

Non-Clinical Performance Improvement Project (PIP)

Impact of Peer and Family Support Specialists on Client Recovery and Engagement

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO BEHAVIORAL HEALTH SERVICES

Executive Summary*

Recent research conducted by the County indicated that almost half of adult clients (47% of 41,222 in 2010) and approximately one-third of child/youth/family clients (27% of youth and 39% of 19,010 child/youth/family clients in 2014) interacted with Peer and Family Support Specialists (P/FSS). This proportion is only expected to increase as the role of P/FSSs in the system increases. Therefore, identifying the general impact as well as differential impacts by demographic characteristics, level of care, and usage is of prime importance. This Performance Improvement Project (PIP) specifically explored: What is the impact of interaction with P/FSS on client satisfaction and client outcomes?

Study Question

What is the impact of interaction with P/FSS on client satisfaction and client outcomes compared to clients who did not interact with P/FSS?

Population

The study population included all of the County of San Diego Behavioral Health Services Adult/Older Adult and Child/Youth/Family Mental Health Services clients who completed the Mental Health Statistics Improvement Program (MHSIP) Consumer Survey or the Youth Services Survey (YSS) during a five day period in November 2014. The survey was sent to all County mental health programs with the exception of inpatient and emergency services. Participants were 868 youth clients (YC), 1,344 youth client caregivers (YCC), and 1,621 adults and older adults (AOA).



During the course of your treatment, have you met with a P/FSS?

	Total Clients	Yes		No	
		N	%	N	%
Youth Clients (YC)	868	233	27%	635	73%
YC Caregivers (YCC)	1,344	473	35%	871	65%
AOA Clients	1,621	802	49%	819	51%

Analyses

Data analysis comparing two groups (i.e., contact with a P/FSS versus no-contact) for all designated outcomes were conducted. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) analyses were performed to determine if differences between groups were statistically significant. To account for possible differences due to program type, level of care was used as a statistical control variable. To test for differential impact of interaction with a P/FSS, interaction tests were run for both client race/ethnicity and age. All analyses were performed at the $p < 0.05$ level of significance.

Intervention

The intervention consisted of administration of youth and adult engagement/satisfaction surveys as well as abstraction of recovery/outcome measures. A comparison was made between clients who had contact with a P/FSS and clients who had not.

YOUTH MEASURES

- ◆ **Child Functional Assessment Rating Scale (CFARS):** assesses child/youth functioning.
- ◆ **Child and Adolescent Measurement Systems (CAMS):** measures child and youth internalizing behaviors, externalizing behaviors, and social competence.
- ◆ **Youth Services Survey (YSS):** measures satisfaction with services. There are two versions, one for youth clients and one for youth client caregivers.

ADULT/OLDER ADULT MEASURES

- ◆ **Illness Management and Recovery Scale (IMR):** measures illness management and recovery as assessed by clinicians.
- ◆ **Recovery Markers Questionnaire (RMQ):** measures recovery as assessed by the client.
- ◆ **Mental Health Statistics Improvement Program (MHSIP):** measures client satisfaction with services in the adult and older adult population.

Child/Youth Analyses

The analysis of the child and youth outcomes is presented in a series of parallel analyses, as there was the possibility for both client interaction with a Peer Support Specialist (PSS) or family member/caregiver interaction with a Family Support Specialist (FSS). The first of analyses examine data collected from clients who had contact with a PSS. This was followed by identical analyses of data collected from family member/caregivers who had interaction or contact with a FSS.

Results

Significant findings are presented on the following page.

*Additional results here: Exploring Peer and Family Support Services Report (6/2015)

Child/Youth Significant Findings

Analysis 1: Outcomes for those children/youth who had contact with a PSS.

CFARS:

There were significant differences between treatment groups for the Relationships and Safety domains of the CFARS, with significantly higher scores for client who had an interaction with a PSS.

CAMS:

There was a significant interaction with client ethnicity, indicating that the impact of interacting with a PSS was different for clients of different race/ethnic backgrounds for both the Youth Symptom Behavior Externalizing scale, and Youth Symptom Behavior total score. Specifically, while there was little difference between those who had interacted with a PSS and those who had not for White or Hispanic clients. However, African American clients who interacted with a PSS reported significantly higher scores for those two domains compared to African American clients who had not. It should be noted that sample size diminishes as more levels of comparison and stratification are added. This comparison is based on a very small number of clients. Specifically, 8 African American clients who saw a PSS compared to 5 who did not. However, the effect is worth mentioning in the interest of providing all evidence of differential impact.

YSS:

For the youth version of the YSS, there were significant differences between groups for the Positive Outcomes of Services and Functioning domains, with youth who had interaction with a PSS scoring higher in both cases than those who had not.

Analysis 2: Outcomes for those children/youth whose family member/caregiver had contact with an FSS.

YSS-Caregiver Version:

There were significant differences between treatment groups for the Satisfaction with Services, Cultural Sensitivity, Positive Outcomes, Functioning, and Social Connectedness domains with parent/caregivers who had interacted with an FSS reporting significantly higher scores than those who had not.

Adult/Older Adult Significant Findings

IMR:

Clients who had P/FSS contact had significantly higher Illness Management domain scores than clients who did not have contact with a P/FSS, meaning that clients who had interacted with P/FSSs were managing their illness better.

MHSIP:

Clients who had interacted with P/FSSs had significantly higher scores for all seven domains of the MHSIP consumer satisfaction scale than the clients who did not interact with a P/FSS. This means that clients who interacted with a P/FSS reported greater overall satisfaction with their treatment services than did clients who did not interact with a P/FSS.

The domain with the greatest difference between groups was the Quality and Appropriateness of Services domain, followed by the General Satisfaction and Perception of Outcome Services domains. Mean scores are presented in the tables below.

Conclusion

The PIP demonstrated that both adult and youth clients who had interactions with a P/FSS had more favorable recovery-based outcomes for some measures and greater satisfaction/engagement with services.

Child/Youth Data Tables

OUTCOMES DOMAINS	P/FSS Contact (n=63) Mean	No Contact (n=194) Mean	* Indicates Sig. Difference (p < .05)
CFARS Domain - Relationships	3.33	2.91	0.029 *
CFARS Domain - Safety	2.61	2.18	0.020 *
CFARS Domain - Emotionality	3.77	3.49	0.167
CFARS Domain - Disability	1.65	1.59	0.683
CAMS Youth Symptom-Behavior Internalizing Scale	16.04	17.08	0.164
CAMS Youth Symptom-Behavior Externalizing Scale	29.33	28.17	0.220
CAMS Youth Symptom-Behavior Scale Total	45.37	45.27	0.945

CONSUMER SATISFACTION DOMAINS	P/FSS Contact (n=205) Mean	No Contact (n=526) Mean	* Indicates Sig. Difference (p < .05)
General Satisfaction	4.21	4.13	0.230
Perception of Access to Services	4.14	4.10	0.570
Perception of Quality and Appropriateness of Services	3.95	3.79	0.020 *
Perception of Participation in Treatment Planning	4.02	4.00	0.760
Perception of Outcomes of Services	3.95	3.79	0.015 *
Perception of Functioning	3.95	3.83	0.050
Perception of Social Connectedness	4.12	4.09	0.620

Adult/Older Adult Data Tables

OUTCOMES DOMAINS	P/FSS Contact (n=155) Mean	No Contact (n=135) Mean	* Indicates Sig. Difference (p < .05)
IMR Recovery	3.25	3.14	0.084
IMR Management	2.92	2.77	0.031 *
IMR Substance	4.05	4.29	0.368
IMR Mean	3.35	3.31	0.081
RMQ TOTAL	3.96	3.99	0.986

CONSUMER SATISFACTION DOMAINS	P/FSS Contact (n=701) Mean	No Contact (n=749) Mean	* Indicates Sig. Difference (p < .05)
General Satisfaction	4.44	4.27	0.000 *
Perception of Access to Services	4.20	4.14	0.001 *
Perception of Quality and Appropriateness of Services	4.30	4.18	0.000 *
Perception of Participation in Treatment Planning	4.25	4.18	0.002 *
Perception of Outcomes of Services	3.94	3.75	0.000 *
Perception of Functioning	3.95	3.74	0.000 *
Perception of Social Connectedness	3.91	3.74	0.001 *