

HU 8.11/2002  
c.2

# Administrative Review Division

# Internal Client Satisfaction Survey

2002



**Colorado Department of Human Services**  
*people who help people*

RECEIVED  
MAR 17 2003  
STATE PUBLICATIONS  
Colorado State Library

Administrative Review Division  
1580 Logan Street Suite 600  
Denver, Colorado 80203  
(303) 894-7500

Gayle Ziska-Stack,  
Director, Administrative Review Division

Stephen McGavran  
Manager, Management Information & Outcomes Evaluation  
Unit

---

Report<sup>1</sup> Prepared by:

Tamara Hoxworth, Ph.D.

Data Analyst, Management Information & Outcomes Evaluation  
Unit

March 3, 2003

---

<sup>1</sup> located in I:\X-Quality\Surveys\Internal 2000\InternalSatisReport2002

## Table of Contents

Section	Page
Executive Summary	5
Statewide Information	7
Statewide Rate of Return by Participant	7
Number of Responses by County/Region	8
Responses to Survey Items	9
Comparison of Current Survey to Previous Surveys	12
County Specific Information	14
Adams County	15
Comments	17
Arapahoe County	19
Comments	21
Boulder County	23
Comments	25
Broomfield County	26
Comments	28
Conejos County	29
Comments	31
Delta County	32
Comments	34
Denver County	35
Comments	37
Douglas County	39
Comments	41
Elbert County	42
Comments	44
El Paso County	45
Comments	47
Fremont County	49
Comments	51
Gunnison County	52
Comments	54
Huerfano County	55
Comments	57
Jefferson County	58
Comments	60
La Plata County	62
Comments	64
Larimer County	65
Comments	67
Las Animas County	69
Comments	71
Logan County	72
Comments	74

Mesa County	75
Comments	77
Moffat County	78
Comments	80
Montezuma County	81
Comments	83
Montrose County	84
Comments	86
Morgan County	87
Comments	89
Otero County	90
Comments	92
Park County	93
Comments	95
Pueblo County	96
Comments	98
Rio Grande County	99
Comments	101
Teller County	102
Comments	104
Weld County	105
Comments	107
No Specified County	108
Comments	110
DYC Specific Information	111
Denver Region	112
Comments	114
Central Region	115
Comments	117
Northern Region	118
Comments	120
Southern Region	121
Comments	123
Appendix A	124

# Administrative Review Division Internal Survey Report

2002

The Administrative Review Division (ARD) conducted their annual client satisfaction survey (see Appendix A for a copy of the Client Satisfaction Survey) to determine if ARD is meeting Federal goals and if reviews continue to be worthwhile to the review participants. Each reviewer was given 40 surveys to distribute to attendees at Administrative Reviews during the months of October, November, and December 2002. In addition, participants were asked what they liked about the review and what we could do to improve the reviews. The surveys were written in both English and Spanish.

Survey respondents included Parents, Youth/Children, Foster Parents, Caseworkers/Client Managers, Supervisors, Guardians ad Litem, Kinship Providers, Other Providers, and Others. Respondents chose to either return the completed surveys to the reviewers or mail them in postage paid envelopes. Each county/region was identified on the survey so specific county/region information could be obtained.

This report contains an executive summary of the data collected; aggregate data; a comparison of the 2002 findings with results from previous surveys (1998 through 2001); and county and Department of Youth Corrections-region specific data and comments.

## Executive Summary

Of the 800 surveys distributed, 471 were returned. This return rate (59%) was the highest yet (52% for 1998; 58% for 1999; 56% for 2000; 50% for 2001).

Almost half of the surveys returned (44%) were completed by Caseworkers/Client Managers (N=210). As such, this group had the largest influence on the results presented in this report. The remainder of the participant roles accounted for a high of 9.6% (Other Providers, N=45) to a low of .6% (Kinship Provider, N=3). In addition, the Ten Large counties accounted for the vast majority of the surveys (N=331, 70 %).

Overall, responses to the questions were positive and indicated that the Administrative Reviews achieved the specified goals. The following bullets present an overview for each question:

**Question 1**

- The permanency goal was discussed in 99% (N=467) of the reviews.

**Question 2**

- Progress, or lack of progress, towards the permanency goal was discussed in 99% (N=467) of the reviews.

**Question 3**

- The youth's/child's needs, while in placement, were discussed at 99% (N=468) of the reviews.

**Question 4**

- The youth's/child's safety, while in placement, was discussed at 98% (N=461) of the reviews.

**Question 5**

- Participants felt they were able to express their views/concerns in 98% (N=464) of the reviews.

**Question 6**

- 83% (N=390) of the respondents indicated that the reviews were worthwhile (55% Strongly Agreed; 28% Somewhat Agreed).

In addition, respondents were asked to describe, in text, the most valuable part of the review, and what could be done to improve the review. An examination of these comments revealed the following themes.

**Most Valuable Part of Review:**

1. Professionalism/knowledge/experience/helpfulness of the reviewers.
2. Reviewer's concern for child.
3. Participation/open to everyone (e.g., kids, parents, workers, etc.).
4. Support/allowance for the child/youth to speak.
5. Reviews conducted in respectful manner.
6. Creation of a non-threatening atmosphere that facilitates open discussion.
7. Reviews create method of accountability and a push for permanency.

**Suggestions for Improvement:**


1. Need for all relevant parties (i.e., parents, child, GAL) to attend.
2. Need to ask more questions, especially open-ended questions, of child and parents.
3. Need to improve consistency between reviewers.
4. Time-management issues (demands for more time, less time, and starting on time).
5. Request to create more meaningful reviews, rather than just oversight.

# Statewide Information

## Statewide Rate of Return by Participant

Rate of Return by Participant Role

	N	% of Total N
Caseworker/Client Manager	209	44.4
Other Provider	45	9.6
Parent	44	9.3
Foster Parent	43	9.1
Other	42	8.9
GAL	30	6.4
Youth/Child	21	4.5
Supervisor	17	3.6
CASA	12	2.5
None Specified	5	1.1
Kinship Provider	3	.6
Total	471	100.0



## Number of Responses by County/Region

Category	County/Region	N	% of Total N
Ten Large Counties	Adams	44	9.3%
	Arapahoe	45	9.6%
	Boulder	15	3.2%
	Denver	58	12.3%
	El Paso	33	7.0%
	Jefferson	37	7.9%
	Larimer	41	8.7%
	Mesa	24	5.1%
	Pueblo	16	3.4%
	Weld	18	3.8%
	Category Total	331	70.3%
Mid-Size Counties	Broomfield	2	0.4%
	Conejos	1	0.2%
	Delta	4	0.8%
	Douglas	1	0.2%
	Fremont	5	1.1%
	Huerfano	3	0.6%
	La Plata	5	1.1%
	Las Animas	4	0.8%
	Logan	2	0.4%
	Moffat	8	1.7%
	Montezuma	4	0.8%
	Montrose	5	1.1%
	Morgan	19	4.0%
	Otero	3	0.6%
	Rio Grande	5	1.1%
Teller	2	0.4%	
Category Total	73	15.5%	
Balance of State	Elbert	6	1.3%
	Gunnison	2	0.4%
	Park	2	0.4%
	Category Total	10	2.1%
DYC Regions	DYC Denver	18	3.8%
	DYC Central	3	0.6%
	DYC Northern	10	2.1%
	DYC Southern	1	0.2%
	Category Total	32	6.8%
None Specified	None Specified	25	5.3%
Overall Total		471	100%

## Responses to Survey Items

**Question 1: Was the permanency goal for the youth/child discussed in the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	467	99.2	99.2
No	3	.6	99.8
No Response	1	.2	100.0
Total	471	100.0	

**Question 2: Was the progress, or lack of progress, towards reaching that goal discussed at the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	467	99.2	99.2
No	3	.6	99.8
No Response	1	.2	100.0
Total	471	100.0	

**Question 3: Were the youth's/child's needs, while in placement, discussed at the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	468	99.4	99.4
No	2	.4	99.8
No Response	1	.2	100.0
Total	471	100.0	

**Question 4: Was the youth's/child's safety, while in placement, discussed at the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	461	97.9	97.9
No	8	1.7	99.6
No Response	2	.4	100.0
Total	471	100.0	


**Question 5: Were you able to express your views/concerns during the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	464	98.5	98.5
No	4	.8	99.4
No Response	3	.6	100.0
Total	471	100.0	

**Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	259	55.0	55.0
Somewhat Agree	131	27.8	82.8
Neutral	54	11.5	94.3
Somewhat Disagree	5	1.1	95.3
Strongly Disagree	6	1.3	96.6
No Response	16	3.4	100.0
Total	471	100.0	

**Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?**



## Question 6 Responses

Respondents were asked, “What was the most valuable part of today’s review?” and “What could we do to improve today’s review?” There were 393 responses to the former item, 63 of which were “NA” (not applicable) or “don’t know”.

There were 369 responses regarding how the review could be improved. Of these, 264 were “none,” “nothing,” “no suggestions,” or “no improvements.” An additional 31 gave only positive comments about the reviewer or how the review was conducted, leaving 74 respondents who gave suggestions for improvement.

Comments to both items are included under the county/region specific information. Note that all “none” or “NA” responses were removed, unless additional comment was provided.

## Comparison of 1998-1999-2000-2001-2002 ARD

### State-Wide Client Satisfaction Responses

	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
Surveys Distributed	493	486	760	840	800
Surveys Returned	257	281	428	423	471
Return Rate	52%	58%	56%	50%	59%

#### Question 1

*Was the permanency goal for the youth/child discussed in the review?*

	1998		1999		2000		2001		2002	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	255	99.2	276	98.2	425	99.3	419	99.0	467	99.2
No	1	0.4	3	1.1	2	0.5	2	0.5	3	0.6
No Response	1	0.4	2	0.7	1	0.2	2	0.5	1	0.2

#### Question 2

*Was progress, or lack of progress, towards reaching that goal discussed in the review?*

	1998		1999		2000		2001		2002	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	252	98.0	280	99.6	425	99.3	406	96.0	467	99.2
No	4	1.6	1	0.4	2	0.5	9	2.1	3	0.6
No Response	1	0.4	0	0.0	1	0.2	8	1.9	1	0.2

#### Question 3

*Were the youth's/child's needs, while in placement, discussed in the review?*

	1998		1999		2000		2001		2002	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	256	99.6	279	99.3	424	99.1	413	97.6	468	99.4
No	0	0.0	1	0.4	3	0.7	3	0.7	2	0.4
No Response	1	0.4	1	0.4	1	0.2	7	1.6	1	0.2

**Question 4**

*Was the youth's/child's safety, while in placement, discussed in the review?*

	1998		1999		2000		2001		2002	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	461	97.9
No	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	8	1.7
No Response	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	2	0.4

\* indicates that question 4 was not asked in those surveys

**Question 5**

*Were you able to express your views/concerns during the review?*

	1998		1999		2000		2001		2002	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	249	96.9	277	98.6	423	98.8	413	97.6	464	98.5
No	2	0.8	1	0.4	3	0.7	5	1.2	4	0.8
No Response	6	2.3	1	0.4	2	0.5	5	1.2	3	0.6

**Question 6**

*Did you find the review worthwhile?*

	1998		1999		2000		2001		2002	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Strongly Agree	145	56.4	172	61.2	274	64.0	281	66.4	259	55.0
Somewhat Agree	60	23.3	76	27.0	110	25.7	98	23.2	131	27.8
Neutral	27	10.5	14	5.0	19	4.4	17	4.0	54	11.5
Somewhat Disagree	6	2.3	6	2.1	6	1.4	10	2.4	5	1.1
Strongly Disagree	9	3.5	6	2.1	8	1.9	3	0.7	6	1.3
No Response	10	3.9	7	2.5	11	2.6	14	3.3	16	3.4

## County/Region Specific Information

## Adams County

**Question 1: Was the permanency goal for the youth/child discussed in the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	44	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	44	100.0	

**Question 2: Was the progress, or lack of progress, towards reaching that goal discussed at the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	44	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	44	100.0	

**Question 3: Were the youth's/child's needs, while in placement, discussed at the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	44	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	44	100.0	

**Question 4: Was the youth's/child's safety, while in placement, discussed at the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	44	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	44	100.0	


Question 5: Were you able to express your views/concerns during the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	44	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	44	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	22	50.0	50.0
Somewhat Agree	15	34.1	84.1
Neutral	6	13.6	97.7
Somewhat Disagree	1	2.3	100.0
Strongly Disagree	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	44	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?



**Adams County Comments**

*Most Valuable Part of Review*

Airing grievances about group home to caseworker.
Airing our grievances with others about the group home.
As a parent, I was included by ARD as an integral part of my son's treatment team. I was asked my opinions, recommendations etc. & treated with respect- something that does not always happen during interactions with DHS. Also the caseworker is held accountable by ARD.
Being able to present evidence of the child's progress and our agency's opinions about his present needs. All participants were well informed and displayed concern professionally.
Being able to talk to everyone at once ~in person~
Brought everyone together.
Caseworker was able to share some of the family's suggestions on treatment plan.
Clarifying expectations regarding permanency plan and tasks related to achieving goals.
Combining my foster care review (State) with county review better utilizes caseworker and parents time and is cost effective.
Discussion of termination hearing was encouraging
Discussion w/parent
Education regarding specific info needed in chart and why. Very helpful discussion re: case planning.
Everyone was asked to contribute.
Explanation of federal mandates ~ best practices ~ how these apply to case files
Getting an interpreter.
Getting the big picture (history, current status, future plan)
Good chance to discuss with case manger.
Hearing about his progress in placement.
Hearing parents verbalize their view of the issues that have been present & continue to be present- their minimizing for lack of compliance & how unimportant it is to them.
Hearing the responses of both the father and foster father to questions posed by the facilitator.
I had only met with this child once before and had heard from the child and his mother how he was doing, & briefly from the caseworker, it was good to hear from specific providers more detailed info.
Information shared and our concerns were listened to.
It allows me to have input in a case where (not often) I have more different ideas than ACDSS.
It is always so comprehensive in its scope. I find the process very helpful and definitely focused on the child's welfare.
It's good to know that the review board (system or whatever you call it) is in place to hold everyone accountable.
Learning about orthodontia resources for child.
The reviewer is a great reviewer. It's easy to discuss cases with her. She show great understanding of our cases.
Placement, Therapy, The overall review.
Safety, medical reviews
Seeing progress of client
The input from parent and the various professional members at the review.

The team getting together to discuss the case and make future plans.
To allow the foster family and biological parents an opportunity to discuss how to prioritize the child's needs for permanency as a co-operative effort!
When we more information about the case from all sides.

*Suggestions for Improvement*

Ask more questions about child's well being.
I think the review was very through and covered everything needing to be addressed.
I'm not coming up with any suggestions. I feel that the review was conducted in a very respectful manner.
Maybe if GAL's could attend reviews
My son is in out-of-home placement (different child from today's review) I've had to request that boulder county PRT & ARD meetings NOT be held together. I just talked to another adoptive family today that received notification of joint PRT/ARD meeting without being given the opinion of separate reviews. These meetings are intimidating to say the least & not always evident that the ARD person is directing it.
No suggestions great as usual.
None-- The reviewer organizes time very well and asks in-depth questions as well as asking for more details when needed she is also very respectful towards the parent.
None-- The interview was comfortable and informal while still informative and professional.
None. It went very well.
Possibly have the probation officer present.
Remind interested parties that the review is not evaluating caseworkers skills.
Review was just fine.
The caseworker should be at review
The review went just fine. No improvements.
This review went very smooth. ARD staff The reviewer was excellent.
Went well--Some confusion re: forms between reviewer/caseworker (myself) that appeared to be resolved, but then came up again causing extra work that was unnecessary.

## Arapahoe County

**Question 1: Was the permanency goal for the youth/child discussed in the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	44	97.8	97.8
No	1	2.2	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	45	100.0	

**Question 2: Was the progress, or lack of progress, towards reaching that goal discussed at the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	44	97.8	97.8
No	1	2.2	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	45	100.0	

**Question 3: Were the youth's/child's needs, while in placement, discussed at the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	44	97.8	97.8
No	1	2.2	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	45	100.0	

**Question 4: Was the youth's/child's safety, while in placement, discussed at the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	43	95.6	95.6
No	2	4.4	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	45	100.0	


Question 5: Were you able to express your views/concerns during the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	44	97.8	97.8
No	0	.0	97.8
No Response	1	2.2	100.0
Total	45	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	24	53.3	53.3
Somewhat Agree	12	26.7	80.0
Neutral	6	13.3	93.3
Somewhat Disagree	0	.0	93.3
Strongly Disagree	2	4.4	97.8
No Response	1	2.2	100.0
Total	45	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?



Arapahoe County Comments

Most Valuable Part of Review

-Feedback concerning case planning & needs.
-Not having to do the review in court. It's easier to do the review in our office, especially on long-term cases that are stable.
3rd party objective view of case.
Ability to talk about case with neutral party--
Adult conversation re: The family dynamics and situation without the child client present.
By far, the biggest problem w/this case is the negligence and incompetence of the family caseworker. Hopefully identifying this issue will put some pressure on Human services to make the caseworkers accountable for their actions or lack there of!!
Discussing plan as a team.
Discussing the progress of the case & solidifying the goal & time frame.
Discussion of permanency. Also reviewer did a very nice job of re-directing the parties that were irrational in a way that was direct but not offensive.
Everything was reviewed
Face to face contact, all parties (i.e. GAL, caseworker, parent, etc.) present and on the same page.
Getting foster mother involved
Having his caseworker present. Review & Current on-going issues, situations &/or needs to be addressed.
Hearing from other family members their view on the case. Case planning, feedback from reviewer.
Hearing parents' viewpoint.
In house review is much more convenient than going to court on stable long-term cases.
Information concerning child not previously known
It was helpful to discuss case/disposition plan with an "outside" person.
Kelly was able to express her concerns/feelings about this case. However, the impression was left that everyone had their minds made up prior to the meeting.
Make sure all parties were on same page of goal, or at least, talk about the goal w/all the parties involved. Making sure medical requirements were up to date.
Making sure everyone is on board about James future and what his needs are.
Much needed/utilized the time more for herself than her child but she needed to process & it will help her relinquish.
No because my views, I don't think matter, which is how the case has went all along.
Opportunity to communicate with other professionals ~caseworkers are hard to reach~ GAL's are impossible to contact.
Overview w/caseworker.
Positive support system-- to help child & family members move in a more forward direction. I also felt comfortable speaking out. Thank You.
Review
Reviewer letting me know where my expectations regarding my daughter's treatment were unrealistic.
Seeing a brother & sister excited about seeing each other and getting to hear from each other's

treatment team how they are doing.
Talking about things I need to do and ways I'm going to have a support group when I leave.
That the therapist participated and gave up to date information.
The adoptive family was present & participated & they brought the child.
The control the reviewer showed when members of the meeting became inappropriate.
The feedback the reviewer gave.
The review was timely because the case has changed caseworkers' recently. It gave the new caseworker an opportunity to meet most of the parties and learn first hand where the case has been.
To have a great facilitator, the reviewer, who made each feel at ease. To cover all needed issues of becoming a permanent parent (safety issues, etc). To see and hear the eagerness of each parent to get on with the fiscal adoption process.
Two of the three adopting parents were available after review to discuss adoption & schedule future meetings.

*Suggestions for Improvement*

Don't allow mother's respondent attorney to attend next review.
I want a copy of the final written review & never received one from this office.
I would have liked more input from the potential parents especially the fathers. I also would have like the reviewer to speak to the adoption process --package that was covered in the after meeting.
Include child more-ask if she/he has questions or concerns to discuss. Help client see why meeting is held, why it's valuable that she/he participate.
It was a good review
None at this time. Thought it was a good review. All points covered and everything moved at a good pace.
None, It went well.
None. Reviewer was appropriate in everything she asked. Nice job! Very professional.
None. The reviewer is very competent and appropriate in what he asks.
That the social worker provided an agenda before meeting and stick to it.
That we should maybe be asked to bring documents they were questioning on. Don't feel this has been adequate. Don't think it made any difference of the issues we needed to discuss.
The respondent mother arrived near the end of the review. She was permitted to review (extensively) what she'd missed, which sends her a message that it's okay to disregard meetings & professional's. She was extremely combative & allowed to persist. (*The reviewer did a good job staying focused & keeping things moving in a productive direction!!)
Went great no improvement needed.
Where was the coffee :)

## Boulder County

Question 1: Was the permanency goal for the youth/child discussed in the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	15	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	15	100.0	

Question 2: Was the progress, or lack of progress, towards reaching that goal discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	15	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	15	100.0	

Question 3: Were the youth's/child's needs, while in placement, discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	15	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	15	100.0	

Question 4: Was the youth's/child's safety, while in placement, discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	15	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	15	100.0	


Question 5: Were you able to express your views/concerns during the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	15	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	15	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	14	93.3	93.3
Somewhat Agree	1	6.7	100.0
Neutral	0	.0	100.0
Somewhat Disagree	0	.0	100.0
Strongly Disagree	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	15	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?



## Boulder County Comments

### Most Valuable Part of Review

Answered questions-- reiterated the importance of support services as child's needs change-- Native American roots, etc.
Catching up on child's progress.
Clarification of direction in terms of monitoring weight issues.
Finding out some of the bio-mom's problems with my case will help me to know how to deal w/her in the future.
Group discussion re: progress & concerns
Having everyone in the room together.
Positive attitude re: child's progress
Resolved some conflicts and developed a good plan for future services for child.
Talking about issues--closure on some issues
The most valuable part of this review was discussing the permanency plan.
The part about talking about his progress.
To sit in Foster Care Review & learn more about child's case
We were able to express our views and concerns openly.

### Suggestions for Improvement

Be sure to keep questions open-ended. Thanks for your good work. Reviewer was nice.
Knowing the biological mom was going to be there would have helped me prepare more, mentally

## Broomfield County

Question 1: Was the permanency goal for the youth/child discussed in the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	2	99.9	99.9
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	2	100.0	

Question 2: Was the progress, or lack of progress, towards reaching that goal discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	2	99.9	99.9
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	2	100.0	

Question 3: Were the youth's/child's needs, while in placement, discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	2	99.9	99.9
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	2	100.0	

Question 4: Was the youth's/child's safety, while in placement, discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	2	99.9	99.9
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	2	100.0	


Question 5: Were you able to express your views/concerns during the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	2	99.9	99.9
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	2	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Neutral	1	49.9	49.9
Strongly Agree	1	49.9	99.8
Somewhat Agree	0	.0	99.9
Somewhat Disagree	0	.0	99.9
Strongly Disagree	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	2	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?



**Broomfield County Comments**

Most Valuable Part of Review

Child's progress in placement.  
This is a new case to a new caseworker. The review gave everyone a chance to know what is/has happened, is happening and needs to happen on the case

Suggestions for Improvement

The demeanor of this reviewer is wonderful! She was great at addressing all the issues as well as helping the biological family members stay on task. Most of all, she did a great job with the kids in placement.

## Conejos County

Question 1: Was the permanency goal for the youth/child discussed in the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	1	99.8	99.8
No	0	.1	99.9
No Response	0	.1	100.0
Total	1	100.0	

Question 2: Was the progress, or lack of progress, towards reaching that goal discussed at the review? for county code = Conejos

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	1	99.8	99.8
No	0	.1	99.9
No Response	0	.1	100.0
Total	1	100.0	

Question 3: Were the youth's/child's needs, while in placement, discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	1	99.8	99.8
No	0	.1	99.9
No Response	0	.1	100.0
Total	1	100.0	

Question 4: Was the youth's/child's safety, while in placement, discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	1	99.8	99.8
No	0	.1	99.9
No Response	0	.1	100.0
Total	1	100.0	


Question 5: Were you able to express your views/concerns during the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	1	99.8	99.8
No	0	.1	99.9
No Response	0	.1	100.0
Total	1	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	1	99.5	99.5
Somewhat Agree	0	.1	99.6
Neutral	0	.1	99.7
Somewhat Disagree	0	.1	99.8
Strongly Disagree	0	.1	99.9
No Response	0	.1	100.0
Total	1	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?



Conejos County Comments

Most Valuable Part of Review

[REDACTED]

Going through case IV E eligibility.

Suggestions for Improvement

## Delta County

Question 1: Was the permanency goal for the youth/child discussed in the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	4	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	4	100.0	

Question 2: Was the progress, or lack of progress, towards reaching that goal discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	4	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	4	100.0	

Question 3: Were the youth's/child's needs, while in placement, discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	4	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	4	100.0	

Question 4: Was the youth's/child's safety, while in placement, discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	4	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	4	100.0	


**Question 5: Were you able to express your views/concerns during the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	4	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	4	100.0	

**Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Somewhat Agree	2	50.0	50.0
Strongly Agree	2	49.9	99.9
Neutral	0	.0	99.9
Somewhat Disagree	0	.0	100.0
Strongly Disagree	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	4	100.0	

**Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?**



**Delta County Comments**

Most Valuable Part of Review

Childs foster parents both present a given opportunity to discuss case.
Discussing my work situation and what it will be in the future.
Talking about the child's needs and getting ideas for her drug problem.
Youth changed mind about independent living program to start.

Suggestions for Improvement

## Denver County

Question 1: Was the permanency goal for the youth/child discussed in the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	58	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	58	100.0	

Question 2: Was the progress, or lack of progress, towards reaching that goal discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	58	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	58	100.0	

Question 3: Were the youth's/child's needs, while in placement, discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	58	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	58	100.0	

Question 4: Was the youth's/child's safety, while in placement, discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	58	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	58	100.0	


Question 5: Were you able to express your views/concerns during the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	56	96.5	96.5
No	1	1.7	98.3
No Response	1	1.7	100.0
Total	58	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	31	53.4	53.4
Somewhat Agree	13	22.4	75.9
Neutral	12	20.7	96.5
Somewhat Disagree	1	1.7	98.3
Strongly Disagree	1	1.7	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	58	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?



Denver County Comments

Most Valuable Part of Review

Able to discuss the case with a non-involved party.
All was very informative.
As a GAL I find it helpful to attend reviews to get updated regarding the child.
Client participation
Concern for the child. The invitation for the foster dad to attend.
Discussing youth's future placement.
Discussing permanency plans-- Reviewer is helpful and pleasant
Errors should be disclosed prior to treatment.
Feedback from reviewer, he always asks insightful questions.
Finding out what is best for child/youth and what can we do at the foster home to help him be successful in life.
Foster parents' ability to participate & give their opinions & concerns.
Getting clear on what needs to happen for natural father to have children returned home, getting clear on caseworkers role in getting child in to therapy.
Getting everyone on the case together.
Goal for adoption.
Going over cultural/ethnic issues
Having all parties present. I work w/ the kids & family on a daily basis so these reviews are not informative as much as they are reflective.
Hearing perspectives from different team members while they are in the room.
It opened dialogue with father with foster care. It prepared father for future termination hearing.
The reviewer is a wonderful reviewer.
The reviewer was extremely valuable in helping staff the case and in creatively thinking of possible solutions to problems with the case--Thank you
Knowing that we are doing what has to be done.
Letting people who don't know the child themselves. We live with the child and know what is going on with them and is the people listen and understand.
Mom got to hear permanency goal once again- makes it a little easier for her to hear why we are going in that direction.
The reviewer is always professional and his feedback is very helpful.
Nothing was valuable to me only reviewer.
Overall all areas covered along with presenting to mom how her children react when she is not available.
Placement as soon as possible.
Reviewing strengths/needs of each child and progress.
The reviewer is Great!
Scheduling the review encourages me to update all the case requirements
The administrative review is good to identify and address the needs of the child. The review is very informative to the family.
The change of goals.
The compassion and understanding.

The discussions about safety and progress.
The father having the opportunity to speak with fast-adopt parents.
The needs of the child were adequately addressed.
The review holds me accountable as the caseworker. It makes sure that there is no part of the case that is being overlooked or neglected.
The reviewer had an excellent knowledge of the case.
The reviewer listened to the foster parent to hear what the foster parent believes the child needs.
The reviewer, and the ability to discuss the youth in question
The well being of these children, How the parents have not met their goal in order to get the children back, this is why we are having open court.
To hear about treatment plan
Update for caseworker.
Updates from the caseworker on permanency plan. Hearing how parents are progressing on their treatment plans.

Suggestions for Improvement

Enforce timely start- caseworker was 25 minutes late. Unable to fully express views because caseworker is particularly difficult.
Everything was ok.
Having same reviewers for each case.
How to help the child?
I can think of none. The review was excellent.
i feel that (finally) all of the ugly past in this story is coming to an end. And now the (kids) can begin a new future. This review needs (no) suggestions it hit all the strong and weak points of everyone involved.
If possible the parents feelings toward situation so we can help Laura process her feelings and encourage her in positive ways.
The reviewer did a nice job facilitating.
Listen to the people who the child lives with. We are here with the child and care for the children we listen, and we talk to them and we know how they feel.
No improvements needed.
No provider, client or parent attended. This would be valuable for admin. reviewer
None it was done well. That this review would have been substituted for a "Court review of permanency".
None noted.
Provide positive input on how to improve the services delivered to foster family.
That the caseworker and foster parents could have also been at review but that is beyond DDHS's control, so there really aren't suggestions. I found the review very helpful.
To talk to the parents first.
Would like to see more GAL's at these reviews. Seems they rarely attend.

## Douglas County

**Question 1: Was the permanency goal for the youth/child discussed in the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	1	99.8	99.8
No	0	.1	99.9
No Response	0	.1	100.0
Total	1	100.0	

**Question 2: Was the progress, or lack of progress, towards reaching that goal discussed at the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	1	99.8	99.8
No	0	.1	99.9
No Response	0	.1	100.0
Total	1	100.0	

**Question 3: Were the youth's/child's needs, while in placement, discussed at the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	1	99.8	99.8
No	0	.1	99.9
No Response	0	.1	100.0
Total	1	100.0	

**Question 4: Was the youth's/child's safety, while in placement, discussed at the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	1	99.8	99.8
No	0	.1	99.9
No Response	0	.1	100.0
Total	1	100.0	


Question 5: Were you able to express your views/concerns during the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	1	99.8	99.8
No	0	.1	99.9
No Response	0	.1	100.0
Total	1	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Neutral	1	99.6	99.6
Somewhat Agree	0	.1	99.7
Somewhat Disagree	0	.1	99.8
Strongly Disagree	0	.1	99.9
No Response	0	.1	100.0
Total	1	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?



Douglas County Comments

Most Valuable Part of Review



Look at situation with others

Suggestions for Improvement

## Elbert County

Question 1: Was the permanency goal for the youth/child discussed in the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	6	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	6	100.0	

Question 2: Was the progress, or lack of progress, towards reaching that goal discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	6	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	6	100.0	

Question 3: Were the youth's/child's needs, while in placement, discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	6	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	6	100.0	

Question 4: Was the youth's/child's safety, while in placement, discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	6	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	6	100.0	


Question 5: Were you able to express your views/concerns during the review? for county code = Elbert

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	6	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	6	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	5	83.3	83.3
Neutral	1	16.7	99.9
Somewhat Agree	0	.0	100.0
Somewhat Disagree	0	.0	100.0
Strongly Disagree	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	6	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?



**Elbert County Comments**

Most Valuable Part of Review

Good to review with child/youth what he sees.
Highlighting concerns in a proactive, strengths based way for her staff that are struggling w/lack of supervision for a long time.
The child being there and being able to speak about his needs, safety...
Understanding of the regulations and standards.

Suggestions for Improvement

It would be helpful if we had training in regard to specific forms (i.e. 3A, 5A) and how they are used.
Longer, not enough time, get to the pertinent point.

## El Paso County

Question 1: Was the permanency goal for the youth/child discussed in the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	33	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	33	100.0	

Question 2: Was the progress, or lack of progress, towards reaching that goal discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	33	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	33	100.0	

Question 3: Were the youth's/child's needs, while in placement, discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	33	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	33	100.0	

Question 4: Was the youth's/child's safety, while in placement, discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	33	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	33	100.0	


Question 5: Were you able to express your views/concerns during the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	33	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	33	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Somewhat Agree	15	45.5	45.5
Strongly Agree	14	42.4	87.9
No Response	3	9.1	97.0
Somewhat Disagree	1	3.0	100.0
Neutral	0	.0	100.0
Strongly Disagree	0	.0	100.0
Total	33	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?



## El Paso County Comments

### Most Valuable Part of Review

Able to hear comments from everyone involved in the case.
All parts were valuable.
An evaluation on their review is not fair-- two of the three fathers appeared by phone or in person and monopolized the review.
As a caseworker I find the reviews validating my work.
Being able to hear from the foster parent about child's progress.
Discovering some medical concerns for my son that I was not informed of previously.
Gain consensus on permanency goals.
Info from the reviewer regarding Social Security benefits (historically) & re availability/coordination.
Knowing--confirming everyone has the same goals and concerns.
Child's needs were addressed very well.
Mother's concern of child's problems in foster home.
Overall compliance.
Overview of case, face-to-face introductions.
Parents & foster parent attended & able to provide useful interactive.
Parents concerns; strategies to engage parents in case plan-- Reviewer supportive of parents-- realistic-- Clarified case plan for all.
Progress reporting: Foster parent (Bio-parent, & client/child. Input Recommendations & opinions on case progress--Management
Reinforcement that the dept is making a reasonable effort for achieving permanency.
Review of the case
Reviewer was excellent at including child into entire review at explaining various things/processes to him.
Safety issues
Solid review of essentials; each part followed open questions of any concerns.
The reviewer suggests a lot of helpful resources & different options.
Suggestion for psychological testing.
Suggestions were made to accomplish the goal of return to parent.
The child's needs are being met.
The foster parent, reviewer, & myself were in the review. We were discussing about the needs of the child. The reviewer mentioned a workshop he saw that was coming up & might be helpful to attend. I attended the workshop "Early Identification Project" & it was very informative. As a result I registered the child & foster mom up & they were contacted in days & were evaluated. They are now receiving services & this will be very good for the child. Thanks to the reviewer for his information.
Validation that I continue to do what is necessary for this child/case.

### Suggestions for Improvement

Don't let parents come in and vent for longer than 5 minutes. Don't allow parents, CASA or others

spend the review asking legal questions or staffing the case.
Limit time parents spend ranting.
Making appropriate arrangements for parent to be there--mom had to work maybe scheduling review around parent's schedule.
Need clarification and or escalation on SSI seem to be stuck in the system.
None—the reviewer did a great job!!
None, I was very impressed at how well the person doing the review was informed about the going on in the child's life.
Widening the participants to the therapists.

## Fremont County

Question 1: Was the permanency goal for the youth/child discussed in the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	5	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	5	100.0	

Question 2: Was the progress, or lack of progress, towards reaching that goal discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	5	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	5	100.0	

Question 3: Were the youth's/child's needs, while in placement, discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	5	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	5	100.0	

Question 4: Was the youth's/child's safety, while in placement, discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	3	60.0	60.0
No	2	40.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	5	100.0	


Question 5: Were you able to express your views/concerns during the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	4	80.0	80.0
No	1	20.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	5	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	3	59.9	59.9
Somewhat Agree	1	20.0	79.9
No Response	1	20.0	99.9
Neutral	0	.0	100.0
Somewhat Disagree	0	.0	100.0
Strongly Disagree	0	.0	100.0
Total	5	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?



**Fremont County Comments**

Most Valuable Part of Review

Being able to hear from birth mom.
Idea of discharge plan/timeframe/expectations set
Learning more about what our foster daughter's birth mom is doing. Encouraging her to write a letter explaining why she abandoned her.
When we went over how I was doing in my treatment.

Suggestions for Improvement

I wanted to know when I would be able to start transferring home.
Sometimes this the review is one of the few times we see our kids' G.A.L. Maybe additional time for conversation could be set aside before or after the review for questions to be answered ~This would not necessarily need to have the state reviewer present as we know their time is limited.
To go over problems found w/documentation so worker can discuss w/reviewer then instead of a "surprise" on the findings.

## Gunnison County

Question 1: Was the permanency goal for the youth/child discussed in the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	2	99.9	99.9
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	2	100.0	

Question 2: Was the progress, or lack of progress, towards reaching that goal discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	2	99.9	99.9
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	2	100.0	

Question 3: Were the youth's/child's needs, while in placement, discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	2	99.9	99.9
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	2	100.0	

Question 4: Was the youth's/child's safety, while in placement, discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	2	99.9	99.9
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	2	100.0	


Question 5: Were you able to express your views/concerns during the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	2	99.9	99.9
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	2	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Somewhat Agree	1	49.9	49.9
Strongly Agree	1	49.9	99.8
Neutral	0	.0	99.9
Somewhat Disagree	0	.0	99.9
Strongly Disagree	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	2	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?



Gunnison County Comments

Most Valuable Part of Review

For someone outside (of the situation) to evaluate the situation.
To hear another perspective, even if it was from an employee of Human services.

Suggestions for Improvement

Attendance of attorney's for respondent parents would have created a more balanced set of perspectives.
I participated via telephone; I would have liked to know who was present & listening.

## Huerfano County

Question 1: Was the permanency goal for the youth/child discussed in the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	3	99.9	99.9
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	3	100.0	

Question 2: Was the progress, or lack of progress, towards reaching that goal discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	3	99.9	99.9
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	3	100.0	

Question 3: Were the youth's/child's needs, while in placement, discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	3	99.9	99.9
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	3	100.0	

Question 4: Was the youth's/child's safety, while in placement, discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	3	99.9	99.9
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	3	100.0	


Question 5: Were you able to express your views/concerns during the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	3	99.9	99.9
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	3	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Somewhat Agree	3	99.9	99.9
Neutral	0	.0	99.9
Somewhat Disagree	0	.0	99.9
Strongly Disagree	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	3	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?



Huerfano County Comments

Most Valuable Part of Review

Having everyone input concerns/achievements.
Reviewer reinforced D.S.S. concerns & plans.

Suggestions for Improvement

## Jefferson County

Question 1: Was the permanency goal for the youth/child discussed in the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	36	97.3	97.3
No Response	1	2.7	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
Total	37	100.0	

Question 2: Was the progress, or lack of progress, towards reaching that goal discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	36	97.3	97.3
No Response	1	2.7	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
Total	37	100.0	

Question 3: Were the youth's/child's needs, while in placement, discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	36	97.3	97.3
No Response	1	2.7	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
Total	37	100.0	

Question 4: Was the youth's/child's safety, while in placement, discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	35	94.6	94.6
No	1	2.7	97.3
No Response	1	2.7	100.0
Total	37	100.0	


**Question 5: Were you able to express your views/concerns during the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	36	97.3	97.3
No Response	1	2.7	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
Total	37	100.0	

**Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	22	59.5	59.5
Somewhat Agree	9	24.3	83.8
Neutral	3	8.1	91.9
Strongly Disagree	2	5.4	97.3
No Response	1	2.7	100.0
Somewhat Disagree	0	.0	100.0
Total	37	100.0	

**Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?**



Jefferson County Comments

Most Valuable Part of Review

Acknowledgement that further treatment is needed.
All of the above questions. (1-5)
Assuring when children are placed in foster care their needs are being met.
Attention to safety concerns. Review of case plan.
Clarity on parents involvement
Communication
Discussing & review as team.
Enforcing the part where the parents need to get motivated or to maintain their progress, goals, in order to build upon the relationship with their son. Reminding the client that this is his parents responsibility not his.
File delinquencies.
Finding out parents frustration w/child placement.
Focusing on the permanency plan and how we would pursue that. The reviewer T. did a great job of helping parents focus on goals, at their difficulties communicating.
Getting providers together in same room, all getting on same page as to direction the case is going.
I don't really see these reviews as too valuable except reminding me of the paperwork I have forgotten to include among all my other duties.
I love the reviewer and I am very saddened that he will no longer be working in Jefferson County.
I was able to voice my concerns to an impartial party regarding the RTC where my daughter resides.
It is helpful to hear how other parties involved in the case view things, i.e. GAL, CASA volunteer.
It is valuable to hear positive feedback about the work being done to give the children permanency. It feels good to get a pat on the back every now and then.
Keeps all parties accountable ~and helps CWs to make sure we are meeting needs of kids.
Let respondent father know where case stands. Get professionals on same page.
Naming the child's problem and ways they are working on them.
Noting progress (positive) in case! :)
Obtaining appropriate therapy services.
Opportunity to meet with & discuss current plan & status with most of team & hearing update on treatment plan.
Ross being able to express his view.
Ross's interaction was invaluable, and the process allowing him to talk and make suggestions in his life for future plans.
The reviewer is a great listener who respects each participant's input both negative and positive. This provides an environment of ease and trust, which helps the participants work together to form positive solutions to an issue or concern.
The reviewer was wonderful in facilitating the review. He is consistently organized and respectful of each participant's views and input.
RSA, therapy and why 2 therapies. Long range goals.
The piece about foster care transition or home transition.
The reviewer did an excellent job. He was prepared, related well to the youth and gave everyone

a chance to participate.
The youth's RSA treatment.
This was a new experience for me. I learned about the process and understand the process a little better.
What child's needs are currently & what hinders him from attaining them.

Suggestions for Improvement

All parties involved be there & felt rushed time wise~ This is my son's chance to help himself & his future~ I felt time was more an issue than it should have been!
Bigger room!
Don't talk to me like I'm five years old.
Having a more positive attitude (caseworker).
I feel a list could be distributed about what paperwork is missing so I wouldn't have to schedule and have to find this out.
I have only attended two at this point not sure on this question.
Incorporate the foster care review into the review today.
It is imperative that all parties re: probation, etc. be present during these decision procedures to complete, and compliment the process.
It was great.
Larger room would have been nice.
No improvements to suggest. The reviewer is wonderful!
No suggestions at this time.
No suggestions of change at this time.
No suggestions, This reviewer is very efficient.
None at this time.
None. The review went very well. ~It was very helpful! The reviewer was very professional and complete.
Nothing- This reviewer is my favorite - He is always so helpful to me and I feel that he truly cares about what he does.
This reviewer is fantastic, thorough, and respectful!
Timeliness should not be such an issue, when we are dealing with a young man such as this youth, I believe the process was cut short; I know your time is very valuable, and appreciate the time we received.

## La Plata County

**Question 1: Was the permanency goal for the youth/child discussed in the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	5	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	5	100.0	

**Question 2: Was the progress, or lack of progress, towards reaching that goal discussed at the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	5	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	5	100.0	

**Question 3: Were the youth's/child's needs, while in placement, discussed at the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	5	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	5	100.0	

**Question 4: Was the youth's/child's safety, while in placement, discussed at the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	5	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	5	100.0	


**Question 5: Were you able to express your views/concerns during the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	4	80.0	80.0
No	1	20.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	5	100.0	

**Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Neutral	2	40.0	40.0
Strongly Agree	2	40.0	79.9
Somewhat Agree	1	20.0	99.9
Somewhat Disagree	0	.0	100.0
Strongly Disagree	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	5	100.0	

**Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?**



La Plata County Comments

Most Valuable Part of Review

The reviewer does a good job of getting information from everyone without the review turning into a staffing or a pseudo-hearing.
Talking about the goals for my future.
The child's opportunity to speak her opinions to the team.
The reviewer's support of the dept. & her encouragement that the client takes responsibility for completing the treatment plan. I appreciate the feedback.

Suggestions for Improvement

I don't have any suggestions. I felt that the review was thorough.
Make my dad be the one on the other end of the phone-- not _____
No suggestions

## Larimer County

Question 1: Was the permanency goal for the youth/child discussed in the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	41	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	41	100.0	

Question 2: Was the progress, or lack of progress, towards reaching that goal discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	41	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	41	100.0	

Question 3: Were the youth's/child's needs, while in placement, discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	41	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	41	100.0	

Question 4: Was the youth's/child's safety, while in placement, discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	40	97.6	97.6
No	1	2.4	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	41	100.0	


Question 5: Were you able to express your views/concerns during the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	41	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	41	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	22	53.7	53.7
Somewhat Agree	17	41.5	95.1
Somewhat Disagree	1	2.4	97.6
No Response	1	2.4	100.0
Neutral	0	.0	100.0
Strongly Disagree	0	.0	100.0
Total	41	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?



Larimer County Comments

Most Valuable Part of Review

~Provided over viewing child's current functioning & list current concerns and plans to address concerns.~ The reviewer did an excellent job.
A few issues with placement need to be looked into concerning client.
Ability to discuss permanency.
Agreed to find visitation possible for their mother.
All were good.
All were good.
Always good to have everyone at the same table, in person, to staff/discuss the case.
Case management elements.
The reviewer always shows such an interest in the Independent Living Youth and encourages them to talk and share their goals.
Checking in with all parties. Confirming plan & goals with all.
Coming together as a team, being able to hear all sides of the child's life, preparing for his next transition.
Discussing child's progress over the past 6 months
Discussing long-term plan.
Discussing the youth's best interest -- The honesty being straight forward-- no candy coating--
Discussion of possible future permanent placement away from the parents.
Discussion of progress, Having entire team present, Upbeat atmosphere.
Discussion status/present well being of 3 different brothers. & Having most of the major players all in one room.
Discussion on CRT down
Getting the key players together.
Good to get everyone together to discuss long--term plans & concerns.
Hearing from several team members--DHS caseworker, foster parent, and educational surrogate.
How my child is doing at her foster home.
I liked that it was just a few people.
The reviewer does such a great job of connecting with youth and providers, especially kinship providers. I believe that this helps everyone to relax and brainstorm about positives, negatives, and solutions to problems. She also has a great memory for youth & family issues.
The reviewer has a very good understanding of the Independent Living Program, which helps so much when doing the FCR's. She always shows such an interest in each independent youth & encourages them to share about themselves & their goals.
The reviewer's sensitive, impartial, thorough style of conducting reviews.
Knowing my student would be kept in the working community & not in a confined setting.
Making sure everyone is on the same page.
Meeting & hearing from the staff working with this young man and having him there to speak to his situation.
Meeting biological grandmother & getting all professionals together to discuss over client's progress.
Objective view on the case.

Program towards looking for a foster home in Denver area. (No longer available in Larimer County)
Review of services in place and long-range goals.
The educational & IQ guidelines & services child may qualify for.
The lady doing the review is generally interested in the children. I believe she is the very best. Totally interested in the areas of the child, enthusiastic & caring.
Transition planning to adult services.
Update on placement status

Suggestions for Improvement

Ask the parents more questions.
Bigger room
The reviewer does an EXCELLENT job!!
Excellent review conducted by the reviewer.
Father's participation, GAL's presence. Neither could come.
Food and/or candy.
I have been doing foster care for a long time and I think there is hardly any room for improvement. It was great & very much rewarding for me.
It is always frustrating when a reviewer brings up the permanency goal to debate in front of the parent. Perhaps this should be discussed before the parent comes in the room.
No suggestions
None ~the reviewer is terrific! She has genuine care and concern for the children and appreciates the hard work from the caseworkers. ~
Normally, my Independent living youth attends foster care reviews. Today, she was unable to miss school to attend. With her not being they're the reviewer & I missed the opportunity to hear her talk about her Independent living goals, & what progress she's making in meeting them. (No fault of reviewer's)
Unknown? Can't think of anything to improve it.
Went well no changes needed.

## Las Animas County

Question 1: Was the permanency goal for the youth/child discussed in the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	4	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	4	100.0	

Question 2: Was the progress, or lack of progress, towards reaching that goal discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	4	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	4	100.0	

Question 3: Were the youth's/child's needs, while in placement, discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	4	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	4	100.0	

Question 4: Was the youth's/child's safety, while in placement, discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	3	75.0	75.0
No	1	25.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	4	100.0	


Question 5: Were you able to express your views/concerns during the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	4	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	4	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Neutral	2	50.0	50.0
Strongly Agree	2	49.9	99.9
Somewhat Agree	0	.0	99.9
Somewhat Disagree	0	.0	100.0
Strongly Disagree	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	4	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?



Las Animas County Comments

Most Valuable Part of Review

1. Discuss children's needs (counseling) etc. 2. That keeping the children together was of importance. 3. That awareness due to length of time given to matter to make a change was kept in the best interest of the children.
1.Keep in contact w/school to keep updated w/children's progress. 2.Keeping in contact w/children. 3.Discuss child's weakness where help is needed
To know if I get my kids back.

Suggestions for Improvement

## Logan County

**Question 1: Was the permanency goal for the youth/child discussed in the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	2	99.9	99.9
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	2	100.0	

**Question 2: Was the progress, or lack of progress, towards reaching that goal discussed at the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	2	99.9	99.9
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	2	100.0	

**Question 3: Were the youth's/child's needs, while in placement, discussed at the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	2	99.9	99.9
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	2	100.0	

**Question 4: Was the youth's/child's safety, while in placement, discussed at the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	2	99.9	99.9
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	2	100.0	


Question 5: Were you able to express your views/concerns during the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	2	99.9	99.9
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	2	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	2	99.8	99.8
Somewhat Agree	0	.0	99.8
Neutral	0	.0	99.9
Somewhat Disagree	0	.0	99.9
Strongly Disagree	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	2	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?



Logan County Comments

Most Valuable Part of Review

I think it's a great way to check & balance the work being done for youth. Suggestions are helpful. Talking about permanency goals and getting fresh ideas and approached to finalize those goals.

Suggestions for Improvement

Don't really have any suggestions. Reviewer does a nice job of getting input and information from all parties.  
Redirect when phone person gets off track.

## Mesa County

Question 1: Was the permanency goal for the youth/child discussed in the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	24	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	24	100.0	

Question 2: Was the progress, or lack of progress, towards reaching that goal discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	23	95.8	95.8
No	1	4.2	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	24	100.0	

Question 3: Were the youth's/child's needs, while in placement, discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	24	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	24	100.0	

Question 4: Was the youth's/child's safety, while in placement, discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	24	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	24	100.0	


Question 5: Were you able to express your views/concerns during the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	24	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	24	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	17	70.8	70.8
Somewhat Agree	5	20.8	91.7
Neutral	1	4.2	95.8
No Response	1	4.2	100.0
Somewhat Disagree	0	.0	100.0
Strongly Disagree	0	.0	100.0
Total	24	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?



Mesa County Comments

*Most Valuable Part of Review*

A chance for all team members to express needs and concerns.
A place for child to air her questions and concerns.
All of it.
Answered questions and showed progress.
Discussion as a team sharing information and discussing direction in the case.
Discussion of permanency.
Group discussion is always valuable.
In my opinion it was all valuable.
It is extremely valuable to partner with various agencies in regards to helping special needs kids.
It's a good chance to touch base w/everyone regarding progress and barriers to service.
Open communication to discuss youth's needs. The reviewer makes everyone comfortable to express opinion.
Permanency Goal was previously established. I do feel that reviews or not just valuable but necessary.
Review of plan and safety.
Reviewing all aspects of recent move from Boulder County and transfer of services. Look at therapies, IEP, etc.
Reviewing services.
Summary of services in place for parents and an update of children's condition.
Talking about girls needs and some problem solving.
Talking by phone with the out-of-state kinship provider and hearing the latest developments about the two young siblings in her care.
Team coming together.
The youth's ability to express her concerns and request changes in her treatment plan.
This particular case is very stable. No concerns / issues applied.

*Suggestions for Improvement*

Everything went well. There is an appeal pending, but the children are doing well in their adoptive placement, they have permanency.
Went fine-- no problem in communication facilitator/reviewer did great job.

## Moffat County

**Question 1: Was the permanency goal for the youth/child discussed in the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	8	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	8	100.0	

**Question 2: Was the progress, or lack of progress, towards reaching that goal discussed at the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	8	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	8	100.0	

**Question 3: Were the youth's/child's needs, while in placement, discussed at the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	8	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	8	100.0	

**Question 4: Was the youth's/child's safety, while in placement, discussed at the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	8	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	8	100.0	


Question 5: Were you able to express your views/concerns during the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	8	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	8	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	4	50.0	50.0
No Response	2	25.0	75.0
Somewhat Agree	1	12.5	87.5
Neutral	1	12.5	100.0
Somewhat Disagree	0	.0	100.0
Strongly Disagree	0	.0	100.0
Total	8	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?



Moffat County Comments

Most Valuable Part of Review

Discussing different ways to make sure the child gets the appropriate services even after placement.
Got better overall picture of child's support group & what is happening in his life.
Having all providers in one place to share the information. The reviewer is very skilled at covering sensitive areas.
Offences and out of home placement.
The reviewer gave some valuable suggestions to youth and suggested some ideas to facilitate plan.
Your feedback on how to resolve a situation.

Suggestions for Improvement

I would like to see that we should talk about home placement and offences
Make parents attendance mandatory.
Went ok

## Montezuma County

Question 1: Was the permanency goal for the youth/child discussed in the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	4	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	4	100.0	

Question 2: Was the progress, or lack of progress, towards reaching that goal discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	4	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	4	100.0	

Question 3: Were the youth's/child's needs, while in placement, discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	4	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	4	100.0	

Question 4: Was the youth's/child's safety, while in placement, discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	4	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	4	100.0	


Question 5: Were you able to express your views/concerns during the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	4	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	4	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	4	99.9	99.9
Somewhat Agree	0	.0	99.9
Neutral	0	.0	99.9
Somewhat Disagree	0	.0	100.0
Strongly Disagree	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	4	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?



Montezuma County Comments

Most Valuable Part of Review

Everybody, even child, knows what's going on.
Finding out that the girls were adoptable. Being reassured that we are doing a good job as foster parents.
I feel having a state review w/providers is very valuable to validate the work that is being done and why it is so important.
The interaction of reviewer with participants and suggestions have been well received. Good rapport with all yet expects 100% compliance with regulations, good reviewer.

Suggestions for Improvement

I feel that the reviewer is a very informed reviewer that has the children's best interest first. No suggestion for improvement.
In our opinion we felt that the review went really well.

**Montrose County**

**Question 1: Was the permanency goal for the youth/child discussed in the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	5	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	5	100.0	

**Question 2: Was the progress, or lack of progress, towards reaching that goal discussed at the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	5	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	5	100.0	

**Question 3: Were the youth's/child's needs, while in placement, discussed at the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	5	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	5	100.0	

**Question 4: Was the youth's/child's safety, while in placement, discussed at the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	5	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	5	100.0	


Question 5: Were you able to express your views/concerns during the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	5	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	5	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No Response	2	40.0	40.0
Strongly Agree	2	40.0	79.9
Somewhat Agree	1	20.0	99.9
Neutral	0	.0	100.0
Somewhat Disagree	0	.0	100.0
Strongly Disagree	0	.0	100.0
Total	5	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?



Montrose County Comments

Most Valuable Part of Review

All of us in room at same time helps with sharing information.
Contact on progress with foster parent. Caught error in case. Contact with out of state monitoring of case as per the ICPC request.
Discussion about permanency of the behavior of the children regarding this issue when addressed.
Preparing, getting the file in order.

Suggestions for Improvement

## Morgan County

**Question 1: Was the permanency goal for the youth/child discussed in the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	19	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	19	100.0	

**Question 2: Was the progress, or lack of progress, towards reaching that goal discussed at the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	19	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	19	100.0	

**Question 3: Were the youth's/child's needs, while in placement, discussed at the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	19	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	19	100.0	

**Question 4: Was the youth's/child's safety, while in placement, discussed at the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	19	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	19	100.0	


Question 5: Were you able to express your views/concerns during the review?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	19	100.0	100.0	100.0
	No	0	.0	.0	100.0
	No Response	0	.0	.0	100.0
	Total	19	100.0	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	10	52.6	52.6
Somewhat Agree	5	26.3	78.9
Neutral	4	21.1	100.0
Somewhat Disagree	0	.0	100.0
Strongly Disagree	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	19	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?



Morgan County Comments

*Most Valuable Part of Review*

Discussing youth's goals and future plans and him expressing a need for a license.
Don't know
Hearing how all are working on behalf of the child. Finding out the person who caused some of the damage to the child was dealt with. (Stepfather).
I don't know I am used to this.
I like to know from a different source if I am doing the correct thing for the kids.
It shows progress with our foster child. Outlines this years goals.
It was court ordered. Administrative review had to be held.
Letting all parties discuss views.
Opportunity to address issues of independent living EBT account & issues of no driver license.
Reviewing the whole case and progress.
She kind of picks your brain about what else can be done. Other suggestions.
That the child was able to be part of the plans for her future.
To Learn about the last placement. Since only in ours for a month. To have mom there and watch them engage w/each other.
Update on her placement on how she is doing. Trying to keep her in placement where she is at.
Updates on progress in other settings.

*Suggestions for Improvement*

Advising all participants that can attend of the time/date of review. I wasn't notified until after review started.
Don't discuss what caseworker hasn't done in front of clients.
It was my first one. I really like starting on time and staying on task. Thank you.
To have the child come up with a plan and have it done before next review.
To let me know what would happen if she couldn't stay where she is at now.

**Otero County**

**Question 1: Was the permanency goal for the youth/child discussed in the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	3	99.9	99.9
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	3	100.0	

**Question 2: Was the progress, or lack of progress, towards reaching that goal discussed at the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	3	99.9	99.9
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	3	100.0	

**Question 3: Were the youth's/child's needs, while in placement, discussed at the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	3	99.9	99.9
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	3	100.0	

**Question 4: Was the youth's/child's safety, while in placement, discussed at the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	3	99.9	99.9
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	3	100.0	


Question 5: Were you able to express your views/concerns during the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	3	99.9	99.9
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	3	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	3	99.8	99.8
Somewhat Agree	0	.0	99.9
Neutral	0	.0	99.9
Somewhat Disagree	0	.0	99.9
Strongly Disagree	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	3	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?



Otero County Comments

*Most Valuable Part of Review*

Being brought up to date on recent issues.
I have a better understanding of what the future for the client could be.
Provided the motivation & pressure to get the file current & in order.

*Suggestions for Improvement*

None~ this reviewer has always done a good job at foster care reviews. I appreciate what she does.

## Park County

**Question 1: Was the permanency goal for the youth/child discussed in the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	2	99.9	99.9
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	2	100.0	

**Question 2: Was the progress, or lack of progress, towards reaching that goal discussed at the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	2	99.9	99.9
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	2	100.0	

**Question 3: Were the youth's/child's needs, while in placement, discussed at the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	2	99.9	99.9
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	2	100.0	

**Question 4: Was the youth's/child's safety, while in placement, discussed at the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	2	99.9	99.9
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	2	100.0	


Question 5: Were you able to express your views/concerns during the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	2	99.9	99.9
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	2	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	2	99.8	99.8
Somewhat Agree	0	.0	99.8
Neutral	0	.0	99.9
Somewhat Disagree	0	.0	99.9
Strongly Disagree	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	2	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?



**Park County Comments**

Most Valuable Part of Review

Consensus of opinions amongst all parties.
Hearing provider's update and discussing with family.

Suggestions for Improvement

## Pueblo County

Question 1: Was the permanency goal for the youth/child discussed in the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	14	87.5	87.5
No	2	12.5	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	16	100.0	

Question 2: Was the progress, or lack of progress, towards reaching that goal discussed at the review? for county code = Pueblo

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	15	93.7	93.7
No	1	6.3	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	16	100.0	

Question 3: Were the youth's/child's needs, while in placement, discussed at the review? for county code = Pueblo

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	16	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	16	100.0	

Question 4: Was the youth's/child's safety, while in placement, discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	16	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	16	100.0	


Question 5: Were you able to express your views/concerns during the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	15	93.7	93.7
No	1	6.3	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	16	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Somewhat Agree	7	43.7	43.7
Strongly Agree	5	31.2	75.0
Neutral	3	18.8	93.7
No Response	1	6.3	100.0
Somewhat Disagree	0	.0	100.0
Strongly Disagree	0	.0	100.0
Total	16	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?



Pueblo County Comments

Most Valuable Part of Review

Allows biological parents to hear of child's progress, likes/dislikes, feel apart of child's planning.
Discussion and approval of permanency goals. Opportunity for foster parent to be heard regarding the progress of the child.
Discussion re: Living arrangement after age 21.
Everything went all right, they say the house always clean. He likes being here with us.
Information from all parties was shared.
Information update on child's permanency goal in regard to his mother.
It validated my plan.
Learning status of the case (legal)
Review of client's previous success.
Reviewer was attentive and considerate to others input & questions. Reviewer was pleasant and conducted himself in a professional manner.
That she is doing well in her foster home and she's not just saying so. I think animal therapy would really help her because she really loves animals.
The interviewer was interactive w/teen, made him feel important, and made both children in review feel comfortable and feel that they mattered.
This case has been reviewed before by this reviewer. It was positive to see the development of the case since last FCR. The best interest of the child is truly being served.
Validation that the case was moving in the right direction.

Suggestions for Improvement

It went very well.
More activities, incentives to keep her grades up and to continue visit with me because of our bond, she needs to know that I will remain a part of her life.
None-Good review
Today's review was fine. I would like to suggest that reviewers not make suggestions to clients. That is called casework and reviewers do not know what has been discussed between client and caseworker. If reviewer has a suggestion, it should be discussed with the caseworker only. It did not happen in this review but has in the past with not only this caseworker, but others.
We talk about the child, how he like being over there, Delivery on wheels. The child like being with us when time go we go with him outside and we tell him bye

## Rio Grande County

Question 1: Was the permanency goal for the youth/child discussed in the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	5	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	5	100.0	

Question 2: Was the progress, or lack of progress, towards reaching that goal discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	5	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	5	100.0	

Question 3: Were the youth's/child's needs, while in placement, discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	5	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	5	100.0	

Question 4: Was the youth's/child's safety, while in placement, discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	5	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	5	100.0	


Question 5: Were you able to express your views/concerns during the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	5	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	5	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	5	99.9	99.9
Somewhat Agree	0	.0	99.9
Neutral	0	.0	99.9
Somewhat Disagree	0	.0	100.0
Strongly Disagree	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	5	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?



Rio Grande County Comments

Most Valuable Part of Review

Everyone on the same page to go forward. To get the child home.
Good interaction between all parties. Child willing to share information with the reviewer, even if by telephone. The reviewer is very helpful.
It's another opportunity to get input from all parties. The reviewer allowed everyone to talk.
The child's parent was able to see that his child was being taken care of and able to see his progress.
The detail of progress by the youth.

Suggestions for Improvement

The meeting went well if it is followed by action.

## Teller County

Question 1: Was the permanency goal for the youth/child discussed in the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	2	99.9	99.9
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	2	100.0	

Question 2: Was the progress, or lack of progress, towards reaching that goal discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	2	99.9	99.9
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	2	100.0	

Question 3: Were the youth's/child's needs, while in placement, discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	2	99.9	99.9
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	2	100.0	

Question 4: Was the youth's/child's safety, while in placement, discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	2	99.9	99.9
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	2	100.0	


Question 5: Were you able to express your views/concerns during the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	2	99.9	99.9
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	2	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Somewhat Agree	1	49.9	49.9
Strongly Agree	1	49.9	99.8
Neutral	0	.0	99.9
Somewhat Disagree	0	.0	99.9
Strongly Disagree	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	2	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?



Teller County Comments

Most Valuable Part of Review

Discussion of permanency goal & possible future changes.
Suggestions by the reviewer about updating on emancipation plan so all parties are clear on the goals. I appreciate Steve's willingness to work with us as a whole system and all its aspects.

Suggestions for Improvement

## Weld County

Question 1: Was the permanency goal for the youth/child discussed in the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	18	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	18	100.0	

Question 2: Was the progress, or lack of progress, towards reaching that goal discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	18	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	18	100.0	

Question 3: Were the youth's/child's needs, while in placement, discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	18	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	18	100.0	

Question 4: Was the youth's/child's safety, while in placement, discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	17	94.4	94.4
No	1	5.6	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	18	100.0	


Question 5: Were you able to express your views/concerns during the review? for county code = Weld

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	18	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	18	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	12	66.6	66.6
Somewhat Agree	5	27.8	94.4
No Response	1	5.6	100.0
Neutral	0	.0	100.0
Somewhat Disagree	0	.0	100.0
Strongly Disagree	0	.0	100.0
Total	18	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?



Weld County Comments

Most Valuable Part of Review

Being able to express my concerns and opinions about the reduction in therapy for developmental-delayed foster daughter.
The reviewer helped to focus on the lack of services the agency was producing to child & provider w/ tack and clarity. Very Helpful.
Getting updated information regarding the parents' status with their treatment plans. The reviewer has a good way with the clients.
Great update and tool for permanency planning. State reviewer always does a great job asks good & tough questions and provides insight and suggestions.
Helped me see a few small things I missed on the case.
I got suggestions from the reviewer and the Gal on how to help my client.
It's good to get the information so that if an audit comes up we are prepared, and gets everything in the file.
Knowing that my kids will be home soon.
My concerns about the safety of my kids.
Not having caseworker there & having a fill in, got a lot of dust out of the way & ideas off people's chest.
The therapist response upon us. How well reviewer listened. How well we are doing on case Jesse & Marlene.
To ensure this case is moving towards permanency.
Validated/Achieved good progress-- "Recognized by state" as on task--

Suggestions for Improvement

Doctor's absence prevented what could have been a great discussion.
I believe that the review is well organized, very informative, and very professional.
No suggestions
None. Reviewer is great and very helpful.

## County Not Specified

Question 1: Was the permanency goal for the youth/child discussed in the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	25	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	25	100.0	

Question 2: Was the progress, or lack of progress, towards reaching that goal discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	25	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	25	100.0	

Question 3: Were the youth's/child's needs, while in placement, discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	24	96.0	96.0
No	1	4.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	25	100.0	

Question 4: Was the youth's/child's safety, while in placement, discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	25	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	25	100.0	


Question 5: Were you able to express your views/concerns during the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	25	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	25	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	11	44.0	44.0
Somewhat Agree	8	32.0	76.0
Neutral	5	20.0	96.0
Somewhat Disagree	0	.0	96.0
Strongly Disagree	0	.0	96.0
No Response	1	4.0	100.0
Total	25	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?



County Not Specified Comments

Most Valuable Part of Review

Being able to have time with the social worker.
Discussing emancipation home and A.Y.A
Discussion of next steps regarding parents.
Good input from reviewer & Open-minded and professional.
Having an outside point of view for the parent.
Hearing other providers prospective.
I was able to explain to the CPA what needed to be done and why we were going in the direction that we were.
It helps the parents to hear progress.
It was obvious that everyone had interest in doing what's best for the child.
Listening to the other peoples opinions
Open, frank
Opportunity to meet with everyone involved with case.
Placement plan
Plan for oldest child to return home.
Review and talk of general health and safety concern. Dental evaluation case discussed and brace.
Review of gamily involvement, sex offender treatment goals and progress made in permanent plan by MCDHS.
Reviewer clearly explained expectations, regulations.
System analysis ~Family progress in relation to each individual.~
The child's placing with me his grandfather. Also the help that he will be receiving while in my care Medicaid and his vision care.
The total case progress & how it is or is not working. We didn't just focus on negative but what is working for the child from a team approach.
This is a long-term foster care placement since 1993. Things have been status quo for the last couple of years.

Suggestions for Improvement

Improvement has been reached to satisfactory level. No other suggestion needed.
More specifics to people w/children in placement as to when they are going to be returned would benefit all.
Positive remarks concerning placement of child.
Review was nice and pleasant.
Where is _____ ??? She was very interested in the children.

## DYC Specific Information

**DYC Denver**

**Question 1: Was the permanency goal for the youth/child discussed in the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	18	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	18	100.0	

**Question 2: Was the progress, or lack of progress, towards reaching that goal discussed at the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	18	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	18	100.0	

**Question 3: Were the youth's/child's needs, while in placement, discussed at the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	18	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	18	100.0	

**Question 4: Was the youth's/child's safety, while in placement, discussed at the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	17	94.4	94.4
No	0	.0	94.4
No Response	1	5.6	100.0
Total	18	100.0	


Question 5: Were you able to express your views/concerns during the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	18	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	18	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	8	44.4	44.4
Somewhat Agree	4	22.2	66.7
Neutral	3	16.7	83.3
Somewhat Disagree	1	5.6	88.9
Strongly Disagree	1	5.6	94.4
No Response	1	5.6	100.0
Total	18	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?



DYC Denver Region Comments

*Most Valuable Part of Review*

A tool for holding the client accountable to the plan and progress. Also a tool to holding the provider accountable to services. Lastly but not least, a helpful tool for me to assure I am addressing all areas and doing my job.
Demonstrates clients strengths
Discussion around progress and client needs as well as long term goals.
Feedback and accountability
Feedback on file.
File Review
How I'm doing.
My daughter's goals. Her safety while in placement. My daughter's views and concerns and her being able to talk about anything that is bothering her.
Opportunity for multi-layered conference re: child's welfare
Review goals
Reviewing progress towards treatment goals. Letting the child know that the review goes to the committing judge.
That _____'s knowledge and understanding of what is expected is very clear.
The youth had an opportunity to speak about his progress checks and balances for case management. Helps me with keeping records accurate.
Took place of monthly review. Heard new info. Discussed new/updated info regarding mother's involvement. Clarified for _____ the expectations that she sometimes puts off.
Understandable, parole

*Suggestions for Improvement*

None I think that you are all doing a good job. Thank you very much
None. Went well. All areas covered.
Please do something about parking

## DYC Central

Question 1: Was the permanency goal for the youth/child discussed in the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	3	99.9	99.9
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	3	100.0	

Question 2: Was the progress, or lack of progress, towards reaching that goal discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	3	99.9	99.9
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	3	100.0	

Question 3: Were the youth's/child's needs, while in placement, discussed at the review? I

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	3	99.9	99.9
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	3	100.0	

Question 4: Was the youth's/child's safety, while in placement, discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	3	99.9	99.9
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	3	100.0	


Question 5: Were you able to express your views/concerns during the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	3	99.9	99.9
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	3	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Neutral	2	66.6	66.6
Somewhat Agree	1	33.3	99.9
Somewhat Disagree	0	.0	99.9
Strongly Disagree	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	3	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?



DYC Central Region Comments

Most Valuable Part of Review

The reviewer is always amicable and appears to be genuinely interested in my cases/kids.
Making sure documents were complete.
Reinforcement from reviewer to put responsibility on client for poor progress not provider.

Suggestions for Improvement

**DYC Northern**

**Question 1: Was the permanency goal for the youth/child discussed in the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	10	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	10	100.0	

**Question 2: Was the progress, or lack of progress, towards reaching that goal discussed at the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	10	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	10	100.0	

**Question 3: Were the youth's/child's needs, while in placement, discussed at the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	10	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	10	100.0	

**Question 4: Was the youth's/child's safety, while in placement, discussed at the review?**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	10	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	10	100.0	


Question 5: Were you able to express your views/concerns during the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	10	100.0	100.0
No	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	10	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	7	70.0	70.0
Somewhat Agree	2	20.0	90.0
Neutral	1	10.0	100.0
Somewhat Disagree	0	.0	100.0
Strongly Disagree	0	.0	100.0
No Response	0	.0	100.0
Total	10	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?



DYC Northern Region Comments

Most Valuable Part of Review

Clarification of the 'system'
Discussing the youth's major goal and how he could attain it.
Discussion involving outside party.
Expressing my concerns along with trying to tell where I go and what is going to happen.
Finding out that the youth could not spend the night out until he is on parole.
For me, It was touching base with _____, and putting the child's future in a logical perspective. Also, being informed that he'll be home April 7 was very valuable information.
The reviewer does an excellent job working with families. She is able to mediate conflicts with clients & providers. She often receives compliments from families because she is very attentive & families feel that their concerns are being addressed. She is very professional and extremely competent.
Reinforcement of DYC & systems. Client reality check.
The youth was able to show he's responsible for his actions & also express his needs & concerns.
The help I got and helpful feedback.

Suggestions for Improvement

To keep doing well.
I've never been to a review of this type so I wouldn't know what to improve maybe if his counselor/manager was here that would be an improvement.
None ~the reviewer was fabulous with this family~

## DYC Southern

Question 1: Was the permanency goal for the youth/child discussed in the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	1	99.8	99.8
No	0	.1	99.9
No Response	0	.1	100.0
Total	1	100.0	

Question 2: Was the progress, or lack of progress, towards reaching that goal discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	1	99.8	99.8
No	0	.1	99.9
No Response	0	.1	100.0
Total	1	100.0	

Question 3: Were the youth's/child's needs, while in placement, discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	1	99.8	99.8
No	0	.1	99.9
No Response	0	.1	100.0
Total	1	100.0	

Question 4: Was the youth's/child's safety, while in placement, discussed at the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	1	99.8	99.8
No	0	.1	99.9
No Response	0	.1	100.0
Total	1	100.0	


Question 5: Were you able to express your views/concerns during the review?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	1	99.8	99.8
No	0	.1	99.9
No Response	0	.1	100.0
Total	1	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Somewhat Agree	1	99.6	99.6
Neutral	0	.1	99.7
Somewhat Disagree	0	.1	99.8
Strongly Disagree	0	.1	99.9
No Response	0	.1	100.0
Total	1	100.0	

Question 6: Did you find the review worthwhile?



DYC Southern Region Comments

Most Valuable Part of Review

No comments provided.

Suggestions for Improvement

No suggestions provided.

## Appendix A

10/02

### CLIENT SATISFACTION SURVEY

Your participation in today's Administrative Review (known as Foster Care Review) is appreciated. Please assist us in improving our process by answering the following questions.

ROLE: (Circle one)

A. Parent	B. Youth/Child	C. Foster Parent	D. Caseworker/Client Manager
E. Supervisor	F. GAL	G. Kinship Provider	H. Other Provider
I. Other _____			

The purpose of today's review was to discuss the safety, permanency and well being of the youth/child in out-of-home placement.

1- Was the permanency goal for the youth/child discussed during the review?	YES	NO
2- Was progress, or lack of progress, toward reaching that goal discussed during the review?	YES	NO
3- Were the youth's/child's needs, while in placement, discussed during the review?	YES	NO
4- Was the youth's/child's safety, while in placement, discussed during the review?	YES	NO
5- Were you able to express your views/concerns during the review?	YES	NO

6- Did you find the review valuable? (Circle one response)

Strongly agree    Somewhat agree    Neutral    Somewhat disagree    Strongly disagree

7- Please list the most valuable parts of today's review:

---



---

8- Please list suggestions to improve today's review:

---



---



---

Your name (optional): \_\_\_\_\_

Thank you for your time and comments!

(Español en la otra cara)