

ADHS Provider Response to SAMHSA Fidelity Review

Complete the following form in response to the SAMHSA fidelity review process conducted by ADHS behavioral health staff.

Date: 7/29/15
Name and contact information of provider: Child & Family Support Services Sarah Piano, Director of Quality Management, sarahp@cfssinc.com , 480-237-6837 Kristin Grimsrud, Program Director, kristing@cfssinc.com , 480-237-6829

Type of evidence-based practice provider (select one):	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Permanent Supportive Housing
<input type="checkbox"/>	Supported Employment
<input type="checkbox"/>	Consumer Operated Services
<input type="checkbox"/>	Assertive Community Treatment

What was your experience with the fidelity review conducted at your agency?

The reviewers were knowledgeable and thorough in their explanation of the review process as well as the fidelity tool. They gave clear expectations of what the day would look like and they followed this structure, making it much easier for us to ensure that participants were available when needed. They also made all participants feel comfortable with the process.

It was disconcerting to be reviewed on a model of supported housing that, thus far, is not within our contracted scope. It was stated by the fidelity team during the follow-up phone call that if what is contractually expected of us remains the same, we will continue to score poorly in several areas of this tool.

It was encouraging to receive feedback from the team that many areas of internal focus have been met with much success, including relationships with the young adults being supported, recovery focus, individualized services, and quality documentation that would be understandable to the individuals if they were to request their record.

What was most helpful about the fidelity review process for your agency?

The reviewers approach to the process was incredibly helpful. They were personable, took their time, and were patient when extra clarification was needed.

The follow-up phone call was also incredibly helpful. We were able to talk through the challenges with this tool being applied to how our services are contractually designed. We were also able to gain clarification from both the reviewers and MMIC that we are meeting the expectations that have been set regarding our services, although this conflicts with some of the expectations being reviewed as part of this fidelity tool. It was also helpful to be able to talk through some of the recommendations to better understand their intent and how we may be able to implement them.

What suggestions would improve the review process?

While MMIC has expressed that this review is being used to gauge a baseline of the system, the review process indicated that the deficiencies were the responsibility of the provider. It would be beneficial for the review to separate out what is the responsibility of the provider, the leasing company, the case management agency, and the RBHA, and if the scores were reflective of this separation.

Comments from your agency regarding the findings of the review and/or the fidelity report:

CFSS is excited about the opportunities ahead as the system moves to align with this model. Several of the recommendations that were made would require a different service model than we are currently contracted to provide. For example, it was recommended that CFSS learn from its scattered site model that is being utilized in the northern Arizona region; CFSS is looking forward to scattered site service opportunities increasing in Maricopa County.

CFSS intends to modify some of its administrative processes to better support this model and fidelity review.



