



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

**“There is value in knowing you are serving
another human being”**

Annual Report of the Maryland Foster Parent Survey

Sara Moothart, MSW
Program Administrative Specialist

Gillian Gregory, MSW
Project Manager

Nina Esaki, Ph.D., MSW, MBA
Co-Principal Investigator

August 2010



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 Sara Moothart. Jonalyn Denlinger assisted in data collection, coding and data entry for this report. Dr. Nina Esaki provided the editorial review. Dr. Diane DePanfilis, as the Principal Investigator, manages the interagency agreement for Quality Assurance efforts, 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.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	2
Introduction	4
Summary Comparing 2009 Findings to 2010.....	5
Methodology.....	5
Response Rate	6
Sample Description	6
Sample Demographics.....	7
Motivation for Becoming a Foster Parent	8
Aware of a Child who Needed a Caregiver.....	8
Adoption	8
Caring for a Family Member	9
Personal Experience	9
Training and Preparation	9
Ongoing Training Needs	10
Scheduling Training to Accommodate Foster Parents	10
Training to Address the Emotional Impact of Fostering	11
Staffing & Support from the Agency	11
Consistency and Availability of Staff.....	12
Communication as a Support Mechanism	13
Utilization of Available Resources	14
Exit Reasons.....	15
Behavior Problems	15
Adoption	16
Needing a Break	16
Problems with the Agency & Staff	16
Recruitment and Retention Efforts.....	16
Improvement for Relative Caregivers.....	16
Support with Behavior Modification.....	17
Engaging Foster Parents as Recruiters	17
Accurate and Timely Communication Methods	17
Strategies	18
Appendix A: Exit Interview Data.....	19
Appendix B: Continuing Interview Data.....	29

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.

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 FY2010 survey. The report opens with a discussion of methodology and describes the sample of 257 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.

Summary Comparing 2009 Findings to 2010

This annual report revealed some differences from this reporting period (July 1, 2009 to June 30, 2010) compared to the previous reporting period (November 1, 2008 to June 30, 2009), as well as some similarities. Most of the demographics had minimal variance from the last reporting period to the current, with the exception of race. The majority of respondents for both periods identified as African-American or Caucasian, however last year, 55% of the respondents were Caucasian and 41% were African-American. This reporting period reflected the opposite, with 55% respondents identifying as African-American and 40% as Caucasian.

Generally, the findings for training and support questions were consistent for both reporting periods. However, the main reason for withdrawal for 2009 was due to life situation changes (52%), while the primary reason for leaving for 2010 was the result of problems with the agency (51%).

Through analysis of the qualitative data, some themes reemerged such as adoption being a key reason for entry into foster care, underutilization of the Foster Parent Association across jurisdictions, and the importance of consistent communication. It is important to note that many of the strategies recommended in last year's final report, are also proposed in this report. These strategies include a focus on:

- Support for relative caregivers
- Support with behavior modification
- Engaging foster parents as recruiters, and
- Sharing accurate information in a timely manner.

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. A total of 1314 calls were made for exited foster parents and 790 for continuing foster parents.

Response Rate

Outcome of Attempted Phone Interviews	Exited (N=1314)	Continuing (N=790)
Completed	10%	17%
Messages	52%	55%
Disconnected	12%	6%
Wrong Number	5%	3%
No Message Left	13%	12%
Busy	5%	2%
Declined	3%	5%

Sample Description

The sample included 125 exited foster parents and 132 continuing foster parents. The exited sample included all foster parents who exited the Maryland resource family system between January 31, 2008 to September 30, 2009. The continuing sample included a random sample of all foster parents who were active in the Maryland resource family system as of November 24, 2008 between April 30, 2009. Exited samples are typically provided to UMB by DHR/SSA based on those who exited the system by jurisdiction for each quarter. There were approximately 376 former foster parents in the exit sample for this reporting period. In April 2009, DHR/SSA submitted a list of over 5000 cases to UMB to use for ongoing continuing samples. This sample was used for this reporting period and a stratified random sample of cases was pulled each quarter with Baltimore City presenting approximately 30%.

Demographics of the sample are provided in the table that follows. The majority of the respondents for the exited (54%) and continuing (62%) samples were married. Eighteen percent of both samples were single. Continuing foster parents were a few years older than exited foster parents, with an average age of 46 for continuing and 36 for exited. The majority of the respondents identified as African-American or Caucasian. Most respondents for both exited and continuing samples reported that they worked full time. However, 25% of exited reported that they were unemployed. The majority of respondents for both the exited (74%) and continuing (78%) samples had post high school education.

The average number of children fostered by continuing (1.8) was slightly higher than exited (.7), although the average length of service was longer for exited (4.3 years) foster parents than continuing (3.6 years). A smaller percentage of exited foster parents (20%) adopted children from foster care than did continuing foster parents (38%).

Sample Demographics

	Exited (N=94)	Continuing (N=117)
Marital Status		
Married	54%	62%
Separated	1%	4%
Divorced	14%	13%
Widowed	12%	3%
Single/Never Married	18%	18%
Same Sex Partnership	0%	0%
Other	1%	0%
Age (mean)	51 yrs.	45 yrs.
Race	(N=88)	(N=116)
African-American	65%	47%
American Indian	0%	0%
Asian/Pacific Islander	2%	0%
Caucasian	32%	49%
Hispanic	1%	1%
More than one Race	0%	3%
Employment Status	(N=84)	(N=112)
Full Time	43%	59%
Part Time	12%	7%
Retired	19%	16%
Unemployed	25%	1%
Student	1%	0%
Highest Educational Level	(N=67)	(N=110)
Less than High School	4%	6%
High School/GED	22%	16%
Some College	31%	36%
Associates	13%	8%
College Graduate	13%	15%
Some Graduate	4%	1%
Graduate Degree	13%	18%

Fostering Experience

# Children Fostered (mean)	.7 (range 0-6)	1.8 (range 0-6)
Length of Foster Parenting (mean)	4.3 years (range 0-25)	3.6 years (range 0-24)
# of Foster Families Who Adopted	24 (out of 118) 20%	47 (out of 125) 38%
Adopted Foster Children (mean)	1.8 (range 0-8)	1.6 (range 0-4)

*The "N" for the fields in the sample demographics is different because respondents are given the choice to not respond to any questions they do not want to answer.

Motivation for Becoming a Foster Parent

Interviews began by asking respondents why they chose to become a foster parent. Stories and specific motivation varied among respondents, but responses could be categorized into the five overarching themes. Adoption, caring for a family member, knowing of a child who was in need of a caregiver, giving back to the community, and one's own personal experience all emerged as main reasons factoring in to the respondent's decision to foster. The sentiment conveyed by the majority of foster parents was that they wanted to help a child in need by providing safety and love.

Aware of a Child who Needed a Caregiver

Numerous respondents were non-relatives who knew of a specific child in need of a caregiver. These respondents had come to know the child through a previous relationship such as a neighbor, teacher, or family friend. One foster parent told us, "I knew the children. They were the children that lived next door to me. Social services let me take the younger kids to dance class and the kids begged me to live with me." Another foster parent reported, "I was working (school teacher) and our secretary's niece needed a foster family so we took her and we like it so we keep doing it."

Adoption

Adoption was again identified as the main reason why many respondents decided to become foster parents, as evidenced by a parent who reported, "My desire was really motivated by eventual adoption. I saw several programs on television about orphans in other countries. I was in a position to help kids in the United States, so I did." Another family made the decision to pursue foster care as a means to add to their already growing family, "We only had one child

and we wanted to have another one. We wanted to do foster care to adopt.” The possibility of adopting a child through the foster care system is a motivating factor for many potential foster parents. Therefore, recruitment efforts should be directed toward prospective adoptive parents.

Caring for a Family Member

Many respondents were motivated to provide care for relatives due to concern that siblings may be separated from one another or in hopes of “keeping the family together”. One foster parent accounts, “They are my grandchildren and we didn't want them to be separated.” Another foster parent replied, “It was my family and I didn't want them to be with strangers. I wanted to keep the family together.” Engaging family members for foster parent service should be a strong focus of recruitment efforts.

Personal Experience

Previous personal experience tended to be a driving force in several respondents’ decision to become a foster parent. Although the personal experiences that were shared varied in degree and nature, each generated a desire to be a part of the foster parent program. One respondent replied, “I worked with at risk youth in college and did mentoring for foster kids. I always thought that was something I wanted to do.” Another foster parent reported, “I am an adopted kid myself so I am all for adoption and foster.”

Training and Preparation

Continuing and exited respondents were asked to assess the effectiveness of the training in preparation for their role as a foster parent. This section addresses training and support for foster parents prior to taking children into their home.

Training for Foster Parents	Exited (N=95)	Continuing (N=115)
More than Adequate	27%	33%
Adequate	62%	57%
Less than Adequate	11%	10%

The training received was adequate for more than half of the respondents for both exited (62%) and continuing (57%), and more than adequate for 27% of exited and 33% of continuing respondents. Eleven percent of exited foster parents and 10% of continuing foster parents felt the training was less than adequate.

Effective Preparation by Agency	Exited (N=86)	Continuing (N=115)
Very Effective	31%	26%
Effective	49%	49%
Ineffective	15%	16%
Very Ineffective	5%	9%

Nearly half of the respondents (49%) for both exited and continuing reported that the agency was effective in preparing them for their experiences as foster parents. Over 25% found the agency to be “very effective” in preparing them. Very few of the exited (5%) and continuing (9%) foster parents rated agency preparation as “very ineffective”.

Foster parents identified training as a helpful tool in becoming equipped to effectively care for a child placed with them. Many respondents advised perspective foster parents to participate in as much training as possible. One respondent stated, “I would advise them to take classes and take anything that they can grab out there. The things that we need under our belt to be good foster parents are counseling and education.” Another respondent indicated it would be wise to learn about specifics in childhood development and trauma, “Be educated on every aspect of the behavior of the child, especially those who have been abused sexually, physically, and emotionally.”

Ongoing Training Needs

The training was rated as adequate by the majority of foster parents; however, respondents did indicate they would feel better prepared for fostering if the training provided further detailed information regarding different aspects of foster parenting. Specific suggestions included:

- How to better cooperate with biological parents,
- Child and adolescent development,
- Behavior management techniques,
- General mental health issues
- Preparing emotionally for fostering
- Agency rules and regulations, and
- Licensing requirements.

Scheduling Training to Accommodate Foster Parents

Foster parents also identified barriers that prevented them from being fully engaged, which affected their ability to learn from and enjoy the training. As evidenced by the quantitative data previously reported, 59% of continuing and 43% of exited respondents reported being employed full time. As such, many foster parents found it to be challenging to take time away from work to attend foster parent trainings. One foster parent recommended “Saturday classes” to accommodate those who have conflicting work schedules. Additionally, some foster parents

found it difficult to attend training due to lack of childcare resources. This may account for early attrition of perspective foster parents. One foster parent shared her thoughts on this and stated, "I think a lot of people drop out because there is no place to take the children during the meetings."

Training to Address the Emotional Impact of Fostering

Several respondents also suggested that greater emphasis be placed on preparing fostering parents for dealing with the emotional aspect of fostering. In particular, emotionally challenging situations may arise during times of transition, interactions with biological parents, reunification of foster child with biological family, and general difficulties when parenting. One foster parent indicated, "The emotional stress of dealing with the children's biological families was very difficult." Another foster parent echoed that statement, "The worst part was seeing the child go for visits to the biological parents. It was a very emotional experience for my husband and myself." A third foster parent stated, "The uncertainty of it all is really hard. Wondering if you should put your guard up and not get emotionally hurt or show your feelings is difficult." Still another parent revealed, "They didn't really explain how emotional things were going to get. It would've been nice to have some preparation for the emotional experience."

Although DHR should not be expected to anticipate and provide emotional preparation for every situation a foster family may experience, it is recommended that a component of training address "emotional challenges" while fostering. Additionally, on-going support services should be made available to foster parents in the form of regular contact with their workers. Increased contact could help to reduce foster parents' anxiety and frustration and promote greater feelings of success.

Staffing & Support from the Agency

Support from the Agency	Exited (N=91)	Continuing (N=119)
More than Adequate	23%	30%
Adequate	44%	51%
Less than Adequate	33%	19%

Agency support was rated as adequate for 44% of exited and 51% of continuing foster parents. Twenty-three percent of exited and 30% of continuing respondents indicated that the support was more than adequate. However, 33% of exited and 19% of continuing respondents felt the support was less than adequate.

Effectiveness of Agency Support	Exited (N=88)	Continuing (N=115)
Very Effective	29%	26%
Effective	42%	49%
Ineffective	19%	16%
Very Ineffective	10%	9%

Exited and continuing respondents provided comparable ratings of the effectiveness of agency support. For exited, 42% felt that the support was effective and 29% rated the support as very effective. Almost half (49%) of the continuing respondents reported that agency support was effective, while 26% felt the support was very effective.

Consistency and Availability of Staff

Respondents reported consistency and availability of workers were key elements in creating an environment that encourages retention of foster parents. Foster parents felt best supported when DHR personnel stayed consistent and were available to help guide foster families in meeting the needs of foster children. For example this foster parent recalled, "They were very organized and on top of the case. They made it easier for us. When we would call they would always answers our questions or get right back to us. If our case workers weren't there someone was always willing to help."

Alternatively, some foster families had challenging experiences. One foster parent stated, "My assigned social worker never responded to my emails or phone calls. I'd have to track her down." Another foster parent said, "There is a lot of turn-over and the ones that you deal with are hard to deal with sometimes. The system as a whole is just so overwhelmed." Retention of workers, and the reduction of staff turnover may prove to alleviate some of the challenges that foster parents report. Foster families may feel more inclined to continuing fostering if they have a consistent worker with whom they can build a solid working relationship.

Support from Child's Worker	Exited (N=83)	Continuing (N=113)
More than Adequate	28%	44%
Adequate	43%	36%
Less than Adequate	29%	20%

Ratings of support from the child's worker varied. 44% of the continuing respondents indicated that the support received from the child's worker was more than adequate, while 43% of exited respondents rated the support as adequate. Twenty-eight percent of exited

foster parents reported that the support was more than adequate, however 29% of exited felt the support was less than adequate. In addition, 20% of continuing foster parents felt the support was less than adequate, and 36% rated the support as adequate.

The qualitative data was consistent with the percentages above and revealed mixed experiences ranging from contentment to feeling unsupported. One parent reported, "I knew all the workers and was able to ask for things I needed. They were very active in helping me." Another added, "they were there whenever I needed them". However, some foster parents were less than satisfied with the support but contributed some of it to staffing issues within the department. One parent felt that the caseworkers were "overworked", and another stated that, "The caseload is too much for them to handle".

Support from Resource Workers	Exited (N=94)	Continuing (N=118)
More than Adequate	31%	39%
Adequate	42%	42%
Less than Adequate	27%	19%

42% of continuing and exited respondents rated the support received from the resource worker as adequate. Thirty-one percent of exited and 39% of continuing found the support to be more than adequate. Less than 30% for both exited and continuing found the support received from the resource workers as less than adequate.

Communication as a Support Mechanism

Greater communication with personnel is another component that foster parents indicated would enhance feelings of success and increase support during fostering. For some, understanding the system was challenging as evidenced by a parent who reported, "There was a lot of confusion and we didn't know what the procedure was".

Some respondents reported that they would feel better support if they had more information about safety, or health issues prior to accepting that child. One foster parent said, "Sometimes things that are known aren't presented to us. If we had a heads up we could have handled things better or differently. We had one foster child that had attacked his previous foster parents. It would have been nice to have that information." Another foster parent dealt with a similar situation and did not feel supported by her worker, "I had a child with depression and I was lacking in information and knowledge. They were not very helpful."

Many foster parents reported feeling alienated and isolated from the agency because they were not able to reach their worker. “They need to be there more. It seems like they just dropped the kids off at the house and that was it. I felt like I was totally on my own.” This foster parent reported a similar experience, “You would think that they would help you. When I got this child they just dropped her off and left me. I didn't even know what to do.” Providing a network of both DHR staff and other foster parents that are available 24/7 to provide support services would likely alleviate feelings of isolation and increase feelings of parenting success. This may have a direct impact on retention of foster parents.

Respondents overwhelmingly indicated that timely communication would go a long way to support them in fostering. Improvement in the timeliness in which workers respond to questions, concerns, or emergent situations could greatly enhance retention of foster families.

Utilization of Available Resources

In this survey, respondents were asked to rate the support received through resources such as the foster parent association as well as the sufficiency of the board rate provided to care for children in care.

	Exited (N=17)	Continuing (N=46)
Support from the Foster Parent Association		
More than Adequate	12%	24%
Adequate	76%	59%
Less than Adequate	12%	17%

Support from the Foster Parent Association was rated as adequate for 76% of exited and 59% of continuing respondents. Most foster parents were unable to respond to this item because they were not aware of the Association, they were not involved, or there was no established Association in their jurisdiction. Although Foster Parent Associations seem to be underutilized, some parents have benefited from the Association and encourage others to “get involved”. The Association could be used as a resource for information and support for new and experienced foster parents.

	Exited (N=71)	Continuing (N=110)
Foster Parent Board Rate		
More than Adequate	15%	18%
Adequate	44%	57%
Less than Adequate	41%	25%

The majority of exited (44%) and continuing (57%) respondents rated the board rate as adequate. These respondents felt it was an appropriate amount to take care of the child in their care. However, 41% of exited and 25% of continuing foster parents rated the board rate as less than adequate, with some reporting that they had to use their own resources. Only 15% of exited and 18% of continuing reported that the rate was more than adequate. Assessing the board rate periodically, particularly as the child ages, could be helpful to foster parents who struggle to meet the basic needs of the child.

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=122*)
My life situation changed	43%
Problems with the Agency	51%
Problems with the children in my home	5%
Other	43%

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

More than half of the respondents (51%) indicated that they withdrew from the foster care system due to problems with the agency, while an equal amount of respondents (43%) withdrew due to their life situation changing or other reasons. Some of the “Other” reasons included finalized adoptions, the child aged out of care, or was reunified with the family of origin.

Behavior Problems

Behavior and emotional challenges was cited as a reason for withdrawal for some foster parents. Several respondents felt that they were unable and unwilling to care for children with challenging behaviors. One parent stated that, “The kids became rebellious and it was difficult for me to care for them”. Another reported, “She had ADHD and I couldn’t control her”. Many respondents indicated that more information about the children would have been helpful in preparing them to meet the needs of the children.

Adoption

Many foster parents entered into foster care with the primary goal of adoption, therefore once the adoption was achieved, they withdrew from the system. One parent stated, "We only went to fostering to adopt our nephew". Often times, those who adopt chose to not foster other children.

Needing a Break

Several foster families decided to withdraw as the result of feeling overwhelmed in managing their own lives as well as caring for a foster child. One parent stated, "My son and husband felt tremendous stress so it wasn't a good situation for us any longer". Another responded, "I'm a single mom and my oldest daughter has been too difficult. I needed a break". Some of the older caregivers felt that they were ready to retire and enter into a new phase of their life.

Problems with the Agency & Staff

Unpleasant and unproductive interactions with agency staff was cause for withdrawal for some foster parents. Many cited "communication problems" as the source of frustration, which caused some parents to feel unappreciated. This parent reported, "We had terrible communication interactions with the workers and there was lack of support from the agency. No one wanted to help us with the immediate needs of the children." Some felt that they had adversarial relationships with their caseworkers, which made it difficult to carry on as a foster parent, as evidenced by a parent who stated, "I didn't continue because I didn't feel respected".

Recruitment and Retention Efforts

This study's findings suggest that recruitment and retention efforts be focused around means to offer increased support and guidance to foster parents in the State of Maryland. Increased efforts to engage foster parents on multiple levels will undoubtedly empower foster families to continue to provide safe and healthy homes on a long-term basis. Recommendations included in this section include specific ways that DHR/SSA might improve their recruitment and retention efforts.

Improvement for Relative Caregivers

Respondents who decided to become foster parents in response to a relative in need of care comprise a large majority of the foster parents interviewed for this study. Although the agency makes concerted efforts to identify relatives as resources for placements, more relatives may be retained if efforts were increased to explore the unique complexities that these foster families face. Aiding families in accessing financial and other supportive resources is identified as the foremost necessity for relative caregivers. As one relative caregiver commented, "They could

have allowed me to know the resources that are available to me. I have been taking care of my grandson on my own up until two months ago completely."

Visitation with the child's biological parents is another area that relative caregivers face unique challenges. Presenting means of establishing concrete boundaries between relatives and biological parents, offering better preparation for relative caregivers prior to visitation and providing opportunities to 'debrief' after visitation may help to ensure minimal placement disruptions.

Support with Behavior Modification

Foster parents recalled not feeling confident in caseworkers to help problem solve and address crises. One foster parent said, "Most of the problem is when the children have behavior difficulties and you feel like you are on your own. There is no one to help you with solving the problem. Not a lot of solutions are taught to you. You can't reach them easily." 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 care workers need to be educated in child development and behavior management techniques in order to confidently provide foster families the tool necessary to address inappropriate behaviors.

Another helpful tool would be to establish support groups for foster parents that focus on dealing with disruptive foster children. Establishing creative solutions to alleviate obstacles that make it difficult for foster parents to attend trainings is imperative. Many foster parents cited scheduling and childcare conflicts as barriers to participating in the trainings and the Foster Parent Association. Thoughtful planning is necessary to address ways to provide feedback, information, and encouragement to foster parents, which could be a productive mechanism that might help to retain foster parents.

Engaging Foster Parents as Recruiters

Foster parents that have had successful experiences can be the State's greatest ally in furthering recruitment and retention efforts. Many foster parents describe their experience as "rewarding" and "worth it." Greater collaboration with enthusiastic foster families through formalized networking may prove to be a rewarding component in the State's campaign. Foster families can offer exceptional advice and perspective to potential participants, which may strengthen motivation.

Accurate and Timely Communication Methods

Some foster parents reported a lack of timely response from their assigned worker in regards to questions or concerns. Consequently, some foster parents felt unsupported and isolated while providing care for foster children. First, it would be beneficial to offer alternative means in

which foster parents can access their caseworker or other support staff. This may include access to alternative telephone numbers for workers, additional telephone line support staff, and access to a crisis line and/or making available community resource agents specific to foster care. Additionally workers should make every attempt to maintain ongoing correspondence with foster parents. This will provide a conduit to allow foster parents to properly plan and care for the children placed in their home and possibly prevent disrupted placements.

Disclosing pertinent health and safety information about the child is another way to help improve retention of foster parents. This disclosure could help the family to better plan, prepare, and possibly prevent disrupted placements. Many foster families indicated they did not feel that enough information was shared about the child or family in order to feel equipped to handle potential placement complexities. In addition, it appears that most of the foster parents that participated in this study care very deeply for the children that are placed in their homes and become frustrated when information is not disclosed which could aide in establishing patterns of attachment and bonding.

Strategies

This study indicates that recruitment efforts could focus more on relative caregivers or community members who are already connected to children in need of a placement. This could allow for a smoother transition for both the child and caregiver. Also, retention of foster parents could be improved by ensuring that foster families are supported in every aspect of the process. Providing pertinent information regarding licensing, resources and support, and behavior management techniques could better prepare individuals in the role of foster parent. In addition, developing more of a partnership between the agency and the foster family is essential in establishing respectful and positive relationships that are long lasting and mutually beneficial.

Appendix A: Exit Interview Data

Table 1: Demographics for Exited Foster Parent Survey, 7/1/09-6/30/10

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=2)	57 yrs old.	African American 50% (n=1) Caucasian 50% (n=1)	Retired 100% (n=1)	Graduate Degree 100% (n=1)	1 (range 0-4)	4.2 years (0-16)	1 out of 6 17%	8 (range 0-8)
Anne Arundel	Married 50% (n=3) Divorced 50% (n=3)	46 yrs. old	African-American 40% (n=2) Caucasian 60% (n=3)	Full Time 60% (n=3) Retired 20% (n=1) Unemployed 20% (n=1)	High School 25% (n=1) Some College 25% (n=1) College Graduate 25% (n=1) Graduate Degree 25% (n=1)	0.6 (range 0-2)	0.8 years (range 0-2)	1 out of 8 13 %	2 (range 0-2)

Baltimore City	Married 43% (n=22) Divorced 8% (n=4) Widowed 18% (n=9) Single 27% (n=14) Separated 2% (n=1) Other 2% (n=1)	52 yrs. old	African-American 84% (n=42) Caucasian 16% (n=8)	Full Time 48% (n=22) Part Time 7% (n=3) Retired 24% (n=11) Unemployed 20% (n=9) Student 2% (n=1)	Less Than High School 6% (n=2) High School 29% (n=10) Some College 41% (n=14) Associate Degree 12% (n=4) College Graduate 3% (n=1) Some graduate School 3% (n=1) Graduate Degree 6% (n=2)	0.6 (range 0-4)	5.2 years (range 0-25)	9 out of 63 14%	1.6 (range 0-3)
Baltimore County	Married 40% (n=2) Divorced 40% (n=2) Widowed 20% (n=1)	53 yrs. old	African American 60% (n=3) Caucasian 40% (n=2)	Full Time 25% (n=1) Part Time 50% (n=2) Retired 25% (n=1)	Some College 25% (n=1) College Graduate 75% (n=3)	0.3 (range 0-1)	7 years (range 0-20)	2 out of 6 33.3 %	1.5 (range 0-2)
Calvert	Married 100% (n=1)	46 yrs. old	Caucasian 100% (n=1)	Unemployed 100% (n=1)		1 (range 1-1)	3 years (range 3-3)	0 out of 1 0%	0 (range 0-0)
Caroline	Married 100% (n=1)	27 yrs. old	African American 100% (n=1)	Full Time 100% (n=1)	College Graduate 100% (n=1)	1 (range 1-1)	2.5 years (range 2.5-2.5)	1 out of 2 50%	1 (range 0-1)
Carroll	Married 100% (n=2)	49 yrs. old	Caucasian 50% (n=1) Asian/Pacific Islander 50% (n=1)	Full Time 50% (n=1) Unemployed 50% (n=1)	Associate Degree 100% (n=1)	0 (range 0-0)	2.5 years (range 2.5-2.5)	1 out 2 50%	1 (0-1)

Cecil	Married 75% (n=3) Divorced 25% (n=1)	50 yrs. old	Caucasian 67% (n=2) Hispanic 33% (n=1)	Full Time 25% (n=1) Part Time 50% (n=2) Unemployed 25% (n=1)	High School 33% (n=1) Some college 33% (n=1) Associates Degree 33% (n=1)	0 (range 0-0)	3.2 years (range 0-13)	3 out of 5 60%	1.7 (0-3)
Frederick	Married 100% (n=1)	49 yrs. old	African- 100% American (n=1)	Unemployed 100% (n=1)	High School 100% (n=1)	0 (range 0-0)	1years (range 1-1)	0 out of 1 0%	0 (range 0-0)
Harford	Married 75% (n=3) Single 25% (n=1)	53 yrs. old	African- 50% American (n=2) Caucasian 50% (n=2)	Part Time 50% (n=2) Unemployed 50% (n=2)	Graduate Degree 100% (n=1)	1.3 (range 0-2)	1.9 years (range 1-3)	0 out of 4 0%	0 (range 0-0)
Howard	Married 20% (n=1) Divorced 40% (n=2) Widowed 20% (n=1) Single 20% (n=1)	54 yrs. old	African 40% American (n=2) Caucasian 60% (n=3)	Full Time 40% (n=2) Retired 40% (n=2) Unemployed 20% (n=1)	Some College 40% (n=2) Associates Degree 20% (n=1) College Graduate 20% (n=1) Some Graduate 20% (n=1)	0.2 (range 0-1)	5.4 years (range 0-23)	4 out 6 67%	1.5 (range 0-3)
Kent	Married 100% (n=1)	56 yrs. old	African 100% American (n=1)	Unemployed 100% (n=1)	Some college 100% (n=1)	1 (range 1-1)	0.3 years (range 0.3-0.3)	0 out 1 0%	0 (range 0-0)
Montgomery	Married 100% (n=4)	52 yrs. old	Caucasian 67% (n=2) Asian/ Pacific Islander 33% (n=1)	Part Time 33% (n=1) Unemployed 67% (n=2)	High School 33% (n=1) Associate Degree 33% (n=1) College Graduate 33% (n=1)	0.8 (range 0-1)	0.6 years (range 0-1)	0 out of 4 0%	0 (range 0-0)

Prince George's	Divorced 50% (n=1) Single 50% (n=1)	49 yrs. old	African American 100% (n=1)	Full Time 100% (n=1)	Some College 100% (n=1)	0.5 (range 0-1)	5 years (range 0-10)	0 out of 2 0%	0 (range 0-0)
Queen Anne's	Married 100% (n=2)	49 yrs. old	African American 100% (n=1)	Full Time 100% (n=2)	College graduate 100 % (n=1)	1.5 (range 1-2)	9 years (range 8-10)	1 out of 2 50%	1 (range 0-1)
Saint Mary's	Married 100% (n=1)	40 yrs. old	Caucasian 100% (n=1)	Full time 100% (n=1)	Graduate degree 100% (n=1)	1 (1-1)	1.5 years (1.5-1.5)	0 out of 1 0%	0 (0-0)
Washington	Married 100% (n=2)	42 yrs. old	Caucasian 100% (n=2)	Full Time 50% (n=1) Unemployed 50% (n=1)	Less Than High School 50% (n=1) Graduate Degree 50% (n=1)	2.7 (range 0-6)	2.7 years (range 0-7)	2 out of 3 67%	2 (range 0-2)

Table 2: Responses to Training Questions for Exited Foster Parent Survey, 7/1/09-6/30/10

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=3)	More than Adequate	25% (n=1)	More than Adequate	33% (n=1)	More than Adequate	33% (n=1)	Adequate	100% (n=1)	Less than Adequate	100% (n=2)
			Adequate	25% (n=1)	Adequate	33% (n=1)	Adequate	33% (n=1)				
			Less than Adequate	50% (n=2)	Less than Adequate	33% (n=1)	Less than Adequate	33% (n=1)				
Anne Arundel	More than Adequate	50% (n=3)	More than Adequate	25% (n=1)	More than Adequate	67% (n=2)	More than Adequate	25% (n=1)	Adequate	100% (n=1)	Adequate	50% (n=1)
	Adequate	50% (n=3)	Adequate	25% (n=1)	Adequate	33% (n=1)	Adequate	50% (n=2)			Less than Adequate	50% (n=1)
			Less than Adequate	50% (n=2)			Less than Adequate	25% (n=1)				
Baltimore City	More than Adequate	27% (n=14)	More than Adequate	29% (n=15)	More than Adequate	26% (n=12)	More than Adequate	18% (n=9)	More than Adequate	11% (n=1)	More than Adequate	21% (n=8)
	Adequate	61% (n=31)	Adequate	42% (n=22)	Adequate	44% (n=20)	Adequate	47% (n=24)	Adequate	78% (n=7)	Adequate	33% (n=13)
	Less than Adequate	12% (n=6)	Less than Adequate	29% (n=15)	Less than Adequate	30% (n=14)	Less than Adequate	35% (n=18)	Less than Adequate	11% (n=1)	Less than Adequate	46% (n=18)
Baltimore County	More than Adequate	17% (n=1)	More than Adequate	20% (n=1)	More than Adequate	20% (n=1)	More than Adequate	20% (n=1)	Adequate	100% (n=1)	Adequate	60% (n=3)
	Adequate	83% (n=5)	Adequate	80% (n=4)	Adequate	40% (n=2)	Adequate	60% (n=3)			Less than Adequate	40% (n=2)
					Less than Adequate	40% (n=2)	Less than Adequate	20% (n=1)				

Calvert	More than Adequate	100% (n=1)	More than Adequate	100% (n=1)		More than Adequate	100% (n=1)			
Caroline				Adequate	100% (n=1)					
Carroll	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	50% (n=1)
	Adequate	50% (n=1)	Less than Adequate	50% (n=1)	Less than Adequate	50% (n=1)	Less than Adequate	50% (n=1)	Less than Adequate	50% (n=1)
Cecil	Adequate	50% (n=2)	More than Adequate	25% (n=1)	More than Adequate	25% (n=1)	More than Adequate	25% (n=1)	Adequate	100% (n=1)
	Less than Adequate	50% (n=2)	Adequate	25% (n=1)	Adequate	25% (n=1)	Adequate	50% (n=2)	Less than Adequate	67% (n=2)
			Less than Adequate	50% (n=2)	Less than Adequate	50% (n=2)	Less than Adequate	25% (n=1)		
Frederick	Adequate	100% (n=1)	Adequate	100% (n=1)	Adequate	100% (n=1)	Adequate	100% (n=1)		
Harford	More than Adequate	33% (n=1)	More than Adequate	25% (n=1)	More than Adequate	67% (n=2)	Adequate	67% (n=2)	Adequate	100% (n=1)
	Adequate	67% (n=2)	Adequate	75% (n=3)	Adequate	33% (n=1)	Less than Adequate	33% (n=1)	Adequate	67% (n=2)
Howard	More than Adequate	40% (n=2)	More than Adequate	60% (n=3)	More than Adequate	40% (n=2)	More than Adequate	60% (n=3)	Adequate	100% (n=1)
	Adequate	60% (n=3)	Adequate	40% (n=2)	Adequate	60% (n=3)	Adequate	20% (n=1)	Less than Adequate	20% (n=1)
Kent	Adequate	100% (n=1)	Less than Adequate	100% (n=1)	Adequate	100% (n=1)	Less than Adequate	100% (n=1)	Adequate	100% (n=1)

Montgomery	More than Adequate	33% (n=1)	More than Adequate	33% (n=1)	More than Adequate	67% (n=2)	Adequate	67% (n=2)		Adequate	67% (n=2)	
	Adequate	33% (n=1)	Adequate	33% (n=1)	Less than Adequate	33% (n=1)	Less than Adequate	33% (n=1)		Less than Adequate	33% (n=1)	
	Less than Adequate	33% (n=1)	Less than Adequate	33% (n=1)								
Prince George's	Adequate	100% (n=2)	More than Adequate	50% (n=1)	Adequate	100% (n=1)	More than Adequate	50% (n=1)	Adequate	100% (n=1)	Less than Adequate	100% (n=1)
			Adequate	50% (n=1)			Adequate	50% (n=1)				
Queen Anne's	Adequate	50% (n=1)	Adequate	50% (n=1)	Less than Adequate	100% (n=2)	Less than Adequate	100% (n=2)			Adequate	50% (n=1)
	Less than Adequate	50% (n=1)	Less than Adequate	50% (n=1)							Less than Adequate	50% (n=1)
Saint Mary's	More than Adequate	100% (n=1)	More than Adequate	100% (n=1)			More than Adequate	100% (n=1)	Adequate	100% (n=1)	Adequate	100% (n=1)
Washington	More than Adequate	33% (n=1)	More than Adequate	33% (n=1)	Adequate	67% (n=2)	More than Adequate	33% (n=1)			More than Adequate	50% (n=1)
	Adequate	67% (n=2)	Adequate	67% (n=2)	Less than Adequate	33% (n=1)	Adequate	33% (n=1)			Adequate	50% (n=1)
							Less than Adequate	33% (n=1)				

Table 3: Responses to Support Questions for Exited Foster Parent Survey, 7/1/09-6/30/10

Jurisdiction	Preparation for Experiences		Support during Experiences	
Allegany	Effective	100% (n=2)	Ineffective	67% (n=2)
			Very Ineffective	33% (n=1)
Anne Arundel	Very Effective	40% (n=2)	Very Effective	33% (n=1)
	Effective	40% (n=2)	Effective	33% (n=1)
	Ineffective	20% (n=1)	Ineffective	33% (n=1)

Baltimore City	Very Effective	35% (n=16)	Very Effective	27% (n=13)
	Effective	41% (n=19)	Effective	43% (n=21)
	Ineffective	15% (n=7)	Ineffective	16% (n=8)
	Very Ineffective	9% (n=4)	Very Ineffective	14% (n=7)
Baltimore County	Effective	100% (n=6)	Very Effective	40% (n=2)
			Effective	40% (n=2)
			Ineffective	20% (n=1)
Calvert	Effective	100% (n=1)	Effective	100% (n=1)
Carroll	Very Effective	50% (n=1)	Very Effective	50% (n=1)
	Effective	50% (n=1)	Ineffective	50% (n=1)
Cecil	Effective	75% (n=3)	Very effective	25% (n=1)
	Ineffective	25% (n=1)	Effective	25% (n=1)
			Very Ineffective	50% (n=2)
Frederick	Effective	100% (n=1)	Effective	100% (n=1)

Harford	Very Effective	67% (n=2)	Very Effective	25% (n=1)
	Effective	33% (n=1)	Effective	75% (n=3)
Howard	Very Effective	40% (n=2)	Very Effective	60% (n=3)
	Effective	40% (n=2)	Effective	20% (n=1)
	Ineffective	20% (n=1)	Ineffective	20% (n=1)
Kent	Effective	100% (n=1)	Ineffective	100% (n=1)
Montgomery	Very Effective	33% (n=1)	Effective	100% (n=3)
	Ineffective	67% (n=2)		
Prince George's	Effective	100% (n=1)	Effective	100% (n=1)
Queen Anne's	Effective	50% (n=1)	Ineffective	100% (n=2)
	Ineffective	50% (n=1)		
Saint Mary's	Very Effective	100% (n=1)	Effective	100% (n=1)
Washington	Very Effective	67% (n=2)	Very Effective	67% (n=2)
	Effective	33% (n=1)	Effective	33% (n=1)

Appendix B: Continuing Interview Data

Table 1: Demographics for Continuing Foster Parent Survey, 7/1/09 to 6/30/10

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 80% (n=4)	56 yrs. old	African-American 20% (n=1)	Full Time 60% (n=3)	High School 20% (n=1)	2.8 (range 0-6)	7.4 (range 0-24)	2 (out of 5) 40%	1.5 (range 0-2)
	Single 20% (n=1)		Caucasian 80% (n=4)	Retired 40% (n=2)	Some College 60% (n=3) College Degree 20% (n=1)				
Anne Arundel	Married 75% (n=6)	45 yrs. old	African-American 25% (n=2)	Full Time 63% (n=5)	Some College 38% (n=3)	1.5 (range 0-3)	3.6 (range 0-24)	2 (out of 8) 25%	1.0 (range 0-1)
	Single 25% (n=2)		Caucasian 50% (n=4) More than one Race 25% (n=2)	Part Time 13% (n=1) Retired 13% (n=1) Unemployed 13% (n=1)	College Degree 38% (n=3) Some Graduate School 13% (n=1) Graduate Degree 13% (n=1)				

Baltimore City	Married 47% (n=18) Single 26% (n=10) Divorced 13% (n=5) Separated 5% (n=2) Widowed 8% (n=3)	53 yrs. old	African-American 84% (n=31) Caucasian 14% (n=5) Hispanic 3% (n=1)	Full Time 58% (n=21) Part Time 3% (n=1) Retired 22% (n=8) Unemployed 17% (n=6)	Less than High School 14% (n=5) High School 17% (n=6) Some College 40% (n=14) Associates Degree 3% (n=1) College Degree 14% (n=5) Graduate Degree 11% (n=4)	3.6 (range 0-3)	3.6 (range 0-24)	20 (out of 38) 53%	1.5 (range 0-4)
Baltimore County	Married 78% (n=7) Divorced 11% (n=1) Separated 11% (n=1)	49 yrs. old	African-American 22% (n=2) Caucasian 67% (n=6) Hispanic 11% (n=1)	Full Time 67% (n=6) Part Time 11% (n=1) Retired 11% (n=1) Unemployed 11% (n=1)	Less than High School 13% (n=1) Some College 25% (n=2) Associates Degree 13% (n=1) College Degree 13% (n=1) Graduate Degree 38% (n=3)	2.2 (range 0-4)	0.9 (range 0-4)	7 (out of 10) 70%	1.4 (range 0-2)
Calvert	Married 100% (n=5)	44 yrs. old	African-American 20% (n=1) Caucasian 80% (n=4)	Full Time 67% (n=2) Retired 33% (n=1)	Some College 33% (n=1) College Degree 33% (n=1) Graduate Degree 33% (n=1)	1.6 (range 0-3)	5.0 (range 0-24)	1 (out of 5) 20%	2.0 (range 0-2)

Caroline	Married 100% (n=1)	31 yrs. old	Caucasian 100% (n=1)	Full Time 100% (n=1)	High School 100% (n=1)	1.0 (range 0-2)	0.7 (range 0-1.4)	1 (out of 2) 50%	1.0 (range 0-1)
Carroll	Married 67% (n=2) Single 33% (n=1)	41 yrs. old	African-American 33% (n=1) Caucasian 67% (n=2)	Full Time 33% (n=1) Part Time 33% (n=1) Unemployed 33% (n=1)	Some College 67% (n=2) College Degree 33% (n=1)	1.3 (range 1-2)	0	0 (out of 3) 0%	0
Cecil	Married 100% (n=1)	52 yrs. old	Caucasian 100% (n=1)	Part Time 100% (n=1)	College Degree 100% (n=1)	2.0 (range 0-6)	4.3 (range 1-6)	1 (out of 3) 33%	1.0 (range 0-1)
Charles	Married 75% (n=3) Divorced 25% (n=1)	44 yrs. old	African-American 75% (n=3) Caucasian 25% (n=1)	Full Time 75% (n=3) Unemployed 25% (n=1)	Some College 25% (n=1) Graduate Degree 75% (n=3)	1.5 (range 0-3)	0.8 (range 0-2)	1 (out of 4) 25%	2.0 (range 0-2)
Dorchester	Married 75% (n=3) Single 25% (n=1)	53 yrs. old	African-American 50% (n=2) Caucasian 50% (n=2)	Full Time 50% (n=2) Part Time 25% (n=1) Retired 25% (n=1)	High School 67% (n=2) Associates Degree 33% (n=1)	1.5 (range 0-5)	0.9 (range 0-4)	2(out of 6) 33%	2.0 (range 0-2)
Frederick	Married 50% (n=2) Divorced 50% (n=2)	45 yrs. old	African-American 50% (n=2) Caucasian 50% (n=2)	Full Time 50% (n=2) Part Time 25% (n=1) Unemployed 25% (n=1)	High School 25% (n=1) Some College 25% (n=1) Graduate Degree 50% (n=2)	1.8 (range 0-4)	0.5 (range 0-1.2)	0 (out of 4) 0%	0
Garrett	Married 100% (n=1)	51 yrs. old	Caucasian 100% (n=1)	Unemployed 100% (n=1)	Associates Degree 100% (n=1)	1.0 (range 1-1)	2 (range 2-2)	1 (out of 1) 100%	1 (range 1-1)

Harford	Married 60% (n=6)	49 yrs. old	African- America 40% (n=4)	Full Time 30% (n=3)	High School 20% (n=2)	3.1 (range 0-6)	5.7 (range 0-22)	1 (out of 10) 10%	1 (range 0-1)
	Single 10% (n=1)		Caucasian 60% (n=6)	Retired 20% (n=2)	Some College 50% (n=5)				
	Divorced 20% (n=2)			Unemployed 50% (n=5)	College Degree 10% (n=1)				
	Widowed 10% (n=1)				Graduate Degree 20% (n=2)				
Howard	Married 75% (n=3)	49 yrs. old	Caucasian 100% (n=4)	Full Time 75% (n=3)	Some College 25% (n=1)	3.0 (range 2-4)	12.3 (range 1.5-19.5)	3 (out of 4) 75%	1.3 (range 0-2)
	Divorced 25% (n=1)			Unemployed 25% (n=1)	Associates Degree 25% (n=1)				
					College Degree 25% (n=1)				
					Graduate Degree 25% (n=1)				
Kent	Married 100% (n=1)	47 yrs. old	Caucasian 100% (n=1)	Part Time 100% (n=1)	High School 100% (n=1)	4.0 (range 4-4)	0.8 (range 0.8-0.8)	0 (out of 1) 0%	0
Montgomery	Married 75% (n=3)	52 yrs. old	African- American 25% (n=1)	Full Time 75% (n=3)	Some College 50% (n=2)	1.8 (range 0-3)	6.0 (range 0-12)	1 (out of 4) 25%	1 (range 0-1)
	Divorced 25% (n=1)		Caucasian 75% (n=3)	Unemployed 25% (n=1)	College Degree 25% (n=1)				
					Graduate Degree 25% (n=1)				

Prince George's	Married 60% (n=3) Single 20% (n=1) Separated 20% (n=1)	48 yrs. old	African-American 60% (n=3) Caucasian 40% (n=2)	Full Time 60% (n=3) Retired 40% (n=2)	Some College 20% (n=1) Associates Degree 60% (n=3) College Degree 20% (n=1)	2.0 (range 0-4)	4.2 (range 0-19)	1 (out of 6) 17%	1.0 (range 0-1)
St. Mary's	Married 100% (n=2)	53 yrs. old	Caucasian 100% (n=2)	Full Time 50% (n=1) Retired 50% (n=1)	High School 50% (n=1) Graduate Degree 50% (n=1)	2.0 (range 2-2)	17 years (range 10-24)	1 (out of 2) 50%	2 (range 0-2)
Somerset	Married 50% (n=1) Single 50% (n=1)	38 yrs. old	African-American 50% (n=1) Caucasian 50% (n=1)	Full Time 100% (n=1)	Some College 100% (n=2)	1.0 (range 1-1)	0.8 (range 0-1.5)	0 (out of 2) 0%	0
Talbot	Divorced 50% (n=1) Separated 50% (n=1)	50 yrs. old	African-American 50% (n=1) Caucasian 50% (n=1)	Full Time 100% (n=2)	High School 100% (n=2)	1.0 (range 0-2)	0	1 (out of 2) 50%	3 (range 0-3)
Washington	Married 33% (n=1) Single 33% (n=1) Divorced 33% (n=1)	46 yrs. old	Caucasian 100% (n=3)	Full Time 100% (n=3)	High School 33% (n=1) Some College 67% (n=2)	1.0 (range 0-2)	0.3 (range 0-1.5)	1 (out of 5) 20%	4 (range 0-4)
Wicomico	Single 100% (n=1)	30 yrs. Old	Caucasian 100% (n=1)	Full Time 100% (n=1)	Graduate Degree 100% (n=1)	0.0 (range 0-0)	1.8 (range 0-3.5)	1 (out of 2) 50%	3 (range 0-3)
Worcester	Married 100% (n=2)	46 yrs. old	Caucasian 100% (n=2)	Unemployed 100% (n=2)	Associates Degree 100% (n=2)	2.0 (range 2-2)	0.4 (range 0.4-0.4)	0 (out of 2) 0%	0

Table 2: Responses to Training Questions for Continuing Foster Parent Survey, 7/1/09-6/30/10

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 25% (n=1)	More than Adequate 25% (n=1)	More than Adequate 50% (n=2)	More than Adequate 50% (n=2)	More than Adequate 50% (n=1)	More than Adequate 20% (n=1)
	Adequate 25% (n=1)	Adequate 50% (n=2)	Adequate 50% (n=2)	Adequate 50% (n=2)	Adequate 50% (n=1)	Adequate 40% (n=2)
	Less than Adequate 25% (n=1)	Less than Adequate 25% (n=1)				Less than Adequate 40% (n=2)
Anne Arundel	More than Adequate 50% (n=4)	More than Adequate 50% (n=4)	More than Adequate 57% (n=4)	More than Adequate 38% (n=3)	More than Adequate 25% (n=1)	Adequate 57% (n=4)
	Adequate 50% (n=4)	Adequate 50% (n=4)	Adequate 14% (n=1)	Adequate 50% (n=4)	Adequate 75% (n=3)	Less than Adequate 43% (n=3)
			Less than Adequate 29% (n=2)	Less than Adequate 13% (n=1)		
Baltimore City	More than Adequate 34% (n=12)	More than Adequate 34% (n=12)	More than Adequate 54% (n=20)	More than Adequate 24% (n=9)	More than Adequate 18% (n=2)	More than Adequate 23% (n=8)
	Adequate 51% (n=18)	Adequate 51% (n=18)	Adequate 30% (n=11)	Adequate 58% (n=22)	Adequate 64% (n=7)	Adequate 51% (n=18)
	Less than Adequate 14% (n=5)	Less than Adequate 14% (n=5)	Less than Adequate 16% (n=6)	Less than Adequate 18% (n=7)	Less than Adequate 18% (n=2)	Less than Adequate 26% (n=9)

Baltimore County	More than Adequate	56% (n=5)	More than Adequate	56% (n=5)	More than Adequate	67% (n=6)	More than Adequate	60% (n=6)	More than Adequate	50% (n=1)	More than Adequate	11% (n=1)
	Adequate	44% (n=4)	Adequate	44% (n=4)	Adequate	11% (n=1)	Adequate	30% (n=3)	Adequate	50% (n=1)	Adequate	78% (n=7)
					Less than Adequate	22% (n=2)	Less than Adequate	10% (n=1)			Less than Adequate	11% (n=1)
Calvert	More than Adequate	40% (n=2)	More than Adequate	40% (n=2)	More than Adequate	25% (n=1)	More than Adequate	40% (n=2)	More than Adequate	25% (n=1)	More than Adequate	40% (n=2)
	Adequate	60% (n=3)	Adequate	60% (n=3)	Less than Adequate	75% (n=3)	Adequate	40% (n=2)	Adequate	50% (n=2)	Adequate	20% (n=1)
							Less than Adequate	20% (n=1)	Less than Adequate	25% (n=1)	Less than Adequate	40% (n=2)
Caroline	Adequate	100% (n=1)	Adequate	100% (n=1)	Adequate	100% (n=1)	Adequate	100% (n=1)	Less than Adequate	100% (n=1)	Adequate	100% (n=1)
Carroll	More than Adequate	67% (n=2)	More than Adequate	67% (n=2)	More than Adequate	50% (n=1)	Adequate	100% (n=2)	Adequate	100% (n=1)	Adequate	67% (n=2)
	Adequate	33% (n=1)	Adequate	33% (n=1)	Adequate	50% (n=1)					Less than Adequate	33% (n=1)
Cecil	Adequate	100% (n=3)	Adequate	100% (n=3)	More than Adequate	33% (n=1)	Adequate	33% (n=1)	Adequate	33% (n=1)	Adequate	33% (n=1)
					Less than Adequate	67% (n=2)	Less than Adequate	67% (n=2)	Less than Adequate	67% (n=2)	Less than Adequate	67% (n=2)
Charles	More than Adequate	50% (n=2)	More than Adequate	50% (n=2)	More than Adequate	67% (n=2)	More than Adequate	25% (n=1)	Adequate	50% (n=1)	Adequate	67% (n=2)
	Adequate	50% (n=2)	Adequate	50% (n=2)	Adequate	33% (n=1)	Adequate	50% (n=2)	Less than Adequate	50% (n=1)	Less than Adequate	33% (n=1)
							Less than Adequate	25% (n=1)				

Dorchester	More than Adequate	20% (n=1)	More than Adequate	20% (n=1)	More than Adequate	17% (n=1)	More than Adequate	33% (n=2)	More than Adequate	100% (n=1)	Adequate	75% (n=3)
	Adequate	80% (n=4)	Adequate	80% (n=4)	Adequate	67% (n=4)	Adequate	50% (n=3)			Less than Adequate	25% (n=1)
					Less than Adequate	17% (n=1)	Less than Adequate	17% (n=1)				
Fredrick	More than Adequate	33% (n=1)	More than Adequate	33% (n=1)	More than Adequate	25% (n=1)	More than Adequate	50% (n=2)	More than Adequate	50% (n=1)	More than Adequate	25% (n=1)
	Adequate	67% (n=2)	Adequate	67% (n=2)	Adequate	75% (n=3)	Adequate	50% (n=2)	Adequate	50% (n=1)	Adequate	50% (n=2)
											Less than Adequate	25% (n=1)
Garrett	Less than Adequate	100% (n=1)	Less than Adequate	100% (n=1)	More than Adequate	100% (n=1)	More than Adequate	100% (n=1)	Less than Adequate	100% (n=1)	Less than Adequate	100% (n=1)
Harford	More than Adequate	22% (n=2)	More than Adequate	22% (n=2)	More than Adequate	20% (n=2)	More than Adequate	10% (n=1)	More than Adequate	100% (n=1)	Adequate	80% (n=8)
	Adequate	67% (n=6)	Adequate	67% (n=6)	Adequate	50% (n=5)	Adequate	60% (n=6)			Less than Adequate	20% (n=2)
	Less than Adequate	11% (n=6)	Less than Adequate	11% (n=6)	Less than Adequate	30% (n=3)	Less than Adequate	30% (n=3)				
Howard	More than Adequate	50% (n=2)	More than Adequate	50% (n=2)	More than Adequate	50% (n=2)	More than Adequate	25% (n=1)	More than Adequate	33% (n=1)	More than Adequate	25% (n=1)
	Adequate	25% (n=1)	Adequate	25% (n=1)	Adequate	25% (n=1)	Less than Adequate	75% (n=3)	Adequate	67% (n=2)	Adequate	75% (n=3)
	Less than Adequate	25% (n=1)	Less than Adequate	25% (n=1)	Less than Adequate	25% (n=1)						
Kent	Adequate	100% (n=1)	Adequate	100% (n=1)	Adequate	100% (n=1)	Adequate	100% (n=1)			More than Adequate	100% (n=1)

Montgomery	Adequate	75% (n=3)	Adequate	75% (n=3)	More than Adequate	33% (n=1)	More than Adequate	50% (n=2)	More than Adequate	33% (n=1)	More than Adequate	67% (n=2)
	Less than Adequate	25% (n=1)	Less than Adequate	25% (n=1)	Adequate	33% (n=1)	Adequate	25% (n=1)	Adequate	67% (n=2)	Adequate	33% (n=1)
Prince George's	More than Adequate	20% (n=1)	More than Adequate	20% (n=1)	More than Adequate	20% (n=1)	More than Adequate	20% (n=1)	Adequate	100% (n=2)	Adequate	80% (n=4)
	Adequate	80% (n=4)	Adequate	80% (n=4)	Adequate	40% (n=2)	Adequate	20% (n=1)	Less than Adequate	60% (n=3)	Less than Adequate	20% (n=1)
Saint Mary's	Adequate	50% (n=1)	Adequate	50% (n=1)	More than Adequate	50% (n=1)	More than Adequate	50% (n=1)			More than Adequate	50% (n=1)
	Less than Adequate	50% (n=1)	Less than Adequate	50% (n=1)	Less than Adequate	50% (n=1)	Adequate	50% (n=1)			Less than Adequate	50% (n=1)
Somerset	Adequate	100% (n=2)	Adequate	100% (n=2)	Adequate	100% (n=2)	Adequate	100% (n=2)	Adequate	100% (n=1)	More than Adequate	50% (n=1)
											Adequate	50% (n=1)
Talbot	More than Adequate	100% (n=2)	More than Adequate	100% (n=2)	More than Adequate	50% (n=1)	More than Adequate	50% (n=1)	Adequate	100% (n=2)	Adequate	100% (n=2)
					Adequate	50% (n=1)	Adequate	50% (n=1)				
Washington	Adequate	100% (n=5)	Adequate	100% (n=5)	More than Adequate	67% (n=2)	More than Adequate	33% (n=1)	More than Adequate	100% (n=1)	Adequate	100% (n=1)
					Adequate	33% (n=1)	Adequate	67% (n=2)				

Wicomico	More than Adequate 100% (n=2)	More than Adequate 100% (n=2)	More than Adequate 50% (n=1)	More than Adequate 50% (n=1)		More than Adequate 50% (n=1)
			Adequate 50% (n=1)	Adequate 50% (n=1)		Adequate 50% (n=1)
Worcester	More than Adequate 100% (n=2)	More than Adequate 100% (n=2)	Adequate 100% (n=2)	Adequate 100% (n=2)		Adequate 100% (n=2)

Table 3: Responses to Support Questions for Continuing Foster Parent Survey, 7/1/09 to 6/30/10

Jurisdiction	Preparation for Experiences		Support during Experiences	
Allegany	Very Effective	75% (n=3)	Very Effective	25% (n=1)
	Effective	25% (n=1)	Effective	75% (n=3)
Anne Arundel	Very Effective	29% (n=2)	Very Effective	29% (n=2)
	Effective	43% (n=3)	Effective	43% (n=3)
	Ineffective	29% (n=2)	Ineffective	29% (n=2)
Baltimore City	Very Effective	28% (n=10)	Very Effective	28% (n=10)
	Effective	42% (n=15)	Effective	42% (n=15)
	Ineffective	17% (n=6)	Ineffective	17% (n=6)
	Very Ineffective	14% (n=5)	Very Ineffective	14% (n=5)
Baltimore County	Very Effective	50% (n=5)	Very Effective	50% (n=5)
	Effective	30% (n=3)	Effective	30% (n=3)
	Ineffective	20% (n=2)	Ineffective	20% (n=2)

Calvert	Very Effective	20% (n=1)	Very Effective	20% (n=1)
	Effective	80% (n=4)	Effective	80% (n=4)
Caroline	Effective	100% (n=1)	Effective	100% (n=1)
Carroll	Very Effective	33% (n=1)	Very Effective	33% (n=1)
	Effective	67% (n=2)	Effective	67% (n=2)
Cecil	Effective	33% (n=1)	Effective	33% (n=1)
	Ineffective	67% (n=2)	Ineffective	67% (n=2)
Charles	Effective	75% (n=3)	Effective	75% (n=3)
	Ineffective	25% (n=1)	Ineffective	25% (n=1)
Dorchester	Very Effective	60% (n=3)	Very Effective	60% (n=3)
	Effective	40% (n=2)	Effective	40% (n=2)
Fredrick	Very Effective	50% (n=2)	Very Effective	50% (n=2)
	Effective	25% (n=1)	Effective	25% (n=1)
	Ineffective	25% (n=1)	Ineffective	25% (n=1)
Garrett	Effective	100% (n=1)	Effective	100% (n=1)

Harford	Very Effective	10% (n=1)	Very Effective	10% (n=1)
	Effective	50% (n=5)	Effective	50% (n=5)
	Ineffective	20% (n=2)	Ineffective	20% (n=2)
	Very Ineffective	20% (n=2)	Very Ineffective	20% (n=2)
Howard	Very Effective	25% (n=1)	Very Effective	25% (n=1)
	Ineffective	75% (n=3)	Ineffective	75% (n=3)
Kent	Effective	100% (n=1)	Effective	100% (n=1)
Montgomery	Very Effective	25% (n=1)	Very Effective	25% (n=1)
	Effective	25% (n=1)	Effective	25% (n=1)
	Ineffective	25% (n=1)	Ineffective	25% (n=1)
	Very Ineffective	25% (n=1)	Very Ineffective	25% (n=1)
Prince George's	Effective	80% (n=4)	Effective	80% (n=4)
	Very Ineffective	20% (n=1)	Very Ineffective	20% (n=1)
Saint Mary's	Very Effective	50% (n=1)	Very Effective	50% (n=1)
	Ineffective	50% (n=1)	Ineffective	50% (n=1)

Somerset	Effective	100% (n=1)	Effective	100% (n=1)
Talbot	Very Effective	50% (n=1)	Very Effective	50% (n=1)
	Effective	50% (n=1)	Effective	50% (n=1)
Washington	Very Effective	33% (n=1)	Very Effective	33% (n=1)
	Effective	67% (n=2)	Effective	67% (n=2)
Wicomico	Effective	100% (n=2)	Effective	100% (n=2)
Worcester	Effective	100% (n=2)	Effective	100% (n=2)