

# 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**

## 2009 REFERRAL SOURCE SATISFACTION SURVEY

BY

Richard J. Coelho

December 2009

Technical Report Number: **09003**

## 2009 Referral Source Satisfaction Survey

### I. Summary

Referral source satisfaction surveys are a form of "feedback" from those who have referred persons for services (i.e., referral sources). Feedback may assume many forms, and the conclusions one can draw from feedback depend on the strength and type of controls placed over the collection of information. For example, comments from providers or referral sources can offer meaningful insights that can lead to the improvement of service delivery.

In general, the purpose of consumer satisfaction is to demonstrate how well an organization is progressing toward its goal of service improvement. By asking representative groups of customers about their level of satisfaction, the results can produce careful, quantitative ratings of performance over time. The purpose of this survey was to help the Community Mental Health Affiliation of Mid-Michigan (1) gauge the level of satisfaction among its providers and referral sources and (2) determine ways it could improve its practices to better serve its customers. This report describes the survey process, presents its results, and recommends actions that could be taken to address the significant issues identified by survey respondents.

The Referral Source Satisfaction Survey was developed by the Michigan Department of Community Health and intended to be a standardized and general measure of satisfaction for use by community mental health organizations in the state. The instrument consists of six items, rated on five-point Likert-type scales that allow for neutral responses. 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. (See Appendix D for a copy of the survey instrument). The instrument also allows for respondents to record any

additional comments or suggestions. Appendix A shows the survey trends for selected items.

Each CMH compiled a listing of current referral sources for their organization. Each survey was coded by CMH (i.e., CEI, Ionia, Gratiot, Newaygo or Manistee-Benzie). Coded survey forms were then mailed by each CMH to their referral source listed. The mailing included an informational letter from the particular CMH, a survey form (with their organization's name on it) and a stamped self-addressed return envelope. Surveys were mailed by each CMH during end of September 2009 and returned to the CEI Evaluation Unit for data entry and analysis.

Each survey contained a section at the end to request direct contact from the CMH regarding their comments. When this section was completed by the respondent, a copy of the survey and identifying information was sent directly to the CMH's representative for follow-up.

## **II. Findings**

Four hundred and seventeen (n=417) referral source surveys were mailed. One hundred and fifty-seven (n=157) surveys were completed and used in the data analysis. This was a return rate of 38% (up from 33% last year). Table 1 shows the return rates for Ionia (51%) and Manistee-Benzie (25%), Gratiot (32%), CEI (44%) and Newaygo (32%).

**Table 1: 2009 Affiliation Referral Source Survey Return Rates**

<b>PROGRAM</b>	<b># Mailed</b>	<b># Returned (completed)</b>	<b>Return Rate (%)</b>
<b>CEI</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>IONIA</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>GRATIOT</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>NEWAYGO</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>MANISTEE-BENZIE</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>417</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>38%</b>

Return rate is calculated on the following formula: [(# Returned Completed)/((# mailed)-(# returned from P.O.))] X 100

Demographic information showed that respondents were represented by administrators (n=45, 29%), representatives from law enforcement/ probation/judicial system (n=18, 12%), and clinicians (n=24, 16%). Referring agency respondents were also represented by representatives from educational institutions (n=24, 16%), physicians (n=18, 12%), representatives from advocacy organizations (n=7, 5%), and other (n=17, 11%).

Many respondents (n=134, 90%) had referred a consumer to CMH during 2009. Five people reported the last time they referred a client to CMH was in 2008 and three people reported their last referral to be in 2007 or earlier. Seven people reported having no contact with CMH. (See Appendix E for frequencies to the demographic questions by each CMH).

In addition, respondents were asked about their frequency of referrals over the past year. Results showed that 43 respondents (29%) had referred eleven or more times over the past year, 68 (46%) indicated they referred 3-10 times, and 26 (18%) indicated that they referred 1-2 times. Ten respondents (7%) indicated that they had not referred clients to CMH over the past year. Overall, respondents seem very familiar with each CMH within the Affiliation and their services.

### III. Analysis of Findings

Overall, respondents gave a high provider satisfaction grade with Affiliation services and each of its five CMH organizations. Many of the respondents were either administrators or clinicians from referring agencies who have had frequent contact with CMH over the past year. Most respondents expressed that they were satisfied with the prompt manner that CMH responds to request for services, that staff were courteous and helpful, and an overall satisfaction with the services provided by CMH.

The response frequencies to the six items of the Referral Source Satisfaction Survey are reported in Table 3. The means by CMH for each of the six survey items are reported in Table 4. Item means ranged from 3.50 to 4.48, indicating that they were in the "agree" range of response. From Table 5, most respondents expressed that they were most satisfied. Eighty-six percent responded "agree" or "strongly agree" to the question: "CMH staff I (we) have dealt with have been courteous, knowledgeable and helpful." Seventy-six percent responded "agree" or "strongly agree" to the question: "Communication with CMH on mutual clients has been satisfactory." Seventy-one percent responded "agree" or "disagree" to the question: "CMH responded promptly to my request for service. For question number 6: "In general, I (we) were satisfied with the

services provided by CMH." Seventy-three percent stated that they "agreed" or "strongly agreed" with this statement. (See Appendix B for frequencies by each CMH).

On the other hand, respondents expressed their lowest satisfaction level with question number 2. Sixty-three percent responded "agree" or "strongly agree" to the question: "CMH provided timely feedback regarding disposition of referrals or service contacts."

**Table 3: Frequencies and Percentages for Survey Items for the CMH System**

2009 Referral Source Satisfaction Survey										
Community Mental Health Affiliation of Mid-Michigan (CEI, Ionia, Gratiot, Newaygo, & Manistee-Benzie)										
	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1. CMH responded promptly to my request for service.	2	1	10	7	32	21	70	46	40	26
2. CMH provided timely feedback regarding disposition of referrals or service contacts.	6	4	17	11	34	22	61	40	36	23
3. CMH staff helped referred individuals get the right type of service for their problem.	2	1	13	9	38	25	66	43	34	22
4. CMH staff I (we) have dealt with have been courteous, knowledgeable and helpful.	2	1	3	2	17	11	64	41	69	45
5. Communication with CMH on mutual clients has been satisfactory.	1	1	12	8	23	15	61	40	55	36
6. In general, I (we) were satisfied with the services provided by CMH.	6	4	10	6	26	17	72	46	42	27

N=157 (Manistee-Benzie, n=12 Ionia, n=23 Gratiot, n=27 Newaygo, n=25 CEI, n=70)

To obtain an overall impression of provider satisfaction with CMH services, a total scale

score (sum) was developed for the Affiliation mental health system and its five CMHs. The total scale score for the survey was formed by summing the six item scores.

The means and standard deviations derived from the total (sum) scale score of the satisfaction survey by CMH program are reported in Table 4. Total scale score means for programs ranged from 22.44 to 25.23 with the overall Affiliation mean being 23.60. Thus, Respondents from all Affiliation CMHs indicated a high level of satisfaction with each CMH=s service delivery system.

**Table 4: Means by CMH for Survey Items**

Survey Item	CEI	Ionia	Newaygo	Manistee-Benzie	Gratiot	Total
1. CMH responded promptly to referrals and request for service.	3.67	4.26	3.88	3.92	4.12	3.88
2. CMH provided timely feedback regarding disposition of referrals or service contacts.	3.50	3.87	3.68	3.50	4.04	3.68
3. CMH staff helped referred individuals get the right type of service for their problem.	3.53	3.91	3.80	3.91	4.15	3.76
4. CMH staff I (we) have dealt with have been courteous, knowledgeable and helpful.	4.10	4.48	4.42	4.17	4.38	4.26
5. Communication with CMH on mutual clients has been satisfactory.	3.87	4.30	3.88	4.08	4.35	4.03
6. In general, I (we) were satisfied with the services provided by CMH.	3.56	4.39	3.92	3.75	4.19	3.86
Sum Score	22.44	25.22	23.59	23.36	25.23	23.60

(Total N=157) Range of item means = 3.35 to 4.39

**Table 5: Percentages of "Agree/Strongly Agree" By Affiliation CMH for Survey Items**

Survey Item	Percentage “Agree/Strongly Agree”					
	CEI	Ionia	Newaygo	Manistee-Benzie	Gratiot	Total
1. CMH responded promptly to referrals and request for service.	64	87	75	75	73	71
2. CMH provided timely feedback regarding disposition of referrals or service contacts.	54	70	68	58	77	63
3. CMH staff helped referred individuals get the right type of service for their problem.	56	78	60	73	81	65
4. CMH staff I (we) have dealt with have been courteous, knowledgeable and helpful.	83	91	88	83	89	86
5. Communication with CMH on mutual clients has been satisfactory.	70	87	63	92	89	76
6. In general, I (we) were satisfied with the services provided by CMH.	64	87	76	75	81	73

#### IV. Use of Findings

The percentages by Affiliation and its member CMHs indicate areas in which referral source satisfaction is very positive (score of 4 and above), neutral (scores of 3), and not positive (scores of 2 or lower). Each CMH staff should use these findings along with the written comments to further initiate quality improvement efforts.



## APPENDIX A

### SURVEY TRENDS - SELECTED VARIABLES

<b>SURVEY TRENDS c Selected Variables</b>								
<b>Means for Survey Items by Year, Return Rates and Number of Respondents</b>								
<b>SURVEY ITEMS</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>
1. CMH responded promptly to my request for service.	3.62	3.67	3.66	3.26	3.55	3.66	3.66	3.67
2. CMH provided timely feedback regarding disposition of referrals or service contacts.	3.54	3.44	3.38	3.29	3.31	3.46	3.36	3.50
3. CMH staff helped referred individuals get the right type of service for their problem.	3.53	3.58	3.59	3.10	3.46	3.56	3.37	3.53
4. CMH staff I (we) have dealt with have been courteous, knowledgeable and helpful.	4.08	4.31	4.02	3.73	4.21	4.02	4.29	4.10
5. Communication with CMH on mutual clients has been satisfactory.	3.71	3.95	3.69	3.29	4.07	3.76	3.91	3.87
6. In general, I (we) were satisfied with the services provided by CMH.	3.43	3.76	3.52	3.22	3.78	3.68	3.70	3.56
<b>SUM SCORE</b>	<b>22.00</b>	<b>22.65</b>	<b>21.78</b>	<b>19.79</b>	<b>22.41</b>	<b>22.15</b>	<b>22.34</b>	<b>22.44</b>
<b>RETURN RATE (%)</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>44%</b>
<b>RESPONDENTS TO SURVEY</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>70</b>

**IONIA CMH SYSTEM**

<b>SURVEY TRENDS c Selected Variables Means for Survey Items by Year, Return Rates and Number of Respondents</b>								
<b>SURVEY ITEMS</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>
1. CMH responded promptly to my request for service.	3.40	4.14	4.06	4.20	3.85	4.23	4.36	4.26
2. CMH provided timely feedback regarding disposition of referrals or service contacts.	3.30	4.00	3.75	3.80	3.54	3.85	4.09	3.87
3. CMH staff helped referred individuals get the right type of service for their problem.	3.40	3.63	3.76	3.80	3.85	4.15	4.12	3.91
4. CMH staff I (we) have dealt with have been courteous, knowledgeable and helpful.	3.80	4.38	4.33	4.50	4.31	4.54	4.56	4.48
5. Communication with CMH on mutual clients has been satisfactory.	3.50	4.00	3.94	4.05	3.85	4.15	4.21	4.30
6. In general, I (we) were satisfied with the services provided by CMH.	3.40	4.13	4.19	4.25	3.88	4.38	4.33	4.39
<b>SUM SCORE</b>	<b>20.80</b>	<b>24.29</b>	<b>24.36</b>	<b>24.60</b>	<b>23.27</b>	<b>25.30</b>	<b>25.76</b>	<b>25.22</b>
<b>RETURN RATE (%)</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>51%</b>
<b>RESPONDENTS TO SURVEY</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>23</b>

GRATIOT CMH SYSTEM

<b>SURVEY TRENDS c Selected Variables</b> <b>Means for Survey Items by Year,</b> <b>Return Rates and Number of Respondents</b>								
<b>SURVEY ITEMS</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>
1. CMH responded promptly to my request for service.	3.73	3.33	3.76	3.96	4.27	4.07	4.23	4.12
2. CMH provided timely feedback regarding disposition of referrals or service contacts.	3.52	3.38	3.38	3.72	4.14	3.85	4.14	4.04
3. CMH staff helped referred individuals get the right type of service for their problem.	3.42	3.39	3.69	3.88	4.10	3.81	4.09	4.15
4. CMH staff I (we) have dealt with have been courteous, knowledgeable and helpful.	3.88	3.65	3.93	4.24	4.36	4.30	4.37	4.38
5. Communication with CMH on mutual clients has been satisfactory.	3.66	3.26	3.65	4.08	3.90	3.96	4.26	4.35
6. In general, I (we) were satisfied with the services provided by CMH.	3.63	3.22	3.85	4.04	4.09	3.88	4.20	4.19
<b>SUM SCORE</b>	<b>21.90</b>	<b>20.71</b>	<b>22.43</b>	<b>23.88</b>	<b>24.81</b>	<b>23.88</b>	<b>25.29</b>	<b>25.23</b>
<b>RETURN RATE (%)</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>32%</b>
<b>RESPONDENTS TO SURVEY</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>27</b>

**NEWAYGO CMH SYSTEM**

<b>SURVEY TRENDS c Selected Variables Means for Survey Items by Year, Return Rates and Number of Respondents</b>								
<b>SURVEY ITEMS</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>
1. CMH responded promptly to my request for service.	4.00	3.70	4.12	4.22	4.13	3.44	3.75	3.88
2. CMH provided timely feedback regarding disposition of referrals or service contacts.	3.88	3.55	4.06	4.00	3.25	3.28	3.92	3.68
3. CMH staff helped referred individuals get the right type of service for their problem.	3.94	3.88	3.88	4.20	3.63	3.71	3.73	3.80
4. CMH staff I (we) have dealt with have been courteous, knowledgeable and helpful.	4.12	4.21	4.47	4.40	4.33	4.33	4.17	4.42
5. Communication with CMH on mutual clients has been satisfactory.	3.88	3.96	4.13	4.30	3.57	3.78	4.00	3.88
6. In general, I (we) were satisfied with the services provided by CMH.	4.12	3.88	4.13	4.30	3.75	3.82	4.08	3.92
<b>SUM SCORE</b>	24.31	23.95	24.81	25.78	22.43	22.29	23.50	23.59
<b>RETURN RATE (%)</b>	26%	41%	35%	13%	11%	24%	17%	32%
<b>RESPONDENTS TO SURVEY</b>	18	25	17	10	9	18	13	25

**MANISTEE-BENZIE CMH SYSTEM**

<b>SURVEY TRENDS c Selected Variables</b> <b>Means for Survey Items by Year,</b> <b>Return Rates and Number of Respondents</b>								
<b>SURVEY ITEMS</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>
1. CMH responded promptly to my request for service.	3.61	3.41	3.45	3.68	3.37	3.32	3.71	3.92
2. CMH provided timely feedback regarding disposition of referrals or service contacts.	3.28	2.82	3.30	3.42	3.56	3.35	3.30	3.50
3. CMH staff helped referred individuals get the right type of service for their problem.	3.61	3.35	3.60	3.47	3.39	3.39	3.23	3.291
4. CMH staff I (we) have dealt with have been courteous, knowledgeable and helpful.	3.94	4.00	4.03	4.26	4.42	4.13	4.16	4.17
5. Communication with CMH on mutual clients has been satisfactory.	3.61	3.47	3.87	3.79	3.78	3.78	3.70	4.08
6. In general, I (we) were satisfied with the services provided by CMH.	3.50	3.24	3.42	3.42	3.47	3.39	3.62	3.75
<b>SUM SCORE</b>	21.56	20.29	21.41	22.05	22.35	21.23	21.96	23.36
<b>RETURN RATE (%)</b>	48%	46%	38%	25%	26%	30%	30%	25%
<b>RESPONDENTS TO SURVEY</b>	19	17	31	19	20	24	31	12

## APPENDIX B

### RESULTS By CMH

## Referral Source Satisfaction Survey

CEI - 2009

	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. CMH responded promptly to my request for service.	1	1	3	4	21	30	37	54	7	10
2. CMH provided timely feedback regarding disposition of referrals or service contacts.	2	4	8	12	20	29	26	38	11	16
3. CMH staff helped referred individuals get the right type of service for their problem.	2	3	7	10	21	31	29	42	9	13
4. CMH staff I (we) have dealt with have been courteous, knowledgeable and helpful.	1	1	2	3	9	13	35	50	23	33
5. Communication with CMH on mutual clients has been satisfactory.	1	2	7	10	12	18	27	40	20	30
6. In general, I (we) were satisfied with the services provided by CMH.	5	7	4	6	16	23	37	53	8	11



## Referral Source Satisfaction Survey

NEWAYGO - 2009

	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. CMH responded promptly to my request for service.	1	4	4	4	4	17	12	50	6	25
2. CMH provided timely feedback regarding disposition of referrals or service contacts.	1	4	4	16	3	12	11	44	6	24
3. CMH staff helped referred individuals get the right type of service for their problem.	0	0	2	8	8	32	8	32	7	28
4. CMH staff I (we) have dealt with have been courteous, knowledgeable and helpful.	0	0	0	0	3	13	8	33	13	54
5. Communication with CMH on mutual clients has been satisfactory.	0	0	3	13	6	25	6	25	9	38
6. In general, I (we) were satisfied with the services provided by CMH.	0	0	3	12	3	12	12	48	7	28

## Referral Source Satisfaction Survey

GRATIOT - 2009

	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. CMH responded promptly to my request for service.	0	0	3	12	4	15	6	23	13	50
2. CMH provided timely feedback regarding disposition of referrals or service contacts.	2	8	0	0	4	15	9	35	11	42
3. CMH staff helped referred individuals get the right type of service for their problem.	0	0	1	4	4	15	11	42	10	39
4. CMH staff I (we) have dealt with have been courteous, knowledgeable and helpful.	1	4	0	0	2	8	8	31	15	58
5. Communication with CMH on mutual clients has been satisfactory.	0	0	1	4	2	8	10	39	5	50
6. In general, I (we) were satisfied with the services provided by CMH.	1	4	1	4	3	12	8	31	13	50

## Referral Source Satisfaction Survey

IONIA - 2009

	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. CMH responded promptly to my request for service.	0	0	1	4	2	9	10	44	10	44
2. CMH provided timely feedback regarding disposition of referrals or service contacts.	0	0	2	9	5	22	10	44	6	26
3. CMH staff helped referred individuals get the right type of service for their problem.	0	0	3	13	2	9	12	52	6	26
4. CMH staff I (we) have dealt with have been courteous, knowledgeable and helpful.	0	0	1	4	1	4	7	30	14	61
5. Communication with CMH on mutual clients has been satisfactory.	0	0	0	0	3	13	10	44	10	44
6. In general, I (we) were satisfied with the services provided by CMH.	0	0	0	0	3	13	8	35	12	52

## Referral Source Satisfaction Survey

MANISTEE-BENZIE - 2009

	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. CMH responded promptly to my request for service.	0	0	2	17	1	8	5	42	4	33
2. CMH provided timely feedback regarding disposition of referrals or service contacts.	0	0	3	25	2	17	5	42	2	17
3. CMH staff helped referred individuals get the right type of service for their problem.	0	0	0	0	3	27	6	55	5	18
4. CMH staff I (we) have dealt with have been courteous, knowledgeable and helpful.	0	0	0	0	2	17	4	50	4	33
5. Communication with CMH on mutual clients has been satisfactory.	0	0	1	8	0	0	8	67	3	25
6. In general, I (we) were satisfied with the services provided by CMH.	0	0	2	17	1	8	7	58	2	17

## Appendix C

### Written Comments

## Referral Source Satisfaction Survey – 2009 Comments

### 2009 Referral Comments

#### CEI

We believe for the emergency services portion of CMH for clients we have referred have been and continues to be disappointing at best. We have come to understand the ES will not provide appropriate services for our youth in need.

Services for children and adolescents are in greater demand but resources are becoming more limited. Centralized emergency services in Lansing makes it very difficult for law enforcement and case workers to get clients from the crisis situation in outlying areas to an assessment and referral to appropriate services.

Although the relationship and services our client receives has certainly improved; there is great need for some systematic changes that will yield stronger services for homeless, uninsured citizens.

Unfortunately more often than not fails at its primary function – assisting the mentally ill of the tri-county area, providing them with access to treatment and ensuring that they complete this treatment. The homeless and people living below poverty, in particular, seem to be completely forgotten – it may appear that the sole purpose of CMH is to come up with creative ways to refuse them services.

We understand that funding is limited but in all honesty, CEI is the worst county to deal with, they do not look at individuals on a case by case basis, very little services are available, clients from your county are not being served well at all. This isn't about specific staff; it's a bigger systems issue that needs to be addressed.

Outpatient mental services for adults is desperately needed.

We need more access for complicated depressed and bi-polar patients.

Given the high demand for services, decreased staff and fiscal resources it's amazing how well L and other CMH staff I've worked and partnered with can do such an outstanding job. A has also been engaged and helpful to our team!

I have referred patients for medication management on psychotherapies without assistance. Providing an outline of what sources you provide would be helpful.

Eaton County appreciates any support and collaboration with CMH. We are honored to have A have an office in one of our buildings - this has helped greatly. We understand that budgets are tight but we still experience frustration for accessing services for our young adults with mental health issues.

As a Director, I have not had occasion for direct referral or contact. However, my staff reports reasonable results.

The reports given by CMH staff are not of much benefit. I do not like the little boxes that are checked to report progress in the tx, there is not enough information provided here. I would prefer a more thorough summary report of how my youth is doing in tx.

CMH is critical to our facility, inmates and staff. The support, communication, emergency services and communications are always with professionalism.

I had asked for brochures about your services for my students who will exit out of special services at age 26 to give parents. I have not yet received then when I asked in August 2009.

I have not referred clients directly but as an administrator discuss with staff their experiences.

ACT is great!

Our school works primarily with CSDD. The workers in the children's division are outstanding collaborators and communicators. This is not always the case when we work with case workers for our adult students. It seems to depend on which worker is assigned and this can be frustrating.

Our collaboration with Eaton County Counseling Center through Truancy Intervention Program has been a huge success. We made 69 referrals to ECCC in the 2008-2009 fiscal year. I can't imagine conducting my work with truant students without ECCC as a resource and partner.

When asking for help and direction people that answer phone could sound pleased to help you. My social workers both felt put off like they were bothering someone.

Keeping up with what you offer to whom and what services are covered is difficult at times.

We utilize Emergency Services and the PIP program for our prenatal clinics as well as Family Planning Clinic who we refer to Open Door.

CMH has been of NO help to minors in need of treatment.

I would appreciate professional development opportunities – along with support for our parents who have children with a mental illness.

### **GRATIOT**

your staff is very friendly and knowledgeable. They always have very good information for us and very helpful hints. We are very lucky to have them!

I understand there have been many budget cuts, however, the need for home-based services for children and their families is a must. If there is any way to increase services in this area please do – you are spread much too thin!

As budgets shrink, our concerns will escalate and we will need to work very collaboratively to assure family needs are able to be met. Thanks for all you do for our families in need and good luck on your attempt to continue these services on less money.

If a student is already a CMH client, their CMH counselor(s) have been helpful and very cooperative. We have problems when we refer students and because of privacy issues can't get follow-up info. Also families are told they can't be seen because they don't qualify and it's frustrating.

Increase timeliness and content of reports! Otherwise, they are fabulous!

R and her team are great. When they come in to the facility they are very courteous to everyone. They care about our guest!

Looking forward to continued positive working relationship with GCMH. Employees with GCMH always provide prompt service with any requests from the Gratiot County Sheriff Office. The Gratiot County Sheriff Office continues using Jail Services Education Training. Gratiot Community Mental Health Employee's expert knowledge in Jail Diversion has helped the Gratiot County Sheriff Office greatly in getting offenders into the inpatient/outpatient programs outside of the jail. Giving the offenders the treatment they need, rather than the jail being a dumping grounds for mentally ill.

The waiting time for an appointment with a psychiatrist is unfortunate.

Many times when I would say “I would encourage you to go to CMH”. I get the response we tried but we don't qualify to receive services. How or guess who is eligible? And what would make someone get turned away?

## **IONIA**

Keep up the good work!

My staff may refer clients to CMH, I personally do not. However, your services are vital to people in our area.

I value the collaboration between CMH and the client.

CEO needs to work on his people skills and interacting with other service providers in the community. Staff are always helpful.

I know the psychiatrist are very busy but as a primary care provider making a referral for



evaluation and treatment, having a patient come back and say I can't see the psychiatrist (or Clinical Psychologist) until I've seen the counselor 4 times and visits are 2-4 weeks apart is very frustrating. If the referral was strictly for counseling – then fine. No other specialty referral I make sees the office nurse for 3 or 4 visits before seeing the physician.

Need more funding for individuals that fall between the cracks – no insurance pay??

Always a pleasure to work with your staff, they are prompt and professional. I have not received concerns – negative comments from Er staff regarding your agency follow-up. Thanks.

### **MANISTEE-BENZIE**

Insufficient follow-up – we are often unaware of whether referral is in compliance. Inadequate liaison work.

Our counselor takes care of questions 8 and 9.

No follow up yet since referral (one week).

We appreciate your prompt services and consultations. We especially appreciate G's attention and assistance to our residents.

Would appreciate current list of Manistee provider services and phone numbers.

Cannot recall any specific referrals at this point, but can say when I have spoken with people in your agency in the past, they've most always been polite, professional and helpful.

Communication is excellent.

Timely follow up is a challenge. Not always clear on when patient will be seen, sometimes resulting in additional hospital days at our expense. In the ED setting, physicians do not always feel patients are alright just using the triage line. This could be due to a lack of understanding on our part of how the program really works.

### **NEWAYGO**

NCMH provides us with excellent services. Clinicians are friendly and knowledgeable.

Currently there is a CMH provider who has & will be coming to our center to visit with a student. It would be helpful if a meeting was arranged prior to the first visit informing the appropriate staff of visit frequency, times and maybe ideas if activities in the classroom that may be extra helpful to the individual student.

I have been working with clinical supervisor of CMH and have nothing but good things to say about Mike's abilities and commitment.

The only concern I have about CMH services is with the access line.

The workers do not come to school meetings prepared to help. They do not communicate well with the school. We are not aware of the services the child/family receives.

As funding is cut, so are services. Most items are selected a neutral simply because there are not many services that bring CMH into the schools as the used to be.

A couple of the workers have done a very poor job with our student. Other workers (like K) are always more than satisfactory.

At White Cloud Elementary schools we have been so fortunate to have a great working relationship with CMH. The staff is knowledgeable and so helpful. We appreciate the work they do and the services they provide to our students!!

The latest frustration on our end was a delay in getting us CMH information regarding the work done with one of our students. Parent signed a release and was told it would be 10 days before it would be taken care of. N information received on our end yet.

W and B are excellent with our Synergy Program. CMH staff have always been helpful with our adult students as well.

It's always a challenge to access services. Intake questioning doesn't always root out the problems and thus referrals are denied.

## APPENDIX D

### REFERRAL SOURCE SATISFACTION SURVEY

**CLINTON-EATON-INGHAM COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH  
Referral Source Satisfaction Survey**

<p>The Clinton-Eaton-Ingham Community Mental Health Board is committed to offering the best service possible. As a valued provider/referral source, you can help us by providing feedback regarding our services. By answering the following questions, you will help us in our commitment to bring you top-quality service.</p>					
<p>Please answer questions 1 through 5 by "<b>circling</b>" the number next to each question that best describes your view.</p>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
1. CMH responded promptly to referrals and request for service.	1	2	3	4	5
2. CMH provided timely feedback regarding disposition of referrals or service contacts.	1	2	3	4	5
3. CMH staff helped referred individuals get the right type of service for their problem.	1	2	3	4	5
4. CMH staff I (we) have dealt with have been courteous, knowledgeable and helpful.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Communication with CMH on mutual clients has been satisfactory.	1	2	3	4	5
6. In general, I (we) were satisfied with the services provided by CMH.	1	2	3	4	5
<p><b>(Please check appropriate box):</b></p>					
<p>7. In what capacity are you familiar with the services provided by the Clinton-Eaton-Ingham Community Mental Health?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1. As administrator at a referring agency</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2. As a clinician at a referring agency</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3. As a physician who refers persons</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 4. As a representative of an advocacy organization</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 5. As a representative of law enforcement/probation/judicial system</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 6. As a representative of an educational institution</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 7. Other (specify):</p>					
<p>8. When was the last time you referred a client to the Clinton-Eaton-Ingham Community Mental Health Board for services?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1. 2009</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2. 2008</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3. 2007 (or earlier)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 4. Have not had contact</p>	<p>9. Over the past year, how often have you referred clients to CMH?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1. None</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2. 1-2 times</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3. 3-10 times</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 4. 11 or more times</p>				

- OVER -

<b>We also welcome your comments and suggestions.</b>

If you would like someone from Community Mental Health to work with you on addressing your concerns noted above, please provide us with your name and phone number.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Telephone: \_\_\_\_\_

**THANK YOU VERY MUCH, WE APPRECIATE YOUR HELP**

**Richard Coelho**  
**Community Mental Health of Clinton-Eaton-Ingham**  
**812 East Jolly Road, Suite G10**  
**Lansing, MI 48910**

## APPENDIX E

### REFERRAL SOURCE SATISFACTION SURVEY

#### DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS

In what capacity are you familiar with the services provided by...	CEI (N=48)		IONIA (N=34)		GRATIOT (N=35)		NEWAYGO (N=13)		MANISTEE- BENZIE (N=31)		TOTAL (N=161)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
As administrator at a referring agency	23	34	10	43	3	12	7	28	2	17	45	29
As a clinician at a referring agency	9	13	3	13	6	24	2	8	4	33	24	1
As a physician who refers persons	6	9	5	22	3	12	0	0	4	33	18	12
As a representative of an advocacy organization	3	4	1	4	1	4	2	8	0	0	7	5
As a representative of law enforcement/ probation/judicial system	10	15	2	9	2	8	3	12	1	8	18	12
As a representative of an educational institution	9	13	2	9	5	20	8	32	0	0	24	16
Other	8	12	0	0	5	20	3	12	1	8	7	11
<b>When was the last time you referred a client for services?</b>												
2009	59	89	21	91	22	88	23	92	9	90	134	90
2008	2	3	1	4	1	4	1	4	0	0	5	3
2007 (or earlier)	2	3	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	3	2
Have not had contact	3	5		4	1	4	1	4	1	10	7	5
<b>Over the past year, how often have you referred clients to CMH?</b>												
None	5	8	2	9	1	4	1	4	1	9	10	7
1-2 times	14	22	1	5	4	16	6	24	1	9	26	18
3-10 times	27	42	9	41	14	56	14	56	4	36	68	46
11 or more times	18	28	10	46	6	24	4	16	5	46	43	29