

Region X Home Visiting Workforce Study



RESEARCH BRIEF #1

Demographic and Educational Characteristics of the Region X Home Visiting Workforce

© 2019 University of Denver

All rights reserved Design: Butler Institute for Families, Graduate School of Social Work, University of Denver

Butler Institute for Families Graduate School of Social Work University of Denver, Craig Hall 2148 S. High Street Denver, CO 80208-7101

University of Colorado Denver School of Education and Human Development 1380 Lawrence Street Denver, Colorado 80204

Public Consulting Group 148 State Street, 10th Floor Boston, Massachusetts, 02109

Special thanks to: Laura Alfani, Washington Department of Children, Youth, and Families; Nina Evers, Washington Department of Children, Youth, and Families; Judy King, Washington Department of Children, Youth, and Families; Kerry Cassidy Norton, Oregon Health Authority; Benjamin Hazelton, Oregon Health Authority; Drewallyn B. Riley, Oregon Health Authority; Sherrell Holtshouser, Alaska Division of Public Health; Kristin McKie, Idaho Department of Health and Welfare; Erin Bruce, Idaho Department of Health and Welfare; members of the workforce study working group, and all members of the Region X home visiting workforce.

This Region X project is 100% funded by the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) under The Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program, #UH4MC30465, total award of \$3,957,620.00. This information or content and conclusions are those of the author and should not be construed as the official position or policy of, nor should any endorsements be inferred by HRSA, HHS, or the U.S. Government.

Suggested citation:

Schaack, D., Molieri, A., Franko, M., Roberts, A., Wacker, A., Estrada, M., & Gann, H. (2019). *The Region X Home Visiting Workforce Study: Brief 1*. Denver, CO: Butler Institute for Families, Graduate School of Social Work, University of Denver.

Table of Contents

Key Findings
Introduction
Research Questions
Sample
Results7
Age7
Experience
Primary Languages
Ethnicity
Educational Levels
Degree Content
Specialized Course work
Specialized Credentials
Policy Considerations
Recruiting a Home Visiting Supervisor Pipeline
Recruiting and Developing Home Visitors
Developing Scholarship Pools
Enhancing Professional Development to Ensure a Workforce That Can Address the Needs of the Range of Families in the Region
References
Appendix A

This research brief is the first in a series that is part of the *Region X Home Visiting Workforce Study* funded by the *Region X Innovation Grant* at the Washington Department of Children, Youth, and Families, in partnership with the Alaska Division of Public Health, the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare, and the Oregon Health Authority. The study was designed to identify the current strengths, gaps, and unmet needs in the home visiting workforce in Region X to inform workforce recruitment, retention, and professional development efforts. For more information about the study, please see *The Region X Home Visiting Workforce Study: Introduction.vi*

Key Findings

Many home visitors and home visiting supervisors in the region are new to the profession.

- A third of home visitors and almost a quarter of supervisors have been in the home visiting profession less than two years.
- Almost half of home visitors and slightly over a third of supervisors have been in their current job less than two years.

A quarter of home visitors and about 40% of supervisors are approaching retirement age.

Fifteen percent of home visitors and 9% of supervisors speak a home language other than English. The most common home language other than English is Spanish.

Home visitors and supervisors most commonly identified as white and of European origin; supervisors were more likely to be white than were home visitors (78% vs. 62%, respectively).

The majority of home visitors (70%) and supervisors (90%) hold bachelor's degrees or higher, with supervisors more likely to have a graduate degree than home visitors. However, many home visitors (40%) and supervisors (45%) hold degrees in fields unrelated to the profession.

Home visitors and supervisors rated themselves most confident in their knowledge of child and social-emotional development and least confident in supporting families with children with special needs and in culturally and linguistically responsive home visiting practices.



Introduction

Over the past decade, home visiting has received an unprecedented amount of policy attention. This attention stems from several decades of research documenting the potential role that home visiting programs can play in addressing many of society's most pressing problems, including child abuse, neglect, and failure to succeed in school.ⁱ Indeed, evidence-based home visiting can lead to increased parenting capacity and support for children, improved school readiness and health outcomes for children,ⁱⁱ and reductions in family involvement in juvenile justice and social service systems.ⁱⁱⁱ Consequently, the federal government has invested \$1.85 billion in home visiting programs since 2010, and the numbers of families receiving home visiting services across the country has quadrupled.^{iv} This federal investment, as well as additional state and private investments in home visitation programs, has resulted in a need to substantially increase the numbers of home visitors across the country (including in Region X) and to ensure a skilled and thriving current and future workforce.

Evidence-based home visiting can lead to increased parenting capacity and support for children and improved school readiness and health outcomes for children. Home visitors are widely viewed as the most important ingredient for ensuring the effectiveness of the services programs deliver. Their knowledge and skills are paramount to administering an evidence-based home visiting model to fidelity.^v They are also important for appropriately implementing and using assessments, for the dyadic work of supporting the parent-child relationship and building parent capacity to support their child's development, for helping families to access and navigate resources, for fostering collaborative relationships with families, and for being culturally sensitive and responsive to the family systems in which they work. Therefore, a number of efforts are underway in Region X to enhance the knowledge, competencies, and skills of the home visiting workforce.

Yet very little is currently known about the home visiting workforce collectively across Region X, including their strengths, gaps, and unmet needs. Thus, efforts to best support them are often challenged by the lack of detailed information that describes their basic characteristics, including their demographic information, education, and their professional development needs. Such information is needed to help decisionmakers create a strong system of professional preparation and ongoing, in-service professional development to help ensure an effective home visiting workforce.

Home visitors are widely viewed as the most important ingredient for ensuring the effectiveness of the services programs deliver.



Detailed information about the current gaps in the workforce is also needed to understand where recruitment efforts could best be targeted to build a workforce pipeline that is reflective of the diversity of families in the region and well positioned to meet the needs of the families who experience persistent challenges to their well-being.

Research Questions

The purpose of this research brief is to address the following research questions:

- (1) What are the demographic characteristics of a sample of home visitors and home visiting supervisors in Region X?
- 2) What are the educational levels and educational backgrounds of the sample of home visitors and supervisors?
- 3) What are home visitors' and supervisors' perceptions of their professional knowledge and professional development needs?

Sample

The sample used for this research brief includes 468 home visitors who provide home visiting services directly to families, and 161 home visiting supervisors, 29% of whom have a caseload of families they serve. These home visitors and supervisors were drawn from Alaska, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington, collectively known as Region X. Of the sample, 44.2% of home visitors and 47.8% of supervisors worked in home visiting programs that received Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program (MIECHV) funding. The sample also worked in organizations that employed a variety of different home visiting models, including Babies First, Child Parent Psychotherapy, Early Head Start, Early Steps to School Success, Family Spirit, Healthy Families America, Infant Learning Program, The Nurse Family Partnership, The Outreach Doula, The Parent Child Home Program, and Parents as Teachers. For more information about how the sample was drawn and the measures used for this study, please see *The Region X Home Visiting Workforce Study:* Introduction.^{vi} Throughout this brief, we have merged data categories in cases where a single cell has fewer than five respondents. This protects the anonymity of respondents and minimizes the suppression of data. In the few instances where merging categories is not possible, we have suppressed data in an effort to preserve anonymity of survey respondents.

Results

Research Question 1: What are the demographic characteristics of a sample of home visitors and home visiting supervisors in Region X?

In this section, descriptive information on the ages, experience levels, home languages, and the racial/ethnic backgrounds of the sample of home visitors and home visiting supervisors in Region X are provided.

Within the next decade, a sizeable proportion of the workforce *may be retiring and leaving the field.*

AGE

Across the region, there were statistically significant differences found in the ages of the sample based on job role,¹ with home visiting

supervisors² being approximately 5.8 years older, on average, than home visitors. As a region, home visitors averaged approximately 41 years of age, with a median age of 38, and



ranged in age from 20 to 71 years old. Supervisors averaged approximately 46 years of age, with a median age of 45 years of age, and ranged from 26 to 73 years old. In addition, 24.4% of home visitors and 41.2% of supervisors across the region reported being 50 years of age or older. *This suggests that within the next decade a sizable proportion of the workforce may be retiring and leaving the field.* Table 1.1 displays the ages of the sample by job role for each state and for the region as a whole.

1 (t = -5.434, p<.001)

² For all analyses, we combined supervisors who do and do not carry a caseload into one group labeled as "supervisor."



Table 1.1. Ages of Home Visitors and Supervisors

EXPERIENCE

Table 1.2 focuses on home visitors and their professional experience. The table displays their average years of experience in the early childhood field, defined as paid work experience with children birth to five years of age or their families, which could include work in other early childhood service sectors. The table also displays their average years of experience in the home visitation profession providing direct services and their years of

Home visitors averaged more than 10 years' experience working with young children or their families and averaged approximately 6.8 years in the home visiting service sector. experience in their current position.

When considering the professional background of home visitors, it appears that many did not begin their careers in home visiting. Approximately 62% worked in other early childhood sectors, with an average of about 3.6 years in the early childhood field prior to becoming a home visitor. On the other hand, approximately 38% of home visitors' first jobs in early childhood were in home visitation.

As a region, home visitors averaged more than 10 years of experience working with young children or their families and averaged approximately 6.8 years in the home visiting service sector. The average home visitor reported being in their current job slightly more than four years. However, the large standard deviations suggest wide variation in home visitors' experience levels, with a sizable group new to the profession and another group having more than 10 years of experience in home visiting.

For example, across the region, 33.3% have been in the home visiting sector less than two years, and 49.8% have been in their current jobs less than two years. These trends are



similar within individual states, with 30% of home visitors in Alaska and Idaho, 34.1% in Oregon, and 34.1% in Washington in the home visiting sector less than two years. Similarly, 40.7% of home visitors in Alaska, 66.7% in Idaho, 50.3% in Oregon, and 49.5% in Washington have been in their jobs less than two years. When taken together, these figures suggest a degree of occupational stability in the field working in early childhood, but less job longevity as a home visitor specifically.

In contrast, across Region X, 26.7% of home visitors have been in the home visiting profession more than 10 years and 13.2% have been in their current position more than 10 years. These trends too are similar within each of the four states, with 23.3% of home visitors in Alaska, 33.3% in Idaho, 27.0% in Oregon, and 26.5% in Washington having been in the home visitation sector more than 10 years. Similarly, 15.4% of home visitors in Alaska, 14.6% in Idaho, 12.4% in Oregon, and 15.1% in Washington have been in their jobs more than 10 years.

Across Region X, 26.7% of home visitors have been in the home visiting profession more than 10 years and 13.2% have been in their current position more than 10 years.

	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min.	Max.
Years in Early Childhood Field	l			
Alaska	11.45	8.97	1	40
Idaho	10.00	8.42	0	30
Oregon	10.19	8.99	0	43
Washington	10.30	8.39	0	38
Region X	10.39	8.70	0	43
Years in Home Visiting Sector				
Alaska	7.32	8.08	0	39
Idaho	5.97	5.46	0	17
Oregon	6.72	7.15	0	40
Washington	6.87	7.24	0	30
Region X	6.81	7.20	0	40
Years in Current Position				
Alaska	4.53	4.51	0	20
Idaho	3.57	4.60	0	17
Oregon	4.08	5.12	0	31
Washington	4.08	4.57	0	28
Region X	4.10	4.78	0	31

Table 1.2. Experience Levels: Home Visitors

Typically, supervisors spent approximately 8.3 years as a home visitor prior to becoming a supervisor. Table 1.3 turns to home visiting supervisors. Similar to home visitors, the typical supervisor began their career in other early childhood service sectors, averaging approximately 7.9 years in other sectors before entering the home visiting profession. Only a small percentage of supervisors across the region, 11.4%, had no experience as a home visitor prior to becoming supervisor. Typically, supervisors spent approximately 8.3 years as a home visitor prior to becoming a supervisor. These figures varied somewhat by state, with the average number of years spent as a home visitor prior to becoming a supervisor prior to becoming a supervisor prior to becoming a supervisor. These figures varied somewhat by state, with the average number of years spent as a home visitor prior to becoming a supervisor calculated at 7.1 in Alaska, 5.6 in Idaho, and 8.7 in Oregon and Washington. ³ *This suggests both a degree of occupation stability for*

supervisors and that a transition may occur for many home visitors approximately six to eight years into the profession, when some move into leadership positions.

Table 1.3 shows that the average home visiting supervisor across the region has considerable experience in the early childhood field, yet the large standard deviations also suggest wide variation in experience levels. Like home visitors, many are new to the home

³ Figures for supervisors in Alaska and Idaho should be interpreted with caution due to the small sample size.



visiting profession and to their jobs. Almost a quarter (22.8%) have been in the home visiting sector less than two years, and slightly over a third (36.5%) have been in their current jobs less than two years. These trends vary somewhat across states, with 27.8% of supervisors in Alaska, 36.4% in Idaho, 27% in Oregon, and 15.2% in Washington reporting having been in the service sector less than two years. In Alaska and Washington, 27.8% and 29.4% of supervisors, respectively, reported being in their jobs less than two years. These figures were higher in Idaho and Oregon, where 54.5% and 43.5% of supervisors, respectively, reported being in their jobs less than two years.

When comparing the experience levels of home visitors and home visiting supervisors, supervisors had slightly more experience in the home visiting profession⁴ and in their current position⁵ than home visitors. Differences between the two groups were statistically significant for both—on average, supervisors had approximately 1.52 years more experience in home visitation and approximately 1.81 more years of experience in their current jobs than home visitors.

	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min.	Max.
Years in Early Childhood Field				
Alaska	17.56	10.23	4	36
Idaho	15.27	9.12	1	30
Oregon	16.21	11.59	1	45
Washington	16.09	9.00	0	35
Region X	16.25	10.14	0	45
Years in Home Visiting				
Alaska	7.11	7.34	0	23
Idaho	5.64	5.16	0	15
Oregon	8.73	8.43	0	32
Washington	8.73	7.44	0	28
Region X	8.33	7.70	0	32
Years in Current Position				
Alaska	8.00	7.48	0	25
Idaho	3.36	2.91	1	10
Oregon	5.24	6.30	0	37
Washington	6.37	6.86	0	33
Region X	5.91	6.56	0	37

Table 1.3. Experience Levels: Home Visiting Supervisors

 $^{^{4}}$ (t = -2.25, p<.05)

⁵ (t = -3.19, p<.01)

PRIMARY LANGUAGES

Table 1.4 displays the languages that home visitors and home visiting supervisors reported speaking as their primary language at home. The first column under each state displays the percentage of home visitors (HV) who reported speaking the language at home, the second column displays the percentage of supervisors (Sup.) who reported speaking the language at home, and the third column (State) displays the percentage of the population in the state that primarily speaks the language at home.⁶ In some cases, there were fewer than five respondents within job roles in individual states that responded to speaking a primary language other than English or Spanish. In these cases, we merged the Spanish and "Other" primary language responses to protect anonymity.

Less than 0.05% of home visitors and supervisors combined reported speaking a primary language other than English or Spanish.

Across the region, 15% of home visitors and 11.1% of home visiting supervisors indicated speaking a primary language other than English. These figures varied across states and ranged from no home visitors in Idaho speaking a primary language other than English to 18.3% in Washington. Similar variations were noted in supervisors' primary languages, which ranged from no supervisors in Alaska speaking a primary language other than English to 11.1% in Oregon.

As can be seen in Table 1.4, English is by far the most common primary language for home visitors and for home visiting supervisors, followed by Spanish. Less than 0.05% of home visitors and supervisors combined reported speaking a primary language other than English or Spanish.⁷ The table also shows that there may be a need to recruit more Spanish-speaking home visitors and supervisors in Idaho to reflect the primary languages spoken in the state.⁸

In Alaska and Washington, according to US census estimates, 16.2% and 19.0% of their respective population speak a primary language other than English or Spanish, commonly

⁶It is important to note that this study collected information on home languages, not on all of the languages that home visitors and home visiting supervisors speak.

⁷ Across states and job roles, less than 5% of the sample combined reported speaking Mandarin, Cantonese, French, Arabic, Russian, Somali, Vietnamese, Farsi, Inupiat, Lingala, Samoan, Swahili, Thai, and Mien as their primary language.

⁸ It is important to note that the population of families participating in home visitation programs may not match the home language demographics of the state as a whole and may be more likely to speak non-English home languages. Thus, there may be a greater need to develop bilingual home visitors than the population language parameters may indicate.



an Asian or Pacific Island language. According to 2016 census estimates, 5.5% of the population in Alaska and 5.7% in Washington speak an Asian or Pacific Island language. Thus, efforts may also be needed to recruit home visitors and supervisors who speak Cantonese, Mandarin, Tagalog, and Thai, among other Asian and Pacific Island languages, in these states. ^{vii}

	Alaska I		Idaho Ore		Oregon	Oregon			Washington			
Language	HV	Sup.	State	HV	Sup.	State	HV	Sup.	State	HV	Sup.	State
English	91.5%	100%	83.8%	100%	90.9%	89.4%	83.9%	88.9%	84.9%	81.8%	89.9%	81.0%
Spanish	8.5%		3.5%		9.1%	7.9%	13.4%	11.1%	8.9%	14.1%	10.1%	8.4%
Other			12.7%		0.0%	2.7%	2.7%	-	6.2%	4.2%		10.6%

Table 1.4. Languages Spoken

-- Missing, suppressed, or 0.0 value cells.





ETHNICITY

Table 1.5 displays the racial/ethnic backgrounds of the sample of home visitors in each state. For comparative purposes, Table 1.6 displays the racial/ethnic makeup of the population in each state based on 2016 census estimates.

Across the region, 38.2% of home visitors identified as people of color. These figures varied somewhat by state, with 31.7% of home visitors in Alaska, 23.3% in Idaho, 38.7% in Oregon,

and 42.7% in Washington identifying as people of color. The most common racial/ethnic background, other than white, across states also varied somewhat, with 16.7% of home visitors in Alaska identifying as Indigenous Americans / Alaska Natives, and almost one quarter of home visitors in Oregon (24.7%) and Washington (22.9%) identifying as Hispanic/Latina.

For home visiting supervisors, 21.7% identified as people of color. Across individual states, 11.1% of supervisors in Alaska, 27.3% in Idaho, 25.4% in Oregon, and 20.3% in Washington did not report being white. In Oregon, 12.7% of supervisors identified as Hispanic/Latina, and in Washington, 8.7% reported being Hispanic/Latina.

When comparing the ethnicities of the sample across job roles, home visiting supervisors were more likely to be of white, European origin than were home visitors.⁹ When examining whether supervisors were more likely to be

Table 1.5. Racial/Ethnic Backgrounds HomeVisitors

	AK	ID	OR	WA
African American				4.2%
Indigenous Americans / Native Alaskans	16.7%			
Asian / Pacific Islander				4.1%
Hispanic/Latina			24.7%	22.9%
White	68.3%	76.7%	61.3%	57.3%
Multi-racial			5.4%	5.7%
Missing summersed on 0.0 mal				

-- Missing, suppressed, or 0.0 value cells.

Table 1.6. Racial/Ethnic	Backgrounds of State
Population	

	AK	ID	OR	WA
African American	3.3%	< 1%	1.9%	3.6%
Indigenous Americans / Native Alaskans	14.1%	1.3%	1.1%	1.3%
Asian / Pacific Islander	7.2%	1.4%	4.4%	8.4%
Hispanic	7.1%	11.2%	13.1%	12.7%
White	65.6%	91.3%	85.1%	77.3%
Multi-racial	8.5%	2.6%	4.4%	5.3%

⁹ (X² = 14.45, p <.001)

white than home visitors within individual states, results showed that in Alaska, Oregon, and Washington, a higher percentage of supervisors were white, but the only statistically significant difference was found in Washington.¹⁰

Research Question 2: What are the educational levels and educational backgrounds of the sample?

This section explores the educational levels and backgrounds of home visitors and home visiting supervisors in the sample.

EDUCATIONAL LEVELS

Table 1.7 displays the highest educational attainment of home visitors and home visiting supervisors by state and as a region. In cases where there were fewer than five respondents, we merged response categories to protect anonymity.

As can be seen in the Table 1.7, a high percentage of home visitors in the region are degreed (84.7%)—having attained at least an associate's (A.A.)¹¹ degree or higher. High percentages of degreed home visitors are also observed within individual states, with 85% of home visitors in Alaska, 96.6% in Idaho, 79.5% in Oregon, and 88% in Washington holding an A.A. degree or higher. When considering bachelor's degree attainment (B.A.), 70% of home visitors in Alaska, 83.3% in Idaho, 63.2% in Oregon, 80.1% in Washington, and 72.3% across the region have a B.A. degree or higher. A high percentage of home visitors in the region have attained at least an associate's (A.A.) degree or higher.

 $^{^{10}}$ (X²= 10.694, p >.001)

¹¹ For the ease of the reader, we refer to all associate's degrees, including associate's of arts, science, and transfer degrees, as an A.A. Similarly, we refer to both bachelor's of arts and of science as B.A. degrees.

	Alaska		Idaho		Oregon		Washington		Region	
	HV	Sup.	HV	Sup.	HV	Sup.	HV	Sup.	HV	Sup.
H.S. / Some College	15.0%				20.5%		12.0%		15.2%	5.0%
A.A.	15.0%				16.2%	60 204	7.9%	E0 0	12.4%	8.1%
B.A.	30.0%	88.9%	96.6%	100%	56.8%	00.3%	65.4%	50.0	57.7%	46.9%
Graduate	40.0%	-			6.5%	34.9%	14.7%	36.8%	14.6%	40.0%

Table 1.7. Highest Degree Attainment

-- Missing, suppressed, or 0.0 value cells.

Similar to home visitors, a high percentage of home visiting supervisors are also degreed. Across the region, 86.9% have a B.A. degree or higher, with similar figures found in Oregon (87.3%) and Washington (89.7%) and with slightly lower figures found in Alaska and Idaho—although Alaska has a noticeably higher percentage of supervisors with graduate degrees. When considering differences in educational levels between home visitors and supervisors, supervisors were approximately 20% more likely to have a graduate degree than were home visitors¹².

DEGREE CONTENT

Home visitors and home visiting supervisors who had completed at least one degree were also asked to report on their major or concentration area for their highest degree. Degree majors were then classified into four categories. The first category, *Education and Development*, includes majors such as human development and family relations, early childhood education / special education, and child development. The second category, *Social Services*, includes majors such as social work and human services. The third category, *Clinical*, includes majors such as nursing, speech pathology, and early intervention. The final category, *Unrelated*, includes all other majors, such as biology and economics. Table 1.8 displays the percentage of home visitors and supervisors for each state, and for the region as a whole, who hold degrees in different majors.

As can be seen in Table 1.8, home visitors come to their jobs with a range of educational backgrounds. When considering the region as a whole, approximately 22.8% have degrees focused on education or development, 17.2% have social service–focused degrees, 20% have clinically focused degrees, and the remaining 40% hold degrees in unrelated fields. Some differences in degree focus emerged across states, with Alaska having a higher percentage of home visitors holding educationally focused degrees and degrees in related fields and a lower percentage of home visitors holding clinically focused degrees than home

¹² (X² = 50.86, p <.001)

visitors in the region. Similarly, Idaho and Washington had more clinically focused degree holders than did the region.

	Alaska		Idaho	Idaho Oregon		Washington		Region		
	HV	Sup.	HV	Sup	HV	Sup.	HV	Sup.	HV	Sup.
Education & Development										
A.A.	11.8%		25.00/		4.1%		2.4%	3.1%	4.6%	5.9%
B.A.	9.8%		- 25.0%		14.3%	13.5%	16.7%	9.2%	14.9%	7.2%
Graduate	17.6%				2.7%	-		10.8%	3.3%	7.2%
Total	39.2%		25.0%		21.2%	13.5%	19.2%	23.3%	22.8%	20.3%
Social Service										
A.A.					1.4%	1.7%			0.5%	0.7%
B.A.	10 (0)				12.9%	10.0%	13.1%	15.4%	11.1%	11.2%
Graduate	19.6%				1.4%	13.3%	6.5%	12.3%	5.6%	13.2%
Total	19.6%				15.6%	25.0%	19.6%	27.7%	17.2%	25.1%
Clinical										
A.A.					4.1%		21 4%		2.3%	
B.A.			24.1%		12 60/	12 20/	_ 21.170	16.00/	15.4%	11.2%
Graduate					13.0%	15.5%	3.6%		2.3%	4.6%
Total			24.1%		17.7%	13.3%	25.0%	16.9%	20.0%	15.8%
Unrelated										
A.A.	10 (0)				10.9%	20.00/	6.0%	20.00/	7.3%	8.6%
B.A.	19.0%	37 5%	44.8%		34.7%	- 30.0%	23.8%	- 20.0%	26.2%	19.7%
Graduate	13.7%	- 57.570			- 5 1.7 70	18.3%	6.5%	12.3%	6.1%	17.1%
Total	33.3%	37.5%	44.8%		45.6%	48.3%	36.3%	32.3%	40.0%	45.4%

 Table 1.8. Highest Degree Major

-- Missing, suppressed, or 0.0 value cells.

Home visiting supervisors also appear to come to their jobs with varying educational backgrounds. Across the region, 20.3% have degrees focused on education or development, 25.1% have social service–focused degrees, 15.8% have clinically focused degrees, and the remaining 45.4% hold degrees in unrelated fields. Some differences in degree focus emerged across states, with Idaho having a higher percentage of supervisors holding educationally and clinically focused degrees and a lower percentage holding social service related degrees compared to the region as a whole. Alaska, Idaho, and Washington also have fewer supervisors with unrelated degrees than in Oregon and the region as a whole.



When comparing home visitors and home visiting supervisors, no differences were found in their educational backgrounds with respect to holding a degree in a related field.¹³ Home visitors were no more or less likely to hold a degree in an unrelated field than were supervisors.

SPECIALIZED COURSE WORK

Home visitors and home visiting supervisors also reported on whether their preparatory experiences included course work that fostered specialized knowledge considered critical to being effective in their job roles. Figure 1.1 shows the percentage of home visitors (indicated by the green bars) and supervisors (indicated by the blue bars) across the region that have completed formal college course work that addressed core knowledge domains. For more information about the percentage of home visitors and supervisors in each individual state that have completed course work in the core knowledge domains, please see Appendix A.





Figure 1.1. Percent Who Have Completed Course Work in Core Knowledge Areas

Across the region, for the most part, home visitors and home visiting supervisors have completed course work focused on child development, including their social-emotional development, and to a slightly lesser extent have completed course work that focused on fostering family health, well-being, and positive parent-child relationships. However, less than half have completed course work related to supporting families with children with special needs, effective home visiting practices, family resources and support, and reflective practices. There were no significant differences in the percentages of home visitors and supervisors that completed course work in each knowledge domain.¹⁴

¹⁴ Significance testing ranged from $X^2 = 2.75$, p = .10 to $X^2 = 0.03$, p = .88.



SPECIALIZED CREDENTIALS

Home visitors and home visiting supervisors also reported on whether they had earned any specialized credentials related to supporting families, including the *Child Development Associate – Home Visiting Credential (CDA)* and the *Infant Mental Health Credential*. Across the region, only 9.5% of home visitors and 7.0% of supervisors have obtained a *CDA Home Visiting Credential*. Only 7.5% of home visitors and 5.6% of supervisors have completed an *Infant Mental Health Credential*. These figures are similar across states, except within Alaska, where 13.3% of home visitors have earned an *Infant Mental Health Credential* and 39.9% of supervisors hold either a *CDA Home Visiting Credential* or an *Infant Mental Health Credential*.

Research Question 3: What are home visitors' and supervisors' perceptions of their professional knowledge?

To better understand the areas of the work where home visitors and home visiting supervisors feel confident and where they might need more professional development, they were asked to reflect on their professional knowledge and skills. Specifically, they were asked to rate on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 meaning very knowledgeable, how knowledgeable they felt in the key professional knowledge domains described in Figure 1.2.



Figure 1.2. Home Visitor Perceptions of Professional Knowledge

■ Alaksa ■ Idaho ■ Oregon ■ Washington

Figure 1.2 shows that home visitors rated themselves most knowledgeable in their understanding of child development, family health and well-being, and parent-child relationship processes. They rated themselves as the least confident in their knowledge and skills related to culturally and linguistically responsive home visiting practices, supporting families with children with special needs, reflective supervision practices, and fostering collaboration.



Home visitors rated themselves most knowledgeable in their understanding of child development, family health and well-being, and parent-child relationship processes. Figure 1.3 displays home visiting supervisors' ratings of their professional knowledge. Similar to home visitors, supervisors rated themselves as the least confident in their knowledge and skills related to supporting families with children with special needs and home visiting practices that are responsive to the cultural and linguistic diversity of the families that they serve. Across the region, however, supervisors reported feeling more confident in culturally and linguistically responsive home visiting practices, supporting families with children with special needs, and fostering collaborations than did home visitors.¹⁵

¹⁵ The significance values of T-tests ranged from <.001 to .86.



Figure 1.3. Home Visiting Supervisor Perceptions of Professional Knowledge

Policy Considerations

This research brief points to several important policy considerations to support the home visiting workforce in Region X.

Recruiting a Home Visiting Supervisor Pipeline

Region X might consider strategic efforts for developing a diverse pipeline of home visiting supervisors. The results of this brief suggest that over the next 10 years, the region may lose about 20% of the supervisor workforce to retirement. Results also point to the important period in a home visitor's career trajectory in which some home visitors transition into leadership roles—between six and eight years into the profession. This time period may represent an important period in which home visitors may be mentored toward leadership roles and provided with additional professional development. This professional development might focus on developing reflective supervision skills and collaborations, areas that home visitors report feeling less confident in their knowledge and skills than do supervisors. Strategic efforts might also be made to expand their leadership competencies in other areas, including, for example, human resources, organizational development and fiscal

management, and developing home visiting professionals. Targeting leadership development and mentoring toward home visitors of color will be an important strategy for ensuring that leaders better represent the diversity of the profession, as currently supervisors are more likely to be white and of European origin than are home visitors.

Recruiting and Developing Home Visitors

Strategic efforts are also needed to develop a pipeline of well-qualified home visitors. This brief finds that about a quarter of the home

Over the next 10 years, the region may lose about 20% of the supervisor workforce to retirement.

visitors in this study will also be approaching retirement in the next decade, creating a need to recruit and induct new home visitors into the profession. This brief also finds that many home visitors come to the profession after completing degrees that are educationally focused and after gaining experience in other early childhood service sectors, such as early learning settings. Home visiting leaders might consider working with early childhood education and/or child and adolescent development departments within local colleges and universities to offer course work that will deepen the understanding of family support, home visiting practices, infant mental health, and reflective supervision, and will promote the home visiting career pathway through advisement¹⁶ as many students may not know about home visiting as a career trajectory.

Developing Scholarship Pools

The results of this brief also suggest that while this workforce appears to be highly educated in comparison to other early childhood service sectors, such as early learning, viii there are still opportunities to advance the formal education of home visitors in the region. Efforts might focus on developing a scholarship pool targeted toward supporting home visitors in articulating their A.A. degree to a B.A. degree in a relevant field and working with colleges and universities to foster articulation agreements. Fairly high proportions of home visitors and supervisors also hold degrees unrelated to children and families. Thus, certification or endorsement programs may be an important strategy for attaining specialized training and for supporting the cross-section of the profession with unrelated degrees. Home visiting leaders might consider collaborations with local workforce development offices to identify potential funding to support greater educational attainment for the workforce.

¹⁶ See San Diego State University for an example of a bachelor's degree program that specifically embeds a home visiting credential and specialized course work within a Child and Family Development degree.

Enhancing Professional Development to Ensure a Workforce That Can Address the Needs of the Range of Families in the Region

Home visitors and home visiting supervisors across the region also indicate that they feel less confident in their knowledge and skills for supporting families with children with special needs and in culturally and linguistically responsive home visiting practices. These responses represent key areas in which home visiting leaders might develop comprehensive professional development to address these needs and where they might work with local colleges and universities to enhance their offerings in these areas.



References

- ⁱ Karoly, L., Kilburn, R., & Cannon, J. (2005). *Early Childhood Interventions: Proven Results, Future Promise.* Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.
- ¹¹ Paulsell, D., Avellar, S., Sama Martin, E., & Del Grosso, P. (2011). *Home Visiting Evidence of Effectiveness Review: Executive Summary.* Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, US Department of Health and Human Services. Washington, DC.
- iii Karoly et al. (2005).
- ^{iv} James Bell Associates. (2017). *Home-Visiting Yearbook 2017.* Washington, DC: National Home Visiting Resource Center.
- v Olds, D. L., Holmberg, J. R., Donelan-McCall, N., Luckey, D. W., Knudtson, M. D., & Robinson, J. (2014). Effects of home visits by paraprofessionals and by nurses on children follow-up of a randomized trial at ages 6 and 9 years. *JAMA Pediatrics*, 168(2), 114– 121.
- ^{vi} Franko, M., Schaack, D., Roberts, A., Molieri, A., Wacker, A., Estrada, M., & Gann, H. (2018). *The Region X Home Visiting Workforce Study: Introduction*. Denver, CO: Butler Institute for Families, Graduate School of Social Work, University of Denver.
- vii US Census Bureau. (2016). US Census Bureau, 2012–2016 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Retrieved from

https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml

 viii National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team. (2013). Number and Characteristics of Early Care and Education (ECE) Teachers and Caregivers: Initial Findings from the National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE). OPRE Report #2013-38, Washington DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, US Department of Health and Human Services.

Appendix A

Course Work in Core Knowledge Domains										
	Alaska		Idaho		Oreg	gon	Wa	Washington		
Specialized Course Work	HV	Sup.	HV	Sup.	HV	Sup.	HV	Sup.		
Child development	93.2%	94.1%	92.9%	100.0%	73.5%	87.3%	83.9%	83.1%		
Family health & well-being	69.5%	81.3%	67.9%	63.6%	66.5%	77.4%	75.1%	77.3%		
Parent-child relationships	71.2%	81.3%	57.1%	63.6%	55.9%	74.6%	65.2%	66.7%		
Social-emotional well-being	78.0%	81.3%	67.9%	72.7%	69.2%	87.3%	80.0%	76.9%		
Cultural/linguistic responsiveness	71.2%	56.3%	42.9%	54.5%	59.9%	72.6%	66.3%	65.2%		
Screening & assessment	71.2%	68.8%	60.7%	54.5%	42.5%	69.8%	58.4%	62.1%		
Family resources & support	50.8%	52.9%	21.4%	27.3%	29.1%	38.1%	32.3%	34.3%		
Effective home visiting practices	36.2%	41.2%	11.1%	9.1%	24.4%	25.4%	32.4%	26.9%		
Collaboration	34.5%	52.9%	22.2%	36.4%	24.4%	34.9%	28.6%	36.4%		
Reflective practice	39.0%	41.2%	25.0%	18.2%	34.3%	33.3%	28.3%	22.4%		
children with	67.8%	82.4%	28.6%	9.1%	34.8%	44.4%	37.1%	43.3%		

Percent of Home Visitors and Home Visiting Supervisors in Each State That Have Completed