

**FEERICK CENTER
FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE**

Convening on Developing
Parent Feedback Models
for the New York City
Child Welfare System



FORDHAM UNIVERSITY
THE SCHOOL OF LAW

This report was drafted by students in the Feerick Center's Social Justice Clinic of Fordham University School of Law:

Maria Biaggi (Spring 2013)

Scarlett Camargo (Spring 2013)

Yoonmee Cho (Spring 2013)

Joseph Duffy (Fall 2013)

Melodie Eastmond (Spring 2013)

Tanya Shah (Fall 2013)

Anna Stallmann (Spring 2013)

The students were supervised by:

Elizabeth B. Cooper, Associate Professor, Feerick Center Faculty Director

Gaylynn Burroughs, Visiting Clinical Assistant Professor, 2012 – 2013

Mara Wishingrad, Feerick Center Fellow

**Feerick Center Social Justice Clinic
Fordham University School of Law**

**Convening on Developing Parent Feedback Models
for the New York City Child Welfare System:**

Convening Report

I. Introduction

Over forty stakeholders gathered on March 1, 2013, for a Convening on Developing Parent Feedback Models for the New York City Child Welfare System, sponsored by the Social Justice Clinic of the Feerick Center at Fordham University School of Law. The Convening was the first time such a diverse group of experts came together with the Administration for Children's Services (ACS) to plan and discuss the creation of a parent feedback mechanism that would elicit systematic, actionable, qualitative and quantitative data to be incorporated into ACS' accountability measures.

The topics discussed at the Convening were particularly important given that parent feedback models have the potential to confer several important benefits on parents, children, and the child welfare system as a whole. First, feedback data can provide valuable information concerning the effectiveness of specific programs and policies, providing an avenue to identify areas of strength and those in need of improvement. Feedback may also reveal both the level of satisfaction parents have with the services provided to their families as well as their level of satisfaction with the modes in which those services are delivered. Parent feedback may therefore help the agency determine whether and how to enhance or modify policies and practices in ways that encourage robust family engagement with the system, ultimately leading to better outcomes for children and families. Finally, collecting parent feedback may send a strong signal that the

system values parents as partners, helping to empower parents and leading to more positive relationships between caseworkers and families.

This report summarizes and examines the goals and themes that emerged from the Convening, including the opening session, the breakout group discussions facilitated by members of the Social Justice Clinic,¹ and the closing conversation. Although the breakout groups discussed two different sets of questions,² many common themes emerged. The most prevalent themes identified by the breakout groups were the importance of:

- Identifying a common definition of “parent feedback”;
- Specifying the purpose(s) of collecting parent feedback;
- Establishing the scope of data collection;
- Determining the type of data sought: qualitative and quantitative;
- Resolving methodological questions concerning data collection;
- Formulating a plan for implementing a feedback mechanism; and
- Confronting practical challenges to collecting parent feedback.³

To facilitate this process, Convening attendees strongly suggested the creation of a multi-stakeholder workgroup that would examine the design and implementation of parent feedback mechanism(s) in more concrete detail.

The report will first consider the goals prioritized by participants during the Goals Identification Exercise before turning to a discussion of the aforementioned themes and potential next steps.

¹ Members of the Social Justice Clinic divided participants into four breakout groups, each consisting of eight to ten stakeholders, two facilitators, and a note-taker. Each of the groups contained a diverse set of stakeholders, representing different constituencies within the child welfare system.

² See attached Appendix A for breakout group questions.

³ To ascertain the themes identified by the breakout groups, members of the Clinic compiled and reviewed the notes taken by each group’s designated note-takers.

II. Goals

Immediately following the opening session, in which stakeholders heard from ACS Commissioner Ronald E. Richter, Child Welfare Organizing Project Board Chair Sandra Killett,⁴ and Philadelphia Department of Human Services Deputy Commissioner Brian Clapier, Convening participants engaged in a Goals Identification Exercise, in which stakeholders identified and prioritized goals for the creation of a parent feedback mechanism. Participants worked in small groups to brainstorm potential goals, which they later shared with the entire group. After a brief discussion, individuals voted for primary and secondary goals.⁵ Four principle goals emerged (listed in the order of weighted preference based on voting):

- Ensure that the feedback mechanism produces actionable data that can lead to constructive policy change;
- Create a tool that can collect more individualized, and less formulaic, feedback from parents;
- Craft a feedback design process that will bridge the gap between agency intentions and possible public perceptions, such that parents feel comfortable providing feedback;
- Design a tool that will allow agencies to use feedback to improve the services provided to families, by making those services more meaningful to parents and caregivers.

Pinpointing concrete goals created shared priorities for the day and helped shape the work of the distinct breakout groups. Going forward, these goals can guide the development of the feedback mechanism(s) to ensure that the resulting model addresses stakeholders' priorities.

⁴ Since the Convening, Sandra Killett has become the Executive Director of the Child Welfare Organizing Project (CWOP).

⁵ See attached Appendix B for a list of all identified goals and the vote counts for each.

III. Themes

This section explores the themes that arose from the breakout sessions, identifying areas of general agreement among Convening participants, as well as issues that need further examination.

Definition of “Parent Feedback”

Each breakout group touched upon the need to define the term “parent feedback.” A clear definition of the term would ensure that all stakeholders have a consistent, unambiguous understanding of the type of data that ACS seeks to collect. It will also provide a guidepost to determine whether this data accurately reflects stakeholders’ priorities. Although Convening participants did not come to an agreement on a specific definition of parent feedback, there was consensus that a formal, systematic feedback data collection model would be far more useful than more informal processes of gathering information, such as through a hotline. Further, in his opening remarks to Convening participants, ACS Commissioner Ronald E. Richter signaled the agency’s preference for collecting data that would allow ACS to methodically analyze the impact of its policies and practices.

Purpose of Collecting Parent Feedback

Importance of Transparency

Convening participants agreed that stakeholders would benefit from a clear understanding of the purpose of collecting parent feedback data. There was a general consensus that parents and their advocates, ACS caseworkers, and contract agencies are likely to have concerns about the role of parent feedback. In turn, there was consensus that transparency regarding how ACS might use feedback could promote participation among these different constituent groups, help create buy-in, and encourage investment in the feedback system

Specifically, with respect to parents, participants expressed that clearly articulating the purpose of soliciting feedback could help to manage parents' expectations concerning how, or whether, data collection would affect their individual cases. This point is especially critical to consider if the purpose of collecting feedback is to effect larger changes to ACS policies and practices rather than to design specific interventions in any given case. In addition, transparency would address the possibility that the data collected may not be entirely confidential and could lead to the reporting of additional allegations of child abuse or neglect.⁶

Using Parent Feedback to Inform Policy and Practice

Overall, there was agreement among the breakout groups that parent feedback must serve to inform ACS policy and practice in order to ensure system-wide advances in service delivery and outcomes. The breakout groups identified several specific ways feedback could play an important role:

- **Evaluation of Best Practices.** Parent feedback may be used to assess whether ACS caseworkers are meeting best practice standards in a given case or more generally. It may also help ACS, where appropriate, to re-evaluate best practice standards in partnership with families in order to help the agency fulfill its mission to ensure the safety and well-being of New York City's children.
- **Effectiveness of Current Programs.** Data collected from parent feedback may help ACS assess which programs and services are working effectively and which are not. ACS could then seek to create new service areas, or change or improve existing programs and services.

⁶ See N.Y. Soc. Serv. Law § 413(McKinney's 2012) (listing the circumstances under which specific persons and officials are required to report suspected child abuse or maltreatment).

- **Improve Training Programs.** Parent feedback could be used to strengthen training programs for caseworkers. For example, parent feedback may provide information on whether ACS and/or other agency caseworkers have been sufficiently trained to handle particular types of cases, such as those involving domestic violence or sexual abuse, or particular types of clients. If the data collected reveal trends that caseworkers are not adequately prepared, ACS may choose to add, remove or enhance its training programs.
- **Better “Customer Service.”** Some participants suggested that because ACS is providing services to parents and families, ACS should view parents and families as consumers. Thus, parent feedback might allow for a shift in ACS’ institutional culture in the direction of providing better customer service. Some individuals also suggested that agencies may be more willing to listen to parents’ concerns if parents’ voices, similar to other consumer voices, carried more weight in the agency review process. Other participants, however, highlighted that this framework may not be appropriate as parents and families are not *voluntarily* involved in the child welfare system, unlike individuals participating in more traditional consumer settings.

After identifying the ways in which parent feedback could be used to inform ACS policy and practice, it is necessary now to consider the appropriate scope of collection that would make the data meaningful in the ways identified by participants.

Scope of Data Collection

All of the breakout groups addressed the desired scope of the parent feedback mechanism. The first question regarding scope centered on the appropriate amount of data that should be

collected. Several groups identified a need to collect feedback on a large scale to ensure that ACS receives useful information. For example, some participants noted that feedback with a larger data sample would more clearly show patterns within the system, and therefore provide more actionable information to ACS, whereas a smaller sample size might not provide information on systemic trends.⁷

In addition, the groups addressed when the feedback tool should be used. Some participants felt that the tool should be implemented at multiple stages in a family's involvement with ACS, whereas others felt that a standardized feedback tool could best be used once a matter was closed. Most groups concluded, however, that as cases often last for years, using a tool once at the end of the case would not likely yield the richest or most accurate information. For example, the substance of a particular parent's feedback, and its potential usefulness to ACS, may be different if it is collected in conjunction with particular ACS activity, rather than just at the end of the matter. Of course, gathering feedback during especially sensitive periods in parents' lives, that often involve crisis and instability, raises special concerns regarding the manner and tone of the data collection.

In spite of this challenge, Convening participants felt it necessary to consider implementing the feedback tool at various stages of ACS' involvement with a family, including at the very onset. Although the "beginning" stages of involvement may vary, feedback on initial interactions is crucial because the early stages may set the tone for the remainder of a family's involvement with the child welfare system. Collecting data at this point, especially data that will

⁷ An additional benefit of having a large data sample is that it would alleviate the concern, voiced by some, that any discrepancies between parents' feedback and caseworkers' notes and reports would make it difficult to draw objective conclusions. A large-scale parent feedback mechanism would make it easier to identify and manage inconsistent data – resulting either from parents' frustrations or caseworkers' inaccuracies – that do not fit larger patterns and trends.

be used to inform ACS practices, could improve parents' perceptions of the system and foster greater engagement in the process, leading to long-term positive implications.

Most breakout groups also discussed the importance of collecting feedback during the pendency of the case. Without explicitly defining what it means to collect information "during" the case, and recognizing that case timelines may vary, the Convening participants identified a number of benefits of collecting feedback while a case was open. For example, collecting data as events unfold would likely elicit more accurate information concerning how parents experience the system.

The breakout groups also largely endorsed the importance of inviting parents to give feedback after the family has completed its experience with ACS in order to report successes and concerns. Collecting feedback at the conclusion of a case is likely to give parents the opportunity to reflect on their experiences as a whole.

In addition to a discussion of the feedback mechanism's scope, the groups also addressed the type of information that should be collected. There was general agreement among participants that a useful feedback mechanism must gather both qualitative and quantitative data.

Qualitative and Quantitative Data

The decision to collect objective and/or subjective data depends on the purpose of the feedback mechanism. Several breakout groups concurred that the feedback mechanism should contain both subjective and objective elements because both types of information are necessary to provide ACS with the information it requires to consider making changes to its policies and

practices. Although objective data provides quantifiable information,⁸ subjective data supplies the context to give that information meaning.

Not only does qualitative data give context, but it also provides information that more objective measurements cannot adequately capture. Convening participants noted that it would be beneficial to elicit subjective information on how families felt about their experiences with ACS and what value they felt they received, if any, from preventive services or from their interactions with foster care agencies.⁹ This approach provides more robust, and perhaps more helpful, information to the child welfare system while also providing parents with an outlet to voice their concerns.

After identifying the data to be measured, one must determine *how* that data can be measured, giving rise to several methodological questions, discussed in the section below.

Methodological Questions

The breakout groups agreed that key, diverse stakeholders must be involved not only in identifying what should be measured, but also how it should be measured. Such a collaboration, incorporating the different and relevant perspectives from each constituent group, would be the best, if not the only, way for the parent feedback project to be successful.

Breakout groups focused on two specific questions regarding methodology: how should the mechanisms for collecting parent feedback be developed; and how should parent feedback be collected.

⁸ Examples of objective questions noted during the breakout sessions included: Do you know your case planner's name? Do you have a case planner? Do you speak the same language as your case planner?

⁹ For example, during the opening session, Brian Clapier from Philadelphia DHS explained that through Philadelphia's Quality Service Review volunteers ask parents qualitative questions to find out not only if a current service plan exists, but also whether parents feel that the service plan is "their own." See Brian Clapier, *Philadelphia Department of Human Services: The Quality Service Review; The Quality Visitation Review*, PowerPoint Presentation, Convening on Developing Parent Feedback Models for the New York City Child Welfare System (Mar. 1, 2013).

Developing a Mechanism

Participants agreed that feedback tools should be developed by experts. Questions must be sculpted carefully: if questions are too specific, there is a danger that the feedback collection would overlook important problems; conversely, the absence of specific questions may make it more difficult to get at the most significant data. Participants also emphasized the importance of drafting the questions used in feedback collection to give parents the opportunity to voice their opinions freely, including both criticism and praise for ACS and other relevant contract agencies.

The breakout groups expressed strong interest in exploring the Philadelphia Quality Service Review (QSR) process presented by Brian Clapier.¹⁰ QSR is “a practice improvement approach designed to assess current outcomes and system performance by gathering information directly from families, children and service team members.”¹¹ The QSR model achieves this purpose by collecting case-specific feedback along with aggregate system-level feedback.¹² Per the QSR model, two volunteers review an assigned case.¹³ One volunteer comes from within the Department of Human Services; the other is an independent community member.¹⁴ Both volunteers interview a variety of people (e.g., biological parents, foster parents, teachers, caseworkers) who have had contact with the subject child within the last 30-60 days.¹⁵ The QSR process lasts three days and occurs six times annually, with 12 cases explored during each three-day QSR period.¹⁶

Brian Clapier noted in his presentation that one of the attributes of QSR most valued by the Philadelphia DHS is the benefit of working with volunteers. In particular, the Department

¹⁰ *See id.*

¹¹ *Id.*

¹² *See id.*

¹³ *Id.*

¹⁴ *Id.* One supervisor from the county agency manages the review process and recruits the volunteers. *Id.*

¹⁵ *Id.*

¹⁶ *Id.* At least one participant at the Convening expressed concern that the QSR model dedicated too many resources to exploring too few cases.

has found that volunteers, who include community members, agency employees, and others dedicated to improving the child welfare system, are likely to be enthusiastic about the project and devoted to seeing it succeed. Working with volunteers has the additional benefit of being less taxing on resources than the use of paid employees. However, working with community volunteers may mean sharing confidential case files, raising important ethical and legal issues that would have to be explored before volunteers could be used in New York City.¹⁷

Philadelphia also utilizes another accountability model, the Quality Visitation Review (QVR), which is “part of a larger continual quality improvement process surrounding practice at DHS.”¹⁸ A distinct feature of QVR is its focus on collecting objective information from parents as well as foster/kinship caregivers.¹⁹ The QVR process, therefore, compliments QSR, but its purpose differs. Whereas the QSR seeks to determine the quality of the services provided, the QVR is meant to determine whether “the visitation documented by both county (DHS) and contracted provider workers is occurring and that the case file documentation accurately reflects the services being provided to the family.”²⁰ Philadelphia contracts with an outside agency to implement the QVR.²¹ DHS selects the cases to be reviewed, either randomly or through an audit, but the contract agency employs its own social workers to conduct the interviews.²²

Looking to Philadelphia’s models, it may be helpful to incorporate a dual method of review. Using a variety of methods to gather feedback may produce more complete and accurate data and minimize bias. Parents, caseworkers, and other stakeholders in the child welfare system all experience the system differently, and each individual will have a unique

¹⁷ Although not discussed by the breakout groups, stakeholders would also need to consider the best ways to recruit and train community volunteers.

¹⁸ Clapier, *supra*, note 8.

¹⁹ *See id.*

²⁰ *Id.*

²¹ *Id.*

²² *Id.*

perspective. Convening participants generally believed that by including interviews, observation, service records and case records in the feedback collection process, ACS would have the opportunity to assemble the most comprehensive view of how the system functions and how parents experience it in practice.

Collecting Feedback

Several breakout groups discussed who would be best suited to collect feedback once a system has been created and put in place. Some participants stressed the importance of using a neutral party, such as a social worker who is not associated with either a parent organization or ACS; this person may make parents feel more at ease, allowing a good rapport to develop while also minimizing bias. This approach, however, may come with its own challenges, as social workers are mandated reporters.²³ In addition, as discussed above, participants also considered using community volunteers or an outside contract agency to collect information.

Some Convening participants noted that the collection of feedback may pose a significant strain on the resources of the child welfare system. To minimize the resources expended in this effort, some participants suggested the use of technology, specifically web-based instruments to collect data. There were concerns expressed, however, that relying on technology may have the effect of excluding parents who have no access, or inadequate access, to the Internet. Thus, if technology is incorporated into the feedback system, attention must be paid to how its use could be structured to make data collection more inclusive.

Some participants thought that using phone interviews could be a more effective way to collect feedback as parents may be more likely to have phones than Internet access. Concerns about adopting this approach include the potential difficulty of locating phone numbers, and the possibility that people will be unwilling to answer their phones or will hang up on the surveyor.

²³ See New York Social Services Law §413 (McKinney's 2012).

In addition, some parents may not have consistent access to a phone, and many families struggling with poverty would still be excluded from data collection.

After analyzing the abovementioned methodological questions associated with developing mechanism(s) for collecting parent feedback, method(s) for implementation must be identified.

Implementation

Once a feedback mechanism is developed, it is important to test it. Some participants asserted that a small-scale pilot demonstration might be an optimal way to begin the process of collecting parent feedback. A pilot program may be a more manageable way to commence than a massive city-wide project. At least one participant, however, raised concerns that starting with a pilot program may cause undesirable delay in the launching of the larger project.

There are a number of ways to constrain a pilot demonstration (e.g., by geographical area, by agencies). There was no consensus on how best to structure or limit initial implementation, and this issue should be explored in greater detail by relevant stakeholders. Participants suggested that willing agencies could be asked to volunteer to participate in a pilot program. Beginning with a group of volunteers would have the advantage of guaranteeing buy-in. Other participants, however, raised the concern that self-selection may skew results. For example, agencies that are confident of the positive relationships they have with families may be more eager to participate in feedback collection.

Participants also suggested that although a larger parent feedback model is being developed, targeted mechanisms for obtaining parent feedback could be incorporated into existing evaluative tools. ChildStat was mentioned as one already-existing tool that might be partially adapted to incorporate parent feedback. Similar to Philadelphia's QSR system, the

ChildStat process involves an intense examination of a small number of cases. As with QSR, some may be concerned that the collection of parent feedback in the ChildStat process will yield such a small sample as not to be generalizable to ACS' policies, programs, and practices.

Challenges to Implementation

Convening participants identified getting buy-in from agencies and parents and establishing meaningful follow-through as the most significant challenges to implementing a parent feedback model.

Developing Buy-In

Buy-in from foster care and preventive service agencies will be crucial to the success of any feedback system. Convening participants expressed concern that agencies might not be receptive to a feedback program because they believe their work is already sufficiently assessed and do not always feel comfortable with existing evaluation programs. Further, they expressed concern that faring poorly in a parent feedback process might impede their ability to keep or renew contracts with ACS. By contrast, some participants noted that integrating parent feedback into existing evaluation mechanisms could prove positive and helpful in agencies' program and policy development. As discussed earlier in this report, involving agencies in the development of parent feedback models, and maintaining transparency throughout implementation, would likely be the most effective way to allay these potential concerns.

Convening participants also saw obtaining buy-in from parents as a potentially substantial hurdle to implementation. Specifically, many participants expressed concern that parents would be afraid to provide information for fear that the information would negatively affect their cases. To address this potential problem, one breakout group suggested that parents should be able to provide feedback anonymously, especially if the feedback is solicited during an

ongoing case. Further, making the feedback process as transparent and readily understood as possible could signal to parents that their concerns are a priority for ACS; in turn, this could have the salutatory effect of fostering trust between parents and ACS. This apparent benefit, however, raised new concerns that building such trust might lead parents to make unintended disclosures in the feedback process that could jeopardize their cases.

Follow-Through

In addition to the feedback tool itself, many participants signaled a need to implement a process for ensuring meaningful follow-through on the data collected. As reflected in the Goals Identification Exercise, participants expressed a strong desire to ensure that the feedback mechanism created would lead to constructive changes in policy and practice to benefit children, families, and the system as a whole. Stakeholders should therefore consider creating a process for sharing the data collected. The Philadelphia QSR model, for example, includes reporting of data to DHS management, service providers, parent and child advocates, and representatives from the courts, mental health, educational, and medical systems, as a part of the standard QSR procedure.²⁴ The model also includes a process for tracking recommendations that develop from the QSR.²⁵ Stakeholders may want to consider whether these practices could be adapted to fit the needs of the New York City child welfare system.

Finally, some participants expressed concern that the commitment to collecting parent feedback would vary by administration. One suggested way to combat this potential problem was to include ACS' commitment to gathering and using parent feedback in its strategic plan. However, there was some concern that it was too early to go public with a feedback system and that going public with the plan would not be sufficient to ensure its longevity. Ultimately,

²⁴ Clapier, *supra*, note 8.

²⁵ *Id.*

stakeholders agreed that the best way to safeguard a parent feedback model would be to integrate it into ACS' practices in such a way that it becomes indispensable.

IV. Next Steps

The Convening produced an important consensus: transparency and communication are essential to developing an effective parent feedback model. Participants agreed that to ensure continued transparency and communication, the most important next step would be to create a workgroup of stakeholders that would explore and review mechanisms for obtaining systemic parent feedback.²⁶

There was further consensus that the workgroup, or any consultative process, should include a diverse combination of stakeholders, including members of organizations that work in parent defense and support, members of organizations that represent children and their interests, academics, representatives from foster care agencies, parents who have had experiences within the child welfare system, caseworkers, and experts in data collection.

The adoption of any new program will require continuing input from all stakeholders. Towards that end, creative, concrete collaboration will best facilitate further integration of the ideas discussed at the Convening and in this report. The process may further benefit through consultation with additional stakeholders and experts who may not have participated in the original Convening.

The Social Justice Clinic was honored to be a part of this first step in the development of a parent feedback mechanism in New York City and looks forward to discussing how the Clinic might help the stakeholder group continue to move this process forward.

²⁶ See Appendix C for a summary of each breakout group's proposed next steps.

V. Conclusion

The March 1, 2013 Convening on Developing Parent Feedback Models for the New York City Child Welfare System represented an essential step towards creating a parent feedback mechanism that has tremendous positive potential for ACS, the provider agencies, and families who engage with the child welfare system. Participants identified several complementary goals for a feedback model and were overwhelmingly enthusiastic about collaborating with ACS on development and implementation.

Using the information presented by the speakers during the opening session, participants identified several areas that were in need of further study and attention. In particular, participants focused on creating a common definition of “parent feedback”; the potential ways in which feedback data could be used; the scope of data collection; the type of data sought; the methodology imposed; and a plan for implementation. Participants agreed that these areas should be examined in depth by a smaller workgroup composed of a diverse combination of stakeholders.

During this Convening, the New York City child welfare community signaled its desire to use an inclusive, collaborative process to create a feedback mechanism that would integrate parents into ACS’ accountability measures. As the group contemplates creating a smaller workgroup, it should continue to be mindful of the need to include more parents, caseworkers, and others in the conversation in order to devise the most effective tool possible to help ensure the continued improvement of the city’s child welfare policies and programs.

APPENDIX A

Convening on Developing Parent Feedback Models for the New York City Child Welfare System March 1, 2013

QUESTIONS FOR BREAKOUT GROUPS A AND B

- 1 At what points in a child welfare case is collecting feedback most essential? What are our priorities? For example, are we interested in collecting information about initial child safety conferences, service providers, or caseworker interactions?
- 2 What kinds of information are we interested in gathering? For example, are we primarily interested in parent satisfaction, quality of services, both, or something else? How do we define those terms? Are there subjective or objective measurements you would want to employ?
- 3 How can we collect parent feedback while responsibly addressing confidentiality concerns?
- 4 What are the obstacles to collecting parent feedback, and how can we overcome them? For example, consider the issue of receiving feedback from particularly vulnerable groups.
- 5 What would be the next steps to achieve useful parent feedback?

QUESTIONS FOR BREAKOUT GROUPS C AND D

- 1 How would you like to see parent feedback used to achieve our goals? How do we ensure that this information is used actively and responsibly?
- 2 How can we ensure that the process of giving feedback empowers and supports parents?
- 3 How can we ensure that the process of collecting parent feedback motivates and rewards ACS, its caseworkers, and its contract agencies?
- 4 What would be the next steps to achieve useful parent feedback?

APPENDIX B

Convening on Developing Parent Feedback Models for the New York City Child Welfare System March 1, 2013

Goals Exercise Summary

Goal	Primary (Red)	Secondary (Blue)
Create mechanisms for accountability → Ensure that there are constructive changes to policy.	9	3
More individualized, not formulaic.	7	3
Bridge gap between intentions and perceptions.	7	3
Families should have a say in the services provided and the services should be relevant and accessible.	4	12
Feedback may create incentives for better job performance.	4	0
Actionable feedback on business process and services changes for ACS to consider.	2	3
Parent feedback should be safe, honest, constructive, and confidential to better affect policy change.	1	4
Create self-assessment to measure against child welfare assessment. More collaboration between parents and ACS.	0	3
Structured and formal feedback as checks and balances.	0	1
Feedback not only on caseworkers, but also on services provided.	0	1
Culture Change - More respect for ACS roles. More individualized interaction.	0	0

APPENDIX C

Convening on Developing Parent Feedback Models for the New York City Child Welfare System March 1, 2013

Next Steps Summary

Each breakout group identified potential next steps:

- **Group A** identified the importance of having another Convening for parents, caseworkers, and agencies to come together to further this discussion on the development of parent feedback models.
- **Group B** highlighted the importance of: (1) having ACS review best practices within the child welfare system with regard to parent feedback models; (2) determining how to implement those practices into ACS' policies; and (3) the need for more service-users, including parents, children, and other family members in the conversation.
- **Group C** suggested developing a workgroup of stakeholders to explore the parent feedback models that New York City could adapt and possibly implement into new and existing programs in New York City. It also echoed Group B's suggestion of bringing more service users into the conversation.
- **Group D** also identified the importance of forming a workgroup to learn more about other models, including the Philadelphia Quality Service Review, to determine how New York City may adapt them.