

Quality Assurance Annual Report, State Fiscal Year 2007

For the period of July 1, 2006 - June 30, 2007

Your Human Resource Center

of Wayne and Holmes Counties, Ohio

(Abridged version for the World Wide Web)

Respectfully submitted,

Mathew Musgrave, LISW
Quality Assurance Specialist
qualityassurance@yhrc.org

Table of Contents

I.	Quality Assurance Program.....	3-4
II.	New Client Enrollment	
	A. Referral Sources.....	5
	B. Access To Services.....	6
	D. Residence Location.....	7
	E. Mean Educational Level.....	8
III.	Client Satisfaction	8-9
IV.	Referral Source Satisfaction	9-11
V.	Employee Satisfaction	11 A-H

Quality Assurance Program

Quality Assurance activities are those focused on improving all services the agency provides to clients, and include: clinical assessment and counseling, case management, supportive and administrative, and financial.

To accomplish this mission, different record samples are monitored and reviewed on a regular basis i.e. monthly, quarterly, and annually to accurately identify trends and events impacting agency services. These reviews are designed according to the agency's Quality Assurance Plan to be comprehensive, representative, and reliable for the areas measured. Data collection and analysis are guided by principles of continuing quality improvement (CQI), plan-do-study-act (PDSA), and other similar quality models.

Primary among these review activities are:

Peer Review

A committee is convened monthly to review a randomly-selected, predetermined quantity sample of records for determining the quality of services delivered to clients are consistent with evidenced-based, clinical best practices. Records are reviewed in the service phases of assessment, counseling, and interagency/transfer. Standards applied originate in certification and accreditation bodies as well as the organization's internal standards.

Utilization Review

This committee is convened monthly to review a randomly-selected, predetermined quantity sample of records for establishing validation of service need and efficacy in admission, continuing stay, and termination phases of services. Standards applied originate in certification and accreditation bodies as well as the organization's internal standards.

Completeness of Record Review

This committee is comprised of four reviewers who review monthly a randomly-selected, predetermined quantity sample of records for establishing that records contain required and completed elements in the admission and termination phases of services. Standards applied originate in certification and accreditation bodies, as well as the organization's internal standards.

Fiscal Reviews

This committee is convened monthly to review a randomly-selected, predetermined quantity sample of records for conformance to principles of fiscal compliance and accounting, including record Progress Note matching services rendered, costs, and dates billed; note legibility and completeness; and accounts outstanding. Standards applied originate in certification and accreditation bodies, and Medicaid and third-party payer requirements.

Physical Plant and Safety Review

This committee is convened monthly to review physical and safety issues at the respective four agency sites. Site safety and first aid resources monthly checks, compliance with quarterly fire and tornado drills, and general maintenance issues are reviewed. Standards applied originate in certification and accreditation bodies, insurance requirements and state fire/safety laws.

Other service audits and reviews are conducted throughout the year as indicated and required. These include service outcome reviews applying selected national outcome measures (NOMS), client satisfaction, and referral source satisfaction.

Additional information may be requested from Mathew Musgrave, Quality Assurance Specialist, at qualityassurance@yhrc.org or by calling 330-264-9597.

NEW CLIENT ENROLLMENTS: Referral Sources
 State Fiscal Year 2007: Your Human Resource Center

Referral Source	SFY 2006		SFY 2007	
	n	%	n	%
Self	166	16	108	11
Unknown*	26	2	14	1
Attorney	24	2	15	1
Wayne County Adult Probation	3	<1	4	<1
Wayne County Municipal Court	234	22	231	23
Wayne County Municipal Court: Home Arrest	10	1	9	1
Wayne County DJFS - Work First Training	160	15	142	14
Wayne County Common Pleas Court	32	3	51	5
Wayne County Juvenile Court	109	10	147	14
Holmes County Municipal Court	8	1	3	<1
Holmes County Juvenile Court	22	2	22	2
Holmes County Common Pleas Court	3	<1	0	0
Holmes County Adult Probation	49	5	35	3
Ohio Adult Parole Authority	18	2	18	2
Ohio Dept. of Youth Services	0	0	1	<1
Ohio county courts outside Wayne-Holmes	32	3	37	4
Other Wayne-Holmes Municipal Courts	N/A	N/A	25	2
Wayne County DJFS [non-Work First]	8	1	2	<1
Wayne County Children Services Board	39	4	28	3
Holmes County Job and Family Services	4	<1	2	<1
Holmes County DJFS - Children Services Unit	6	<1	9	1
Project Stay	6	<1	0	0
Ohio CSBs outside Wayne-Holmes	N/A	N/A	6	1
MHR Board of Wayne-Holmes Counties	2	<1	0	0
Ohio Rehabilitation Commission	0	0	0	0
High Schools of Wayne-Holmes Counties	2	<1	8	1
Christian Children's Home of Ohio	3	<1	10	1
Dr. Radwan/ Other physicians	14/0	1	4 / 0	<1
STEPS	10	1	2	<1
The Counseling Center of W-H Counties	4	<1	3	<1
Employers	10	1	4	<1
Source One Group	8	1	11	1
Family	16	2	8	1
EAP	10	1	12	1
Friends	6	<1	0	0
All Other Sources	0	0	32	3
Total	1044	100%	1003*	100%

Access To Services

For SFY 2007, monitoring of routine Initial Client Contacts (Enrollments) was provided on an ongoing basis per the XAKTsoft database report Program Enrollment SAI/DUI/Indigent [enrollees seen at Goodwill/Work First Training Program are excluded].

For these routine [non-crisis] contacts, the respective days elapsed – from the date the client initially contacted the agency to the date of the first appointment offered – were calculated for determining the average (mean) service admission interval (in days).

Accordingly, the Mean Service Admission Interval (average elapsed time in days between the client’s initial contact and first appointment offered) for new, routine client enrollments’ in SFY 2007 was a mean of 5.6 days [2006 Service Admission Interval was 5.3 days].

The relatively low admission interval sustained over the last year continues to support the value of an initiative in the Wooster office of centralizing scheduling of new clients’ Diagnostic Assessments with one clinician. Additionally, service hours have been expanded at Rittman and Orrville during 2007.

Best practice research supports that prompt initial appointment scheduling (access) – within 24 to 48 hours after first contact – minimizes first appointment no-show rates.

Efforts will continue in SFY 2008 to monitor all routine, new client enrollment admission intervals to identify opportunities for continued reduction in this indicator. Implementation of electronic same-day scheduling with XAKTsoft system software for Wooster, Millersburg, and Rittman is anticipated when the software is perfected – this is anticipated for SFY 2008. The noted three offices are now connected per the Internet, and centralized scheduling is expected to result in an “any time” monitoring of this indicator for additional efficiencies.

Age Range of New Enrollments: SFY 2007

Age Range	n	%
Under 5	2	<1
5-10	6	1
11-17	178	18
18-20	176	18
21-34	388	39
35-54	218	22
55-59	13	1
60+	12	1
Unknown	1	<1
Total (N)	994	100%

New Client Enrollment : Client Residence Location
 State Fiscal Year 2007
 Your Human Resource Center

Location	SFY 2006		SFY 2007	
	n	%	n	%
Wooster	387	39	335	34
Millersburg	87	9	92	9
Rittman	74	7	117	12
Orrville	108	11	127	13
West Salem	29	3	21	2
In Ohio, but outside of Wayne/Holmes Counties	49	5	35	4
Outside of Ohio	0	0	0	0
Apple Creek	26	3	19	2
Baltic	2	<1	0	0
Berlin	3	<1	3	<1
Big Prairie	12	1	5	1
Burbank	8	1	5	1
Creston	23	2	26	3
Dalton	17	2	20	2
Doylestown	39	4	41	4
Fredericksburg	8	1	10	1
Glenmont	15	1	14	1
Holmesville	11	1	4	<1
Jeromesville	0	0	0	0
Kidron	2	<1	0	0
Killbuck	32	3	26	3
Lakeville	15	1	12	1
Loudonville	5	<1	3	<1
Marshallville	17	2	16	2
Nashville	2	<1	4	<1
Shreve	21	2	28	3
Smithville	9	1	19	2
Sterling	9	1	12	1
Wilmot	0	0	0	0
Walnut Creek	0	0	1	<1
TOTAL	1003	100%	994	100%

New Client Enrollment - Mean Educational Level

For new clients enrolled in State Fiscal Year 2007, the Mean Educational Level Attained is 11.1 years – this data and the accompanying mean is extracted from the Behavioral Health enrollment database.

Education Years Completed	Percentage (%) of All Enrollments In SFY 2007
13 Years +	11.84 %
12 Years	40.13 %
9-11 Years	29.45 %
8 Years	7.60 %
7 Years or Less	10.97 %
Unknown	0
TOTAL	100 %

CLIENT GRIEVANCES

There were no client grievances filed with the agency in State Fiscal Year 2007

CLIENT SATISFACTION SURVEYS

During State Fiscal Year 2007 client satisfaction surveys were distributed in the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th Quarters. A total of 335 clients were surveyed in the four quarterly surveys with the three survey types.

For the 135 clients participating in the Form Two – Exit surveys [three or more service visits and exiting services], 114 of 132 (86%) who responded rated the “Overall Quality of Care and Service” [item #13] of YHRC as between “Very Good – Excellent”.

For the Form Two item “Would you or family members return to YHRC if treatment was needed in the future?” [item #11], 104 of 133 (73%) clients responding to Exit Surveys [terminating services] rated as “Very Good – Excellent” their preference to return to YHRC.

In rating their response to the question: “Would you refer others to YHRC?” [item #10], 99 of 132 (75%) of these same Form Two Exit clients rated this prospect as “Very Good – Excellent.”

Form Two Exit clients viewed the value and quality of service through the question of “How well do you feel your counseling needs are being met?” [item #7], and 106 of 129 (82%) rated their response as “Very Good – Excellent.”

For clients responding to the Form One survey [two or less service visits], item #10 asked “Were there any barriers in getting services?” – and 71 of 76 responding (93%) responded “No”.

Form One respondents were asked by item # 2: “How would you rate the way you were greeted by staff the first time you called?” – 58 of 75 (77%) rated their response in the “Very Good – Excellent” range.

And, in response to the question of item #3: “How would you rate how fast you were able to set up your first appointment?” – 60 of 75 (80%) answered in the “Very Good – Excellent” range.

For item # 4: “How would you rate being able to get an appointment that fit your schedule?” 59 of 75 (79%) responding rated this issue in the “Very Good – Excellent” range.

For clients from both the Form One and Form Two surveys responding to the item: “Are you satisfied that your service providers were culturally aware and/or competent?” [items #12 and #15, respectively]. Accordingly, 274 of 283 (97%) responded “Yes”.

In regard to computer access and usage, 205 of 330 (62%) of the combined Form One and Form Two clients surveyed responded that they have weekly access to a computer; and 185 of 317 (58%) of these same Form One and Form Two respondents indicated they use the Internet.

These survey results indicate that YHRC continues to provide a very high quality of service as perceived by clients – the majority of whom are involuntary referrals – to the extent that consumers are positive in endorsing referral of others to the agency, and they/family members would return for service if needing it in the future.

Service delivery continues to be perceived as accessible, timely, convenient to their schedule, clinically effective and culturally competent. Consumers perceive very few barriers to obtaining service, and transportation is the most frequently cited barrier when one is identified. The majority of consumers have access to a computer on a regular basis, as well as the skills to use it. The Internet plays an increasing role in client lives, and the technical skills and use of this media has become a significant trait of the population served.

REFERRAL SOURCE SATISFACTION SURVEY – SFY 2007

A Referral Source Satisfaction Survey is conducted annually, and is typically distributed in the Fourth Quarter of the state fiscal year.

Accordingly, this survey was mailed on June 1, 2007 per postal service mail to 60 primary referral sources of Your Human resource Center – county and municipal courts, social service agencies, private practitioners, etc. A return date of June 13 was established for receipt of all responses, with

the vast majority of responses received by that date. To allow for late responses, aggregation of data was undertaken and completed in August, 2007.

Of the 60 total (N) surveys mailed, 29 (n) were returned, this resulting in a return rate of 48% – a very good return rate for as mail survey. While the wording of the survey’s salutation and closing changed slightly from the SFY 2006 instrument, the wording of survey items on the SFY 2007 remained unchanged.

The following chart presents the aggregated survey data, and the accompanying Findings and Analysis provides interpretive conclusions and recommendations.

Findings and Analysis

As noted, this survey was distributed on June 1, 2007 to 60 referral sources in Wayne, Holmes, and several contiguous counties.

Twenty-nine (29) of 60, or 48% of the surveys were returned – this relatively high return rate for a mail survey strongly supports generalizing the results to all referral sources.

Respondents from the community sectors represent the majority of the large annual referral sources for Your Human Resource Center (YHRC) e.g. municipal and juvenile court staffs, judges, and other social service agencies predominated in the return responses – several noted referral quantity in the 30+ range, and three additional sources noted quantities in the 70+ range.

Accordingly, the mean referral quantity was at the 11+ referrals annually category. Respondent history is likely to be typical for interaction with YHRC services as opposed to respondents limited to making only one or two referrals annually.

Respondents found the referral process for YHRC to be straightforward and without difficulty; the mean rating of respondents regarding the referral process was a 4.6 out of 5 – the range of ratings extended from a rating of 5 = “Easy” to a rating of 1= “Difficult”.

It is worth noting that the rating achieved for this item is exactly the same as was achieved in the SFY 2006 Referral Source Satisfaction survey.

As in surveys of previous years, respondents in SFY 2007 very strongly supported YHRC as responsive to requests for program services information when requested, resulting in a cumulative rating of 95% “Yes.”

Even higher ratings were achieved per referred clients being seen in a timely manner, rated at 100% “Yes”, and referral source receipt of timely client assessment and/or progress reports was also rated at 100% “Yes.”

For all respondents, 92% of respondents felt that reports furnished by YHRC staff were relevant and adequate for the referral sources needs. This item was rated at 86% in the SFY 2006 survey, and has exhibited some improvement over the last year.

For the survey item asking respondents as to whether their clients experienced any problems in obtaining services at YHRC – respondents stated “No” at a 96% level.

For the item asking respondents for any recommendations to improve the quality or coordination of services, 95% stated “No”.

Suggestions for improving service included the following:

“[Reports are] not always consistent in reporting dates of service and recommendations”

“[For] sexual offender assessments ...an indicator(s) of likelihood to re-offend is desirable”

“[Wayne County Municipal Court] Probation Department would request [that] termination letters [be sent] in a more timely manner”

“[Reports to Wayne County Municipal Court] are often too brief”

“Excellent service and care”

While none of the respondents requested a meeting to resolve any of these concerns, all suggestions for improvement were reviewed with management. If improvement needs are identified as widespread and significant, quality improvements will be instituted.

Management reviews clinical practice on an ongoing basis throughout the year to assure client reporting to referral sources is both adequate and consistent.

EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION SURVEY – SFY 2007

Based upon responses in the Employee Satisfaction Survey of SFY 2006, it was determined that incorporating additional items to measure organizational communication would be advisable.

Accordingly, management convened an employee committee to suggest changes in the employee survey, and those suggestions were included in a revised survey format utilized in SFY 2007 (see 2007 Employee Satisfaction Survey).

This survey was distributed to staff in mid-June, 2007 with a submission deadline of June 25th established for receipt of completed surveys.

Employee Satisfaction Survey: State Fiscal Year 2007

Your Human Resource Center Findings Summary – All Employees

n = 32 employees responding out of 38 (N)

Items	Responses							
	Very Satisfied					Very Dissatisfied	Blank	Mean
	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
1. Overall, I am satisfied with YHRC as an employer.	13	16	1	1			1	6.3
	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	No Opinion	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly		Blank	Mean
	5	4	3	2	1			
2. I have confidence in the management of YHRC.	16	14	1	1				4.4
3. I am sufficiently informed about corporate goals/objectives.	9	16	4	3				4.0
4. YHRC values employee initiative.	17	11	4					4.4
5. I feel valued by YHRC for my work.	16	9	3	3	1			4.1
6. YHRC provides recognition for work well done.	19	5	2	5	1			4.1
7. Agency-wide communications are timely.	8	9	3	11	1			3.4
8. Agency-wide communications are understandable.	11	12	2	7				3.8
9. Inter-department communications are timely.	10	14	4	4				3.9
10. Interdepartmental communications are understandable	12	13	4	3				4.1

	Agree Strongly	Agree Some-what	No Opinion	Disagree Some-what	Disa-gree Strongly			Blank	Mean
	5	4	3	2	1				
11. My supervisor communicates clearly.	20	6	2	4					4.3
12. My supervisor communicates in a timely manner	17	6	2	7					4.0
13. I feel safe at work.	24	4	2	1	1				4.5
14. I have adequate material and equipment to do my job.	22	6	1	3					4.5
15. My workload is realistic for the amount of time employed.	18	10	2	2					4.4
16. Deadlines assigned are consistent with time available.	14	14	2	2					4.3
17. My supervisor seeks my input for unit work issues.	14	13	2	2					4.2
18. My supervisor schedules regular staff meetings with my co-workers and me.	22	8	2						4.6
19. My supervisor treats me with fairness	22	8	2						4.6
20. My supervisor provides support when I need it.	21	10	1						4.6
21. My supervisor acts in a timely manner to introduce improvements in work procedures.	18	8	4	2					4.3
22 a. Satisfied with amount of annual leave	20	10	2						4.6
22 b. Satisfied with YHRC share of health costs	10	12	6	3			1		3.9
22 c. Satisfied with 401 (b) Plan	15	12	5						4.3
22 d. Satisfied with salary	8	17	3	4					3.9
Items #2-22 TOTAL Responses [768]	383	247	65	67	5			1	
Items #2-22 % of TOTAL	50%	32%	8%	9%	1%			<1%	
23. See attached									
24. See attached									
25. See attached									

Findings and Analysis

Introduction

The 2007 YHRC Employee Satisfaction Survey marks the first administration of a new survey instrument. While some items are the same or similar to previous years' survey items, a significant number of items are new. While every effort was made to develop survey items with strong validity and reliability, this year's findings will be carefully examined not just for the significance of the findings i.e. scores, but also to confirm validity and reliability of survey items are reflected in those responses.

It should be noted that 32 of 38 employees responded to the survey, resulting in a very high response rate of 84%. Accordingly, one can infer that the Findings – presuming existence of item validity and reliability – are generalizable to the organization as a whole.

Where validly possible, item score comparisons will be made to employee satisfaction results from State Fiscal Year 2006 to determine the respective positive or negative change.

Also new in the 2007 survey is that items are grouped in the following areas:

- Item #1..... Overall Satisfaction
- Item #2-3..... YHRC Leadership and Planning
- Item #4-6..... Corporate Environment
- Item #7-12..... Communications
- Item #13-16..... Work Conditions
- Item #17-21..... Immediate Supervision
- Item #22a-d; 23..... Benefits and Compensation
- Item #24 and 25..... Quality

Accordingly, the respective Findings are as follows:

Overall Satisfaction

Survey item #1 measured employees' overall satisfaction with YHRC; as such, results for this item can be considered the "barometer reading" i.e. one essential indicator for measuring how employees feel about their employment. Accordingly, employees responding rated YHRC at 6.3 of 7 (with 7 being Very Satisfied). This is a very high rating, and indicates strong employee satisfaction with the work place. *In the 2006 survey, a comparable item (On the whole, YHRC is a good place to work) achieved a 4.4 of 5 rating*

YHRC Leadership and Planning

Survey items #2 and #3 measured employees' opinions of YHRC's management leadership (#2) and employee perception of management's goals and objectives planning (#3).

For #2, a rating of 4.4 of 5 was achieved, indicative that employees have a very high level of confidence in the competence of corporate leadership.

The rating for #3, while lower at 4.0 of 5, is nevertheless fairly high. [In September, 2007 management intends to disseminate results of a recent employee-management 3-Year Agency Planning process, and the perception of satisfaction with this item will likely be elevated further.]

In 2006, a comparable to item # 3 (“The overall goals and objectives of this organization are communicated to staff”) was rated at 3.9 of 5.

Corporate Environment

Employee perception of the work environment was measured by employee responses to items 4-6. For item #4, a rating of 4.4 of 5 was achieved, for item #5 a rating of 4.1, and for #6 a rating of 4.1. The organization may be better served in 2008 by identifying additional opportunities to provide recognition for work well done [item #6] and thus improve employees’ perception of being valued by the organization [item # 5]. And, supervisors can be a key component of recognition as the survey findings support supervisors’ very positive bond with employees (see ratings for items #17-21).

Communications

Items #7-12 measure the perception of employee satisfaction regarding the quality and timeliness of agency communication. With 6 items in this respective category, it comprises the greatest single area of the survey, and this design is due in large part to the SFY 2006 survey noting the single greatest issue of dissatisfaction being relative to corporate communications.

For item #7, the timeliness of corporate-wide communications, a rating of 3.4 of 5 was achieved – this was the lowest rating of any item on the 2007 survey.

A higher rating was given to the clarity of corporate-wide communications [item #8] as it achieved a 3.8 of 5.

Item #9 measured timeliness of interdepartmental communications, and item #10 the clarity of interdepartmental communications. While they achieved ratings of 3.9 and 4.0 respectively, supervisors can employ strategies to improve these areas in 2008.

Reiteration of employee responsibility for seeking directive clarifications may well reduce employee expectations of “mind-reading” by supervisors, re-establishing the primary responsibility of employees to seek additional supervision rather than simply acquiescing to a weekly supervisory meeting.

Ratings of intra-department i.e. supervisory communications [items #11 and #12] were good at 4.3 and 4.0, respectively.

Work Conditions

Items # 13-16 measure employees' perception of working conditions. All of these items had relatively high ratings at 4.5, 4.5, and 4.4 respectively. *Item #13; "I feel safe at work" was also on the 2006 survey, and was rated at 4.5 at that time.* Thus, the perception of work place safety has remained stable in the last year. And, employees favorably support that work loads match time available [#15] and assigned deadlines match time available [#16].

Immediate Supervision

Items #17-21, comprising five items, is the second largest section of the survey, again based on SFY 2006 responses when many of the qualitative criticisms were linked with supervision issues.

Item #17 – supervisory solicitation of employee input on work issues – was rated a very adequate 4.2 of 5. *A comparable item on the 2006 survey ("I have sufficient input into decisions that affect my job") was rated a 3.6 of 5,* thus, one can infer significant improvement has taken place in this area.

Survey items #18, 19, 20, and 21 achieved ratings of 4.6, 4.6, 4.6, and 4.3, respectively. These ratings are very high.

For survey item #19, a comparable 2006 item ("I am satisfied with the way I am supervised") achieved a rating of 4.2 as compared to item #19's rating of 4.6 in 2007. This strongly suggests that a significant improvement has occurred regarding employee perceptions of their supervisor and supervision in general.

A 2006 survey item ("My supervisor provides clear direction, is supportive, and provides sufficient feedback about job performance") comparable to item # 20 was rated at 4.1 vs. the 2007 rating of 4.6 for item # 20.

This data, along with all other 2007 ratings for items #18-21, solidifies the significant improvement in employee perceptions of supervision in the last year.

Benefits and Compensation

Items # 22 a – d, and # 23 [qualitative data] comprise this section, and are intended to gauge employee satisfaction with pay and benefits.

Employees gave a very high, positive rating to the amount of annual leave made available [item #22-a], rating it at 4.6 of 5.

The items reflecting the least satisfaction in this category were in response to YHRC share of health care costs [#22-b] and salary compensation [item #22-d], both rated at 3.9 of 5.

Satisfaction with the corporate 401 (b) Plan [item 22-c] was rated at a relative high 4.3 of 5. For qualitative data item #23, a recurrent theme was consideration of adding dental care to the corporate health plan

Quality

Item #23 is designed to elicit improvement suggestions for the YHRC employee benefits package, and items # 24 and # 25 are designed to identify any themes regarding the major likes and dislikes regarding YHRC. Management will attempt to identify opportunities to ameliorate issues presented consistent with these three items.

These will be discussed by the management team and all will be addressed commensurate with their frequency and merit. YHRC managers will develop an action plan for 2008 to address improvements and will consider such things as supervisory meetings, reviewing benefits options/changes, revised communication protocols, training, quality circles, and policy (infrastructure) change.

[It should be noted that supervisory staff meet with employee work units either weekly or every two weeks, and an agency all staff meeting is convened monthly. Accordingly, an action plan will incorporate current meeting activities continuing at their same frequency for SFY 2008]