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SUMMARY:
The purpose of this study was to assess aspects of the MDT affiliated with a CAC from the perspective of various professionals on the MDT and considering the developmental status of the CAC.

Subjects/Design:
217 MDT members in Virginia – representing 16 CACs
These individuals had been members of the MDT an average of 3.9 years
These participants were grouped into three categories:
- Investigators (law enforcement, child protective services, prosecutors) – 65.3%
- CAC Staff – 6.5%
- Other Service Providers – 28.2%

Survey was completed and included:
- Demographic information
- MDT perception of how well the case review was functioning
- MDT knowledge of the MDT philosophy and procedures

Findings:
1. CAC staff had higher attendance at MDT meetings than any other discipline
2. These same individuals felt the MDT does not meet frequently enough
3. Investigators reported case review meetings last too long and that they are more likely to receive information about a case through observing the child interview
4. Service providers reported case review meetings did not last too long and that they were more likely to obtain information about a case through case review meetings
5. Law enforcement was more likely than CPS workers to perceive the MDT as possessing greater knowledge of philosophy and procedures, and also to perceive case review is more highly attended and participatory
6. Frontline workers perceived service provision as the core function of a CAC while supervisors perceived the coordinating, nurturing, and training of the MDT as the core function of the CAC
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