

# General and Older Adult Mental Health Evaluation Advisory Group

July 14, 2004

Attendance	Names
ADAMH	Dean, Mina, Thomas
CHOICES	
Columbus Area	Arthur Rose
Concord	
DFYF	David Drake
Dublin	Debbie Shubouf, Anna Keels
North Central	Ali Koca
North Community	
Northwest	Mary Ellen Franzen
Southeast	Dick Reynolds

# 2004 Priority

To develop client level standardized outcomes indicators of relapse, positive discharge, and improvement

# Agenda

- CSQ-8
- 2004 Annual Report
- Key indicators of relapse
- Summary
- Next steps

# **CSQ-8 Preliminary Analysis**

**Results of the 2004 GAOAMH CSQ-8 survey demonstrate that general and older adult mental health consumers in Franklin County are highly satisfied with services.**

# CSQ-8

Question	2003 (N=415)		2004 (N=421)*	
	Fair/Poor	Good/Excellent	Fair/Poor	Good/Excellent
Quality of Services Received	12.6%	87.4%	14.8%	85.2%
Received the Kind of Service Wanted	No 14.8%	Yes 85.2%	No 12.0%	Yes 88.0%
Program Met Needs	A Few/None 27.1%	Most/All 72.9%	A Few/None 20.3%	Most/All 79.7%
Recommend the Program to a Friend	No 11.4%	Yes 88.6%	No 6.8%	Yes 93.2%
Amount of Services Received	Dissatisfied 18.9%	Satisfied 81.1%	Dissatisfied 12.1%	Satisfied 87.9%
Helped to Deal with Problems Effectively	No 12.3%	Yes 87.7%	No 9.7%	Yes 90.3%
In General, Services Received	Dissatisfied 14.7%	Satisfied 85.3%	Dissatisfied 12.8%	Satisfied 87.2%
Come Back to Program	No 10.4%	Yes 89.6%	No 9.2%	Yes 90.8%

\* excludes CHOICES

# 2004 Annual Report

- **Similar format as 2003 report (service cost & pattern by general and older adults by plan code and form type) – need to separate clinical SMDs from this group**
- **Drill down provider-specific outcomes and present demographic, diagnosis, baseline difference by provider**
- **Drill down provider-specific client satisfaction result and present demographic, diagnosis, baseline difference by provider**

# Relapse

**In our last meeting we agreed that receiving crisis services at Netcare is an indication of relapse. Of 1,954 consumers who have received a Consumer B assessment in 2002, 540 (27.6%) received services at Netcare after they completed an assessment.**

**Preliminary run: received services at Netcare after receiving an assessment (including 1<sup>st</sup> assessment)**

# Relapse

**There are several caveats in this analysis:**

- **Consumers may not have completed treatment**
- **Visits to Netcare may not be for the same problems for which consumers received services**
- **Netcare serves as safety net and crisis care**

# Relapse

## **Suggestion:**

- **Fine tune data : receive minimum services (5 service dates for MH ) and then receive services at Netcare (1 crisis ? 2 for non-crisis?)**
- **While clients are under the provider care and receiving crisis care from Netcare, provider can access Netcare Services for coordination of client cares**
- **Convenience of service [need to examine time of services rendered at Netcare? weekend vs non weekend to gauge crisis vs non crisis needs]**
- **Analyze crisis service utilized at provider [if provider has crisis capacity]**
- **Client re-enter treatment at the provider. Examine if there was a different diagnosis the second admission**

# Relapse

## Suggestions

- **determine relapses by comparing 2 intake critical items and diagnosis when client re-enters treatment at the same provider**
- **symptoms and functioning at the 2<sup>nd</sup> intake were worse off than the first intake**

# Next Steps

**Thomas will run analysis:**

- **in-tx receive minimum services (5 service dates for MH ) and then receive services at Netcare (1 crisis ? 2 for non-crisis?)**
  - **Among these Netcare services, how many are weekend vs non-weekend crisis service**
- **Minimum 5 services at provider and Post-tx [180 days without services] receive crisis services at Netcare**
- **Continuing discussions on recidivism with Mary Ellen's indices in November meeting**