Consumer Action Response Team (CART) OF ALLEGHENY COUNTY

A Program of the National Alliance on Mental Illness (NAMI) Keystone Pennsylvania

2012 ANNUAL REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Page</u>	<u>e</u>
CART Vision and Background	1
Satisfaction Interview Totals and Demographics	2
Standard Satisfaction Interview Responses Table	3
Quality of Life Interview Responses4-	5
Interview Responses of Former Mayview Residents5-	7
Interview Responses for Community-Based Children's Services7-1	0
The Problem of Community Integration	1
CART Staff & Advisory Board	2

Consumer Action & Response Team of Allegheny County CART

Vision

CART's vision is that consumers and providers will dialogue regularly about improvements that could be made in existing behavioral health services. This dialogue will result in the best possible services for consumers, who will become empowered to make choices and participate in their own recovery.

CART is designed to provide:

- Processes for consumers and families to dialogue with their providers
- Structured process for providers to respond to consumer dissatisfactions
- Aggregate reports of response frequencies to Health Choices Appendix L Areas of Observation and Discussion as a means of looking at system trends
- Reports that identify satisfaction and dissatisfaction themes for various levels of care in the provider system
- Feedback from CSP and CHIPP consumers to Allegheny County Office of Behavioral Health and providers about their satisfactions with services and adjustment to living in the community
- Information about under-served groups in order to supply consumer feedback to system planners and policy makers

Advantages of CART:

- Independence from provider organizations
- Interviewers are former recipients of services and family members
- Conducts face-to-face interviews
- Consumers who wish to be identified can use the CART process as an occasion to meet with their provider to dialogue about their concerns about their services.
- Consumers provide more detailed responses because of the semi-structured format of CART interviews.
- Provider organizations can demonstrate their commitment to quality improvement by using CART reports.

Summary of CART Methodology

The Consumer Action Response Team (CART) conducts face-to-face interviews with willing consumers of behavioral health services at all known provider sites. In some cases, telephone interviews are done with family members and consumers who do not utilize site-based services. A survey/interview tool is utilized to obtain quantitative information about Appendix L Areas of Concern. At the same time, qualitative information is obtained by asking consumers a number of open-ended questions about services received. Consumers at provider sites are surveyed via scheduled site visits twice a year. The interview findings for each service site are summarized into a report and mailed to the provider for their written response, or the provider may choose to discuss the report during a scheduled Quality Improvement Meeting with CART staff. Aggregate data reports are submitted to CCBH quarterly and annually. An annual report, that highlights significant findings and trends, is also distributed to all stakeholders.

TABLE OF TOTAL INTERVIEWS AND DEMOGRAPHICS FOR 2012 n = 2064

NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS BY POPULATION							
	Adult Mental Health	Children's Mental Health	Adult Drug & Alcohol				
Number	1168	53	452	391			
% Interviewed	56.6%	2.6%	21.9%	18.9%			

NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS BY AGE									
	Under 14	14 - 17	18 - 21	22 - 64	65+				
Number	329	114	66	1488	67				
% Interviewed	15.9%	5.5%	3.2%	72.1%	3.3%				

NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS BY RACE							
African							
	American	White	Other				
Number	524	1338	202				
% Interviewed 25.4% 64.8% 9.8%							

NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS BY GENDER						
Male Female						
1024	1040					
49.6%	50.4%					

ADULT MENTAL HEALTH & FAMILY INTERVIEWS BY SERVICE		CHILD MENTAL HEA INTERVIEWS BY SERV		DRUG & ALCOHOL INTERVIEWS BY SERVICE		
Service	#	Service #		Service	#	
Extended Acute Care	15	Partial	23	Inpatient Detox	15	
Inpatient	150	Outpatient	8	Non-Hospital Rehab	105	
Partial	80	Service Coordination	137	Partial	33	
Outpatient	244	BHRS / Wraparound	194	Outpatient	164	
Service Coordination	186	Family Based	79	Halfway House	62	
Psychosocial & Vocational	307	Residential Treatment Facility (RTF)	11	Transitional Housing		
Long-Term Structured Residence (LTSR)	40			Bridge Housing	1	
Community Residential Rehabilitation (CRR) & Supported Housing	93					
Enhanced Personal Care Boarding Home (EPCBH)	42					
Diversion & Acute Stabilization (DAS)	2					
Community Treatment Team (CTT)	62					

Standard Satisfaction Interviews	2064
CSP & CHIPP Interviews	246
Customized Survey Interviews	269
Telephone Complaint Interviews	105
Grand Total	2684

TABLE OF CONSUMER AND PARENT RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS ABOUT THEIR TREATMENT – A TWO YEAR COMPARISON

QUESTIONS	YEAR	MEI	NTAL HEA	ALTH	MENTAL HEALTH CHILDREN			DRUG	G & ALCO	OHOL
QUESTIONS	ICAK	Yes/ Sat.	No/ Dissat	Other/ Neutral	Yes/ Sat.	No/ Dissat	Other/ Neutral	Yes/ Sat.	No/ Dissat	Other/ Neutral
(a) How satisfied are you with the hours of operation and	2011	89% (455)	5% (27)	6% (28)	92% (412)	3% (12)	5% (23)	88% (159)	5% (9)	7% (12)
appointment times made available to you?	2012	88% (591)	5% (32)	7% (51)	94% (263)	2% (6)	4% (10)	88% (174)	11% (21)	1% (2)
(b) Do you feel comfortable with the staff who works with	2011	90% (1014)	6% (67)	4% (48)	97% (543)	2% (12)	1% (3)	94% (302)	4% (12)	2% (7)
you?	2012	89% (1090)	8% (98)	3% (33)	98% (444)	1% (5)	1% (3)	92% (359)	7% (26)	1% (6)
(c) Were you given the chance to make treatment decisions?	2011	77% (820)	12% (127)	11% (112)	96% (536)	1% (6)	3% (14)	81% (261)	12% (38)	7% (21)
	2012	82% (916)	10% (112)	8% (94)	95% (431)	2% (9)	3% (12)	83% (323)	11% (45)	6% (23)
(d) Were you involved in planning your treatment or setting	2011	76% (567)	16% (117)	8% (61)	96% (452)	2% (10)	2% (9)	87% (279)	12% (38)	1% (4)
goals for your services?	2012	82% (728)	9% (76)	9% (76)	97% (306)	2% (6)	1% (3)	87% (339)	11% (42)	2% (10)
(e) Have your services helped you with your goals for recovery?	2011	83% (942)	7% (84)	10% (103)	90% (504)	3% (16)	7% (38)	91% (291)	5% (17)	4% (13)
	2012	85% (1037)	6% (74)	9% (110)	94% (424)	3% (13)	3% (15)	91% (357)	3% (12)	6% (22)
(f) What effect has the treatment you received had on the quality of	2011	74% (830)	6% (73)	20% (226)	87% (486)	2% (10)	11% (62)	88% (282)	3% (9)	9% (30)
your life?	2012	76% (924)	5% (62)	19% (235)	88% (397)	2% (8)	10% (47)	87% (339)	2% (7)	11% (45)
(g) Overall, how satisfied are you with the services you	2011	81% (911)	5% (61)	14% (157)	92% (511)	2% (11)	6% (36)	89% (287)	3% (9)	8% (25)
received?	2012	82% (1004)	6% (72)	12% (145)	93% (422)	1% (4)	6% (26)	87% (341)	4% (17)	9% (33)

- There was a 5% increase, 77% to 82% of mental health consumers who reported that they were given the chance to make treatment decisions.
- There was a 6% increase, 76% to 82% of mental health consumers who reported that they were involved in setting goals for their services.

TABLE OF CONSUMER RESPONSES TO QUALITY OF LIFE QUESTIONS A TWO YEAR COMPARISON

		Mental Health Adult				Drug and Alcohol Adult			
QUESTIONS	YEAR	Yes	Unsure	No	No Interest	Yes	Unsure	No	No Interest
Do you feel connected to your community?	2011	59% (444)	5% (44)	34% (255)	2% (14)	62% (196)	3% (13)	34% (107)	1% (2)
	2012	61% (596)	5% (52)	31% (300)	3% (31)	69% (268)	4% (15)	27% (107)	0% (0)

		Mental He	ealth Adult	Drug and Alcohol Adult		
		Employed	Unemployed	Employed	Unemployed	
Are you employed or _unemployed?	2011	12% (115)	88% (849)	19% (59)	81% (258)	
	2012	13% (143)	87% (1000)	15% (60)	85% (330)	

		Mental Health Adult					
		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Not So Sure	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	
Which statement best describes your	2011	23% (191)	33% (276)	10% (88)	21% (181)	13% (131)	
unemployed situation? (for Unemployed Consumers)	2012	27% (268)	35% (353)	10% (96)	17% (172)	11% (111)	

		Drug and Alcohol Adult					
		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Not So Sure	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	
Which statement best describes your	2011	9% (23)	25% (64)	10% (27)	26% (67)	30% (77)	
unemployed situation? (for Unemployed Consumers)	2012	13% (42)	42% (138)	8% (28)	24% (78)	13% (44)	

			M	ental Health Ad	ult	
		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Not So Sure	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
Which statement best	2011	49% (467)	27% (262)	6% (52)	9% (87)	9% (88)
describes your housing situation?	2012	39% (441)	35% (393)	5% (58)	10% (120)	11% (123)

			Dru	ug & Alcohol Ac	lult	
		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Not So Sure	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
Which statement best	2011	41% (127)	39% (123)	3% (8)	6% (19)	11% (35)
describes your housing situation?	2012	32% (125)	40% (155)	5% (19)	11% (43)	12% (46)

- More adult mental health and drug & alcohol services consumers reported feeling connected to their communities – an increase of 2% for mental health and 7% for drug & alcohol service consumers.
- Increased percentages of mental health and drug & alcohol consumers reported being satisfied with their unemployed status 6% more mental health adults and 21% more drug and alcohol services consumers.
- Increased percentages of adult mental health and drug & alcohol services consumers reported being dissatisfied with their housing -3% more mental health adults and 6% more drug & alcohol services consumers.

INTERVIEW RESPONSES OF PEOPLE DISCHARGED FROM MAYVIEW IN 2008 & 2009 - A THREE YEAR COMPARISON

(N = 162 in 2010) (N = 148 in 2011) (N = 134 in 2012)

Do you	get to w	ork on g	oals tha	t are imp	oortant to	you?					
	Yes			No			Unsure		0	ther & N/	Ά
2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012
69% (111)	68% (101)	64% (86)	17% (27)	18% (26)	16% (21)	6% (9)	7% (10)	13% (17)	8% (15)	7% (11)	7% (10)

Has sor	neone h	elped y	ou under	stand yo	our illnes	s?					
	Yes			No			Unsure		0	ther & N/	Ά
2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012
62% 65% 71% 31% 28% 19% (101) (97) (95) (51) (41) (26)						6% (9)	5% (7)	9% (12)	1% (1)	2% (3)	1% (1)

Does yo	ur Servic	e Coordi	nator or	CTT help	you ident	ify your st	rengths?				
	Yes			No			Unsure		0	ther & N/	Α
2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012
61% (99)	61% (90)	66% (89)	23% (38)	28% (42)	16% (21)	12% (20)	8% (11)	16% (21)	4% (5)	3% (5)	2% (3)

Are you	u satisfie	d with th	e service	es you a	re receiv	ring?					
	Yes			No			Unsure		0	ther & N/	Ά
2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012
71% (115)	84% (124)	81% (109)	19% (31)	12% (17)	12% (16)	9% (14)	3% (5)	6% (8)	1% (2)	1% (2)	1% (1)

Is your	life bette	er since y	ou left tl	ne hospi	tal?						
	Yes			No			Unsure		С	ther & N/	Α
2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012
90% (145)	85% (117)	89% (119)	6% (10)	8% (117)	7% (9)	3% (5)	5% (117)	3% (5)	1% (2)	2% (117)	1% (1)

How v	would y	ou rat	e wher	e you	live?									
Е	xceller	t	-	Average	9		Poor			Unsure		0	her & N	IA
2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012
43% (69)	42% (62)	46% (61)	38% (62)	45% (66)	47% (63)	16% (26)	11% (16)	4% (6)	1% (2)	1% (2)	2% (3)	2% (3)	1% (2)	1% (1)

Are you	u workin	g or volu	nteering	?							
	Yes			No			Unsure		0	ther & N/	Α
2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012
19% (30)	18% (27)	24% (32)	81% (131)	79% (117)	75% (101)	(0)	1% (1)	1% (1)	1% (1)	2% (3)	(0)

If not c	urrently v	working,	would y	ou like to	o work?							
Yes No Unsure Other & N/A												
2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012	2010 2011 2012			2010	2011	2012	
54% (87)	41% (61)	38% (51)	28% (45)	36% (53)	40% (54)	4% (6)	7% (10)	5% (6)	14% (24)	16% (24)	17% (23)	

Are you	u interest	ed in fur	thering y	our edu	cation?						
	Yes			No			Unsure		0	ther & N/	Α
2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012	2010 2011 2012			2010 2011 2012		
41% (66)	35% (69)	34% (45)	52% (85)	51% (69)	61% (82)	6% (10)	10% (69)	4% (5)	1% (1)	4% (69)	1% (2)

How v	would y	ou rat	e your	social	life?									
Е	xceller	ıt	-	Average	9		Poor			Unsure		0	ther & N	IA
2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012
24% (39)	19% (28)	20% (27)	49% (80)	55% (82)	66% (88)	23% (37)	20% (29)	12% (16)	2% (3)	1% (2)	1% (2)	2% (3)	5% (7)	1% (1)

How v	How would you rate your access to physical health care?													
Е	xcellen	t	A	Average	•	Poor			Unsure			Other & NA		
2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012
39% (63)	34% (51)	28% (37)	49% (79)	42% (62)	62% (84)	7% (11)	9% (13)	6% (8)	3% (5)	8% (12)	3% (4)	2% (4)	7% (10)	1% (1)

Positive Trends (over 3 years)

- There was a 9% increase of consumers who reported that someone has helped them understand their illness.
- There was a 5% increase of consumers who reported that their Service Coordinator or CTT helped them to identify their strengths.
- There was a 12% decrease of consumers who rated their living situation as poor.
- There was a 5% increase of consumers who reported that they worked or volunteered.

• There was an 11% decrease of consumers who rated their social lives as poor.

Negative Trends (over 3 years)

- There was a 5% decrease of consumers who reported that they were able to work on goals important to them.
- There was a 16% decrease of unemployed consumers who reported that they would like to work. In other words, there are 16% less consumers who are motivated to find work.

TABLES OF INTERVIEW RESPONSES FOR COMMUNITY-BASED CHILDRENS MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES – A TWO YEAR COMPARISON

FAMILY BASED MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

How satisfied are you	Satisfied		Neu	ıtral	Dissa	tisfied	Unsure	
with the number of	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012
your family's scheduled visits?	94% (48)	93% (56)	(0)	3% (2)	6% (3)	4% (2)	(0)	(0)

Do you feel	Y	es	N	lo	Unsure		
comfortable with the	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	
staff who works with your family?	92% (47)	97% (58)	4% (2)	3% (2)	4% (2)	(0)	

	Ye	es	Some	times	N	lo	Court Ordered		
Were you given the chance to make	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	
treatment decisions?	98% (50)	97% (58)	2% (1)	1% (1)	(0)	2% (1)	(0)	(0)	

Have your family's	Y	es	N	lo	Unsure		
services helped your	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	
family with their goals?	82% (42)	92% (55)	4% (2)	5% (3)	14% (7)	3% (2)	

What effect has the	Much Better		A Little Better		About the Same		A Little Worse		Much Worse	
treatment your family	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012
received had on the quality of their life?	45% (23)	52% (31)	39% (20)	35% (21)	16% (8)	10% (6)	(0)	(0))	(0)	3% (2)

- 5% more families reported that they were comfortable with the staff who work with them.
- 10% more families reported that services helped them with their goals.

FAMILY FOCUSED SOLUTION BASED SERVICES

How satisfied are you	Satisfied		Neu	utral	Dissa	risfied	Unsure	
with the number of	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012
your family's scheduled visits?	92% (33)	95% (18)	5% (2)	(0)	(0)	5% (1)	3% (1)	(0)

Do you feel	Y	es	N	lo	Unsure		
comfortable with the	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	
staff who works with your family?	100% (36)	100% (19)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	

	Yes		Sometimes		No		Court Ordered	
Were you given the chance to make	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012
treatment decisions?	97% (35)	95% (18)	3% (1)	(0)	(0)	5% (1)	(0)	(O)

	Ye	es	N	0	Unsure		
Have your family's services helped your	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	
family with their goals?	83% (29)	95% (18)	3% (1)	(0)	14% (5)	5% (1)	

What effect has the	Much	Auch Better A Little Better		About the Same		A Little Worse		Much Worse		
treatment your family	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012
received had on the quality of their life?	42% (15)	53% (10)	42% (15)	47% (9)	13% (5)	(O)	(0)	(0))	3% (1)	(0)

- 12% more families reported that services helped them with their goals.
- 16% more families reported that services had a positive effect on their quality of life.

BEHAVIORAL HEALTH REHABILITATION SERVICES (BHRS)

	Satisfied		Neutral		Dissa	hisfied	Unsure	
How satisfied are you with the number of your child's scheduled visits?	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012
	89% (297)	90% (172)	5% (16)	3% (5)	5% (16)	6% (12)	1% (4)	1% (3)

Do you feel comfortable with the staff who works with your child?	Y	es	N	lo	Unsure		
	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	
	98% (354)	100% (194)	2% (7)	(0)	(0)	(0)	

Were you and/or your child given the chance to make treatment decisions?	Yes		Some	times	No		Court Ordered	
	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012
	96% (344)	98% (190)	3% (9)	0% (1)	1% (4)	2% (3)	0% (1)	(0)

Have your child's services helped them with their goals?	Y	es	N	lo	Unsure		
	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	
	93% (337)	96% (185)	3% (9)	2% (3)	4% (15)	2% (4)	

What effect has the	Much Better		A Little Better		About the Same		A Little Worse		Much Worse	
treatment your child received had on the	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012
quality of their life?	55%	54%	37%	38%	7%	7%	0%	0%	1%	1%
	(198)	(104)	(133)	(74)	(25)	(13)	(1)	(1)	(4)	(2)

Significant Changes from 2011 to 2012

• Parents reported a 2-3% improvement in all five areas of BHRS service delivery.

POSITIVE DEVIANCE AND THE PROBLEM OF COMMUNITY INTEGRATION

Since CART's inception in 1998, we have played a part in the on-going quality improvement and system transformation of behavioral health services in Allegheny County. Our role has been and is to accurately reflect the perceptions of behavioral health consumers and their families about service delivery and to promote discussions about how services could be improved. From our vantage point at CART we have seen service quality improve over the past fifteen years because of providers' and payers' efforts to address consumer and family feedback, among other things.

Supporting behavioral health consumers with their recovery became a priority in 2003-2004 because of the findings of the New Freedom Commission. Finding effective ways to do this has proven to be more complex than providing evidence-based/ best practices in facility—based clinics and programs.

Recovery is synonymous with re-integration into community life. Traditional behavioral health services, as a whole, have not been able to effectively work with consumers in the areas of community integration because of financial or structural constraints. Unemployment, subsidized housing and social isolation are the norm for consumers of behavioral health services in Allegheny County. Some consumers are supported by the behavioral health system to find employment, to live in supported and/or subsidized housing and to socialize within programs, but very few consumers take the steps necessary to fully re-integrate into society.

Positive Deviance (PD) is a problem-solving strategy that brings a community of peers together to fix what's wrong by discovering and spreading hidden existing solutions. It is applied to complex social/ behavioral problems that defy technical solutions. The community integration problems faced by the majority of behavioral health consumers seem to warrant a PD approach. In fact, PD has been applied successfully at the New Horizons Drop-In Center in Bellevue where members are solving their identified problem of social isolation by helping each other to improve their social lives outside of the Center on the weekends. Currently, plans are being made to apply PD to the problem of an eighty-seven percent unemployment rate for persons being treated in mental health programs in Allegheny County.

If you would like more information about applying PD to intractable community integration problems contact me at:

CART of Allegheny County, 938 Penn Ave., 5th Floor, Pittsburgh, PA 15222, phone: 412-281-7333 or: <u>pfreund@cartallegheny.org</u>
Paul Freund, Director of Consumer & Family Satisfaction Services, NAMI
Southwestern PA

CART STAFF

Alan Corn, CART Director

Darrell Williams, CHIPP & CSP Supervisor

Paula Pinon, Information Specialist

Marilyn Micknowski, Clerical Support

Minnie Benjamin, Data Reporter

Suzi Wright, Interviewer/ Data Entry

Regina Cass, Interviewer/ Data Entry

Jeffrey Fitzwilliam, Interviewer/ Community Projects Assistant

Lee Moses Interviewer

Mary Bates, Interviewer

Seth Gall, Interviewer

Phyllis Nettles, Interviewer

Brian Rayne, Interviewer

Paul Freund, C/FST Services Director

Christine Michaels, Executive Director, NAMI Southwestern PA

2012 CART ADVISORY BOARD

Eva Bednar, NAMI Southwestern PA

Curtis Constant, MA, Mercy Behavioral Health

Craig Dorin, MA, Transitional Services, Inc.

Kim Falk, PhD, Evaluation Specialist, Allegheny County Office of Behavioral Health, Department of Human Services

Antonio Fevola, PhD, University of Pittsburgh, Early Childhood Partnerships

Ray Firth, MEd, University of Pittsburgh, Office of Child Development

Michael Gruber, MSW, Allegheny County Office of Behavioral Health, Department of Human Services

Harold Hartger, MSW, CPRP, Mercy Behavioral Health

Linda Morrison, PhD, Duquesne University, Department of Sociology

Curtis Upsher, MS, Community Care Behavioral Health

Denise Weis, Community Support Program (CSP)

FUNDERS

Allegheny County Department of Human Services & Community Care