

Evaluation Of The IHC Initiative For The Hogg Foundation For Mental Health

✓
✓
✓

Brenda Coleman-Beattie
Richard G. Frank
Howard H. Goldman

Evaluation Team

- **Richard G. Frank;** Health economist, specializes in mental health issues and links with primary care
- **Brenda Coleman-Beattie;** Has held executive positions in managed care, mental health provider organizations, evaluated adoption of evidence based practices and system transformations
- **Howard H. Goldman;** Psychiatrist who has led major evaluations of innovative program in mental health; including RWJ 9 Cities

Aims of the Evaluation

- Three Main Aims
 - To perform a formative evaluation, which provides timely and targeted information to demonstration organizations to enable mid-course corrections
 - To offer an assessment of the IHC approach and to offer lessons on implementing this for other health care organizations in Texas
 - To derive some broad lessons for the larger field that is interested in bringing more mental health care into primary care settings

Evaluative Philosophy

- Establishing working relationships with all participants
 - Required by aim to give feedback
 - Data collection and local expertise are critical
- Balancing practical concerns with desire for rigor in design
 - Data collection
 - Comparisons
- Use of qualitative and quantitative approaches to assessment
 - Interviews about management and processes
 - Use of clinical, services and economic data

Key Collaborative Choices

- What measures of mental health status to use?
 - How often should these be measured?
- What information on services used by patients are routinely collected and what else needs to be collected?
 - Is there a need to obtain data about other providers?
- What is the best way to obtain cost information?
- Who should be interviewed in each organization to best track implementation process?

Collecting Clinical Information

- Characterizing the population at baseline
- Tracking clinical change and progress
- Desire to use well known –well validated measures
- Practical considerations
 - Clinical heterogeneity of conditions to be treated
 - Focus on symptoms and function
 - Minimization of burden on all parties

Collaborative Decision-Making

- Develop A Learning Community
- Designing Projects Together
- Formative Evaluation
- Constructive Feedback

Collaborative Design

- Intervention Design
- Evaluation Design
- Instrument Selection
- Data Collection Procedures

Instrument Selection

- Diagnostic instruments (e.g. PHQ-9)
- Diagnosis specific instruments
 - Beck for depression in adults
 - Conners for ADHD in children
- Broad symptom measures
 - Brief Symptom Inventory for adults
 - Child Behavior Checklist

Measures of Functioning

- **Social Functioning**
 - Global Assessment Scale
 - Global Assessment Scale for Children
- **Workplace Functioning**
- **School Functioning**

Management and Implementation

- Success in dissemination frequently involves the method by which innovations are introduced and supported within an organization
- Understanding implementation typically involves complicated arrangements that are not easily captured in simple quantitative measures
- Interviews and site visits are frequently very revealing; offering insights to visitors and visited alike

Evaluation Process

- Uniform on-site interview protocol tool to facilitate interviews about management and processes
- Schedule on-site visit to gather specific grantee information, which will include:
 - ✓ an overview of the health care delivery system
 - ✓ the organizational operational infrastructure (e.g., financial and technology mechanisms and systems)
 - ✓ available and accessible clinical and services data
 - ✓ implementation plan familiarity
 - ✓ clinic(s) site selection and dispersion process
 - ✓ workforce selection (structure)
 - ✓ initiative orientation plans for staff prior to grantee training

Communication Process

- Mutually determine the most effective communication manner for evaluators and grantees and appropriate contacts during the evaluation process
- Provide periodic review of evaluative narratives to grantees for comment and review of *factual* statements

Submission of Interval Data to Evaluators

- Quarterly reporting of service utilization, billing, and reimbursement data
- Hogg Foundation and Grantee agreement reporting timeframes
 - August 1, November 1, February 1, April, May, etc.
- Reporting format to be developed in collaboration with grantees after initial site visit and follow-up discussions

Use of Evaluative Feedback for IHC Project Success

- Provide grantees with timely information that can facilitate mid-course corrections
- Qualitative and quantitative data to hone in on facilitators and barriers to implementation
- Questions for grantees:
 - How will you use the data to identify the project facilitators and barriers (who will do this, when, how)?
 - What (and who) will be the mechanism for developing the plan to address and the timing thereof?
 - What will be the mechanism to implement to the plan of action and to monitor the progress?

Questions for the Evaluators

