

HEALTHY FAMILIES OREGON 2019 EVALUATION DATA TABLES



June 2020



Submitted to
Oregon Early Learning Division

Submitted by
NPC Research

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table 1a. Healthy Families Oregon Service Delivery Indicators 2019.....	1
Table 1b. Healthy Families Oregon Service Delivery Indicators 2019	4
Table 2. Healthy Families Oregon Outcome Indicators (OI) 2019	7
Table 3a. Screening and Initial Interest in Healthy Families Oregon Service 2019 Cohort (CE 1-1.C)	10
Table 3b. Service Offer: Healthy Families Oregon 2019 Cohort	13
Table 3c. Reported Location of Screen 2019	16
Table 4. Receipt and Acceptance of Healthy Families Oregon 2019 Cohort (CE 1-2.A)	19
Table 5. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service: Race/Ethnicity 2019 Cohort (CE 1-2.B, CE 5-4.B).....	22
Table 6. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service: Demographic Factors 2019 Cohort (CE 1-2.B, CE 5-4.B).....	25
Table 7. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service: Demographic Factors 2019 Cohort (CE 1-2.B, CE 5-4.B).....	28
Table 8. Retention Rates for Families Newly Enrolled 2017 (CE 3-4.B)	31
Table 9. Retention Rates for Families Newly Enrolled 2018 (CE 3-4.B)	34
Table 10a. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Race/Ethnicity for Families Enrolled 2018 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B).....	37
Table 10b. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Spoken Language for Families Enrolled 2018 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B).....	40
Table 11a. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Demographic Factors for Families Enrolled 2018 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B)	43
Table 11b. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Demographic Factors for Families Enrolled 2018 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B)	46
Table 12. Participant Reasons for Exiting Program Prior to Program Completion (CE 3-4.B)	49
Table 13a. Parent Survey (Kempe) Risk Factors for One or Both Parents/Caregivers in Intensive Service: Childrearing Characteristics	52
Table 13b. Parent Survey (Kempe) Risk Factors for One or Both Parents/Caregivers in Intensive Service.....	55
Table 13c. Parent Survey (Kempe) Risk Factors for One or Both Parents/Caregivers in Intensive Service.....	58
Table 14. Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families: Race/Ethnicity.....	61
Table 15a. NBQ Risks and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families.....	64

Table 15b. NBQ Risks and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families.....	67
Table 15c. NBQ Risks and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families.....	70
Table 15d. NBQ Risks and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families.....	73
Table 16. Health Care for Intensive Service Families: Health Care Provider & Well-Child Check-Ups.....	76
Table 17a. Health Care for Intensive Service Families: Health Insurance.....	79
Table 17b. Health Care for Intensive Service Families: Use of Emergency Room in Past 6 Months.....	82
Table 18a. Comparison of Prenatal Care and Smoke Exposure for Families Served Pre- & Postnatal.....	85
Table 18b. Comparison of Health Outcomes for Families Served Pre- & Postnatal.....	88
Table 19. Prenatal Care for Subsequent Births.....	91
Table 20a. HOME Observation/Score.....	94
Table 20b. Developmental Screening.....	97
Table 21. Developmental Screening (ASQ) Results & Subsequent Actions.....	100
Table 22. Social Emotional Developmental Screening (ASQ-SE) Results & Subsequent Actions.....	103
Table 23. Connection to Essential Resources for Intensive Service Families.....	106
Table 24a. Family Outcomes and Life Events at 6 Months.....	109
Table 24b. Family Outcomes and Life Events at 12 Months.....	112
Table 25a. Promotion of Positive Parenting Skills & Helping Children Learn.....	115
Table 25b. Promotion of Positive Parenting Skills & Helping Children Learn.....	118
Table 26a. Ratings of Home Visitor Helpfulness.....	121
Table 26b. Ratings of Home Visitor Helpfulness.....	124
Table 27a. Cultural Competency & Strength Orientation of Home Visitors 2019 (CE 5-4.B).....	127
Table 27b. Cultural Competency & Strength Orientation of Home Visitors 2019 (CE 5-4.B).....	130

Table 1a. Healthy Families Oregon Service Delivery Indicators 2019

Program/County	Number Births 2019	Number (%) Births Screened	Service Delivery Indicator #1	Service Delivery Indicator #2	Service Delivery Indicator #3			
			Number (%) Screened Prenatally or Within 2 Weeks of Birth ¹	Number (%) Receiving First HV Within 3 Months of Birth ²	% Families with 75% or More of Expected Home Visits Completed ³			
					Qtr 1 2019	Qtr 2 2019	Qtr 3 2019	Qtr 4 2019
Benton & Linn	1,807	69 (4%)	57 (83%)	24 (83%)	86%	70%	86%	80%
Benton	667	31 (5%)	26 (84%)	14 (88%)	--	--	--	--
Linn	1,140	38 (3%)	31 (82%)	10 (77%)	--	--	--	--
Clackamas	3,851	343 (9%)	289 (84%)	30 (83%)	79%	79%	89%	78%
Columbia, Clatsop, & Tillamook	1,096	128 (12%)	96 (75%)	39 (98%)	85%	85%	82%	85%
Clatsop	372	53 (14%)	42 (79%)	11 (100%)	--	--	--	--
Columbia	484	44 (9%)	29 (66%)	13 (93%)	--	--	--	--
Tillamook	240	31 (13%)	25 (81%)	15 (100%)	--	--	--	--
Coos & Curry	733	10 (1%)	8 (80%)	1 (50%)	100	76%	91%	80%
Coos	553	1 (<1%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	--	--	--	--
Curry	180	9 (5%)	7 (78%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--
Crook, Deschutes, & Jefferson	1,631	543 (33%)	528 (97%)	40 (95%)	88%	89%	90%	82%
Crook	225	67 (30%)	63 (94%)	8 (100%)	--	--	--	--
Deschutes	1,084	394 (36%)	383 (97%)	30 (94%)	--	--	--	--
Jefferson	322	82 (26%)	82 (100%)	2 (100%)	--	--	--	--
Douglas, Klamath, & Lake	1,937	252 (13%)	238 (94%)	45 (94%)	87%	93%	91%	86%
Douglas	1,039	169 (16%)	165 (98%)	16 (94%)	--	--	--	--
Klamath	817	67 (8%)	59 (88%)	23 (92%)	--	--	--	--
Lake	81	16 (20%)	14 (88%)	6 (100%)	--	--	--	--

¹ 80-94% of screens completed prenatally or within 2 weeks of birth adequately meets the Performance Standard.

² 80-94% of first home visits completed prenatally or within 3 months of birth adequately meets the Performance Standard.

³ 75% of families received 75% or more of their expected home visits *each quarter* adequately meets the Performance Standard.



Table 1a. Healthy Families Oregon Service Delivery Indicators 2019

Program/County	Number Births 2019	Number (%) Births Screened	Service Delivery Indicator #1	Service Delivery Indicator #2	Service Delivery Indicator #3			
			Number (%) Screened Prenatally or Within 2 Weeks of Birth ¹	Number (%) Receiving First HV Within 3 Months of Birth ²	% Families with 75% or More of Expected Home Visits Completed ³			
					Qtr 1 2019	Qtr 2 2019	Qtr 3 2019	Qtr 4 2019
Grant & Harney	133	35 (26%)	30 (86%)	11 (92%)	86%	75%	93%	67%
Grant	60	22 (37%)	20 (91%)	7 (100%)	--	--	--	--
Harney	73	13 (18%)	10 (77%)	4 (80%)	--	--	--	--
Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, & Wheeler	574	117 (20%)	94 (80%)	18 (86%)	80%	82%	85%	79%
Gilliam	16	3 (19%)	2 (67%)	--	--	--	--	--
Hood River	249	52 (21%)	37 (71%)	7 (78%)	--	--	--	--
Sherman	22	3 (14%)	3 (100%)	1 (100%)	--	--	--	--
Wasco	278	57 (21%)	52 (91%)	9 (100%)	--	--	--	--
Wheeler	9	2 (22%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	--	--	--	--
Josephine & Jackson	2,896	497 (17%)	466 (94%)	50 (93%)	84%	81%	77%	88%
Jackson	2,143	256 (12%)	229 (89%)	23 (88%)	--	--	--	--
Josephine	753	241 (32%)	237 (98%)	27 (96%)	--	--	--	--
Lane	3,250	754 (23%)	708 (94%)	61 (94%)	81%	89%	87%	83%
Marion & Polk	4,967	429 (9%)	396 (92%)	79 (95%)	66%	69%	75%	72%
Marion	4,087	393 (10%)	363 (92%)	73 (95%)	--	--	--	--
Polk	880	36 (4%)	33 (92%)	6 (100%)	--	--	--	--

¹ 80-94% of screens completed prenatally or within 2 weeks of birth adequately meets the Performance Standard.

² 80-94% of first home visits completed prenatally or within 3 months of birth adequately meets the Performance Standard.

³ 75% of families received 75% or more of their expected home visits adequately meets the Performance Standard.

Table 1a. Healthy Families Oregon Service Delivery Indicators 2019

Program/County	Number Births 2019	Number (%) Births Screened	Service Delivery Indicator #1	Service Delivery Indicator #2	Service Delivery Indicator #3			
			Number (%) Screened Prenatally or Within 2 Weeks of Birth ¹	Number (%) Receiving First HV Within 3 Months of Birth ²	% Families with 75% or More of Expected Home Visits Completed ³			
					Qtr 1 2019	Qtr 2 2019	Qtr 3 2019	Qtr 4 2019
Multnomah	7,973	706 (9%)	653 (92%)	139 (95%)	87%	84%	88%	82%
Umatilla, Union, & Morrow	1,389	439 (32%)	421 (96%)	31 (91%)	68%	76%	74%	65%
Morrow	163	47 (29%)	40 (85%)	2 (50%)	--	--	--	--
Umatilla	965	281 (29%)	272 (97%)	18 (95%)	--	--	--	--
Union	261	111 (43%)	109 (98%)	11 (100%)	--	--	--	--
Wallowa, Baker, & Malheur	612	99 (16%)	85 (86%)	11 (92%)	87%	97%	86%	--
Baker	157	31 (20%)	28 (90%)	4 (100%)	--	--	--	--
Malheur	388	54 (14%)	44 (81%)	5 (100%)	--	--	--	--
Wallowa	67	14 (21%)	13 (93%)	2 (67%)	--	--	--	--
Washington	6,387	204 (3%)	158 (77%)	34 (92%)	85%	78%	84%	77%
Yamhill	1,095	41 (4%)	28 (68%)	7 (100%)	75%	89%	94%	85%
State	41,758	4,666 (11%)	4,255 (91%)	620 (93%)	--	--	--	--

¹ 80-94% of screens completed prenatally or within 2 weeks of birth adequately meets the Performance Standard.

² 80-94% of first home visits completed prenatally or within 3 months of birth adequately meets the Performance Standard.

³ 75% of families received 75% or more of their expected home visits adequately meets the Performance Standard.



Table 1b. Healthy Families Oregon Service Delivery Indicators 2019

	Service Delivery Indicator #4	Service Delivery Indicator #5	Service Delivery Indicator #8	Service Delivery Indicator #9
<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) IS Families Engaged in Services for 90 Days or Longer (2019) ⁴	Number (%) Families Remaining in IS for 12 Months or Longer (enrolled 2018) ⁵	Age Appropriate ASQ Screening ⁶	Percentage of Depression Screenings ⁷
Benton & Linn	22 (73%)	19 (54%)	21 (66%)	3 (10%)
Benton	14 (78%)	13 (72%)	17 (74%)	3 (18%)
Linn	8 (67%)	6 (35%)	4 (44%)	0 (0%)
Clackamas	21 (91%)	14 (67%)	22 (81%)	33 (92%)
Columbia, Clatsop, & Tillamook	29 (94%)	34 (85%)	70 (82%)	28 (61%)
Clatsop	12 (100%)	12 (86%)	28 (88%)	6 (46%)
Columbia	8 (100%)	4 (80%)	24 (89%)	9 (56%)
Tillamook	9 (82%)	18 (86%)	18 (69%)	13 (76%)
Coos & Curry	2 (67%)	6 (75%)	2 (22%)	1 (25%)
Coos	1 (50%)	4 (67%)	2 (25%)	0 (0%)
Curry	1 (100%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)
Crook, Deschutes, & Jefferson	30 (77%)	17 (77%)	43 (74%)	29 (59%)
Crook	8 (80%)	1 (25%)	1 (50%)	2 (25%)
Deschutes	16 (70%)	11 (85%)	35 (73%)	26 (67%)
Jefferson	6 (100%)	5 (100%)	7 (88%)	1 (50%)
Douglas, Klamath, & Lake	26 (79%)	33 (67%)	37 (70%)	16 (31%)
Douglas	11 (69%)	5 (36%)	12 (80%)	10 (59%)
Klamath	11 (85%)	26 (79%)	25 (76%)	6 (23%)
Lake	4 (100%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

⁴ 75-89% of Intensive Service families engaging in services for 90 days or longer (based on date of first home visit) adequately meets the Performance Standard.

⁵ To adequately meet the Performance Standard, 50-64% of families must remain in Intensive Service for 12 months or longer.

⁶ For 2019, 90% of children receiving two TIMELY developmental screenings each year adequately meets the Performance Standard.

⁷ For 2019, 80-94% of families screened for depression prenatally (when served prenatally) and within 90 days of enrollment meets the Performance Standard.

Table 1b. Healthy Families Oregon Service Delivery Indicators 2019

	Service Delivery Indicator #4	Service Delivery Indicator #5	Service Delivery Indicator #8	Service Delivery Indicator #9
<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) IS Families Engaged in Services for 90 Days or Longer (2019) ⁴	Number (%) Families Remaining in IS for 12 Months or Longer (enrolled 2018) ⁵	Age Appropriate ASQ Screening ⁶	Percentage of Depression Screenings ⁷
Grant & Harney	9 (90%)	3 (60%)	4 (67%)	10 (83%)
Grant	4 (100%)	1 (100%)	3 (100%)	7 (100%)
Harney	5 (83%)	2 (50%)	1 (33%)	3 (60%)
Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, & Wheeler	20 (100%)	12 (80%)	37 (82%)	14 (52%)
Gilliam	--	--	--	--
Hood River	9 (100%)	10 (83%)	28 (93%)	4 (31%)
Sherman	--	--	--	1 (100%)
Wasco	9 (100%)	2 (67%)	9 (64%)	8 (73%)
Wheeler	2 (100%)	--	0 (0%)	1 (50%)
Josephine & Jackson	38 (83%)	15 (43%)	48 (81%)	22 (32%)
Jackson	18 (72%)	11 (42%)	21 (84%)	13 (36%)
Josephine	20 (95%)	4 (44%)	27 (79%)	9 (27%)
Lane	39 (85%)	30 (67%)	67 (74%)	35 (50%)
Marion & Polk	51 (84%)	29 (59%)	85 (69%)	72 (68%)
Marion	48 (83%)	25 (56%)	80 (70%)	66 (67%)
Polk	3 (100%)	4 (100%)	5 (56%)	6 (75%)

⁴ 75-89% of Intensive Service families engaging in services for 90 days or longer (based on date of first home visit) adequately meets the Performance Standard.

⁵ To adequately meet the Performance Standard, 50-64% of families must remain in Intensive Service for 12 months or longer.

⁶ For 2019, 90% of children receiving two TIMELY developmental screenings each year adequately meets the Performance Standard.

⁷ For 2019, 80-94% of families screened for depression prenatally (when served prenatally) and within 90 days of enrollment meets the Performance Standard.



Table 1b. Healthy Families Oregon Service Delivery Indicators 2019

	Service Delivery Indicator #4	Service Delivery Indicator #5	Service Delivery Indicator #8	Service Delivery Indicator #9
<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) IS Families Engaged in Services for 90 Days or Longer (2019) ⁴	Number (%) Families Remaining in IS for 12 Months or Longer (enrolled 2018) ⁵	Age Appropriate ASQ Screening ⁶	Percentage of Depression Screenings ⁷
Multnomah	91 (83%)	75 (65%)	124 (60%)	86 (48%)
Umatilla, Union, & Morrow	25 (100%)	17 (71%)	12 (55%)	5 (12%)
Morrow	5 (100%)	4 (67%)	4 (80%)	2 (50%)
Umatilla	13 (100%)	10 (71%)	7 (50%)	2 (8%)
Union	7 (100%)	3 (75%)	1 (33%)	1 (8%)
Wallowa, Baker, & Malheur	8 (67%)	7 (54%)	5 (71%)	8 (57%)
Baker	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	2 (33%)
Malheur	5 (83%)	6 (60%)	4 (80%)	4 (80%)
Wallowa	2 (67%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)
Washington	33 (94%)	36 (71%)	75 (82%)	24 (44%)
Yamhill	7 (100%)	10 (67%)	19 (76%)	5 (56%)
State	451 (85%)	357 (66%)	671 (71%)	391 (49%)

⁴ 75-89% of Intensive Service families engaging in services for 90 days or longer (based on date of first home visit) adequately meets the Performance Standard.

⁵ To adequately meet the Performance Standard, 50-64% of families must remain in Intensive Service for 12 months or longer.

⁶ For 2019, 90% of children receiving two TIMELY developmental screenings each year adequately meets the Performance Standard.

⁷ For 2019, 80-94% of families screened for depression prenatally (when served prenatally) and within 90 days of birth meets the Performance Standard.

Table 2. Healthy Families Oregon Outcome Indicators (OI) 2019

<i>Program/County</i>	OI #1 Number (%) Children with Primary Care Provider ⁸	OI #2 Number (%) Children with Up-to-Date Immunizations ⁹	OI #3 Number (%) of 2-Year-Olds with Up-to-Date Immunizations	OI #4 Number (%) Parents Reading to Child 3x Per Week or More ¹⁰	OI #4 Number (%) Parents Reporting Positive Parent-Child Interactions ¹¹	OI #5 Number (%) Parents with Reporting Reduced Parenting Stress ¹²	OI #6 Number (%) Parents Reporting HFA Oregon Helped with Social Support ¹³
Benton & Linn	54 (100%)	40 (87%)	15 (88%)	34 (85%)	36 (90%)	12 (60%)	30 (91%)
Benton	35 (100%)	29 (94%)	9 (100%)	19 (76%)	22 (88%)	7 (58%)	18 (95%)
Linn	19 (100%)	11 (73%)	6 (75%)	15 (100%)	14 (93%)	5 (63%)	12 (86%)
Clackamas	55 (100%)	34 (89%)	11 (85%)	23 (74%)	28 (90%)	15 (52%)	24 (89%)
Columbia, Clatsop, & Tillamook	124 (96%)	95 (90%)	46 (90%)	98 (96%)	99 (97%)	59 (66%)	89 (97%)
Clatsop	43 (96%)	33 (85%)	16 (80%)	38 (100%)	38 (100%)	24 (75%)	31 (100%)
Columbia	38 (95%)	31 (100%)	20 (100%)	31 (100%)	31 (100%)	18 (58%)	26 (93%)
Tillamook	43 (98%)	31 (86%)	10 (91%)	29 (88%)	30 (91%)	17 (63%)	32 (97%)
Coos & Curry	13 (100%)	7 (78%)	2 (100%)	9 (100%)	9 (100%)	5 (83%)	7 (100%)
Coos	9 (100%)	6 (86%)	2 (100%)	7 (100%)	7 (100%)	4 (80%)	6 (100%)
Curry	4 (100%)	1 (50%)	--	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Crook, Jefferson, & Deschutes	114 (99%)	71 (74%)	33 (70%)	78 (91%)	81 (94%)	48 (63%)	74 (96%)
Crook	16 (100%)	8 (67%)	3 (60%)	8 (80%)	8 (80%)	7 (88%)	6 (86%)
Deschutes	87 (99%)	54 (74%)	29 (73%)	61 (94%)	62 (95%)	39 (68%)	57 (97%)
Jefferson	11 (100%)	9 (82%)	1 (50%)	9 (82%)	11 (100%)	2 (18%)	11 (100%)
Douglas, Klamath, & Lake	85 (100%)	54 (92%)	20 (80%)	49 (84%)	56 (97%)	28 (64%)	46 (85%)
Douglas	34 (100%)	20 (91%)	8 (80%)	21 (91%)	23 (100%)	13 (65%)	18 (86%)
Klamath	45 (100%)	32 (91%)	12 (80%)	28 (82%)	32 (94%)	15 (63%)	27 (84%)
Lake	6 (100%)	2 (100%)	--	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	--	1 (100%)

⁸ 80-94% of children with a primary care provider meets the Performance Standard.

⁹ 80-89% of children with up-to-date immunizations meets the Performance Standard.

¹⁰ 80-89% of parents who report they read to their children 3 times a week or more (reported on the My Parenting Experience Survey) meets the Performance Standard.

¹¹ 80-89% of parents reporting positive parent-child interactions meets the Performance Standard.

¹² 50-64% of parents reporting reduced parenting stress meets the Performance Standard.

¹³ 80-89% of parents reporting Healthy Families Oregon helped with social support meets the Performance Standard.



Table 2. Healthy Families Oregon Outcome Indicators (OI) 2019

<i>Program/County</i>	OI #1 Number (%) Children with Primary Care Provider ⁸	OI #2 Number (%) Children with Up-to-Date Immunizations ⁹	OI #3 Number (%) of 2-Year-Olds with Up-to-Date Immunizations	OI #4 Number (%) Parents Reading to Child 3x Per Week or More ¹⁰	OI #4 Number (%) Parents Reporting Positive Parent-Child Interactions ¹¹	OI #5 Number (%) Parents with Reporting Reduced Parenting Stress ¹²	OI #6 Number (%) Parents Reporting HFA Oregon Helped with Social Support ¹³
Grant & Harney	16 (100%)	8 (73%)	2 (50%)	9 (82%)	10 (100%)	7 (64%)	5 (56%)
Grant	9 (100%)	4 (80%)	2 (67%)	4 (67%)	6 (100%)	4 (67%)	2 (40%)
Harney	7 (100%)	4 (67%)	0 (0%)	5 (100%)	4 (100%)	3 (60%)	3 (75%)
Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, & Wheeler	72 (100%)	56 (97%)	28 (93%)	51 (94%)	51 (96%)	30 (67%)	46 (92%)
Gilliam	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hood River	45 (100%)	40 (100%)	20 (100%)	35 (95%)	35 (97%)	23 (72%)	33 (97%)
Sherman	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Wasco	25 (100%)	14 (88%)	8 (80%)	14 (93%)	14 (93%)	6 (50%)	12 (86%)
Wheeler	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	--	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (50%)
Josephine & Jackson	121 (98%)	71 (73%)	38 (72%)	83 (87%)	88 (93%)	48 (59%)	86 (100%)
Jackson	65 (97%)	42 (86%)	22 (92%)	42 (86%)	45 (92%)	25 (63%)	44 (100%)
Josephine	56 (100%)	29 (60%)	16 (55%)	41 (89%)	43 (93%)	23 (55%)	42 (100%)
Lane	154 (99%)	106 (84%)	64 (93%)	111 (91%)	113 (93%)	71 (66%)	98 (98%)
Marion & Polk	229 (98%)	149 (83%)	82 (80%)	133 (82%)	143 (88%)	95 (69%)	112 (81%)
Marion	213 (98%)	139 (83%)	76 (79%)	125 (81%)	134 (88%)	92 (70%)	104 (80%)
Polk	16 (100%)	10 (83%)	6 (100%)	8 (89%)	9 (100%)	3 (50%)	8 (100%)

⁸ 80-94% of children with a primary care provider meets the Performance Standard.

⁹ 80-89% of children with up-to-date immunizations meets the Performance Standard.

¹⁰ 80-89% of parents who report they read to their children 3 times a week or more (as reported on the Parent Survey) meets the Performance Standard.

¹¹ 80-89% of parents reporting positive parent-child interactions meets the Performance Standard.

¹² 50-64% of parents reporting reduced parenting stress meets the Performance Standard.

¹³ 80-89% of parents reporting Healthy Families Oregon helped with social support meets the Performance Standard.

Table 2. Healthy Families Oregon Outcome Indicators (OI) 2019

<i>Program/County</i>	OI #1 Number (%) Children with Primary Care Provider ⁸	OI #2 Number (%) Children with Up-to-Date Immunizations ⁹	OI #3 Number (%) of 2-Year-Olds with Up-to-Date Immunizations	OI #4 Number (%) Parents Reading to Child 3x Per Week or More ¹⁰	OI #4 Number (%) Parents Reporting Positive Parent- Child Interactions ¹¹	OI #5 Number (%) Parents with Reporting Reduced Parenting Stress ¹²	OI #6 Number (%) Parents Reporting HFA Oregon Helped with Social Support ¹³
Multnomah	353 (99%)	214 (87%)	106 (85%)	221 (92%)	223 (93%)	123 (67%)	133 (86%)
Umatilla, Union, & Morrow	49 (100%)	32 (97%)	10 (100%)	23 (79%)	26 (93%)	15 (68%)	17 (85%)
Morrow	10 (100%)	8 (89%)	--	5 (83%)	6 (100%)	4 (100%)	2 (67%)
Umatilla	30 (100%)	19 (100%)	8 (100%)	13 (72%)	15 (88%)	9 (60%)	13 (93%)
Union	9 (100%)	5 (100%)	2 (100%)	5 (100%)	5 (100%)	2 (67%)	2 (67%)
Wallowa, Baker, & Malheur	30 (100%)	19 (90%)	4 (80%)	18 (90%)	20 (100%)	10 (71%)	11 (85%)
Baker	9 (100%)	5 (100%)	1 (100%)	4 (67%)	6 (100%)	3 (60%)	4 (80%)
Malheur	17 (100%)	13 (93%)	3 (75%)	12 (100%)	12 (100%)	5 (71%)	5 (83%)
Wallowa	4 (100%)	1 (50%)	--	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)
Washington	144 (99%)	103 (86%)	60 (87%)	96 (83%)	105 (93%)	56 (64%)	101 (92%)
Yamhill	36 (100%)	25 (78%)	14 (78%)	28 (90%)	27 (87%)	13 (52%)	24 (86%)
State	1,649 (99%)	1,084 (85%)	535 (84%)	1,064 (88%)	1,115 (93%)	635 (65%)	903 (90%)

⁸ 80-94% of children with a primary care provider meets the Performance Standard.

⁹ 80-89% of children with up-to-date immunizations meets the Performance Standard.

¹⁰ 80-89% of parents who report they read to their children 3 times a week or more (as reported on the Parent Survey) meets the Performance Standard.

¹¹ 80-89% of parents reporting positive parent-child interactions meets the Performance Standard.

¹² 50-64% of parents reporting reduced parenting stress meets the Performance Standard.

¹³ 80-89% of parents reporting Healthy Families Oregon helped with social support meets the Performance Standard.



Table 3a. Screening and Initial Interest in Healthy Families Oregon Service 2019 Cohort (CE 1-1.C)

Program/County	Screened #	Missing Screening Result #	Negative # (%)	Positive (including clinical pos) # (%)	Positive Screen Interest:				
					Interested, if available # (%)	Not interested, too busy # (%)	Not interested, Service not needed # (%)	Not interested, other # (%)	Missing interest info # ¹⁴
Benton & Linn	70	3	6 (9%)	61 (91%)	59 (97%)	0 (0%)	2 (3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Benton	31	0	0 (0%)	31 (100%)	29 (94%)	0 (0%)	2 (6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Linn	39	3	6 (17%)	30 (83%)	30 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Clackamas	348	145	11 (5%)	192 (95%)	112 (58%)	10 (5%)	52 (27%)	18 (9%)	0 (0%)
Columbia, Clatsop, & Tillamook	131	4	14 (11%)	113 (89%)	108 (96%)	0 (0%)	3 (3%)	2 (2%)	0 (0%)
Clatsop	55	4	12 (24%)	39 (76%)	39 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Columbia	45	0	0 (0%)	45 (100%)	43 (96%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)
Tillamook	31	0	2 (6%)	29 (94%)	26 (90%)	0 (0%)	2 (7%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)
Coos & Curry	9	0	2 (22%)	7 (78%)	4 (80%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	2 (0%)
Coos	1	0	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Curry	8	0	2 (25%)	6 (75%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	2 (0%)
Crook, Deschutes, & Jefferson	408	37	122 (33%)	249 (67%)	240 (97%)	0 (0%)	6 (2%)	2 (1%)	1 (0%)
Crook	45	2	12 (28%)	31 (72%)	30 (97%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Deschutes	302	29	101 (37%)	172 (63%)	167 (97%)	0 (0%)	5 (3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Jefferson	61	6	9 (16%)	46 (84%)	43 (96%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (4%)	1 (0%)
Douglas, Klamath, & Lake	245	0	112 (46%)	133 (54%)	122 (92%)	2 (2%)	7 (5%)	2 (2%)	0 (0%)
Douglas	166	0	92 (55%)	74 (45%)	66 (89%)	1 (1%)	5 (7%)	2 (3%)	0 (0%)
Klamath	65	0	17 (26%)	48 (74%)	47 (98%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Lake	14	0	3 (21%)	11 (79%)	9 (82%)	0 (0%)	2 (18%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

¹⁴ Note that occurrences with small numbers may be denoted as 0% due to rounding.

Table 3a. Screening and Initial Interest in Healthy Families Oregon Service 2019 Cohort (CE 1-1.C)

Program/County	Screened #	Missing Screening Result #	Negative # (%)	Positive (including clinical pos) # (%)	Positive Screen Interest:				
					Interested, if available # (%)	Not interested, too busy # (%)	Not interested, Service not needed # (%)	Not interested, other # (%)	Missing interest info # ¹⁴
Grant & Harney	30	0	8 (27%)	22 (73%)	18 (82%)	1 (5%)	3 (14%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Grant	21	0	6 (29%)	15 (71%)	11 (73%)	1 (7%)	3 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Harney	9	0	2 (22%)	7 (78%)	7 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, & Wheeler	92	4	36 (41%)	52 (59%)	43 (83%)	6 (12%)	2 (4%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)
Gilliam	3	0	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Hood River	45	1	16 (36%)	28 (64%)	21 (75%)	5 (18%)	2 (7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Sherman	2	0	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Wasco	40	2	17 (45%)	21 (55%)	19 (90%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)
Wheeler	2	1	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Josephine & Jackson	516	7	161 (32%)	348 (68%)	337 (97%)	3 (1%)	7 (2%)	1 (0%)	0 (0%)
Jackson	253	5	92 (37%)	156 (63%)	152 (97%)	1 (1%)	3 (2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Josephine	263	2	69 (26%)	192 (74%)	185 (96%)	2 (1%)	4 (2%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)
Lane	794	5	229 (29%)	560 (71%)	318 (57%)	42 (8%)	166 (30%)	34 (6%)	0 (0%)
Marion & Polk	413	5	6 (1%)	402 (99%)	402 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Marion	379	4	6 (2%)	369 (98%)	369 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Polk	34	1	0 (0%)	33 (100%)	33 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

¹⁴ Note that occurrences with small numbers may be denoted as 0% due to rounding.



Table 3a. Screening and Initial Interest in Healthy Families Oregon Service 2019 Cohort (CE 1-1.C)

Program/County	Screened #	Missing Screening Result #	Negative # (%)	Positive (including clinical pos) # (%)	Positive Screen Interest:				
					Interested, if available # (%)	Not interested, too busy # (%)	Not interested, Service not needed # (%)	Not interested, other # (%)	Missing interest info # ¹⁴
Multnomah	773	9	24 (3%)	740 (97%)	484 (65%)	1 (0%)	185 (25%)	70 (9%)	0 (0%)
Umatilla, Union, & Morrow	443	28	178 (43%)	237 (57%)	175 (74%)	8 (3%)	36 (15%)	18 (8%)	0 (0%)
Morrow	49	5	19 (43%)	25 (57%)	17 (68%)	0 (0%)	5 (20%)	3 (12%)	0 (0%)
Umatilla	280	16	116 (44%)	148 (56%)	106 (72%)	7 (5%)	23 (16%)	12 (8%)	0 (0%)
Union	114	7	43 (40%)	64 (60%)	52 (81%)	1 (2%)	8 (13%)	3 (5%)	0 (0%)
Wallowa, Baker, & Malheur	95	4	30 (33%)	61 (67%)	27 (44%)	11 (18%)	19 (31%)	4 (7%)	0 (0%)
Baker	30	1	11 (38%)	18 (62%)	14 (78%)	0 (0%)	3 (17%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)
Malheur	51	2	10 (20%)	39 (80%)	10 (26%)	11 (28%)	15 (38%)	3 (8%)	0 (0%)
Wallowa	14	1	9 (69%)	4 (31%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Washington	184	8	23 (13%)	153 (87%)	152 (99%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Yamhill	33	5	4 (14%)	24 (86%)	24 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
State	4,584	264	966 (22%)	3,354 (78%)	2,625 (78%)	84 (3%)	489 (15%)	153 (5%)	3 (0%)

¹⁴ Note that occurrences with small numbers may be denoted as 0% due to rounding.

Table 3b. Service Offer: Healthy Families Oregon 2019 Cohort¹⁵

Program/County	HV Offered # (%)	HV Not Offered # (%)	Missing Offer Info #	Not Offered, Caseload Full		Not Offered, Other			
				Didn't meet local priority criteria # (%)	Program at capacity # (%)	Could not locate family # (%)	Family moved out of state # (%)	Family involved in other HV program # (%)	Other # (%)
Benton & Linn	55 (96%)	2 (4%)	2	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Benton	28 (100%)	0 (0%)	1	--	--	--	--	--	--
Linn	27 (93%)	2 (7%)	1	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Clackamas	41 (40%)	61 (60%)	10	2 (3%)	39 (64%)	15 (25%)	0 (0%)	2 (3%)	3 (5%)
Columbia, Clatsop, & Tillamook	49 (46%)	58 (54%)	1	0 (0%)	32 (55%)	17 (29%)	3 (5%)	0 (0%)	6 (10%)
Clatsop	13 (33%)	26 (67%)	0	0 (0%)	14 (54%)	10 (38%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)
Columbia	15 (36%)	27 (64%)	1	0 (0%)	18 (67%)	3 (11%)	2 (7%)	0 (0%)	4 (15%)
Tillamook	21 (81%)	5 (19%)	0	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (80%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)
Coos & Curry	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	0	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Coos	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
Curry	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	0	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Crook, Deschutes, & Jefferson	103 (44%)	131 (56%)	6	1 (1%)	33 (25%)	66 (50%)	2 (2%)	1 (1%)	28 (21%)
Crook	20 (67%)	10 (33%)	0	1 (10%)	3 (30%)	5 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)
Deschutes	72 (45%)	89 (55%)	6	0 (0%)	11 (12%)	50 (56%)	2 (2%)	0 (0%)	26 (29%)
Jefferson	11 (26%)	32 (74%)	0	0 (0%)	19 (59%)	11 (34%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	1 (3%)
Douglas, Klamath, & Lake	76 (63%)	45 (37%)	1	0 (0%)	6 (13%)	30 (67%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	8 (18%)
Douglas	35 (53%)	31 (47%)	0	0 (0%)	6 (19%)	20 (65%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (16%)
Klamath	34 (72%)	13 (28%)	0	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	9 (69%)	0 (0%)	1 (8%)	3 (23%)
Lake	7 (88%)	1 (13%)	1	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

¹⁵ Due to rounding, percentages may not exactly equal 100%.



Table 3b. Service Offer: Healthy Families Oregon 2019 Cohort¹⁵

Program/County	HV Offered # (%)	HV Not Offered # (%)	Missing Offer Info #	Not Offered, Caseload Full		Not Offered, Other			
				Didn't meet local priority criteria # (%)	Program at capacity # (%)	Could not locate family # (%)	Family moved out of state # (%)	Family involved in other HV program # (%)	Other # (%)
Grant & Harney	17 (94%)	1 (6%)	0	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Grant	10 (91%)	1 (9%)	0	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Harney	7 (100%)	0 (0%)	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, & Wheeler	37 (86%)	6 (14%)	0	0 (0%)	1 (17%)	4 (67%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (17%)
Gilliam	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hood River	20 (95%)	1 (5%)	0	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Sherman	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
Wasco	14 (74%)	5 (26%)	0	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (80%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)
Wheeler	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
Josephine & Jackson	104 (31%)	233 (69%)	0	2 (1%)	90 (39%)	136 (58%)	1 (0%)	1 (0%)	3 (1%)
Jackson	50 (33%)	102 (67%)	0	0 (0%)	18 (18%)	83 (81%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)
Josephine	54 (29%)	131 (71%)	0	2 (2%)	72 (55%)	53 (40%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	2 (2%)
Lane	133 (42%)	185 (58%)	0	1 (1%)	13 (7%)	161 (87%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	9 (5%)
Marion & Polk	174 (45%)	214 (55%)	14	0 (0%)	32 (15%)	175 (82%)	1 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (3%)
Marion	163 (46%)	193 (54%)	13	0 (0%)	32 (17%)	156 (81%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	4 (2%)
Polk	11 (34%)	21 (66%)	1	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	19 (90%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (10%)

¹⁵ Due to rounding, percentages may not exactly equal 100%

Table 3b. Service Offer: Healthy Families Oregon 2019 Cohort¹⁵

Program/County	HV Offered # (%)	HV Not Offered # (%)	Missing Offer Info #	Not Offered, Caseload Full		Not Offered, Other			
				Didn't meet local priority criteria # (%)	Program at capacity # (%)	Could not locate family # (%)	Family moved out of state # (%)	Family involved in other HV program # (%)	Other # (%)
Multnomah	310 (67%)	150 (33%)	24	0 (0%)	41 (27%)	91 (61%)	1 (1%)	8 (5%)	9 (6%)
Umatilla, Union, & Morrow	66 (40%)	100 (60%)	9	10 (10%)	52 (52%)	22 (22%)	0 (0%)	10 (10%)	6 (6%)
Morrow	7 (50%)	7 (50%)	3	0 (0%)	2 (29%)	5 (71%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Umatilla	36 (36%)	64 (64%)	6	6 (9%)	27 (42%)	16 (25%)	0 (0%)	10 (16%)	5 (8%)
Union	23 (44%)	29 (56%)	0	4 (14%)	23 (79%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)
Wallowa, Baker, & Malheur	17 (63%)	10 (37%)	0	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	8 (80%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)
Baker	7 (50%)	7 (50%)	0	1 (14%)	0 (0%)	5 (71%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (14%)
Malheur	7 (70%)	3 (30%)	0	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Wallowa	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
Washington	89 (68%)	42 (32%)	21	0 (0%)	9 (21%)	19 (45%)	4 (10%)	2 (5%)	8 (19%)
Yamhill	17 (77%)	5 (23%)	2	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (60%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)
State	1,291 (51%)	1,244 (49%)	90	17 (1%)	349 (28%)	749 (60%)	14 (1%)	25 (2%)	90 (7%)

¹⁵ Due to rounding, percentages may not exactly equal 100%.



Table 3c. Reported Location of Screen 2019

<i>Program/County</i>	Hospital # (%)	Health Clinic # (%)	Parent Home # (%)	Phone # (%)	Other # (%)
Benton & Linn	38 (54%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	31 (44%)	0 (0%)
Benton	11 (35%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	19 (61%)	0 (0%)
Linn	27 (69%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	12 (31%)	0 (0%)
Clackamas	215 (62%)	14 (4%)	0 (0%)	116 (33%)	3 (1%)
Columbia, Clatsop, & Tillamook					
Clatsop	41 (31%)	1 (1%)	4 (3%)	71 (54%)	14 (11%)
Columbia	34 (62%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	19 (35%)	0 (0%)
Tillamook	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	2 (4%)	35 (78%)	7 (16%)
Tillamook	6 (19%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	17 (55%)	7 (23%)
Coos & Curry	4 (44%)	0 (0%)	3 (33%)	0 (0%)	2 (22%)
Coos	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Curry	4 (50%)	0 (0%)	3 (38%)	0 (0%)	1 (13%)
Crook, Deschutes, & Jefferson	387 (95%)	8 (2%)	1 (0%)	9 (2%)	2 (0%)
Crook	42 (93%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	2 (4%)	0 (0%)
Deschutes	293 (97%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (2%)	2 (1%)
Jefferson	52 (85%)	8 (13%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)
Douglas, Klamath, & Lake	169 (69%)	0 (0%)	9 (4%)	62 (25%)	5 (2%)
Douglas	117 (70%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	46 (28%)	3 (2%)
Klamath	44 (68%)	0 (0%)	6 (9%)	15 (23%)	0 (0%)
Lake	8 (57%)	0 (0%)	3 (21%)	1 (7%)	2 (14%)

Table 3c. Reported Location of Screen 2019

<i>Program/County</i>	Hospital # (%)	Health Clinic # (%)	Parent Home # (%)	Phone # (%)	Other # (%)
Grant & Harney	7 (23%)	0 (0%)	7 (23%)	3 (10%)	13 (43%)
Grant	4 (19%)	0 (0%)	7 (33%)	1 (5%)	9 (43%)
Harney	3 (33%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (22%)	4 (44%)
Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, & Wheeler	1 (1%)	42 (47%)	4 (4%)	36 (40%)	7 (8%)
Gilliam	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)
Hood River	0 (0%)	12 (27%)	2 (5%)	29 (66%)	1 (2%)
Sherman	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Wasco	0 (0%)	28 (70%)	1 (3%)	7 (18%)	4 (10%)
Wheeler	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Josephine & Jackson	442 (86%)	1 (0%)	3 (1%)	58 (11%)	12 (2%)
Jackson	194 (77%)	0 (0%)	1 (0%)	55 (22%)	3 (1%)
Josephine	248 (94%)	1 (0%)	2 (1%)	3 (1%)	9 (3%)
Lane	682 (86%)	2 (0%)	1 (0%)	106 (13%)	2 (0%)
Marion & Polk	355 (86%)	0 (0%)	1 (0%)	55 (13%)	2 (0%)
Marion	323 (85%)	0 (0%)	1 (0%)	53 (14%)	2 (1%)
Polk	32 (94%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (6%)	0 (0%)



Table 3c. Reported Location of Screen 2019

<i>Program/County</i>	Hospital # (%)	Health Clinic # (%)	Parent Home # (%)	Phone # (%)	Other # (%)
Multnomah	601 (78%)	2 (0%)	5 (1%)	156 (20%)	9 (1%)
Umatilla, Union, & Morrow	400 (90%)	2 (0%)	1 (0%)	34 (8%)	6 (1%)
Morrow	39 (80%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	6 (12%)	3 (6%)
Umatilla	250 (89%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	27 (10%)	3 (1%)
Union	111 (97%)	2 (2%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)
Wallowa, Baker, & Malheur	30 (32%)	20 (21%)	4 (4%)	2 (2%)	39 (41%)
Baker	25 (83%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	4 (13%)
Malheur	5 (10%)	8 (16%)	3 (6%)	1 (2%)	34 (67%)
Wallowa	0 (0%)	12 (86%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	1 (7%)
Washington	2 (1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	167 (91%)	15 (8%)
Yamhill	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	26 (87%)	4 (13%)
State	3,374 (74%)	92 (2%)	44 (1%)	932 (20%)	135 (3%)

Table 4. Receipt and Acceptance of Healthy Families Oregon 2019 Cohort (CE 1-2.A)

Program/County	Accepted # (%)	Declined, too busy # (%)	Declined, service not needed # (%)	Declined, other # (%)	Missing Acceptance Info #	Received HV		Total families with HV (regardless of first HV date)
						Yes # (%)	No # (%)	
Benton & Linn	37 (67%)	2 (4%)	8 (15%)	6 (11%)	2 (4%)	30 (81%)	7 (19%)	74
Benton	20 (71%)	0 (0%)	3 (11%)	4 (14%)	1 (4%)	16 (80%)	4 (20%)	45
Linn	17 (63%)	2 (7%)	5 (19%)	2 (7%)	1 (4%)	14 (82%)	3 (18%)	29
Clackamas	35 (85%)	1 (2%)	4 (10%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	33 (94%)	2 (6%)	68
Columbia, Clatsop, & Tillamook	43 (88%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	4 (8%)	0 (0%)	42 (98%)	1 (2%)	142
Clatsop	12 (92%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	12 (100%)	0 (0%)	47
Columbia	15 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	14 (93%)	1 (7%)	45
Tillamook	16 (76%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	4 (19%)	0 (0%)	16 (100%)	0 (0%)	50
Coos & Curry	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	15
Coos	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	10
Curry	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	5
Crook, Deschutes, & Jefferson	47 (46%)	25 (24%)	23 (22%)	8 (8%)	0 (0%)	43 (91%)	4 (9%)	125
Crook	8 (40%)	4 (20%)	3 (15%)	5 (25%)	0 (0%)	8 (100%)	0 (0%)	16
Deschutes	37 (51%)	19 (26%)	14 (19%)	2 (3%)	0 (0%)	33 (89%)	4 (11%)	96
Jefferson	2 (18%)	2 (18%)	6 (55%)	1 (9%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	13
Douglas, Klamath, & Lake	51 (67%)	1 (1%)	15 (20%)	9 (12%)	0 (0%)	48 (94%)	3 (6%)	113
Douglas	19 (54%)	1 (3%)	7 (20%)	8 (23%)	0 (0%)	17 (89%)	2 (11%)	39
Klamath	25 (74%)	0 (0%)	8 (24%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	24 (96%)	1 (4%)	63
Lake	7 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (100%)	0 (0%)	11



Table 4. Receipt and Acceptance of Healthy Families Oregon 2019 Cohort (CE 1-2.A)

Program/County	Accepted # (%)	Declined, too busy # (%)	Declined, service not needed # (%)	Declined, other # (%)	Missing Acceptance Info #	Received HV		Total families with HV (regardless of first HV date)
						Yes # (%)	No # (%)	
Grant & Harney	14 (82%)	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	2 (12%)	0 (0%)	11 (79%)	3 (21%)	20
Grant	8 (80%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)	6 (75%)	2 (25%)	11
Harney	6 (86%)	0 (0%)	1 (14%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (83%)	1 (17%)	9
Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, & Wheeler	25 (68%)	1 (3%)	2 (5%)	7 (19%)	2 (5%)	24 (96%)	1 (4%)	79
Gilliam	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	--
Hood River	13 (65%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	4 (20%)	2 (10%)	13 (100%)	0 (0%)	47
Sherman	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1
Wasco	9 (64%)	0 (0%)	2 (14%)	3 (21%)	0 (0%)	9 (100%)	0 (0%)	28
Wheeler	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	3
Josephine & Jackson	64 (62%)	19 (18%)	17 (16%)	4 (4%)	0 (0%)	55 (86%)	9 (14%)	149
Jackson	39 (78%)	2 (4%)	6 (12%)	3 (6%)	0 (0%)	33 (85%)	6 (15%)	79
Josephine	25 (46%)	17 (31%)	11 (20%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	22 (88%)	3 (12%)	70
Lane	68 (51%)	20 (15%)	38 (29%)	7 (5%)	0 (0%)	67 (99%)	1 (1%)	182
Marion & Polk	132 (76%)	11 (6%)	23 (13%)	8 (5%)	0 (0%)	102 (77%)	30 (23%)	261
Marion	126 (77%)	10 (6%)	20 (12%)	7 (4%)	0 (0%)	96 (76%)	30 (24%)	243
Polk	6 (55%)	1 (9%)	3 (27%)	1 (9%)	0 (0%)	6 (100%)	0 (0%)	18

Table 4. Receipt and Acceptance of Healthy Families Oregon 2019 Cohort (CE 1-2.A)

<i>Program/County</i>	Accepted # (%)	Declined, too busy # (%)	Declined, service not needed # (%)	Declined, other # (%)	Missing Acceptance Info #	Received HV		Total families with HV (regardless of first HV date)
						Yes # (%)	No # (%)	
Multnomah	167 (54%)	6 (2%)	130 (42%)	5 (2%)	2 (1%)	130 (78%)	37 (22%)	423
Umatilla, Union, & Morrow	41 (62%)	16 (24%)	8 (12%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	35 (85%)	6 (15%)	68
Morrow	5 (71%)	1 (14%)	1 (14%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (80%)	1 (20%)	11
Umatilla	22 (61%)	9 (25%)	5 (14%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	18 (82%)	4 (18%)	42
Union	14 (61%)	6 (26%)	2 (9%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	13 (93%)	1 (7%)	15
Wallowa, Baker, & Malheur	14 (82%)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	13 (93%)	1 (7%)	34
Baker	5 (71%)	1 (14%)	1 (14%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (100%)	0 (0%)	11
Malheur	6 (86%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (14%)	0 (0%)	5 (83%)	1 (17%)	19
Wallowa	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	4
Washington	58 (65%)	11 (12%)	16 (18%)	4 (4%)	0 (0%)	49 (84%)	9 (16%)	171
Yamhill	16 (94%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	7 (44%)	9 (56%)	37
State	815 (63%)	115 (9%)	287 (22%)	68 (5%)	6 (0%)	691 (85%)	124 (15%)	1,961



Table 5. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service: Race/Ethnicity 2019 Cohort¹⁶ (CE 1-2.B, CE 5-4.B)

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Hispanic/Latino Families Offered Intensive Service	Number (%) of Hispanic/Latino Families Accepting Intensive Service	Number of White Families Offered Intensive Service	Number (%) of White Families Accepting Intensive Service	Number of Other Race/Ethnicity Families ¹⁷ Offered Intensive Service	Number (%) of Other Race/Ethnicity Families Accepting Intensive Service
Benton & Linn	24	13 (54%)	25	13 (52%)	6	4 (67%)
Benton	10	5 (50%)	12	7 (58%)	6	4 (67%)
Linn	14	8 (57%)	13	6 (46%)	0	--
Clackamas	7	7 (100%)	23	17 (74%)	11	9 (82%)
Columbia, Clatsop, & Tillamook	7	6 (86%)	33	28 (85%)	9	8 (89%)
Clatsop	3	2 (67%)	10	10 (100%)	0	--
Columbia	2	2 (100%)	7	7 (100%)	6	5 (83%)
Tillamook	2	2 (100%)	16	11 (69%)	3	3 (100%)
Coos & Curry	0	--	3	2 (67%)	0	--
Coos	0	--	1	1 (100%)	0	--
Curry	0	--	2	1 (50%)	0	--
Crook, Deschutes, & Jefferson	14	7 (50%)	69	32 (46%)	20	4 (20%)
Crook	0	--	17	7 (41%)	3	1 (33%)
Deschutes	10	6 (60%)	50	25 (50%)	12	2 (17%)
Jefferson	4	1 (25%)	2	0 (0%)	5	1 (20%)
Douglas, Klamath, & Lake	5	4 (80%)	61	37 (61%)	10	7 (70%)
Douglas	3	2 (67%)	28	13 (46%)	4	2 (50%)
Klamath	1	1 (100%)	28	19 (68%)	5	4 (80%)
Lake	1	1 (100%)	5	5 (100%)	1	1 (100%)

¹⁶ Acceptance is defined as receiving a first home visit (either as indicated on a Family Intake form sent to NPC or a first home visit entered in the statewide data system).

¹⁷ Sample sizes were not sufficient for an analysis of acceptance rates for other individual racial/ethnic groups. Other racial/ethnic groups included: African American, American Indian, Asian, Multiracial, and Other (including unreported).

Table 5. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service: Race/Ethnicity 2019 Cohort¹⁶ (CE 1-2.B, CE 5-4.B)

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Hispanic/Latino Families Offered Intensive Service	Number (%) of Hispanic/Latino Families Accepting Intensive Service	Number of White Families Offered Intensive Service	Number (%) of White Families Accepting Intensive Service	Number of Other Race/Ethnicity Families ¹⁷ Offered Intensive Service	Number (%) of Other Race/Ethnicity Families Accepting Intensive Service
Grant & Harney	1	1 (100%)	13	10 (77%)	3	1 (33%)
Grant	0	--	8	6 (75%)	2	1 (50%)
Harney	1	1 (100%)	5	4 (80%)	1	0 (0%)
Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, & Wheeler	17	13 (76%)	17	11 (65%)	3	1 (33%)
Gilliam	0	--	1	0 (0%)	0	--
Hood River	12	8 (67%)	8	5 (63%)	0	--
Sherman	0	--	1	1 (100%)	0	--
Wasco	5	5 (100%)	6	4 (67%)	3	1 (33%)
Wheeler	0	--	1	1 (100%)	0	--
Josephine & Jackson	12	9 (75%)	69	34 (49%)	23	12 (52%)
Jackson	9	6 (67%)	28	17 (61%)	13	10 (77%)
Josephine	3	3 (100%)	41	17 (41%)	10	2 (20%)
Lane	19	13 (68%)	99	45 (45%)	15	9 (60%)
Marion & Polk	89	52 (58%)	50	31 (62%)	35	19 (54%)
Marion	86	50 (58%)	44	28 (64%)	33	18 (55%)
Polk	3	2 (67%)	6	3 (50%)	2	1 (50%)

¹⁶ Acceptance is defined as receiving a first home visit (either as indicated on a Family Intake form sent to NPC or a first home visit entered in the statewide data system).

¹⁷ Sample sizes were not sufficient for an analysis of acceptance rates for other individual racial/ethnic groups. Other racial/ethnic groups included: African American, American Indian, Asian, Multiracial, and Other (including missing).



Table 5. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service: Race/Ethnicity 2019 Cohort¹⁶ (CE 1-2.B, CE 5-4.B)

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Hispanic/Latino Families Offered Intensive Service	Number (%) of Hispanic/Latino Families Accepting Intensive Service	Number of White Families Offered Intensive Service	Number (%) of White Families Accepting Intensive Service	Number of Other Race/Ethnicity Families ¹⁷ Offered Intensive Service	Number (%) of Other Race/Ethnicity Families Accepting Intensive Service
Multnomah	79	41 (52%)	83	32 (39%)	148	71 (48%)
Umatilla, Union, & Morrow	17	11 (65%)	33	15 (45%)	16	9 (56%)
Morrow	7	4 (57%)	0	--	0	--
Umatilla	10	7 (70%)	15	6 (40%)	11	5 (45%)
Union	0	--	18	9 (50%)	5	4 (80%)
Wallowa, Baker, & Malheur	1	1 (100%)	14	12 (86%)	2	1 (50%)
Baker	0	--	7	6 (86%)	0	--
Malheur	1	1 (100%)	4	3 (75%)	2	1 (50%)
Wallowa	0	--	3	3 (100%)	0	--
Washington	34	18 (53%)	24	16 (67%)	31	16 (52%)
Yamhill	3	0 (0%)	10	6 (60%)	4	1 (25%)
State	329	196 (60%)	626	341 (54%)	336	172 (51%)

¹⁶ Acceptance is defined as receiving a first home visit (either as indicated on a Family Intake form sent to NPC or a first home visit entered in the statewide data system).

¹⁷ Sample sizes were not sufficient for an analysis of acceptance rates for other individual racial/ethnic groups. Other racial/ethnic groups included: African American, American Indian, Asian, Multiracial, and Other (including missing).

Table 6. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service: Demographic Factors 2019 Cohort (CE 1-2.B, CE 5-4.B)

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of English Speaking Households Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) of Spanish Speaking Households Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) of Married Mothers Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) of Single Mothers Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) of Non-Teen Mothers Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) of Teen Mothers Accepting Intensive Service
Benton & Linn	18 (56%)	9 (45%)	16 (64%)	14 (47%)	30 (56%)	0 (0%)
Benton	11 (61%)	2 (29%)	9 (56%)	7 (58%)	16 (59%)	0 (0%)
Linn	7 (50%)	7 (54%)	7 (78%)	7 (39%)	14 (52%)	--
Clackamas	26 (76%)	6 (100%)	11 (85%)	22 (79%)	32 (80%)	1 (100%)
Columbia, Clatsop, & Tillamook	35 (85%)	7 (88%)	12 (80%)	29 (88%)	42 (86%)	--
Clatsop	10 (100%)	2 (67%)	4 (80%)	8 (100%)	12 (92%)	--
Columbia	12 (92%)	2 (100%)	4 (100%)	10 (91%)	14 (93%)	--
Tillamook	13 (72%)	3 (100%)	4 (67%)	11 (79%)	16 (76%)	--
Coos & Curry	2 (67%)	--	1 (50%)	1 (100%)	2 (67%)	--
Coos	1 (100%)	--	1 (100%)	--	1 (100%)	--
Curry	1 (50%)	--	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	1 (50%)	--
Crook, Deschutes, & Jefferson	42 (42%)	1 (50%)	11 (42%)	32 (42%)	39 (40%)	4 (80%)
Crook	8 (40%)	--	4 (44%)	4 (36%)	8 (40%)	--
Deschutes	32 (46%)	1 (100%)	7 (50%)	26 (45%)	30 (44%)	3 (75%)
Jefferson	2 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (25%)	1 (10%)	1 (100%)
Douglas, Klamath, & Lake	47 (63%)	--	11 (73%)	37 (61%)	45 (63%)	3 (60%)
Douglas	17 (49%)	--	6 (67%)	11 (42%)	17 (50%)	0 (0%)
Klamath	24 (71%)	--	3 (75%)	21 (70%)	22 (71%)	2 (67%)
Lake	6 (100%)	--	2 (100%)	5 (100%)	6 (100%)	1 (100%)



Table 6. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service: Demographic Factors 2019 Cohort (CE 1-2.B, CE 5-4.B)

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of English Speaking Households Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) of Spanish Speaking Households Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) of Married Mothers Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) of Single Mothers Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) of Non-Teen Mothers Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) of Teen Mothers Accepting Intensive Service
Grant & Harney	12 (75%)	--	5 (83%)	7 (64%)	12 (71%)	--
Grant	7 (78%)	--	2 (100%)	5 (63%)	7 (70%)	--
Harney	5 (71%)	--	3 (75%)	2 (67%)	5 (71%)	--
Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, & Wheeler	14 (64%)	8 (73%)	10 (83%)	15 (60%)	24 (67%)	1 (100%)
Gilliam	0 (0%)	--	--	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	--
Hood River	6 (67%)	6 (67%)	6 (75%)	7 (58%)	12 (63%)	1 (100%)
Sherman	1 (100%)	--	--	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	--
Wasco	6 (60%)	2 (100%)	3 (100%)	7 (64%)	10 (71%)	--
Wheeler	1 (100%)	--	1 (100%)	--	1 (100%)	--
Josephine & Jackson	51 (52%)	4 (80%)	14 (44%)	41 (57%)	55 (54%)	0 (0%)
Jackson	29 (64%)	4 (80%)	8 (57%)	25 (69%)	33 (69%)	0 (0%)
Josephine	22 (41%)	--	6 (33%)	16 (44%)	22 (42%)	0 (0%)
Lane	50 (45%)	10 (91%)	25 (56%)	42 (48%)	67 (51%)	0 (0%)
Marion & Polk	59 (59%)	35 (61%)	36 (62%)	66 (57%)	99 (59%)	3 (43%)
Marion	54 (59%)	34 (62%)	36 (64%)	60 (56%)	93 (60%)	3 (43%)
Polk	5 (56%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	6 (67%)	6 (55%)	--

Table 6. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service: Demographic Factors 2019 Cohort (CE 1-2.B, CE 5-4.B)

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of English Speaking Households Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) of Spanish Speaking Households Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) of Married Mothers Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) of Single Mothers Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) of Non-Teen Mothers Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) of Teen Mothers Accepting Intensive Service
Multnomah	83 (41%)	21 (49%)	47 (47%)	97 (46%)	134 (45%)	10 (91%)
Umatilla, Union, & Morrow	27 (51%)	6 (75%)	6 (46%)	29 (55%)	34 (54%)	1 (33%)
Morrow	1 (50%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	4 (67%)	4 (67%)	0 (0%)
Umatilla	13 (46%)	3 (75%)	4 (57%)	14 (48%)	18 (50%)	--
Union	13 (57%)	--	2 (40%)	11 (61%)	12 (57%)	1 (50%)
Wallowa, Baker, & Malheur	12 (80%)	1 (100%)	3 (100%)	11 (79%)	13 (87%)	1 (50%)
Baker	6 (86%)	--	2 (100%)	4 (80%)	6 (86%)	--
Malheur	3 (60%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	4 (67%)	4 (80%)	1 (50%)
Wallowa	3 (100%)	--	--	3 (100%)	3 (100%)	--
Washington	27 (53%)	21 (60%)	18 (64%)	32 (52%)	50 (58%)	0 (0%)
Yamhill	6 (43%)	1 (33%)	1 (20%)	6 (50%)	7 (41%)	--
State	511 (53%)	130 (62%)	227 (57%)	481 (54%)	685 (55%)	24 (55%)



Table 7. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service: Demographic Factors 2019 Cohort (CE 1-2.B, CE 5-4.B)

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) Mothers with At Least a High School Education Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) Mothers with Less Than a High School Education Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) of Employed Parents Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) of Unemployed Parents Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) of Prenatal Screens Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) of Postnatal Screens Accepting Intensive Service
Benton & Linn	18 (55%)	12 (55%)	25 (57%)	5 (45%)	20 (59%)	10 (50%)
Benton	9 (53%)	7 (64%)	12 (57%)	4 (57%)	10 (56%)	6 (60%)
Linn	9 (56%)	5 (45%)	13 (57%)	1 (25%)	10 (63%)	4 (40%)
Clackamas	24 (80%)	9 (82%)	21 (84%)	12 (75%)	16 (84%)	17 (81%)
Columbia, Clatsop, & Tillamook	33 (87%)	9 (82%)	22 (85%)	20 (87%)	17 (85%)	24 (86%)
Clatsop	9 (100%)	3 (75%)	9 (90%)	3 (100%)	1 (100%)	11 (92%)
Columbia	12 (92%)	2 (100%)	4 (100%)	10 (91%)	8 (100%)	6 (86%)
Tillamook	12 (75%)	4 (80%)	9 (75%)	7 (78%)	8 (73%)	7 (78%)
Coos & Curry	2 (67%)	--	1 (50%)	1 (100%)	1 (50%)	1 (100%)
Coos	1 (100%)	--	1 (100%)	--	1 (100%)	--
Curry	1 (50%)	--	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Crook, Deschutes, & Jefferson	33 (40%)	10 (48%)	30 (45%)	13 (35%)	3 (43%)	37 (41%)
Crook	8 (44%)	0 (0%)	6 (40%)	2 (40%)	0 (0%)	8 (47%)
Deschutes	24 (43%)	9 (56%)	23 (51%)	10 (37%)	3 (75%)	27 (42%)
Jefferson	1 (13%)	1 (33%)	1 (17%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	2 (22%)
Douglas, Klamath, & Lake	34 (65%)	14 (58%)	19 (63%)	29 (63%)	23 (66%)	22 (65%)
Douglas	13 (57%)	4 (33%)	7 (50%)	10 (48%)	8 (44%)	8 (62%)
Klamath	18 (69%)	6 (75%)	9 (69%)	15 (71%)	13 (87%)	10 (59%)
Lake	3 (100%)	4 (100%)	3 (100%)	4 (100%)	2 (100%)	4 (100%)

Table 7. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service: Demographic Factors 2019 Cohort (CE 1-2.B, CE 5-4.B)

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) Mothers with At Least a High School Education Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) Mothers with Less Than a High School Education Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) of Employed Parents Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) of Unemployed Parents Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) of Prenatal Screens Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) of Postnatal Screens Accepting Intensive Service
Grant & Harney	9 (69%)	3 (75%)	2 (50%)	10 (77%)	7 (70%)	5 (71%)
Grant	6 (75%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	6 (75%)	5 (71%)	2 (67%)
Harney	3 (60%)	2 (100%)	1 (50%)	4 (80%)	2 (67%)	3 (75%)
Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, & Wheeler	15 (79%)	10 (56%)	19 (68%)	6 (67%)	16 (67%)	9 (75%)
Gilliam	--	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	--	--	0 (0%)
Hood River	7 (64%)	6 (67%)	9 (64%)	4 (67%)	6 (55%)	7 (78%)
Sherman	--	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	--	1 (100%)	--
Wasco	7 (100%)	3 (43%)	8 (73%)	2 (67%)	9 (75%)	1 (100%)
Wheeler	1 (100%)	--	1 (100%)	--	--	1 (100%)
Josephine & Jackson	43 (51%)	12 (63%)	40 (56%)	15 (47%)	5 (71%)	49 (54%)
Jackson	24 (63%)	9 (75%)	24 (77%)	9 (47%)	4 (100%)	29 (63%)
Josephine	19 (40%)	3 (43%)	16 (39%)	6 (46%)	1 (33%)	20 (44%)
Lane	57 (50%)	10 (50%)	37 (43%)	30 (65%)	25 (68%)	38 (45%)
Marion & Polk	60 (58%)	42 (60%)	57 (57%)	45 (61%)	29 (73%)	65 (56%)
Marion	56 (58%)	40 (61%)	56 (58%)	40 (60%)	28 (72%)	60 (56%)
Polk	4 (57%)	2 (50%)	1 (25%)	5 (71%)	1 (100%)	5 (50%)



Table 7. Analysis of Acceptance Rates for Intensive Service: Demographic Factors 2019 Cohort (CE 1-2.B, CE 5-4.B)

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) Mothers with At Least a High School Education Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) Mothers with Less Than a High School Education Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) of Employed Parents Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) of Unemployed Parents Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) of Prenatal Screens Accepting Intensive Service	Number (%) of Postnatal Screens Accepting Intensive Service
Multnomah	87 (44%)	57 (50%)	46 (48%)	98 (46%)	41 (52%)	90 (44%)
Umatilla, Union, & Morrow	15 (44%)	20 (63%)	20 (53%)	15 (54%)	11 (55%)	23 (52%)
Morrow	1 (33%)	3 (75%)	3 (60%)	1 (50%)	2 (100%)	2 (40%)
Umatilla	7 (41%)	11 (58%)	12 (50%)	6 (50%)	8 (50%)	9 (50%)
Union	7 (50%)	6 (67%)	5 (56%)	8 (57%)	1 (50%)	12 (57%)
Wallowa, Baker, & Malheur	12 (86%)	2 (67%)	6 (86%)	8 (80%)	7 (100%)	7 (78%)
Baker	6 (86%)	--	3 (100%)	3 (75%)	3 (100%)	3 (75%)
Malheur	3 (75%)	2 (67%)	2 (67%)	3 (75%)	2 (100%)	3 (75%)
Wallowa	3 (100%)	--	1 (100%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	1 (100%)
Washington	30 (59%)	20 (53%)	24 (57%)	26 (55%)	32 (58%)	17 (53%)
Yamhill	4 (36%)	3 (50%)	4 (44%)	3 (38%)	5 (45%)	2 (40%)
State	476 (54%)	233 (56%)	373 (55%)	336 (55%)	258 (63%)	416 (52%)

Table 8. Retention Rates¹⁸ for Families Newly Enrolled 2017 (CE 3-4.B)

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of <u>New IS</u> Families Enrolled in 2017 ¹⁹	Number (%) Still Enrolled 3 Months Later	Number (%) Still Enrolled 6 Months Later	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) Still Enrolled 18 Months Later	Number (%) Still Enrolled 24 Months Later	Of Those Exited, Average Number of Months in Program
Benton & Linn	22	20 (91%)	20 (91%)	16 (73%)	13 (59%)	10 (45%)	12
Benton	12	11 (92%)	11 (92%)	8 (67%)	7 (58%)	5 (42%)	12
Linn	10	9 (90%)	9 (90%)	8 (80%)	6 (60%)	5 (50%)	13
Clackamas	4	4 (100%)	4 (100%)	3 (75%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	12
Columbia, Clatsop, & Tillamook	42	38 (90%)	37 (88%)	33 (79%)	30 (71%)	28 (67%)	14
Clatsop	17	16 (94%)	15 (88%)	15 (88%)	15 (88%)	15 (88%)	20
Columbia	14	13 (93%)	13 (93%)	10 (71%)	10 (71%)	8 (57%)	14
Tillamook	11	9 (82%)	9 (82%)	8 (73%)	5 (45%)	5 (45%)	9
Coos & Curry	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
Coos	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
Curry	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
Crook, Deschutes, & Jefferson	12	11 (92%)	10 (83%)	8 (67%)	6 (50%)	6 (50%)	12
Crook	5	4 (80%)	3 (60%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7
Deschutes	5	5 (100%)	5 (100%)	5 (100%)	5 (100%)	5 (100%)	34
Jefferson	2	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	17
Douglas, Klamath, & Lake	38	32 (84%)	30 (79%)	26 (68%)	26 (68%)	25 (66%)	12
Douglas	19	16 (84%)	14 (74%)	11 (58%)	11 (58%)	11 (58%)	9
Klamath	17	15 (88%)	15 (88%)	14 (82%)	14 (82%)	13 (76%)	18
Lake	2	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	2

¹⁸ Healthy Families America suggests using the first and last home visit dates to calculate retention. In the event of incomplete data, the date of the exit form was substituted when the last home visit date was missing.

¹⁹ Healthy Families America recommends calculating retention rates based on earlier enrollment years. Therefore, this table presents retention rates for all families enrolled in 2017. Enrollment is based on the number of families receiving a first home visit during 2017.



Table 8. Retention Rates¹⁸ for Families Newly Enrolled 2017 (CE 3-4.B)

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of <u>New IS</u> Families Enrolled in 2017 ¹⁹	Number (%) Still Enrolled 3 Months Later	Number (%) Still Enrolled 6 Months Later	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) Still Enrolled 18 Months Later	Number (%) Still Enrolled 24 Months Later	Of Those Exited, Average Number of Months in Program
Grant & Harney	4	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	8
Grant	4	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	8
Harney	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, & Wheeler	4	4 (100%)	4 (100%)	4 (100%)	4 (100%)	4 (100%)	N/A
Gilliam	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hood River	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
Sherman	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
Wasco	4	4 (100%)	4 (100%)	4 (100%)	4 (100%)	4 (100%)	N/A
Wheeler	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
Josephine & Jackson	20	19 (95%)	17 (85%)	17 (85%)	16 (80%)	13 (65%)	15
Jackson	11	10 (91%)	9 (82%)	9 (82%)	8 (73%)	6 (55%)	13
Josephine	9	9 (100%)	8 (89%)	8 (89%)	8 (89%)	7 (78%)	18
Lane	45	39 (87%)	33 (73%)	30 (67%)	28 (62%)	26 (58%)	13
Marion & Polk	4	4 (100%)	4 (100%)	3 (75%)	3 (75%)	3 (75%)	11
Marion	4	4 (100%)	4 (100%)	3 (75%)	3 (75%)	3 (75%)	11
Polk	0	--	--	--	--	--	--

¹⁸ Healthy Families America suggests using the first and last home visit dates to calculate retention. In the event of incomplete data, the date of the exit form was substituted when the last home visit date was missing.

¹⁹ Healthy Families America recommends calculating retention rates based on earlier enrollment years. Therefore, this table presents retention rates for all families enrolled in 2017. Enrollment is based on the number of families receiving a first home visit during 2017.

Table 8. Retention Rates¹⁸ for Families Newly Enrolled 2017 (CE 3-4.B)

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of <u>New IS</u> Families Enrolled in 2017 ¹⁹	Number (%) Still Enrolled 3 Months Later	Number (%) Still Enrolled 6 Months Later	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) Still Enrolled 18 Months Later	Number (%) Still Enrolled 24 Months Later	Of Those Exited, Average Number of Months in Program
Multnomah	115	108 (94%)	96 (83%)	87 (76%)	75 (65%)	71 (62%)	11
Umatilla, Union, & Morrow	29	22 (76%)	18 (62%)	16 (55%)	15 (52%)	14 (48%)	7
Morrow	2	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	(unk.)
Umatilla	17	14 (82%)	12 (71%)	10 (59%)	9 (53%)	8 (47%)	9
Union	10	7 (70%)	5 (50%)	5 (50%)	5 (50%)	5 (50%)	3
Wallowa, Baker, & Malheur	3	2 (67%)	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	4
Baker	1	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2
Malheur	2	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	7
Wallowa	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
Washington	42	42 (100%)	41 (98%)	40 (95%)	39 (93%)	36 (86%)	23
Yamhill	11	11 (100%)	11 (100%)	9 (82%)	5 (45%)	4 (36%)	14
State	395	357 (90%)	328 (83%)	294 (74%)	264 (67%)	244 (62%)	13

¹⁸ Healthy Families America suggests using the first and last home visit dates to calculate retention. In the event of incomplete data, the date of the exit form was substituted when the last home visit date was missing.

¹⁹ Healthy Families America recommends calculating retention rates based on earlier enrollment years. Therefore, this table presents retention rates for all families enrolled in 2017. Enrollment is based on the number of families receiving a first home visit during 2017.



Table 9. Retention Rates for Families Newly Enrolled 2018 (CE 3-4.B)

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of <u>New IS</u> Families Enrolled in 2018 ²⁰	Number (%) Still Enrolled 3 Months Later	Number (%) Still Enrolled 6 Months Later	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Of Those Exited, Average Number of Months in Program
Benton & Linn	35	24 (69%)	23 (66%)	19 (54%)	4
Benton	18	15 (83%)	14 (78%)	13 (72%)	4
Linn	17	9 (53%)	9 (53%)	6 (35%)	4
Clackamas	21	19 (90%)	15 (71%)	14 (67%)	6
Columbia, Clatsop, & Tillamook	40	38 (95%)	38 (95%)	34 (85%)	9
Clatsop	14	14 (100%)	14 (100%)	12 (86%)	12
Columbia	5	4 (80%)	4 (80%)	4 (80%)	7
Tillamook	21	20 (95%)	20 (95%)	18 (86%)	6
Coos & Curry	8	6 (75%)	6 (75%)	6 (75%)	1
Coos	6	4 (67%)	4 (67%)	4 (67%)	1
Curry	2	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	--
Crook, Deschutes, & Jefferson	22	20 (91%)	20 (91%)	17 (77%)	6
Crook	4	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	1 (25%)	4
Deschutes	13	13 (100%)	13 (100%)	11 (85%)	9
Jefferson	5	5 (100%)	5 (100%)	5 (100%)	--
Douglas, Klamath, & Lake	49	46 (94%)	39 (80%)	33 (67%)	6
Douglas	14	12 (86%)	7 (50%)	5 (36%)	5
Klamath	33	32 (97%)	30 (91%)	26 (79%)	7
Lake	2	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	--

²⁰ Healthy Families America recommends calculating retention rates based on earlier enrollment years. Therefore, this table presents retention rates for all families enrolled in 2018. Enrollment is based on the number of families receiving a first home visit during 2018.

Table 9. Retention Rates for Families Newly Enrolled 2018 (CE 3-4.B)

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of <u>New IS</u> Families Enrolled in 2018 ²⁰	Number (%) Still Enrolled 3 Months Later	Number (%) Still Enrolled 6 Months Later	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Of Those Exited, Average Number of Months in Program
Grant & Harney	5	4 (80%)	3 (60%)	3 (60%)	3
Grant	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	--
Harney	4	3 (75%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	3
Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, & Wheeler	15	14 (93%)	14 (93%)	12 (80%)	5
Gilliam	0	--	--	--	--
Hood River	12	11 (92%)	11 (92%)	10 (83%)	4
Sherman	0	--	--	--	--
Wasco	3	3 (100%)	3 (100%)	2 (67%)	6
Wheeler	0	--	--	--	--
Josephine & Jackson	35	29 (83%)	27 (77%)	15 (43%)	8
Jackson	26	22 (85%)	20 (77%)	11 (42%)	7
Josephine	9	7 (78%)	7 (78%)	4 (44%)	8
Lane	45	41 (91%)	36 (80%)	30 (67%)	8
Marion & Polk	49	42 (86%)	36 (73%)	29 (59%)	4
Marion	45	38 (84%)	32 (71%)	25 (56%)	4
Polk	4	4 (100%)	4 (100%)	4 (100%)	--

²⁰ Healthy Families America recommends calculating retention rates based on earlier enrollment years. Therefore, this table presents retention rates for all families enrolled in 2018. Enrollment is based on the number of families receiving a first home visit during 2018.



Table 9. Retention Rates for Families Newly Enrolled 2018 (CE 3-4.B)

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of <u>New IS</u> Families Enrolled in 2018 ²⁰	Number (%) Still Enrolled 3 Months Later	Number (%) Still Enrolled 6 Months Later	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Of Those Exited, Average Number of Months in Program
Multnomah	116	99 (85%)	90 (78%)	75 (65%)	6
Umatilla, Union, & Morrow	24	20 (83%)	17 (71%)	17 (71%)	3
Morrow	6	6 (100%)	4 (67%)	4 (67%)	5
Umatilla	14	11 (79%)	10 (71%)	10 (71%)	2
Union	4	3 (75%)	3 (75%)	3 (75%)	1
Wallowa, Baker, & Malheur	13	12 (92%)	11 (85%)	7 (54%)	11
Baker	2	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	9
Malheur	10	9 (90%)	8 (80%)	6 (60%)	12
Wallowa	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	--
Washington	51	48 (94%)	40 (78%)	36 (71%)	6
Yamhill	15	14 (93%)	12 (80%)	10 (67%)	7
State	543	476 (88%)	427 (79%)	357 (66%)	6

²⁰ Healthy Families America recommends calculating retention rates based on earlier enrollment years. Therefore, this table presents retention rates for all families enrolled in 2018. Enrollment is based on the number of families receiving a first home visit during 2018.

Table 10a. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Race/Ethnicity for Families Enrolled 2018 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B)

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Hispanic/ Latino Families Enrolled in 2018	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number of White Families Enrolled in 2017	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number of Other Race Families ²¹ Enrolled in 2018	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later
Benton & Linn	13	5 (38%)	19	13 (68%)	3	1 (33%)
Benton	7	5 (71%)	9	7 (78%)	2	1 (50%)
Linn	6	0 (0%)	10	6 (60%)	1	0 (0%)
Clackamas	3	1 (33%)	15	12 (80%)	3	1 (33%)
Columbia, Clatsop, & Tillamook	9	9 (100%)	27	21 (78%)	4	4 (100%)
Clatsop	3	3 (100%)	8	6 (75%)	3	3 (100%)
Columbia	1	1 (100%)	4	3 (75%)	0	--
Tillamook	5	5 (100%)	15	12 (80%)	1	1 (100%)
Coos & Curry	1	1 (100%)	6	5 (83%)	1	0 (0%)
Coos	1	1 (100%)	4	3 (75%)	1	0 (0%)
Curry	0	--	2	2 (100%)	0	--
Crook, Deschutes, & Jefferson	4	4 (100%)	16	11 (69%)	2	2 (100%)
Crook	1	1 (100%)	3	0 (0%)	0	--
Deschutes	1	1 (100%)	11	9 (82%)	1	1 (100%)
Jefferson	2	2 (100%)	2	2 (100%)	1	1 (100%)
Douglas, Klamath, & Lake	4	3 (75%)	35	21 (60%)	10	9 (90%)
Douglas	1	1 (100%)	11	2 (18%)	2	2 (100%)
Klamath	3	2 (67%)	22	17 (77%)	8	7 (88%)
Lake	0	--	2	2 (100%)	0	--

²¹ Sample sizes were not sufficient for analysis of acceptance rates for other individual racial/ethnic groups.



Table 10a. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Race/Ethnicity for Families Enrolled 2018 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B)

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Hispanic/ Latino Families Enrolled in 2018	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number of White Families Enrolled in 2017	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number of Other Race Families ²¹ Enrolled in 2018	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later
Grant & Harney	0	--	5	3 (60%)	0	--
Grant	0	--	1	1 (100%)	0	--
Harney	0	--	4	2 (50%)	0	--
Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, & Wheeler	10	9 (90%)	4	3 (75%)	1	0 (0%)
Gilliam	0	--	0	--	0	--
Hood River	9	8 (89%)	3	2 (67%)	0	--
Sherman	0	--	0	--	0	--
Wasco	1	1 (100%)	1	1 (100%)	1	0 (0%)
Wheeler	0	--	0	--	0	--
Josephine & Jackson	8	4 (50%)	21	9 (43%)	6	2 (33%)
Jackson	7	3 (43%)	14	6 (43%)	5	2 (40%)
Josephine	1	1 (100%)	7	3 (43%)	1	0 (0%)
Lane	6	5 (83%)	33	20 (61%)	6	5 (83%)
Marion & Polk	34	21 (62%)	12	7 (58%)	3	1 (33%)
Marion	32	19 (59%)	10	5 (50%)	3	1 (33%)
Polk	2	2 (100%)	2	2 (100%)	0	--

²¹ Sample sizes were not sufficient for analysis of acceptance rates for other individual racial/ethnic groups.

Table 10a. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Race/Ethnicity for Families Enrolled 2018 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B)

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Hispanic/ Latino Families Enrolled in 2018	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number of White Families Enrolled in 2017	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number of Other Race Families ²¹ Enrolled in 2018	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later
Multnomah	31	18 (58%)	23	14 (61%)	62	43 (69%)
Umatilla, Union, & Morrow	14	10 (71%)	7	5 (71%)	3	2 (67%)
Morrow	6	4 (67%)	0	--	0	--
Umatilla	8	6 (75%)	3	2 (67%)	3	2 (67%)
Union	0	--	4	3 (75%)	0	--
Wallowa, Baker, & Malheur	2	2 (100%)	7	3 (43%)	4	2 (50%)
Baker	0	--	1	0 (0%)	1	0 (0%)
Malheur	2	2 (100%)	6	3 (50%)	2	1 (50%)
Wallowa	0	--	0	--	1	1 (100%)
Washington	28	21 (75%)	15	9 (60%)	8	6 (75%)
Yamhill	6	4 (67%)	8	5 (63%)	1	1 (100%)
State	173	117 (68%)	253	161 (64%)	117	79 (68%)

²¹ Sample sizes were not sufficient for analysis of acceptance rates for other individual racial/ethnic groups.



Table 10b. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Spoken Language²² for Families Enrolled 2018 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B)

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Spanish Speaking Households Enrolled in 2018	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number of English Speaking Households Enrolled in 2018	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later
Benton & Linn	9	4 (44%)	24	14 (58%)
Benton	5	4 (80%)	12	8 (67%)
Linn	4	0 (0%)	12	6 (50%)
Clackamas	1	0 (0%)	20	14 (70%)
Columbia, Clatsop, & Tillamook	6	6 (100%)	33	27 (82%)
Clatsop	1	1 (100%)	12	10 (83%)
Columbia	1	1 (100%)	4	3 (75%)
Tillamook	4	4 (100%)	17	14 (82%)
Coos & Curry	0	--	8	6 (75%)
Coos	0	--	6	4 (67%)
Curry	0	--	2	2 (100%)
Crook, Deschutes, & Jefferson	1	1 (100%)	20	15 (75%)
Crook	0	--	4	1 (25%)
Deschutes	1	1 (100%)	12	10 (83%)
Jefferson	0	--	4	4 (100%)
Douglas, Klamath, & Lake	1	1 (100%)	47	31 (66%)
Douglas	1	1 (100%)	13	4 (31%)
Klamath	0	--	32	25 (78%)
Lake	0	--	2	2 (100%)

²² Sample sizes were not sufficient for analysis of acceptance rates for other individual language groups.

Table 10b. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Spoken Language²² for Families Enrolled 2018 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B)

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Spanish Speaking Households Enrolled in 2018	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number of English Speaking Households Enrolled in 2018	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later
Grant & Harney	0	--	5	3 (60%)
Grant	0	--	1	1 (100%)
Harney	0	--	4	2 (50%)
Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, & Wheeler	8	8 (100%)	7	4 (57%)
Gilliam	0	--	0	--
Hood River	7	7 (100%)	5	3 (60%)
Sherman	0	--	0	--
Wasco	1	1 (100%)	2	1 (50%)
Wheeler	0	--	0	--
Josephine & Jackson	2	1 (50%)	30	13 (43%)
Jackson	2	1 (50%)	21	9 (43%)
Josephine	0	--	9	4 (44%)
Lane	4	3 (75%)	39	25 (64%)
Marion & Polk	24	16 (67%)	23	12 (52%)
Marion	23	15 (65%)	20	9 (45%)
Polk	1	1 (100%)	3	3 (100%)

²² Sample sizes were not sufficient for analysis of acceptance rates for other individual language groups.



Table 10b. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Spoken Language²² for Families Enrolled 2018 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B)

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Spanish Speaking Households Enrolled in 2018	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number of English Speaking Households Enrolled in 2018	Number (%) Still Enrolled 12 Months Later
Multnomah	17	11 (65%)	56	36 (64%)
Umatilla, Union, & Morrow	10	7 (70%)	13	10 (77%)
Morrow	3	3 (100%)	2	1 (50%)
Umatilla	7	4 (57%)	7	6 (86%)
Union	0	--	4	3 (75%)
Wallowa, Baker, & Malheur	1	1 (100%)	11	5 (45%)
Baker	0	--	2	0 (0%)
Malheur	1	1 (100%)	8	4 (50%)
Wallowa	0	--	1	1 (100%)
Washington	18	14 (78%)	30	19 (63%)
Yamhill	3	1 (33%)	11	8 (73%)
State	105	74 (70%)	377	242 (64%)

²² Sample sizes were not sufficient for analysis of acceptance rates for other individual language groups.

Table 11a. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Demographic Factors for Families Enrolled 2018 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B)

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of Married Mothers Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) of Single Mothers Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) of Mothers with At Least a High School Education Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) of Mothers with Less Than a High School Education Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) of Employed Parents Still Enrolled 12 Months Later
Benton & Linn	6 (67%)	13 (50%)	10 (56%)	9 (53%)	11 (50%)
Benton	3 (75%)	10 (71%)	6 (75%)	7 (70%)	8 (73%)
Linn	3 (60%)	3 (25%)	4 (40%)	2 (29%)	3 (27%)
Clackamas	3 (100%)	10 (59%)	9 (69%)	5 (63%)	8 (100%)
Columbia, Clatsop, & Tillamook	10 (77%)	24 (89%)	25 (83%)	9 (90%)	23 (88%)
Clatsop	6 (86%)	6 (86%)	9 (90%)	3 (75%)	9 (90%)
Columbia	--	4 (80%)	1 (50%)	3 (100%)	3 (100%)
Tillamook	4 (67%)	14 (93%)	15 (83%)	3 (100%)	11 (85%)
Coos & Curry	1 (33%)	3 (100%)	5 (83%)	1 (50%)	5 (100%)
Coos	1 (33%)	2 (100%)	3 (75%)	1 (50%)	3 (100%)
Curry	--	1 (100%)	2 (100%)	--	2 (100%)
Crook, Deschutes, & Jefferson	1 (50%)	16 (80%)	12 (75%)	5 (83%)	11 (79%)
Crook	--	1 (25%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Deschutes	1 (50%)	10 (91%)	7 (78%)	4 (100%)	7 (100%)
Jefferson	--	5 (100%)	4 (100%)	1 (100%)	4 (100%)
Douglas, Klamath, & Lake	9 (75%)	24 (65%)	24 (69%)	9 (64%)	7 (54%)
Douglas	2 (100%)	3 (25%)	4 (40%)	1 (25%)	2 (40%)
Klamath	7 (70%)	19 (83%)	19 (79%)	7 (78%)	5 (63%)
Lake	--	2 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	--



Table 11a. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Demographic Factors for Families Enrolled 2018 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B)

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of Married Mothers Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) of Single Mothers Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) of Mothers with At Least a High School Education Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) of Mothers with Less Than a High School Education Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) of Employed Parents Still Enrolled 12 Months Later
Grant & Harney	2 (67%)	1 (50%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
Grant	--	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	--	--
Harney	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, & Wheeler	5 (100%)	6 (67%)	7 (88%)	4 (67%)	9 (82%)
Gilliam	--	--	--	--	--
Hood River	5 (100%)	4 (67%)	5 (83%)	4 (80%)	8 (80%)
Sherman	--	--	--	--	--
Wasco	--	2 (67%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Wheeler	--	--	--	--	--
Josephine & Jackson	9 (64%)	6 (29%)	11 (39%)	4 (57%)	7 (35%)
Jackson	7 (70%)	4 (25%)	9 (41%)	2 (50%)	5 (36%)
Josephine	2 (50%)	2 (40%)	2 (33%)	2 (67%)	2 (33%)
Lane	9 (69%)	21 (66%)	23 (62%)	7 (88%)	21 (78%)
Marion & Polk	12 (57%)	17 (63%)	17 (59%)	12 (60%)	20 (65%)
Marion	12 (57%)	13 (57%)	16 (57%)	9 (53%)	18 (62%)
Polk	--	4 (100%)	1 (100%)	3 (100%)	2 (100%)

Table 11a. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Demographic Factors for Families Enrolled 2018 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B)

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of Married Mothers Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) of Single Mothers Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) of Mothers with At Least a High School Education Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) of Mothers with Less Than a High School Education Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) of Employed Parents Still Enrolled 12 Months Later
Multnomah	26 (63%)	44 (63%)	42 (61%)	29 (67%)	24 (57%)
Umatilla, Union, & Morrow	2 (67%)	15 (71%)	10 (91%)	7 (54%)	10 (67%)
Morrow	0 (0%)	4 (80%)	2 (67%)	2 (67%)	3 (60%)
Umatilla	1 (100%)	9 (69%)	6 (100%)	4 (50%)	6 (67%)
Union	1 (100%)	2 (67%)	2 (100%)	1 (50%)	1 (100%)
Wallowa, Baker, & Malheur	2 (50%)	5 (56%)	4 (50%)	3 (60%)	4 (67%)
Baker	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	--
Malheur	2 (67%)	4 (57%)	4 (57%)	2 (67%)	4 (67%)
Wallowa	--	1 (100%)	--	1 (100%)	--
Washington	20 (87%)	16 (57%)	21 (64%)	15 (83%)	18 (67%)
Yamhill	5 (63%)	4 (67%)	8 (67%)	2 (67%)	4 (50%)
State	122 (69%)	225 (63%)	231 (65%)	121 (67%)	184 (66%)



Table 11b. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Demographic Factors for Families Enrolled 2018 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B)

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of Unemployed Parents Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) of Teen Mothers Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) of Non-Teen Mothers Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) of Families Screened Prenatally Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) of Families Screened After Birth Still Enrolled 12 Months Later
Benton & Linn	5 (63%)	1 (33%)	18 (56%)	13 (52%)	6 (60%)
Benton	4 (80%)	0 (0%)	13 (76%)	10 (71%)	3 (75%)
Linn	1 (33%)	1 (50%)	5 (33%)	3 (27%)	3 (50%)
Clackamas	4 (44%)	3 (75%)	11 (65%)	10 (83%)	4 (44%)
Columbia, Clatsop, & Tillamook	3 (75%)	--	34 (85%)	13 (93%)	21 (81%)
Clatsop	1 (100%)	--	12 (86%)	2 (100%)	10 (83%)
Columbia	--	--	4 (80%)	2 (67%)	2 (100%)
Tillamook	2 (67%)	--	18 (86%)	9 (100%)	9 (75%)
Coos & Curry	1 (33%)	--	6 (75%)	6 (86%)	0 (0%)
Coos	1 (33%)	--	4 (67%)	4 (80%)	0 (0%)
Curry	--	--	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	--
Crook, Deschutes, & Jefferson	1 (50%)	--	17 (77%)	5 (100%)	9 (64%)
Crook	--	--	1 (25%)	--	1 (25%)
Deschutes	0 (0%)	--	11 (85%)	2 (100%)	7 (78%)
Jefferson	1 (100%)	--	5 (100%)	3 (100%)	1 (100%)
Douglas, Klamath, & Lake	17 (77%)	2 (100%)	31 (66%)	12 (57%)	20 (74%)
Douglas	1 (25%)	--	5 (36%)	1 (13%)	4 (67%)
Klamath	14 (88%)	2 (100%)	24 (77%)	10 (83%)	15 (75%)
Lake	2 (100%)	--	2 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)

Table 11b. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Demographic Factors for Families Enrolled 2018 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B)

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of Unemployed Parents Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) of Teen Mothers Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) of Non-Teen Mothers Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) of Families Screened Prenatally Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) of Families Screened After Birth Still Enrolled 12 Months Later
Grant & Harney	1 (50%)	--	3 (60%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)
Grant	1 (100%)	--	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	--
Harney	0 (0%)	--	2 (50%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)
Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, & Wheeler	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	11 (85%)	9 (90%)	3 (60%)
Gilliam	--	--	--	--	--
Hood River	--	0 (0%)	9 (90%)	8 (100%)	2 (50%)
Sherman	--	--	--	--	--
Wasco	1 (100%)	--	2 (67%)	1 (50%)	1 (100%)
Wheeler	--	--	--	--	--
Josephine & Jackson	5 (56%)	--	15 (43%)	3 (43%)	12 (43%)
Jackson	3 (50%)	--	11 (42%)	1 (20%)	10 (48%)
Josephine	2 (67%)	--	4 (44%)	2 (100%)	2 (29%)
Lane	7 (58%)	2 (67%)	28 (67%)	7 (54%)	22 (71%)
Marion & Polk	4 (44%)	--	29 (59%)	4 (50%)	25 (64%)
Marion	3 (38%)	--	25 (56%)	2 (33%)	23 (62%)
Polk	1 (100%)	--	4 (100%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)



Table 11b. Analysis of 12-Month Retention Rates by Demographic Factors for Families Enrolled 2018 (CE 3-4.B, CE 5-4.B)

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of Unemployed Parents Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) of Teen Mothers Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) of Non-Teen Mothers Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) of Families Screened Prenatally Still Enrolled 12 Months Later	Number (%) of Families Screened After Birth Still Enrolled 12 Months Later
Multnomah	40 (66%)	1 (33%)	70 (64%)	22 (61%)	49 (64%)
Umatilla, Union, & Morrow	4 (67%)	1 (50%)	16 (73%)	7 (58%)	10 (83%)
Morrow	--	1 (100%)	3 (60%)	3 (60%)	1 (100%)
Umatilla	4 (80%)	--	10 (71%)	2 (50%)	8 (80%)
Union	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	2 (67%)	1 (100%)
Wallowa, Baker, & Malheur	2 (67%)	1 (50%)	6 (55%)	5 (56%)	2 (50%)
Baker	0 (0%)	--	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Malheur	1 (100%)	1 (50%)	5 (63%)	4 (57%)	2 (67%)
Wallowa	1 (100%)	--	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	--
Washington	14 (82%)	2 (100%)	34 (69%)	15 (68%)	21 (78%)
Yamhill	3 (100%)	--	10 (67%)	5 (83%)	5 (56%)
State	112 (65%)	13 (59%)	339 (66%)	139 (66%)	209 (65%)

Table 12. Participant Reasons for Exiting Program Prior to Program Completion²³ (CE 3-4.B)

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Exiting Families in 2018	Median ²⁴ Age of Child at Exit (In Months)	Number (%) that Reached the Age Limit of the Program	Number (%) Moved, Unable to Locate	Number (%) Parent Declined Further Service ²⁵	Number (%) Families Moved Out of County	Other Reason ²⁶
Benton & Linn	44	18	8 (18%)	4 (9%)	27 (61%)	5 (11%)	0 (0%)
Benton	24	16	5 (21%)	3 (13%)	12 (50%)	4 (17%)	0 (0%)
Linn	20	19	3 (15%)	1 (5%)	15 (75%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)
Clackamas	18	25	4 (22%)	0 (0%)	7 (39%)	6 (33%)	1 (6%)
Columbia, Clatsop, & Tillamook	43	18	16 (37%)	3 (7%)	7 (16%)	15 (35%)	2 (5%)
Clatsop	9	37	5 (56%)	0 (0%)	1 (11%)	2 (22%)	1 (11%)
Columbia	18	15	4 (22%)	1 (6%)	5 (28%)	7 (39%)	1 (6%)
Tillamook	16	22	7 (44%)	2 (13%)	1 (6%)	6 (38%)	0 (0%)
Coos & Curry	3	4	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)
Coos	3	4	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)
Curry	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
Crook, Deschutes, & Jefferson	25	14	8 (32%)	1 (4%)	8 (32%)	4 (16%)	4 (16%)
Crook	5	9	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	4 (80%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Deschutes	14	9	4 (29%)	0 (0%)	4 (29%)	3 (21%)	3 (21%)
Jefferson	6	38	4 (67%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (17%)	1 (17%)
Douglas, Klamath, & Lake	32	13	8 (25%)	5 (16%)	10 (31%)	5 (16%)	4 (13%)
Douglas	18	8	4 (22%)	4 (22%)	5 (28%)	2 (11%)	3 (17%)
Klamath	14	17	4 (29%)	1 (7%)	5 (36%)	3 (21%)	1 (7%)
Lake	0	--	--	--	--	--	--

²³ Reasons for exiting Intensive Services are reported on the family's Exit Form completed by the home visitor.

²⁴ The "median" is the middle value in a series of numbers arranged from smallest to largest. The median is less sensitive to outliers compared to the average ("mean"), and is a more meaningful statistic for this type of analysis.

²⁵ "Decline Further Service" includes: (1) Parent no longer interested, (2) parent too busy, and (3) home visitor left, parent decided not to remain in program.

²⁶ "Other Reason" includes: (1) Child removed from custody, (2) home visitor had safety concerns visiting the family, or (3) the family transferred to a non-HFO program.



Table 12. Participant Reasons for Exiting Program Prior to Program Completion²³ (CE 3-4.B)

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Exiting Families in 2018	Median ²⁴ Age of Child at Exit (In Months)	Number (%) that Reached the Age Limit of the Program	Number (%) Moved, Unable to Locate	Number (%) Parent Declined Further Service ²⁵	Number (%) Families Moved Out of County	Other Reason ²⁶
Grant & Harney	6	38	4 (67%)	1 (17%)	1 (17%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Grant	3	36	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Harney	3	40	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, & Wheeler	27	15	4 (15%)	5 (19%)	10 (37%)	4 (15%)	4 (15%)
Gilliam	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hood River	11	15	3 (27%)	0 (0%)	5 (45%)	2 (18%)	1 (9%)
Sherman	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
Wasco	15	15	1 (7%)	5 (33%)	4 (27%)	2 (13%)	3 (20%)
Wheeler	1	24	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Josephine & Jackson	54	11	9 (17%)	5 (9%)	24 (44%)	6 (11%)	10 (19%)
Jackson	29	9	7 (24%)	2 (7%)	10 (34%)	3 (10%)	7 (24%)
Josephine	25	16	2 (8%)	3 (12%)	14 (56%)	3 (12%)	3 (12%)
Lane	61	16	16 (26%)	12 (20%)	23 (38%)	5 (8%)	5 (8%)
Marion & Polk	107	24	32 (30%)	29 (27%)	32 (30%)	7 (7%)	7 (7%)
Marion	102	24	31 (30%)	27 (26%)	30 (29%)	7 (7%)	7 (7%)
Polk	5	23	1 (20%)	2 (40%)	2 (40%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

²³ Reasons for exiting Intensive Services are reported on the family’s Exit Form completed by the home visitor and entered into the statewide data system.

²⁴ The “median” is the middle value in a series of numbers arranged from smallest to largest. The median is less sensitive to outliers compared to the “mean”, and is a more meaningful statistic for this type of analysis.

²⁵ “Decline Further Service” includes: (1) Parent no longer interested, (2) parent too busy, and (3) home visitor left, parent decided not to remain in program.

²⁶ “Other Reason” includes: (1) Child removed from custody, (2) home visitor had safety concerns visiting the family, or (3) the family transferred to a non-HFO program.

Table 12. Participant Reasons for Exiting Program Prior to Program Completion²³ (CE 3-4.B)

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Exiting Families in 2018	Median ²⁴ Age of Child at Exit (In Months)	Number (%) that Reached the Age Limit of the Program	Number (%) Moved, Unable to Locate	Number (%) Parent Declined Further Service ²⁵	Number (%) Families Moved Out of County	Other Reason ²⁶
Multnomah	190	21	64 (34%)	22 (12%)	73 (38%)	22 (12%)	9 (5%)
Umatilla, Union, & Morrow	16	24	5 (31%)	1 (6%)	8 (50%)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)
Morrow	5	28	2 (40%)	0 (0%)	2 (40%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)
Umatilla	10	26	3 (30%)	1 (10%)	5 (50%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)
Union	1	0	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Wallowa, Baker, & Malheur	13	9	2 (15%)	0 (0%)	6 (46%)	4 (31%)	1 (8%)
Baker	3	6	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	1 (33%)
Malheur	10	11	2 (20%)	0 (0%)	5 (50%)	3 (30%)	0 (0%)
Wallowa	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
Washington	61	19	21 (34%)	8 (13%)	16 (26%)	12 (20%)	4 (7%)
Yamhill	22	17	6 (27%)	1 (5%)	14 (64%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)
State	722	18	208 (29%)	97 (13%)	267 (37%)	97 (13%)	53 (7%)

²³ Reasons for exiting Intensive Services are reported on the family's Exit Form completed by the home visitor and entered into the statewide data system.

²⁴ The "median" is the middle value in a series of numbers arranged from smallest to largest. The median is less sensitive to outliers compared to the "mean", and is a more meaningful statistic for this type of analysis.

²⁵ "Decline Further Service" includes: (1) Parent no longer interested, (2) parent too busy, and (3) home visitor left, parent decided not to remain in program.

²⁶ "Other Reason" includes: (1) Child removed from custody, (2) home visitor had safety concerns visiting the family, or (3) the family transferred to a non-HFO program.



Table 13a. Parent Survey (Kempe) Risk Factors²⁷ for One or Both Parents/Caregivers in Intensive Service: Childrearing Characteristics

Program/County	Number of Completed Family Assessments	High Stress Family Assessment	Number (%) Lacking Nurturing Parents (history of maltreatment, corporal punishment, emotional abuse/neglect)		Number (%) with Substance Abuse, Mental Illness, or Criminal History		Substance Abuse	Mental Illness	Criminal History
			Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe			
Benton & Linn	54 (73%)	40 (74%)	7 (13%)	36 (67%)	9 (17%)	28 (52%)	21 (39%)	34 (63%)	11 (20%)
Benton	32 (71%)	21 (66%)	6 (19%)	18 (56%)	8 (25%)	12 (38%)	12 (38%)	19 (59%)	6 (19%)
Linn	22 (76%)	19 (86%)	1 (5%)	18 (82%)	1 (5%)	16 (73%)	9 (41%)	15 (68%)	5 (23%)
Clackamas	61 (90%)	55 (90%)	4 (7%)	52 (87%)	12 (20%)	43 (70%)	26 (43%)	34 (56%)	22 (36%)
Columbia, Clatsop, & Tillamook	119 (84%)	92 (77%)	13 (11%)	89 (75%)	27 (23%)	67 (56%)	72 (60%)	77 (64%)	59 (49%)
Clatsop	37 (79%)	29 (78%)	2 (5%)	28 (76%)	5 (14%)	25 (68%)	26 (68%)	26 (68%)	25 (66%)
Columbia	38 (84%)	28 (74%)	2 (5%)	31 (82%)	7 (18%)	19 (50%)	24 (63%)	22 (58%)	14 (37%)
Tillamook	44 (88%)	35 (80%)	9 (20%)	30 (68%)	15 (34%)	23 (52%)	22 (50%)	29 (66%)	20 (45%)
Coos & Curry	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Coos	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Curry	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Crook, Deschutes, & Jefferson	98 (78%)	84 (86%)	9 (9%)	78 (80%)	20 (20%)	65 (66%)	57 (58%)	64 (65%)	40 (41%)
Crook	16 (100%)	13 (81%)	2 (13%)	11 (69%)	6 (38%)	8 (50%)	4 (25%)	13 (81%)	3 (19%)
Deschutes	72 (75%)	61 (85%)	6 (8%)	58 (81%)	11 (15%)	52 (72%)	46 (64%)	51 (71%)	36 (50%)
Jefferson	10 (77%)	10 (100%)	1 (10%)	9 (90%)	3 (30%)	5 (50%)	7 (70%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)
Douglas, Klamath, & Lake	79 (70%)	68 (86%)	4 (5%)	70 (89%)	13 (16%)	60 (76%)	55 (70%)	54 (68%)	32 (41%)
Douglas	30 (77%)	24 (80%)	1 (3%)	25 (83%)	4 (13%)	23 (77%)	21 (70%)	20 (67%)	8 (27%)
Klamath	42 (67%)	38 (90%)	3 (7%)	38 (90%)	8 (19%)	33 (79%)	30 (71%)	31 (74%)	21 (50%)
Lake	7 (64%)	6 (86%)	0 (0%)	7 (100%)	1 (14%)	4 (57%)	4 (57%)	3 (43%)	3 (43%)

²⁷ Parent Survey risk factors are scored by the Home Visitor as 0 (not present), 5 (mild) or 10 (severe) and entered into the statewide data system. High stress assessments are those in which either parent’s score is 40 or higher.

**Table 13a. Parent Survey (Kempe) Risk Factors²⁷ for One or Both Parents/Caregivers in Intensive Service:
Childrearing Characteristics**

Program/County	Number of Completed Family Assessments	High Stress Family Assessment	Number (%) Lacking Nurturing Parents (history of maltreatment, corporal punishment, emotional abuse/neglect)		Number (%) with Substance Abuse, Mental Illness, or Criminal History		Substance Abuse	Mental Illness	Criminal History
			Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe			
Grant & Harney	14 (70%)	12 (86%)	1 (7%)	12 (86%)	3 (21%)	9 (64%)	9 (64%)	8 (57%)	5 (36%)
Grant	9 (82%)	8 (89%)	1 (11%)	8 (89%)	2 (22%)	6 (67%)	6 (67%)	5 (56%)	3 (33%)
Harney	5 (56%)	4 (80%)	0 (0%)	4 (80%)	1 (20%)	3 (60%)	3 (60%)	3 (60%)	2 (40%)
Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, & Wheeler	50 (63%)	44 (88%)	3 (6%)	42 (86%)	17 (35%)	21 (43%)	21 (42%)	26 (52%)	16 (32%)
Gilliam	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hood River	26 (55%)	24 (92%)	3 (12%)	23 (88%)	11 (42%)	7 (27%)	10 (38%)	9 (35%)	4 (15%)
Sherman	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Wasco	23 (82%)	20 (87%)	0 (0%)	19 (86%)	6 (27%)	14 (64%)	11 (48%)	17 (74%)	12 (52%)
Wheeler	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Josephine & Jackson	130 (87%)	107 (82%)	13 (10%)	105 (81%)	25 (19%)	74 (57%)	66 (51%)	61 (47%)	41 (32%)
Jackson	74 (94%)	54 (73%)	10 (14%)	55 (75%)	12 (16%)	39 (53%)	37 (50%)	29 (39%)	24 (32%)
Josephine	56 (80%)	53 (95%)	3 (5%)	50 (89%)	13 (23%)	35 (63%)	29 (52%)	32 (57%)	17 (30%)
Lane	141 (77%)	119 (84%)	12 (9%)	120 (85%)	23 (16%)	93 (66%)	86 (61%)	91 (65%)	44 (31%)
Marion & Polk	211 (81%)	131 (62%)	29 (14%)	136 (65%)	53 (25%)	79 (37%)	60 (28%)	75 (36%)	57 (27%)
Marion	200 (82%)	121 (61%)	29 (15%)	125 (63%)	49 (25%)	74 (37%)	55 (28%)	69 (35%)	52 (26%)
Polk	11 (61%)	10 (91%)	0 (0%)	11 (100%)	4 (36%)	5 (45%)	5 (45%)	6 (55%)	5 (45%)

²⁷ Parent Survey risk factors are scored by the Home Visitor as 0 (not present), 5 (mild) or 10 (severe) and entered into the statewide data system. High stress assessments are those in which either parent's score is 40 or higher.



Table 13a. Parent Survey (Kempe) Risk Factors²⁷ for One or Both Parents/Caregivers in Intensive Service: Childrearing Characteristics

Program/County	Number of Completed Family Assessments	High Stress Family Assessment	Number (%) Lacking Nurturing Parents (history of maltreatment, corporal punishment, emotional abuse/neglect)		Number (%) with Substance Abuse, Mental Illness, or Criminal History		Substance Abuse	Mental Illness	Criminal History
			Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe			
Multnomah	305 (72%)	230 (75%)	54 (18%)	201 (66%)	78 (26%)	120 (40%)	90 (30%)	145 (48%)	67 (22%)
Umatilla, Union, & Morrow	52 (76%)	38 (73%)	11 (21%)	31 (60%)	8 (15%)	23 (44%)	20 (38%)	17 (33%)	16 (31%)
Morrow	10 (91%)	7 (70%)	5 (50%)	3 (30%)	2 (20%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	3 (30%)	1 (10%)
Umatilla	30 (71%)	20 (67%)	5 (17%)	17 (57%)	6 (20%)	12 (40%)	12 (40%)	7 (23%)	7 (23%)
Union	12 (80%)	11 (92%)	1 (8%)	11 (92%)	0 (0%)	10 (83%)	7 (58%)	7 (58%)	8 (67%)
Wallowa, Baker, & Malheur	20 (59%)	12 (60%)	3 (15%)	13 (65%)	6 (30%)	8 (40%)	9 (45%)	10 (50%)	7 (35%)
Baker	4 (36%)	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	4 (100%)	1 (25%)	3 (75%)	3 (75%)	2 (50%)	3 (75%)
Malheur	15 (79%)	7 (47%)	3 (20%)	8 (53%)	5 (33%)	4 (27%)	5 (33%)	7 (47%)	4 (27%)
Wallowa	1 (25%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
Washington	132 (77%)	95 (72%)	15 (11%)	97 (74%)	33 (25%)	62 (47%)	37 (28%)	54 (41%)	33 (25%)
Yamhill	2 (5%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	1 (50%)
State	1,468 (75%)	1,129 (77%)	178 (12%)	1,083 (74%)	327 (22%)	754 (52%)	631 (43%)	752 (51%)	451 (31%)

²⁷ Parent Survey risk factors are scored by the Home Visitor as 0 (not present), 5 (mild) or 10 (severe) and entered into the statewide data system. High stress assessments are those in which either parent’s score is 40 or higher.

Table 13b. Parent Survey (Kempe) Risk Factors²⁸ for One or Both Parents/Caregivers in Intensive Service

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) with Previous or Current Child Welfare Involvement		<i>Prior Child Welfare Involvement</i>	<i>Current Child Welfare Involvement</i>	Number (%) with Isolation, Low Self-Esteem		Number (%) with Multiple Stressors	
	Mild	Severe			Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe
Benton & Linn	7 (13%)	8 (15%)	8 (15%)	9 (17%)	21 (39%)	14 (26%)	21 (40%)	21 (40%)
Benton	5 (16%)	7 (22%)	6 (19%)	7 (22%)	16 (50%)	6 (19%)	13 (41%)	11 (34%)
Linn	2 (9%)	1 (5%)	2 (9%)	2 (9%)	5 (23%)	8 (36%)	8 (38%)	10 (48%)
Clackamas	8 (13%)	6 (10%)	11 (18%)	2 (3%)	11 (19%)	37 (63%)	11 (18%)	45 (75%)
Columbia, Clatsop, & Tillamook	12 (10%)	25 (21%)	34 (28%)	13 (11%)	24 (20%)	55 (46%)	44 (37%)	54 (45%)
Clatsop	5 (14%)	7 (19%)	11 (29%)	5 (13%)	6 (16%)	21 (57%)	13 (35%)	17 (46%)
Columbia	3 (8%)	9 (24%)	10 (26%)	8 (21%)	10 (26%)	15 (39%)	18 (47%)	14 (37%)
Tillamook	4 (9%)	9 (20%)	13 (30%)	0 (0%)	8 (18%)	19 (43%)	13 (30%)	23 (52%)
Coos & Curry	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Coos	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Curry	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Crook, Deschutes, & Jefferson	5 (5%)	17 (18%)	15 (15%)	14 (14%)	22 (22%)	50 (51%)	23 (23%)	62 (63%)
Crook	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	4 (25%)	6 (38%)	2 (13%)	11 (69%)
Deschutes	3 (4%)	15 (21%)	14 (19%)	11 (15%)	15 (21%)	39 (54%)	20 (28%)	43 (60%)
Jefferson	2 (20%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	2 (20%)	3 (30%)	5 (50%)	1 (10%)	8 (80%)
Douglas, Klamath, & Lake	12 (15%)	23 (29%)	30 (38%)	10 (13%)	12 (15%)	45 (57%)	16 (20%)	53 (67%)
Douglas	5 (17%)	8 (27%)	9 (30%)	5 (17%)	7 (23%)	15 (50%)	7 (23%)	19 (63%)
Klamath	6 (14%)	12 (29%)	16 (38%)	5 (12%)	3 (7%)	26 (62%)	6 (14%)	30 (71%)
Lake	1 (14%)	3 (43%)	5 (71%)	0 (0%)	2 (29%)	4 (57%)	3 (43%)	4 (57%)

²⁸ Parent Survey risk factors are scored by the Home Visitor as 0 (not present), 5 (mild) or 10 (severe) and entered into the statewide data system. High stress assessments are those in which either parent's score is 40 or higher.



Table 13b. Parent Survey (Kempe) Risk Factors²⁸ for One or Both Parents/Caregivers in Intensive Service

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) with Previous or Current Child Welfare Involvement		<i>Prior Child Welfare Involvement</i>	<i>Current Child Welfare Involvement</i>	Number (%) with Isolation, Low Self-Esteem		Number (%) with Multiple Stressors	
	Mild	Severe			Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe
Grant & Harney	1 (7%)	4 (29%)	5 (36%)	1 (7%)	2 (14%)	6 (43%)	3 (21%)	9 (64%)
Grant	0 (0%)	2 (22%)	2 (22%)	1 (11%)	2 (22%)	3 (33%)	2 (22%)	6 (67%)
Harney	1 (20%)	2 (40%)	3 (60%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (60%)	1 (20%)	3 (60%)
Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, & Wheeler	4 (8%)	6 (12%)	4 (8%)	3 (6%)	21 (42%)	24 (48%)	18 (36%)	25 (50%)
Gilliam	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hood River	2 (8%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	15 (58%)	10 (38%)	13 (50%)	11 (42%)
Sherman	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Wasco	2 (9%)	6 (26%)	3 (13%)	3 (13%)	5 (22%)	14 (61%)	4 (17%)	14 (61%)
Wheeler	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
Josephine & Jackson	10 (8%)	22 (17%)	24 (18%)	6 (5%)	31 (24%)	54 (43%)	55 (43%)	53 (41%)
Jackson	5 (7%)	15 (20%)	16 (22%)	3 (4%)	16 (23%)	28 (39%)	19 (26%)	35 (49%)
Josephine	5 (9%)	7 (13%)	8 (14%)	3 (5%)	15 (27%)	26 (46%)	36 (64%)	18 (32%)
Lane	18 (13%)	26 (18%)	33 (23%)	16 (11%)	30 (21%)	81 (57%)	47 (33%)	78 (55%)
Marion & Polk	16 (8%)	21 (10%)	20 (9%)	14 (7%)	56 (27%)	75 (36%)	80 (38%)	76 (36%)
Marion	12 (6%)	20 (10%)	18 (9%)	12 (6%)	54 (27%)	70 (35%)	75 (38%)	72 (36%)
Polk	4 (36%)	1 (9%)	2 (18%)	2 (18%)	2 (18%)	5 (45%)	5 (45%)	4 (36%)

²⁸ Parent Survey risk factors are scored by the Home Visitor as 0 (not present), 5 (mild) or 10 (severe) and entered into the statewide data system. High stress assessments are those in which either parent’s score is 40 or higher.

Table 13b. Parent Survey (Kempe) Risk Factors²⁸ for One or Both Parents/Caregivers in Intensive Service

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) with Previous or Current Child Welfare Involvement		<i>Prior Child Welfare Involvement</i>	<i>Current Child Welfare Involvement</i>	Number (%) with Isolation, Low Self-Esteem		Number (%) with Multiple Stressors	
	Mild	Severe			Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe
Multnomah	25 (8%)	27 (9%)	31 (10%)	24 (8%)	98 (32%)	153 (50%)	98 (32%)	160 (52%)
Umatilla, Union, & Morrow	6 (12%)	12 (23%)	14 (27%)	5 (10%)	25 (48%)	15 (29%)	16 (31%)	24 (46%)
Morrow	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	7 (70%)	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	5 (50%)
Umatilla	5 (17%)	6 (20%)	8 (27%)	2 (7%)	14 (47%)	7 (23%)	13 (43%)	9 (30%)
Union	1 (8%)	5 (42%)	5 (42%)	3 (25%)	4 (33%)	6 (50%)	1 (8%)	10 (83%)
Wallowa, Baker, & Malheur	1 (5%)	2 (10%)	2 (10%)	1 (5%)	10 (50%)	4 (20%)	7 (35%)	7 (35%)
Baker	1 (25%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	3 (75%)
Malheur	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	9 (60%)	1 (7%)	7 (47%)	3 (20%)
Wallowa	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Washington	9 (7%)	10 (8%)	15 (11%)	5 (4%)	45 (35%)	45 (35%)	54 (41%)	49 (37%)
Yamhill	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
State	134 (9%)	209 (14%)	246 (17%)	123 (8%)	408 (28%)	660 (45%)	493 (34%)	718 (49%)

²⁸ Parent Survey risk factors are scored by the Home Visitor as 0 (not present), 5 (mild) or 10 (severe) and entered into the statewide data system. High stress assessments are those in which either parent's score is 40 or higher.



Table 13c. Parent Survey (Kemper) Risk Factors²⁹ for One or Both Parents/Caregivers in Intensive Service

Program/County	Number (%) with Potential for Violence		Number (%) with Unrealistic Expectations of Infant		Number (%) with Plans for Severe Discipline for Infant		Number (%) with Negative Perception of Infant		Number (%) with Bonding/Attachment Issues	
	Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe
Benton & Linn	4 (7%)	11 (20%)	19 (35%)	4 (7%)	9 (17%)	4 (7%)	6 (11%)	2 (4%)	20 (37%)	6 (11%)
Benton	4 (13%)	4 (13%)	8 (25%)	3 (9%)	4 (13%)	1 (3%)	3 (10%)	2 (6%)	10 (31%)	3 (9%)
Linn	0 (0%)	7 (32%)	11 (50%)	1 (5%)	5 (23%)	3 (14%)	3 (14%)	0 (0%)	10 (45%)	3 (14%)
Clackamas	8 (14%)	11 (19%)	28 (47%)	3 (5%)	6 (10%)	4 (7%)	5 (9%)	0 (0%)	31 (52%)	12 (20%)
Columbia, Clatsop, & Tillamook	18 (15%)	18 (15%)	43 (36%)	13 (11%)	22 (19%)	9 (8%)	22 (19%)	3 (3%)	62 (52%)	8 (7%)
Clatsop	8 (22%)	8 (22%)	12 (32%)	6 (16%)	9 (24%)	5 (14%)	6 (16%)	3 (8%)	20 (54%)	1 (3%)
Columbia	6 (16%)	5 (13%)	13 (34%)	2 (5%)	8 (21%)	2 (5%)	9 (24%)	0 (0%)	19 (50%)	3 (8%)
Tillamook	4 (9%)	5 (12%)	18 (42%)	5 (12%)	5 (12%)	2 (5%)	7 (16%)	0 (0%)	23 (52%)	4 (9%)
Coos & Curry	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Coos	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Curry	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Crook, Deschutes, & Jefferson	11 (11%)	19 (20%)	37 (38%)	10 (10%)	8 (8%)	12 (12%)	11 (11%)	4 (4%)	59 (60%)	13 (13%)
Crook	2 (13%)	3 (19%)	7 (44%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	5 (33%)	4 (25%)	0 (0%)	8 (50%)	3 (19%)
Deschutes	5 (7%)	14 (20%)	23 (32%)	8 (11%)	7 (10%)	4 (6%)	7 (10%)	2 (3%)	46 (64%)	8 (11%)
Jefferson	4 (40%)	2 (20%)	7 (70%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	3 (30%)	0 (0%)	2 (22%)	5 (50%)	2 (20%)
Douglas, Klamath, & Lake	7 (9%)	26 (33%)	28 (35%)	8 (10%)	10 (13%)	3 (4%)	12 (15%)	4 (5%)	51 (65%)	8 (10%)
Douglas	2 (7%)	10 (33%)	12 (40%)	3 (10%)	4 (13%)	2 (7%)	6 (21%)	2 (7%)	20 (67%)	4 (13%)
Klamath	5 (12%)	13 (31%)	16 (38%)	5 (12%)	5 (12%)	1 (2%)	5 (12%)	2 (5%)	28 (67%)	4 (10%)
Lake	0 (0%)	3 (43%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (14%)	0 (0%)	1 (14%)	0 (0%)	3 (43%)	0 (0%)

²⁹ Parent Survey risk factors are scored by the Home Visitor as 0 (not present), 5 (mild) or 10 (severe) and entered into the statewide data system. High stress assessments are those in which either parent’s score is 40 or higher.

Table 13c. Parent Survey (Kemper) Risk Factors²⁹ for One or Both Parents/Caregivers in Intensive Service

Program/County	Number (%) with Potential for Violence		Number (%) with Unrealistic Expectations of Infant		Number (%) with Plans for Severe Discipline for Infant		Number (%) with Negative Perception of Infant		Number (%) with Bonding/Attachment Issues	
	Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe
Grant & Harney	3 (21%)	2 (14%)	5 (36%)	1 (7%)	2 (14%)	1 (7%)	3 (21%)	0 (0%)	7 (50%)	1 (7%)
Grant	1 (11%)	1 (11%)	3 (33%)	1 (11%)	1 (11%)	1 (11%)	2 (22%)	0 (0%)	5 (56%)	0 (0%)
Harney	2 (40%)	1 (20%)	2 (40%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	2 (40%)	1 (20%)
Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, & Wheeler	3 (6%)	6 (12%)	32 (64%)	7 (14%)	4 (8%)	2 (4%)	12 (26%)	6 (13%)	22 (44%)	6 (12%)
Gilliam	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hood River	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	16 (62%)	3 (12%)	2 (8%)	2 (8%)	8 (32%)	3 (12%)	11 (42%)	1 (4%)
Sherman	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Wasco	3 (13%)	6 (26%)	16 (70%)	4 (17%)	2 (9%)	0 (0%)	4 (20%)	3 (15%)	10 (43%)	5 (22%)
Wheeler	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
Josephine & Jackson	24 (19%)	13 (10%)	55 (42%)	13 (10%)	20 (16%)	17 (13%)	18 (14%)	5 (4%)	54 (42%)	16 (12%)
Jackson	13 (18%)	8 (11%)	37 (50%)	4 (5%)	5 (7%)	8 (11%)	11 (15%)	3 (4%)	30 (41%)	8 (11%)
Josephine	11 (20%)	5 (9%)	18 (32%)	9 (16%)	15 (27%)	9 (16%)	7 (13%)	2 (4%)	24 (43%)	8 (14%)
Lane	25 (18%)	22 (16%)	67 (48%)	6 (4%)	11 (8%)	6 (4%)	16 (12%)	4 (3%)	80 (58%)	17 (12%)
Marion & Polk	11 (5%)	20 (10%)	84 (41%)	9 (4%)	10 (5%)	7 (3%)	17 (8%)	3 (1%)	122 (58%)	16 (8%)
Marion	9 (5%)	20 (10%)	79 (41%)	8 (4%)	10 (5%)	7 (4%)	15 (8%)	3 (2%)	112 (57%)	16 (8%)
Polk	2 (18%)	0 (0%)	5 (45%)	1 (9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (18%)	0 (0%)	10 (91%)	0 (0%)

²⁹ Parent Survey risk factors are scored by the Home Visitor as 0 (not present), 5 (mild) or 10 (severe) and entered into the statewide data system. High stress assessments are those in which either parent's score is 40 or higher.



Table 13c. Parent Survey (Kemper) Risk Factors²⁹ for One or Both Parents/Caregivers in Intensive Service

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) with Potential for Violence		Number (%) with Unrealistic Expectations of Infant		Number (%) with Plans for Severe Discipline for Infant		Number (%) with Negative Perception of Infant		Number (%) with Bonding/Attachment Issues	
	Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe	Mild	Severe
Multnomah	33 (11%)	37 (12%)	130 (43%)	16 (5%)	34 (11%)	6 (2%)	29 (10%)	14 (5%)	122 (40%)	61 (20%)
Umatilla, Union, & Morrow	5 (10%)	7 (14%)	21 (41%)	3 (6%)	5 (10%)	1 (2%)	8 (16%)	1 (2%)	34 (65%)	2 (4%)
Morrow	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	8 (80%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	10 (100%)	0 (0%)
Umatilla	5 (17%)	2 (7%)	7 (24%)	2 (7%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	5 (17%)	0 (0%)	14 (47%)	2 (7%)
Union	0 (0%)	5 (42%)	6 (50%)	1 (8%)	3 (25%)	0 (0%)	2 (17%)	1 (8%)	10 (83%)	0 (0%)
Wallowa, Baker, & Malheur	3 (15%)	3 (15%)	4 (20%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	3 (19%)	0 (0%)	12 (60%)	1 (5%)
Baker	0 (0%)	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (75%)	1 (25%)
Malheur	3 (20%)	0 (0%)	2 (13%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (7%)	2 (18%)	0 (0%)	8 (53%)	0 (0%)
Wallowa	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
Washington	11 (9%)	23 (18%)	42 (33%)	7 (5%)	14 (11%)	3 (2%)	10 (8%)	2 (2%)	66 (50%)	16 (12%)
Yamhill	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
State	166 (11%)	219 (15%)	596 (41%)	102 (7%)	156 (11%)	77 (5%)	173 (12%)	48 (3%)	742 (51%)	185 (13%)

²⁹ Parent Survey risk factors are scored by the Home Visitor as 0 (not present), 5 (mild) or 10 (severe) and entered into the statewide data system. High stress assessments are those in which either parent’s score is 40 or higher.

Table 14. Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families: Race/Ethnicity

<i>Program/County</i>	Total Number of Intensive Service Families with Race/Ethnicity Information ³⁰	Number (%) African American	Number (%) Hispanic/Latino	Number (%) Asian	Number (%) American Indian	Number (%) White	Number (%) Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	Number (%) Multiracial	Number (%) Other	Number (%) Unreported
Benton & Linn	74	0 (0%)	34 (46%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	34 (46%)	0 (0%)	3 (4%)	2 (3%)	0 (0%)
Benton	45	0 (0%)	21 (47%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	18 (40%)	0 (0%)	3 (7%)	2 (4%)	0 (0%)
Linn	29	0 (0%)	13 (45%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	16 (55%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Clackamas	68	2 (3%)	15 (22%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	40 (59%)	0 (0%)	6 (9%)	3 (4%)	2 (3%)
Columbia, Clatsop, & Tillamook	142	0 (0%)	29 (20%)	3 (2%)	2 (1%)	94 (66%)	1 (1%)	11 (8%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)
Clatsop	47	0 (0%)	10 (21%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	34 (72%)	1 (2%)	2 (4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Columbia	45	0 (0%)	8 (18%)	1 (2%)	2 (4%)	28 (62%)	0 (0%)	6 (13%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Tillamook	50	0 (0%)	11 (22%)	2 (4%)	0 (0%)	32 (64%)	0 (0%)	3 (6%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)
Coos & Curry	15	0 (0%)	2 (13%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	12 (80%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (7%)
Coos	10	0 (0%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	8 (80%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Curry	5	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (80%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)
Crook, Deschutes, & Jefferson	125	1 (1%)	14 (11%)	1 (1%)	2 (2%)	93 (74%)	0 (0%)	8 (6%)	1 (1%)	5 (4%)
Crook	16	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)	13 (81%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Deschutes	96	1 (1%)	8 (8%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	75 (78%)	0 (0%)	6 (6%)	1 (1%)	4 (4%)
Jefferson	13	0 (0%)	5 (38%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (38%)	0 (0%)	2 (15%)	0 (0%)	1 (8%)
Douglas, Klamath, & Lake	113	2 (2%)	9 (8%)	2 (2%)	0 (0%)	83 (73%)	0 (0%)	13 (12%)	0 (0%)	4 (4%)
Douglas	39	1 (3%)	3 (8%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	27 (69%)	0 (0%)	3 (8%)	0 (0%)	4 (10%)
Klamath	63	1 (2%)	5 (8%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	47 (75%)	0 (0%)	9 (14%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Lake	11	0 (0%)	1 (9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	9 (82%)	0 (0%)	1 (9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

³⁰ Not all families reported race/ethnicity information.



Table 14. Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families: Race/Ethnicity

<i>Program/County</i>	Total Number of Intensive Service Families with Race/Ethnicity Information ³⁰	Number (%) African American	Number (%) Hispanic/Latino	Number (%) Asian	Number (%) American Indian	Number (%) White	Number (%) Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	Number (%) Multiracial	Number (%) Other	Number (%) Unreported
Grant & Harney	20	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	17 (85%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)
Grant	11	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	10 (91%)	0 (0%)	1 (9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Harney	9	0 (0%)	1 (11%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (78%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (11%)
Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, & Wheeler	79	0 (0%)	53 (67%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	20 (25%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	3 (4%)	2 (3%)
Gilliam	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hood River	47	0 (0%)	37 (79%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	9 (19%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)
Sherman	1	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Wasco	28	0 (0%)	15 (54%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	8 (29%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	3 (11%)	1 (4%)
Wheeler	3	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Josephine & Jackson	149	0 (0%)	24 (16%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	101 (68%)	1 (1%)	19 (13%)	3 (2%)	1 (1%)
Jackson	79	0 (0%)	18 (23%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	44 (56%)	0 (0%)	14 (18%)	3 (4%)	0 (0%)
Josephine	70	0 (0%)	6 (9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	57 (81%)	1 (1%)	5 (7%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)
Lane	182	4 (2%)	35 (19%)	5 (3%)	0 (0%)	122 (67%)	0 (0%)	13 (7%)	2 (1%)	1 (1%)
Marion & Polk	261	2 (1%)	166 (64%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	64 (25%)	3 (1%)	12 (5%)	1 (0%)	13 (5%)
Marion	243	2 (1%)	160 (66%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	55 (23%)	3 (1%)	10 (4%)	1 (0%)	12 (5%)
Polk	18	0 (0%)	6 (33%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	9 (50%)	0 (0%)	2 (11%)	0 (0%)	1 (6%)

³⁰ Not all families reported race/ethnicity information.

Table 14. Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families: Race/Ethnicity

<i>Program/County</i>	Total Number of Intensive Service Families with Race/Ethnicity Information ³⁰	Number (%) African American	Number (%) Hispanic/Latino	Number (%) Asian	Number (%) American Indian	Number (%) White	Number (%) Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	Number (%) Multiracial	Number (%) Other	Number (%) Unreported
Multnomah	423	50 (12%)	143 (34%)	64	6 (1%)	82 (19%)	7 (2%)	39 (9%)	22 (5%)	10 (2%)
Umatilla, Union, & Morrow	68	2 (3%)	31 (46%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	25 (37%)	1 (1%)	6 (9%)	0 (0%)	2 (3%)
Morrow	11	0 (0%)	11 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Umatilla	42	1 (2%)	20 (48%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	14 (33%)	0 (0%)	4 (10%)	0 (0%)	2 (5%)
Union	15	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	11 (73%)	1 (7%)	2 (13%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Wallowa, Baker, & Malheur	34	1 (3%)	7 (21%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	23 (68%)	0 (0%)	3 (9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Baker	11	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	10 (91%)	0 (0%)	1 (9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Malheur	19	1 (5%)	7 (37%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	10 (53%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Wallowa	4	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Washington	171	4 (2%)	95 (56%)	3 (2%)	1 (1%)	38 (22%)	4 (2%)	20 (12%)	4 (2%)	2 (1%)
Yamhill	37	0 (0%)	9 (24%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	23 (62%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (11%)	1 (3%)
State	1,961	68 (3%)	667 (34%)	79 (4%)	12 (1%)	871 (44%)	17 (1%)	155 (8%)	46 (2%)	46 (2%)

³⁰ Not all families reported race/ethnicity information.



Table 15a. NBQ Risks and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families

<i>Program/County</i>	Average Number of NBQ (V2) Risks ³¹	Number (%) with 1 Risk	Number (%) with 2 Risks	Number (%) with 3 Risks	Number (%) with 4 Risks	Number (%) with 5+ Risks	Number (%) of English Speaking Households	Number (%) of Spanish Speaking Households	Number (%) of Other Language Households
Benton & Linn	3.4	5 (7%)	21 (30%)	15 (21%)	13 (18%)	17 (24%)	43 (62%)	25 (36%)	1 (1%)
Benton	3.6	2 (5%)	14 (32%)	7 (16%)	8 (18%)	13 (30%)	26 (63%)	14 (34%)	1 (2%)
Linn	3.2	3 (11%)	7 (26%)	8 (30%)	5 (19%)	4 (15%)	17 (61%)	11 (39%)	0 (0%)
Clackamas	4.2	1 (1%)	14 (21%)	11 (16%)	15 (22%)	27 (40%)	54 (84%)	9 (14%)	1 (2%)
Columbia, Clatsop, & Tillamook	3.9	9 (6%)	20 (14%)	35 (25%)	35 (25%)	42 (30%)	116 (83%)	23 (17%)	0 (0%)
Clatsop	3.7	3 (6%)	5 (11%)	15 (32%)	11 (23%)	13 (28%)	39 (85%)	7 (15%)	0 (0%)
Columbia	4.7	1 (2%)	3 (7%)	10 (22%)	9 (20%)	22 (49%)	37 (84%)	7 (16%)	0 (0%)
Tillamook	3.2	5 (10%)	12 (24%)	10 (20%)	15 (31%)	7 (14%)	40 (82%)	9 (18%)	0 (0%)
Coos & Curry	3.4	1 (7%)	3 (21%)	3 (21%)	2 (14%)	5 (36%)	14 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Coos	3.8	0 (0%)	2 (20%)	3 (30%)	2 (20%)	3 (30%)	10 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Curry	2.6	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (50%)	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Crook, Deschutes, & Jefferson	3.3	14 (12%)	28 (24%)	17 (14%)	25 (21%)	35 (29%)	115 (97%)	3 (3%)	0 (0%)
Crook	2.3	5 (31%)	6 (38%)	0 (0%)	5 (31%)	0 (0%)	15 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Deschutes	3.4	7 (8%)	20 (22%)	16 (18%)	19 (21%)	29 (32%)	89 (97%)	3 (3%)	0 (0%)
Jefferson	3.4	2 (17%)	2 (17%)	1 (8%)	1 (8%)	6 (50%)	11 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Douglas, Klamath, & Lake	4.8	1 (1%)	8 (7%)	21 (19%)	22 (20%)	58 (53%)	105 (99%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)
Douglas	4.0	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	13 (35%)	10 (27%)	13 (35%)	35 (97%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)
Klamath	5.3	0 (0%)	6 (10%)	7 (11%)	11 (18%)	38 (61%)	60 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Lake	5.1	1 (9%)	1 (9%)	1 (9%)	1 (9%)	7 (64%)	10 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

³¹ Programs began using Version 2 of the NBQ in July 2015. Version 2 has a maximum of 15 scored risk indicators.

Table 15a. NBQ Risks and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families

<i>Program/County</i>	Average Number of NBQ (V2) Risks ³¹	Number (%) with 1 Risk	Number (%) with 2 Risks	Number (%) with 3 Risks	Number (%) with 4 Risks	Number (%) with 5+ Risks	Number (%) of English Speaking Households	Number (%) of Spanish Speaking Households	Number (%) of Other Language Households
Grant & Harney	3.8	3 (16%)	0 (0%)	5 (26%)	4 (21%)	7 (37%)	19 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Grant	4.2	2 (18%)	0 (0%)	2 (18%)	3 (27%)	4 (36%)	11 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Harney	3.2	1 (13%)	0 (0%)	3 (38%)	1 (13%)	3 (38%)	8 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, & Wheeler	3.2	7 (10%)	18 (25%)	17 (24%)	13 (18%)	16 (23%)	37 (50%)	37 (50%)	0 (0%)
Gilliam	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hood River	2.9	6 (14%)	14 (33%)	7 (16%)	8 (19%)	8 (19%)	16 (36%)	29 (64%)	0 (0%)
Sherman	2.0	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Wasco	3.5	1 (4%)	3 (12%)	9 (36%)	5 (20%)	7 (28%)	18 (72%)	7 (28%)	0 (0%)
Wheeler	4.0	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)
Josephine & Jackson	3.2	11 (8%)	44 (30%)	44 (30%)	20 (14%)	27 (18%)	136 (94%)	8 (6%)	1 (1%)
Jackson	3.3	5 (6%)	21 (27%)	26 (33%)	13 (16%)	14 (18%)	68 (91%)	6 (8%)	1 (1%)
Josephine	3.1	6 (9%)	23 (34%)	18 (27%)	7 (10%)	13 (19%)	68 (97%)	2 (3%)	0 (0%)
Lane	4.4	8 (4%)	17 (9%)	39 (22%)	37 (21%)	79 (44%)	147 (86%)	22 (13%)	1 (1%)
Marion & Polk	4.0	2 (1%)	65 (25%)	51 (20%)	44 (17%)	96 (37%)	116 (50%)	117 (50%)	1 (0%)
Marion	4.0	2 (1%)	62 (26%)	47 (20%)	41 (17%)	88 (37%)	103 (48%)	112 (52%)	1 (0%)
Polk	4.3	0 (0%)	3 (17%)	4 (22%)	3 (17%)	8 (44%)	13 (72%)	5 (28%)	0 (0%)

³¹ Programs began using Version 2 of the NBQ in July 2015. Version 2 has a maximum of 15 scored risk indicators.



Table 15a. NBQ Risks and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families

<i>Program/County</i>	Average Number of NBQ (V2) Risks ³¹	Number (%) with 1 Risk	Number (%) with 2 Risks	Number (%) with 3 Risks	Number (%) with 4 Risks	Number (%) with 5+ Risks	Number (%) of English Speaking Households	Number (%) of Spanish Speaking Households	Number (%) of Other Language Households
Multnomah	4.6	12 (3%)	27 (7%)	68 (16%)	89 (22%)	217 (53%)	206 (59%)	84 (24%)	60 (17%)
Umatilla, Union, & Morrow	3.8	4 (6%)	10 (16%)	15 (23%)	11 (17%)	24 (38%)	38 (58%)	24 (36%)	4 (6%)
Morrow	3.2	2 (18%)	3 (27%)	3 (27%)	0 (0%)	3 (27%)	1 (9%)	9 (82%)	1 (9%)
Umatilla	3.5	1 (3%)	6 (16%)	9 (24%)	10 (26%)	12 (32%)	22 (55%)	15 (38%)	3 (8%)
Union	5.0	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	3 (20%)	1 (7%)	9 (60%)	15 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Wallowa, Baker, & Malheur	3.6	4 (12%)	3 (9%)	10 (30%)	5 (15%)	11 (33%)	29 (91%)	3 (9%)	0 (0%)
Baker	4.0	1 (9%)	0 (0%)	5 (45%)	1 (9%)	4 (36%)	11 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Malheur	3.2	3 (17%)	3 (17%)	4 (22%)	3 (17%)	5 (28%)	14 (82%)	3 (18%)	0 (0%)
Wallowa	4.8	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	2 (50%)	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Washington	3.9	4 (2%)	33 (20%)	47 (28%)	24 (14%)	61 (36%)	77 (46%)	81 (49%)	8 (5%)
Yamhill	4.4	1 (3%)	4 (11%)	9 (24%)	6 (16%)	17 (46%)	27 (82%)	5 (15%)	1 (3%)
State	4.0	87 (5%)	315 (16%)	407 (21%)	365 (19%)	739 (39%)	1,279 (71%)	442 (25%)	78 (4%)

³¹ Programs began using Version 2 of the NBQ in July 2015. Version 2 has a maximum of 15 scored risk indicators.

Table 15b. NBQ Risks and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) Teen Mothers (17 or younger)	Number (%) Single Mothers	Number (%) Less Than HS Education	Number (%) Late Prenatal Care	Number (%) Lack of Comprehensive Prenatal Care	Number (%) Unemployed Parent (s)
Benton & Linn	0 (0%)	38 (52%)	32 (43%)	10 (14%)	1 (3%)	18 (24%)
Benton	0 (0%)	23 (52%)	23 (51%)	5 (12%)	1 (4%)	15 (33%)
Linn	0 (0%)	15 (52%)	9 (31%)	5 (18%)	0 (0%)	3 (10%)
Clackamas	3 (4%)	44 (65%)	16 (24%)	10 (15%)	0 (0%)	27 (40%)
Columbia, Clatsop, & Tillamook	2 (1%)	90 (64%)	41 (29%)	16 (12%)	5 (5%)	63 (44%)
Clatsop	1 (2%)	26 (55%)	13 (28%)	4 (9%)	3 (7%)	12 (26%)
Columbia	0 (0%)	33 (73%)	16 (36%)	7 (16%)	2 (6%)	30 (67%)
Tillamook	1 (2%)	31 (65%)	12 (24%)	5 (11%)	0 (0%)	21 (42%)
Coos & Curry	0 (0%)	8 (73%)	2 (14%)	4 (29%)	0 (0%)	5 (36%)
Coos	0 (0%)	6 (67%)	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)	3 (30%)
Curry	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	2 (50%)	0 (0%)	2 (50%)
Crook, Deschutes, & Jefferson	5 (4%)	89 (74%)	29 (24%)	18 (15%)	6 (5%)	42 (35%)
Crook	0 (0%)	8 (50%)	1 (6%)	2 (13%)	0 (0%)	5 (31%)
Deschutes	3 (3%)	71 (77%)	24 (26%)	13 (14%)	3 (3%)	33 (36%)
Jefferson	2 (17%)	10 (83%)	4 (33%)	3 (30%)	3 (30%)	4 (33%)
Douglas, Klamath, & Lake	3 (3%)	80 (72%)	29 (26%)	23 (22%)	3 (3%)	71 (64%)
Douglas	0 (0%)	26 (70%)	10 (27%)	8 (22%)	0 (0%)	23 (62%)
Klamath	2 (3%)	46 (73%)	13 (21%)	10 (16%)	2 (4%)	41 (65%)
Lake	1 (9%)	8 (73%)	6 (55%)	5 (56%)	1 (14%)	7 (64%)



Table 15b. NBQ Risks and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) Teen Mothers (17 or younger)	Number (%) Single Mothers	Number (%) Less Than HS Education	Number (%) Late Prenatal Care	Number (%) Lack of Comprehensive Prenatal Care	Number (%) Unemployed Parent (s)
Grant & Harney	0 (0%)	8 (42%)	3 (16%)	2 (11%)	0 (0%)	11 (58%)
Grant	0 (0%)	6 (55%)	1 (9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (64%)
Harney	0 (0%)	2 (25%)	2 (25%)	2 (25%)	0 (0%)	4 (50%)
Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, & Wheeler	3 (4%)	40 (53%)	36 (47%)	8 (11%)	3 (6%)	27 (36%)
Gilliam	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hood River	3 (7%)	21 (48%)	25 (56%)	2 (5%)	2 (7%)	16 (36%)
Sherman	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Wasco	0 (0%)	17 (63%)	9 (33%)	6 (24%)	1 (5%)	10 (37%)
Wheeler	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)
Josephine & Jackson	2 (1%)	99 (66%)	31 (21%)	22 (15%)	5 (3%)	45 (30%)
Jackson	2 (3%)	52 (66%)	19 (24%)	9 (12%)	3 (4%)	27 (34%)
Josephine	0 (0%)	47 (67%)	12 (17%)	13 (19%)	2 (3%)	18 (26%)
Lane	8 (4%)	120 (66%)	31 (17%)	24 (13%)	5 (3%)	67 (37%)
Marion & Polk	6 (2%)	175 (68%)	111 (43%)	60 (24%)	9 (4%)	124 (48%)
Marion	5 (2%)	162 (67%)	105 (44%)	58 (25%)	8 (4%)	114 (47%)
Polk	1 (6%)	13 (72%)	6 (33%)	2 (11%)	1 (6%)	10 (56%)

Table 15b. NBQ Risks and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) Teen Mothers (17 or younger)	Number (%) Single Mothers	Number (%) Less Than HS Education	Number (%) Late Prenatal Care	Number (%) Lack of Comprehensive Prenatal Care	Number (%) Unemployed Parent (s)
Multnomah	18 (4%)	255 (61%)	189 (45%)	77 (19%)	9 (2%)	263 (63%)
Umatilla, Union, & Morrow	2 (3%)	53 (80%)	38 (58%)	11 (17%)	1 (2%)	30 (45%)
Morrow	1 (9%)	10 (91%)	9 (82%)	4 (40%)	0 (0%)	3 (27%)
Umatilla	0 (0%)	30 (75%)	21 (53%)	6 (15%)	1 (3%)	17 (43%)
Union	1 (7%)	13 (87%)	8 (53%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	10 (67%)
Wallowa, Baker, & Malheur	4 (12%)	25 (74%)	10 (29%)	7 (22%)	1 (4%)	16 (47%)
Baker	0 (0%)	7 (64%)	2 (18%)	4 (36%)	1 (9%)	6 (55%)
Malheur	4 (21%)	14 (74%)	7 (37%)	3 (18%)	0 (0%)	7 (37%)
Wallowa	0 (0%)	4 (100%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (75%)
Washington	3 (2%)	96 (57%)	74 (44%)	30 (20%)	7 (6%)	74 (44%)
Yamhill	0 (0%)	24 (67%)	13 (35%)	6 (17%)	2 (11%)	17 (47%)
State	59 (3%)	1,244 (65%)	685 (35%)	328 (18%)	57 (4%)	900 (47%)



Table 15c. NBQ Risks and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) Difficulty Paying for Expenses	Number (%) Depression Indicated	Number (%) Relationship Problems	Number (%) Substance Abuse Issues	Number (%) At or Below Poverty Level³²
Benton & Linn	49 (68%)	14 (19%)	20 (27%)	7 (10%)	14 (93%)
Benton	32 (74%)	9 (20%)	13 (29%)	5 (11%)	11 (92%)
Linn	17 (59%)	5 (18%)	7 (25%)	2 (7%)	3 (100%)
Clackamas	57 (84%)	23 (34%)	22 (33%)	16 (24%)	23 (79%)
Columbia, Clatsop, & Tillamook	116 (82%)	24 (17%)	39 (27%)	22 (15%)	59 (70%)
Clatsop	43 (91%)	6 (13%)	10 (21%)	10 (21%)	22 (56%)
Columbia	40 (89%)	11 (24%)	20 (44%)	7 (16%)	27 (93%)
Tillamook	33 (67%)	7 (14%)	9 (18%)	5 (10%)	10 (63%)
Coos & Curry	10 (71%)	3 (21%)	2 (14%)	3 (21%)	7 (88%)
Coos	7 (70%)	3 (30%)	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	6 (86%)
Curry	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	1 (100%)
Crook, Deschutes, & Jefferson	78 (65%)	23 (19%)	18 (15%)	12 (10%)	59 (76%)
Crook	6 (38%)	3 (19%)	2 (13%)	0 (0%)	5 (42%)
Deschutes	67 (73%)	19 (21%)	15 (16%)	11 (12%)	48 (83%)
Jefferson	5 (42%)	1 (8%)	1 (8%)	1 (8%)	6 (75%)
Douglas, Klamath, & Lake	78 (72%)	45 (41%)	37 (34%)	19 (17%)	52 (87%)
Douglas	23 (64%)	8 (22%)	14 (40%)	7 (19%)	27 (90%)
Klamath	47 (75%)	35 (56%)	22 (35%)	10 (16%)	22 (88%)
Lake	8 (80%)	2 (18%)	1 (10%)	2 (18%)	3 (60%)

³² Poverty level is not a risk item on the NBQ, but is collected on the Family Intake form. It is included here as an additional variable of interest.

Table 15c. NBQ Risks and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) Difficulty Paying for Expenses	Number (%) Depression Indicated	Number (%) Relationship Problems	Number (%) Substance Abuse Issues	Number (%) At or Below Poverty Level ³²
Grant & Harney	12 (63%)	5 (26%)	6 (32%)	7 (37%)	11 (73%)
Grant	8 (73%)	4 (36%)	5 (45%)	5 (45%)	6 (75%)
Harney	4 (50%)	1 (13%)	1 (13%)	2 (25%)	5 (71%)
Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, & Wheeler	32 (42%)	11 (14%)	19 (25%)	6 (8%)	19 (86%)
Gilliam	--	--	--	--	--
Hood River	18 (40%)	5 (11%)	14 (31%)	2 (4%)	13 (87%)
Sherman	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	--
Wasco	12 (44%)	5 (19%)	4 (15%)	2 (7%)	5 (83%)
Wheeler	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	2 (67%)	1 (100%)
Josephine & Jackson	79 (53%)	19 (13%)	25 (17%)	12 (8%)	71 (82%)
Jackson	41 (52%)	9 (12%)	16 (21%)	6 (8%)	42 (84%)
Josephine	38 (55%)	10 (14%)	9 (13%)	6 (9%)	29 (78%)
Lane	148 (82%)	39 (22%)	80 (45%)	23 (13%)	69 (70%)
Marion & Polk	208 (81%)	51 (20%)	59 (24%)	22 (9%)	94 (85%)
Marion	192 (80%)	46 (19%)	54 (23%)	18 (8%)	86 (83%)
Polk	16 (89%)	5 (29%)	5 (29%)	4 (24%)	8 (100%)

³² Poverty level is not a risk item on the NBQ, but is collected on the Family Intake form. It is included here as an additional variable of interest.



Table 15c. NBQ Risks and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) Difficulty Paying for Expenses	Number (%) Depression Indicated	Number (%) Relationship Problems	Number (%) Substance Abuse Issues	Number (%) At or Below Poverty Level³²
Multnomah	368 (90%)	236 (57%)	83 (20%)	33 (8%)	213 (76%)
Umatilla, Union, & Morrow	36 (55%)	7 (11%)	16 (24%)	11 (17%)	29 (78%)
Morrow	1 (9%)	0 (0%)	1 (9%)	0 (0%)	7 (78%)
Umatilla	25 (63%)	5 (13%)	10 (25%)	2 (5%)	15 (75%)
Union	10 (67%)	2 (13%)	5 (33%)	9 (60%)	7 (88%)
Wallowa, Baker, & Malheur	20 (59%)	4 (12%)	10 (30%)	7 (21%)	20 (95%)
Baker	4 (36%)	1 (9%)	5 (45%)	5 (45%)	9 (100%)
Malheur	12 (63%)	1 (6%)	3 (17%)	1 (6%)	7 (88%)
Wallowa	4 (100%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	1 (25%)	4 (100%)
Washington	104 (62%)	39 (23%)	38 (22%)	14 (8%)	93 (76%)
Yamhill	28 (78%)	15 (42%)	13 (37%)	8 (23%)	13 (72%)
State	1,423 (74%)	558 (29%)	487 (26%)	222 (12%)	846 (78%)

³² Poverty level is not a risk item on the NBQ, but is collected on the Family Intake form. It is included here as an additional variable of interest.

Table 15d. NBQ Risks and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) Parenting 3 or more children under age 5	Number (%) Parenting a special needs child	Number (%) families with unstable housing	Number (%) parents reporting anxiety	Number (%) parents with fewer than 2 social supports
Benton & Linn	4 (5%)	8 (20%)	11 (15%)	25 (34%)	18 (25%)
Benton	4 (9%)	5 (20%)	5 (11%)	15 (33%)	8 (18%)
Linn	0 (0%)	3 (20%)	6 (21%)	10 (36%)	10 (36%)
Clackamas	2 (3%)	12 (18%)	12 (18%)	27 (40%)	17 (25%)
Columbia, Clatsop, & Tillamook	15 (11%)	22 (18%)	27 (19%)	48 (34%)	19 (13%)
Clatsop	8 (17%)	5 (11%)	14 (30%)	16 (34%)	4 (9%)
Columbia	4 (9%)	10 (22%)	7 (16%)	18 (40%)	7 (16%)
Tillamook	3 (7%)	7 (26%)	6 (12%)	14 (29%)	8 (16%)
Coos & Curry	1 (8%)	3 (25%)	0 (0%)	4 (29%)	6 (46%)
Coos	1 (10%)	3 (33%)	0 (0%)	4 (40%)	3 (33%)
Curry	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (75%)
Crook, Deschutes, & Jefferson	7 (6%)	11 (16%)	15 (13%)	52 (43%)	7 (6%)
Crook	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	9 (56%)	0 (0%)
Deschutes	6 (7%)	10 (18%)	13 (14%)	38 (41%)	5 (5%)
Jefferson	1 (8%)	0 (0%)	2 (17%)	5 (42%)	2 (17%)
Douglas, Klamath, & Lake	12 (12%)	25 (27%)	29 (26%)	66 (60%)	23 (21%)
Douglas	2 (6%)	7 (26%)	4 (11%)	19 (51%)	5 (14%)
Klamath	7 (13%)	18 (33%)	20 (32%)	43 (69%)	15 (24%)
Lake	3 (30%)	0 (0%)	5 (45%)	4 (36%)	3 (27%)



Table 15d. NBQ Risks and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) Parenting 3 or more children under age 5	Number (%) Parenting a special needs child	Number (%) families with unstable housing	Number (%) parents reporting anxiety	Number (%) parents with fewer than 2 social supports
Grant & Harney	4 (21%)	5 (29%)	3 (16%)	9 (47%)	0 (0%)
Grant	1 (9%)	2 (22%)	1 (9%)	6 (55%)	0 (0%)
Harney	3 (38%)	3 (38%)	2 (25%)	3 (38%)	0 (0%)
Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, & Wheeler	3 (4%)	9 (15%)	13 (17%)	19 (25%)	21 (28%)
Gilliam	--	--	--	--	--
Hood River	1 (2%)	4 (11%)	5 (11%)	9 (20%)	10 (23%)
Sherman	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Wasco	2 (7%)	5 (25%)	8 (30%)	8 (30%)	10 (37%)
Wheeler	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)	1 (33%)
Josephine & Jackson	18 (12%)	24 (17%)	14 (10%)	71 (48%)	12 (8%)
Jackson	14 (18%)	17 (24%)	7 (9%)	32 (41%)	9 (12%)
Josephine	4 (6%)	7 (11%)	7 (10%)	39 (56%)	3 (4%)
Lane	15 (8%)	13 (9%)	25 (14%)	123 (68%)	85 (47%)
Marion & Polk	23 (9%)	32 (14%)	33 (13%)	72 (28%)	67 (27%)
Marion	21 (9%)	31 (15%)	31 (13%)	66 (28%)	64 (27%)
Polk	2 (11%)	1 (7%)	2 (13%)	6 (35%)	3 (18%)

Table 15d. NBQ Risks and Demographic Characteristics of Intensive Service Families

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) Parenting 3 or more children under age 5	Number (%) Parenting a special needs child	Number (%) families with unstable housing	Number (%) parents reporting anxiety	Number (%) parents with fewer than 2 social supports
Multnomah	28 (7%)	42 (18%)	44 (11%)	246 (59%)	73 (18%)
Umatilla, Union, & Morrow	6 (9%)	8 (15%)	12 (18%)	14 (22%)	10 (15%)
Morrow	1 (9%)	1 (11%)	0 (0%)	1 (9%)	3 (27%)
Umatilla	2 (5%)	5 (16%)	7 (18%)	7 (18%)	7 (18%)
Union	3 (20%)	2 (15%)	5 (33%)	6 (46%)	0 (0%)
Wallowa, Baker, & Malheur	3 (9%)	0 (0%)	5 (15%)	7 (21%)	4 (12%)
Baker	2 (18%)	0 (0%)	3 (27%)	3 (27%)	1 (9%)
Malheur	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	3 (17%)	3 (17%)
Wallowa	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)
Washington	19 (11%)	33 (22%)	29 (17%)	53 (31%)	50 (30%)
Yamhill	5 (15%)	5 (15%)	7 (20%)	14 (39%)	5 (14%)
State	165 (9%)	252 (17%)	279 (15%)	850 (44%)	417 (22%)



Table 16. Health Care for Intensive Service Families:³³ Health Care Provider & Well-Child Check-Ups

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Caregivers with Primary Health Care Provider Information	Number (%) of Caregivers with a Primary Health Care Provider	Number of Children with Primary Health Care Provider Information	Number (%) of Children with a Primary Health Care Provider	Number of Children with Well-Child Check-Up Information	Number (%) of Children Receiving Regular Well-Child Check-Ups
Benton & Linn	54	28 (53%)	54	54 (100%)	46	42 (91%)
Benton	35	17 (50%)	35	35 (100%)	31	29 (94%)
Linn	19	11 (58%)	19	19 (100%)	15	13 (87%)
Clackamas	57	53 (96%)	57	55 (100%)	38	34 (89%)
Columbia, Clatsop, & Tillamook	130	106 (82%)	130	124 (96%)	104	93 (89%)
Clatsop	45	36 (80%)	45	43 (96%)	38	32 (84%)
Columbia	40	35 (88%)	40	38 (95%)	30	29 (97%)
Tillamook	45	35 (80%)	45	43 (98%)	36	32 (89%)
Coos & Curry	13	12 (100%)	13	13 (100%)	9	9 (100%)
Coos	9	9 (100%)	9	9 (100%)	7	7 (100%)
Curry	4	3 (100%)	4	4 (100%)	2	2 (100%)
Crook, Deschutes, & Jefferson	115	107 (93%)	115	114 (99%)	91	80 (88%)
Crook	16	15 (94%)	16	16 (100%)	12	12 (100%)
Deschutes	88	81 (92%)	88	87 (99%)	69	60 (87%)
Jefferson	11	11 (100%)	11	11 (100%)	10	8 (80%)
Douglas, Klamath, & Lake	85	83 (99%)	85	85 (100%)	56	50 (89%)
Douglas	34	34 (100%)	34	34 (100%)	20	18 (90%)
Klamath	45	44 (98%)	45	45 (100%)	34	30 (88%)
Lake	6	5 (100%)	6	6 (100%)	2	2 (100%)

³³ Health outcomes are tracked by the Home Visitors and reported at 6-month intervals on the Family Update form. Outcome information is taken from the most recent form for each child.

Table 16. Health Care for Intensive Service Families:³³ Health Care Provider & Well-Child Check-Ups

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Caregivers with Primary Health Care Provider Information	Number (%) of Caregivers with a Primary Health Care Provider	Number of Children with Primary Health Care Provider Information	Number (%) of Children with a Primary Health Care Provider	Number of Children with Well-Child Check-Up Information	Number (%) of Children Receiving Regular Well-Child Check-Ups
Grant & Harney	16	14 (88%)	16	16 (100%)	11	10 (91%)
Grant	9	9 (100%)	9	9 (100%)	5	4 (80%)
Harney	7	5 (71%)	7	7 (100%)	6	6 (100%)
Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, & Wheeler	72	72 (100%)	72	72 (100%)	57	55 (96%)
Gilliam	0	--	0	--	0	--
Hood River	45	45 (100%)	45	45 (100%)	39	38 (97%)
Sherman	0	--	0	--	0	--
Wasco	25	25 (100%)	25	25 (100%)	16	15 (94%)
Wheeler	2	2 (100%)	2	2 (100%)	2	2 (100%)
Josephine & Jackson	122	115 (94%)	123	121 (98%)	94	85 (90%)
Jackson	66	64 (97%)	67	65 (97%)	47	44 (94%)
Josephine	56	51 (91%)	56	56 (100%)	47	41 (87%)
Lane	155	130 (87%)	155	154 (99%)	124	112 (90%)
Marion & Polk	236	156 (68%)	236	229 (98%)	174	162 (93%)
Marion	220	142 (66%)	220	213 (98%)	162	150 (93%)
Polk	16	14 (93%)	16	16 (100%)	12	12 (100%)

³³ Health outcomes are tracked by the Home Visitors and reported at 6-month intervals on the Family Update form. Outcome information is taken from the most recent form for each child.



Table 16. Health Care for Intensive Service Families:³³ Health Care Provider & Well-Child Check-Ups

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Caregivers with Primary Health Care Provider Information	Number (%) of Caregivers with a Primary Health Care Provider	Number of Children with Primary Health Care Provider Information	Number (%) of Children with a Primary Health Care Provider	Number of Children with Well-Child Check-Up Information	Number (%) of Children Receiving Regular Well-Child Check-Ups
Multnomah	359	311 (87%)	361	353 (99%)	241	224 (93%)
Umatilla, Union, & Morrow	49	28 (57%)	49	49 (100%)	32	29 (91%)
Morrow	10	2 (20%)	10	10 (100%)	9	8 (89%)
Umatilla	30	21 (70%)	30	30 (100%)	18	18 (100%)
Union	9	5 (56%)	9	9 (100%)	5	3 (60%)
Wallowa, Baker, & Malheur	30	29 (97%)	30	30 (100%)	21	21 (100%)
Baker	9	9 (100%)	9	9 (100%)	5	5 (100%)
Malheur	17	16 (94%)	17	17 (100%)	14	14 (100%)
Wallowa	4	4 (100%)	4	4 (100%)	2	2 (100%)
Washington	145	104 (72%)	145	144 (99%)	118	113 (96%)
Yamhill	36	34 (94%)	36	36 (100%)	32	29 (91%)
State	1,674	1,382 (84%)	1,677	1,649 (99%)	1,248	1,148 (92%)

³³ Health outcomes are tracked by the Home Visitors and reported at 6-month intervals on the Family Update form. Outcome information is taken from the most recent form for each child.

Table 17a. Health Care for Intensive Service Families: Health Insurance

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Children with Health Insurance Information (Family Update)	Number (%) with Private Insurance	Number (%) with OHP	Number (%) with No Insurance	Number of Children Lacking Health Insurance at time of NBQ	Number (%) of These Children with Health Insurance at Most Recent Follow-Up
Benton & Linn	45	4 (9%)	41 (91%)	0 (0%)	2	2 (100%)
Benton	30	3 (10%)	27 (90%)	0 (0%)	1	1 (100%)
Linn	15	1 (7%)	14 (93%)	0 (0%)	1	1 (100%)
Clackamas	38	3 (8%)	35 (92%)	0 (0%)	1	1 (100%)
Columbia, Clatsop, & Tillamook	104	7 (7%)	96 (92%)	1 (1%)	3	3 (100%)
Clatsop	37	0 (0%)	37 (100%)	0 (0%)	0	--
Columbia	31	2 (6%)	29 (94%)	0 (0%)	2	2 (100%)
Tillamook	36	5 (14%)	30 (83%)	1 (3%)	1	1 (100%)
Coos & Curry	9	0 (0%)	9 (100%)	0 (0%)	0	--
Coos	7	0 (0%)	7 (100%)	0 (0%)	0	--
Curry	2	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0	--
Crook, Deschutes, & Jefferson	96	1 (1%)	95 (99%)	0 (0%)	3	3 (100%)
Crook	12	0 (0%)	12 (100%)	0 (0%)	1	1 (100%)
Deschutes	73	0 (0%)	73 (100%)	0 (0%)	1	1 (100%)
Jefferson	11	1 (9%)	10 (91%)	0 (0%)	1	1 (100%)
Douglas, Klamath, & Lake	60	2 (3%)	58 (97%)	0 (0%)	0	--
Douglas	22	2 (9%)	20 (91%)	0 (0%)	0	--
Klamath	36	0 (0%)	36 (100%)	0 (0%)	0	--
Lake	2	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0	--



Table 17a. Health Care for Intensive Service Families: Health Insurance

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Children with Health Insurance Information (Family Update)	Number (%) with Private Insurance	Number (%) with OHP	Number (%) with No Insurance	Number of Children Lacking Health Insurance at time of NBQ	Number (%) of These Children with Health Insurance at Most Recent Follow-Up
Grant & Harney	11	2 (18%)	9 (82%)	0 (0%)	1	1 (100%)
Grant	5	0 (0%)	5 (100%)	0 (0%)	1	1 (100%)
Harney	6	2 (33%)	4 (67%)	0 (0%)	0	--
Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, & Wheeler	58	3 (5%)	55 (95%)	0 (0%)	0	--
Gilliam	0	--	--	--	0	--
Hood River	40	2 (5%)	38 (95%)	0 (0%)	0	--
Sherman	0	--	--	--	0	--
Wasco	16	1 (6%)	15 (94%)	0 (0%)	0	--
Wheeler	2	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0	--
Josephine & Jackson	97	10 (10%)	84 (87%)	3 (3%)	0	--
Jackson	49	8 (16%)	40 (82%)	1 (2%)	0	--
Josephine	48	2 (4%)	44 (92%)	2 (4%)	0	--
Lane	127	20 (16%)	107 (84%)	0 (0%)	2	2 (100%)
Marion & Polk	181	5 (3%)	176 (97%)	0 (0%)	5	5 (100%)
Marion	169	5 (3%)	164 (97%)	0 (0%)	4	4 (100%)
Polk	12	0 (0%)	12 (100%)	0 (0%)	1	1 (100%)

Table 17a. Health Care for Intensive Service Families: Health Insurance

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Children with Health Insurance Information (Family Update)	Number (%) with Private Insurance	Number (%) with OHP	Number (%) with No Insurance	Number of Children Lacking Health Insurance at time of NBQ	Number (%) of These Children with Health Insurance at Most Recent Follow-Up
Multnomah	246	11 (4%)	231 (94%)	4 (2%)	1	1 (100%)
Umatilla, Union, & Morrow	33	1 (3%)	32 (97%)	0 (0%)	5	5 (100%)
Morrow	9	0 (0%)	9 (100%)	0 (0%)	3	3 (100%)
Umatilla	19	1 (5%)	18 (95%)	0 (0%)	2	2 (100%)
Union	5	0 (0%)	5 (100%)	0 (0%)	0	--
Wallowa, Baker, & Malheur	22	1 (5%)	21 (95%)	0 (0%)	0	--
Baker	6	1 (17%)	5 (83%)	0 (0%)	0	--
Malheur	14	0 (0%)	14 (100%)	0 (0%)	0	--
Wallowa	2	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0	--
Washington	120	10 (8%)	107 (89%)	3 (3%)	14	14 (100%)
Yamhill	31	0 (0%)	31 (100%)	0 (0%)	0	--
State	1,278	80 (6%)	1,187 (93%)	11 (1%)	37	37 (100%)



Table 17b. Health Care for Intensive Service Families: Use of Emergency Room in Past 6 Months

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of Children Reporting ER Use During Last 6 Months	Average Number Child ER Visits During Last 6 Months ³⁴	Average Number Child ER Visits During Last 6 Months ³⁵	Number (%) of Mothers Reporting ER Use During Last 6 Months	Average Number Mother ER Visits During Last 6 Months ³⁶	Average Number Mother ER Visits During Last 6 Months ³⁷
Benton & Linn	9 (20%)	1.22	0.24	6 (13%)	1.17	0.15
Benton	5 (16%)	1.20	0.19	3 (10%)	1.00	0.10
Linn	4 (27%)	1.25	0.33	3 (20%)	1.33	0.27
Clackamas	11 (31%)	1.18	0.36	3 (8%)	1.00	0.08
Columbia, Clatsop, & Tillamook	26 (25%)	1.23	0.30	23 (22%)	1.74	0.38
Clatsop	14 (36%)	1.07	0.38	10 (26%)	1.50	0.38
Columbia	2 (6%)	1.00	0.06	3 (10%)	1.00	0.10
Tillamook	10 (28%)	1.50	0.42	10 (28%)	2.20	0.61
Coos & Curry	3 (33%)	1.33	0.44	1 (11%)	2.00	0.22
Coos	3 (43%)	1.33	0.57	1 (14%)	2.00	0.29
Curry	0 (0%)	--	0.00	0 (0%)	--	0.00
Crook, Deschutes, & Jefferson	27 (29%)	1.26	0.37	18 (20%)	1.61	0.32
Crook	4 (33%)	1.75	0.58	3 (25%)	1.33	0.33
Deschutes	21 (30%)	1.14	0.35	12 (17%)	1.75	0.30
Jefferson	2 (18%)	1.50	0.27	3 (27%)	1.33	0.36
Douglas, Klamath, & Lake	10 (17%)	2.00	0.33	9 (15%)	2.67	0.40
Douglas	2 (9%)	1.00	0.09	1 (5%)	1.00	0.05
Klamath	7 (19%)	2.29	0.44	7 (19%)	3.00	0.58
Lake	1 (50%)	2.00	1.00	1 (50%)	2.00	1.00

³⁴ Of families reporting child had at least one ER visit in the past 6 months.

³⁵ Of all families responding to the ER use question (including those with no use) in the past 6 months.

³⁶ Of mothers reporting they had at least one ER visit in the past 6 months.

³⁷ Of mothers responding to the ER use question (including those with no use) in the past 6 months.

Table 17b. Health Care for Intensive Service Families: Use of Emergency Room in Past 6 Months

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of Children Reporting ER Use During Last 6 Months	Average Number Child ER Visits During Last 6 Months ³⁴	Average Number Child ER Visits During Last 6 Months ³⁵	Number (%) of Mothers Reporting ER Use During Last 6 Months	Average Number Mother ER Visits During Last 6 Months ³⁶	Average Number Mother ER Visits During Last 6 Months ³⁷
Grant & Harney	0 (0%)	--	0.00	1 (9%)	1.00	0.09
Grant	0 (0%)	--	0.00	0 (0%)	--	0.00
Harney	0 (0%)	--	0.00	1 (17%)	1.00	0.17
Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, & Wheeler	8 (14%)	1.38	0.19	4 (7%)	1.50	0.11
Gilliam	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hood River	6 (15%)	1.17	0.18	3 (8%)	1.67	0.13
Sherman	--	--	--	--	--	--
Wasco	1 (6%)	1.00	0.06	1 (6%)	1.00	0.06
Wheeler	1 (50%)	3.00	1.50	0 (0%)	--	0.00
Josephine & Jackson	14 (14%)	1.43	0.21	6 (6%)	2.00	0.12
Jackson	6 (12%)	1.00	0.12	2 (4%)	3.00	0.12
Josephine	8 (17%)	1.75	0.29	4 (8%)	1.50	0.13
Lane	18 (14%)	1.28	0.18	10 (8%)	1.30	0.10
Marion & Polk	16 (9%)	1.63	0.14	10 (6%)	1.30	0.07
Marion	15 (9%)	1.67	0.15	9 (5%)	1.33	0.07
Polk	1 (8%)	1.00	0.08	1 (8%)	1.00	0.08

³⁴ Of families reporting child had at least one ER visit in the past 6 months.

³⁵ Of all families responding to the ER use question (including those with no use) in the past 6 months.

³⁶ Of mothers reporting they had at least one ER visit in the past 6 months.

³⁷ Of mothers responding to the ER use question (including those with no use) in the past 6 months.



Table 17b. Health Care for Intensive Service Families: Use of Emergency Room in Past 6 Months

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of Children Reporting ER Use During Last 6 Months	Average Number Child ER Visits During Last 6 Months ³⁴	Average Number Child ER Visits During Last 6 Months ³⁵	Number (%) of Mothers Reporting ER Use During Last 6 Months	Average Number Mother ER Visits During Last 6 Months ³⁶	Average Number Mother ER Visits During Last 6 Months ³⁷
Multnomah	47 (19%)	1.60	0.31	26 (11%)	1.50	0.16
Umatilla, Union, & Morrow	13 (39%)	1.38	0.55	4 (12%)	1.25	0.15
Morrow	3 (33%)	1.00	0.33	0 (0%)	--	0.00
Umatilla	7 (37%)	1.57	0.58	1 (5%)	1.00	0.05
Union	3 (60%)	1.33	0.80	3 (60%)	1.33	0.80
Wallowa, Baker, & Malheur	5 (23%)	1.40	0.32	4 (18%)	1.50	0.27
Baker	1 (17%)	2.00	0.33	1 (17%)	3.00	0.50
Malheur	2 (14%)	1.50	0.21	1 (7%)	1.00	0.07
Wallowa	2 (100%)	1.00	1.00	2 (100%)	1.00	1.00
Washington	19 (16%)	1.21	0.19	19 (16%)	1.68	0.27
Yamhill	5 (16%)	1.00	0.16	4 (13%)	1.00	0.13
State	231 (18%)	1.39	0.25	148 (12%)	1.59	0.19

³⁴ Of families reporting child had at least one ER visit in the past 6 months.

³⁵ Of all families responding to the ER use question (including those with no use) in the past 6 months.

³⁶ Of mothers reporting they had at least one ER visit in the past 6 months.

³⁷ Of mothers responding to the ER use question (including those with no use) in the past 6 months.

Table 18a. Comparison of Prenatal Care and Smoke Exposure for Families Served Pre- & Postnatal

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) with Early Prenatal Care on Intake		Number (%) Children with Passive Smoke Exposure	
	First HV Prenatal Service ³⁸	First HV Postnatal Service ³⁹	First HV Prenatal Service	First HV Postnatal Service
Benton & Linn	6 (86%)	26 (93%)	0 (0%)	5 (18%)
Benton	4 (80%)	16 (94%)	0 (0%)	4 (24%)
Linn	2 (100%)	10 (91%)	0 (0%)	1 (9%)
Clackamas	14 (82%)	25 (74%)	3 (18%)	8 (24%)
Columbia, Clatsop, & Tillamook	20 (87%)	72 (92%)	6 (26%)	16 (21%)
Clatsop	1 (100%)	29 (94%)	0 (0%)	7 (23%)
Columbia	5 (63%)	20 (91%)	2 (25%)	3 (14%)
Tillamook	14 (100%)	23 (92%)	4 (29%)	6 (24%)
Coos & Curry	3 (75%)	1 (100%)	3 (75%)	1 (100%)
Coos	3 (75%)	--	3 (75%)	--
Curry	--	1 (100%)	--	1 (100%)
Crook, Deschutes, & Jefferson	5 (83%)	54 (83%)	3 (50%)	13 (21%)
Crook	--	12 (86%)	--	1 (8%)
Deschutes	5 (83%)	34 (83%)	3 (50%)	9 (23%)
Jefferson	--	8 (80%)	--	3 (30%)
Douglas, Klamath, & Lake	5 (100%)	58 (83%)	1 (20%)	21 (30%)
Douglas	--	28 (85%)	--	13 (39%)
Klamath	5 (100%)	26 (84%)	1 (20%)	7 (23%)
Lake	--	4 (67%)	--	1 (17%)

³⁸ Prenatal service families are those families who were both screened prenatally and began intensive service prenatally (as determined by the first home visit date occurring before the birth of the baby).

³⁹ Postnatal service families are those families who began intensive service after the birth of the baby (the first home visit date is after the baby's date of birth).



Table 18a. Comparison of Prenatal Care and Smoke Exposure for Families Served Pre- & Postnatal

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) with Early Prenatal Care on Intake		Number (%) Children with Passive Smoke Exposure	
	First HV Prenatal Service ³⁸	First HV Postnatal Service ³⁹	First HV Prenatal Service	First HV Postnatal Service
Grant & Harney	6 (86%)	8 (100%)	1 (14%)	1 (13%)
Grant	2 (100%)	6 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (17%)
Harney	4 (80%)	2 (100%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)
Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, & Wheeler	18 (90%)	22 (92%)	4 (20%)	2 (8%)
Gilliam	--	--	--	--
Hood River	7 (100%)	16 (89%)	1 (14%)	2 (11%)
Sherman	--	--	--	--
Wasco	11 (85%)	6 (100%)	3 (23%)	0 (0%)
Wheeler	--	--	--	--
Josephine & Jackson	4 (100%)	66 (88%)	0 (0%)	8 (10%)
Jackson	3 (100%)	41 (98%)	0 (0%)	7 (16%)
Josephine	1 (100%)	25 (76%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)
Lane	12 (86%)	93 (91%)	5 (33%)	19 (18%)
Marion & Polk	15 (94%)	83 (81%)	1 (6%)	7 (7%)
Marion	14 (93%)	76 (81%)	1 (6%)	6 (6%)
Polk	1 (100%)	7 (88%)	0 (0%)	1 (13%)

³⁸ Prenatal service families are those families who were both screened prenatally and began intensive service prenatally (as determined by the first home visit date occurring before the birth of the baby).

³⁹ Postnatal service families are those families who began intensive service after the birth of the baby (the first home visit date is after the baby’s date of birth).

Table 18a. Comparison of Prenatal Care and Smoke Exposure for Families Served Pre- & Postnatal

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) with Early Prenatal Care on Intake		Number (%) Children with Passive Smoke Exposure	
	First HV Prenatal Service ³⁸	First HV Postnatal Service ³⁹	First HV Prenatal Service	First HV Postnatal Service
Multnomah	29 (88%)	192 (80%)	4 (12%)	27 (11%)
Umatilla, Union, & Morrow	5 (100%)	27 (77%)	0 (0%)	5 (14%)
Morrow	2 (100%)	6 (75%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Umatilla	2 (100%)	16 (76%)	0 (0%)	2 (10%)
Union	1 (100%)	5 (83%)	0 (0%)	3 (50%)
Wallowa, Baker, & Malheur	6 (75%)	9 (82%)	2 (25%)	4 (36%)
Baker	1 (100%)	3 (60%)	0 (0%)	3 (60%)
Malheur	3 (75%)	5 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Wallowa	2 (67%)	1 (100%)	2 (67%)	1 (100%)
Washington	28 (90%)	64 (89%)	2 (6%)	7 (10%)
Yamhill	8 (80%)	6 (75%)	3 (27%)	1 (13%)
State	184 (88%)	806 (84%)	38 (18%)	145 (15%)

³⁸ Prenatal service families are those families who were both screened prenatally and began intensive service prenatally (as determined by the first home visit date occurring before the birth of the baby).

³⁹ Postnatal service families are those families who began intensive service after the birth of the baby (the first home visit date is after the baby's date of birth).



Table 18b. Comparison of Health Outcomes for Families Served Pre- & Postnatal

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of Babies with Primary Health Care Providers		Number (%) of Mothers Breastfeeding		Number (%) of Babies Born Premature	
	First HV Prenatal Service	First HV Postnatal Service	First HV Prenatal Service	First HV Postnatal Service	First HV Prenatal Service	First HV Postnatal Service
Benton & Linn	7 (100%)	27 (96%)	3 (43%)	23 (82%)	0 (0%)	3 (11%)
Benton	5 (100%)	16 (94%)	3 (60%)	15 (88%)	0 (0%)	1 (6%)
Linn	2 (100%)	11 (100%)	0 (0%)	8 (73%)	0 (0%)	2 (18%)
Clackamas	13 (87%)	34 (100%)	13 (81%)	28 (82%)	2 (12%)	6 (19%)
Columbia, Clatsop, & Tillamook	23 (100%)	76 (97%)	19 (83%)	55 (71%)	0 (0%)	10 (13%)
Clatsop	1 (100%)	31 (100%)	1 (100%)	21 (68%)	0 (0%)	3 (10%)
Columbia	9 (100%)	21 (95%)	8 (89%)	18 (82%)	0 (0%)	3 (14%)
Tillamook	13 (100%)	24 (96%)	10 (77%)	16 (64%)	0 (0%)	4 (17%)
Coos & Curry	4 (100%)	1 (100%)	3 (75%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Coos	4 (100%)	--	3 (75%)	--	0 (0%)	--
Curry	--	1 (100%)	--	1 (100%)	--	0 (0%)
Crook, Deschutes, & Jefferson	6 (100%)	64 (98%)	3 (60%)	43 (66%)	0 (0%)	11 (17%)
Crook	--	14 (100%)	--	11 (79%)	--	3 (21%)
Deschutes	6 (100%)	40 (98%)	3 (60%)	26 (63%)	0 (0%)	6 (15%)
Jefferson	--	10 (100%)	--	6 (60%)	--	2 (20%)
Douglas, Klamath, & Lake	5 (100%)	69 (99%)	4 (80%)	48 (69%)	0 (0%)	7 (10%)
Douglas	--	33 (100%)	--	24 (73%)	--	2 (6%)
Klamath	5 (100%)	30 (97%)	4 (80%)	19 (61%)	0 (0%)	5 (17%)
Lake	--	6 (100%)	--	5 (83%)	--	0 (0%)

Table 18b. Comparison of Health Outcomes for Families Served Pre- & Postnatal

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of Babies with Primary Health Care Providers		Number (%) of Mothers Breastfeeding		Number (%) of Babies Born Premature	
	First HV Prenatal Service	First HV Postnatal Service	First HV Prenatal Service	First HV Postnatal Service	First HV Prenatal Service	First HV Postnatal Service
Grant & Harney	7 (100%)	8 (100%)	5 (71%)	6 (75%)	0 (0%)	1 (13%)
Grant	2 (100%)	6 (100%)	2 (100%)	5 (83%)	0 (0%)	1 (17%)
Harney	5 (100%)	2 (100%)	3 (60%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, & Wheeler	20 (100%)	24 (100%)	18 (90%)	19 (79%)	1 (5%)	4 (17%)
Gilliam	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hood River	7 (100%)	18 (100%)	5 (71%)	14 (78%)	1 (14%)	3 (18%)
Sherman	--	--	--	--	--	--
Wasco	13 (100%)	6 (100%)	13 (100%)	5 (83%)	0 (0%)	1 (17%)
Wheeler	--	--	--	--	--	--
Josephine & Jackson	4 (100%)	77 (100%)	4 (100%)	60 (78%)	2 (50%)	4 (5%)
Jackson	3 (100%)	43 (100%)	3 (100%)	33 (77%)	1 (33%)	2 (5%)
Josephine	1 (100%)	34 (100%)	1 (100%)	27 (79%)	1 (100%)	2 (6%)
Lane	15 (100%)	100 (98%)	12 (80%)	79 (77%)	1 (7%)	10 (10%)
Marion & Polk	14 (93%)	99 (98%)	14 (88%)	78 (78%)	1 (6%)	7 (7%)
Marion	13 (93%)	91 (98%)	14 (93%)	70 (76%)	1 (7%)	6 (7%)
Polk	1 (100%)	8 (100%)	0 (0%)	8 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (14%)



Table 18b. Comparison of Health Outcomes for Families Served Pre- & Postnatal

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of Babies with Primary Health Care Providers		Number (%) of Mothers Breastfeeding		Number (%) of Babies Born Premature	
	First HV Prenatal Service	First HV Postnatal Service	First HV Prenatal Service	First HV Postnatal Service	First HV Prenatal Service	First HV Postnatal Service
Multnomah	30 (97%)	232 (95%)	26 (81%)	185 (77%)	5 (16%)	24 (10%)
Umatilla, Union, & Morrow	5 (100%)	34 (100%)	4 (80%)	26 (74%)	1 (25%)	3 (9%)
Morrow	2 (100%)	7 (100%)	2 (100%)	7 (88%)	0 (0%)	1 (13%)
Umatilla	2 (100%)	21 (100%)	1 (50%)	15 (71%)	1 (100%)	1 (5%)
Union	1 (100%)	6 (100%)	1 (100%)	4 (67%)	0 (0%)	1 (17%)
Wallowa, Baker, & Malheur	8 (100%)	10 (91%)	6 (75%)	7 (64%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Baker	1 (100%)	4 (80%)	0 (0%)	3 (60%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Malheur	4 (100%)	5 (100%)	3 (75%)	4 (80%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Wallowa	3 (100%)	1 (100%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Washington	28 (97%)	71 (99%)	27 (87%)	63 (88%)	3 (10%)	16 (23%)
Yamhill	11 (100%)	8 (100%)	8 (80%)	6 (75%)	1 (9%)	2 (25%)
State	200 (98%)	934 (98%)	169 (81%)	727 (76%)	17 (8%)	108 (11%)

Table 19. Prenatal Care for Subsequent Births

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Intensive Service Families with Information on Prenatal Care (All Families)	Number (%) with Adequate Prenatal Care for Initial Pregnancy (All Families)	Number of Intensive Service Families with Second Pregnancy	Number (%) with Adequate Prenatal Care for Initial Pregnancy (Families with Subsequent Birth)	Number (%) with Adequate Prenatal Care for Second Pregnancy
Benton & Linn	38	35 (92%)	0	--	--
Benton	24	22 (92%)	0	--	--
Linn	14	13 (93%)	0	--	--
Clackamas	56	43 (77%)	2	2 (100%)	2 (100%)
Columbia, Clatsop, & Tillamook	121	108 (89%)	3	3 (100%)	3 (100%)
Clatsop	39	36 (92%)	2	2 (100%)	2 (100%)
Columbia	39	32 (82%)	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Tillamook	43	40 (93%)	0	--	--
Coos & Curry	10	9 (90%)	0	--	--
Coos	7	6 (86%)	0	--	--
Curry	3	3 (100%)	0	--	--
Crook, Deschutes, & Jefferson	110	94 (85%)	4	3 (75%)	4 (100%)
Crook	15	13 (87%)	1	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Deschutes	84	72 (86%)	3	3 (100%)	3 (100%)
Jefferson	11	9 (82%)	0	--	--
Douglas, Klamath, & Lake	75	63 (84%)	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Douglas	33	28 (85%)	0	--	--
Klamath	36	31 (86%)	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Lake	6	4 (67%)	0	--	--



Table 19. Prenatal Care for Subsequent Births

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Intensive Service Families with Information on Prenatal Care (All Families)	Number (%) with Adequate Prenatal Care for Initial Pregnancy (All Families)	Number of Intensive Service Families with Second Pregnancy	Number (%) with Adequate Prenatal Care for Initial Pregnancy (Families with Subsequent Birth)	Number (%) with Adequate Prenatal Care for Second Pregnancy
Grant & Harney	16	15 (94%)	0	--	--
Grant	9	9 (100%)	0	--	--
Harney	7	6 (86%)	0	--	--
Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, & Wheeler	68	63 (93%)	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Gilliam	0	--	0	--	--
Hood River	44	42 (95%)	0	--	--
Sherman	0	--	0	--	--
Wasco	23	20 (87%)	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Wheeler	1	1 (100%)	0	--	--
Josephine & Jackson	117	103 (88%)	3	3 (100%)	3 (100%)
Jackson	66	63 (95%)	2	2 (100%)	2 (100%)
Josephine	51	40 (78%)	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Lane	146	128 (88%)	4	3 (75%)	4 (100%)
Marion & Polk	219	184 (84%)	6	6 (100%)	6 (100%)
Marion	206	172 (83%)	6	6 (100%)	6 (100%)
Polk	13	12 (92%)	0	--	--

Table 19. Prenatal Care for Subsequent Births

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Intensive Service Families with Information on Prenatal Care (All Families)	Number (%) with Adequate Prenatal Care for Initial Pregnancy (All Families)	Number of Intensive Service Families with Second Pregnancy	Number (%) with Adequate Prenatal Care for Initial Pregnancy (Families with Subsequent Birth)	Number (%) with Adequate Prenatal Care for Second Pregnancy
Multnomah	340	277 (81%)	7	6 (86%)	7 (100%)
Umatilla, Union, & Morrow	44	36 (82%)	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Morrow	10	8 (80%)	0	--	--
Umatilla	26	21 (81%)	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Union	8	7 (88%)	0	--	--
Wallowa, Baker, & Malheur	27	21 (78%)	0	--	--
Baker	9	6 (67%)	0	--	--
Malheur	14	12 (86%)	0	--	--
Wallowa	4	3 (75%)	0	--	--
Washington	129	116 (90%)	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Yamhill	30	25 (83%)	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
State	1,546	1,320 (85%)	34	31 (91%)	34 (100%)



Table 20a. HOME Observation/Score

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Families with HOME⁴⁰ Score Information (at 12 Months)	Number (%) of Families with “Good” or Higher HOME Score (at 12 Months)	Number (%) of parents Reading (at Least) Daily to Child (at 12 Months)
Benton & Linn	13	10 (77%)	15 (63%)
Benton	8	5 (63%)	11 (65%)
Linn	5	5 (100%)	4 (57%)
Clackamas	18	14 (78%)	13 (72%)
Columbia, Clatsop, & Tillamook	71	65 (92%)	64 (88%)
Clatsop	25	24 (96%)	28 (97%)
Columbia	25	22 (88%)	25 (100%)
Tillamook	21	19 (90%)	11 (58%)
Coos & Curry	2	2 (100%)	2 (100%)
Coos	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Curry	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Crook, Deschutes, & Jefferson	61	56 (92%)	46 (73%)
Crook	3	3 (100%)	2 (50%)
Deschutes	49	47 (96%)	38 (76%)
Jefferson	9	6 (67%)	6 (67%)
Douglas, Klamath, & Lake	40	36 (90%)	24 (65%)
Douglas	15	14 (93%)	11 (79%)
Klamath	23	20 (87%)	13 (57%)
Lake	2	2 (100%)	--

⁴⁰ The Home Observation measures family effectiveness as the child’s first teacher for Measurement of Environment (HOME). The HOME combines a semi-structured parent interview with direct observation of the home environment and is conducted annually starting when the child is 12 months of age. Percentages for “good” or higher refer to families with total scores on the HOME reaching the 75th percentile or higher (above average) for the normative population as established by the tools and developers.

Table 20a. HOME Observation/Score

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Families with HOME ⁴⁰ Score Information (at 12 Months)	Number (%) of Families with “Good” or Higher HOME Score (at 12 Months)	Number (%) of parents Reading (at Least) Daily to Child (at 12 Months)
Grant & Harney	5	5 (100%)	1 (25%)
Grant	4	4 (100%)	1 (33%)
Harney	1	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, & Wheeler	39	35 (90%)	30 (71%)
Gilliam	0	--	--
Hood River	30	28 (93%)	24 (77%)
Sherman	0	--	--
Wasco	8	6 (75%)	6 (67%)
Wheeler	1	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
Josephine & Jackson	61	54 (89%)	34 (57%)
Jackson	32	30 (94%)	15 (50%)
Josephine	29	24 (83%)	19 (63%)
Lane	92	82 (89%)	66 (73%)
Marion & Polk	121	97 (80%)	59 (48%)
Marion	113	91 (81%)	54 (47%)
Polk	8	6 (75%)	5 (56%)

⁴⁰ The Home Observation measures family effectiveness as the child’s first teacher for Measurement of Environment (HOME). The HOME combines a semi-structured parent interview with direct observation of the home environment and is conducted annually starting when the child is 12 months of age. Percentages for “good” or higher refer to families with total scores on the HOME reaching the 75th percentile or higher (above average) for the normative population as established by the tools and developers.



Table 20a. HOME Observation/Score

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Families with HOME⁴⁰ Score Information (at 12 Months)	Number (%) of Families with “Good” or Higher HOME Score (at 12 Months)	Number (%) of parents Reading (at Least) Daily to Child (at 12 Months)
Multnomah	145	118 (81%)	106 (68%)
Umatilla, Union, & Morrow	20	19 (95%)	12 (60%)
Morrow	6	6 (100%)	2 (50%)
Umatilla	12	12 (100%)	7 (54%)
Union	2	1 (50%)	3 (100%)
Wallowa, Baker, & Malheur	10	10 (100%)	7 (88%)
Baker	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Malheur	9	9 (100%)	6 (86%)
Wallowa	0	--	--
Washington	89	81 (91%)	47 (52%)
Yamhill	25	21 (84%)	16 (64%)
State	812	705 (87%)	542 (65%)

⁴⁰ The Home Observation measures family effectiveness as the child’s first teacher for Measurement of Environment (HOME). The HOME combines a semi-structured parent interview with direct observation of the home environment and is conducted annually starting when the child is 12 months of age. Percentages for “good” or higher refer to families with total scores on the HOME reaching the 75th percentile or higher (above average) for the normative population as established by the tools and developers.

Table 20b. Developmental Screening⁴¹

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Children Eligible for a Developmental Screening	Number (%) of Eligible Children with at Least One Developmental Screening	Number (%) Children with a Diagnosed Developmental Delay ⁴²	Percentage of Children with a Diagnosed Developmental Delay Receiving Early Intervention Services
Benton & Linn	54	50 (93%)	0 (0%)	--
Benton	33	30 (91%)	0 (0%)	--
Linn	21	20 (95%)	0 (0%)	--
Clackamas	45	41 (91%)	1 (2%)	1 (100%)
Columbia, Clatsop, & Tillamook	118	111 (94%)	11 (11%)	11 (100%)
Clatsop	42	40 (95%)	3 (9%)	3 (100%)
Columbia	35	33 (94%)	6 (18%)	6 (100%)
Tillamook	41	38 (93%)	2 (5%)	2 (100%)
Coos & Curry	11	11 (100%)	0 (0%)	--
Coos	8	8 (100%)	0 (0%)	--
Curry	3	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	--
Crook, Deschutes, & Jefferson	99	88 (89%)	6 (7%)	6 (100%)
Crook	13	10 (77%)	0 (0%)	--
Deschutes	75	69 (92%)	6 (9%)	6 (100%)
Jefferson	11	9 (82%)	0 (0%)	--
Douglas, Klamath, & Lake	73	71 (97%)	6 (8%)	6 (100%)
Douglas	30	30 (100%)	2 (7%)	2 (100%)
Klamath	39	38 (97%)	4 (11%)	4 (100%)
Lake	4	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	--

⁴¹ Intensive Service children are screened for normal growth and development using the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ).

⁴² Note that these diagnoses are not provided by Healthy Families Oregon staff.



Table 20b. Developmental Screening⁴¹

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Children Eligible for a Developmental Screening	Number (%) of Eligible Children with at Least One Developmental Screening	Number (%) Children with a Diagnosed Developmental Delay ⁴²	Percentage of Children with a Diagnosed Developmental Delay Receiving Early Intervention Services
Grant & Harney	14	14 (100%)	2 (14%)	2 (100%)
Grant	7	7 (100%)	0 (0%)	--
Harney	7	7 (100%)	2 (29%)	2 (100%)
Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, & Wheeler	65	63 (97%)	6 (10%)	4 (67%)
Gilliam	0	--	--	--
Hood River	42	41 (98%)	2 (5%)	0 (0%)
Sherman	0	--	--	--
Wasco	21	20 (95%)	4 (20%)	4 (100%)
Wheeler	2	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	--
Josephine & Jackson	116	113 (97%)	4 (4%)	4 (100%)
Jackson	64	62 (97%)	3 (5%)	3 (100%)
Josephine	52	51 (98%)	1 (2%)	1 (100%)
Lane	135	128 (95%)	2 (2%)	2 (100%)
Marion & Polk	185	157 (85%)	4 (3%)	4 (100%)
Marion	174	149 (86%)	4 (3%)	4 (100%)
Polk	11	8 (73%)	0 (0%)	--

⁴¹ Intensive Service children are screened for normal growth and development using the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ).

⁴² Note that these diagnoses are not provided by Healthy Families Oregon staff.

Table 20b. Developmental Screening⁴¹

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Children Eligible for a Developmental Screening	Number (%) of Eligible Children with at Least One Developmental Screening	Number (%) Children with a Diagnosed Developmental Delay ⁴²	Percentage of Children with a Diagnosed Developmental Delay Receiving Early Intervention Services
Multnomah	285	253 (89%)	14 (6%)	13 (93%)
Umatilla, Union, & Morrow	33	31 (94%)	1 (3%)	1 (100%)
Morrow	8	8 (100%)	0 (0%)	--
Umatilla	18	17 (94%)	1 (6%)	1 (100%)
Union	7	6 (86%)	0 (0%)	--
Wallowa, Baker, & Malheur	24	23 (96%)	0 (0%)	--
Baker	7	6 (86%)	0 (0%)	--
Malheur	15	15 (100%)	0 (0%)	--
Wallowa	2	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	--
Washington	129	122 (95%)	9 (8%)	8 (89%)
Yamhill	32	32 (100%)	2 (6%)	2 (100%)
State	1,418	1,308 (92%)	68 (5%)	64 (94%)

⁴¹ Intensive Service children are screened for normal growth and development using the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ).

⁴² Note that these diagnoses are not provided by Healthy Families Oregon staff.



Table 21. Developmental Screening (ASQ) Results & Subsequent Actions

Program/County	Number (%) with Typical Development ⁴³ at Most Recent Developmental Screening	Number (%) of Children with Delays Indicated on Most Recent ASQ	Of those with delays indicated (note that multiple actions can be taken):				
			Number (%) Referred to Early Intervention	Number (%) Connected to Early Intervention Services	Number (%) Given Information/Support for Child's Development	Number (%) of Families Declining Early Intervention Services	Total Number (%) Receiving at Least ONE Follow-Up Service or Action
Benton & Linn	38 (78%)	4 (10%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	4 (100%)	1 (25%)	4 (100%)
Benton	25 (86%)	2 (7%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
Linn	13 (65%)	2 (13%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	1 (50%)	2 (100%)
Clackamas	25 (61%)	5 (17%)	4 (80%)	0 (0%)	4 (80%)	1 (20%)	5 (100%)
Columbia, Clatsop, & Tillamook	81 (73%)	11 (12%)	4 (36%)	7 (64%)	11 (100%)	2 (18%)	11 (100%)
Clatsop	32 (80%)	1 (3%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Columbia	18 (55%)	8 (31%)	1 (13%)	6 (75%)	8 (100%)	0 (0%)	8 (100%)
Tillamook	31 (82%)	2 (6%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)
Coos & Curry	6 (55%)	1 (14%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Coos	4 (50%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Curry	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--
Crook, Deschutes, & Jefferson	73 (84%)	4 (5%)	2 (50%)	3 (75%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	4 (100%)
Crook	5 (56%)	1 (17%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Deschutes	60 (87%)	3 (5%)	1 (33%)	3 (100%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)
Jefferson	8 (89%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--
Douglas, Klamath, & Lake	53 (75%)	8 (13%)	1 (13%)	5 (63%)	8 (100%)	0 (0%)	7 (88%)
Douglas	23 (77%)	4 (15%)	1 (25%)	3 (75%)	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	4 (100%)
Klamath	29 (76%)	3 (9%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)
Lake	1 (33%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

⁴³ Typical development and early intervention are measured using the Ages and States Questionnaire and are reported by the Healthy Families Oregon Home Visitor.

Table 21. Developmental Screening (ASQ) Results & Subsequent Actions

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) with Typical Development ⁴³ at Most Recent Developmental Screening	Number (%) of Children with Delays Indicated on Most Recent ASQ	<i>Of those with delays indicated (note that multiple actions can be taken):</i>				
			Number (%) Referred to Early Intervention	Number (%) Connected to Early Intervention Services	Number (%) Given Information/Support for Child's Development	Number (%) of Families Declining Early Intervention Services	Total Number (%) Receiving at Least ONE Follow-Up Service or Action
Grant & Harney	10 (71%)	1 (9%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Grant	7 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--
Harney	3 (43%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, & Wheeler	49 (79%)	5 (9%)	1 (20%)	3 (60%)	5 (100%)	1 (20%)	4 (80%)
Gilliam	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hood River	32 (80%)	3 (9%)	1 (33%)	2 (67%)	3 (100%)	1 (33%)	3 (100%)
Sherman	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Wasco	15 (75%)	2 (12%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)
Wheeler	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--
Josephine & Jackson	85 (75%)	10 (11%)	7 (70%)	5 (50%)	6 (60%)	2 (20%)	10 (100%)
Jackson	46 (74%)	6 (12%)	5 (83%)	2 (33%)	5 (83%)	1 (17%)	6 (100%)
Josephine	39 (76%)	4 (9%)	2 (50%)	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	4 (100%)
Lane	103 (80%)	7 (6%)	3 (43%)	3 (43%)	3 (43%)	2 (29%)	6 (86%)
Marion & Polk	111 (71%)	16 (13%)	2 (13%)	3 (19%)	12 (75%)	8 (50%)	13 (81%)
Marion	103 (69%)	16 (13%)	2 (13%)	3 (19%)	12 (75%)	8 (50%)	13 (81%)
Polk	8 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--

⁴³ Typical development and early intervention are measured using the Ages and States Questionnaire and are reported by the Healthy Families Oregon Home Visitor.



Table 21. Developmental Screening (ASQ) Results & Subsequent Actions

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) with Typical Development ⁴³ at Most Recent Developmental Screening	Number (%) of Children with Delays Indicated on Most Recent ASQ	<i>Of those with delays indicated (note that multiple actions can be taken):</i>				
			Number (%) Referred to Early Intervention	Number (%) Connected to Early Intervention Services	Number (%) Given Information/Support for Child's Development	Number (%) of Families Declining Early Intervention Services	Total Number (%) Receiving at Least ONE Follow-Up Service or Action
Multnomah	195 (77%)	24 (11%)	3 (13%)	14 (58%)	14 (58%)	5 (21%)	23 (96%)
Umatilla, Union, & Morrow	26 (84%)	3 (10%)	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)
Morrow	8 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--
Umatilla	13 (76%)	2 (13%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
Union	5 (83%)	1 (17%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Wallowa, Baker, & Malheur	18 (78%)	4 (18%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (100%)	1 (25%)	4 (100%)
Baker	3 (50%)	2 (40%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
Malheur	14 (93%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Wallowa	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Washington	80 (66%)	23 (22%)	11 (48%)	5 (22%)	17 (74%)	4 (17%)	18 (78%)
Yamhill	24 (75%)	5 (17%)	2 (40%)	2 (40%)	3 (60%)	1 (20%)	5 (100%)
State	977 (75%)	131 (12%)	44 (34%)	52 (40%)	97 (74%)	28 (21%)	119 (91%)

⁴³ Typical development and early intervention are measured using the Ages and States Questionnaire and are reported by the Healthy Families Oregon Home Visitor.

Table 22. Social Emotional Developmental Screening (ASQ-SE) Results & Subsequent Actions⁴⁴

Program/County	Number (%) Scoring Typical on Most Recent ASQ-SE	Number (%) with Delay Indicated on Most Recent (ASQ-SE)	Of those with delays indicated (note that multiple actions can be taken):				
			Number (%) Referred to Early Intervention	Number (%) Connected to Early Intervention	Number (%) Giving Information/Support for Child's Development	Number (%) Declined Additional Services	Total Number (%) Receiving at Least ONE Follow-Up Service or Action
Benton & Linn	35 (83%)	3 (7%)	2 (67%)	2 (67%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)
Benton	23 (85%)	1 (4%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Linn	12 (80%)	2 (13%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
Clackamas	32 (86%)	1 (3%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Columbia, Clatsop, & Tillamook	95 (93%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Clatsop	34 (97%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--
Columbia	27 (84%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Tillamook	34 (97%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--
Coos & Curry	7 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--
Coos	6 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--
Curry	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--
Crook, Deschutes, & Jefferson	79 (99%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--
Crook	8 (89%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--
Deschutes	62 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--
Jefferson	9 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--
Douglas, Klamath, & Lake	55 (90%)	3 (5%)	1 (33%)	2 (67%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)
Douglas	22 (81%)	3 (11%)	1 (33%)	2 (67%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)
Klamath	30 (97%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--
Lake	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--

⁴⁴ Social-Emotional Development is reported by the Home Visitor using the ASQ-SE Form.

Table 22. Social Emotional Developmental Screening (ASQ-SE) Results & Subsequent Actions⁴⁴

Program/County	Number (%) Scoring Typical on Most Recent ASQ-SE	Number (%) with Delay Indicated on Most Recent (ASQ-SE)	Of those with delays indicated (note that multiple actions can be taken):				
			Number (%) Referred to Early Intervention	Number (%) Connected to Early Intervention	Number (%) Giving Information/Support for Child's Development	Number (%) Declined Additional Services	Total Number (%) Receiving at Least ONE Follow-Up Service or Action
Grant & Harney	8 (89%)	1 (11%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Grant	5 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--
Harney	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, & Wheeler	53 (95%)	1 (2%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Gilliam	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hood River	34 (92%)	1 (3%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Sherman	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Wasco	17 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--
Wheeler	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--
Josephine & Jackson	86 (91%)	4 (4%)	2 (50%)	1 (25%)	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	3 (75%)
Jackson	44 (90%)	3 (6%)	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)
Josephine	42 (93%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Lane	109 (95%)	1 (1%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Marion & Polk	137 (95%)	1 (1%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Marion	130 (96%)	1 (1%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Polk	7 (88%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--

⁴⁴ Social-Emotional Development is reported by the Home Visitor using the ASQ-SE Form.

Table 22. Social Emotional Developmental Screening (ASQ-SE) Results & Subsequent Actions⁴⁴

Program/County	Number (%) Scoring Typical on Most Recent ASQ-SE	Number (%) with Delay Indicated on Most Recent (ASQ-SE)	Of those with delays indicated (note that multiple actions can be taken):				
			Number (%) Referred to Early Intervention	Number (%) Connected to Early Intervention	Number (%) Giving Information/ Support for Child's Development	Number (%) Declined Additional Services	Total Number (%) Receiving at Least ONE Follow-Up Service or Action
Multnomah	211 (93%)	10 (4%)	1 (10%)	6 (60%)	5 (50%)	0 (0%)	9 (90%)
Umatilla, Union, & Morrow	22 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--
Morrow	6 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--
Umatilla	12 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--
Union	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--
Wallowa, Baker, & Malheur	19 (90%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Baker	4 (80%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Malheur	14 (100%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--
Wallowa	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	--	--	--	--	--
Washington	104 (95%)	3 (3%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)
Yamhill	28 (88%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
State	1,080 (93%)	31 (3%)	11 (35%)	18 (58%)	25 (81%)	1 (3%)	29 (94%)

⁴⁴ Social-Emotional Development is reported by the Home Visitor using the ASQ-SE Form.



Table 23. Connection to Essential Resources for Intensive Service Families

Program/County	Number Needing and Connected to Service at 6 Months (% Connected)							
	Drug/Alcohol		Domestic Violence		Public Health Nursing		TANF	
	Number Referred	Number (%) Connected	Number (%) Connected	Number (%) Connected	Number Referred	Number (%) Connected	Number Referred	Number (%) Connected
Benton & Linn	1	0 (0%)	1	0 (0%)	3	1 (50%)	2	1 (100%)
Benton	1	0 (0%)	0	--	3	1 (50%)	2	1 (100%)
Linn	0	--	1	0 (0%)	0	--	0	--
Clackamas	2	2 (100%)	2	1 (50%)	0	--	6	3 (60%)
Columbia, Clatsop, & Tillamook	8	7 (88%)	9	5 (56%)	4	3 (75%)	13	10 (77%)
Clatsop	0	--	0	--	2	2 (100%)	0	--
Columbia	1	1 (100%)	3	2 (67%)	0	--	4	4 (100%)
Tillamook	7	6 (86%)	6	3 (50%)	2	1 (50%)	9	6 (67%)
Coos & Curry	1	1 (100%)	1	0 (0%)	3	2 (67%)	2	2 (100%)
Coos	0	--	1	0 (0%)	3	2 (67%)	2	2 (100%)
Curry	1	1 (100%)	0	--	0	--	0	--
Crook, Deschutes, & Jefferson	3	3 (100%)	0	--	2	2 (100%)	2	2 (100%)
Crook	0	--	0	--	1	1 (100%)	0	--
Deschutes	2	2 (100%)	0	--	1	1 (100%)	2	2 (100%)
Jefferson	1	1 (100%)	0	--	0	--	0	--
Douglas, Klamath, & Lake	1	1 (100%)	1	1 (100%)	6	6 (100%)	6	4 (67%)
Douglas	0	--	0	--	3	3 (100%)	1	1 (100%)
Klamath	1	1 (100%)	1	1 (100%)	2	2 (100%)	5	3 (60%)
Lake	0	--	0	--	1	1 (100%)	0	--

Table 23. Connection to Essential Resources for Intensive Service Families

<i>Program/County</i>	<i>Number Needing and Connected to Service at 6 Months (% Connected)</i>							
	<i>Drug/Alcohol</i>		<i>Domestic Violence</i>		<i>Public Health Nursing</i>		<i>TANF</i>	
	<i>Number Referred</i>	<i>Number (%) Connected</i>	<i>Number (%) Connected</i>	<i>Number (%) Connected</i>	<i>Number Referred</i>	<i>Number (%) Connected</i>	<i>Number Referred</i>	<i>Number (%) Connected</i>
Grant & Harney	2	2 (100%)	0	--	1	1 (100%)	3	2 (67%)
Grant	1	1 (100%)	0	--	0	--	2	2 (100%)
Harney	1	1 (100%)	0	--	1	1 (100%)	1	0 (0%)
Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, & Wheeler	1	1 (100%)	4	3 (100%)	6	6 (100%)	4	3 (75%)
Gilliam	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hood River	1	1 (100%)	3	3 (100%)	4	4 (100%)	1	1 (100%)
Sherman	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--
Wasco	0	--	1	--	2	2 (100%)	2	1 (50%)
Wheeler	0	--	0	--	0	--	1	1 (100%)
Josephine & Jackson	5	2 (40%)	3	0 (0%)	1	1 (100%)	4	2 (50%)
Jackson	3	2 (67%)	3	0 (0%)	1	1 (100%)	2	2 (100%)
Josephine	2	0 (0%)	0	--	0	--	2	0 (0%)
Lane	2	1 (50%)	2	1 (50%)	2	1 (50%)	3	3 (100%)
Marion & Polk	1	0 (0%)	1	1 (100%)	0	--	6	4 (80%)
Marion	1	0 (0%)	1	1 (100%)	0	--	6	4 (80%)
Polk	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--



Table 23. Connection to Essential Resources for Intensive Service Families

<i>Program/County</i>	<i>Number Needing and Connected to Service at 6 Months (% Connected)</i>							
	<i>Drug/Alcohol</i>		<i>Domestic Violence</i>		<i>Public Health Nursing</i>		<i>TANF</i>	
	<i>Number Referred</i>	<i>Number (%) Connected</i>	<i>Number (%) Connected</i>	<i>Number (%) Connected</i>	<i>Number Referred</i>	<i>Number (%) Connected</i>	<i>Number Referred</i>	<i>Number (%) Connected</i>
Multnomah	1	0 (0%)	2	1 (50%)	0	--	1	1 (100%)
Umatilla, Union, & Morrow	2	2 (100%)	1	0 (0%)	0	--	3	3 (100%)
Morrow	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--
Umatilla	1	1 (100%)	1	0 (0%)	0	--	2	2 (100%)
Union	1	1 (100%)	0	--	0	--	1	1 (100%)
Wallowa, Baker, & Malheur	0	--	1	1 (100%)	0	--	2	2 (100%)
Baker	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--
Malheur	0	--	0	--	0	--	1	1 (100%)
Wallowa	0	--	1	1 (100%)	0	--	1	1 (100%)
Washington	6	3 (50%)	2	1 (50%)	1	0 (0%)	5	3 (60%)
Yamhill	0	--	0	--	0	--	1	0 (0%)
State	36	25 (69%)	30	15 (52%)	29	23 (82%)	63	45 (75%)

Table 24a. Family Outcomes and Life Events at 6 Months⁴⁵

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of Families Reporting a New Job	Number (%) of Families Reporting Having Obtained a GED or Having Graduated from School	Number (%) of Families Reporting the Discontinuation of TANF	Number (%) of Child Welfare Reports Made by Home Visitor
Benton & Linn	10 (28%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Benton	6 (24%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Linn	4 (36%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Clackamas	10 (28%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (8%)
Columbia, Clatsop, & Tillamook	26 (25%)	0 (0%)	2 (2%)	0 (0%)
Clatsop	10 (26%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Columbia	5 (16%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Tillamook	11 (32%)	0 (0%)	2 (6%)	0 (0%)
Coos & Curry	3 (33%)	0 (0%)	2 (22%)	1 (11%)
Coos	2 (33%)	0 (0%)	2 (33%)	0 (0%)
Curry	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)
Crook, Deschutes, & Jefferson	32 (37%)	1 (1%)	4 (5%)	1 (1%)
Crook	2 (18%)	0 (0%)	1 (9%)	0 (0%)
Deschutes	26 (41%)	0 (0%)	3 (5%)	1 (2%)
Jefferson	4 (36%)	1 (9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Douglas, Klamath, & Lake	10 (19%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)
Douglas	5 (25%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Klamath	4 (13%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)
Lake	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

⁴⁵ Family outcomes and events are reported by the Home Visitor on the Family Update form. Percentages are calculated based on the number of families with valid Family Update information for each item.



Table 24a. Family Outcomes and Life Events at 6 Months⁴⁵

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of Families Reporting a New Job	Number (%) of Families Reporting Having Obtained a GED or Having Graduated from School	Number (%) of Families Reporting the Discontinuation of TANF	Number (%) of Child Welfare Reports Made by Home Visitor
Grant & Harney	3 (30%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)
Grant	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Harney	2 (33%)	0 (0%)	1 (17%)	0 (0%)
Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, & Wheeler	6 (12%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)
Gilliam	--	--	--	--
Hood River	3 (9%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Sherman	--	--	--	--
Wasco	3 (21%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (7%)
Wheeler	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Josephine & Jackson	24 (27%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)
Jackson	13 (31%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)
Josephine	11 (24%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Lane	28 (23%)	1 (1%)	2 (2%)	2 (2%)
Marion & Polk	27 (18%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	6 (4%)
Marion	27 (19%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	6 (4%)
Polk	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

⁴⁵ Family outcomes and events are reported by the Home Visitor on the Family Update form. Percentages are calculated based on the number of families with valid Family Update information for each item.

Table 24a. Family Outcomes and Life Events at 6 Months⁴⁵

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of Families Reporting a New Job	Number (%) of Families Reporting Having Obtained a GED or Having Graduated from School	Number (%) of Families Reporting the Discontinuation of TANF	Number (%) of Child Welfare Reports Made by Home Visitor
Multnomah	28 (14%)	3 (1%)	1 (0%)	3 (1%)
Umatilla, Union, & Morrow	13 (41%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Morrow	5 (63%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Umatilla	8 (42%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Union	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Wallowa, Baker, & Malheur	3 (14%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Baker	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Malheur	3 (23%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Wallowa	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Washington	24 (22%)	0 (0%)	4 (4%)	1 (1%)
Yamhill	3 (12%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)
State	250 (22%)	10 (1%)	17 (1%)	20 (2%)

⁴⁵ Family outcomes and events are reported by the Home Visitor on the Family Update form. Percentages are calculated based on the number of families with valid Family Update information for each item.



Table 24b. Family Outcomes and Life Events at 12 Months⁴⁶

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of Families Reporting a New Job	Number (%) of Families Reporting Having Obtained a GED or Having Graduated from School	Number (%) of Families Reporting the Discontinuation of TANF	Number (%) of Child Welfare Reports Made by Home Visitor
Benton & Linn	2 (8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Benton	2 (11%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Linn	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Clackamas	6 (26%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (13%)
Columbia, Clatsop, & Tillamook	19 (23%)	0 (0%)	2 (2%)	1 (1%)
Clatsop	4 (14%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)
Columbia	6 (23%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)
Tillamook	9 (33%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Coos & Curry	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Coos	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Curry	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Crook, Deschutes, & Jefferson	26 (39%)	4 (6%)	3 (5%)	0 (0%)
Crook	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	2 (40%)	0 (0%)
Deschutes	21 (40%)	3 (6%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)
Jefferson	4 (44%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Douglas, Klamath, & Lake	10 (25%)	0 (0%)	2 (5%)	3 (8%)
Douglas	3 (20%)	0 (0%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)
Klamath	7 (29%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (13%)
Lake	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)

⁴⁶ Family outcomes and events are reported by the Home Visitor on the Family Update form. Percentages are calculated based on the number of families with valid Family Update information for each item.

Table 24b. Family Outcomes and Life Events at 12 Months⁴⁶

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of Families Reporting a New Job	Number (%) of Families Reporting Having Obtained a GED or Having Graduated from School	Number (%) of Families Reporting the Discontinuation of TANF	Number (%) of Child Welfare Reports Made by Home Visitor
Grant & Harney	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)
Grant	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)
Harney	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, & Wheeler	11 (26%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	2 (5%)
Gilliam	--	--	--	--
Hood River	8 (25%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Sherman	--	--	--	--
Wasco	2 (22%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (22%)
Wheeler	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)
Josephine & Jackson	19 (29%)	2 (3%)	3 (5%)	4 (6%)
Jackson	8 (26%)	1 (3%)	1 (3%)	3 (10%)
Josephine	11 (31%)	1 (3%)	2 (6%)	1 (3%)
Lane	22 (23%)	2 (2%)	4 (4%)	3 (3%)
Marion & Polk	27 (20%)	2 (2%)	1 (1%)	2 (2%)
Marion	26 (21%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	2 (2%)
Polk	1 (11%)	1 (11%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

⁴⁶ Family outcomes and events are reported by the Home Visitor on the Family Update form. Percentages are calculated based on the number of families with valid Family Update information for each item.



Table 24b. Family Outcomes and Life Events at 12 Months⁴⁶

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of Families Reporting a New Job	Number (%) of Families Reporting Having Obtained a GED or Having Graduated from School	Number (%) of Families Reporting the Discontinuation of TANF	Number (%) of Child Welfare Reports Made by Home Visitor
Multnomah	46 (27%)	1 (1%)	4 (2%)	2 (1%)
Umatilla, Union, & Morrow	5 (22%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)
Morrow	4 (57%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Umatilla	1 (8%)	0 (0%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)
Union	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)
Wallowa, Baker, & Malheur	2 (17%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Baker	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Malheur	2 (18%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Wallowa	--	--	--	--
Washington	25 (26%)	3 (3%)	2 (2%)	2 (2%)
Yamhill	2 (9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
State	225 (25%)	15 (2%)	24 (3%)	23 (3%)

⁴⁶ Family outcomes and events are reported by the Home Visitor on the Family Update form. Percentages are calculated based on the number of families with valid Family Update information for each item.

Table 25a. Promotion of Positive Parenting Skills & Helping Children Learn⁴⁷

<i>Program/County</i>	Number Reporting Parenting Skills Information (at 6 months)	Number (%) Reporting Improved Parenting Skills (at 6 months)	Number Reporting Parenting Skills Information (at 12 months)	Number (%) Reporting Improved Parenting Skills (at 12 months)
Benton & Linn	33	20 (61%)	23	15 (65%)
Benton	22	13 (59%)	16	12 (75%)
Linn	11	7 (64%)	7	3 (43%)
Clackamas	31	23 (74%)	18	15 (83%)
Columbia, Clatsop, & Tillamook	100	65 (65%)	74	54 (73%)
Clatsop	37	27 (73%)	29	23 (79%)
Columbia	30	21 (70%)	25	15 (60%)
Tillamook	33	17 (52%)	20	16 (80%)
Coos & Curry	8	5 (63%)	2	2 (100%)
Coos	6	4 (67%)	1	1 (100%)
Curry	2	1 (50%)	1	1 (100%)
Crook, Deschutes, & Jefferson	82	54 (66%)	62	42 (68%)
Crook	10	6 (60%)	4	3 (75%)
Deschutes	61	40 (66%)	49	32 (65%)
Jefferson	11	8 (73%)	9	7 (78%)
Douglas, Klamath, & Lake	54	35 (65%)	35	26 (74%)
Douglas	23	14 (61%)	14	8 (57%)
Klamath	30	20 (67%)	21	18 (86%)
Lake	1	1 (100%)	0	--

⁴⁷ The primary caregiver rates their parenting skills and ability to help their child learn on the 6- and 12-month surveys. Percentages are calculated based on the number of caregivers with information for each item.



Table 25a. Promotion of Positive Parenting Skills & Helping Children Learn⁴⁷

<i>Program/County</i>	Number Reporting Parenting Skills Information (at 6 months)	Number (%) Reporting Improved Parenting Skills (at 6 months)	Number Reporting Parenting Skills Information (at 12 months)	Number (%) Reporting Improved Parenting Skills (at 12 months)
Grant & Harney	11	6 (55%)	4	3 (75%)
Grant	6	4 (67%)	3	3 (100%)
Harney	5	2 (40%)	1	0 (0%)
Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, & Wheeler	46	24 (52%)	42	30 (71%)
Gilliam	0	--	0	--
Hood River	32	16 (50%)	31	23 (74%)
Sherman	0	--	0	--
Wasco	13	7 (54%)	9	6 (67%)
Wheeler	1	1 (100%)	2	1 (50%)
Josephine & Jackson	88	53 (60%)	61	43 (70%)
Jackson	42	23 (55%)	30	19 (63%)
Josephine	46	30 (65%)	31	24 (77%)
Lane	114	72 (63%)	89	58 (65%)
Marion & Polk	147	71 (48%)	122	77 (63%)
Marion	140	67 (48%)	113	70 (62%)
Polk	7	4 (57%)	9	7 (78%)

⁴⁷ The primary caregiver rates their parenting skills and ability to help their child learn on the 6- and 12-month surveys. Percentages are calculated based on the number of caregivers with information for each item.

Table 25a. Promotion of Positive Parenting Skills & Helping Children Learn⁴⁷

<i>Program/County</i>	Number Reporting Parenting Skills Information (at 6 months)	Number (%) Reporting Improved Parenting Skills (at 6 months)	Number Reporting Parenting Skills Information (at 12 months)	Number (%) Reporting Improved Parenting Skills (at 12 months)
Multnomah	194	113 (58%)	154	87 (56%)
Umatilla, Union, & Morrow	26	15 (58%)	20	15 (75%)
Morrow	5	2 (40%)	4	1 (25%)
Umatilla	16	8 (50%)	13	11 (85%)
Union	5	5 (100%)	3	3 (100%)
Wallowa, Baker, & Malheur	18	10 (56%)	8	6 (75%)
Baker	6	4 (67%)	1	1 (100%)
Malheur	10	5 (50%)	7	5 (71%)
Wallowa	2	1 (50%)	0	--
Washington	97	67 (69%)	91	65 (71%)
Yamhill	31	19 (61%)	25	17 (68%)
State	1,080	652 (60%)	830	555 (67%)

⁴⁷ The primary caregiver rates their parenting skills and ability to help their child learn on the 6- and 12-month surveys. Percentages are calculated based on the number of caregivers with information for each item.



Table 25b. Promotion of Positive Parenting Skills & Helping Children Learn⁴⁸

<i>Program/County</i>	Number Reporting Ability to Help Their Child Learn Information (at 6 months)	Number (%) Reporting Improved Ability to Help Their Child Learn (at 6 months)	Number Reporting Ability to Help Their Child Learn Information (at 12 months)	Number (%) Reporting Improved Ability to Help Their Child Learn (at 12 months)
Benton & Linn	32	15 (47%)	22	9 (41%)
Benton	21	11 (52%)	15	6 (40%)
Linn	11	4 (36%)	7	3 (43%)
Clackamas	31	17 (55%)	17	13 (76%)
Columbia, Clatsop, & Tillamook	95	57 (60%)	72	47 (65%)
Clatsop	36	19 (53%)	28	21 (75%)
Columbia	27	19 (70%)	24	13 (54%)
Tillamook	32	19 (59%)	20	13 (65%)
Coos & Curry	8	4 (50%)	2	2 (100%)
Coos	6	2 (33%)	1	1 (100%)
Curry	2	2 (100%)	1	1 (100%)
Crook, Deschutes, & Jefferson	80	39 (49%)	60	37 (62%)
Crook	10	5 (50%)	4	3 (75%)
Deschutes	59	29 (49%)	47	27 (57%)
Jefferson	11	5 (45%)	9	7 (78%)
Douglas, Klamath, & Lake	54	24 (44%)	32	15 (47%)
Douglas	23	11 (48%)	14	6 (43%)
Klamath	30	13 (43%)	18	9 (50%)
Lake	1	0 (0%)	0	--

⁴⁸ The primary caregiver rates their parenting skills and ability to help their child learn on the 6- and 12-month surveys. Percentages are calculated based on the number of caregivers with information for each item.

Table 25b. Promotion of Positive Parenting Skills & Helping Children Learn⁴⁸

<i>Program/County</i>	Number Reporting Ability to Help Their Child Learn Information (at 6 months)	Number (%) Reporting Improved Ability to Help Their Child Learn (at 6 months)	Number Reporting Ability to Help Their Child Learn Information (at 12 months)	Number (%) Reporting Improved Ability to Help Their Child Learn (at 12 months)
Grant & Harney	10	4 (40%)	4	3 (75%)
Grant	6	4 (67%)	3	3 (100%)
Harney	4	0 (0%)	1	0 (0%)
Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, & Wheeler	44	30 (68%)	40	28 (70%)
Gilliam	0	--	0	--
Hood River	31	22 (71%)	29	22 (76%)
Sherman	0	--	0	--
Wasco	12	7 (58%)	9	5 (56%)
Wheeler	1	1 (100%)	2	1 (50%)
Josephine & Jackson	83	43 (52%)	59	33 (56%)
Jackson	39	20 (51%)	28	13 (46%)
Josephine	44	23 (52%)	31	20 (65%)
Lane	109	52 (48%)	88	43 (49%)
Marion & Polk	145	62 (43%)	120	64 (53%)
Marion	138	59 (43%)	111	58 (52%)
Polk	7	3 (43%)	9	6 (67%)

⁴⁸ The primary caregiver rates their parenting skills and ability to help their child learn on the 6- and 12-month surveys. Percentages are calculated based on the number of caregivers with information for each item.



Table 25b. Promotion of Positive Parenting Skills & Helping Children Learn⁴⁸

<i>Program/County</i>	Number Reporting Ability to Help Their Child Learn Information (at 6 months)	Number (%) Reporting Improved Ability to Help Their Child Learn (at 6 months)	Number Reporting Ability to Help Their Child Learn Information (at 12 months)	Number (%) Reporting Improved Ability to Help Their Child Learn (at 12 months)
Multnomah	191	100 (52%)	143	82 (57%)
Umatilla, Union, & Morrow	25	14 (56%)	19	15 (79%)
Morrow	5	3 (60%)	4	3 (75%)
Umatilla	16	7 (44%)	12	9 (75%)
Union	4	4 (100%)	3	3 (100%)
Wallowa, Baker, & Malheur	18	6 (33%)	8	3 (38%)
Baker	6	2 (33%)	1	0 (0%)
Malheur	10	3 (30%)	7	3 (43%)
Wallowa	2	1 (50%)	0	--
Washington	91	52 (57%)	88	61 (69%)
Yamhill	30	11 (37%)	25	11 (44%)
State	1,046	530 (51%)	799	466 (58%)

⁴⁸ The primary caregiver rates their parenting skills and ability to help their child learn on the 6- and 12-month surveys. Percentages are calculated based on the number of caregivers with information for each item.

Table 26a. Ratings of Home Visitor Helpfulness⁴⁹

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Families Needing Help with Basic Resources	Number (%) Reporting Home Visitor “Helped a Little or a Lot” with Basic Resources	Number of Families Needing Help with Social Support	Number (%) Reporting Home Visitor “Helped a Little or a Lot” with Social Support	Number of Families Needing Help with Parenting Information	Number (%) Reporting Home Visitor “Helped a Little or a Lot” with Parenting Information
Benton & Linn	24	24 (100%)	33	30 (91%)	36	36 (100%)
Benton	16	16 (100%)	19	18 (95%)	21	21 (100%)
Linn	8	8 (100%)	14	12 (86%)	15	15 (100%)
Clackamas	26	26 (100%)	27	24 (89%)	30	30 (100%)
Columbia, Clatsop, & Tillamook	68	68 (100%)	92	89 (97%)	100	100 (100%)
Clatsop	23	23 (100%)	31	31 (100%)	35	35 (100%)
Columbia	17	17 (100%)	28	26 (93%)	31	31 (100%)
Tillamook	28	28 (100%)	33	32 (97%)	34	34 (100%)
Coos & Curry	6	6 (100%)	7	7 (100%)	8	8 (100%)
Coos	5	5 (100%)	6	6 (100%)	7	7 (100%)
Curry	1	1 (100%)	1	1 (100%)	1	1 (100%)
Crook, Deschutes, & Jefferson	57	54 (95%)	77	74 (96%)	83	83 (100%)
Crook	3	3 (100%)	7	6 (86%)	10	10 (100%)
Deschutes	45	42 (93%)	59	57 (97%)	62	62 (100%)
Jefferson	9	9 (100%)	11	11 (100%)	11	11 (100%)
Douglas, Klamath, & Lake	51	48 (94%)	54	46 (85%)	54	54 (100%)
Douglas	19	18 (95%)	21	18 (86%)	21	21 (100%)
Klamath	31	29 (94%)	32	27 (84%)	32	32 (100%)
Lake	1	1 (100%)	1	1 (100%)	1	1 (100%)

⁴⁹ Ratings are taken from the family’s last completed My Parenting Experience II-B. “Please tell us whether Healthy Families has helped your family with the following issues” items are rated as “Visitor has helped a lot” “Helped a little,” “Hasn’t helped yet” and “We don’t need help from visitor.” Percentages are calculated based on the number of families reporting “helped a lot” and “helped a little.”



Table 26a. Ratings of Home Visitor Helpfulness⁴⁹

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Families Needing Help with Basic Resources	Number (%) Reporting Home Visitor “Helped a Little or a Lot” with Basic Resources	Number of Families Needing Help with Social Support	Number (%) Reporting Home Visitor “Helped a Little or a Lot” with Social Support	Number of Families Needing Help with Parenting Information	Number (%) Reporting Home Visitor “Helped a Little or a Lot” with Parenting Information
Grant & Harney	7	7 (100%)	9	5 (56%)	10	10 (100%)
Grant	5	5 (100%)	5	2 (40%)	6	6 (100%)
Harney	2	2 (100%)	4	3 (75%)	4	4 (100%)
Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, & Wheeler	41	40 (98%)	50	46 (92%)	53	53 (100%)
Gilliam	0	--	0	--	0	--
Hood River	28	28 (100%)	34	33 (97%)	36	36 (100%)
Sherman	0	--	0	--	0	--
Wasco	13	12 (92%)	14	12 (86%)	15	15 (100%)
Wheeler	0	--	2	1 (50%)	2	2 (100%)
Josephine & Jackson	60	57 (95%)	86	86 (100%)	91	91 (100%)
Jackson	30	28 (93%)	44	44 (100%)	46	46 (100%)
Josephine	30	29 (97%)	42	42 (100%)	45	45 (100%)
Lane	71	64 (90%)	100	98 (98%)	114	112 (98%)
Marion & Polk	139	134 (96%)	138	112 (81%)	157	154 (98%)
Marion	132	127 (96%)	130	104 (80%)	147	144 (98%)
Polk	7	7 (100%)	8	8 (100%)	10	10 (100%)

⁴⁹ Ratings are taken from the family’s last completed My Parenting Experience II-B. “Please tell us whether Healthy Families has helped your family with the following issues” items are rated as “Visitor has helped a lot” “Helped a little,” “Hasn’t helped yet” and “We don’t need help from visitor.” Percentages are calculated based on the number of families reporting “helped a lot” and “helped a little.”

Table 26a. Ratings of Home Visitor Helpfulness⁴⁹

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Families Needing Help with Basic Resources	Number (%) Reporting Home Visitor “Helped a Little or a Lot” with Basic Resources	Number of Families Needing Help with Social Support	Number (%) Reporting Home Visitor “Helped a Little or a Lot” with Social Support	Number of Families Needing Help with Parenting Information	Number (%) Reporting Home Visitor “Helped a Little or a Lot” with Parenting Information
Multnomah	164	158 (96%)	154	133 (86%)	218	218 (100%)
Umatilla, Union, & Morrow	20	19 (95%)	20	17 (85%)	26	26 (100%)
Morrow	4	4 (100%)	3	2 (67%)	5	5 (100%)
Umatilla	13	12 (92%)	14	13 (93%)	17	17 (100%)
Union	3	3 (100%)	3	2 (67%)	4	4 (100%)
Wallowa, Baker, & Malheur	17	17 (100%)	13	11 (85%)	20	20 (100%)
Baker	5	5 (100%)	5	4 (80%)	6	6 (100%)
Malheur	10	10 (100%)	6	5 (83%)	12	12 (100%)
Wallowa	2	2 (100%)	2	2 (100%)	2	2 (100%)
Washington	94	90 (96%)	110	101 (92%)	112	112 (100%)
Yamhill	28	26 (93%)	28	24 (86%)	30	30 (100%)
State	873	838 (96%)	998	903 (90%)	1,142	1,137 (100%)

⁴⁹ Ratings are taken from the family’s last completed My Parenting Experience II-B. “Please tell us whether Healthy Families has helped your family with the following issues” items are rated as “Visitor has helped a lot” “Helped a little,” “Hasn’t helped yet” and “We don’t need help from visitor.” Percentages are calculated based on the number of families reporting “helped a lot” and “helped a little.”



Table 26b. Ratings of Home Visitor Helpfulness⁵⁰

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Families Needing Help with Emotional Issues	Number (%) Reporting Home Visitor “Helped a Little or a Lot” with Emotional Issues	Number of Families Needing Help with Education	Number (%) Reporting Home Visitor “Helped a Little or a Lot” with Education
Benton & Linn	30	30 (100%)	25	23 (92%)
Benton	17	17 (100%)	15	13 (87%)
Linn	13	13 (100%)	10	10 (100%)
Clackamas	30	28 (93%)	17	17 (100%)
Columbia, Clatsop, & Tillamook	93	91 (98%)	46	40 (87%)
Clatsop	30	30 (100%)	15	14 (93%)
Columbia	31	31 (100%)	16	13 (81%)
Tillamook	32	30 (94%)	15	13 (87%)
Coos & Curry	8	8 (100%)	4	3 (75%)
Coos	7	7 (100%)	4	3 (75%)
Curry	1	1 (100%)	0	--
Crook, Deschutes, & Jefferson	72	71 (99%)	49	45 (92%)
Crook	7	6 (86%)	3	3 (100%)
Deschutes	56	56 (100%)	38	34 (89%)
Jefferson	9	9 (100%)	8	8 (100%)
Douglas, Klamath, & Lake	50	50 (100%)	35	32 (91%)
Douglas	18	18 (100%)	11	10 (91%)
Klamath	31	31 (100%)	24	22 (92%)
Lake	1	1 (100%)	0	--

⁵⁰ Ratings are taken from the family’s last completed My Parenting Experience II-B. “Please tell us whether Healthy Families has helped your family with the following issues” items are rated as “Visitor has helped a lot” “Helped a little,” “Hasn’t helped yet” and “We don’t need help from visitor.” Percentages are calculated based on the number of families reporting “helped a lot” and “helped a little.”

Table 26b. Ratings of Home Visitor Helpfulness⁵⁰

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Families Needing Help with Emotional Issues	Number (%) Reporting Home Visitor “Helped a Little or a Lot” with Emotional Issues	Number of Families Needing Help with Education	Number (%) Reporting Home Visitor “Helped a Little or a Lot” with Education
Grant & Harney	9	8 (89%)	2	1 (50%)
Grant	5	5 (100%)	1	0 (0%)
Harney	4	3 (75%)	1	1 (100%)
Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, & Wheeler	48	48 (100%)	29	28 (97%)
Gilliam	0	--	0	--
Hood River	34	34 (100%)	21	21 (100%)
Sherman	0	--	0	--
Wasco	13	13 (100%)	8	7 (88%)
Wheeler	1	1 (100%)	0	--
Josephine & Jackson	84	83 (99%)	48	41 (85%)
Jackson	41	41 (100%)	26	22 (85%)
Josephine	43	42 (98%)	22	19 (86%)
Lane	110	110 (100%)	52	46 (88%)
Marion & Polk	134	128 (96%)	92	63 (68%)
Marion	126	120 (95%)	88	60 (68%)
Polk	8	8 (100%)	4	3 (75%)

⁵⁰ Ratings are taken from the family’s last completed My Parenting Experience II-B. “Please tell us whether Healthy Families has helped your family with the following issues” items are rated as “Visitor has helped a lot” “Helped a little,” “Hasn’t helped yet” and “We don’t need help from visitor.” Percentages are calculated based on the number of families reporting “helped a lot” and “helped a little.”



Table 26b. Ratings of Home Visitor Helpfulness⁵⁰

<i>Program/County</i>	Number of Families Needing Help with Emotional Issues	Number (%) Reporting Home Visitor “Helped a Little or a Lot” with Emotional Issues	Number of Families Needing Help with Education	Number (%) Reporting Home Visitor “Helped a Little or a Lot” with Education
Multnomah	169	169 (100%)	107	89 (83%)
Umatilla, Union, & Morrow	22	22 (100%)	16	14 (88%)
Morrow	3	3 (100%)	3	3 (100%)
Umatilla	16	16 (100%)	11	9 (82%)
Union	3	3 (100%)	2	2 (100%)
Wallowa, Baker, & Malheur	20	20 (100%)	11	10 (91%)
Baker	6	6 (100%)	4	4 (100%)
Malheur	12	12 (100%)	6	6 (100%)
Wallowa	2	2 (100%)	1	0 (0%)
Washington	97	96 (99%)	64	56 (88%)
Yamhill	29	29 (100%)	16	10 (63%)
State	1,005	991 (99%)	613	518 (85%)

⁵⁰ Ratings are taken from the family’s last completed My Parenting Experience II-B. “Please tell us whether Healthy Families has helped your family with the following issues” items are rated as “Visitor has helped a lot” “Helped a little,” “Hasn’t helped yet” and “We don’t need help from visitor.” Percentages are calculated based on the number of families reporting “helped a lot” and “helped a little.”

Table 27a. Cultural Competency & Strength Orientation of Home Visitors⁵¹ 2019 (CE 5-4.B)

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Encouraged Them to Think About Their Culture	Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Respected Their Family's Culture and/or Religious Beliefs	Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Provided Materials in Their Preferred Language	Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Helps Them to See Strengths They Didn't Know They Had
Benton & Linn	34 (94%)	35 (100%)	9 (100%)	30 (83%)
Benton	19 (90%)	21 (100%)	4 (100%)	17 (81%)
Linn	15 (100%)	14 (100%)	5 (100%)	13 (87%)
Clackamas	28 (93%)	30 (100%)	12 (100%)	28 (93%)
Columbia, Clatsop, & Tillamook	88 (88%)	100 (99%)	33 (100%)	92 (91%)
Clatsop	34 (97%)	36 (100%)	12 (100%)	33 (92%)
Columbia	22 (71%)	30 (97%)	17 (100%)	27 (87%)
Tillamook	32 (94%)	34 (100%)	4 (100%)	32 (94%)
Coos & Curry	7 (88%)	7 (88%)	2 (100%)	6 (75%)
Coos	6 (86%)	6 (86%)	2 (100%)	5 (71%)
Curry	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	--	1 (100%)
Crook, Deschutes, & Jefferson	68 (80%)	80 (94%)	33 (100%)	75 (88%)
Crook	7 (70%)	9 (90%)	4 (100%)	8 (80%)
Deschutes	54 (84%)	60 (94%)	28 (100%)	58 (91%)
Jefferson	7 (64%)	11 (100%)	1 (100%)	9 (82%)
Douglas, Klamath, & Lake	52 (91%)	56 (98%)	17 (85%)	51 (89%)
Douglas	21 (91%)	23 (100%)	6 (67%)	21 (91%)
Klamath	30 (91%)	32 (97%)	11 (100%)	29 (88%)
Lake	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	--	1 (100%)

⁵¹ The family reports their perceptions of Culturally Competent and Strength-based Practice/Service on the My Parenting Experience II-B on multiple items using the Strengths-Based Practices Inventory (Green, Tarte, & McAllister, 2004). Parents indicate "Yes," "No," or "Not Sure" for each item. These data represent information from the most recent available survey completed by the parent. Percentages are calculated based on the number of families reporting "Yes."



Table 27a. Cultural Competency & Strength Orientation of Home Visitors⁵¹ 2019 (CE 5-4.B)

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Encouraged Them to Think About Their Culture	Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Respected Their Family’s Culture and/or Religious Beliefs	Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Provided Materials in Their Preferred Language	Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Helps Them to See Strengths They Didn’t Know They Had
Grant & Harney	8 (80%)	10 (91%)	1 (50%)	10 (91%)
Grant	5 (83%)	5 (83%)	0 (0%)	5 (83%)
Harney	3 (75%)	5 (100%)	1 (100%)	5 (100%)
Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, & Wheeler	53 (98%)	53 (98%)	24 (100%)	52 (96%)
Gilliam	--	--	--	--
Hood River	37 (100%)	37 (100%)	17 (100%)	36 (97%)
Sherman	--	--	--	--
Wasco	14 (93%)	14 (93%)	7 (100%)	14 (93%)
Wheeler	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	--	2 (100%)
Josephine & Jackson	87 (94%)	92 (99%)	30 (97%)	85 (91%)
Jackson	45 (96%)	46 (98%)	11 (92%)	44 (94%)
Josephine	42 (91%)	46 (100%)	19 (100%)	41 (89%)
Lane	101 (86%)	113 (96%)	46 (98%)	106 (91%)
Marion & Polk	146 (91%)	156 (98%)	71 (97%)	144 (90%)
Marion	138 (92%)	146 (97%)	69 (97%)	135 (90%)
Polk	8 (80%)	10 (100%)	2 (100%)	9 (90%)

⁵¹ The family reports their perceptions of Culturally Competent and Strength-based Practice/Service on the My Parenting Experience II-B on multiple items using the Strengths Based Practices Inventory (Green, Tarte, & McAllister, 2004). Parents indicate “Yes,” “No,” or “Not Sure” for each item. These data represent information from the most recent available survey completed by the parent. Percentages are calculated based on the number of families reporting “Yes.”

Table 27a. Cultural Competency & Strength Orientation of Home Visitors⁵¹ 2019 (CE 5-4.B)

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Encouraged Them to Think About Their Culture	Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Respected Their Family's Culture and/or Religious Beliefs	Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Provided Materials in Their Preferred Language	Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Helps Them to See Strengths They Didn't Know They Had
Multnomah	195 (89%)	216 (98%)	65 (83%)	202 (92%)
Umatilla, Union, & Morrow	25 (89%)	27 (96%)	7 (88%)	28 (100%)
Morrow	6 (100%)	6 (100%)	--	6 (100%)
Umatilla	15 (88%)	16 (94%)	5 (83%)	17 (100%)
Union	4 (80%)	5 (100%)	2 (100%)	5 (100%)
Wallowa, Baker, & Malheur	19 (95%)	19 (95%)	3 (100%)	20 (100%)
Baker	6 (100%)	6 (100%)	--	6 (100%)
Malheur	11 (92%)	11 (92%)	3 (100%)	12 (100%)
Wallowa	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	--	2 (100%)
Washington	106 (95%)	110 (98%)	46 (100%)	104 (93%)
Yamhill	29 (94%)	29 (94%)	14 (100%)	28 (90%)
State	1,046 (90%)	1,133 (97%)	413 (95%)	1,061 (91%)

⁵¹ The family reports their perceptions of Culturally Competent and Strength-based Practice/Service on the My Parenting Experience II-B on multiple items using the Strengths-Based Practices Inventory (Green, Tarte, & McAllister, 2004). Parents indicate "Yes," "No," or "Not Sure" for each item. These data represent information from the most recent available survey completed by the parent. Percentages are calculated based on the number of families reporting "Yes."



Table 27b. Cultural Competency & Strength Orientation of Home Visitors⁵² 2019 (CE 5-4.B)

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Helped Them Use Their Own Skills and Resources to Solve Problems	Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Worked With Them to Meet Their Needs	Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Helped Them to See They Are Good Parents	Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Encouraged Them to Think About Their Own Personal Goals or Dreams
Benton & Linn	33 (94%)	36 (100%)	36 (100%)	35 (97%)
Benton	19 (90%)	21 (100%)	21 (100%)	20 (95%)
Linn	14 (100%)	15 (100%)	15 (100%)	15 (100%)
Clackamas	27 (90%)	30 (100%)	30 (100%)	27 (90%)
Columbia, Clatsop, & Tillamook	99 (98%)	100 (99%)	101 (100%)	99 (98%)
Clatsop	35 (97%)	36 (100%)	36 (100%)	36 (100%)
Columbia	31 (100%)	31 (100%)	31 (100%)	30 (97%)
Tillamook	33 (97%)	33 (97%)	34 (100%)	33 (97%)
Coos & Curry	7 (88%)	7 (88%)	7 (88%)	8 (100%)
Coos	6 (86%)	6 (86%)	6 (86%)	7 (100%)
Curry	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Crook, Deschutes, & Jefferson	79 (93%)	81 (95%)	81 (95%)	83 (98%)
Crook	8 (80%)	10 (100%)	9 (90%)	9 (90%)
Deschutes	61 (95%)	60 (94%)	61 (95%)	63 (98%)
Jefferson	10 (91%)	11 (100%)	11 (100%)	11 (100%)
Douglas, Klamath, & Lake	55 (96%)	54 (95%)	56 (98%)	55 (96%)
Douglas	23 (100%)	23 (100%)	23 (100%)	23 (100%)
Klamath	31 (94%)	30 (91%)	32 (97%)	31 (94%)
Lake	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)

⁵² The family reports their perceptions of Culturally Competent and Strength-based Practice/Service on the My Parenting Experience II-B on multiple items using the Strengths-Based Practices Inventory (Green, Tarte, & McAllister, 2004). Parents indicate “Yes,” “No,” or “Not Sure” for each item. These data represent information from the most recent available survey completed by the parent. Percentages are calculated based on the number of families reporting “Yes.”

Table 27b. Cultural Competency & Strength Orientation of Home Visitors⁵² 2019 (CE 5-4.B)

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Helped Them Use Their Own Skills and Resources to Solve Problems	Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Worked With Them to Meet Their Needs	Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Helped Them to See They Are Good Parents	Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Encouraged Them to Think About Their Own Personal Goals or Dreams
Grant & Harney	10 (91%)	11 (100%)	11 (100%)	11 (100%)
Grant	6 (100%)	6 (100%)	6 (100%)	6 (100%)
Harney	4 (80%)	5 (100%)	5 (100%)	5 (100%)
Hood River, Wasco, Gilliam, Sherman, & Wheeler	54 (100%)	53 (98%)	54 (100%)	54 (100%)
Gilliam	--	--	--	--
Hood River	37 (100%)	37 (100%)	37 (100%)	37 (100%)
Sherman	--	--	--	--
Wasco	15 (100%)	14 (93%)	15 (100%)	15 (100%)
Wheeler	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)
Josephine & Jackson	88 (95%)	92 (99%)	93 (100%)	89 (96%)
Jackson	43 (91%)	46 (98%)	47 (100%)	45 (96%)
Josephine	45 (98%)	46 (100%)	46 (100%)	44 (96%)
Lane	111 (94%)	115 (97%)	116 (98%)	111 (94%)
Marion & Polk	145 (91%)	153 (96%)	156 (98%)	152 (95%)
Marion	135 (90%)	143 (95%)	146 (97%)	142 (95%)
Polk	10 (100%)	10 (100%)	10 (100%)	10 (100%)

⁵² The family reports their perceptions of Culturally Competent and Strength-based Practice/Service on the My Parenting Experience II-B on multiple items using the Strengths Based Practices Inventory (Green, Tarte, & McAllister, 2004). Parents indicate "Yes," "No," or "Not Sure" for each item. These data represent information from the most recent available survey completed by the parent. Percentages are calculated based on the number of families reporting "Yes."



Table 27b. Cultural Competency & Strength Orientation of Home Visitors⁵² 2019 (CE 5-4.B)

<i>Program/County</i>	Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Helped Them Use Their Own Skills and Resources to Solve Problems	Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Worked With Them to Meet Their Needs	Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Helped Them to See They Are Good Parents	Number (%) of Families Reporting Staff Encouraged Them to Think About Their Own Personal Goals or Dreams
Multnomah	210 (96%)	218 (99%)	219 (100%)	215 (98%)
Umatilla, Union, & Morrow	25 (89%)	27 (96%)	28 (100%)	27 (96%)
Morrow	6 (100%)	6 (100%)	6 (100%)	6 (100%)
Umatilla	15 (88%)	16 (94%)	17 (100%)	16 (94%)
Union	4 (80%)	5 (100%)	5 (100%)	5 (100%)
Wallowa, Baker, & Malheur	19 (95%)	19 (95%)	20 (100%)	19 (95%)
Baker	6 (100%)	6 (100%)	6 (100%)	6 (100%)
Malheur	11 (92%)	11 (92%)	12 (100%)	11 (92%)
Wallowa	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)
Washington	108 (96%)	110 (98%)	112 (100%)	108 (96%)
Yamhill	30 (97%)	30 (97%)	31 (100%)	30 (97%)
State	1,100 (95%)	1,136 (98%)	1,151 (99%)	1,123 (96%)

⁵² The family reports their perceptions of Culturally Competent and Strength-based Practice/Service on the My Parenting Experience II-B on multiple items using the Strengths-Based Practices Inventory (Green, Tarte, & McAllister, 2004). Parents indicate “Yes,” “No,” or “Not Sure” for each item. These data represent information from the most recent available survey completed by the parent. Percentages are calculated based on the number of families reporting “Yes.”