

2023 Quality Service Review

Arizona Health Care Cost Containment System

August 31, 2023



Contents

- 1. Executive Summary..... 1
 - Overview of Key Findings..... 1
- 2. Overview 5
 - Goals and Objectives of Analyses.....5
 - Limitations and Conditions5
- 3. Background 7
 - History of Arnold v. Sarn.....7
 - Serious Mental Illness Service Delivery System7
- 4. Methodology..... 9
 - Peer Reviewers9
 - Peer Reviewer Training9
 - Ongoing Support for Peer Reviewers..... 11
 - Sample Selection..... 11
 - Member Interviews 11
 - Medical Record Reviews 12
 - Data Analysis..... 12
- 5. Findings..... 14
 - Sample Demographics and Characteristics 14
 - Identification of Needs 15
 - Service Provision to Meet Identified Needs..... 19
 - Availability of Services 23
 - Extent that Supports and Services Are Meeting Identified Needs 26
 - Supports and Services Designed Around Member Strengths and Goals 31

Appendix A: Service-Specific Findings..... 34

- Case Management 34
- Peer Support 35
- Family Support Services..... 36
- Supportive Housing 36
- Living Skills Training..... 37
- Supported Employment..... 38
- Crisis Services 39
- Medication Management Services 40
- Assertive Community Treatment 41

Appendix B: QSR Study Conclusions and Recommendations 42

- 2023 QSR — Summary of Findings 42

Appendix C: Training Syllabus 44

- Quality Service Review (QSR) Project Syllabus 44
- Learning Activities, Objectives, and Outcome Measures 45

Appendix D: Quality Service Review Interview Tool 47

Appendix E: Quality Service Review Medical Record Review Tool 61

Section 1

Executive Summary

The Arizona Health Care Cost Containment System (AHCCCS) has engaged Mercer Government Human Services Consulting (Mercer) to implement a quality service review (QSR) for persons determined to have a serious mental illness (SMI). This report represents the tenth in an annual series of QSRs and the seventh to be facilitated by Mercer. The purpose of the review is to identify strengths, service capacity gaps, and areas for improvement at a system-wide level for members with SMI receiving services from the public behavioral health delivery system in Maricopa County, Arizona.

The QSR includes an evaluation of nine targeted behavioral health services: Case Management, Peer Support, Family Support, Supportive Housing, Living Skills Training, Supported Employment, Crisis Services, Medication and Medication Services, and Assertive Community Treatment (ACT) services. Mercer conducted the QSR of the targeted services using the following methods:

- **Peer Reviewers** — Mercer contracted with two consumer-operated organizations to assist with completing project activities, including scheduling and conducting interviews and completing medical record reviews (MRRs) for a sample of members with SMI.
- **Training** — Mercer developed a two-week training curriculum to orient and train peer reviewers on relevant aspects of the project. The training included inter-rater reliability (IRR) testing to ensure consistent application of the review tools.
- **Ongoing Support for Peer Reviewers** — Mercer monitored the number of interviews and MRRs completed, provided feedback to the peer reviewer team leads, and addressed questions and follow-up throughout the project period.
- **Member Interviews** — Peer reviewers contacted and interviewed a random sample of 135 members to evaluate service needs, access to, timeliness, and satisfaction with the targeted services.
- **MRRs** — Peer reviewers conducted record reviews of the sample of members to assess individual assessments, individual service plans (ISPs), and progress notes utilizing a standard review tool.
- **Data Analysis** — Mercer conducted an analysis of data from the interviews, the MRR, service utilization data, and other member demographics queried from the AHCCCS Client Information System (CIS).

Overview of Key Findings

A summary of key findings related to the 2023 QSR are presented in this section. Information is presented in the context of the QSR study questions. It should be noted that the information in this report spans a timeframe¹ that includes ongoing disruptions stemming from the ongoing

¹ The timeframe for this QSR study is October 1, 2021 to September 30, 2022

COVID-19 pandemic. Due to the unprecedented disruptions the pandemic caused to the behavioral health delivery system, ongoing consideration should be given when reviewing the utilization and member satisfaction findings included in this report.

Additionally, as this is the tenth year the QSR study has been conducted, Mercer has continued to add a five-year average to certain data points, alongside the year-over-year analyses. Each year, data shifts across the targeted services, and these shifts are often inconsistent from year to year. This can make it challenging to extrapolate yearly data to form long-term conclusions regarding the status of Maricopa County’s behavioral health system. The addition of this five-year average takes into consideration the variations in data year over year and may allow for clearer interpretation of the data.

Are the needs of members with SMI being identified?

In keeping with previous QSRs, case management services, and medication and medication management services were the most frequently identified service needs. The five-year calculated average demonstrates that this has been a consistent trend for the last five years.

In 2023, 79% of cases included ISP objectives that addressed members’ needs (compared to 71% in 2022). A five-year average shows that ISP objectives address members’ needs 65% of the time. Similar to past years, and in many cases, the review team did note that objectives were presented as actions that the clinical team planned to complete as opposed to an activity that the member and/or family would initiate.

Five-Year Average 2019–2023
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ISP objectives addressed members’ needs = 65% ISP services were based on members’ needs = 85%

Eighty-nine percent (89%) of the cases reviewed included ISP services that were based on the member’s needs. This represents an incremental improvement from 2022 (86%). A five-year average shows that services are based on a member’s needs 85% of the time.

Over the last five years, an average of 19.8 members, or 15% of the sample, did not include a current ISP.

It is important to note that 30 members, or 22% of the sample, did not include a current ISP. Service needs are unable to be identified when ISPs are missing or are outdated. When appropriate, these 30 members were excluded from analyses.

When identified as a need, are members with SMI receiving each of the targeted behavioral health services?

The QSR examines the extent to which the targeted behavioral health services are received by members following the identification of need. ISP need is defined as the service being documented in the ISP. Reviewers evaluated progress notes, interview responses, and service utilization data to determine if the service was subsequently provided to the member.

Case management, medication management, and ACT team services were the services most consistently provided following the identification of the need for these services. These results are similar to the 2022 QSR results. Notably, peer support, family support, supportive housing, living skills training, and supported employment were not found to be as consistently provided once the need was identified on the ISP.

As mentioned above, the need for the targeted services could not be established in 22% of the records that did not include a valid ISP. Discrepancies between identified needs and service provision may also result from a misunderstanding of the intent and purpose of the services. Peer reviewers also noted that some individuals received one or more of the targeted services, regardless of an identified need documented in the assessment or ISP.

Are the targeted behavioral health services available?

As part of the QSR interview, members were asked to identify the duration of time required to access one or more of the targeted services. To support the analyses, the timeframes were consolidated into three ranges: 1–15 days; 15–30 days, and 30 days or more.

- The services most readily available within 15 days were medication management (95%), peer support services (67%), ACT services (61%), and family support services (60%). For peer and family support services, this was a significant improvement from 2022 (36% and 25%, respectively). However, access to peer services has not returned to the levels documented in 2019, 2020, and 2021 (84%, 77%, and 80% within 15 days, respectively).
- Notably, access to case management within 15 days dropped further in 2023 to 48% (compared to 54% in 2022 and an average of 88% between 2019, 2020, and 2021).
- Similar to last year, the services least available within 15 days were living skills training (45%), supported employment (43%), and supportive housing (16%). Access to ACT services increased to 61% in 2023. Despite this improvement, prompt access to ACT services remains reduced compared to 100% access within 15 days in years 2019, 2020, and 2021.
- Similar to the last three years, almost half of the respondents receiving supportive housing services reported that it took more than 30 days to access the service. Notably, of the 11 individuals who reported receiving supportive housing services 30 days or more after the service was initiated, only five of those were referring to the receipt of a rental subsidy or housing voucher as their sole supportive housing service.

Since 2019, on average, case management was available to members within 15 days 88% of the time. The 2023 rate represents a 59% reduction in the availability in case management within 15 days.

The QSR interview tool also includes a set of questions related to access to care. Reviewers are instructed to describe access to care to members as “how easily you are able to get the services you feel you need”. The access to care questions and percent of affirmative (i.e., “Yes”) responses are presented below:

- The location of services is convenient (79%) — compared to 68% in 2022.
- Services were available at times that are good for you (87%) — compared to 78% in 2022.
- Do you feel that you need more of a service that you have been receiving? (31%) — compared to 24% in 2022.
- Do you feel that you need less of a service you have been receiving (3%) — compared to 1% in 2022.

The responses to these questions demonstrate members do not appear to perceive location and time of services as barriers to receiving services. Overall, member approval of both location and time preferences improved over 2022 responses. Although one member did request more availability of evening hours, and others requested more home visits from case managers. Regarding needing more or less of a service, members reported similar needs in 2023 compared to 2022.

Are supports and services that members with SMI receive meeting identified needs?

The QSR interview tool includes questions that assess the efficacy of services and the extent to which these services satisfy identified needs.

Historically, medication and medication management services were the service perceived to be the most helpful with a members' recovery (five-year average of 91%). However, this year, ACT services were perceived as the most effective of all services (100%). The perception of peer support services as beneficial to a member's recovery improved to 96% (compared to 44% in 2022). Similar to last year, case management was perceived as being the least effective in helping members advance their recovery (73%).

In comparison to 2022, family support, supportive housing, living skills training, crisis services, and medication and medication management were reported to have more problems. Other services, such as case management, peer support, and ACT, were reported to have less problems. However, case management continues to have the highest year-over-year rates of reported problems (five-year average of 38%). The services with the lowest percentage of reported problems over a five-year average are living skills training, family support, and peer support services.

Case management services continue to have the highest rate of reported problems of all services — Five-year average of 38%.

Are supports and services designed around members with SMI strengths and goals?

The QSR MRR tool defines a strength as “*traits, abilities, resources, and characteristics that are relevant for and/or will assist the recipient with his or her needs and objectives. Strengths can be identified by the recipient or clinical team members.*” Similar to the 2021 and 2022 QSRs, peer reviewers noted that strengths were most commonly identified in the ISP and the assessment (both 80% of the time) compared to progress notes (45% of the time). The rate at which ISP objectives are based on members' identified strengths has continued to improve to 61% in 2023 compared to 43% in 2019. Peer reviewers noted an upward trend in the identification of strengths in progress notes (69%), along with a similar improvement in consistency across all document types (42%).

Overall, 77% of members felt that services were based on their strengths and needs. This outcome aligns with the five-year average of 76%.

More detailed and additional findings can be found in Section 5, Findings.

Section 2

Overview

The Arizona Health Care Cost Containment System (AHCCCS) contracted with Mercer Government Human Services Consulting (Mercer) to implement a quality service review (QSR) for persons determined to have a serious mental illness (SMI).² The QSR evaluation approach includes interviews and medical record reviews (MRRs) of a sample of members with SMI by persons with lived experience, and determines need and availability of the following targeted behavioral health services:

- Case Management
- Peer Support
- Family Support
- Supportive Housing
- Living Skills Training
- Supported Employment
- Crisis Services
- Medication and Medication Services
- Assertive Community Treatment (ACT) Services

Goals and Objectives of Analyses

The primary objective of the QSR is to answer the following questions pertaining to the targeted services. To the extent possible, results are compared to findings from the prior year QSR.

1. Are the needs of members with SMI being identified?
2. Do members with SMI need, and are they receiving, each of the targeted behavioral health services?
3. Are the targeted behavioral health services available?
4. Are supports and services that members with SMI receive meeting identified needs?
5. Are supports and services designed around members' with SMI strengths and goals?

Limitations and Conditions

Mercer applied best practices in training and testing to foster optimal review findings for both interview and record review results. Mercer did not design the interview or record review tools

² The determination of SMI requires both a qualifying SMI diagnosis and functional impairment as a result of the qualifying diagnosis.

used in the QSR and is unable to attest to the instrument's validity or reliability. The applicability and integrity of the results of the review are contingent on the reliability and validity of the tools.

The 2015 and 2016 QSR samples were comprised of 50% Title XIX eligible and 50% Non-Title XIX eligible members. Beginning with the 2017 QSR, the study sample frame was stratified to approximate proportions found in the overall SMI population (80% Title XIX eligible, 20% Non-Title XIX eligible).³

Given these considerations, the year-to-year analyses may include variance due to tool validity or reliability issues associated with the review instruments and/or sample stratification methodologies rather than reflect changes in the availability and quality of services over time.

³ The sample used for the QSR project excludes Arizona Long-Term Care System (ALTCS) members.

Section 3

Background

AHCCCS serves as the single State of Arizona authority to provide coordination, planning, administration, regulation, and monitoring of all facets of the State public behavioral health system. AHCCCS contracts with health plans, known as Regional Behavioral Health Agreements (RBHAs), to administer integrated physical health (to select populations) and behavioral health services throughout the state. Effective July 1, 2016, AHCCCS began to administer and oversee the full spectrum of services to support integration efforts at the health plan, provider, and member levels.

History of *Arnold v. Sarn*

In 1981, a class action lawsuit was filed alleging that the State, through the Arizona Department of Health Services and Maricopa County, did not adequately fund a comprehensive mental health system as required by State statute. The lawsuit, *Arnold v. Sarn*, sought to enforce the community mental health residential treatment system on behalf of persons with SMI in Maricopa County. Furthermore, the severe State budget crisis in recent years resulted in significant funding reductions to class members, a temporary stay in enforcement of the lawsuit, and agreement by the parties to renegotiate exit criteria.

On May 17, 2012, as the State's fiscal situation was improving, former Arizona Governor, Jan Brewer, State health officials, and plaintiffs' attorneys announced a two-year agreement that included a return of much of the previously reduced funding for a package of recovery-oriented services, including supported employment, living skills training, supportive housing, case management, and expansion of organizations run by and for people living with SMI. The two-year agreement included activities aimed to assess the quality of services provided, member outcomes, and overall network sufficiency.

On January 8, 2014, a final agreement was reached in the *Arnold v. Sarn* case. The final settlement provides a variety of community-based services and programs agreed upon by the State and plaintiffs, including crisis services, supported employment and housing services, ACT, family and peer support, life skills training, and respite care services. The Arizona Department of Health Services, Division of Behavioral Health Services was required to adopt national quality standards outlined by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, as well as annual QSRs conducted by an independent contractor and an independent service capacity assessment to ensure the delivery of quality care to Maricopa County's population experiencing SMI.

Serious Mental Illness Service Delivery System

AHCCCS contracts with RBHAs to deliver integrated physical and behavioral health services to select populations in three geographic service areas across Arizona. Each RBHA must manage a network of providers to deliver all covered physical health and behavioral health services to Medicaid and non-Medicaid eligible persons determined to have a SMI. RBHAs contract with behavioral health providers to provide the full array of covered physical and behavioral health services, including the nine targeted behavioral health services that are the focus of the QSR.

RBHA-contracted community-based contractors and crisis providers are also responsible for providing crisis services.

For persons determined to have a SMI in Maricopa County, the RBHA has a contract with multiple adult administrative entities that manage ACT teams and/or operate health homes throughout the county. Health homes provide a range of recovery-focused services to recipients with SMI such as medication services, medical management, case management, transportation, peer support services, family support services, and health and wellness groups. Twenty-four ACT teams are available at different health homes and community provider locations. Access to other covered behavioral health services, including supported employment and supportive housing, living skills training, and crisis services, are accessible to recipients with SMI primarily through RBHA-contracted community-based providers.

Section 4

Methodology

The QSR included an evaluation of nine targeted behavioral health services: Case Management, Peer Support, Family Support, Supportive Housing, Living Skills Training, Supported Employment, Crisis Services, Medication and Medication Services, and ACT services. Mercer conducted the QSR of the targeted services using the following methods:

- **Peer Reviewers** — Mercer contracted with two consumer-operated organizations to assist with completing project activities, including scheduling and conducting interviews and completing MRRs for a sample of members with SMI.
- **Training** — Mercer developed a two-week training curriculum to orient and train peer reviewers on relevant aspects of the project. The training included IRR testing to ensure consistent application of the review tools.
- **Ongoing Support for Peer Reviewers** — Mercer monitored the number of interviews and MRRs completed, provided feedback to the peer reviewer team leads, and addressed questions and follow-up throughout the project period.
- **Member Interviews** — Peer reviewers contacted and interviewed a random sample of 135 members to evaluate service needs, access to, timeliness, and satisfaction with the targeted services.
- **MRRs** — Peer reviewers conducted record reviews of the sample of members to assess individual assessments, individual service plans (ISPs), and progress notes utilizing a standard review tool.
- **Data Analysis** — Mercer conducted an analysis of data from the interviews, the MRR, service utilization data, and other member demographics queried from the AHCCCS Client Information System (CIS).

The methodology used for each QSR component is described below.

Peer Reviewers

Mercer contracted with Recovery Empowerment Network (REN) and Stand Together and Recover Centers, Inc. (S.T.A.R.) to participate in the QSR review activities. REN and S.T.A.R. both agreed to provide space, as needed, to meet and conduct interviews with members. Each consumer-operated organization identified a team leader who served as a central contact person and provided ongoing direction to the broader peer reviewer team. Both REN and S.T.A.R. attested to Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) compliant medical record storage and handling procedures and that each of the peer reviewers had been trained in HIPAA requirements for managing personal health information.

Peer Reviewer Training

A two-part training curriculum was developed to train the peer reviewers on the appropriate application of the member interview and MRR tools. Part one of the training was held prior to

the member interviews and occurred over two days in one week. Trainees were provided an overview of the project, as well as interview standards and practice with feedback on using the interview tool. An important component of the training included brainstorming about how to most effectively engage members to ascertain interest in participating in the QSR. Throughout the process, Mercer staff and peer reviewers sought to identify “best practices” for the review components of the QSR evaluation.

Part one training curriculum included the following schedule and topics:

Day One

- Introduction to the course and the project
- Interview standards
- Workflows for completing the interviews
- Overview of target services

Day Two

- Scripts and brainstorming methods to engage members in the interview
- Overview of the interview tool and supporting tools
- Practice using the interview tool, with feedback

Part two of the training occurred a month later, after most of the member interviews had been completed and prior to the MRR phase of the project. The second section of the training included a review of the components of a medical record, an introduction to the QSR MRR tool, and practice using the tool with redacted member medical records. The training concluded with IRR testing of reviewers. The syllabus for the training curriculum can be found in Appendix C.

Part two training curriculum included the following schedule and topics:

Day One

- Components of a medical record
- Introduction to the MRR tool and supports
- Group scoring of Case #1
- Group debrief of Case #1 and initial review of Case #2

Day Two

- Individual scoring of Case #2
- Group debrief of Case #2
- IRR testing of Case #3

Day Three

- Complete IRR testing of Case #3
- IRR testing of Case #4

IRR testing was determined by correlating the peer reviewer's response with a "gold standard"; the answer was deemed to be correct by two experienced clinicians based on the instructions that accompanied the QSR MRR tool. The overall concordance rate was found to be consistent with the "gold standard" in 85% of the IRR cases.

Ongoing Support for Peer Reviewers

Mercer provided ongoing consultation to and with REN and S.T.A.R. team leads to address questions, follow up with concerns, and track the number of interviews and MRRs completed. In addition, clinical consultation support was available to the peer reviewer team through the duration of the project.

Sample Selection

A sample size of 135 was selected to achieve a confidence level of 95%, with an 8% confidence interval for the SMI population of 37,107.⁴ The sample was stratified proportionally based on the total population of Title XIX eligible members (80%) and Non-Title XIX members (20%). In total, approximately 1,600 members living with SMI were identified as an oversample to compensate for individuals who declined to participate or could not be contacted by the peer reviewers after reasonable and sustained attempts.

The final sample of members included 109 Title XIX members (81%) and 26 Non-Title XIX members (19%). It should be noted that a member's Title XIX eligibility status can change during the review period. To address this phenomenon consistently, Mercer delineated the member's eligibility based on the member's eligibility status during the latest date of service identified in the service utilization data file (dates of service: October 1, 2021 through December 31, 2022). By the end of the QSR, S.T.A.R. peer reviewers completed 68 reviews, and REN peer reviewers completed 67 reviews.

Member Interviews

Peer reviewer team leads were provided a list of members generated from the sample and oversample containing contact information for both the member and their assigned case managers. Peer reviewer team leads assigned cases to peer reviewers, who attempted to contact the individuals. The assigned peer reviewer used a standardized member contact protocol that included a HIPAA-compliant script for leaving voicemails. The member contact protocol included procedures to contact the member's assigned case manager for assistance with engaging the member when deemed necessary. When the individual was contacted, the peer reviewer described the purpose of the project and invited them to meet for an interview. Members who agreed to be interviewed were offered the choice to meet face-to-face or over the telephone. This was done to be sensitive to safety and social distancing measures related to the

⁴ Count of unduplicated SMI members derived from service utilization file spanning dates of service October 1, 2021 through December 31, 2022.

COVID-19 pandemic. All 135 member interviews were completed between March 2023 and April 2023.

Medical Record Reviews

The review period for the MRR portion of the QSR was identified as October 1, 2021 through September 30, 2022. This review period was established to be consistent with prior QSR annual reviews. However, to ensure that peer reviewers had access to at least three months of progress notes, the review period was extended when a selected member's ISP was completed after June 30, 2022 (e.g., If a member's ISP was dated August 15, 2022, Mercer requested three months of progress notes following the date of the ISP). The adult health homes were instructed to provide the requested documentation for each assigned member with a completed QSR interview. Requested documentation included the following:

- The member's initial or annual assessment update
- The member's annual psychiatric evaluation
- The member's ISP
- Clinical team progress notes, including:
 - Case management progress notes
 - Nursing progress notes
 - Behavioral health medical practitioner progress notes

Mercer requested that all versions of the assessment and/or ISP completed during the review period be submitted. In addition, the adult health homes were asked to identify any cases that did not have an assessment and/or ISP completed during the review period. In these cases, progress notes were requested, and the records were scored per the QSR MRR tool protocol.

The medical records were housed and reviewed in a secured location at each of the consumer-operated organizations. Peer reviewers utilized the QSR MRR tool (see Appendix E) to audit the records, consistent with the review tool protocol and training that Mercer performed prior to the review activity. Throughout the MRR process, a Mercer licensed PhD and licensed master social worker were available for clinical consultations and/or clarification in the event questions arose about how to score a particular case.

Data Analysis

AHCCCS provided Mercer with the following data for the sample period of October 1, 2021 through December 31, 2022:

- **Service Utilization Data** — Member level file that includes the number of units of all services provided, procedure codes, and date of service for individuals with SMI in Maricopa County.
- **CIS Demographic Information** — Member level file that identifies name, date of birth, gender identity, primary language, race/ethnicity, and dates for the latest assessment and ISP.

This data was integrated with the QSR interview and MRR data and extracted by Mercer using a statistical analysis system program to determine congruence between the various data sources as well as utilization of the targeted services.

Data Congruence

Prior QSR studies have examined the extent of file matches for the interview, medical record, and CIS files. Mercer performed a similar analysis and a summary of results, including a comparison to the 2019–2023 QSRs, which is presented in the table below.

Table A — Data Congruence

Congruence Between Interview, Medical Record, and CIS File(2019–2023)						
	2019 (N=135)	2020 (N=135)	2021 (N=135)	2022 (N=135)	2023 (N=135)	5-Year Average
Case Management	82%	78%	87%	70%	82%	80%
Peer Support	53%	39%	39%	44%	51%	45%
Family Support	81%	72%	77%	84%	87%	80%
Supportive Housing	57%	50%	52%	65%	54%	56%
Living Skills Training	76%	48%	53%	64%	69%	62%
Supported Employment	54%	35%	41%	33%	48%	42%
Crisis Services	66%	57%	65%	78%	73%	68%
Medication and Medication Management	64%	61%	67%	68%	86%	69%
ACT Team Services ⁵	93%	93%	93%	99%	89%	93%

Congruence was most often established when null values (“no responses”) were consistently identified across the medical record, interview, and CIS data. Discrepancies were most often associated with the medical record data which is likely due, in part, to the fact that health home progress notes primarily reflect services that are delivered directly by health home staff. Other community-based behavioral health services are rarely referenced or otherwise present through a review of health home progress notes. In these instances, members would report receiving the service, and CIS encounter data would support the member’s response, but the health home record would not have documented references of the service being delivered.

⁵ ACT Team services do not have a distinct billing code and, therefore, are not represented in the CIS data file. As an alternative, congruence for ACT team members was limited to members’ interview responses and medical record documentation.

Section 5

Findings

Per the *Stipulation for Providing Community Services and Terminating the Litigation* (January 8, 2014), the QSR is used to identify strengths, service capacity gaps, and areas for improvement at the system-wide level in Maricopa County. The QSR is intended to objectively evaluate:

- Whether the needs of members with SMI are being identified
- Whether members with SMI need, and are receiving, each of the targeted behavioral health services
- Whether the targeted behavioral health services are available
- Whether supports and services that members with SMI receive are meeting identified needs
- Whether supports and services are designed around members' with SMI strengths and goals

To the extent possible and when applicable, this report offers a year-to-year analysis based on 2023 QSR findings and a five-year average analysis, when appropriate, for some units of analysis. To meet the objectives of the *Stipulation for Providing Community Services and Terminating the Litigation*, analysis and findings will be presented for the following main topics:

- Sample demographics and characteristics
- Identification of needs
- Service provision to meet identified needs
- Availability of services
- Extent that supports and services are meeting identified needs
- Supports and services designed around member strengths and goals
- Service specific findings
- Conclusions and recommendations

Sample Demographics and Characteristics

The information presented below includes a breakout of demographic data for the sample population. The 2023 QSR final sample of members with SMI is relatively similar to characteristics reported in prior QSR samples, except that the number of members ages 38 years–49 years now surpasses those between 18 years–37 years.

Table 1 — Sample Age Group (Title XIX and Non-Title XIX)

Age Break-Out	Number and Percent of Members (2023)
18 years–37 years	31 (23%)
38 years–49 years	37 (27%)
50 years–55 years	19 (14%)
56+ years	48 (36%)
Total	135

Table 2 — Sample Race and Ethnicity (Title XIX and Non-Title XIX)

Race/Ethnicity	Frequency (2023) ⁶	Percent (2023)
White	72	53%
African American	11	8%
Hispanic	0	0%
American Indian	4	3%
Asian	0	0%
Native Hawaiian	0	0%
Not reported	48	36%
Total	135	100%

Identification of Needs

This next section of the report presents the extent to which services are identified as a need by the clinical team. The QSR MRR tool defines a need as “an issue or gap that is identified by the individual or the clinical team that requires a service or an intervention.”

The following table demonstrates the percentage of members from the sample that were deemed to need each service by the clinical team and was identified as a need on the member’s ISP.

⁶ Frequency counts and percentages do not equal 135 or 100% because some individuals are identified across more than one race/ethnicity.

Table 3 — Percentage of Identified Need for Each Targeted Service Based on the Member’s ISP ⁷

Comparison of Data From 2019 to 2023																
Targeted Service	Title XIX ⁸					Non-Title XIX					Total					Total
	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	5-Year Average
Case Management	87%	86%	90%	80%	75%	68%	79%	82%	82%	85%	84%	84%	87%	80%	77%	82%
Peer Support Services	36%	47%	43%	25%	32%	20%	46%	28%	29%	27%	33%	47%	39%	26%	31%	35%
Family Support Services	12%	9%	3%	1%	12%	4%	11%	0%	0%	0%	10%	10%	2%	1%	2%	5%
Supportive Housing	19%	20%	16%	17%	17%	8%	4%	8%	7%	0%	17%	16%	13%	15%	13%	15%
Living Skills Training	24%	32%	17%	12%	17%	20%	14%	15%	10%	12%	23%	28%	16%	12%	16%	19%
Supported Employment	29%	50%	44%	32%	43%	20%	43%	31%	54%	31%	27%	49%	40%	36%	41%	39%
Crisis Services	0%	0%	4%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	3%	1%	0%	1%
Medication and Medication Management	82%	80%	88%	79%	75%	68%	75%	82%	82%	81%	79%	79%	86%	79%	76%	80%
ACT Services	1%	5%	7%	3%	12%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	4%	5%	3%	10%	5%

⁷ The QSR MRR tool requires a “Yes” or “No” response to question 18, column B (“Does the recent ISP identify need for the services in column A?”). Thirty cases, or 22% of the sample, did not include a current ISP.

⁸ Calculations for Title XIX and Non-Title XIX members are based on a reduced sample size, which correlates to the number of Title XIX and Non-Title XIX members in the final sample. Calculations will not total 100% across the table due to the reduced sample sizes used in the individual calculations.

In keeping with previous QSRs, case management services and medication and medication management services were the most frequently identified service needs. The five-year average demonstrates that this has been a consistent trend for the last five years.

In 2023, thirty members, or 22% of the sample, did not include a current ISP. None of the targeted services can be identified as a need on the ISP when the ISP is missing or is outdated. This is an increase compared to the last two years when 16% (2022) or 13% (2021) of the QSR sample did not include a current ISP. However, over the last five years, this number has varied and resulted in an average of 19.8 or 15% of the sample, not including a current ISP.

The data in Table 4 below reflects whether the ISP objectives address the individual’s needs identified in the ISP and whether the ISP contains services that address the individual’s needs. These indicators measure the extent of the individualization of a treatment plan and whether the person is receiving a service based on their individualized needs and objectives. The QSR MRR tool defines an ISP objective as “a specific action step the recipient or family will take toward meeting a need.”

Table 4 presents results for 2019–2023, as well as a five-year average.

Table 4 — Percentage of Objectives and Services that Address Individuals’ Needs

Evaluation Criteria	Title XIX					Non-Title XIX					Total					
	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	5-Year Average
ISP objectives addressed individuals’ needs.	58%	59%	60%	74%	80%	61%	48%	64%	82%	77%	59%	57%	61%	71%	79%	65%
Services are based on individuals’ needs.	91%	72%	90%	89%	88%	89%	60%	91%	100%	95%	91%	70%	90%	86%	89%	84%

*30 cases were scored “cannot be determined” due to missing ISPs and were eliminated from the analysis in this table.

Seventy-nine percent (79%) of cases included ISP objectives that addressed members’ needs (compared to 71% in 2022). A five-year average shows that ISP objectives address members’ needs 65% of the time. Similar to past years, and in many cases, the review team did note that objectives were presented as actions that the clinical team planned to complete as opposed to an activity that the member and/or family would initiate.

Eighty-nine percent (89%) of the cases reviewed included ISP services that were based on the member’s needs. This represents a small improvement from 2022 (86%). A five-year average shows that services are based on a member’s needs 84% of the time.

Service Provision to Meet Identified Needs

This section of the report describes the extent to which the targeted behavioral health services are received following the identification of need.

Table 5a identifies the percentage of each targeted service that was received after the service was identified as a need on the member’s ISP. The analysis includes any case that identified a need for one or more of the targeted services. ISP need was defined as the service being documented on the ISP. Reviewers then reviewed the progress notes to determine whether the service was subsequently provided to the member.

Table 5a — Percentage of Identified Service Needs (per ISP) and Percentage of Documented Evidence that the Service Was Provided (per progress notes)

2023 QSR — Title XIX and Non-Title XIX						
Targeted Service	Title XIX		Non-Title XIX		Total	
	ISP Need	Services Provided	ISP Need	Services Provided	ISP Need	Services Provided
Case Management	75%	77%	85%	75%	77%	76%
Peer Support Services	32%	20%	27%	18%	31%	19%
Family Support Services	12%	0%	0%	0%	2%	0%
Supportive Housing	17%	10%	0%	0%	13%	8%
Living Skills Training	17%	11%	12%	7%	16%	10%
Supported Employment	43%	25%	31%	18%	41%	24%
Crisis Services	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Medication and Medication Management	75%	76%	81%	75%	76%	76%
ACT Services	12%	12%	0%	0%	10%	10%

Case management, medication management, and ACT team services were the services most consistently provided following the identification of the need for these services. These results are similar to the 2022 QSR results. Notably, peer support, family support, supportive housing, living skills training, and supported employment were not found to be as consistently provided once the need was identified on the ISP.

Table 5b identifies the percentage of each targeted service that was received per the member interview responses. An ISP need was identified when the service was included on the ISP. Consistent with the 2021 and 2022 QSR studies, peer support, supported employment, and living skills training services were provided at a lower rate than the identified need based on responses from members during face-to-face interviews.

Table 5b — Percentage of Identified Service Needs (per ISP) and Percentage of Services Received as Reported by the Member (per interview)

2023 QSR — Title XIX and Non-Title XIX						
Targeted Service	Title XIX		Non-Title XIX		Total	
	ISP Need	Services Received	ISP Need	Services Received	ISP Need	Services Received
Case Management	75%	76%	85%	16%	77%	93%
Peer Support Services	32%	17%	27%	3%	31%	20%
Family Support Services	3%	6%	0%	1%	2%	7%
Supportive Housing	17%	18%	0%	1%	13%	19%
Living Skills Training	17%	11%	12%	1%	16%	12%
Supported Employment	43%	15%	31%	2%	41%	17%
Crisis Services	0%	13%	0%	2%	0%	16%
Medication and Medication Management	75%	75%	81%	17 %	76%	92%
ACT Services	12%	12%	0%	2%	10%	13%

The QSR interview tool also includes questions that may indicate an unmet need for a particular targeted service. Related questions and aggregate member responses are presented below.

Question #	Question	2019 Response — Yes	2020 Response — Yes	2021 Response — Yes	2022 Response — Yes	2023 Response — Yes	5-Year Average
Q2	Do you have enough contact with your case manager (i.e., telephone and in-person meetings with the case manager at a frequency that meets your needs)?	68%	75%	76%	70%	70%	72%
Q10	If you do not receive peer support, would you like to receive this kind of support?	43%	36%	30%	33%	36%	36%
Q18	If your family is not receiving family support services, would you and your family like to have these services?	26%	23%	17%	26%	23%	23%
Q24	If you did not receive supportive housing services, have you been at risk for losing housing because you needed financial assistance with rent or utilities?	24%	28%	21%	13%	25%	22%
Q34	If you did not receive living skills training, did you feel you needed it during the past year?	31%	24%	22%	24%	27%	26%
Q44	In the past year, did you feel you needed services to help you get or keep a job?	36%	29%	32%	26%	21%	29%
Q71	If you are not receiving ACT services, would you like to have these services?	11%	8%	14%	10%	19%	12%

Table 5c — Percentage of Identified Service Needs (per ISP) and Percentage of Services Received as Reported by Service Encounter Data (CIS)

2023 QSR — Title XIX and Non-Title XIX						
Targeted Services	Title XIX		Non-Title XIX		Total	
	ISP Need	CIS	ISP Need	CIS	ISP Need	CIS
Case Management	77%	100%	75%	100%	85%	100%
Peer Support Services	31%	39%	32%	19%	27%	35%
Family Support Services	2%	4%	3%	0%	0%	3%
Supportive Housing	13%	26%	17%	31%	0%	27%
Living Skills Training	16%	19%	17%	12%	12%	18%
Supported Employment	41%	50%	43%	39%	31%	47%
Crisis Services	0%	17%	0%	15%	0%	17%
Medication and Medication Management	76%	98%	75%	65%	81%	92%

Table 5c illustrates the percentage of members with an identified need for each targeted service and the corresponding percentage of members who received the service as measured by the presence of service utilization data. The service utilization data is inclusive of all fully adjudicated service encounters with dates of service over a specified period (October 1, 2021–December 31, 2022).

During the MRR, peer reviewers noted that some individuals received one or more of the targeted services, regardless of an identified need documented in the assessment or ISP. Discrepancies between identified needs and service provision may also result from a misunderstanding of the intent and purpose of the services.

As indicated earlier in the report, 22% of the sample did not include a valid ISP, and a need for the targeted services cannot be established in these cases.

Availability of Services

As part of the QSR interview, members were asked to identify their perception of the duration of time required to access one or more of the targeted services. Aggregated results of the interviews are illustrated in Table 6a. To support the analyses, the timeframes were consolidated into three ranges: 1 day–15 days, 15 days–30 days, and 30 days or more. Table 6b shows the aggregated results over a five-year period for access to services within 15 days. Table 6a indicates:

- The services most readily available within 15 days were medication management (95%), peer support services (67%), ACT services (61%), and family support services (60%). For peer and family support services, this was a significant improvement from 2022 (36% and 25%, respectively). However, access to peer services has not returned to the levels documented in 2019, 2020, and 2021 (84%, 77%, and 80% within 15 days, respectively).
- Notably, access to case management within 15 days dropped further in 2023 to 48% (compared to 54% in 2022 and an average of 88% between 2019, 2020, and 2021).
- Similar to last year, the services least available within 15 days were living skills training (45%), supportive employment (43%), and supportive housing (16%). Access to ACT services increased to 61% in 2023. Despite this improvement, prompt access to ACT services remains reduced compared to 100% access within 15 days in years 2019, 2020, and 2021.
- Similar to the last three years, almost half of the respondents receiving supportive housing services reported that it took more than 30 days to access the service. Notably, of the 11 individuals who reported receiving supportive housing services 30 days or more after the service was initiated, only five of those were referring to the receipt of a rental subsidy or housing voucher as their sole supportive housing service.

Table 6a — Percentage of Individuals Receiving Services Between 1 Day–15 Days, 15 Days–30 Days, and Greater Than 30 Days

2023 QSR — Title XIX and Non-Title XIX ⁹									
Targeted Services	Title XIX			Non-Title XIX			Total		
	1 day–15 days	Within 30 days	>30 days	1 day–15 days	15 days–30 days	>30 days	1 day–15 days	15 days–30 days	>30 days
Case Management	47%	3%	11%	45%	5%	5%	48%	3%	10%
Peer Support Services	70%	0%	4%	50%	25%	0%	67%	4%	4%
Family Support Services	63%	0%	13%	50%	0%	0%	60%	0%	10%
Supportive Housing	13%	13%	46%	100%	0%	0%	16%	12%	44%
Living Skills Training	40%	7%	20%	0%	0%	0%	45%	0%	18%
Supported Employment	45%	5%	10%	13%	0%	13%	43%	4%	13%
Medication and Medication Management	95%	0%	0%	96%	0%	0%	95%	0%	0%
ACT Team Services	69%	0%	6%	0%	0%	50%	61%	0%	6%

⁹ When percentages total less than 100% across the responses presented in the table, the “n” has been reduced to eliminate members who indicated they did not receive the services and/or responded “Not sure.”

Table 6b — Percentage of Individuals Receiving Services Between 1 Day–15 Days Over a Five-Year Period

2019–2023 QSR — Title XIX and Non-Title XIX					
Targeted Services	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Case Management	83%	91%	90%	54%	48%
Peer Support Services	84%	77%	80%	36%	67%
Family Support Services	83%	93%	69%	25%	60%
Supportive Housing	34%	25%	31%	20%	16%
Living Skills Training	82%	84%	89%	25%	45%
Supported Employment	66%	65%	36%	48%	43%
Medication and Medication Management	100%	100%	100%	91%	95%
ACT Team Services	100%	100%	100%	50%	61%

The QSR interview tool includes a set of questions related to access to care. Reviewers are instructed to describe access to care to members as “how easily you are able to get the services you feel you need.” The access to care questions and percent of affirmative (i.e., “Yes”) responses are presented below:

- The location of services is convenient (79%) — compared to 68% in 2022.
- Services were available at times that are good for you (87%) — compared to 78% in 2022.
- Do you feel that you need more of a service that you have been receiving? (31%) — compared to 24% in 2022. *See call-out box for examples of services that members requested.*
- Do you feel that you need less of a service you have been receiving? (3%) — compared to 1% in 2022.

Examples of Additional Services Requested

- Dental and vision coverage
- Counseling
- Support to get physically healthy
- Housing and help finding housing
- Housekeeping, decluttering of home
- Help getting driver’s license

The responses to these questions demonstrate members do not appear to perceive location and time of services as barriers to receiving services. Overall, member approval of both location and time preferences improved over 2022 responses. Although one member did request more availability of evening hours, and others requested more

home visits from case managers. Regarding needing more or less of a service, members reported similar needs in 2023 compared to 2022.

Extent that Supports and Services Are Meeting Identified Needs

This section of the report examines whether supports and services that members with SMI receive are meeting their identified needs. The QSR interview tool includes questions that assess the efficacy of services and the extent to which those services satisfy identified needs.

Mercer examined responses to the following QSR interview questions to assess, by individual targeted service, how individuals perceived the effectiveness of the services.

For selected targeted services, QSR interview questions ask members the extent to which they agree or disagree that the service was helpful and/or supported their recovery. See Table 7 below for findings. Family support services are excluded from the analysis, as there are no corresponding questions on the interview tool related to that service.

Historically, medication and medication management services was the service perceived to be the most helpful with a members' recovery (five-year average of 91%). However, this year, ACT services were perceived as the most effective of all services (100%). The perception of peer support services as beneficial to a member's recovery improved to 96% (compared to 44% in 2022). Similar to last year, case management was perceived as being the least effective in helping members advance their recovery (73%).

Table 7 — Percentage of Individuals Agreeing That Services Help With Their Recovery

2019–2023 QSR — Title XIX and Non-Title XIX																
Targeted Service	Title XIX					Non-Title XIX					Total					
	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	5-Year Avg
Case Management	78%	77%	76%	68%	73%	87%	85%	81%	72%	73%	80%	78%	78%	69%	73%	76%
Peer Support Services	93%	92%	88%	45%	96%	100%	89%	90%	40%	100%	94%	92%	89%	44%	96%	83%
Supportive Housing	88%	84%	78%	84%	75%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	89%	86%	82%	78%	76%	82%
Living Skills Training	86%	90%	86%	90%	80%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	88%	91%	89%	92%	81%	88%
Supported Employment	89%	96%	93%	62%	80%	100%	100%	80%	100%	67%	90%	97%	89%	65%	78%	84%
Crisis Services	88%	93%	89%	75%	72%	80%	100%	100%	100%	100%	87%	94%	92%	78%	76%	85%
Medication and Medication Management	88%	100%	90%	82%	86%	91%	96%	100%	93%	97%	89%	99%	93%	84%	88%	91%
ACT Services	100%	75%	89%	67%	100%	N/A	100%	100%	N/A ¹⁰	100%	100%	80%	89%	67%	100%	87%

¹⁰ N/A indicates that there were zero Non-Title XIX members receiving ACT services and, therefore, no responses were available.

Table 8 illustrates the percentage of members who reported a problem with one or more of the targeted services. In comparison to 2022, family support, supportive housing, living skills training, crisis services, and medication and medication management were reported to have more problems. Other services, such as case management, peer support, and ACT, were reported to have less problems. However, case management continues to have the highest year-over-year rates of reported problems (five-year average of 38%). The services with the lowest percentage of reported problems over a five-year average are living skills training, family support, and peer support services.

Table 8 — Percentage of Reported Problems with Services

2019–2023 QSR — Title XIX and Non-Title XIX																
Targeted Service	Title XIX					Non-Title XIX					Total					
	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	5-Year Avg
Case Management	47%	40%	29%	41%	37%	26%	31%	27%	28%	41%	43%	38%	29%	41%	38%	38%
Peer Support Services	24%	18%	9%	20%	9%	20%	11%	10%	0%	0%	24%	17%	9%	17%	7%	15%
Family Support Services	9%	27%	9%	0%	25%	0%	0%	25%	0%	0%	8%	23%	13%	0%	20%	13%
Supportive Housing	21%	32%	16%	11%	0%	0%	25%	33%	0%	10%	19%	31%	18%	11%	24%	21%
Living Skills Training	7%	20%	14%	0%	13%	0%	67%	0%	0%	0%	6%	26%	11%	0%	13%	11%
Supported Employment	28%	19%	21%	5%	10%	0%	0%	20%	50%	0%	24%	17%	21%	9%	9%	16%
Crisis Services	15%	33%	21%	20%	44%	20%	50%	0%	33%	0%	15%	35%	17%	22%	38%	25%
Medication and Medication Management	24%	23%	16%	17%	20%	22%	19%	20%	19%	21%	23%	22%	17%	17%	20%	20%
ACT Services	29%	25%	22%	33%	19%	N/A ¹¹	0%	0%	N/A	0%	29%	20%	17%	33%	17%	23%

¹¹ N/A indicates that there were zero Non-Title XIX members receiving ACT services and, therefore, no responses were available.

The interview tool solicits additional information regarding the nature of the perceived problem when a member identifies that there have been issues with a service. For case management, which has one of the highest rates of reported problems, the types of reported problems included case manager turnover, lack of communication regarding case manager changes, lack of follow-up on member requests, failure to return calls, and limited or no contact with case managers. These comments are consistent with problems reported during the 2020, 2021, and 2022 QSRs.

In Table 9 below, members are asked to report their satisfaction with specific services on a rating scale from 1 to 10, with 1 being dissatisfied and 10 being completely satisfied. In 2023, services rated with the highest levels of satisfaction were peer support services, supportive housing, supportive employment, ACT services and medication and medication management. When considering a five-year average in satisfaction ratings, peer support services (8.3), family support services (8.1), supportive housing (8.1), and medication management (8.0) have scored the highest ratings. Notably, case management and ACT services have scored the lowest averages over a five-year period.

Table 9 — Average Service Ratings (rated from 1 [lowest] to 10 [highest])

2019–2023 QSR — Title XIX and Non-Title XIX																
Targeted Service	Title XIX					Non-Title XIX					Total					
	2019	2020	2021	2022	2032	2019	2020	2021	2022	2032	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	5-Year Average
Case Management	7.0	7.3	7.6	7.3	7.1	7.5	7.1	7.7	7.3	6.7	7.1	7.2	7.7	7.3	7.0	7.3
Peer Support Services	8.3	8.0	8.4	7.3	9.5	7.6	9.0	8.2	8.3	7.8	8.2	8.2	8.4	7.5	9.2	8.3
Family Support Services	6.9	7.8	8.4	8.4	8.0	10	8.9	9.0	8	8.0	7.4	8.2	8.5	8.3	8.0	8.1
Supportive Housing	6.6	8.0	7.3	8.8	8.6	10	6.8	8.4	8	9	7.9	7.8	7.5	8.7	8.6	8.1
Living Skills Training	7.0	7.8	8.0	8.1	6.9	10.0	8.0	6.7	9.3	8	7.6	7.8	7.7	8.3	7.0	7.7
Supported Employment	7.0	8.0	7.4	7.7	8.7	6.8	9.0	8.6	7.8	8.3	7.0	8.2	7.7	7.7	8.4	7.8

2019–2023 QSR — Title XIX and Non-Title XIX																
Targeted Service	Title XIX					Non-Title XIX					Total					
	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	5-Year Average
Crisis Services	6.4	7.7	8.7	7.9	7.1	7.2	6.5	9.0	8.7	7.7	6.5	7.5	8.8	8.0	7.2	7.6
Medication and Medication Management	9.1	8.6	8.8	8.1	8.1	7.6	8.5	8.8	8.5	7.8	6.6	8.6	8.8	8.1	8.1	8.0
ACT Services	4.1	7.8	7.4	7	8.3	N/A ¹²	9.0	3.3	N/A	8.5	4.1	8.1	6.4	7	8.3	6.8

Table 10 below depicts rates of functional outcomes as determined through member interviews, progress notes, assessments, and ISPs. Rates of employment among members dropped slightly to 22% but matches the five-year average for employment among members surveyed (22%).

The QSR MRR tool offers the following guidance when determining whether a member is involved in a meaningful day activity: “Does the activity make the person feel part of the world and does it bring meaning to their life?” and “Does it enhance their connection to the community and others?” If a member was determined to be employed, that person would also be considered to be engaged in a meaningful day activity. In 2023, the percentage of members who reported being engaged in a meaningful activity improved to 72%. The five-year average is 75%. The percent of members in the sample determined to have housing also improved to 90%. The five-year average for members in the sample with housing is 91%.

¹² N/A indicates that there were zero Non-Title XIX members receiving ACT services and, therefore, no responses were available.

Table 10 — Functional Outcomes

2019–2023 QSR — Title XIX and Non-Title XIX																
Functional Outcomes	Title XIX					Non-Title XIX					Total					5-Year Average
	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	
Employed	17%	20%	27%	27%	22%	17%	12%	24%	36%	19%	17%	18%	26%	29%	22%	22%
Meaningful Day Activities	84%	78%	78%	64%	70%	89%	80%	70%	57%	81%	84%	79%	76%	64%	72%	75%
Housing	89%	93%	91%	85%	89%	100%	96%	97%	89%	96%	91%	93%	93%	86%	90%	91%

Supports and Services Designed Around Member Strengths and Goals

Table 11 depicts the percentage of the sample in which the services were based on the individual’s strengths and goals in the assessment, ISP, progress notes, and in all three documents. The final measure indicates the percentage of ISP objectives that were deemed to be based on the individual’s strengths. The QSR MRR tool defines strength as “traits, abilities, resources, and characteristics that are relevant for and/or will assist the recipient with his or her needs and objectives. Strengths can be identified by the recipient or clinical team members.”

Table 11 — Percentage of Individual Strengths Identified in Assessment, ISP, Progress Notes, and ISP Objectives

2019–2023 QSR — Title XIX and Non-Title XIX																
Document Type	Title XIX					Non-Title XIX					Total					5-Year Average
	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	
Assessment	85%	72%	79%	80%	71%	76%	79%	82%	86%	81%	83%	73%	80%	80%	73%	78%
ISP	86%	79%	91%	81%	73%	72%	75%	82%	75%	81%	84%	78%	88%	80%	75%	81%
Progress Notes	75%	65%	54%	43%	69%	84%	61%	69%	54%	69%	77%	64%	59%	45%	69%	63%
All Three Documents	54%	39%	45%	26%	42%	48%	36%	56%	29%	42%	53%	39%	48%	27%	42%	42%
ISP Objectives Based on Strengths	46%	49%	50%	52%	60%	28%	46%	49%	57%	65%	43%	48%	50%	53%	61%	51%

During the MRR process, peer reviewers determined if member strengths were documented in the assessment, ISP, and progress notes. A final MRR item assesses whether the member’s strengths were consistently identified in the assessment, ISP, and progress notes (all three documents).

Similar to the 2021 and 2022 QSRs, peer reviewers noted that strengths were most commonly identified in the ISP and the assessment (both 80% of the time) compared to progress notes (45% of the time). The rate at which ISP objectives are based on members’ identified strengths has continued to improve to 61% in 2023 compared to 43% in 2019. Peer reviewers noted an upward trend in the identification of strengths in progress notes (69%), along with a similar improvement in consistency across all document types (42%).

Table 12 illustrates the percentage of members who felt that the services they received considered their strengths and needs. This information was captured through member interviews.

Table 12 — Percentage of Members Who Feel the Services They Received Considered Their Strengths and Needs

2019–2023 QSR — Title XIX and Non-Title XIX																
Evaluation Criteria	Title XIX					Non-Title XIX					Total					
	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	5-Year Average
Services are based on individuals' strengths and needs	74%	81%	77%	75%	76%	72%	61%	79%	82%	77%	73%	77%	78%	76%	77%	76%

Overall, 77% of members felt that services were based on their strengths and needs. This outcome aligns with the five-year average of 76%.

If the member responded “No”, then the peer reviewer asked “why not”? A sample of member comments are presented below:

- “They treat me like a number on a chart instead of an individual. They threaten to take my meds away like I'm an addict.”
- “Unstable services affect the way care is delivered. It is hard to trust with the constant change of providers.”
- “I have multiple degrees and not believed about it. I am not taken seriously due to ‘SMI’.”
- “Care is not based on my need, but what they feel I need. They don't listen to me.”
- “There's no one there to help me, and nobody wants to help anybody. People are working with the mentally ill; it's not what they want to do. People need to understand mental illness before they enter the job. They need compassion, understanding, and human kindness.”

Appendix A

Service-Specific Findings

Case Management

Table A1 — Individual Report on Case Management (Title XIX and Non-Title XIX)

Interview Questions	Number of Individuals Responding	2023 “Yes” Response Rate	2022 “Yes” Response Rate
Do you have enough contact with your case manager?	125	70%	70%
Your case manager helps you find services and resources that you ask for.	124 ¹³	73%	67%
On a scale of 1 to 10, how satisfied were you with the case management services you received? (Average score)	125	7.0	7.30
Were there problems with the case management services that you received?	125	38%	41%
How long did it take for you to receive case management services? (Percent receiving services within 15 days)	125	48%	54%

Consistent with previous years, peer reviewers noted that turnover in the case manager position is a common experience. Many members reported frequent changes in their assigned case manager and that they can go for extended periods of time (i.e. six or more months) without a case manager. For one member, not having a case manager became an issue when she was in crisis, and she was not able to get the help she needed from her health home.

Members reported they were not informed of changes in case managers, often did not know who they were assigned to, and requested to be notified of case manager changes in a timely manner. One member stated “They kept changing my case managers, and I did not know who to contact. I got very frustrated.” Others shared that case managers do not follow up on what they say they will do, and one member reported that they would have to remind their case manager to follow up on referrals to outside programs.

Similar to last year, case managers were often noted by members to be difficult to reach, and some failed to return telephone calls. Overall, reported problems with case management services improved slightly, and members reported an improvement in the level of helpfulness from case managers compared to 2022 QSR results. However, general satisfaction with

¹³ This reduced number of individuals responding is due to a lack of a member response to this interview question.

case management services reduced slightly, and there was a reduction in the time of delivery within 15 days. A few members expressed satisfaction and appreciation for the role that the case manager assumed in supporting their recovery. Below are examples of member comments extracted from the interview tools:

- “They do a good job supporting my needs.”
- “Not a problem. They always offered assistance.”
- “I love my case manager. Give him a raise!”

Peer Support

Table A2 — Individual Report on Peer Support Services (Title XIX and Non-Title XIX)

Interview Questions	Number of Individuals Responding	2023 “Yes” Response Rate	2022 “Yes” Response Rate
Your peer support/recovery support specialist helps you to better understand and use the services available to you.	27	96%	44%
How long did it take for you to receive peer support services? (Percent receiving services within 15 days)	27	67%	36%
On a scale of 1 to 10, how satisfied were you with the peer support services you received? (Average score)	27	9.3	7.8
Were there problems with the peer support services that you received?	27	7%	23%

Similar to last year, a reduced number of members reported receiving peer support services compared to previous years (N = 50 in 2020, N = 46 in 2021, N = 25 in 2022). Notably, 35 members (36%) who were not receiving peer support services indicated a desire to receive this type of support. For those members receiving the service, there was an improvement in the time it took for the service to start, an improvement in the level of satisfaction of the peer support services received, and fewer members had problems with the service. Overall, members appear satisfied with the peer support services they receive.

Family Support Services

Table A3 — Individual Report on Family Support Services (Title XIX and Non-Title XIX)

Interview Questions	Number of Individuals Responding	2023 “Yes” Response Rate	2022 “Yes” Response Rate
How long did it take for you and your family to receive family support services? (Percent receiving services within 15 days)	9	60%	25%
On a scale of 1 to 10, how satisfied were you with the family support services you received? (Average score)	9	8.0	8.1
Were there problems with the family support services that you received?	9	20%	0%

This year, there was a decrease in the number of members receiving family support services, representing 7% of the sample interviewed. Notably, there was an improvement in the time it took for the service to be provided, but an increase in the number of members reporting a problem with the family support service they received. For those who reported an issue, the comments were limited and included:

- “My family needs therapy too, to understand what I go through.”

Supportive Housing

Table A4 — Individual Report on Supportive Housing Services (Title XIX and Non-Title XIX)

Interview Questions	Number of Individuals Responding	2023 “Yes” Response Rate	2022 “Yes” Response Rate
Your supportive housing services help you with your recovery.	25	76%	85%
How long did it take for you to receive supportive housing services? (Percent receiving services within 15 days)	25	16%	20%
On a scale of 1 to 10, how satisfied were you with the supportive housing services you received? (Average score)	25	8.6	8.7
Were there problems with the supportive housing services that you received?	25	24%	10%
If you did not receive supportive housing services, have you been at risk of losing housing because you needed financial assistance with rent or utilities?	102	25%	16%

Interview Questions	Number of Individuals Responding	2023 “Yes” Response Rate	2022 “Yes” Response Rate
Do you feel safe in your housing/neighborhood?	25	92%	67%

The types of supportive housing services that individuals received are collected during the member interviews. Similar to the 2021 and 2022 QSRs, the most frequent services/assistance received were rental subsidies (routine assistance paying for all or part of the rent through a publicly funded program) and “pays no more than 30% of income for rent”. When considering the full array of supportive housing services, such as bridge funding, relocation services, legal assistance, furniture, neighborhood orientation, help with budgeting, etc., QSR analyses demonstrate that year over year, few members receive these services alongside the rental subsidies.

The percent of members receiving supportive housing services within 15 days dropped to 16% in 2023 compared to 20% in 2022.

Last, in 2023, members reported a higher percentage of problems (24%) with supportive housing compared to 2022 (10%). Of those experiencing problems, they shared the following comments:

- “I am worried about places not accepting the voucher in the future.”
- “I am having a difficult time finding a place due to the lack of finding places that accept vouchers.”
- “I need more support and hands-on help. I would like my team to be more supportive and available.”

Living Skills Training

Table A5 — Individual Report on Living Skills Training Services (Title XIX and Non-Title XIX)

Interview Questions	Number of Individuals Responding	2023 “Yes” Response Rate	2022 “Yes” Response Rate
Living skills services have helped you manage your life and live in your community.	16	81%	92%
How long did it take for you to receive living skills training services? (Percent receiving services within 15 days)	16	44%	25%
On a scale of 1 to 10, how satisfied were you with the skills management training you received? (Average score)	16	8.1	8.2
Were there problems with the skills management training that you received?	16	13%	17%

Living skills training metrics have largely continued to trend downward year over year. In 2021, 34 members reported receiving living skills training services compared to 16 in 2023 and 12 in 2022. Notably, of the 16 individuals who reported receiving living skills training, almost half (47%) reported also receiving ACT services. The percentage of members reporting problems with living skills training dropped slightly compared to 2022.

For members who reported problems, comments included the following.

- “I never received services they said I would get.”
- “It took too long to receive resources.”

Supported Employment

Table A6 — Individual Report on Supported Employment Services (Title XIX and Non-Title XIX)

Interview Questions	Number of Individuals Responding	2023 “Yes” Response Rate	2022 “Yes” Response Rate
You found these job-related services helpful.	23	78%	78%
How long did it take for you to receive supported employment services? (Percent receiving services within 15 days)	23	43%	48%
On a scale of 1 to 10, how satisfied were you with the employment services you received? (Average score)	23	8.8	8.2
Were there problems with the employment services that you received?	23	9%	9%
Someone at your clinic told you about job-related services such as resume writing, interview, job group, or vocational rehabilitation.	134 ¹⁴	50%	42%
Did you know that there are programs available for people receiving SSI and/or SSDI benefits to help protect them from losing their financial and medical benefits if they were to get a job?	133	55%	55%

Of the members interviewed, 23% (N=31) reported they are working either part-time or full-time.¹⁵ Of the members who were not working at the time of their interviews, most reported that they engage in meaningful activities during the day. These activities included socializing with friends and/or family, walking their dogs, reading, listening to music, attending groups at peer-run organizations, babysitting children or grandchildren, and

¹⁴ Note: The last two questions in this table are asked of the entire sample and results in a significantly higher “N” than the preceding questions. The preceding questions pertain only to members who report having received Supported Employment services.

¹⁵ Note: The percentage of members who reported employment in the interviews was slightly higher (23%) compared to the percentage of members with documented employment in their medical records (22%); interviews are conducted at a point in time and employment status may change over time.

exercising. A number of members reported they were retired and were enjoying this stage of their lives while others shared they are actively seeking employment.

The types of supported employment services were collected during the member interviews. The most frequent services received by individuals receiving supported employment included: job coaching (19), resume preparation (14), job interview skills (13), and transportation (10). This array of services is similar to the 2022 results. Comments from members regarding supported employment services were limited and included the following:

- “No communication with job coach and never could connect. I finally gave up.”
- “Issues with job developer. Not very helpful.”

Crisis Services

Table A7 — Individual Report on Crisis Services (Title XIX and Non-Title XIX)

Interview Questions*	Number of Individuals Responding	2023 “Yes” Response Rate	2022 “Yes” Response Rate
Did you receive any mobile crisis team intervention services within the past year?	21	52%	64%
Did you receive any crisis services from a crisis unit within the past year?	21	33%	68%
Did you receive any crisis hotline services within the past year?	21	33%	39%
Were crisis services available to you right away?	21	91%	91%
On a scale of 1 to 10, did the crisis services you received help you resolve the crisis? (Average score)	20	7.2	8.0
Did you have any problems with the crisis services that you received?	21	38%	22%

*These questions are posed to a subset of the sample that responds “Yes” to having received crisis services in the past year (QSR Interview Tool Q.54).

Overall, members reported that crisis services helped them to resolve the crisis; however, 38% of members who received crisis services indicated some problems with the services received. Interviewers captured the following comments:

- “People seem to hurt you more than help you.”
- “I did not feel I was heard. I could not have my service animal with me.”
- “They laid down strict rules, and I didn't really get any help. Some people are nice but a lot of them aren't.”
- “Not effective. All they do is ask what med you want and just send you away.”

- “Crisis services can't help with anything other than having police come and that they can't do anything unless they are willing.”

Medication Management Services

Table A8 — Individual Report on Medication Management Services (Title XIX and Non-Title XIX)

Interview Questions	Number of Individuals Responding	2023 “Yes” Response Rate	2022 “Yes” Response Rate
Were you told about your medications and side effects?	124	77%	75%
Were you told about the importance of taking your medicine as prescribed?	124	92%	86%
Do you feel comfortable talking with your doctor about your medications and how they make you feel?	124	91%	91%
The medication services you received helped you in your recovery.	124	89%	84%
On a scale of 1 to 10, how satisfied were you with the medication services you received? (Average score)	124	8.1	8.1
Were there problems with the medication services that you received?	120 ¹⁶	21%	17%

This year, there was slight improvement in the number of members who report being told about their medications and side effects and the importance of taking medications as prescribed. Overall, members expressed satisfaction with the medication services received, but several members shared concerns regarding the turnover of prescribers and difficulty obtaining their medications. Twenty-one percent of members reported that there were problems with their medication services — a slight increase over 2022 (17%). This included the following reports:

- “I feel my doctor gives me medications that I don't need.”
- “Provider did not tell all/any of the side effects and, as a result, I ended up with the worst side effects.”
- “They did not talk about side effects enough.”
- “I went without a doctor for at least a year. Providers were constantly changing. Makes it difficult to gauge effectiveness. Medication was out of stock for three weeks.”
- “It has been hard to get meds filled and to see the doctor.”

¹⁶ This reduced number of individuals responding is due to a lack of member responses to this interview question.

- “I am not able to see anyone to get medications. They are making appointments and not telling me about them.”
- “Not all nurses perform injections with comfortable experience, leading to pain.”

Assertive Community Treatment

Table A9 — Individual Report on ACT Services (Title XIX and Non-Title XIX)

Interview Questions	Number of Individuals Responding	2023 “Yes” Response Rate	2022 “Yes” Response Rate
Your ACT services help you with your recovery.	18	100%	67%
How long did it take you to receive ACT services? (Percent receiving services within 15 days)	18	61%	33%
On a scale of 1 to 10, how satisfied were you with the ACT services you received? (Average score)	18	8.3	7
Were there problems with your ACT services?	18	17%	50%

Historically, the number of individuals who complete the QSR interview and who are also receiving ACT services has been quite low. However, this year, 18 members (13%) interviewed reported receiving ACT services (compared to three members in 2022). Overall, members receiving ACT appear to be satisfied with the service, and only three members reported an issue with their ACT services. Comments were limited, with one member reporting the following as an issue:

- “Being forced to take medication.”

Appendix B

QSR Study Conclusions and Recommendations

The following conclusions are presented based on the 2023 QSR analysis, organized by each of the QSR study questions. As recommended by Mercer following prior QSRs, existing performance improvement initiatives should be leveraged when applicable and a thorough root-cause analysis be completed for each finding to help ensure that primary causal factors are identified and addressed.

2023 QSR — Summary of Findings

A. Are the needs of members with SMI being identified?

- A.1.** Twenty-two percent of the sample did not have a current ISP and 20% did not have a current assessment available. A need for targeted services cannot be established in these cases.
- A.2.** Seventy-nine percent of the cases included ISP objectives that addressed members' needs; an increase from 71% in 2021. QSR reviewers continue to note that some ISP objectives were presented as actions that the clinical team planned to complete as opposed to an activity that the member and/or family would initiate.

B. When identified as a need, are members with SMI receiving each of the targeted behavioral health services?

- B.1.** Overall, there continues to be inconsistency across progress notes, QSR interviews, and encounter data that services assessed as needs in the ISP are provided.
- B.2.** Peer support, family support, supportive housing, living skills training, and supported employment were not found to be as consistently provided once the need was identified on the ISP. Reviewers found that clinical teams indicated the need on the ISP but did not subsequently initiate a referral for the services.
- B.3.** Similar to past years, CIS data demonstrates that members received one or more of the targeted services regardless of an identified need documented in the ISP or assessment. This pattern was found in all nine targeted services.
- B.4.** Thirty-four percent of members reported they do not feel they have enough contact with their case manager. Consistent with prior years, there were many comments from members expressing frustration over inconsistent communication, access, and follow-up with regard to case management.
- B.5.** Similar to last year's QSR, a significant percentage of member interview responses indicate that members who reportedly did not receive select targeted services perceived the need for many of those same services.

C. Are the targeted behavioral health services available?

- C.1.** Thirty-one percent of members in the sample reported that they would like more of a service than what they have been receiving.
- C.2.** Access to case management within 15 days dropped further in 2023 to 48% (compared to 54% in 2022 and an average of 88% between 2019, 2020, and 2021).
- C.3.** Access to peer support services improved in 2023 (67%) compared to 2022 (36%). However, access to peer services has not returned to the levels documented in 2019, 2020, and 2021 (84%, 77%, and 80%, within 15 days, respectively).
- C.4.** As has been the case during the last several years, approximately half of the respondents reported that it took more than 30 days to receive supportive housing services. Notably, of the 11 individuals who reported receiving supportive housing services 30 days or more after the service was initiated, only five of those were referring to the receipt of a rental subsidy or housing voucher as their sole supportive housing service.

D. Are supports and services that members with SMI receive meeting identified needs?

- D.1.** Case management services continue to have the highest percentage of problems, including high case manager turnover, lack of communication regarding case manager changes, lack of follow-up on member requests, failure to return calls, and limited or no contact with case managers.
- D.2.** Members were asked to report their satisfaction with specific services. Services that were rated with the highest levels of satisfaction were peer support services, supportive housing, supportive employment, ACT, and medication and medication management. When considering a five-year average in satisfaction ratings, peer support (8.3), family support (8.1), supportive housing (8.1), and medication management (8.0) have scored the highest ratings. Notably, case management and ACT services have scored the lowest averages over a five-year period.
- D.3.** Based on a review of medical records, 22% of members are employed. This is a reduction from 2022 (29%) but matches the five-year average for employment among members surveyed (22%).

E. Are supports and services designed around members with SMI strengths and goals?

- E.1.** Peer reviewers noted that strengths were most commonly identified in the ISP and assessment. Strength-based ISP objectives were found in 61% of cases reviewed. The rate at which ISP objectives are based on members' identified strengths has continued to improve since 2019 (43%).
- E.2.** Overall, 77% of members felt that services were based on their strengths and needs. This aligns with a five-year average of 76%.

Appendix C

Training Syllabus

Quality Service Review (QSR) Project Syllabus

The Arizona Health Care Cost Containment System (AHCCCS) asked Mercer to assist with the annual quality service review (QSR) to ensure the delivery of quality care to members with a serious mental illness (SMI) in Maricopa County.

The purpose of the QSR project is to monitor the use of strengths-based assessment and treatment planning, and to ensure that members receive the target services as needed. The target services include case management, peer and family support, supportive housing, living skills training, supported employment, crisis services, medications and medication management, and assertive community treatment team services.

Two of the components of the QSR project include a) interviews with consumers, and b) a corresponding medical record review by peer support workers. Mercer contracted with Recovery Empowerment Network (REN) and Stand Together and Recover (S.T.A.R) to provide peer support workers to complete these two tasks. This syllabus describes the peer support worker training required to successfully conduct the interviews and medical record reviews.

The training takes place in two sections and coordinates with the two project tasks. The first section provides an overview of the QSR project, topics to support task completion, and how to conduct member interviews. After participating in this training, the participant will be able to conduct the member interviews. It is anticipated that most of the interviews will be completed by the end of March.

The second training section (Part Two) occurred in March 2023 and provides inter-rater reliability (IRR) training and testing on completing the medical record reviews. A three-day training, Part Two will prepare trainees to use the medical record review tool to score medical records of those members who have been interviewed.

Requirements For the Successful Completion of This Course

Successful completion of the requirements of this course is required to assist in conducting interviews and medical record reviews. Course requirements include: a) arriving on time for each day's training, b) participating in all the modules identified in this syllabus, c) completing all the assigned tasks, and d) meeting or exceeding 80% on the IRR testing. Due to the tight timelines involved with this project, make-up sessions will not be offered.

To take full advantage of our time together and to respect the work of other trainees and the teachers, we ask the following of all participants.

- Arrive ten minutes early to ensure each day starts on time.
- Turn off all telephones and other electronic devices during the classes and small groups (phone calls and emails may be returned during breaks and during lunch. If an urgent

matter comes up, please quietly leave the room to take care of the matter in a space that does not disrupt other trainees).

- Remain on site during lunch and breaks (lunch will be provided each day).

Part One Schedule

January 4, 2023: Introduction to the Project

9:00 a.m.–9:30 a.m.	Welcome and participant introductions.
9:30 a.m.–10:15 a.m.	Overview: Training and Project
10:15 – 10:45 a.m.	Break
10:45 a.m.–11:30 a.m.	Interview Standards and Introduction to Workflow
11:30 a.m.–12:30 p.m.	Lunch
12:15 p.m.–1:15 p.m.	Workflow barriers and solutions
1:15 p.m.–1:45 p.m.	Introduction to Target Services
1:45 p.m.—2:10 p.m.	Break
2:10 p.m.—2:55 p.m.	Target Services
2:55 p.m.—3:00 p.m.	Wrap Up

January 5, 2023: Engaging and Interviewing Survey Participants

9:00 a.m.–10:45 a.m.	Engaging Participants
10:45 a.m.–11:05 a.m.	Break
11:05 a.m.–12:00 a.m.	Introduction to the Interview Tool
12:00 a.m.–12:55 p.m.	Lunch
12:55 p.m.–2:00 p.m.	Interview Tool and Role Play
2:00 p.m.–2:15 p.m.	Break
2:15 p.m.–3:00 p.m.	Interview Tool Debrief
2:45 p.m.–3:15 p.m.	Next steps, Wrap Up, Certificates

Learning Activities, Objectives, and Outcome Measures

Review of Interview Standards: Confidentiality and Ethics; Health and Safety; Boundaries

Learning activity: Lecture

Learning objective: Trainees will be able to identify situations that pose risk of confidentiality and/or ethics violations, identify health and safety concerns, possible boundary violations, and be able to respond to those situations appropriately.

Outcome measure: A signed attestation that the trainee agrees to comply with HIPAA and Code of Ethics throughout the project and includes the process on addressing questions if an issue arises.

Standardized Workflow for Completing Project Tasks

Learning activities: Lecture, small group task

Learning objective: Trainees will learn a) the steps needed to successfully complete each of their assigned tasks, b) the importance of complying with the standardized procedures, and c) how to respond to challenges to successfully completing the tasks in the workflow.

Outcome measure: In a small group, trainees will develop a list of possible barriers to completing the workflow and propose solutions. Trainees will then present findings to the larger group.

Target Services

Learning activities: Lecture, small group task

Learning objective: Trainees will learn the service description, typical tasks of the service, needs, and objectives associated with each target service.

Outcome measures:

- In a small group, the trainee will successfully match each target service with its description, purpose, provider type, and location.
- Trainees will correctly answer a majority of the items on an eight-question quiz over the structure and functions of the RBHAs.

Engaging Members

Learning activities: Overview of issues, lessons learned from prior year, role play, small group practice

Learning objective: Trainees will share best practices, and role play engagement techniques and motivational interviewing strategies.

Outcome measure: In small groups, using caller's protocol and incorporating feedback, trainees will be able to role play a phone call to successfully invite a member to participate in an interview. Group will generate a list of best practices.

Successful Use of the Interview Tool

Learning activities: Lectures, small group tasks, interview practice sessions

Learning objectives: Trainees will become familiar with the interview tool and learn to conduct a standardized interview.

Outcome measures: Trainees will demonstrate proficiency in using the interview tool by participating in each of the three roles (interviewer, interviewee, observer) using the interview tool and providing feedback to other participants from each of those roles.

Appendix D

Quality Service Review Interview Tool

Interviewer Initials: _____

Review Number: _____ (Located on the face sheet)

Title XIX Non-Title XIX

Case Management. Case managers help make sure that you are achieving your treatment goals and that you are receiving the services that are right for you. Case managers help you develop a treatment plan, call you to see how your treatment is going, help you find resources in the community, help you get services that you need, and call you when you are in crisis or miss an appointment.

1. Do you have a case manager?
1. Yes 2. No 3. Not sure

(If question 1 is “No” or “Not Sure”, Skip to question 8)

2. In the past year, did you have enough contact with your case manager (i.e., telephone and in person meetings with case manager at a frequency that meets your needs)?
1. Yes 2. No 3. Not sure
3. *I am going to read you a statement and ask you to respond using this scale (use scale tool). “In the past year, your case manager helps you find the services and resources that you ask for.”*
1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly Disagree
5. No opinion
6. N/A
4. Were case management services available to you right away?
1. Yes 2. No 3. Not sure
5. How long did it take for you to receive case management services?
1. 1–7 days
2. 8–15 days
3. 15–30 days
4. 30 days or more
5. Not sure

6. On a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 being completely satisfied and 1 being dissatisfied, how satisfied were you with the case management you received (use scale tool)?
7. Were there problems with the case management service(s) you received?
1. Yes 2. No 3. Not sure

If yes, what were those problems? Comments/Suggestions:

Peer Support Services. Peer support is getting help from someone who has had a similar mental health condition. Receiving social and emotional support from someone who has been there can help you reach the change you desire. You can receive peer support services for free or for a fee, depending on the type of service.

8. In the past year, have you received peer support from someone who has personal experience with mental illness?
1. Yes 2. No 3. Not sure
9. Do you go to peer-run agencies for peer support, such as CHEEERS, S.T.A.R. Centers, or REN?
1. Yes 2. No 3. Not sure

(If questions 8 AND 9 are “No” or “Not Sure”, go to question 10. If question 8 OR 9 are “Yes” skip to question 11)

10. If you do not receive peer support, would you like to receive this kind of support?
1. Yes 2. No 3. Not sure

(If question 10 is completed, skip to question 16)

11. *I am going to read you a statement and ask you to respond using this scale (use scale tool). “In the past year, did your Peer Support/Recovery Support Specialist helps you to better understand and use the services available to you?”*
1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly Disagree
5. No opinion
6. N/A
12. Were peer support services available to you right away?
1. Yes 2. No 3. Not sure
13. How long did it take for you to receive peer support services?
1. 1–7 days
2. 8–15 days
3. 15–30 days
4. 30 days or more
5. Not sure

14. On a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 being completely satisfied and 1 being dissatisfied, how satisfied were you with the peer support services you received (use scale tool)?

15. Were there problems with your peer support service(s)?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Not sure

If yes, what were those problems? Comments/Suggestions:

Family Support. Family support helps increase your family's ability to assist you through your recovery and treatment process. These services include helping you and your family understand your diagnosis, providing training and education, providing information and resources available, providing coaching on how to best support you, assisting in assessing services you may need, and assisting with how to find social supports.

16. In the past year, have you and your family received family support from an individual who has personal experience with mental illness?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Not sure

17. Does your family attend groups or receive family support from organizations such as NAMI or Family Involvement Center?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Not sure

(If questions 16 AND 17 are "No" or "Not Sure", go to question 18. If questions 16 OR 17 are "Yes" skip to question 19)

18. If your family is not receiving family support services, would you and your family like to have these services?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Not sure

(If question 18 is completed, go to question 23)

19. Were family support services available to you right away?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Not sure

20. How long did it take for you and your family to receive family support services?

1. 1–7 days
2. 8–15 days
3. 15–30 days
4. 30 days or more
5. Not sure

21. On a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 being completely satisfied and 1 being dissatisfied, how satisfied were you with the family support services you received (use scale tool)?

22. Were there problems with your family support services?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Not sure

If yes, what were those problems? Comments/Suggestions:

Supportive Housing. Supportive housing services help you to obtain and keep housing in the community such as an apartment, your own home, or homes that are rented by your behavioral health provider. Examples of supportive housing include help with paying your rent, help with utility subsidies, and help with moving. It also includes supports to help you maintain your housing and be a successful tenant.

23. In the past year, did you receive supportive housing services?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Not sure

(If question 23 is “No” or “Not Sure”, skip to question 24.)

If yes, please indicate which of the following services you have received.

- a. Rental subsidies (routine assistance paying for all or part of your rent through a publicly funded program)
- b. Bridge funding for deposits and household needs (help with furnishings, first and second month's rent, deposits, and household items)
- c. Relocation services
- d. Legal assistance
- e. Furniture
- f. Neighborhood orientation
- g. Help with landlord/neighbor relations
- h. Help with budgeting, shopping, property management
- i. Pays no more than 30% of income in rent
- j. Eliminating barriers to housing access and retention (helping you get into housing and keep your housing)
- k. Fostering a sense of home (making you feel at home and comfortable)
- l. Facilitating community integration and minimizing stigma (helping you become a part of your community)
- m. Utilizing a harm-reduction approach for substance use, if applicable (assisting you in safer use of substances, meeting you where you are at re: substance use)
- n. Adhering to consumer choice (letting you choose where you want to live)

(After services are checked, skip to question 25)

24. If you did not receive supportive housing services, have you been at risk for losing housing because you needed financial assistance with rent or utilities?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Not sure

(If question 24 is completed, skip to question 31)

25. *I am going to read you a statement and ask you to respond using this scale (use scale tool). “In the past year, your supportive housing services help you with your recovery.”*

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree

- 3. Disagree
- 4. Strongly Disagree
- 5. No opinion
- 6. N/A

26. Do you feel safe in your housing/neighborhood?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Not sure

27. Were supportive housing services available to you right away?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Not sure

If yes, please check each service that was available right away.

- a. Rental subsidies (routine assistance paying for all or part of your rent through a publicly funded program)
- b. Bridge funding for deposits and household needs (help with furnishings, first and second month's rent, deposits, and household items)
- c. Relocation services
- d. Legal assistance
- e. Furniture
- f. Neighborhood orientation
- g. Help with landlord/neighbor relations
- h. Help with budgeting, shopping, property management
- i. Pays no more than 30% of income in rent
- j. Eliminating barriers to housing access and retention (helping you get into housing and keep your housing)
- k. Fostering a sense of home (making you feel at home and comfortable)
- l. Facilitating community integration and minimizing stigma (helping you become a part of your community)
- m. Utilizing a harm-reduction approach for substance use, if applicable (assisting you in safer use of substances, meeting you where you are at re: substance use)
- n. Adhering to consumer choice (letting you choose where you want to live)

28. How long did it take for you to receive supportive housing services?

- 1. 1–7 days
- 2. 8–15 days
- 3. 15–30 days
- 4. 30 days or more
- 5. Not sure

29. On a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 being completely satisfied and 1 being dissatisfied, how satisfied were you with the supportive housing services you received (use scale tool)?

30. Were there problems with the supportive housing service(s) you received?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Not sure

If yes, what were those problems? Comments/Suggestions:

Living Skills Training. Living skills training teaches you how to live independently, socialize, and communicate with people in the community so that you are able to function within your community. Examples of services include managing your household, taking care of yourself, grooming, and how to behave in public situations.

31. In the past year, have you received living skills support that helps you live independently (such as managing your household or budgeting)?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Not sure

32. In the past year, have you received living skills support that helps you maintain meaningful relationships and find people with common interests?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Not sure

33. In the past year, have you received living skills support that helps you use community resources, such as the library, YMCA, food banks, to help you live more independently?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Not sure

(If questions 31 through 33 are all “No” or “Not Sure”, go to question 34. If one or more of questions 31-33 are "Yes", skip to question 35)

34. If you did not receive living skills training, did you feel you needed it during the past year?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Not sure

(If question 34 is completed, skip to question 40)

35. *I am going to read you a statement and ask you to respond using this scale (use scale tool). “In the past year, living skills services have helped you manage your life and live in your community.”*

1. Strongly Agree
 2. Agree
 3. Disagree
 4. Strongly Disagree
 5. No opinion
 6. N/A

36. Were living skills training services available to you right away?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Not sure

37. How long did it take for you to receive living skills training services?

1. 1–7 days
 2. 8–15 days

- 3. 15–30 days
- 4. 30 days or more
- 5. Not sure

38. On a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 being completely satisfied and 1 being dissatisfied, how satisfied were you with the living skills services you received (use scale tool)?

39. Were their problems with the living skills training service(s) you received?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Not sure

If yes, what were those problems? Comments/Suggestions:

Supported Employment. Supported Employment services help you get a job. These services include career counseling, shadowing someone at work, help with preparing a resume, help with preparing for an interview, training on how to dress for work, and on the job coaching so you can keep your job.

40. In the past year, did you receive assistance in preparing for, identifying, attaining, and maintaining competitive employment?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Not sure

(If question 40 is “No” or “Not Sure”, please skip to question 41)

If yes, which of the following services have you received? Please check all services received.

- 1. Job coaching
- 2. Transportation
- 3. Assistive technology (technology that assists you — i.e., talk to text software, electric wheelchair, audio players, specialized desks and equipment, etc.)
- 4. Specialized job training
- 5. Career counseling
- 6. Job shadowing
- 7. Resume preparation
- 8. Job interview skills
- 9. Study skills
- 10. Time management skills
- 11. Individually tailored supervision

41. Did you know that your clinical team can help you get a job?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Not sure

42. Are you working now?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

If no, what are your daily activities?

43. Did you know that there are programs available for people receiving SSI and/or SSDI benefits to help protect them from losing their financial and medical benefits if they were to get a job?

1. Yes 2. No

44. In the past year, did you feel you needed services to help you get or keep a job?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Not sure

45. Did you tell anyone about this?

1. Yes 2. No

46. *I am going to read you a statement and ask you to respond using this scale (use scale tool).* “Someone at your clinic told you about job-related services such as resume writing, interview, job group, or vocational rehabilitation.”

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly Disagree
5. No opinion
6. N/A

47. *I am going to read you a statement and ask you to respond using this scale (use scale tool).* “In the past year, you have been told about job related services available in your community, such as volunteering, education/training, computer skills or other services that will help you to get a job.”

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly Disagree
5. No opinion
6. N/A

(If no services were received, skip to question 54)

48. *I am going to read you a statement and ask you to respond using this scale (use scale tool).* “In the past year, you have received job related services such as resume writing, interview skills, job group, or vocational rehabilitation through your clinic.”

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly Disagree
5. No opinion
6. N/A

49. *I am going to read you a statement and ask you to respond using this scale (use scale tool). "You found these job related services helpful."*

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly Disagree
5. No opinion
6. N/A

50. Were supported employment services available to you right away?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Not sure

51. How long did it take for you to receive supported employment services?

1. 1–7 days
2. 8–15 days
3. 15–30 days
4. 30 days or more
5. Not sure

52. On a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 being completely satisfied and 1 being dissatisfied, how satisfied were you with the supported employment services you received (use scale tool)?

53. Were there problems with the supported employment services you received?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Not sure

If yes, what were those problems? Comments/Suggestions:

Crisis Services. Crisis services are provided when a person needs to be supported to prevent a situation from getting worse or to stop them from going into a crisis. Examples of behavioral crisis services include services that come to you, known as mobile teams, inpatient services at an urgent psychiatric center or psychiatric rehabilitation center, or hospitals.

54. In the past year, have you received crisis services?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Not sure

(If question 54 is "No" or "Not Sure", please skip to question 62)

If yes, which of the following crisis services did you receive?

1. Crisis hotline services
2. Mobile Crisis Team intervention services
3. Emergency department visit
4. Counseling

5. Other (Please specify _____)

55. Did you receive any crisis services from a hospital within the past year?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Not sure

56. Did you receive any crisis services from a crisis unit within the past year (Urgent Psychiatric Care Center, Recovery Response Center, etc.)?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Not sure

57. Did anyone (i.e., mobile team, clinical team member) come to you to help you in the crisis?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Not sure

58. *I am going to read you a statement and ask you to respond using this scale (use scale tool). "In the past year, the crisis services you received helped you resolve the crisis."*

- 1. Strongly Agree
- 2. Agree
- 3. Disagree
- 4. Strongly Disagree
- 5. No opinion
- 6. N/A

59. Were crisis services available to you right away?

1. Yes 2. No

60. On a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 being completely satisfied and 1 being dissatisfied, how satisfied were you with the crisis services you received (use scale tool)?

61. Did you have any problems with the crisis service you received?

1. Yes 2. No

If yes, what were those problems? Comments/Suggestions:

Medications and Medication Management Services. The next few questions are about your medications. Medication management services involve training and educating you about your medications and when you are supposed to take them.

62. In the past year, did you receive medications from your behavioral health provider?

1. Yes 2. No

(If question 62 is "No", please skip to question 70)

63. *I am going to read you a statement and ask you to respond using this scale (use scale tool). "Were you told about your medications and side effects?"*

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly Disagree
5. No opinion
6. N/A

64. *I am going to read you a statement and ask you to respond using this scale (use scale tool). "Were you told about the importance of taking your medicine as prescribed?"*

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly Disagree
5. No opinion
6. N/A

65. *I am going to read you a statement and ask you to respond using this scale (use scale tool). "Do you feel comfortable talking with your doctor about your medications and how they make you feel?"*

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly Disagree
5. No opinion
6. N/A

66. *I am going to read you a statement and ask you to respond using this scale (use scale tool). "The medication services you received helped you in your recovery."*

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly Disagree
5. No opinion
6. N/A

67. Were medication services available to you right away?

1. Yes
2. No

68. On a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 being completely satisfied and 1 being dissatisfied, how satisfied were you with the medication services you received (use scale tool)?

69. Did you have any problems with the medication service you received?

1. Yes
2. No

Assertive Community Services (ACT). ACT is a way of delivering all the services you need in a more unified way when the traditional services you have received have not gone well. ACT includes a group of people working as a team of 10 to 12 practitioners to provide the services you need.

70. In the past year, did you receive ACT services?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Not sure

(If question 70 is “No” or “Not Sure”, please skip to question 71)

If yes, please indicate which of the following services you have received.

- a. Crisis assessment and intervention
- b. Comprehensive assessment
- c. Illness management and recovery skills
- d. Individual supportive therapy
- e. Substance-abuse treatment
- f. Employment-support services
- g. Side-by-side assistance with activities of daily living
- h. Intervention with support networks (family, friends, landlords, neighbors, etc.)
- i. Support services, such as medical care, housing, benefits, transportation
- j. Case management
- k. Medication prescription, administration, and monitoring

(After services are checked, skip to question 72)

71. If you are not receiving ACT services, would you like to have these services?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Not sure

(If question 71 is completed, please skip to question 77)

72. *I am going to read you a statement and ask you to respond using this scale (use scale tool). “In the past year, your ACT services help you with your recovery.”*

- 1. Strongly Agree
- 2. Agree
- 3. Disagree
- 4. Strongly Disagree
- 5. No opinion
- 6. N/A

73. Were ACT services available to you right away?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Not sure

74. How long did it take for you to receive ACT services?

1. 1–7 days
2. 8–15 days
3. 15–30 days
4. 30 days or more
5. Not sure

75. On a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 being completely satisfied and 1 being dissatisfied, how satisfied were you with the ACT services you received (use scale tool)?

76. Were there problems with your ACT services?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Not sure

Access to Care. The next few questions are about access to care. Access to care refers to how easily you are able to get the services you feel you need.

77. *I am going to read you a statement and ask you to respond using this scale (use scale tool).* “Is the location of your services convenient for you?”

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly Disagree
5. No opinion
6. N/A

78. *I am going to read you a statement and ask you to respond using this scale (use scale tool).* “Were services available at times that are good for you?”

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly Disagree
5. No opinion
6. N/A

79. Do you feel you need more of a service you have been receiving?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Not sure

80. Do you feel you need less of a service you have been receiving?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Not sure

Comments/Suggestions:

81. What other services, if any, do you feel would be helpful in addressing your needs?

82. Do you feel that the services you receive consider your strengths and needs?

1. Yes 2. No

If not, why not?

83. Do you have anything you would like to add?

1. Yes 2. No

If yes, write comments here.

84. Have you brought this issue to anyone's attention?

1. Yes 2. No

If yes, write the name or position of the person here (Example: Case manager)

Appendix E

Quality Service Review Medical Record Review Tool

Reviewer Initials: _____ Individual ID: _____

Title XIX Non-Title XIX

SECTION 1: IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS

To score Q1–2, use the following guidelines:

Based on a review of the assessment, ISP and at least three months of progress notes (case manager, nursing, and BHMP), determine if the clinical team has identified needs for the individual. These may include requests for services, instances where the individual may identify an issue or concern that needs to be addressed.

“Need”: is defined as an issue or gap that is identified by the individual or the clinical team that requires a service or an intervention.

Scoring, if needs were identified: enter each category of need in table and enter page numbers where each need was found in the assessment, ISP, or progress notes.

Notes Guidelines:

- Justify all responses for Questions 1, 2 and 4 in each table as indicated.
- For yes responses, provide the category of need and the supporting documentation reference.
- For the assessment (Question 1) and ISP (Question 2), provide the date of the document for supporting documentation reference and page numbers.

1. Were the individual’s needs identified in the most recent assessment?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Cannot determine

Assessment Type	Dates	Category of need	Page nos.
Part E		Need 1:	
Part E		Need 2:	
Part E		Need 3:	
Part E		Need 4:	
Part E		Need 5:	
Part E		Additional needs:	
		The assessment was not found <input type="checkbox"/>	

2. Were the individual’s needs identified in the ISP?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Cannot determine

ISP/ISRP	Dates	Category of need	Page nos.
Part D		Need 1:	
Part D		Need 2:	
Part D		Need 3:	
Part D		Need 4:	
Part D		Need 5:	
Part D		Additional needs:	
		The ISP was not found <input type="checkbox"/>	

3. Were the individual’s needs identified in the progress notes?

RESERVED — DO NOT SCORE THIS ITEM

To score Q4, use the following guidelines:

Review the needs identified for questions 1 to 3 and compare the needs across document sources. Based on this comparison, determine if the needs are consistent between the assessment, ISP and progress notes.

“Consistent” means that the needs identified in the assessment, ISP and progress notes relate to each other. For example, if the assessment addresses the need to maintain sobriety, and the progress notes indicate the need for substance abuse services (halfway house, AA, etc.), these needs would be considered consistent.

Scoring:

YES: If both of the following are true:

- Questions 1–2 are ALL “Yes”.
- The needs identified in assessment, ISP and the progress notes are consistent.

Note: There may be more needs identified in the assessment than in the ISP and progress notes.

NO: If any of the following are true:

- Question 1 OR 2 is “No”.
- The needs identified in the assessment and ISP were not consistent.

4. Are the individual’s needs consistently identified in the most recent assessment and ISP?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Cannot determine

SECTION 2: IDENTIFICATION OF STRENGTHS

Identification of Strengths: “Strengths” are traits, abilities, resources, and characteristics that are relevant for and/or will assist the recipient with his or her needs and objectives. Strengths can be identified by the recipient or clinical team members.

*** Reviewer Notes: For Scoring Questions 5–7, if there is one or more strengths identified in the relevant document, score “Yes”.

*** Reviewer Notes: For “Notes regarding questions 5–8” below, use the following guidelines.

Guidelines:

- Justify all responses for Questions 5–8 in the tables provided.
- For “Yes” responses, provide the category of strength and the supporting documentation reference.
 - For the assessment and ISP, provide the date of the document for supporting documentation reference.
 - For the progress notes, provide the type of progress note (i.e., BHMP, CM, RN) and the date.

5. Are the individual’s strengths identified in the most recent assessment?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Cannot determine

Assessment was not found

Assessment Type	Dates	Category of strength in Assessment	Page nos.
Part E		Strength 1:	
Part E		Strength 2:	
Part E		Strength 3:	
Part E		Strength 4:	
Part E		Strength 5:	
Part E		Additional strengths:	
		Assessment was not found <input type="checkbox"/>	

6. Are the individual’s strengths identified in the most recent ISP?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Cannot determine

ISP/ISRP	Dates	Category of strength in ISP	Page nos.
Part D		Strength 1:	
Part D		Strength 2:	
Part D		Strength 3:	

ISP/ISRP	Dates	Category of strength in ISP	Page nos.
Part D		Strength 4:	
Part D		Strength 5:	
Part D		Additional strengths:	
		The ISP was not found <input type="checkbox"/>	

7. Are the individual’s strengths identified in the most recent progress notes?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Cannot determine

Progress note Type	Dates	Category of strength in Progress Notes	Page nos.
BHMP		Strength 1:	
		Strength 2:	
		Strength 3:	
		Strength 4:	
		Strength 5:	
		Additional strengths:	
CM		Strength 1:	
		Strength 2:	
		Strength 3:	
		Strength 4:	
		Strength 5:	
		Additional strengths:	
RN		Strength 1:	
		Strength 2:	
		Strength 3:	
		Strength 4:	
		Strength 5:	
		Additional strengths:	
		BHMP notes not found <input type="checkbox"/> CM notes not found <input type="checkbox"/> RN notes not found <input type="checkbox"/>	

**** Reviewer Notes: For Question 8 to be marked “Yes”, Questions 5–7 must all be “Yes”. Additionally, in the context of this question, “consistently” refers to the presence of relevant strengths in each type of documentation as opposed to an “exact match”.*

8. Are the individual’s strengths consistently identified in the most recent assessment, ISP, and progress notes?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Cannot determine

SECTION 3: INDIVIDUAL SERVICE PLAN

Individual Service Plan (ISP): (An “Individual Service Plan” is a written plan that summarizes the goals an individual is working towards and how he or she is going to achieve those goals.)

The following are definitions of terms found in the questions below:

“**Objective**” is a specific action step the recipient or family will take toward meeting a need. “**Need**” is an issue or gap identified by the individual or clinical team that requires a service or intervention.

“**Strengths**” are traits, abilities, resources, and characteristics that are relevant for and/or will assist the recipient with his or her needs and objectives. Strengths can be identified by the recipient or clinical team members.

*** *Reviewer Notes: Use the most recent ISP to answer the questions below. If an ISP is not available, mark cannot determine.*

Section 3.1: ISP Objectives — Needs

To score Q9–10, use the following guidelines:

YES: If either of the following are true:

- *If the ISP contains objectives related to the individual’s needs.*
- *For needs not addressed by objectives, documentation (in progress notes, assessment or ISP) showed that individual did not want to address them.*

NO: If any of the following are true:

- *The ISP did not contain objectives that relate to the individual’s needs.*
- *If there is one identified need without a corresponding objective on the ISP, the response is “No”.*

*** *Reviewer Notes:*

- *Justify “No” and “Cannot determine” responses to Questions 9, 10, and 12 below.*
- *For “No” responses, note specific needs not addressed for the relevant question.*

9. Do the ISP objectives address the individual’s needs identified in the assessment?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Cannot determine

Assessment	Dates	Category of need addressed by ISP objectives	Page nos.
Part E Part D		Need 1: ISP Objective:	

Part E Part D		Need 2: ISP Objective:	
Part E Part D		Need 3: ISP Objective:	
Part E Part D		Need 4: ISP Objective:	
Part E Part D		Need 5: ISP Objective:	
		Assessment not found <input type="checkbox"/> Needs not specified <input type="checkbox"/> List needs not addressed:	

10. Do the ISP objectives address the individual’s needs identified in the ISP?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Cannot determine

ISP	Dates	Category of need addressed by ISP objectives	Page nos.
Part D		Need 1: ISP Objective:	
Part D		Need 2: ISP Objective:	
Part D		Need 3: ISP Objective:	
Part D		Need 4: ISP Objective:	
Part D		Need 5: ISP Objective:	
		ISP not found <input type="checkbox"/> Needs not specified <input type="checkbox"/> List needs not addressed:	

11. Do the ISP objectives address the individual’s needs identified in the progress notes?

RESERVED — DO NOT SCORE THIS ITEM

12. Do the ISP objectives address the individual’s needs identified in the assessment, ISP, and progress notes?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Cannot determine

Section 3.2: ISP Objectives — Strengths

To score Q13, use the following guidelines:

YES: If strengths are documented for objectives.

For a “Yes”, there needs to be a corresponding strength for each objective. Please note a single strength may be related to one of more objectives.

NO: If any of the following are true:

- If the ISP did not document strengths for objectives.

*** Reviewer Notes:

- Justify “No” and “Cannot determine” responses to Question 13 below.
- For “No” responses, note specific strengths not addressed.

13. Were the individual's objectives in the ISP based on the individual's strengths? (Strengths are often identified in the strengths field on the ISP)

1. Yes 2. No 3. Cannot determine

ISP	Dates	Objectives in ISP based on strengths	Page nos.
Part D		Strength 1: ISP Objective:	
Part D		Strength 2: ISP Objective:	
Part D		Strength 3: ISP Objective:	
Part D		Strength 4: ISP Objective:	
Part D		Strength 5: ISP Objective:	
		ISP not found <input type="checkbox"/> Strengths not specified <input type="checkbox"/> List strengths not addressed:	

Section 3.3: ISP Objectives — Services

To score Q14–15, use the following guidelines:

YES: If services are documented for needs. For a “Yes” there must be a service for each identified need (as documented in the assessment, ISP and progress notes).

NO: If any of the following are true:

- *If services are not documented for needs.*
- *If one identified need does not have a corresponding service, score “No”.*

*** Reviewer Notes:

- *Justify “No” and “Cannot determine” responses to Question 14–15 below.*
- *For “No” responses, note specific needs not addressed.*

14. Does the ISP contain services that address the individual’s needs that are identified in the assessment?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Cannot determine

ISP	Dates	Category of services that address needs: Assessment	Page nos.
Part D Part E		Service 1: Need 1:	
Part D Part E		Service 2: Need 2:	
Part D Part E		Service 3: Need 3:	
Part D Part E		Service 4: Need 4:	
Part D Part E		Service 5: Need 5:	
		Assessment not found <input type="checkbox"/> Services not specified <input type="checkbox"/> List services not addressed:	

15. Does the ISP contain services that address the individual's needs that are identified in the ISP?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Cannot determine

ISP	Dates	Category of services that address needs: ISP	Page nos.
Part D		Service 1: Need 1:	
Part D		Service 2: Need 2:	
Part D		Service 3: Need 3:	
Part D		Service 4: Need 4:	
Part D		Service 5: Need 5:	

ISP	Dates	Category of services that address needs: ISP	Page nos.
		ISP not found <input type="checkbox"/> Services not specified <input type="checkbox"/> List services not addressed:	

16. Does the ISP contain services that address the individual's needs that are identified in the progress notes?

RESERVED — DO NOT SCORE THIS ITEM

SECTION 4: SERVICES

To score Q17–19, use the following guidelines:

The services indicated on the ISP were provided and whether specific services (Q18) were identified or provided.

“**Services**” means any medical or behavioral health treatment or care provided, both paid and unpaid, for the purpose of preventing or treating an illness or disease.

To score Q17, use the following guidelines:

Look at the services listed in the Services area of the ISP and then review the progress notes to determine if each listed service was provided (as noted on ISP). Additionally, if the progress notes indicate that a service is to be provided, you will also want to review subsequent progress notes, within the review period, to determine if the service is provided. You may need to review the service definitions to determine which services should be provided as the Service Type listed in the ISP does not always correspond to an actual service. For example, the Service Type may list Prevention Services, but the Use of Service states that the individual will attend appoints with the psychiatrist, which would be a Medication service.

Note: the service needs to be provided as described on the ISP; for example, if the ISP indicates the Case Manager will have monthly face-to-face contact for the BHR, you would be looking in the progress notes to determine if monthly contact occurred. If the progress notes demonstrate that the case manager attempted the visits or there was a brief lag with phone follow up, this should be scored as “Yes”.

YES: If either of the following are true:

- Progress notes indicate the individual received the services listed on the ISP.
- There was documentation indicating the individual did not wish to receive the identified service(s) at that time.

If the progress notes indicate that the individual has refused either the service or a specific service provider, mark “Yes”.

*** Reviewer Notes: For table under question 17, please:

- Justify “No” and “Cannot determine” responses to Question 17 below.

- For “No” responses, note specific services not provided.

17. Were the services documented in the most recent ISP and progress notes actually provided?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Cannot determine

ISP/Progress Note Type	Dates	Category of services	Services provided?		Page nos.
			Yes	No	
Part D		Service 1:			
Part D		Service 2:			
Part D		Service 3:			
Part D		Service 4:			
Part D		Service 5:			
Part D		Service 6:			
		Services not addressed in ISP <input type="checkbox"/>			
		Services not addressed In Progress Notes <input type="checkbox"/> Services not specified <input type="checkbox"/> List services not addressed:			

To complete Q18, column B, review the most recent ISP (column B) to determine whether the record identified the need for any of the following services. Score ‘Y’ for each of the services that were identified on the ISP (column B). Score ‘N’ if the service was not identified on the ISP (column B).

Note: You may need to review the service definitions to determine which services are identified, as the Service Type listed in the ISP or referred to in the progress notes does not always correspond to an actual service. For example, the Service Type may list Prevention Services, but the Use of Service states that the individual will attend appoints with the psychiatrist, which would be a Medication service. Reminder: the services listed in question 18 are not inclusive of all services provided in Maricopa County.

To complete Q18, column D, indicate ‘Y’ if there is documented evidence in the progress notes that the service has been provided. Indicate ‘N’ if there is no evidence that the service was provided.

To complete Q18, column E, for each ‘Y’ in column B that has a corresponding ‘Y’ in column D, score ‘Y’. For each ‘Y’ in column B that has a corresponding ‘N’ in column D, indicate ‘N’. For each “N” in column B that has a corresponding “Y” in column D, score “N”. Leave column E blank if column B and column D are both scored “N”.

18. Needs and Services to be provided — Please complete the table, indicating “Yes” or “No” for each cell.

A Services	B ISP Needs	C Progress Note Needs DO NOT SCORE	D Service Provision	E Needs compared to service provision
	Does the recent ISP identify need for the services in column A?	Do progress notes identify needs for the services in column A? DO NOT SCORE	Were column A services provided?	Did the most recent ISP and progress notes identify <i>AND</i> provide any of the following services?
1. Case Management				
2. Peer Support				
3. Family Support				
4. Supportive Housing				
5. Living Skills Training				
6. Supported Employment				
7. Crisis Services				
8. Medication and Medication Services				
9. ACT services				

To Score Q19, answer question 19 if applicable (i.e., service identified but not provided). If no services were identified on the ISP and/or progress notes and NOT provided, indicate such in the “notes” section for Q19 and proceed to Q20. If there are varying reasons for services not being provided, indicate this in the notes section, supplying the specifics.

You should select all of the reasons that apply as there may be multiple reasons as to why different services were not provided.

19. Why were services identified on the ISP and/or progress notes NOT provided?

- A. Service was unavailable.
- B. There was a wait list for services.
- C. The individual refused services.
- D. Unable to determine.
- E. Other (Please provide reasons that services were not provided)

Notes regarding Question 19:

SECTION 5: OUTCOMES

To Score Q20–22, use the following guidelines:

These are overall outcome questions that take into account information you obtain from the interview and record review. In instances where the interview information differs from the record documentation, use the interview information to score the questions and indicate this in the notes.

The following are definitions of terms found in the questions below:

“Outcomes” An “Outcome” is a change or effect on an individual’s quality of life.

“Employment” is consistent, paid work at the current minimum wage rate.

“Meaningful Day Activities” is any goal or activities related to learning, working, living, or socializing. Goals/activities may include, but are not limited to, going to school or completing some form of training, building social networks, physical exercise, finding a new place to live or changing something about one’s living environment, skill development, finding a job or exploring the possibility of returning to work, volunteering, etc. Meaningful goals/activities are focused on community engagement and DO NOT include goals related to symptom reduction, adherence to a medication regimen, or regular visits with a case manager/psychiatrist.

“Housing” is considered to be a permanent and safe place where an individual lives. An individual would NOT be considered to have “housing” if he or she is residing in a shelter, staying with friends or relatives on a non-permanent basis, or is homeless. Also, if an individual is residing in a licensed Supervisory Care Facility or Board and Care Home, this would also NOT be considered permanent housing.

To score Q20, review the completed interview, assessment, ISP and progress notes to determine if there is documentation that the individual is employed.

YES: Documentation indicates the individual is employed.

If the documentation is unclear as to whether or not the individual is employed, and the individual indicates in the interview that they are employed, score “Yes”, note the discrepancy in documentation in the comments and document that the individual reported being employed during the interview.

NO: Documentation indicates the individual is not employed.

Cannot Determine: Reviewer cannot determine whether or not the individual is employed.

20. Based on the interview, progress notes, assessment, and ISP, is the individual employed?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Cannot determine

Notes regarding Question 20:

To score Q21, review the completed interview, assessment, ISP and progress notes to determine if there is documentation that the individual is engaged in meaningful day activity.

YES: Documentation indicates the individual is involved in a meaningful daily activity.

If the documentation is unclear as to whether or not the individual is engaged in meaningful day activity, and the individual indicates in the interview that they are participating in a consistent activity that meets the definition of a meaningful day activity, score “Yes” and note the discrepancy in documentation in the comments and document the individual’s response during the interview.

Does the activity make the person feel part of the world and does it bring meaning to their life? Does it enhance their connection to the community and others?

NO: Documentation indicates the individual is not involved in a meaningful daily activity.

Cannot Determine: Reviewer cannot determine whether or not the individual is involved in a meaningful daily activity.

21. Based on the interview, progress notes, assessment, and ISP, is the individual involved in a meaningful day activity?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Cannot determine

If "Yes" what were these meaningful day activities?

Notes regarding Question 21:

To score 22, review the completed interview, assessment, ISP and progress notes to determine if the individual has housing — they are not homeless, residing in a shelter or staying with friends/relatives on a non-permanent basis.

YES: Documentation indicates the individual has housing.

If the documentation is unclear as to whether or not the individual has housing and it is clear during the interview that the person has permanent housing, score “Yes” and note the discrepancy in the comments and document the individual’s response during the interview.

NO: Documentation indicates the individual does not have housing.

If the individual is residing in a licensed Supervisory Care Facility or Board and Care Home, score “No”. Please note that the individual is residing in one of these facilities in the “notes” section.

Cannot Determine: Reviewer cannot determine whether or not the individual has housing.

22. Based on the interview, progress notes, assessment, and ISP, does the individual have housing?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Cannot determine

Notes regarding Question 22:

SECTION 6: ISSUES DURING INTERVIEW¹⁷

The following questions will be answered after the interview is completed. The purpose of these questions is to identify any issues raised by the interviews and any follow up steps taken.

To score Q23, review the individual's interview and determine if the individual identified an issue or concern, such as having side effects, wanting to receive additional services, requesting a change in case manager. If the individual identified an issue during the interview, mark "Yes". If the individual did not identify an issue or concern during the interview, mark "No".

23. Were any issues identified during the individual's interview?

1. Yes 2. No

To score Q24, if the response to Q23 is "Yes", write down the issue as described by the individual. As appropriate, use their own words and note if the individual reported this issue to a member of their clinical team.

24. If "Yes" what were the issues identified in the interview?

To complete Q25, if the response to Q23 is "Yes", review the progress notes to determine if the individual reported the issue to a member of the clinical team. If the response to Q23 is "No", or the individual did not report the issue to a member of the clinical team, mark "N/A". Indicate "Yes" if the individual reported the issue to a member of the clinical team and there is documentation that the clinical team took action (e.g., made referrals, scheduled an appointment, held a team meeting, revised the ISP) to address the individual's concern.

Indicate "No" if the individual reported the issue to a member of the clinical team and there is no documentation that the concern or issue was addressed in any way.

25. Did the documentation in the records indicate any follow up on these issues?

1. Yes 2. No 3. N/A

To complete Q26, if the response to Q23 is "Yes", review the progress notes to determine if the individual reported the issue to a member of the clinical team. If the response to Q23 is "No", or the individual did not report the issue to a member of the clinical team, mark "N/A".

Indicate "Yes" if the individual reported the issue to a member of the clinical team and there is documentation that the clinical team offered a service or made a referral for a service in response to the concern or issue.

If the clinical team offered a service and the individual refused the service, indicate "Yes" as well.

¹⁷ Follow protocol related to urgent/emergent issues, if indicated.

Indicate "No" if the individual reported the issue to a member of the clinical team and there is no documentation that a service was offered or that referrals for a service were made.

26. Was a service was offered to address these issues?

1. Yes 2. No 3. N/A



Mercer Health & Benefits LLC
2325 East Camelback Road, Suite 600
Phoenix, AZ 85016
www.mercer-government.mercer.com

Services provided by Mercer Health & Benefits LLC.

Copyright © 2022 Mercer Health & Benefits LLC. All rights reserved.

A business of Marsh McLennan