methods and techniques relative to issues of child abuse or neglect in the local curriculum, and personnel reporting of suspected child abuse and neglect to DYFS pursuant to N.J.S.A. 9:6-8.10 et seq. All New Jersey teachers and school personnel must receive training in the detection of child abuse and neglect and current reporting laws at least once a year. Our survey results identified that approximately 45% of the teachers surveyed had not received any training on child abuse and neglect. This training should include the mandatory reporting requirement – any school personnel who suspects child abuse or neglect must report to 1-877-NJABUSE.
- e. The CRP recommends that training materials be updated and that training be conducted by appropriate professionals. The survey showed that most training was provided by the school itself and that training tools, such as the video *A Teacher Saved My Life*, are out of date and contain incorrect information.

6. The CRP recommends the allocation of additional staffing for the CRP and control of the CRP budget.

The New Jersey Task Force and the CRPs reside in but not of the DHS. Staffing and funding of the CRP is provided by DYFS. The inherent conflict of interest is apparent in that DYFS controls both the level of staffing available to the CRPs and access to its funding. This control has impeded the actions of the CRP on several important initiatives, such as transcribing official transcripts and setting up the CRPs website. The CRP requests control over its funding allocation and an increase in staff allocation.

7. The CRP recommends that the State provide feedback relative to progress made on past CRP recommendations.

Please see attached Recommendations Status Report.

Introduction

In 1996, the Federal Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA) was amended to direct states receiving the CAPTA Basic State Grant to submit a five-year State plan and establish CRPs to evaluate the extent to which the State is effectively fulfilling its child protection responsibilities.

NJ Comprehensive Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act

In July 1997, the New Jersey Comprehensive Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CCAPTA) was enacted to comply with Federal CAPTA amendments. The NJ CCAPTA required the Commissioner of the Department of Human Services (DHS) to designate entities to evaluate interagency coordination and compliance with State and Federal mandates for the protection of children.

CRP Membership

The Federal and State law requires states to establish CRPs composed of volunteer members who are broadly representative of the community, as well as members with expertise in the prevention and treatment of child abuse and neglect.

Citizen Review Panel

In 1998, the Department of Human Services Commissioner designated the New Jersey Task Force on Child Abuse and Neglect as a CRP. The responsibility of identifying CRP members was assigned to the Task Force Protection and Prevention Subcommittees. On June 30, 1999 the New Jersey Task Force on Child Abuse and Neglect CRP convened its first meeting. Meetings have continued on a monthly basis since that time. A report of the CRP's deliberations and findings are published each year in June.

Federal Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA)

In 2004, the CRP discussed the Keeping Children and Families Safe Act, Public Law 108-36, signed into law on June 25, 2003 that reauthorized CAPTA through 2008. CRP members evaluated methods to comply with the new requirements. Each CRP shall provide for public outreach and comment in order to assess the impact of current procedures and practices upon children and families in the community and in order to meet its obligations. Not later than six (6) months after the date on which a report is submitted by the CRP to the State, the appropriate State agency shall submit a written response to State and local child protection systems and the CRP that describes whether or how the State will incorporate the recommendations of such CRP to make measurable progress in improving the State and local child protection systems.

I. The State must respond to Citizen Review Panel (CRP) Annual Reports within six months of receipt according to Federal CAPTA Guidelines.

- A. As of June 2006, the CRP has not received a response from the NJ Department of Human Services concerning the CRP 2004-2005 annual report. It was noted that the CAPTA coordinator has made several requests to DHS for a response. It has been nearly one year since the CRP has submitted this report – the State is out of compliance.

II. The CRP requests the State Central Registry's (SCR) quality assurance measurement tools, reports, and data for review.

A. History:

- The CRP has invested considerable energy in reviewing the policies and practices of the SCR.
- The CRP received reports from citizens who had encountered difficulties when attempting to report suspected child abuse and neglect to the SCR. The CRP made a decision to pursue a thorough investigation of the SCR. On November 17, 2004, in a letter to the Commissioner of DYFS, the CRP chairman requested that the SCR Administrator meet with the CRP.
- On December 7, 2004 the CRP chairman attended the Staffing and Outcome Review Panel meeting, at which the SCR Administrator reported on data regarding the SCR.
- On January 5, 2005, the SCR Administrator reported on data regarding the SCR to the CRP. In this presentation, the CRP learned, among other things, of the NJ SPIRIT 9-7/Referral Application, inadequate staffing, and that the operation was not yet a 24 hour operation. Soon thereafter, the SCR Administrator was removed from his post and replaced by an interim Administrator.
- The CRP chairman attended a meeting of the New Jersey Task Force on Child Abuse and Neglect at which the interim SCR Administrator presented.
- On February 16, 2005, the CRP chairman, in a letter to the Commissioner of DYFS, requested the NJ SPIRIT 9-7/Referral Application and an appointment to visit the SCR at a date in March 2005.

- The CRP chairman never received a response to either written request. Despite repeated additional requests, the CRP did not receive a copy of the NJ SPIRIT 9-7/Referral Application until June 8, 2005.
 - Based on the data the CRP collected, the CRP developed a questionnaire (please see appendix). To prepare for the SCR visit, CRP members reviewed the protection subcommittee minutes, the allegations-based model, and the NJ SPIRIT screening applications utilized by SCR staff.
 - On October 14, 2005, four members of the CRP visited the SCR.
 - The CRP members reported back to the CRP that many of the CRP's concerns appeared to be in the process of being addressed. CRP members also stated that that they were impressed with the third SCR Administrator's management of the operation and the progress reported.
 -
 - The CRP decided to invite the SCR administrator to apply for membership of the CRP. The SCR Administrator applied and was accepted as a member of the CRP. Within a few months, it was reported to the CRP that the SCR Administrator resigned. The SCR Administrator was removed from the CRP by a unanimous vote.
- B. Over the course of less than a year, the SCR has been administered by four Administrators.
- C. The CRP is concerned about the quality of service the SCR provides for the children of New Jersey. Inasmuch, the CRP requests copies of all protocols and tools utilized by SCR and/or any outside provider or contractor to assess the quality of service delivery of SCR and its compliance with the child welfare reform plan; any reports concerning quality assurance issued since SCR was instituted; and sample of all ongoing data reports developed for tracking of implementation and/or quality assurance of SCR.
- D. The CRP recommends that the SCR Administrator meet with the CRP, initially, to vet the various documents for relevance to the CRP's ongoing monitoring of SCR. The CRP recommends that, thereafter, the SCR Administrator report to the CRP on an as requested basis.
- E. The CRP additionally recommends that the State and/or SCR Administrator identify a call screener to serve as SCR representative to the CRP.
- F. The CRP will continue to monitor the SCR process.

III. The CRP requests support for necessary public outreach.

- A. The CRP prioritized public outreach.
- B. Two years ago, the CRP decided that one of the most effective ways to provide information and be accessible to the public was through the creation of a website. The goal of the website is to inform the public about CRP activities and invite public comment on the State's child protection system. The CRP holds public hearings and therefore must make certain information about the CRP available to the public, i.e., meeting dates. Because of delays by the DHS and a lack of funding and support, the CRPs have yet to develop this important website. The CRP must receive direct funding and technical support for this imperative public outreach initiative.
- C. In February, the CRP developed a tri-fold brochure for all three CRPs (The Child Fatality Review Panel, and the Staffing and Outcome Review Panel), which will contain basic information about the goals of the CRPs. The brochure will also explain the origin and purpose of the CRPs as well as provide the public with contact information of the CRPs. The CRP will finalize the brochure in the upcoming year and develop a distribution plan. The CRP will require funding and staff assistance to implement this public outreach strategy.
- D. In an effort to be more accessible to the public, the CRP's monthly meetings were moved from New Brunswick to the NJ State House Annex, State Street, Trenton. CRP members felt that this location was more central and large enough to accommodate public testimony.

IV. The CRP recommends that the state amend its policy regarding Kinship Legal Guardian subsidies, specifically by increasing the dollar amount received by KLGs finalized before July 1, 2004 (\$250) to the amount received by those finalized after July 1, 2004.

- A. The CRP listened to public testimony from various groups and individuals that interface regularly with the state's child protection system. For example, a paternal grandmother and legal guardian testified to the CRP that her monthly payment was one-half (\$250 per child – relative to the pre-July 1, 2004 exclusion) of the regular Kinship Legal Guardian (KLG) payment. She shared with the CRP that DYFS never informed her of certain deadlines that would have doubled her allocation. Because of her plight, she has formed a support group of grandmothers who are in a similar situation – she testified that the group is quickly growing.

- B. The CRP recommends that the \$250 subsidy for the approximately 250 KLGs who were finalized before July 1, 2004, be increased to equal the amount received by KLGs finalized after July 1, 2004.
- C. The CRP has agreed to continue to follow her case to ensure that the State properly responds to this growing and unjust situation.
- D. The CRP will increase the opportunities for public testimony next year..

V. Interface between the Department of Education and the Division of Youth and Family Services

- A. In 2004, the CRP began to explore the interface between DYFS, the Department of Education (DOE) and local school districts. This effort was in response to testimony by teachers at the CRP public forum held at the NJ Task Force conference on child abuse and neglect. Teachers testified to: conflicting school policies on reporting abuse and neglect; problems encountered in utilizing the new DYFS SCR reporting system; a lack of communication on the part of DYFS to schools; and a failure of school districts and/or DOE to provide training for school personnel.
- B. Two CRP members developed a basic questionnaire for schools and conducted an informal random survey of school personnel to determine their knowledge about child abuse and neglect reporting and the extent of training available. Feedback obtained from school personnel confirmed the testimony from the public hearing.
- C. In September 2005, the DHS Office of Evaluation was contacted for assistance in designing a formal questionnaire to elicit qualitative information from school personnel on which to base recommendations to DOE and DHS.
- D. The CRP's Public Outreach/Survey Committee met with the DHS Office of Evaluation representative to discuss the type of information that the CRP was interested in collecting. Subsequently, a formal survey instrument was developed and approved by the CRP (see attachment).
- E. One thousand (1,000) survey questionnaires were printed by the NJ Task Force on Child Abuse and Neglect for distribution at the November 2005 NJEA Convention Center held in Atlantic City, New Jersey. The CRP Chair and two student interns distributed and collected 700 questionnaires at the NJEA Conference.
- F. Six hundred and ten (610) completed surveys were provided to the DHS Office of Evaluation for analysis. In 2006, the DHS analyst met with the CRP to discuss the survey findings (full report attached). Highlights of the report include:

- Of the 610 surveys provided, 2/3 of the respondents were teachers.
- All counties were represented.
- 23.3% of survey respondents indicated that they had not been advised of their school's child abuse and neglect reporting policy
- 45.4% of the teachers stated they had not received training in child abuse and neglect.
- 49.1% reported the training they did receive was provided internally, by school personnel.
- 33% of teachers stated that if they suspected child abuse, they would first contact the school nurse. 28.6% indicated they would first contact the principal
- 18.9 % of teachers stated that if they suspected child abuse or neglect they would contact the Statewide Central Registry directly.
- 72.1% indicated that they had been advised about their school's reporting policy.

G. The CRP was very concerned about the large number of teachers reporting that they had not received any training on child abuse and neglect. Members were also concerned that those who had been trained were trained by school staff without any oversight or quality assurance to make sure the information provided to them was accurate. The survey statistics indicate that the DOE is out of compliance with state law. N.J.A.C. 6A:16-11.2 requires district boards of education to adopt and implement policies and procedures for reporting abuse and neglect. Specifically N.J.A.C. 16-11.2(a) (6) requires the provision for the annual delivery of information and in-services training programs to school personnel concerning child abuse or neglect, instructional methods and techniques relative to issues of child abuse or neglect in the local curriculum, and personnel responsibilities pursuant to N.J.S.A. 9:6-8.10 et seq. All new school district employees, both paid and voluntary, shall receive the required information and training as part of their orientation.

H. The DHS Office of Evaluation representative offered to assist the CRP with refining the survey to collect more data if we decided to disseminate the survey statewide.

- I. The DHS Office of Evaluation survey report was shared with the Task Force, the DHS commissioner, the NJEA, Principals and Supervisors Association, the NJ School Board Association, the DOE commissioner and the DOE Office of Program Support Services' liaison to the Task Force. The CRP will follow up with the above entities receiving the survey report to ensure that they are able to respond to the results and that their comments are considered when designing future surveys.
- J. In October 2005, the CRP viewed the training video *A Teacher Saved My Life* and recommended that the Task Force update the video before utilizing it again because it contained outdated information.
- K. Additionally, it was learned that local school districts are responsible for developing policies and for training school personnel annually, and there is no state monitoring due to a lack of funding. It is reported that some schools have an unwritten rule called 'three to agree' – meaning that the reporter must meet with the Principal and another school official, i.e., the School Nurse – when reporting abuse and neglect. This does not comply with State law: N.J.A.C. 6A:16-11.2(a) (1) requires school personnel, compensated and uncompensated (volunteer) to immediately report to DYFS alleged incidents of child abuse and neglect. The report shall include, when possible, the following information: name of child, age and grade of child, name and address of the child's parent; description of the child's condition, including any information concerning current or previous injuries, abuse or maltreatment; the nature and extent of the child's injuries and any other pertinent information that the referrer believes may be relevant. Notice of the report may be given to the school principal or designee after the referral has been made. However notice need not be given when the person believes that such notice would likely endanger the child or referrer or result in retaliation against the referrer or child.
- L. In response to questions regarding how many local school districts have DYFS liaisons, it was learned that each district school board is mandated to have a DYFS liaison. However, there is no list to determine which school districts have DYFS liaisons. The CRP recommends the creation of such list.
- M. The Department of Education is currently in the process of updating the NJ DOE Administrative Code and would not be able to discuss any proposed changes. The NJ DOE Administrative Code was published in the November 2005 New Jersey Register for comment and adopted in March 2006. CRP members learned that the new DOE Administrative Code must reflect statute N.J.S.A.18A:36-25 requiring school districts to establish a policy for dual reporting of missing children and suspected cases of abuse and neglect to law enforcement and the child welfare system.

- N. A policy memo dated September 8, 2005 sent by the DOE commissioner advised all school districts of this 1985 dual reporting statute. The CRP discussed the policy requiring dual reporting and the issues it raised for teachers and local law enforcement. It was learned that a DOE representative presented information to the Task Force on DOE focus groups with school districts. Participants in the focus groups expressed confusion with the policy and voiced concerns regarding confidentiality and the overburdening of local police. Individual school personnel observed that with dual reporting they were less inclined to report abuse and neglect.
- O. In January 2006, the DOE Commissioner sent a clarifying directive to the school administrators acknowledging that dual reporting had created confusion among school personnel. The clarifying directive advised that individual school personnel are required to report to the Division of Youth and Family Services and not required to report to law enforcement. The requirement to report to law enforcement rested with school districts.
- P. The CRP will review the new DOE Administrative Code as it applies to training, when it becomes available.
- Q. In 2006, the CRP learned that the state level DHS liaison position had been eliminated. The CRP will follow up on this and continue to encourage collaboration between the DHS and DOE. If the communication between DHS and DOE is poor, so too will be the protection of New Jersey's children.

VI. The CRP recommends the allocation of additional staffing for the CRP and control of the CRP budget.

- A. The CRP recommends that the relationship between the CRPs and DYFS be clearly defined and documented. Currently, there is an obvious conflict of interest.
- B. The CRPs need increased staff support. The CRP recommends the provision of 1.5 FTE positions for this CRP.
- C. Funding emerged as an issue for the CRP. During discussions concerning strategies to conduct public outreach, it became clear that funding would be critical to the CRP's ability to carry out its responsibilities. The CRP relied on the Task Force for printing and mailing and on the DHS for analysis of surveys. DHS has allocated \$6,000 for the CRP, but the CRP is not in control of this money or the budget. The CRP recommends that the CRP continue to receive funding for its work and also be in charge of its own budget in order to accomplish important initiatives such as transcription of testimony and creation of a website and brochures.

VII. The CRP recommends that the State provide feedback relative to progress made on past recommendations.

- A. This year, the CRP developed a tracking tool to monitor and report on progress made by the State regarding the CRPs recommendations. In the appendix, please find the document “Recommendations Status Report.” There are many recommendations on which the State, to date, has made no progress, or has not made evident to the CRP the progress that has been made. Inasmuch, the CRP requests that the State provide a progress report on these past recommendations, or information concerning the State’s intention to address these recommendations.



State of New Jersey

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES
TASK FORCE ON CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT
CITIZEN REVIEW PANEL
Post Office Box 717
Trenton NJ 08625-0717

Richard J. Codey
Acting Governor

James M. Davy

Commissioner

Survey Conducted at NJEA Conference of Child Abuse and Neglect

1. What is your occupation? Please use checks (✓).

- Teacher, Principal, Guidance Counselor / Student Services, School Nurse, Administrator, Special Services / Services for Disabled, Secretary, School Social Worker, Phys. Ed. / Athletics Staff, Other:

2. County where you are employed?

- Atlantic, Camden, Essex, Hunterdon, Monmouth, Passaic, Sussex, Bergen, Cape May, Gloucester, Mercer, Morris, Salem, Union, Burlington, Cumberland, Hudson, Middlesex, Ocean, Somerset, Warren

3. Length of employment in current position? 0 to 4 months, 5 months to 1 year, 1 to 3 years, 4+years

4. Do you receive training on recognizing child abuse and neglect? Yes, No, Not yet, I am newly hired

If yes, how often? 2x in 1Year, 1x in 1Year, 1x in 2Years, Other:

Training was conducted by:

- School Personnel, Outside Agency, DYFS Staff, Computer, Don't know

5. Have you been advised about your school's child abuse and neglect reporting policy? Yes, No

6. Are you aware of the dual reporting requirement of notifying the appropriate law enforcement authority as well as DYFS? Yes, No

7. If you suspect child abuse (physical, sexual, emotional or neglect), please designate whom you contact first (1) and next (2)?

Please use the numbers 1 and 2 in your response.

- Contact a teacher, Contact Department Head, Contact the school nurse, Contact School Special or Disabled Services, Contact the school principal, Call Statewide Centralized Registry 1-877-NJ Abuse, Contact the school secretary, directly, Other:

8. Were you aware that a person making a child abuse report could obtain limited feedback from DYFS about the report? Yes, No

9. Were you aware that the request for feedback must be made in writing to DYFS? Yes, No

10. What would you suggest to improve communication between schools and DYFS or to make the reporting process better? Use the back if you need more space.

Thank you for your time.

**NJ TASK FORCE ON CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT
CITIZEN REVIEW PANEL**

RECOMMENDATIONS STATUS REPORT

REPORT	RECOMMENDATION	STATUS
2004	DYFS to expand the use of family conferencing & training DYFS workers as facilitators	REPORTED AS BEING USED IN SOME COUNTIES
	DHS is urged to expand Home Visiting Programs to all at-risk families as well as families with substance abuse	INCOMPLETE
	The DHS Child Welfare Plan should include a campaign to publicize the NJ Task Force's Hotline number 1-800-THE KIDS	NO PROGRESS
	The Panel encourages the replication of research-based prevention models by DHS	REFERRED TO CHILDREN'S TRUST FUND, STANDARDS FOR PREVENTION PROGRAMS, CHILD WELFARE REFORM PLAN
	DYFS to ensure all adolescents aging out of foster care should have a case plan that includes services to facilitate stability and independence, housing options, education needs and health care	OPEN CASE UNTIL 21, CONTRACTS TO PROVIDE LIFE SKILLS, POST SECONDARY EDUCATION SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM, EXPANSION OF LIFE SKILLS CONTRACTS
	DYFS should develop specialized training for persons working with adolescents, the aging out population and adolescents with special needs	ACCORDING TO NANCY CAPLAN, THE NATIONAL RESOURCE CENTER FOR YOUTH SERVICES WILL BE PROVIDING TRAINING ON THE NJ STRENGTH BASED ASSESSMENT, ARE WRITING A TRAIN THE TRAINERS' CURRICULUM FOR NJ, AND PLANNING A ROLL OUT.
2005	The DHS should respond immediately to the Panel's June 30, 2004 annual report	RESPONSE RECEIVED 8/1/05

	The DHS should allocate funds for the purpose of carrying out initiatives related to the Panel's Federal and State mandates under CAPTA	DOLLARS FOR PANEL ACTIVITIES ARE AVAILABLE THROUGH A RATHER ARDUOUS PROCESS. THE PANEL DOES NOT HAVE CONTROL OF ITS OWN BUDGET
	DYFS should implement a quality assurance program to insure that the SCR Unit is operating at its highest level to keep children safe	INCOMPLETE/NO PROGRESS
	The initial training for SCR screeners should be expanded beyond the current three (3) days and include annual in-service training	UNKNOWN
	DYFS should implement a tracking system to monitor whether DYFS Local and Area Offices follow through on referrals	UNKNOWN
	DYFS Assistant Commissioner, Ed Cotton (or future staff), should respond to the Panel's written request to visit the SCR and to receive a copy of the NJ Spirit Application for review	SCR VISITED BY CRP CONTINGENT ON OCTOBER 14, 2005.
	DYFS should implement a policy on domestic violence for inclusion in the training curriculum for workers	POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS SUBMITTED 5/9/05. NO RESPONSE AS OF 6/1/06.
	All reports of "child on child" sex abuse should be investigated	ACCOMPLISHED
	DHS should keep the panel informed of its progress in implementing community prevention services and community collaboratives	ALL TEAM LEADERS DISMISSED IN MAY 06. NO PLANS TO IMPLEMENT NEW COMMUNITY COLLABORATIVES.
	The DOE should identify a liaison to work with the Panel to improve training on child abuse and neglect for school personnel	NO PROGRESS

	CRPs should be included in the Child Welfare Reform Plan	NO PROGRESS
--	--	--------------------

2005-2006 FUTURE DIRECTIONS FOR REVIEW	STATUS
1. The Panel will continue to examine and provide comment as to how the DHS reform structure impacts the State's ability to provide safety, permanency, and well being for children.	ONGOING
2. The Panel will continue to examine and review the SCR system and make recommendations for improvement.	ONGOING
3. The Panel will analyze the DYFS survey for the purpose of identifying new areas for review.	ONGOING
4. The Panel will continue to work with the DHS Office of Planning and Evaluation to discuss methods to improve the questionnaire, develop a new distribution plan, and create future surveys.	ONGOING – BUT CONTACT PERSON HAS BEEN REASSIGNED
5. The Panel will continue its outreach efforts to the public.	ONGOING
6. The Panel will recruit additional members to reflect the State's diverse ethnic populations and geographic regions.	RECRUITMENT ONGOING: 2005-2006 SEVEN NEW MEMBERS
7. The Panel will continue to examine the areas of domestic violence, youth aging out of foster care, DYFS structured decision-making and prevention as previously identified in 2003-2004.	NO ACTION 2005-2006
8. The Panel will reach out to the two other review panels with the intention of collaboration and to coordinate which child welfare topics are to be covered by whom, to reduce duplication of work. This Panel recommends an annual meeting among all three (3) CRPs.	A MEETING WAS HELD DEC 8 2005; MEETING ANNUALLY

<p>9. This Panel will develop a checklist to track recommendations made to the State and future directions made for the Panel to ensure compliance.</p>	<p>DRAFT CHECKLIST COMPLETE; UPDATED AS ITEMS ACCOMPLISHED</p>
<p>10. The Panel will pursue a steady source of funds from DHS to facilitate the Panel’s ability to plan and execute projects necessary to comply with its Federal and State mandates, and to improve the quality of work performed by this Panel.</p>	<p>DOLLARS FOR PANEL ACTIVITIES ARE AVAILABLE THROUGH A RATHER ARDUOUS PROCESS. THE PANEL DOES NOT HAVE CONTROL OF ITS OWN BUDGET</p>
<p>11. The Panel will attempt to increase public awareness and visibility of the work and benefits of the CRP.</p>	<p>DEVELOPING A BROCHURE AND WEBSITE.</p>
<p>12. The Panel will continue to foster its relationship with the National Citizen Review Panel network.</p>	<p>PANEL CO-CHAIRS PARTICIPATE ON THE NATIONAL CRP E-LIST.</p>
<p>13. The Panel will pursue CRP volunteer recognition.</p>	<p>DID NOT HAPPEN</p>
<p>14. The Panel will continue its review of the relationship between the DOE and DYFS.</p>	<p>REPORT ON SURVEY AT NJEA CONVENTION SENT TO NJEA, SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOC, PRINCIPALS & ADMINISTRATORS ASSOC; ONGOING</p>

**New Jersey Department of Human Services
Task Force on Child Abuse and Neglect
Citizen Review Panel**

Survey Conducted at NJEA on Child Abuse and Neglect

The Citizen Review Panel (CRP) of the New Jersey Task Force on Child Abuse prepared a survey for distribution at the New Jersey Education Association (NJEA) convention. The intent of the survey was to gather information from teachers, principals, administrators and other education personnel regarding their understanding and knowledge of child abuse and neglect policies and procedures and their actions based on that understanding and knowledge. The survey was distributed and collected at the convention on November 10-11, 2005. Data entry began in late November and was completed before the end of December. A total of 610 surveys were collected and entered for analysis. For most of these 610 surveys, full responses from all participants were provided. For example, for eight of the ten survey questions, the percentage of missing data or no response was less than 4.6%. Data was compiled and analyzed for a preliminary draft presentation at the January 4, 2006 meeting of the CRP.

This report examines response frequencies to all of the survey questions and also looks at the relationships between responses to selected questions. Where appropriate, statistical tests of significance were applied to the data.

Results

Question 1: What is your occupation?

About 2/3 of all respondents (66.7%) identified themselves as a Teacher. As can be seen in Table 1, the next most frequent occupation identified was School Nurse, 3.9% of all respondents (the Other category was chosen by 13.9% but only a minority of these participants, listed an actual “other” occupation).

Table 1: Occupation

	Frequency	Percent
Teacher	407	66.7
School Nurse	24	3.9
Secretary	16	2.6
Principal	4	.7
Administrator	5	.8
School Social Worker	13	2.1
Guidance Counselor/Student Services	14	2.3
Special Services/Services for Disabled	22	3.6
Phys. Ed./Athletics Staff	4	.7
Other	85	13.9
Total	594	97.4
Missing	16	2.6
Total	610	100.0

What this means to the analysis of the survey data is that conclusions are effectively about what the 400+ Teachers reported in their surveys. The number of respondents who identified occupations other than

Teacher is, in each instance, too small to have any bearing on the analysis. In addition, this means that any analyses that propose to compare the responses of Teachers to those of the other occupations cannot be legitimately conducted due to the very small sample sizes for the other occupations.

Question 2: County where you are employed?

Table 2 summarizes information about the counties where survey respondents are employed. All 21 counties in New Jersey were represented by at least three respondents. In the majority of instances, the percent of survey respondents from a county was somewhat similar to the percentage of state residents that a county's population represents as can be seen by comparing the Percent column with the Percent of State Pop. Column in Table 2. However, there were a few incongruities. The counties of Bergen, Morris and Passaic were underrepresented* by the survey sample. Atlantic, Cape May, Cumberland, Hudson and Salem counties were overrepresented by the survey sample.** In these cases, drawing generalizations about a county from the survey data from these counties would be questionable.

Table 2: County of Employment

	Frequency	Percent	Percent of State Pop
Atlantic**	68	11.1	3.0
Bergen*	22	3.6	10.51
Burlington	35	5.7	5.03
Camden	64	10.5	6.05
Cape May**	18	3.0	1.22
Cumberland**	24	3.9	1.74
Essex	58	9.5	9.43
Gloucester	27	4.4	3.03
Hudson**	21	3.4	7.24
Hunterdon	5	.8	1.45
Mercer	28	4.6	4.17
Middlesex	38	6.2	8.92
Monmouth	39	6.4	7.31
Morris*	15	2.5	5.59
Ocean	30	4.9	6.07
Passaic*	40	6.6	5.81
Salem**	12	2.0	0.76
Somerset	12	2.0	3.54
Sussex	3	.5	1.71
Union	37	6.1	6.21
Warren	6	1.0	1.22
Total	602	98.7	
Missing	8	1.3	
Total	610	100.0	

* Underrepresentation = survey sample % is .5 or less times the % of state population

** Overrepresentation = survey sample % is 2.0 or more times the % of state population

Question3: Length of time employed in current position?

Table 3: Length of Employment

	Frequency	Percent
0 to 4 months	66	10.8
5 months to 1 yr.	25	4.1
1 to 3 yrs.	124	20.3
4+ years	386	63.3
Total	601	98.5
Missing	9	1.5
Total	610	100.0

Almost 2/3 of the survey respondents (63.3%) indicated a length of employment of four or more years. About 15% (14.9%) said they had been employed in the current position less than one year (Table 3). There was no information available about what the *total* length of employment has been for these respondents, including all positions held.

Question 4a: Do you receive training on recognizing abuse and neglect?

About 1/3 of the respondents reported they had not received training on recognizing abuse and neglect. Another 11.6% had not because of being new to the job. More than half the respondents said they had received training.

Table 4a: Received Training

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	326	53.4
No	206	33.8
Not yet, I am newly hired	71	11.6
Total	603	98.9
Missing	7	1.1
Total	610	100.0

Table 4a indicates that 326 respondents said they had received training on recognizing abuse and neglect while in their current position. Question 4b asked: ***If yes (to Question 4a), how often?*** In Table 4b, there were 297 respondents who reported on frequency of training, 91% of the 326 in Question 4a who said they had received training. Of the 297 respondents, nearly half (49.2%) indicated training was on an annual (once a year) basis. No other choice garnered ¼ of the remaining responses.

Table 4b: Frequency of Training

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Twice in one year	39	6.4	13.1
Once a year	146	23.9	49.2
Once in two years	48	7.9	16.2
Other	64	10.5	21.5
Total	297	48.7	100.0
Missing	313	51.3	
Total	610	100.0	

Question 4c asked the respondents who said they had been trained to indicate **“Training was conducted by”**. 286 of the 326 trained staff (88%) responded. Table 4c summarizes the results. It was reported that almost ½ of the training (49.3%) was conducted by School Personnel. An Outside Agency was responsible for about ¼ of the training (26.6%). DYFS staff were responsible for 12.2% of the training.

Table 4c: Who Conducted Training

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
School Personnel	141	23.1	49.3
Computer	7	1.1	2.4
Outside Agency	76	12.5	26.6
Don't Know	27	4.4	9.4
DYFS Staff	35	5.7	12.2
Total	286	46.9	100.0
Missing	324	53.1	
Total	610	100.0	

Question 5: Have you been advised about your school's child abuse and neglect reporting policy?

Question 6: Are you aware of the dual reporting requirement of notifying the appropriate law enforcement authority as well as DYFS?

Of the 582 responses to Question 5, more than 70% indicated they had been advised about the child abuse and neglect reporting policy of their school. 23.3% said they had not yet been advised about their school's reporting policy. Similarly, more than 2/3 of the respondents (67.4%) said they were aware of the requirement that a dual report about abuse or neglect must be made to the appropriate law enforcement agency and DYFS. Almost 30% (29.5%) said they were not aware of the reporting requirement. Table 5 and Table 6 below summarize the response to these two questions.

Table 5: Advised on Child Abuse & Neglect Policy

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	440	72.1
No	142	23.3
Total	582	95.4
Missing	28	4.6
Total	610	100.0

Table 6: Aware of Dual Reporting Requirement

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	411	67.4
No	180	29.5
Total	591	96.9
Missing	19	3.1
Total	610	100.0

Survey participants were asked to designate their first and second choices to contact if they suspected child abuse of any kind (physical, sexual emotional) or neglect (Question 7). Their choices included the School Principal, their Department Head and Special Services. Tables 7a and 7b below summarize the responses regarding who would be contacted first (Table 7a) and who would be contacted next (Table 7b).

Table 7a: Suspicion of Abuse/Neglect – First Contact

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Teacher	38	6.2	7.7
School Nurse	163	26.7	33.1
School Principal	141	23.1	28.6
School Secretary	2	.3	.4
Department Head	15	2.5	3.0
Special or Disabled Svcs.	4	.7	.8
SCR directly	93	15.2	18.9
Other	37	6.1	7.5
Total	493	80.8	100.0
Missing	117	19.2	
Total	610	100.0	

When asked whom they would contact first (Table 7a) when abuse or neglect was suspected, respondents were most likely to select School Nurse (26.7%), School Principal (23.1%) and SCR directly (15.2%). Controlling for the 117 who did not provide an answer to this question, those percentages grew to 33.1%, 28.6%, and 18.9%, respectively (Valid Percent). Together, the three most frequent choices accounted for 64% of all respondents and 80.6% of the actual given responses.

When given the opportunity to make a second choice (Table 7b) about who would be contacted, the most frequently selected choices were the same three, in a slightly different order – School Principal (21.5%), School Nurse (11.0%) and SCR directly (10.7%). When the 292 individuals who did not respond to this

question are not included, the percentages of those who did respond become School Principal – 41.2%, School Nurse – 21.1%, and SCR directly – 20.4.

The survey respondents reported that if they suspected any type of child abuse or neglect, they were most likely to turn to the School Nurse with this information, although the School Principal was contacted almost as often as a first choice. As the next contact, the School Principal was clearly the most likely choice, therefore the most likely pattern of response would be to see the School Nurse and then the School Principal about the suspicion. In both cases, contacted the SCR was the third most popular alternative.

Table 7b: Suspicion of Abuse/Neglect – Next Contact

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Teacher	8	1.3	2.5
School Nurse	67	11.0	21.1
School Principal	131	21.5	41.2
School Secretary	2	.3	.6
Department Head	10	1.6	3.1
Special or Disabled Svcs.	22	3.6	6.9
SCR directly	65	10.7	20.4
Other	13	2.1	4.1
Total	318	52.1	100.0
Missing	292	47.9	
Total	610	100.0	

Two general questions regarding awareness of reporting procedures were Question 8, ***“Were you aware that a person making a child abuse report could obtain limited feedback from DYFS about the report?”*** and Question 9, ***“ Were you aware that the request for feedback must be made in writing to DYFS?”***

Table 8: Awareness of Limited Feedback

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	265	43.4
No	323	53.0
Total	588	96.4
Missing	22	3.6
Total	610	100.0

Table 9: Awareness of Feedback Request in Writing

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	177	29.0
No	419	68.7
Total	596	97.7
Missing	14	2.3
Total	610	100.0

For both questions, a minority of respondents reported awareness of the procedure. Only 43.4% said they were aware that they could obtain limited feedback from DYFS about a child abuse report they submitted (Table 8). Just 29% were aware that any request for feedback from DYFS must be made in written form (Table 9).

Question 10: What would you suggest to improve communication between schools and DYFS, or to make the reporting process better?

Table 10: Suggestions

	Frequency	Percent
No Response	435	71.3
Response	175	28.7
Total	610	100.0

When asked what suggestions could be made to improve communication or the reporting process between schools and DYFS, 175 of the respondents (28.7%) offered at least one suggestion (Table 10).

Table 11: Most Frequently Cited Suggestions for Improvement

Suggestion Categories	N	%
In-service education/training/workshops in schools (by DFYS)	44	25.1%
Training (procedures/policies)	27	15.4%
Visit schools/outreach to school staff	12	6.9%
Follow up/feedback to school staff	11	6.3%
Improve quality of communication/conversation with schools	10	5.7%
Policy and Procedure workshops	10	5.7%
Improve response time to reports of abuse	4	2.3%
Hire more social workers	2	1.1%
Other (single entries)	61	34.9%
Total	175	

The suggestions from the 175 respondents to Question 10 were sorted into a number of descriptive categories. As can be seen in Table 11, above, these categories demonstrate some overlap. For instance, ***in-service education or training by DYFS staff*** for school personnel and ***visiting schools/outreach to school staff*** are similar in the general sense they both involve going into the school community. The difference lies in how specific the respondent was when suggesting the visiting/outreach. In the first example, respondents specifically suggested in-service education or workshops in the schools while the responses included in the second example were not that specific. Therefore, depending on the specific detail desired in the analysis, it could be said that 44 respondents suggested in-service education, training or workshops in the schools and 12 suggested a visit to the school for outreach to staff, or that 56 respondents suggested DYFS staff go into the school community to support school staff. For this description, the analysis is more rather than less specific.

In-service education et. al. by DYFS staff was the most frequent suggestion to come from the school personnel, accounting for about 25% of all responses. Training, specifically on policies and procedures, was the next most likely suggestion at 15.4%. No other single suggestion was more than 6.9% of the total responses.

It was noted in Table 2 that, with a few exceptions, the percentage of those who participated in the survey as a function of their county of employment was similar to the percentage of the state population that each county represents. For example 5.7% of the survey participants were employed in Burlington County. The population of Burlington County is 5.03% of the total population of New Jersey. For analytical purposes, this similarity enhances the value of the data regarding any statewide generalizations based on the location of the respondent employment.

County of Employment (Question 2) was examined as a function three of the survey questions that inquire about the respondent’s awareness of child abuse and neglect reporting policy and/or procedure. If a significant difference was found on these variables, as a function of County of Employment, it would suggest communication and information management issues that are county-based and training needs that would be targeted to some counties rather than all or none of the counties.

County of Employment was not significantly associated with responses to Question 5: **“Have you been advised about your school’s child abuse and neglect reporting policy?”** All survey respondents, regardless of county of employment, were equally likely to say they have (or have not) been advised about this policy. Table 12, below, summarizes the pattern of responses

Table 12: County of Employment X Advised About Reporting Policy

2. County where you are employed?	5. Have you been advised about your school's child abuse and neglect reporting policy?		
	Yes	No	Total
Atlantic	49	15	64
Bergen	18	3	21
Burlington	22	12	34
Camden	46	16	62
Cape May	11	7	18
Cumberland	20	4	24
Essex	43	11	54
Gloucester	16	10	26
Hudson	16	4	20
Hunterdon	3	1	4
Mercer	16	11	27
Middlesex	30	7	37
Monmouth	35	3	38
Morris	11	2	13
Ocean	18	11	29

Passaic	31	7	38
Salem	7	4	11
Somerset	7	4	11
Sussex	2	1	3
Union	29	6	35
Warren	6	0	6
Total	436	139	575

County of Employment was also not significantly related to responses to Question 6: ***“Are you aware of the dual reporting requirement of notifying the appropriate law enforcement authority as well as DYFS?”*** Table 13 displays the pattern of responses.

Table 13: County of Employment X Awareness of Dual Reporting Requirement

		6. Are you aware of the dual reporting requirement of notifying the appropriate law enforcement authority as well as DYFS?			
2. County where you are employed?	Yes	No	Total	% of Yes Responses	
Atlantic	47	19	66	71%	
Bergen	15	7	22	68%	
Burlington	23	10	33	70%	
Camden	44	20	64	69%	
Cape May	11	7	18	61%	
Cumberland	16	7	23	70%	
Essex	42	13	55	76%	
Gloucester	10	15	25	40%	
Hudson	15	6	21	71%	
Hunterdon	2	3	5	40%	
Mercer	16	10	26	62%	
Middlesex	26	11	37	70%	
Monmouth	31	7	38	82%	
Morris	9	4	13	69%	
Ocean	17	13	30	57%	
Passaic	27	12	39	69%	
Salem	8	4	12	67%	
Somerset	9	3	12	75%	
Sussex	3	0	3	100%	
Union	31	6	37	84%	
Warren	4	1	5	80%	
Total	406	178	584	70%	

There was no *significant effect* on responses to Question 6 as a function of the location of employment of the respondent. Statewide, 70% of the respondents said they were aware of the dual reporting requirement. However, despite the lack of significant results, several counties had results far below this mean percentage (70%) of respondents. These five counties are shaded in Table 13. In two instances, the percentage of respondents who were aware of the dual reporting requirement was 40% and for the three other examples, the percentage was no greater than 62% (the next smallest percentage was 67%). Therefore, although there was no statistically significant difference in responses due to employment location, a desired outcome, there were responses from a few counties where the awareness of the policy was much less than the other counties. This should suggest a further examination of policy awareness for a few counties, if not all of the counties.

Similarly, County of Employment was not significantly associated with responses to Question 8: **“Were you aware that a person making a child abuse report could obtain limited feedback from DYFS about the report?”** This is also a desired outcome in that it indicates that there is no difference in respondents’ awareness of the procedure regarding obtaining limited feedback as a function of where the respondent works (Table 14)

Table 14: County of Employment X Awareness of Procedure for Limited Feedback

2. County where you are employed?	8. Were you aware that a person making a child abuse report could obtain limited feedback from DYFS about the report?		
	Yes	No	Total
Atlantic	26	39	65
Bergen	9	12	21
Burlington	17	17	34
Camden	24	39	63
Cape May	7	10	17
Cumberland	12	12	24
Essex	29	25	54
Gloucester	8	18	26
Hudson	7	14	21
Hunterdon	2	3	5
Mercer	10	16	26
Middlesex	15	22	37
Monmouth	20	19	39
Morris	8	7	15
Ocean	15	13	28
Passaic	19	21	40
Salem	3	8	11
Somerset	6	6	12
Sussex	1	2	3
Union	22	12	34

Warren	3	3	6
Total	263	318	581

Employment experience, the length of time the survey respondent was employed in his/her current position (note that a more complete measure of experience would be one that included all work experience rather than just experience in the current position) was the focus of Question 3: **“Length of time employed in current position?”** In Table 3, it can be seen that the most frequent choice was 4+ years, 63.3% of all responses. Responses to Question 3 were examined for an association with Question 5 (advisement on reporting policy), Question 6 (awareness of dual reporting requirements) and Question 8 (awareness about obtaining limited feedback from DYFS).

Responses to Question 5: **“Have you been advised about your school's child abuse and neglect reporting policy?”** were significantly associated with the length of time the respondent was employed in his/her current position. Table 15 illustrates this relationship. As length of employment increases, the percentage of those who responded “yes” increases to a level higher than the average percentage of those who were advised (80% to 76%, respectively).

The more time spent in the current position, the greater the chance that the respondent was advised on this policy, a desired and perhaps even expected outcome but one that lends support to the value of work experience.

Table 15: Length of Employment X Advised About Reporting Policy*

3. Length of time employed in current position.	5. Have you been advised about your school's child abuse and neglect reporting policy?			
	Yes	No	Total	% of Yes Responses
0 to 4 months	43	19	62	69%
5 months to 1 yr.	15	10	25	60%
1 to 3 yrs.	84	37	121	69%
4+ years	296	72	368	80%
Total	438	138	576	76%

* Significant at the p = .01 level

Length of time employed was also significantly related to responses to Question 6: **“Are you aware of the dual reporting requirement of notifying the appropriate law enforcement authority as well as DYFS?”** In Table 16, it can be seen that as the length of employment increases for respondents, the percentage that say they are aware of the dual reporting requirement increases. The percentage increases from 56% to 74% (with one decrease where there are small frequencies of responses – 5 months to 1 yr.), as length of employment increases. Again, results confirm what would be expected as time on the job increases and opportunities for training and/or for experience to influence work outcomes increases.

Table 16: Length of Employment X Awareness of Dual Reporting Requirement*

	6. Are you aware of the dual reporting requirement of notifying the appropriate law enforcement authority as well as DYFS?			
3. Length of time employed in current position.	Yes	No	Total	% of Yes Responses
0 to 4 months	35	28	63	56%
5 months to 1 yr.	11	14	25	44%
1 to 3 yrs.	82	39	121	68%
4+ years	279	96	375	74%
Total	407	177	584	70%

* Significant at the p = .01 level

When length of time employed in current position was compared to responses to Question 8: “**Were you aware that a person making a child abuse report could obtain limited feedback from DYFS about the report?**” there was no significant relationship uncovered. Unlike overall responses to the previous two questions which were 76% and 70% respectively, only 45% of respondents said they were aware they could obtain limited feedback from DYFS. Awareness percentages were depressed for every level of length of employment, when compared to the previous questions and the percentages evidenced much less change as experience increased. Thus, awareness in general remained much lower for this issue and was not significantly influenced by length of time employed in the current position. Table 17 illustrates these relationships.

Table 17: Length of Employment X Awareness of Procedure for Limited Feedback

	8. Were you aware that a person making a child abuse report could obtain limited feedback from DYFS about the report?			
3. Length of time employed in current position.	Yes	No	Total	% of Yes Responses
0 to 4 months	34	30	64	53%
5 months to 1 yr.	7	16	23	30%
1 to 3 yrs.	55	65	120	46%
4+ years	166	208	374	44%
Total	262	319	581	45%

The final section of this report focuses on relationships between responses to Question 4a: “**Do you receive training on recognizing abuse and neglect?**” and responses to questions that looked at the respondents knowledge or awareness of child abuse and neglect policy and procedures. When responses to this question were examined in regard to responses to Question 7: “**If you suspect child abuse (physical, sexual, emotional, or neglect), please designate whom you contact first and next.**” no significant relationship was found. The report of prior training had no impact on what person

was identified as the first contact when abuse or neglect was suspected. Similarly, prior training had no effect on the person identified as the next choice in this situation. It would appear that whatever the content of the prior training, it did not effectively specify a first and second preferred choice to report to (or this information was not well retained) when abuse or neglect was suspected. Tables 18 and 19 summarize these two relationships.

Table 18: Contact First X Received Training

	4a. Do you receive training on recognizing abuse and neglect			
7a. Contact First	Yes	No	Not yet, I am newly hired	Total
Teacher	22	11	5	38
School Nurse	80	66	17	163
School Principal	71	48	20	139
School Secretary	1	1	0	2
Department Head	6	3	6	15
Special or Disabled Svcs.	2	2	0	4
SCR directly	56	30	6	92
Other	16	15	6	37
Total	254	176	60	490

Table 19: Contact Next X Received Training

	4a. Do you receive training on recognizing abuse and neglect			
7b. Contact Next	Yes	No	Not yet, I am newly hired	Total
Teacher	3	2	3	8
School Nurse	35	22	10	67
School Principal	66	48	16	130
School Secretary	2	0	0	2
Department Head	3	6	1	10
Special or Disabled Svcs.	13	6	3	22
SCR directly	41	15	7	63
Other	7	6	0	13
Total	170	105	40	315

Responses to Question 4a: **“Do you receive training on recognizing abuse and neglect?”** were compared to responses to Question 5: **“Have you been advised about your school's child abuse and neglect reporting policy?”** These responses were strongly and significantly related. Respondents who indicated they had received training on recognizing abuse and neglect were much more likely to report they had been advised about their school's child abuse and neglect reporting policy than if they said they had no received training. Table 20 summarizes this relationship.

Table 20: Advised About Reporting Policy X Received Training*

	4a. Do you receive training on recognizing abuse and neglect			
5. Have you been advised about your school's child abuse and neglect reporting policy?	Yes	No	Not yet, I am newly hired	Total
Yes	296	102	36	434
No	17	94	31	142
Total	313	196	67	576

* Significant at the p = .01 level

Responses to Question 4a were also compared to responses to Question 6: **“Are you aware of the dual reporting requirement of notifying the appropriate law enforcement authority as well as DYFS?”** Again, a strong relationship between the responses was found. If a respondent said he had received training he or she was more likely to indicate awareness of the dual reporting requirement. Finally, when responses to Question 4a were compared to responses to Question 8: **“Were you aware that a person making a child abuse report could obtain limited feedback from DYFS about the report?”** it was again revealed that a significant association existed. If a respondent said he or she had received training on recognizing abuse and neglect, it was more likely that respondent would also report awareness that limited feedback from DYFS about the report could be obtained. Tables 21 and 22, below, present these relationships.

Table 21: Awareness of Dual Reporting Requirement X Received Training*

	4a. Do you receive training on recognizing abuse and neglect			
6. Are you aware of the dual reporting requirement of notifying the appropriate law enforcement authority as well as DYFS?	Yes	No	Not yet, I am newly hired	Total
Yes	263	106	37	406
No	53	94	32	179
Total	316	200	69	585

• Significant at the p = .01 level

Table 22: Awareness of Procedure for Limited Feedback X Received Training*

	4a. Do you receive training on recognizing abuse and neglect			
8. Were you aware that a person making a child abuse report could obtain limited feedback from DYFS about the report?	Yes	No	Not yet, I am newly hired	Total
Yes	174	62	26	262
No	143	136	41	320
Total	317	198	67	582

* Significant at the $p = .01$ level

Table 23 summarizes the relationships between responses to three questions regarding qualities of the respondents to this survey and responses to the three questions that examined the respondent's awareness of child abuse policies, requirements and procedures.

Table 23: Respondent Qualities X Awareness of Policies, Requirements and Procedures

	Advised About Reporting Polices (Question 5)	Aware of Dual Reporting Requirement (Question 6)	Aware of Limited Feedback Procedure (Question 8)
County of Employment (Question 2)	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant
Length of Employment (Question 3)	Significant	Significant	Not Significant
Received Training (Question 4)	Significant	Significant	Significant

Clearly, where the respondent was employed had little impact on responses to the questions that examined awareness of child abuse and neglect policies, requirements, and procedures. However, the length of employment of a respondent did have a positive effect on being advised about reporting policies and being aware of a reporting requirement. It did not positively affect awareness of the procedure for obtaining limited feedback about a report from DYFS (it was previously noted that the overall response to this question was much less likely to result in a positive response than for the other two questions). When it was reported that training on reporting child abuse had been received, there was a strong and positive effect on responses to all three "awareness" questions.

Recommendations

Increase the percentage of school personnel who are trained on recognizing child abuse and neglect.

At the time of this survey, only 53.4% of the respondents indicated they had received training on child abuse and neglect recognition. With the strong effect shown by these results for the relationship between receiving training and awareness of policy, requirements and/or procedures, it would seem imperative that a larger percentage of school personnel be trained.

There was no significant interaction between receiving training on recognizing child abuse and neglect and how the respondent reacted when there was a suspicion of abuse or neglect. Training had no impact on who was identified as the first and next choice to be contacted when suspicions existed. However, it should be noted that many school systems have their own reporting procedure that very often includes medical personnel (the school nurse) and administrative staff (the principal). It is possible that, when faced with a choice between following school (and employer) procedures and observing a relatively new law regarding SCR reporting, many respondents chose the former. To confirm and further illuminate this behavior, follow up with school administration would be advisable.

Increase the percentage of non-teacher participants in the survey sample

Nearly 2/3 of all the survey participants identified themselves as a teacher. No other category of occupation was greater than 3.9%. For the results of this survey to be relevant to a greater variety of school personnel, the percentages of respondents from each occupation category should be higher and also more consistently representative of the personnel profile in the school systems.

With future surveys, record the following information about the respondent:

County of residence. The current survey asked respondents to identify the county where they are employed. Several analyses of responses to that question were conducted for this report. Data regarding county of employment does provide useful information regarding the distribution of the survey. As noted in Table 2, the percentages of respondents who work in a particular county, with a few exceptions, are similar to the percentage of the total state population that that county's population represents. However, if the intent was to learn more about the relationship between a county and awareness of child abuse and neglect policies and procedures, the county of residence for the respondent, rather than the county of employment, would seem a better choice for data collection. Information about the employer of the respondent would be more properly gained through the collection of data about school district.

School district. Information on the school district of the respondent would be more useful in directing follow up efforts to train and educate school personnel, than any data collected with the current survey. It would also have the potential to improve the report by permitting an analysis by district rather than county. Information about district would, of course, also provide information about county of employment.

Executive Summary

The Citizen Review Panel (CRP) of the New Jersey Task Force on Child Abuse prepared a survey for distribution at the New Jersey Education Association (NJEA) convention. The intent of the survey was to gather information from teachers, principals, administrators and other education personnel regarding their understanding and knowledge of child abuse and neglect policies and procedures and their actions based on that understanding and knowledge. The survey was distributed and collected at the convention on November 10-11, 2005. Data entry began in late November and was completed before the end of December. A total of 610 surveys were collected and entered for analysis. Data was compiled and analyzed for a preliminary draft presentation at the January 4, 2006 meeting of the CRP. This report examines response frequencies to all of the survey questions and also looks at the relationships between responses to selected questions. Where appropriate, statistical tests of significance were applied to the data.

To assist your review of the enclosed survey results, I have highlighted key points of the survey analysis, which include:

- Statistically, this analysis primarily reflects the responses of teachers, in that 66.7% of respondents, or 407 out of 610, were teachers.
- The county in which a teacher (or, other school employee) was employed did not have any significant correlation to whether the respondent received training, knew of the dual reporting requirement, etc.
- 53.4% of survey respondents indicated that they have received training on recognizing child abuse and neglect.
- 49.3% of survey respondents indicated that their training on recognizing abuse and neglect was conducted by school personnel.
- 23.3% of survey respondents indicated that they had not been advised of their school's child abuse and neglect reporting policy.
- If suspecting child abuse and/or neglect, 33.1% (valid percent) of survey respondents indicated they would first contact the school nurse, 28.6% (valid percent) indicated they would first contact the school principal, while 18.9% (valid percent) indicated they would first contact Statewide Central Registry (SCR) directly.
- 53% of survey respondents indicated they were unaware they could obtain limited feedback from DYFS about their report.
- Of the number of respondents who left written suggestions for improvement (# = 175), 25.1% suggested in-service education/training/workshops in schools by DYFS and 15.4% suggested training on procedures/policies.

To be certain, this survey and its results, do not answer all of the questions the CRP has concerning the connection between child protection and education in New Jersey; this is in part

due to the fact that the survey missed asking some key questions and also in part due to the fact that this is the first survey, related to this topic, that this panel has issued. Hindsight is 20/20. What is also certain, however, is that these results raise critical concerns. For example, it is clear, and very significant that of the 600+ respondents, only 53.4% indicated that they had been trained on recognizing abuse and neglect. Ought all educators to receive training on recognizing child abuse and neglect? Further, it is significant that 23.3% of the respondents were unaware of their schools' reporting policy.

Expert training on child abuse and neglect detection and clarity of school reporting policies and procedures are critical in the effort to protect New Jersey's children.

We invite you to review the enclosed materials.

Respectfully submitted,

Keeva Kase, Chair

Questions for CRP visit to SCR
October 14, 2005

1. What is the protocol for assigning/coding a call?
2. Is the screening tool used for every call or is there latitude in the type of questions asked?
3. Are the calls timed and if so, what happens if time runs out? Are there time parameters for calls?
4. If the goal of the center is to ensure that the local office of the Division of Youth and Family Services only gets "substantial" abuse and neglect cases, what happens to those cases that are considered borderline? Who do you refer them to and what happens once they are referred. Is there a follow up procedure? Does a timetable exist for referrals going to DPCP/CBH?
5. Who is keeping track of repeat referrals? Is there a different protocol for repeat referrals? Does the local office get notified of the referrals?
6. If the local office has an open case and there is concern that abuse is occurring, does the screening center follow the same protocol? If it does not rise to the level of abuse, does the local office get notified of the referral? If the local office is the referent does it not seem redundant that they must refer through the screening center? How does (or, Does?) the SCR know about currently open cases at the LO?
7. Have the response times changed for reports of abuse? Are all reports that rise to the level of abuse and/or neglect seen within 24 hours? What is the follow up once referred?
8. It has been rumored that referrals are only being accepted from professionals (schools, police, agencies, etc.) in that the information needed to possibly substantiate abuse would only be available from someone who has had contact with the family. What happens if a neighbor calls in a referral and they do not have all the necessary information? Who is responsible for securing the information? If the information can not be secured, what happens?
9. How much time does it take from time of referral at the screening center to referral of the case to the local office? Are there stats available on this? And, if so, what trends are you seeing?
10. Why has there been such a decrease in the amount of abuse referrals? Is it believed that previously the local offices accepted too many cases in the name of abuse? Is that such

a bad thing if the family did get services? Why the drop in number of children in out-of-home placement?

11. How much communication exists between the local office and the screening center? Who are the liaisons between SCR and the L.O.? And what is the nature of the communication?
12. What types of documentation is being kept on the families. Is their open dialogue with Children's Behavioral Health? Would the screening center make a referral for services without having a face to face contact with a family?
13. What is "Safe Measures?"
14. Is the SCR 24/7? If so, what is the staff schedule and how is it determined when more staff is needed?
15. What are the qualifications for SCR staff?
16. Is there D/V screening?
17. To where are calls that are coded "Child Welfare" sent? If a Local Office does not have CW response in place, what happens?
18. How are "Other" calls handled?
19. How long does an LO have to begin an investigation from the time the SCR receives it?

New Jersey Task Force on Child Abuse and Neglect Citizen Review Panel Directory

<p>Chairperson Keeva Kase, M.Div. Director of Program Services CASA of New Jersey, Inc. 844 West State Street Trenton, NJ 08618 Tel: 609.695.8817 Fax: 609.695.0040 keeva@casaofnj.org</p> <p>Victoria De Almeida, Esq. Deputy Attorney General Division of Law 124 Halsey Street, Fifth Floor PO Box 45029 Newark, NJ 07101 Tel (1): 973.648.4872 Tel (2): 973.877.1336 Fax: 973.648.3879 Dealmvic@dol.lps.state.nj.us</p> <p>Jackie Ramirez, MCC Parent Representative Parents Anonymous of NJ, Inc. 37 Valley Road Jackson, NJ 08527 Tel: 732.901.0522 Parentrap@verizon.net</p> <p>Erik Peterson, MA Trainer Foster and Adoptive Family Services 4301 Route 1 South PO Box 518 Monmouth Junction, NJ 08852 Tel: 800.222.0047 Fax: 609.520.1515 Epeterson@fafsonline.org</p>	<p>Vice-Chairperson Kathleen Roe, MA Executive Director Parents Anonymous of NJ, Inc. 127 Route 206 South, Suite 10 Trenton, NJ 08610 Tel: 609.585.7666 Fax: 609.585.7686 Kroepanj@aol.com</p> <p>Donna Pincavage, MSW, MPA Executive Director N.J. Task Force on Child Abuse and Neglect PO Box 711 Trenton, NJ 08625-0711 Tel: 609.292.0888 Fax: 609.633.2926 Donna.Pincavage@dhs.state.nj.us</p> <p>Sharon Surette, MSW, LSW N.J. Task Force on Child Abuse and Neglect PO Box 700 Trenton, NJ 08625-0700 Tel: 609.292.0888 Fax: 609.633.2926 Sharon.Surette@dhs.state.nj.us</p> <p>Barbara Price Executive Director New Jersey Coalition for Battered Women 1670 Whitehorse-Hamilton Square Road Trenton, NJ 08690 Tel: 609.584.8107 Fax: 609.3584.9750 Price@njcbw.org</p>
---	--

Mary Beth Diehl, MSW
Director of Family & Volunteer Services
Brain Injury Association of NJ
1090 King George Post Road
Suite 708
Edison, NJ 08837
Tel: 732.738.1002
Fax: 732.738.1132
mbdiehl@bianj.org

Mary Coogan, Esq.
Assistant Director
Association for the Children of New Jersey
35 Halsey Street
Newark, NJ 07102
Tel: 973.643.3876
mcoogan@acnj.org

Charles M. Ings, MA
321 Hillcrest Avenue
Trenton, NJ 08618-2509
Tel: 609.882.0107
cings@comcast.net

Damon L. Humes, MHS
3150 Alabama Road
Camden, NJ 08104
Tel: 856.963.2432
Tel: 856.916.0450
damonlhumes@hotmail.com

Staff

Nelson Gonzalez, MPA, CSW
CFNFR Coordinator, DYFS
P.O. Box 717
Trenton, NJ 08625-0717
Tel: 609.292.5823
Nelson.Gonzalez@dhs.state.nj.us

John M. Doran, Esq.
Law Guardian
172 A New Street
New Brunswick, NJ 08901
Tel: 732.426.5912
Fax: 732.729.6573
Doranj@opd.state.nj.us

Linda Porcaro
Administrator
Somerset County Youth Services
P.O. Box 3000
Somerville, NJ 08876
Tel: 908.704.6313
Fax: 908.23.0180
Porcaro@co.somerset.nj.us

Shantel D. Garner
225 Church Street
Trenton, NJ 08618
Tel: 609.520.1500
Tel: 609.392.4215
sgarner@fafsonline.org

Shyra Bland, MS
Executive Director
CASA of Camden County, Inc.
216 Haddon Avenue, Suite 403
Haddon Township, NJ 08108
sbland@casaofcamdencounty.org

Mary McManus, Esq.
100 Metroplex Drive
Edison, NJ 08818-1357
Tel: 732.572.9100
Tel: 732.961.0408
mmcmanus@lsnj.org