

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**

CLIENT SATISFACTION MEASUREMENT OPEN CASES: NOVEMBER 2008

By

Richard J. Coelho, Ph.D.

February 2009

Technical Report Number: 09001

Table of Contents

Subject	Page
I. Summary	1
Survey Development	3
Procedure	5
II. Findings	5
III. Analysis of Findings	7
IV. Use of Findings	7
 Appendices	
A. Consumer Satisfaction Survey	19-20
B. Community Mental Health Authority - Clinton-Eaton-Ingham	
Program Response Rates	22-51
C. Ionia Community Mental Health Services	
Program Response Rates	53-58
D. Manistee-Benzie Community Mental Health	
Program Response Rates	60-65
E. Newaygo Community Mental Health	
Program Response Rates	67-76
F. Gratiot Community Mental Health Agency	
Program Response Rates	77-90

G. Consumer Written Comments

Community Mental Health Authority Clinton-Eaton-Ingham.....	92
Gratiot Community Mental Health Agency.....	102
Ionia Community Mental Health Services.....	106
Manistee-Benzie Community Mental Health.....	115
Newaygo Community Mental Health.....	118

Listing of Tables

Subject	Page
Table 1: Survey Rates	9
Table 2: Persons who Answered, chose not to answer, or could not answer survey items by CMH	9
Table 3: Identified Individual who Answered or Assisted the Consumer in Completing the Survey By CMH	10
Table 4a: Are you Hispanic or Latino?.....	11
Table 4b: What most closely describes your race?.....	11
Table 5: Numbers, Means and Standard Deviations for the Eleven Items of the Consumer Satisfaction Survey for Persons with Mental Illness.....	12
Table 6: Numbers, Means and Standard Deviations for the Eleven Items of the Consumer Satisfaction Survey for Persons with Developmental Disabilities	13
Table 7: Response Rates for Persons with Mental Illness	14
Table 8: Response Rates for Persons with Developmental Disabilities	15
Table 9: Response rates for CMH System - MI & DD.....	16
Table 10: Response rates for CMH System - MI & DD	17

Community Mental Health Affiliation of Mid-Michigan Client Satisfaction Measurement Open Cases: November 2008

I. SUMMARY

As part of the Community Mental Health Affiliation of Mid-Michigan's (Affiliation) quality improvement efforts, a consumer satisfaction survey was administered to persons who were receiving Affiliation services and were "open cases" during November 2008. There were 4,721 "open cases" for that period. Of the 4,721 surveys administered by case managers, 2,539 were returned. Therefore, there was a 54% return rate.

Data results in this report came from self-selected consumers who chose to return questionnaires voluntarily. The respondents to the survey were anonymous.

In November 2008, Affiliation Case Managers were provided a listing of clients open on their caseload, along with a questionnaire for each client to complete. Questionnaires were coded to each CMH in the Affiliation and to programs to which the particular consumer was "opened in" for CMH services. Case managers were asked, during their next meeting with the consumer (over a six-week period), to have the consumer complete a survey and return it to their area designee. The area designee then forwarded all surveys to the CEI Evaluation Unit for coding and data entry.

The survey instrument 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 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. (See Appendix A for copy of survey instruments).

The purpose of this survey was to help the Community Mental Health Affiliation of Mid-Michigan (1) gauge the level of satisfaction among its consumers who were receiving services and (2) determine ways it could improve its practices to better serve its consumers. The results of the survey help to measure the quality of CMH services. This evaluation report summarizes the levels of satisfaction with their CMH service system.

SURVEY DEVELOPMENT

The CMH of CEI developed the Consumer Satisfaction Survey based on a comprehensive literature review and consultation with other mental health agencies (within and outside the state), including recommendations from the Michigan Department of Community Health. The survey was reviewed by CMH clients, its Advocacy Groups and clinicians to establish face and content validity of the questionnaire.

In January 1996, CMH of CEI conducted a consumer satisfaction survey of persons who received crisis intervention, inpatient prescreening or partial hospitalization prescreening services from CMH's Emergency Services unit from August through December 1995. CMH of CEI randomly selected a sample of 200 consumers from a population of more than 900 for the specified period. The survey was conducted for two purposes: 1) To serve as a pilot for use of this instrument with all CMH clients; 2) To fulfill contractual obligations with the Michigan

Department of Community Health relative to client satisfaction measures. The consumer satisfaction survey used in the pilot study represented a combination of a tool of items developed by the Michigan Department of Community and the Client Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ-8) developed by Attkisson (1982). The objective was to develop a client-centered questionnaire that evaluated the care experience from the clients= perspective.

The inter-tem correlation matrix was reviewed using exploratory factor analysis (i.e., principal components with communalities followed by Varimax rotation). An oblique multiple groups factor analysis with communalities (i.e., confirmatory factor analysis) was then employed to evaluate the resulting factor structure. The result of this analysis procedure yielded one factor or scale containing nine items. Cronbach=s coefficient alpha is a statistical formula which measures the internal consistency of a multi-item survey. A high coefficient alpha (.80 or greater) computed for survey items indicates that the items are highly inter-correlated, and are all measuring the purported survey dimension. Internal consistency was found to be high (.9332) among the pilot group in 1986 and similarly for the respondents during the 2001 administration (.9375)

The final version of the survey (based on the pilot investigation) used by CMH consists of nine items. Each item is rated on five point Likert-type scales (strongly disagree to strongly agree) that allow for neutral responses. The instrument also includes a section for the client to record comments.

The survey was revised for the 2002 administration by the addition of two consumer survey questions (i.e., ACMH staff follows my person centered plan or family centered plan and ACHM helped me identify natural supports) and one demographic question (i.e., ethnic

background) at the recommendation of the Michigan Department of Community Health.

The survey was again revised in 2006 administration to reflect current federal racial categories. Question numbers 10 and 11 were modified to include clarifying language for “person centered planning” and “natural supports.” Also, at the end of the survey, space was provided for respondents to self identify if they wanted to be contacted by the CMH to follow up on their comments.

PROCEDURE

Each Affiliation CMH compiled a listing of current open cases for their organization. Each survey was coded by CMH (i.e., CEI, Ionia, Gratiot, Manistee-Benzie or Newaygo). Coded survey forms were then disseminated by each CMH to their clients open during the survey period. Completed surveys were returned to the CEI Evaluation Unit for data entry and analysis. This was the fifth administration to consumers of Affiliation members.

II. FINDINGS

Table 1 shows that the highest survey return rates were for Ionia CMH (72%), followed by CEI CMH (58%), Gratiot CMH (61%), Manistee-Benzie (36%), and Newaygo CMH (30%).

Table 2 shows the number of persons who "chose not to complete" a survey or "could not communicate" their answers. Of the 2,539 surveys returned, 203 (8%) chose not to respond and 359 (14%) could not communicate their responses. For the latter figure, most of these persons receiving services were persons with developmental disabilities.

Table 3 shows a breakdown of who completed the surveys. The primary consumer completed most of the surveys (n=1,293, 64%). However, staff (n=442, 22%), family members (n=268, 13%), and friends (n=12, 1%) also assisted consumers in completing surveys.

Table 4a shows a breakdown of persons who self identified themselves as Hispanic or Latino. Overall, 95% (n=1,880) stated that they were not Hispanic or Latino.

Table 4b presents a breakdown of consumer race by CMH. Overall, many of the respondents were White (n=1,699, 85%), followed by African American (n=177, 9%), American Indian (n=45, 2%) Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (n=3, <1%), Asian (n=15, 1%) and Other race (n=64, 3%).

Tables 5 and 6 show the means and standard deviations and Tables 7 and 8 show the spread of responses to the eleven items of the AConsumer Satisfaction Survey.® Item means ranged from 4.11 to 4.29 for the Affiliation. For persons with mental illness, a review of Table 7 shows that for ten of the eleven survey items, 90% or more of the respondents indicated "agree" or "strongly agree" responses to each survey item. For persons with developmental disabilities, item means ranged from 2.88 to 2.98. A review of Table 8 shows that for nine of the eleven survey items, 90% or more of the respondents indicated "Yes" responses to each item. (See Appendix B-C for item response rates for each CMH and their program components).

Table 9 shows a review of the entire Affiliation CMH system (CEI, Ionia, Gratiot, and Newaygo CMH). Responses of Astrongly agree,® Aagree,® and Ayes® were combined for this table. A review of Table 9 shows that for the Affiliation, all eleven survey items surpassed the 2004 minimum standards.

To obtain an overall impression of consumer satisfaction, a total scale score for the survey was formed by summing the eleven item scores. The mean response score of all questions was calculated at 4.27 on a five-point scale for persons with mental illnesses receiving services and 2.91 on a three-point scale for persons with developmental disabilities receiving services. Thus,

respondents from all Affiliation CMH programs indicated a high level of satisfaction with the services they are receiving and the staff providing those services.

III. Analysis of Findings

Overall, consumers who were receiving services from the Affiliation were very positive with their current services and treatment from each CMH, their programs and staff (See Tables 9 and 10). Ninety-seven percent indicated that they felt CMH staff treated them with courtesy and respect. Ninety-three percent were satisfied with the services provided by CMH. Ninety-three percent reported that they believed that CMH staff had the knowledge and skills to serve them well. Ninety-two percent indicated that CMH staff helped them get the right type of service for their problems. Ninety-one percent indicated that they would recommend CMH to a friend or family member if they needed similar services. Ninety-two percent of the respondents said that CMH staff understood their needs and situation. Ninety-seven percent were satisfied with the promptness with which CMH responded to their request for services. Ninety-two percent indicated that if they were to seek help again, they would return to the same program. Ninety-one percent indicated that the services they received helped them to function better in their life. Ninety-two percent felt that CMH staff followed their person-centered plan. Eighty-seven percent expressed that their CMH helped them identify natural supports.

IV. Use of Findings

The scores indicate areas in which consumer satisfaction is very positive (scores of 4 and 5 or "yes" for persons with developmental disabilities), neutral (score of 3 or "not sure" for persons with developmental disabilities), and not positive (scores of 1 and 2 or "no" for persons

with developmental disabilities). Each CMH and its programs should begin to use these findings to further initiate quality improvement efforts.

Managers from each CMH should review these findings with their staff, using them as continuing catalysts for quality improvement efforts. The fact should be underscored that the great majority of CMH clients report high levels of satisfaction with the organization and this fact goes far in promoting continued excellence. Also, the findings should be shared with each CMH=s Board of Directors, the local media, and press relations office of the Department of Community Health.

Table 9 shows the Affiliation and each CMH=s response rate for the eleven survey items. Each CMH should compare their satisfaction levels to the A2004 minimum standards.@ A CMH with items below standard should develop a QI plan to address the item(s) for next year=s administration. The results of the plan of correction should be reported back to the Core QI group.

Program	Number Distributed	Number Returned	Return Rate (%)
CEI	2,365	1,378	58
Ionia	585	423	72
Newaygo	601	181	30
Manistee-Benzie	620	224	36
Gratiot	550	333	61
TOTAL:	4,721	2,539	54

CMH	Answered Survey Questions		Choose Not To Answer Questions		Could Not Communicate Answers	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
CEI (n=1,378)	974	71	156	11	248	18
Ionia (n= 423)	388	92	5	1	30	7
Newaygo (n=118)	169	93	12	7	0	0
Manistee-Benzie (n=224)	177	79	12	5	35	16
Gratiot (n=333)	269	81	18	5	46	14
TOTAL (n= 2,539)	1,977	78	203	8	359	14

Table 3: Identified Individual who Answered or Assisted the Consumer in Completing the Survey By CMH (MI & DD) (CEI, Ionia, Gratiot, Newaygo & Manistee-Benzie)

Program	SELF		FAMILY (assisted by)		FRIEND (assisted by)		STAFF (assisted by)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CEI (n=1,014)	607	60	85	8	7	1	315	31
Ionia (n=381)	307	81	47	12	3	1	24	6
Newaygo (n=162)	115	71	41	25	1	1	5	3
Manistee-Benzie (n=190)	105	55	21	11	1	1	63	33
Gratiot (n=268)	159	59	74	28	0	0	35	13
TOTAL: (n=2,015)	1,293	64	268	13	12	1	442	22

Table 4a: Are you Hispanic or Latino?				
CMH	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
CEI (n=974)	55	6	919	94
Ionia (n=380)	6	2	374	98
Newaygo (n=163)	5	3	158	97
Manistee-Benzie (n=188)	2	1	186	99
Gratiot (n=265)	22	8	243	92
TOTAL (n=1,970):	90	5	1,880	95

Table 4b: What most closely describes your race?												
CMH	African American		American Indian		Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander		White		Asian		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CEI (n=1,006)	156	16	22	2	3	<1	767	76	13	1	45	5
Ionia (n=382)	3	1	7	2	0	0	362	95	2	<1	8	2
Newaygo (n=166)	10	6	3	2	0	0	148	89	0	0	5	3
Manistee-Benzie (n=188)	4	2	11	6	0	0	170	90	0	0	3	2
Gratiot (n=261)	4	2	2	1	0	0	252	97	0	0	3	1
TOTAL (n=2,003):	177	9	45	2	3	<1	1,699	85	15	1	64	3

Table 5: Numbers, Means and Standard Deviations for the Eleven Items of the Consumer Satisfaction Survey for Persons with Mental Illness (CEI, Ionia, Gratiot, Newaygo, Manistee-Benzie)

Item	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
1. CMH responded to my request for services.	1,601	4.23	.95
2. CMH staff are courteous and respectful.	1,608	4.41	.88
3. CMH staff helps me to get the right type of services for my problem.	1,604	4.24	.95
4. In general, I am satisfied with the services provided by CMH.	1,608	4.29	.01
5. CMH staff understand my needs and situation.	1,602	4.24	.95
6. CMH staff have the knowledge and skills to serve me well.	1,606	4.28	.93
7. If a friend or family member were in need of similar services, I would recommend my CMH program to him or her.	1,606	4.30	.97
8. The services I receive help me to function better in my life.	1,602	4.22	.94
9. If I were to seek help again, I would come back to the same program.	1,603	4.27	.97
10. CMH staff follows my person centered plan (PCP) or family centered plan.	1,587	4.22	.90
11. CMH helped me identify natural supports.	1,582	4.11	.99
Sum Score	1,585	46.99	9.26

Table 6: Numbers, Means and Standard Deviations for the Eleven Items of the Consumer Satisfaction Survey for Persons with Developmental Disabilities (CEI, Ionia, Gratiot, Newaygo, Manistee-Benzie)

Item	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
1. CMH responded to my request for services.	369	2.88	.37
2. CMH staff are courteous and respectful.	370	2.98	.17
3. CMH staff helps me to get the right type of services for my problem.	371	2.89	.36
4. In general, I am satisfied with the services provided by CMH.	372	2.91	.32
5. CMH staff understand my needs and situation.	369	2.93	.29
6. CMH staff have the knowledge and skills to serve me well.	370	2.95	.25
7. If a friend or family member were in need of similar services, I would recommend my CMH program to him or her.	369	2.88	.39
8. The services I receive help me to function better in my life.	370	2.89	.37
9. If I were to seek help again, I would come back to the same program.	370	2.88	.40
10. CMH staff follows my person centered plan (PCP) or family centered plan.	369	2.93	.27
11. CMH helped me identify natural supports.	366	2.88	.35
Sum Score	362	32.02	2.35

Table 7: Response Rates for Persons with Mental Illness (CEI, Ionia, Gratiot, Newaygo, Manistee-Benzie)

Survey Item	Disagree		Neither		Agree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. CMH responded promptly to my request for services.	65	4	78	5	1,502	91
2. CMH staff are courteous and respectful.	38	2	21	1	1,592	96
3. CMH staff helps me to get the right type of services for my problem.	61	4	72	4	1,514	92
4. In general, I am satisfied with the services provided by CMH.	48	3	65	4	1,538	93
5. CMH staff understand my needs and situation.	65	4	70	4	1,510	92
6. CMH staff have the knowledge and skills to serve me well.	53	3	67	4	1,529	93
7. If a friend or family member were in need of similar services, I would recommend my CMH program to him or her.	61	4	76	5	1,512	92
8. The services I receive help me to function better in my life.	57	4	94	6	1,494	91
9. If I were to seek help again, I would come back to the same program.	68	4	65	4	1,513	92
10. CMH staff follows my person centered plan (PCP) or family centered plan.	46	3	84	5	1,500	92
11. CMH helped me identify natural supports.	79	5	139	9	1,407	87

Note: Disagree includes the combined responses to Strongly Disagree and Disagree.
 Agree includes the combined responses to strongly Agree and Agree.

**Table 8: Response Rates for Persons with Developmentally Disabilities
(CEI, Ionia, Gratiot, Newaygo, Manistee-Benzie)**

Survey Item	NO		NOT SURE		YES	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. CMH responded promptly to my request for services.	6	2	30	9	289	89
2. CMH staff are courteous and respectful.	1	<1	10	3	316	97
3. CMH staff helps me to get the right type of services for my problem.	8	2	24	7	296	90
4. In general, I am satisfied with the services provided by CMH.	4	1	22	7	303	92
5. CMH staff understand my needs and situation.	5	2	15	5	306	94
6. CMH staff have the knowledge and skills to serve me well.	3	<1	15	5	309	95
7. If a friend or family member were in need of similar services, I would recommend my CMH program to him or her.	8	2	26	8	292	90
8. The services I receive help me to function better in my life.	7	2	22	7	298	91
9. If I were to seek help again, I would come back to the same program.	9	3	24	7	294	90
10. CMH staff follows my person centered plan (PCP) or family centered plan.	1	<1	24	7	301	92
11. CMH helped me identify natural supports.	4	1	37	12	282	87

Table 9: Response Rates for CMH System - MI & DD (CEI, IONIA, GRATIOT, NEWAYGO, MANISTEE-BENZIE)

Survey Item	CEI		IONIA		NEWAYGO		MANISTEE-BENZIE		GRATIOT		TOTAL		Minimum 2004 Standard
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
1. CMH responded promptly to my request for services.	849	88	361	94	154	93	169	92	258	95	1,791	91	85
2. CMH staff are courteous and respectful.	920	95	378	98	164	98	178	97	268	98	1,908	97	85
3. CMH staff helps me to get the right type of services for my problem.	870	90	363	94	156	93	163	89	258	95	1,810	92	85
4. In general, I am satisfied with the services provided by CMH.	888	92	359	93	159	95	170	93	265	97	1,841	93	85
5. CMH staff understand my needs and situation.	871	91	359	93	161	96	167	91	258	95	1,816	92	85
6. CMH staff have the knowledge and skills to serve me well.	885	92	364	94	161	96	171	93	257	95	1,838	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.	859	89	363	94	159	95	164	90	259	95	1,804	91	85
8. The services I receive help me to function better in my life.	875	90	346	90	155	92	158	87	258	95	1,792	91	85
9. If I were to seek help again, I would come back to the same program.	868	90	357	93	159	95	164	91	259	95	1,807	92	85
10. CMH staff follows my person centered plan (PCP) or family centered plan.	861	90	355	94	161	96	166	92	258	94	1,801	92	85
11. CMH helped me identify natural supports.	803	84	333	89	150	90	156	87	247	90	1,689	87	85

Note: % = Agree/Strongly Agree/Yes

**Table 10: Response Rates for CMH System - MI & DD
(CEI, IONIA, GRATIOT, NEWAYGO, MANISTEE-BENZIE)**

Survey Item	NO/ DISAGREE		NEITHER/ NOT SURE		YES/ AGREE	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. CMH responded promptly to my request for services.	71	4	108	6	1,791	91
2. CMH staff are courteous and respectful.	39	2	31	2	1,908	97
3. CMH staff helps me to get the right type of services for my problem.	69	3	96	5	1,810	92
4. In general, I am satisfied with the services provided by CMH.	52	3	87	4	1,841	93
5. CMH staff understand my needs and situation.	70	4	85	4	1,816	92
6. CMH staff have the knowledge and skills to serve me well.	56	3	82	4	1,838	93
7. If a friend or family member were in need of similar services, I would recommend my CMH program to him or her.	69	4	102	5	1,804	91
8. The services I receive help me to function better in my life.	64	3	116	6	1,792	91
9. If I were to seek help again, I would come back to the same program.	77	4	89	5	1,807	92
10. CMH staff follows my person centered plan (PCP) or family centered plan.	47	2	108	6	1,801	92
11. CMH helped me identify natural supports.	83	4	176	9	1,689	87