

UNLOCKING THE POTENTIAL OF RECOVERY COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS AND PEER RECOVERY SUPPORT SERVICES

“The community is the soil in which alcohol and other drug problems grow or fail to grow and in which the resolutions to such problems thrive or fail thrive over time.”

William White

Emeritus Senior Research Consultant, Chestnut Health Systems

AUTHORS:

Robin Peyson, MHSA

Kenneth Smith, PhD

Sierra Castedo de Martell, MPH



**FACES & VOICES
OF RECOVERY**

ADVOCATE. ACT. ADVANCE.

Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
INTRODUCTION	6
SECTION I: DEVELOPMENTS IN PEER RECOVERY SUPPORT SERVICES SINCE 2010	8
PRSS as an Evidence-Based Intervention	11
Social Determinants of Health and Recovery	16
Fidelity to the Model	17
The Role of Recovery Community Organizations in Delivering PRSS	19
Development of national standards for PRSS.....	21
SECTION 2: FUNDING PEER RECOVERY SUPPORT SERVICES	23
PRSS and Federal Funding	23
PRSS Settings and Medicaid.....	25
PRSS and Medicaid Benefits	26
Peer Support Service Roles and Medicaid	27
PRSS and Medicaid Codes	28
PRSS and Medicaid Rates	28
PRSS and Medicaid Providers	29
PRSS and Medicaid Funded Settings	29
Federal Grant Funding	30
SAMHSA Funding.....	30
Health Resources & Services Administration Funding	31
State, County and City Funding	32
Health Insurers	33
Health Care Plans and Private Providers.....	33

AUTHORS AND AFFILIATIONS

Robin Peyson, MHSA, Owner & Lead Consultant of RLP Consulting

Kenneth D. Smith, PhD, Assistant Professor of Public Health at the University of Tennessee Knoxville

Sierra Castedo de Martell, MPH, Doctoral Candidate, UTHealth School of Public Health, Austin Regional Campus.

Contents

SECTION 3: CULTIVATING THE VALUE OF PEER RECOVERY SUPPORT	35
INTRODUCTION.....	35
EMERGING INNOVATIONS OFFERING LEVERAGE FOR TRANSFORMATIVE CHANGE	35
THE UNREALIZED POTENTIAL OF PEER RECOVERY SUPPORT.....	36
Unlocking potential at multiple levels.....	37
Ending The Failure to Value Peer Workers	39
Uplifting the peer support labor force	43
Leveraging Delivery System and Payment Innovations	44
Implications for peer recovery support	45
Action strategies for broader systems change.....	47
Leveraging Emerging Collaborative Approaches to Complexity	48
Addressing complex social problems through collaboration.	49
The Accountable Community for Health model.....	51
Implications for peer recovery support	51
Action strategies for broader systems change.....	52
The Need for Leadership	52
SECTION 4: RECOMMENDATIONS	52
REFERENCES	56

RECOMMENDED CITATION

Peyson, R., Smith, K.D., Castedo de Martell, S. (2022) *Unlocking the Potential of Recovery Community Organizations and Peer Recovery Support Services*. Faces & Voices of Recovery. <https://facesandvoicesofrecovery.org/publication/unlocking-the-potential-of-recovery-community-organizations-and-peer-recovery-support-services/>

Executive Summary

The shift toward recognizing addiction as a chronic disease has placed peer recovery support services in greater focus. Since the 2010 release of the Faces & Voices of Recovery (FVR) report, *Addiction Recovery Peer Service Roles: Recovery Management in Health Reform*, certified peer specialists delivering recovery services (peer workers) have become key components of interventions designed to improve recovery outcomes. The inclusion of peer workers has become a best practice, and a number of interventions utilizing them demonstrate compelling outcomes. Of course, this progress was built on earlier development of peer recovery support services and a long history of peer based efforts, dating back to the 1800's, as described well by William White in his 2009 paper on the history, theory, practice and evaluation of peer support in SUD recovery (W. L. White, 2009).

Spurred by efforts to improve the Triple Aim, delivery-system and reimbursement innovations have emerged in the addiction recovery space. Some of these innovations incorporate peer workers as design features. However, these innovations face a wide variety of systemic barriers that constrain their effectiveness and their diffusion across regions. For example, health insurance churning may limit continuity of recovery supports during the full five-year period science suggests is needed for full recovery. Moreover, for those living in low resource communities, recovery capital—the internal and external resources needed to sustain recovery—may be far more challenging to draw upon. Without a long-term strategy to address such inequities, peer recovery support will not realize its potential for transformational impact.

This white paper lays out the key issues underlying the need for action to bring about broad systems change. First, we discuss the emergence of peer workers as distinct from counselors, social workers, and care coordinators. While offering evidence for the beneficial impact of peer recovery workers, we stress the critical need for fidelity to recovery principles and values for maximum effectiveness. ***A peer-to-peer relationship based on trust and the presence of someone with lived experience during the recovery journey are what make peer workers unique.*** Trying to match the peer receiving services with the peer coach that best reflects their lived experience, culture, and race is important and points to the need for more diversity in the PRSS delivery field. The peer-to-peer relationship also impacts health at multiple levels of the socioecological model (i.e., at individual, family, community, and societal levels) and has potential not currently actualized.

Second, we survey the variety of reimbursement and financing practices for peer recovery services. In addition to wide variability across states in financing peer recovery services, we find little evidence that reimbursement levels are adequate to cover RCOs' administrative costs. More important, we find that the compensation levels for peer workers are often below the living wage and fail to compensate them for other positive outcomes that are unmeasured, unmeasurable, or ignored by payers. Unfortunately, reimbursement levels are not set based on the actual value that emerges from the delivery of peer recovery support, nor are they based on outcomes. The broad systems change that is needed includes a paradigm shift about the transformational potential of peer workers that matches the science of addiction and the recognition of addiction as a chronic disease. This requires more than just targeting policies and practices governing reimbursement levels.

Notwithstanding reimbursement policies and practices, we believe that peer workers are systematically undervalued in ways similar to other occupations like childcare and home health care workers. This provided further impetus for considering creative strategies to address what appears to us as a complex social phenomenon. As William White notes, the issue of disproportionate pay for people in recovery has pervaded the modern history of addiction treatment and continues today (Olmstead et al., 2005, 2007).

Third, we summarize some of the trends that can be used as leverage for transformative systems change. This was the foundation for a theory of change that posits that by understanding and leveraging the dynamics emerging from these trends, Recovery Community Organizations (RCOs) can intervene in the complex systems that shape substance use and recovery. ***By engaging with key stakeholders and promoting a compelling vision for peer workers in recovery ready communities, RCOs can nurture new dynamics that ensure existing trends move toward genuinely transformative systems change.*** Crucially, this involves RCOs playing a central role in addressing the social determinants of health in coalition with local, regional, and national stakeholders—for example, by building recovery ready communities and advocating on behalf of peer workers.

We identify two leverage points where recovery community leadership can foster greater value, appropriate utilization, and adequate compensation for peer recovery support. Based on our underlying theory of change, we expect these recovery-community-led actions will uplift the peer worker profession, greatly reduce re-occurrence of substance use through peer and other recovery supports, and foster the development of recovery ready communities across the US.

The recovery community cannot do this alone, however. ***This white paper is a call to action for Faces & Voices of Recovery, RCOs, government agencies, payers, philanthropy, and stakeholders from other sectors to work collaboratively to bring about lasting, transformative change in the U.S.*** Our recommendations are grouped into four action areas designed to nurture systems change: (1) laws and regulations, (2) organizational capacity-building and community development, (3) workforce development, and (4) leadership development. Over time, these actions can support RCO efforts to shift systems from their current, sub-optimal state to robust recovery-ready communities. We hope our white paper will become a catalyst for reinvigorating the RCO and peer movement and ultimately lead to improved health and well-being for all.

Introduction

This white paper was initially conceived as focusing on how peer recovery support services (PRSS) were financed, looking at current payment models, and making a recommendation on which payment model was the best fit for PRSS. However, we found that, currently, no single payment model can be said to be a good fit: It is more complicated.

We therefore took a step back and thought about how we could address the need for a reimbursement system that better reflects the science of addiction, better meets the need for sustainable funding for PRSS and recovery community organizations (RCOs) and allows for greater availability of and access to PRSS. We wanted to approach this through a public health lens, given our commitment to and interest in public health.

We recognize the need for delivery-system reform and greater integration of behavioral health into primary care. Throughout this paper, we will discuss the PRSS and substance use continuum of care in the context of the triple aim. The triple aims are: (1) to improve the quality of the individual patient experience, (2) to improve health outcomes at the population level, and (3) to reduce the per capita costs of healthcare and work toward efficiency (Berwick et al., 2008). And we note the call for creating the Quadruple Aim (Sikka et al., 2015) by acknowledging the critical role of the workforce in healthcare transformation. The Quadruple Aim would add a fourth aim of improving the experience of providing care.

While the triple aim is of fundamental importance, we also recognize the need to improve the healthcare system's ability to address social determinants of health (SDOH) and address community wellness and diseases of despair (Case & Deaton, 2015). For example, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services report, *Healthy People 2030* (2019), speaks to the need for an increased emphasis on SDOH in order to improve our nation's health. The triple aim, however, does not explicitly require a focus on health equity (Berwick et al., 2008). Notwithstanding that, reducing health disparities is considered one aspect of improved quality (aim 1), and models developed to address the triple aim, such as Accountable Care Organizations, are also better equipped to incorporate ethical and culturally competent practices into new delivery system reforms (Betancourt et al. 2014).

We recognize that communities heavily populated by people of color, neighborhoods of ethnic groups, communities on indigenous tribal lands and many rural communities face significant additional barriers to health care, much less accessing peer recovery support services. It will be important for recovery communities to collaborate with other groups addressing these equity and justice issues. One way to do this is to ensure that the recovery community is involved in the design, development, and implementation of innovative models of care that have the capacity and are incentivized to address health disparities. This can help ensure an equity lens when innovative care models become a routine part of the health system.

New approaches to reimbursement are required to support the development of a robust network of providers at the scale required to address the substance abuse crisis and its root causes. Our analysis suggests that current rates and methods of payment have negatively impacted the availability and accessibility of PRSS. ***We need a delivery system that provides adequate pay for PRSS, covers the indirect costs of providing PRSS, and supports the development of a robust network of recovery support service providers if we are to impact the health of communities.***

In this paper, we propose that PRSS and RCOs are effective means of addressing SDOH, community wellness and diseases of despair at a community level, as they work to meet the needs of individuals struggling with addiction and associated social components of this disease. SUD peer workers who work in a recovery community organization are uniquely positioned to provide long-term engagement and an environment in which connection and healing can occur. Recovery Community Organizations that are built on recovery values and principles are organized in a way that supports the effective delivery of PRSS. In fact, it is quite possible that the observed variability of evaluative research on PRSS may be the result of the failure to consider key structural factors that impact an organization's ability to deliver effective PRSS.

As communities across our country search for solutions to the opioid epidemic, there is a need to identify strategies that can nurture the development of approaches that go beyond health system reform. In addition, we, as a country, need to identify effective strategies for addressing the impact of COVID on substance use and mental health, and the healthcare workforce. Furthermore, our understanding of the impact of the social and structural determinants of health on individuals and communities suggests the need for prevention and recovery services to work collaboratively. This paper describes the changes we have seen in PRSS since the 2010 paper released by Faces & Voices of Recovery and the Office of National Drug Control Policy, *Addiction Recovery Peer Service Roles: Recovery Management in Health Reform*, and the shift toward recognizing addiction as a chronic disease that benefits from a population health approach of disease management (Delphin-Rittmon, 2021; Saitz et al., 2008). It is time to integrate prevention, harm reduction, early intervention, treatment and long-term recovery support, as is appropriate for any chronic illness. Many leaders have called for such a system change for years and it is time for leaders in the recovery movement and beyond to take up this challenge.

This paper is organized into four sections. Section I provides a brief overview of the following: the evidence base for PRSS; the understanding of and need for long-term engagement of people with addiction, as well as an emphasis on the social determinants of health; the role of RCOs; and the need for standards based on principles and values of PRSS. Section II reviews current methods of payment for PRSS in the United States. Section III presents strategies for developing PRSS as a profession while promoting delivery system and payment reforms that better fit with the science and need for long-term engagement of people with addiction. These strategies are designed to help ensure peer workers and RCOs play a leading role in improving recovery at the individual and community level. Section IV provides a set of recommendations in support of these ideas.

Section I: Developments in Peer Recovery Support Services since 2010

In July 2010, Faces & Voices of Recovery (FVR) and the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy held a Roundtable on Peer Recovery Support Services. The result of this Roundtable was a white paper entitled *Addiction Recovery Peer Service Roles: Recovery Management in Health Reform*. The purpose of this paper was to “raise the profile of new services developed by recovery community organizations (RCOs) to support people seeking or in recovery from addiction – services that exemplify this new recovery orientation” (Faces & Voices of Recovery, 2010, p. 1). These roundtable deliberations were instrumental in the development of a more focused peer service continuum and service-specific roles. The roundtable also reflected a change in thinking about recovery at the federal level.

Many sectors of the substance use continuum of care were adopting this peer-driven, recovery-oriented culture of recovery. This sea change is exemplified by the following passage from SAMHSA's 2010 Resource Guide...

Recovery support services are non-clinical services that assist individuals and families working towards recovery from substance use disorders. They incorporate a full range of social, legal, and other resources that facilitate recovery and wellness to reduce or eliminate environmental or personal barriers to recovery. RSS include social supports, linkage to and coordination among allied service providers, and other resources to improve quality of life for people in and seeking recovery and their families.

— (Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration [SAMHSA], 2010, p. 7)

It should be noted that later definitions of recovery include emotional support as a key component of the model, including social, affiliational, and instrumental peer support (Bringing Recovery Supports to Scale - Technical Assistance Center Strategy [BRSS-TACS], 2017).

This context for understanding and addressing substance use represented an important shift away from providing only clinically based services rooted in a medical model of care and focused on “the problem.” This shift broadened the continuum of care to include a solution-focused public health perspective that gave voice to the individual in recovery, as well as the larger recovery community, including family members and allies, what William White refers to as “Friends of Recovery” (W. L. White, 2013, p. 1) The recovery movement harnessed the power of personal, family and community recovery capital. In addition, the existence and legitimacy of multiple pathways and styles of recovery were increasingly embraced.

A key element of this paradigm shift was the recognition that addiction is not an acute illness, but a primary, chronic disease of the brain that impacts reward motivation, memory and related neural circuitry leading to characteristic biological, psychological, social and spiritual manifestations. Instead of the standard “single dose of treatment,” it has become clear that long-term engagement is essential for successful recovery (Volkow et al., 2016). This needed change in understanding addiction as a chronic illness had been identified by many authors for over 20 years, calling for the development of a recovery-oriented system of care, recovery management, post-treatment recovery check-ups and related support services, and chronic disease management of

addiction. Today, acute care models of SUD treatment are recognized as limited, but they persist as the standard of care. There remains much to do, and change has been slow. However, today, recovery has emerged as an organizing paradigm and governing image for addressing alcohol and drug issues, with a shift in focus from pathology to resilience and recovery, and from problem to solution (Dennis & Scott, 2007; McLellan et al., 2000; Saitz et al., 2008; Volkow et al., 2016.; W. L. White et al., 2002).

The impact of this shifting paradigm is outlined nicely in a paper entitled *The Role of Partnership in Recovery-Oriented Systems of Care: The Philadelphia Experience*:

Recovery-focused systems transformation is the process through which behavioral health organizations shift their historical focus on acute or palliative care (serial episodes of brief biopsychosocial stabilization or sustained amelioration of personal pathology and its related social costs) toward support for long-term recovery and enhanced quality of personal/family life in recovery. Systems transformation initiatives are dramatically changing service goals and philosophies, funding and regulatory policies, service practices, constituency relationships, and approaches to performance measurement and monitoring.

These efforts are marked by:

- Unprecedented levels of participation of recovering people and their families at all levels of system decision-making
- Increased integration of addiction treatment, mental health, and primary health care
- Integration of professionally directed clinical services and peer-based recovery support services
- New organizational partners (recovery community organizations, recovery homes, recovery schools, recovery industries, recovery ministries/churches)
- Assertive approaches to sustained recovery management. (Lamb et al., 2009, p. 1)

White, Boyle and Loveland's (2003) paper on Behavioral Health Recovery Management speaks to the need to change the model to one of disease management to match the science on addiction.

Recovery management reconfigures services by offering an expanded range of services earlier than traditional intervention occurs and sustaining them long after traditional treatment services have been terminated. Recovery management is not a new rationale for larger doses of residential/inpatient treatment or more outpatient counseling sessions. It is instead a call to wrap these traditional services in a larger web of pre-treatment, in-treatment, and post-treatment recovery support services that are delivered in the community. This is not to say that treatment and recovery support services cannot be delivered in a residential or outpatient setting, but that eventually, people must apply and refine the skills of recovery management in their natural living environments. Recovery management, with its emphasis on building and preserving recovery capital, extends the time over which services are delivered, but shifts the emphasis of these services from high intensity, high-cost crisis stabilization services to proactive, lower intensity, and more sustained recovery support services. Expanding the Service Continuum Recovery management models extend the current continuum of care for addiction by including: 1) pre-treatment (recovery priming) services, 2) recovery mentoring through primary treatment, and 3) sustained post-treatment recovery support services.

— (W. L. White et al., 2003, p. 3)

In summary, the paradigm shift toward a recovery orientation and the developments in PRSS since 2010 have focused primarily on two of the three triple aims: improving the patient experience of care (aim 1) and improving the health of the public (aim 2). Developed in 2008, the Institute for Healthcare Improvement's triple aim framework influenced thinking about how behavioral health services ought to be delivered to people with SUD (Berwick et al., 2008). The framework promotes health systems changes to improve quality and population health outcomes at lower costs. For example, efforts to reduce the costs associated with substance use through primary prevention, harm reduction, and preventing relapse are all consistent with this framework.

There has also been a paradigm shift among providers in the need for cultural humility as a necessary condition to delivering culturally congruent services and producing culturally congruent outcomes. While recognizing the importance of cultural competence in supporting quality of care among diverse populations (Betancourt 2006), many are recognizing the importance of cultural humility and accountability as crucial for achieving health equity (Lekas et al. 2020). Accessing empathy and humility (Cabello-De la Garcia 2018), are the cutting edge of provider efforts to improve quality outcomes for diverse populations--and this new emphasis is consistent with recovery values.

Recovery-oriented systems of care are a promising practice that may provide better care for patients and close gaps in an all-too-often disjointed system. The recovery orientation recognizes that the recovery process is lifelong, reflecting a substantially different approach from acute care services and resulting in an improved patient experience. Further, the expansion of PRSS and proliferation of RCOs and recovery-oriented systems of care over the past decade have helped make recovery more accessible to more of the population. ***Community-based RCOs and peer workers embedded in their recovery communities go beyond addressing the immediate need for substance use cessation to help people address the Social Determinants of Health (SDOH) challenges that present barriers to lifelong recovery.*** The growth of local recovery community

organizations and other new recovery support institutions that are community-based support the possibility of developing recovery friendly communities that are well situated to addressing SDOH.

The role of peer workers is distinct from other roles in the provision of services to individuals impacted by addiction. According to a 2020 Government Accountability Office (GAO) report, SAMHSA notes that peer providers are not intended to duplicate or replace therapists, case managers or other members of a treatment team; instead, peer providers can complement clinical treatment by offering non-clinical services to support recovery (United States Government Accountability Office, 2020). SAMHSA also states in this GAO report that PRSS may also serve as an alternative, rather than as a complement, to clinical treatment for SUD. For example, PRSS may function as an alternative for individuals who decline clinical treatment for SUD. In the same report, the Office of National Drug Control Policy noted that when peer providers stay engaged with individuals who decline treatment, the possibility of future treatment engagement can be maintained. (For a detailed description of the role of peer workers and PRSS, please see Appendix A. and W. L. White, 2006, 2009).

The next section provides an overview of the evidence for the effectiveness of PRSS that has emerged since SAMHSA's 2010 review. These updates have greatly advanced PRSS as an evidence-based intervention and contributed to its expansion to almost every US state, and coverage under Medicaid in most US states. However, the third aim of the triple aims – reducing per-capita costs and addressing questions of population-level efficiency – has not yet been adequately addressed. We will explore these gaps and present what is currently known about PRSS costs and efficiency in subsequent sections of this paper.

PRSS AS AN EVIDENCE-BASED INTERVENTION

There has been a great deal of research on the effectiveness of peer workers when treating chronic illnesses. The University of North Carolina's Peers for Progress Program, located in the Department of Health Behavior in the Gillings School of Global Public Health was established in November 2015. Peers for Progress was founded in 2006 initially as a program of the American Academy of Family Physicians Foundation in conjunction with the American Academy of Family Physicians. The research they cite clearly demonstrates that peer support

is a critical and effective strategy for ongoing health care and sustained behavior change for people with chronic diseases and other conditions, and its benefits can be extended to community, organizational and societal levels (Peers for Progress, n.d.).

Overall, studies have found that peer-based social support services:

- decreases morbidity and mortality rates
- increases life expectancy
- increases knowledge of a disease
- improves self-efficacy
- improves self-reported health status and self-care skills, including medication adherence, and
- reduces use of emergency services (Walker & Peterson, 2021).

Research on patients with cancer, cardiovascular disease, diabetes, dementia, hypertension, asthma, and depression and other mental illnesses have all shown how effective peer support can be in learning how to manage a long-term chronic illness (Peers for Progress, n.d.). Additionally, peer providers of recovery support services report that, as a result of providing this support, individuals in recovery who provide the recovery support services report that they themselves experience “less depression, heightened self-esteem and self-efficacy, and improved quality of life” (Peers for Progress, n.d.).

The University of Michigan’s Behavioral Health Workforce Research Center found that peer workers, including certified peer specialists, peer support specialists and/or recovery coaches provide a variety of services which help patients with these chronic illnesses:

- Reduce symptoms and hospitalizations
- Increase social support and community participation
- Decrease the length of hospitalization stays and reduce costs of services
- Improve well-being, self-esteem, and social functioning, and
- Encourage better recovery outcomes (Gaiser et al., 2021; Videka et al., 2019).

In a report on Peer Support Programs to Manage Chronic Disease, it was found that:

Peer support is so effective in part because of the non-hierarchical, reciprocal relationship created through the sharing of experiences and knowledge with others who have faced or are facing similar challenges. This exchange promotes mastery of self-care behaviors and improves disease outcomes.
— (Heisler, 2006, p. 8)

In addition, they found that both the intensity and mechanisms linking peer support to improved health outcomes are different from and probably complementary to those provided by clinical care services from professional health care providers (Heisler, 2006). Peer workers provide a level of hope and understanding that cannot be provided by someone who lacks the personal, lived experience with the condition.

Like other chronic conditions, serious SUD often requires ongoing monitoring and recovery management to support continued remission, as well as providing early re-intervention should reinstatement of the disorder occur (Dennis & Scott, 2007; Kelly & White, 2011). This observation is one of the principal reasons why ongoing PRSS are recommended following medical stabilization and short-term care.

There has been a dramatic growth in recovery focused research, with profound results for the design of addiction treatment and recovery support services. In August 2017, Dr. John Kelly, with the Recovery Research Institute of Harvard, published his *Report of Findings from a Systematic Review of the Scientific Literature on Recovery Support Services in the United States* (SAMHSA & Recovery Research Institute, 2017). In his paper, Dr. Kelly provides a brief rationale for why recovery support services are essential to addressing substance use disorders, including the impact of alcohol and other drug use on the brain and changes to the nervous and neuroendocrine systems. He notes the psychosocial impact of substance use disorders on educational attainment, employment skills, social relationships, as well as criminal justice involvement, can leave individuals isolated from

family and friends. These deficits in recovery resources, often referred to as “recovery capital” (Cloud & Garfield, 2004; Cloud & Granfield, 2008), in turn can create hopelessness, decreasing resolve and ability to tolerate and meet the demands and challenges of early recovery. Further, it can take an additional 4-5 years before the risk of meeting criteria for SUD in the next year drops below 15% (the annual risk for SUD in the general population), as the central nervous system is repaired (Dennis & Scott, 2007; Kelly & White, 2011). In fact, earlier research by Kelly and Hoepfner (2015) indicates that higher recovery capital is associated with lower levels of cortisol, the body’s main stress hormone levels, which can support continued remission.

Specifically, the current body of research suggests that people receiving PRSS may experience:

- Improved access to social supports (Andreas et al., 2010; Boisvert et al., 2008; O’Connell et al., 2017),
- Improved relationships with treatment providers and social supports (Eddie, et al.2019),
- Increased treatment retention, treatment engagement and treatment satisfaction (Eddie et al., 2019; Magidson et al., 2021),
- Greater housing stability (Ja et al., 2009),
- Decreased criminal justice involvement (Mangrum, 2008; Rowe et al., 2007),
- Decreased emergency service utilization (Kamon & Turner, 2013; Magidson et al., 2021),
- Reduced relapse rates (Eddie, et al, 2019, Boisvert et al., 2008)
- Reduced re-hospitalization rates (Mangrum et al., 2018; Min et al., 2007), and
- Reduced substance use (Armitage et al., 2010; Bernstein et al., 2005; Boyd et al., 2005; Eddie et al., 2019; Kamon & Turner, 2013; Magidson et al., 2021; Mangrum, 2008; Mangrum et al., 2018; O’Connell et al., 2017; Rowe et al., 2007).

Additional outcome data on PRSS is reported in the University of Texas Study, Fiscal Year 2017 Final Recovery Support Services Project (Mangrum et al., 2018). Evaluations of PRSS outcomes – called recovery coaching in the study – were conducted on the outcomes of 1,226 individual participants who enrolled in long-term recovery coaching and who had completed the 3-, 6-, 9-, and 12-month check-up interviews following enrollment. Participant outcomes were examined in the following domains:

- housing status,
- employment status and wages,
- abstinence or reduced substance use,
- improvement in recovery capital, and
- healthcare service utilization.

The results from the 2018 evaluation by Mangrum and colleagues are encouraging and again reflect SAMHSA’s model of recovery domains. Long-term recovery coaching participants demonstrated improvements at check-up points in a wide range of life domains, including:

- Housing status, with 54% of long-term coaching participants owning or renting their own living quarters at 12-month check-up, as compared to 32% at enrollment in long-term coaching

- Overall employment, which increased from 27% at enrollment to 60% at 12-month check-up
- Average monthly wages of employed participants, which increased from \$258 per month at enrollment to \$881 at 12-month check-up. Additional positive outcomes for long-term recovery coaching participants included:
 - 83% of participants were abstinent or had reductions in substance use at 12-month check-up □ 71% had improved recovery capital at 12-month check-up
- Healthcare service utilization decreased over the first 12 months of recovery coaching in outpatient settings (4,242 visits at enrollment; 835 visits at 12-month check-up), inpatient settings (9,362 days at enrollment; 1,122 days at 12-month check-up) and emergency rooms (433 visits at enrollment; 162 visits at 12-month check-up), *saving an estimated \$3,518,948 in healthcare costs*. This represents a 74% reduction in healthcare costs for 1,226 individuals between enrollment (\$4,745,073) and 12 months (\$1,226,125) (Mangrum et al., 2018).

Another analysis of cost savings was completed by the Capital Area Behavioral Health Collaborative, Inc (Capital Area Behavioral Health Collaborative, 2014). The purpose of the Recovery Specialist Program Analysis was to determine if participation in the RSP program led to a decrease in the utilization of Inpatient/Non-Hospital Drug and Alcohol (D & A) services during participation in the RSP and after discharge from the program along with a subsequent decrease in costs. RSP services were provided by the RASE Project, an RCO in Harrisburg, PA. The RSP program provided one-on-one peer support to help individuals stay on the path to recovery. The Recovery Specialist worked with the participant to create recovery goals that included improved housing, vocational skills, and the continuation of traditional treatment. The ultimate goal of the RSP was to increase an individual's recovery capital and improve their level of life functioning thus aiding in their ability to sustain recovery.

CABHC utilized the encounter data from RASE for consumers who received service from June 2012 through August 30, 2013. Evaluation of the cost efficacy of the RSP looked at use of D & A services prior to and during the 15 months of the study. The study found that consumers utilized \$77,414 of D&A services prior to their participation in the RSP. If consumers utilized a similar amount of services during the entire report period without access to the RSP, total costs would be approximately \$232,242. The actual total costs of service during the report period for all three categories including the RSP totaled \$192,073. The difference is a cost savings of 17% or \$40,169 for the 40 consumers in the study group. Additional savings would be generated over a longer period of time, as a result of consumers being more successful on their path towards recovery and utilizing less D&A services. The study found that the total costs for D&A services after participation in the RSP decreased 58% in comparison to the costs for similar services prior to RSP.

The study also found that the type of service utilized by consumers changed from prior to RSP to after RSP. There was a high utilization of the Non-Hospital Residential Rehabilitation and Halfway services prior to RSP. After participating in the RSP, consumers decreased their use of Non-Hospital Residential Rehab and Halfway and increased their use of Outpatient services. Intensive Outpatient services had the highest increase in utilization after RSP services. (Recovery Specialist Program study, CABHC, 2014)

Analysis of cost savings is an important first step toward addressing the third of the triple aims of improving healthcare; reducing per capital cost. However, if we are to fully assess economic impact, any potential cost savings must be examined in combination with the effects of these savings on an individual's whole health; quality of life and other outcomes must be fully integrated into the

analysis. It is also important to recognize that cost savings cannot be realized at the expense of peer worker job satisfaction, long-term job retention and paying a living wage. As in many helping fields, when service delivery is informed by cost saving measures, resulting in underpaid and overworked staff, then the patient/ client/consumer/peer is adversely impacted, as are the outcomes. It will be impossible to build an experienced peer workforce as peer workers leave the field to find more financially sustainable careers.

However, there are several variables that make it challenging to assess the effectiveness of PRSS. In 2019, Eddie and colleagues conducted a systematic review of PRSS and noted that PRSS researchers face significant issues, including the inability to distinguish the effects of PRSS from other recovery support activities, heterogeneous populations, inconsistency in the definitions of peer workers and recovery coaches, and lack of appropriate – or any – comparison groups (Eddie et al., 2019). Further, role definitions for PRSS and the complexity of clinical boundaries for peers working in the field represent important implementation challenges (Eddie et al., 2019). In addition, the language used to describe peers differs from state to state, resulting in additional inconsistency that presents challenges to measuring outcomes.

Race, ethnicity, and cultural factors also have an impact on assessing the effectiveness of PRSS and to the ability to realize the full potential of PRSS. Barriers to access include transportation, distance to PRSS providers, distrust in the systems delivering services, and language making it difficult to assess the effectiveness of services that may be informally delivered and underreported. In rural communities, even having access to internet services can impact connecting with peer workers, formally or informally.

PRSS is currently delivered in a variety of settings, and that flexibility is one of the features that makes PRSS promising as an intervention. In addition to traditional settings like recovery community organizations and SUD treatment centers, PRSS is also delivered in general medical settings (Cos et al., 2020; Magidson et al., 2021; Watson et al., 2020), in emergency departments and emergency medical services (Ashford, Meeks, et al., 2019; Fabiano et al., 2019; Gertner et al., 2021; Langabeer et al., 2021; McGuire et al., 2020), services for people experiencing homelessness (Bardwell et al., 2018; Miler et al., 2020; Powell, 2012; Satinsky et al., 2020), parent peer mentors in child welfare settings (Berrick et al., 2011; Choi, 2015; Ryan et al., 2016), criminal justice settings including drug courts (Belenko et al., 2021; Hamilton et al., 2022; Nixon, 2020), HIV services (Latkin, 1998; Purcell et al., 2007), college campuses (Mastroleo et al., 2008), and harm reduction services (Ashford et al., 2018). However, this heterogeneity of settings can also pose a further challenge to research efforts, in part because PRSS may be implemented differently across settings, and because different outcomes may be targeted across settings.

Several other systematic reviews of the PRSS evidence base have highlighted that there is substantial variability in the assessed outcomes across studies (Bassuk et al., 2016; Chapman et al., 2018; Eddie et al., 2019; Gaiser et al., 2021). This is, in part, reflective of a general movement away from abstinence as the only measure of success for substance use recovery, and toward the use of more holistic measures that address quality of life and SDOH improvements. This presents a challenge to reaching the gold standard of evidence – the synthesis of multiple experimental studies into a meta-analysis (Brownson et al., 2009) – because identical outcome measures are not used across studies.

Many definitions of recovery include three dimensions: 1) positive changes in person-drug relationship as measured by diagnostic remission or abstinence 2) progressive improvement in global health and functions, and 3) repair of the person-community relationship (sometimes captioned as “citizenship”.) These dimensions are reflected in the way PRSS effectiveness is measured. Common outcomes of PRSS that are used as measures of effectiveness can be broken into three categories: substance use changes, changes in holistic quality of life for the individual, and changes in factors related to the social determinants of health and healthcare utilization. Substance use changes include traditional measures of abstinence, but also reductions in substance use, or changes in substance use patterns (e.g., not using intravenously, not drinking to intoxication, changes in the frequency of use, etc.). Changes in wholistic quality of life may use established measures of quality of life employed across multiple types of health issues, such as the WHO’s or EuroQOL quality of life measures (EuroQol Group, 1990; Feng et al., 2021; Skevington et al., 2004), or may use more emerging measures like the Assessment of Recovery Capital (Groshkova et al., 2013; Vilsaint et al., 2017), measures of social support, self-efficacy, and a variety of other individual-level psychosocial states, including community engagement. It is important to recognize that the third dimension of “citizenship” relates to building social capital, which creates an environment that supports greater social change and healthier communities (Betty Ford Institute Consensus Panel, 2007; W. L. White, 2007).

The third category of outcomes relates to the social determinants of health or healthcare utilization. These may be constructed to match SAMHSA’s supporting domains of recovery: health, home, purpose, and community (SAMHSA, 2012). Healthcare utilization changes measured as an outcome are a critically important first step toward understanding the efficiency of PRSS. These are often measured as reductions in using costly emergency or hospital resources, adhering to medications that keep an individual stable and healthy (such as mental health medications, medications for comorbidities like diabetes or cardiovascular disease, or medications that help treat substance use disorder), engaging in or completing SUD treatment, and adhering to regular medical visits that might not be directly related to SUD (for example, consistently attending visits with a peer worker, seeing a primary care doctor to manage a physical health concern, or consistently attending therapy for mental health concerns). So, while most studies have not yet focused on the third of the triple aims, several studies reviewed in this section have recorded some outcomes that give us a start toward understanding PRSS efficiency.

SOCIAL DETERMINANTS OF HEALTH AND RECOVERY

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention state that SDoH are the conditions in which people are born, grow, live, work and age as well as the complex interrelated social structures and economic systems that shape these conditions (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2021). Social determinants of health include aspects of the social environment, the physical environment, and health services. They are linked to a lack of opportunity and to a lack of resources to protect, improve and maintain health, and taken together, these factors are mostly responsible for health inequities, the unfair and avoidable differences in health status seen within and between populations, especially underserved and marginalized communities. In 2021, CMS issued guidance for states to address social determinants of health to improve outcomes and lower costs. While recognizing the flexibility of states to design different services to address the SDOH, it encourages states to consider existing authorities that already allow for housing, transportation, education, employment, and other services that address the social determinants of health (Costello, 2021).

Health care plans are now offering programs that address community-based PRSS reflecting the new focus of public health on the social determinants of health. Many peers become adept at navigating difficult systems, as well as having a finger on the pulse of available community resources. What makes PRSS unique is not only targeting each of these supports to people in recovery but the PRSS provision of emotional support and cultivating a growing network of trust-based relationships in the community.

The four dimensions of recovery support services developed by SAMSHA reflect this approach:

- Health—overcoming or managing one’s disease(s) or symptoms and making informed, healthy choices that support physical and emotional well-being.
- Home—having a stable and safe place to live.
- Purpose—conducting meaningful daily activities and having the independence, income, and resources to participate in society.
- Community—having relationships and social networks that provide support, friendship, love, and hope. (SAMHSA, 2012, p. 3)

As noted above in the research from the University of North Carolina, peer work also benefits the peer workers themselves. In addition, there are other benefits to joining the peer workforce. Individuals with a history of substance use disorders often have a higher prevalence of criminal justice involvement, as well as problematic educational and employment records. As a result, individuals in recovery frequently experience stigma and a loss of opportunities, even for those who have a well-established history of recovery. Certification as a peer worker represents a path to career options that turn closed doors into opportunities – the “peer to career” pipeline. While the pay scale for peer workers is low, it is often higher paying and represents more stable employment in comparison to other options available for individuals with a history of the challenges mentioned above. Better employment can lead to improvement in economic stability, safer housing and improvements in other key social determinants of health. Considering the current opioid epidemic, PRSS represents a path to rebuilding many lives as more and more individuals find themselves on a path to rebuilding their lives.

FIDELITY TO THE MODEL

When delivering any intervention or model of care, ensuring that these services are being delivered as designed is critical. This is especially true in a new field such as PRSS. As Eddie and colleagues (2019) note, there is significant heterogeneity in implementation of PRSS. This may be one of the strengths of PRSS, in that it is provided in many different settings. In addition, PRSS is delivered in different durations and intensities to different populations. However, this presents many challenges to establishing practices and training standards for each combination of variation along each of those axes, as well as presenting challenges to economic analyses, and, as already discussed, evaluating outcomes. And some research indicates that the setting and organizational structures and values may have a significant impact on the effectiveness of the peer recovery support services being delivered.

Fidelity to the model refers to the degree to which a practice model is delivered as intended. The elements of the practice model must be present and recognizable. It is important because programs that have high fidelity to the model produce superior outcomes for those individuals who receive the services of that program (Hrouda, 2015; C. T. Mowbray et al., 2003).

Fidelity criteria should include aspects of structure and process; structure encompasses the framework for service delivery and process comprises the way in which services are delivered. These can be reflected in developing standards against which service delivery may be measured, as they relate to both organizational variables as well as interactions between the provider and the individual receiving services. They reflect key elements tied to staff roles, qualifications, training, supervision, as well as key principles associated with peer interventions and ensuring that peer support retains its distinctive relational qualities, in comparison to clinical-patient relationships. These standards should also be trauma-informed and reflect the need for cultural congruence in the delivery of PRSS. It should, however, be noted that there exists some tension between manualizing/standardizing practice and the ethos of person-centered, peer-driven recovery support services.

In the article *Developing and Testing a Principle-Based Fidelity Index for Peer Support in Mental Health Services*, Gillard and colleagues (2021) note that ***evidence suggests that the distinctive relational qualities of peer support-compared to clinical patient relationships-can be eroded in regulated healthcare environments***. They further state that the measurement of fidelity in trials of peer support is lacking, and report on the development and testing of a fidelity index for one-to-one peer support in mental health services, designed to assess fidelity to principles that characterize the distinctiveness of peer support. We believe that fidelity to the model is an important unmeasured variable in program evaluations that likely suppresses the estimated impact of recovery support.

The authors state:

It has been widely argued that peer support in mental health services is grounded in peer-to-peer relationships that are highly distinctive from clinical-patient relationships, with peer-to-peer relationships underpinned by:

- a sense of connection between peers based on a recognition of shared experiences
- Reciprocity in the relationship whereby both parties learn from each other
- The validation and exchange of experiential, rather than professionally acquired knowledge. (Gillard et al., 2021, p. 1903)

The peer-to-peer relationship is based on shared power, mutual learning, connection, and validation. This helps replace old social connections that incentivize substance misuse. These new peer-based connections form the basis for cultivating new relationships with others outside the peer-to-peer relationship that models the underlying values and ethics displayed by the PRSS. This is how social capital, particularly its relational dimensions, begins to be built and spread at the community level (Claridge, 2018). The Oxford Dictionary defines social capital as the networks of relationships among people who live and work in a particular society, enabling that society to function effectively. William White's 2009 monograph on PRSS describes in detail the theoretical principles undergirding peer helping in the context of addiction recovery, which is critical for distinguishing clinical services and non-clinical peer recovery support services.

THE ROLE OF RECOVERY COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS IN DELIVERING PRSS

As mentioned above, fidelity encompasses structural/organizational variables. We believe this is a key to delivering effective peer recovery support services. Research has indicated that organizational factors relating to the implementation of peer support can impact the extent to which peer workers feel able to make use of their personal experiences in supporting others (Gillard et al., 2013).

The Peer Recovery Fidelity assessment model proposed by Gillard and colleagues is based on four principle-based domains, including:

- Building trusting relationships based on shared lived experience
- Reciprocity and mutuality
- Leadership, choice and control
- Building strengths and making connections to the community (Gillard et al., 2021, p. 1903)

This work offers a critical perspective in underlying the importance of developing an organizational culture that is based on recovery principles and values. (See Appendix A.) Organizations that lack this culture are not likely to provide the kind of environment necessary to support peer staff and deliver effective peer services and supports. In addition, recovery values and principals reflect the kind of culture that many wider communities seek as they see rising rates of diseased of despair in their neighborhoods. There has been a steady trend in the loss of social connections and trust within communities. (Mackinko, James and Bargara Starfield, 2001).

Brené Brown's body of work on healing, shame and vulnerability speaks to these issues (Brown, 2015, 2021). In her research, she found that connection gives purpose and meaning to our lives and that we are wired biologically for connection. People with high levels of shame fear connecting with others- they fear they are unworthy, not good enough. However, in order for connection to happen, human beings have to allow themselves to be seen, to find a way of becoming vulnerable and accept themselves as worthy. When shame and a sense of unworthiness is present, human beings numb themselves to avoid feeling vulnerable. Addiction is one of the ways that human beings numb themselves.

In the recovery field we often say that "addiction=isolation and recovery=connection." We recognize that the work done by peer workers is relational. It rests on the ability of the peer worker to be authentic and vulnerable, to share stories, talk about their mistakes and what they have learned on their recovery journey, to come from a place of compassion and forgiveness and lead from the heart. This is what makes PRSS transformative. Because of their lived experience, peer workers are unique in their ability to establish relationships based on trust, compassion and non-judgmental approaches. They can "see" the person seeking recovery for who they are and accept and care for them. For this to occur, the work environment where peer recovery support services are delivered must be built on trust and provide a sense of safety, both for staff and for those seeking and in services. This includes not only people seeking recovery, but people who use drugs.

This means that ***leadership and management need to create such an environment and act as role models of authenticity and vulnerability***, which is a very different style of leadership and management than is found in traditional healthcare or clinical settings. This leadership style matters, because it sets the tone for the whole organization. Leadership needs to create a work environment

that allows peer staff to be vulnerable and authentic, so that staff can engage in delivering effective peer recovery support services. And leaders need to engage with and invite the staff to co-create such an environment, because it must be an organizational effort in order to succeed. RCOs and other community-based organizations delivering PRSS that are based on recovery values and principles are best suited to this task of supporting an effective peer workforce.

The importance of creating a work environment that supports the joy and meaning of work is addressed by Sikka, Morath and Leape in their article on the Quadruple Aim; care, health, cost and meaning in work.(Sikka, R., Morath JM, Leape,L, BMJ Qual Saf. Published Online First 10.1136/bmjqs-2015-004160.) They note that the core of workforce engagement is the experience of joy and meaning in the work of healthcare.

“By meaning, we refer to the sense of importance of daily work. By joy, we refer to the feeling of success and fulfilment that results from meaningful work.....an engaged staff that ‘think and act in a positive way about the work they do, the people they work with and the organization that they work in.’..... This absence of joy and meaning experienced by the majority of the healthcare workforce is in part due to the threats of psychological and physical harm that are common in the work environment...The current dysfunctional health care work environment is in part a by-product of the gradual shift in healthcare from a public service to a business model that occurred in the latter half of the 20th century. Complex, intimate caregiving relationships have been reduced to a series of transactional demanding tasks, with a focus on productivity and efficiency, fueled by the pressures of decreasing reimbursement. These forces have led to an environment with lack of teamwork, disrespect between colleagues and lack of workforce engagement. The precondition for restoring joy and meaning is to ensure that the workforce has physical and psychological freedom from harm, neglect and disrespect. For a health system aspiring to the Triple Aim, fulfilling this precondition must be a non-negotiable, enduring property of the system. It alone does not guarantee the achievement of joy and meaning, however the absence of a safe environment guarantees robbing people of joy and meaning in their work. Cultural freedom from physical and psychological harm is the right thing to do and it is smart economics because toxic environments impose real costs on the organization, its employees, physicians, patients and ultimately the entire population.”

This article was written in 2015, and today it rings true more than ever. Considering the pressures felt worldwide in delivering healthcare during the COVID pandemic, issues of workplace environment in the healthcare system have reached critical thresholds. This Quadruple Aim speaks to why organizational structures that support a safe environment are especially critical for Recovery Community Organizations. As noted above, a work environment that not only supports finding joy and meaning in work, but provides an environment that allows coaches to be authentic and vulnerable, embracing “complex, intimate caregiving relationships”, is essential to fulfilling the transformative nature of PRSS. In addition, accreditation standards that are built on the values and principles of recovery are essential to establishing organizations that support a successful peer workforce.

DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL STANDARDS FOR PRSS

In response to the need for peer-based work environments to further refine performance and build capacity, FVR hosted a meeting of RCO representatives and allies in January of 2011. The purpose of the meeting was to explore the possibility of establishing an accreditation system for organizations and programs providing peer recovery support services (PRSS).

In the meeting, the participants were asked to share their expertise, raise questions and considerations, provide best thinking on issues, and make recommendations related to the issue of accreditation. The group showed congruent thinking and fundamental agreement that: (a) a process should be established to create an accreditation program, including the development of standards focusing initially on PRSS; (b) the process should include the formation of an advisory board, composed of key stakeholders and Faces & Voices directors for the planning and startup; and (c) ultimately, an accrediting body should be established.

Based on the recommendations from the convening, the FVR Board of Directors established The Council on Accreditation of Peer Recovery Support Services (CAPRSS) in 2013, to develop and implement an accreditation system for Recovery Community Organizations, and programs providing peer recovery support and other services and programs. The CAPRSS is the only accrediting body in the U.S. specifically designed for Recovery Community Organizations (RCOs) and other programs offering addiction Peer Recovery Support Services (PRSS). In recognition that these standards were initially developed by a non-diverse group of individuals in recovery, FVR will be revisiting these standards in the near future to assess them using a Diversity/Equity/Inclusion lens.

The primary goal of the CAPRSS accreditation process is to evaluate the level of competency in various domains, which assess the peer service(s) being delivered. Accreditation is sponsored by a non-governmental agency, in which trained external peer and expert reviewers evaluate an organization's conformance with pre-established performance standards. Although it is usually voluntary, it is often a requirement set by many diverse funders and purchasers of services. As of January of 2022, there are twenty-five accredited organizations, nationally, who will become eligible for re-accreditation every three years from their original accreditation designation date.

The CAPRSS assesses organizations/program's ability to deliver PRSS by:

- Examining their ability to create the infrastructure necessary for peer service delivery, including standards-driven, continuous quality improvement;
- Reviewing their ability to facilitate and disseminate promising, best, and, ultimately, evidence-based practices; and
- Assessing their ability to reinforce recovery-based values and principles that underlie peer services and make them valuable and effective in supporting long term recovery.

Initially, FVR focused on accrediting peer run organizations. RCOs are peer run, and by definition a minimum of 51% of their boards are made of peers and family members. However, as federal and state funding to address the opioid overdose crisis has increased and many providers have sought to add peer recovery support services to their programs, FVR now accepts accreditation applications from organizations that are not peer based and wish to add a peer-based recovery program, including treatment and criminal justice settings

This decision has not been without controversy in the recovery community. Critics of this decision voice concerns about the authenticity of PRSS delivered in organizations that lack a recovery orientation of services or a board made up of 51% of individuals in recovery or their allies. ***The power of lived experience to inform the core of an organization and the services they provide cannot be lost and is invaluable. However, RCO's who services are not based on recovery values and principles will be missing key elements of effective PRSS.*** And recovery programs based in treatment and other settings or organizations not calling themselves RCO's that fully understand and utilize recovery principles and values and support peer staff may be able to deliver effective PRSS. It is not so much the name of the organization that matters, as it is the culture of the organization and the environment they create for staff and those being served. Recovery Community Centers and Recovery Café's are also a part of the recovery community, as are organizations whose focus is on harm reduction or people who use drugs. And Faces & Voices of Recovery has taken the lead in providing support to a broader spectrum of organizations who desire to learn from and develop a recovery orientation. FVR is well-positioned to lead in this arena, nevertheless, great care should be taken not to weaken the essential elements of the recovery movement as it grows.

However, for the strategies and recommendations that we discuss in Section 3 and Section 4 to be successful, an organizational infrastructure and mission beyond operating a recovery program will be needed. We believe that RCOs have an opportunity to distinguish themselves as leaders in supporting community health, living out the values that led to the creation of FVR. This white paper offers a blueprint for how RCOs can help to bring about transformative systems change through peer-led leadership, based on the principles and values of recovery.

Section 2: Funding Peer Recovery Support Services

There are a variety of ways that peer recovery support services are financed in the United States. This section first presents information on federal funding, beginning with information on Medicaid benefits, roles, codes, rates, providers and settings, followed by information on other federal funding provided by HRSA, NIH and the DOE. We then review information on non-federal funding.

PRSS AND FEDERAL FUNDING

Currently, Medicaid, which is jointly funded by the federal and state governments, is used in most states to pay for most PRSS. In August, 2020, the United States Government Accounting Office (GAO) issued a report on *Medicaid Coverage of Peer Support Services for Adults* (United States Government Accountability Office [US GAO], 2020). The GAO estimated that 19.3 million adults have a substance use disorder (SUD) and about 4 million of these individuals are enrolled in Medicaid. The GAO notes that, in 2007, the Center for Medicaid Services (CMS) recognized that the experiences of peer providers could be an important component of effective treatment and provided information on how states could cover peer support services in their Medicaid programs.

While it was reported that only 37 states covered peer support services for adults with SUDs, there were actually 43 states in total. This variance can be attributed to six of these states using two authorities to cover services. According to the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, states can use 1915 (c) waiver and 1915 (i) state plan authorities to cover peer support services. However, MACPAC did not identify any states that were using these authorities to cover peer support for adults with primary diagnosis of SUD at the time of this data collection. Additionally, they refer to the District of Columbia as a state.

The GAO report (2020) and other data below (see table on following page) indicate that 43 states covered peer support services for adults with SUD in their Medicaid programs. States that choose to cover peer support services in their Medicaid programs have a number of different options to choose from:

- States may choose to include coverage for PRSS under their state Medicaid Plans, which must be approved by CMS in order for states to receive the federal share of the Medicaid payments they make.
- States may seek permission from CMS to provide PRSS under waivers or demonstrations, which allow states to set aside certain, otherwise applicable, federal Medicaid requirements.

These various Medicaid strategies represent a significant challenge to sustainable funding for peer recovery support services. Issues include the lack of a common definition for PRSS, the low reimbursement rates paid by Medicaid for PRSS, and the lack of adequate compensation for peer workers. The use of waivers reflects that states are trying to find ways to “work around” the system to find ways to pay for these valuable services. In order to develop a robust national delivery system for PRSS, these issues need to be addressed.

Title and Number of States Using this Authority	Authorizing Statute	Description
State plan rehabilitative services* 23 States use this	Social Security Act 1905(a)(13)	Allows a state to cover, under its state plan, medical or remedial services recommended by a physician or other licensed health care provider, to reduce physical or mental disability, and restore a Medicaid beneficiary to the best possible functional level.
Medicaid Demonstration 9 States use this	SSA 1115	Allows the Secretary of Health and Human Services to waive certain federal Medicaid requirements and allow costs that would not otherwise be eligible for federal funds for experimental, pilot, or demonstration projects that, in the Secretary's judgment, are likely to assist in promoting Medicaid objectives.
Certified Community Behavioral Health Clinics (CCBHC's) Demonstration 8 States use this	Protecting Access to Medicare Act of 2014 Section 223 as amended	Authorizes funding for eight states for a 2-year demonstration or through November 30, 2020, whichever is longer, to certify and reimburse CCBHCs, which must provide access to a comprehensive range of treatment and recovery support services, including peer support services. Allows selected states to certify and reimburse clinics that provide a comprehensive range of treatment and recovery services, including PRSS.
Non-Medicaid Services Waiver 3 States use this	SSA 1915(b)(3)	Allows states to use savings accrued from the utilization of cost-effective Medicaid managed care programs to furnish additional services to beneficiaries over and above those in its state plan.
Service Not Covered 14 states		

From US GAO, 2020.

PRSS Settings and Medicaid

There is also considerable variety regarding where adults with SUD are able to receive Medicaid-covered PRSS. Data on this was available to the GAO for 25 states and data from MACPAC was used (US GAO, 2020). Of these 25 states, at least 19 allowed PRSS to be delivered in multiple settings. Depending on the state, this can include PRSS being delivered in a clinical setting, such as a behavioral health clinic, in a residential treatment facility, or in hospital emergency departments. It can also include PRSS being delivered in non-clinical settings such as homes, workplaces, places of worship, and parks. Harm reduction programs and street outreach programs may also be settings for the delivery of PRSS.

The most frequently cited settings for peer support were outpatient provider sites, such as behavioral health clinics and substance use treatment centers. In addition, PRSS was frequently provided on a one-to-one basis. However, the MACPAC data also indicated that at least 16 states covered PRSS provided to groups, including other adults with SUD or members of the beneficiary's family or support network.

The GAO (2020) also selected three states to study in more detail. Colorado, Missouri and Oregon were chosen. These states offered PRSS as a complement to, rather than as an alternative, to clinical treatment for SUD. Some of the findings were that:

- Missouri reported that peer providers were part of a treatment team, working in conjunction with doctors, nurses, therapists, and case managers.
- Colorado and Oregon reported that PRSS was offered only as a part of a treatment plan.
- All three states covered PRSS as a "stand-alone" service, billed by clinics where the peer providers worked, in 15-minute increments.
- None of these states allowed peer providers to bill Medicaid independently. None of the states required prior authorization in order to provide PRSS.
- Colorado paid five Medicaid MCOs capitated monthly payments to coordinate care and administer behavioral health services, including PRSS, under a 1915(b)(3) waiver. State officials noted that there were no incentives in their contracts with the five Regional Accountable Entities (RAE) to encourage the use of PRSS, and they were not required to contract with facilities that had peer providers on staff. However, they noted that there might be an inherent incentive for RAEs to provide PRSS since they are paid a capitated rate and that PRSS might prevent individuals for escalating to higher, more expensive levels of care.
- Missouri combined a CCBHC demonstration option with their rehabilitative services state plan to provide PRSS using a fee-for-service system. SUD services were carved out of the managed care contracts held by the state. Missouri also used a 1115 demonstration option for specific community health centers in St. Louis County, using a capitated benefit.
- Oregon paid 15 Medicaid MCOs, called Coordinated Care Organizations, a capitated payment to deliver both physical and behavioral health services, including PRSS, under their rehabilitative services state plan and CCBHC demonstration. While there were no built-in requirements for the CCOs to have peer providers available, state officials stated that doing so might help the CCOs meet certain performance expectations, such as reducing emergency department use. As of December 2019, Oregon was in the process of applying for an 1115 demonstration that would allow PRSS to be provided by community-based peer-run organizations, led by individuals with

lived experience of mental health or substance use conditions. Oregon’s application for this waiver noted that peer-run organizations would expand the network of available providers and more effectively engage individuals who may be reluctant to access care in clinical settings.

PRSS and Medicaid Benefits

The Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission (MACPAC) issued a report entitled *Recovery Support Services for Medicaid Beneficiaries with a Substance Use Disorder* (2019). They note that, historically, Medicaid payments for RSS was mainly limited to beneficiaries with mental health conditions, and less common for states to pay for these services for beneficiaries with a SUD. This has changed due to two factors – the opioid epidemic which has disproportionately impacted Medicaid beneficiaries and the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA). ACA established SUD and mental health services, as well as rehabilitative services, as essential health benefits for individuals purchasing coverage in the individual insurance market and those newly covered by Medicaid.

This report notes that recovery support services are not defined in federal Medicaid statute, regulations, or in policy guidance. As a result, there is wide variation in how states define and pay for these services in Medicaid, as noted above. Several states reported that they use the SAMHSA description of recovery as having four dimensions: home, health, community, and purpose.

MACPAC found that this lack of definition presented a challenge to even being able to conduct a survey of the 50 states to determine what is provided across the nation. As a result, MACPAC developed a framework consisting of five distinct service categories of RSS:

- Comprehensive Community Supports
- Peer Support Services
- Skills Training and Development
- Supportive Employment
- Supported Housing

The survey of 50 states and the District of Columbia showed that these services are offered to varying degrees across the states for beneficiaries with a SUD:

- 27 states cover some form of Comprehensive Community Supports
- 37 states cover some type of Peer Support Services
- 11 states cover some form of Skill Training and Development
- 11 states cover Supported Employment
- 4 states cover some form of Supportive Housing

For additional detail see the report [here](#).

Peer Support Service Roles and Medicaid

The findings of the GAO (2020) report are also confirmed by an earlier March 2018 report from *OPEN MINDS* entitled *State Medicaid Reimbursement for Peer Support Services (OPEN MINDS, 2018)*. The *OPEN MINDS* report found that peer support services vary widely by program and state. Service roles played by peer specialists can include:

1. Recovery Coaches
2. Whole Health and Wellness Coaches
3. Community Treatment teams
4. Transition team members bridging consumers from hospitals to community
5. System Navigators
6. Insurance Navigators
7. Data Collection
8. Supportive Employment
9. Support Housing

These various roles are also reflected in the five distinct service categories outlined in the MACPAC 2019 Report.

Peer workers' responsibilities may sometimes overlap with those of a case manager in typical implementation (Blash et al., 2015; Gaiser et al., 2021). This can lead to confusion within care teams about the role differentiation between a peer worker and a case manager, especially if both roles exist within care teams, or can lead to the creation of a "consumer case manager" role (Blash et al., 2015). Added confusion may also arise from certification being confused with a job title. For example, Pennsylvania has a CRS state certification, CRS job positions, and job positions for CRS that are not entitled CRS.

Role definition and a clear differentiation of job responsibilities is important to ensure that operationalization of PRSS is consistent and done with fidelity to the model, but it is also important in order to keep a peer worker within their scope of practice, and within a reasonable workload. Having a reasonable workload may lead to better retention of peer workers because of its association with job satisfaction: one study of mental health peer workers found that peer workers who had significantly higher workloads (Black/African American peer workers) also had significantly lower job satisfaction compared to white peer workers (O. Mowbray et al., 2021). While differentiating the peer worker role from the role of a 12-Step sponsor and from a clinical therapist has been the focus of previous efforts (W. L. White, 2006), differentiation from a case manager and other important behavioral health roles is a key future direction. While there may be elements of these services in PRSS, case managers and care coordinators do not bring lived experience to the table. These clinical roles are not based on building trust, being vulnerable or communicating authentically.

MACPAC (2018) found that Case Management is an important component of building a continuum of care for an individual's continued recovery. They concluded that in order to support continued recovery, individuals need progressive clinical treatment, such as outpatient services and medication assisted treatment, as well as non-clinical supports such as recovery services. MACPAC's survey of 50 states found that:

- 10 states covered some form of recovery management for certain beneficiaries with SUD
- 17 states covered transitional case management for a patient following discharge from a hospital or a facility-based care, and
- 41 states covered targeted case management for certain Medicaid SUD beneficiaries, giving them access to needed medical, social, educational, and other services

Several states are using Section 1115 to provide comprehensive, clinically appropriate SUD care, including RSS: California, Illinois, Indiana, Rhode Island and West Virginia.

PRSS and Medicaid Codes

Medicaid reimbursement is primarily made to the organization employing the certified peer specialist, rather than on an individual basis, as can be done for Medicaid clinical professionals. Billing Codes used include:

- For General services:
 - H0038: Self-help/peer services for 15 minutes
 - H3008 HQ group, per 15 minutes
- For specific services:
 - H0039: Assertive community treatment, face-to-face, per 15 minutes
 - H0040: Assertive community treatment, per diem
 - H0025: Behavioral health prevention education service (delivery of services with target population to affect knowledge, attitude and/or behavior)

PRSS and Medicaid Rates

The 2018 *OPEN MINDS* report found that RSS rates range as low as \$1.94 for 15 minutes of group therapy to \$24.36 for code H0038. According to data from ADP supplemented with statistics from ZIPRecruiter, the cities with the highest average salaries have hourly wages ranging from \$19.50 to \$21.84. Given an average fringe rate of 30% (based on data from the Bureau of Labor and Statistics), this would be equivalent to \$25.25 to \$28.39. This suggests that MCD rates would not be capable of compensating for just the wages of PRSS in these cities—and that is just for the services. These costs exclude time outside of consultation or administrative costs. Reimbursement rates this low make it impossible for RCO's to serve Medicaid clients without incurring substantial losses. Even in states that have rates that are above these very low rates do not cover the direct or indirect costs for delivering peer recovery support services.

The low rate of reimbursement for these services continues to be problematic and does not support the sustainable development of recovery community organizations or similar non-profits offering PRSS, much less support building the capacity as states face the opioid epidemic and rising use of alcohol and drugs in the face of the COVID pandemic. An August 2020 publication in Health Services Research, *The Effects of State Regulations and Medicaid Plans on the Peer Support Specialist Workforce* (Page et al., 2020) looked at national directory data from the 2018 National Survey on Substance Abuse Treatment Services (N-SSATS) and the 2018 National Mental Health Services Survey (N-MHSS). The authors then pulled all state regulations of peer provider licensing/certification, service authorization, and Medicaid reimbursement. Their statistical analysis suggests

that increasing the Medicaid reimbursement rate for peers and creating a state-regulated peer credential (license or certification) could improve the rate at which MHTX and SUDTX facilities offer services within states. Since recovery community organizations were not included in the N-SSATS or N-MHSS directories, no data related to RCOs was included. However, it is clear that increasing the Medicaid rates would also result in an increase in recovery community organizations in states where RCOs can bill for Medicaid.

PRSS and Medicaid Providers

The MACPAC (2019) survey also found that there was a wide range of providers paid by State Medicaid programs to deliver RSS, from peers to physicians. In most states, paraprofessionals provide RSS and bill Medicaid. Peers workers provide recovery management services as well as one-on-one peer support and employment support. They engage in a wide array of activities, including advocating for people in recovery, leading recovery groups, mentoring and setting goals.

The types of providers may include:

- certified recovery support specialists
- certified family support specialists or family support peer advocates
- certified peer recovery coaches and
- youth peer support specialists

Most often, peers are individuals who are in recovery themselves from a behavioral health condition and have obtained specific training and met certification requirements defined by the state. The training, education, certification, and practice requirements for peer workers vary significantly from state to state. There are no national standards at this time and the quality of the training, as well as the key content and required length of the training varies. RCO's that employ peer workers can evaluate what additional training would be beneficial beyond state requirements, as a part of staff development. As research provides additional information on what the key elements are and what makes PRSS effective, training and education will need to be updated.

In addition, MACPAC found that professionals, including social workers, psychologists, and addiction counselors can typically bill for RSS, including skills training and development and comprehensive community support services. In some states, physicians, nurse practitioners and physician assistants can also bill Medicaid for RSS. As discussed, having clinicians deliver peer recovery supports and services is problematic, at the very least, and likely to be ineffective, as the unique elements will be missing. In order to ensure peer support is delivered in the way that people in recovery desire, delivery of PRSS would be restricted to peers.

PRSS and Medicaid Funded Settings

Medicaid reimburses PRSS in clinical settings, such as outpatient behavioral health providers, as well as in community settings, such as a beneficiaries' homes or workplaces. A few states restrict the delivery of RSS to behavioral health treatment facilities, which means that recovery community organizations are under-utilized. Many of the individuals interviewed stated that they prefer that RSS be made available across the continuum of care, rather than limited to specific treatment settings such as residential treatment, including once treatment is complete.

The availability of where individuals can access peer recovery support services is a limiting factor and has a structural impact on the development of a robust recovery-oriented system of care and recovery-based community solutions. This is a systems issue that needs to be addressed. The current Medicaid system supports a medically based model in which recovery is based within a clinical treatment model, and is available post-treatment. In medical settings, treatment is administered to achieve stability/normal range functioning with a minimum follow-up (i.e. 3 months 6 months, 1 year.) Treatment plans are developed by clinical staff, and are not person-centered, strength-based or generated by the person who is the recipient of the plan, as is a recovery plan. In addition, clinical and medical language often does not translate well to peer and SUD services. The Medicaid system does not reflect the current research on addiction as a chronic illness, where 3 to 5 years of long-term engagement is required for successful recovery.

FEDERAL GRANT FUNDING

SAMHSA Funding

The MACPAC report, *Recovery Support Services for Medicaid Beneficiaries with a Substance Use Disorder* (2019), also details the use of Non-Medicaid Funding for RSS. SAMHSA has made funding available for these services through numerous programs including

- Access to Recovery grants
- State Targeted Response to the Opioid Crisis grants
- Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Block grants

Importantly, the MACPAC report notes that there is a need to identify a long-term source of funding for RSS. Stakeholders note that they must use multiple funding streams to provide comprehensive RSS to Medicaid beneficiaries. Grant funding is often used as a way to make up for restrictions posed by Medicaid on payment for certain services needed by the population being served, such as housing and food. This again points to the discussion in Section 1 on the social determinants of health and the need to meet basic wellness requirements.

The Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration has paid for peer recovery support services through Building Communities of Recovery (BCOR) funding opportunities, among other mechanisms. Rather than reimbursing PRSS in a fee-for-service payment system, BCOR and other similar grants would support all or a portion of a peer worker's salary, delivering PRSS more flexibly than fee-for-service models may allow. Leaders of mental health peer-run organizations were surveyed in 2012 about their willingness to accept Medicaid reimbursement for mental health peer services, and indicated concerns about the compatibility of a recovery orientation of services with fee-for-service reimbursement, as well as concerns about lacking sufficient staff to manage billing (Ostrow et al., 2017). Funding mechanisms like BCOR allow recovery community organizations and other organizations where PRSS are delivered to structure budgets and pay for PRSS in ways that are compatible with the mission and capacity of the organization.

It should be noted that Federal grants are often used to provide funding for the salaries of the SUD peer workers; the result of which is that the salary is set by the organization submitting the grant. According to a June 2022 aggregation of reported certified peer worker, the average hourly rate is \$16.33 (Annual salary of \$38,061 with a range of about \$13.00 to \$21.00 (Indeed.com, 2022). This is particularly important during the substantial increases in cost of living across many US regions

since the COVID-19 pandemic: Medicaid reimbursement rates set by each state may not be able to keep pace with cost-of-living increases, while grants that allow for organizations to set their own employee salaries may offer more flexibility to address these concerns. Furthermore, multiple funding streams can create disparities in the delivery and reporting of PRSS and reimbursement rates within the same organization. For example, grant funding streams may allow for more flexibility in delivering PRSS and a higher wage/salary for the peer providing those services under the grant funding stream. Whereas, the delivery of PRSS under Medicaid may result in a lower wage/salary and a more restrictive delivery of PRSS. Differing funding streams may also create additional barriers to the delivery of PRSS through burdensome documentation of the PRSS. This is evident in organizations that have diverse funding streams with PRSS delivered through grants, contracts, and Medicaid.

Block Grant funds are received by each state from the federal government to support behavioral health services. Each state has discretion about how these funds are spent. Funds are provided by SAMHSA for Community Mental Health Services (MHBG) and for Substance Abuse, Prevention and Treatment (National Association of State Alcohol and Drug Abuse Directors, 2021; Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, 2017). Block grants are non-competitive grants and are used to supplement Medicaid, Medicare and private insurance services. Specifically, they fund

- priority treatment and support services for individuals without insurance or for whom coverage is terminated for short periods of time
- priority treatment and support services that demonstrate success in improving outcomes and/or supporting recovery that are not covered by Medicaid, Medicare, or private insurance

States have specific dollar amounts that they are required to spend in specific amounts. SAMHSA requires states to “set aside” a percentage of the appropriated amount to cover its costs for data collection, technical assistance, and program evaluation, as well as a baseline allotment. The baseline allotment is calculated based on the relative shares of the Population-at-risk, Cost-of-Services and Fiscal Capacity Indexes. Some states have made substantial investments in recovery support services, including peer support services, RCO’s, recovery housing and recovery workforce development using SAPT Block Grant funds. Recovery stakeholders are currently advocating for SAMHSA to require each state to “set aside” 10% percent of the SAPTBG specifically for RCO’s and PRSS. This would be an important step in providing stable, sustainable funding for PRSS and RCO’s.

In addition to funds received by the federal government through Block Grants and other grant funding, States are also using general revenue funds, as well as dedicated funds from Governor’s commissions or task forces. Funds from lawsuits brought against pharmaceutical companies implicated in unethical practices during the opioid public health emergency may also provide important, if temporary, funds for some states. Lessons learned from tobacco industry lawsuit settlement funds may provide important guidance for how these funds are allocated (Sharfstein & Olsen, 2020).

Health Resources & Services Administration Funding

The Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) offers multi-year funding for rural communities to address barriers to treatment of opioid use disorders and other substance use disorders the community may consider a priority. The grants are eligible to communities in HRSA-designated rural areas with a demonstrated need to address substance use. The program, the

Rural Communities Opioid Response Program (RCORP), provides funding and technical assistance for communities to develop and convene a regional coalition of multisector stakeholders (e.g., behavioral health providers, residents with lived experience, homeless/housing sectors, criminal justice system, communities of faith, etc.) to conduct an assessment and an action plan to address use of opioids and other substances. Additional grant funding is available for plan implementation. Since 2018, HRSA has invested over \$400 million across 1,500 counties (Health Resources Services Administration, 2022). RCORP initiatives offer the opportunity to reduce silos and work at community and systems levels to address barriers to SUD prevention, treatment, and recovery.

The Health Resources & Services Administration (HRSA) has relatively recently begun to fund the training and development of the substance use disorder peer workforce. One recently-concluded funding opportunity entitled the Opioid Workforce Expansion Program (OWEP) for Paraprofessionals provided up to \$3,000 in scholarships per trainee, in addition to supporting some administrative costs of training programs (Health Resources & Services Administration [HRSA], 2021). A recent expansion of HRSA's Behavioral Workforce Education and Training funding opportunity to include paraprofessionals further expands OWEP by providing both the \$3,000 in scholarships, and an additional stipend of \$5,000 per trainee to offset the financial burden of experiential training required by many states for peer worker certification (HRSA, 2021). While HRSA workforce development grants do not fund the provision of peer recovery support services, they are an important and relatively recent mechanism by which the expansion of the peer workforce can be promoted.

State, County and City Funding

The University of Massachusetts Medical School (UMASS) conducted a December 2018 study, *Recovery Coaches in Opioid Use Disorder Care*, prepared for the RIZE Foundation (London et al., 2018). The study conducted interviews of 10 programs and found that state and county entities frequently administer federally funded grants or use other public grants to fund recovery coach programs.

For example, Communities for Recovery (CforR), an RCO in Austin, TX has a number of grant funded contracts. CforR currently receives funding from Travis County as a subrecipient of a SAMHSA grant to serve the Family Drug Treatment Court. CforR also has a contract with the County's local Mental Health Authority, Integral Care. In addition, they have contracts with the City of Austin for the Downtown Community Court and the Office of Public Health. A third subrecipient contract with the City is through a partnership with the Texas Harm Reduction Alliance. All of these contracts serve individuals below 200% of the poverty rate; many are also either unhoused or formerly unhoused. Furthermore, CforR is in the process of developing additional contracts through the county, including with a community based Federally Qualified Health Center (FQHC).

Sobering centers may also employ peer workers, and are often funded by local governments at the city or county level (Warren et al., 2016). Sobering centers are alternatives to jail or emergency departments for individuals who are publicly intoxicated, but not otherwise suffering from a medical emergency due to that intoxication (Warren et al., 2016). For example, the sobering center in Houston, Texas receives a budget of \$1.64 million from the city of Houston, and the primary staff on site are state-certified SUD peer workers, working in concert with psychiatric technicians to serve acutely intoxicated individuals and connect them to appropriate services prior to discharge (Jarvis et al., 2019).

Health Insurers

The UMASS study (London et al., 2018) notes that private insurers are beginning to cover recovery coach services on a limited basis. In Massachusetts, Aetna Insurance had agreed to fund recovery coach services for individuals enrolled in its programs. And several private health plans employed their own recovery coaches.

The UMASS paper also notes that a strong recovery coach workforce needs sustainable financing that can be relied on year after year. The study found that most recovery coach programs that were reviewed for the study were funded through grants that required annual renewal. While grant funding provided much-appreciated flexibility, it did not provide sustainability. Some programs were working on developing the infrastructure needed to bill third parties, particularly Medicaid. In addition, some RSS providers were concerned that trying to utilize a medically oriented system such as Medicaid for revenue would have a negative impact on the peer-driven model.

Health Care Plans and Private Providers

There has been an explosion of interest and investment nationally in peer recovery support substance use services, including recovery services. *Middle Market Growth* notes that, as the demand for drug and alcohol rehab facilities continues to rise, private equity firms see an opportunity to help patients receive care. According to an analysis conducted by Provident, a leading investment banking firm specializing in merger and acquisition, strategic planning and capital formation, addiction treatment has rapidly become one of the most highly sought-after subsectors of healthcare services for investment. They identify a multitude of key factors at both the macroeconomic and microeconomic level that have promoted the flow of private equity dollars into the sector.

“Given the varied treatment settings for addiction treatment services, private equity firms are attracted to the multitude of options available for growing a portfolio investment within the sector across a number of services, payors, and geographical segments.”

For example, in 2019, Austin, Texas based MAP Health Management (“MAP”), a leading national provider of peer recovery support services announced an investment by Triton Pacific Capital Partners, LLC. This investment is in addition to the \$25 million capital round MAP announced closing in March, 2019, which was headed by Aetna, a CVS Health Business.

Joseph Davis, Managing Partner at Triton Pacific, said, “MAP’s important mission of providing ongoing care for the chronic disease of addiction through leveraging peer services is filling a very substantial gap in the addiction treatment space. We’re thrilled to invest in MAP and help power the company’s national expansion of treatment providers and health plans.”

Ophelia, a New York-based provider of virtual opioid disorder treatment services, landed \$15 million in Series A Funding. They raised another \$50 million in a Series B funding round. RCap Equity, a Philadelphia private equity firm made a growth investment in Ascension Recovery Services in 2020 (Coward, 2021; Larson, 2021). The addiction treatment market is estimated to be worth \$42 billion, and has grown alongside the nationwide rise in substance use disorders (Albinus, 2021).

This is part of an overall growth trend for private equity investment in the US healthcare industry. According to Bruch et al. (2020), private equity investments in US Healthcare grew from \$23.1 billion to \$78.9 billion from 2015 to 2019. Private equity investment in the addiction treatment industry is likely to lead to increasing concentration with larger providers operating facilities across multiple states. Equity investment offers the potential for greater returns for its investors through innovation or improved efficiencies. It is unclear how private equity would impact peer workers. On the one hand, equity investors may be willing to support peer worker interventions depending on how the intervention impacts the organization's bottom line—which depends on the reimbursement practices of the organization's payers. Value-based care arrangements that incentivize maintenance of recovery would provide support for peer worker programs. On the other hand, the desire for efficiencies may incentivize lower wage offers and higher caseloads for peer workers. Notwithstanding these opportunities and threats, the recovery community should be prepared for the competition that a more consolidated addiction treatment industry would entail.

Additionally, private equity investors may be willing to fund innovating models that involve peer workers to demonstrate proof of concept. Such opportunities may involve more local-level enterprises at the municipal and regional levels.

What is clear from this review of both federal and non-federal funding sources is that the current funding system falls short of providing sustainable funding for peer recovery support services, recovery community organizations or other organizations delivering authentic PRSS in peer-led settings. And it also appears that, as PRSS increases in popularity as an effective approach to addressing substance use and addiction, for-profit companies and health insurance providers are adding these services to their health care programs and plans. However, in doing so, they may overlook the very organizational elements that lead to PRSS being an effective intervention. Without the presence of a strong organizational recovery culture built on recovery principles and values, PRSS outcomes may vary in their effectiveness.

Section 3: CULTIVATING THE VALUE OF PEER RECOVERY SUPPORT

INTRODUCTION

As discussed in Section 1, peer workers emerged as a profession during a period of health reform and a rise in diseases of despair. These trends are influencing how the behavioral health system will deliver care to people struggling with substance use, which, in turn, will shape the employment and professional development of peer workers. From these trends, we sense an emerging future that develops peer recovery support services as a critical component of a science-based approach to recovery, liberated from the structural constraints that inhibit transformative systems change.

This chapter provides a summary of the trends that have shaped the current opportunity structures for transformative systems change. We identify two leverage points where RCOs and other recovery advocates can intervene to produce larger shifts in complex systems that shape substance misuse and recovery. Based on an underlying theory of change, we expect those shifts will uplift the peer recovery support services profession, greatly reduce relapse through peer and other recovery supports, and foster the development of recovery ready communities across the US.

EMERGING INNOVATIONS OFFERING LEVERAGE FOR TRANSFORMATIVE CHANGE

Because substance misuse has historically been viewed as a moral or a criminal justice issue, not a treatable medical condition, resources for prevention and treatment have often been limited. This social/cultural lens has revealed significant disparities and inequities, and transformative change must include efforts to address these issues. Developing culturally informed PRSS systems, increasing BIPOC PRSS providers and BIPOC led organizations that provide PRSS, as well as creating space for BIPOC recovery leaders to emerge and receive recognition are all needed in a system that supports harm reduction, recovery, and wellness for BIPOC community members.

The greater recognition of SUD as a treatable disease and the desire to increase resources for treatment accelerated efforts to integrate behavioral health with medical care. As noted in Section 1, the Institute for Healthcare Improvement's triple aim framework has more recently influenced thinking about how behavioral health services ought to be delivered for people with SUD.

Section 1115 waivers allow states flexibility to implement innovative delivery system reforms to reduce costs and improve efficiency in Medicaid. CMS has expressed interest in working with states to provide a continuum of care for people struggling with addiction. In a letter to state Medicaid directors, CMS (2017) offered guidance for applying for waivers to address the opioid epidemic. This included a set of goals and milestones for proposed 5-year demonstrations. Proposed demonstrations utilizing peer supports can support several of the 6 recommended milestones, particularly for improved coordination and transitions between levels of care and comprehensive treatment and prevention strategies.

This is an example of how the Affordable Care Act (ACA) accelerated innovative approaches to achieve the triple aim. The Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services' (CMS') value-based programs involve a number of innovative financing methods to ensure that providers are paid for quality rather than volume. The CMS Innovation Center has nurtured delivery system and payment

innovations for both Medicare and Medicaid. For example, the Patient Centered Medical Home (PCMH) is a model designed to provide comprehensive, coordinated, patient-centered primary care. Over 500 PCMHs have been implemented across the country (Appold, 2021). CMS offers the Medicaid Medical Home Plan option to develop similar models as an option for Medicaid managed care organizations (MCO).¹ In response to ACA, MCOs in a number of states, particularly those that expanded Medicaid, have integrated substance abuse benefits with physical health and mental health benefits, and many states have explored ways to integrate social services for beneficiaries with SUD (Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, 2019).

More recent innovations go beyond meeting an individual patient's social needs to active involvement in community transformation through cross sectoral collaboration. For example, FQHCs implementing the Community Centered Health Homes model (Cantor et al., 2011) go beyond screening and matching patients with services. Rather, the model involves FQHC leadership taking an active role in addressing the social determinants of health in their communities. By improving the environments where patients, their families, and neighbors live, learn, work, play, pray, and transport, community stakeholders can address the root causes that determine how patients present in the clinic. Those efforts can be seen as a continuation of the movement to build healthy communities and reduce health inequities through policy, systems, and environmental change. A common approach is to convene local or regional stakeholders from multiple sectors for assessment, planning, and plan implementation (Cantor et al., 2011; Woulfe et al., 2010).

The current environment is fertile ground for introducing a greater focus on treatment, prevention, and recovery. Peer specialists already link clients in recovery with tangible assistance like housing and transportation—two important social determinants of health. ***Recovery community organizations already foster connections with social service agencies to whom peer workers refer their clients. They are an ideal convener for recovery-related assessment and planning. The recovery ready ecosystem model (Ashford, Brown, et al., 2019) provides a systematic framework for building a recovery ready community that prevents substance abuse, promotes harm reduction, and ensures people in recovery have needed supports to prevent re-occurrence of use.***

This suggests the seeds are already sown for new, more efficacious approaches to recovery. However, a clear understanding of the lay of the land will be needed before cultivating the field. In the next section, we discuss the potential value of peer recovery support and the factors limiting that potential.

THE UNREALIZED POTENTIAL OF PEER RECOVERY SUPPORT

As discussed in Section 1 on the Value of PRSS, research had shown that the risk level of SUD among individuals in recovery takes approximately 4-5 years to decrease the risk level to that of the general population (Dennis et al., 2007; Dennis & Scott, 2007). During this time frame, higher than average stress hormones render these individuals more prone to return to stress-induced use (Kelly & Hoepfner, 2015; Stephens & Wand, 2012). Stress hormones also impair the cultivation of new skills, which can make it challenging for people in recovery to learn to cope with stressors of place, people, mode states, etc.

¹ This and other options involve waivers that facilitate delivery system improvements. For example, by law, federal Medicaid dollars can be allocated only to medical care. However, certain waivers provide supports for home and community-based services to facilitate long-term care and other supports.

Peer workers, by design, are poised to play a leading role in reducing re-occurrence of use by supporting those that are most challenged by these stressors. Peer workers help people in recovery draw upon recovery capital to sustain recovery over the long-term. They build an individual's recovery capital by offering four sources of support, including (1) tangible support (e.g., linkages to jobs, housing), (2) informational support (e.g., advice), (3) emotional support (compassion, empathy), and (3) social support (e.g., sense of belonging) . These supports build resilience and buffer stress during the recovery period. Evidence indicates that recovery capital is associated with reducing serum CRH/cortisol levels, which can support continued remission (Kelly & Hoepfner, 2015).

Research suggests a large segment of the recovery population could benefit from PRSS. Although half of this population will recover from alcohol and other drug problems after one or two quit attempts, the other half struggle with chronic re-occurrence of use. For example, the distribution of quit attempts among those with alcohol and other drug problems is highly skewed with an average of 5.4 quit attempts (with a standard deviation of ± 13.4). This suggests a very large population with severe SUD continue to struggle with relapse (Kelly et al., 2019), some over multiple years. Many of these individuals are likely exposed to multiple social stressors and could substantially benefit from a trustworthy partner who can help them build the recovery capital needed to prevent a return to use. In a systematic review of the scientific findings on peer-based recovery services, Kelly (2017) confirms: "Taken together, results from the emerging P-BRSS [peer-based recovery support services] literature suggest P-BRSS may have potential to reduce substance use and increase treatment engagement and adherence. (p. 9)"

Unlocking potential at multiple levels

The current behavioral health delivery system is focused primarily on acute care medical stabilization and has insufficient funding for long-term recovery management and support services. Waivers required to incorporate wrap-around and other community supports involve transaction costs that can constrain the spread of innovations. These factors result in a system that fails people in recovery at unnecessarily higher costs to taxpayers. The research points to a solution: an extended recovery period combined with peer recovery support services. Systems changes that could bring this about can improve a number of population health outcomes, including lower rates of re-occurrence of use, and associated societal and health systems cost savings. However, PRSS has the potential to effect change beyond the walls of the health system, as well as the walls of our criminal justice system.

Peer workers hold the promise of a trust-worthy companion helping to unlock potential and transform the lives of people on their journeys to full recovery (Simpson et al., 2014). As members of a community at large, these peer workers, with the support of recovery care organizations, can also transform communities by strengthening social cohesion. In the process of supporting their individual clients, peer workers help build networks of trust within the recovery community and beyond. Social cohesion, the strength of relationships and a sense of solidarity in the community, is a key component of Healthy People 2030's Social and Community Context Domain (Pronk et al., 2021). Greater social cohesion is associated with greater levels of physical and psychosocial wellbeing. at the individual level (Thoits, 2011). Social cohesion can also help foster action at the community level that further improves access to tangible supports often lacking in many communities.

There is incidental evidence that peer workers and RCOs are helping to produce social cohesion at the community level—a positive externality for which, by definition, they are not being

compensated. The cultivation of a trusting relationship is a core part of developing a sense of belonging. Developing a sense of belonging is one of the ways peer support specialists provide social support. However, such a relationship by nature cannot be fully transactional, and some would consider it inherently priceless.

RCOs and peer workers are best positioned to play a major role in improving community cohesion as well as community-level recovery capital. RCOs, for example, can leverage their networks to advocate for changes in policies and practices at the local level. They could be the convener of regional cross-sector collaboratives to foster joint action among sectors that are impacted by addictions but often do not work together—including for example, homelessness, healthcare, and criminal justice sectors. In fact, we recommend that new behavioral health delivery system innovations consider incorporating an explicit role for recovery care organizations to improve the social and community context in which people in recovery live. This would potentially strengthen the impact of the model by operating across multiple levels of the socio-ecological model.

The socioecological model is a framework that recognizes the relationship between individual, relational, community, and societal factors at shaping health. Peer workers impact the health at the individual level by helping their peer avoid a return to use and to offer support in the event of a return to use. However, they also impact health at the relational level by providing a trusted companion on the peer's recovery journey. That kind of social support has an impact on health beyond the individual health impacts. By developing recovery ready communities, RCOs can have an impact on health and the community level, as more resources for building recovery capital are available to people in recovery. Finally, by supporting the peer worker profession, they have an impact on health at the societal level by supporting wellbeing of the peer workers and their families through a living wage.

Notwithstanding the existing evidence of the benefits of peer recovery support services, we wonder whether observational or experimental studies can capture the full potential of this evolving profession. Current market dynamics suggest peer recovery services are operating below their optimal level of impact in society. Peer recovery support services, which were originally recommended by people in recovery themselves—not by medical experts—exist in a market environment that currently under utilizes and undervalues the services that peer workers provide. Estimates of the impact of peer workers, for example, are conditioned on a market that does not enable the coaches to provide as much as they can potentially offer. In a world where peer workers flourish as a profession and are fully integrated in the recovery process, it is quite likely that they would demonstrate even better outcomes.

Ending The Failure to Value Peer Workers

To gain insight about how peer workers are valued in the market, we compared observed hourly wages with the livability wage for one state.² Texas, a middling state in terms of annual salaries (see Table III.1), is below the national average for hourly wages. At \$15.44 per hour, the mean observed wage comes within 11 cents of a living wage for a single adult with zero children (see Table III.2). However, the mean observed wage for peer workers in Texas is well below the living wage for a family of two working adults with one child. If both adults are working, they would both need to earn at least \$21.24 to afford the basic necessities of life; otherwise, a peer recovery specialist could still earn the average wage of \$15.44 but their partner would need to earn \$26.93 to achieve a combined livable wage.

2 The living wage is a market-based approach that draws upon geographically specific expenditure data related to a family's likely minimum costs for food, childcare, health insurance, housing, transportation, cell phone and broadband service, funds for civic engagement and other necessities (Glasmeier, 2020).

TABLE III.1: Estimated Peer Recovery Specialist (Peer Worker) Average Salary: National and Select States, March 2022

State	Annual Salary	Hourly Wage
National	\$36,869	\$17.73
Top 5		
Massachusetts	\$42,961	\$20.65
Washington	\$39,333	\$18.91
Maryland	\$38,305	\$18.42
New York	\$38,101	\$18.32
Nebraska	\$37,558	\$18.06
Middle Range		
Delaware	\$35,842	\$17.23
Vermont	\$34,690	\$16.68
Connecticut	\$33,689	\$16.20
West Virginia	\$33,115	\$15.92
Alaska	\$33,108	\$15.92
Pennsylvania	\$32,555	\$15.65
Texas	\$32,121	\$15.44
Minnesota	\$31,853	\$15.31
Oregon	\$31,346	\$15.07
North Carolina	\$30,907	\$14.86
Kansas	\$30,861	\$14.84
Bottom 5		
Iowa	\$30,459	\$14.64
Alabama	\$30,213	\$14.53
New Mexico	\$30,039	\$14.44
Florida	\$29,158	\$14.02
Mississippi	\$28,909	\$13.90

Source: ZipRecruiter estimations based on ADP data, March 2022 Note: Estimated salaries are based on a sample of 20 percent of the US labor force and track closely with estimates from the US Bureau of Labor Statistics.

It is important to note that a significant share of peer workers in Texas earn a wage well above the mean. ³If they lack health insurance, however, the wage in Texas is too high for Medicaid. The peer workers would purchase a plan on the individual insurance market. Notwithstanding compensation, well over a third (See Table III.3) of peer workers in Texas earn above the livable wage for a single individual while none of them earn a livable wage for a single parent adult—at least among those that appear in the ADP database.

TABLE III.2: Peer Recovery Specialist (Peer Worker) Hourly Actual with Living Wage: Texas, March 2022

Wage Group	March 2022 Average
Hourly Wage: Peer Recovery Specialist, Texas, 2022	\$15.44
Living Hourly Wage: One Adult, No Children, Texas, 2022	\$15.41
Living Hourly Wage: One Adult, One Children, Texas, 2022	\$31.55
Living Hourly Wage: Two Adults (both working), No Children, Texas, 2022	\$21.43

Source: MIT Wage Calculator, 2020. Note: Living wages were inflated from 2020-2022 dollars using the Consumer Price Index to enable comparisons in comparable years.

³ Some might suggest the higher salary ranges evidence the potential for career advancement; however, the geographic distribution of jobs in a state as large as Texas makes this highly unlikely. Furthermore, the peer workers are more effective when they come from the same communities and similar backgrounds as those they serve.

TABLE III.3: Observed Peer Recovery Specialist (Peer Worker) Wage Distribution: Texas, March 2022

Annual Salary Range	Midpoint Hourly Wage	Jobs within Rangea
\$17,721 - 21,264	\$9.37	3%
\$21,265 - \$24,808	\$11.06	14%
\$24,809 - \$28,352	\$12.75	24%
\$28,353 - \$31,897	\$14.49	23%
\$31,898 - \$35,441	\$16.19	13%
\$35,442 - \$38,985	\$17.89	6%
\$38,986 - \$42,529	\$19.60	8%
\$42,529 - \$46,071	\$21.30	2%
\$46,074 - \$56,708	\$24.71	<1%

Source: ZipRecruiter estimations based on ADP data, March 2022 Note: Observed salaries are based on a sample of 20 percent of the US labor force and track closely with estimates from the US Bureau of Labor Statistics. aThe distribution does not add to 100 because it excludes observations for which salary information was unavailable.

Peer recovery support services is apparently an industry that can be characterized as a market failure. If the current prices offered for these services are insufficient to incentivize for-profit firms to enter the market, services will not be provided at the optimal level for society. One consequence of this is that peer workers will fail to grow as a mature profession. One observed outcome demonstrating market failure in the peer worker market is the predominance of mission-based non-profits such as recovery community organizations that offer support services. Despite the risk, such organizations may deliver services at margins far more narrow than for-profit firms because of a desire for social impact. As a result, they may hire, train, and offer services under financial constraints that limit both organizational capacity-building and peer worker workforce development. Similar phenomena (Budd, 2011) have been observed in other “caring professions” such as those in the childcare and long-term care industries, where occupations are considered “low status,” “women’s work,” or “not real work” (Folbre, 1995; Greener, 2015; Harbach, 2015).

Notwithstanding the risk, some enterprising private firms may enter the recovery market. However, for profit firms would enter the market only with a business strategy that would assure sufficient profit margins. One the one hand, they may implement business models that compete based on improved cost efficiencies. This may involve leaner staff with lower salaries, which may conflict with our efforts to elevate the compensation levels of peer workers, or stinting on quality. On the other hand, they enter the market through mergers and acquisition to create a more concentrated market that allows them to negotiate higher prices given an increase in market power. However, private investments in the recovery market need not be a predatory affair, and private investments may play an important role in developing recovery ready communities. Non-profit RCOs may develop

and control for-profit entities that could partner with investors to market a goods and services to supplement their peer recovery support services.

Like many jobs in the US, the wages of peer workers do not reflect their dignity as individuals. For peer workers, low wages are compounded by stigma associated with SUD, no matter how many years have passed. Peer workers have themselves demonstrated successful navigation in their own recovery journeys. Their employment as peer workers ought to support continued success of that journey. However, low wages are a social determinant of health that can impact one's ability to maintain recovery. Thus, the wages of peer workers ought to represent more than what the market offers, especially if the employer is genuinely interested in recovery.

There are, however, challenges when it comes to the market placing a value on peer workers. The cultivation of a trusting relationship is a necessary condition for positive reception of informational and social support. ***Some forms of social support, such as expressions of empathy, love, trust, or caring, however, are inherently non-transactional. Some would consider a relationship based on trust and understanding as priceless.*** However, it is clear that recovery community organizations that are based on the values and principles of recovery can deliver these priceless services.

Peer recovery support occurs within community and also builds greater community. The relationships formed are likely to endure. Over time, peer workers can build a powerful network of people in recovery who can not only support others individually but can also can and do take leadership roles in advocating for systems change. This provides a further untapped and unappreciated resource for building recovery ready communities and nurturing broad systems change.

Uplifting the peer support labor force

A signal that transformative systems change has arrived is when peer workers are adequately compensated and valued for their services. We can reduce the gap between the vision and the current state by actively promoting the peer recovery support services labor force as innovative care models are implemented. For example, behavioral health delivery reforms that utilize peer workers should support the workforce development of the profession by:

- Prioritizing the lived experience of recovery coaches in hiring practices
- Incorporating self-care in the organizational structure to reduce burnout
- Providing a living wage and financial support that aligns payment of services to meet client needs, and
- Offering opportunities for training and professional development to improve coaches' potential for impact (London et al., 2018).
- Embedding PRSS as comprehensive service using a bundled case rate where the peer support is naturally a part of the system of care, not something that can be "picked apart."

The best way of making this happen is for advocates of peer recovery support services to be active in developing, promoting, and implementing models with the most promising impact that :

1. are consistent with fidelity standards of peer support
2. incorporate the workforce development features described above
3. address the need for diversity in the workforce and make recovery spaces more diverse

As these innovative models are implemented and evaluated, positive outcomes will demonstrate the economic value of peer workers. If you pay them fairly and utilize them optimally *up front*, there will be an economic return that will, post facto, evidence the monetary value of peer recovery support. Our theory of change is that these workforce features will become the norm when their use is associated with the cutting edge, impactful approaches to recovery.

The next two sections identify the two kinds of innovative approaches to improving health that recovery advocates can leverage for change. The idea is that we can foster new labor market behaviors by incorporating the value of recovery support in the organizational forms that are most likely to proliferate in the future. We discuss these forms and identify strategies to help nurture changes that bring us closer to our recovery vision.

LEVERAGING DELIVERY SYSTEM AND PAYMENT INNOVATIONS

We scanned the literature for delivery system and payment reform models having the greatest potential for reducing relapse and for wider dissemination across the country. We zeroed in on those with all three of the following criteria:

1. Science-based: Recovery period up to five years.
2. Fidelity: Peer recovery support services in fidelity with standards of recovery support.
3. Fair Value: Potential to garner resources to ensure a living wage, employment stability, self-care time, and professional development opportunities among the peer workers they employ.

Among these, the Addiction Recovery Medical Home-Alternative Payment Model emerged at the top of the list. We describe the key features of this model and their implications for peer recovery support. We identify actions to further benefit patients, their communities, and the peer worker profession. These actions can leverage the ARMH-APM model to support more transformative systems change (Foster-Fishman et al., 2007).

The Addiction Recovery Medical Home was designed to treat addiction like other chronic diseases. Services are delivered in three care transition phases where bundles of services are delivered to stabilize, treat, and ensure full recovery. An alternative payment model is presented to ensure adequate compensation for bundles of services for treatment with additional payments for achieving quality metrics. None of these features are particularly novel except in their application to SUD. (See Text Box: Components of Value-Based Care)

The most innovative and impactful component of the model is the time allotted for treatment and recovery. After an initial 1-month Pre-Recovery and Stabilization phase, patients enrolled in the ARMH undergo a Recovery Initiation and Active Treatment episode of up to 12 months and a Community-Based Recovery Phase from 12 months to 60 months. Consistent with the science, the model provides the opportunity for the development of recovery capital and the provision of supports needed to prevent relapse during the sensitive period where the brain is still healing. While not everyone will require all 60 months, the fact that the model structures the episode of care based on the science is an advancement.

More important, peer workers (called coaches in the model) figure predominantly as core members of a Care Recovery Team. The model is most consistent with the fidelity of the recovery support standards. A peer worker is involved in all three care transition phases; however, they have their greatest impact in the last phase where recovery capital has the greatest opportunity to reduce the risk of re-occurrence of use.

Implications for peer recovery support

The model appears consistent with fidelity standards of recovery support. The peer worker is a part of the care team. There is a clear distinction between the care coordinator and the peer recovery specialist role. Peer workers meet with patients early on to cultivate a relationship based on trust. The model clearly defines the nature and role of a peer recovery coach (peer worker) and the kinds of supports they would provide as part of the intervention.

Less clear, however, is how peer workers will be compensated in the model. The model includes a procedure code for reimbursement for peer services (CT18384), but the peer worker in the model is doing more than individual consultations. How would they be compensated for times in meetings?

TABLE III.4: Structural Elements of AMH-APM and Implications for Recovery Support

Structure	Structure Description	Implications for Recovery Support
Recovery Care Team	The recovery care team includes providers, a care coordinator, and the peer recovery coach. They help ensure coordination of both medical care but also community supports.	Peer worker is an important member of the care team. The role is distinct from the coordinator and is focused on building recovery capital.
Treatment & Recovery Plan	The patient develops a treatment and recovery plan at intake with necessary revisions across episodes of care.	The peer worker supports patients in developing care plans, provides ongoing recovery support, and connects patients with community resources to improve recovery capital. Early introduction strengthens potential for relationship-building
Network	A network of medical and behavioral providers and specialists are linked, presumably through a common Electronic Health Record, to provide integrated medical and behavioral care.	RCOs could be integrated into the network to place peer workers, foster linkages with the community, and help build community-level recovery capital where they are lacking.
Quality Metrics	Quality metrics are used to monitor outcomes and the basis for performance-based payments.	One quality metric in this model includes degree of engagement with peer workers, which makes receipt of recovery support a performance indicator. Engagement levels and quality of engagement may be shaped by caseloads, case mix, and community-level recovery capital.
Payment Model	An alternative payment model incorporates value-based reimbursement over an extended recovery period. A blended financing model involves fee-for-service reimbursement during Pre-Recovery and Stabilization, capitated payments across two episodes of care, and additional quality achievement and bonus payments.	The peer relationship is extended for up to five years, maximizing the potential to prevent reoccurrence of use. However, the peer compensation levels and methods are unspecified. It is unclear how discontinuities in coverage during the community-based recovery and management period will impact the peer relationship and the ability of peer specialists to support recovery.

More than any other model, the ARMH-APM model elevates peer workers into a valued profession. They are part of a care team, and they are given the opportunity to offer needed support for as much as five years. This is something that recovery community organizations and other recovery advocates can wholeheartedly support, especially if the fair value criterion is met.

Indeed, recovery community organizations could actively promote and support the model as a partner. ***RCOs could potentially be included in the integrated network as a provider of trained peer workers. They can ensure supervision, continual training, provide professional development activities, and offer programs for self-care. They could potentially play a role of ombudsman or mediator when human resources issues arise. They could become a platform for peer workers to provide support to each other and function as a regional Hub for supporting PRSS regionally.***

The model includes a quality measure for engagement with a peer worker. It is unclear how bonuses associated with meeting this quality measure will be distributed to the peer workers, if at all. The outcomes of peer recovery support depend on community level factors that cannot be controlled by the peer worker. Individuals from low resource communities may lack access to community-level recovery supports available to individuals from high-resource communities. As a result, performance measures across different peer workers may be the result not just of individual level differences in caseloads, but the characteristics of the communities in which participants live. This could potentially disincentivize the uptake of individuals from low resource communities or incentivize cherry picking from higher resource communities. Some thinking may be required to develop a risk-adjusted caseload to ensure equality among peer workers. This might be a role for recovery community organizations: they could potentially advocate on behalf of peer workers who may be unable to negotiate with a larger organization when their cases become unfairly allocated.

Without taking community-level differences into consideration, the ARMH-APM model could potentially magnify existing disparities. While caseloads could be risk adjusted with more time allocated to building individual recovery capital, the model does not address some of the structural factors that might be associated with substance misuse, reoccurrence of use and associated disparities in a community. Again, RCOs can play a role. If included as a part of the network implementing the ARMH-APM, they could work to help build community-level recovery capital in collaboration with other organizations in low resourced communities. In this way, RCOs can help reduce health inequities across communities. Funding sources could examine how to effectively address these differences between neighborhoods and communities.

Action strategies for broader systems change

In reviewing the implications of the ARMH-APM model, we identified different ways that the model could be enriched and bring about broader systems change. The first involves being explicit about the model demonstrating the value of peer workers as a profession. All systems have a purpose, often unstated, that shapes the rules of the game. By being explicit that the model is demonstrating the value of the profession and identifying ways to do that at the outset, the ARMH-APM will be “pre-programmed” to ensure the profession is continually valued. As it becomes disseminated, it will help disseminate this value as well.

The second activity involves the role of recovery community organizations as partners in the implementation of the model. They have a role to play to support the provision and maintain the valuing of peer workers. More importantly, their participation as a partner can help strengthen linkages with the community and provide the foundation for building recovery ready communities. In doing so, they will further improve the outcomes of the ARMH-APM model.

LEVERAGING EMERGING COLLABORATIVE APPROACHES TO COMPLEXITY

Substance misuse is a complex problem that impacts a wide variety of sectors that often do not communicate, let alone collaborate, to address an issue that significantly impacts each sector. The result is a system where the most vulnerable find themselves trapped in a vicious cycle. Consider an individual with substance abuse and a mental health diagnosis who gets arrested. While substance use is a significant risk factor for incarceration, prior imprisonment causes unstable housing. In turn, unstable housing and homelessness are correlated with substance use and recidivism. The end result is that the most vulnerable individuals with SUD fall through the cracks as they move across systems (criminal justice, social services, housing, behavioral health, etc.) that often fail to communicate across siloed sectors.

Collective impact (Kania & Kramer, 2011, 2013) and other collaboration models have emerged as a tool for addressing complex and seemingly intractable social problems. In this chapter we summarize some of the emerging work around collaboration in health. Like the last section, we zero in on a model of collaboration that has the greatest prospect for addressing substance abuse and could be retrofitted for improving recovery support at the individual and community levels. We conclude with actions to leverage the model to build community recovery while advocating for opportunities to value peer recovery support.

Common Agenda

All participants have a **shared vision for change** including a common understanding of the problem and a joint approach to solving it through agreed upon actions.

Shared Measurement

Collecting data and measuring results consistently across all participants ensures efforts remain aligned and participants hold each other accountable.

Mutually Reinforcing Activities

Participant activities must be differentiated while still being coordinated through a mutually reinforcing plan of action.

Continuous Communication

Consistent and open communication is needed across the many players to build trust, assure mutual objectives, and appreciate common motivations.

Backbone Support


Creating and managing collective impact requires a dedicated staff and a specific set of skills to **serve as the backbone for the entire initiative and coordinate participating organizations and agencies.**

From (Kania & Kramer, 2011)

Addressing complex social problems through collaboration.

Over the past two decades, the U.S. experienced growth in a wide variety of cross-sector collaborative approaches to address complex social problems, including substance use. In 2011 FSG consulting group researchers John Kania and Mark Kramer described what became known as the Collective Impact model. The model is based on the theory that stakeholders, through shared information and coordinated action, can collaborate to intentionally solve complex social problems. Kania and Kramer (2013) describe the five key components required to successfully coordinate joint action to effect change in complex systems (see text box). Despite varying perspectives, stakeholders from different sectors must develop a common agenda for change. The stakeholders must develop a set of mutually reinforcing activities consistent with their agenda and track progress using a common set of progress measures. This requires a communications infrastructure not only for collecting and sharing data but also for facilitating dialogue among the various stakeholders. The final component is a backbone organization to maintain the administrative infrastructure to sustain the enterprise over the long run.

CROSS-SECTOR ALIGNMENT THEORY OF CHANGE



Robert Wood Johnson Foundation cross-sector alignment theory of change, from (Lanford et al., 2022).

The Collective Impact Forum is an associative organization to support coalitions building effective collective impact models. The forum recognized collective impact models as having all five key components with a focus on three complex social issues. For example, Prosper Waco, a collective impact coalition in Texas, focuses on education, health, and financial opportunities in the city.

Many multi-sector coalitions describe themselves as a collective impact model, but often lack a three-issue focus. For example, the Marathon AOD Partnership in Wisconsin focuses mainly on alcohol and other drug abuse issues. The Collective Impact model has been criticized for lacking transparency and accountability to the populations impacted by the targeted social problem. The promoters of the model, however, suggest that health equity and involvement with affected populations is a core value of genuine collective impact.

The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation has developed a cross-sector collaboration theory of change that more explicitly incorporates transparency and accountability structures (Lanford et al., 2022). The theory of change was developed to better understand capacities needed to align medical, public health, and social service sectors to improve population health and health equity through collaboration. The theory of change identifies four individual, organizational, and systems-level enablers of success, including (1) a shared purpose, vision, outcomes; (2) shared data and measurements; (3) sustainable financing with suitable accountability structures; and (4) strong, transparent government structures. The model is currently being tested nationally. For example, The Texas Health Institute is evaluating whether the theory of change is consistent with over a dozen multi-sector partnerships for health equity in Texas. Two of these, the Panhandle Behavioral Health Alliance and the El Paso Behavioral Health Consortium, include a focus on substance misuse.

Table III.5: Core Elements of an Accountable Community for Health

1. Mission
2. Multi-Sectoral Partnership
3. Integrator Organization
4. Governance
5. Data and Indicators
6. Strategy and Implementation
7. Community Member Engagement
8. Communications
9. Financing

Source: (Prevention Institute, 2015)

The Accountable Community for Health model

We assessed a wide variety of collaboration approaches for their potential for integrating a focus on recovery and wide dissemination across the country. Among these approaches, the Accountable Community for Health (ACH) model appears most promising. ACHs incorporate many of the features of multi-sector collaboration approaches discussed above but are focused on improving population health and health equity. (See Table III.5.) Rather than centering population health activities on the delivery system, where the focus is holding providers accountable for managing patient health, the ACH model provides a framework for stakeholders across sectors to develop systems to improve health and health equity in their community (see Table III.5).

ACHs incorporate many of the features of multi-sector collaboration approaches discussed above but are focused on improving population health and health equity. (See Table III.5.) Key ACH elements include the following: Convening diverse stakeholders with active participation in planning on joint priorities; developing a shared vision, mission, and priorities; building adequate structure and support such as staff, governance, analytic capacity, etc.; developing and implementing action plans with metrics to track progress; and leading the enterprise in ways that foster trust, open communication, and collaboration.

The number of ACHs has grown rapidly over the past 10 years as the result of CMS's State Innovation Model initiative. Implemented through the Innovation Center, the initiative provides states with financial and technical support to advance new service delivery models and multi-payer health care payment reforms. According to the Funders Forum on Accountable Health, there are currently 154 ACHs in the country. That number is likely to increase with additional philanthropic funding supporting demonstrations of this model. For example, the Episcopal Health Foundation of Texas is funding 6 new ACHs in its recently launched demonstration initiative.

Implications for peer recovery support

The leaders of ACH have themselves recognized the potential for leveraging ACHs to address SUD. The Funders Forum for on Accountable Health (FFAH) convened a meeting of experts and stakeholders about the use of ACHs and similar models to address SUD. In a summary of their meeting (2018) they identify supportive policies and technical assistance to support ACH adoption of initiatives to address SUD. Currently, 62 ACHs across 18 states have a behavioral health focus on their mission. It is unclear whether and to what extent those 62 ACHs incorporate recovery support. However, the Funders Forum acknowledges that genuine community engagement for ACHs tackling SUD is paramount. That acknowledgement provides an opportunity for RCOs and advocates with ACHs in those 18 states. However, RCOs would require education about the ACH model before engaging with leaders in ACHs. There is, however, great promise that ACHs and RCOs can work collaboratively to develop recovery ready communities. It also offers a platform to advocate for the peer recovery profession.

Action strategies for broader systems change

RCO leadership and other recovery advocates have an opportunity to engage with ACHs and other cross-sectoral coalition to determine the potential for collaboration to build recovery ready communities and advance peer recovery support in fidelity with recovery support standards.

Those engagement activities would be strengthened by an engagement plan and additional resources. This can include a service area profile of ACHs and other coalitions working in the area and messaging to support communication and engagement.

THE NEED FOR LEADERSHIP

Systems thinker and famed environmentalist Donella Meadows notes that “The most powerful place to intervene in a system is the paradigm out of which it arises.” This is because systems are often driven by unconscious mindsets and paradigms that limit what is conceivable. Our approach involves nurturing the rise of new systems that incorporate the mindsets associated with recovery principles and heartfelt appreciation for the value that peer workers bring to communities. Leaders who already have that mindset are a necessary condition for this to happen, and many of them can be found leading state and local RCOs. Thus, RCOs and other recovery advocates have a role to play in leading from the emerging future.

Our vision of growing recovery ready communities that value peer recovery support is possible. We can see the components of this vision already emerging. However, for leadership to nurture what appears to be the initial stages of its manifestation, they will need assistance and capacity building. In the next section, we discuss in more detail some of the recommendations to help build the leadership capacity necessary to nurturing transformative systems change.

Section 4: Recommendations

Our call to action for broad systems change will require the recovery community to work with allies across sectors to effect change in laws and regulations, organizational capacity-building and community development, workforce development, and leadership. We detail the specific recommendations for each of these four areas below, and we encourage allies in the recovery advocacy movement to join forces to translate these recommendations into action.

1. Laws and Regulations

Our first recommendation in this section is to develop a common understanding of PRSS by codifying a definition in federal and state statute based on the SAMHSA definition or some variant developed with peer input. We need national uniformity in our definition and this definition must distinguish PRSS from case management. In addition, it must ensure that we are talking about “peer-based”—that these services are delivered by individuals who themselves are in recovery. We also need to Leverage 1115(a) demonstration waivers and other authorizations to develop state innovations that incorporate the continuum of recovery supports, including peer recovery.

Our second recommendation involves payment reforms that adequately compensate for the full cost associated with employing and supporting peer workers for providing recovery services. In order for RCO’s to be sustainable, peer workers need to be paid a living wage, and Medicare and

Medicaid reimbursement levels must increase. Furthermore, Fee-for-service rates also need to be increased to adequately account for administrative costs such as the costs for providing quality supervision, offering training and professional development, and time for self-care.

Third, the recovery advocacy community must be involved in ongoing conversations about payment reforms. Alternatives to the fee-for-for services model need to include discussions about the design of capitated payments methods. For example, will capitated payments incentivize stinting on recovery services in ways that ultimately limit the effectiveness of peer worker outcomes? If so, could carve outs be one way of neutralizing that incentive?

Similarly, in designing value-based care reimbursement approaches, we recommend greater thought about how to ensure that the optimal use of peer workers is recognized as a quality performance measure. While we highly recommend the Alliance for Addiction Payment Reform's alternative payment model, we would also recommend additional consideration of bonuses to be allocated to peer workers for successful recovery outcomes and that peer worker caseloads be reimbursed based on the characteristics of the cases and the cases' communities.

Fourth, we recommend that the National Institute for Mental Health or another federal agency study the impact of various financing models i.e. embed PRSS in comprehensive bundled package vs. FFS rate in terms of access, engagement, long term outcomes and overall cost reductions compared to costs of care without PRSS. The study of various financing models could be done in the context of demonstration models, such as the Addiction Recovery Medical Home Model or Accountable Communities for Health. In both cases, the differences in reimbursement approaches could be an element of the model design, which, in turn, can be evaluated for its impact on outcomes. We recommend considering the structure of peer worker compensation as a design element and the peer worker satisfaction and compensation adequacy as key evaluation outcomes.

Finally, ***we recommend and encourage comprehensive and bundled rate approaches that incorporate all aspects of PRSS-services, peer support, housing, medical and behavioral/SUD.***

2. Organizational Capacity Building and Community Development

We recommend RCOs receive support to better understand their role as players in the public health arena. RCO's will need to be educated about public health systems and the role that they can play in building community health from a broader perspective. They will need to build capacity to implement the strategies presented in this paper.

Recovery community leadership can develop webinars to educate RCO's about the role they can play in public health, addressing SDOH and community health transformation. They will need assistance in identifying and collaborating with public health partners in their communities and they will need training on policy, systems and environmental change strategies. RCO can engage with and lead local and regional coalitions that address the social determinants of health and support new or existing cross-sector coalitions.

Recovery organizations generally have a strong role to play in community transformation efforts. For example, Recovery Café provide a strong sense of community for all people who have been traumatized by substance use and mental health issues. They and other recovery organizations should be encouraged to participate in cross-sector partnership initiatives like Build Health Challenge, which encourages non-profits working to work collaboratively to develop infrastructure solutions that elevate quality and accessibility of healthcare.

We also see the need to develop a national social marketing campaign to address the stigma associated with substance use and to improve the perception of the value of peer support services. Research makes it clear that stigma persists related to substance use. It also impacts the way the public values peer recovery support services as a credible and effective means of receiving help with recovery.

Funding from philanthropy and government agencies will be needed to help build capacity for RCOs to lead in the development of recovery ready community initiatives. It would also be useful to provide training for RCO's on where they might look locally for public health funding at the state, regional and local level. Funders and policy makers can promote the value of consciously building recovery ready communities as a key component of a healthy community. We recommend prioritizing support for building systems-level and regional initiatives and the capacity-building needed for RCOs to lead those efforts.

And last, but not least, we recommend that there be on-going support for the implementation of CAPRSS standards that focus on recovery values and principles. As the PRSS workforce grows and develops, there must be a focus on peers with lived experience, the unique elements of PRSS and fidelity to the model, so that key elements are not lost.

3. Workforce Development

We recommend that recovery community stakeholders and policy makers actively monitor compensation levels and the development of PRSS as a profession. We need to prioritize the issue of peer workers earning a living wage, having time for self-care, and providing opportunities for training and professional development. RCOs can play an assurance role by becoming hubs for contracting to expand PRSS in the community. Contracts for PRSS could be designed to assure adequate compensation, fair caseloads, time for self-care, etc. It also could include services that increase recovery capital in the community, which might lead to new civic engagement opportunities for peer workers.

Career advancement paths should be fostered within the recovery support profession. Having a regional RCO HUB structure for delivering PRSS would be extremely helpful in providing a variety of career paths for PRSS as PRSS moves into judicial, educational, and medical settings, to name a few. Building an experienced workforce to move into supervisory, management and leadership positions as programs expand would be critical to building a recovery ready community. Workplace environments also need to be built with a recovery orientation for delivering services and a supportive organizational peer culture. And labor force development needs to be promoted at the organizational, community, regional, state, and national systems level. RCO HUBS will also contribute to ensuring that PRSS is practiced with sufficient support for peer workers, with supervision provided by individuals who themselves are in recovery and who have experience providing PRSS, and with management provided by organizations that understand the key elements of PRSS.

Because the diversity of the peer workforce is linked to its ability to support diverse communities in recovery, we recommend all recovery organizations strengthen efforts in hiring, training, maintaining, and developing a diverse workforce. We recommend RCOs monitor and report on their efforts to promote a diverse workforce, including annual training to support cultural competence and humility of all staff.

4. Leadership Development

We recommend that recovery community leaders develop a partnership with the Alliance for Addiction Payment Reform to support and further enrich their model by addressing community-level supports. We need to build cross-sector collaborative partnerships within service areas where ARMH and similar models are being implemented using PRSS. We need to provide support to RCOs to engage and partner with Accountable Communities for Health (ACH). Webinars for RCOs on how strategies to connect with ACH's need to be provided.

We recommend that recovery leaders convene a group of major players to discuss ways to coordinate and collaborate to build a stronger movement for PRSS. This should include the following:

- Peer Workers
- Individuals in recovery who have used PRSS
- Individuals from communities who have been disproportionately impacted by SUD and/or historically under-served by recovery related services.
- RCO leaders at state and local levels
- Private, public, and non-profit sectors
- Behavioral health and other providers
- Insurers: Medicaid, Managed Care Organizations, leaders of new delivery system models
- Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA); National Institute of Mental Health, Health Resource Services Administration, (HRSA)
- Faces & Voices of Recovery
- Philanthropic Funders/Foundation; Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, Hogg Foundation for Mental Health, Meadows Foundation, Dell Foundation
- Alliance for Payment Reform leadership
- Representatives from Accountable Communities for Health
- Funders Forum on Accountable Health

We offer this White Paper and make these recommendations not only as a call to action, but also a call to courage. We truly believe that our greatest strength as a movement is our values, and by effecting change in these four areas, we have an opportunity to promote those values throughout society.

“Courage is a heart word. The root of the word courage is cor—the Latin word for heart. In one of its earliest forms, the word courage meant ‘To speak one’s mind by telling all one’s heart.’ Over time, this definition has changed, and today, we typically associate courage with heroic and brave deeds. But in my opinion, this definition fails to recognize the inner strength and level of commitment required for us to actually speak honestly and openly about who we are and about our experiences—good and bad. Speaking from our hearts is what I think of as ordinary courage.”

Brené Brown

References

- Albinus, P. (2021, March 10). Alcohol and Drug Treatment Centers Draw Private Equity Backing. *Middle Market Growth*. <https://middlemarketgrowth.org/the-round-alcohol-and-drug-treatment-centers-draw-private-equity-backing/>
- Andreas, D., Ja, D. Y., & Wilson, S. (2010). Peers Reach Out Supporting Peers to Embrace Recovery (PROSPER): A Center for Substance Abuse Treatment recovery community services program. *Alcoholism Treatment Quarterly*, 28(3), 326–338. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07347324.2010.488538>
- Appold, K. (2021). Patient-Centered Medical Homes: Were They Built to Last? *MHE Publication*, 31(5). <https://www.managedhealthcareexecutive.com/view/patient-centered-medical-homes-were-they-built-to-last->
- Armitage, E. V., Lyons, H., & Moore, T. L. (2010). Recovery Association Project (RAP), Portland, Oregon. *Alcoholism Treatment Quarterly*, 28(3), 339–357. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07347324.2010.488539>
- Ashford, R. D., Brown, A. M., Ryding, R., & Curtis, B. (2019). Building recovery ready communities: The recovery ready ecosystem model and community framework. *Addiction Research & Theory*, 0(0), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16066359.2019.1571191>
- Ashford, R. D., Curtis, B., & Brown, A. M. (2018). Peer-delivered harm reduction and recovery support services: Initial evaluation from a hybrid recovery community drop-in center and syringe exchange program. *Harm Reduction Journal*, 15(1), 52. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12954-018-0258-2>
- Ashford, R. D., Meeks, M., Curtis, B., & Brown, A. M. (2019). Utilization of peer-based substance use disorder and recovery interventions in rural emergency departments: Patient characteristics and exploratory analysis. *Journal of Rural Mental Health*, 43(1), 17–29. <https://doi.org/10.1037/rmh0000106>
- Bardwell, G., Kerr, T., Boyd, J., & McNeil, R. (2018). Characterizing peer roles in an overdose crisis: Preferences for peer workers in overdose response programs in emergency shelters. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 190, 6–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2018.05.023>
- Bassuk, E. L., Hanson, J., Greene, R. N., Richard, M., & Laudet, A. B. (2016). Peer-delivered recovery support services for addictions in the United States: A systematic review. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 63, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsat.2016.01.003>
- Belenko, S., LaPollo, A. B., Gesser, N., Weiland, D., Perron, L., & Johnson, I. D. (2021). Augmenting substance use treatment in the drug court: A pilot randomized trial of peer recovery support. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 131. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsat.2021.108581>
- Bernstein, J., Bernstein, E., Tassiopoulos, K., Heeren, T., Levenson, S., & Hingson, R. (2005). Brief motivational intervention at a clinic visit reduces cocaine and heroin use. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 77(1), 49–59. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2004.07.006>
- Berrick, J. D., Young, E. W., Cohen, E., & Anthony, E. (2011). 'I am the face of success': Peer mentors in child welfare. *Child & Family Social Work*, 16(2), 179–191. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2206.2010.00730.x>
- Berwick, D. M., Nolan, T. W., & Whittington, J. (2008). The Triple Aim: Care, health, and cost. *Health Affairs*, 27(3), 759–769. <https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.27.3.759>

- Betty Ford Institute Consensus Panel. (2007). What is recovery? A working definition from the Betty Ford Institute. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 33(3), 221–228. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsat.2007.06.001>
- Blash, L., Chan, K., & Chapman, S. (2015). *The Peer Provider Workforce in Behavioral Health: A Landscape Analysis*. UCSF Health Workforce Research Center on Long-Term Care. https://healthworkforce.ucsf.edu/sites/healthworkforce.ucsf.edu/files/Report-Peer_Provider_Workforce_in_Behavioral_Health-A_Landscape_Analysis.pdf
- Boisvert, R. A., Martin, L. M., Grosek, M., & Clarie, A. J. (2008). Effectiveness of a peer-support community in addiction recovery: Participation as intervention. *Occupational Therapy International*, 15(4), 205–220. <https://doi.org/10.1002/oti.257>
- Boyd, M. R., Moneyham, L., Murdaugh, C., Phillips, K. D., Tavakoli, A., Jackwon, K., Jackson, N., & Vyavaharkar, M. (2005). A peer-based substance abuse intervention for HIV+ rural women: A pilot study. *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing*, 19(1), 10–17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apnu.2004.11.002>
- Bringing Recovery Supports to Scale - Technical Assistance Center Strategy. (2017). *Peers Supporting Recovery from Substance Use Disorders*. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. https://www.samhsa.gov/sites/default/files/programs_campaigns/brss_tacs/peers-supporting-recovery-substance-use-disorders-2017.pdf
- Brown, B. (2015). *Daring Greatly: How the Courage to Be Vulnerable Transforms the Way We Live, Love, Parent, and Lead*. Penguin.
- Brown, B. (2021). *Atlas of the Heart: Mapping Meaningful Connection and the Language of Human Experience*. Random House Publishing Group.
- Brownson, R. C., Fielding, J. E., & Maylahn, C. M. (2009). Evidence-based public health: A fundamental concept for public health practice. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 30, 175–201. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.lib.utexas.edu/10.1146/annurev.publhealth.031308.100134>
- Bruch, J. D., Gondi, S., & Song, Z. (2020). Changes in Hospital Income, Use, and Quality Associated With Private Equity Acquisition. *JAMA Internal Medicine*, 180(11), 1428–1435. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.3552>
- Budd, J. W. (2011). *The Thought of Work*. Cornell University Press. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7591/j.ctt7z7zd>
- Cantor, J., Cohen, L., Mikkelsen, L., Pañares, R., Srikantharajah, J., & Valdovinos, E. (2011). *Community-Centered Health Homes: Bridging the gap between health services and community prevention*. Prevention Institute. <https://www.preventioninstitute.org/publications/community-centered-health-homes-bridging-the-gap-between-health-services-and-community-prevention>
- Capital Area Behavioral Health Collaborative. (2014). *Recovery Specialist Efficacy Study*.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2021, March 10). *About Social Determinants of Health (SDOH)*. <https://www.cdc.gov/socialdeterminants/about.html>
- Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. (2019). *Medicaid Health Homes: An Overview* (p. 3). Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, Health Home Information Resource Center. <http://www.chcs.org/media/HH-Fact-sheet-January-2019.pdf>

- Chapman, S. A., Blash, L. K., Mayer, K., & Spetz, J. (2018). Emerging Roles for Peer Providers in Mental Health and Substance Use Disorders. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 54(6, Supplement 3), S267–S274. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2018.02.019>
- Choi, S. (2015). Improving Service Utilization for Parents with Substance Abuse Problems: Experimenting with Recovery Coaches in Child Welfare. *Journal of Evidence-Informed Social Work*, 12(6), 547–555. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15433714.2013.858090>
- Claridge, T. (2018). *Dimensions of Social Capital—Structural, cognitive, and relational* (p. 4). Social Capital Research. <https://www.socialcapitalresearch.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/Dimensions-of-Social-Capital.pdf>
- Cloud, W., & Garfield, R. (2004). A life course perspective on exiting addiction: The relevance of recovery capital in treatment. *NAD Publication (Nordic Council for Alcohol and Drug Research)*, 44, 185–202.
- Cloud, W., & Granfield, R. (2008). Conceptualizing Recovery Capital: Expansion of a Theoretical Construct. *Substance Use & Misuse*, 43(12–13), 1971–1986. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10826080802289762>
- Cos, T. A., LaPollo, A. B., Aussendorf, M., Williams, J. M., Malayter, K., & Festinger, D. S. (2020). Do Peer Recovery Specialists Improve Outcomes for Individuals with Substance Use Disorder in an Integrative Primary Care Setting? A Program Evaluation. *Journal of Clinical Psychology in Medical Settings*, 27(4), 704–715. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10880-019-09661-z>
- Costello, A. M. (2021, January 7). *RE: Opportunities in Medicaid and CHIP to Address Social Determinants of Health (SDOH)*, SHO# 21-001 [State Health Official Letter]. <https://www.medicaid.gov/federal-policy-guidance/downloads/sho21001.pdf>
- Coward, K. (2021, October 10). *Private Equity-Backed BrightView Health Focused on Scaling High-Quality Addiction Treatment*. Behavioral Health Business. <https://bhbusiness.com/2021/10/10/private-equity-backed-brightview-health-focused-on-scaling-high-quality-addiction-treatment/>
- Delphin-Rittmon, M. E. (2021, November 9). Building Community Resilience – Prevention and Recovery Services Working Together. SAMHSA Blog. <https://www.samhsa.gov/blog/building-community-resilience-prevention-recovery-together>
- Dennis, M., Foss, M. A., & Scott, C. K. (2007). An eight-year perspective on the relationship between the duration of abstinence and other aspects of recovery. *Evaluation Review*, 31(6), 585–612. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0193841X07307771>
- Dennis, M., & Scott, C. K. (2007). Managing Addiction as a Chronic Condition. *Addiction Science & Clinical Practice*, 4(1), 45–55.
- Eddie, D., Hoffman, L., Vilsaint, C., Abry, A., Bergman, B., Hoepfner, B., Weinstein, C., & Kelly, J. F. (2019). Lived experience in new models of care for substance use disorder: A systematic review of peer recovery support services and recovery coaching. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01052>
- EuroQol Group. (1990). EuroQol—A new facility for the measurement of health-related quality of life. *Health Policy (Amsterdam, Netherlands)*, 16(3), 199–208. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0168-8510\(90\)90421-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0168-8510(90)90421-9)

- Fabiano, S. E., Carey, C. W., Moschella, P. C., Lommel, K. M., Jones, R., Kahler, Z., & Linden, J. (2019). Peer opioid addiction intervention in the emergency department impacts recovery. *Academic Emergency Medicine*, 26, S28. <https://doi.org/10.1111/acem.13756>
- Faces & Voices of Recovery. (2010). *Addiction Recovery Peer Service Roles: Recovery Management in Health Reform*. Faces & Voices of Recovery. <https://facesandvoicesofrecovery.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Addiction-Recovery-Peer-Service-Roles-Recovery-Management-in-Health-Reform.pdf>
- Feng, Y.-S., Kohlmann, T., Janssen, M. F., & Buchholz, I. (2021). Psychometric properties of the EQ-5D-5L: A systematic review of the literature. *Quality of Life Research*, 30(3), 647–673. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-020-02688-y>
- Folbre, N. (1995). "Holding hands at midnight": The paradox of caring labor. *Feminist Economics*, 1(1), 73–92.
- Foster-Fishman, P. G., Nowell, B., & Yang, H. (2007). Putting the system back into systems change: A framework for understanding and changing organizational and community systems. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 39(3), 197–215. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-007-9109-0>
- Funders Forum on Accountable Health. (2018). *Leveraging Accountable Communities for Health to Address Substance Use Disorder: Meeting Summary*. George Washington University. https://accountablehealth.gwu.edu/sites/accountablehealth.gwu.edu/files/SUD%20Meeting%20Summary%20Final%20021319%2Bappendix_0.pdf
- Gaiser, M. G., Buche, J. L., Wayment, C. C., Schoebel, V., Smith, J. E., Chapman, S. A., & Beck, A. J. (2021). A Systematic Review of the Roles and Contributions of Peer Providers in the Behavioral Health Workforce. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 61(4), e203–e210. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2021.03.025>
- Gertner, A. K., Roberts, K. E., Bowen, G., Pearson, B. L., & Jordan, R. (2021). Universal screening for substance use by Peer Support Specialists in the Emergency Department is a pathway to buprenorphine treatment. *Addictive Behaviors Reports*, 14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.abrep.2021.100378>
- Gillard, S. G., Banach, N., Barlow, E., Byrne, J., Foster, R., Goldsmith, L., Marks, J., McWilliam, C., Morshead, R., Stepanian, K., Turner, R., Verey, A., & White, S. (2021). Developing and testing a principle-based fidelity index for peer support in mental health services. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 56(10), 1903–1911. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-021-02038-4>
- Gillard, S. G., Edwards, C., Gibson, S. L., Owen, K., & Wright, C. (2013). Introducing peer worker roles into UK mental health service teams: A qualitative analysis of the organisational benefits and challenges. *BMC Health Services Research*, 13(1), 188. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-13-188>
- Glasmeier, A. K. (2020). *Living Wage Calculator*. livingwage.mit.edu
- Greener, J. (2015). Embedded neglect, entrenched abuse: Market failure and mistreatment in elderly residential care. *Social Policy Review*, 27, 131–149.
- Groshkova, T., Best, D., & White, W. L. (2013). The Assessment of Recovery Capital: Properties and psychometrics of a measure of addiction recovery strengths. *Drug and Alcohol Review*, 32(2), 187–194. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1465-3362.2012.00489.x>

- Hamilton, J., Ti, L., Korchinski, M., & Nolan, S. (2022). Peer Support Specialists: An Underutilized Resource in the Criminal Justice System for Opioid Use Disorder Management? *Journal of Addiction Medicine*, 16(2), 132–134. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ADM.0000000000000866>
- Harbach, M. (2015). Childcare Market Failure. *Utah Law Review*, 2015(3). <https://dc.law.utah.edu/ulr/vol2015/iss3/3>
- Health Resources & Services Administration. (2021a). *Opioid Workforce Expansion Program (OWEP) Paraprofessionals Awards* | Bureau of Health Workforce. <https://bhw.hrsa.gov/funding/opioid-workforce-paraprofessionals-awards>
- Health Resources & Services Administration. (2021b, January 13). *Behavioral Health Workforce Education and Training (BHWET) Program for Paraprofessionals [Text]*. Official Web Site of the U.S. Health Resources & Services Administration. <https://www.hrsa.gov/grants/find-funding/hrsa-21-090>
- Health Resources Services Administration. (2022). *Opioid Response* | HRSA. <https://www.hrsa.gov/rural-health/opioid-response>
- Heisler, M. (2006). *Building Peer Support Programs to Manage Chronic Disease: Seven Models for Success* (p. 42). California HealthCare Foundation.
- Hrouda, D. (2015). *Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices: What's fidelity got to do with it?* Center for Evidence-Based Practices, Case Western Reserve University.
- Indeed.com. (2022, June 25). *Certified Peer Specialist salary in United States*. <https://www.indeed.com/career/certified-peer-specialist/salaries>
- Ja, D. Y., Gee, M., Savolainen, J., Wu, S., & Forghani, S. (2009). *Peers Reaching Out Supporting Peers to Embrace Recovery (PROSPER): A final evaluation report*. DYJ, Inc., for Walden House, Inc., and the Center for Substance Abuse Treatment, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration.
- Jarvis, S. V., Kincaid, L., Weltge, A. F., Lee, M., & Basinger, S. F. (2019). Public Intoxication: Sobering Centers as an Alternative to Incarceration, Houston, 2010–2017. *American Journal of Public Health*, 109(4), 597–599. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2018.304907>
- Kamon, J., & Turner, W. (2013). *Recovery Coaching in Recovery Centers: What the initial data suggest: A brief report from the Vermont Recovery Network*. Evidence-Based Solutions.
- Kania, J., & Kramer, M. (2011). Collective Impact. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 9(1), 36–41. <https://doi.org/10.48558/5900-KN19>
- Kania, J., & Kramer, M. (2013). *Embracing Emergence: How Collective Impact Addresses Complexity*. Stanford University.
- Kelly, J. F., Greene, M. C., Bergman, B. G., White, W. L., & Hoepfner, B. B. (2019). How Many Recovery Attempts Does it Take to Successfully Resolve an Alcohol or Drug Problem? Estimates and Correlates From a National Study of Recovering U.S. Adults. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research*, 43(7), 1533–1544. <https://doi.org/10.1111/acer.14067>
- Kelly, J. F., & Hoepfner, B. (2015). A biaxial formulation of the recovery construct. *Addiction Research & Theory*, 23(1), 5–9. <https://doi.org/10.3109/16066359.2014.930132>

- Kelly, J. F., & White, W. L. (2011). Recovery Management and the Future of Addiction Treatment and Recovery in the USA. In J. F. Kelly & W. L. White (Eds.), *Addiction recovery management: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 303–317). Humana Press.
- Lamb, R., Evans, A., & White, W. L. (2009). *The Role of Partnership in Recovery-oriented Systems of Care*. 23.
- Lanford, D., Petiwala, A., Landers, G., & Minyard, K. (2022). Aligning healthcare, public health and social services: A scoping review of the role of purpose, governance, finance and data. *Health & Social Care in the Community*, 30(2), 432–447. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hsc.13374>
- Langabeer, J. R., Persse, D., Yatsco, A., O’Neal, M. M., & Champagne-Langabeer, T. (2021). A Framework for EMS Outreach for Drug Overdose Survivors: A Case Report of the Houston Emergency Opioid Engagement System. *Prehospital Emergency Care*, 25(3), 441–448. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10903127.2020.1755755>
- Larson, C. (2021, December 14). *Ophelia Health, a Virtual Opioid Use Disorder Provider, Raises \$50M in Funding*. Behavioral Health Business. <https://bhbusiness.com/2021/12/14/ophelia-health-a-virtual-opioid-use-disorder-provider-raises-50m-in-funding/>
- Latkin, C. A. (1998). Outreach in natural settings: The use of peer leaders for HIV prevention among injecting drug users’ networks. *Public Health Reports*, 113(Suppl 1), 151–159.
- London, K., McCaffrey, M., McDowell, L., Maughan, M., & Tourish, J. (2018). *Recovery Coaches in Opioid Use Disorder Care*. RIZE Massachusetts. <https://apha.confex.com/apha/2019/mediafile/Handout/Paper448288/APHA2019%20session2094%20Recovery%20coach%20services%20in%20opioid%20use%20disorder%20care%20UMMS%20handout.pdf>
- Magidson, J. F., Regan, S., Powell, E., Jack, H. E., Herman, G. E., Zaro, C., Kane, M. T., & Wakeman, S. E. (2021). Peer recovery coaches in general medical settings: Changes in utilization, treatment engagement, and opioid use. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 122, 108248. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsat.2020.108248>
- Mangrum, L. (2008). *Creating access to recovery through drug courts: Final evaluation report*. Gulf Coast Addiction Technology Transfer Center, Texas Department of State Health Services, Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services Division. <https://socialwork.utexas.edu/dl/files/cswr/institutes/ari/pdf/ATRFinalEvaluationReport-Final.pdf>
- Mangrum, L., Spence, R., Nichols, M., & Kaviani, C. (2018). *Recovery Support Services Project Fiscal Year 2017 Final Evaluation Report* (HHSC Contract No. 2017-049621-001). The University of Texas at Austin, Addiction Research Institute. <https://socialwork.utexas.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/Recovery-Support-Services-2017.pdf>
- Mastroleo, N. R., Mallett, K. A., Ray, A. E., & Turrisi, R. (2008). The Process of Delivering Peer-Based Alcohol Intervention Programs in College Settings. *Journal of College Student Development*, 49(3), 255–259. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.0.0010>
- McGuire, A. B., Powell, K. G., Treitler, P. C., Wagner, K. D., Smith, K. P., Cooperman, N., Robinson, L., Carter, J., Ray, B., & Watson, D. P. (2020). Emergency department-based peer support for opioid use disorder: Emergent functions and forms. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 108, 82–87. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsat.2019.06.013>
- McLellan, A. T., Lewis, D. C., O’Brien, C. P., & Kleber, H. D. (2000). Drug dependence, a chronic medical illness: Implications for treatment, insurance, and outcomes evaluation. *JAMA*, 284(13), 1689–1695.

- Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission (MACPAC). (2018). *Access to Substance Use Disorder Treatment in Medicaid*. Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission. <https://www.macpac.gov/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/Access-to-Substance-Use-Disorder-Treatment-in-Medicaid.pdf>
- Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission [MACPAC]. (2019). *Recovery Support Services for Medicaid Beneficiaries with a Substance Use Disorder* (p. 21) [Issue Brief]. Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission. <https://www.macpac.gov/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/Recovery-Support-Services-for-Medicaid-Beneficiaries-with-a-Substance-Use-Disorder.pdf>
- Miler, J. A., Carver, H., Foster, R., & Parkes, T. (2020). Provision of peer support at the intersection of homelessness and problem substance use services: A systematic “state of the art” review. *BMC Public Health*, 20(1), 641. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12889-020-8407-4>
- Min, S.-Y., Whitecraft, J., Rothbard, A. B., & Salzer, M. S. (2007). Peer support for persons with co-occurring disorders and community tenure: A survival analysis. *Psychiatric Rehabilitation Journal*, 30(3), 207–213. <https://doi.org/10.2975/30.3.2007.207.213>
- Mowbray, C. T., Holter, M. C., Teague, G. B., & Bybee, D. (2003). Fidelity Criteria: Development, Measurement, and Validation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 24(3), 315–340. <https://doi.org/10.1177/109821400302400303>
- Mowbray, O., Campbell, R. D., Disney, L., Lee, M., Fatehi, M., & Scheyett, A. (2021). Peer support provision and job satisfaction among certified peer specialists. *Social Work in Mental Health*, 19(2), 126–140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332985.2021.1885090>
- National Association of State Alcohol and Drug Abuse Directors. (2021). *Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment (SAPT) Block Grant*. National Association of State Alcohol and Drug Abuse Directors. <https://nasadad.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/SAPT-Block-Grant-Fact-Sheet-Feb.-2021-FINAL.pdf>
- Neale, B. (2017). *SMD # 17-003 Strategies to Address the Opioid Epidemic* [Open letter]. <https://www.medicaid.gov/federal-policy-guidance/downloads/smd17003.pdf>
- Nixon, S. (2020). ‘Giving back and getting on with my life’: Peer mentoring, desistance and recovery of ex-offenders. *Probation Journal*, 67(1), 47–64. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0264550519900249>
- O’Connell, M. J., Flanagan, E. H., Delphin-Rittmon, M. E., & Davidson, L. (2017). Enhancing outcomes for persons with co-occurring disorders through skills training and peer recovery support. *Journal of Mental Health (Abingdon, England)*, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09638237.2017.1294733>
- Olmstead, T. A., Johnson, J. A., Roman, P. M., & Sindelar, J. L. (2005). What are the correlates of substance abuse treatment counselor salaries? *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 29(3), 181–189. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsat.2005.06.001>
- Olmstead, T. A., Johnson, J. A., Roman, P. M., & Sindelar, J. L. (2007). Why are recovering substance abuse counselors paid less? *Substance Abuse*, 28(1), 31–44. https://doi.org/10.1300/J465v28n01_05
- Open Minds. (2018). *State Medicaid Reimbursement For Peer Support Service: An OPEN MINDS Reference Guide*. Open Minds. <https://openminds.com/market-intelligence/reference-guide/state-medicaid-reimbursement-for-peer-support-service/>
- Ostrow, L., Steinwachs, D., Leaf, P. J., & Naeger, S. (2017). Medicaid Reimbursement of Mental Health Peer-Run Organizations: Results of a National Survey. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, 44(4), 501–511. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-015-0675-4>

- Page, C., Videka, L., Neale, J., Buche, J., Thomas, R., Gaiser, M., Wayment, C., & Beck, A. (2020). The Effects of State Regulations and Medicaid Plans on the Peer Support Specialist Workforce. *Health Services Research*, 55(Suppl 1), 73. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6773.13430>
- Peers for Progress. (n.d.). *Science Behind Peer Support* | Peers For Progress. Retrieved June 29, 2022, from <http://peersforprogress.org/learn-about-peer-support/science-behind-peer-support/>
- Powell, J. (2012). Recovery Coaching with Homeless African Americans with Substance Use Disorders. *Alcoholism Treatment Quarterly*, 30(3), 364–366. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07347324.2012.691345>
- Prevention Institute. (2015). *Accountable communities for health: Opportunities and recommendations*. Prevention Institute. <https://www.preventioninstitute.org/sites/default/files/publications/Accountable%20Communities%20for%20Health%20Opportunities%20and%20Recommendations%20Executive%20Summary.pdf>
- Pronk, N. P., Kleinman, D. V., & Richmond, T. S. (2021). Healthy People 2030: Moving toward equitable health and well-being in the United States. *EclinicalMedicine*, 33, 100777. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2021.100777>
- Purcell, D. W., Latka, M. H., Metsch, L. R., Latkin, C. A., Gómez, C. A., Mizuno, Y., Arnsten, J. H., Wilkinson, J. D., Knight, K. R., Knowlton, A. R., Santibanez, S., Tobin, K. E., Rose, C. D., Valverde, E. E., Gourevitch, M. N., Eldred, L., & Borkowf, C. B. (2007). Results from a randomized controlled trial of a peer-mentoring intervention to reduce HIV transmission and increase access to care and adherence to HIV medications among HIV-seropositive injection drug users. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*, 46 Suppl 2, S35-47. <https://doi.org/10.1097/QAI.0b013e31815767c4>
- Rowe, M., Bellamy, C., Baranoski, M., Wieland, M., O'Connell, M. J., Benedict, P., Davidson, L., Buchanan, J., & Sells, D. (2007). A peer-support, group intervention to reduce substance use and criminality among persons with severe mental illness. *Psychiatric Services (Washington, D.C.)*, 58(7), 955–961. <https://doi.org/10.1176/ps.2007.58.7.955>
- Ryan, J. P., Victor, B. G., Moore, A., Mowbray, O., & Perron, B. E. (2016). Recovery coaches and the stability of reunification for substance abusing families in child welfare. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 70, 357–363. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2016.10.002>
- Saitz, R., Larson, M. J., LaBelle, C., Richardson, J., & Samet, J. H. (2008). The Case for Chronic Disease Management for Addiction. *Journal of Addiction Medicine*, 2(2), 55–65. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ADM.0b013e318166af74>
- Satinsky, E. N., Doran, K., Felton, J. W., Kleinman, M., Dean, D., & Magidson, J. F. (2020). Adapting a peer recovery coach-delivered behavioral activation intervention for problematic substance use in a medically underserved community in Baltimore City. *PLoS ONE*, 15(1), e0228084. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0228084>
- Sharfstein, J. M., & Olsen, Y. (2020). How Not to Spend an Opioid Settlement. *JAMA*, 323(11), 1031–1032. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.1371>
- Sikka, R., Morath, J. M., & Leape, L. (2015). The Quadruple Aim: Care, health, cost and meaning in work. *BMJ Quality & Safety*, 24(10), 608–610. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjqs-2015-004160>
- Simpson, A., Flood, C., Rowe, J., Quigley, J., Henry, S., Hall, C., Evans, R., Sherman, P., & Bowers, L. (2014). Results of a pilot randomised controlled trial to measure the clinical and cost effectiveness of peer support in increasing hope and quality of life in mental health patients discharged from hospital in the UK. *BMC Psychiatry*, 14(1), 30. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-244X-14-30>

- Skevington, S. M., Lotfy, M., O'Connell, K. A., & WHOQOL Group. (2004). The World Health Organization's WHOQOL-BREF quality of life assessment: Psychometric properties and results of the international field trial. A report from the WHOQOL group. *Quality of Life Research: An International Journal of Quality of Life Aspects of Treatment, Care and Rehabilitation*, 13(2), 299–310. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:QURE.0000018486.91360.00>
- Stephens, M. A. C., & Wand, G. (2012). Stress and the HPA axis: Role of glucocorticoids in alcohol dependence. *Alcohol Research: Current Reviews*, 34(4), 468–483.
- Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. (2010). *Recovery-Oriented Systems of Care (ROSC) Resource Guide*. https://www.samhsa.gov/sites/default/files/rosc_resource_guide_book.pdf
- Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. (2012). *SAMHSA's Working Definition of Recovery* | SAMHSA. <http://store.samhsa.gov/product/SAMHSA-s-Working-Definition-of-Recovery/PEP12-RECDEF>
- Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. (2017). *Overview of the FFY18-19 SAMHSA Block Grant Application: Behavioral Health Assessment and Plans, Annual Reports*. <https://www.samhsa.gov/grants/block-grants>
- Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration & Recovery Research Institute. (2017). *Report of Findings from a Systematic Review of the Scientific Literature on Recovery Support Services in the United States*. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. <https://www.mass.gov/doc/recovery-support-research-literature-review-submitted-by-kim-krawczyk/download>
- Thoits, P. A. (2011). Mechanisms linking social ties and support to physical and mental health. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 52(2), 145–161. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022146510395592>
- United States Government Accountability Office. (2020). *Substance use disorder: Medicaid coverage of peer support services for adults* (Report to Congressional Committees GAO-20-616). U.S. Government Accountability Office. <https://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-20-616>
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion. (2019). *Healthy People 2030*. HealthyPeople.Gov. <https://health.gov/healthypeople>
- Videka, L., Neale, J., Page, C., Buche, J., Beck, A. J., Wayment, C., & Gaiser, M. (2019). *National analysis of peer support providers: Practice settings, requirements, roles and reimbursement*. University of Michigan, School of Public Health, Behavioral Health Workforce Research Center.
- Vilsaint, C. L., Kelly, J. F., Bergman, B. G., Groshkova, T., Best, D., & White, W. L. (2017). Development and validation of a Brief Assessment of Recovery Capital (BARC-10) for alcohol and drug use disorder. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 177, 71–76. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2017.03.022>
- Volkow, N. D., Koob, G. F., & McLellan, A. T. (2016). Neurobiologic Advances from the Brain Disease Model of Addiction. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 374(4), 363–371. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMr1511480>
- Walker, C., & Peterson, C. L. (2021). Where Does Value Lie in Peer Support? An Exploratory Discussion of the Theories and Methods Underpinning Effective Research in Peer Support. *Qualitative Health Research*, 31(2), 218–227. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732320964173>

- Warren, O., Smith-Bernardin, S., Jamieson, K., Zaller, N., & Liferidge, A. (2016). Identification and Practice Patterns of Sobering Centers in the United States. *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved*, 27(4), 1843–1857. <https://doi.org/10.1353/hpu.2016.0166>
- Watson, D. P., Brucker, K., McGuire, A., Snow-Hill, N. L., Xu, H., Cohen, A., Campbell, M., Robison, L., Sightes, E., Buhner, R., O'Donnell, D., & Kline, J. A. (2020). Replication of an emergency department-based recovery coaching intervention and pilot testing of pragmatic trial protocols within the context of Indiana's Opioid State Targeted Response plan. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 108, 88–94. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsat.2019.06.002>
- White, W. L. (2006). *Sponsor, recovery coach, addiction counselor: The importance of role clarity and role integrity*. Philadelphia Department of Behavioral Health and Mental Retardation Services.
- White, W. L. (2007). Addiction recovery: Its definition and conceptual boundaries. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 33(3), 229–241. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsat.2007.04.015>
- White, W. L. (2009). Peer-Based Addiction Recovery Support: History, Theory, Practice, and Scientific Evaluation. *Counselor*, 10(5), 54–59.
- White, W. L. (2013). *State of the New Recovery Advocacy Movement: Amplification of Remarks to the Association of Recovery Community Organizations at Faces & Voices of Recovery Executive Directors Leadership Academy, Dallas, Texas, November 15, 2013*. <https://www.chestnut.org/resources/5cd82f5d-f9cb-4e50-8391-7eadb9700e34/2013-State-of-the-New-Recovery-Advocacy-Movement.pdf>
- White, W. L., Boyle, M., & Loveland, D. (2002). Alcoholism/Addiction as a Chronic Disease. *Alcoholism Treatment Quarterly*, 20(3–4), 107–129. https://doi.org/10.1300/J020v20n03_06
- White, W. L., Boyle, M., & Loveland, D. (2003). Behavioral health recovery management: Transcending the limitations of addiction treatment. *Behavioral Health Management*, 23(3), 38–44.
- Woulfe, J., Oliver, T. R., Siemering, K. Q., & Zahner, S. J. (2010). Multisector Partnerships in Population Health Improvement. *Preventing Chronic Disease*, 7(6), A119.



**FACES & VOICES
OF RECOVERY**

ADVOCATE. ACT. ADVANCE.

10 G Street NE, Suite 600,
Washington, DC 20002

202.737.0690

www.facesandvoicesofrecovery.org

info@facesandvoicesofrecovery.org