



University of California
San Francisco

Peer Providers in Behavioral Health:
Case Studies from 4 states
California Mental Health Planning Council,
WET Summit, March 9, 2017

UCSF: Susan Chapman, Joanne Spetz Lisel Blash, Krista Chan
California Institute for Behavioral Health Solutions: Kimberly Mayer

Study Purpose

- SAMHSA requested
- To identify and assess best practices in peer support including training and certification, employment, roles, billing, challenges, and key policy issues

Peer Provider Workforce Drivers

- Workforce and funding shortages drive demand for peers
- Greater recognition of peer role and unique contributions
- Emphasis on recovery model
- Emphasis on team models of care
- Financing and reimbursement changes

Key Research Questions

- How have states have implemented CMS-approved billing for peer providers?
- What are the models of care in states with successful practices in peer provider employment in MH and SA?
- What are the specific roles and functions of peer provider in teams?
- What are the skills and training required of peer providers?
- How do training and certification requirements vary across states?
- What is the impact of implementing peer provided services on the roles and responsibilities of other members of the healthcare team?
- How accepted are MH and SA peer providers by other members of the healthcare team?
- How does the implementation of peer provided services impact the level of service integration?

Methods

- Landscape analysis of related literature
- National panel of experts convened in Feb 2015
- Identified 4 states: Arizona (MH), Georgia (MH, SUD), Texas (MH, SUD), Pennsylvania (MH, SUD)
- Snowball sampling to identify best practice organizations
- Site visits of 3-5 days to each state
 - 193 KI interviews
- Interviewed state government reps, management and staff at a variety of organizations
 - Peer-led, traditional BH, for-profit, non profit
- Thematic analysis

Findings: Landscape Analysis

- Job titles vary
 - Outreach specialist
 - Telephone support specialist
 - Peer educator
 - Resident counselor
 - Forensic peer specialist
 - Peer evaluator
 - Employment/job coach
 - Peer navigator
 - Peer whole health and wellness coach

Findings: Landscape Analysis

- Peer providers work in a variety of settings
 - Peer-run organizations - non-clinical rehabilitation and recovery
 - Traditional care settings- MH clinics, detox centers
 - Forensic settings increasing for SUD- drug courts
- Training and Certification
 - 40 states statewide certification for MH peer support
 - 1/3 of states have SUD statewide certification
 - IC&RC national certification in 13 states for SUD peer training

Findings: Landscape Analysis

- Evidence of efficacy
 - Less hospitalization, higher medication adherence
 - Much research lacks rigor and longitudinal data
 - More evidence in MH than SUD
- Challenges in peer provider services
 - Acceptance from non-peer colleagues
 - Stigma of lived experience
 - Friction between traditional and recovery-oriented models

Lessons Learned: Case Studies (AZ, PA, GA, TX)

- Policy environment
 - Medicaid billing authorization key to sustainable funding
 - In GA and AZ, class action lawsuits expanded behavioral health access & use of peers
 - Some states and programs mandate use of peers
- Training and Certification
 - Statewide training and certification required for billing
 - Number of training organizations varied
 - MH and SUD trainings and certifications are often separate

Lessons Learned: Case Studies

■ Employment

- Little consistent data available on employment numbers, settings
- Often part time, low wages and little opportunity for career growth
- Workplace accommodations beneficial for retention
- Stigma of lived experience in some settings
- Reentry into workforce important component to recovery
- Separation of policy decisions on billing for services – fewer states allow billing for SUD peer services

Policy Implications

- Standardized training to assure quality and allow mobility
- Better employment data to assess supply and demand
- More research on efficacy and outcomes
- Career advancement opportunities and sustainable wages
- Workplace accommodations essential for employees in recovery
- Coordination between MH and SUD trainings to address co-occurring disorders
- Billing requirements should not undermine a recovery-oriented model

Next steps for California

- California Consortium of Addiction Programs and Professionals (CCAPP) has been approved by IC&RC to begin issuing certifications for Peer Recovery Specialists
- SB 614 would have established MH certification but was “gutted and will be replaced”
- Advocates are working on new legislation
- Peer support growing in implementation of realignment at county level
- CA continues to lag other states in adoption of peer provider roles, employment, training, and payment

New study funded by CHCF

- Peer support in California for transitions of care
 - Incarceration to the community
 - Hospitalization to the community
 - Few studies specific to transitions of care
- Updated literature review
 - Fast-growing profession
 - Lack of consensus on core components of the role or core competencies needed
 - Little new evidence on client outcomes

Funding and Resources

- http://healthworkforce.ucsf.edu/sites/healthworkforce.ucsf.edu/files/Report-Peer_Provider_Workforce_in_Behavioral_Health-A_Landscape_Analysis.pdf
- http://healthworkforce.ucsf.edu/sites/healthworkforce.ucsf.edu/files/Education_Certification_and_Roles_of_Peer_Providers-Lessons_from_Four_States.pdf#sthash.2Ca7Kdtn.dpuf

This study was funded by the Substance Abuse Mental Health Services Administration and the Health Resources Services Administration's National Center for Health Workforce Analysis

