Urban Versus Rural Analysis: Likert Questions

Each PIHP fell into one of two categories: Urban or Rural (see appendix for methodology of determining each PIHP's designation). The following tables document responses, from two categories of PIHPs, to the Likert questions wherein participants were asked to respond to each statement with their level of agreement. Respondents answered on a scale of 1 to 7 where 1 indicated "Strongly Disagree" and 7 indicated "Strongly Agree." The mean is the average result of all respondents on this scale of 1 to 7. The standard deviation indicates the degree of variation among the respondents.

	Rural Response n=44	Urban Response n=95	
I. Awareness of EBPs:			
a. Our CMHSP/Region adequately educates consumers.	Mean 4.09 Standard 1.395 Deviation	Mean 4.20 Standard 1.316 Deviation	
b. The CMHSP/Region has an effective outreach policy.	Mean 3.98 Standard 1.470 Deviation	Mean 3.87 Standard 1.346 Deviation	
c. Clinicians are aware of the EBPs offered by the region.	Mean 4.82 Standard 1.529 Deviation	Mean 4.74 Standard 1.444 Deviation	
d. Administrators are aware of the EBPs offered by the region.	Mean 5.39 Standard 1.166 Deviation	Mean 5.17 Standard 1.493 Deviation	
e. It is difficult to find consumers to participate in EBPs.	Mean 4.16 Standard 1.493 Deviation	Mean 3.75 Standard 1.509 Deviation	

		esponse 44	Urban R n=	_
II. Billing of EBPs:				
a. Securing clinician/staff certification in order to bill for EBPs is a challenge.	Mean Standard Deviation	5.05 1.346	Mean Standard Deviation	4.43 1.579
b. Initial billing issues (e.g. modifiers) related to new EBPs in our CMHSP/Region are resolved quickly.	Mean Standard Deviation	3.93 1.486	Mean Standard Deviation	3.87 1.470
c. It is difficult for staff to keep up with the frequent changes to billing procedures related to EBPs.	Mean Standard Deviation	4.59 1.352	Mean Standard Deviation	4.47 1.385

	Rural Ro n=	-	Urban R n=	
III. Fidelity of EBPs:				
a. The current fidelity guidelines for EBPs prevent us from adapting the EBPs to our regional needs.	Mean Standard Deviation	4.09 1.537	Mean Standard Deviation	3.72 1.527
b. Despite the costs to our CMHSP/Region, external audits of EBPs are worthwhile.	Mean Standard Deviation	4.05 1.524	Mean Standard Deviation	4.98 1.626
c. Fidelity guidelines restrict access to services to some consumers.	Mean Standard Deviation	4.05 1.569	Mean Standard Deviation	3.92 1.734
d. It is difficult for our CMHSP/Region to monitor external provider contract agencies for EBP fidelity.	Mean Standard Deviation	3.64 1.448	Mean Standard Deviation	3.92 1.763

	Rural Response		Urban Response	
	n=44		n=95	
IV. Training of EBPs:				
a. The cost of EBP trainings is a worthwhile investment for	Mean	4.98	Mean	5.46
building CMHSP/Regional capacity.	Standard Deviation	1.438	Standard Deviation	1.527
b. Holding trainings outside of our	Mean	5.61	Mean	4.86
CMHSP/Region is a significant barrier to sustaining EBPs.	Standard Deviation	1.401	Standard Deviation	1.626
c. EBP trainings currently offered	Mean	4.93	Mean	4.82
by the State provide trainees with practical hands-on skills.	Standard Deviation	1.149	Standard Deviation	1.734
d. It's a good idea to train staff in	Mean	5.14	Mean	5.38
more than one EBP.	Standard Deviation	1.374	Standard Deviation	1.734
e. The staff time required to implement the Train-the-Trainer	Mean	4.84	Mean	5.19
model is a worthwhile investment for the CMHSP/Region to make.	Standard Deviation	1.346	Standard Deviation	1.734
Tot the difficily region to make.				
f. Ongoing EBP trainings are	Mean	3.89	Mean	3.73
offered frequently enough to meet the CMHSP/Region's needs.	Standard Deviation	1.466	Standard Deviation	1.734
g. EBP trainings adequately	Mean	4.37	Mean	4.28
address cultural and diversity factors.	Standard Deviation	1.254	Standard Deviation	1.734

Rural Respons	е
n=44	

Urban Response n=95

V. Gathering Data and Measuring Outcomes of EBPs:

- a. Our CMHSP/Region uses outcome data to make decisions.
- b. It is difficult for our CMHSP/Region to document how EBPs benefit consumers.
- c. It would reduce duplication of reporting if EBP fidelity measures were incorporated into State audits as part of the QI process.
- d. Our current medical records system gives clinicians timely access to clinical information they need for work with consumers.
- e. A standardized statewide system of electronic medical records would enhance evaluation of EBP outcomes.
- f. The State needs to adopt standardized outcome measures for EBPs.

Mean	4.23
Standard	1.412
Deviation	1.412

Mean	4.16
Standard Deviation	1.613

Mean	4.75
Standard	1.672
Deviation	1.072

Mean	5.25
Standard	1.349
Deviation	1.349

Mean	4.57
Standard Deviation	1.946

Mean	5.39
Standard	1.298
Deviation	1.290

Mean	4.42
Standard	1.590
Deviation	1.590

Mean	3.90
Standard	1.587
Deviation	1.50/

Mean	4.44
Standard	2.003
Deviation	2.003

Mean	5.01
Standard	1.805
Deviation	1.005

Mean	4.08
Standard Deviation	2.124

Mean	5.38
Standard	1.602
Deviation	1.002

	Rural Response n=44	Urban Response n=95		
VI. CMHSP/Region or Location and EBPs:				
a. The small number of clinical staff within our CMHSP/Region makes it difficult to implement multiple EBPs with fidelity.	Mean 5.07 Standard 1.797 Deviation	Mean 3.70 Standard 1.960 Deviation		
b. Not all EBPs recommended by the State fit the needs of our consumer population.	Mean 5.23 Standard 1.669 Deviation	Mean 4.62 Standard 1.859 Deviation		
c. Transportation issues for consumers and staff limit our ability to sustain EBPs.	Mean 5.61 Standard 1.450 Deviation	Mean 4.99 Standard 1.678		
d. Localized trainings would improve the sustainability of EBPs in our CMHSP/Region.	Mean 5.89 Standard 1.104 Deviation	Mean 5.86 Standard 0.979 Deviation		
e. The Technology infrastructure to support training and supervision in our CMHSP/Region is adequate.	Mean 4.23 Standard 1.655 Deviation	Mean 4.48 Standard 1.717 Deviation		
f. Recruiting staff with the required State certification for specific EBPs is a challenge in our CMHSP/Region.	Mean5.34Standard Deviation1.539	Mean 5.06 Standard 1.480 Deviation		

	Rural Response n=44		Urban Response n=95	
VII. Technology and EBPs:				
a. Available conferencing technology in our CMHSP/Region is satisfactory.	Mean Standard Deviation	4.80 1.948	Mean Standard Deviation	4.54 1.782
b. The State should invest in creating onsite training opportunities (e.g. DVDs) to support EBPs.	Mean Standard Deviation	5.73 1.387	Mean Standard Deviation	5.83 1.267
c. The State should increase funding for networking and communication technology to improve sustainability of EBPs.	Mean Standard Deviation	5.73 1.149	Mean Standard Deviation	5.57 1.340
d. Use of conferencing technologies to link CMHSP/Regions statewide would help sustain EBPs.	Mean Standard Deviation	5.70 1.025	Mean Standard Deviation	5.62 1.321