

2007
Performance Report
Core Programs

Pathways Counseling Center, Inc.

Performance Report 2007: All Core Programs

Introduction

This performance report relies heavily on the data collected and processed in the Ohio Outcomes Data Mart. The information gathered in the Data Mart is from the Ohio Scales (for adolescents) and the Ohio Consumer Outcomes (for adults). Every mental health client at our agency is asked to participate in the outcomes process. Data is also collected from agency-designed surveys administered in regular intervals through-out the year. Through this process the agency staff receives feedback on service delivery in the following areas: Access, Effectiveness, Efficiency, and Input from Stakeholders. “Target Goal Expectancies” for each domain are chosen based upon the agency’s performance in past end of the year reports.

The data from the outcomes forms is used in two ways: 1) provide the clinical and support team with feedback about agency performance and 2) as a means to enhance the overall performance of the agency. Clinicians record the individual outcome scores in the clients’ Diagnostic Assessment and subsequent scorings are included in the chart. By comparing these scores the clinicians may make inferences about a client’s progress and may make suggestions about his or her treatment direction.

Corporately, the overall scores from the instruments are gathered and compared to the goals set by the agency staff and directors. This comparison gives rise to suggestions of how to enhance treatment delivery in certain areas. This process reminds the staff of the value of teamwork and of the need to support one another in our efforts to provide excellent behavioral health services to the communities of Putnam County.

Outline

- I. Outcomes
 - A. Access: Adult and Adolescent*
 - B. Effectiveness
 - Adolescent/Parent Outcomes
 - Adult
 - C. Efficiency: Adult and Adolescent/Parent*
 - D. Input from Stakeholders: Adult and Adolescent*

* Note: For now, Input from Stakeholders and Access data for adult and child service outcomes are taken from the same source and denote no distinction between whether the client is receiving adult or child services.

PROGRAM: ADULT and ADOLESCENT SERVICES

DOMAIN: ACCESS

DATE: 2007

OBJECTIVE	Client's have optimal access to services
INDICATORS	<p># of New Client Surveys and Anonymous Client Satisfaction Surveys completed</p> <p>New Client Survey % of "yes" answers to the following questions: #2 "Were you able to schedule an appointment in a timely manner?"</p> <p>Anonymous Client Satisfaction Survey's % of "yes" answers to the following questions: #1 "Were appointments made at times convenient for you?" # 2 "Were cancelled or rescheduled appointments completed in a timely manner?"</p>
WHO APPLIED TO:	All adult and adolescent clients
TIME OF MEASURE:	Upon received
DATA SOURCE:	New Client Survey, Anonymous Client Satisfaction Survey and Intake Data Sheet
OBTAINED BY:	Support Staff
TARGET GOAL EXPECTANCY:	80% of clients will respond "yes" to questions on the New Client Survey and Anonymous Client Satisfaction Survey.
KEY CHARACTERISTICS OF PERSON'S SERVED:	Adults and adolescents requesting services at Pathways
BARRIERS WHICH IMPACT TARGET GOAL:	Type of Presenting Problem Special Requests by client Court-ordered clients
CLIENT SEVERITY FACTORS WHICH IMPACT TARGET GOAL:	Refusal to answer survey Incarceration Severity of Diagnosis
INTERNAL/ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS WHICH IMPACT TARGET GOAL:	Limited staff Limited evening hours

A. Access: Adult and Adolescent Outcomes 2007

The following outcomes information is from the New Client Survey and the Anonymous Client Satisfaction Survey. These questions were chosen because they reflect a client's perception of their ability to access the services at our agency.

New Client Survey

#2: Were you able to schedule an appointment in a timely manner?

Yes	510	98%
No	10	2%
blank	4	

Anonymous Client Satisfaction Survey

#1: Were appointments made at times convenient to you?

Yes	37	100%
No	0	0%

Anonymous Client Satisfaction Survey

#2: Were rescheduled appointments completed in a timely manner?

Yes	33	97%
No	1	3%

According to these outcomes the staff at Pathways does an excellent job of assuring access to our services. The answers to question #2 of the Anonymous Client Satisfaction Survey reflect the staff's ability to schedule appointments in a timely manner. Also, when there is a special request (specific counselor, schedule around work or school hours, etc.) during the initial phone interview the support staff informs the clients that such requests may delay the time of their initial visit. This information ensures that the clients are informed of our service limitations and abilities.

PROGRAM: ADULT SERVICES

DOMAIN: EFFECTIVENESS

DATE: 2007

OBJECTIVE	Client reports positive changes across a spectrum of indicators related to their health, safety, esteem, presenting problem and satisfaction with services
INDICATORS	# of Ohio Consumer Outcomes (Outcomes Data Mart) and Anonymous Client Satisfaction Survey % of clients scoring favorably for the following areas -Quality of Life including sub-scores of Friendship, Financial, Freedom, and Relationships -Symptom Management including sub-score of Symptom Recognition and Prevention -Empowerment including sub-score of Optimism
WHO APPLIED TO:	All adult clients completing the Ohio Consumer Outcomes and Anonymous Client Satisfaction Survey
TIME OF MEASURE:	Beginning of treatment and 90 days into treatment
DATA SOURCE:	ODMH Data Mart
OBTAINED BY:	Support staff
TARGET GOAL EXPECTANCY:	Improve scores over time
KEY CHARACTERISTICS OF PERSON'S SERVED:	Participated in Intake Enrolled in Program
BARRIERS WHICH IMPACT TARGET GOAL:	Court-ordered; length of treatment; non-voluntary admission
CLIENT SEVERITY FACTORS WHICH IMPACT TARGET GOAL:	Severity of diagnosis; relapse; functioning; compliance to services
INTERNAL/ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS WHICH IMPACT TARGET GOAL:	Staff and limits of services

B. Effectiveness: Adult Outcomes 2007

The following outcomes information is from the Ohio Mental Health Consumer Outcomes System’s Adult Consumer Form. These outcomes reflect a client’s perception of change in Quality of Life. Furthermore, four areas of their Quality of Life score are examined individually; Friendship, Financial, Freedom, and Relationships. The indicators are scored on a 5 point Likert scale and expressed as percentages. The options given are “terrible”, “mostly dissatisfied”, “equally satisfied/dissatisfied”, “most satisfied”, and “very pleased”. We will also examine a client’s perception of how well they manage the symptoms associated with their mental and emotional distress or mental illness; the options given are “always”, “often”, “sometimes”, “seldom”, and “never”.

We expect to see improvement from the initial administration of the instrument, time = 30, to the follow-up administration of the instrument, time = 90. The follow-up administration is given to clients who remain in treatment for 90 days. Average scores in the State of Ohio are also recorded for the initial administration and the 90-day follow-up administration of the assessment instrument. We will compare these state averages with the scores from Pathways Counseling Center, Inc.

Quality of Life Scores

Quality of Life: Overall combined									
time	n	mean	stan. dev.	terrible	mostly dis.	equally sat./dis.	mostly sat.	very pleased	missing
30	188	3.12	0.69	5.32	19.68	40.96	26.72	4.26	1.06
90	50	3.28	0.65	2	14	44	24	10	6
180	38	3.23	0.8	2.63	26.32	34.21	23.68	10.53	2.63
state30	48.5K	2.85	0.78	9.65	28	33.67	15.93	4.61	7.93
state90	7.7K	3.02	0.81	5.34	16.73	24.33	14.52	5.54	33.53

QoL: Friendship combined									
time	n	mean	stan. dev.	terrible	mostly dis.	equally sat./dis.	mostly sat.	very pleased	missing
30	188	3.24	1.15	9.57	13.83	32.98	28.19	14.36	1.06
90	50	3.43	1.28	8	18	18	28	24	4
180	38	3.23	1.23	7.89	23.68	23.68	26.32	18.42	0
state30	48.5K	2.98	1.26	14.42	20.34	24.18	22.2	12.64	6.22
state90	7.7K	3.17	1.24	8.2	12.15	17.54	18.71	10.92	32.47

QoL: Financial combined									
time	n	mean	stan. dev.	terrible	mostly dis.	equally sat./dis.	mostly sat.	very pleased	missing
30	188	2.38	1.06	38.83	14.36	26.6	12.77	5.32	2.13
90	50	2.52	0.96	26	20	36	10	4	4
180	38	2.53	1.22	31.58	21.05	23.68	10.53	13.16	0
state30	48K	48.03	1	48.03	18.35	16.74	6.58	2.76	7.54
state90	7.7K	2.17	1.06	29.8	13.29	14.68	6.65	2.52	33.05

QoL: Freedom combined									
time	n	mean	stan. dev.	terrible	mostly dis.	equally sat./dis.	mostly sat.	very pleased	missing
30	188	3.03	1.15	11.75	18.62	32.98	25.53	10.11	1.06
90	50	3.31	1.16	6	18	30	24	18	4
180	38	3.39	1.1	2.63	21.05	28.95	28.95	18.42	0
state30	48.5K	3.09	1.3	14.29	16.95	23.51	23.14	15.72	6.36
state90	7.7K	3.27	1.27	7.89	11.04	16.63	18.33	13.46	32.65

QoL: Relationships combined									
time	n	mean	stan. dev.	terrible	mostly dis.	equally sat./dis.	mostly sat.	very pleased	missing
30	188	3.24	1.23	9.57	18.09	27.13	25	18.09	1.06
90	50	3.58	1.18	4	14	28	22	28	4
180	38	3.7	1.12	0	21.05	15.79	31.58	28.95	0
state30	48.5K	3.13	1.34	14.28	16.26	21.93	21.27	18.14	6.51
state90	7.7K	3.35	1.31	7.76	10.16	15.25	16.75	16.16	32.64

Narrative

Quality of Life Overall (QOL): From time = 30 to time = 90 the scores for QOL increased. Initially only about 31% of adult clients ranked their perception of QOL as “mostly satisfied” and “very pleased”. In the follow-up administration almost 34% noted the same rank. The state averages for the same scores were 20.5% and 20%.

Friendship (FRND): From time = 30 to time = 90 the scores for FRND increased. Initially only about 42.5% of adult clients ranked their perception of FRND as “mostly satisfied” and “very pleased”. In the follow-up administration almost 52% noted the same rank. The state averages for the same scores were 35% and 30%.

Financial (FIN): From time = 30 to time = 90 the scores for FIN decreased. Initially about 18% of adult clients ranked their perception of FIN as “mostly satisfied” and “very pleased”. In the follow-up administration only 14% noted the same rank. The state averages were 9.3% and 9.1%.

Freedom (FRDM): From time = 30 to time = 90 the scores for FRDM increased. Initially only about 35.6% of adult clients ranked their perception of FRND as “mostly satisfied” and “very pleased”. In the follow-up administration almost 42% noted the same rank. The state averages were 38.8% and 32%.

Relationships (REL): From time = 30 to time = 90 the scores for REL increased. Initially about 43% of adult clients ranked the perception of REL as “mostly satisfied” and “very pleased”. In the follow-up administration 50% noted the same rank. The state averages were 39.4% and 33%.

All scores except for Financial increased in the given time span. This may be because the amount of money a person has is a hard number whereas the other sections in the QOL examination are more subjective in nature. This could also reflect the current state of the economy and the rise in gas and food prices in 2007. While all the scores from the Pathways Counseling Center, Inc. out-paced the averages from the state there is one thing to consider: 30% of all state90 scores were missing. It is not apparent why this occurred. It may be connected to information loss when the data are gathered and sent to the state.

In the following charts we examine a client’s perception of how their symptoms negatively affect their functioning in day-to-day activities. The answer choices are “not at all”, “a little bit”, “some”, “quite a bit”, and “extremely”. In the second chart we examine the clients’ perceptions of how well they can recognize symptoms associated with their mental and emotional distress or mental illness and prevent the symptoms from impacting their functioning; the options given are “always”, “often”, “sometimes”, “seldom”, and “never”.

We expect to see improvement from the initial administration of the instrument, time = 30, to the follow-up administration of the instrument, time = 90. The follow-up administration is given to clients who remain in treatment for 90 days. Average scores in the State of Ohio are also recorded for the initial administration and the 90-day follow-up administration of the assessment instrument. We will compare these state averages with the scores from Pathways Counseling Center, Inc.

Symptom Management Scores

Symptom Distress: Overall									
time	n	mean	stan. dev.	not at all	a little bit	some	quite a bit	extremely	missing
30	188	37.46	14.33	29.26	27.13	23.94	14.89	3.72	1.06
90	50	32.45	12.67	46	20	22	6	2	4
180	38	33.05	13.68	42.11	28.95	21.05	5.26	2.63	0
state30	10.7K	40.49		22.13	22.03	25.17	17.65	6.45	6.57
state90	1.7K	36.3		23.14	16.71	14.57	9.59	3.2	32.79

S,H, & S Rec/Prev. Symptom Recognition combined									
time	n	mean	stan. dev.	never	seldom	sometimes	often	always	missing
30	188	2.92	1.19	14.36	19.15	36.7	17.02	11.7	1.06
90	50	2.68	1.15	18	22	34	16	6	4
180	38	2.63	1.12	15.79	34.21	26.32	18.42	5.26	0
state30	48.5K	3.05	1.18	12.31	13.36	33.69	20.99	11.03	8.62
state90	7.7K	3.04	1.17	8.98	9.55	25.21	14.4	7.78	34.08

Symptom Distress: This measurement reflects a client’s perception of the extent their mental health symptoms negatively affect their day-to-day functioning. At time = 30 clients recorded that symptoms affect their functioning “not at all” or “a little bit” about 56% of the time. At time = 90 clients scores improved; 66% of the responses fell within the same range. The state averages declined from time = 30 to time = 90; from 44% to 40%.

Symptom Recognition: This measurement refers to the client’s ability to recognize symptoms of their mental illness. From time = 30 to time = 90 the scores for Symptom Recognition decreased. Initially about 30% of adult clients ranked their ability to recognize symptoms of their illness as “often” or “always”. In the follow-up administration only about 16% noted the same rank. This downward trend may reflect an increased awareness of their symptoms due to prolonged contact with a mental health clinician. Scores for the state contain the same trend; from 36% at time = 30 to 22.5% at time = 90.

In the next set of charts we take a look at two conditions of a client’s perspective: optimism and empowerment. “Optimism” reflects a client’s perception of the future and whether or not areas in their life will improve. “Empowerment” reflects a client’s perception of their ability to accomplish activities they deem necessary and fulfilling to their sense of wellbeing and self-efficacy.

We expect to see improvement from the initial administration of the instrument, time = 30, to the follow-up administration of the instrument, time = 90. The follow-up administration is given to clients who remain in treatment for 90 days. Average scores in the State of Ohio are also recorded for the initial administration and the 90-day follow-up administration of the assessment instrument. We will compare these state averages with the scores from Pathways Counseling Center, Inc.

Empowerment Scores

Empowerment: Optimism								
time	n	mean	stan. dev.	very opt.	somewhat opt.	somewhat opt.	very opt	missing
30	188	2.74	0.45	1.06	33.51	50	7.45	7.98
90	50	2.76	0.38	0	30	52	4	6
180	38	2.73	0.58	2.63	39.47	44.74	13.16	0
state30	48.5K	2.69	0.51	1.81	36.19	36.3	6.76	10.94
state90	7.7K	2.75	0.52	1.44	23.66	30.32	6.12	38.46

Empowerment: Overall								
time	n	mean	stan. dev.	v.unemp.	somewhat unemp.	somewhat emp.	v. emp	missing
30	188	2.72	0.32	0.53	30.32	64.89	2.66	1.6
90	50	2.74	0.25	0	14	82	0	4
180	38	2.76	0.36	2.63	26.32	68.42	2.363	0
state30	48.5K	2.66	0.34	0.62	31.33	52.43	2.44	13.19
state90	7.7K	2.71	0.35	0.34	18.79	42.31	2.42	36.15

Optimism: At time = 30 57.5% of clients chose either “somewhat optimistic” or “very optimistic”. At time = 90 relatively the same # of clients chose options: 56%. For the state the percentage of clients choosing the better options fell from time = 30 to time = 90: from 43% to 37%.

Empowerment Overall: At time = 30, 57.5% of clients chose either “somewhat empowered” or “very empowered”. At time = 90 82% of the clients chose the higher rating. For the state the percentage of clients choosing the better options fell from time = 30 to time = 90: from 55% to 45%.

PROGRAM: ADOLESCENT SERVICES

DOMAIN: EFFECTIVENESS

DATE: 2007

OBJECTIVE	Client and parents report positive changes across a spectrum of indicators related to their health, safety, esteem, presenting problem and satisfaction with services
INDICATORS	# of Child and Adolescent Outcomes (Outcomes Data Mart) % of favorable answers for the following areas: Functioning Problem Severity Satisfaction with Services
WHO APPLIED TO:	All child & adolescent clients and their parent/guardian completing the Ohio Youth Problem, Functioning and Satisfaction Scales
TIME OF MEASURE:	Beginning of treatment and 90 day into treatment
DATA SOURCE:	ODMH Data Mart
OBTAINED BY:	Support staff and clinical staff
TARGET GOAL EXPECTANCY:	50% will indicate favorable score
KEY CHARACTERISTICS OF PERSON'S SERVED:	Participated in Intake Child, Adolescent or Parent/Guardian
BARRIERS WHICH IMPACT TARGET GOAL:	May be generally behaviorally problematic
CLIENT SEVERITY FACTORS WHICH IMPACT TARGET GOAL:	Severity of diagnosis; diagnosis of Oppositional Defiant Disorder Client may leave treatment process prior to completing second administration of instrument.
INTERNAL/ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS WHICH IMPACT TARGET GOAL:	Limits of services

B. Effectiveness: Adolescent Outcomes 2007

The following outcomes information is from the Ohio Mental Health Consumer Outcomes System's Youth and Parent forms. These outcomes reflect a child's perception of change in their functioning, problem severity, and satisfaction with services. Parents also rate their perception of these outcomes for their children. We hope to see and improvement of scores from time = 30 (the first administration of the instrument) to time = 90 (the follow-up administration given 90 days later). It is common for a child to refuse to complete a section. The "missing" column reflects this fact. The indicators are scored on a 5 point Likert scale and expressed as percentages. The options vary from section to section but the child and the parent forms have the same selections.

Functioning: how well a child is functioning in the day-to-day activities (school, home, peers, etc.)

Parents: Child and Adolescent Functioning Overall									
time	n	mean	stan. dev.	ex.troub.	q.a.f. troub.	some troub	doing ok	very well	missing
30	112	47.71	15.01	3.57	12.5	28.57	43.75	8.04	3.57
90	22	51	16.3	4.55	4.55	40.91	22.73	22.73	4.55
180	22	47.55	15.5	4.55	4.55	36.36	31.82	13.64	9.09
state30	37K	45.54	15.09	3.02	15.33	33.7	31.84	9.37	6.73
state90	12K	49.21	15.31	1.72	9.98	24.76	31.26	12.74	19.54

Adolescents: Child and Adolescent Functioning Overall									
time	n	mean	stan. dev.	ex.troub.	q.a.f. troub.	some troub	doing ok	very well	missing
30	64	55.01	12.55	0	4.69	25	40.63	28.13	1.56
90	16	57.06	13.09	0	6.25	12.5	56.25	25	0
180	16	59.43	13.2	0	6.25	6.25	50	37.5	0
state30	21K	56.31	13.4	0.68	3.96	18.41	41.88	25.81	9.27
state90	7.6K	59.48	13.18	0.42	2.73	10.52	34.33	29.28	22.71

Functioning Overall: In time = 30, 51.7% of parents report their children are doing "ok" or "very well". At time = 90, 45.6% report the same score. 68.7% of children in time = 30, reported their child is "doing ok" or "very well" and in time = 90 their score rose to 81.3%. As is often the case the children report better scores for themselves compared to their parent's scores. This may be a useful talking point in the counseling session. Across the state parents reported 41% in time = 30 and 44% in time = 90 and children reported 68% in time = 30 and 64% in time = 90.

Problem Severity: client’s perception of how behavior and attitude negatively affect their functioning in day-to-day activities

Parents: Child and Adolescent Problem Severity Overall									
time	n	mean	stan. dev.	no sig.	low	moderate	intense	very intense	missing
30	112	27.31	15.66	13.39	18.75	40.18	20.54	6.25	0.89
90	22	23.59	15.41	27.27	13.64	36.36	18.18	4.55	0
180	22	21.05	11.89	22.73	18.18	45.45	4.55	0	9.09
state30	36.8K	27.84	16.37	12.69	20.54	35.73	18.83	8.09	4.12
state90	11.9K	22.31	15.43	18.57	22.21	26.47	10.6	4.11	18.05

Adolescents: Child and Adolescent: Problem Severity Overall									
time	n	mean	stan. dev.	no sig.	low	moderate	intense	very intense	missing
30	64	26.88	17.66	20.31	20.31	23.44	26.56	7.81	1.56
90	16	20.68	16.41	43.75	12.5	25	12.5	6.25	0
180	16	15.06	8.91	37.5	50	6.25	6.25	0	0
state30	21K	23.07	15.99	20.52	24.5	29.19	12.61	5.24	7.94
state90	7.6K	18.37	14.65	25.72	23.58	19.51	6.72	2.7	21.78

Problem Severity Overall: in time = 30, nearly 32% of parents reported “no significant” or “low” negative impact upon activities compared to almost 41% of adolescents for the same measure. In time = 90, 41% of parents reported the same scores compared to more than 56% of adolescence. Across the state at time = 30 33% of parents and 45% of adolescents reported the same range and at time = 90 scores changed to 41% of parents and 50% of adolescents.

Satisfaction: a client's and parent's satisfaction with services.

Parents: Child and Adolescent: Satisfaction Overall										
time	n	mean	stan. dev.	xtr. satis.	mod. satis.	som. satis.	som. dis.	mod. Disat.	ext. disat.	missing
30	112	11.07	4.8	10.71	10.71	11.61	8.93	4.46	0.89	52.68
90	22	7.52	4.26	54.55	22.73	4.55	9.09	4.55	0	4.55
180	22	7.1	3.71	50	22.73	4.55	9.09	0	0	13.64
state30	36.8K	8.66	4.87	23.08	12.2	6.59	4.64	3.34	0.97	49.2
state90	11.9K	6.65	3.61	46.89	14.82	5.76	3.09	1.53	0.26	27.65

Adolescents: Child and Adolescent: Satisfaction Overall										
time	n	mean	stan. dev.	xtr. satis.	mod. satis.	som. satis.	som. dis.	mod. Disat.	ext. disat.	missing
30	64	11.51	4.17	6.25	15.63	15.63	6.25	7.18	0	48.44
90	16	7.75	31.25	50	31.25	12.5	0	6.25	0	0
180	16	10.18	6.48	37.5	18.75	18.75	12.5	0	12.5	0
state30	20.9K	10.43	5.07	14.62	15.58	9.59	7.48	5.88	1.5	45.36
state90	7.6K	8.38	4.52	30.91	18.84	8.55	5.54	3.83	0.84	31.49

Satisfaction: This measurement records a child's and parent's satisfaction with services to date. Because this is administered on the first day of contact this score is often left blank at time = 30. Parents and children state they haven't enough time to make a conclusion about the services they've received. This is why there are a large number of "missing" scores for the initial administration of the measure. The most significant scores in this section, in my opinion, are the "extremely satisfied" and "moderately satisfied" scores in the parent's portion. Over 77% of parents report they are satisfied with services at the second administration of the outcome form. Hopefully this is a reflection of their involvement with services provided to their child and the clinicians' connection to the parent during the care of their child at the agency. Again, sample size is a consideration. 64 adolescents and 112 parents were initially involved in the administration of the instrument. At 3 months into services (time = 90) only 16 adolescents and 22 parents completed the instrument. One could surmise that only the clients with more severe symptoms stayed in therapy for at least 3 months.

PROGRAM: ADULT and ADOLESCENT SERVICES

DOMAIN: EFFICIENCY

DATE: 2007

OBJECTIVE	Services are provided in accordance with the client's level of expectation and comfort
INDICATORS	<p># of Ohio Outcomes and Anonymous Client Satisfaction Surveys completed</p> <p>New Client Survey % of "yes" answers on the following questions: # 3 "Did you receive friendly & courteous service over the phone?" #4 "Were you treated with respect during your first visit to Pathways?"</p> <p>Anonymous Client Satisfaction Survey % of "yes" answers on the following questions: #3 "Were the services provided to you what you needed?" #4 "If applicable, are you satisfied that your service providers were culturally aware and/or competent?"</p>
WHO APPLIED TO:	All adult clients completing the Ohio Consumer Outcomes and Anonymous Client Satisfaction Survey
TIME OF MEASURE:	During intake and @ 60 days after closure
DATA SOURCE:	Anonymous Client Satisfaction Survey and New Client Survey
OBTAINED BY:	Support staff
TARGET GOAL EXPECTANCY:	90 %
KEY CHARACTERISTICS OF PERSON'S SERVED:	Participated in Intake Enrolled in Program
BARRIERS WHICH IMPACT TARGET GOAL:	Court-ordered; client does not want services; length of treatment
CLIENT SEVERITY FACTORS WHICH IMPACT TARGET GOAL:	Severity of diagnosis; relapse; functioning; compliance to services
INTERNAL/ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS WHICH IMPACT TARGET GOAL:	Type of diagnosis and limits of service provider

C. Efficiency: Adult and Adolescent Outcomes 2007

The following outcomes information is from the New Client Survey and the Anonymous Client Satisfaction Survey. These questions were chosen because they reflect a client's perception of service provision and whether or not services were provided in accordance with their expectations and comfort levels. We expected to see high scores in these areas ($\leq 85\%$) as they are a reflection of how well we communicate with and attend to the client's needs.

New Client Survey

#3: Did you receive friendly and courteous service over the phone?

Yes	521	99%
No	5	1%

#4: Were you treated with respect during your first visit to Pathways?

Yes	482	99%
No	5	1%
n/a	42	

Anonymous Client Satisfaction Survey

#3: Were the services provided to you what you needed?

Yes	37	100%
No	0	0%

#4: Are you satisfied that your service providers were culturally aware and/or competent?

Yes	31	97%
No	1	3%

There are no concerns here. The scores for this sample reflect the high quality of services delivered at Pathways Counseling Center, Inc. The high scores on question #3 on the New Client Survey reflect the support staff's commitment to provide a good first impression to the clients we serve.

PROGRAM: ADULT and ADOLESCENT SERVICES

DOMAIN: INPUT FROM STAKEHOLDERS

DATE: 2007

OBJECTIVE	Stakeholders/Clients will provide feedback to the agency
INDICATORS	# of Post-Discharge Surveys completed Post-Discharge score averages
WHO APPLIED TO:	All stakeholders
TIME OF MEASURE:	"When received" for Post-Discharge Surveys (the surveys are distributed 60 days after treatment discharge)
DATA SOURCE:	Post-Discharge Surveys
OBTAINED BY:	Support staff and clinical reviewers
TARGET GOAL EXPECTANCY:	An average score of <3 indicates agreement with the question
KEY CHARACTERISTICS OF PERSON'S SERVED:	Stakeholders and referral sources
BARRIERS WHICH IMPACT TARGET GOAL:	Lack of response Some believe services should be free of charge
OTHER FACTORS WHICH IMPACT TARGET GOAL:	No release of information

D. Input from Stakeholders: Adult and Adolescent 2007

The following outcomes information is derived from feedback from referral sources and the Post Discharge Survey results (PDS). The PDS is sent to all clients 60 days after they are discharged from services. The eight questions on the survey provide a summation of our clients' perceptions of long-lasting positive change realized through participation of our services. On the PDS an average score of less than "3" is considered a good score.

Post Discharge Survey (35 total)

- | | |
|---|-----|
| 1. Since ending services at Pathways I have maintained the goals achieved through counseling. | 2.0 |
| 2. I feel good about myself. | 1.8 |
| 3. I have learned and continue to use self-help skills. | 2.0 |
| 4. I believe I am able to make good choices in finding help. | 1.6 |
| 5. My ability to handle routine tasks has improved. | 1.8 |
| 6. My feelings of helplessness and fear have decreased | 1.8 |
| 7. I believe I am capable of facing the future. | 1.6 |
| 8. The services I received at Pathways met my needs. | 1.8 |
| 9. Should the need arise I would return to Pathways for help. | 1.6 |

Feedback from referral sources gives us an indication of how our services are perceived by the community. Consistently referral sources report they would like more communication from us regarding clients referred to our agency. Such requests have prompted us to explain to them the limits of confidentiality when discussing personal health information. Through our dialogue we've reviewed

the importance of obtaining a proper “Release of Information” so that we may provide the referral source with helpful information about the client’s condition.

Post Discharge Survey results demonstrate consistent excellence by the clinical staff in providing services. All score averages are below the mid-point score of “3” and reflect a general consensus of agreement with the statements. This direct feedback is important as the agency considers goals for its strategic planning. However, the low return-rate of PDS makes it increasingly difficult to obtain this information. The team of directors, in calendar year 2008, may decide upon other means to gather data on the long-term, positive affects our clinical services have upon client functioning.