



DIVISION OF YOUTH SERVICES



2006 SATISFACTION EVALUATION

by
R. Steven Harrison, Ph.D.
Bach-Harrison
and
Roger D. Gisseman, Ph.D.
Salt Lake County
Division of Youth Services

April, 2007

2006
DIVISION OF YOUTH SERVICES
SATISFACTION EVALUATION

During September and continuing through December 2006, the Division of Youth Services (DYS) contracted with the Bach-Harrison, L.L.C. to determine the satisfaction level of those who used the services provided by DHS. The primary researchers were R. Steven Harrison, Ph.D., Bach-Harrison, L.L.C. and Roger D. Gisseman, Ph.D., Division of Youth Services. The groups who provided satisfaction information were the consumers of services (youth and their parents). A Client Evaluation of Services form was developed (see the Appendix for a copy of the form). The results from this survey are presented in this report.

CLIENT SURVEYS

Characteristics of Those Completing the Survey

There were 401 clients who were surveyed using the Client Evaluation of Services questionnaire for programs and 54 clients who were surveyed with the Emergency Care System questionnaire for a total of 455 clients surveyed. One of the programs, Crisis Intake Services (CIS), has both a main and south location. Programs evaluated with one service location are: In Home Services (IHS), Substance Abuse Services (SAS), Get Real (GR), Parents Who Care (PWC), SICA, Discovering Possibilities (DP), General Counseling Services (GCS), and Crisis Residential - Main (CR-M). The Emergency Care System has three programs, the Girls Group Home (GGH), Boys Group Home (BGH), and Christmas Box House (CBH). The results of the Emergency Care System satisfaction survey will be shown later in this report. Table 1 shows the number of clients surveyed, other than those in Emergency Care, by the type of service they received. The surveys from the Emergency Care System contain questions that are different from those used with the programs presented in Table 1. The Emergency Care System survey findings are presented following the results from the programs and listed in Table 6.

For the programs shown in Table 1, there were a total of 401 clients who completed the survey. ***It should be noted that the numbers in the categories presented in Table 1 do not always add to the totals. This is due to the fact that not all clients answered all of the questions.*** For example, there were 56 people who did not provide their gender. Of those who provided their gender, 50.4% were males and 49.6% females. Seventy-seven percent (77%) of the surveys were completed by the youth, while 23% were completed by adults. Adults were participants who were 18 years of age or older. Of the adults, 73% were completed by females and 27% by males.

TABLE 1
NUMBER OF CLIENTS FROM EACH PROGRAM
WHO COMPLETED THE SURVEY

	CIS-M	CIS-S	SAS	IHS	GR	PWC	SICA	DP	GCS	CR-M	Total
Total Clients	55	50	34	35	61	28	20	24	36	58	401
Percent of Sample	13.7%	12.5%	8.5%	8.7%	15.2%	7.0%	5.0%	6.0%	9.0%	14.5%	100.0%
Male Youth	22	29	14	8	38	0	8	0	11	22	152
Female Youth	16	18	8	1	12	0	1	24	5	27	112
Total Youth	46	50	27	14	61	0	10	24	19	58	309
Male Adults	4	0	2	4	0	8	2	0	2	0	22

	CIS-M	CIS-S	SAS	IHS	GR	PWC	SICA	DP	GCS	CR-M	Total
Female Adults	5	0	5	15	0	17	5	0	12	0	59
Total Adults	9	0	7	21	0	28	10	0	17	0	92

In Table 1, the number of clients from each service is presented by whether the clients were youth or adults and whether they were from the main or south locations. The program with a south location is CIS-S. An attempt was made to have enough clients complete the survey from each program to be confident that the results were representative of the general client population. Overall, there is generally good representation for each program. However, when the participants are divided into the various groups shown in Table 1, some of the categories have very few respondents. For example, there were very few adults who completed the SAS satisfaction survey compared to the number of youth. Thus, except where there were few actual program participants, when there are few respondents, the results should be interpreted with caution.

The mean age of those completing the survey was 20.7 years of age, with a mean age for youth of 15.0 years and a mean age for adults of 39.9 years. When clients were asked about the type of services they received, 34% reported family counseling, 46% individual counseling, 6% Emergency placement, 20% alcohol and drug prevention, 4% parenting groups, 9% support groups, 27% education classes, 4% supervised community service, 2% information and referral to another agency, 7% recreational therapy, and 14% home visits/school visits. The ethnic categories were 70% White, 21% Hispanic, 4% African American, 3% Native American, 1% Asian, and 2% Pacific Islander. The reason for the youth being admitted was 24% ungovernable, 11% runaway, 25% family problems, 17% delinquent, 3% DCFS custody, 14% substance abuse, and 29% other. Of those who indicated that they had received on going services, the average number of sessions was 6.5. It should be noted that the demographics and programs of participants described above are very similar to those reported in prior years. For a comparison of participant characteristics for the past seven years, see the Comparison of the 1997 through 2006, Client Evaluation of Services section later in this report.

Client's Ratings of the Services

There were 11 dimensions on which clients rated the services they received. The complete questions are listed below:

1. How would you rate the **quality** of service you have received?
2. Did you get the **kind** of service you wanted?
3. To what extent has our program **met your needs**?
4. If a friend were in need of similar help, would you **recommend our program** to him or her?
5. How satisfied are you with the **amount** of help you have received?
6. Have the services you received **helped you** to deal more effectively with your problems?
7. How **competent and knowledgeable** was the staff person you worked with?
8. Did the staff seem **friendly and make you feel comfortable**?
9. How **convenient were appointments**?
10. In an overall, general sense, **how satisfied are you with the service you received**?
11. If you were to seek help again, **would you come back to our program**?

Clients were asked to rate each of the above questions on a four-point scale. The wording for each answer can be seen on the form in the Appendix, however, in general the four answers were: 1) no, definitely not, 2) no, not really, 3) yes, generally, and 4) yes, definitely. Thus each question has a four-point scale and the aggregate mean is a summary of how all individuals rated the service. Table 2 contains the means for the 11 dimensions by program for all clients, youth (Table 3), and adults (Table 4). The mean values in

Tables 2, 3, and 4 have been scored so that 1 is very unsatisfactory and 4 indicates that the program is doing as well as possible in meeting clients' needs. An average score would be 2.5. This scoring system was used to allow a comparison with the results from the surveys conducted in 1997 through 2006.

Overall, the scores were very positive with the mean satisfaction of all the ratings being 3.3, which is between 3 mostly satisfied and 4 very satisfied. A review of the question that inquires about "overall satisfaction," showed a 3.4 rating. Because of the large number of programs and locations, tables were prepared to provide information on the programs from the Main and South locations along with In Home Services, Parents Who Care, SICA, Discovering Possibilities, General Counseling Service, and Crisis Residential-Main. The number of clients who rated each program is presented so that the reader can determine if the scores are truly representative of the program.

TABLE 2, All Raters

SCALE	CIS-C	CIS-S	SAS	IHS	GR	PWC	SICA	DP	GCS	CR-M	Total
Number of Respondents	55	50	34	35	61	28	20	24	36	58	401
Quality of Services	3.3	3.5	3.7	3.7	3.3	3.6	3.1	3.4	3.8	2.8	3.4
Kind of Service Desired	3.5	3.3	3.5	3.6	3.3	3.7	3.2	3.5	3.6	2.7	3.3
Program Met Needs	3.1	3.2	3.5	3.5	3.1	3.3	3.1	3.2	3.3	2.5	3.1
Recommend to Friends	3.3	3.2	3.5	3.7	3.3	3.8	2.9	3.5	3.6	2.6	3.3
Amount of Help Received	3.3	3.3	3.7	3.7	3.3	3.7	3.1	3.3	3.5	2.8	3.3
Services Helped with Problems	3.1	3.0	3.4	3.7	3.2	3.8	3.0	3.3	3.6	2.6	3.2
Knowledgeable Staff	3.5	3.6	3.8	3.9	3.5	3.9	3.3	3.5	3.7	2.9	3.5
Friendly Staff	3.7	3.5	3.8	3.9	3.5	3.9	3.6	3.8	3.8	3.0	3.6
Convenient Appointments	3.1	3.0	3.5	3.7	3.3	3.5	2.7	3.3	3.6	2.8	3.2
Overall Satisfaction	3.3	3.4	3.7	3.8	3.3	3.8	3.1	3.4	3.7	2.7	3.4
Would Return for Services	3.3	3.1	3.6	3.7	3.2	3.9	2.9	3.3	3.6	2.6	3.3
Mean Score	3.3	3.3	3.6	3.7	3.3	3.7	3.1	3.4	3.6	2.7	3.3

TABLE 3, Total Youth

SCALE	CIS-C	CIS-S	SAS	IHS	GR	SICA	DP	GCS	CR-M	Total
Number of Respondents	46	50	27	14	61	10	24	19	58	309
Quality of Services	3.3	3.5	3.7	3.6	3.3	3.1	3.4	3.8	2.8	3.3
Kind of Service Desired	3.4	3.3	3.4	3.5	3.3	3.1	3.5	3.6	2.7	3.3
Program Met Needs	3.1	3.2	3.5	3.4	3.1	3.0	3.2	3.4	2.5	3.1
Recommend to Friends	3.3	3.2	3.5	3.4	3.3	2.7	3.5	3.4	2.6	3.2
Amount of Help Received	3.2	3.3	3.7	3.6	3.3	2.9	3.3	3.5	2.8	3.3
Services Helped with Problems	3.1	3.0	3.4	3.5	3.2	2.8	3.3	3.7	2.6	3.1
Knowledgeable Staff	3.5	3.6	3.9	3.8	3.5	3.2	3.5	3.9	2.9	3.5

Friendly Staff	3.6	3.5	3.8	3.8	3.5	3.5	3.8	3.7	3.0	3.5
Convenient Appointments	3.1	3.0	3.5	3.4	3.3	2.6	3.3	3.6	2.8	3.2
Overall Satisfaction	3.3	3.4	3.7	3.7	3.3	2.9	3.4	3.7	2.7	3.3
Would Return for Services	3.2	3.1	3.6	3.2	3.2	2.9	3.3	3.6	2.6	3.1
Mean Score	3.3	3.3	3.6	3.5	3.3	3.0	3.4	3.6	2.7	3.3

TABLE 4, Total Adults

SCALE	CIS-C	SAS	IHS	PWC	SICA	GCS	Total
Number of Respondents	9	7	21	28	10	17	92
Quality of Services	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.6	3.0	3.6	3.6
Kind of Service Desired	3.9	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.2	3.5	3.6
Program Met Needs	3.4	3.3	3.6	3.3	3.1	3.2	3.3
Recommend to Friends	3.8	3.6	3.9	3.8	3.0	3.8	3.7
Amount of Help Received	3.6	3.7	3.8	3.7	3.2	3.4	3.6
Services Helped with Problems	3.4	3.4	3.8	3.8	3.1	3.4	3.6
Knowledgeable Staff	3.4	3.4	4.0	3.9	3.4	3.5	3.7
Friendly Staff	3.9	3.9	4.0	3.9	3.6	3.8	3.9
Convenient Appointments	3.6	3.4	3.8	3.5	2.8	3.5	3.5
Overall Satisfaction	3.6	3.7	3.9	3.8	3.2	3.6	3.7
Would Return for Services	3.7	3.7	4.0	3.9	3.0	3.6	3.7
Mean Score	3.6	3.6	3.8	3.7	3.1	3.6	3.6

As in previous years, adults continue to differ from youth in their overall satisfaction for most programs. Table 5 shows the comparisons between youth and adults on program rating. As in past years, adults rated almost all programs higher than youth with adults overall rating .3 higher than youth.

**TABLE 5
Mean Satisfaction Score for Youth and Adults**

Program	Adults	Youth	Adult - Youth
CIS-M	3.6	3.3	+ .3
CIS-S	3.6	3.3	+ .3
SAS	3.9	3.6	+ .3
IH	3.8	3.5	+ .3
SICA	3.2	3.0	+ .2
GCS	3.6	3.6	+ .0
Total (all ratings)	3.6	3.3	+ .3

2006 EMERGENCY CARE SYSTEM CLIENT EVALUATION OF SERVICES

This is the sixth year that a separate survey instrument has been used for the youth in Emergency Care. There were a total of 54 youth who completed the Emergency Care System, Client Evaluation of Services questionnaire (see Table 6 for a list of clients by program). The questionnaire is similar in format to the questionnaire completed by clients in other DYS programs with the exception that the questions are focused specifically on the Emergency Care System (See Appendix for a copy of the questionnaire).

TABLE 6 Emergency Care System

	CBH	GGH	BGH	Total
Total Clients	13	13	28	54
Percent of Sample	24.1%	24.1%	51.9%	100%
Male Youth				
Male Youth	5	n/a	28	33
Percent of Sample	15.2%	n/a	84.8%	100%
Female Youth				
Female Youth	8	13	n/a	21
Percent of Sample	38.1%	61.9%	n/a	100%
Average Age				
Average Age	9.1	14.9	14.7	13.4

Emergency Care Client's Ratings of the Services

There were 10 dimensions on which clients rated the services they received. The complete questions are listed below:

1. How would you rate the **quality** of service you have received?
2. Did our program help you **feel safer**?
3. Did someone here (at the program) **show you around the building**?
4. Did someone here **tell you the reason(s) you were brought here**?
5. Have the **services you received here helped you**?
6. Did the staff **seem friendly**?
7. Did the staff **make you feel comfortable**?
8. Generally, how **happy are you with the help you received**?
9. How happy were you with the **building you stayed in**?
10. How happy were you with the **room you stayed in**?

With the exception of two questions which were answered “yes” or “no,” clients were asked to rate each of the above questions on a four-point scale. The wording for each answer can be seen on the form in the Appendix, however, in general the four answers were: 1) no, definitely not, 2) no, not really, 3) yes, generally, and 4) yes, definitely. Thus, there were eight questions with a four-point scale and two with a two-point scale. The mean values in Table 7 have been scored so that 1 is very unsatisfactory and 4 indicates that the program is doing as well as possible in meeting clients’ needs (a higher number is better). An average score would be 2.5.

TABLE 7, Emergency Care System

SCALE	CBH	GGH	BGH	Total
Number of Respondents	13	13	28	54
Quality of Services	3.2	3.4	3.1	3.2
Feel Safer	3.2	3.4	3.0	3.1
Have Services Helped You	3.5	3.3	2.9	3.2
Friendly Staff	3.6	3.8	3.5	3.6
Staff Make You Feel Comfortable	3.1	3.7	3.3	3.4
Happy with Help You Received	3.4	3.5	3.2	3.3
Happy with Building	3.2	3.4	3.1	3.2
Happy with Room	3.1	3.6	3.3	3.3
Mean Score	3.3	3.5	3.2	3.3

Two Questions with Yes-No Responses:

Show You Around Building (% yes)	61.5%	84.6%	75.0%	74.1%
Tell You the Reason You are Here (% yes)	30.8%	84.6%	92.9%	75.9%

The mean satisfaction of all the ratings was 3.3, which is between 3 “mostly satisfied” and 4 “very satisfied”. Overall, all programs have mean rating scores that are very positive.

In order to observe the spread of client responses across the four possible choices, Tables 7A and 7B were prepared and show the number and percentage of participants who marked each response choice for each question.

TABLE 7A, All Raters—Outpatient

SCALE	1 Poor (No, Definitely Not)		2 Fair (No, Not Really)		3 Good (Yes, Generally)		4 Excellent (Yes, Definitely)		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Quality of Services	6	1.5	36	9.0	158	39.6	199	49.9	399	100
Kind of Service Desired	7	1.8	28	7.0	184	46.2	179	45.0	398	100
Program Met Needs	19	4.8	52	13.0	190	47.5	139	34.8	400	100
Recommend to Friends	20	5.0	35	8.8	152	38.2	191	48.0	398	100
Amount of Help Received	4	1.0	34	8.75	178	45.5	175	44.8	391	100
Services Helped with Problems	11	2.8	40	10.3	187	48.3	149	38.5	387	100
Knowledgeable Staff	5	1.3	20	5.1	132	33.9	232	59.6	391	100
Friendly Staff	5	1.3	11	2.8	122	31.1	254	64.8	392	100
Convenient Appointments	13	3.4	44	11.4	167	43.4	161	41.8	385	100
Overall Satisfaction	8	2.1	30	7.7	158	40.5	194	49.7	390	100
Would Return for Services	23	5.9	35	9.0	139	35.8	191	49.2	388	100

7B All Raters--Residential

SCALE	1 Poor (No, Definitely Not)		2 Fair (No, Not Really)		3 Good (Yes, Generally)		4 Excellent (Yes, Definitely)		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Quality of Services	2	3.8	6	11.5	24	46.2	20	38.5	52	100
Feel Safer	3	5.6	5	9.3	28	51.9	18	33.3	54	100
Have Services Helped You	2	3.8	8	15.1	22	41.5	21	39.6	53	100
Friendly Staff	1	1.9	2	3.8	13	24.5	37	69.8	53	100
Staff Make You Feel Comfortable	2	3.7	4	7.4	21	38.9	27	50.0	54	100
Happy with Help You Received	2	3.7	3	5.6	25	46.3	24	44.4	54	100
Happy with Building	3	5.6	6	11.1	23	42.6	22	40.7	54	100
Happy with Room	4	7.4	3	5.6	20	37.0	27	50.0	54	100
Questions with No-Yes Answer	NO		YES							
	N	%	N	%						
Show You Around Building	14	25.9	40	74.1					54	100
Tell You the Reason You are Here	13	24.1	41	75.9					54	100

COMPARISON OF THE 1997 through 2006 CLIENT EVALUATION OF SERVICES

This is the tenth annual client satisfaction survey conducted by DYS. Over the past ten years, several new program components have been added along with a new south location. A few programs have been discontinued so previous years results were not included. A report for each year has been prepared and those desiring additional information about a previous survey should consult the reports.

Characteristics of Those Completing the Survey

The number of total surveys shown in Table 8 does not include all of the surveys conducted in a given year, only the total for currently existing programs. While there were 381 clients surveyed in 1997, 149 were in CIS with the others from programs that have been discontinued. Similarly, there were 361 clients surveyed in 1998, 443 clients in 1999, 327 in 2000, 375 in 2001. From 2002 on, the number shown in Table 8 is the actual number of individuals who completed the Client Evaluation of Services questionnaire in the indicated year. Programs that are comparable over the years are shown in Table 8 and include the clients from Crisis Intake Services (CIS), Substance Abuse Services (SA), In-Home Services, Get Real, Parents Who Care, SICA, Discovering Possibilities (DP), General Counseling Services (GCS), and Crisis Residential - Main (CR-M). Table 9 shows the percentage of those surveyed by the service they received. An attempt was made to have enough clients complete the survey from each program to be confident that the results were representative of the general client population. However, caution should be exercised when comparing one year to another, especially for programs where there are very few respondents.

As with the report in the previous section, it should be noted that some of the numbers presented in this report do not add to the totals shown in some of the tables. This is because not everyone who completed a survey answered every item. The mean age of those completing the survey in 1997 and 1998 was 23 years old, for 1999 it was 21 years, for 2000 it was 22 years old, in 2001 it was 20.4, 20.6 in 2002, 22.6 in 2003, 21.1 in 2004, 24.1 in 2005, and 20.7 in 2006. The mean age for youth in 1997 was 14, in 1998 it was 14.6, in 1999 and 2000 it was 14.2, in 2001 it was 14.5, in 2002 it was 14.6, in 2003 it was 14.7, in 2004 it was 14.8, in 2005 it was 15.0, and in 2006 the mean age of youth was 15.0. The mean age for adults completing the survey in 1997 was 40 years old, the mean age in 1998 was 39.4, in 1999 it was 41.1, in 2000 it was 41.2, in 2001 it was 42.1, in 2002 it was 39.6, in 2003 it was 39.1, in 2004 it was 40.5, in 2005 it was 40.1, and in 2006 the mean age was 39.9. Thus, the age range of clients surveyed has remained quite consistent over the past nine years.

**TABLE 8
1997-2006, NUMBER OF CLIENTS FROM EACH PROGRAM
WHO COMPLETED THE SURVEY**

	YEAR	CIS	SA	IH	GR	PWC	SICA	DP	GCS	CR-M	Total
Total Clients	1997	149									149
	1998	206									206
	1999	198	101	12							311
	2000	172	31	31							249
	2001	229	81	25							354
	2002	261	37	36	26	25					438
	2003	154	32	30	21	56					353
	2004	220	37	61	40	39	36				469

	YEAR	CIS	SA	IH	GR	PWC	SICA	DP	GCS	CR-M	Total
	2005	162	29	48	71	66	34				410
	2006	105	34	35	61	28	20	24	36	58	401
Percent of Sample	1997	39.1									39.1
	1998	57.0									57.0
	1999	44.7	22.8	2.7							70.2
	2000	52.6	9.5	9.5							75.3
	2001	61.1	21.6	6.7							94.5
	2002	59.6	8.4	8.2	5.9	5.7					100.0
	2003	43.6	9.1	8.5	5.9	15.9					100.0
	2004	46.9	7.9	13.0	8.5	8.3	7.7				100.0
	2005	39.5	7.1	11.7	17.3	16.1	8.3				100.0
	2006	26.2	8.5	8.7	15.2	7.0	5.0	6.0	9.0	14.5	100.0
Youth	1997	129									129
	1998	176									176
	1999	198	58	5							261
	2000	165	15	17							205
	2001	190	47	10							257
	2002	219	31	18	23	1					333
	2003	131	27	13	21	1					233
	2004	201	34	25	39	0	19				353
	2005	130	25	17	66	0	13				251
	2006	85	22	9	50	0	9	24	16	49	264
Adults	1997	15									15
	1998	28									28
	1999	n/a	42	7							49
	2000	6	16	14							43
	2001	24	26	11							66
	2002	41	6	18	3	24					104
	2003	20	5	16	0	53					111
	2004	17	3	36	1	39	17				115
	2005	19	3	30	3	66	21				142
	2006	9	7	21	0	25	7	0	14	0	81

The next two tables, 9 and 10, represent the type of services the clients reported receiving and the reasons that they were coming to the DYS. *It should be noted that not all programs offer all of the services available at the DYS, and some of the clients received more than one service at DYS. Therefore, the numbers presented in the tables add up to more than 100%.* It should be noted that the types of services that clients report receiving is dependent on the sample. Therefore, comparisons between years should not be used to attempt to show changes in the mix of services that are provided. Rather, the information should be used to see the types of services that were given to the individuals who participated in the satisfaction survey.

**TABLE 9
CLIENT-REPORTED TYPES OF SERVICES RECEIVED**

Service Received	Year	Percent
Family Counseling	1997	37%
	1998	32%
	1999	49%
	2000	45%
	2001	35%
	2002	39%
	2003	40%
	2004	32%
	2005	26%
Individual Counseling	2006	34%
	1997	24%
	1998	40%
	1999	47%
	2000	35%
	2001	32%
	2002	51%
	2003	46%
	2004	49%
2005	28%	
Emergency Placement	2006	46%
	1997	13%
	1998	13%
	1999	5%
	2000	11%
	2001	14%
	2002	28%
	2003	18%
	2004	13%
2005	7%	
Alcohol and Drug	2006	6%
	1997	5%
	1998	8%
	1999	29%
	2000	22%
	2001	42%
	2002	41%
	2003	29%
	2004	37%
2005	32%	
Parenting Group	2006	20%
	1997	4%
	1998	7%
	1999	2%
	2000	6%
	2001	5%
	2002	7%
	2003	16%
2004	7%	
2005	17%	

Service Received	Year	Percent
	2006	4%
Support Group	1997	4%
	1998	7%
	1999	2%
	2000	11%
	2001	8%
	2002	11%
	2003	7%
	2004	14%
	2005	10%
	2006	16%
Education Classes	1997	4%
	1998	16%
	1999	24%
	2000	22%
	2001	43%
	2002	58%
	2003	33%
	2004	39%
	2005	26%
	2006	27%
Community Services	1997	6%
	1998	7%
	1999	5%
	2000	7%
	2001	3%
	2002	2%
	2003	6%
	2004	2%
	2005	2%
	2006	4%
Information and Referral	1999	3%
	2000	4%
	2001	5%
	2002	6%
	2003	5%
	2004	3%
	2005	2%
	2006	2%
Recreational Therapy	2000	5%
	2001	4%
	2002	2%
	2003	6%
	2004	8%
	2005	4%
	2006	7%
Home Visits/School Visits	2000	13%
	2001	21%
	2002	16%
	2003	11%
	2004	11%

Service Received	Year	Percent
	2005	12%
	2006	14%

**TABLE 10
CLIENT REPORTED PRESENTING PROBLEM**

Reported Presenting Problem	Year	Percentage
Ungovernable	1997	25%
	1998	27%
	1999	30%
	2000	22%
	2001	26%
	2002	38%
	2003	33%
	2004	26%
	2005	20%
	2006	24%
Runaway	1997	25%
	1998	19%
	1999	12%
	2000	17%
	2001	20%
	2002	23%
	2003	19%
	2004	13%
	2005	9%
	2006	11%
Family Problems	1997	27%
	1998	20%
	1999	28%
	2000	30%
	2001	29%
	2002	42%
	2003	34%
	2004	31%
	2005	22%
	2006	25%
Delinquent	1997	22%
	1998	22%
	1999	14%
	2000	12%
	2001	9%
	2002	35%
	2003	25%
	2004	26%
	2005	21%
	2006	17%

Reported Presenting Problem	Year	Percentage
DCFS Custody	1999	3%
	2000	5%
	2001	5%
	2002	5%
	2003	7%
	2004	7%
	2005	2%
Substance Abuse	2000	21%
	2001	23%
	2002	22%
	2003	20%
	2004	19%
	2005	22%
	2006	14%
KEYS	2000	2%
	2001	4%
	2002	6%
	2003	6%
	2004	1%
	2005	0%
Other	2006	0%
	1997	21%
	1998	37%
	1999	27%
	2000	27%
	2001	26%
	2002	26%
	2003	28%
	2004	21%
	2005	28%
2006	29%	

A review of Tables 9 and 10 shows that from 2005 to 2006 there were increases in the percentages of individuals who reported receiving Family Counseling (26% to 34%), Individual Counseling (28% to 46%), Parenting Group (7% to 16%), and Support Group (10% to 16%). There was a decrease in those receiving Alcohol and Drug Prevention (32% to 20%). There was also a decrease for presenting problems of Substance abuse (22% to 14%).

1997-2006 Client's Ratings of the Services

There were 11 dimensions on which clients rated the services they received. Clients were asked to rate each of the questions (see page 14) on a four-point scale. The wording for each answer can be seen on the form in the Appendix, however, in general the four answers were: 1) no, definitely not, 2) no, not really, 3) yes, generally, and 4) yes, definitely. As described above, each question has a four-point scale and the aggregate mean is a summary of how all individuals rated the service. The results for the past ten years are contained in Table 11 for the programs at the Main and South locations. In general, all programs were rated as good to excellent. In the past, the program with the lowest rating was CIS, however, over the years satisfaction has shown a fairly steady increase. The overall satisfaction rating of 3.3 is very good when one considers that most of the clients are there against their will during a very stressful time in their lives. Parents Who Care has shown consistently high ratings over the past five years. Most of the programs have shown an increase in satisfaction over the past ten years.

**TABLE 11
1997-2006 MEAN SCALE VALUES FOR EACH PROGRAM
FOR ALL YOUTH AND ADULTS COMPLETING THE SURVEY**

Scale	Years	CIS-M	CIS-S	SAS	IH	GR	PWC	SICA	DP	GCS	CR-M	Total
Quality of Services	1997	2.8										2.8
	1998	2.8	2.3									2.5
	1999	2.8	n/a		3.3							3.1
	2000	2.9	2.9	3.4	3.3							3.2
	2001	2.8	3.2	3.6	3.6							3.4
	2002	3.1	3.3	3.6	3.2	3.0	3.6					3.2
	2003	3.2	3.2	3.7	3.2	3.2	3.6					3.3
	2004	3.2	3.0	3.8	3.6	3.0	3.7	3.4				3.3
	2005	3.0	3.3	3.7	3.8	3.1	3.7	3.2				3.4
	2006	3.3	3.5	3.7	3.7	3.3	3.6	3.1	3.4	3.8	2.8	3.4
Kind of Service Desired	1997	2.7										2.7
	1998	2.8	2.4									2.6
	1999	2.8	n/a		3.3							3.1
	2000	2.9	2.7	3.4	3.3							3.1
	2001	2.8	3.1	3.5	3.5							3.3
	2002	3.1	3.2	3.6	3.1	3.0	3.6					3.2
	2003	3.1	3.1	3.6	3.2	3.2	3.6					3.2
	2004	3.2	3.0	3.5	3.6	3.2	3.6	2.9				3.2
	2005	3.0	3.3	3.6	3.7	3.1	3.5	3.2				3.2
	2006	3.5	3.3	3.5	3.6	3.3	3.7	3.2	3.5	3.6	2.7	3.3
Program Met Needs	1997	2.5										2.5
	1998	2.6	1.9									2.3
	1999	2.6	n/a		3.2							2.9
	2000	2.8	2.9	3.3	3.0			2.8				3.0
	2001	2.6	2.9	3.4	3.4			2.9				3.1
	2002	3.1	3.1	3.5	2.9	2.7	3.3	3.3				3.1
	2003	3.1	3.1	3.5	2.9	2.9	3.2	2.9				3.1
	2004	3.0	2.8	3.5	3.3	3.0	3.2	2.9				3.1
	2005	2.9	3.2	3.4	3.5	3.0	3.3	3.0				3.2
	2006	3.1	3.2	3.5	3.5	3.1	3.3	3.1	3.2	3.3	2.5	3.1

Scale	Years	CIS-M	CIS-S	SAS	IH	GR	PWC	SICA	DP	GCS	CR-M	Total
Recommend to Friends	1997	2.6										2.6
	1998	2.7	2.1									2.4
	1999	2.8	n/a		3.2							3.1
	2000	2.8	2.8	3.5	3.3			3.1				3.2
	2001	2.8	2.7	3.6	3.8			3.3				3.3
	2002	3.0	3.1	3.5	3.4	3.1	3.8	3.3				3.2
	2003	3.1	3.0	3.7	3.5	3.0	3.8	3.2				3.3
	2004	3.2	2.8	3.4	3.7	3.0	3.8	3.0				3.2
	2005	3.1	3.1	3.6	3.6	3.1	3.8	3.3				3.3
	2006	3.3	3.2	3.5	3.7	3.3	3.8	2.9	3.5	3.6	2.6	3.3
Amount of Help	1997	2.6										2.6
	1998	2.9	2.1									2.5
	1999	2.9	n/a		3.3							3.2
	2000	2.9	3.0	3.6	3.3			3.4				3.3
	2001	2.9	3.1	3.5	3.7			3.6				3.4
	2002	3.1	3.3	3.7	3.3	3.2	3.5	3.5				3.2
	2003	3.2	3.3	3.8	3.4	3.1	3.5	3.2				3.3
	2004	3.2	3.2	3.6	3.6	3.1	3.6	3.1				3.3
	2005	3.0	3.3	3.7	3.6	3.1	3.5	3.3				3.3
	2006	3.3	3.3	3.7	3.7	3.3	3.7	3.1	3.3	3.5	2.8	3.3
Services Helped with Problems	1997	2.7										2.7
	1998	2.7	2.1									2.4
	1999	2.8	n/a		3.0							3.0
	2000	2.8	3.0	3.6	3.4			2.9				3.2
	2001	2.7	2.8	3.4	3.5			3.3				3.2
	2002	2.9	3.0	3.6	3.2	3.2	3.6	3.4				3.1
	2003	3.1	3.0	3.7	3.5	2.9	3.6	3.2				3.2
	2004	3.0	2.8	3.6	3.6	3.3	3.6	3.1				3.2
	2005	2.9	3.2	3.5	3.7	3.1	3.6	3.3				3.3
	2006	3.1	3.0	3.4	3.7	3.2	3.8	3.0	3.3	3.6	2.6	3.2
Competent and Knowledgeable Staff	1997	2.7										2.7
	1998	3.0	2.2									2.6
	1999	3.1	n/a		3.8							3.4
	2000	3.1	3.4	3.6	3.5			3.5				3.5
	2001	2.9	3.4	3.7	3.9			3.6				3.5
	2002	3.3	3.4	3.8	3.4	3.3	3.8	3.6				3.4
	2003	3.2	3.6	3.8	3.6	3.2	3.8	3.5				3.5
	2004	3.2	3.4	3.8	3.8	3.5	3.8	3.3				3.5
	2005	3.1	3.5	3.8	3.8	3.4	3.8	3.5				3.5
	2006	3.5	3.6	3.8	3.9	3.5	3.9	3.3	3.5	3.7	2.9	3.5
Friendly Staff	1997	3.0										3.0
	1998	3.1	2.4									2.8
	1999	3.2	n/a		3.9							3.6
	2000	3.2	3.2	3.8	3.6			3.7				3.6
	2001	3.1	3.3	3.7	3.8			3.8				3.6
	2002	3.3	3.5	3.8	3.5	3.5	3.8	3.8				3.4
	2003	3.4	3.6	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.9	3.6				3.6
	2004	3.3	3.4	3.9	3.9	3.5	3.8	3.5				3.6
	2005	3.1	3.6	3.9	3.9	3.5	3.9	3.8				3.6
	2006	3.7	3.5	3.8	3.9	3.5	3.9	3.6	3.8	3.8	3.0	3.6

Scale	Years	CIS-M	CIS-S	SAS	IH	GR	PWC	SICA	DP	GCS	CR-M	Total
Convenient Appointments	1997	2.65										2.7
	1998	2.7	2.2									2.4
	1999	2.7	n/a		3.6							3.2
	2000	2.7	2.5	3.4	3.3			3.4				3.1
	2001	2.8	3.1	3.4	3.8			3.6				3.3
	2002	3.0	2.9	3.4	3.3	3.0	3.4	3.4				3.1
	2003	3.1	3.1	3.5	3.5	3.1	3.5	3.2				3.2
	2004	3.0	2.9	3.3	3.6	3.3	3.6	3.1				3.2
	2005	3.0	3.2	3.5	3.6	3.1	3.5	3.2				3.3
	2006	3.1	3.0	3.5	3.7	3.3	3.5	2.7	3.3	3.6	2.8	3.2
Overall Satisfaction	1997	2.8										2.8
	1998	2.9	2.1									2.5
	1999	2.9	n/a		3.5							3.3
	2000	3.0	3.0	3.7	3.5			3.4				3.4
	2001	2.9	3.1	3.6	3.7			3.5				3.4
	2002	3.2	3.3	3.7	3.3	3.2	3.7	3.6				3.3
	2003	3.3	3.2	3.7	3.5	3.1	3.7	3.2				3.3
	2004	3.2	3.1	3.6	3.8	3.2	3.6	3.1				3.4
	2005	3.0	3.4	3.8	3.6	3.1	3.7	3.4				3.4
	2006	3.3	3.4	3.7	3.8	3.3	3.8	3.1	3.4	3.7	2.7	3.4
Would Return for Services	1997	2.5										2.5
	1998	2.7	1.9									2.3
	1999	2.7	n/a		3.3							3.1
	2000	2.8	2.9	3.6	3.2			3.3				3.2
	2001	2.8	2.9	3.6	3.8			3.6				3.4
	2002	3.0	3.0	3.5	3.2	2.8	3.9	3.4				3.1
	2003	3.0	3.0	3.7	3.4	3.1	3.6	3.2				3.3
	2004	3.2	2.5	3.6	3.6	3.0	3.7	2.7				3.2
	2005	3.1	3.2	3.7	3.6	3.0	3.8	3.2				3.3
	2006	3.3	3.1	3.6	3.7	3.2	3.9	2.9	3.3	3.6	2.6	3.3
Mean Score	1997	2.7										2.7
	1998	2.8	2.1									2.5
	1999	2.8	n/a		3.4							3.2
	2000	2.9	2.9	3.5	3.4			3.3				3.3
	2001	2.8	3.1	3.5	3.7			3.5				3.3
	2002	3.1	3.2	3.6	3.2	2.8	3.9	3.4				3.1
	2003	3.2	3.2	3.7	3.4	3.1	3.6	3.2				3.3
	2004	3.2	3.0	3.6	3.6	3.2	3.6	3.1				3.3
	2005	3.0	3.3	3.6	3.7	3.1	3.7	3.3				3.4
	2006	3.3	3.3	3.6	3.7	3.3	3.7	3.1	3.4	3.6	2.7	3.3

Emergency Care System

The Emergency Care System has had a separate satisfaction form for the past six years. Tables 12 and 13 contain the results of the Emergency Care System survey for 2001 through 2006. Comparing the results from 2006 with those from other years shows that the satisfaction is generally very good with overall mean scores of approximately 3.3. results are very similar with a slight decrease from 2002 and 2003. The area with the greatest increase was the Girls Group Home with an overall increase from 3.0 to 3.5. For the

Christmas Box House, there was an increase in the percentage of respondents who indicated that they were shown around the building from a percentage of 29% in 2005, to 62% in 2006. Being told the reason they were at the facility increased from 21% in 2005 to 31% in 2006, but is still considerable below the ratings for the Girls and Boys Group Homes.

TABLE 12
2001-2006, NUMBER OF CLIENTS FROM EACH PROGRAM
WHO COMPLETED THE SURVEY

	YEAR	CBH	GGH	BGH	Total
Total Clients	2001	33	35	31	99
	2002	24	41	31	96
	2003	19	26	23	68
	2004	30	49	29	108
	2005	28	23	33	84
	2006	13	13	28	54
Percent of Sample	2001	33%	35%	31%	100%
	2002	25%	43%	32%	100%
	2003	28%	38%	34%	100%
	2004	28%	45%	27%	100%
	2005	33%	28%	39%	100%
	2006	24%	24%	52%	100%
Youth	2001	33	35	31	99
	2002	24	40	25	89
	2003	19	26	23	68
	2004	30	48	29	109
	2005	28	23	33	84
	2006	13	13	28	54
Adults	2001	n/a	0	0	0
	2002	n/a	1	5	6
	2003	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	2004	n/a	1	1	2
	2005	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	2006	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

TABLE 13
2001-2006 MEAN SCALE VALUES FOR EACH PROGRAM
FOR ALL YOUTH AND ADULTS COMPLETING THE SURVEY

SCALE	Year	CBH	GGH	BGH	Total
Number of Respondents	2001	33	35	31	99
	2002	24	41	31	96
	2003	19	26	23	68
	2004	30	49	29	109
	2005	28	23	33	84
	2006	13	13	28	54
Quality of Services	2001	3.3	3.1	3.1	3.1
	2002	3.4	3.2	3.5	3.3
	2003	3.4	3.2	3.2	3.3
	2004	2.8	2.8	3.0	2.9
	2005	3.0	2.7	3.3	3.0
	2006	3.2	3.4	3.1	3.2
Feel Safer	2001	3.0	3.1	3.4	3.1

SCALE	Year	CBH	GGH	BGH	Total
	2002	3.5	3.1	3.3	3.3
	2003	3.5	3.2	3.2	3.3
	2004	3.2	2.9	3.0	3.0
	2005	3.3	3.0	3.2	3.2
	2006	3.2	3.4	3.0	3.1
Have Services Helped You	2001	3.0	3.2	3.2	3.1
	2002	3.4	3.1	3.3	3.2
	2003	3.5	3.1	3.3	3.3
	2004	3.2	2.9	3.2	3.1
	2005	3.4	2.8	3.2	3.2
	2006	3.5	3.3	2.9	3.2
Friendly Staff	2001	3.5	3.5	3.3	3.4
	2002	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.5
	2003	3.6	3.5	3.7	3.6
	2004	3.4	3.2	3.5	3.3
	2005	3.5	3.2	3.4	3.4
	2006	3.6	3.8	3.5	3.6
Staff Make You Feel Comfortable	2001	3.4	3.3	3.0	3.3
	2002	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.5
	2003	3.5	3.3	3.6	3.5
	2004	3.4	3.1	3.3	3.2
	2005	3.4	3.0	3.4	3.3
	2006	3.1	3.7	3.3	3.4
Happy with Help You Received	2001	3.3	3.2	3.3	3.3
	2002	3.4	3.2	3.4	3.3
	2003	3.5	3.2	3.3	3.3
	2004	3.4	3.0	3.3	3.2
	2005	3.3	3.0	3.3	3.2
	2006	3.4	3.5	3.2	3.3
Happy with Building	2001	3.2	3.1	3.1	3.1
	2002	3.6	3.3	3.5	3.4
	2003	3.5	3.3	3.4	3.4
	2004	3.6	3.2	3.3	3.4
	2005	3.3	2.9	3.2	3.2
	2006	3.2	3.4	3.1	3.2
Happy with Room	2001	3.2	3.1	2.9	3.1
	2002	3.6	3.4	3.2	3.4
	2003	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.4
	2004	3.1	3.0	3.2	3.1
	2005	3.0	3.2	3.2	3.1
	2006	3.1	3.6	3.3	3.3
Mean Score	2001	3.3	3.2	3.2	3.2
	2002	3.5	3.3	3.4	3.4
	2003	3.5	3.3	3.4	3.4
	2004	3.2	3.0	3.2	3.1
	2005	3.3	3.0	3.3	3.2
	2006	3.3	3.5	3.2	3.3

Two Questions with Yes-No Responses:

Show You Around Building	2001	67%	54%	74%	66%
(% yes)	2002	83%	95%	90%	90%

SCALE	Year	CBH	GGH	BGH	Total
	2003	79%	72%	61%	70%
	2004	48%	69%	72%	64%
	2005	29%	74%	84%	63%
	2006	62%	85%	75%	74%
Tell You the Reason You are Here (% yes)	2001	64%	80%	61%	66%
	2002	54%	82%	74%	72%
	2003	26%	58%	65%	52%
	2004	10%	69%	80%	56%
	2005	21%	68%	90%	61%
	2006	31%	85%	75%	76%

Appendix

2006 AGENCY SATISFACTION SURVEY

Hello, my name is _____ . We are currently evaluating the services delivered by DYS. I understand you have worked with them. I am doing a survey of 8 questions that takes about 10-15 min. of your time to complete.

1. What has been the nature of your interaction with the _____ program?
2. Have the staff been cooperative and helpful?
3. What is your impression of the quality of the program?
4. Have you experienced any problems in your interactions with the program?
5. What do you consider to be weaknesses of the program?
6. What do you consider to be strengths of the program?
7. Do you recommend the program to other service providers?
8. If the program could be changed in any way, what would you recommend changing?
9. Do you have anything you want to add?