

Recovery-oriented practices and role perceptions of healthcare staff providing community-based mental healthcare as team in Central and Eastern Europe: an observational study

Catharina Roth (✉ catharina.roth@med.uni-heidelberg.de)

University Hospital Heidelberg, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3346-1191>

Michel Wensing

University Hospital Heidelberg, Department of General Practice and Health Services Research

Martina Rojnic Kuzman

Zagreb University Hospital Centre, Clinic for Psychiatry and Psychological Medicine

Sarah Bjedov

Zagreb University Hospital Centre, Clinic for Psychiatry and Psychological Medicine

Sara Medved

Zagreb University Hospital Centre, Clinic for Psychiatry and Psychological Medicine

Ana Istvanovic

Croatian Institute of Public Health, Zagreb Croatia

Danijela Stimac Grbic

Croatian Institute of Public Health, Zagreb Croatia

Ivana Pavic

Croatian Institution of Public Health, Zagreb Croatia

Aleksander Tomcuk

Health Institution Special Psychiatric Hospital Dobrota Kotor

Jovo Dedovic

Health Institution Special Psychiatric Hospital Dobrota Kotor

Tatijana Djurisc

Public Health Institute of Montenegro

Raluca Ileana Nica

Institute Liga Romana pentru Sanatate Mintala

Tiberiu Rotaru

Siret Psychiatric Hospital

Antoni Novotni

University Clinic of Psychiatry, UCPS Skopje

Stojan Bajraktarov

University Clinic of Psychiatry, UCPS Skopje

Milos Milutinovic

University Clinic of Psychiatry, UCPS Skopje

Vladimir Nakov

National Centre of Public Health and Analyses, Directorate Mental Health and Prevention of Addictions

Zahari Zarkov

National Centre of Public Health and Analyses, Directorate Mental Health and Prevention of Addictions

Roumyana Dinolova

National Centre of Public Health and Analyses, Directorate Mental Health and Prevention of Addictions

Bethany Hipple Walters

Dutch Institute for Mental Health and Addiction, Trimbos Institute

Laura Shields-Zeeman

Dutch Institute for Mental Health and Addiction, Trimbos Institute

Ionela Petrea


Dutch Institute for Mental Health and Addiction, Trimbos Institute

Research article

Keywords: Community mental health services, Implementation, Collaborative Teamwork, Role perceptions

Posted Date: February 11th, 2021

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-215308/v1>

License:  This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. [Read Full License](#)

Abstract

Background: CMHTs deliver healthcare that supports the recovery of people with mental illness. They should achieve a sufficient level of good quality teamwork, composed of individual professional skills as well their adaptation within the clearly defined roles in teams in order to work efficiently. This paper analyses to what extent team members of five CMHTs newly implemented in five countries had introduced aspects of the recovery-oriented approach and evaluates what the team members' perceptions on their collaborative care roles and their level of confidence with this role are.

Method: A quantitative survey was administered among 66 professionals and peer worker including the Recovery Self-Assessment Tool Provider Version (RSA-P), the Team Member Self-Assessment Tool (TMSA), and demographic questions.

Result: The RSA-P showed that all teams had the perception that they provide recovery-oriented practice to a moderately high degree after a training week on recovery-oriented care. Healthcare providers with fewer years of professional experience perceived more frequently that they operated in a recovery-oriented way ($p=0.036$, $B=-0.268$). Nurses and peer workers did not feel confident or responsible to fulfil specific roles.

Conclusion: Trainings on community-based practices and collaborative teamwork may facilitates recovery-oriented care and helps to improve team cohesion.

Trial registration: Each trial was registered before participant enrolment in the clinicaltrials.gov database: Croatia, Zagreb (Trial Reg. No. NCT03862209); Montenegro, Kotor (Trial Reg. No. NCT03837340); Romania, Suceava (Trial Reg. No. NCT03884933); Macedonia, Skopje (Trial Reg. No. NCT03892473); Bulgaria, Sofia (Trial Reg. No. NCT03922425)

Background

Mental disorders are the main cause for disability worldwide (1), and contribute substantially to loss of healthy life years (2, 3). Moreover, people suffering from mental illnesses are more likely to be excluded from social life, are at higher risk of poverty and stigmatisation (2, 3). They are more likely to suffer from medical comorbidity, poor physical health, and are at higher risk of premature death compared to people without mental disorders (4). Access to and quality of mental healthcare varies considerably across European countries and systems (5). The World Health Organisation (WHO) reported that in low- and middle-income countries between 76% and 85% of people suffering from mental disorders do not receive the treatment they need (1, 3).

Many mental health systems have gone through a process of deinstitutionalization by replacing long-stay and institutional care in inpatient settings with community-based alternatives (5, 6). Shifting healthcare from the hospitals to community care aims at supporting individuals with mental disorders in maintaining independence, promoting choices, and enhancing inclusion (6). There are many types of community-based mental health services, with a number of models used conceptualise their organization and the delivery of services. One of the more common types of community-based services is that of a multidisciplinary community mental health team (CMHTs) (6). CMHTs usually include professions such as nurses, psychiatrists, psychologists, and social workers (6). The combined expertise and interdisciplinary work practices of these professions enables a client to receive more holistic care addressing their medical, mental and social needs (6). A frequently used care model for community based care which is recognised as a good practice is the *flexible assertive community treatment* (FACT) model (7). The FACT model helps clients receive intensive support within their community by a team using a team case-load and assertive community treatment principles (7). A case manager coordinates individual case-loads, although all professionals within the team provide mental healthcare. In times of an increased need for treatment and care, the team works together to meet those needs.

This care model provides an opportunity for a transition between high- and low-intensity treatment and care and a shared case-load, and thus may enhance recovery (7).

Although recovery from severe mental illness is an individual journey, professional care and guidance can support recovery outcomes (8, 9). A recovery-oriented approach focuses on the person, addresses stigmatisation and facilitates social inclusion, and improves quality of life, citizenship, and participation in society (3, 10). It is a collaborative process between mental healthcare providers and clients which facilitates shared-decision making and puts the individual recovery version of the clients in the centre of the treatment (11, 12). Recovery-oriented practice includes patient empowerment, peer support, the right to informed choice, respecting individual needs, and the right to be treated ethically (12). Recovery usually occurs in an individual's personal environment and includes feelings like hope, understanding of competences and skills, having an active and social life, personal autonomy, and living a meaningful life with a positive sense of self (10, 13). Peer support in mental health is defined as aid for a person with severe mental illness (SMI) by people with personal experiences of a mental health issues (14). They can be a member of a mental health team and have been increasingly implemented internationally. The support of peer works can have a positive impact on the recovery of people with SMI (14).

If the process of recovery is managed by a highly qualified CMHT supporting discharge from hospital to community, participation in social life and overall patient satisfaction increases (15–17). This requires commitment by each team member, a shared vision, a clear distribution of roles, and a common purpose (18). Multidisciplinary team functioning is complex and requires a deeper understanding of the different professions operating in teams, such as in CMHTs. Boundaries between the profession can act as a barrier and influence communication and coordination negatively which has an impact on patient safety and care integration (19). Previous research shows that not all healthcare providers work effectively in a multidisciplinary team (18). Unclear role allocation, lack of clarity regarding leadership can also hinder team functioning (18).

Research has shown that comprehensive community-based mental health services lead to an improvement in healthcare and patient outcomes, including quality of life, treatment adherence, healthcare accessibility, and social outcomes (6, 20–22). Additionally, CMHTs reduce the number of days spent in hospital, increase patient satisfaction, reduce suicide rates, and number of admissions to the hospital (6, 18). Furthermore, most people with SMI favour recovery-oriented healthcare services provided in their community in order to participate in social life and sustain employment (13, 15, 16).

These insights have led to the design and implementation of CMHTs for providing inclusive mental healthcare based on the recovery-oriented approach and social support in five sites in five Central and Eastern European countries within the *Large-scale implementation of community-based mental health care for people with severe and enduring mental ill health in Europe* project (RECOVER-E) (23). The ultimate aim of the RECOVER-E project is to implement and evaluate multidisciplinary CMHTs delivering care in a recovery-oriented way to people with SMI and compare it to the treatment as usual on three levels: 1) patients outcome, 2) team members; and 3) socioeconomic evaluation (23).

The present study aimed to assess to what extent members of the five CMHTs in five sites had introduced aspects of the recovery-oriented approach after they received a one-week training on the recovery-oriented approach to care for people with SMI in community settings aimed to support the organisation of their local CMHTs. The secondary aim was to evaluate what the team members' perceptions on their collaborative care roles and their level of confidence with this role, according to their background profession.

Methods And Design

Study Design

The research presented in this manuscript is part of the RECOVER-E project, a European research project with five patient-randomized trials on the implementation of community-based mental healthcare for people SMI (23). In each of the five sites, the study was designed as a clinical and health-economic evaluation on the basis of a hybrid effectiveness-implementation trial, which assesses both implementation outcomes and patient health outcomes. Each of the five hybrid trials is conducted as pragmatic randomised trial in two parallel groups with measurements among service users and healthcare providers (members of the CMHTs within each site).

The present study reports the findings from a paper-based survey among all team members of the CMHTs in each project site at local start of the study, after having completed a one-week training session on the concept of CMHT and the principles of the recovery-oriented practice approach. The local research teams were responsible to distribute the survey to the CMHT members after the training.

Study setting

Community mental health teams were established and implemented in Croatia, Zagreb; Montenegro, Kotor; Romania, Siret; North Macedonia, Skopje; and Bulgaria, Sofia (Table 1). The full rationale and selection criteria for these sites is described in a prior publication (23).

Table 1: Characteristics of the study settings/project sites

Participants

Healthcare providers were eligible for joining the CMHT and then participating in the study if they were over the age of 18 working with people with SMI in the five project sites. Additionally, peer workers (persons with lived experience of a SMI). over the age of 18 were asked to join the CMHT and to participated in this study. Each team had to consist of at least one nurse, psychiatrist, psychologist, social worker, and a peer worker. Healthcare professional and peer worker were excluded if they did not meet the inclusion criteria, did not give consent to participate in this study, or were not able to give consent to participate. Each team member of each project site participated on a voluntary basis and gave consent prior to the start of the study. Sampling and recruitment were organised by the local research team in each project site individually.

Sampling and recruitment

Zagreb, Croatia

During a daily meeting at the department of psychiatry at the University Hospital Centre Zagreb (ZUHC) the RECOVER-E project and its goals were presented. Healthcare professionals who were interested in this topic could approach the local principal investigator and decide if they want to participate. All healthcare professionals who accepted to become a part of the CMHT participated in this study, and were employees of the ZUHC. Peer workers were recruited from patients that were treated at the ZUHC due to SMI and were recovered during psychosocial treatment afterwards.

Kotor, Montenegro

In Montenegro CMHT members were employed by the Special Psychiatric Hospital in Kotor. They have been selected by the director of the clinic based on their commitment to work, their previous work results and on their own motivation and

interest to work in this kind of programme and their awareness of the need to provide more than just hospital-based services for service users. The directors explained the project and the nature of the study and asked if they want to participate on a voluntary basis. In early October 2018 three peer worker were recruited from a group of locally treated clients at the hospital and the Mental Health Centre in Kotor. Inclusion criteria were a presence of severe mental health disorder, the willingness to participate in working activities of mental health team, and the capacity to offer peer support based on the opinion of the treating psychiatrist. All healthcare professionals and peer workers who accepted to become a part of the CMHT participated in this study.

Siret, Romania

In Romania CMHT members were selected out of the people working at the hospital in Siret by the local principle investigator. All team members were willing to spend some of their free time on pioneering a new service in mental health. Moreover, they were the most active during the on-site training provided by the project coordination. The peer worker was selected together by the social worker, psychiatrist and psychologist based on their professional experience. All healthcare professionals and the peer worker who accepted to become a part of the CMHT participated in this study.

Skopje, North Macedonia

All CMHT members were employed at the University Clinic of Psychiatry Skopje and were recruited by the directors of the clinic. They selected the employees based on their willingness and motivation to try something new. The directors explained the project and the nature of the study and asked if they want to participate. The two peer workers, who were recruited, were treated at the clinic due to SMI previously and were recovered during psychosocial treatment. They are not employed at the clinic but were also selected by the directors of the clinic. Everybody took part in the first training that was organized in Skopje. All healthcare professionals and the peer worker who accepted to become a part of the CMHT also decided to participate in this study. Six members went to the second training in the Netherlands and updated the others.

Sofia, Bulgaria

Healthcare providers were recruited by the director of the MHC Shipkovenski. They decided on a voluntary basis if they want to participate in this project. All CMHT members were employed at the MHC "Prof. N. Shipkovenski" a hospital for the district Sofia. The psychiatrists who work at the MHC Shipkovenski and those who collaborate with the centre suggested patients who were interested to fill in the role as peer workers. The director of the MHC Shipkovenski selected ten potential participants which participated in the training in July 2019. Three of them were invited and agreed to participate in the project. All healthcare professionals and the peer worker who accepted to become a part of the CMHT also decided to participate in this study.

Training on recovery-oriented practices

After members of the CMHTs were appointed by each mental health service in the five sites, CMHT members participated in a two-week training programme, with one week of the training carried out in their home country and one week as an intensive site visit and training week in the Netherlands, hosted by GGZ Noord-Holland-Noord. In this training, healthcare professionals had the chance to improve their understanding of community based mental health approaches, with the aim of being able to implement a cohesive team in their city or district. The training programme for the CMHT were developed by a multidisciplinary Expert Panel (including a peer worker) and reviewed closely by the

implementation site coordinators for local relevance and adaptation. The training covered key components of community mental health care, working with a shared caseload, and home treatments. It focused on building the hands-on skills and competencies necessary for delivering high quality community care, as well as working with peer specialists and families. A substantial component of the training (and subsequent mentoring and hands-on coaching) focused on the most difficult change process in building a sustainable CMHT, which is changing the mindset from viewing treatment for people with SMI as custodial (protection from communities/societies, care in institutions and hospitals) and shift to perceiving services as an aid to a meaningful life in the community.

Data collection

Data was collected using a paper-based survey administered among CMHT members at the local start of the study during a staff meeting in each site by the local research team after the first week of training in their home country (Table 2). The questionnaire items had been translated prior to the start of the study at each site into the local language by members of the local research team who were fluent in English and in the local language and back translated. It took the team members approximately 15 to 20 minutes to complete the questionnaire. An informed consent was signed by all selected staff members prior to the start of the study.

Table 2: Period of data collection and dates of the two training weeks per project site

Measurements

Sociodemographic data questionnaire

The sociodemographic part of the questionnaire included questions such as year of birth, sex, profession, years of professional experience, and place of work.

Recovery Self-Assessment (RSA-Provider Version)

The Recovery Self-Assessment (RSA) is a 32-item measure developed to assess to what degree a program implements recovery-oriented practice (24). It is a self-reflective tool that is designed to identify efforts made by healthcare agencies to provided recovery-oriented care. Research has shown that the RSA has moderate to strong internal reliability (Cronbach's α 0.63 – 0.90) (24-27). Response options include a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) and two additional answering options (Don't know and Not Applicable) (28). There are four different versions of the RSA: Person in recovery, Family member/advocate, provider, and CEOs/Directors. In this study the provider version (RSA-P) was used. The measure covers the following five subscales: Life Goals, Involvement, Diversity of Treatment Options, Choice, and Individually Tailored Services. The Life Goal domain refers to the extent to which staff helps with the development and achievement of life goals based on the preferences of the patient. Involvement indicates to what degree healthcare provider and clients perceive that clients are involved in their healthcare and in decision-making. Diversity of Treatment Option Subscale refers to what extend the healthcare organisation provides different treatment options and supports clients to get involved in non-mental health activities. The Choice domain indicates to what degree healthcare provider and clients feel that choices are available to clients and if the choice is respected. The subscale Individually Tailored Services refers to the perception that healthcare services are tailored to individuals' personal needs, culture and affectations (27). Higher scores indicate a greater degree of implementation of recovery-oriented practices (24).

Team Member Self-Assessment

The Team member Self-Assessment Tool (TMSA) developed by the Advancing Integrated Mental Health Solutions (AIMS) Centre of the University of Washington, Psychiatry & Behavioural Sciences Division of Population Health and is a part of the Team building and workflow guide (29). The tool (worksheet) consists of 26-items that allow each member of a care team to think about what collaborative care roles he/she currently practices. The worksheet includes five different care roles: Identify and Engage Patients, Track Treatment Outcome, Initiate, and Provide Treatment, Proactively Adjust Treatment if Patients are not responding, and other tasks Important for our Program. Response options for the first question "*Is this your role*" include yes or no. Answering option for the second question "*Your level of comfort with this task*" include high or medium/low.

Data analysis

All questionnaires were included in the analysis. Prior to analysis, all variables were checked for data entry errors and missing values. The two response options ('Don't Know' and 'Not Applicable') were set as user missing value when conducting the first analysis since this is a common method for categorical variables with response options like 'Not Applicable' or 'Don't Know'. Then the standard technique to calculate scale scores for each subscale of the RSA-P was used (30). This meant that, for each subscale all associate items were summarized and aggregate measures were constructed for further analysis for the whole sample as well as per project site. This method only allows for a few missing values. Thus, items with a high number ($n > 6$) of 'Not Applicable' responses were reviewed and discussed with the local research teams of each site to understand in what way this response option was interpreted by the CMHT members who completed the questionnaire. Most of these items turned out to be relating to services/treatment options which were not offered by the hospitals, the mental health institutes or not within the scope of the RECOVER-E project. Thus, the answering option 'Not Applicable' was combined with 'Strongly Disagree' in the second and final analysis, as both indicated that those services were not provided. Bivariate linear regression analyses were applied to explore the impact of predictors on the five aggregate measures for the whole sample. Predictors with significant effects were included in multiple regression models, albeit these were considered as highly tentative given the small sample size. The internal consistency of the RSA-P and its five subscales were evaluated using Cronbach's alpha coefficient.

Descriptive statistics were used to calculate the means and standard deviations for continuous variables and frequencies and percentages for categorical variables for the TMSA tool and demographic data. For interpretation of the findings the cut-off points for the TMSA tool for each profession was 50% indicated that half of the given profession felt like a listed role is their responsibility or that half of them felt confident to fulfil these roles. Two participants indicated 'other' as profession and were excluded TMSA analysis. Data was analysed with the Statistical Package for Social Science SPSS version 25 (31). Statistical significance was defined as $p < 0.05$.

Results

Description of the sample

All team members from each site filled in the questionnaire ($n=66$). Table 3 presents the descriptive characteristics of the sample categorised by countries. The largest community mental health team was the Croatian team with 21 (31.8% of the total sample), the smallest team was the Romanian team with 6 (9.1% of the sample) individuals. Of the total study population 65.2% ($n=43$) were female. The mean age was 40.02 (SD=10.96) years. A third of the participating professionals were nurses (31.8%). A vast majority of the healthcare professionals had more than five years of experience.

Table 3: Description of the study population (n= 66 healthcare professionals and peer worker) per project site

Recovery Self-Assessment Provider Version (RSA-P)

Overall Recovery Self-Assessment Scale

The members of the CMHT in Romania and Bulgarian reported the highest means of the RSA-P subscales, with an overall scale 4.46 (SD 0.327) and 4.46 (SD 0.211), respectively. The team members of the Croatian team reported an overall mean of 4.16 (SD 0.404). The lowest means were indicated by the Macedonian team 4.05 (SD 0.694) and the Montenegrin team 3.58 (SD 0.275). This pattern was similar for the different subscales (Table 4).

Table 4: Recovery Self-Assessment Scale (Provider Version) per project site

Associations between individual characteristics and Recovery Self-Assessment

Profession ($p=0.029$, beta coefficient= 0.271) and professional experience ($p=0.008$, beta coefficient= -0.328) were associated with the total RSA-P score. However, only professional experience ($p=0.036$, beta coefficient= -0.268) remained significant in the multiple regression analysis with both predictors. The effect of professional experience on the total RSA-P implied that healthcare providers with fewer years of professional experience were more likely to perceive that their healthcare practice operated recovery-oriented compared to team members with more years of professional experience.

RSA-P-Subscales: The amount of professional experience had an impact on the degree to what healthcare provider perceived choices are available to clients and if these choices are respected ($p=0.027$, beta coefficient= -0.286). More specifically, professionals with fewer years of professional experience were more likely to perceive that individual choices are available to clients and that these choices are respected than with team members with more years of work experience. Additionally, work experience ($p=0.003$, beta coefficient= -0.357) and profession ($p=0.012$, beta coefficient= 0.311) were associated with the extent to which staff helps with the development and achievement of life goals based on the preferences of the patients. In the multiple regression analysis with both predictors, only professional experience remained significant ($p=0.023$, beta coefficient= -0.286). Thus, CMHT members with more years of professional experience perceived that their role was less supportive regarding helping clients with achieving and developing their individual life goals. Healthcare provider with less years of work experience had a higher tendency to perceive that clients are involved in their healthcare and in decision-making compared to their those with more years of experience ($p=0.016$, beta coefficient= -0.311). Professionals with more years of work experience felt less like their healthcare organisation provides different treatment options or supports clients to get involved in non-mental health activities ($p=0.017$, beta coefficient= -0.302). The expected effect of professional experience on the subscale Individually Tailored Services was not significant although close ($p=0.051$, beta coefficient= -0.251).

Team Member Self-Assessment

The findings of the TMSA are reported by professions. More than 50% indicate that a majority of members of a profession saw themselves in a certain role and/or felt highly confident in fulfilling these roles. The questionnaire was

completed after the healthcare professionals received the first week of training, and started to work as CMHTs. Thus, it is expected they evaluated their role and responsibilities within the team.

Nurses: A large majority of the nurses (n=81.0%) saw themselves in the role of identifying and engaging patients. Nevertheless, only a small number (n=33.3%) stated that they feel highly confident to fulfil the different responsibilities within this role on the CMHT. A third stated that diagnosing behavioural health disorders is their responsibility (n=33.3%). Over 50% also saw themselves as having a role in tracking treatment outcomes, although only a few felt confident to fulfil this role. A vast majority of nurses saw their role in different responsibilities within this role as well, such as by conducting behavioural health assessments, developing and updating behavioural health treatment plans, educating patient about symptoms and treatment option, brief counselling, activity scheduling, behavioural activation, facilitating referral to specialty care or social services, and creating and supporting relapse prevention plan. However, only a few felt confident to fulfil these responsibilities. A large majority of nurses also stated that proactively adjust treatment if patients are not responding is their role, however less than a third of them felt confident to fulfil these roles. Although other tasks like e.g. administrative support for program (scheduling, resources) is a role more than 50% of the nurses also saw themselves in, only a few felt confident to fulfil these roles (Table 5 – 7).

Psychiatrists: The large majority of psychiatrists saw themselves in all listed roles, and also felt confident to fulfil these roles. They particularly identified with the role of tracking treatment outcomes and initiating and providing treatment (Table 5 – 7).

Psychologists: A vast majority of psychologists identified with all roles listed and felt highly confident to fulfil these roles. Although they felt like they were responsible for some tasks such as prescribing psychotropic medications, patient education about medications and side effects, identifying and treating coexisting medical conditions, and facilitating referral to specialty care or social services of within the role of tracking treatment outcomes, they saw themselves more in the roles of identifying and engaging patients and initiating and providing treatment (Table 5 – 7).

Social workers: A majority of social workers saw themselves in all roles listed, but did not feel confident to fulfil these roles. All social workers stated that they were responsible for identifying people who may need help, engaging patients and introducing the care team to the patient. Interestingly, all social workers saw themselves in the role of tracking outcome of referrals and other treatments, but only two felt confident to fulfil this role (n=25.0%). Initiate and provide treatment is a role mainly psychiatrists identified with; however, all social workers stated that they saw themselves in facilitate referral to specialty care or social services and create and support relapse prevention plans, and indicated feeling highly confident to fulfil these tasks (Table 5 – 7).

Peer workers: Almost all peer workers saw themselves in the role of engaging patients in the care program and introduce care team to the patient (n=78.6%), only around a third felt confident to fulfil this role (n=28.6%). Interestingly, more than half of peer workers saw themselves in the role of tracking treatment outcomes, except for tracking patients' symptoms with measurement tools, although they did not feel confident to fulfil this role. They also stated to be responsible for some tasks within the role of initiating and providing treatment like performing behavioural health assessment, develop and update behavioural health treatment plan, patient education about symptoms and treatment option, and brief counselling, activity scheduling, behavioural activation. However, they only felt confident to fulfil the task of educating patients about symptoms and treatment options. Less than 50% felt responsible for the role of proactively adjusting treatment if patients are not responding. Half of the peer workers identified with the role of fulfilling other tasks important for the program, nevertheless only a few felt confident enough to fulfil this role (Table 5 – 7).

Table 5: Team Member Self-Assessment tool: Identify and Engage Patients and Track Treatment Outcome

Table 6: Team Member Self-Assessment tool: Initiate and provide treatment

Table 7: Team Member Self-Assessment tool: Proactively adjust treatment if patients are not responding and other tasks important for our project

Discussion

The overall aim of this study was to explore to what degree members of the five CMHTs had introduced aspects of the recovery-oriented practice in community settings after they received the first week of a two-weeks of training session covering the concept of recovery-oriented practice and started to work as CMHT. The secondary aim was to evaluate what the team members think about what collaborative care roles they currently practice within the CMHT, how confident they feel with this role, and to explore differences between the professions involved.

In general, we found out that all CMHTs had the perception that they provide recovery-oriented practices to a moderately high degree based on the findings of the RSA-P. Nevertheless, specific aspects such as connecting clients with self-help, peer support or advocacy groups and programs, and encouraging them to attend advisory boards and management meetings showed room for enhanced implementation. Healthcare professionals with less professional experience had the tendency to perceive that their healthcare practice implemented recovery-oriented practice compared to team members with a higher degree of professional experience. Nurses saw themselves mainly in the role of identifying and engaging patients, tracking treatment outcomes, proactively adjusting treatment if patients are not responding and other tasks important for this project. Nevertheless, compared to the psychiatrists and psychologists, most of the nurses did not feel confident to fulfil specific roles. Psychiatrists, psychologists, and social workers saw themselves in almost all roles listed. In comparison with the psychologists and social workers, psychiatrists felt highly confident to fulfil each role. Peer workers mainly saw themselves in the role of engaging patients and fulfil other tasks important to the project. Nevertheless, they did not feel confident to fulfil specific roles. Interestingly, a majority of peer workers saw themselves in roles included within the domain of track treatment outcomes and initiate and provide treatment.

In 2013, the WHO released the Mental Health Action Plan (32) stating the need for availability of recovery-oriented mental health services in the community. In our study, all CMHTs had already introduced various aspects of recovery-oriented practices. However, it needs to be considered that most team members were highly enthusiastic about community care prior to the start of the project which might have had a positive impact on the results. These findings are consistent with those by Simmonds et al. (22), they reported that a high level of enthusiasm for community care has been seen by all members of CMHTs which have been evaluated. Nevertheless, it cannot be concluded that enthusiasm and motivation alone have an impact on the quality of care provided by healthcare professionals. Additionally, members of each CMHTs of this study have been selected by the research team based on their commitment or were motivated to be part of this project. Thus, it is possible that the motivation to provide recovery-oriented care within the teams is higher compared to healthcare providers who have not been selected or are not interested in community care. These findings are consistent with those by Malone et al. (6). They conducted a systematic review on the effects of CMHT management compared to non-research CMHT management. All healthcare professionals working as CMHT included in their review have been selected or linked to the research programme. Hence, it is not clear if the results can be generalised from selected or highly committed professionals to non-selected professionals. The same applies to the findings of this study. The members of each CMHT of this study attended the first week of two-weeks training on the concept of recovery provided by the coordinating project team. This training might have a positive impact on the perceptions of the healthcare provider regarding degree of recovery-oriented care within their organisation. These findings agree with those of Hornik-Lurie et al. (12). In their study they found out that staff which had been trained in recovery-oriented interventions had higher perceptions of recovery-oriented care compared to nontrained staff (12). Thus, training on recovery-oriented practices may be an effective strategy to facilitate implementation of this care approach.

In this study, higher RSA-P scores and thus the tendency to perceive that more aspects of recovery-oriented practice were introduced were detected in healthcare professionals with limited professional experience. Since the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) of the US incorporated a curriculum on recovery-oriented care into the training of mental health professionals in 2009, the recovery-oriented approach has become more conversant (33). Thus, it is possible that the younger generation is more trained in the principles of the recovery-oriented approach due to changes to the curriculum over the last years (33).

CMHT members of this study, especially nurses and peer workers, are not always aware of their role or responsibilities or do not feel confident to fulfil specific roles. It makes sense that for example nurses do not feel confident doing some of the tasks that a psychiatrist usually does, as it is not necessarily their role in the teams, it may be something that they have not been trained for and/or it is something that they are legally not allowed to. Moreover, it may be due to the specific training/education these professionals acquire through their university career as well as longstanding traditions. In Croatia for example university level education of nurses is very new (34). Thus, nurses may have not yet acquired their professional identity. This might have an impact on how nurses identified with certain roles and responsibilities. Additionally, peer workers, in general, do not have any specific peer support education to define their professional identity. These findings are consistent with those by Carpenter et al. (35); in their study they investigated the impact of working in multidisciplinary CMHTs in North England on social workers and health professionals. They particularly examined the relationship between team identification, team functioning, psychological well-being and job satisfaction (35). Although they found out that there is a moderate to high level of role clarity within the members of CMHTs, various role conflicts were detected (35). Conflicts included disagreements between professions or discipline, workload, misunderstandings of roles and responsibilities or an increase in paperwork (35). Carpenter et al. (35) concluded that role clarity promoted job satisfaction and decreases work related stress. In our study role clarity seems to be problematic, thus conflicts and disagreements may be pre-programmed. In addition, psychiatrists, psychologist, and social workers saw themselves in almost all listed roles, regardless of being confident to fulfil those roles, an unclear division of roles impeded effective team collaboration and cooperation. The existing stigmatisation in the society and among healthcare professionals may have had an impact on the role of peer workers. The fact that peer workers are more and more involved in providing mental health care requires a huge shift in the way mental health professionals think. Additionally, the level of self-stigmatisation among peers may be very high and influencing these results of this study as well (36).

Another source of role conflict detected by Carpenter et al. (35) was inadequate allocation of resources for people with SMI e.g. access to appropriate service based on individual needs. These findings agree with those by Singh (18), in his study he reported that the rapid reduction of beds for people with SMI had a negative impact on the care provided by CMHTs. Although CMHTs may operate effectively, a majority of patients with SMI need to be admitted to acute hospital care to receive the care they need (18). Thus, access to an adequate number of acute beds and hospital care is necessary not only for patients with SMI but also for CMHTs to provide effective community-based mental health care and to avoid conflicts.

Implications for practice and policy

- It is important that CMHTs consist of healthcare professionals with a wide range of professional experience and different competences to ensure high quality of community-based mental health services.
- Role clarity, particularly the role of nurses and peer workers, is important to run CMHTs effectively and to avoid conflicts within the teams.
- More training and different steps for ensuring team cohesion may be necessary.

Strengths and Limitations

The study had a high participation rate and used some validated measures. However, this is a descriptive study in five mental health centres in different Eastern and Central Europe countries, hence the generalizability of the findings is uncertain. Moreover, all healthcare providers of all five CMHT volunteered to be part of a mobile team, so their personal commitment and their own motivation might influence the results positively compared to healthcare provider who are not involved in such a project. In addition, results may be driven by particular countries due to the difference in sample size. Due to relatively small sample sizes per country, country-specific analysis cannot be performed.

Conclusion

Trainings on community-based practices and collaborative teamwork may enhance recovery-oriented practice and helps to allocate roles and responsibilities clearly. Recovery-oriented care is a complex concept which requires time, skills and professional mindset to shift different care approaches to this new way of working. Thus, investments are needed to support CMHT members to gradually shift towards seeing strengths and weaknesses of providing community-based recovery-oriented care and being a part of the recovery process of patients rather than being leading role of this process. Furthermore, roles and responsibilities within the CMHT should be clear to everyone, particularly the role of peer workers. Additional training is needed support the role of peer workers within the CMHT and enhance their self-esteem.

Abbreviations

WHO: World Health Organisation

SMI: Severe Mental Illness

CMHT: Community Mental Health Team

RECOVER-E: Large-scale implementation of community-based mental health care for people with severe and enduring mental ill health in Europe

RSA-P: Recovery self-assessment tool Provider Version

TMSA: Team Member Self-Assessment Tool

Declarations

Ethics approval

Ethics approval was obtained of the Medical Ethics Committee of the Medical Faculty Heidelberg (S-496/2018) prior to the start of the study in August 2018 by the Heidelberg Team. Additionally, each study in each implementation site has received ethical approval from a local institutional review board prior to the start of the study:

Name of the committee for Zagreb, Croatia: Ethics Committee of the University Hospital Centre (UHC) Zagreb; Ethical approval: 18.07.2018, Number: 02/21 AG, Class 8.1-18/149-2

Name of the committee for Kotor, Montenegro: Ethics Committee of the HI Specialized Psychiatric Hospital Dobrota Kotor, Ethical approval: 28.09.2018, Number 3463/1

Name of the committee for Suceava, Romania: Ethics Council Chronic Psychiatric Hospital Siret, Ethical approval: 21.11.2018

Name of the committee for Skopje, North Macedonia: Ethical Committee for Research on Human Subjects, Medical Faculty, SS Cyril and Methodius University Skopje, Skopje, North Macedonia; Ethical approval: 21.05.2018

Name of the committee for Sofia, Bulgaria: Commission of Ethics at the National Centre of Public Health and Analyses, Sofia, Bulgaria; Ethical approval: 25.01.2019.

The study was performed in accordance with the ethical standards as laid down in the 1964 Declaration of Helsinki and its later amendments.

Consent to participate

Written informed consent was obtained from all participants before enrolment.

Consent for publication

Not applicable

Availability of data and material

The dataset generated and analysed during the current study will not be made publicly available due to European Data Protection Law but maybe available by the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Funding

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement 779362.

Authors' contributions

MW and LSZ conceived this study and elaborated the research protocol. CR wrote the manuscript. All authors provided substantial comments and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank all healthcare professionals who participated in this study and contribute to the improvement of mental health care. Moreover, would we like to acknowledges the mandate and funding for this project from the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme and the Global Alliance for Chronic Disease.

Authors' information

Not applicable

References

1. Wang PS, Aguilar-Gaxiola S, Alonso J, Angermeyer MC, Borges G, Bromet EJ, et al. Use of mental health services for anxiety, mood, and substance disorders in 17 countries in the WHO world mental health surveys. *The Lancet*. 2007;370(9590):841-50.
2. Vos T, Barber RM, Bell B, Bertozzi-Villa A, Biryukov S, Bolliger I, et al. Global, regional, and national incidence, prevalence, and years lived with disability for 301 acute and chronic diseases and injuries in 188 countries, 1990–2013: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2013. *The Lancet*. 2015;386(9995):743-800.
3. Kohn R, Saxena S, Levav I, Saraceno B. The treatment gap in mental health care. *Bull World Health Organ*. 2004;82(11):858-66.
4. Mitchell AJ, Malone D, Doebbeling CC. Quality of medical care for people with and without comorbid mental illness and substance misuse: systematic review of comparative studies. *British Journal of Psychiatry*. 2009;194(6):491-9.
5. Gutierrez-Colosia MR, Salvador-Carulla L, Salinas-Perez JA, Garcia-Alonso CR, Cid J, Salazzari D, et al. Standard comparison of local mental health care systems in eight European countries. *Epidemiology and Psychiatric Sciences*. 2019;28(2):210-23.
6. Malone D, Newron-Howes G, Simmonds S, Marriot S, Tyrer P. Community mental health teams (CMHTs) for people with severe mental illnesses and disordered personality. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2007(3):CD000270.
7. van Veldhuizen JR. FACT: a Dutch version of ACT. *Community Ment Health J*. 2007;43(4):421-33.
8. Khoury E. Recovery Attitudes and Recovery Practices Have an Impact on Psychosocial Outreach Interventions in Community Mental Health Care. *Front Psychiatry*. 2019;10:560-.
9. Davidson L, O'Connell M, Tondora J, Styron T, Kangas K. The Top Ten Concerns About Recovery Encountered in Mental Health System Transformation. *Psychiatric Services*. 2006;57(5):640-5.
10. Boardman J, Shepherd G. RECOVERY: Implementing recovery in mental health services. *Int Psychiatry*. 2012;9(1):6-8.
11. Osborn LA, Stein CH. Community Mental Health Care Providers' Understanding of Recovery Principles and Accounts of Directiveness with Consumers. *Psychiatr Q*. 2017;88(4):755-67.
12. Hornik-Lurie T, Shalev A, Haknazar L, Garber Epstein P, Ziedenberg-Rehav L, Moran GS. Implementing recovery-oriented interventions with staff in a psychiatric hospital: A mixed-methods study. *Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing*. 2018;25(9-10):569-81.
13. Andresen R, Caputi P, Oades L. Stages of recovery instrument: development of a measure of recovery from serious mental illness. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*. 2006;40(11-12):972-80.
14. Gillard S, Holley J. Peer workers in mental health services: literature overview. *Advances in Psychiatric Treatment*. 2018;20(4):286-92.
15. Leff J, Trieman N. Long-stay patients discharged from psychiatric hospitals: Social and clinical outcomes after five years in the community. the TAPS Project 46. *British Journal of Psychiatry*. 2000;176(3):217-23.
16. Trieman N, Leff J, Glover G. Outcome of long stay psychiatric patients resettled in the community: prospective cohort study. *BMJ*. 1999;319(7201):13-6.
17. Caldas de Almeida J, Killaspy H. Long Term Mental Health Care for People with Severe Mental Disorders. 2011.

18. Singh SP. Running an effective community mental health team. *Advances in Psychiatric Treatment*. 2018;6(6):414-22.
19. Haines A, Perkins E, Evans EA, McCabe R. Multidisciplinary team functioning and decision making within forensic mental health. *Ment Health Rev (Brighton)*. 2018;23(3):185-96.
20. Caldas Almeida J, Mateus P, Tomé G, Katschnig H, Hinkov H, Sooniste I. Joint Action on Mental Health and Well-Being, Towards Community-Based and Socially Inclusive Mental Health Care, Situation Analysis and Recommendations for Action. 2016.
21. Bond G, Drake R, Mueser K, Latimer E. Assertive Community Treatment for People with Severe Mental Illness. *Disease Management and Health Outcomes*. 2001;9(3):141-59.
22. Simmonds S, Coid J, Joseph P, Marriott S, Tyrer P. Community mental health team management in severe mental illness: a systematic review. *Br J Psychiatry*. 2001;178(6):497-502; discussion 3-5.
23. Shields-Zeeman L, Petrea I, Smit F, Walters BH, Dedovic J, Kuzman MR, et al. Towards community-based and recovery-oriented care for severe mental disorders in Southern and Eastern Europe: aims and design of a multi-country implementation and evaluation study (RECOVER-E). *Int J Ment Health Syst*. 2020;14(1):30.
24. O'Connell M, Tondora J, Croog G, Evans A, Davidson L. From rhetoric to routine: assessing perceptions of recovery-oriented practices in a state mental health and addiction system. *Psychiatr Rehabil J*. 2005;28(4):378-86.
25. Williams J, Leamy M, Bird V, Harding C, Larsen J, Le Boutillier C, et al. Measures of the recovery orientation of mental health services: Systematic review. *Social psychiatry and psychiatric epidemiology*. 2012;47(11):1827-35.
26. Salzer MS, Brusilovskiy E. Advancing Recovery Science: Reliability and Validity Properties of the Recovery Assessment Scale. *Psychiatric Services*. 2014;65(4):442-53.
27. Konkoly Thege B, Ham E, Ball LC. A Factor Analytic Investigation of the Person-in-Recovery and Provider Versions of the Revised Recovery Self-Assessment (RSA-R). *Eval Health Prof*. 2017;40(4):505-16.
28. Piat M, Boyer R, Fleury M-J, Lesage A, O'Connell M, Sabetti J. Resident and proprietor perspectives on a recovery orientation in community-based housing. *Psychiatric rehabilitation journal*. 2015;38(1):88-95.
29. Team building and workflow guide: University of Washington – AIMS Center 2019 [cited 2020 21. January]. Available from: <https://aims.uw.edu/resource-library/team-building-and-workflow-guide>.
30. O'Connell M. Recovery Self-Assessment (RAS): Scoring instructions and factors. 2019.
31. Wagner III WE. Using IBM® SPSS® statistics for research methods and social science statistics: Sage Publications; 2019.
32. Saxena S, Funk M, Chisholm D. World Health Assembly adopts Comprehensive Mental Health Action Plan 2013-2020. *Lancet*. 2013;381(9882):1970-1.
33. Sowers W, Primm A, Cohen D, Pettis J, Thompson K. Transforming Psychiatry: A Curriculum on Recovery-Oriented Care. *Acad Psychiatry*. 2016;40(3):461-7.
34. Kalauz S, Orlic-Sumić M, Simunec D. Nursing in Croatia: past, present, and future. *Croat Med J*. 2008;49(3):298-306.
35. Carpenter J. Working in Multidisciplinary Community Mental Health Teams: The Impact on Social Workers and Health Professionals of Integrated Mental Health Care. *British Journal of Social Work*. 2003;33(8):1081-103.
36. Vandewalle J, Debyser B, Beeckman D, Vandecasteele T, Van Hecke A, Verhaeghe S. Peer workers' perceptions and experiences of barriers to implementation of peer worker roles in mental health services: A literature review. *Int J Nurs Stud*. 2016;60:234-50.

Tables

Table 1: Characteristics of the study settings/project sites

	Zagreb, Croatia	Kotor, Montenegro	Siret, Romania	Skopje, Macedonia	Sofia, Bulgaria
Catchment area (inhabitants)	980.000	89.000 (initially/at beginning of the study) 165.000 enlarged from October 2019**	100.000	500.000	1.300.000****
Total number of psychiatric patients in catchment area	12.226	9.000 (initially / at the beginning of thy study) 16.000 *enlarged / from October 2019***	51.000	30.000*	27.000*****
CMHT staff structure	Psychiatrists, Psychologist, Nurses, Social Worker, Non-mental health Professionals	Psychiatrists, Psychologist, Nurses Social Worker	Psychiatrists, Psychologist, Nurses, Social Worker, Occupational therapists	Psychiatrists, Psychologist, Nurses, Social Worker, Psychiatric Trainees, Occupational Therapists, Disability Therapists	Psychiatrists, Psychologist, Nurses, Social Worker
Type of services for people with mental health issues	Inpatient treatment (acute and chronic care) Psychotherapeutic inpatient care, Outpatient visits 1 per month and daily hospital for first episode psychosis and schizophrenia Mobile team since 2017	Inpatient and outpatient treatment (acute and chronic care) Community based mental health service since 2010	Inpatient and outpatient treatment (acute and chronic care)	Inpatient and outpatient treatment (acute and chronic care)	Inpatient and outpatient treatment (acute and chronic care)
Financing of mental health services	Croatian Health Insurance Fund Out-of-pocket costs are not significant	National Health Insurance Fund (Bismarck's model of financing) Funds from donations	Romanian Health Insurance Fund through the DRG system	Macedonian Health Insurance Fund	State financing Municipality National Health Insurance Fund and Out-of-pocket

* Clinic of Psychiatry, Psychiatric hospital Skopje and outpatients MH Services

** Census of Population in Montenegro 2011 /

[http://www.monstat.org/userfiles/file/popis2011/saopstenje/saopstenje\(1\).pdf](http://www.monstat.org/userfiles/file/popis2011/saopstenje/saopstenje(1).pdf)

*** Data gathered from hospital and mental health centres in each municipality (free estimation / there is no published source)

**** <https://www.nsi.bg/en/content/6704/population-districts-municipalities-place-residence-and-sex>

*****Data form NCPHA database (not published)

Table 2: Period of data collection and dates of the two training weeks per project site

	Zagreb, Croatia	Kotor, Montenegro	Siret, Romania	Skopje, North Macedonia	Sofia, Bulgaria
Period of Recruitment	May 2018 – September 2018	1. – 15. October 2018	January 2018 and March 2018	20. – 31. May 2019	April 2019 – June 2019
Training Week 1 (on-site-training)	24. – 28. September 2018	4. – 8. November 2018	28. January – 02. February 2019	24. – 28. June 2019	15. – 19. July 2019
Data collection	February 2019	February 2019	April 2019	June 2019	November 2019
Training Week 2 (Netherlands)	6. – 10. May 2019	6. – 10. May 2019	6. – 10. May 2019	02. – 06. December 2019	02. – 06. December 2019

Table 3: Description of the study population (n= 66 healthcare professionals and peer worker) per project site

Project site	Zagreb, Croatia n= 21	Kotor, Montenegro n=15	Siret, Romania n= 6	Skopje, North Macedonia n=10	Sofia, Bulgaria n=14	Total N=66
Gender						
Female	15 (71.4%)	9 (60.0%)	4 (66.7%)	5 (50.0%)	10 (71.4%)	43 (65.2%)
Male	6 (28.6%)	6 (40.0%)	2 (33.3%)	5 (50.0%)	4 (28.6%)	23 (34.8%)
Age						
Mean (SD)	41.3 (12.56)	38.47 (9.71)	43.67 (6.98)	39.10 (11.22)	38.93 (11.83)	40.02 (10.96)
Profession						
Nurse	9 (42.9%)	5 (33.3%)	2 (33.3%)	2 (20.0%)	3 (21.4%)	21 (31.8%)
Psychiatrist		4 (26.7%)		2 (20.0%)		
Psychologist	4 (19.0%)	2 (13.3%)	1 (16.7%)	2 (20.0%)	2 (14.3%)	13 (19.7%)
Social worker	1 (4.8%)	1 (6.7%)	1 (16.7%)	1 (10.0%)	3 (21.4%)	9 (13.6%)
Peer worker		3 (20.0%)		2 (20.0%)		
Other	3 (14.3%)	0	1 (16.7%)	1 (10.0%)	2 (14.3%)	8 (12.1%)
	4 (19.0%)		1 (16.7%)		4 (28.6%)	14 (21.2%)
	0		0 (16.7%)		0	1 (1.5%)
Professional Experience						
Less than one year	0	2 (13.3%)	1 (16.7%)	1 (10.0%)	4 (28.6%)	8 (12.1%)
Between one and two years	1 (4.8%)	0	0	1 (10.0%)	3 (21.4%)	5 (7.6%)
Between two and three years	3 (14.3%)	0	0	1 (10.0%)	0	3 (4.5%)
Between three and four years	2 (9.5%)	0	1 (16.7%)	3 (30.0%)	0	4 (6.1%)
Between four and five years		13 (86.7%)	0	4 (40.0%)	0	4 (6.1%)
More than five years	1 (4.8%)		4 (66.7%)		7 (50.0%)	42 (63.6%)
	14 (66.7%)					

**Team size varies due different local human resources*

Table 4: Recovery Self-Assessment Scale (Provider Version) per project site

Project sites					
RSA-P subscale, mean (standard deviation)	Zagreb, Croatia	Kotor, Montenegro	Siret, Romania	Skopje, Macedonia	Sofia, Bulgaria
Life Goals	4.09 (0.456)	3.74 (0.327)	4.64 (0.368)	4.02 (0.684)	4.38 (0.281)
Involvement	3.84 (0.568)	2.67 (0.645)	4.63 (0.446)	3.95 (0.880)	4.57 (0.312)
Diversity of treatment option	4.17 (0.536)	3.07 (0.230)	4.60 (0.357)	4.05 (0.754)	4.70 (0.188)
Choice	4.44 (0.433)	4.53 (0.317)	4.48 (0.349)	4.02 (0.722)	4.79 (0.146)
Individually tailored service	3.99 (0.457)	3.35 (0.470)	4.71 (0.368)	4.06 (0.914)	4.63 (0.235)
Total RSA-P	4.16 (0.404)	3.58 (0.275)	4.46 (0.327)	4.05 (0.694)	4.46 (0.211)

Table 5: Team Member Self-Assessment tool: Identify and Engage Patients and Track Treatment Outcome

In total n=65 professionals		Nurse n=21	Psychiatrist n=13	Psychologist n=9	Social worker n=8	Peer worker n=14
Identify and Engage Patients						
Identify People who may need help	Is this my role ^a	17 (81.0%)	13 (100.0%)	8 (88.9%)	8 (100.0%)	3 (21.4%)
	Highly confident ^b	7 (33.3%)	13 (100.0%)	8 (88.9%)	6 (75.0%)	2 (14.2%)
Screen for behavioural health problems using valid measures	Is this my role ^a	13 (61.9%)	12 (92.3%)	8 (88.9%)	5 (62.5%)	1 (7.1%)
	Highly confident ^b	5 (23.8%)	11 (84.6%)	6 (66.7%)	2 (25.0%)	1 (7.1%)
Diagnose behavioural health disorders	Is this my role ^a	7 (33.3%)	13 (100.0%)	7 (77.7%)	5 (62.5%)	1 (7.1%)
	Highly confident ^b	5 (23.8%)	12 (92.3%)	6 (66.7%)	1 (12.5%)	0 (0.0%)
Engage patients in collaborative care program and introduce care team	Is this my role ^a	17 (81.0%)	13 (100.0%)	7 (77.7%)	8 (100.0%)	11 (78.6%)
	Highly confident ^b	10 (47.6%)	10 (76.9%)	4 (44.4%)	4 (50.0%)	4 (28.6%)
Track Treatment Outcome						
Track treatment engagement & adherence using registry	Is this my role ^a	15 (71.4%)	12 (92.3%)	5 (55.6%)	5 (62.5%)	8 (57.1%)
	Highly confident ^b	3 (14.3%)	9 (69.2%)	1 (11.1%)	2 (25.0%)	1 (7.1%)
Reach out to patients who are non-adherent or disengaged	Is this my role ^a	17 (81.0%)	12 (92.3%)	8 (88.9%)	6 (75.0%)	9 (64.3%)
	Highly confident ^b	6 (28.6%)	8 (61.5%)	3 (33.3%)	2 (25.0%)	1 (7.7%)
Track patients' symptoms with measurement tool	Is this my role ^a	12 (57.1%)	12 (92.3%)	8 (88.9%)	5 (62.5%)	4 (28.6%)
	Highly confident ^b	5 (23.8%)	9 (69.2%)	5 (55.5%)	3 (37.5%)	0 (0.0%)
Track medication side effects and concerns	Is this my role ^a	13 (61.9%)	13 (100.0%)	4 (44.4%)	3 (37.5%)	7 (50.0%)
	Highly confident ^b	9 (42.9%)	11 (84.6%)	1 (11.1%)	1 (12.5%)	1 (7.1%)
Track outcome of referrals and other treatments	Is this my role ^a	15 (71.4%)	13 (100.0%)	7 (77.7%)	8 (100.0%)	8 (57.1%)
	Highly	8	11 (84.6%)	4 (44.4%)	2	2

	confident ^b	(38.1%)	(25.0%)	(14.3%)
--	------------------------	---------	---------	---------

Absolute Numbers; a Answering categories were: yes; no; b Answering categories were: high; Med/low confident; ‘other n=1’ was excluded from this analysis

Table 6: Team Member Self-Assessment tool: Initiate and provide treatment

In total n=65 professionals		Nurse n=21	Psychiatrist n=13	Psychologist n=9	Social worker n=8	Peer worker n=14
Initiate and provide treatment						
Perform behavioural health assessment	Is this my role ^a	12 (57.1%)	13 (100.0%)	8 (88.9%)	6 (75.0%)	8 (57.1%)
	Highly confident ^b	5 (28.8%)	11 (84.6%)	5 (55.6%)	3 (37.5%)	2 (14.3%)
Develop and update behavioural health treatment plan	Is this my role ^a	12 (57.1%)	13 (100.0%)	8 (88.9%)	5 (62.5%)	10 (71.4%)
	Highly confident ^b	3 (14.3%)	11 (84.6%)	3 (33.3%)	2 (25.0%)	2 (14.3%)
Patient education about symptoms and treatment option	Is this my role ^a	14 (66.7%)	13 (100.0%)	8 (88.9%)	4 (50.0%)	9 (64.3%)
	Highly confident ^b	7 (33.3%)	13 (100.0%)	6 (66.7%)	4 (50.0%)	8 (57.1%)
Prescribe psychotropic medications	Is this my role ^a	4 (19.0%)	13 (100.0%)	1 (11.1%)	1 (12.5%)	1 (7.1%)
	Highly confident ^b	1 (4.8%)	13 (100.0%)	1 (11.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Patient education about medications and side effects	Is this my role ^a	6 (28.6%)	13 (100.0%)	2 (22.2%)	1 (12.5%)	4 (28.6%)
	Highly confident ^b	4 (19.0%)	13 (100.0%)	2 (22.2%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (7.1%)
Brief counselling, activity scheduling, behavioural activation	Is this my role ^a	13 (61.9%)	13 (100.0%)	9 (100.0%)	7 (87.5%)	8 (57.1%)
	Highly confident ^b	7 (33.3%)	11 (84.6%)	6 (66.7%)	5 (62.5%)	2 (14.3%)
Evidence-based psychotherapy	Is this my role ^a	6 (28.6%)	11 (84.6%)	8 (88.9%)	3 (37.5%)	1 (7.1%)
	Highly confident ^b	4 (21.1%)	8 (61.5%)	6 (66.7%)	1 (12.5%)	0 (0.0%)
Identify and treat coexisting medical conditions	Is this my role ^a	7 (33.3%)	13 (100.0%)	3 (33.3%)	1 (12.5%)	0 (0.0%)
	Highly confident ^b	4 (21.1%)	11 (84.6%)	3 (33.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Facilitate referral to specialty care or social services	Is this my role ^a	13 (61.9%)	13 (100.0%)	4 (44.4%)	8 (100.0%)	2 (14.3%)
	Highly confident ^b	5 (28.8%)	11 (84.6%)	2 (22.2%)	7 (87.5%)	1 (7.1%)

Create and support relapse prevention plan	Is this my role ^a	17 (81.0%)	13 (100.0%)	9 (100.0%)	8 (100.0%)	5 (35.7%)
	Highly confident ^b	8 (38.1%)	13 (100.0%)	6 (66.7%)	5 (62.5%)	1 (7.1%)

Absolute Numbers; a Answering categories were: yes; no; b Answering categories were: high; Med/low confident; 'other n=1' was excluded from this analysis

Table 7: Team Member Self-Assessment tool: Proactively adjust treatment if patients are not responding and other tasks important for our project

In total n=65 professionals		Nurse n=21	Psychiatrist n=13	Psychologist n=9	Social worker n=8	Peer worker n=14
Proactively adjust treatment if patients are not responding						
Assess need for changes in treatment	Is this my role ^a	15 (71.4%)	13 (100.0%)	7 (77.8%)	7 (87.5%)	5 (35.7%)
	Highly confident ^b	4 (21.1%)	12 (92.3%)	4 (44.4%)	5 (62.5%)	0 (0.0%)
Facilitate changes in treatment/ treatment plan	Is this my role ^a	15 (71.4%)	13 (100.0%)	9 (100.0%)	7 (87.5%)	5 (35.7%)
	Highly confident ^b	5 (28.8%)	10 (76.9%)	4 (44.4%)	4 (50.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Provide caseload-focused psychiatric consultation	Is this my role ^a	13 (61.9%)	13 (100.0%)	4 (44.4%)	5 (62.5%)	6 (42.9%)
	Highly confident ^b	6 (28.6%)	11 (84.6%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (5.0%)	2 (14.3%)
Provide in-person psychiatric assessment when needed	Is this my role ^a	12 (57.1%)	13 (100.0%)	4 (44.4%)	1 (12.5%)	1 (7.1%)
	Highly confident ^b	5 (23.8%)	13 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (12.5%)	1 (7.1%)
Other tasks important for this program						
Coordinate communication among team members/ providers	Is this my role ^a	11 (52.4%)	11 (84.6 %)	8 (88.9%)	5 (62.5%)	7 (50.0%)
	Highly confident ^b	4 (21.1%)	9 (69.2%)	5 (55.6%)	3 (37.5%)	3 (21.4%)
Administrative support for program (e.g., scheduling, resources)	Is this my role ^a	15 (71.4%)	11 (84.6%)	6 (66.7%)	7 (87.5%)	7 (50.0%)
	Highly confident ^b	4 (21.1%)	9 (69.2%)	3 (33.3%)	4 (50.0%)	2 (14.3%)
Clinical supervision for Program	Is this my role ^a	10 (47.6%)	12 (92.3%)	5 (55.6%)	4 (50.0%)	7 (50.0%)
	Highly confident ^b	5 (23.8%)	12 (92.3%)	3 (33.3%)	1 (12.5%)	3 (21.4%)

Absolute Numbers; a Answering categories were: yes; no; b Answering categories were: high; Med/low confident; 'other n=1' was excluded from this analysis