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Date: April 20, 2014

 To: Chairpersons and/or Directors



 Local Mental Health Boards and Commissions

From: California Mental Health Planning Council

Subject: **Instructions for Data Notebook 2014**

We ask that this report be prepared by the MH Board or Commission members. You are the most important resources for identifying program strengths and needs in your community.

On the first page, please fill in the requested information for your county websites:

* Department of Behavioral Health/ Mental Health
* Public reports about your county’s MH services.

Please send a copy of the filled-in first page to the Planning Council along with your final report which contains your answers to the questions in the Data Notebook. Please submit your report within 60 days by email to:

DataNotebook@cmhpc.ca.gov.

Or, you may mail a printed copy of your report to:

* Data Notebook Project
* California Mental Health Planning Council
* 1501 Capitol Avenue, MS 2706
* P.O. Box 997413 Sacramento, CA 95899-7413

Please examine the enclosed information, which will help you discuss the questions in the Data Notebook. We provide examples of recent mental health data for your county. In some figures, the term “MHP” is used to refer to your county’s Mental Health Plan.

Some data comes from APS Healthcare/EQRO, which gave permission to use their figures and tables, prepared for review of each county’s Medi-Cal Specialty Mental Health services. Data in this packet came from the following review cycle:

\_\_X\_\_ Fiscal Year 2013 -- 2014: <http://caeqro.com/webx/.ee85675/>

\_\_\_\_\_ Fiscal Year 2012 -- 2013: <http://caeqro.com/webx/.ee851c3/>

For some questions, you will need to consult your local county Quality Improvement Coordinator, and/or Mental Health Director. If you are not able to address all of the questions, just answer the ones you can.

Thank you for your participation in the Data Notebook Project.
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Lake County: Data Notebook 2014

for California

Mental Health Boards and Commissions

County Name: **Lake** Population (2013): 64,443

Website for County Department of Mental Health (MH) or Behavioral Health:

 ­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­<http://www.co.lake.ca.us/Government/Directory/Behavioral_Health.htm>

<http://lcmh.lakecountyca.gov/>

Website for Local County MH Data and Reports: *For MHSA*: <http://www.co.lake.ca.us/Government/Directory/Behavioral_Health/MHSA.htm>

Website for local MH Board/Commission Meeting Announcements and Reports: *None*

Specialty MH Data from review Year 2013-2014: <http://caeqro.com/webx/.ee85675>

Total number of persons receiving Medi-Cal in your county (2012): 23,540

Average number Medi-Cal eligible persons per month: 18,911

 Percent of Medi-Cal eligible persons who were:

 Children, ages 0-17: 38.6 %

Adults, ages 18-59: 45.9 %

Adults, Ages 60 and Over: 15.5 %

Total persons with SMI[[1]](#footnote-1) or SED[[2]](#footnote-2) who received Specialty MH services (2012): 919

 Percent of Specialty MH service recipients who were:

Children 0-17: 31.0 %

Adults 18-59: 58.3 %

Adults 60 and Over: 10.7 %
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INTRODUCTION: Purpose, Goals, and Data Resources

This Data Notebook has been developed for the use by the local mental health (MH) boards and commissions by a yearlong workgroup comprised of members from:

* California Mental Health Planning Council (CMHPC)
* California Association of Local Mental Health Boards and Commissions (CALMHB/C)
* APS Healthcare/ EQRO (External Quality Review Organization)

Our plan is for the Data Notebook to meet these goals:

* assist local boards to meet their mandates to review the local county mental health systems, identify unmet needs, and recommend improvements.
* provide a professional format for submitting reports to their local Board of Supervisors, and/or their county Director of Mental Health Services.
* function as an educational tool for local boards, whose members have varying levels of skills, frequent turnover, and need ‘refresher’ training about using data.
* help the CMHPC fulfill its mandates to review and report on the public mental health system in California, which also helps provide evidence for advocacy.

Data reporting drives policy, and policy drives funding for programs. But the data must be both recent and available to the public, or else it is not useful. So, the CMHPC will provide examples of local data from current public reports. We focus on two broad areas: (1) evaluation of program performance, and (2) indicators of client outcomes.

 We recognize that each county has a unique population, resources, strengths, and needs. Thus, there is no single perfect data source to answer all the important questions one might ask about mental health services. However, the following data resources will help board members answer questions in this Data Notebook:

* experience and opinions of the local mental health board members
* recent reports about county MH programs from APS Healthcare/EQRO
* data you request from your county QI Coordinator and/or Mental Health Director (because CMHPC does not have that data, and it’s not in other public reports)
* client outcomes data provided by California Institute of Mental Health (CiMH) in their analysis of the most recent Consumer Perception Survey.

Some of our data comes from APS Healthcare/EQRO, which kindly gave permission to use their figures and tables, prepared for review of each county’s Medi-Cal Specialty Mental Health services. Those reviews are at: [www.CAEQRO.com](http://www.CAEQRO.com). You may find the full-length EQRO reports helpful because they summarize key programs and quality improvement efforts for each county. They also describe strengths, opportunities for improvement, and changes in mental health programs since the last year.

Understanding changes in local programs can help consumers because of the massive re-organization of mental health services statewide. Some changes have been confusing to clients. The old state Department of Mental Health was eliminated in 2012 and many functions were moved to the Department of Health Care Services. Other changes due to federal health care reform and the Affordable Care Act affect how mental health services are provided, funded, and linked to primary health care or substance use treatment. Also, local counties have adjusted to major challenges.

Remember, this report is about your community, and what you and your stakeholders choose to discuss. Examining the data can indeed “Tell a Human Story.” But quantitative data (numbers) provides only part of the picture, for example:

* measures of whether the quality of program services improve over time
* whether more people from different groups are receiving services
* how many clients got physical healthcare or needed substance use treatment.

The other part of the story gives human context to the numbers. Such qualitative data (narrative, descriptions, or stories) tells more of the story, because we can:

* describe special programs targeted for outreach to specific groups
* examine how the programs are actually implementing their goals
* list concrete steps that are taken to improve services, and
* tell what is being done to increase client engagement with continued treatment.

We hope this project contributes to ongoing quality improvement (QI) in mental health services. We seek constant improvement in our approach to quality because:

* needs change over time,
* all human endeavors are by nature imperfect,
* creativity gives rise to new ideas, and
* we can share examples of successful programs to help other communities.

One question is whether local boards are permitted to provide additional information, besides that requested in this Notebook. We always welcome supplemental reports about successful projects, or which the county administration uses to inform the public. Any additional reports may be attached in an “Appendix,” with the website address (if available). However, we emphasize such extra reports are not required.

Thank you for participating in this project. We hope this Data Notebook serves as a springboard for your discussion about all areas of the mental health system, not just those topics highlighted by our questions.

TREATING THE WHOLE PERSON:

Integrating Behavioral and Physical Health Care

Studies have shown that individuals with serious mental illness die, on average, 25 years earlier than the general population.  This information makes improving the physical health of clients of great importance and should be a goal of county mental health departments along with providing effective and appropriate mental health services.  Coordination of care for mental health, substance abuse and physical health is one way of accomplishing the goal.

The California Mental Health Planning Council does not have any data to provide to show how your county’s programs connect clients of mental health services with necessary physical health care. We ask that the local mental health board request information from your county mental health department for any data on numbers (or percent) of total mental health clients who are referred to, or connected with, physical health providers to assess, treat and monitor physical health issues.

If your county has data on numbers or percentages of clients who are also receiving physical health care, please include it in your Data Notebook you submit to the Council.

\_\_\_ Check here if your county does not have such data or information.

**1)  Please describe any efforts in your county to improve the physical health of clients.**

 Lake County does ask mental health clients who their PCP is. 57.29% of our do specify a PCP. Out of a total of 1049 open clients, 601 responded with either the name of the PCP, or the clinic where they are seen. 428 clients provided the name of their doctor, while the other 173 provided a NP, clinic, or other name.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Count of PCP (Y/N) |   | PCP (Y/N) |   |   |  |
| Open/Closed | Type | No | Yes | Grand Total |  |
| O |   | 448 |   | 448 | 42.71% |
|   | DR |   | 428 | 428 | 71.21% |
|   | Other |   | 173 | 173 | 28.79% |
| O Total |   | 448 | 601 | 1049 | 57.29% |

**2)  How does your county address wellness programs to engage and motivate clients to take charge of improving their physical health?**

The resources provided to Lake County through Proposition 63 and the Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) have provided the Behavioral Health Department with the vehicle to work with the community to develop programming aimed at elevating a person’s sense of well-being. Improving physical health through mindfulness, exercise, and diet are significant to programming in the network of community wellness centers funded through the MHSA. Centers that serve the homeless, veteran, Latino and Tribal populations of the County offer activities that encourage clients to take better care of themselves by eating better, being physically active, and taking responsibility for their own care. These “peer” run programs are informal social support systems that encourage participants toward better health.

For the past two years the County has participated in a CDC funded community transformation process involving multiple initiatives. The Health Leadership Network’s Health Policy Cabinet used this resource to increase the overall health of Lake County residents. Results from the recent county health rankings and community feedback related to the Lake County Community Health Needs Assessment indicated priority health issues to improve on. These health issues included creating more opportunities to support healthy eating, physical activity, and emotional health, and ways to reduce smoking and exposure to secondhand smoke. For more information go to: http://www.climbtothepeakofhealth.org/

#### NEW CLIENTS: One Measure of Access

One way to evaluate the quality of mental health services outreach is to measure how many clients receive services who have never been part of the service system before (“brand new” clients). Another measure is how many clients return for services after a period of time with no services (“new” clients).

The California Mental Health Planning Council is exploring how each county mental health department defines “new” clients, and how a client is labelled when they return for additional services. This information is important in determining whether your county has a “revolving door,” that is, clients who are in and out of mental health services repeatedly. This data is one indicator of the success of your county’s programs in closing cases appropriately and providing adequate discharge planning to clients.

This data is not currently reported by the counties to the state. The Council does not have data to provide to you. This information should be requested from your county mental health department.

\_\_\_\_ Check here if your county does not have this information.

**3. How does your county define 'new' client for those individuals who have previously received services, but who have not received services for a while? (e.g., 6 months, 12 months, 2 years?)**

 With the use of our county Electronic Health Record, Lake County essentially has three categories of clients: new, open, or inactive. Therefore, anyone who has been opened and then closed previously at any point in time and is being re-opened is considered from going inactive to open. Both New and Inactive are treated the same as far as intake/opening procedures.

**4.  Please provide any data your county has on the number of 'new' clients last year.  And if you have it, how many of those new clients were brand new clients?  You may need to ask your county mental health department for this data.**

# new children/youth  (0-17 yrs)  245

of these, how many (or %) are ‘brand new’ clients \_166\_

# new adults (18-59 yrs) 714

of these, how many (or %) are ‘brand new’ clients 275

# new older adults  (60+ yrs) 217

of these, how many (or %) are ‘brand new’ clients 68

REDUCING RE-HOSPITALIZATION: Access to Follow-up Care

Sometimes, an individual experiences acute symptoms of mental illness or substance abuse which can result in a brief stay in an acute care hospital.  Receiving follow-up services after discharge from a short-term (3-14 day) hospitalization can be critical to preventing a return to the hospital.

The chart below shows the percentage of people discharged in your county who received at least one service within 7 days of discharge. Also shown is the percentage of those same people who were readmitted to the hospital.  The chart also shows the same information for receiving services and being readmitted to the hospital within 30 days.  Red indicates the numbers for your county and the blue indicates the percentage for the state of California.

**Lake County**:



**6.  Looking at the chart, is your county doing better or worse than the state?  Discuss why (e.g., your county has programming available that specifically ensures a warm handoff for follow-up services).**

Overall, Lake County is doing better than the State as far as follow-up services and reduced admission rates (if only slightly on the latter). Our process is to closely follow anyone who has been hospitalized via our discharge planner, who upon discharge, arranges for a follow-up appointment that’s especially designed for these situations, called an RDHT appointment (Recent Discharge/High Triage). Often that is done the day of discharge, particularly for children. Otherwise, it’s done within a week, but is typically 2-3 days from discharge. If the person no-shows for that appointment, then we make efforts to do outreach and follow-up to try and re-engage them.

**7. Do you have any suggestions on how your county can improve follow-up and reduce re-hospitalizations?**

Through the SB 82 grants that we’ve obtained, we are increasing our crisis efforts to reduce hospitalizations and crises as a whole. An substantial aspect of this will be employing peers to sit with and work with people after the initial crisis to help them stabilize more. We will also be doing more outreach with a crisis “navigator” to help them find the appropriate services.

**8. What are the three most significant barriers to service access? Examples:**

* **Transportation** - we are a rural county that has a large lake in the middle of it, therefore even with a public transportation system, transportation is a challenge as it takes time to get to locations for services as well as the restrictions of public transportation time frames.
* **~~Child care~~**
* **Language barriers or lack of interpreters** – we have too few clinical staff who speak Spanish and must rely on interpreters. This is not the most ideal and puts clients off in this cumbersome process.
* **~~Specific cultural issues~~**
* **~~Too few child or adult therapists~~**
* **~~Lack of psychiatrists or tele-psychiatry services~~**
* **Delays in service**  - Although our MH department does well in timeliness of services per regulation, as an outpatient clinic, we still schedule initial appointments that are often days away from when a person is seeking service. We often loose people at that time who decide by then other ways to handle their issues.
* **~~Restrictive time window to schedule an appointment~~**

##### ACCESS BY UNSERVED AND UNDER-SERVED COMMUNITIES

One goal of the Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) is to reach unserved and underserved communities, especially communities of color. The MHSA promotes outreach to engage these communities in services. If individuals and families in these communities are not accessing services, then we may need to explore new ways of reaching them. Or, we may need to change our programs to meet their mental health needs in ways that better complement their culture.

From data the counties report to the state, we can see how many individuals living in your county are eligible for Medi-Cal, and of those individuals, how many received mental health services. Are you serving the Medi-Cal clients who need your services?

**Lake County Data**:



**9. Is there a big difference between the race/ethnicity breakdown on the two charts? Do you feel that the group(s) that need services in your county are receiving services?**

Review of the two charts shows noticeable differences of  those in the White Race/Ethnicity higher on the Beneficiaries Served chart by over 10% more than the Eligibles chart and an even larger difference for the Hispanic population of almost 12%; other difference are not as apparent.

LCBH’s has put more focused efforts on creating a warm, friendly environment for access through the efforts of the Innovation Committee over the last two years.

This year LCBH has taken a large step towards addressing better access with the Hispanic population by opening up a wellness center in the city of Clearlake, La Esperanza Centro Latino. This is in addition to our existing Circle of Native Minds wellness center in the city of Lakeport. Both wellness centers promote and support culturally specific interventions and wellness, which are not reflected on the Medi-Cal penetration rates.

Nevertheless, hopefully through these wellness centers as well as continued outreach efforts by our culturally specific outreach specialists these percentages will increase in those populations.

**10. What outreach efforts are being made to reach minority groups in your community?**

As stated above (see #9), LCBH has created 2 wellness centers to focus on more outreach efforts with the Hispanic and Native American minorities. In addition to the two wellness centers and our two culturally specific outreach specialists, LCBH also has a Peer Run Drop-In-Center in Clearlake. This center’s Mission Statement is:

“The mission of The Bridge (Peer Center) is to provide a positive and supportive environment for those who have been diagnosed with mental illness to grow personally, emotionally, socially, and spiritually in their recovery by providing compassion, a unique perspective through Peer Support, and the belief in peoples’ enormous potential and ability to recover.”

LCBH is also in partnership to provide peer services to the TAY population with a Drop-In-Center in Lower Lake, Harbor on Main.

**11. Do you have suggestions for improving outreach to and/or programs for underserved groups?**

Utilizing the information collected both in our department and for the county assists our efforts to focus on groups that may have difficulties in accessing services. Continue to support traditional and non-traditional services in order to appeal to this multi-cultural community both now and in the future.

##### CLIENT ENGAGEMENT IN SERVICES

One MHSA goal is to connect individuals to services they need to be successful. Clients who stop services too soon may not achieve much improvement, nor is it likely to last. So it is important to measure not only who comes in for treatment, but also how long they stay in services. Here we are considering individuals with high service needs, not someone who just needs a ‘tune-up.’ Although not every individual needs the same amount of services, research shows that when someone with severe mental illness continues to receive services over time, their chances of recovery increase.

Engagement in services, also called ‘retention rate’, is important to review. If individuals come in, receive only one or two services and never come back, it may mean the services were not appropriate, or that the individual did not feel welcome, or some other reason that should be explored. Again, we recognize that some individuals only need minimal services, but here we are looking at those with severe mental illness. Ultimately, the goal is to ensure they are getting needed services and are on the road to recovery. But we would not know that unless we look at how many services individuals received over time.

The chart below shows the number of Medi-Cal beneficiaries in your county who received 1, or 2, or 3, or 4, or 5, or more than15 mental health services during the year. For individuals experiencing severe mental illness, the more engaged they are in services, the greater the chance for lasting improvements in mental health.



**12. Do you think your county is doing a good job at keeping clients engaged in services? If yes, how? If not, why?**

For the clients receiving 15 or more services, Lake County appears to be doing average statistically compared to the rest of the state. However, a large portion of our staff is dedicated to the FSP program, working with the most chronic and challenging in our community. This is a smaller population but it is also more intense, which could explain why the numbers appear the way they do.

**13. For those clients receiving less than 5 services, what is your county doing to follow-up and re-engage those individuals for further mental health services?**

Not all of our the people we initially see are eligible for our ongoing services (the most low functioning and challenging) and we refer them elsewhere, sometime helping them for a few services to make sure that referral will work. For those that do fit our target population, we do reach out and try to engage. Even those we’re not sure about, but may have just gotten out of the hospital, we will try to follow-up to engage to determine what will best help them.

**14. Looking at the previous chart of who is being served by race/ethnicity in your county, do you have any thoughts or ideas to share regarding your county’s engagement of underserved communities?**

Serving the underserved is a strong goal LCBH has and we utilize a significant portion and planning of our MHSA monies in those efforts. Through the community/stakeholder planning process, we have identified the following to make extra efforts in engaging:

* Native American population
* Latino population
* Older Adults
* Those youth/young adult at risk for mental illness
* Those with mental illness who are close to release from incarceration
* Those with severe mental illness who are homeless or at risk

We are also in the planning/discussion stages of how to engage the LGBTQI population, another identified underserved population.

CLIENT OUTCOMES: Consumer Perception Survey (August 2013)

Ultimately, the reason we provide mental health services is to help individuals manage their mental illness and to lead productive lives. We have selected two questions from the Consumer Perception Survey which capture this intention. One question is geared toward adults of any age, and the other is for children and youth under 18.

Below are the data for responses by clients in your county to these two questions.

For general comparison, statewide reference information and data for various sized counties are shown in the tables on page 19.

The total numbers of surveys completed for Adults or Children/Youth in your county are shown separately in the tables below, under the heading “**Total**.”

Q1. Adults. As a direct result of the services I received, I deal more effectively with daily problems.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Strongly Disagree  | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree | Total |
| Number of Responses | 0 | 6 | 6 | 17 | 14 | 43 |
| Percent of Responses | 0 % | 14.0 % | 14.0 % | 39.5 % | 32.6 % | 100.0 % |

Q2. Children/Youth. As a result of services my child and/or family received, my child is better at handling daily life.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Strongly Disagree  | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree | Total |
| Number of Responses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| Percent of Responses | 0 % | 0 % | 0 % | 60.0 % | 40.0 % | 100.0 % |

**15. Are the data consistent with your perception of the effectiveness of mental health services in your county?**

Due to the small number of respondents, it’s difficult to extrapolate to the client population as a whole in our community. However, of those that did respond, yes, we do agree.

**16. Do you have any recommendations for improving effectiveness of services?**

Increase staffing resource to adequately support a “high touch” approach with our clients.

Continue to build and support our partnerships with other community organizations that serve our clients.

Ensure our staff our trained and cross-trained with other community organizations.

Continue to create a more welcoming and friendly environment for our clients.

**17. Many counties experience very low numbers of surveys completed. Do you have suggestions to increase the response rate?**

LCBH has no ability to influence if a client fills out a survey or not – there are no incentives to do so. We’ve tried having peer volunteers present to assist in filling out the survey, but the volunteers usually just sat around with very little to do – so that didn’t work. It would be nice to, besides our two clinics, is to offer them at our wellness center sites; however, the surveys require a client number and a number of people go to the wellness centers who aren’t open clients to LCBH, but receive more services there via non-traditional means. One thing that may help is to offer additional time to collect surveys rather than just a week.

**18. Lastly, but perhaps most important overall, with respect to delivery of services, do you have suggestions regarding any of the following:**

1. **Specific unmet needs or gaps in services**

Post crisis follow-up for lower acuity people and provide supports.

1. **Improvements to, or better coordination of, existing services**

Continue in our efforts of improvement that we are already engaged in, measuring out comes of these improvements.

1. **New programs that need to be implemented to serve individuals in your county**

Full implement our Early Intervention and Screening program (the aforementioned youth/young adult at risk for mental illness) and our Co-Occurring program (for those that have both mental health and substance abuse challenges).

**<END>**

REFERENCE DATA: for general comparison with your county MHP results





**County Mental Health Plan Size:** Categories are based upon DHCS definitions by county population.

o Small‐Rural MHPs = Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, Colusa, Del Norte, Glenn, Inyo, Lassen, Mariposa, Modoc, Mono, Plumas, Siskiyou, Trinity

o Small MHPs = El Dorado, Humboldt, Imperial, Kings, Lake, Madera, Mendocino, Napa, Nevada, San Benito, Shasta, Sutter/Yuba, Tehama, Tuolumne

o Medium MHPs = Butte, Marin, Merced, Monterey, Placer/Sierra, San Joaquin, San Luis Obispo, San Mateo, Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz, Solano, Sonoma, Stanislaus, Tulare, Yolo

o Large MHPs = Alameda, Contra Costa, Fresno, Kern, Orange, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco, Santa Clara, Ventura

o Los Angeles’ statistics are excluded from size comparisons, but are included in statewide data.

Total Values (in Tables above) = include all statewide data received by CiMH for these survey items.

**REMINDER:**

Thank you for your participation in completing your Data Notebook report.

Please feel free to provide feedback or recommendations you may have to improve this project for the following year. We welcome your input.

**Please submit your Data Notebook report by email to:**

**DataNotebook@CMHPC.CA.GOV**

**Or, you may submit a printed copy by postal mail to:**

* **Data Notebook Project**
* **California Mental Health Planning Council**
* **1501 Capitol Avenue, MS 2706**
* **P.O. Box 997413**
* **Sacramento, CA 95899-7413**

For information, you may contact either email address above, or telephone:

(916) 449-5249, or

(916) 323-4501



1. Serious Mental Disorder, term used for adults 18 and older. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Severe Emotional Disorder, term used for children 17 and under. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)