Table 1. Six Levels of Collaboration/Integration (Core Descriptions)

COORDINATED KEY ELEMENT: COMMUNICATION		CO-LOCATED KEY ELEMENT: PHYSICAL PROXIMITY		INTEGRATED KEY ELEMENT: PRACTICE CHANGE	
LEVEL 1 Minimal Collaboration	LEVEL 2 Basic Collaboration at a Distance	LEVEL 3 Basic Collaboration Onsite	LEVEL 4 Close Collaboration Onsite with Some System Integration	LEVEL 5 Close Collaboration Approaching an Integrated Practice	LEVEL 6 Full Collaboration in a Transformed/ Merged Integrated Practice
Behavioral health, primary care and other healthcare providers work:					
In separate facilities, where they:	In separate facilities, where they:	In same facility not necessarily same offices, where they:	In same space within the same facility, where they:	In same space within the same facility (some shared space), where they:	In same space within the same facility, sharing all practice space, where they:
▸▸ Have separate systems ▸▸ Communicate about cases only rarely and under compelling circumstances ▸▸ Communicate, driven by provider need ▸▸ May never meet in person ▸▸ Have limited understanding of each other's roles	▸▸ Have separate systems ▸▸ Communicate periodically about shared patients ▸▸ Communicate, driven by specific patient issues ▸▸ May meet as part of larger community ▸▸ Appreciate each other's roles as resources	▸▸ Have separate systems ▸▸ Communicate regularly about shared patients, by phone or e-mail ▸▸ Collaborate, driven by need for each other's services and more reliable referral ▸▸ Meet occasionally to discuss cases due to close proximity ▸▸ Feel part of a larger yet ill-defined team	▸▸ Share some systems, like scheduling or medical records ▸▸ Communicate in person as needed ▸▸ Collaborate, driven by need for consultation and coordinated plans for difficult patients ▸▸ Have regular face-to-face interactions about some patients ▸▸ Have a basic understanding of roles and culture	▸▸ Actively seek system solutions together or develop work-a-rounds ▸▸ Communicate frequently in person ▸▸ Collaborate, driven by desire to be a member of the care team ▸▸ Have regular team meetings to discuss overall patient care and specific patient issues ▸▸ Have an in-depth understanding of roles and culture	▸▸ Have resolved most or all system issues, functioning as one integrated system ▸▸ Communicate consistently at the system, team and individual levels ▸▸ Collaborate, driven by shared concept of team care ▸▸ Have formal and informal meetings to support integrated model of care ▸▸ Have roles and cultures that blur or blend

Heath B, Wise Romero P, and Reynolds K. A Review and Proposed Standard Framework for Levels of Integrated Healthcare. Washington, D.C.SAMHSA-HRSA Center for Integrated Health Solutions. March 2013

Table 2A. Six Levels of Collaboration/Integration (Key Differentiators)

COORDINATED		CO-LOCATED		INTEGRATED	
LEVEL 1 Minimal Collaboration	LEVEL 2 Basic Collaboration at a Distance	LEVEL 3 Basic Collaboration Onsite	LEVEL 4 Close Collaboration Onsite with Some System Integration	LEVEL 5 Close Collaboration Approaching an Integrated Practice	LEVEL 6 Full Collaboration in a Transformed/ Merged Integrated Practice
Key Differentiator: Clinical Delivery					
▸▸ Screening and assessment done according to separate practice models ▸▸ Separate treatment plans ▸▸ Evidenced-based practices (EBP) implemented separately	▸▸ Screening based on separate practices; information may be shared through formal requests or Health Information Exchanges ▸▸ Separate treatment plans shared based on established relationships between specific providers ▸▸ Separate responsibility for care/EBPs	▸▸ May agree on a specific screening or other criteria for more effective in-house referral ▸▸ Separate service plans with some shared information that informs them ▸▸ Some shared knowledge of each other's EBPs, especially for high utilizers	▸▸ Agree on specific screening, based on ability to respond to results ▸▸ Collaborative treatment planning for specific patients ▸▸ Some EBPs and some training shared, focused on interest or specific population needs	▸▸ Consistent set of agreed upon screenings across disciplines, which guide treatment interventions ▸▸ Collaborative treatment planning for all shared patients ▸▸ EBPs shared across system with some joint monitoring of health conditions for some patients	▸▸ Population-based medical and behavioral health screening is standard practice with results available to all and response protocols in place ▸▸ One treatment plan for all patients ▸▸ EBPs are team selected, trained and implemented across disciplines as standard practice
Key Differentiator: Patient Experience					
▸▸ Patient physical and behavioral health needs are treated as separate issues ▸▸ Patient must negotiate separate practices and sites on their own with varying degrees of success	▸▸ Patient health needs are treated separately, but records are shared, promoting better provider knowledge ▸▸ Patients may be referred, but a variety of barriers prevent many patients from accessing care	▸▸ Patient health needs are treated separately at the same location ▸▸ Close proximity allows referrals to be more successful and easier for patients, although who gets referred may vary by provider	▸▸ Patient needs are treated separately at the same site, collaboration might include warm hand-offs to other treatment providers ▸▸ Patients are internally referred with better follow-up, but collaboration may still be experienced as separate services	▸▸ Patient needs are treated as a team for shared patients (for those who screen positive on screening measures) and separately for others ▸▸ Care is responsive to identified patient needs by of a team of providers as needed, which feels like a one-stop shop	▸▸ All patient health needs are treated for all patients by a team, who function effectively together ▸▸ Patients experience a seamless response to all healthcare needs as they present, in a unified practice

Heath B, Wise Romero P, and Reynolds K. A Review and Proposed Standard Framework for Levels of Integrated Healthcare. Washington, D.C.SAMHSA-HRSA Center for Integrated Health Solutions. March 2013

Table 2B. Six Levels of Collaboration/Integration (Key Differentiators, continued)

COORDINATED		CO-LOCATED		INTEGRATED	
LEVEL 1 Minimal Collaboration	LEVEL 2 Basic Collaboration at a Distance	LEVEL 3 Basic Collaboration Onsite	LEVEL 4 Close Collaboration Onsite with Some System Integration	LEVEL 5 Close Collaboration Approaching an Integrated Practice	LEVEL 6 Full Collaboration in a Transformed/ Merged Integrated Practice
Key Differentiator: Practice/Organization					
▸▸ No coordination or management of collaborative efforts ▸▸ Little provider buy-in to integration or even collaboration, up to individual providers to initiate as time and practice limits allow	▸▸ Some practice leadership in more systematic information sharing ▸▸ Some provider buy-into collaboration and value placed on having needed information	▸▸ Organization leaders supportive but often co-location is viewed as a project or program ▸▸ Provider buy-in to making referrals work and appreciation of onsite availability	▸▸ Organization leaders support integration through mutual problem-solving of some system barriers ▸▸ More buy-in to concept of integration but not consistent across providers, not all providers using opportunities for integration or components	▸▸ Organization leaders support integration, if funding allows and efforts placed in solving as many system issues as possible, without changing fundamentally how disciplines are practiced ▸▸ Nearly all providers engaged in integrated model. Buy-in may not include change in practice strategy for individual providers	▸▸ Organization leaders strongly support integration as practice model with expected change in service delivery, and resources provided for development ▸▸ Integrated care and all components embraced by all providers and active involvement in practice change
Key Differentiator: Business Model					
▸▸ Separate funding ▸▸ No sharing of resources ▸▸ Separate billing practices	▸▸ Separate funding ▸▸ May share resources for single projects ▸▸ Separate billing practices	▸▸ Separate funding ▸▸ May share facility expenses ▸▸ Separate billing practices	▸▸ Separate funding, but may share grants ▸▸ May share office expenses, staffing costs, or infrastructure ▸▸ Separate billing due to system barriers	▸▸ Blended funding based on contracts, grants or agreements ▸▸ Variety of ways to structure the sharing of all expenses ▸▸ Billing function combined or agreed upon process	▸▸ Integrated funding, based on multiple sources of revenue ▸▸ Resources shared and allocated across whole practice ▸▸ Billing maximized for integrated model and single billing structure

Heath B, Wise Romero P, and Reynolds K. A Review and Proposed Standard Framework for Levels of Integrated Healthcare. Washington, D.C.SAMHSA-HRSA Center for Integrated Health Solutions. March 2013

Table 3. Advantages and Weaknesses at Each Level of Collaboration/Integration

COORDINATED		CO-LOCATED		INTEGRATED	
LEVEL 1 Minimal Collaboration	LEVEL 2 Basic Collaboration at a Distance	LEVEL 3 Basic Collaboration Onsite	LEVEL 4 Close Collaboration Onsite with Some System Integration	LEVEL 5 Close Collaboration Approaching an Integrated Practice	LEVEL 6 Full Collaboration in a Transformed/ Merged Integrated Practice
Advantages					
▸▸ Each practice can make timely and autonomous decisions about care ▸▸ Readily understood as a practice model by patients and providers	▸▸ Maintains each practice's basic operating structure, so change is not a disruptive factor ▸▸ Provides some coordination and information-sharing that is helpful to both patients and providers	▸▸ Colocation allows for more direct interaction and communication among professionals to impact patient care ▸▸ Referrals more successful due to proximity ▸▸ Opportunity to develop closer professional relationships	▸▸ Removal of some system barriers, like separate records, allows closer collaboration to occur ▸▸ Both behavioral health and medical providers can become more well-informed about what each can provide ▸▸ Patients are viewed as shared which facilitates more complete treatment plans	▸▸ High level of collaboration leads to more responsive patient care, increasing engagement and adherence to treatment plans ▸▸ Provider flexibility increases as system issues and barriers are resolved ▸▸ Both provider and patient satisfaction may increase	▸▸ Opportunity to truly treat whole person ▸▸ All or almost all system barriers resolved, allowing providers to practice as high functioning team ▸▸ All patient needs addressed as they occur ▸▸ Shared knowledge base of providers increases and allows each professional to respond more broadly and adequately to any issue
Weaknesses					
▸▸ Services may overlap, be duplicated or even work against each other ▸▸ Important aspects of care may not be addressed or take a long time to be diagnosed	▸▸ Sharing of information may not be systematic enough to effect overall patient care ▸▸ No guarantee that information will change plan or strategy of each provider ▸▸ Referrals may fail due to barriers, leading to patient and provider frustration	▸▸ Proximity may not lead to greater collaboration, limiting value ▸▸ Effort is required to develop relationships ▸▸ Limited flexibility, if traditional roles are maintained	▸▸ System issues may limit collaboration ▸▸ Potential for tension and conflicting agendas among providers as practice boundaries loosen	▸▸ Practice changes may create lack of fit for some established providers ▸▸ Time is needed to collaborate at this high level and may affect practice productivity or cadence of care	▸▸ Sustainability issues may stress the practice ▸▸ Few models at this level with enough experience to support value ▸▸ Outcome expectations not yet established

Heath B, Wise Romero P, and Reynolds K. A Review and Proposed Standard Framework for Levels of Integrated Healthcare. Washington, D.C.SAMHSA-HRSA Center for Integrated Health Solutions. March 2013