

# Ohio Scales Presentation

## Youth and Adolescent Mental Health Advisory Group

Franklin County ADAMH Board  
Planning, Evaluation and Quality Improvement  
August 6, 2003



# Contents of 2003 Annual Report

- Why Outcomes?
- Statewide Ohio Scales Initiative
- Franklin County Ohio Scales Initiative
- Data Submission/Quality Assurance
- Ohio Scales Validity and Reliability
- Intake Scale Scores
- Treatment Success over Time

# Why Outcomes?

## Clinical

- Demonstrates individual client recovery
- Demonstrates Tx effectiveness

## Program Evaluation

- In 2002, ADAMH served 7,051 youth
- Accounting for \$17.1 million (\$2,400/child)

# Franklin County Ohio Scales Initiative

- On December 1, 2000 Ohio Scales were required to be completed by providers.
- At this time, 1,878 eligible youth were receiving services from 12 providers and were “phased in”
  - 918 (48.9%) youth (aged 5-11 years)
  - 960 (51.1%) adolescent (aged 12-17 years)
- 15,972 Ohio Scales administered (12-1-2000 – 5-31-2003) to 4,745 unique clients

# Intake Demographics – Provider Submission

Intake Forms Administered 12-1-2000 – 5-31-2003 Matching MACSIS

Provider	Youth		Parent		Worker	
	Exp. N	Rec. N (%)	Exp. N	Rec. N (%)	Exp. N	Rec. N (%)
Concord	131	50 (38.4%)	236	87 (36.9%)	236	<b>58 (24.6%)</b>
St. Vincent	330	144 (43.6%)	1,205	<b>314 (26.0%)</b>	1,205	<b>180 (14.9%)</b>
Dublin	123	<b>96 (78.0%)</b>	184	71 (38.6%)	184	<b>120 (65.2%)</b>
North Comm.	113	38 (33.6%)	115	36 (31.3%)	115	40 (34.8%)
Hanna Neil	59	21 (36.0%)	150	64 (42.7%)	150	70 (46.7%)
Northwest	153	60 (39.2%)	382	127 (33.2%)	382	140 (36.6%)
North Central	367	<b>211 (57.5%)</b>	657	<b>407 (61.9%)</b>	657	<b>430 (65.4%)</b>
Directions	1,369	<b>173 (12.6%)</b>	1,897	<b>175 (9.2%)</b>	1,897	<b>170 (9.0%)</b>
Rosemont	594	<b>423 (71.2%)</b>	918	<b>555 (60.5%)</b>	918	<b>637 (69.4%)</b>
Buckeye	598	272 (45.5%)	751	261 (34.8%)	751	313 (41.7%)
Huck House	731	<b>85 (11.6%)</b>	756	<b>76 (10.0%)</b>	756	<b>39 (5.2%)</b>
Children's	2,276	<b>582 (25.6%)</b>	6,211	1,872 (30.1%)	6,211	1,880 (30.3%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,844</b>	<b>2,153 (31.5%)</b>	<b>13,462</b>	<b>4,043 (30.1%)</b>	<b>13,462</b>	<b>4,073 (30.3%)</b>

# Intake Demographics – Diagnosis

Diagnosis	Youth		Parent		Worker	
	Exp. N	Rec. N (%)	Exp. N	Rec. N (%)	Exp. N	Rec. N (%)
Adjustment	1,197	438 (36.6%)	2,875	999 (34.7%)	2,875	1,033 (35.9%)
ODD	1,171	453 (38.7%)	2,842	835 (29.4%)	2,842	811 (28.5%)
Depression	994	346 (34.8%)	2,063	728 (35.3%)	2,063	719 (34.9%)
ADHD	800	251 (31.4%)	1,277	425 (33.3%)	1,277	421 (33.0%)
CD	397	143 (36.0%)	715	237 (33.1%)	715	235 (32.9%)
Disruptive Behavior	342	84 (24.6%)	469	145 (30.9%)	469	153 (32.6%)
PTSD	195	81 (41.5%)	391	131 (33.5%)	391	143 (36.6%)
Bipolar	176	57 (32.4%)	298	<b>67 (22.5%)</b>	298	<b>65 (21.8%)</b>
Parent-Child Relational	171	<b>30 (17.5%)</b>	283	<b>64 (22.6%)</b>	283	<b>65 (23.0%)</b>
Substance	167	<b>34 (20.3%)</b>	206	69 (33.5%)	206	67 (32.5%)
Anxiety	105	35 (33.3%)	172	<b>33 (19.2%)</b>	172	<b>34 (19.8%)</b>
School/Learning	91	<b>14 (15.4%)</b>	167	<b>31 (18.6%)</b>	167	<b>30 (18.0%)</b>
ICD	45	17 (37.8%)	76	19 (25.0%)	76	28 (36.8%)
Other / Unknown	986	<b>170 (17.2%)</b>	1,609	<b>260 (16.2%)</b>	1,609	<b>269 (16.7%)</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,837</b>	<b>2,153 (31.5%)</b>	<b>13,443</b>	<b>4,043 (30.1%)</b>	<b>13,443</b>	<b>4,073 (30.3%)</b>

# Intake Demographics – Sex, Race, Age

	Youth		Parent		Worker	
Sex	Exp. N	Rec. N (%)	Exp. N	Rec. N (%)	Exp. N	Rec. N (%)
Male	3,596	1,111 (30.9%)	7,933	2,395 (30.2%)	7,933	2,375 (29.9%)
Female	3,241	1,042 (32.1%)	5,510	1,648 (29.9%)	5,510	1,698 (30.8%)
Race						
White	3,744	1,247 (33.3%)	7,250	2,208 (30.5%)	7,250	2,211 (30.5%)
Black	2,847	<b>824 (28.9%)</b>	5,574	1,652 (29.6%)	5,574	1,672 (30.0%)
Other	246	82 (33.3%)	619	183 (29.6%)	619	190 (30.7%)
Age						
5-7	0	30 (N/A)	2,168	752 (34.7%)	2,168	730 (33.7%)
8-9	0	33 (N/A)	2,118	627 (29.6%)	2,118	612 (28.9%)
10-11	0	90 (N/A)	2,181	636 (29.2%)	2,181	626 (28.7%)
12-13	2,346	700 (29.8%)	2,485	706 (28.4%)	2,485	734 (29.5%)
14-15	2,594	781 (30.1%)	2,596	740 (28.5%)	2,596	789 (30.4%)
16-17	1,839	<b>503 (27.4%)</b>	1,837	<b>453 (24.7%)</b>	1,837	<b>471 (25.6%)</b>

# Intake Demographics – Service History Across Providers

Treatment Episode*	Youth		Parent		Worker	
	Exp. N	Rec. N (%)	Exp. N	Rec. N (%)	Exp. N	Rec. N (%)
1	4,904	1,742 (35.5%)	9,192	3,223 (35.1%)	9,192	3,230 (35.1%)
2	1,260	311 (24.7%)	2,654	591 (22.3%)	2,654	603 (22.7%)
3	393	71 (18.1%)	926	153 (16.5%)	926	157 (17.0%)
4+	280	29 (10.3%)	671	76 (11.3%)	671	83 (12.4%)
<b>Total</b>	6,837	2,153 (31.5%)	13,443	4,043 (30.1%)	13,443	4,073 (30.3%)

\*defined to be a period of continuous treatment having no lapse in service exceeding 63 days. This construct is necessary as differences exist between coding paradigms for the administration value (i.e., intake, six-month, term.) across providers, and to encompass both phased-in and new clients.

# Intake Demographics Summary

Factors predicting higher rate of intake administration:

- Provider (Dublin, North Central, Rosemont)
- Diagnosis (adjustment, PTSD, depression)
- Service History (No prior Tx episode at any provider)

Factors predicting lower rate of intake administration:

- Provider (St. Vincent, Directions, Huck House)
- Diagnosis (Bipolar, parent-child relational, anxiety, school/learning, other/unknown Dx)
- Age (adolescents 16-17 years old)
- Service History (Prior Tx episodes at any provider)

# Final Intake Exclusion Criteria

	Youth	Parent	Worker
Expected	6,837	13,443	13,443
Received	2,153	4,043	4,073
Outside Age Parameters	-161 (under 12) -8 (18 or older)	-120 (under 5) -9 (18 or older)	-100 (under 5) -11 (18 or older)
Refused or Unable to be Completed*	-12 Refused -21 Unable	-20 Refused -73 Unable	-9 Refused** -32 Unable**
Usable Intakes	1,951	3,821	3,921

\*Note: For clients falling outside Ohio Scales age parameters, do not administer an assessment and mark “Unable to Complete”. **No assessment should be given.**

\*\*Why are clinicians refusing or unable to complete assessments?

# Most Commonly Missed Items (Youth Form)

Scale	Item	% Missed
<b>Problem Severity</b>	4. Fits of Anger	1.7%
<b>Functioning</b>	3. Dating or developing relationships with boyfriends or girlfriends.	6.4%
	4. Getting along with adults outside the family.	3.5%
	9. Participating in hobbies.	3.6%
	10. Participating in recreational activities.	3.6%
	12. Attending school and getting passing grades in school.	3.5%
	13. Learning skills that will be useful for future jobs.	3.5%
	17. Earning money and learning how to use money wisely	3.1%
<b>Hope</b>	1. Overall, how satisfied are you with your life right now?	9.0%
	2. How energetic and healthy do you feel right now?	8.7%
	3. How much stress or pressure is in your life right now?	8.8%
	4. How optimistic are you about the future?	9.2%

# Ohio Scales Intake\* Clinical Indices

	Scale	N (%)	Mean (SD)	Median	Skew	Kurtosis
Youth N=1,951	Problem Severity	1,938 (99.3%)	24.94 (16.27)	22.0	0.77	0.28
	Functioning	1,904 (97.6%)	55.83 (13.21)	57.0	-0.68	0.85
	Hope	1,750 (89.7%)	10.72 (4.13)	10.0	0.50	-0.20
	Satisfaction	855 (43.8%)	10.76 (5.11)	10.0	0.56	-0.46
Parent N=3,821	Problem Severity	3,747 (98.1%)	31.72 (17.26)	30.0	0.45	-0.09
	Functioning	3,615 (94.6%)	42.95 (15.10)	44.0	-0.03	-0.33
	Hope	3,461 (90.6%)	12.69 (4.53)	12.0	0.26	-0.54
	Satisfaction	1,423 (37.2%)	9.20 (5.26)	7.0	0.95	-0.05
Worker N=3,921	Problem Severity	3,916 (99.9%)	30.48 (15.06)	29.0	0.53	0.13
	Functioning	3,865 (98.6%)	42.28 (12.78)	42.0	-0.04	0.12
	ROLES	3,921 (100.0%)	0.06 (0.46)	0.0	9.38	108.52

\*Intake here connotes an initial assessment matching MACSIS claims data, and neither implies treatment onset nor a true baseline assessment.

# Comparison of Published Ohio Scales Norms to ADAMH Clinical Sample

	Scale	Problem Severity M (SD)	Functioning M (SD)	Hope M (SD)
	<b>Measurement</b>	0 (good) – 100 (poor)	0 (poor) – 80 (good)	4 (good) – 24 (bad)
Community Ogles	Youth (N=166)	18.2 (15.0)	61.1 (13.0)	9.7 (3.8)
	Parent (N=329)	10.3 (9.9)	64.0 (12.7)	8.3 (3.5)
	Worker (N=40)	17.6 (9.6)	67.0 (9.0)	N/A
Clinical Ogles	Youth (N=76)	36.3 (21.0)	55.1 (13.4)	10.6 (4.4)
	Parent (N=137)	39.4 (17.7)	41.7 (16.0)	13.8 (5.3)
	Worker (N=134)	41.0 (14.4)	33.9 (12.9)	N/A
Clinical ADAMH	Youth (N=1,938)	24.94 (16.27)	55.83 (13.21)	10.72 (4.13)
	Parent (N=3,747)	31.72 (17.26)	42.95 (15.10)	12.69 (4.53)
	Worker (N=3,921)	30.48 (15.06)	42.28 (12.78)	N/A

# After Six Months of Treatment...

**Problem Severity** decreased by approximately 5 points on average. The ADAMH sample fell between the clinical and community comparison samples in level of severity.

- Youth (N=170) mean change -5.22 (SD=14.67) into normal range
- Parent (N=251) mean change -4.91 (SD=16.89) into normal range
- Worker (N=494) mean change -5.80 (SD=15.74) into normal range

**Functioning** increased by approximately 2-3 points on average. Although ADAMH parent and worker forms closely correlated, youths tended to rate themselves significantly higher at both intake and subsequent assessments. This was not observed in the community sample. Both parents and clinicians of the ADAMH sample rated youths functionally impaired following treatment.

- Youth (N=163) mean change 1.98 (SD=11.82) slightly impaired (unreliable)
- Parent (N=242) mean change 3.31 (SD=15.19) still impaired
- Worker (N=489) mean change 3.31 (SD=12.34) still impaired

**Hope** increased (scale scores decreased) by 1-1.5 points on average. This initially, however, does not show true clinical significance.