

**COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH AUTHORITY  
Clinton-Eaton-Ingham**

**SUMMARY OF SATISFACTION SURVEYS: 2013**

**By**

**Richard J. Coelho, Ph.D.**

**June 2014**

## Consumer Satisfaction Surveys – 2013

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. This summary report focuses on the 2012 results from the Community Mental Health Authority – Clinton-Eaton-Ingham.

### 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 2,492

clients open within the CMHA-CEI 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 170 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 42 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 57 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 CMHs. 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**”, “**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 a “**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 a “**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. Three hundred and eighty-two (n=382) surveys were sent to residents and 234 to family members or guardians. There was a 73% (n=279) response rate for residents and a 85% (n=198) response rate for Guardians. Overall, 11% (n=34) individuals choose not to answer the survey and 50% (n=138) could not communicate answers.

## 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 2013 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 87% to 94%, which compares favorably with results from last year’s administration. For CMHA-CEI, 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 86% to 100%. This finding compares favorably with last year’s administration. For CMHA-CEI, response rates showed that 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 59% to 80%. The response rates for all questions indicated that respondents had high levels of satisfaction with the service delivery system. For CMHA-CEI, response rates, five of the six survey items surpassed the minimum standards established for each item.
- 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 67% to 100%. Response rates showed that thirteen of the fourteen survey items met or 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 CMHA-CEI residential services.

<b>Closed Cases Satisfaction Survey</b> (“Agree/Strongly Agree”)	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>Minimum Standard</b>
1. CMH responded promptly to my request for services.	100	90	100	70%
2. CMH staff were courteous and respectful.	100	90	100	85%
3. CMH staff helped me get the right type of services for my problem.	100	100	86	85%
4. In general, I was satisfied with the services provided by CMH.	100	100	86	85%
5. CMH staff understood my needs and situation.	100	100	100	85%
6. CMH staff had the knowledge and skills to serve me well.	100	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.	100	100	90	85%
8. The services I received helped me to function better in my life.	100	100	93	80%
9. If I were to seek help again, I would come back to the same program.	100	100	93	80%

<b>Referral Source Satisfaction Survey</b> (“Agree/Strongly Agree”)	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>Minimum Standard</b>
1. CMH responded promptly to my request for service.	73	75	71	60%
2. CMH provided timely feedback regarding disposition of referrals or service contacts.	60	75	59	60%
3. CMH staff helped referred individuals get the right type of service for their problem.	70	67	65	60%
4. CMH staff I (we) have dealt with have been courteous, knowledgeable and helpful.	87	75	80	60%
5. Communication with CMH on mutual clients has been satisfactory.	83	67	74	60%
6. In general, I (we) were satisfied with the services provided by CMH.	70	64	73	60%

<b>Open Cases Satisfaction Survey</b> (“Agree/Strongly Agree”)	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>Minimum Standard</b>
1. CMH responded to my request for services.	91	91	91	85%
2. CMH staff are courteous and respectful.	96	96	94	85%
3. CMH staff helps me to get the right type of services for my problem.	91	92	91	85%
4. In general, I am satisfied with the services provided by CMH.	92	94	93	85%
5. CMH staff understand my needs and situation.	91	92	91	85%
6. CMH staff have the knowledge and skills to serve me well.	92	93	94	85%
7. If a friend or family member were in need of similar services, I would recommend my CMH program to him or her.	89	92	90	85%
8. The services I receive help me to function better in my life.	90	91	91	85%
9. If I were to seek help again, I would come back to the same program.	89	99	89	85%
10. CMH staff follows my person centered plan (PCP) or family centered plan.	89	91	91	85%
11. CMH helped me identify natural supports.	85	87	87	85%



<b>Contractor Satisfaction Survey</b> (“Very/Somewhat Satisfied”)	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>Minimum Standard</b>
<b>How satisfied are you with CMH in the following areas related to clinical care?</b>				
1. How satisfied are you with the quality of the care authorization process at CMH.	94	100	100	80
2. How satisfied are you with access to consultations relative to a specific client or episode with CMH staff?	89	93	100	80
3. How satisfied are you with grievance and appeal procedures at CMH?	82	80	100	80
4. How satisfied are you with the customer service provided by CMH to clients and their families?	94	90	100	80
5. How satisfied are you with the customer service provided by CMH to contractors and office staff?	89	86	100	80
6. Do you feel that CMH clients are well informed about their rights as a mental health consumer?	100	85	100	80
<b>How satisfied are you with CMH in the following areas related to administration and organization?</b>				
7. How satisfied are you with the amount of paperwork required by CMH?	95	93	100	80
8. How satisfied are you with the timeliness of payment for your services from CMH?	100	79	100	80
9. How satisfied are you with the accuracy of payment for your services from CMH?	100	100	100	80
10. How satisfied are you with the training provided by CMH to the staff of contractors?	100	82	67	80
11. How satisfied are you with your ability to participate in quality management or quality assurance activities?	94	100	100	80
12. How satisfied are you with the contract negotiation process used by CMH?	93	91	100	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)?	100	92	100	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?	88	69	100	80

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

<b>CEI</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>
Resident Satisfaction Survey	48.42	49.39	47.32
Family/Guardian Satisfaction Survey	49.69	49.48	49.74
Case Manager Satisfaction Survey	49.49	48.75	48.85

**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)**