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Transforming Care: The Turn to “Outcome”

• “Outcome,” “Evidence,” “Effectiveness” & “Accountability” are the watchwords of the day.

• Part of a world wide trend not specific to mental health and independent of any particular type of reimbursement system.


Transforming Care:

The Current Environment

- Move from inpatient to outpatient, from hospital to community;
- Shortened lengths of intensive treatment;
- Increased utilization and performance reviews;
- Declining reimbursement rates;
The Current Environment
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- More accountability, responsibility, risk...
- "Professionalization" of treatment (in addiction treatment especially)
- Expansion of treatment options, mandated modalities
- Individualized, clinically-driven, “recovery-oriented” treatment
• In most studies conducted over the last 40 years, the average treated person is better off than 80% of the untreated sample.

Improving Effectiveness

Tutorial on Outcome

Effect size of Aspirin

Effect size of therapy

The bottom line?

• The majority of helpers are effective and efficient most of the time.
• Average person in care accounts for only 7% of expenditures.

So, what’s the problem…
Improving Effectiveness

The “Bad News” about Care

- Drop out rates average 47%;
- 1 out of 10 consumers accounts for 60-70% of expenditures;
- Providers frequently fail to identify “at risk” and failing cases.


Some Clues to Why we fail

• Study of 6,146 adults seen in real-world clinical practice:
  • Average age of 40;
  • Completed at least 6 months of treatment (average sessions = 10);
  • Diagnosis included depression (46.3%), adjustment disorder (30.2%), anxiety (11%), bipolar disorder, PTSD, and other.

• 581 full-time providers working independently in a networked managed care system:
  • 72.3% female, 27.7% male;
  • Average 21 years of experience;
  • 30.3% doctoral level, 63.7% master’s level, 3.6% medical degrees.
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Some Clues to Why we fail

• Factors widely and traditionally believed to exert strong influence on outcome accounted for little or no variability:
  • Diagnosis after accounting for severity and for case mix (less than 1%);
  • Consumer age and gender (0%);
  • Provider age, experience level, professional degree or certification;
  • Use of medication;
  • Within and between provider regression to the mean.

Some Clues to Why we fail

• Variability in outcomes between providers (5-8%) equaled or exceeded the contribution of factors known to exert a significant impact on therapeutic success:
  • Quality of the therapeutic alliance (5-8%);
  • Allegiance (3-4%);
  • Treatment model or method (1%).

• Medication generally helpful only when given by an effective practitioner.

“You can’t solve a problem with the same kind of thinking that created it.”

Albert Einstein
The Medical Model Equation:

- Evidence-based practice;
- Quality assurance;
- External management;
- Continuing education requirements;
- Legal protection of trade and terminology.

The Results

- All approaches work equally well with some clients at some times;
- Diagnosis little help in differential treatment selection and unrelated to outcome.
- QA practices neither improve the quality or outcome of the service;
- External management actually increases costs;
- No difference in outcome based on training.

The Medical Model: What treatment, by whom, is most effective for this individual with that specific problem, under which set of circumstances, and how does it come about?

The “Contextual” Model: Is this relationship between this consumer and this provider, program, level of care working for this individual at this time and place?
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The Core Principles of CDOI

Contextual versus Medical Orientation

Consumer-driven Service Delivery

Routine Monitoring & Feedback regarding alliance and outcome

Restoration and Recovery versus Cure of Illness

The “Common Factors” of Effective Behavioral Health Care
Outcome of Behavioral Healthcare Services:

- 60% due to “Alliance” ([aka “common factors”] 8%/13%)
- 30% due to “Allegiance” Factors (4%/13%)
- 8% due to model and technique (1/13)

Transforming Care

Consumer-Directed Service Delivery

• Research on the alliance reflected in over 1100 research findings.

Transforming Care

Routine Outcome Monitoring & Feedback

Valid
Reliable
Feasible

The O.R.S

The S.R.S

Learn more and register for free working copies at:

www.scottdmiller.com/?g=node/6
Historically, in the field of behavioral health, “recovery” was a term reserved for substance abuse treatment programs:

In CDOI, “recovery” refers to the shift away from “illness,” “treatment,” and “cure” toward an emphasis on consumer desires, the “fit of services” and measureable improvement in individual, relational, and social well being.
Currently, 13 RCT's involving 12,374 clinically, culturally, and economically diverse consumers:

- Routine outcome monitoring and feedback as much as doubles the “effect size” (reliable and clinically significant change);
- Decreases drop-out rates by as much as half;
- Decreases deterioration by 33%;
- Reduces hospitalizations and shortened length of stay by 66%;
- Significantly reduced cost of care (non-feedback groups increased).
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The Evidence

• The consumer-driven, outcome-informed approach is being used with broad and diverse group of adults, youth, and children in agencies and treatment settings around the world including:
  • Inpatient
  • Outpatient
  • Residential
  • Prison-based (mandated care)
  • Case management

Center for Family Service in Palm Beach County, Florida:

- Struggled with limited resources, more requests for services than capacity, competing demands from stakeholders, lengthy episodes of care, and high no show and attrition rates.

- Average length of stay decreased more than 40%, cancellation and no-show rates dropped by 40 and 25%, and the percentage of clients in long-term treatment that experienced little or no measured improvement fell by 80%!

Transforming Care

• Community Health and Counseling Services in Bangor, Maine:
  
  • Consumers traditionally characterized as “severely and persistently mentally ill”;
  
  • No-show and cancellation rates reduced by 30%, average length of stay decreased by 59%, need for long-term, ongoing support in the form of either residential treatment or case management dropped by 50% and 72% (2 years to 6 months)—all this while consumer satisfaction with services markedly improved.

“The devil is in the details…”
Transforming Care: Changing Systems

Getting from “here” to “there”

TURN 180

Clinical
Administrative
Info/Doc/IT
Regulatory/Accreditation
Consumers
Funders
A Case Example

• Founded in 1961 as an “Information and Referral Service;
• Gradually added services:
  • 24/7/365 Detox Center
  • Halfway Houses
  • IOP
  • Assessment
  • Inpatient
  • Extended Care
• Now the third largest provider of substance abuse services in the state of Minnesota.
A Case Example

The Original Model Used at the CADT:

- Diagnosis-driven;
- Fixed program and lengths of stay;
- Fixed “one size fits all” treatment plans;
- 12 Step and A.A. orientation.
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“Tipping Points”

- In the mid-1990’s insurance companies and licensure started to demand evidence of individualized treatment and outcomes;
- Difficulty with prior authorization process managed care reducing days of care;
- 50% or greater client drop out rate;
- Low reimbursement.

- Assessments often did not relate to client service;
- Clinical staff took an insular and defensive stance to change;
- Clinical staff did not know how to identify clients early in treatment who were likely to leave or have a poor outcome.
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Characteristics of Successful Agencies and Treatment Systems

PHASE ONE:

1. Exposure of all front line clinicians to the basic ideas and elements of practice;
2. Administration that understands the ideas and elements, has vision of and 3-year commitment to system change;
3. Creation of a “transition oversight group” with clear line of authority and reporting responsibility;
4. Implementation of a “bottom up” pilot project;
Systems Change: Changing Systems

- Reform basic philosophy of CADT from “program-driven” to a service-delivery system:
  - Made consumer motivation and outcome central;
  - Organized services around consumer desires and outcomes;
  - Consumer as partner rather than patient.
- Formed a “transition oversight group.”
- Instituted a “bottom up” pilot project.

- Agency goals and objectives:
  - Improve client retention, completion rates;
  - Individualized treatment/service plans;
  - Link paperwork to service;
  - Be able to measure success rates;
  - Develop clinical supervision mechanisms that were objective and related to client service;
  - Improve the agency “bottom line.”
Systems Change: Changing Systems

Challenges

- Paperwork and IT system:
  - Intake;
  - Assessment;
  - Treatment planning;
  - Service documentation;

- During the pilot, clinicians reported to the transition oversight group:
  - Conflicts between CDOI and documentation;
  - Paperwork & IT needs.
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Challenges

• **Clinical and programmatic:**
  • **Operations:**
    - Most services were delivered in groups;
  • **Content**
  • **Supervision**
  • **Training**
• During the pilot, clinicians reported to the transition oversight group:
  • Conflicts between CDOI and service content, mode of delivery;
• Training and supervision needs.
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Solutions

• In addition to strong administrative support, regular meetings between pilot clinicians and TOG and TOG with administration:
  • Routine continuing education of all staff in CDOI;
  • Ongoing telephonic and onsite training, consultation, and support.
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Characteristics of Successful Agencies and Treatment Systems

PHASE TWO:

1. Integration of pilot project findings into agency policy and procedure;
   a. Systematic program including training, manuals, routine outcome consultation.
   b. Development and standardization of “continuum of care.”
   c. Clear strategies for ineffective treatment, therapists, programs.
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Systemic Effect from Attrition of Below Average Counselors
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Challenges

Agency Aggregate Effect Size

Percentage of Original Below Average Counselors to Overall Staff


0.30 0.58 0.74 0.82

22.0% 10.0% 6.7% 4.3%
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Characteristics of Successful Agencies and Treatment Systems

PHASE TWO (cont):

2. System wide implementation;
3. Development of program and system-specific norms;
4. Launch of automated outcome tracking and feedback system;
5. Ongoing on-site and telephonic consultation throughout.
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The “Results”

• Between 2002-2006, C.A.D.T.:
  • Significantly improved retention and success rates;
  • Streamlined service delivery;
  • Reduced paperwork;
  • Significantly increased revenue and cash flow.
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The “Results”

- Improved retention rates:
  - 50% or less with old model;
  - 82% with CDOI.
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The “Results” on Cost of Inpatient and OP Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CADT</th>
<th>All Prgrms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completers</td>
<td>6036</td>
<td>9979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/Completer</td>
<td>2945</td>
<td>4694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Clients</td>
<td>5380</td>
<td>8474</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CADT</th>
<th>All Prgrms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>2385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/Complete</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>1263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Clients</td>
<td>1489</td>
<td>2385</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The “Results” on Revenue and Funding

- Adopting CDOI forced changes throughout the agency:
  - Billing;
  - Intake/Admission Procedures;
  - Data Collection Systems;
  - Staff Training
- The changes caused some public relation issues:
  - Funders were very supportive;
  - Probation/Corrections did not like the changes;
  - Some conflicts with social service agencies arose around differing perceptions as to client treatment strategies.
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