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Introduction

This summary of the Comprehensive Community Services (CCS) 2014 Monitoring Report describes:

- CCS expansion across Wisconsin
- Division of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services (DMHSAS)-approved and Division of Quality Assurance (DQA)-certified CCS programs and regions
- Data collection processes
- Counts and characteristics of consumers served by CCS
- Medicaid recipients of, and expenditures paid for, CCS services
- CCS services offered, including evidence-based practices (EBPs)
- Discharge reasons and outcomes for CCS consumers
- Consumer satisfaction with CCS services
CCS Expansion

- CCS Administration
  - DHS Administrative Code, Chapter DHS 36
  - DMHSAS-Approved
  - DQA-Certified

- DQA-Certified Programs
  - 2005: 8 programs
  - Dec 31, 2013: 31 programs
  - Dec 31, 2014: 37 programs
    (+6 = +19% in 2014)

- DQA-Certified Regions
  - Dec 31, 2013: 3 regions
  - Dec 31, 2014: 10 regions
    (+7 = +233% in 2014)
CCS Regions (as of December 31, 2014)
Data Collection Processes

- Quarterly Program Enrollment Reports
- Annual Program Surveys
  - Admissions and discharges
  - Consumer demographics
  - Evidence-based practices (EBPs)
- Program Participation System (PPS) Data
- Medicaid Recipients and Expenditures
- Functional Screen Data
  - Adult (18 years and older)
  - Children (17 years and younger)
- Annual Consumer Satisfaction Surveys
  - Adults (18 years and older)
  - Youth (13-17 years)
  - Family (12 years and younger)
Consumers Enrolled and Served

- Consumers Enrolled (as of December 31, each year)
  - 2012: 1,316
  - 2013: 1,544 (+17%)
  - 2014: 1,937 (+25%)

- Consumers Served (during the calendar year)
  - 2012: 1,698
  - 2013: 1,947 (+15%)
  - 2014: 2,438 (+25%)
Consumers Admitted and Discharged

- **Consumers Admitted (during the calendar year)**
  - 2012: 473
  - 2013: 656 (+39%)
  - 2014: 894 (+36%)

- **Consumers Discharged (during the calendar year)**
  - 2012: 382
  - 2013: 399 (+4%)
  - 2014: 501 (+26%)
Demographics

- **Gender**: half male, half female
- **Age**:
  - Most 21–64 years (59%)
  - Many 17 or younger (32%)
  - Some 18–20 years (5%)
  - Few 65 years or older (4%)
- **Race and Ethnicity**:
  - Mostly White, non-Hispanic (90%)
  - 5% African-Americans (7% in Wisconsin)
  - 2% American Indian/Alaskan Native (1% in Wisconsin)
  - 2% Hispanics (7% in Wisconsin)
- **Veterans**: 2% (7% in Wisconsin)
Medical Conditions and Substance Use

- **Medical Conditions**
  - Lower prevalence of health problems than expected (e.g., obesity, high blood pressure, high cholesterol)
  - Maybe CCS consumers are younger than U.S. population, but also staff may not routinely collect medical data

- **Reported Substance Use**
  - 1 in 4 used tobacco
  - 1 in 5 abused alcohol
  - 1 in 10 used illicit drugs

---

Reported Substance Use, 2012-2014

- Tobacco Use: 20%, 25%, 26%
- Alcohol Abuse: 7%, 10%, 18%
- Illicit Drugs Use: 2%, 8%, 11%
Some consumers receive CCS services under the standard Medicaid fee-for-service system

Count of CCS Medicaid Recipients
- 2012: 1,649
- 2013: 1,849 (+12%)
- 2014: 2,328 (+26%)

Medicaid Claims Expenditures for CCS services provided
- 2012: $9.8 million
- 2013: $10.6 million (+8%)
- 2014: $14.9 million (+40%)
Evidence-Based Practices (EBPs)

- 1 in 4 of programs (28%) offered no EBPs (none)
- 6 in 10 programs (61%) offered some EBPs (one to four)
- 1 in 10 programs (11%) offered many EBPs (five or more)
EBPs Offered

- Less than half of all CCS programs offered any one EBP
- Most commonly offered EBPs were:
  - Supported Employment: offered by 42% of CCS programs
  - Family Psycho-education: offered by 42%
  - Integrated Dual Disorder Treatment (IDDT): offered by 39%

EBPs Offered by CCS Programs, 2012-2014
EBPs were received by only 2%-14% of consumers

Most commonly offered EBPs were:
- Illness Management and Recovery (IMR): 13% of consumers
- Supported Employment: 11%
- Family Psycho-education: 9%
- Other EBPs: 14% (including Motivational Interviewing, Cognitive Behavioral Therapy, and Dialectical Behavioral Therapy)
EBP Training, Toolkits, and Monitoring

- **Training**
  - Most programs (80%-100%) trained staff to implement EBPs
  - 38% trained staff to implement Permanent Supportive Housing

- **Toolkits**
  - Most (91%) used a toolkit to implement IMR
  - Half (40%-60%) used toolkits for IDDT, Family Psycho-education, MedTEAM, and Supported Employment
  - Few (13%) used a toolkit for Permanent Supportive Housing

- **Monitoring**
  - Half (53%) monitored their implementation of Supported Employment
  - Less than one third (20%-36%) monitored fidelity to other EBPs
  - Few programs used an outside monitor to gauge fidelity, except half (47%) of programs offering Supported Employment
1 in 5 consumers (501 of 2,438 served) were discharged in 2014

Discharge Reasons
- 1/3 recovered (no longer need services)
- 1/5 moved out of the CCS service area
- 1/5 withdrew from CCS
- 1/10 needed additional services (beyond what CCS can offer)
- 1/33 funding or authorization ended

Discharged Reason, 2014

- Recovered (38%)
- Moved (20%)
- Needed Addt’l Services (11%)
- Withdraw (20%)
- Funding or Authoriz’n Ended (3%)
- All Other Reasons (8%)
Discharge Reason Types (grouped)

- “Positive” (16%) = completed services with major or moderate improvement
- “Neutral” (52%) = service ended because referred, transferred, or no probable cause
- “Negative” (32%) = completed services but no change, withdrew against staff advice, funding expired, incarcerated, entered nursing home, etc.

Discharged Reason Types, 2012-2014
Consumer Outcomes

- **Functional Screens—Adults and Children**
  - Assess mental health and substance abuse needs
  - Initial screen completed before CCS enrollment
  - Update screen completed annually and at CCS discharge
  - Initial and update screens compared to assess impact of CCS (for 1,657 adults and 581 children)

- **Outcomes among Adults**
  - Psychiatric inpatient stays: 50% decline
  - Chapter 51 Emergency Detentions (“ED”s): 58% decline

- **Outcomes among Children**
  - Suicide attempts or significant ideation: 47% decline
  - Destruction of property or vandalism: 50% decline
  - Serious threats of violence: 41% decline
  - Stealing or burglary: 36% decline
Consumer Satisfaction

- CCS programs administer three satisfaction surveys to consumers with six months or more of services:
  - ROSI Adult Satisfaction Survey (consumers ages 18 and over)
  - MHSIP Youth Satisfaction Survey (consumers ages 13-17)
  - MHSIP Family Satisfaction Survey (parents of children ages 12 and under)

- Results include:
  - Average scores for all consumers:
    - Overall Mean: Satisfaction across all survey questions
    - Six Scales: Satisfaction calculated for related survey questions
  - Percent of CCS consumers who had a:
    - More recovery-oriented/positive experience
    - Less recovery-oriented/positive experience
    - Mixed experience
### Consumer Satisfaction – ROSI Adults

**Average Scores and Percent of Adult Consumers Reporting a Mostly, Mixed, and Less Recovery-Oriented Experience, 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Score for All Consumers</th>
<th>Overall Adult ROSI Mean</th>
<th>Scale 1 - Person Centered</th>
<th>Scale 2 - Barriers Exist</th>
<th>Scale 3 - Empower</th>
<th>Scale 4 - Employ</th>
<th>Scale 5 - Negative Staff Approach</th>
<th>Scale 6 - Basic Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent with Mostly Recovery-Oriented Experience</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with Mixed Experience</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>83.5%</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with Less Recovery-Oriented Experience</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 76% of adults reported a “mostly recovery-oriented experience”
- Scale 3: 90% said they felt “mostly” empowered by staff
- Scale 1: 84% said services were “mostly” person-centered
- Scale 2: But many felt “barriers exist” to their recovery
### Consumer Satisfaction – ROSI Adults

Average Scores and Percent of Adult Consumers Reporting a Mostly, Mixed, and Less Recovery-Oriented Experience, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Adult ROSI Mean</th>
<th>Scale 1 - Person Centered</th>
<th>Scale 2 - Barriers Exist</th>
<th>Scale 3 - Empower</th>
<th>Scale 4 - Employ</th>
<th>Scale 5 - Negative Staff Approach</th>
<th>Scale 6 - Basic Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Score for All Consumers</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with Mostly Recovery-Oriented Experience</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>83.5%</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with Mixed Experience</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with Less Recovery-Oriented Experience</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 76% of adults reported a “mostly recovery-oriented experience”
- Scale 3: 90% said they felt “mostly” empowered by staff
- Scale 1: 84% said services were “mostly” person-centered
- Scale 2: But many felt “barriers exist” to their recovery
76% of adults reported a “mostly recovery-oriented experience”
- Scale 3: 90% said they felt “mostly” empowered by staff
- Scale 1: 84% said services were “mostly” person-centered
- Scale 2: But many felt “barriers exist” to their recovery

### Average Scores and Percent of Adult Consumers Reporting a Mostly, Mixed, and Less Recovery-Oriented Experience, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall Adult ROSI Mean</th>
<th>Scale 1 - Person Centered</th>
<th>Scale 2 - Barriers Exist</th>
<th>Scale 3 - Empower</th>
<th>Scale 4 - Employ</th>
<th>Scale 5 - Negative Staff Approach</th>
<th>Scale 6 - Basic Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Score for All Consumers</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with Mostly Recovery-Oriented Experience</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>83.5%</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with Mixed Experience</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with Less Recovery-Oriented Experience</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Consumer Satisfaction – ROSI Adults

Average Scores and Percent of Adult Consumers Reporting a Mostly, Mixed, and Less Recovery-Oriented Experience, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Score for All Consumers</th>
<th>Overall Adult ROSI Mean</th>
<th>Scale 1 - Person Centered</th>
<th>Scale 2 - Barriers Exist</th>
<th>Scale 3 - Empower</th>
<th>Scale 4 - Employ</th>
<th>Scale 5 - Negative Staff Approach</th>
<th>Scale 6 - Basic Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 76% of adults reported a “mostly recovery-oriented experience”
- Scale 3: 90% said they felt “mostly” empowered by staff
- Scale 1: 84% said services were “mostly” person-centered
- Scale 2: But many felt “barriers exist” to their recovery
Consumer Satisfaction – ROSI Adults

Average Scores and Percent of Adult Consumers Reporting a Mostly, Mixed, and Less Recovery-Oriented Experience, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 1 - Person Centered</th>
<th>Scale 2 - Barriers Exist</th>
<th>Scale 3 - Empower</th>
<th>Scale 4 - Employ</th>
<th>Scale 5 - Negative Staff Approach</th>
<th>Scale 6 - Basic Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Adult ROSI Mean</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent with Mostly Recovery-Oriented Experience</th>
<th>75.7%</th>
<th>83.5%</th>
<th>49.1%</th>
<th>89.7%</th>
<th>63.3%</th>
<th>77.6%</th>
<th>72.4%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent with Mixed Experience</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with Less Recovery-Oriented Experience</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 76% of adults reported a “mostly recovery-oriented experience”
- Scale 3: 90% said they felt “mostly” empowered by staff
- Scale 1: 84% said services were “mostly” person-centered
- Scale 2: But many felt “barriers exist” to their recovery
### Consumer Satisfaction – MHSIP Youth

Average Scores and Percent of Youth Consumers Reporting a More, Mixed, and Less Positive Experience, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Score for All Consumers</th>
<th>Overall Youth MHSIP Mean</th>
<th>Scale 1 - Satisfaction</th>
<th>Scale 2 - Participation</th>
<th>Scale 3 - Access</th>
<th>Scale 4 - Culture</th>
<th>Scale 5 - Outcomes</th>
<th>Scale 6 - Social Connectedness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with More Positive Experience</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with Mixed Experience</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with Less Positive Experience</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 93% of youth reported a “more positive experience”
- Scale 4: 96% said services were culturally-sensitive
- Scale 6: 91% said they felt socially-connected
- Scale 5: Fewer (76%) said their life had improved with CCS
### Consumer Satisfaction – MHSIP Youth

Average Scores and Percent of Youth Consumers Reporting a More, Mixed, and Less Positive Experience, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Youth MHSIP Mean</th>
<th>Scale 1 - Satisfaction</th>
<th>Scale 2 - Participation</th>
<th>Scale 3 - Access</th>
<th>Scale 4 - Culture</th>
<th>Scale 5 - Outcomes</th>
<th>Scale 6 - Social Connectedness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Score for All Consumers</strong></td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent with More Positive Experience</strong></td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent with Mixed Experience</strong></td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent with Less Positive Experience</strong></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 93% of youth reported a “more positive experience”
- Scale 4: 96% said services were culturally-sensitive
- Scale 6: 91% said they felt socially-connected
- Scale 5: Fewer (76%) said their life had improved with CCS
93% of youth reported a “more positive experience”

- Scale 4: 96% said services were culturally-sensitive
- Scale 6: 91% said they felt socially-connected
- Scale 5: Fewer (76%) said their life had improved with CCS

---

**Average Scores and Percent of Youth Consumers Reporting a More, Mixed, and Less Positive Experience, 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Youth MHSIP Mean</th>
<th>Scale 1 - Satisfaction</th>
<th>Scale 2 - Participation</th>
<th>Scale 3 - Access</th>
<th>Scale 4 - Culture</th>
<th>Scale 5 - Outcomes</th>
<th>Scale 6 - Social Connectedness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Score for All Consumers</strong></td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent with More Positive Experience</strong></td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent with Mixed Experience</strong></td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent with Less Positive Experience</strong></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consumer Satisfaction – MHSIP Youth

Average Scores and Percent of Youth Consumers Reporting a More, Mixed, and Less Positive Experience, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall Youth MHSIP Mean</th>
<th>Scale 1 - Satisfaction</th>
<th>Scale 2 - Participation</th>
<th>Scale 3 - Access</th>
<th>Scale 4 - Culture</th>
<th>Scale 5 - Outcomes</th>
<th>Scale 6 - Social Connectedness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Score for All Consumers</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with More Positive Experience</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with Mixed Experience</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with Less Positive Experience</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 93% of youth reported a “more positive experience”
- Scale 4: 96% said services were culturally-sensitive
- Scale 6: 91% said they felt socially-connected
- Scale 5: Fewer (76%) said their life had improved with CCS
### Consumer Satisfaction – MHSIP Youth

#### Average Scores and Percent of Youth Consumers Reporting a More, Mixed, and Less Positive Experience, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 1 - Satisfaction</th>
<th>Scale 2 - Participation</th>
<th>Scale 3 - Access</th>
<th>Scale 4 - Culture</th>
<th>Scale 5 - Outcomes</th>
<th>Scale 6 - Social Connectedness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Youth MHSIP Mean</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Average Score for All Consumers**
  - 92.9% for Scale 1
  - 86.9% for Scale 2
  - 89.4% for Scale 3
  - 90.2% for Scale 4
  - 96.0% for Scale 5
  - 75.6% for Scale 6

- **Percent with More Positive Experience**
  - 92.9% for Scale 1
  - 86.9% for Scale 2
  - 89.4% for Scale 3
  - 90.2% for Scale 4
  - 95.0% for Scale 5
  - 90.5% for Scale 6

- **Percent with Mixed Experience**
  - 7.1% for Scale 1
  - 13.1% for Scale 2
  - 7.1% for Scale 3
  - 4.9% for Scale 4
  - 2.0% for Scale 5
  - 7.1% for Scale 6

- **Percent with Less Positive Experience**
  - 0.0% for Scale 1
  - 0.0% for Scale 2
  - 3.5% for Scale 3
  - 4.9% for Scale 4
  - 2.4% for Scale 5
  - 2.4% for Scale 6

- 93% of youth reported a “more positive experience”
- Scale 4: 96% said services were culturally-sensitive
- Scale 6: 91% said they felt socially-connected
- Scale 5: Fewer (76%) said their life had improved with CCS
### Consumer Satisfaction - MHSIP Family

#### Average Scores and Percent of Family Consumers Reporting a More, Mixed, and Less Positive Experience, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall Family MHSIP Mean</th>
<th>Scale 1 - Satisfaction</th>
<th>Scale 2 - Participation</th>
<th>Scale 3 - Access</th>
<th>Scale 4 - Culture</th>
<th>Scale 5 - Outcomes</th>
<th>Scale 6 - Social Connectedness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Score for All Consumers</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with More Positive Experience</td>
<td>89.1%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
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Conclusions

Key Findings
- Expanded number of programs, regions, consumers served
- Elderly, Hispanics, and veterans under-represented
- Reported substance use increased
- Few EBPs received by consumers, little monitoring for fidelity
- Most satisfied with CCS services, less satisfied with outcomes

Next Steps
- Better represent Wisconsin’s population
- Address consumers’ physical health
- Expand EBPs delivered to consumers with fidelity
- Improve satisfaction with CCS outcomes
Thank you

- Link to CCS 2014 Monitoring Report:

- For additional information about CCS, please visit:
  - dhs.wisconsin.gov/ccs

- For questions or comments, please contact:
  - Laura.Blakeslee@wisconsin.gov
  - Tim.Connor@wisconsin.gov