

STRATEGIC PLANNING WORK GROUP EVALUATION:

Community Integration/Service Reform 3/18/2013

99 participants, 78 evaluations returned

Please rate your level of agreement on whether the outcomes for this day of working groups were attained.

5 – strongly agree
 4 – agree
 3 – neither agree nor disagree
 2 – disagree
 1 – disagree strongly

1. The purpose of the day was clearly presented	28	32	4		
2. I understood what the goals of the day were.	24	28	10	1	
3. Those goals were accomplished.	14	29	15	1	
4. Directions for activities were clear.	30	32	9	1	
5. I was comfortable contributing.	34	29	1		
6. I thought I was part of a process that would bring about change.	20	30	11	6	
7. Flow of the day was smooth.	27	33	7		
8. Format was effective for the task (small group, lecture, large group, etc.)	29	7	10	1	
9. Facilitation was effective.	33	21	6		
10. The room and amenities were conducive to learning (if applicable.)	23	22	8	2	1
11. The delivery method was appropriate.	25	25	6	1	

12. What was the most valuable thing about today, and why?

Networking and sharing.

To think about how I, as a provider, can provide better, more efficient services.

Bringing in participation from all different backgrounds.

Full participation of all stakeholders.

Small group work because I learned about the addiction side.

Able to interact with other providers and stakeholders & see different thought process.

Opportunity to have various perspectives come together.

The consumers who spoke.

Seeing different perspectives on the problems with different agencies and levels.

All the different providers brainstorming together.

Talking openly and honestly about the real issues we as providers deal with.

Working with people from other agencies, brainstorming & sharing experiences – wisdom.

Being in a group was inclusive.

Meeting with the providers at my table. Networking.

Understanding the thought process of the Division.

Willingness of the Division to listen.

Our feedback.
Better services.
Goals were good.
Hearing a lot of ideas and meeting people.
The decision making process appears useful.
Getting professionals to communicate concerns & recommendations (statewide.)
Small groups.
Opened the needs of the mental health world to those of us in the addictions world.
Listening to many viewpoints.
This was a lot to cover in one day but it was well organized and very productive! It was great to discuss with other people in other areas of service to gain perspective.
Appreciate the opportunity to give feedback.
We are all part of the change process.
Ability to contribute and feel that the feedback would be used in a strategic planning process.
I was able to see where the Division is and what it values.
The idea of including local experts to secure their input into the DMHAS strategic plan.
Being able to be a part of something that could possibly help improve the system by helping consumers.
Well thought out and well organized.
Being able to give my input and decide what I thought was most important.
Meeting Harry Reyes. Ability to express concerns and thoughts. Facilitators were excellent.

13. What was of least value to you and why?

Lunch broke the concentration.
Too much repetition of ideas; not enough focus.
Too many providers.
Lack of understanding of higher structure within the Division.
The misappropriation of "community integration."
Outcome. Not sure it was effective to open the day with sort of a wish list. Much of what was discussed will not be possible because of regulations, willing structure and the coming realities.
Hard to hear in a large group.
More time to explain the groups results. It was more like hearing a laundry list.
Myself! I couldn't grasp it all. The information was great but overwhelmed me.
Get the scribe to write bigger.
Direction for small group activity was vague.
Lack of background/orientation
Parking.
All of it was valuable – would have liked to hear more about what will be done with the info, but maybe e-mail could fix that?
Length of time.
It should have been made clear to bring your own lunch.
Narrow the questions down to 3.

14. Please add suggestions for improvement:

Keep doing better as you strive to provide services in the community.

Check in at front door was TOO slow especially considering the temperature. We need another plan if twice as many people are coming next time.

Acoustics in the space not conducive to activity planned.

Our group was mainly addictions – would have been nice to have a better mix in groups.

Should move faster and be half day.

Don't hold at a state hospital.

Clearer language of services (too many abbreviations of programs.)

Make it a 2-3 day session, really need time to discuss issues

Review of pending issues – Medicaid waiver, white paper on Behavioral Health Homes, ASO, CSS regs to set the stage for what we will be working through.

More clarity with prioritization process.

Free food!

Focus us sooner.

Please, please, please keep us informed of how (if?) the information gets used and what the process will be.

More comprehensive overview.

Let us know how our information will be used for systems change.

Feedback loop to ensure that process continues.

More balance of consumers at the tables.

Clear explanation for the small group process.

Notification regard restriction, substantial walk to get to the facility, availability of food for purchase.

Put the subjects in order.

Recommendation with the invite for who should attend.

Start on time.

Complete in this order: Barriers – strengths – action steps – outcomes.

Parking was a challenge & it wasn't clear that there was a shuttle to bring participants "up the hill."

For the issues and circumstances it was fine, however there seems to be a sense among some at table that there are divergent ideas about what the DAS and MH communities receive in terms of service. It might help to understand the "parity" or not of covered services for each subset/subgroup of behavioral health. * and get some sense of how each subprovider discipline can teach the other of what those needs are and how we can all reach them to provide the best possibility of meeting needs.

Have all groups post their outcomes and have the groups rotate through them rather than give report to large group. Especially after lunch.

Question for group two was confusing.

Fee structure (Must Medicaid)

15. Please add additional comments:

Enjoyed the leadership of Kathi and Harry!

Many presentations were about issues that are the focus of the other two forums.

Should use exact wording of consumers, not changing to 'system' or 'provider' words.

Free coffee/tea :)

Be clearer in topic descriptions – very little of this was addressed.

How to get individuals more engaged in communities of choice.

More enthusiastic.

Good start.

The day was well planned and the process of working with the providers gives a better perspective on how to make the two systems operate collaboratively.

Thank you for the opportunity to be involved in the merger process.

Great job! We might use this process at a local level. (county) Thank you!

Make sure your strategic plans use this work & reconvene group to read the draft plan.

Not convinced this information will be used for change.

I thought the format was well balanced and allowed for broad base participation

Thank you for the opportunity to have my voice heard.

It was very informative.

Good meeting.

Senior management appears to be missing from DMHAS.

Please send a copy of the completed Strategic Plan to all who participated.

Nice job. I know now what to expect and how to move my own organization forward in preparation for the future.

I would appreciate allowing for additional comments on website.

Put the top 10 priorities on Survey Monkey and have community input for those who could not attend.

I wonder if this process will actually result in a Strategic Plan that reflects the thought of the participants.

How many consumers actually were advised that this process is being utilized?

Thank you and it was a positive experience for me!

Trust in Addiction

Looking forward to the next round of meetings!

Very well run, looking forward to the next segments

State staff should be separate from providers/consumers