

COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH AFFILIATION OF MID-MICHIGAN

**Community Mental Health Authority - Clinton-Eaton-Ingham
Gratiot Community Mental Health Agency
Ionia Community Mental Health Services
Manistee-Benzie Community Mental Health
Newaygo Community Mental Health**

SUMMARY OF SATISFACTION SURVEYS: 2008

By

Richard J. Coelho, Ph.D.

February 2009

Consumer Satisfaction Surveys – 2008

As part of the Community Mental Health Affiliation of Mid-Michigan's (Affiliation) quality improvement efforts, several satisfaction surveys (e.g., consumer, referral source, contractors, and family/guardian) were administered during the year. Specifically, a satisfaction survey was administered to persons who were receiving Affiliation services during a specified period, a survey to persons who no longer receive treatment because their case has been closed, and a survey to community persons who refer persons for treatment to Affiliation CMHs', as well as, persons who contract services with the organization and family members/guardians of persons residing in directly operated or contract operated residential settings.

Survey Instruments

- I. The "**Open Cases Satisfaction Survey**" consisted of eleven items recommended by the Michigan Department of Community Health. Although the same eleven questions were asked of all participants, the response rating format differed between programs. Respondents in programs for persons with developmental disabilities responded to a format that required each to respond either "yes," "not sure," or "no" to each question. Respondents at other mental health programs responded using a five-point Likert-type scale ("strongly disagree," "disagree," "neither," "agree," "strongly agree"). Also, each survey contained a section to identify each respondent's ethnic background, as well as, who completed or assisted in completing the survey (i.e., self, parent, friend, or staff). If a respondent elected not

to respond or could not communicate answers, a section was provided on the survey to record this information. The survey was administered to 4,804 clients open within the Affiliation CMH system.

- II. The “**Closed Cases Satisfaction Survey**” contained nine items rated on five-point Likert-type scales (“**strongly disagree**,” “**disagree**,” “**neither**,” “**agree**,” “**strongly agree**”) that allows for neutral responses. The instrument also includes a section for the respondent to indicate the program they attended, their ethnicity, who completed or assisted in completing the survey, and a section for the respondent to record comments. The survey was administered to 570 former clients.

- III. The “**Contractor Satisfaction Survey**” contained 20 questions, divided into three sections (e.g., clinical care, administration, demographics). Fourteen questions use a four-point Likert-type format (“**very satisfied**,” “**somewhat satisfied**,” “**somewhat dissatisfied**,” “**very dissatisfied**”). Five questions identify participant demographics (e.g., practice type, tenure with CMH). The questionnaire also includes a section for respondents to provide written comments for enhancing their satisfaction level. The survey was administered by mail to 311 contractors.

- IV. The ***“Referral Source Satisfaction Survey”*** consisted of six items, rated on five-point Likert-type scales that allow for neutral responses (***“strongly disagree,” “disagree,” “neutral,” “agree,” “strongly agree”***). The weights corresponding to responses for each item are summed over the six items to yield a total score, with higher scores representing greater satisfaction with CMH services. The instrument also allows for respondents to record any additional comments or suggestions. The “Referral Source” survey was administered by mail to 494 persons from the community.
- V. The ***“Residential Satisfaction Surveys”*** are three separate brief surveys designed to give people receiving services, their guardian/family members, and case managers an opportunity to express their level of satisfaction with residential services provided by Affiliation CMH’s. Each survey is designed to be easily completed.
- A. The ***“Resident Satisfaction Survey”*** consisted of 15 items, rated by the respondent on either a three-point scale (e.g., ***“bad,” “ok,”*** or ***“good”***) or rated on a two-point scale (e.g., ***“yes”*** or ***“no”***). The survey instrument also ascertains how long the individual has resided in the particular home (e.g., 0-6 months, 6-12 months). One question ascertains the resident’s future expectation for residential location and who completed the survey (e.g., the resident or with assistance). The instrument also allowed for respondents to record any additional comments or suggestions. There was also a section for the resident to indicate their ethnicity.

- B. The “**Family/Guardian Satisfaction Survey**” contained 18 items, rated by the respondent as either “no,” “not sure,” or “yes.” The survey instrument also ascertains the frequency of guardian visits to the home (e.g., weekly, monthly) and the respondent's relationship to the resident (e.g., parent, sibling, etc.). The instrument also allowed for respondents to record comments or suggestions.
- C. The “**Case Manager Satisfaction Survey**” consisted of 14 items, rated by the case manager as either “no,” “not sure,” or “yes.” The instrument also allowed for respondents to record comments or suggestions about the home.

Each satisfaction survey was coded to the resident, the resident's guardian, the resident's case manager and the resident's Affiliation CMH. Ten percent of the completed questionnaires were re-entered as a quality control measure. Seven hundred and forty (n=740) surveys were sent to residents and 543 to family members or guardians.

General Findings

Survey Standards

The minimum standards (criteria) expected for each question on the **Closed, Open, Referral** and **Contractor** surveys have been established by the QI Group (see the table below). The criteria was applied for the 2008 survey administration. The **Resident** and **Guardian** residential surveys have standards based on “standard scores” (i.e., below a standard score of 40 may require more attention by the QI Group and the identified CMH).

- For the “**Open Cases**” survey, respondents showed high levels of satisfaction. For the eleven survey questions, satisfaction levels ranged from 87% to 97%, which compares favorably with results from last year’s administration. For the Affiliation, response rates for all eleven survey items surpassed the minimum standards established for each item.
- For the “**Closed Cases**” survey, respondents indicated high levels of satisfaction. For the nine survey questions, satisfaction levels ranged from 82% to 95%. This finding compares favorably with last year’s administration. For the Affiliation, response rates showed that five of the nine survey items met or surpassed the minimum standards established for each item.
- The “**Referral**” survey showed that respondents gave a high provider satisfaction grade with CMH services. For the six questions, satisfaction levels ranged from 67% to 87%. The average response score for all questions was 4.80 indicating respondents high level of satisfaction with the Affiliation’s service delivery system. For the Affiliation, response rates showed that five of the six survey items surpassed the minimum standards established for each item.
- This was the sixth administration of the “**Contractor**” survey instrument. Overall, contractors were positive with the services and treatment received for CMH. Respondents were asked 14 questions related to CMH’s ability to offer quality clinical care and the administration’s effectiveness. The satisfaction levels ranged from 88% to 100%. For the Affiliation, response rates for all fourteen survey items surpassed the minimum standards established for each item.
- The “**Residential**” surveys showed that respondents gave a high provider satisfaction grade with CMH services. Standard scores showed that residents and guardians were very positive with the services provided by Affiliation residential services.

Closed Cases Satisfaction Survey ("Agree/Strongly Agree")	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Minimum Standard
1. CMH responded promptly to my request for services.	84	94	85	88	81	93	70%
2. CMH staff were courteous and respectful.	90	89	95	91	95	95	85%
3. CMH staff helped me get the right type of services for my problem.	82	92	79	85	83	84	85%
4. In general, I was satisfied with the services provided by CMH.	83	92	80	86	83	84	85%
5. CMH staff understood my needs and situation.	83	91	77	85	81	82	85%
6. CMH staff had the knowledge and skills to serve me well.	86	91	79	86	90	86	85%
7. If a friend or family member were in need of similar services, I would recommend my CMH program to him or her.	86	86	81	86	83	89	85%
8. The services I received helped me to function better in my life.	81	85	76	79	85	78	80%
9. If I were to seek help again, I would come back to the same program.	81	86	79	82	83	91	80%

Referral Source Satisfaction Survey ("agree/strongly agree")	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Minimum Standard
1. CMH responded promptly to my request for service.	71	70	69	72	67	79	60%
2. CMH provided timely feedback regarding disposition of referrals or service contacts.	56	56	61	61	57	67	60%
3. CMH staff helped referred individuals get the right type of service for their problem.	60	66	61	69	63	69	60%
4. CMH staff I (we) have dealt with have been courteous, knowledgeable and helpful.	82	79	81	90	84	87	60%
5. Communication with CMH on mutual clients has been satisfactory.	69	73	69	75	70	80	60%
6. In general, I (we) were satisfied with the services provided by CMH.	65	69	69	77	70	81	60%

Open Cases Satisfaction Survey ("Yes/Agree/Strongly Agree")	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Minimum Standard
1. CMH responded to my request for services.	90	91	91	92	92	91	85%
2. CMH staff are courteous and respectful.	96	96	96	96	95	97	85%
3. CMH staff helps me to get the right type of services for my problem.	92	92	92	92	92	92	85%
4. In general, I am satisfied with the services provided by CMH.	93	93	93	93	93	93	85%
5. CMH staff understand my needs and situation.	91	91	91	91	92	92	85%
6. CMH staff have the knowledge and skills to serve me well.	92	93	94	93	94	93	85%
7. If a friend or family member were in need of similar services, I would recommend my CMH program to him or her.	91	91	91	92	91	91	85%
8. The services I receive help me to function better in my life.	90	90	90	91	91	91	85%
9. If I were to seek help again, I would come back to the same program.	90	91	91	92	91	92	85%
10. CMH staff follows my person centered plan (PCP) or family centered plan.	89	89	87	91	91	92	85%
11. CMH helped me identify natural supports.	85	87	86	87	89	87	85%

Contractor Satisfaction Survey ("Very/Somewhat Satisfied")	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Minimum Standard
How satisfied are you with CMH in the following areas related to clinical care?							
1. How satisfied are you with the quality of the care authorization process at CMH.	99	95	93	89	94	95	80
2. How satisfied are you with access to consultations relative to a specific client or episode with CMH staff?	93	93	96	91	93	97	80
3. How satisfied are you with grievance and appeal procedures at CMH?	100	94	91	93	83	96	80
4. How satisfied are you with the customer service provided by CMH to clients and their families?	93	87	89	92	97	99	80
5. How satisfied are you with the customer service provided by CMH to contractors and office staff?	97	90	91	88	94	98	80
6. Do you feel that CMH clients are well informed about their rights as a mental health consumer?	95	93	96	95	98	100	80
How satisfied are you with CMH in the following areas related to administration and organization?							
7. How satisfied are you with the amount of paperwork required by CMH?	92	86	89	86	91	88	80
8. How satisfied are you with the timeliness of payment for your services from CMH?	96	90	90	97	96	94	80
9. How satisfied are you with the accuracy of payment for your services from CMH?	100	97	95	97	98	97	80
10. How satisfied are you with the training provided by CMH to the staff of contractors?	97	88	89	87	93	96	80
11. How satisfied are you with your ability to participate in quality management or quality assurance activities?	89	91	96	86	94	95	80
12. How satisfied are you with the contract negotiation process used by CMH?	92	85	87	83	93	92	80
13. How satisfied are you with CMH's efforts to keep you informed about issues that may impact CMH or your organization (e.g., changes in funding, regulations)?	91	84	84	88	89	96	80
14. How satisfied are you with CMH's openness to your recommendations for changes in their contractual operations and their negotiations with your organization?	95	83	89	84	85	96	80

Resident Satisfaction Survey

Standard Scores for Survey Type by CMH (MEAN=50.00; Standard Deviation=10)

CEI	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Resident Satisfaction Survey	48.03	48.04	48.16	47.26	48.66	48.32
Family/Guardian Satisfaction Survey	49.80	49.38	49.58	50.88	49.44	49.66
Case Manager Satisfaction Survey	50.73	49.87	51.38	49.61	49.05	49.11
IONIA	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Resident Satisfaction Survey	48.55	47.39	57.64	55.36	49.49	51.23
Family/Guardian Satisfaction Survey	47.95	50.54	52.57	48.27	51.53	51.17
Case Manager Satisfaction Survey	49.35	52.52	45.47	50.44	54.83	52.66
GRATIOT	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Resident Satisfaction Survey	56.32	54.50	52.61	53.46	50.31	54.68
Family/Guardian Satisfaction Survey	51.26	52.80	48.55	51.63	51.86	52.71
Case Manager Satisfaction Survey	52.19	40.03	44.06	48.68	51.24	52.27
NEWAYGO	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Resident Satisfaction Survey	48.21	54.73	55.70	54.77	55.05	50.59
Family/Guardian Satisfaction Survey	50.33	52.22	53.00	44.86	52.36	51.40
Case Manager Satisfaction Survey	33.39	53.22	52.82	53.21	55.33	53.62
MANISTEE-BENZIE	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Resident Satisfaction Survey	54.78	54.37	53.21	54.77	54.08	54.99
Family/Guardian Satisfaction Survey	51.11	47.61	50.69	46.63	48.96	44.20
Case Manager Satisfaction Survey	49.75	52.58	51.00	51.13	46.57	47.12

STANDARD:

T-Score Above 60 (above average satisfaction level)

T-Score 40-60 (average satisfaction level range)

T-Score below 40 (below average & may require more QI attention)