

## **The Independent Evaluation of the CMHS BG Program**

### **Estimates of Burden for the Collection of Information.**

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The OMB control number for this project is 0930-xxxx. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 60 minutes per survey, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to SAMHSA Reports Clearance Officer, 1 Choke Cherry Road, Room 7-1044, Rockville, Maryland, 20857.

Dear Regional Reviewer:

The Community Mental Health Services Block Grant (CMHS BG), funded by Congress to develop community-based systems of care for adults with serious mental illness and children with a serious emotional disturbance, is the largest Federal program dedicated to improving community mental health services. The sponsor of the program, the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration's Center for Mental Health Services, has contracted with Altarum to conduct an independent evaluation of this program.

We are soliciting feedback about the CMHS BG from key program stakeholders. As a Regional Reviewer, you have important insights and views about the intent, implementation, and impact of the CMHS BG in a number of States. We therefore would appreciate greatly your assistance with the evaluation by completing this survey. Most of the questions are closed-ended questions, where you will be asked to check the appropriate answer or answers. In addition, there are several open-ended questions, where you have the opportunity to comment. We urge you to be as honest and thoughtful as possible.

Please be assured that your answers will be strictly confidential. We will report responses to questions only in the aggregate, and we will never attribute specific comments to particular individuals. Your responses will not be used by the sponsoring organization to assess State compliance with the requirements and will not have any repercussions for any particular State; they will be used solely for the purposes of evaluating the CMHS BG as a whole.

Thank you very much for taking the time to participate.

**1a) Do the five criteria provide an adequate framework for States to describe their State mental health systems?**

- ☐ Yes  
☐ No

**1b) Please explain.**

---

---

---

---

---

**1c) Are there other criteria that could be helpful in developing States' plan?**

- ☐ Yes  
☐ No

**1d) If so, please discuss.**

---

---

---

---

---

### **Regional Review Process**

**2) How effective was the CMHS BG regional review process at assessing compliance with CMHS BG legislation in Fiscal Year (FY) 2005?**

- ☐ Very ineffective  
☐ Somewhat ineffective  
☐ Neither effective nor ineffective  
☐ Somewhat effective  
☐ Very effective  
☐ Cannot answer

**3a) Are you aware that an objective of the CMHS BG program is to promote Federal-State information exchange on States' mental health systems of care?**

- ☐ Yes  
☐ No  
☐ Cannot answer

**3b) How effective was the CMHS BG regional review process at generating Federal-State information exchange on States' mental health systems of care in FY 2005?**

- ☐ Very ineffective  
☐ Somewhat ineffective  
☐ Neither effective nor ineffective  
☐ Somewhat effective  
☐ Very effective  
☐ Cannot answer

**4a) How effective is feedback from the regional review panel in helping States to identify strengths and weaknesses of their State mental health system of care?**

- ☐ Very ineffective  
☐ Somewhat ineffective  
☐ Neither effective nor ineffective  
☐ Somewhat effective  
☐ Very effective  
☐ Cannot answer

**4b) Please discuss.**

---

---

---

---

---

**5a) How effective is feedback from the regional review panel in helping States to identify technical assistance (TA) needs regarding CMHS BG-related activities?**

- ☐ Very ineffective  
☐ Somewhat ineffective  
☐ Neither effective nor ineffective  
☐ Somewhat effective  
☐ Very effective  
☐ Cannot answer

**5b) Please discuss.**

---

---

---

---

---

**6a) For FY 2005, did you receive training about the regional review process?**

- ☐ Yes  
☐ No  
☐ Don't know

**6b) If so, how prepared did you feel following the training to perform your duties as a regional reviewer?**

- ☐ Not at all  
☐ A little  
☐ Somewhat  
☐ Very  
☐ Completely  
☐ Cannot answer

**7a) For FY 2005, did you receive training materials about the regional review process?**

- ☐ Yes  
☐ No  
☐ Don't know

**7b) If so, please rate how helpful these materials were in enabling you to understand your responsibilities as a reviewer.**

- ☐ Very unhelpful  
☐ Somewhat unhelpful  
☐ Neither helpful nor unhelpful  
☐ Somewhat helpful  
☐ Very helpful  
☐ Cannot answer

**8a) Are there any training materials or supplemental information that you did not receive that would have been helpful?**

- ☐ Yes  
☐ No  
☐ Don't know

**8b) If so, what are they?**

---

---

---

---

---

---

9a) Do you feel that the time allotted for the review of the CMHS BG applications is sufficient for a comprehensive review?

- ☐ Yes  
☐ No  
☐ Cannot answer

9b) If not, please discuss.

---

---

---

---

---

10) Please rate the extent to which you felt that your contributions to the FY 2005 CMHS BG application review process were valued by other members of the review panel.

- ☐ Not at all  
☐ A little  
☐ Somewhat  
☐ Very  
☐ Completely  
☐ Cannot answer

11) Please rate the extent to which you agree that each possible change listed below would improve the regional review process.

Potential change	Completely disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Somewhat agree	Completely agree	Cannot answer
Submit a joint CMHS BG application and implementation report on December 1						
Develop a more structured CMHS BG application in order to make it easier to review						
Review the CMHS BG application and previous year's implementation report simultaneously						
Formally identify State TA needs as part of the regional review						

Potential change	Completely disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Somewhat agree	Completely agree	Cannot answer
Utilize technology to determine CMHS BG compliance prior to the onsite regional review						
Create a regional partnership program to promote opportunities for inter-State information exchange						
Provide separate TA to States and reviewers on developing appropriate performance indicators						
Provide TA on developing the CMHS BG plan and submitting National Outcome Measures						
Provide TA on developing the CMHS BG plan and submitting evidence-based practices						

Other (please describe)

---



---



---

**12) What are the strengths of the regional review process?**

---



---



---



---



---

**13) What are the weaknesses of regional review process?**

---



---



---



---



---

**14a) Are there any unintended positive results of the regional review process?**

- ☐ Yes  
☐ No  
☐ Don't know

**14b) If so, what are they?**

---

---

---

---

**15a) Are there any unintended negative results of the regional review process?**

- ☐ Yes  
☐ No  
☐ Don't know

**15b) If so, what are they?**

---

---

---

---

#### **Implementation Report Review Process**

**16) How effective is the implementation report review process at assessing compliance with States' CMHS BG State Plan?**

- ☐ Very ineffective  
☐ Somewhat ineffective  
☐ Neither effective nor ineffective  
☐ Somewhat effective  
☐ Very effective  
☐ Cannot answer

**17a) For FY 2005, did you receive training about the implementation report review process?**

- ☐ Yes  
☐ No  
☐ Don't know

**17b) If yes, how prepared did you feel following the training to perform your duties with regard to reviewing State implementation reports?**

- ☐ Not at all
- ☐ A little
- ☐ Somewhat
- ☐ Very
- ☐ Completely
- ☐ Cannot answer

**18a) For FY 2005, did you receive training materials about the implementation report review process?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Don't know

**18b) If so, please rate how helpful these materials were in enabling you to understand how to review State implementation reports.**

- ☐ Very unhelpful
- ☐ Somewhat unhelpful
- ☐ Neither helpful nor unhelpful
- ☐ Somewhat helpful
- ☐ Very helpful
- ☐ Cannot answer

**19a) Do you have recommendations for improving the training that reviewers receive?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Don't know

**19b) If so, what are they?**

---

---

---

---

---

**20a) Do you think the time allotted for the review of the implementation reports is sufficient for a comprehensive review?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Cannot answer



**20b) If not, please discuss.**

---

---

---

---

---

**21) What are the strengths of the process for reviewing the implementation report?**

---

---

---

---

---

**22) What are the weaknesses of the process for reviewing the implementation report?**

---

---

---

---

---

**23a) Do you have recommendations for improving the process of reviewing States' implementation reports?**

- ☐ Yes  
☐ No  
☐ Don't know

**23b) If so, what are they?**

---

---

---

---

---