YSSF Survey Technical Report Fiscal Year 2009

A Report from the Colorado Department of Human Services

Division of Behavioral Health





This report was prepared by:

Samantha A Farro, PhD Division of Behavioral Health, Data and Evaluation

About this Report

In 2009 and 2010, the Colorado Division of Behavioral Health (DBH) conducted its seventh annual Youth Services Survey for Families (YSSF) Survey with a focus on services provided in State Fiscal Year 2009 (July 1, 2008-June 30, 2009). Consistent with national trends in performance measurement, DBH administers the YSSF Consumer Survey to assess perceptions of public behavioral health services provided in Colorado. This report, to be disseminated to all mental health centers, describes data collection, sample selection, and results of this year's survey. DBH is committed to the inclusion of consumer participation at multiple levels of behavioral health services and perceives the YSSF survey as one way of meeting this ongoing goal.

It is important to note that the YSSF Caregiver Survey was modeled after the Mental Health Statistics Improvement Program (MHSIP) Consumer Survey. The MHSIP survey was developed at a national level in part to promulgate data standards that allow for valid results that better inform policy and decisions. Other seminal aims of these surveys are the inclusion of consumers' and families' feedback and the promotion of consumer and family-oriented services through data. DBH has a vested interest in promoting these values in Colorado as the state moves toward a recovery-oriented behavioral health system. Continuing the national-state MHSIP and YSSF partnership is key to this endeavor. As evidence of the weight that DBH has placed on the promotion of consumer-driven services, it is notable that the MHSIP and YSSF have been incorporated into multiple levels of operations, including a federal grant application and statewide mental health center contracts. The YSSF survey continues to provide an excellent opportunity for DBH to partner on both national and statewide levels to shape future services through data.

Thank you to all who assisted in the data collection of the YSSF survey. Center collaboration is instrumental to the success of the survey and DBH acknowledges and appreciates the hard work of the mental health centers and clinics in this process.

What is the YSSF?

A modification of the MHSIP survey for adults, the YSSF assesses caregivers' perceptions of behavioral health services for their children (aged 14 and under; see Appendix A for survey). Caregivers complete items pertaining to demographic (e.g. age, gender) and other pertinent information (e.g. medication, police encounters) about their child. Caregivers then use a Likert scale, ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree to answer 21 items that compose the five following domains (see Appendix B):

- Access Domain (two items)
- Participation Domain (three items)
- Cultural Sensitivity (four items)
- Appropriateness Domain (six items)
- Outcomes Domain (six items)

Why Did the Survey Procedures Change?

In late 2008, a work group of stakeholders was formed in order to address a number of concerns raised by Colorado's mental health centers about the YSSF survey project. This work group consisted of representatives from DBH, Colorado's Department of Health Care Policy and Financing, Behavioral Health Organizations, and various mental health centers across the state. Meeting regularly, the workgroup addressed several concerns from previous years including: a low number of respondents per mental health center, delayed feedback of consumers from time of service to time of data collection, high administrative and financial costs, and resulting data that was not representative of the population served.

What Survey Procedures Changed?

In order to address concerns from previous years, changes were made in the procedures used to collect FY 2009's YSSF data. For the first time, surveys were given directly to caregivers whose youth were currently receiving services rather than mailed to caregivers of current and discharged youth consumers. Additionally, caregivers who chose to complete the YSSF survey were eligible to enter a drawing to win a \$10 gift card for a local grocery or convenient stores. And lastly, this year all caregivers of youth consumers were included in the survey regardless of payor source. This was different

from previous years that included only the caregivers of youth consumers who were indigent or on Medicaid in the sample.

Who Received the Survey?

The Division used a convenience sampling method whereby each of the 17 community mental health centers and the two specialty clinics, Asian Pacific and Servicios de la Raza, were provided with surveys to hand out to consumers who were receiving services during a three week period. Consumers who were attending a first appointment or an intake were excluded from the sample.

How Was the Survey Administered?

DBH contracted with the State of Colorado Central Services, Integrated Document Solutions (IDS) department to prepare, mail, receive, and enter data for the FY 2009 survey period. IDS mailed 350 YSSF packets (including a cover letter, a YSSF survey, and a lottery ticket to enter the gift card drawing) to each of the 17 community mental health centers and 100 YSSF packets to each of the two specialty clinics. During the three-week data collection period, caregivers of youth consumers were offered the opportunity to complete the YSSF survey and a lottery ticket for entering a gift card drawing. Caregivers of youth consumers could choose to mail the survey directly to IDS in a postage-paid return envelope or could drop (completed and refused) surveys in a secure box located at the center. At the end of the data collection period, centers shipped all surveys collected to IDS where they were sorted and processed. Data from the completed surveys were then entered and forwarded to DBH by IDS.

Results

Response Rate

During the three-week data collection period, 1,290 surveys were offered to caregivers of youth consumers. A total of 160 caregivers of youth consumers declined to participate. The Division received a total of 1,130 completed or partially completed surveys, representing an 87.6% return rate (see Appendices F and G), an increase from the 15.7% return rate of the FY 2008 YSSF. However, to be true to the development of the YSSF instrument, data was excluded if caregivers reported that the youth consumer was older than 14 years of age. This resulted in a total of 904 completed or partially completed surveys being used in the below analyses.

Respondent Demographics

The majority of the YSSF respondents² were male (62.2%), compared to 31.9% females (1.1% preferred not to answer and 4.9% did not report gender). Regarding age, 10.7% of respondents were 0-5 years old, 48.7% were 6-10 years old, and 35.4% were 11-14 years old (5.2% were missing age data).

Following national guidelines, race and ethnicity were separated into two questions on this year's survey. Hispanic was the sole choice for ethnicity, and almost 24.2% of respondents endorsed this item. Notably, 8.4% of respondents preferred not to answer this item and 11.4% left the item blank. Race had the following choices: American Indian/Alaska Native, White/Caucasian, Black/African American, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, Asian, and Other. If a respondent chose more than one race, their racial identification was coded as Multiracial. The majority of respondents identified with only one racial group (70.4%). Most respondents identified as White/Caucasian (58.2%) followed by Multiracial and Prefers Not to Answer (7.6% and 7.1% respectively; see Appendix C).

Place of Residence and Language Fluency. Regarding place of residence, 44.6% of respondents reported living within 5 miles of the mental health center, followed by 28.1% who lived 6-10 miles away, 12.5% who lived 11-20 miles away, 9.8% who were more than 20 miles away, and 5.0% who did not respond to the item. Regarding language fluency, 85.8% of respondents were fluent in English only, 8.6% were bilingual or multilingual, 0.8 were fluent in Spanish only, and 0.8 preferred not to answer this item.

¹ The data for respondents older than 14 years are included in data sets that are sent to individual agencies upon request and thus, can be analyzed by individual agencies as they see fit.

² Although parents/guardians comprised actual respondents, the term 'respondents' herein refers to clients for whom YSSF data was reported – that is, for the youth who received the services.

Disability. Of the FY2009 YSSF respondents, 25.9% identified as a person with one disability, 11.5% identified as a person with two disabilities, and 2.7% as a person with three or more disabilities. There were 46.7% that reported having no disability, 5.3% that preferred not to answer, and 8.0% had missing data regarding disability. Of the 25.9% that identified as having one disability, 0.4% identified as a person with Deafness or Hard of Hearing, 0.7% identified as a person with Blindness or Partially Sighted, 0.8% identified as a person with a Physical disability, 4.5% identified as a person with a Developmental disability, 10.7% identified as a person with a Learning disability, 0.2% identified as a person with a traumatic brain injury, and 8.5% identified as a person with some other type of disability.

Health Services Utilization and Treatment Duration. Descriptive statistics were employed to investigate health services utilization. Half (50.0%) of the sample of respondents were identified by staff as having received Medicaid at the time of survey completion. Among 2009 YSSF respondents, 75.5% indicated having seen a physician or nurse for a health checkup, physical exam, or for an illness during the past year. Just under half of the respondents (46.3%) indicated that they were prescribed medication for emotional/behavioral problems from the mental health center.

Regarding number of sessions in the past six months, the majority of respondents (59.7%) reported attending 11 or fewer sessions at the time of survey completion and 8.1% reported attending 26 or more sessions (see Appendix C).

Criminal Background. For respondents who had been in services for less than 12 months, a small minority (2.9%) reported having been arrested in the past 12 months with a slightly higher proportion (3.5%) indicating having been arrested in the 12 months prior to that time frame. Respondents who had been in services for more than 12 months were similar with 2.7% indicating having been arrested in the past 12 months and 3.1% indicating having been arrested in the 12 months prior to that time frame.

YSSF respondents compared to the CCAR population

Chi-square analyses were conducted to compare YSSF respondents to the population of Colorado mental health consumers aged 14 and under as reported by fiscal year 2009 CCAR data. Overall, the YSSF youth differed significantly from the CCAR population on several dimensions including Gender, Age Group, and Race (see Appendix D).

The responses on the YSSF indicated the sample was more likely to be male than the CCAR population (66.1% vs. 60.7%; $\chi 2$ =10.16, p < .001). Respondents were also significantly different from CCAR youth in terms of age distribution. YSSF youth had a significantly higher percentage in the age groups 0-5 years and 6-10 years than the CCAR groups (11.3% vs. 16.9% and 60.9% vs. 50.3%, respectively), and a significantly smaller percentage in the age group 11-14 years old (27.8% vs. 32.8%). With regard to race, a large majority (74.6%) of the YSSF respondents identified as White/Caucasian. In comparison, only 64.8% of the CCAR population identified as White/Caucasian. No differences were noted between groups in Hispanic ethnicity endorsement.

While significant differences were detected between the two groups, an explanation for such findings may relate to the small sample size of the YSSF respondents. Specifically, there were 904 YSSF respondents as compared to 18,054 CCAR respondents. In other words, the YSSF population represented approximately 5% of the CCAR sample. Although random sampling was employed, such differences, however small, between highly discrepant sample sizes, may lead to significant differences between groups.

Domain Analyses

DBH computes domain scores reflecting the percentage of agreement versus disagreement for the State of Colorado. Agreement is defined as a mean that ranges from 1 to 2.49 whereas disagreement is defined as a mean that ranges from 2.50 to 5. Respondents who do not answer at least 2/3 of domain items do not receive a domain score. This method of computation follows national recommendations. Table 1 displays the corresponding items for each domain.

Table 1 YSSF Domain Items

Access Domain (2)

The location of services was convenient.

Services were available at times that were good for me.

Participation Domain (3)

I helped to choose my child's services.
I helped to choose my child's treatment goals.

I participated in my child's treatment.

Outcomes Domain (6)

My child is better at handling daily life.

My child gets along better with family members.

My child gets along better with friends and other people.

My child is doing better in school and/or work.

My child is better able to cope when things go wrong.

I am satisfied with our family life right now.

Appropriateness Domain (6)

Overall, I am satisfied with the services my child received. The people helping my child stuck with us no matter what. I felt my child had someone to talk to when he/she was troubled.

The services my child and/or family received were right for us.

My family got the help we wanted for my child. My family got as much help as we needed for my child.

Cultural Sensitivity (4)

Staff treated me with respect.

Staff respected my family's religious/spiritual beliefs. Staff spoke with me in a way that I understood.

Staff were sensitive to my cultural/ethnic background.

Table 2 presents summary results in percentages with confidence intervals (95%) for the total scores for the 2008 fiscal year as well as for 2007 and 2008. Due to the changes in sampling procedures and data collection methods for FY 2009, trends across years are not made. Please see Appendix E where percentages of endorsement for the full Likert scale are presented by item within each domain.

Table 2

Valid Percent Agreement by Fiscal Year

Fiscal Year	Access	Cultural Sensitivity	Outcomes	Participation	Appropriateness
2007	68.9	89.0	55.4	76.0	66.3
	(64.16-72.74)	(86.37-91.63)	(51.3-59.5)	(72.48-79.52)	(62.42-70.18)
2008	65.2	85.5	55.4	76.9	67.0
	(61.33-69.07)	(82.64-88.36)	(51.36-59.44)	(73.48-80.32)	(63.18-70.82)
2009*	74.6	90.5	56.4	85.7	81.1
(95% CI)	(71.7-77.5)	(88.5-92.5)	(53.1-59.7)	(83.4-88.0)	(78.5-83.7)
(n)	(674)	(818)	(510)	(775)	(733)

^{*}Note: A new sampling method was utilized during Fiscal Year 2009. Because of this, comparisons across years is cautioned.

Moderators of Domain Agreement

A moderator is a variable that influences the direction or strength of an outcome. Analysis of variance was conducted to examine the effects of a number of demographic variables that could impact the levels of agreement. Due to the number of tests conducted, an alpha level of .001 was utilized. No effects were demonstrated for gender, age group, race, ethnicity, or length of treatment indicating that level of agreement was not related to these demographic variables (see Tables 3-7 below).

Table 3
Valid Percent Agreement by Gender

Gender (n)	Access	Quality/Appropriateness	Outcomes	Participation	Cultural Sensitivity
Female (282)	77.8	82.9	58.6	87.3	93.6
Male (551)	76.3	83.7	57.9	90.0	95.3
Transgendered (0)	-	-	-	-	-
PNTA (10)	90.0	90.0	70.0	90.0	80.0

Note. The reported n of each gender category reflects the smallest number of total respondents on any one domain. The number of respondents across domains fluctuated by a small amount.

Table 4
Valid Percent Agreement by Age Group

Age Group (n)	Access	Quality/Appropriateness	Outcomes	Participation	Cultural Sensitivity
0-5 (95)	83.3	84.5	64.6	88.7	96.8
6-10 (432)	75.5	82.8	57.4	90.3	95.8
11-14 (312)	77.5	83.7	57.9	87.4	92.3

Note. The reported n of each age group category reflects the smallest number of total respondents on any one domain. The number of respondents across domains fluctuated by a small amount.

Table 5
Valid Percent Agreement by Race

Race (n)	Access	Quality/Appropriateness	Outcomes	Participation	Cultural Sensitivity
American Indian/Alaska Native (16)	81.2	88.2	64.7	88.2	100
Asian (4)	60.0	100	60.0	100	100
Black/African American (33)	82.4	91.2	64.7	94.1	97.0
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (4)	75.0	75.0	50.0	100	100
Multiracial (66)	79.4	85.5	55.1	91.3	98.5
Other (47)	87.3	87.8	51.0	87.5	97.9
White/Caucasian (518)	74.6	82.9	57.8	89.3	93.4
PNTA (62)	79.0	73.4	57.8	81.0	91.9

Note. The reported n of each racial category reflects the smallest number of total respondents on any one domain. The number of respondents across domains fluctuated by a small amount.

Table 6
Valid Percent Agreement by Ethnicity

Ethnicity (n)	Access	Quality/Appropriateness	Outcomes	Participation	Cultural Sensitivity
Hispanic (214)	82.3	87.0	61.9	91.6	96.3
Non-Hispanic (494)	74.4	82.4	55.3	88.5	93.9
PNTA (73)	74.7	81.6	57.9	85.3	93.2

Note. The reported n of each ethnicity category reflects the smallest number of total respondents on any one domain. The number of respondents across domains fluctuated by a small amount.

Table 7

Valid Percent Agreement by Length of Treatment

Length of Treatment (n)	Access	Quality/Appropriateness	Outcomes	Participation	Cultural Sensitivity
< 1 Month (71)	78.7	79.7	46.5	86.7	93.2
1-5 Months (226)	76.7	82.6	54.6	89.8	95.2
6 Months to 1 Year (226)	77.8	86.2	65.8	91.3	94.7
> 1 Year (266)	77.1	83.1	58.2	88.6	94.7

Note. The reported n of each length of treatment category reflects the smallest number of total respondents on any one domain. The number of respondents across domains fluctuated by a small amount.

Differences were found between groups for disability, distance from agency, and language groups (see Tables 8-10). Respondents without a disability had significantly higher levels of agreement on the Outcomes domain than did respondents with 2 or more disabilities, F(3, 816) = 6.79, p = .000. Respondents who lived 0-5 miles away from a mental health center had significantly higher levels of agreement on the Access domain as compared to all other respondents, F(3, 841) = 19.78, p = .000. Lastly, respondents who identified as Bilingual had significantly higher levels of agreement on the Outcomes domain as compared to respondents who reported being fluent in English only, F(3, 851) = 5.65, p = .001.

Table 8

Valid Percent Agreement by Disability

Disability (n)	Access	Quality/Appropriateness	Outcomes	Participation	Cultural Sensitivity
1 Disability (229)	73.2	84.0	53.9	89.6	94.8
2 Disabilities (123)	77.0	75.0	42.9	90.6	91.1
No Disability (413)	79.2	83.8	63.5	87.8	94.9
PNTA (47)	79.2	91.7	66.7	87.2	95.8

Note. The reported n of each number of disability category reflects the smallest number of total respondents on any one domain. The number of respondents across domains fluctuated by a small amount.

Table 9
Valid Percent Agreement by Distance from Agency

Distance From Agency (n)	Access	Quality/Appropriateness	Outcomes	Participation	Cultural Sensitivity
0-5 Miles (395)	87.4	86.1	60.6	91.8	95.7
6-10 Miles (248)	72.4	78.3	56.1	82.7	92.7
11-20 Miles (110)	64.6	84.8	59.5	89.3	94.6
20+ Miles (87)	57.5	83.0	52.3	92.0	94.3

Note. The reported n of each distance from agency category reflects the smallest number of total respondents on any one domain. The number of respondents across domains fluctuated by a small amount.

Table 10
Valid Percent Agreement by Language

Language (n)	Access	Quality/Appropriateness	Outcomes	Participation	Cultural Sensitivity
English (760)	75.9	82.5	56.6	88.7	94.3
Spanish (7)	100	85.7	42.9	100	100
Bilingual (73)	86.8	94.7	80.3	91.8	97.4
PNTA (7)	85.7	71.4	57.1	71.4	85.7

Note. The reported n of each language category reflects the smallest number of total respondents on any one domain. The number of respondents across domains fluctuated by a small amount.

What about Caregiver Comments?

Two open-ended survey questions queried caregivers about the most and least helpful aspects of services delivered to the caregiver and the child. In response to these questions, approximately 70.9% of respondents provided written comments regarding what was most helpful and 57.6% provided written feedback for how to improve services. Per the request of each center, DBH shares caregivers' comments in addition to the raw quantitative data.

Discussion and Implications

In 2009 and 2010, DBH conducted its seventh annual YSSF survey illuminating caregiver perceptions of the behavioral health services provided to youth consumers. Analyses were conducted at the state level. Despite that the sample may not be representative of the population of mental health consumers, the data do provide very rich information from which future mental health services can be informed.

Similar to prior years, the Outcomes domain demonstrated the lowest levels of agreement. However, this domain had a higher percentage of "Undecided" responses compared to the other domains. Further, there was not a high level of disagreement with improved outcomes. Rather, respondents reported higher levels of feeling indecisive about the impact that services had on their daily lives.

In summary, the YSSF 2009 provides valuable data regarding caregiver perceptions and will be used to inform change and highlight strengths for the state as a whole.

For information regarding this report please contact Samantha Farro, PhD, at the Division of Behavioral Health, 3824 W. Princeton Circle, Denver, CO 80236, 303-866-7400.

Appendix A

Youth Services Survey for Families

Please help our agency make services better by answering some questions about the services your child received **OVER THE LAST 6 MONTHS**. Your answers are confidential and will not influence the services you or your child receives. Please indicate if you **Strongly Disagree**, **Disagree**, **Are Undecided**, **Agree**, **or Strongly Agree** with each of the statements below. Put a cross (X) in the box that best describes your answer. Thank you!!!

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
1.	Overall, I am satisfied with the services my child received.					
2.	I helped to choose my child's services.					
3.	I helped to choose my child's treatment goals.					
4.	The people helping my child stuck with us no matter what.					
5.	I felt my child had someone to talk to when he/she was troubled.					
6.	I participated in my child's treatment.					
7.	The services my child and/or family received were right for us.					
8.	The location of services was convenient for us.					
9.	Services were available at times that were convenient for us.					
10.	My family got the help we wanted for my child.					
11.	My family got as much help as we needed for my child.					
12.	Staff treated me with respect.					
13.	Staff respected my family's religious/spiritual beliefs.					
14.	Staff spoke with me in a way that I understood.					
	Staff were sensitive to my cultural/ethnic background.					
As	a result of the services my child and/or family received:	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
16.	My child is better at handling daily life.					
	My child gets along better with family members.					
	My child gets along better with friends and other people.					
	My child is doing better in school and/or work.					
	My child is better able to cope when things go wrong.					
21.	I am satisfied with our family life right now.					
22.	My child is better able to do things he or she wants to do.					
Oth	ner than my child's service providers:	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
23.	I know people who will listen and understand me when I need to talk.					_
24.	In a crisis, I would have the support I need from family and friends.					

27. What has been the most helpful thing about the services you and your child received over the last 6 months?

28. What would improve services here?

problems.

25. I have people that I am comfortable talking with about my child's

26. I have people with whom I can do enjoyable things.

Please answer the following questions to let us know how your child is doing.

29.		ot including today		nas your crilic a	itteriaea tirroagi	i illis Center III ti	ie past o months
	O	1-5	6-11	12-18	19-25	26+	
30.		rrently living with your No	ou?				
31.	Has your child I	ived in any of the fo	ollowing places ir	n the last 6 mor	nths? (CHECK /	ALL THAT APPL	Y)
	Wit Fos The Cri	th one or both pare th another family m ster home erapeutic foster ho sis Shelter meless shelter	ember	Reside Hosp Local State	p home dential treatmen oital I jail or detention e correctional fac away/homeless/o	n facility cility	
	Oth	ner (describe):					
32.	In the last year, (Check one)	did your child see	a medical doctor	(or nurse) for a	health check up	o or because he/s	she was sick?
	Yes, in a	a clinic, office, or ho	ome visit				
	Yes, but	only in a hospital	emergency room				
	No						
	Do not re	emember					
33.	Is your child bei	ing prescribed med No	ication from this	Center?			
	33a. If yes, did	the doctor or nurs No	se tell you and/or	your child what	side effects to v	vatch for?	
34.	Is someone oth court-ordered)?	er than a parental t	igure requiring the Yes ■No	nat your child att	tend mental hea	lth sessions (e.g.	, social services,
Ple	ase answer the	e following question	ons to let us kno	ow a little abou	ıt your child.		
		Age:()					
36.	Ethnicity: My	y child is Hispanic/l	_atino/a My o	child is not Hispa	anic/Latino/a	I prefer not to a	nswer
37.	Black/A	III that apply) an Indian/Alaska N African American Caucasian	ative		iian/Pacific Islan	der	
	I prefer i	not to answer					

38. Cn	ilia s Genaer:	Воу	Giri	■ Transgender	■ I prefer not to ans
	which languages English Spanish American Sign German French Vietnamese Korean Other	Language	·	hat apply) Chinese (Manda Russian Japanese Italian Polish Tagalog Arabic I prefer not to an	
	Person who is Person who is Person with a person with a person with a leading to the person who is the person who is the person who is the person with a leading to the person with a leading to the person who is the person with a person with a leading to the leading to the person with a leading to the	deaf or hard of olind or partially ohysical disabili developmental of earning disabili raumatic brain	hearing y sighted ty disability	(Mark all that apply)	
	ith which sexual of Heterosexual Lesbian/Gay Bisexual I prefer not to a		s your child mos	t closely identify?	
	proximate distan lease check one)		ome to this men	tal health center:	0-5 miles 6-10 miles 11-20 miles 20+ miles

c. 6 months to 1 year (Continue to qu	estion 45)
d. Longer than 1 year (Skip to question 50)	
	<u> </u>
44. Was your child arrested since beginning to receive mental health services from this Center?	50. Was your child arrested during the last 12 months? ☐ Yes ☐ No
□ Yes □ No	51. Was your child arrested during the 12 months prior to that? ☐ Yes ☐ No
 45. Was your child arrested during the 12 months prior to that? Yes No 46. Since your child began to receive mental health services from this Center, have their encounters with the police a. been reduced (for example, he/she has not been arrested, hassled by police, taken by police to a shelter or crisis program) b. stayed the same c. increased d. not applicable (He/she had no police encounters this year or last year.) 	 52. Over the last year, have your child's encounters with the police □ a. been reduced (for example, he/she has not been arrested, hassled by police, taken by police to a shelter or crisis program) □ b. stayed the same □ c. increased □ d. not applicable (They had no police encounters this year or last year 53. Was your child expelled or suspended from school during the last 12 months? □ Yes □ No
47. Was your child expelled or suspended from school since beginning services from this Center?☐ Yes☐ No	54. Was your child expelled or suspended from school during the 12 months prior to that? ☐ Yes ☐ No
48. Was your child expelled or suspended from school during the 12 months prior to that? ☐ Yes ☐ No	55. Over the last year, the number of days my child was in school is a. □ Greater b. □ About the same c. □ Less
49. Since starting to receive services from this Center, the number of days my child was in school is a. □ Greater b. □ About the same c. □ Less d. □ Does not apply (please select why this does not apply) i. □ child did not have a problem with attendance before starting services ii. □ child is too young to be in school iii. □ child was expelled from school iv. □ child is home schooled v. □ child dropped out of school vi. □ Other:	d. □ Does not apply (please select why this does not apply) i. □ child did not have a problem with attendance before starting services ii. □ child is too young to be in school iii. □ child was expelled from school iv. □ child is home schooled v. □ child dropped out of school vi. □ Other:

Thank you for taking the time to answer these questions!

43. How long has your child received services from this Center?

a. Less than 1 month

b. 1 - 5 months

Appendix B: Domain Items

Access Domain (completion of both items needed for domain score)

The location of services was convenient.

Services were available at times that were good for me.

Participation Domain (completion of two items needed for domain score)

I helped to choose my child's services.

I helped to choose my child's treatment goals.

I participated in my child's treatment.

Cultural Sensitivity (completion of three of the four items needed for domain score)

Staff treated me with respect.

Staff respected my family's religious/spiritual beliefs.

Staff spoke with me in a way that I understood.

Staff were sensitive to my cultural/ethnic background.

Appropriateness Domain (completion of four of the six items needed for domain score)

Overall, I am satisfied with the services my child received.

The people helping my child stuck with us no matter what.

I felt my child had someone to talk to when he/she was troubled.

The services my child and/or family received were right for us.

My family got the help we wanted for my child.

My family got as much help as we needed for my child.

Outcomes Domain (completion of four of the six items needed for domain score)

My child is better at handling daily life.

My child gets along better with family members.

My child gets along better with friends and other people.

My child is doing better in school and/or work.

My child is better able to cope when things go wrong.

I am satisfied with our family life right now.

Appendix C: Demographic Information of 2009 YSSF Respondents

	YSSF Respondents		
Gender	%	n	
Female	31.9	288	
Male	62.2	562	
Transgendered	0	0	
Prefer Not to Answer	1.1	10	
Missing	4.9	44	
Age Group in Years			
0-5	10.7	97	
6-10	48.7	440	
11+	35.4	320	
Missing	5.2	47	
Ethnicity			
Hispanic/Latina/o	24.2	219	
Non-Hispanic/Latina/o	56.0	506	
Prefer Not to Answer	8.4	76	
Missing	11.4	103	
Race			
American Indian/Alaska Native	2.0	18	
Asian	0.6	5	
Black/African American	3.8	34	
Multi-Racial	7.6	69	
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0.4	4	
Other	5.4	49	
White/Caucasian	58.2	526	
Missing	14.9	135	
Disability			
One Disability Identified	25.9	234	
Two Disabilities Identified	11.5	104	
Multiple Disabilities Identified	2.7	24	
None	46.7	422	
Prefer Not to Answer	5.3	48	
Missing	8.0	72	

Appendix D: Comparison of Demographic Information of 2009 YSSF to 2009 CCAR Respondents

	YSSF Res	spondents ³	CCAR Respondents		
Gender	%	n	%	N	
Female	33.9	288	39.3	7103	
Male	66.1	562	60.7	10951	
Age Group in Years					
0-5	11.3	97	16.9	3041	
6-10	60.9	522	50.3	9069	
11+	27.8	238	32.8	5924	
Ethnicity					
Hispanic/Latina/o	30.2	219	30.9	5573	
Non-Hispanic/Latina/o	69.8	506	69.1	12481	
Race					
American Indian/Alaska Native	2.6	18	1.3	235	
Asian	0.7	5	0.4	63	
Black/African American	4.8	34	5.1	919	
Multi-Racial	9.8	69	7.4	1328	
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0.6	4	0.2	32	
Other	7.0	49	20.8	3735	
White/Caucasian	74.6	526	64.8	11638	

_

³ Percentages for this table differ slightly from the previous table in Appendix C because "Missing" values were not taken into account for these analyses

Appendix E: Percent Endorsement of YSSF Domains by Item⁴

Access Domain Item Endorsement

Access Item (N)	Percent Endorsement					
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
The location of services was convenient for us (877).	47.3	39.9	5.8	5.5	1.5	
Services were available at times that were convenient for us (880).	40.7	39.9	10.2	6.4	2.8	
Quality/Appropriateness Domain Ite	em Endorsement					
	Percent Endorsement					
Quality/Appropriateness Item (N)	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
Overall, I am satisfied with the services my child received (822).	46.0	43.5	7.5	2.0	0.9	

The people helping my child stuck with us no matter what 35.1 12.5 3.8 46.9 1.6 (865). The services my child and/or family received were right for us 41.9 40.6 13.8 2.3 1.4 (874). I felt my child had someone to talk to when he/she was troubled 39.3 10.1 3.2 1.3 46.1 (870).My family got the help we 38.3 43.2 2.4 14.9 1.1 wanted for my child (870). My family got as much help as

38.7

20.9

35.7

Participation Domain Item Endorsement

we needed for my child (869).

1.4

3.3

⁴ Missing values were excluded.

	Percent Endorsement				
Participation Item (N)	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I helped to choose my child's services (873).	37.9	45.8	8.1	6.4	1.7
I helped to choose my child's treatment goals (871).	42.0	46.0	7.5	3.3	1.1
I participated in my child's treatment (876).	49.0	43.9	4.1	1.9	1.0

Outcome Domain Item Endorsement

	Percent Endorsement					
Outcome Item (N)	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
My child is better at handling daily life (873).	24.2	40.5	28.2	5.3	1.8	
My child gets along better with family members (871).	22.3	42.6	25.9	7.7	1.5	
My child gets along better with friends and other people (867).	21.3	45.4	26.2	5.3	1.7	
My child is doing better in school and/or work (863).	26.9	40.0	25.8	5.2	2.1	
My child is better able to cope when things go wrong (867).	19.4	37.8	33.1	7.3	2.4	
I am satisfied with our family life right now (860).	17.9	39.7	28.3	10.6	3.6	
My child is better able to do things he or she wants to do (863).	19.9	45.7	27.3	5.0	2.1	

Cultural Sensitivity

-	Percent Endorsement					
Satisfaction Item (N)	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
Staff treated me with respect (874).	62.2	34.4	2.1	0.9	0.3	
Staff respected my family's religious/spiritual beliefs (858).	51.6	37.2	9.8	1.0	0.3	
Staff spoke with me in a way that I understood (875).	58.1	39.1	2.3	0.2	0.3	
Staff were sensitive to my cultural/ethnic background (853).	50.6	38.6	9.4	0.9	0.5	

Appendix F: Survey Counts/Response Rate by Agency

Agency	Blank Surveys	Completed	Rejected	Total	Response Rate
Arapahoe/Douglas	350	41	14	55	74.5
Asian Pacific	100	0	0	0	0
Aurora	350	33	5	38	86.8
Centennial	350	70	18	88	79.5
Colorado West	350	54	13	67	80.6
Community Reach	350	147	53	200	73.5
Jefferson	350	39	0	39	100
Larimer	350	125	12	137	91.2
MHCBBC	350	91	4	95	95.8
MHCD	350	53	8	61	86.9
Midwestern	350	14	21	35	40.0
North Range	350	60	1	61	98.4
Pikes Peak	350	224	5	229	97.8
San Luis Valley	350	5	0	5	100
Servicios de la Raza	100	2	0	2	100
Southeast	350	36	1	37	97.3
Southwest/Axis Health	350	29	5	34	85.3
Spanish Peaks	350	51	0	51	100
West Central	350	56	0	56	100
Total	6150	1130 ⁵	160	1290	87.6

⁵ All of the 1,130 completed surveys were included when calculating response rates. However, the 226 that were reported as over the age of 14 years were not included in this report's domain or demographic analyses.