



UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

Ruth H. Young Center for Families and Children

525 West Redwood Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21201 * 410-706-3014

**“The experience of being a foster parent is
invaluable to the children”**

Annual Report of the Maryland Foster Parent Survey

Gillian Gregory, MSW
Project Manager

Sarah Kaye, PhD
Principal Investigator

July 2009



UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK



Acknowledgements

This report was prepared by faculty and staff at the University of Maryland School of Social Work's Ruth H. Young Center for Families & Children in partnership with staff at the Maryland Department of Human Resources, Social Service Administration.

Gillian Gregory led the interviewing, coding, analysis of exited and continuing foster parents and writing of this report with Dr. Sarah Kaye. Shantel Closson, Jonalyn Denlinger, Elizabeth Greeno, Mark Lardner, Emilie Linsenmeyer, Sara Moothart, and Tiffany Williams, all assisted in data collection and coding. Drs. Diane DePanfilis, Sarah Kaye, and Terry V. Shaw managed the interagency agreement establishing the Quality Assurance Collaborative, including the foster parent surveys.

John Bertulis and Kevin Keegan of the Maryland Department of Human Resources, Social Services Administration guided the activities of the foster parent survey.



UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK



Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Acknowledgements..... | ii |
| Introduction | 3 |
| Methodology..... | 4 |
| Response Rate..... | 4 |
| Sample Description | 5 |
| Motivation for Becoming a Foster Parent | 7 |
| Adoption | 7 |
| Caring for a Family Member | 7 |
| Loving Children..... | 7 |
| “Giving Back” to the Community | 7 |
| Training and Preparation | 8 |
| Ongoing Training Needs..... | 8 |
| Agency Support and Responsiveness | 10 |
| Staffing & Support from the Agency..... | 10 |
| Accessibility and Availability of Staff..... | 10 |
| Communication as a Support Mechanism | 12 |
| Peer Support as a Support Mechanism..... | 12 |
| Meeting Children’s Needs..... | 13 |
| Meeting Children’s Basic Needs..... | 13 |
| Foster Care Board Rate | 13 |
| Daycare Stipends..... | 13 |
| Meeting Children’s Specialized Needs | 14 |
| Exit Reasons | 15 |
| Changing Life Circumstances | 15 |
| Problems with the Agency | 15 |
| Problems with the Foster Children | 15 |
| Lack of Appreciation | 16 |
| Unable to Meet Agency Requirements..... | 16 |
| Adoption | 16 |
| Recruitment and Retention Efforts..... | 17 |
| Clarify Expectations for Relative Caregivers | 17 |
| Support with Behavior Modification..... | 17 |
| Engaging Foster Parents as Recruiters | 17 |
| Accurate and Timely Information Sharing | 18 |
| Reinforcement and Empathy to Enhance Training | 18 |
| Strategies | 18 |
| References | 19 |
| Appendix A: Exit Interview Data | 20 |
| Appendix B: Continuing Interview Data..... | 35 |

Introduction

In 2008, the Maryland Department of Human Resources, Social Services Administration (DHR/SSA) launched the **1000 by 10 Initiative** to increase the number of resource families by 1000 by the year 2010. This initiative aims to improve the recruitment and retention of foster parents through a number of strategies including foster care parties where participants tell family and friends about the foster parent experience. Maryland will also give bonuses of \$500 to foster parents who help recruit foster parents.

Researchers at the Ruth H. Young Center (RYC) at the University of Maryland, School of Social Work (UMB/SSW) are supporting this initiative by providing an unbiased and objective means for foster parents to share their experiences with the State. The Maryland Foster Parent Survey was developed to solicit feedback on foster parents' perceptions of the training and support provided to them by DHR/SSA, and to collect suggestions for improvement. Researchers at RYC collected and analyzed the foster parent survey data. Quarterly reports of quantitative data and thematic memos of qualitative data have kept DHR/SSA informed of emerging findings throughout the project year.

This annual report summarizes major findings from the entire SFY2009 survey. The report opens with a discussion of methodology and describes the sample of 338 foster parents and former foster parents interviewed as a part of this study. This report is organized by thematic area to highlight strengths of current practices and to identify opportunities for improvement.

Methodology

The Annie E. Casey Foundation led the development of the foster parent survey with input from DHR/SSA and RYC. The survey collected demographic information, reasons for entry and withdrawal, experiences as foster parents, and perceptions about training and support provided by DHR/SSA. This survey is the first attempt to capture the experiences of Maryland foster parents. Because this was an exploratory area of research, open-ended qualitative items were included to encourage participants to identify salient issues without being constrained by pre-determined choices. Quantitative items were also included to capture critical information that DHR/SSA was interested in obtaining from all participants (e.g. ratings of training and support). Together, this mixed methods survey allowed the study to collect a breadth of information about the range of foster parents' experiences and in-depth information about areas that DHR/SSA is targeting in **1000 by 10**.

Surveys were conducted over the phone. Each foster parent was called a total of five times, unless it was a wrong or disconnected number, foster parents were deceased, or declined to be interviewed. In an attempt to reach foster parents when they were most likely to be at home, at least two of the five calls were made in the evening after 5pm. Interviews were recorded in Access for tracking and frequency analysis of quantitative items, and open coded in Nvivo for thematic analysis of qualitative items.

Response Rate

| <u>Outcome of Attempted Phone Interviews</u> | <u>Exited (N=1041)</u> | <u>Continuing (N=1050)</u> |
|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Completed | 15% | 18% |
| Messages | 53% | 54% |
| Disconnected | 8% | 4% |
| Wrong Number | 5% | 4% |
| No Message Left | 13% | 16% |
| Busy | 5% | 4% |
| Deceased | 0% | 3% |
| Declined | 1% | |

Survey response rates were comparable for exited and continuing foster parents. Since November 2008, 1,041 calls were made to exited foster parents; 15% of the calls were successful and an interview was completed. A little more than half (53%) of the calls were unanswered and a message was left requesting a return call. Since March 16, 2009, 1,050 calls were made to continuing foster parents; 18% of the calls were successful and an interview was completed. More than half (54%) of the calls were unanswered and a message was left requesting a return call.

Sample Description

The sample included 153 exited foster parents and 188 continuing foster parents. The exited sample included all foster parents who exited the Maryland resource family system between July 1, 2006 and June 30, 2008 and September 1, 2008 and December 31, 2009. The continuing samples included a random sample of all foster parents who were active in the Maryland resource family system as of November 24, 2008 and April 30, 2009.

Demographics of the sample are provided in the table that follows. The majority of the respondents for the exited (71%) and continuing (59%) samples were married. There was more than double the percentage of single foster parents in the continuing sample (23%) than the exited sample (10%). Exited foster parents were older than continuing foster parents, with an average age of 51 for exited and 46 for continuing. The majority of the respondents identified as African-American or Caucasian. Exited foster parents included a greater percentage of Caucasian than continuing. Most respondents for both exited and continuing samples reported that they worked full time. However, 18% of exited and 22% of continuing reported that they were unemployed. There were an equal percentage of respondents for both the exited and continuing samples (76%) who had post high school education. Exited foster parents were more likely than continuing foster parents to have a Graduate Degree.

The average number of children fostered by exited foster parents was smaller than continuing, although the average length of service was longer for exited foster parents than continuing. A larger percentage of Exited foster parents adopted children from foster care than did Continuing foster parents.

| Sample Demographics | Exited (N=153) | Continuing (N=188) |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Marital Status | | |
| Married | 71% | 59% |
| Separated | 1% | 3% |
| Divorced | 11% | 10% |
| Widowed | 6% | 4% |
| Single/Never Married | 10% | 23% |
| Same Sex Partnership | 0% | 1% |
| Other | 1% | 1% |
| Age (mean) | 51 | 46 |
| Race | | |
| African-American | 35% | 47% |
| American Indian | 0% | 1% |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 2% | 1% |
| Caucasian | 63% | 49% |
| Hispanic | 0% | 1% |
| More than one Race | 2% | 1% |
| Employment Status | | |
| Part Time | 16% | 15% |
| Retired | 19% | 5% |
| Unemployed | 18% | 22% |
| Student | 1% | 6% |
| Highest Educational Level | | |
| High School/GED | 20% | 23% |
| Some College | 28% | 31% |
| Associates | 6% | 11% |
| College Graduate | 14% | 17% |
| Some Graduate | 5% | 2% |
| Graduate Degree | 23% | 15% |
| Fostering Experience | | |
| # Children Fostered (mean) | 1.5 (range 0-7) | 1.9 (range 0-12) |
| Length of Foster Parenting (mean) | 6 years (range 0-36) | 2.1 years (range 0-30) |
| Adopted Foster Children | 54% | 31% |

Motivation for Becoming a Foster Parent

Interviews opened by asking respondents what initially prompted them to become a foster parent. Stories and specific motivation varied among respondents, but responses could be categorized into the four categories of adoption, caring for a family member, giving back to the community, and loving children. The overall attitude expressed by most foster parents was that they wanted to provide a child with a stable and loving home.

Adoption

Adoption was identified as a key reason why many respondents decided to become foster parents, as evidenced by a parent who reported, “We decided to become foster parents in hopes that we would eventually adopt”. Some foster parents “weren’t able to have children” but wanted to have a family and decided that adoption was their best option. Other families were caring for a relative and decided to adopt to prevent additional foster care placements and provide a permanent home for the child.

Caring for a Family Member

Many respondents indicated that they chose to become foster parents because they had a relative that needed a caregiver. One foster parent stated, “My husband’s great nephew needed someone to care for him....so in order to get his needs met, we became foster parents”. Another stated, “I was trying to help my niece, because she was in the home of my sister and she was being mistreated. My sister wanted to put her in a group home and I didn't think that was the right thing”.

Loving Children

Some families also cited love for children and having resources as reasons for becoming foster parents. One foster parent stated, “I have love for children and I felt like I could offer a child a stable environment”.

“Giving Back” to the Community

Other respondents who were non-relatives also saw a need and believed it was their responsibility to give back. This respondent stated, “I wanted to help give a child a better life, a better home environment and better education. Prepare them for the future”.

Training and Preparation

To better understand the strengths and limitations of foster parent training, both continuing and exited foster parents were asked about their preparation for their foster parent role. This section addresses training and support for foster parents prior to taking children into their home. For many respondents, the experience of fostering was exciting as well as overwhelming with a lot of “uncertainty”, and “questions”.

| Training for Foster Parents | Exited (N=150) | Continuing (N=188) |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| More than Adequate | 39% | 24% |
| Adequate | 53% | 63% |
| Less than Adequate | 7% | 12% |

Foster parent training currently encompasses many aspects of the foster parent experience, from laws and regulations to parenting children with special needs. The training received was adequate for more than half of the respondents for both exited (53%) and continuing (63%) respondents, and more than adequate for 39% of exited and 24% of continuing foster parents.

| Preparation by Agency | Exited (N=144) | Continuing (N=182) |
|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| Very Effective | 37% | 30% |
| Effective | 51% | 51% |
| Ineffective | 13% | 11% |
| Very Ineffective | 0% | 8% |

More than half of the respondents for both exited and continuing samples (51%) reported that the agency was effective in preparing them for the experiences they have had as a foster parent. Over 30% found the agency “very effective” in preparing them to be foster parents. Thirteen percent of exited foster parents and 19% of continuing foster parents thought that the agency was ineffective or very ineffective in preparing them for their foster parenting experience.

Ongoing Training Needs

Although the majority of respondents rated the training as adequate, quite a few felt that the training should go into more depth regarding different aspects of foster parenting. Specific suggestions included:

- Caring for drug addicted newborns,
- Rights of biological parents,
- Navigating the education system,
- Managing children’s behavioral issues,
- Agency rules and regulations, and
- Licensing requirements.

One foster parent stated that the agency, “could better inform you on what needs to be done before your house is inspected by the fire department and health care workers”. Another added, “On-line training programswould increase productivity and proficiency”.

Respondents noted a need for specific training to better prepare them to deal with issues as they arise. Additionally, foster parents desire regular contact with their workers to share resources, information, and guidance. Increased contact and sharing could help to reduce foster parents’ anxiety and frustration and promote feelings of success.

Agency Support and Responsiveness

Many foster families reported that support received from staff was generally adequate. However, agency support and responsiveness to foster families is an area needing improvement. Quantitative data reveal that a fifth of exited and continuing foster parents rate support from the agency, resource workers, and the child’s workers as “less than adequate”. Qualitative data help to describe foster parents experiences and suggestions for improvement. Some respondents suggested that agency staff could provide additional support by being “more proactive”, “more available and responsive”, and providing “better training of personnel”. Foster parents consistently requested the following support mechanisms to improve their experience:

- Attending scheduled home visits,
- Consistent , open, and respectful communication,
- Timely and effective responses to emergent situations, and
- Provision of appropriate services and resources.

Staffing & Support from the Agency

| Support from the Agency | Exited (N=147) | Continuing (N=176) |
|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| More than Adequate | 33% | 22% |
| Adequate | 45% | 52% |
| Less than Adequate | 22% | 26% |

Exited and continuing foster parents provided comparable ratings of agency support. For exited respondents, 45% indicated that the support received from the agency was adequate, and 33% reported that the support was more than adequate. More than half of the continuing respondents (52%) reported that the support received from the agency was adequate, while 22% indicated that the support received was less than adequate.

“Our experience was great.....they have always been there for us”, was a sentiment expressed by a foster parent regarding her experience with her local department. Another foster commented, “....the agency was wonderful.....I think highly of the trainers and social workers”.

Other foster parents had experiences that were more challenging. One parent reported, “The continuity wasn’t really there all the time, so we were getting different people in and out a lot”. Another foster parent stated, "Sometimes you don’t have the agency standing behind you when you are faced with a crisis. I had a child for 10 years....and she became rebellious and began running away. I tried to get help”. Other concerns included feeling “disrespected”, being “lied to” and “left out of the loop”.

Accessibility and Availability of Staff

Research in foster parent recruitment and retention indicates that unsatisfactory interactions with child welfare personnel negatively affect foster parents’ decision to foster (Gibbs & Wildfire, 2007). Once

foster parents are approved and begin fostering, the positive or negative perception of agency services and caseworkers interactions may have the greatest affect upon whether caregivers continue to foster (Cox, Buehler & Orme, 2002).

| Support from Resource Workers | Exited (N=140) | Continuing (N=188) |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| More than Adequate | 43% | 40% |
| Adequate | 41% | 39% |
| Less than Adequate | 16% | 21% |

Exited and continuing foster parents reported similar levels of support from resource workers. The majority of respondents rated support from resource workers as “adequate” (41% and 39%) or “more than adequate” (43% and 40%). Between 16 and 21% of foster parents rated the level of support they receive from resource workers as “less than adequate”.

| Support from Child's Worker | Exited (N=143) | Continuing (N=174) |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| More than Adequate | 43% | 35% |
| Adequate | 36% | 43% |
| Less than Adequate | 21% | 22% |

A larger portion of exited foster parents (43%) rated support from child’s worker as “more than adequate” than continuing foster parents (35%). A slightly larger portion of continuing foster parents (43%) rated the support from the child’s worker as “adequate” than exited foster parents (36%). Just over 20% of exited and continuing foster parents rated support from the child’s worker as “less than adequate”.

Many families felt that agency staff was not easily accessible or available. A few foster parents expressed frustration with the lack of returned calls and visits, particularly when the foster family initiated the contact seeking additional support and guidance. One parent reported, “...it would be nice for a follow up call especially because it was our first placement”. Another respondent added, “Once we got our kids we had no visits from the children’s worker at all...if we had questions we had no one to answer them”. One parent stated that the agency should have been “more available and responsive when I called to address whatever my issue was. Sometimes I would have to wait two or three days, and sometimes that’s too long”.

In addition to a lack of response, interactions with the worker were also a source of distress for some foster parents. This parent reported that her interactions with her resource worker was the worst part about her experience as a foster parent, “She never calls me....she never lets me know what’s going on”. Another parent reported, “There was no relationship between me and my worker”. Another added, “The child’s worker was horrible. I felt there was no respect for me and what I was trying to do”.

Several foster parents described positive relationships with workers. One parent stated, “Any time we had trouble we called and got help”. Another respondent stated, “My worker was very good, very supportive. Paperwork was always updated”. This parent added, “When it came time for court hearings, they were very upfront about what to expect”. Responsive and supportive workers can enhance the fostering experience for parents by providing useful information, and responding to concerns and problems in a timely fashion.

Communication as a Support Mechanism

Many respondents reported that more information about the child’s history, and consistent and mutually respectful communication would better assist them in caring for foster children and navigating through the child welfare system. A parent stated that she would have preferred that the agency “give a little more history of the child and the conditions of the environment of where the child was coming from”. Another foster parent felt that if she had the opportunity to, “go to the agency from time to time and discuss with a team of workers”, her foster child might not have deteriorated.

Information and Resources as a Support Mechanism

A few foster parents indicated that workers could better support them by informing them of resources and services that the foster family is eligible to receive and assisting in accessing those services. One parent added, “Coordinating services for (foster) families would have been a huge help and could help to retain foster parents”.

Peer Support as a Support Mechanism

| Support from the Foster Parent Association | Exited (N=60) | Continuing (N=109) |
|--|---------------|--------------------|
| More than Adequate | 22% | 20% |
| Adequate | 57% | 61% |
| Less than Adequate | 17% | 18% |

Many respondents could not respond to inquiries about the Foster Parent Association because they were not aware of the Association, they were not involved with the Foster Parent Association, or there was not an established Foster Parent Association in their home county. However, more than half of respondents for exited (57%) and continuing (61%) who did answer this question reported that the support from the foster parent association was adequate; 22% of exited and 20% of continuing reported that the support was more than adequate.

One parent stated, “The Foster Parent Association is great...” Another parent felt the Association was very helpful and stated, “I found out more about things from the Foster Parent Association.....than anyone else”. A foster parent who is not involved with a Foster Parent Association reiterated the need and desire for support from other foster parents. This parent was interested in “a support group for foster parents to get together and talk about things that are happening, because maybe people are going through the same thing.”

Meeting Children’s Needs

In the survey, foster parents were asked about their perceptions of the foster parent board rate. For many parents, this emerged into a larger issue of their ability to meet children’s basic needs. This discussion is related to foster parents’ feelings of adequacy around meeting children’s specialized needs. This section addresses foster parents’ description of their ability to meet children’s needs and their assessment of the agency’s support to ensure children’s needs are met.

Meeting Children’s Basic Needs

A few foster families agreed that the foster care stipend is not always sufficient to meet the basic needs of the child, particularly as the child ages and needs increase. Some parents often use their own finances to get the children what is needed when they are first placed and continue to use personal finances even after they begin to receive the monthly payment. One foster parent stated, “I do not recall an occasion where I did not have to fork over my own money to buy them clothes, some come with absolutely nothing...” Another parent reported, “I don’t receive enough money for the children in my home. They have needs and the money doesn’t cover it”.

Foster Care Board Rate

According to a recent national study, Maryland’s foster care rates are among the best in the nation (DePanfilis, Daining, Frick, Farber, & Levinthal, 2006). Maryland is already reimbursing foster families a minimally adequate rate for children ages 2 and 9; rates for 16 year olds should increase 5% to meet standard costs for caring for children.

Foster families surveyed in this study were generally satisfied with the current board rates. Over 60% of foster parents surveyed found the board rate to be adequate and over 12% believed that it was more than adequate. However, 28% of the exited respondents and 23% of the continuing respondents reported that the board rate was less than adequate. These families felt that they could adequately meet the needs of the children in their care if the foster care stipend increased.

| Foster Parent Board Rate | Exited (N=136) | Continuing (N=171) |
|--------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| More than Adequate | 12% | 13% |
| Adequate | 60% | 64% |
| Less than Adequate | 28% | 23% |

Daycare Stipends

There is some confusion and inconsistency in the provision of daycare stipends. Several respondents argued that either they did not receive assistance from the agency with paying for daycare services or what they did receive was not enough to cover daycare and additional expenses for the child. This respondent reported, “I had to apply for childcare vouchers and my daycare would go months at a time without being paid”. Providing clear information regarding the childcare payments, and submitting

vouchers in a timely manner would also assist foster parents in planning and making informed decisions when fostering.

Meeting Children's Specialized Needs

Research suggests that most children in need of foster placement today have increasingly complex behavioral, emotional, psychological, educational and medical needs (Baum, Crase, & Crase, 2001) and require intensive care. Findings from the foster parent survey in Maryland indicate that foster parents are struggling to appropriately meet their children's special needs and could benefit from additional support.

When discussing her experience with a foster child, one parent reported "...he was born severely drug addicted... they never gave me any training on what to expect....there should be more classes to instruct you on what to do". Many foster parents expressed difficulty managing the behavior and emotional problems of their foster children and felt "inadequate" and unprepared to help them. Respondents mentioned "stealing", "lying", and "manipulation" as frequent problems and the cause of disrupted placements. Some foster parents stated that additional training specifically focusing on behavior management could be helpful when caring for children with behavior and emotional problems.

Exit Reasons

The reasons for withdrawing from the agency varied for respondents but fell into one of four categories including problems with the agency, problems with the child in care, life situation changes, or other reasons specific to that foster family.

| Reasons for Withdrawal | Exited (N=203) |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------|
| My life situation changed | 52% |
| Problems with the Agency | 16% |
| Problems with the children in my home | 11% |
| Other | 20% |

Respondents chose all options that applied to them; therefore, the total number of responses is greater than the total number of completed exit interviews.

Changing Life Circumstances

More than half of the respondents (52%) reported that they withdrew from the agency due to changes in their life, which included changes such as illness, moving to another State, and pregnancy. One parent stated, “My adult son got cancer when he was 40 years old and I had to go to North Carolina to take care of him. And after the last child, I did not want to do it anymore. I didn't have the patience and after my son died, I didn't want any more foster children”. For some foster parents, the family composition changed due to pregnancy or marriage, which prompted their decision to leave the agency. This parent reported, “I got married and now I have three stepchildren plus a newborn.....we would not even have room in the house for another child”.

Problems with the Agency

Some foster parents (16%) cited problems with the agency as the primary reason for withdrawing. Many felt that they did not receive adequate support to deal with the stressors of fostering such as problems with the foster children, accessing services and resources, and lack of financial assistance. However, other foster families withdrew because they disagreed with agency decisions. This foster parent recalled her experience, “They reunified a child that should not have been reunified. Quit that day”. Another stated, “They wouldn't let us adopt a child we had been caring for since he was ten months”.

Problems with the Foster Children

Many respondents withdrawal from the agency was the result of problems with the foster children in their home (11%), usually attributed to being, “unable to handle their behaviors”. A few respondents felt overwhelmed and not equipped to deal with the challenges they were faced with. One parent shared her experience, “The child used the restroom everywhere. Was not told how severe the problem

was. The child used the bathroom on the floor in the corner.” Another parent stated, “Things were happening with this child and they weren’t addressed...He ended up killing my dog”.

Lack of Appreciation

Not feeling appreciated was a common reason for withdrawal from the agency for foster parents. One foster parent stated, “They made me feel like the bad guy. When I had questions they weren’t supporting me, instead they just pulled the child from my home”. It was suggested by a respondent that the agency “should be sensitive to the needs of the foster parents”. Another parent expressed a similar sentiment and added, “As foster parents, we don’t have rights and I feel like I should have some input in case I see something that is important”.

Unable to Meet Agency Requirements

Several foster parents expressed their frustration with the licensing requirements specifically regarding their home. Many felt that some of the requirements set by the agency were unreasonable and did not pose a threat to a child. Others felt that the agency should have provided financial assistance to make the adjustments to the home.

Adoption

Many respondents became foster parents with the primary goal of adopting; therefore, many decided to withdraw from the system after the adoption was finalized because they wanted to focus on their family. Nationwide, the increase of foster parents adopting from the pool of foster children has unintentionally reduced the number of available foster homes (Gibbs, 2004). For several foster families, lack of space, resources, and time affected the decision to withdraw from the agency after adoption. One parent reported, “Our house is full. We have our work cut out for us with the three children we have adopted”. Many families expressed the desire to provide the highest level of care to their adopted child and felt it was best to focus primarily on caring for their family without taking on the added responsibility of fostering more children.

Recruitment and Retention Efforts

Analysis of the responses from foster families regarding their experiences suggests that recruitment and retention efforts should focus on activities that empower foster parents in a way that can assist them in sustaining the foster family. The recommendations included in this section include specific ways that DHR/SSA might improve their recruitment and retention efforts.

Clarify Expectations for Relative Caregivers

Many respondents decided to become foster parents in response to a relative in need of care. The agency makes concerted efforts to identify relatives as resources for placements. However, more relatives could be retained if the agency increased its effort to provide these families with concrete information about the process for fostering and adoption when the need for placement is initially determined so that their expectations are reasonable.

Additionally, as placement is considered, the agency should engage potential foster parents in ongoing discussions, particularly regarding financial assistance and agency regulations. Although out of home placements can occur at short notice, it would be helpful to keep relative as well as non-relative families informed to help to minimize ambiguity and potential dissatisfaction with the system.

Support with Behavior Modification

Respondents discussed feeling incompetent and unprepared to deal with the many emotional and behavioral problems that foster children often come with. As such, more training opportunities, both formal and informal should be made available to foster parents to learn specific skills to deal with the behaviors and obtain information to help them to better understand the behaviors. Foster parents need and desire assistance to increase their ability to effectively manage behavior problems without feeling overwhelmed and ineffective. Additionally, support groups for foster parents that focus on dealing with disruptive foster children in which families provide feedback, information, and encouragement to one another could be a productive mechanism that might help to retain foster parents.

Engaging Foster Parents as Recruiters

Using current foster families to help recruit foster parents could be a successful strategy for Maryland. Many families offered advice for potential foster families including having “patience”, and “being committed”. One parent stated, “Get as much information as possible in advance”, another added, “Don’t be afraid to ask the social worker questions”. Foster families have a wealth of knowledge about the system and could serve as models and provide guidance for potential foster families as recommended by a foster parent who offered this advice, “Talk to some foster parents who have been doing it for a while”.

Accurate and Timely Information Sharing

Respondents often noted a lack of information and support to properly plan and care for the children in care. Consequently, some families felt that they were working independent of the local agency and felt overwhelmed and unsuccessful. Disclosing pertinent information about the child could help the family to better plan, prepare, and possibly prevent disrupted placements as evidenced by one foster parent who reported, “More information would have helped me to work with her better.”

In addition, agency staff should work in collaboration with the foster family by consistently being responsive, providing information on an ongoing basis, and supporting families in setting realistic expectations for themselves, the foster child, and the agency.

Reinforcement and Empathy to Enhance Training

Information taught and provided during training should be reinforced on an ongoing basis by staff during home visits and other contact with the foster families. In addition, listening and responding empathically to the issues and concerns raised by foster parents could assist them in working through some of their challenges and could help to reduce anxiety and uncertainty associated with fostering.

Strategies

Foster parent recruitment and retention strategies should focus on meeting the needs of the foster parent by providing them with the necessary tools, information, and resources to educate themselves about being a foster parent and also to successfully parent children in care. Consistent support through quality home visits and phone contacts are imperative for foster parents as they navigate through the child welfare system and care for children who often have complex needs that require a great deal of time and attention.

Additionally, agency staff should work to develop and maintain mutually respectful relationships with foster families in which thoughts, feelings, and needs are expressed and explored in an effort to better understand the foster parent’s perspective and resolve issues. Responding to concerns that arise is essential and could help foster parents to build confidence and increase their ability to effectively respond to the many challenges that are present when fostering children. The agency should also increase its effort to provide more opportunities for foster parents to engage with one another to promote a sense of community in which the common bond is built on love and concern for children in care, while inspiring and supporting one another through challenges and triumphs.

References

- Cox, M. E., Buehler, C., & Orme, J. G. (2002). Recruitment and foster family service. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 29 (3), 151–177.
- DePanfilis, D., Daining, C., Frick, K., Farber, J., & Levinthal, L. (2007). Hitting the M.A.R.C. Establishing foster care Minimum Adequate Rates for Children, Technical Report. New York: Children's Rights, Inc.
- Gibbs, D. A. (2004). Understanding foster parenting: Using administrative data to explore retention. Report prepared by RTI International for U.S. Department of Health and Human Services; Office of Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation. Washington, D.C.
- Gibbs, D., & Wildfire, J. (2007). Length of service for foster parents: Using administrative data to understand retention. *Children and Youth Service Review*, 29, 588.

Appendix A: Exit Interview Data

Table 1: Demographics for Exited Foster Parent Survey, 11/01/08-6/30/09

| Jurisdiction | Marital Status | Average Age | Race | Employment Status | Highest Educational Level | Average # of children fostered | Average Length of Foster Parenting | # Of Foster Parents who adopted their children | Average # of Foster Children Adopted |
|----------------|--|-------------|--|--|--|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| Allegany | Married 100% (n=1) | 46 yrs. old | Caucasian 100% (n=1) | Full Time 100% (n=1) | Associates Degree 100% (n=1) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Anne Arundel | Married 76% (n=13) Divorced 12% (n=2) Single 12% (n=2) | 47 yrs. old | African-American 35% (n=6) Caucasian 65% (n=11) | Full Time 53% (n=9) Part Time 12% (n=2) Retired 6% (n=1) Unemployed 29% (n=5) | Some College 35% (n=6) Associates Degree 6% (n=1) College Graduate 6% (n=1) Some Graduate 6% (n=1) Graduate Degree 47% (n=8) | 1.5 (range 0-4) | 2.8 years (range1-10) | 9(out of 17) 53% | 1.7 (range 0-4) |
| Baltimore City | Married 45% (n=10) | 57 yrs. old | African-American 73% (n=16) | Full Time 27% (n=6) | Less Than High School 18% (n=4) | 1 (range 0-4) | 8.7 years (range 0-35) | 12(out of 22) 55% | 3.2 (range 0-20) |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|--|-------------|--|---|---|---------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|
| | <p>Divorced 9% (n=2)</p> <p>Widowed 18% (n=4)</p> <p>Single 27% (n=6)</p> | | <p>Caucasian 23% (n=5)</p> <p>More than 5 % One Race (n=1)</p> | <p>Part Time 14% (n=3)</p> <p>Retired 36% (n=8)</p> <p>Unemployed 23% (n=5)</p> | <p>High School 45% (n=10)</p> <p>Some College 9% (n=2)</p> <p>College Graduate 14% (n=3)</p> <p>Graduate Degree 14% (n=3)</p> | | | | |
| Baltimore County | <p>Married 59% (n=19)</p> <p>Divorced 13% (n=4)</p> <p>Widowed 6% (n=2)</p> <p>Single 13% (n=4)</p> <p>Separated 3% (n=1)</p> | 49 yrs. old | <p>African 28% American (n=9)</p> <p>Caucasian 72% (n=23)</p> | <p>Full Time 50% (n=16)</p> <p>Part Time 13% (n=4)</p> <p>Retired 22% (n=7)</p> <p>Unemployed 16% (n=5)</p> | <p>High School 31% (n=10)</p> <p>Some College 28% (n=9)</p> <p>Associates Degree 6% (n=2)</p> <p>College Graduate 3% (n=1)</p> <p>Some Graduate 6% (n=2)</p> | 1.9 (range 0-5) | 5.4 years (range .4-25) | 23(out of 32) 72% | 1.6 (range0-3) |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|--|-------------|--|---|---|--------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|
| | Other 6% (n=2) | | | | Graduate Degree 25% (n=8) | | | | |
| Calvert | Married 100% (n=1) | 50 yrs. old | Caucasian 100% (n=1) | Full Time 100% (n=1) | Some College 100% (n=1) | 1 | 3.5 years | 0 (out of 1) | 0 |
| Carroll | Married 100% (n=4) | 50 yrs. old | Caucasian 100% (n=4) | Full Time 50% (n=2) Part Time 50% (n=2) | High School 25% (n=1) Some College 50% (n=2) Graduate Degree 25% (n=1) | 2.5 (range 1-4) | 4.3 years (range 1-8) | 4(out of 4) 100 % | 1.3 (range 1-2) |
| Cecil | Single 100% (n=1) | 50 yrs .old | Caucasian 100% (n=1) | Part Time 100% (n=1) | Associates Degree 100% (n=1) | 0 | 8 years | 0 (out of 1) | 0 |
| Charles | Married 100% (n=5) | 40 yrs. old | African- 80% American (n=4) More 20% Than One (n=1) | Full Time 25% (n=1) Unemployed 75% (n=3) | High School 25% (n=1) Some College 50% (n=2) Some Graduate 25% (n=1) | 2 (range 0-4) | 3.2 years (range 0-4) | 3(out of 5) 60% | 2 (range 0-3) |
| Frederick | Married 94% (n=16) Widowed 6% (n=1) | 49 yrs. old | African- 18% American (n=3) Caucasian 82% (n=14) | Full Time 29% (n=5) Part Time 29% (n=5) Retired 24% (n=4) | High School 18% (n=3) Some College 24% (n=4) College Graduate 18% (n=3) | 1.7 (range 0-7) | 5.9 years (range .5-18) | 6(out of 17) 35% | 2.5 (range 0-6) |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|------------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|
| | | | | Unemployed 18% (n=3) | Some Graduate 12% (n=2) | | | | |
| | | | | | Graduate Degree 29% (n=5) | | | | |
| Garrett | Married 100% (n=2) | 47 yrs .old | Caucasian 100% (n=2) | Full Time 50% (n=1) | Some College 100% (n=2) | 2.5 (range 2-3) | 6 years (range 5-7) | 2(out of 2) 100% | 2 |
| | | | | Part Time 50% (n=1) | | | | | |
| Harford | Married 86% (n=6) | 47 yrs. old | African- American (n=1) 14% | Full Time 57% (n=4) | High School 29% (n=2) | 2.1 (range 0-4) | 3.4 years (range 1-6) | 6(out of 7) 86% | 2 (range 0-4) |
| | Divorced 14% (n=1) | | Caucasian 86% (n=6) | Part Time 14% (n=1) | Some College 29% (n=2) | | | | |
| | | | | Student 14% (n=1) | Associates Degree 14% (n=1) | | | | |
| | | | | Unemployed 14% (n=1) | College Graduate 14% (n=1) | | | | |
| | | | | | Graduate Degree 14% (n=1) | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|------------------------------|-------------|--|--------------------------------|---|--------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|
| Howard | Married 89% (n=8) | 50 yrs. old | Caucasian 89% (n=8) | Full Time 67% (n=6) | Associates Degree 11% (n=1) | 1.4 (range 0-3) | 7.5 years (range .1-33) | 3(out of 9) 33% | 1.3 (range 0-2) |
| | Single 11% (n=1) | | More than 11% One Race (n=1) | Retired 22% (n=2) | Some College 11% (n=1) | | | | |
| | | | | Unemployed 11% (n=1) | College Graduate 44% (n=4) | | | | |
| | | | | | Some Graduate 11% (n=1) | | | | |
| | | | | | Graduate Degree 22% (n=2) | | | | |
| Kent | Single 100% (n=1) | 52 yrs .old | Caucasian 100% (n=1) | Full Time 100% (n=1) | Less Than High School 100% (n=1) | 1 | 1 year | 1 (out of 1) 100% | 1 |
| Montgomery | Married 63% (n=5) | 54 yrs. old | African- American 13% (n=1) | Full Time 38% (n=3) | High School 13% (n=1) | .8 (range0-2) | 2.9 years (range.5-6) | 3(out of 8) 38% | 1 (range0-1) |
| | Divorced 25% (n=2) | | Caucasian 88% (n=7) | Part Time 38% (n=3) | Some College 25% (n=2) | | | | |
| | Widowed 13% (n=1) | | | Student 13% (n=1) | Associates Degree 13% (n=1) | | | | |
| | | | | Retired 13% (n=1) | College Graduate 13% (n=1) | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|--|-------------|---|---|--|--------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|
| | | | | | Graduate Degree 38% (n=3) | | | | |
| Prince George's | Married 60% (n=6) Divorced 30% (n=3) Widowed 10% (n=1) | 54 yrs. old | African American 90% (n=9) Caucasian 10% (n=1) | Full Time 50% (n=5) Part Time 20% (n=2) Retired 20% (n=2) Unemployed 10% (n=1) | Associates Degree 10% (n=1) Some College 50% (n=5) College Graduate 30% (n=3) Graduate Degree 10% (n=1) | 1.2 (range 0-4) | 7 years (range 0-21) | 3(out of 10) 30% | 1.7 (range 0-2) |
| Queen Anne's | Married 100% (n=1) | 54 yrs. old | Caucasian 100% (n=1) | Full Time 100% (n=1) | Graduate Degree 100% (n=1) | 2 | 2 years | 1 (out of 1) 100% | 1.7 (range 0-2) |
| Somerset | Married 100% (n=1) | 50 yrs. old | African-American 100% (n=1) | Full Time 100% (n=1) | Some College 100% (n=1) | 0 | 2 years | 0 (out of 1) | 0 |
| Talbot | Married 100% (n=1) | 50 yrs. old | Caucasian 100% (n=1) | Part Time 100% (n=1) | Some College 100% (n=1) | 1 | 3 years | 0 (out of 1) | 0 |
| Washington | Married 100% (n=5) | 53 yrs. old | Caucasian 100% (n=5) | Full Time 25% (n=1) Part Time 25% (n=1) Retired 50% (n=2) | Less Than High School 25% (n=1) Some College 50% (n=2) College Graduate 25% (n=1) | .8 (range 0-4) | 16 years (range 0-36) | 2 (out of 5) 40% | 2.5 (range 0-3) |
| Wicomico | Married 71% (n=5) | 50 yrs. old | African American 29% (n=2) | Full Time 86% (n=6) | High School 14% (n=1) | 1.7 (range 0-5) | 9.2 years (range 1-22) | 4 (out of 7) 57% | 2 (range 0-2) |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|-------------------------------|-------------|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|----------|-----------------------------|---|
| | Divorced 29% (n=2) | | Caucasian 71% (n=5) | Unemployed 14% (n=1) | Some College 14% (n=1) | | | | |
| | | | | | College Graduate 43% (n=3) | | | | |
| | | | | | Some Graduate 14% (n=1) | | | | |
| | | | | | Graduate Degree 14% (n=1) | | | | |
| Worcester | Divorced 100% (n=1) | 65 yrs. old | African- 100% American (n=1) | Retired 100% (n=1) | High School 100% (n=1) | 1 | 16 years | 1(out of 1) 100 % | 1 |

Table 2: Responses to Training Questions for Exited Foster Parent Survey, 11/01/08-6/30/09

| Jurisdiction | Training for Foster Parents | | Support from Resource Worker | | Support from Child's Worker | | Support from the Agency | | Support from the Foster Parent Association | | Foster Parent Board Rate |
|------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------|---------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|---------------|------------------------------------|
| Allegany | Adequate | 100% (n=1) | Adequate | 100% (n=1) | Less than Adequate | 100% (n=1) | Adequate | 100% (n=1) | More than adequate | 100% (n=1) | |
| Anne Arundel | More than Adequate | 31% (n=5) | More than Adequate | 40% (n=6) | More than Adequate | 33% (n=5) | More than Adequate | 25% (n=4) | More than Adequate | 33% (n=2) | Adequate 79% (n=11) |
| | Adequate | 56% (n=9) | Adequate | 40% (n=6) | Adequate | 53% (n=8) | Adequate | 50% (n=8) | Adequate | 50% (n=3) | Less than Adequate 21% (n=3) |
| | Less than Adequate | 13% (n=2) | Less than Adequate | 20% (n=3) | Less than Adequate | 13% (n=2) | Less than Adequate | 25% (n=4) | Less than Adequate | 17% (n=1) | |
| Baltimore City | More than Adequate | 45% (n=10) | More than Adequate | 45% (n=9) | More than Adequate | 50% (n=11) | More than Adequate | 32% (n=7) | More than Adequate | 10% (n=1) | More than Adequate 10% (n=2) |
| | Adequate | 45% (n=10) | Adequate | 50% (n=10) | Adequate | 27% (n=6) | Adequate | 50% (n=11) | Adequate | 90% (n=9) | Adequate 48% (n=10) |
| | Less than Adequate | 9% (n=2) | Less than Adequate | 5% (n=1) | Less than Adequate | 23% (n=5) | Less than Adequate | 18% (n=4) | Less than Adequate | | Less than Adequate 43% (n=9) |
| Baltimore County | More than Adequate | 56% (n=18) | More than Adequate | 35% (n=11) | More than Adequate | 44% (n=14) | More than Adequate | 38% (n=12) | More than Adequate | 22% (n=2) | More than Adequate 10% (n=2) |
| | Adequate | 38% (n=12) | Adequate | 42% (n=13) | Adequate | 34% (n=11) | Adequate | 38% (n=12) | Adequate | 44% (n=4) | Adequate 65% (n=20) |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| | Less than Adequate | 6% (n=2) | Less than Adequate | 23% (n=7) | Less than Adequate | 22% (n=7) | Less than Adequate | 25% (n=8) | Less than Adequate | 33% (n=3) | Less than Adequate | 26% (n=8) |
| Calvert | Less than Adequate | 100% (n=1) | More than Adequate | 100% (n=1) | Less than Adequate | 100% (n=1) | Less than Adequate | 100% (n=1) | Less than Adequate | 100% (n=1) | Less than Adequate | 100% (n=1) |
| Carroll | More than Adequate | 50% (n=2) | More than Adequate | 50% (n=2) | More than Adequate | 75% (n=3) | More than Adequate | 50% (n=2) | Adequate | 100% (n=1) | Adequate | 75% (n=3) |
| | Adequate | 50% (n=2) | Adequate | 50% (n=2) | Less than Adequate | 25% (n=1) | Adequate | 50% (n=2) | | | Less than Adequate | 25% (n=1) |
| Cecil | Adequate | 100% (n=1) | Less than Adequate | 100% (n=1) | Less than Adequate | 100% (n=1) | Less than Adequate | 100% (n=1) | Adequate | 100% (n=1) | Less than Adequate | 100% (n=1) |
| Charles | More than Adequate | 40% (n=2) | More than Adequate | 40% (n=2) | More than Adequate | 40% (n=2) | More than Adequate | 20% (n=1) | More than Adequate | 100% (n=1) | Adequate | 25% (n=1) |
| | Adequate | 60% (n=3) | Adequate | 40% (n=2) | Adequate | 40% (n=2) | Adequate | 40% (n=2) | | | Less than Adequate | 75% (n=3) |
| | | | Less than Adequate | 20% (n=1) | Less than Adequate | 20% (n=1) | Less than Adequate | 40% (n=2) | | | | |
| Frederick | More than Adequate | 41% (n=7) | More than Adequate | 50% (n=7) | More than Adequate | 47% (n=7) | More than Adequate | 53% (n=8) | More than Adequate | 43% (n=3) | More than Adequate | 21% (n=3) |
| | Adequate | 53% (n=9) | Adequate | 43% (n=6) | Adequate | 40% (n=6) | Adequate | 40% (n=6) | Adequate | 43% (n=3) | Adequate | 64% (n=9) |
| | Less than Adequate | 6% (n=1) | Less than Adequate | 7% (n=1) | Less than Adequate | 13% (n=2) | Less than Adequate | 7% (n=1) | Less than Adequate | 14% (n=1) | Less than Adequate | 14% (n=2) |
| Garrett | More than Adequate | 50% (n=1) | More than Adequate | 100% (n=2) | More than Adequate | 100% (n=2) | More than Adequate | 50% (n=1) | More than Adequate | 100% (n=1) | Adequate | 100% (n=1) |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| | Adequate | 50% (n=1) | | | | Adequate | 50% (n=1) | | | | | |
| Harford | More than Adequate | 71% (n=5) | More than Adequate | 86% (n=6) | More than Adequate | 43% (n=3) | More than Adequate | 57% (n=4) | More than Adequate | 20% (n=1) | More than Adequate | 43% (n=3) |
| | Adequate | 29% (n=2) | Adequate | 14% (n=1) | Adequate | 57% (n=4) | Adequate | 43% (n=3) | Adequate | 80% (n=4) | Adequate | 57% (n=4) |
| Howard | More than Adequate | 44% (n=4) | More than Adequate | 38% (n=3) | More than Adequate | 33% (n=3) | More than Adequate | 33% (n=3) | More than Adequate | 33% (n=1) | More than Adequate | 13% (n=1) |
| | Adequate | 44% (n=4) | Adequate | 50% (n=4) | Adequate | 33% (n=3) | Adequate | 56% (n=5) | Adequate | 33% (n=1) | Adequate | 50% (n=4) |
| | Less than Adequate | 11% (n=1) | Less than Adequate | 13% (n=1) | Less than Adequate | 33% (n=3) | Less than Adequate | 11% (n=1) | Less than Adequate | 33% (n=1) | Less than Adequate | 38% (n=3) |
| Kent | Adequate | 100% (n=1) | More than Adequate | 100% (n=1) | More than Adequate | 100% (n=1) | More than Adequate | 100% (n=1) | | | Adequate | 100% (n=1) |
| Montgomery | More than Adequate | 38% (n=3) | More than Adequate | 63% (n=5) | More than Adequate | 86% (n=6) | More than Adequate | 57% (n=4) | Adequate | 100% (n=3) | More than Adequate | 50% (n=3) |
| | Adequate | 63% (n=5) | Adequate | 13% (n=1) | Less than Adequate | 14% (n=1) | Adequate | 43% (n=3) | | | Adequate | 50% (n=3) |
| | | | Less than Adequate | 25% (n=2) | | | | | | | | |
| Prince George's | More than Adequate | 10% (n=1) | More than Adequate | 11% (n=1) | More than Adequate | 11% (n=1) | Adequate | 40% (n=4) | More than Adequate | 33% (n=2) | Adequate | 33% (n=3) |
| | Adequate | 80% | Adequate | 56% | Adequate | 56% | Less than | 60% | Adequate | 50% | Less than | 67% |

| | | | | | | |
|--------------|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| | (n=8) Less than Adequate 10% (n=1) | (n=5) Less than Adequate 33% (n=3) | (n=5) Less than Adequate 33% (n=3) | Adequate (n=6) Less than Adequate 17% (n=1) | (n=3) Adequate (n=6) | |
| Queen Anne's | Adequate 100% (n=1) | More than Adequate 100% (n=1) | More than Adequate 100% (n=1) | Adequate 100% (n=1) | Less than Adequate 100% (n=1) | Adequate 100% (n=1) |
| Somerset | Adequate 100% (n=1) | | | | | |
| Talbot | Less than Adequate 100% (n=1) | Adequate 100% (n=1) | | Less than Adequate 100% (n=1) | | Adequate 100% (n=1) |
| Washington | More than Adequate 33% (n=1) | More than Adequate 50% (n=2) | More than Adequate 50% (n=2) | More than Adequate 25% (n=1) | | More than Adequate 25% (n=1) |
| | Adequate 67% (n=2) | Adequate 25% (n=1) | Adequate 25% (n=1) | Adequate 50% (n=2) | | Adequate 75% (n=3) |
| | | Less than Adequate 25% (n=1) | Less than Adequate 25% (n=1) | Less than Adequate 25% (n=1) | | |
| Wicomico | Adequate 100% (n=7) | More than Adequate 14% (n=1) | More than Adequate 17% (n=1) | More than Adequate 14% (n=1) | More than Adequate 25% (n=1) | Adequate 86% (n=6) |
| | | Adequate 57% (n=4) | Adequate 67% (n=4) | Adequate 57% (n=4) | Adequate 50% (n=2) | Less than Adequate 14% (n=1) |
| | | Less than Adequate 29% (n=2) | Less than Adequate 17% (n=1) | Less than Adequate 29% (n=2) | Less than Adequate 25% (n=1) | |
| Worcester | Adequate 100% (n=1) | | Adequate 100% (n=1) | Adequate 100% (n=1) | | Adequate 100% (n=1) |

Table 3: Responses to Training Questions for Exited Foster Parent Survey, 11/01/08-6/30/09

| Jurisdiction | Preparation for Experiences | | Support during Experiences | |
|---------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Allegany | Effective | 100% (n=1) | Effective | 100% (n=1) |
| Anne Arundel | Very Effective | 29% (n=4) | Very Effective | 29% (n=4) |
| | Effective | 57% (n=8) | Effective | 50% (n=7) |
| | Ineffective | 14% (n=2) | Ineffective | 14% (n=2) |
| | | | Very Ineffective | 7% (n=1) |
| Baltimore City | Very Effective | 41% (n=9) | Very Effective | 41% (n=9) |
| | Effective | 36% (n=8) | Effective | 32% (n=7) |
| | Ineffective | 23% (n=5) | Ineffective | 23% (n=5) |
| | | | Very Ineffective | 5% (n=1) |
| Baltimore County | Very Effective | 47% (n=15) | Very Effective | 50% (n=15) |
| | Effective | 50% (n=16) | Effective | 33% (n=10) |
| | Ineffective | 3% (n=1) | Ineffective | 17% (n=5) |

| | | | | |
|-----------|----------------|----------------------|------------------|----------------------|
| Calvert | Very Effective | 100% (n=1) | Ineffective | 100% (n=1) |
| Carroll | Very Effective | 50% (n=2) | Very Effective | 75% (n=3) |
| | Effective | 50% (n=2) | Ineffective | 25% (n=1) |
| Cecil | Effective | 100% (n=1) | Very Ineffective | 100% (n=1) |
| Charles | Very Effective | 20% (n=1) | Very Effective | 40% (n=2) |
| | Effective | 60% (n=3) | Effective | 40% (n=2) |
| | Ineffective | 20% (n=1) | Ineffective | 20% (n=1) |
| Frederick | Very Effective | 53% (n=9) | Very Effective | 63% (n=10) |
| | Effective | 41% (n=7) | Effective | 25% (n=4) |
| | Ineffective | 6% (n=1) | Ineffective | 13% (n=2) |
| Garrett | Very Effective | 100% (n=2) | Very Effective | 100% (n=2) |
| Harford | Very Effective | 57% (n=4) | Very Effective | 71% (n=5) |
| | Effective | 43% (n=3) | Effective | 29% (n=2) |
| Howard | Very Effective | 22% (n=2) | Very Effective | 22% (n=2) |

| | | |
|-----------------|--|---|
| | Effective 56% (n=5) | Effective 56% (n=5) |
| | Ineffective 22% (n=2) | Ineffective 11% (n=1) |
| | | Very Ineffective 11% (n=1) |
| Kent | Very Effective 100% (n=1) | Very Effective 100% (n=1) |
| Montgomery | Very Effective 29% (n=2) | Very Effective 57% (n=4) |
| | Effective 43% (n=3) | Effective 43% (n=3) |
| | Ineffective 29% (n=2) | |
| Prince George's | Effective 63% (n=5) | Very Effective 22% (n=2) |
| | Ineffective 38% (n=3) | Effective 22% (n=2) |
| | | Ineffective 56% (n=5) |
| Queen Anne's | Effective 100% (n=1) | Effective 100% (n=1) |
| Talbot | | |
| Washington | Effective 75% (n=3) | Very Effective 25% (n=1) |
| | Ineffective 25% (n=1) | Effective 50% (n=2) |

| | | | |
|-----------|----------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|
| | | Ineffective | 25% (n=1) |
| Wicomico | Effective | 100% (n=6) | Effective 83% (n=5) |
| | | | Ineffective 17% (n=1) |
| Worcester | Very Effective | 100% (n=1) | Effective 100% (n=1) |

Appendix B: Continuing Interview Data

Table 1: Demographics for Continuing Foster Parent Survey, 11/1/08-6/30/09

| Jurisdiction | Marital Status | Average Age | Race | Employment Status | Highest Educational Level | Average # of children fostered | Average Length of Foster Parenting | # of Foster Parents who adopted their children | Average # of Foster Children Adopted |
|--------------|------------------------------|-------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| Allegany | Married 100% (n=5) | 52 yrs.old | Caucasian 100% (n=5) | Full Time 40% (n=2) | Associate Degree 40% (n=2) | 3.8 (range 1-8) | .6 (range 0-1.5) | 4 (out of 5) 80% | 2.8 (range 0-8) |
| | | | | Retired 20% (n=1) | College Graduate 20% (n=1) | | | | |
| | | | | Student 20% (n=1) | Graduate Degree 40% (n=2) | | | | |
| | | | | Unemployed 20% (n=1) | | | | | |
| Anne Arundel | Married 62% (n=8) | 48 yrs.old | African-American 17% (n=2) | Full Time 54% (n=7) | High School 15% (n=2) | 1.8 (range 0-6) | 1.9 years (range 0-14) | 3 (out of 13) 23% | 1 (range 0-1) |
| | Divorced 8% (n=1) | | Caucasian 83% (n=10) | Part Time 23% (n=3) | Some College 54% (n=7) | | | | |
| | Separated 8% | | | Unemployed 23% | Associates Degree 15% | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|--|------------|---|--|--|---------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------|
| | (n=1) Single 23% (n=3) | | | (n=3) | (n=2) College Graduate 8% (n=1) Graduate Degree 8% (n=1) | | | | |
| Baltimore City | Married 37% (n=19) Divorced 13% (n=7) Separated 2% (n=1) Same Sex Partnership 2% (n=1) Widowed 6% (n=3) Single 40% (n=21) | 49 yrs.old | African-American 82% (n=41) Caucasian 16% (n=8) Hispanic 2% (n=1) | Full Time 52% (n=27) Part Time 12% (n=6) Retired 13% (n=7) Student 8% (n=4) Unemployed 15% (n=8) | High School 38% (n=20) Some College 27% (n=14) Associates Degree 8% (n=4) College Graduate 15% (n=8) Some Graduate 2% (n=1) Graduate Degree 10% (n=5) | 1.8 (range 0-11) | 2.5 years (range 0-22) | 17 (out of 53) 32% | 2.4 (range 0-8) |
| Baltimore County | Married 55% (n=6) | 46 yrs.old | African-American 55% (n=6) | Full Time 82% (n=9) | High School 9% (n=1) | 2.1 (range 1-6) | .6 (range 0-2) | 2 (out of 11) 18% | 3 (range 0-5) |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|--|------------|--|--|---|--------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|
| | <p>Divorced 9% (n=1)</p> <p>Widowed 18% (n=2)</p> <p>Single 18% (n=2)</p> | | <p>Caucasian 45% (n=5)</p> | <p>Part Time 9% (n=1)</p> <p>Unemployed 9% (n=1)</p> | <p>Some College 27% (n=3)</p> <p>Associate Degree 9% (n=1)</p> <p>College Graduate 9% (n=1)</p> <p>Some Graduate 9% (n=1)</p> <p>Graduate Degree 36% (n=4)</p> | | | | |
| Calvert | <p>Married 75% (n=3)</p> <p>Single 25% (n=1)</p> | 48 yrs.old | <p>African-American 25% (n=1)</p> <p>American Indian 25% (n=1)</p> <p>Caucasian 50% (n=2)</p> | Full Time 100% (n=4) | <p>Associate Degree 25% (n=1)</p> <p>College Graduate 50% (n=2)</p> <p>Graduate Degree 25% (n=1)</p> | 1.3 (range 0-3) | 0 | 3 (out of 4) 75% | 1 (range 0-1) |
| Caroline | Married 100% (n=1) | 44 yrs.old | Caucasian 100% (n=1) | Full Time 100% (n=1) | Associate Degree 100% (n=1) | 3 | 1.4 years | 0 (out of 1) | 0 |
| Carroll | Married 100% (n=8) | 46 yrs.old | African-American 13% (n=1) | Full Time 38% (n=3) | High School 13% (n=1) | 3 (range 0-6) | 2.9 years (range 0-15) | 3 (out of 8) 38% | 2.7 (range 0-5) |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|------------------------------|------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|------------------|
| | | | Asian 13% (n=1) | Part Time 13% (n=1) | Some College 38% (n=3) | | | | |
| | | | Caucasian 75% (n=6) | Unemployed 50% (n=4) | College Graduate 50% (n=4) | | | | |
| Cecil | Married 100% (n=3) | 37 yrs.old | African-American 33% (n=1) | Full Time 33% (n=1) | High School 33% (n=1) | 2.8 (range 0-8) | .8 (range 0-2.5) | 2 (out of 4) 50% | 3 (range 0-5) |
| | | | Caucasian 67% (n=2) | Part Time 33% (n=1) | Associate Degree 33% (n=1) | | | | |
| | | | | Unemployed 33% (n=1) | College Graduate 33% (n=1) | | | | |
| Charles | Married 33% (n=1) | 55 yrs.old | African-American 67% (n=2) | Full Time 67% (n=2) | High School 33% (n=1) | .7 (range 0-1) | .1 (range 0-.2) | 1 (out of 3) 33% | 2 (range 0-2) |
| | Single 33% (n=1) | | Caucasian 33% (n=1) | Student 33% (n=1) | Some College 33% (n=1) | | | | |
| | Widowed 33% (n=1) | | | | College Graduate 33% (n=1) | | | | |
| Dorchester | Married 20% (n=1) | 55 yrs.old | African-American 80% (n=4) | Full Time 60% (n=3) | High School 60% (n=3) | .8 (range 0-2) | .2 (range 0-1) | 2 (out of 5) 40% | 3 (range 0-4) |
| | Divorced 20% (n=1) | | Caucasian 20% (n=1) | Part Time 20% (n=1) | Some College 20% (n=1) | | | | |
| | Single 60% | | | Unemployed 20% | Associate Degree 20% | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|------------------------------|------------|--|--------------------------------|---|--------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|--|
| | (n=3) | | | (n=1) | (n=1) | | | | | |
| Frederick | Married 71% (n=5) | 40 yrs.old | African-American 29% (n=2) | Full Time 86% (n=6) | High School 14% (n=1) | 2 (range 0-5) | .3 (range 0-1.6) | 3 (out of 7) 43% | 2.7 (range 0-5) | |
| | Divorced 14% (n=1) | | Caucasian 57% (n=4) | Part Time 14% (n=1) | Some College 43% (n=3) | | | | | |
| | Single 14% (n=1) | | More than one Race 14% (n=1) | | Graduate Degree 43% (n=3) | | | | | |
| Garrett | Married 100% (n=7) | 43 yrs.old | Caucasian 100% (n=7) | Full Time 57% (n=4) | Associate Degree 29% (n=2) | 2.4 (range 1-4) | .3 (range 0-1) | 1 (out of 7) 14% | 1 (range 0-1) | |
| | | | | Part Time 14% (n=1) | Some College 29% (n=2) | | | | | |
| | | | | Unemployed 29% (n=2) | College Graduate 14% (n=1) | | | | | |
| | | | | | Graduate Degree 29% (n=2) | | | | | |
| Harford | Married 71% (n=5) | 35 yrs.old | African-American 57% (n=4) | Full Time 43% (n=3) | Less than High School 14% (n=1) | 2 (range 0-4) | 1.9 years (range 0-5) | 2 (out of 7) 29% | 3 (range 0-4) | |
| | Divorced 29% (n=2) | | Caucasian 43% (n=3) | Student 14% (n=1) | High School 14% (n=1) | | | | | |
| | | | | Unemployed 43% (n=3) | Some College 57% (n=4) | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---|------------|---|---|---|--------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------|
| | | | | | College Graduate 14% (n=1) | | | | |
| Howard | Married 50% (n=1) Same Sex Partnership 50% (n=1) | 44 yrs.old | African-American 50% (n=1) Caucasian 50% (n=1) | Part Time 50% (n=1) Unemployed 50% (n=1) | Some College 50% (n=1) Some Graduate 50% (n=1) | 3.5 (range 3-4) | 0 | 1 (out of 2) 50% | 2 (range 0-2) |
| Kent | Married 50% (n=1) Widowed 50% (n=1) | 62 yrs.old | Caucasian 100% (n=2) | Part Time 50% (n=1) Retired 50% (n=1) | Associate Degree 50% (n=1) College Graduate 50% (n=1) | 1 (range 1) | .5 (range 0-1) | 0(out of 2) 0% | 0 |
| Montgomery | Married 88% (n=7) Single 13% (n=1) | 45 yrs.old | Caucasian 88% (n=7) Hispanic 13% (n=1) | Full Time 50% (n=4) Unemployed 50% (n=4) | Less than High School 13% (n=1) High School 13% (n=1) Some College 13% (n=1) College Graduate 38% (n=3) Graduate Degree 25% (n=2) | 1.8 (range 0-3) | .7 (range 0-2.5) | 0 (out of 8) 0% | 0 |
| Prince George's | Married 38% (n=8) | 47 yrs.old | African-American 81% (n=17) | Full Time 55% (n=11) | Less than High School 5% (n=1) | 1 (range 0-3) | 3.9 years (range 0-24) | 3(out of 21) 14% | 1 (range 0-1) |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|---|------------|---|---|--|--------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|------------------|
| | Divorced 14% (n=3) Separated 10% (n=2) Single 33% (n=7) Other 5% (n=1) | | Caucasian 19% (n=4) | Part Time 15% (n=3) Retired 5% (n=1) Student 5% (n=1) Unemployed 20% (n=4) | High School 25% (n=5) Some College 25% (n=5) College Graduate 25% (n=5) Graduate Degree 20% (n=4) | | | | |
| Queen Anne's | Married 67% (n=2) Divorced 33% (n=1) | 51 yrs.old | Caucasian 100% (n=3) | Full Time 33% (n=1) Part Time 33% (n=1) Unemployed 33% (n=1) | High School 33% (n=1) Associate Degree 33% (n=1) College Graduate 33% (n=1) | 1.3 (range 1-2) | 4.3 years (range 0-9) | 1 (out of 3) 33% | 2 (range 0-2) |
| Saint Mary's | Married 83% (n=5) Single 17% (n=1) | 36 yrs.old | African-American 20% (n=1) Asian 20% (n=1) Caucasian 60% | Full Time 20% (n=1) Part Time 20% (n=1) Unemployed 60% | High School 40% (n=2) Some College 20% (n=1) Associates Degree 20% | 3 (range 0-6) | 3 years (range 0-7) | 2(out of 6) 33% | 2 (range 0-2) |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|--|------------|---|---|---|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|--|
| | | | (n=3) | (n=3) | (n=1) | Graduate Degree 20% (n=1) | | | | |
| Somerset | Married 80% (n=4) Single 20% (n=1) | 37 yrs.old | African-American 20% (n=1) Caucasian 80% (n=4) | Full Time 40% (n=2) Part Time 20% (n=1) Student 20% (n=1) Unemployed 20% (n=1) | Less than High School 20% (n=1) Some College 80% (n=4) | 1.8 (range 0-4) | 1 years (range 0-3) | 2 (out of 5) 40% | 1 (range 0-1) | |
| Talbot | Married 50% (n=1) Divorced 50% (n=1) | 31 yrs.old | Caucasian 100% (n=2) | Part Time 50% (n=1) Unemployed 50% (n=1) | High School 50% (n=1) Some College 50% (n=1) | .3 (range 0-1) | 2 years (range 0-6) | 0(out of 3) 0% | 0 | |
| Washington | Married 71% (n=5) Widowed 14% (n=1) Single 14% (n=1) | 49 yrs.old | Caucasian 100% (n=7) | Full Time 43% (n=3) Part Time 43% (n=3) Unemployed 14% (n=1) | Some College 71% (n=5) Graduate Degree 29% (n=2) | 2.7 (range 1-5) | 6.1 years (range 0-30) | 4(out of 7) 57% | 2.3 (range 0-3) | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|--------------------------------|------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|---------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------|
| Wicomico | Married 100% (n=5) | 46 yrs.old | African-American 40% (n=2) | Full Time 40% (n=2) | Associate Degree 40% (n=2) | 3.8 (range 1-12) | 1.9 years (range .7-6) | 3(out of 5) 60% | 4 (range 0-7) |
| | | | Caucasian 60% (n=3) | Part Time 20% (n=1) | Some College 20% (n=1) | | | | |
| | | | | Student 20% (n=1) | Some Graduate School 20% (n=1) | | | | |
| | | | | Unemployed 20% (n=1) | Graduate Degree 20% (n=1) | | | | |
| Worcester | Separated 100% (n=1) | 69 yrs.old | African-American 100% (n=1) | Student 100% (n=1) | High School 100% (n=1) | 2 | 10 years | 1(out of 1) 100% | 1 |

Table 2: Responses to Training Questions for Continuing Foster Parent Survey, 11/01/08-6/30/09

| Jurisdiction | Training for Foster Parents | | Support from Resource Worker | | Support from Child's Worker | | Support from the Agency | | Support from the Foster Parent Association | | Foster Parent Board Rate | |
|---------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------|---|----------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|
| Allegany | More than Adequate | 40% (n=2) | More than Adequate | 40% (n=2) | More than Adequate | 40% (n=2) | More than Adequate | 20% (n=1) | More than Adequate | 33% (n=1) | Adequate | 60% (n=3) |
| | Adequate | 60% (n=3) | Adequate | 60% (n=3) | Adequate | 60% (n=3) | Adequate | 80% (n=4) | Adequate | 67% (n=2) | Less than Adequate | 40% (n=2) |
| Anne Arundel | More than Adequate | 23% (n=3) | More than Adequate | 23% (n=3) | More than Adequate | 25% (n=3) | More than Adequate | 9% (n=1) | Adequate | 67% (n=4) | Adequate | 67% (n=8) |
| | Adequate | 62% (n=8) | Adequate | 62% (n=8) | Adequate | 50% (n=6) | Adequate | 64% (n=7) | Less than Adequate | 33% (n=2) | Less than Adequate | 33% (n=4) |
| | Less than Adequate | 15% (n=2) | Less than Adequate | 15% (n=2) | Less than Adequate | 25% (n=3) | Less than Adequate | 27% (n=3) | | | | |
| Baltimore City | More than Adequate | 21% (n=11) | More than Adequate | 21% (n=11) | More than Adequate | 27% (n=13) | More than Adequate | 12% (n=6) | More than Adequate | 15% (n=4) | More than Adequate | 6% (n=3) |
| | Adequate | 64% (n=34) | Adequate | 64% (n=34) | Adequate | 44% (n=21) | Adequate | 53% (n=26) | Adequate | 63% (n=17) | Adequate | 64% (n=30) |
| | Less than Adequate | 15% (n=8) | Less than Adequate | 15% (n=8) | Less than Adequate | 27% (n=13) | Less than Adequate | 35% (n=17) | Less than Adequate | 22% (n=6) | Less than Adequate | 30% (n=14) |
| Baltimore County | More than Adequate | 9% (n=1) | More than Adequate | 9% (n=1) | More than Adequate | 36% (n=4) | More than Adequate | 10% (n=1) | More than Adequate | 25% (n=1) | Adequate | 64% (n=7) |
| | Adequate | 55% | Adequate | 55% | Adequate | 36% | Adequate | 50% | Adequate | 25% | Less than Adequate | 36% |

| | | | | | | | |
|----------|--------------------|----------------------|---|---|---|--|--|
| | | (n=6) | (n=6) | (n=4) | (n=5) | (n=1) | Adequate (n=4) |
| | Less than Adequate | 36% (n=4) | Less than Adequate 36% (n=4) | Less than Adequate 27% (n=3) | Less than Adequate 40% (n=4) | Less than Adequate 50% (n=2) | |
| Calvert | Adequate | 100% (n=4) | Adequate 100% (n=4) | More than Adequate 50% (n=2) | More than Adequate 67% (n=2) | More than Adequate 33% (n=1) | More than Adequate 25% (n=1) |
| | | | | Adequate 50% (n=2) | Adequate 33% (n=1) | Adequate 33% (n=1) | Adequate 75% (n=3) |
| | | | | | | Less than Adequate 33% (n=1) | |
| Caroline | Less than Adequate | 100% (n=1) | Less than Adequate 100% (n=1) | Less than Adequate 100% (n=1) | Less than Adequate 100% (n=1) | | Adequate 100% (n=1) |
| Carroll | More than Adequate | 38% (n=3) | More than Adequate 38% (n=3) | More than Adequate 38% (n=3) | More than Adequate 29% (n=2) | Adequate 67% (n=4) | More than Adequate 13% (n=1) |
| | Adequate | 63% (n=5) | Adequate 63% (n=5) | Adequate 38% (n=3) | Adequate 57% (n=4) | Less than Adequate 33% (n=2) | Adequate 50% (n=4) |
| | | | | Less than Adequate 25% (n=2) | Less than Adequate 14% (n=1) | | Less than Adequate 38% (n=3) |
| Cecil | Adequate | 100% (n=2) | Adequate 100% (n=2) | More than Adequate 33% (n=1) | Adequate 67% (n=2) | Adequate 100% (n=1) | More than Adequate 33% (n=1) |
| | | | | Adequate 33% (n=1) | Less than Adequate 33% (n=1) | | Adequate 67% (n=2) |
| | | | | Less than Adequate 33% | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | Adequate (n=1) | | | | |
| Charles | Adequate 100% (n=3) | Adequate 100% (n=3) | Adequate 67% (n=2) | Adequate 33% (n=1) | More than Adequate 33% (n=1) | Adequate 100% (n=3) | |
| | | | Less than Adequate 33% (n=1) | Less than Adequate 67% (n=2) | Adequate 33% (n=1) | | |
| | | | | | Less than Adequate 33% (n=1) | | |
| Dorchester | More than Adequate 60% (n=3) | More than Adequate 60% (n=3) | More than Adequate 67% (n=2) | More than Adequate 80% (n=4) | More than Adequate 33% (n=1) | Adequate 100% (n=3) | |
| | Adequate 20% (n=1) | Adequate 20% (n=1) | Adequate 33% (n=1) | Less than Adequate 20% (n=1) | Adequate 33% (n=1) | | |
| | Less than Adequate 20% (n=1) | Less than Adequate 20% (n=1) | | | Less than Adequate 33% (n=1) | | |
| Frederick | More than Adequate 29% (n=2) | More than Adequate 29% (n=2) | More than Adequate 33% (n=2) | More than Adequate 17% (n=1) | More than Adequate 25% (n=1) | More than Adequate 17% (n=1) | |
| | Adequate 57% (n=4) | Adequate 57% (n=4) | Adequate 50% (n=3) | Adequate 67% (n=4) | Adequate 75% (n=3) | Adequate 67% (n=4) | |
| | Less than Adequate 14% (n=1) | Less than Adequate 14% (n=1) | Less than Adequate 17% (n=1) | Less than Adequate 17% (n=1) | | Less than Adequate 17% (n=1) | |
| Garrett | More than Adequate 14% (n=1) | More than Adequate 14% (n=1) | More than Adequate 50% (n=3) | More than Adequate 14% (n=1) | Adequate 100% (n=3) | More than Adequate 33% (n=2) | |
| | Adequate 71% | Adequate 71% | Adequate 33% | Adequate 57% | | Adequate 67% | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| | | (n=5) | | (n=5) | | (n=2) | | (n=4) | | | | | (n=4) |
| | Less than Adequate | 14% (n=1) | Less than Adequate | 14% (n=1) | Less than Adequate | 17% (n=1) | Less than Adequate | 29% (n=2) | | | | | |
| Harford | More than Adequate | 14% (n=1) | More than Adequate | 14% (n=1) | More than Adequate | 43% (n=3) | More than Adequate | 43% (n=3) | More than Adequate | 20% (n=1) | More than Adequate | 43% (n=3) | |
| | Adequate | 71% (n=5) | Adequate | 71% (n=5) | Adequate | 57% (n=4) | Adequate | 57% (n=4) | Adequate | 80% (n=4) | Adequate | 43% (n=3) | |
| | Less than Adequate | 14% (n=1) | Less than Adequate | 14% (n=1) | | | | | | | | Less than Adequate | 14% (n=1) |
| Howard | Adequate | 100% (n=2) | Adequate | 100% (n=2) | Adequate | 50% (n=1) | Adequate | 100% (n=2) | Adequate | 100% (n=2) | Adequate | 100% (n=2) | |
| | | | | | Less than Adequate | 50% (n=1) | | | | | | | |
| Kent | Adequate | 100% (n=2) | Adequate | 100% (n=2) | More than Adequate | 100% (n=1) | Adequate | 100% (n=1) | Adequate | 100% (n=1) | Adequate | 50% (n=1) | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | Less than Adequate | 50% (n=1) |
| Montgomery | More than Adequate | 63% (n=5) | More than Adequate | 63% (n=5) | More than Adequate | 13% (n=1) | More than Adequate | 38% (n=3) | More than Adequate | 25% (n=1) | More than Adequate | 29% (n=2) | |
| | Adequate | 25% (n=2) | Adequate | 25% (n=2) | Adequate | 50% (n=4) | Adequate | 50% (n=4) | Adequate | 25% (n=1) | Adequate | 71% (n=5) | |
| | Less than Adequate | 13% | Less than Adequate | 13% | Less than Adequate | 38% | Less than Adequate | 13% | Less than Adequate | 50% | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|-----------------|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| | Adequate (n=1) | Adequate (n=1) | Adequate (n=3) | Adequate (n=1) | Adequate (n=2) | |
| Prince George's | More than Adequate 24% (n=5) | More than Adequate 24% (n=5) | More than Adequate 29% (n=5) | More than Adequate 10% (n=2) | More than Adequate 29% (n=5) | More than Adequate 13% (n=2) |
| | Adequate 76% (n=16) | Adequate 76% (n=16) | Adequate 59% (n=10) | Adequate 65% (n=13) | Adequate 65% (n=11) | Adequate 69% (n=11) |
| | | | Less than Adequate 12% (n=2) | Less than Adequate 25% (n=5) | Less than Adequate 6% (n=1) | Less than Adequate 19% (n=3) |
| Queen Anne's | Adequate 67% (n=2) | Adequate 67% (n=2) | More than Adequate 67% (n=2) | More than Adequate 100% (n=2) | More than Adequate 33% (n=1) | Adequate 100% (n=3) |
| | Less than Adequate 33% (n=1) | Less than Adequate 33% (n=1) | Adequate 33% (n=1) | | Adequate 33% (n=1) | |
| | | | | | Less than Adequate 33% (n=1) | |
| Saint Mary's | More than Adequate 17% (n=1) | More than Adequate 17% (n=1) | More than Adequate 33% (n=2) | More than Adequate 17% (n=1) | More than Adequate 40% (n=2) | Adequate 83% (n=5) |
| | Adequate 67% (n=4) | Adequate 67% (n=4) | Adequate 50% (n=3) | Adequate 67% (n=4) | Adequate 60% (n=3) | Less than Adequate 17% (n=1) |
| | Less than Adequate 17% (n=1) | Less than Adequate 17% (n=1) | Less than Adequate 17% (n=1) | Less than Adequate 17% (n=1) | | |
| Somerset | More than Adequate 60% (n=3) | More than Adequate 60% (n=3) | More than Adequate 80% (n=4) | More than Adequate 80% (n=4) | More than Adequate 100% (n=1) | More than Adequate 25% (n=1) |

| | | | | | | |
|------------|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | Adequate 20% (n=1) | Adequate 20% (n=1) | Less than Adequate 20% (n=1) | Less than Adequate 20% (n=1) | | Adequate 50% (n=2) |
| | Less than Adequate 20% (n=1) | Less than Adequate 20% (n=1) | | | | Less than Adequate 25% (n=1) |
| Talbot | More than Adequate 50% (n=1) | More than Adequate 50% (n=1) | More than Adequate 50% (n=1) | More than Adequate 50% (n=1) | Adequate 100% (n=1) | Adequate 100% (n=2) |
| | Adequate 50% (n=1) | Adequate 50% (n=1) | Adequate 50% (n=1) | Less than Adequate 50% (n=1) | | |
| Washington | More than Adequate 43% (n=3) | More than Adequate 43% (n=3) | More than Adequate 43% (n=3) | More than Adequate 29% (n=2) | More than Adequate 25% (n=1) | More than Adequate 43% (n=3) |
| | Adequate 57% (n=4) | Adequate 57% (n=4) | Adequate 29% (n=2) | Adequate 29% (n=2) | Adequate 75% (n=3) | Adequate 14% (n=1) |
| | | | Less than Adequate 29% (n=2) | Less than Adequate 43% (n=3) | | Less than Adequate 43% (n=3) |
| Wicomico | More than Adequate 20% (n=1) | More than Adequate 20% (n=1) | More than Adequate 80% (n=4) | More than Adequate 40% (n=2) | Adequate 50% (n=) | More than Adequate 40% (n=2) |
| | Adequate 80% (n=4) | Adequate 80% (n=4) | Adequate 20% (n=1) | Adequate 60% (n=3) | Less than Adequate 50% (n=1) | Adequate 40% (n=2) |
| | | | | | | Less than Adequate 20% (n=1) |
| Worcester | Adequate 100% (n=1) | Adequate 100% (n=1) | Adequate 100% (n=1) | Adequate 100% (n=1) | Adequate 100% (n=1) | Less than Adequate 100% (n=1) |

Table 3: Responses to Support Questions for Continuing Foster Parent Survey, 11/1/08-6/30/09

| Jurisdiction | Preparation for Experiences | | Support during Experiences | |
|---------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Allegany | Effective | 100% (n=5) | Effective | 100% (n=5) |
| Anne Arundel | Very Effective | 17% (n=2) | Very Effective | 17% (n=2) |
| | Effective | 67% (n=8) | Effective | 67% (n=8) |
| | Very Ineffective | 17% (n=2) | Very Ineffective | 17% (n=2) |
| Baltimore City | Very Effective | 26% (n=13) | Very Effective | 26% (n=13) |
| | Effective | 42% (n=21) | Effective | 42% (n=21) |
| | Ineffective | 16% (n=8) | Ineffective | 16% (n=8) |
| | Very Ineffective | 16% (n=8) | Very Ineffective | 16% (n=8) |
| Baltimore County | Very Effective | 9% (n=1) | Very Effective | 9% (n=1) |
| | Effective | 45% | Effective | 45% |

| | | | | |
|------------|--|-------|--|-------|
| | Ineffective 36% (n=4) | (n=5) | Ineffective 36% (n=4) | (n=5) |
| | Very Ineffective 9% (n=1) | | Very Ineffective 9% (n=1) | |
| Calvert | Very Effective 50% (n=2) | | Very Effective 50% (n=2) | |
| | Effective 50% (n=2) | | Effective 50% (n=2) | |
| Caroline | Ineffective 100% (n=1) | | Ineffective 100% (n=1) | |
| Carroll | Effective 75% (n=6) | | Effective 75% (n=6) | |
| | Ineffective 25% (n=2) | | Ineffective 25% (n=2) | |
| Cecil | Very Effective 67% (n=2) | | Very Effective 67% (n=2) | |
| | Effective 33% (n=1) | | Effective 33% (n=1) | |
| Charles | Very Effective 67% (n=2) | | Very Effective 67% (n=2) | |
| | Effective 33% (n=1) | | Effective 33% (n=1) | |
| Dorchester | Very Effective 80% | | Very Effective 80% | |

| | | | | |
|------------|----------------|----------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| | | (n=4) | | (n=4) |
| | Effective | 20% (n=1) | Effective | 20% (n=1) |
| Frederick | Effective | 86% (n=6) | Effective | 86% (n=6) |
| | Ineffective | 14% (n=1) | Ineffective | 14% (n=1) |
| Garrett | Very Effective | 14% (n=1) | Very Effective | 14% (n=1) |
| | Effective | 86% (n=6) | Effective | 86% (n=6) |
| Harford | Very Effective | 57% (n=4) | Very Effective | 57% (n=4) |
| | Effective | 43% (n=3) | Effective | 43% (n=3) |
| Howard | Effective | 100% (n=2) | Effective | 100% (n=2) |
| Kent | Effective | 100% (n=2) | Effective | 100% (n=2) |
| Montgomery | Very Effective | 50% (n=4) | Very Effective | 50% (n=4) |
| | Effective | 38% (n=3) | Effective | 38% (n=3) |
| | Ineffective | 13% | Ineffective | 13% |

| | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | (n=1) | (n=1) |
| Prince George's | Very Effective 50% (n=9) | Very Effective 50% (n=9) |
| | Effective 44% (n=8) | Effective 44% (n=8) |
| | Very Ineffective 6% (n=1) | Very Ineffective 6% (n=1) |
| Queen Anne's | Very Effective 67% (n=2) | Very Effective 67% (n=2) |
| | Effective 33% (n=1) | Effective 33% (n=1) |
| Saint Mary's | Very Effective 17% (n=1) | Very Effective 17% (n=1) |
| | Effective 67% (n=4) | Effective 67% (n=4) |
| | Ineffective 17% (n=1) | Ineffective 17% (n=1) |
| Somerset | Very Effective 60% (n=3) | Very Effective 60% (n=3) |
| | Effective 20% (n=1) | Effective 20% (n=1) |

| | | | | |
|------------|------------------|----------------------|------------------|----------------------|
| | Ineffective | 20% (n=1) | Ineffective | 20% (n=1) |
| Talbot | Very Effective | 50% (n=1) | Very Effective | 50% (n=1) |
| | Very Ineffective | 50% (n=1) | Very Ineffective | 50% (n=1) |
| Washington | Very Effective | 29% (n=2) | Very Effective | 29% (n=2) |
| | Effective | 57% (n=4) | Effective | 57% (n=4) |
| | Very Ineffective | 14% (n=1) | Very Ineffective | 14% (n=1) |
| Wicomico | Very Effective | 20% (n=1) | Very Effective | 20% (n=1) |
| | Effective | 60% (n=3) | Effective | 60% (n=3) |
| | Ineffective | 20% (n=1) | Ineffective | 20% (n=1) |
| Worcester | Very Effective | 100% (n=1) | Very Effective | 100% (n=1) |