

Longitudinal Analysis of School Social Work Practice in Wisconsin: Wisconsin School Social Worker Survey – 1998-2013

For more information from the School Social Work Practice Guide visit:
http://sspw.dpi.wi.gov/sspw_sswguide

Nic Dibble, LSSW, CISW
Education Consultant
School Social Work Services

Description

The Wisconsin School Social Work Survey was developed to identify 1) what areas of responsibility Wisconsin school social workers are involved in (e.g., special education, school attendance, mental health, homelessness), and 2) what professional strategies and programs they are using to address these areas of responsibility (e.g., consultation, advocacy, home visits, counseling).

There are 39 areas of responsibility and 43 professional strategies and programs on the 2013 survey. Respondents were asked to estimate the amount of time they spent on each item using the following scale:

1. High – indicating involvement at least a few times weekly
2. Medium – indicating involvement at least once weekly
3. Low – indicating involvement at least once monthly
4. Infrequent – indicating involvement less than monthly
5. Not at all

By using this scale (as opposed to some other method, such as asking respondents to estimate the amount of time they spend on each item), respondents are able to complete the survey in minimal time, while still allowing them to differentiate the time devoted to these different issues and services. Time necessary to complete the survey is a critical variable in the response rate.

The survey has historically been administered using a census sample (attempting to make it widely available to as many school social workers in the state as possible) six times on a triennial basis (1998, 2001, 2004, 2007, 2010, 2013) by the Department of Public Instruction (DPI) with the important support of the Wisconsin School Social Work Association (WSSWA).

The Wisconsin School Social Work Survey has changed little over its six administrations, primarily asking for additional information in later years.

- 1998 – The original survey did not include “infrequent” as a choice to estimate how much time respondents devoted to any given item on the survey. This choice was added to the second survey conducted in 2001.
- 2001 – The second survey asked respondents what grade level(s) they were assigned to, choosing from PreK-2, 3-5, 6-8 and 9-12. “Basic human needs” was added as an area of responsibility and “program coordination” was added as a professional strategy and program.

- 2004 – The third survey asked respondents what percentage of time they spent on work related to special education. “Learnfare” was dropped as an area of responsibility.
- 2007 – The fourth survey added “crisis” as an area of responsibility.
- 2010 – The fifth survey asked respondents to report how many school buildings they were assigned to work in, with their choices being from none to seven buildings or more. “Mental health/illness,” “self injury,” and “students living in out-of-home care” were added as areas of responsibility. Five new professional strategies and programs were added: “data-based decision-making,” “evaluation of professional practice,” “Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS),” “Response to Intervention (RtI),” and “restorative justice.”
- 2013 – The most recent survey asked respondents 1) to share the licenses and certifications they hold; 2) to estimate the amount of time they spend at Tiers 1, 2, and 3 within a RtI system; and 3) to indicate if they work as internal or external PBIS coaches.

See Appendix A for a copy of the 2013 survey.

Response Rates

The first survey was available in hard-copy only. It was distributed, completed, and returned during meetings of school social workers throughout the 1998-99 school year. This method yielded a 28% response rate.

Prior to the second survey, DPI gained the capacity to communicate by email with people outside the agency. The state consultant for school social work services created a voluntary email group to disseminate information that may be of interest to school social workers. The 2001 survey was emailed (numerous times throughout the 2001-02 school year) as an attachment to members of the Wisconsin School Social Worker email group. Respondents were responsible for printing, completing, and mailing the completed survey to the DPI. The 2001 survey had a significantly higher participation rate of 41.5%.

The subsequent surveys have been available in an electronic format only. School social workers learned about the survey through email correspondence with a link to the survey embedded in the email. Electronic notices were sent several times over four to six months each survey administration. This method helped increase response rates to 50-55% in 2004, 2007, 2010, and 2013.

Response rates by CESA for the 2013 survey were approximately proportional to the number of school social workers in six of the 12 CESAs. School social workers were over-represented in CESAs 2, 4, 9, and 10. School social workers were under-represented in CESAs 6 and 8. See Table 1.

Table 1. Distribution of School Social Workers by CESA

CESA	# of Survey Respondents by CESA	% of Sample	# of School Social Workers by CESA	% by CESA
1	153	50.7	271	48.7
2	70	23.2	136	13.5
3	1	0.3	2	0.3
4	10	3.3	13	2.3
5	10	3.3	19	3.4
6	14	4.6	39	7.0
7	28	9.3	53	9.5
8	3	1.0	9	1.6
9	6	2.0	6	1.1
10	3	1.0	3	0.5
11	3	1.0	5	0.9
12	1	0.3	1	0.2

Analysis

Weighted aggregate scores were calculated, in order to reflect the overall level of involvement with each of the areas of responsibility and professional strategies and programs. These weighted scores were then used to 1) rank the items from highest to lowest weight (i.e., amount of time devoted to that particular item), and 2) compare changes over time. Weighted scores were calculated in the following manner:

1. Convert each total number of responses to each high, medium, low, and infrequent rating for each item to a percentage.
2. Weight each percentage:
 - a. Multiply each percentage of “high” responses by four.
 - b. Multiply each percentage of “medium” responses by three.
 - c. Multiply each percentage of “low” responses by two.
 - d. Multiply percentages of “infrequent” responses by one.
 - e. Eliminate percentages of “not at all” responses.
3. Add all of the weighted scores for each item to create an aggregate weighted score for each item.

Using this method, the highest possible weighted aggregate score for any single item is 4.00 (i.e., $4 \times 100\% = 4.00$).

Comparisons across the six surveys must take into consideration that the first survey did not give survey participants the option of “infrequent” as a response. Consequently, slightly lower weighted aggregate scores in the first survey are actually comparable to the other five surveys. See Appendix B.

Results

At what grade levels are school social workers working?

In 2001, the survey was modified to ask respondents the grade levels at which they work. Responses are provided in Table 2 for the past five surveys and indicate a consistent distribution across the years in grades 6-8 and 9-12 and a slight decline in grades PreK-2 and 3-5. The total numbers of responses in each year are greater than the total number of respondents, because most school social workers reported working at multiple grade levels.

Table 2. Grade Levels at which Survey Respondents Work

Year	PreK-2		Grades 3-5		Grades 6-8		Grades 9-12	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	%	%
2001	139	61.5	149	65.9	100	44.2	92	40.7
2004	174	63.0	189	68.5	131	47.5	116	42.0
2007	166	61.0	188	69.1	126	46.3	96	35.3
2010	182	59.3	182	59.3	123	40.1	128	41.7
2013	170	56.3	179	59.3	131	43.4	122	40.4

How much time do school social workers devote to special education?

Respondents were asked to report time spent on special education within ten-percentage-point ranges. Approximately four in five school social workers report spending 50% or less time on special education.

Table 3. % of Time on Special Education

% of Time on special Education	% of Respondents
0-10	11.6
11-20	23.2
21-30	20.5
31-40	15.2
41-50	10.6
51-60	5.3
61-70	2.6
71-80	3.0
81-90	2.0
91-100	6.0

What experiences from other areas of social work do school social workers bring to the school setting?

The 2013 survey asked for the first time what social work certifications, licensure, and experience (other than school social work) respondents possess, as they bring valuable, direct knowledge and skill sets from other systems into the school environment. Certifications and licensure through the Wisconsin Department of Safety and Professional Services were reported as follows: certified social worker – 14.2%; certified advanced practice social worker – 28.8%; certified independent social worker – 4.0%; and licensed clinical social worker – 13.6%. Social work experience (other than school social work) is reported in Table 4 in descending order.

Table 4. Other Areas of Social Work Experience

Areas of Social Work	Number	%
Mental health/clinical practice	89	29.5
Child protective services	86	28.5
Juvenile justice	59	19.5
Foster care	59	19.5
Medical/health/hospital	54	17.9
Supervision/administration	35	11.6
AODA	34	11.3
Adoption	31	10.3
Domestic violence	24	7.9
Corrections	20	6.6
Sexual assault	14	4.6
Adult education	14	4.6
Consulting	14	4.6

What issues are school social workers addressing?

The issues addressed most often by Wisconsin school social workers have remained relatively consistent over the past 15 years. Table 5 lists the 15 areas of responsibility that were ranked in the top 10 in at least one of the six surveys. For each item, the table lists the rank from the 2013 survey, the average rank for all six surveys, the 2013 aggregate weighted score and the average aggregate weighted score for all six surveys. Only 15 areas of responsibility have been ranked in the top 10 in at least one of the six surveys, including three items (i.e., basic human needs, crisis, mental health) that were added since the initial survey.

Table 5. Top Areas of Responsibility – 2013 and averages of all six surveys

Area of Responsibility	2013 Rank	Average Rank	2013 Aggregate Weighted Score	Average Aggregate Weighted Score
Children at risk	1	2.2	3.48	3.47
Attendance, truancy, dropouts	2	2.5	3.45	3.47
Behavior management	3	3.3	3.39	3.37
Mental health	4	3.5	3.28	3.37
Basic human needs	5	6	3.27	3.17
Parent-child relationships	6	4.67	3.17	3.31
Special education	7	4.5	3.14	3.34
Crisis	8	8	3.10	3.12
Family trauma, change	9	7.3	3.06	3.12
Homelessness	10	14.5	2.98	2.34
Conflict resolution, anger management	11	8	2.95	3.04
Child abuse and neglect	14	10.1	2.54	2.71
School climate and environment	15	12.2	2.46	2.58
Discipline	17	14	2.30	2.44
Alcohol, tobacco, & other drug abuse	24	17	1.83	2.25

Appendix B lists the ranks and weighted scores for each Area of Responsibility on the survey for each of the six surveys. Changes in the amount of time spent and relative emphasis on any given Area of Responsibility can be monitored by tracking any changes in rank and weighted aggregate scores over time. Based upon those two data sets, Wisconsin school social workers are reporting spending comparatively less time now than in the past in these areas.

- Alcohol, tobacco and other drug abuse
- Child abuse and neglect
- Comprehensive school health
- Discipline
- Human growth and development
- Juvenile delinquency
- Parent-child relationships
- Pregnancy prevention
- School-age parents
- School climate and environment
- Section 504 assessment and coordination
- Special education
- Students living in out-of-home care
- Transition plans
- Wellness
- W-2

In contrast, Wisconsin school social workers report spending comparatively more time now than in the past in these areas.

- Anti-victim education and protective behaviors
- Basic human needs
- Homelessness

What professional strategies and programs are Wisconsin school social workers using to address these issues?

The professional strategies and programs utilized most often by Wisconsin school social workers have remained relatively consistent over the past 15 years. Table 6 lists the professional strategies and programs that were ranked in the top 10 in at least one of the six surveys. For each item, the table lists the rank from the 2013 survey, the average rank for all six surveys, the 2013 aggregate weighted score and the average aggregate weighted score for all six surveys. Only 14 different professional strategies and programs have been ranked in the top 10 in at least one of the six surveys, including one item (i.e., PBIS) that was added since the initial survey.

Table 6. Top Professional Strategies and Programs – 2013 and averages of all six surveys

Professional Strategy or Program	2013 Rank	Average Rank	2013 Aggregate Weighted Score	Average Aggregate Weighted Score
Advocacy for students and families	1	1.5	3.68	3.59
Individual student counseling	2	3	3.43	3.40
Consultation	3	1.8	3.38	3.51
Referral and information	4	3.7	3.37	3.37
Case management	5	5.3	3.08	3.21
School-home liaison, home visits	6	7.0	2.98	3.09
Crisis intervention, coordination	7	7.5	2.97	3.02
Pupil services teaming	8	10	2.91	2.81
PBIS	9	11.5	2.85	2.74
Group work & counseling	10	13.5	2.84	2.37
Assessment of students	11	6.1	2.77	3.06
Building consultation team	13	10.7	2.69	2.84
School-community liaison	14	11.3	2.67	2.77
Parent conferences	15	11.2	2.54	2.80

Appendix B lists the ranks and weighted scores for each of the Professional Strategies and Programs on the survey for each of the six surveys since 1998. Changes in the amount of time spent and relative emphasis on any given Professional Strategy or Program can be monitored by tracking any changes in rank and weighted aggregate scores over time. Based upon those two data sets, Wisconsin school social workers are reporting spending comparatively less time now than in the past on these strategies and programs.

- Assessment of students
- Comprehensive school counseling program
- Observations (of students)
- Parent conferences
- Parent groups, classes, and presentations
- Peer programs
- Policy development
- Program coordination
- Program development
- School-community liaison
- School health services
- School-home liaison and home visits
- Screening students

In contrast, Wisconsin school social workers report spending comparatively more time now than in the past in these areas.

- Data-based decision making
- Group work and counseling
- Intradistrict collaboration
- PBIS
- Pupil services teaming
- Referral and information
- Research
- Restorative justice
- School-community collaborative partnerships

How are Wisconsin school social workers involved in systemic activities?

A number of the professional strategies listed in the survey involve activities that bring about systemic change to a school or school-community. School social workers are specifically trained to examine systems and work to make them more responsive to students. Because some of these strategies often are lower-frequency activities, it can be more descriptive to share how many Wisconsin school social workers are involved at any level, rather than how much time is devoted to them. For each identified Professional Strategy or Program, Table 7 lists the percentage of Wisconsin school social workers indicating any level of involvement on the 2013 survey and the averages from the previous five surveys. The percentage of school social workers reporting any time devoted to program evaluation, research, school-community partnerships, and staff development has increased while other areas have remained relatively flat.

Table 7. Wisconsin School Social Worker Involvement in Systemic Activities

Professional Strategy	2013 Survey %	Average % of Prior Surveys
Grant-writing/management	47	48
PBIS	90	86
Policy development	68	66
Program coordination	79	83
Program development	79	79
Program evaluation	79	73
Research	70	59
RtI	91	90
School-community collaborative partnerships	94	87
Staff development, training, in-services	92	79

How has Wisconsin’s adoption of Response to Intervention (RtI) and Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) impacted school social work practice?

Wisconsin school social workers are active participants in Wisconsin school districts’ school improvement efforts related to RtI and PBIS. Respondents reported spending approximately the same amount of time at each of the three tiers (i.e., 20.7% at Tier 1, 25.4% at Tier 2, and 20.4% at Tier 3). Approximately one in five survey respondents serve as PBIS internal coaches and approximately one in 20 serve as PBIS external coaches.

How are survey results utilized?

School social workers possess diverse knowledge and skills to improve educational outcomes for students. School districts typically focus school social work services on the issues that present the greatest challenges for students in their respective communities. The results of the Wisconsin school social worker survey are used to help describe school social work practice in Wisconsin and how it is (and is not) changing over time. This information can be especially helpful to local school district officials who wish to 1) compare their school social work services to other school districts state-wide, and 2) consider adding school social work services to better support students experiencing challenges to their school success.

Appendix A - 2013 Wisconsin School Social Worker Survey

This survey is being administered by the Department of Public Instruction (DPI) with the support of the Wisconsin School Social Work Association (WSSWA). Your responses help to create a state-wide picture of the areas of responsibility assigned to and professional strategies utilized by Wisconsin school social workers. This information helps share what Wisconsin school social workers do and how they contribute to student success. The information is gathered every three years in order to identify trends over time. Surveys were previously administered five times beginning in 1998. If you are interested in summaries from previous surveys, you can find them at http://sspw.dpi.wi.gov/sspw_sswpgwhatdowedo.

Please complete this survey only one time this school year.

School District _____ CESA# _____

Check the grade level(s) that most accurately describe the grades you work in:

____ (PreK-2) ____ (3-5) ____ (6-8) ____ (9-12)

How many school buildings are you assigned to work in?

____ (1) ____ (2) ____ (3) ____ (4) ____ (5) ____ (6) ____ (7 or more) ____ (None)

What state licenses or certifications do you presently hold?

____ School social worker ____ Social worker ____ Advanced Practice Social Worker
____ Independent Social Worker ____ Clinical social worker ____ Other

Please estimate the percentage of time you spend on special education services and activities. _____

If your school(s) are implementing a Response to Intervention (RTI) system, including Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), please estimate the time you spend implementing, consulting, coordinating, and facilitating strategies and programs at each tier. The total percentage of the three tiers need not be 100% but cannot exceed 100%.

Tier 1 _____

Tier 2 _____

Tier 3 _____

Are you a PBIS internal coach? ____ Yes ____ No

Are you a PBIS external coach? ____ Yes ____ No

Below is a list of possible areas of responsibility for school social workers. Please indicate your level of involvement in each of them as follows:

H (high) indicating involvement at least a few times weekly;

M (medium) indicating involvement at least once weekly;

L (low) indicating involvement at least once monthly;

I (infrequent) indicating involvement less than monthly; or

N (not at all).

Areas of Responsibility

_____	alcohol, tobacco & other drug abuse	_____	human growth & development
_____	antivictim education/protective	_____	inclusion
_____	behaviors/bullying prevention	_____	juvenile delinquency
_____	attendance/truancy/dropouts	_____	mental health/illness
_____	basic human needs (housing, food, clothing,	_____	parent-child relationships
_____	health care)	_____	pregnancy prevention
_____	behavior management	_____	resiliency/protective assets
_____	bilingual/bicultural/ELL	_____	safety/violence prevention
_____	child abuse & neglect	_____	school age parents
_____	children at risk	_____	school climate & environment
_____	comprehensive school health	_____	Section 504 evaluation/coordination
_____	conflict resolution/anger management	_____	self-injury
_____	crisis	_____	sexual assault prevention
_____	cultural competency/race issues	_____	special education
_____	discipline	_____	students living in out-of-home care
_____	eating disorders	_____	suicide prevention
_____	family trauma/change	_____	suspension/expulsion
_____	gender issues	_____	transition plans
_____	gifted & talented	_____	wellness
_____	homelessness	_____	W-2

Below is a list of professional strategies or programs often used or participated in by school social workers. Please indicate your use of or involvement in each of these as follows:

- H** (high) indicating involvement at least a few times weekly;
- M** (medium) indicating involvement at least once weekly;
- L** (low) indicating involvement at least once monthly;
- I** (infrequent) indicating involvement less than monthly; or
- N** (not at all).

Professional Strategies or Programs

_____	advocacy for students/families	_____	Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports (PBIS)
_____	alternative school/program	_____	peer programs (mediators, helpers, educators, & leaders)
_____	assessment of students	_____	policy development
_____	before/after/summer school program	_____	program coordination
_____	boarding homes	_____	program development
_____	building consultation team	_____	program evaluation
_____	case work/management	_____	pupil services teaming
_____	classroom instruction	_____	referral & information
_____	consultation	_____	research
_____	crisis intervention/coordination	_____	Response to Intervention (RTI)
_____	data-based decision-making	_____	restorative justice
_____	employee assistance program	_____	school-community collaborative
_____	employee wellness program	_____	partnerships
_____	evaluation of your professional practice	_____	school-community liaison
_____	grant writing/management	_____	school health services
_____	group work/counseling/student assistance programs	_____	school-home liaison/home visits
_____	individual student counseling	_____	screening students
_____	intradistrict collaboration	_____	service learning/community service
_____	mentoring program for students	_____	staff development/training/ in-services
_____	observations of students	_____	supervision of school social workers
_____	parent conferences	_____	supervision of school social work students
_____	parent group/classes/presentations	_____	

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey!

Appendix B – Wisconsin School Social Worker Survey

Areas of Responsibility	Trend	2013		2010		2007		2004		2001		1998	
		Rank	Score										
Alcohol, tobacco & other drug abuse	↓	24	1.83	22	2.15	18	2.07	14	2.42	14	2.60	10	2.44
Anti-Victim Education/Protective Behaviors	↑	12	2.56	12	2.83	15	2.16	16	2.27	18	2.24	16	1.94
Attendance/Truancy/Dropouts	—	2	3.45	4	3.45	2	3.41	1	3.44	2	3.63	4	3.42
Basic Human Needs	↑	5	3.27	6	3.35	5	3.12	6	3.08	8	3.04	NA	NA
Behavior Management	—	3	3.39	2	3.46	3	3.22	2	3.41	5	3.44	5	3.27
Bilingual/Bicultural/ELL	—	28	1.49	27	1.77	23	1.72	23	1.83	30	1.53	27	1.33
Child Abuse & Neglect	↓	14	2.54	15	2.72	10	2.51	9	2.69	9	2.90	8	2.89
Children At Risk	—	1	3.48	1	3.62	1	3.43	8	2.95	1	3.68	1	3.66
Comprehensive School Health	↓	35	1.08	35	1.29	22	1.72	22	1.89	23	1.89	20	1.49
Conflict Resolution/Anger Management	—	11	2.95	10	3.15	6	3.00	7	3.04	7	3.20	7	2.92
Crisis	—	8	3.10	8	3.29	8	2.96	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Cultural Competency/Race Issues	—	19	2.08	21	2.21	17	2.10	18	2.08	17	2.24	17	1.74
Discipline	↓	17	2.30	17	2.43	16	2.13	12	2.56	13	2.69	9	2.51
Eating Disorders	—	36	1.06	37	1.20	33	1.07	33	1.22	32	1.30	32	1.08
Family Trauma/Change	—	9	3.06	9	3.19	9	2.93	5	3.19	6	3.24	6	3.12
Gender Issues	—	32	1.35	32	1.48	29	1.29	29	1.40	29	1.58	31	1.10
Gifted & Talented	—	38	0.73	38	0.79	35	0.70	34	0.89	35	1.05	33	0.78
Homelessness	↑	10	2.98	11	2.91	12	2.42	15	2.28	21	2.01	18	1.55
Human Growth & Development	↓	29	1.38	31	1.50	26	1.49	25	1.60	25	1.83	26	1.35
Inclusion	—	18	2.12	18	2.42	20	1.82	19	2.06	16	2.43	12	2.31
Juvenile Delinquency	↓	22	1.93	19	2.31	19	1.99	17	2.27	15	2.56	15	2.19
Learnfare	—	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	34	1.09	34	0.70
Mental Health	—	4	3.28	3	3.45	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Parent-Child Relationships	↓	6	3.17	5	3.36	7	2.97	4	3.31	4	3.53	2	3.54
Pregnancy Prevention	↓	37	1.06	33	1.35	31	1.20	30	1.37	28	1.58	30	1.16
Resiliency/Protective Assets	—	13	2.56	14	2.75	11	2.44	11	2.61	11	2.79	14	2.21
Safety/Violence Prevention	—	16	2.41	16	2.71	13	2.40	13	2.54	12	2.75	13	2.25
School-Age Parents	↓	34	1.19	34	1.33	32	1.14	32	1.27	31	1.50	23	1.39
School Climate & Environment	↓	15	2.46	13	2.79	14	2.33	10	2.65	10	2.81	11	2.42
Section 504 Assessment & Coordination	↓	30	1.38	36	1.25	34	1.00	29	1.36	27	1.75	19	1.51
Self-Injury	—	23	1.84	25	1.89	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sexual Assault Prevention	—	33	1.22	29	1.63	30	1.27	28	1.47	33	1.24	29	1.20
Special Education	↓	7	3.14	7	3.33	4	3.20	3	3.39	3	3.56	3	3.43
Students Living in Out-of-Home Care	↓	20	1.99	20	2.22	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Suicide Prevention	—	21	1.94	23	2.01	24	1.66	20	1.99	20	2.01	21	1.46
Suspension/Expulsion	—	25	1.82	26	1.88	25	1.61	24	1.72	22	2.01	24	1.39
Transition Plans	↓	27	1.50	28	1.77	28	1.37	26	1.50	26	1.80	28	1.29
Wellness	↓	26	1.79	24	1.93	21	1.74	21	1.92	19	2.19	25	1.39
W-2	↓	31	1.37	30	1.60	27	1.39	27	1.50	24	1.85	22	1.40

School social workers rated items as “High” (at least a few times weekly), “Medium” (at least once weekly), “Low” (at least once monthly), “Infrequent” (less than once monthly), or “Not at all.” Weighted scores were calculated by assigning a value of “4” to high ratings, a value of “3” to medium ratings, a value “2” to low ratings, and a value of “1” to infrequent ratings. Weighted scores from 1998 must be considered in light of the survey that year not having the “infrequent” rating available. Arrows to the right of items indicate school social worker involvement with that item is trending up or down. “NA” means “Not Available” and means the survey did not ask about this item in that particular year.

Appendix B – Wisconsin School Social Worker Survey

Professional Strategies & Programs	Trend	2013		2010		2007		2004		2001		1998	
		Rank	Score										
Advocacy for Students & Families	—	1	3.68	1	3.66	1	3.47	2	3.67	2	3.51	2	3.36
Alternative School/Program	—	21	1.86	20	2.12	16	2.02	19	1.87	23	1.72	20	1.38
Assessment of Students	↓	11	2.77	8	3.09	8	2.97	6	3.26	6	3.23	6	3.05
Before/After/Summer School Program	—	34	1.27	35	1.36	28	1.29	28	1.47	29	1.39	28	1.02
Boarding Homes	—	42	0.37	42	0.52	36	0.43	36	0.49	36	0.51	35	0.38
Building Consultation Team	—	13	2.69	9	3.04	9	2.76	9	3.01	11	2.80	11	2.75
Casework/Management	—	5	3.08	5	3.29	5	3.25	5	3.33	5	3.24	7	3.05
Classroom Instruction	—	26	1.65	25	1.82	21	1.73	22	1.78	28	1.52	25	1.23
Comprehensive School Counseling Program	↓	33	1.28	31	1.52	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Consultation	—	3	3.38	3	3.56	2	3.41	1	3.69	1	3.51	1	3.51
Crisis Intervention/Coordination	—	7	2.97	7	3.14	7	3.00	7	3.17	8	3.04	9	2.80
Data-Based Decision Making	↑	12	2.72	16	2.52	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Employee Assistance Program	—	40	0.56	41	0.66	35	0.60	35	0.73	35	0.69	32	0.68
Employee Wellness Program	—	41	0.55	40	0.69	34	0.68	34	0.83	34	0.71	34	0.51
Evaluation of Professional Practice	—	24	1.67	28	1.67	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Grant-Writing/Management	—	39	0.80	39	0.98	32	0.82	32	0.97	33	0.93	31	0.71
Group Work & Counseling	↑	10	2.84	11	2.91	15	2.03	15	2.29	15	2.40	15	1.76
Individual Student Counseling	—	2	3.43	2	3.58	3	3.34	4	3.42	3	3.45	4	3.18
Intradistrict Collaboration	↑	19	2.07	19	2.24	17	1.97	17	2.02	26	1.58	18	1.49
Mentoring Program (for students)	—	29	1.53	27	1.71	23	1.58	26	1.54	21	1.79	24	1.25
Observations (of students)	↓	18	2.15	17	2.50	13	2.46	13	2.47	14	2.42	14	1.98
Parent Conferences	↓	15	2.54	13	2.83	11	2.62	11	2.86	9	2.95	8	3.01
Parent Groups/Classes/Presentations	↓	35	1.22	36	1.34	27	1.47	27	1.53	22	1.77	22	1.30
Peer Programs	↓	30	1.52	30	1.64	25	1.54	20	1.83	17	2.03	17	1.53
Policy Development	↓	36	1.15	34	1.38	29	1.18	29	1.40	30	1.33	29	0.92
PBIS	↑	9	2.85	14	2.62	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Program Coordination	↓	25	1.67	21	2.08	18	1.93	16	2.11	16	2.19	NA	NA
Program Development	↓	23	1.77	23	1.94	20	1.81	18	1.93	24	1.70	16	1.73
Program Evaluation	—	27	1.65	26	1.77	22	1.70	23	1.77	25	1.66	26	1.19
Pupil Services Teaming	↑	8	2.91	6	3.16	10	2.76	12	2.73	12	2.66	12	2.66
Referral & Information	↑	4	3.37	4	3.37	4	3.33	3	3.47	4	3.40	3	3.24
Research	↑	32	1.31	32	1.41	31	1.09	31	1.10	31	1.11	33	0.58
Restorative Justice	↑	28	1.55	33	1.40	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Rtl	—	16	2.50	18	2.41	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
School-Community Collaborative Partnerships	↑	17	2.50	15	2.61	14	2.35	14	2.43	13	2.44	13	2.04
School-Community Liaison	↓	14	2.67	12	2.84	12	2.54	10	2.87	10	2.91	10	2.78
School Health Services	↓	31	1.42	29	1.65	26	1.52	25	1.71	19	1.95	23	1.30
School-Home Liaison/Home Visits	↓	6	2.98	10	3.01	6	3.01	8	3.15	7	3.22	5	3.14
Screening Students	↓	22	1.79	22	2.02	19	1.85	24	1.73	18	1.95	19	1.42
Service Learning/Community Service	—	37	1.10	37	1.22	30	1.11	30	1.26	27	1.52	30	0.80
Staff Development/Training/In-services	—	20	1.89	24	1.91	24	1.54	21	1.79	20	1.83	21	1.35
Supervision of School Social Workers	—	43	0.30	43	0.30	37	0.33	37	0.30	37	0.27	36	0.38
Supervision of School Social Work Students	—	38	0.82	38	1.06	33	0.75	33	0.92	32	1.06	27	1.07