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Overview

Review of major trends and findings in the following areas:

- Youth Served
- Services Rendered
- Outcomes
- Risk Profiles
- Overall Picture
Youth Served
### CAMHD Youth Registered & With Procured & Direct Services:
**Fiscal Year 2012-2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># Youth Registered</th>
<th># Youth with Procured Svcs</th>
<th># Youth with Direct Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1765</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1313</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2089</td>
<td>1337</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2070</td>
<td>1505</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2209</td>
<td>1528</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2296</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2375</td>
<td>1605</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2405</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2496</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28% Increase
Youth Served

CAMHD Youth Registered and Receiving Direct and Procured Services by FGC: Fiscal Year 2012-2016

Registered Youth (N) by Family Guidance Center:
- Hawaii (Big Island)
- Leeward Oahu
- Central Oahu
- Honolulu Oahu
- Maui
- Kauai
- Family Court Liaison

Fiscal Year by Family Guidance Center:
- 2012
- 2013
- 2014
- 2015
- 2016
Youth Served

CAMHD Percent of Race Not Available: Fiscal Year 2011-2016

Youth (%)

Fiscal Year

National Origin NA
Race NA
Ethnicity NA
Youth Served

CAMHD Registered Youth Major Primary Diagnoses:
Fiscal Year 2012-2016

Anxiety: 12% (2012), 11% (2013), 12% (2014), 14% (2015), 11% (2016)
Adjustment: 7% (2012), 7% (2013), 8% (2014), 11% (2015), 12% (2016)
Youth Served

Average Age of Registered Youth: Fiscal Year 2007-2016

Mean Age

Fiscal Year


14.6 14.5 14.4 14.5 14.4 14.2 14.0 13.9 13.6 13.5
Youth Served

Trend in % of Registered Youth 12 or Younger: Fiscal Year 2012-2016

- 2012: 26.3%
- 2013: 28.6%
- 2014: 29.9%
- 2015: 33.1%
- 2016: 35.3%

Legend:
- Older Than 12
- 12 or Younger
Youth Served

CAMHD Registered Youth Gender: Fiscal Year 2012-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Female %</th>
<th>Male %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Youth Served – Key Points

- Continuing increases in number of youth served
- Population continues to grow younger
- Decreases in Disruptive Behavior diagnoses and increases in Adjustment and Anxiety diagnoses

What, if any, adjustments should be made?
Services Rendered
Services Rendered


- Out-of-State: 14, 14, 25, 35, 38, 60, 69
- Hospital Residential: 14, 14, 13, 10, 7
- Community High Risk: 14, 14, 13, 10, 7
- Community Residential: 155, 137, 128, 137, 139, 155
- Transitional Family Home: 205, 192, 168, 173, 145
CAMHD Supportive Service Utilization: Fiscal Year 2012-2016

Services Rendered

Youth (N)
Services Rendered

Procured Service Cost Per Youth: Fiscal Year 2009-2016

Fiscal Year

$0 $5,000 $10,000 $15,000 $20,000 $25,000 $30,000 $35,000


$28,725 $27,898 $26,853 $25,187 $24,450 $23,235 $21,338 $20,835
Services Rendered: Client Satisfaction

CAMHD Consumer Survey 2016: % of Respondents Rating Positively in Each Domain

- Cultural Sensitivity: 94.7%
- Treatment Participation: 87.2%
- Social Connectedness: 90.5%
- Access: 84.3%
- Outcomes: 56.4%
- Functioning: 56.4%
- Overall Program Assessment: 82.9%
- Communication with Care Coordinator: 83.5%

These percentages are based on the number of respondents whose combined scores totaled a ‘3.5’ or better.

A five-point Likert-type scale was used for each item (i.e., ‘Strongly Agree’ (5), ‘Agree’ (4), ‘Undecided’ (3), ‘Disagree’ (2), or ‘Strongly Disagree’ (1)).
Services Rendered: Client Satisfaction

Responses to “What would improve the services offered?” (% of those who responded)

- **19%** More support needed (transitioning to adulthood, extend time-limited services like MST, more care coordinators, more flexible hours)
- **13%** Additional services (weekend activities, group sessions, local [vs out-of-state] facilities)
- **11%** Improve quality of services (improving access, better communication with care coordinators)
- **7%** Improve eligibility process
- **5%** Specific requests for child’s unique needs
Services Rendered: Client Satisfaction

During meeting(s) with my child’s Care Coordinator, I was informed about the role of the Parent Partners.

I understand the role of the Parent Partner in the treatment of my child.
Do you know about the Help You Keiki website that provides information about services for your child?

If “Yes,” during the last year, did you access the Help Your Keiki website for information about services for your child?

NO 69.0% (N = 138)
YES 31.0% (N = 62)

NO 68.9% (N = 42)
YES 31.1% (N = 19)

9.5% of Total
Services Rendered: Parent Informational Website

HelpYourKeiki.com
Services Rendered – Key Points

- Array of services continuing to get “squeezed” in the middle – less youth served in TFH, MST and FFT, while more youth served in Intensive In-Home and on the mainland.
- Decreasing cost per youth
- Decreasing use of evidence-based and cost-reimbursement services (increasing cost per youth for those services)
- Parents mostly satisfied with how current services are provided, but less so with outcomes.
- Parents suggesting additional supports and services
- Need more awareness of parent partners and Help Your Keiki website

What, if any, adjustments should be made?
Outcomes
Outcomes

Average Earliest & Latest Ohio Scales Problem Score by Level of Care:
For Episodes Falling Within 10/1/2014 to 9/30/2016
Outcomes

Percent of Youth Successfully Discharged (MTPS) by Level of Care:
10/1/2014 to 9/30/2016

- HBR: 89%
- PH: 39%
- CHR: 100%
- CBRII: 83%
- CBRIII: 52%
- TFH: 43%
- MST: 78%
- FFT: 79%
- CBI: 55%
- IIH: 63%
Risk Profiles
## Risk Profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial CAFAS Score</th>
<th>Success Rate at This Level or Higher</th>
<th>N at This Level or Higher (Denominator)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90+</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110+</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130+</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150+</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170+</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initial CAFAS is a significant predictor of discharge success.
## Risk Profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Care</th>
<th>CAFAS Cutoff (Scores at This Level or Higher)</th>
<th>Probability of Successful Discharge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Based Residential III</td>
<td>150+</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Family Home</td>
<td>120+</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive In-Home</td>
<td>130+</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Care</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Early Progress Risk Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Based Residential III</td>
<td>4th (Month) MTPS</td>
<td>Average MTPS Progress Rating <strong>Below 2.9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd (Quarter) CAFAS</td>
<td>CAFAS Score <strong>150 or higher</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Family Home</td>
<td>3rd (Month) MTPS</td>
<td>Average MTPS Progress Rating <strong>Below 3.6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd (Quarter) CAFAS</td>
<td>CAFAS Score <strong>140 or higher</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive-In Home</td>
<td>2nd (Month) MTPS</td>
<td>Average MTPS Progress Rating <strong>Below 2.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd (Quarter) CAFAS</td>
<td>CAFAS Score <strong>120 or higher</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital-Based Residential</td>
<td>2nd (Month) MTPS</td>
<td>Average MTPS Progress Rating <strong>Below 2.8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multisystemic Therapy</td>
<td>3rd (Month) MTPS</td>
<td>Average MTPS Progress Rating <strong>Below 3.3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Family Therapy</td>
<td>3rd (Month) MTPS</td>
<td>Average MTPS Progress Rating <strong>Below 3.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall Picture

**Strengths**
- Increasing # of youth served – getting better at reaching our population
- Increasingly serving younger youth
- Overcoming system’s bias toward disruptive behavior problems
- Service cost per youth is decreasing
- Parents satisfied with the services they are receiving
Overall Picture

Areas for Development

- Intensive In-home increasing, but MST & FFT is not
- With challenges in increasing utilization of evidence-based programs, there is an even greater need to bolster evidence-based practices
- System can better identify youth who are at risk – action needs to be taken to increase supports for these youth
  - Increase amount or diversity of supportive services for at-risk youth
    - Additional services, after-care
    - Parent Partner
    - Help Your Keiki Website
  - Increase monitoring of at-risk youth
Mahalo!

- For more information, please contact CAMHD’s Research & Evaluation Office
  David Jackson, PhD
  David.Jackson@doh.hawaii.gov
  (808) 733-8354