

Mental Health Services Act – Statewide Evaluation

Data Quality Report: Implications & Recommendations for Priority Indicators

Prepared by:



&

TRYLON Evaluation & Performance Monitoring

Submitted October 31, 2013

Revision submitted November 14, 2013

The following report was funded by



The following report was revised in partnership with stakeholders who provided important historical context, data consultation, and revisions to ensure this report is accurate and accessible to the broadest audience possible. Feedback, collected prior to, during, and following report development, was crucial to developing this report. The UCLA Evaluation Team would like to express sincere appreciation to the research analysts, advocates, consumers and family members, agency representatives, service providers, and MHSOAC representatives who contributed invaluable insights to this document.

Table of Contents

Purpose & Goals.....	4
Report Organization.....	4
What are Priority Indicators and what are they intended to do?.....	5
Review of Data Available to Support Outcome & Performance Monitoring Through Priority Indicators.....	8
Priority Indicator 1: School Participation.....	14
Priority Indicator 2: Employment.....	21
Priority Indicator 3: Homelessness & Housing.....	30
Priority Indicator 4: Arrests.....	35
Priority Indicator 5: Demographic Profile of Consumers Served.....	43
Priority Indicator 6: Demographic Profile of New Consumers.....	51
Priority Indicator 7: Penetration of Mental Health Services.....	54
Priority Indicator 8: Access to a Primary Care Physician.....	56
Priority Indicator 9: Perceptions of Access to Services.....	59
Priority Indicator 10: Involuntary Status.....	67
Priority Indicator 11: Consumer Perceptions of Improvement in Well-Being as a Result of Services.....	69
Priority Indicator 12: Satisfaction with Services.....	81
Appendix A – California Mental Health Planning Council’s Proposed Indicators and Definitions.....	88

Purpose & Goals

The Mental Health Services Oversight and Accountability Commission (MHSOAC) charged the UCLA Evaluation Team with tracking the impact of Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) Community Services and Supports (CSS) programs on mental health service consumers and the community mental health service system. The current report describes a foundational effort to assess the quality and reliability of existing statewide data needed to accomplish this objective.

The central goals of this report are to:

1. Review and describe the availability, completeness, and quality of existing statewide and county level data, and
2. Make recommendations regarding the use of existing data to calculate priority indicators of mental health service consumer outcomes and community mental health service system performance.

The purpose of accomplishing these goals is to provide the MHSOAC and their priority indicators workgroup (a sub-group of the MHSOAC Evaluation Committee made up of stakeholders with evaluation and data analysis experience and expertise relevant to mental health) with information necessary to provide recommendations regarding preferred options for calculating priority indicators related to mental health consumer outcomes and community mental health system performance. The UCLA Evaluation Team will then use MHSOAC and Priority Indicator Workgroup input to produce a subsequent report detailing the trends of priority indicators across fiscal years (FY) 2004-2005 through 2011-2012.

Report Organization

The organization of this report is as follows:

- Firstly, a description of available statewide data systems relevant for constructing indicators of mental health consumer outcomes and community mental health system performance is provided. Primary data sources include: Client and Service Information system (CSI), Data Collection and Reporting system (DCR), and Consumer Perception Surveys (CPS).
- Secondly, priority indicators are described in order to provide context for the data systems and specific data fields reviewed.
- Thirdly, the report presents detailed description and analysis of data completeness and quality across statewide mental health data systems and recommendations for operationalizing all Exhibit A2 indicators (see Appendix A) at statewide and county levels, across fiscal years for which relevant data was available (i.e., FY 2004-2005 through 2011-2012).
- Lastly, accompanying the report are Excel workbooks that include tables for each priority indicator, which display the quality and completeness of data, at statewide and county levels.

Priority indicator review sections

Priority indicators are individually introduced and quality and completeness of relevant available data is described and reviewed. Priority indicator data review sections are organized as follows:

- **Indicator definition** – explanation provided per MHSOAC Exhibit A2 (see Appendix A), or in line with any subsequent adjustments made in collaboration with MHSOAC staff

- **Recommended data** – applicable details (e.g., in tables and narrative) for each available statewide dataset, regarding:
 - Description of data fields relevant for indicator calculation
 - Completeness (i.e., number of valid cases in a given data field or variable, proportionate to all cases) and quality of recommended data (i.e., number of missing, unknown, or out of range cases, proportionate to all cases)
 - When applicable to the calculation of an indicator, data descriptions are organized by measurement tool (i.e., data collection form), data collection time point (e.g., data collected at enrollment, post enrollment, and discharge), and by demographic groups (e.g., gender, race, ethnicity)
- **Implications of data quality** – discussion of the quality of recommended data sources (databases and specific data fields) and consequent options for calculating priority indicators
- **Recommended calculation** – detail and rationale for calculation recommendations, including discussion of the potential of each recommended calculation for providing useful information about the outcomes of mental health consumers or the performance of the community mental health system

Notes regarding indicator data quality displays

Completeness and quality of each indicator is presented through one or more graphical displays of information. These displays include tables of frequencies and percentages. Frequencies stand for the number of cases (i.e., valid and missing displayed separately) for the given data field, and percentages indicate the proportion of all cases represented. To make viewing and interpreting data displays easier, tables are organized by data system, data collection form (as applicable), data field, fiscal year, and relevant service population (e.g., age group, race/ethnicity, Full Service Partners, or all mental health consumers). Due to the large size of most data review tables, they are often split across pages, by fiscal year, or data system.

Additionally, Excel workbooks have been provided to accompany this report, such that readers can view complete tables (i.e., statewide and county specific), and adjust the view on a single screen or page. Due to the relatively small number of data points within individual small counties (i.e., populations less than 200,000) across databases, small county data quality tables have been consolidated into a single small county data quality workbook, to provide a more informative look at data quality relevant to each indicator.

What are Priority Indicators and what are they intended to do?

Two central functions of priority outcome and performance indicators for public mental health system stakeholders are 1) accountability and 2) continuous quality improvement. These functions can be served by creating a set of standard indicators to measure performance at multiple levels (e.g., statewide, county, and individual) and over time. The California Mental Health Planning Council proposed and defined a set of performance indicators, referred to as *priority indicators*, designed to assess how the MHSA has impacted mental health consumers and the mental health system in target areas that may be most changed through MHSA implementation. Indicators can help track progress among consumers and across the community mental health system. At the consumer level, outcomes such as education and employment will be followed, while outcomes including mental health service penetration and consumer demographics are examined at the broader system level. This report details the quality and completeness of relevant data for

calculating priority indicators vetted by the MHSOAC, and provides recommendations regarding priority indicator calculations.

Development of Priority Indicators¹

The set of priority performance indicators described in this report were arrived at through the following processes:

- The careful identification and approval by the California Mental Health Planning Council²;
- MHSOAC consideration of California Mental Health Planning Council identified indicators for developing a comprehensive outcome and performance monitoring system built upon existing data;
- Availability of data relevant for supporting outcome and performance monitoring through priority indicators (see *Review of Existing Data*, above);
- Consideration of consumer feedback to previous evaluation team reports regarding proposed priority indicators³; and
- Stakeholder feedback regarding the formulation of priority indicators.

Through these evaluation processes and careful deliberation of the MHSOAC in collaboration with the UCLA Evaluation Team, a set of 12 priority performance indicators was developed. These indicators can be categorized as follows:

- **Consumer Indicators** – those intended to provide insight into the outcomes of mental health service; and
- **System Indicators** – those intended for monitoring the performance of the community mental health system more broadly.

Consumer and system indicators, and the consumer groups they are intended to assess, are summarized in the table below.

Service populations addressed by Priority Indicators

The working definition of ‘all mental health consumers’ was individuals served during FYs 2004-05 through 2011-12, primarily represented in the CSI and CPS databases. The working definition of ‘Full Service Partnership consumers’ (FSPs) was individuals served during FYs 2004-05 through 2011-12, represented in the DCR database. The table below outlines the mental health consumer service populations (i.e., types of consumers and age groups) that each priority indicator addresses.

	CONSUMERS EVALUATED
--	---------------------

¹ Although we received strong indicator suggestions from stakeholders, this report helps vet the appropriateness of the original set proposed by the California Mental Health Planning Council. If the MHSOAC chooses, it may vet additional indicators, particularly those proposed by stakeholders, when revising the pool.

² California Mental Health Planning Council (January, 2010). *Performance Indicators for Evaluating the Mental Health System*.

³ Mental Health Services Act Evaluation: Compiling Community Services and Supports (CSS) Data to Produce All Priority Indicators.

	SERVICE POP.	CHILDREN	TAY	ADULTS	OLDER ADULTS
CONSUMER INDICATORS					
<i>Indicator 1 – School Participation</i>	All & FSP Consumers				
<i>Indicator 2 – Employment</i>	All & FSP Consumers				
<i>Indicator 3 – Homelessness and Housing</i>	All & FSP Consumers				
<i>Indicator 4 – Arrests</i>	All & FSP Consumers				
SYSTEM INDICATORS					
<i>Indicator 5 – Demographic Profile of Consumers Served</i>	All & FSP Consumers				
<i>Indicator 6 – Demographic Profile of New Consumers</i>	All & FSP Consumers				
<i>Indicator 7 – Penetration of Mental Health Services</i>	All Consumers				
<i>Indicator 8 – Access to a Primary Care Physician</i>	FSP Consumers				
<i>Indicator 9 – Perceptions of Access to Services</i>	All Consumers				
<i>Indicator 10 – Involuntary Status</i>	All Consumers				
<i>Indicator 11 – Consumer Well-Being</i>	All Consumers				
<i>Indicator 12 – Satisfaction with Services</i>	All Consumers				

Criteria used to identify and evaluate priority indicator calculations

Specific criteria, developed in collaboration with the MHSOAC, were developed to identify and evaluate calculations for producing priority indicators, given the state of existing data. These criteria, outlined for consumer and system indicators below, reflect the goals of the MHSOAC for monitoring consumer outcomes and community mental health system performance at multiple levels (i.e., state and county) for the purposes of program planning and quality improvement. Ideally, priority indicator calculations should include the following characteristics.

Consumer Indicator Evaluation Criteria:

- Indicator can describe changes in consumer outcomes (e.g., change since initiation of services) or describe the status or characteristics of consumers, over time;
- Indicator can provide meaningful and relevant insight into the outcomes of service populations of interest (e.g., all mental health consumers, FSP consumers, and demographic groups);
- Indicator can provide meaningful and relevant insight into the outcomes of consumers statewide and at the county level; and,
- Indicator provides “actionable” insight, which stakeholders can use for the purposes of program planning or to identify areas for service improvement.

System Indicator Evaluation Criteria:

- Indicator can describe meaningful changes in system performance over time.
- Indicator can provide meaningful and relevant insight regarding the extent and quality of services provided to populations of interest (e.g., all mental health consumers, FSP consumers, and demographic groups).
- Indicator can provide meaningful and relevant insight into the performance of the community mental health system at the statewide and county levels.
- Indicator provides “actionable” insight, which stakeholders can use to identify areas for improving the performance of the mental health system.

Recommended calculations that meet as many of these criteria as possible, given the state of existing data, are detailed in the individual priority indicator data quality review and calculation recommendation sections (beginning on p. 8) below.

Review of Data Available to Support Outcome & Performance Monitoring Through Priority Indicators

As directed by the MHSOAC, existing data sources that are systematically collected by California counties and reported to the California Department of Health Care Services (DHCS)⁴ were reviewed, to assess their suitability for supporting outcome and performance monitoring through priority indicators. Several criteria were used to evaluate the quality and suitability of existing data sources, including:

- *Availability* – Data accessible in an analyzable format
- *Completeness* – Levels of missing information within key data fields did not prevent meaningful analysis and interpretation
- *Sustainability* – Data sources are likely to continue to exist in the foreseeable future
- *Relevance* – Data relevant to populations of interest (e.g., all CSS mental health consumers and Full Service Partnership consumers)
- *Longitudinal* – Data available for multiple service years
- *Multilevel* – Data can be analyzed at multiple levels (e.g., state, county, and individual)

⁴ Previously the Department of Mental Health (DMH); The DHCS abbreviation will be used to reference work completed by DMH.

Description of each key data source and important considerations and limitations regarding each are summarized in the *Data Sources* table below. Review of indicator-specific data fields is provided within each indicator data quality review section.

Data Sources

Client & Service Information (CSI)

Summary:

The CSI system is a repository of county, client (e.g., age, gender, preferred language, education, employment status, living arrangement, etc.), and service (type, number and length of service contact) information. CSI records collected from all consumers who receive CSS mental health services, including FSP consumers, are categorized into three distinct types: Client, Service, and Periodic. Client records include basic information about each consumer, including demographics. Service records are created for each service instance, and include information about service type and duration. Periodic records provide information about the current status and characteristics of consumers and are generally created quarterly, but collection and reporting of this information varies by county.

Cases per FY:

Fiscal Year	CSI (Service records only)	CSI (Periodic and Service records)
FY 04-05	663,882	670,498
FY 05-06	666,333	671,528
FY 06-07	656,908	670,170
FY 07-08	674,211	706,545
FY 08-09	674,074	727,247
FY 09-10	675,772	726,830
FY 10-11	688,035	749,057
FY 11-12	663,803	753,342

Considerations and Limitations:

As can be seen in the *Cases per FY* table above, the number of service records available for FY 11-12 is out of range with previous years. Further, variation in the number of cases per county, in FYs 10-11 and 11-12 in particular (see individual county data quality Excel workbooks), raises concerns about the completeness and reliability of CSI data in these most recent years. These data patterns suggest emphasis should be placed on the timeliness, quality and completeness of CSI records. Limitations regarding specific data fields relevant to the calculation of priority indicators are detailed in the individual priority indicator data quality review and calculation recommendation sections (beginning on p. 8) below.

Stakeholder feedback to previous evaluation team reports suggested that inconsistency and potential inaccuracy among race and ethnicity data fields may be due in part to changes in the format of these fields in the CSI data system (see *DMH Information Notice: 06-02*). For details regarding the *Race and Ethnicity* data field changes and procedures employed by the evaluation team to improve data quality, see the review of Priority Indicator 5 (p. 43).

Additionally, the completeness of data fields used to calculate indicators varies greatly across fiscal years and among counties (e.g., more than 50% missing in some data fields at the county level). Thus the representativeness and interpretability of such data fields is in doubt. Proportions of

missing or unknown information are detailed in each priority indicator review section.

Data Collection and Reporting (DCR) System

Summary:

The DCR system houses data for consumers who are served through Full Service Partnership programs (FSP). Data from assessments – the Partnership Assessment Form (PAF), Key Event Tracking (KET), and Quarterly Assessment (3M) – are collected for consumers in specific age categories. The PAF reflects consumer history and baseline information, including consumer education and/or employment, housing situation, legal issues, health status, and substance use. The KET is intended to capture any important changes in the consumer’s life, such as housing, education and/or employment, and legal issues during FSP. The 3M is used to collect information on a quarterly basis, regarding key areas such as education, health status, substance use, and legal issues.

Cases per FY:

Fiscal Year	DCR (includes PAF, KET, and 3M records)
FY 04-05	n/a
FY 05-06	295
FY 06-07	4,427
FY 07-08	12,992
FY 08-09	20,242
FY 09-10	26,946
FY 10-11	28,887
FY 11-12	25,395

Considerations and Limitations:

General limitations of the DCR database include: variation in the completeness of data at the county level across FYs and inconsistency of KET and 3M record collection at state and county levels. The MHSOC is engaged in efforts to improve the quality of DCR data (see statewide and individual county data quality tables). However, the data collection strategy attached to the KET assessment form seems to encourage inconsistent collection. Despite the regular quarterly collection protocol attached to the 3M assessment, many FSP consumers are missing quarterly updates, and this pattern varies between counties (see individual county data quality Excel workbooks). Limitations regarding specific data fields relevant to the calculation of priority indicators are detailed in the individual priority indicator data quality review and calculation recommendation sections (beginning on p. 8) below.

Additionally, Race and ethnicity information in the DCR system are imported from the CSI system by DHCS. As such, the limitations of this information noted for the CSI system also apply here. Specifically, stakeholder feedback to previous evaluation team reports suggested that inconsistency and potential inaccuracy among race and ethnicity data fields may be due in part to changes in the format of these fields in the DCR data system (see *DMH Information Notice: 06-02*). For details regarding race and ethnicity data field changes and procedures employed by the evaluation team to improve data quality, see the review of Priority Indicator 5 (p. 43).

Performance Outcomes and Quality Improvement (POQI) – Consumer Perception Surveys (CPS)

Summary:

Consumer perception survey instruments are designed specific to consumer groups (e.g., family members/caregivers, youth, adults, and older adults) receiving mental health services. Instruments are composed of widely validated measures of several domains, including satisfaction with services, access to services, quality / appropriateness of services, outcomes that may result from engagement in services, functioning, and social connectedness. The data, designed to inform treatment planning and service management, are collected from a sample of individuals with “serious, persistent” mental illness who have received services for 60 days or more and are not categorized as “medication only.”

Cases per FY:

Fiscal Year	Family	Youth	Adult	Older Adult
FY 04-05	27,223	18,308	50,310	4,213
FY 05-06	31,189	21,345	53,021	4,546
FY 06-07	33,157	26,898	48,988	4,336
FY 07-08	35,236	21,860	50,347	5,168
FY 08-09	38,836	22,093	50,383	6,152
FY 09-10	1,623	n/a	2,522	1,118
FY 10-11	8,288	2,576	6,344	749
FY 11-12	3,428	2,733	10,655	1,278

*CPS frequencies are based on unduplicated counts (one survey per respondent, per FY)

Considerations and Limitations:

For FY 2008-09 and prior years, and for FY 2010-11 and subsequent years, a convenience sampling approach was used in which county-level mental health service providers administered surveys twice a year for a two-week period, most in early May and November. Previous investigation of the convenience sampling methodology revealed the resulting information was not representative of the larger mental health service population.⁵ For FY 2009-10 a random sampling methodology was employed. As such, comparisons involving CPS data collected in FY 2009-10 and other FYs cannot be validly made. CPS data collected in FY 2010-11 and 2011-12 also exhibit characteristics that call into question their comparability to previous years. Specifics regarding the fluctuating completeness and quality of CPS data are provided within review sections for each relevant indicator.

Note – The smaller sample generated by the random sampling method employed in FY 2009-10 does not allow for consumer perception analyses at the county level for this fiscal year.

Other Sources

Estimates of Need for Mental Health Services

To achieve a standardized rate for penetration of services across all counties, the evaluation team

⁵ Cowles, E. L., Harris, K., Larsen, C., and Prince, A. (2010). *Assessing Representativeness of the Mental Health Services Consumer Perception Survey.*

contracted with Dr. Charles Holzer for statewide and county mental health service need estimates. Dr. Holzer previously developed penetration rate estimates for the California DHCS. He estimated the proportion of persons with serious mental illness among those whose income falls within 200% of the federal poverty level, using data from the most up-to-date National Comorbidity Survey Replication and generated prevalence estimates for several Census years. (For additional information regarding prevalence estimate methodology, see Dr. Holzer’s website at http://66.140.7.155/estimation/3_Synthetic/synthetic.htm).

Involuntary Status

Involuntary status information was provided by DHCS for the following service categories: 72 hour Evaluation and Treatment (adults, children); 14- and 30-day Intensive Treatment; 180-day Post Certification Treatment; and Temporary and Permanent Conservatorships.

The data systems that contain information relevant for calculating each priority indicator are summarized in the table below.

Priority Indicator Data Sources

	SERVICE POP.	DATA SOURCE			
		CSI	DCR	CPS	OTHER
CONSUMER INDICATORS					
<i>Indicator 1 – School Participation</i>	All & FSP Consumers				
<i>Indicator 2 – Employment</i>	All & FSP Consumers				
<i>Indicator 3 – Homelessness and Housing</i>	All & FSP Consumers				
<i>Indicator 4 – Arrests</i>	All & FSP Consumers				
SYSTEM INDICATORS					
<i>Indicator 5 – Demographic Profile of Consumers Served</i>	All & FSP Consumers				
<i>Indicator 6 – Demographic Profile of New Consumers</i>	All & FSP Consumers				
<i>Indicator 7 – Penetration of Mental Health Services</i>	All Consumers				Holzer Targets
<i>Indicator 8 – Access to a Primary Care Physician</i>	FSP Consumers				

<i>Indicator 9 – Perceptions of Access to Services</i>	All Consumers				
<i>Indicator 10 – Involuntary Status</i>	All Consumers				Aggregate reports provided by DHCS
<i>Indicator 11 – Consumer Well-Being</i>	All Consumers				
<i>Indicator 12 – Satisfaction</i>	All Consumers				

The remainder of this report provides detailed description and analysis of data completeness and quality, across statewide mental health data systems, and recommendations for operationalizing priority indicators, across fiscal years for which relevant data is available (i.e., FY 2004-2005 through 2011-2012).

Data Quality Review: Implications & Recommendations for Priority Indicators

Priority Indicator 1: School Participation

Indicator Definition

Child and Transitioning Age Youth (TAY) participation in school as measured by ratings of attendance (among FSP consumers only), and reports of school absences and suspension/expulsion since beginning services (among a sample of child and TAY mental health consumers).

Recommended Data for Calculating Indicator

Ratings of school attendance among child and TAY FSPs:

DCR (PAF and 3M forms) data field: AttendanceCurr - Estimate the partner's attendance level (excluding scheduled breaks and excused absences) currently. Valid values for this variable are 1 = Always attends school (never truant), 2= attends school most of the time, 3 = Sometimes attends school, 4 = Infrequently attends school, and 5 = Never attends school. Attendance information is collected at intake via the Partnership Assessment Form (PAF) and quarterly via the quarterly 3M form.

DCR (PAF, 3M and KET form) data field: Age_Group - Internal DCR administrative field which indicates the age group the partner belonged to at the time the form was completed. Valid values for this variable are 1 = Child PAF, 4 = TAY PAF, 7 = Adult PAF, and 10 = Older adult PAF. Age group information is collected at intake via the PAF form, quarterly via the 3M, and via key event tracking (KET) forms.

Reports of school absences and suspension/expulsion among a sample of child and TAY mental health service consumers:

Consumer level indicators in general are most informative when they can describe individual level change across time. In this case, change in the rate of absences and suspension/expulsion would be preferable to identify. However, analysis of data completeness revealed that fewer than 20 percent of sampled child and TAY survey respondents completed more than 1 survey within a given FY, and the proportion of sampled respondents completing multiple surveys across FYs is not significantly greater. Thus, the decision was made to review the completeness of data fields (variables) for the most recent survey completed by each consumer, in each FY. This strategy was chosen so that analysis of this data would identify the most up to date status of each consumer in each FY. As such, the completeness and quality of each CPS data field noted in this section, for the most recent survey completed by each consumer, in each FY, is presented in the data completeness and quality tables below.

Consumer Perception Survey (CPS) for Youth and Families Data Fields: SCHABSNT – How often were you absent during the last month? Valid values for this variable are: 1 = 1 day or less, 2 = 2 days, 3 = 3-5 days, 4 = 6-10 days, 5 = more than 10 days, 6 = Do not remember, 8 = Not applicable/not in school, and 9 = missing. Absence data were collected in 2004-05 to 2006-07 only.

Consumer Perception Survey (CPS) for Youth and Families Data Fields: LES12EXPSUS – Were you expelled or suspended since beginning services? Valid response options include 0 = no, 1 = yes, and 9 = missing. Collected via the Youth Services Survey for Youth (YSS-Y) and Youth Services Survey for Families (YSS-F). Expulsion/suspension data were collected in 2006-07 to 2008-09.

Consumer Perception Survey (CPS) for Youth and Families Data Fields: LES12PSTEXPSUS – Were you expelled or suspended during the 12 months prior to that? Valid response options include 0 = no, 1 = yes, and 9 = missing. Collected via the Youth Services Survey for Youth (YSS-Y) and Youth Services Survey for Families (YSS-F). Expulsion/suspension data were collected in 2006-07 to 2008-09.

The only FY in which both absence and expulsion/suspension data were collected was FY 2006-07.

Completeness & Quality of Recommended Data

Data recommended for producing ratings of school attendance among child and TAY FSPs:

Database: DCR (PAF & 3M)	FY 2004-05				FY 2005-06			
	Valid		Missing		Valid		Missing	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Total cases (PAF)	32	100%			294	100%		
AttendanceCurr (PAF)	1	100%	0	0%	34	75.7%	11	24.4%
Total unique consumers	32	100%	0	0%	294	100%	0	0%
Race/Ethnic	29	90.6%	3	9.4%	211	71.8%	83	28.2%
Age Group	32	100%	0	0%	294	100%	0	0%
Gender	32	100%	0	0%	294	100%	0	0%
3M total cases					72	100%	0	0%
Attendance 1st 3M update					5	100%	0	0%
1st 3M update					63	100%	0	0%
Attendance 2nd 3M update					0	0%	5	100%
2nd 3M update					6	100%	0	0%
Attendance 3rd 3M update					0	0%	5	100%
3rd 3M update					3	100%	0	0%
Attendance 4th 3M update					0	0%	5	100%
4th 3M update					0	0	0	0
Total unique consumers					63	100%	0	0%
Race/Ethnic					52	82.5%	11	15.5%
Age Group					63	100%	0	0%
Gender					63	100%	0	0%

Database: DCR (PAF & 3M)	FY 2006-07				FY 2007-08			
	Valid		Missing		Valid		Missing	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Total cases (PAF)	4,209	100%			9,208	100%		
AttendanceCurr (PAF)	877	81.1%	204	18.9%	2,227	81%	524	19%
Total unique consumers	4,209	100%	0	0%	9,208	100%	0	0%
Race/Ethnic	4,024	95.6%	185	4.4%	8,729	94.8%	479	5.2%
Age Group	4,209	100%	0	0%	9,208	100%	0	0%
Gender	4,131	98.1%	78	1.9%	8,894	96.6%	314	3.4%

3M total cases	3,105	100%			18,951	100%		
Attendance 1st 3M update	359	75.1%	119	24.9%	1,685	77.1%	500	22.9%
1st 3M update	2,072	100%	0	0%	8,393	100%	0	0%
Attendance 2nd 3M update	110	23%	368	77%	925	42.3%	1,260	57.7%
2nd 3M update	719	100%	0	0%	5,404	100%	0	0%
Attendance 3rd 3M update	28	5.9%	450	94.1%	464	21.1%	1,721	78.8%
3rd 3M update	234	100%	0	0%	3,405	100%	0	0%
Attendance 4th 3M update	11	2.3%	467	97.7%	210	9.6%	1,975	90.4%
4th 3M update	80	100%	0	0%	1,719	100%	0	0%
Total unique consumers	2,072	100%	0	0%	8,393	100%	0	0%
Race/Ethnic	1,985	95.8%	87	4.20%	8,013	95.5%	380	4.5%
Age Group	2,072	100%	0	0%	8,393	100%		
Gender	2,046	98.7%	26	1.3%	8,208	97.8%	185	2.2%

Database: DCR (PAF & 3M)	FY 2008-09				FY 2009-10			
	Valid		Missing		Valid		Missing	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Total cases (PAF)	1,0277	100%			12,765	100%		
AttendanceCurr (PAF)	2,749	82%	586	18%	3,841	85.7%	643	14.3%
Total unique consumers	1,0277	100%	0	0%	12,765	100%	0	0%
Race/Ethnic	9,701	94.4%	576	5.6%	11,975	93.8%	790	6.2%
Age Group	10,277	100%	0	0%	12,765	100.0%	0	0.0%
Gender	9,898	96.3%	379	3.7%	12,173	95.4%	592	4.6%
3M total cases	36,515	100%			50,568	100%		
Attendance 1st 3M update	2,932	79%	781	21%	4,148	80.2%	1,023	19.8%
1st 3M update	14,271	100%	0	0%	19,687	100%	0	0%
Attendance 2nd 3M update	1,869	50.3%	1,844	49.7%	2,509	50.5%	2,562	49.5%
2nd 3M update	10,166	100%	0	0%	14,496	100%	0	0%
Attendance 3rd 3M update	1,153	31.1%	2,560	68.9%	1,634	31.6%	3,537	68.4%
3rd 3M update	7,268	100%	0	0%	10,349	100%	0	0%
Attendance 4th 3M update	619	16.7%	3,094	83.3%	818	15.8%	4,353	84.2%
4th 3M update	4,703	100%	0	0%	5,879	100%	0	0%
Total unique consumers	14,217	100%	0	0%	19,687	100%	0	0%
Race/Ethnic	13,698	96%	572	4%	18,847	95.7%	840	4.3%
Age Group	14,271	100%	0	0%	19,687	100%	0	0%
Gender	13,957	97.8	314	2.2%	19,185	97.5%	502	2.5%

Database: DCR (PAF & 3M)	FY 2010-11				FY 2011-12			
	Valid		Missing		Valid		Missing	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Variables								

<i>Total cases (PAF)</i>	10,710	100%			8,118	100%		
AttendanceCurr (PAF)	3,872	88.6%	496	11.4%	2,828	84.7%	445	13.6%
Total unique consumers	10,710	100%	0	0%	8,118	100%	0	0%
Race/Ethnic	8,916	83.2%	1,794	16.8%	6,982	86%	1,136	14.0%
Age Group	10,710	100%	0	0%	8,118	100%	0	0%
Gender	10,082	94.1%	628	5.9%	7,394	91.1%	724	8.9%
<i>3M total cases</i>	59,679	100%			48,634	100%		
Attendance 1st 3M update	5,254	82.7%	1,101	17.3%	4,180	82.4%	893	16.6%
1st 3M update	22,476	100%	0	0%	19,599	100%	0	0%
Attendance 2nd 3M update	3,142	49.4%	3,213	50.6%	2,027	40%	3,046	60%
2nd 3M update	16,711	100%	0	0%	12,938	100%	0	0%
Attendance 3rd 3M update	1,811	28.5%	4,544	71.5%	1,100	21.7%	3,973	78.3%
3rd 3M update	12,334	100%	0	0%	9,403	100%	0	0%
Attendance 4th 3M update	923	14.5%	5,432	85.5%	542	10.7%	4,531	89.3%
4th 3M update	7,938	100%	0	0%	6,556	100%	0	0%
Total unique consumers	22,476	100%	0	0%	19,599	100%	0	0%
Race/Ethnic	18,512	82.4%	3,964	17.6%	16,674	85.10%	2,925	14.9%
Age Group	22,476	100%	0	0%	19,599	100%	0	0%
Gender	21,838	97.2%	638	2.8%	18,767	95.80%	832	4.2%

Data recommended for producing rates of school absence and suspension/expulsion among a sample of child and TAY mental health service consumers:

Database: CPS	FY 2004-05				FY 2005-06			
	Valid		Missing		Valid		Missing	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Variables								
CPS Total cases	18,486	100%			20,324	100%		
SCHABSNT - most recent survey administration	11,922	76.4%	3,675	23.6%	12,929	75.6%	4,170	24.4%
Les12expsus - most recent survey administration	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Les12pstexpus -most recent survey administration	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total for most recent survey administration	15,597	100%	0	0%	17,100	100%	0	0%
Race/Ethnic	13,853	88.8%	1,744	11.2%	14,948	87.4%	2,152	12.6%
Age Group	14,785	94.8%	812	5.2%	16,627	97.2%	473	2.8%
Gender	14,594	93.6%	1,003	6.4%	15,944	93.2%	1,156	6.8%

Database: CPS	FY 2006-07				FY 2007-08			
	Valid		Missing		Valid		Missing	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Variables								

CPS Total cases	25,752	100%			23,143	100%		
SCHABSNT - most recent survey administration	7,512	38.7%	11,896	61.3%	0	0%	0	0%
Les12expsus - most recent survey administration	5,049	26.0%	14,359	74.0%	9,039	51.9%	8,389	48.1%
Les12pstexpsus -most recent survey administration	4,962	25.6%	14,446	74.4%	8,864	50.9%	8,564	49.1%
Total for most recent survey administration	19,408	100%	0	0%	17,428	100%	0	0%
Race/Ethnic	14,544	74.9%	4,864	25.1%	12,356	70.9%	5,071	29.1%
Age Group	16,022	82.6%	3,386	17.4%	13,813	79.3%	3,615	20.7%
Gender	16,027	82.6%	3,381	17.4%	13,951	80%	3,477	20%

Database: CPS	FY 2008-09				FY 2009-10			
	Valid		Missing		Valid		Missing	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CPS Total cases	30,334	100%			1,118	100%		
SCHABSNT - most recent survey administration								
Les12expsus - most recent survey administration	11,638	51.8%	10,524	46.8%	564	50.4%	554	49.6%
Les12pstexpsus -most recent survey administration	11,477	51.1%	11,003	48.9%	564	50.4%	554	49.6%
Total for most recent survey administration	22,480	100%	0	0%	1,118	100%	0	0%
Race/Ethnic	16,531	73.5%	5,949	26.5%	1,081	96.7%	37	3.3%
Age Group	18,724	83%	3,756	17%	0	0	0	0
Gender	18,342	81.6%	4,138	18.4%	1,071	95.8%	47	4.2%

Database: CPS	FY 2010-11				FY 2011-12			
	Valid		Missing		Valid		Missing	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CPS Total cases	3	100%			8,666	100%		
SCHABSNT - most recent survey administration								
Les12expsus - most recent survey administration	1	33.3%	2	66.7%	4,528	52.3%	4,138	47.7%
Les12pstexpsus -most recent survey administration	1	33.3%	2	66.7%	4,452	51.4%	4,213	48.6%
Total for most recent survey administration	3	100%	0	0%	8,666	100%	0	0%
Race/Ethnic	2	66.7%	1	33.3%	6,053	69.8%	2,613	30.2%
Age Group	2	66.7%	1	33.3%	6,347	73.2%	2,319	26.8%
Gender	2	66.7%	1	33.3%	6,782	78.3%	1,884	21.7%

Notes:

1. Race/Ethnicity is a created variable.
2. Attendance information (DCR) is presented only for children and TAY (18 years of age and less) so as to not inflate the amount of missing data since this variable is not applicable to most adults and older adults.
3. Valid Absence and expulsion/suspension information (CPS) is presented only for the most recent survey administration for each respondent.

Implications for Indicator Calculation

Ratings of school attendance among child and TAY FSPs:

There is at least 75% valid data for attendance across all fiscal years (refer to tables above under AttendanceCurr – PAF form), thus calculating average attendance with PAF (intake) data will represent a majority of the child and TAY FSPs. The 3M can also be used to calculate average rate of attendance for continuing child and TAY consumers, however the proportion of valid data for this data set is smaller, relative to PAF. For example, the first quarterly update for consumers tends to contain the most valid data with significant drops after the second quarterly update. Refer to the tables above for the proportion of valid and missing data for the 3M quarterly updates.

Reports of school absences and suspension/expulsion among a sample of all child and TAY mental health service consumers:

Absence data is only available for the FYs 2004-05, 2005-06, and 2006-07. For fiscal years 2004-05 and 2005-06, the amount of valid data hovers at around 75%. The proportion of valid data for 2006-07 drops significantly from previous years to 38.7%. There is no expulsion/suspension data for FYs 2004-05 and 2005-06.

Expulsion/Suspension data is available for FYs 2006 – 2011. The amount of valid data for the expulsion/suspension variables is around 50% for 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2011-12. For FY 2006-07, the amount of valid data is about 26%, and there are only 3 cases for FY 2010-11. Fiscal year 2006-07 is the only year that contains both absence and expulsion/suspension data.

Given the lack of overlap across FYs contain these different education variables (i.e., absences vs. expulsion / suspension), it may be necessary to prepare two different calculations for an education indicator focused on absences and suspension/expulsion among a sample of all child and TAY mental health service consumers.

Recommended Calculations

1) Recommended calculation for attendance among FSP consumers (DCR)

Utilize DCR data to calculate the average attendance among new consumers via the PAF and for continuing consumers via the 3M, separately across all fiscal years available.

Caveats regarding 3M databases

For most FSPs, all four quarterly updates (3M – post intake) do not fall within a single FY. For example, for partners that have Partnership/Assessment dates of August 1, 2008, their last quarterly update should be collected during FY 2009 – 2010. For partners with a partnership date of June 1, 2008, all quarterly updates should be in the 2009 - 2010 3M database. Even for partners that have partnership/assessment dates at the beginning of a fiscal year, there is still missing data for 2nd and 3rd quarterly updates because either there are no such updates or because updates are

not recorded on a quarterly basis. In some instances, the first quarterly update can be 4 months to 1 year from the partnership/assessment date.

For the calculation above, it would be best to use the first quarterly update in the 3M for each fiscal year given that it contains the most complete information. It should also be noted that the time between intake (PAF - intake) and the first quarterly update (3M update 1) will not be three months in all cases. The average time between intake and the first quarterly update should be calculated and reported with this indicator.

2) Recommended calculation for absences & suspension / expulsion among a sample of all consumers (CPS)

Utilize CPS data to calculate the average rate of absences for children and TAY using the most recent survey administration for FYs 2004-05, 2005-06, and 2006-07. Calculate the proportion of children and TAY who were expelled or suspended prior to receiving services and the proportion of children and TAY who were expelled or suspended after receiving services for FYs 2006-07 through 2011-12.

Priority Indicator 2: Employment

Indicator Definition

The proportion of TAY, adults, and older adults (FSP consumers and all mental health consumers) who are employed (paid/non-paid), compared to those not employed.

Recommended Data for Calculating Indicator

Proportion of employed/non-employed TAY, adult, and older adult FSPs:

DCR (PAF and KET forms) Data Field: Current_CompetitiveAvgHrWeek – Paid employment in the community in a position that is also open to individuals without a disability. Valid values are the average hours per week the partner currently spends in this employment setting.

DCR (PAF and KET forms) Data Field: Current_SupportedAvgHrWeek – Competitive employment with ongoing on-site or off-site job-related support services provided. Valid values are the average hours per week that the partner currently spends in this employment setting.

DCR (PAF and KET forms) Data Field: Current_TransitionalAvgHrWeek – Paid jobs in the community that are 1) open only to individuals with a specific disability, and 2) either time-limited for the purpose of moving to a more permanent job or are part of a group of disabled individuals who are working as a team in the midst of teams of non-disabled individuals who are performing the same work. Valid values are the average hours per week the partner currently spends in this employment setting.

DCR (PAF and KET forms) Data Field: Current_In-HouseAvgHrWeek – Paid jobs open only to program participants with a disability. Valid values are the average hours per week the partner currently spends in this employment setting.

DCR (PAF and KET forms) Data Field: Current_OtherEmploymentAvgHrWeek – Any informal employment activity that increases the partner's income (e.g., recycling, gardening, babysitting) or participation in formal structured classes and/or workshops providing instruction on issues pertinent to getting a job. (Does not include panhandling or illegal activities). Valid values are the average hours per week the partner currently spends in this employment setting.

DCR (PAF and KET forms) Data Field: Current_Non-paidAvgHrWeek – Non-paid (volunteer) jobs in an agency or volunteer work in the community that provides exposure to the standard expectations of employment. Valid values are the average hours per week the partner currently spends in this employment setting.

DCR (PAF and KET forms) Data Field: Current_Unemployed – The partner is not employed at this time. Valid values are 1 = yes (marked). It should be noted that some DCR-PAF datasets contain "0" values and these are interpreted as a "no" response even though the DCR data dictionary does not list "0" or "no" as valid response options.

DCR (PAF and KET forms) Data Field: Age_Group - Internal DCR administrative field which indicates the age group the partner belonged to at the time the form was completed. Valid values for this variable are 1 = Child PAF, 4 = TAY PAF, 7 = Adult PAF, and 10 = Older adult PAF.

Proportion of employed/non-employed TAY, adult, and older adult consumers

CSI (Periodic updates) Employment Status - Identifies the current employment status of the client. Valid response options are:

- *Employed in competitive job market* - A = full time, 35 hours or more per week, B = part time, less than 35 hours per week,
- *Employed in noncompetitive job market (sheltered workshop, protected environment)* - C = full time, 35 hours or more per week, D = part time, less than 35 hours per week
- *Not in the paid work force* – E = actively looking for work, F = homemaker, G = student, H = volunteer worker, I = retired, J = resident/inmate of institution, K = other, U = unknown/not reported.

CSI (Periodic files) Data Field: Date of birth – Identifies the date on which the client was born.

Completeness & Quality of Recommended Data

Data recommended for identifying the proportion of employed/non-employed TAY, adult, and older adult FSPs:

Database: DCR (PAF & KET)	FY 04-05				FY 05-06			
	Valid		Missing		Valid		Missing	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Variables								
Total cases (PAF)	32	100%			294	100%		
Current_CompetitiveAvgHrWeek	1	3.1%	31	96.6%	11	3.70%	283	96.3%
Current_SupportedAvgHrWk	0	0%	32	100%	0	0%	294	100%
Current_TransitionAvgHrWk	0	0%	32	100%	0	0%	294	100%
Current_In-HouseAvgHrWk	0	0%	32	100%	0	0%	294	100%
Current_OtherEmpAvgHrWk	0	0%	32	100%	4	1%	290	99%
Current_Non-paidAvgHrWk	1	3.1%	31	96.6%	2	0.7%	292	99.3%
Current_Unemployed	30	93.8%	2	6.3%	277	94.2%	17	5.8%
Race/Ethnic	29	90.6%	3	9.4%	211	71.8%	83	28.2%
Age Group	32	100%	0	0%	294	100%	0	0%
Gender	32	100%	0	0%	294	100%	0	0%
Total cases (KET)					228	100%		
Current_CompetitiveAvgHrWeek 1st KET					1	1.3%	77	98.7%
Current_SupportedAvgHrWk 1st KET					0	0%	0	0%
Current_TransitionAvgHrWk 1ST KET					0	0%	0	0%
Current_In-HouseAvgHrWk 1st KET					0	0%	0	0%
Current_OtherEmpAvgHrWk 1st KET					0	0%	0	0%
Current_Non-paidAvgHrWk 1st KET					0	0%	0	0%
Current_Unemployed 1st KET					5	6.4%	73	93.6%
Current_all employment status combined - 2nd KET					0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Current_all employment status combined - 3rd KET					0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Current_all employment status combined - 4th KET		0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Current_all employment status combined - 5th + KET		0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total unique consumers		78	100%		
Race/Ethnic		52	66.7%	26	33.3%
Age Group		78	100%	0	0%
Gender		78	100%	0	0%

Database: DCR (PAF & KET)	FY 06-07				FY 07-08			
	Valid		Missing		Valid		Missing	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Variables								
Total cases (PAF)	7,085	100%	0	0%	23,174	100%	0	0%
Current_CompetitiveAvgHrWeek	37	1.9%	1,952	98.1%	112	1.6%	6,964	98.4%
Current_SupportedAvgHrWk	20	1%	1,969	99%	9	0.1%	7,067	99.9%
Current_TransitionAvgHrWk	1	99.9%	1,988	0.1%	5	0.1%	7,071	99.9%
Current_In-HouseAvgHrWk	12	0.6%	1,977	99.4%	13	0.2%	7,063	99.8%
Current_OtherEmpAvgHrWk	14	0.7%	1,975	99.3%	24	0.3%	7,052	99.7%
Current_Non-paidAvgHrWk	14	0.70%	1,975	99.3%	17	0.2%	7,059	99.8%
Current_Unemployed	90	4.5%	1,899	95.5%	215	3%	6,861	97%
Race/Ethnic	149	7.5%	1,840	92.5%	332	4.7%	6,744	95.3%
Age Group	118	6.0%	1,871	94.0%	240	3.4%	6,836	96.6%
Gender	94	4.7%	1,895	95.3%	167	2.3%	6,909	97.7%
Total cases (KET)	306	15.4%	1,683	84.6%	534	7.5%	5,542	92.5%
Current_CompetitiveAvgHrWeek 1st KET	1,989	100%	0	0%	7,076	100%	0	0%
Current_SupportedAvgHrWk 1st KET	1,988	95.5%	90	4.5%	6,679	94.40%	397	5.60%
Current_TransitionAvgHrWk 1ST KET	1,989	100%	0	0%	7,076	100%	0	0%
Current_In-HouseAvgHrWk 1st KET	1,959	98.5%	30	1.5%	6,851	96.8%	225	3.2%
Current_OtherEmpAvgHrWk 1st KET	7,085	100%	0	0%	23,174	100%	0	0%
Current_Non-paidAvgHrWk 1st KET	37	1.9%	1,952	98.1%	112	1.6%	6,964	98.4%
Current_Unemployed 1st KET	20	1%	1,969	99%	9	0.1%	7,067	99.9%
Current_all employment status combined - 2nd KET	1	99.9%	1,988	0.1%	5	0.1%	7,071	99.9%
Current_all employment status combined - 3rd KET	12	0.6%	1,977	99.4%	13	0.2%	7,063	99.8%
Current_all employment status combined - 4th KET	14	0.7%	1,975	99.3%	24	0.3%	7,052	99.7%
Current_all employment status combined - 5th + KET	14	0.70%	1,975	99.3%	17	0.2%	7,059	99.8%
Total unique consumers	90	4.5%	1,899	95.5%	215	3%	6,861	97%
Race/Ethnic	149	7.5%	1,840	92.5%	332	4.7%	6,744	95.3%
Age Group	118	6.0%	1,871	94.0%	240	3.4%	6,836	96.6%

Gender	94	4.7%	1895	95.3%	167	2.3%	6,909	97.7%
--------	----	------	------	-------	-----	------	-------	-------

Database: DCR (PAF & KET)	FY 08-09				FY 09-10			
	Valid		Missing		Valid		Missing	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Variables								
Total cases (PAF)	10,277	100%	0	0%	12,765	100%	0	0%
Current_CompetitiveAvgHrWeek	292	2.8%	9,985	97.5%	383	3%	12,382	97%
Current_SupportedAvgHrWk	74	0.7%	10,203	99.3%	64	0.5%	12,701	99.5%
Current_TransitionAvgHrWk	60	0.6%	10,217	99.4%	54	0.4%	12,711	99.6%
Current_In-HouseAvgHrWk	75	0.7%	10,202	99.3%	69	0.5%	12,696	99.5%
Current_OtherEmpAvgHrWk	99	1.0%	10,178	99.0%	99	0.8%	12,666	99.2%
Current_Non-paidAvgHrWk	76	0.7%	10,201	99.3%	87	0.7%	12,678	99.3%
Current_Unemployed	9,619	93.6%	658	6.4%	11,715	91.8%	1,050	8.2%
Race/Ethnic	9,702	94.40%	575	5.60%	11,975	93.8%	790	6.2%
Age Group	10,277	100%	0	0%	12,765	100.0%	0	0.0%
Gender	9,898	96.3%	379	3.7%	12,173	95.4%	592	4.6%
Total cases (KET)	40,624	100%	0	0%	49,770	100%	0	0%
Current_CompetitiveAvgHrWeek 1st KET	150	1.2%	12,243	98.8%	196	1.2%	16,631	98.8%
Current_SupportedAvgHrWk 1st KET	17	0.1%	12,376	99.9%	29	0.2%	16,798	99.8%
Current_TransitionAvgHrWk 1ST KET	12	0.1%	12,381	99.9%	10	0.1%	16,817	99.9%
Current_In-HouseAvgHrWk 1st KET	8	0.1%	12,385	99.9%	10	0.1%	16,817	99.9%
Current_OtherEmpAvgHrWk 1st KET	14	0.1%	12,379	99.9%	26	0.20%	16,801	99.8%
Current_Non-paidAvgHrWk 1st KET	46	0.4%	12,347	99.6%	80	0.5%	16,747	99.5%
Current_Unemployed 1st KET	236	2.1%	12,130	97.9%	301	1.8%	16,526	98.2%
Current_all employment status combined - 2nd KET	380	3.1%	12,013	96.9%	348	2.1%	16,479	97.9%
Current_all employment status combined - 3rd KET	260	2.0%	12,679	98.0%	256	1.5%	16,571	98.5%
Current_all employment status combined - 4th KET	190	1.5%	12,203	98.5%	179	1.1%	16,648	98.9%
Current_all employment status combined - 5th + KET	1,437	11.6%	10,956	88.4%	449	2.7%	16,378	97.3%
Total unique consumers	12,393	100%	0	0%	16,827	100%	0	0%
Race/Ethnic	11,697	94.40%	696	5.60%	15,928	94.7%	899	5.3%
Age Group	12,393	100%	0	0%	16,827	100%	0	0%
Gender	11,966	96.6%	427	3.4%	16,225	96.4%	602	3.6%

Database: DCR (PAF & KET)	FY 10-11				FY 11-12			
	Valid		Missing		Valid		Missing	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Variables								

Total cases (PAF)	10,710	100%	0	0%	8,118	100%	0	0%
Current_CompetitiveAvgHrWeek	262	2.4%	10,448	97.6%	192	2.40%	7,926	97.6%
Current_SupportedAvgHrWk	78	0.7%	10,632	99.3%	36	0.4%	8,082	99.6%
Current_TransitionAvgHrWk	69	0.6%	10,641	99.4%	37	0.5%	8,081	99.5%
Current_In-HouseAvgHrWk	78	0.7%	10,632	99.3%	28	0.3%	8,090	99.7%
Current_OtherEmpAvgHrWk	117	1.1%	10,539	98.9%	57	0.7%	8,061	99.3%
Current_Non-paidAvgHrWk	104	1%	10,606	99%	48	0.6%	8,070	99.4%
Current_Unemployed	9,953	92.9%	757	7.1%	7,646	94.2%	472	5.8%
Race/Ethnic	8,899	83.1%	1,811	16.9%	6,982	86%	1,136	14%
Age Group	10,710	100%	0	0%	8,118	100%	0	0%
Gender	10,082	94.1%	628	5.9%	7,394	91.1%	724	8.9%
Total cases (KET)	59,603	100%	0	0%	52,403	100%	0	0%
Current_CompetitiveAvgHrWeek 1st KET	189	1%	19,491	99%	156	0.9%	16,466	99.1%
Current_SupportedAvgHrWk 1st KET	38	0.2%	19,642	99.8%	29	0.2%	16,593	99.8%
Current_TransitionAvgHrWk 1ST KET	18	0.1%	19,662	99.9%	14	0.1%	16,608	99.9%
Current_In-HouseAvgHrWk 1st KET	23	0.1%	19,657	99.9%	33	0.2%	16,589	99.8%
Current_OtherEmpAvgHrWk 1st KET	27	0.1%	19,653	99.9%	38	0.2%	16,584	99.8%
Current_Non-paidAvgHrWk 1st KET	95	0.5%	19,585	99.5%	80	0.5%	16,542	99.5%
Current_Unemployed 1st KET	318	1.6%	19,362	98.4%	229	1.4%	16,393	98.6%
Current_all employment status combined - 2nd KET	431	2.2%	19,249	97.8%	373	2.2%	16,249	97.8%
Current_all employment status combined - 3rd KET	320	1.6%	19,360	98.4%	270	1.6%	16,352	98.4%
Current_all employment status combined - 4th KET	208	1.1%	19,472	98.9%	202	1.2%	16,420	98.8%
Current_all employment status combined - 5th + KET	603	3.1%	19,077	96.9%	542	3.3%	16,080	96.7%
Total unique consumers	19,680	100%	0	0%	16,622	100%	0	0%
Race/Ethnic	16,742	85.1%	2,938	14.9%	14,803	89.1%	1,819	10.9%
Age Group	19,680	100%	0	0%	16,622	100%	0	0%
Gender	18,940	96.2%	740	3.80%	15,723	94.6%	899	5.4%

Data recommended for identifying the proportion of employed/non-employed TAY, adult, and older adult consumers:

Database: CSI (Periodic)	FY 04-05				FY 05-06			
	Valid		Missing		Valid		Missing	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CSI total (Service + Periodic)	670,498	100%	0	0%	671,528	100%	0	0%
1st Employment Status	290,851	80.3%	71,298	19.7%	283,017	79.4%	73,269	20.6%
1st update total	362,149	100%	0	0%	356,286	100%	0	0%
2nd Employment Status	239,254	82.6%	50,284	17.4%	65,588	77.4%	19,191	22.6%
2nd update total	289,538	100%	0	0%	84,779	100%	0	0%

3rd Employment Status	140,820	80%	35,116	20%	18,345	73.7%	6,541	26.3%
3rd update total	175,936	100%	0	0%	24,886	100%	0	0%
4th Employment Status	103,831	79.5%	26,760	20.5%	8,458	75.1%	2,802	24.9%
4th update total	130,591	100%	0	0%	11,260	100%	0	0%
+5 Employment Status	515,421	79.2%	13,500	20.8%	9,115	77.1%	2,706	22.9%
+5 update total	650,421	100%	0	0%	11,821	100%	0	0%
Total unique Periodic	362,149	100%	0	0%	356,286	100%	0	0%
Race/Ethnic	167,928	46.4%	194,221	53.6%	328,378	92.2%	27,908	7.8%
Age Group	361,731	99.9%	418	0.1%	355,504	99.8%	782	0.2%
Gender	361,811	99.9%	338	0.1%	355,961	99.9%	0	0.1%

Database: CSI (Periodic)	FY 06-07				FY 07-08			
	Valid		Missing		Valid		Missing	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CSI total (Service + Periodic)	670,170	100%	0	0%	706,545	100%	0	0%
1st Employment Status	179,912	82.7%	37,539	17.3%	199,819	81.7%	44,614	18.3%
1st update total	217,451	100%	0	0%	244,433	100%	0	0%
2nd Employment Status	50,032	81.3%	11,540	18.7%	65,064	81.8%	14,470	18.2%
2nd update total	61,572	100%	0	0%	79,534	100%	0	0%
3rd Employment Status	18,924	87%	2,830	13%	32,290	86.4%	5,091	13.6%
3rd update total	21,754	100%	0	0%	37,381	100%	0	0%
4th Employment Status	10,664	86%	1,737	14%	23,681	87.7%	3,332	12.3%
4th update total	12,401	100%	0	0%	27,013	100%	0	0%
+5 Employment Status	20,769	84.3%	3,880	15.7%	52,237	89.9%	5,855	10.1%
+5 update total	24,649	100%	0	0%	58,092	100%	0	0%
Total unique Periodic	217,451	100%	0	0%	244,433	100%	0	0%
Race/Ethnic	205,951	94.7%	11,500	5.3%	232,713	95.2%	11,720	4.8%
Age Group	210,330	96.7%	7,121	3.3%	243,607	99.7%	826	0.3%
Gender	216,929	99.2%	522	0.2%	243,689	99.7%	744	0.3%

Database: CSI (Periodic)	FY 08-09				FY 09-10			
	Valid		Missing		Valid		Missing	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CSI total (Service + Periodic)	727,247	100%	0	0%	726,830	100%	0	0%
1st Employment Status	243,636	81.1%	56,846	18.9%	278,760	82.4%	59,483	17.6%
1st update total	300,482	100%	0	0%	338,243	100%	0	0%
2nd Employment Status	105,218	83.4%	20,950	16.6%	129,841	83.7%	25,200	16.3%
2nd update total	126,168	100%	0	0%	155,041	100%	0	0%
3rd Employment Status	34,031	87.7%	4,775	12.3%	29,207	61.9%	6,271	38.1%
3rd update total	38,806	100%	0	0%	35,478	100%	0	0%
4th Employment Status	23,275	88.7%	2,955	11.3%	16,468	82.3%	3,531	17.7%
4th update total	26,230	100%	0	0%	19,999	100%	0	0%
+5 Employment Status	45,454	88.9%	5,651	11.1%	20,082	84%	3,839	16%
+5 update total	51,105	100%	0	0%	23,921	100%	0	0%
Total unique Periodic	300,482	100%	0	0%	338,243	100%	0	0%
Race/Ethnic	286,601	95.4%	13,881	4.6%	322,151	95.2%	16,092	4.8%

Age Group	300,339	99.9%	143	0.1%	338,243	99.9%	241	0.1%
Gender	299,807	99.8%	675	0.2%	337,510	99.8%	733	0.2%

Database: CSI (Periodic) Variables	FY 10-11				FY 11-12			
	Valid		Missing		Valid		Missing	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CSI total (Service + Periodic)	749,057	100%	0	0%	753,342	100%	0	0%
1st Employment Status	359,645	77.9%	101,908	22.1%	146,420	76.5%	44,979	23.5%
1st update total	461,553	100%	0	0%	191,399	100%	0	0%
2nd Employment Status	313,717	81.8%	69,659	18.2%	112,998	79.7%	28,702	20.3%
2nd update total	383,376	100%	0	0%	141,700	100%	0	0%
3rd Employment Status	270,270	82.5%	57,184	17.5%	71,504	79.3%	18,561	20.7%
3rd update total	327,454	100%	0	0%	90,065	100%	0	0%
4th Employment Status	236,575	82.6%	49,996	17.4%	53,113	79.3%	13,826	20.7%
4th update total	286,571	100%	0	0%	66,939	100%	0	0%
+5 Employment Status	862,167	54.9%	707,782	45.1%	141,591	79.6%	42,571	23.1%
+5 update total	1,569,949	100%	0	0%	184,162	100%	0	0%
Total unique Periodic	461,553	100%	0	0%	191,399	100%	0	0%
Race/Ethnic	359,949	78%	101,604	22%	153,254	80.1%	38,145	19.9%
Age Group	459,813	99.6%	1,740	0.4%	189,440	99%	1,959	1%
Gender	460,917	99.9%	636	0.1%	190,829	99.7%	570	0.3%

Notes:

- 1) Race/Ethnicity in every fiscal year is a created variable
- 2) Age group in FY 04-05 and 05-06 is a created variable

Implications for Indicator Calculation

Employment - DCR (PAF)

Calculating the proportion of employed (paid and non-paid) and not employed requires coding of the seven employment variables listed above.

Missing data: According to the full service partnership assessment form, partners only provide information (avg. hours per week & wages) for the employment statuses applicable to them. There are no valid codes for “missing” or “not applicable”. Assessing these variables for missing data is not straightforward – blanks can be interpreted in several ways, such as missing, not applicable, or not employed. The following steps can be taken to get a sense of whether blanks indicate missing, not applicable, or not employed.

Step 1.

For each of the six employment statuses above, if consumers report working an average of 1 – 40 hours per week those can be recoded as 1s and blanks recoded as 0s. All six-employment variables can then be summed across. Summing will result in the following options:

0 = none of the employment options were selected. (A 0 could mean missing or it could mean that a consumer is not employed.)

1 = employed

The SUMEMP variable below, which is the sum of all six employment variables, can then be recoded to the following: 1s = 1s and 0s = 9.

Illustration:

Table 1. Original data as reported in DCR

CompetitiveAvgHr sWk	SupportedAvgHr sWk	Transitional_AvgHr sWk	InHouse_AvgHr sWk	Other_AvgHrs Wk	Nonpaid_AvgHr sWk
5					
	2				
		3			25

Table 2. Recoded data

Competitive	Supported	Transitional	InHouse	Other	Nonpaid	SUMEMP
1	0	0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	1	0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	0	1	1
0	0	1	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 3. Employment for 2005-06 FY (EPSUM variable)

	Frequency	Percent
0 (Not Employed)	241	93.8
1 (Employed)	16	6.2
Total	257	100

Step 2.

The *Current_unemployed* variable, which asks, “the partner is not employed at this time”, 1 = yes, 0 = no (this is assumed since there is no 0 option noted in the data dictionary) was used to interpret the 0s in step one. Valid responses (1s and 0s) can be recoded to equal 1. Missing responses can be recoded to equal 9.

Table 4. Frequency of unemployment for 2005-06 FY

	Frequency	Percent
No (0)	9	3.7
Yes (1)	232	96.3
Missing	16	6.4
Total	257	100
Recoded unemployment variable		
1s	241	94%
9s	16	6%

Step 3.

The recoded EMPSUM variable and the recoded unemployment variable can be concatenated (combined) to identify those cases in which there is missing data for all seven employment variables. There are four possible combinations: 19, 91, 11, and 99.

Values of 19 indicate that there is a valid response for the SUMEMP however missing data for current_unemployment.

Values of 91 indicate that there is missing (blank) data for the EMPSUM variable but there is valid data for the current_unemployed variable.

Values of 11 indicate that there is valid data for the EMPSUM variable and the current_unemployed variable.

The three codes above indicate that there is valid data regarding a partner's employment status.

Values of 99 indicate that there is missing data on the EMPSUM variable and the current_unemployment variable. These responses can be identified as missing.

Identifying the number/proportion of employed/unemployed consumers: Once the amount of missing data has been estimated through the steps detailed above, the proportion of employed (paid and non-paid) and not employed can be calculated using only valid cases (not including missing cases in the denominator) by using the EMPSUM variable. The ratio would be the number of 1s divided by the number of valid cases.

It should be noted that the 1s in the EMPSUM have to be split into paid and non-paid employment to get the ratio of paid employed partners and non-paid employed partners.

Employment - CSI (Periodic)

Due to the format of the respective data fields, calculating employment for all consumers is more straightforward than calculating employment for FSPs. It is important to not include those consumers who are missing employment data, are retired or resident/inmate of an institution in the calculations of employed and non-employed consumers. The employment ratio can be calculated as the number of employed consumers (i.e., those with A, B, C, D or H employment codes) divided by the total number of unique valid cases. Additionally, employed consumers need to be split into paid and non-paid categories.

Recommended Calculations

1) DCR (PAF) - Employment

The recommended calculation will provide descriptive information regarding the proportion of employed and unemployed partners. Given that it requires up to four additional steps to identify valid cases to calculate employment (paid and non-paid) and unemployed, two additional analysis steps are recommended:

1. Collapse the paid and non-paid statuses into a general "employed" status. This step is recommended because the proportion of non-paid employed partners is relatively small, and does not provide much instructive value.
2. Use only the current_unemployed variable to calculate the proportion of employed and not employed consumers. As the table above shows, across all fiscal years the proportion of valid data for this variable is over 90%.

2) CSI (Periodic) - Employment

The recommended calculation is to provide descriptive information regarding the proportion of employed compared to unemployed mental health consumers, for each FY. Additional recommendations are:

1. Collapse the paid and non-paid statuses into a general "employed" status because the proportion of non-paid employed consumers is relatively small, and does not provide significant instructive value.
2. Use the first periodic update for each consumer for each FY, as it is the most complete.

Priority Indicator 3: Homelessness & Housing

Indicator Definition

This indicator is intended to describe the housing status (i.e., independent, group care, foster care, and homeless) of all mental health consumer and FSP consumers.

Recommended Data for Calculating Indicator

Housing status among all mental health consumers:

CSI (Periodic) Data Field: P-01.0 DATE COMPLETED - Valid values: eight digit numeric codes in the form YYYYMMDD. This is a required field, used to separate periodic entries by fiscal year. Entries without valid values (n=379,624; 6.4%) are not included in subsequent analyses because it is not possible to determine in which FY they belong.

CSI (Periodic) Data Field: P-09.0 LIVING ARRANGEMENT - Valid values: one letter codes A-U. This required field is collected with each periodic update. The frequency of collection is variable, but a large majority of updates include valid data for this variable. Approximately 1/2 to 2/3 of consumers receiving services in a fiscal year do not receive a periodic update in that same fiscal year. A small fraction of consumers receive multiple updates in the same fiscal year.

Housing status among FSPs:

DCR (PAF/KET) Data Field: 5.02 Current - Valid values: numerical codes 1-28. This is not a required field. These data are collected once at intake and subsequently at “key events.” The frequency of collection is variable. Approximately 1/3 to 1/2 of consumers receiving services in a fiscal year do not have a “key event tracking” (KET) update in the same fiscal year. Approximately 1/2 of consumers with KET updates include data for this variable. Many consumers have multiple KET updates in a given fiscal year, some (approximately 10%) with more than five.

Completeness & Quality of Recommended Data

Database		Fiscal Year & Number of Cases per Variable							
		FY 04-05				FY 05-06			
		Valid		Missing		Valid		Missing	
Variables	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
CSI (Periodic)	CSI Consumers Total (Service + Periodic)	670,498	100%			671,528	100%		
	1st Update Total	254,984	38.0%	0	0.0%	361,483	53.8%	0	0.0%
	Living Arrangement	254,959	38.0%	25	0.0%	361,483	53.8%	0	0.0%
	2nd Update Total	52,758	7.9%	0	0.0%	83,495	12.4%	0	0.0%
	Living Arrangement	52,757	7.9%	1	0.0%	83,495	12.4%	0	0.0%
	3rd Update Total	19,947	3.0%	0	0.0%	25,208	3.8%	0	0.0%
	Living Arrangement	19,947	3.0%	0	0.0%	25,208	3.8%	0	0.0%
	4th Update Total	10,184	1.5%	0	0.0%	11,526	1.7%	0	0.0%
	Living Arrangement	10,184	1.5%	0	0.0%	11,526	1.7%	0	0.0%
	5+ Updates Total	3,839	0.6%	0	0.0%	6,313	0.9%	0	0.0%
	Living Arrangement	3,839	0.6%	0	0.0%	6,313	0.9%	0	0.0%
	Periodic Consumers (Total by Date Completed)	254,984	38.0%	0	0.0%	361,483	53.8%	0	0.0%
Living Arrangement	254,959	38.0%	25	0.0%	361,483	53.8%	0	0.0%	

	Race/Ethnic	219,658	32.8%	35,326	5.3%	312,743	46.6%	48,740	7.3%
	Age Group	254,961	38.0%	23	0.0%	361,459	53.8%	24	0.0%
	Gender	254,800	38.0%	184	0.0%	361,159	53.8%	324	0.0%
DCR	Total Consumers (PAF + KET + 3M)	32	100%			297	100%		
	Current - General Living Arrangement	32	100.0%	0	0.0%	289	97.3%	7	2.4%
	PAF Total	32	100.0%	0	0.0%	294	98.9%	3	0.0%
	Current	32	100.0%	0	0.0%	289	97.3%	5	1.7%
	Race/Ethnic	29	90.6%	3	9.4%	211	71.0%	83	27.9%
	Age Group	32	100.0%	0	0.0%	294	99.0%	0	0.0%
	Gender	32	100.0%	0	0.0%	294	99.0%	0	0.0%
	1st KET Cases					78	26.3%		
	Current					60	20.2%	-	-
	2nd KET Cases					47	15.8%		
	Current					43	14.5%	-	-
	3rd KET Cases					32	10.8%		
	Current					29	9.8%	-	-
	4th KET Cases					22	7.4%		
	Current					20	6.7%	-	-
	5+ KET Cases					13	4.4%		
	Current					13	4.4%	-	-
	KET Total (consumers)					78	26.3%		
	Current					64	21.5%	14	4.7%
	Race/Ethnic					76	25.6%	2	0.7%
Age Group					78	26.3%	0	0.0%	
Gender					77	25.9%	1	0.3%	

		Fiscal Year & Number of Cases per Variable							
Database	Variables	FY 06-07				FY 07-08			
		Valid		Missing		Valid		Missing	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CSI (Periodic)	CSI Consumers Total (Service + Periodic)	670,170	100%			706,545	100%		
	1st Update Total	224,370	33.5%	0	0.0%	250,376	35.4%	0	0.0%
	Living Arrangement	224,370	33.5%	0	0.0%	250,376	35.4%	0	0.0%
	2nd Update Total	51,519	7.7%	0	0.0%	71,074	10.1%	0	0.0%
	Living Arrangement	51,519	7.7%	0	0.0%	71,074	10.1%	0	0.0%
	3rd Update Total	20,200	3.0%	0	0.0%	36,015	5.1%	0	0.0%
	Living Arrangement	20,200	3.0%	0	0.0%	36,015	5.1%	0	0.0%
	4th Update Total	9,858	1.5%	0	0.0%	24,713	3.5%	0	0.0%
	Living Arrangement	9,858	1.5%	0	0.0%	24,713	3.5%	0	0.0%
	5+ Updates Total	5,601	0.8%	0	0.0%	16,254	2.3%	0	0.0%
	Living Arrangement	5,601	0.8%	0	0.0%	16,254	2.3%	0	0.0%
	Periodic Consumers (Total by Date Completed)	224,370	33.5%	0	0.0%	250,376	35.4%	0	0.0%
	Living Arrangement	224,370	33.5%	0	0.0%	250,376	35.4%	0	0.0%
Race/Ethnic	192,606	28.7%	31,764	4.7%	218,883	31.0%	31,493	4.5%	

	Age Group	224,321	33.5%	49	0.0%	250,322	35.4%	54	0.0%
	Gender	223,827	33.4%	543	0.1%	249,614	35.3%	762	0.1%
DCR	Total Consumers (PAF + KET + 3M)	4,443	100%			13,073	100%		
	Current - General Living Arrangement	4,284	96.4%	93	2.1%	10,930	83.6%	1,182	9.0%
	PAF Total	4,209	94.7%	0	0.0%	9,209	70.4%	0	0.0%
	Current	4,146	93.3%	63	1.4%	9,009	68.9%	200	1.5%
	Race/Ethnic	3,987	89.7%	222	5.0%	8,693	66.5%	516	3.9%
	Age Group	4,209	94.7%	0	0.0%	9,209	70.4%	0	0.0%
	Gender	4,131	93.0%	78	1.8%	8,896	68.0%	313	2.4%
	1st KET Cases	1,989	44.8%	0	0.0%	7,076	54.1%	0	0.0%
	Current	1,168	26.3%	0	0.0%	3,754	28.7%	0	0.0%
	2nd KET Cases	1,225	27.6%	0	0.0%	4,160	31.8%	0	0.0%
	Current	719	16.2%	0	0.0%	2,526	19.3%	0	0.0%
	3rd KET Cases	845	19.0%	0	0.0%	2,785	21.3%	0	0.0%
	Current	494	11.1%	0	0.0%	1,712	13.1%	0	0.0%
	4th KET Cases	628	14.1%	0	0.0%	1,995	15.3%	0	0.0%
	Current	388	8.7%	0	0.0%	1,322	10.1%	0	0.0%
	5+ KET Cases	459	10.3%	0	0.0%	1,412	10.8%	0	0.0%
	Current	402	9.0%	0	0.0%	1,184	9.1%	0	0.0%
	KET Total (consumers)	1,989	44.8%	0	0.0%	7,076	54.1%	0	0.0%
	Current	1,494	33.6%	495	11.1%	4,609	35.3%	2,467	18.9%
	Race/Ethnic	1,876	42.2%	113	2.5%	6,629	50.7%	447	3.4%
Age Group	1,989	44.8%	0	0.0%	7,076	54.1%	0	0.0%	
Gender	1,959	44.1%	30	0.7%	6,851	52.4%	225	1.7%	

		Fiscal Year & Number of Cases per Variable							
Database	Variables	FY 08-09				FY 09-10			
		Valid		Missing		Valid		Missing	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CSI (Periodic)	CSI Consumers Total (Service + Periodic)	727,247	100%			726,830	100%		
	1st Update Total	321,074	44.1%	0	0.0%	360,416	49.6%	0	0.0%
	Living Arrangement	321,070	44.1%	4	0.0%	360,154	49.6%	262	0.0%
	2nd Update Total	125,739	17.3%	0	0.0%	161,952	22.3%	0	0.0%
	Living Arrangement	125,737	17.3%	2	0.0%	161,785	22.3%	167	0.0%
	3rd Update Total	36,227	5.0%	0	0.0%	46,127	6.3%	0	0.0%
	Living Arrangement	36,224	5.0%	3	0.0%	46,125	6.3%	2	0.0%
	4th Update Total	22,174	3.0%	0	0.0%	28,318	3.9%	0	0.0%
	Living Arrangement	22,173	3.0%	1	0.0%	28,316	3.9%	2	0.0%
	5+ Updates Total	13,898	1.9%	0	0.0%	18,499	2.5%	0	0.0%
	Living Arrangement	13,898	1.9%	0	0.0%	18,499	2.5%	0	0.0%
	Periodic Consumers (Total by Date Completed)	321,074	44.1%	0	0.0%	360,416	49.6%	0	0.0%
	Living Arrangement	321,071	44.1%	3	0.0%	360,159	49.6%	257	0.0%
	Race/Ethnic	288,864	39.7%	32,210	4.4%	327,507	45.1%	32,909	4.5%
	Age Group	320,928	44.1%	146	0.0%	360,169	49.6%	247	0.0%
Gender	320,387	44.1%	687	0.1%	359,620	49.5%	796	0.1%	

DCR	Total Consumers (PAF + KET + 3M)	20,363	100%			26,975	100%		
	Current - General Living Arrangement	14,308	70.3%	3,373	16.6%	18,077	67.0%	5,245	19.4%
	PAF Total	10,277	50.5%	0	0.0%	12,765	47.3%	0	0.0%
	Current	9,991	49.1%	286	1.4%	12,533	46.5%	232	0.9%
	Race/Ethnic	9,645	47.4%	632	3.1%	11,881	44.0%	884	3.3%
	Age Group	10,277	50.5%	0	0.0%	12,765	47.3%	0	0.0%
	Gender	9,898	48.6%	379	1.9%	12,173	45.1%	592	2.2%
	1st KET Cases	12,393	60.9%	0	0.0%	16,827	62.4%	0	0.0%
	Current	5,984	29.4%	0	0.0%	7,119	26.4%	0	0.0%
	2nd KET Cases	7,055	34.6%	0	0.0%	8,906	33.0%	0	0.0%
	Current	4,148	20.4%	0	0.0%	5,030	18.6%	0	0.0%
	3rd KET Cases	4,739	23.3%	0	0.0%	5,779	21.4%	0	0.0%
	Current	2,915	14.3%	0	0.0%	3,440	12.8%	0	0.0%
	4th KET Cases	3,496	17.2%	0	0.0%	3,987	14.8%	0	0.0%
	Current	2,226	10.9%	0	0.0%	2,525	9.4%	0	0.0%
	5+ KET Cases	2,622	12.9%	0	0.0%	2,852	10.6%	0	0.0%
	Current	2,069	10.2%	0	0.0%	2,253	8.4%	0	0.0%
	KET Total (consumers)	12,393	60.9%	0	0.0%	16,827	62.4%	0	0.0%
	Current	7,396	36.3%	4,997	24.5%	8,839	32.8%	7,988	29.6%
	Race/Ethnic	11,629	57.1%	764	3.8%	15,825	58.7%	1,002	3.7%
Age Group	12,393	60.9%	0	0.0%	16,827	62.4%	0	0.0%	
Gender	11,966	58.8%	427	2.1%	16,225	60.1%	602	2.2%	

		Fiscal Year & Number of Cases per Variable							
Database	Variables	FY 10-11				FY 11-12			
		Valid		Missing		Valid		Missing	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CSI (Periodic)	CSI Consumers Total (Service + Periodic)	749,057	100%			753,342	100%		
	1st Update Total	413,315	55.2%	0	0.0%	425,637	56.5%	0	0.0%
	Living Arrangement	413,111	55.2%	204	0.0%	425,141	56.4%	496	0.1%
	2nd Update Total	221,108	29.5%	0	0.0%	249,495	33.1%	0	0.0%
	Living Arrangement	221,065	29.5%	43	0.0%	249,141	33.1%	354	0.0%
	3rd Update Total	72,512	9.7%	0	0.0%	81,221	10.8%	0	0.0%
	Living Arrangement	72,509	9.7%	3	0.0%	81,190	10.8%	31	0.0%
	4th Update Total	46,987	6.3%	0	0.0%	56,219	7.5%	0	0.0%
	Living Arrangement	46,984	6.3%	3	0.0%	56,188	7.5%	31	0.0%
	5+ Updates Total	30,534	4.1%	0	0.0%	28,800	3.8%	0	0.0%
	Living Arrangement	30,534	4.1%	0	0.0%	28,799	3.8%	1	0.0%
	Periodic Consumers (Total by Date Completed)	413,315	55.2%	0	0.0%	425,637	56.5%	0	0.0%
	Living Arrangement	413,120	55.2%	195	0.0%	425,159	56.4%	478	0.1%
	Race/Ethnic	373,858	49.9%	39,457	5.3%	390,925	51.9%	34,712	4.6%
	Age Group	412,884	55.1%	431	0.1%	423,832	56.3%	1,805	0.2%
Gender	412,484	55.1%	831	0.1%	424,753	56.4%	884	0.1%	
DCR	Total Consumers (PAF + KET + 3M)	29,045	100%			25,553	100%		
	Current - General Living Arrangement	17,008	58.6%	7,559	26.0%	13,559	53.1%	6,961	27.2%

PAF Total	10,710	36.9%	0	0.0%	8,118	31.8%	0	0.0%
Current	10,436	35.9%	274	0.9%	7,862	30.8%	256	1.0%
Race/Ethnic	8,818	30.4%	1,892	6.5%	6,885	26.9%	1,233	4.8%
Age Group	10,710	36.9%	0	0.0%	8,118	31.8%	0	0.0%
Gender	10,082	34.7%	628	2.2%	7,394	28.9%	724	2.8%
1st KET Cases	19,680	67.8%	0	0.0%	16,622	65.0%	0	0.0%
Current	7,439	25.6%	0	0.0%	5,823	22.8%	0	0.0%
2nd KET Cases	10,276	35.4%	0	0.0%	8,977	35.1%	0	0.0%
Current	5,519	19.0%	0	0.0%	4,557	17.8%	0	0.0%
3rd KET Cases	6,745	23.2%	0	0.0%	5,825	22.8%	0	0.0%
Current	3,987	13.7%	0	0.0%	3,218	12.6%	0	0.0%
4th KET Cases	4,731	16.3%	0	0.0%	4,171	16.3%	0	0.0%
Current	3,014	10.4%	0	0.0%	2,450	9.6%	0	0.0%
5+ KET Cases	3,403	11.7%	0	0.0%	3,103	12.1%	0	0.0%
Current	2,710	9.3%	0	0.0%	2,384	9.3%	0	0.0%
KET Total (consumers)	19,680	67.8%	0	0.0%	16,622	65.0%	0	0.0%
Current	9,548	32.9%	10,132	34.9%	7,737	30.3%	8,885	34.8%
Race/Ethnic	16,572	57.1%	3,108	10.7%	14,640	57.3%	1,982	7.8%
Age Group	19,680	67.8%	0	0.0%	16,622	65.0%	0	0.0%
Gender	18,940	65.2%	740	2.5%	15,723	61.5%	899	3.5%

Notes:

- 1) Race/Ethnic in every fiscal year is a created variable
- 2) Age Group in FY 04-05 & 05-06 is a created variable
- 3) Gender Missing (CSI & DCR) includes "Other" in all FY
- 4) * Data not available

Implications for Indicator Calculation

Review of the completeness of data indicates there is not a standardized or reliable procedure for the frequency of updates—neither for CSI nor DCR— so it is impossible to determine for consumers with no data whether they have not experienced any change in housing status or there were in fact changes that went uncaptured by the data collection process. This issue is particularly salient for any inferences regarding consumers experiencing homelessness. It is easily conceivable that any mechanism that would result in underrepresentation might disproportionately apply to those who are homeless—a notoriously difficult population to accurately sample.

Thus it is difficult to accurately determine the completeness of these data. Although the percentage of consumers with available data is not insignificant, any valid conclusions from these data would be based upon an assumption that the pattern of missing data is unrelated to housing status.

Recommended Calculation

Housing status (i.e., independent, group care, foster care, and homeless) of all mental health service consumers (CSI - Periodic) and FSP consumers (DCR - PAF/KET)

Within each fiscal year, the percentage of consumers within each type of housing setting is calculated. This would allow changes in the proportion of consumers in each type of housing setting to be tracked across fiscal years.

Priority Indicator 4: Arrests

Indicator Definition

The proportion of TAY, adults, and older adults with reported arrests.

Recommended Data for Calculating Indicator

Reports of arrest among a sample of TAY, adult, and older adult health service consumers:

CPS Data Field: ARREST – Valid values: 0 = No arrests; 1 = One arrest; 2 = Two arrests; 3 = Three arrests; 4 = Four or more arrests; 9 = Missing. This variable captures number of arrests in the past month. This item was phased out of the Youth and Family CPS surveys (used to collect data regarding TAY consumers) beginning May 2007.

CPS Data Field: LES12AREST – Valid values: 0 = No; 1 = Yes; 9 = Missing. This field indicates whether consumer had been arrested since beginning services. This item was added to the survey beginning May 2007.

CPS Data Field: LES12PSTAREST – Valid values: 0 = No; 1 = Yes; 9 = Missing. This field indicates whether consumer had been arrested in the twelve months prior to beginning services. This item was added to the survey beginning May 2007.

CPS Data Field: MOR12AREST – Valid values: 0 = No; 1 = Yes; 9 = Missing. This field indicates whether consumer had been arrested in the last twelve months. This item was added to the survey beginning May 2007.

CPS Data Field: MOR12PSTAREST – Valid values: 0 = No; 1 = Yes; 9 = Missing. This field indicates whether consumer had been arrested in the prior twelve months. This item was added to the survey beginning May 2007.

Reports of arrest among TAY, adult, and older adult FSP consumers:

DCR (PAF) Data Field: 9.02 ArrestPast12 – Valid values: 0-99. This required field captures the number of times arrested during the past twelve months. This information is collected at intake only. Almost all consumers have valid information at intake in this field.

DCR (PAF) Data Field: 9.03 ArrestPrior12 – Valid values: 0 = No; 1 = Yes. This required field indicates whether the consumer has been arrested at any time prior to the past twelve months. This information is collected at intake only. Almost all consumers have valid information at intake in this field.

DCR (KET) Data Field: 9.01 DateArrested – Valid values: Date in the form mm/dd/yyyy. This is not a required field. These data are collected at “key event tracking” (KET) updates. The extremely low percentage of consumers with valid data may be due to both the large percentage of consumers with no KET updates and also a low frequency of arrests among FSP consumers. Missing values for the DateArrested variable are dates later than the actual date of collection, and as such dates are out of range.

Completeness & Quality of Recommended Data

		Fiscal Year & Number of Cases per Variable							
		FY 04-05				FY 05-06			
Database	Variables	Valid		Missing		Valid		Missing	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%

DCR	Total Consumers (PAF + KET + 3M)	32	100%			297	100%		
	PAF Total	32	100.0%			294	99.0%		
	ArrestPrior12 - Arrest prior to past 12 months	32	100%	0	0.0%	289	97.3%	5	1.7%
	ArrestPast12 - Arrested during past 12 months	31	96.9%	1	3.1%	287	96.6%	7	2.4%
	Race/Ethnic	29	90.6%	3	9.4%	211	71.0%	83	27.9%
	Age Group	32	100%	0	0.0%	294	99.0%	0	0.0%
	Gender	32	100%	0	0.0%	294	99.0%	0	0.0%
	1st KET Cases					78	26.3%	0	0.0%
	DateArrested					5	1.7%	0	0.0%
	2nd KET Cases					47	15.8%	0	0.0%
	DateArrested					1	0.3%	0	0.0%
	3rd KET Cases					32	10.8%	0	0.0%
	DateArrested					3	1.0%	0	0.0%
	4th KET Cases					22	7.4%	0	0.0%
	DateArrested					1	0.3%	0	0.0%
	5+ KET Cases					13	4.4%	0	0.0%
	DateArrested					1	0.3%	0	0.0%
	KET Total (consumers)					78	26.3%	0	0.0%
	DateArrested					9	3.0%	0	0.0%
	Race/Ethnic					76	25.6%	2	0.7%
Age Group					78	26.3%	0	0.0%	
Gender					77	25.9%	1	0.3%	
CPS	Youth	22,232	100%			25,654	100%		
	ARREST	17,554	79.0%	4,678	21.0%	20,009	78.0%	5,645	22.0%
	LES12AREST					0	0.0%	25,654	100.0%
	LES12PSTAREST					0	0.0%	25,654	100.0%
	MOR12AREST					0	0.0%	25,654	100.0%
	MOR12PSTAREST					0	0.0%	25,654	100.0%
	GENDER	18,278	82.2%	3,954	17.8%	21,091	82.2%	4,563	17.8%
	Race (combined)	15,088	67.9%	7,142	32.1%	16,862	65.7%	8,791	34.3%
	DOB	18,598	83.7%	3,634	16.3%	21,670	84.5%	3,984	15.5%
	Family	32,831	100%			74,194	100%		
	ARREST	24,526	74.7%	8,305	25.3%	54,436	73.4%	19,758	26.6%
	LES12AREST	0	0.0%	32,831	100.0%	0	0.0%	74,194	100.0%
	LES12PSTAREST	0	0.0%	32,831	100.0%	0	0.0%	74,194	100.0%
	MOR12AREST	0	0.0%	32,831	100.0%	0	0.0%	74,194	100.0%
	MOR12PSTAREST	0	0.0%	32,831	100.0%	0	0.0%	74,194	100.0%
	GENDER	26,523	80.8%	6,308	19.2%	59,431	80.1%	14,763	19.9%
	Race (combined)	20,759	63.2%	12,067	36.8%	45,469	61.3%	28,724	38.7%
	DOB	32,826	100.0%	5	0.0%	44,429	59.9%	29,765	40.1%
	Adult	61,443	100%			93,337	100%		
	ARREST	41,453	67.5%	19,990	32.5%	54,228	58.1%	39,109	41.9%
LES12AREST	0	0.0%	61,443	100.0%	0	0.0%	93,337	100.0%	
LES12PSTAREST	0	0.0%	61,443	100.0%	0	0.0%	93,337	100.0%	
MOR12AREST	0	0.0%	61,443	100.0%	0	0.0%	93,337	100.0%	

MOR12PSTAREST	0	0.0%	61,443	100.0%	0	0.0%	93,337	100.0%
GENDER	41,651	67.8%	19,792	32.2%	54,194	58.1%	39,143	41.9%
Race (combined)	38,029	61.9%	23,409	38.1%	49,581	53.1%	43,749	46.9%
DOB	61,435	100.0%	8	0.0%	72,339	77.5%	20,998	22.5%
Older Adult	4,761	100%			7,594	100%		
ARREST	2,888	60.7%	1,873	39.3%	3,991	52.6%	3,603	47.4%
LES12AREST	0	0.0%	4,761	100.0%	0	0.0%	7,594	100.0%
LES12PSTAREST	0	0.0%	4,761	100.0%	0	0.0%	7,594	100.0%
MOR12AREST	0	0.0%	4,761	100.0%	0	0.0%	7,594	100.0%
MOR12PSTAREST	0	0.0%	4,761	100.0%	0	0.0%	7,594	100.0%
GENDER	3,113	65.4%	1,648	34.6%	4,194	55.2%	3,400	44.8%
Race (combined)	2,812	59.1%	1,949	40.9%	3,892	51.3%	3,702	48.7%
DOB	4,761	100.0%	0	0.0%	5,688	74.9%	1,906	25.1%

		Fiscal Year & Number of Cases per Variable							
Database	Variables	FY 06-07				FY 07-08			
		Valid		Missing		Valid		Missing	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
DCR	Total Consumers (PAF + KET + 3M)	4,443	100%			13,073	100%		
	PAF Total	4,209	94.7%	0	0.0%	9,209	70.4%	0	0.0%
	ArrestPrior12 - Arrest prior to past 12 months	4,139	93.2%	70	1.6%	9,032	69.1%	177	1.4%
	ArrestPast12 - Arrested during past 12 months	4,098	92.2%	111	2.5%	8,808	67.4%	401	3.1%
	Race/Ethnic	3,987	89.7%	222	5.0%	8,693	66.5%	516	3.9%
	Age Group	4,209	94.7%	0	0.0%	9,209	70.4%	0	0.0%
	Gender	4,131	93.0%	78	1.8%	8,896	68.0%	313	2.4%
	1st KET Cases	1,989	44.8%	0	0.0%	7,076	54.1%	0	0.0%
	DateArrested	57	1.3%	5	0.1%	165	1.3%	6	0.0%
	2nd KET Cases	1,225	27.6%	0	0.0%	4,160	31.8%	0	0.0%
	DateArrested	34	0.8%	1	0.0%	94	0.7%	3	0.0%
	3rd KET Cases	845	19.0%	0	0.0%	2,785	21.3%	0	0.0%
	DateArrested	25	0.6%	0	0.0%	94	0.7%	2	0.0%
	4th KET Cases	628	14.1%	0	0.0%	1,995	15.3%	0	0.0%
	DateArrested	12	0.3%	1	0.0%	43	0.3%	2	0.0%
	5+ KET Cases	459	10.3%	0	0.0%	1,412	10.8%	0	0.0%
	DateArrested	37	0.8%	1	0.0%	110	0.8%	8	0.1%
	KET Total (consumers)	1,989	44.8%	0	0.0%	7,076	54.1%	0	0.0%
	DateArrested	126	2.8%	8	0.2%	410	3.1%	18	0.1%
	Race/Ethnic	1,876	42.2%	113	2.5%	6,629	50.7%	447	3.4%
Age Group	1,989	44.8%	0	0.0%	7,076	54.1%	0	0.0%	
Gender	1,959	44.1%	30	0.7%	6,851	52.4%	225	1.7%	
CPS	Youth	26,898	100%			29,228	100%		
	ARREST	10,032	45.1%	16,866	75.9%	0	0.0%	29,228	100%
	LES12AREST	8,738	32.5%	18,160	67.5%	16,318	63.6%	12,910	50.3%
	LES12PSTAREST	8,557	31.8%	18,341	68.2%	15,924	62.1%	13,304	51.9%
	MOR12AREST	5,564	20.7%	21,334	79.3%	12,689	49.5%	16,539	64.5%

MOR12PSTAREST	5,376	20.0%	21,522	80.0%	12,240	47.7%	16,988	66.2%
GENDER	21,693	97.6%	5,205	23.4%	23,233	90.6%	5,995	23.4%
Race (combined)	16,939	76.2%	9,959	44.8%	17,953	70.0%	11,274	43.9%
DOB	22,276	100.2%	4,622	20.8%	23,717	92.4%	5,511	21.5%
Family	41,119	100%			43,577	100%		
ARREST	15,151	36.8%	25,968	63.2%	0	0.0%	43,577	100.0%
LES12AREST	11,734	28.5%	29,385	71.5%	22,161	50.9%	21,416	49.1%
LES12PSTAREST	0	0.0%	41,119	100.0%	0	0.0%	43,577	100.0%
MOR12AREST	7,205	17.5%	33,914	82.5%	16,653	38.2%	26,924	61.8%
MOR12PSTAREST	6,855	16.7%	34,264	83.3%	15,964	36.6%	27,613	63.4%
GENDER	32,516	79.1%	8,603	20.9%	34,275	78.7%	9,302	21.3%
Race (combined)	23,864	58.0%	17,242	41.9%	24,397	56.0%	19,178	44.0%
DOB	9,374	22.8%	31,745	77.2%	9,660	22.2%	33,917	77.8%
Adult	64,563	100%			66,887	100%		
ARREST	41,776	64.7%	22,787	35.3%	40,172	60.1%	26,715	39.9%
LES12AREST	13,580	21.0%	50,983	79.0%	22,832	34.1%	44,055	65.9%
LES12PSTAREST	13,318	20.6%	51,245	79.4%	22,275	33.3%	44,612	66.7%
MOR12AREST	15,393	23.8%	49,170	76.2%	31,714	47.4%	35,173	52.6%
MOR12PSTAREST	15,153	23.5%	49,410	76.5%	31,235	46.7%	35,652	53.3%
GENDER	42,720	66.2%	21,843	33.8%	42,002	62.8%	24,885	37.2%
Race (combined)	38,521	59.7%	26,042	40.3%	37,762	56.5%	29,125	43.5%
DOB	43,354	67.1%	21,209	32.9%	45,689	68.3%	21,198	31.7%
Older Adult	4,926	100%			5,900	100%		
ARREST	2,789	56.6%	2,137	43.4%	3,187	54.0%	2,713	46.0%
LES12AREST	828	16.8%	4,098	83.2%	1,461	24.8%	4,439	75.2%
LES12PSTAREST	818	16.6%	4,108	83.4%	1,431	24.3%	4,469	75.7%
MOR12AREST	1,172	23.8%	3,754	76.2%	2,735	46.4%	3,165	53.6%
MOR12PSTAREST	1,131	23.0%	3,795	77.0%	2,653	45.0%	3,247	55.0%
GENDER	3,062	62.2%	1,864	37.8%	3,561	60.4%	2,339	39.6%
Race (combined)	2,811	57.1%	2,115	42.9%	3,232	54.8%	2,668	45.2%
DOB	3,064	62.2%	1,862	37.8%	3,611	61.2%	2,289	38.8%

		Fiscal Year & Number of Cases per Variable							
Database	Variables	FY 08-09				FY 09-10			
		Valid		Missing		Valid		Missing	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
DCR	Total Consumers (PAF + KET + 3M)	20,363	100%			26,975	100%		
	PAF Total	10,277	50.5%	0	0.0%	12,765	47.3%	0	0.0%
	ArrestPrior12 - Arrest prior to past 12 months	10,091	49.6%	186	0.9%	12,513	46.4%	252	0.9%
	ArrestPast12 - Arrested during past 12 months	9,774	48.0%	503	2.5%	12,563	46.6%	202	0.7%
	Race/Ethnic	9,645	47.4%	632	3.1%	11,881	44.0%	884	3.3%
	Age Group	10,277	50.5%	0	0.0%	12,765	47.3%	0	0.0%
	Gender	9,898	48.6%	379	1.9%	12,173	45.1%	592	2.2%
	1st KET Cases	12,393	60.9%	0	0.0%	16,827	62.4%	0	0.0%
	DateArrested	275	1.4%	10	0.0%	279	1.0%	7	0.0%

	2nd KET Cases	7,055	34.6%	0	0.0%	8,906	33.0%	0	0.0%
	DateArrested	153	0.8%	6	0.0%	143	0.5%	5	0.0%
	3rd KET Cases	4,739	23.3%	0	0.0%	5,779	21.4%	0	0.0%
	DateArrested	112	0.6%	2	0.0%	116	0.4%	6	0.0%
	4th KET Cases	3,496	17.2%	0	0.0%	3,987	14.8%	0	0.0%
	DateArrested	89	0.4%	0	0.0%	74	0.3%	0	0.0%
	5+ KET Cases	2,622	12.9%	0	0.0%	2,852	10.6%	0	0.0%
	DateArrested	206	1.0%	5	0.0%	253	0.9%	1	0.0%
	KET Total (consumers)	12,393	60.9%	0	0.0%	16,827	62.4%	0	0.0%
	DateArrested	700	3.4%	22	0.1%	739	2.7%	18	0.1%
	Race/Ethnic	11,629	57.1%	764	3.8%	15,825	58.7%	1,002	3.7%
Age Group	12,393	60.9%	0	0.0%	16,827	62.4%	0	0.0%	
Gender	11,966	58.8%	427	2.1%	16,225	60.1%	602	2.2%	
CPS	Youth	29,908	100%						
	ARREST	0	0.0%	29,908	100.0%				
	LES12AREST	16,243	54.3%	13,665	45.7%				
	LES12PSTAREST	15,845	53.0%	14,063	47.0%				
	MOR12AREST	13,077	43.7%	16,831	56.3%				
	MOR12PSTAREST	12,550	42.0%	17,358	58.0%				
	GENDER	23,730	79.3%	6,178	20.7%				
	Race (combined)	18,054	60.4%	11,771	39.4%				
	DOB	24,883	83.2%	5,025	16.8%				
	Family	49,859	100%			1,118	100%		
	ARREST	0	0.0%	49,859	100.0%	0	0.0%	1,118	100.0%
	LES12AREST	25,671	51.5%	24,188	48.5%	610	54.6%	508	45.4%
	LES12PSTAREST	0	0.0%	49,859	100.0%	588	52.6%	530	47.4%
	MOR12AREST	19,065	38.2%	30,794	61.8%	710	63.5%	408	36.5%
	MOR12PSTAREST	18,207	36.5%	31,652	63.5%	694	62.1%	424	37.9%
	GENDER	39,317	78.9%	10,542	21.1%	1,072	95.9%	46	4.1%
	Race (combined)	27,828	55.8%	21,906	43.9%	912	81.6%	206	18.4%
	DOB	11,746	23.6%	38,113	76.4%	1,049	93.8%	69	6.2%
	Adult	67,792	100%			1,623	100%		
	ARREST	42,092	62.1%	25,700	37.9%	1,578	97.2%	45	2.8%
	LES12AREST	23,175	34.2%	44,617	65.8%	698	43.0%	925	57.0%
	LES12PSTAREST	22,627	33.4%	45,165	66.6%	684	42.1%	939	57.9%
	MOR12AREST	32,063	47.3%	35,729	52.7%	1,285	79.2%	338	20.8%
	MOR12PSTAREST	31,636	46.7%	36,156	53.3%	1,269	78.2%	354	21.8%
	GENDER	42,905	63.3%	24,887	36.7%	1,578	97.2%	45	2.8%
	Race (combined)	38,476	56.8%	28,412	41.9%	1,458	89.8%	165	10.2%
	DOB	47,242	69.7%	20,550	30.3%	1,499	92.4%	124	7.6%
	Older Adult	9,646	100%			2,522	100%		
	ARREST	6,116	63.4%	3,530	36.6%	2,304	91.4%	218	8.6%
	LES12AREST	2,617	27.1%	7,029	72.9%	842	33.4%	1,680	66.6%
	LES12PSTAREST	2,605	27.0%	7,041	73.0%	827	32.8%	1,695	67.2%
	MOR12AREST	5,255	54.5%	4,391	45.5%	2,005	79.5%	517	20.5%
	MOR12PSTAREST	5,153	53.4%	4,493	46.6%	1,984	78.7%	538	21.3%
GENDER	6,675	69.2%	2,971	30.8%	2,390	94.8%	132	5.2%	

Race (combined)	6,013	62.3%	3,577	37.1%	2,200	87.2%	322	12.8%
DOB	6,886	71.4%	2,760	28.6%	2,283	90.5%	239	9.5%

		Fiscal Year & Number of Cases per Variable							
Database	Variables	FY 10-11				FY 11-12			
		Valid		Missing		Valid		Missing	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
DCR	Total Consumers (PAF + KET + 3M)	29,045	100%			25,553	100%		
	PAF Total	10,710	36.9%	0	0.0%	8,118	31.8%	0	0.0%
	ArrestPrior12 - Arrest prior to past 12 months	10,413	35.9%	297	1.0%	7,873	30.8%	245	1.0%
	ArrestPast12 - Arrested during past 12 months	10,428	35.9%	282	1.0%	7,821	30.6%	297	1.2%
	Race/Ethnic	8,818	30.4%	1,892	6.5%	6,885	26.9%	1,233	4.8%
	Age Group	10,710	36.9%	0	0.0%	8,118	31.8%	0	0.0%
	Gender	10,082	34.7%	628	2.2%	7,394	28.9%	724	2.8%
	1st KET Cases	19,680	67.8%	0	0.0%	16,622	65.0%	0	0.0%
	DateArrested	334	1.1%	3	0.0%	289	1.1%	2	0.0%
	2nd KET Cases	10,276	35.4%	0	0.0%	8,977	35.1%	0	0.0%
	DateArrested	192	0.7%	1	0.0%	151	0.6%	0	0.0%
	3rd KET Cases	6,745	23.2%	0	0.0%	5,825	22.8%	0	0.0%
	DateArrested	151	0.5%	0	0.0%	137	0.5%	0	0.0%
	4th KET Cases	4,731	16.3%	0	0.0%	4,171	16.3%		
	DateArrested	100	0.3%	4	0.0%	79	0.3%	1	0.0%
	5+ KET Cases	3,403	11.7%	0	0.0%	3,103	12.1%	0	0.0%
	DateArrested	292	1.0%	3	0.0%	261	1.0%	4	0.0%
	KET Total (consumers)	19,680	67.8%	0	0.0%	16,622	65.0%	0	0.0%
	DateArrested	874	3.0%	11	0.0%	748	2.9%	7	0.0%
	Race/Ethnic	16,572	57.1%	3,108	10.7%	14,640	57.3%	1,982	7.8%
Age Group	19,680	67.8%	0	0.0%	16,622	65.0%	0	0.0%	
Gender	18,940	65.2%	740	2.5%	15,723	61.5%	899	3.5%	
CPS	Youth	2,576	100%			2,733	100%		
	ARREST	0	0.0%	2,576	100.0%				
	LES12AREST	1,525	59.2%	1,051	40.8%	1,808	66.2%	925	33.8%
	LES12PSTAREST	1,505	58.4%	1,071	41.6%	1,756	64.3%	977	35.7%
	MOR12AREST	950	36.9%	1,626	63.1%	1,538	56.3%	1,195	43.7%
	MOR12PSTAREST	916	35.6%	1,660	64.4%	1,476	54.0%	1,257	46.0%
	GENDER	2,532	98.3%	44	1.7%	2,450	89.6%	283	10.4%
	Race (combined)	1,393	54.1%	1,183	45.9%	1,986	72.7%	747	27.3%
	DOB	2,576	100.0%	0	0.0%	2,428	88.8%	305	11.2%
	Family	8,552	100%			3,428			
	ARREST	0	0.0%	8,552	100.0%				
	LES12AREST	4,259	49.8%	4,293	50.2%	2,239	65.3%	1,189	34.7%
	LES12PSTAREST	4,217	49.3%	4,335	50.7%	2,181	63.6%	1,247	36.4%
	MOR12AREST	2,230	26.1%	6,322	73.9%	1,681	49.0%	1,747	51.0%
	MOR12PSTAREST	2,136	25.0%	6,416	75.0%	1,611	47.0%	1,817	53.0%
	GENDER	6,888	80.5%	1,664	19.5%	3,219	93.9%	209	6.1%

Race (combined)	4,262	49.8%	4,290	50.2%	2,412	70.4%	1,016	29.6%
DOB	6,972	81.5%	1,580	18.5%	3,199	93.3%	229	6.7%
Adult	6,344	100%			10,665	100%		
ARREST	2,993	47.2%	3,351	52.8%	7,579	71.1%	3,086	28.9%
LES12AREST	2,587	40.8%	3,757	59.2%	5,619	52.7%	5,046	47.3%
LES12PSTAREST	2,520	39.7%	3,824	60.3%	5,470	51.3%	5,195	48.7%
MOR12AREST	3,408	53.7%	2,936	46.3%	7,561	70.9%	3,104	29.1%
MOR12PSTAREST	3,375	53.2%	2,969	46.8%	7,471	70.1%	3,194	29.9%
GENDER	5,685	89.6%	659	10.4%	10,143	95.1%	522	4.9%
Race (combined)	4,159	65.6%	2,185	34.4%	8,890	83.4%	1,684	15.8%
DOB	5,863	92.4%	481	7.6%	9,166	85.9%	1,499	14.1%
Older Adult	749	100%			1,278	100%		
ARREST	308	41.1%	441	58.9%	750	58.7%	528	41.3%
LES12AREST	249	33.2%	500	66.8%	531	41.5%	747	58.5%
LES12PSTAREST	246	32.8%	503	67.2%	517	40.5%	761	59.5%
MOR12AREST	405	54.1%	344	45.9%	921	72.1%	357	27.9%
MOR12PSTAREST	400	53.4%	349	46.6%	891	69.7%	387	30.3%
GENDER	676	90.3%	73	9.7%	1,209	94.6%	69	5.4%
Race (combined)	445	59.4%	304	40.6%	1,075	84.1%	196	15.3%
DOB	688	91.9%	61	8.1%	1,121	87.7%	157	12.3%

Implications for Indicator Calculation

Review of DCR data suggests that “key even tracking” (KET) updates are not routinely or reliably collected. As such, it is difficult to determine for consumers with no arrest data whether they were not arrested or there were in fact arrests that went unrecorded by KET instrument.

In addition, the CPS survey underwent changes in both content and sampling methodology, which makes comparison across years problematic. In particular, questions relevant to arrest changed in May of 2007. Prior to this change, there was a single question that asked for the number of arrests in the past month. The change removed this question and added four new items, regarding whether there were any arrests during particular time periods. This makes any analysis incomparable across this time period.

There was also a change in sampling methodology reflected in the FY 2009-10 survey administrations and beyond. Changes in the sampling strategy have produced data that are particularly problematic for comparisons at the county level. For example, in FY 2009-10 county identification was not collected, and in subsequent FYs there are some counties not represented in the CPS database at all.

Recommended Calculations

1) *Percentage of sample of all mental health service consumers with reported arrest (CPS):*

- a. in services for one year or less with reported arrest during the 12 months prior to the start of services, and*
- b. in services for more than one year, with reported arrest during the last 12 months.*

These proportions would provide insight into the prevalence of arrests within different subsets of consumers. Comparison across years would allow for examination of trends for changes in prevalence of arrests. This would not account for changes due to CPS sampling variability.

2) Percentage of FSP consumers with reported arrest (DCR):

- a. prior to the past year (PAF),**
- b. during the past year (PAF),**
- c. during the past year but not previously (PAF), and**
- d. during the current service year (KET).**

These proportions tracked across FYs would provide insight into the efficacy of FSP programs to reduce the prevalence of arrests, including examination of recidivism.

Priority Indicator 5: Demographic Profile of Consumers Served

Indicator Definition

This indicator profiles the demographics (race/ethnicity, age, and gender) of all mental health consumers and Full Service Partnership consumers served during FYs 2004-05 through 2011-12.

Recommended Data for Calculating Indicator

Client & Service Information (CSI) Data Fields:

- H-01.0 County / City / Mental Health Plan Submitting Record
- H-02.0 County Client Number
- C-05.0 Gender
- Ethnicity_A and Ethnicity_B: these variables do not appear in the CSI data dictionary but are from the Data Infrastructure Grant database and represent race/ethnicity for public mental health system clients that entered the system prior to 2006.
- C-09.0 Ethnicity
- C-10.0 Race: there are currently five race variables that appear in the dataset in various combinations depending upon the fiscal year.
- S-23.0 Date of Service
- C-03.0 Date of Birth
- Age Group: this variable appears in the dataset as of FY 2006-07.

Data Collection and Reporting (DCR) Data Fields:

- 1.01 Global ID
- 1.02 Assessment ID
- 1.04 Date Partnership Status Change
- 1.05 Partnership Status
- 1.07 Age Group
- 1.08 Assessment Type
- 2.01 CSI Date of Birth
- 2.02 Gender
- 2.03 CSIRace1
- 2.04 CSIRace2
- 2.05 CSIRace3
- 2.06 CSIRace4
- 2.07 CSIRace5
- 2.10 CSI Hispanic: this variable is also called ethnicity
- 3.01 County ID
- 3.05 Partnership Date
- 3.06 Assessment Date

Completeness & Quality of Recommended Data

Ethnicity_A and Ethnicity_B: these variables do not appear in the DCR data dictionary but are from the Data Infrastructure Grant database and represent race/ethnicity for public mental health system clients that entered the system prior to 2006.

Flattening CSI and DCR

A process known as “flattening” was conducted. After merging the Client and Service (CSI) or PAF, 3M and KET files (DCR), a special identification number was created for each record by concatenating H-02.0 County Client Number and H-01.0 County / City / Mental Health Plan Submitting Record (CSI) or 3.01 County ID and 1.01 Global ID (DCR). This unique identifier ensures that any H-01.0 County / City / Mental Health Plan Submitting Record or 1.01 Global ID that may inadvertently been the same between counties is not confused because the H-02.0 County Client Number or 3.01 County ID at the beginning of the new identifier will be unique to the county. Any duplicate records due to other administrations are automatically identified and merged into the single record for each individual as part of the “flattening” process. The flattening process therefore eliminates any subsequent administrations for the same identification number and ensures they are contained within a single individual’s record.

Within the DCR, however, UCLA encountered individuals with the same name, date of birth, but had been assigned new identification numbers. These duplicates could not be handled through the flattening process and are discussed separately.

Removal of Additional Duplicate Records within the DCR

After merging the PAF, 3M and KET files, a sort command was executed using last name, first name and County ID as the variables. A research assistant reviewed the files and flagged all records in which the last name, first name and CSI Date of Birth were identical. A senior analyst then reviewed the log and deleted duplicate records using the following logic:

- Last name, first name, date of birth and county must be identical. If County ID was different the case was retained. In all likelihood the same person moved to a different county.
- When a duplicate was identified, the record with Partnership Date and Assessment Dates falling outside the fiscal year was deleted.
- If Partnership Date and Assessment Dates in both records fell within the same fiscal year, Partnership Status was examined and records with Inactive status were deleted.
- If Partnership Date and Assessment Dates in both records were identical but one record had missing data (gender) and/or invalid Date of Birth (1582 seemed to be a popular date for some reason), the record with missing and/or invalid data was deleted.
- If both records were identical, one was chosen at random for deletion.

The additional labor for FY 2004-05 through 2011-12 to complete this step was 40 hours in total. Client-level indicators retained these duplicates. The Evaluation Advisory Group can explore the difference between the System-level and Client-level and determine whether the level of effort merits this extra step.

Database	Variables	FY 04-05				FY 05-06			
		Valid		Missing		Valid		Missing	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
DCR	Total (PAF)					295	100%	*	*
	Race/Ethnic					286	96.9%	9	3.1%
	Ethnicity_A					252	88.1%	34	11.9%
	Ethnicity_B					1	0.3%	285	99.7%
	Ethnicity					124	43.4%	162	56.6%
	Race1					108	37.8%	178	62.2%
	Race2					2	0.7%	284	99.3%
	Race3					0	0.0%	286	100%
	Race4					0	0.0%	286	100%
	Race5					0	0.0%	286	100%
	Age Group					294	99.7%	1	0.3%
	Gender					294	99.7%	1	0.3%
CSI	Total (CSI)	663,882	100%	*	*	666,338	100%	*	*
	Race/Ethnic	460,044	69.3%	203,838	30.7%	617,647	92.7%	48,691	7.3%
	Ethnicity_A	341,272	74.2%	118,772	25.8%	512,468	83.0%	105,179	17.0%
	Ethnicity_B	8,305	1.8%	451,739	98.2%	11,269	1.8%	606,378	98.2%
	Ethnicity	169,516	36.8%	290,528	63.15%	214,606	34.7%	403,041	65.3%
	Race1	147,911	32.2%	312,133	67.85%	186,701	30.2%	430,946	69.8%
	Race2	6,714	1.5%	453,330	98.5%	8,329	1.3%	609,318	98.7%
	Race3	309	0.1%	459,735	99.9%	386	0.1%	617,261	99.9%
	Race4	21	0.005%	460,023	99.995%	33	0.005%	617,614	99.9947%
	Race5	2	0.0004%	460,042	99.9996%	3	0.0005%	617,644	99.9995%
	Age Group	448,941	67.6%	214,941	32.4%	666,289	99.99%	49	0.01%
	Gender	447,982	67.5%	215,900	32.5%	664,481	99.7%	1,857	0.3%

Database	Variables	FY 06-07				FY 07-08			
		Valid		Missing		Valid		Missing	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
DCR	Total (PAF)	4,427	100%	*	*	12,992	100%	*	*
	Race/Ethnic	4,238	95.7%	189	4.3%	12,352	95.1%	640	4.9%
	Ethnicity_A	2,787	65.8%	1,451	34.2%	8,547	69.2%	3,805	30.8%
	Ethnicity_B	58	1.4%	4,180	98.6%	137	1.1%	12,215	98.9%
	Ethnicity	2,529	59.7%	1,709	40.3%	6,773	54.8%	5,579	45.2%
	Race1	1,903	44.9%	2,335	55.1%	5,345	43.3%	7,007	56.7%
	Race2	100	2.4%	4,138	97.6%	288	2.3%	12,064	97.7%
	Race3	9	0.2%	4,229	99.8%	27	0.2%	12,325	99.8%
	Race4	0	0.0%	4,238	100%	0	0.0%	12,352	100%
	Race5	0	0.0%	4,238	100%	0	0.0%	12,352	100%
	Age Group	4,422	99.9%	5	0.1%	12,966	99.8%	26	0.2%
	Gender	4,351	98.3%	76	1.7%	12,620	97.1%	372	2.9%
CSI	Total (CSI)	656,908	100%	*	*	674,211	100%	*	*
	Race/Ethnic	615,352	93.7%	41,556	6.3%	630,315	93.5%	43,896	6.5%
	Ethnicity_A	391,594	63.6%	223,758	36.4%	369,512	58.6%	260,803	41.4%
	Ethnicity_B								*
	Ethnicity	348,434	56.6%	266,918	43.4%	375,620	59.6%	254,695	40.4%
	Race1	304,405	49.5%	310,947	50.5%	319,465	50.7%	310,850	49.3%
	Race2								
	Race3								
	Race4								
	Race5								
	Age Group	656,852	99.99%	56	0.01%	674,140	99.99%	71	0.01%
	Gender	654,503	99.6%	2,405	0.4%	671,760	99.7%	2,451	0.4%

Database	Variables	FY 08-09				FY 09-10			
		Valid		Missing		Valid		Missing	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
DCR	Total (PAF)	20,242	100%	*	*	26,946	100%	*	*
	Race/Ethnic	19,292	95.3%	950	4.7%	25,620	95.1%	1,326	4.9%
	Ethnicity_A	12,498	64.8%	6,794	35.2%	16,228	63.3%	9,392	36.7%
	Ethnicity_B	253	1.3%	19,039	98.7%	380	1.5%	25,240	98.5%
	Ethnicity	10,892	56.5%	8,400	43.5%	16,166	63.1%	9,454	36.9%
	Race1	8,616	44.7%	10,676	55.3%	12,213	47.7%	13,407	52.3%
	Race2	505	2.6%	18,787	97.4%	659	2.6%	24,961	97.4%
	Race3	40	0.2%	19,252	99.8%	52	0.2%	25,568	99.8%
	Race4	5	0.03%	19,287	99.97%	6	0.02%	25,614	99.98%
	Race5	0	0.0%	19,292	100%	0	0.0%	25,620	100%
	Age Group	20,214	99.9%	28	0.1%	26,899	99.8%	47	0.2%
	Gender	19,676	97.2%	566	2.8%	26,084	96.8%	862	3.2%
CSI	Total (CSI)	674,074	100%	*	*	675,772	100%	*	*
	Race/Ethnic	638,645	94.7%	35,429	5.3%	630,102	93.5%	43,896	6.5%
	Ethnicity_A	352,856	55.3%	285,789	44.7%	314,083	49.8%	316,019	50.2%
	Ethnicity_B			**	**			**	**
	Ethnicity	385,500	60.4%	253,145	39.6%	390,129	61.9%	239,973	38.1%
	Race1	321,632	50.4%	317,013	49.6%	317,127	50.3%	312,975	49.7%
	Race2			**	**			**	**
	Race3			**	**			**	**
	Race4			**	**			**	**
	Race5			**	**			**	**
	Age Group	673,941	99.98%	133	0.02%	610,077	90.3%	65,695	9.7%
	Gender	672,519	99.8%	1,555	0.2%	674,800	99.7%	972	0.1%

Database	Variables	FY 10-11				FY 11-12			
		Valid		Missing		Valid		Missing	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
DCR	Total (PAF)	28,887	100%	*	*	25,395	100%	*	*
	Race/Ethnic	23,863	82.6%	5,024	17.4%	21,540	84.8%	3,855	15.2%
	Ethnicity_A	12,621	52.9%	11,242	47.1%	9,638	44.7%	11,902	55.3%
	Ethnicity_B	398	1.7%	23,465	98.3%	365	1.7%	21,175	98.3%
	Ethnicity	19,025	79.7%	4,838	20.3%	18,361	85.2%	3,179	14.8%
	Race1	13,580	56.9%	10,283	43.1%	13,331	61.9%	8,209	38.1%
	Race2	735	3.1%	23,128	96.9%	777	3.6%	20,763	96.4%
	Race3	54	0.2%	23,809	99.8%	63	0.3%	21,477	99.7%
	Race4	3	0.01%	23,860	99.99%	3	0.01%	21,537	99.99%
	Race5	2	0.01%	23,861	99.99%	2	0.01%	21,538	99.99%
	Age Group	28,828	99.8%	59	0.2%	25,349	99.8%	46	0.2%
	Gender	27,920	96.7%	967	3.3%	24,178	95.2%	1,217	4.8%
CSI	Total (CSI)	688,035	100%	*	*	663,803	100%	*	*
	Race/Ethnic	627,230	91.2%	60,805	8.8%	437,585	93.5%	43,896	6.5%
	Ethnicity_A	260,511	41.5%	366,719	58.5%				
	Ethnicity_B			**	**			**	**
	Ethnicity	411,751	65.6%	215,479	34.4%	398,876	91.2%	38,709	8.8%
	Race1	336,371	53.6%	290,859	46.4%	289,520	66.2%	148,065	33.8%
	Race2			**	**	13,523	3.1%	424,062	96.9%
	Race3			**	**	1,081	0.2%	436,504	99.8%
	Race4			**	**	107	0.02%	437,478	99.98%
	Race5			**	**	13	0.003%	437,572	99.997%
	Age Group	529,506	77.0%	158,529	23.0%	661,058	99.6%	2,745	0.4%
	Gender	687,089	99.9%	946	0.1%	662,773	99.7%	1,030	0.2%

Notes:

- 1) Missing is not applicable (complete dataset)
- 2) Race/Ethnic in every fiscal year is a created variable representing a recode (including a complex series of Boolean logic commands) of concatenated variables Ethnicity_A + Ethnicity_B and Ethnicity + Race1 + Race2 + Race3 + Race4 + Race5.
- 3) As of FY 06-07, UCLA received the race/ethnic data in a format that no longer allowed breakout of into eight race and ethnic variables. The data reported in the table above represents post-concatenation. See the report appendix for further discussion.

- 4) In FY 11-12 race-ethnic was broken out again into single variables as in FY 04-05 and FY 05-06. The old DIG variables (Ethnicity_A and Ethnicity_B) are not included in the FY 11-12 breakouts for illustrative purposes in order to show the proportion of race-ethnic data that rely upon this variable
- 5) Missing in each of the Ethnic/Race variables includes "unknown" response
- 6) Age Group in FY 04-05, 05-06 & 11-12 is a created variable, using a combination of date of birth and intake date
- 7) Gender Missing (CSI & DCR) includes "Other" in all FY

Implications for Indicator Calculation

Race/Ethnic:

Race and ethnicity posed the greatest challenge because the information is contained within seven discrete variables. These seven variables are used in both the CSI and DCR calculations:

- Ethnicity_A (DIG variable for public mental health clients who entered the system prior to 2006)
- Ethnicity_B (see above)
- Ethnicity
- Race_1
- Race_2
- Race_3
- Race_4
- Race_5

In FY 2006-07 through 2009-10, the CSI DIG variables appeared as a concatenated variable (combination of Ethnicity A and B) in the CSI and DCR. In 2006-07 and 2009-10, Race_1 through Race_5 appeared as a concatenated variable in the CSI only. Alternative programming language was written to accommodate these changes, and the original programming language used when the variables again were broken out as in FY 2004-05, 2005-06, and 2010-11 and 2011-2012.

Because race and ethnicity information is contained across seven different variables, as of FY 2011-12 there are over 2,500 concatenated combinations of race/ethnicity that UCLA has programmed. The total programming time required for these combinations (to date) has equaled approximately 250 hours. The indicator table illustrates the number of individuals in the CSI and DCR databases that endorse each variable. The implications are addressed below under "Recommendations."

In addition, the DIG variables are used in each FY except for FY 2010-11 and 2011-12 (DHCS did not provide them in these fiscal years) in order to minimize the amount of missing data. The two DIG variables represent two of the seven race-ethnic variables. As a result of the two DIG variables' absence in FY 2010-11 and 2011-12, the proportion of missing data for race/ethnicity rises.

Gender:

The percentage of clients that endorse "other" is typically one percent or less. "Other" has therefore been re-coded in the CSI and DCR "Missing" because it will not show up in any meaningful way in a trend chart.

Age Group:

Age Group was not included as a variable in the CSI in FY 2004-05 and FY 2005-06 so UCLA created the variable through a combination of Date of Birth and Partnership Date. Age at the time of Partnership Date was used to create Age Group. The CSI Age Group was used in subsequent years.

As of FY 2008-09, the amount of missing data for Age Group in the DCR was near 50 percent so UCLA created Age Group using the same methodology as explained above. In addition, the FY 2008-

09 Age Group DCR variable contained out of range values that didn't correspond to any known DCR data dictionary values (e.g., 12). Because missing for Age Group in subsequent years remained above 25 percent, UCLA retained the method of creating a new Age Group variable rather than relying upon the DCR variable.

Recommended Calculation

Race/Ethnicity:

1. The law of diminishing returns applies when the number of respondents endorsing Race_4 and Race_5 is examined. When a respondent chooses Race_3 it is typically recoded to "multirace", so adding Race_4 and Race_5 doesn't provide any additional useful information (and only will add to programming time).

Recommendation: Drop Race_4 and Race_5 from the CSI and the DCR.

Gender:

2. Although "Other" is rarely endorsed, there are sensitivities around retaining this category and minimal programming is required to re-code it to "missing" if the percentages are too low to display in any meaningful way.

Recommendation: No change to "Gender."

Age Group:

3. The percentage of missing and out of range data in the DCR as of FY 08-09 and missing data in the CSI generally are of concern.

Recommendation: Calculate Age Group using methodology applied by UCLA to the DCR in FY 2008-09 through FY 2011-12 (and to the CSI in 2004-05 and 2006-07)

Priority Indicator 6: Demographic Profile of New Consumers

Indicator Definition

This indicator profiles new mental health consumers (i.e., served during a FY, without service for prior six months) overall and full service partners (FSPs) served during FYs 2004-05 through 2011-12.

Recommended Data for Calculating Indicator

Client & Service Information (CSI) Data Fields:

- H-01.0 County / City / Mental Health Plan Submitting Record
- H-02.0 County Client Number
- C-05.0 Gender
- Ethnicity_A and Ethnicity_B: these variables do not appear in the CSI data dictionary but are from the Data Infrastructure Grant database and represent race/ethnicity for public mental health system clients that entered the system prior to 2006.
- C-09.0 Ethnicity
- C-10.0 Race: there are currently five race variables that appear in the dataset in various combinations depending upon the fiscal year.
- S-23.0 Date of Service
- C-03.0 Date of Birth
- Age Group: this variable appears in the dataset as of FY 2006-07.

Data Collection and Reporting (DCR) Data Fields:

- 1.01 Global ID
- 1.02 Assessment ID
- 1.04 Date Partnership Status Change
- 1.05 Partnership Status
- 1.07 Age Group
- 1.08 Assessment Type
- 2.01 CSI Date of Birth
- 2.02 Gender
- 2.03 CSIRace1
- 2.04 CSIRace2
- 2.05 CSIRace3
- 2.06 CSIRace4
- 2.07 CSIRace5
- 2.10 CSI Hispanic: this variable is also called ethnicity
- 3.01 County ID
- 3.05 Partnership Date
- 3.06 Assessment Date

Completeness & Quality of Recommended Data

In order to examine whether or not a person was served during the previous six months, each data file (CSI and DCR) was merged with the fiscal year immediately preceding. For the DCR the merge was conducted without difficulty. For the CSI, the following difficulties emerged for FYs 2005-06 and FYs 2011-12 because of inconsistencies in formulation of Client ID:

- In most fiscal years, Client ID is akin to the Global Identification Number in the DCR and represents a unique identifier for each individual. However, in FYs 2005-06, the dataset came to UCLA with Client ID appearing to be a concatenation of Client ID and H-01.0 County / City / Mental Health Plan Submitting Record. Under ordinary circumstances we could create a concatenated variable in the later fiscal year and the merge would proceed without incident. Unfortunately, spaces at odd intervals were included in this revised version of Client ID, making even a concatenated version on our end incompatible with a merge.
- County ID was not provided as a separate variable. This means the evaluation team will have to extract it from the concatenated variable (and shrink the Client ID) in order use the Client ID for merging with FY 2006-07.

Database	Variables	FY 04-05		FY 05-06		FY 06-07		FY 07-08	
		Valid		Valid		Valid		Valid	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
DCR	Total (PAF)			295	100%	4,427	100%	12,992	100%
	New Consumers			258	87.5%	4,219	95.3%	9,208	70.9%
	Continuing Consumers			37	12.5%	208	4.7%	3,784	29.1%
CSI	Total (CSI)	663,882	100%	666,338	100%	656,908	100%	674,211	100%
	New Consumers			282,544	42.4%	277,709	42.3%	288,569	42.8%
	Continuing Consumers			383,794	57.6%	379,199	57.7%	385,642	57.2%

Database	Variables	FY 08-09		FY 09-10		FY 10-11		FY 11-12	
		Valid		Valid		Valid		Valid	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
DCR	Total (PAF)	20,242	100%	26,946	100%	28,887	100%	25,395	100%
	New Consumers	10,230	50.5%	12,751	47.3%	7,430	25.7%	8,064	31.8%
	Continuing Consumers	10,012	49.5%	14,195	52.7%	21,457	74.3%	17,331	68.2%
CSI	Total (CSI)	674,074	100%	675,772	100%	688,035	100%	663,803	100%
	New Consumers	284,381	42.2%	286,733	42.4%	283,693	41.2%	296,712	44.7%
	Continuing Consumers	389,693	57.8%	389,039	57.6%	404,342	58.8%	367,091	55.3%

Notes

- 1) DCR FY 04-05 too few cases (see Indicator 5)
- 2) CSI FY 04-05 no previous year to compare to

Implications for Indicator Calculation

None noted.

Recommended Calculation

No recommendations at this time regarding the indicator, which will yield useful and interesting information about turnover within the public mental health system (note the consistency across fiscal years for the CSI in terms of the percentage of new consumers).

However, there is one recommendation related to data management:

Client ID: Recommend consistency in formatting and for DHCS to send non-concatenated identification numbers to MHSOAC. Analysts can easily create a concatenated variable if need be from county and client identification numbers so there is no need for DHCS to take this extra step (which ultimately creates more work for the analysts in the long run). In addition, the county identifier should always be provided with the dataset.

Priority Indicator 7: Penetration of Mental Health Services

Indicator Definition

This indicator details rates of service access relative to estimates of need for service among Californians earning less than 200 percent of the federal poverty income level. This metric is intended to show the extent to which service access is in line with the level of need for services.

Recommended Data for Calculating Indicator

For the purpose of this report, the number of all mental health consumers served and the number with estimated need for service (Holzer Targets) are presented. Demographic breakout frequencies are not repeated because they are contained in Indicator 5. The penetration rates for each demographic group will be presented in the spring report.

Client & Service Information (CSI) Data Fields:

- H-01.0 County / City / Mental Health Plan Submitting Record
- H-02.0 County Client Number
- Ethnicity_A and Ethnicity_B: these variables do not appear in the CSI data dictionary but are from the Data Infrastructure Grant database and represent race/ethnicity for public mental health system clients that entered the system prior to 2006.
- C-09.0 Ethnicity
- C-10.0 Race: there are currently five race variables that appear in the dataset in various combinations depending upon the fiscal year.
- S-23.0 Date of Service
- C-03.0 Date of Birth
- Age Group: this variable appears in the dataset as of FY 2006-07.
- C-05.0 Gender

Estimates of need for mental health services (Holzer Targets) among Californians earning less than 200% of the federal poverty income level.

Completeness & Quality of Recommended Data

The numbers served in each fiscal year as documented in the CSI should reflect those actually served by each county's public mental health system. However, anecdotal reports by some counties indicate that the CSI is not always kept up to date. Therefore, when a spike in numbers for a county occurs (for example, in FY 10-11 Fresno's numbers double compared to previous years), it calls into question whether the increase is due to data input (catching up on data submissions) or actual numbers of people served in FY 10-11.

UCLA recommends discussion with DHCS to determine whether the CSI data obtained to date is considered accurate and whether there is the possibility that CSI data processed for FY 2010-11 and FY 2011-12 may contain errors (e.g., some of the data received was meant to update earlier fiscal years and was instead attributed to FY 2010-11 and FY 2011-12).

Review of DCHS documentation (as of October 2, 2013) indicates that the following counties have not submitted complete data for FY 2011-12:

- Stanislaus
- Riverside
- Marin

In addition, those counties with obvious anomalies (i.e. variance of more than 25% in enrollment) should be queried as to the reason(s) for such variance. After determination is made, only those counties with CSI data that accurately and consistently reflects numbers of individuals served by the public mental health system should be included in calculation of this indicator.

Database	Variables	FY 04-05		FY 05-06		FY 06-07		FY 07-08	
		Valid		Valid		Valid		Valid	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CSI	Total CSI	663,882	100%	666,338	100%	656,908	100%	674,211	100%
Holzer Targets	Total Holzer	976,073	100%	666,333	100%	998,219	100%	1,008,487	100%

Database	Variables	FY 08-09		FY 09-10		FY 10-11		FY 11-12	
		Valid		Valid		Valid		Valid	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CSI	Total CSI	674,074	100%	675,772	100%	688,035	100%	663,803	100%
Holzer Targets	Total Holzer	1,018,138	100%	1,027,663	100%	1,037,560	100%	1,049,220	100%

Notes

- 1) See Indicator 5 for demographic breakouts
- 2) Missing is not applicable (complete dataset)

Implications for Indicator Calculation

The number of counties with CSI variation exceeding 25 percent seems confined to the most recent fiscal years – specifically FY 2010-11 and FY 2011-12. In addition, other than the two “baseline” years (FY 2004-05 and FY 2005-06), missing data issues impact these most recent fiscal years – specifically for race/ethnicity and age group (see the Indicator 5 discussion). Finally, Marin County is not in the FY 2011-12 CSI. These problems support our suspicion that the manner in which the CSI has been updated is at issue.

Recommended Calculation:

No new recommendations at this time – the indicator should be calculated as originally recommended. It provides useful information about the ability of California’s public mental health system to serve its intended target population. Examination of service penetration at the county-level is also possible. Stability over time in penetration rate (except for the anomalies in the CSI, noted above) support the reliability this indicator.

Priority Indicator 8: Access to a Primary Care Physician

Indicator Definition

This indicator details the level of access to a primary care physician reported among FSP consumers, during FYs 2004-05 through 2011-12.

Recommended Data for Calculating Indicator

Data Collection and Reporting (DCR) Data Fields:

- 1.01 Global ID
- 1.02 Assessment ID
- 1.04 Date Partnership Status Change
- 1.05 Partnership Status
- 1.07 Age Group
- 1.08 Assessment Type
- 2.01 CSI Date of Birth
- 2.02 Gender
- 2.03 CSIRace1
- 2.04 CSIRace2
- 2.05 CSIRace3
- 2.06 CSIRace4
- 2.07 CSIRace5
- 2.10 CSI Hispanic: this variable is also called ethnicity
- 3.01 County ID
- 3.05 Partnership Date
- 3.06 Assessment Date
- Ethnicity_A and Ethnicity_B: these variables do not appear in the DCR data dictionary but are from the Data Infrastructure Grant database and represent race/ethnicity for public mental health system clients that entered the system prior to 2006.
- 11.01 PhysicianCurr: This variable appears in the PAF (baseline) and is assessed again in the 3M.

Completeness & Quality of Recommended Data

The development of a composite variable (access to a primary care physician at any point during the 12 month period) minimized the amount of missing data.

Database	Variables	FY 04-05				FY 05-06			
		Valid		Missing		Valid		Missing	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
DCR	Total (PAF + 3M)					295	100%	*	*
	Total w/ Access					181	61.4%	1	0.3%
	PAF Total					295	100%	*	*
	PAF Total w/Access					170	57.6%	2	0.7%
	3M 1 Total					62	21.0%	233	79.0%
	3M 1 Total w/ Access					47	75.8%	233	79.0%

	3M 2 Total		6	2.0%	289	98.0%
	3M 2 Total w/Access		2	33.3%	289	98.0%
	3M 3 Total		3	1.0%	292	99.0%
	3M 3 Total w/ Access		0	0.0%	292	99.0%
	Race/Ethnic (Total w/Access)		174	96.1%	7	3.9%
	Age Group (Total w/Access)		180	99.4%	1	0.6%
	Gender (Total w/Access)		180	99.4%	1	0.6%

Database	Variables	FY 06-07				FY 07-08			
		Valid		Missing		Valid		Missing	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
DCR	Total (PAF + 3M)	4,427	100%	*	*	12,992	100%	*	*
	Total w/ Access	1,300	29.4%	2,449	55.3%	5,887	45.3%	4,780	36.8%
	PAF Total	4,427	100%	*	*	12,992	100%	*	*
	PAF Total w/Access	1,212	27.4%	2,467	55.7%	5,221	40.2%	2	0.0%
	3M 1 Total	668	15%	3,759	84.9%	5,264	40.5%	7,728	59.5%
	3M 1 Total w/ Access	438	65.6%	3,759	84.9%	3,485	75.8%	7,728	59.5%
	3M 2 Total	225	5.1%	4,202	94.9%	3,322	25.6%	9,670	74.4%
	3M 2 Total w/Access	155	68.9%	4,202	94.9%	2,229	33.3%	9,670	74.4%
	3M 3 Total	77	1.7%	4,350	98.3%	1,674	12.9%	11,318	87.1%
	3M 3 Total w/ Access	50	64.9%	4,350	98.3%	1,140	8.8%	11,318	87.1%
	Race/Ethnic (Total w/Access)	1,246	95.8%	54	4.2%	5,632	95.7%	255	4.3%
	Age Group (Total w/Access)	1,297	99.8%	3	0.2%	5,874	99.8%	13	0.2%
	Gender (Total w/Access)	1,281	98.5%	19	1.5%	5,769	98.0%	118	2.0%

Database	Variables	FY 08-09				FY 09-10			
		Valid		Missing		Valid		Missing	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
DCR	Total (PAF + 3M)	20,242	100%	*	*	26,946	100%	*	*
	Total w/ Access	10,812	53.4%	6,162	30.4%	16,197	60.1%	4,780	17.7%
	PAF Total	20,242	100%	*	*	26,946	100%	*	*
	PAF Total w/Access	9,386	46.4%	6,293	31.1%	14,339	53.2%	2	0.0%
	3M 1 Total	9,975	49.3%	10,267	50.7%	14,232	52.8%	12,714	47.2%
	3M 1 Total w/ Access	7,016	70.3%	10,267	50.7%	10,892	75.8%	12,714	47.2%
	3M 2 Total	7,146	35.3%	13,096	64.7%	10,178	37.8%	16,768	62.2%
	3M 2 Total w/Access	5,171	72.4%	13,096	64.7%	8,017	33.3%	16,768	62.2%
	3M 3 Total	4,656	23.0%	15,586	77.0%	5,767	21.4%	21,179	78.6%

	3M 3 Total w/ Access	3,468	74.5%	15,586	77.0%	4,596	17.1%	21,179	78.6%
	Race/Ethnic (Total w/Access)	10,401	96.2%	411	3.8%	15,556	96.0%	641	4.0%
	Age Group (Total w / Access)	10,793	99.8%	19	0.2%	16,172	99.8%	25	0.2%
	Gender (Total w / Access)	10,608	98.1%	204	1.9%	15,841	97.8%	356	2.2%

Database	Variables	FY 10-11				FY 11-12			
		Valid		Missing		Valid		Missing	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
DCR	Total (PAF + 3M)	28,887	100%	*	*	25,395	100%	*	*
	Total w/ Access	18,910	65.5%	6,162	21.3%	16,748	65.9%	4,780	18.8%
	PAF Total	28,887	100%	*	*	25,395	100%	*	*
	PAF Total w/Access	17,313	59.9%	6,293	21.8%	15,681	61.7%	2	0.0%
	3M 1 Total	16,429	56.9%	12,458	43.1%	12,631	49.7%	12,764	50.3%
	3M 1 Total w/ Access	13,220	80.5%	12,458	43.1%	10,652	75.8%	12,764	50.3%
	3M 2 Total	12,147	42.1%	16,740	57.9%	9,195	36.2%	16,200	63.8%
	3M 2 Total w/Access	9,998	82.3%	16,740	57.9%	7,901	33.3%	16,200	63.8%
	3M 3 Total	7,786	27.0%	21,101	73.0%	6,422	25.3%	18,973	74.7%
	3M 3 Total w/ Access	6,573	84.4%	21,101	73.0%	5,611	22.1%	18,973	74.7%
	Race/Ethnic (Total w/Access)	15,832	83.7%	3,078	16.3%	14,576	87.0%	2,172	13.0%
	Age Group (Total w/Access)	18,868	99.8%	42	0.2%	16,717	99.8%	31	0.2%
	Gender (Total w/Access)	18,432	97.5%	478	2.5%	16,117	96.2%	631	3.8%

* Missing is not applicable (complete dataset)

Implications for Indicator Calculation

Access to Physician:

A composite variable was created using PhysicianCurr at the PAF and all 3M follow up points collected within the fiscal year. If the FSP indicated access to a primary care physician at any data collection point, a value of “yes” was assigned. The importance of the follow up data collection becomes apparent when the breakout variables and the number reporting access to a primary care physician at each data collection point are examined.

Recommended Calculation:

No changes are recommended to the calculation of this indicator.

Priority Indicator 9: Perceptions of Access to Services

Indicator Definition

This indicator provides insight into consumer and family perceptions of access to mental health services, among a sample of those currently accessing the community mental health system.

Recommended Data for Calculating Indicator

Family members/caregivers and youth respondents' ratings (1–*Strongly Disagree* to 5–*Strongly Agree*) of two (2) self-report items (specified in the *Data Sources* section below) are averaged to calculate aggregate ratings of perceptions of access to mental health services. Ratings of 3.5 or greater generally indicate positive perceptions. This calculation method is in line with previous DHCS practices.

Adult and Older Adult respondents' ratings (1–*Strongly Disagree* to 5–*Strongly Agree*) of six (6) self-report items (specified under the *Data Sources* section below) are averaged to calculate aggregate ratings of perceptions of access to mental health services. Aggregate ratings were calculated for each fiscal year. This calculation method is in line with previous DHCS practices.

The variable name as it most commonly appears in the dataset is shown next to each survey question. Each question is identified by variable in the tables showing the number of respondents per variable (space limitations preclude display of the full question). It may be helpful to refer back to this brief summary when viewing the Indicator 9 summary table due to the number of survey questions and similarly-named variables.

Consumer Perception Surveys

- Family members/caregivers and youth self-report items analyzed (Youth and Family Member Surveys):
 - The location of services was convenient for us (LOCATION)
 - Services were available at times that were convenient for us (TIMEGOOD)
- Adult and older adult self-report items analyzed (MHSIP):
 - The location of services was convenient (parking, public transportation, distance, etc.) (LOCATION)
 - Staff were willing to see me as often as I felt it was necessary (STAFFWILL)
 - Staff returned my call in 24 hours (RETURNCALL)
 - Services were available at times that were good for me (TIMEGOOD)
 - I was able to get all the services I thought I needed (GETALL)
 - I was able to see a psychiatrist when I wanted to (SEEDOC)

The same individual can take the survey more than once within a fiscal year. In order to prevent duplicated individuals from biasing response patterns, only the first survey for each respondent was retained and summarized for this report.

A review of the potential to analyze individual respondent results over time was explored by analyzing FY 2004-05 and FY 2005-06 data. The two earliest fiscal years were selected because the number of survey respondents is largest in these years. UCLA's recommendation was not to pursue this analytic strategy because:

- the proportion of respondents with repeat surveys is low (see the following page for details) and

- repeat surveys were not collected in a strategic manner (i.e., respondents were not sought out for follow up in a systematic manner but rather were part of a convenience sample)

Below is the number of respondents (same individuals) that repeated the survey at the time of the second survey administration within the same fiscal year. This data is provided for illustrative purposes only. As previously noted, duplicated individuals were screened out of each fiscal year database prior to analysis.

FY 2004-05 Ns at the time of the second survey administration:

- Adults=6,134 (19.4%)
- Older Adults=362 (15.5%)
- Families=3,398 (16.3%)
- Youth=2,529 (17.4%)

FY 2005-06 Ns at the time of the second survey administration:

- Adults=6,904 (20.9%);
- Older Adults=365 (14.5%);
- Families=4,556 (19.4%);
- Youth=3,228 (19.2%)

The results of any study examining the same respondents over time should not be considered representative of public mental health consumers in California.

Completeness & Quality of Recommended Data

Race/Ethnic:

Race and Ethnicity information is contained within seven discrete variables. As is allowed in the DCR and CSI, a respondent may choose up to seven choices.

- American Indian
- Asian
- Black
- Hispanic
- Other
- Pacific Islander
- White

Because race and ethnicity information is contained across seven different variables, UCLA wrote programming to account for all of the various combinations of race-ethnicity. The various combinations include the addition of “multirace” as in the CSI and DCR.

Missing Data:

In order to calculate the indicator in each fiscal year, only respondents with complete data (i.e., no missing questions) were included.

Fiscal Years:

Only state-level analysis is possible in FY 2009-10 (random sample). UCLA recommended in the last report that data collected in FY 2008-09 and 2009-10 must be interpreted separately because a convenience sampling method was used to gather FY 2008-09 data and random sampling was used

to gather data in FY 2009-10.⁶ Examination of scores longitudinally (beginning with FY 2004-05) shaped our final recommendations regarding FY 2009-10 are addressed below.

County-by-county breakouts are likewise not presented for FY 2010-11 and FY 2011-12. Although convenience sampling resumed, anomalies in sample size and county participation (particularly in FY 2010-11) make county breakouts questionable. In addition, variations in scores and demographics (compared to the relatively stable period of time represented from FY 2004-05 through 2008-09) that characterized FY 2010-11 and FY 2011-12 are such that UCLA will only present statewide results at this time – and only for discussion purposes (see *Implications for Indicator Calculation and Recommended Calculation*).

Database	Variables	FY 04-05				FY 05-06			
		Valid		Missing		Valid		Missing	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CPS - Adults	Total (CPS)	50,310	100%	*	*	53,021	100%	*	*
	Total (Access)	31,693	63.0%	18,617	37.0%	33,053	62.3%	19,968	37.7%
	Timegood	31,693	63.0%	18,617	37.0%	33,053	62.3%	19,968	37.7%
	Location	31,693	63.0%	18,617	37.0%	33,053	62.3%	19,968	37.7%
	Staffwill	31,693	63.0%	18,617	37.0%	33,053	62.3%	19,968	37.7%
	Returncall	31,693	63.0%	18,617	37.0%	33,053	62.3%	19,968	37.7%
	Getservices	31,693	63.0%	18,617	37.0%	33,053	62.3%	19,968	37.7%
	Seepsychiatrist	31,693	63.0%	18,617	37.0%	33,053	62.3%	19,968	37.7%
	Race/Ethnic	28,596	90.2%	3,097	6.2%	29,929	90.5%	3,124	9.5%
	Gender	28,369	89.5%	3,324	6.6%	29,638	89.7%	3,415	10.3%
CPS - Older Adults	Total (CPS)	4,213	100%	*	*	4,546	100%	*	*
	Total (Access)	2,330	55.3%	1,883	44.7%	2,519	55.4%	2,027	44.6%
	Timegood	2,330	55.3%	1,883	44.7%	2,519	55.4%	2,027	44.6%
	Location	2,330	55.3%	1,883	44.7%	2,519	55.4%	2,027	44.6%
	Staffwill	2,330	55.3%	1,883	44.7%	2,519	55.4%	2,027	44.6%
	Returncall	2,330	55.3%	1,883	44.7%	2,519	55.4%	2,027	44.6%
	Getservices	2,330	55.3%	1,883	44.7%	2,519	55.4%	2,027	44.6%
	Seepsychiatrist	2,330	55.3%	1,883	44.7%	2,519	55.4%	2,027	44.6%
	Race/Ethnic	2,098	90.0%	232	5.5%	2,272	90.2%	247	9.8%
	Gender	2,081	89.3%	249	5.9%	2,220	88.1%	299	11.9%
F	Total (CPS)	27,223	100%	*	*	31,189	100%	*	*

⁶ Cowles, E. L., Harris, K., Larsen, C., and Prince, A. (2010). *Assessing Representativeness of the Mental Health Services Consumer Perception Survey*.

	Total (Access)	20,888	76.7%	6,335	23.3%	23,457	75.2%	7,732	24.8%
	Timegood	20,888	76.7%	6,335	23.3%	23,457	75.2%	7,732	24.8%
	Location	20,888	76.7%	6,335	23.3%	23,457	75.2%	7,732	24.8%
	Race/Ethnic	19,615	93.9%	1,273	6.1%	21,988	93.7%	1,469	6.3%
	Gender	19,804	94.8%	1,084	5.2%	22,302	95.1%	1,155	4.9%
CPS - Youth	Total (CPS)	18,308	100%	*	*	21,345	100%	*	*
	Total (Access)	14,562	79.5%	3,746	20.5%	16,840	78.9%	4,505	21.1%
	Timegood	14,562	79.5%	3,746	20.5%	16,840	78.9%	4,505	21.1%
	Location	14,562	79.5%	3,746	20.5%	16,840	78.9%	4,505	21.1%
	Race/Ethnic	13,346	91.6%	1,216	6.6%	15,494	92.0%	1,346	8.0%
	Gender	13,565	93.2%	997	5.4%	15,801	93.8%	1,039	6.2%

Database	Variables	FY 06-07				FY 07-08			
		Valid		Missing		Valid		Missing	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CPS - Adults	Total (CPS)	48,988	100%	*	*	50,347	100%	*	*
	Total (Access)	30,385	62.0%	18,617	38.0%	29,794	59.2%	20,553	40.8%
	Timegood	30,385	62.0%	18,617	38.0%	29,794	59.2%	20,553	40.8%
	Location	30,385	62.0%	18,617	38.0%	29,794	59.2%	20,553	40.8%
	Staffwill	30,385	62.0%	18,617	38.0%	29,794	59.2%	20,553	40.8%
	Returncall	30,385	62.0%	18,617	38.0%	29,794	59.2%	20,553	40.8%
	Getservices	30,385	62.0%	18,617	38.0%	29,794	59.2%	20,553	40.8%
	Seepsychiatrist	30,385	62.0%	18,617	38.0%	29,794	59.2%	20,553	40.8%
	Race/Ethnic	27,178	89.4%	3,207	6.5%	26,576	89.2%	3,218	10.8%
	Gender	27,163	89.4%	3,222	6.6%	26,745	89.8%	3,049	10.2%
CPS - Older Adults	Total (CPS)	4,336	100%	*	*	5,168	100%	*	*
	Total (Access)	2,361	54.5%	1,975	45.5%	2,649	51.3%	2,519	48.7%
	Timegood	2,361	54.5%	1,975	45.5%	2,649	51.3%	2,519	48.7%
	Location	2,361	54.5%	1,975	45.5%	2,649	51.3%	2,519	48.7%
	Staffwill	2,361	54.5%	1,975	45.5%	2,649	51.3%	2,519	48.7%
	Returncall	2,361	54.5%	1,975	45.5%	2,649	51.3%	2,519	48.7%
	Getservices	2,361	54.5%	1,975	45.5%	2,649	51.3%	2,519	48.7%
	Seepsychiatrist	2,361	54.5%	1,975	45.5%	2,649	51.3%	2,519	48.7%
	Race/Ethnic	2,104	89.1%	257	5.9%	2,382	89.9%	267	10.1%

	Gender	2,096	88.8%	265	6.1%	2,391	90.3%	258	9.7%
CPS - Family	Total (CPS)	33,157	100%	*	*	35,236	100%	*	*
	Total (Access)	24,250	73.1%	8,907	26.9%	25,677	72.9%	9,559	27.1%
	Timegood	24,250	73.1%	8,907	26.9%	25,677	72.9%	9,559	27.1%
	Location	24,250	73.1%	8,907	26.9%	25,677	72.9%	9,559	27.1%
	Race/Ethnic	22,621	93.3%	1,629	6.7%	23,635	92.0%	2,042	8.0%
	Gender	22,915	94.5%	1,335	5.5%	24,058	93.7%	1,619	6.3%
CPS - Youth	Total (CPS)	20,181	100%	*	*	21,860	100%	*	*
	Total (Access)	15,349	76.1%	4,832	23.9%	16,663	76.2%	5,197	23.8%
	Timegood	15,349	76.1%	4,832	23.9%	16,663	76.2%	5,197	23.8%
	Location	15,349	76.1%	4,832	23.9%	16,663	76.2%	5,197	23.8%
	Race/Ethnic	14,082	91.7%	1,267	6.3%	15,074	90.5%	1,589	9.5%
	Gender	14,294	93.1%	1,055	5.2%	15,364	92.2%	1,299	7.8%

Database	Variables	FY 08-09				FY 09-10			
		Valid		Missing		Valid		Missing	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CPS - Adults	Total (CPS)	50,383	100%	*	*	1,623	100%	*	*
	Total (Access)	30,156	59.9%	18,617	37.0%	1,384	85.3%	239	14.7%
	Timegood	30,156	59.9%	18,617	37.0%	1,384	85.3%	239	14.7%
	Location	30,156	59.9%	18,617	37.0%	1,384	85.3%	239	14.7%
	Staffwill	30,156	59.9%	18,617	37.0%	1,384	85.3%	239	14.7%
	Returncall	30,156	59.9%	18,617	37.0%	1,384	85.3%	239	14.7%
	Getservices	30,156	59.9%	18,617	37.0%	1,384	85.3%	239	14.7%
	Seepsychiatrist	30,156	59.9%	18,617	37.0%	1,384	85.3%	239	14.7%
	Race/Ethnic	26,600	88.2%	3,556	7.1%	1,337	96.6%	47	3.4%
	Gender	26,697	88.5%	3,459	6.9%	1,345	97.2%	39	2.8%
CPS - Older Adults	Total (CPS)	6,152	100%	*	*	2,522	100%	*	*
	Total (Access)	3,190	51.9%	2,962	48.1%	2,015	79.9%	507	20.1%
	Timegood	3,190	51.9%	2,962	48.1%	2,015	79.9%	507	20.1%
	Location	3,190	51.9%	2,962	48.1%	2,015	79.9%	507	20.1%
	Staffwill	3,190	51.9%	2,962	48.1%	2,015	79.9%	507	20.1%
	Returncall	3,190	51.9%	2,962	48.1%	2,015	79.9%	507	20.1%
	Getservices	3,190	51.9%	2,962	48.1%	2,015	79.9%	507	20.1%

	Seepsychiatrist	3,190	51.9%	2,962	48.1%	2,015	79.9%	507	20.1%
	Race/Ethnic	2,779	87.1%	411	6.7%	1,911	94.8%	104	5.2%
	Gender	2,810	88.1%	380	6.2%	1,912	94.9%	103	5.1%
CPS - Family	Total (CPS)	38,836	100%	*	*	1,118	100%	*	*
	Total (Access)	28,733	74.0%	10,103	26.0%	1,071	95.8%	47	4.2%
	Timegood	28,733	74.0%	10,103	26.0%	1,071	95.8%	47	4.2%
	Location	28,733	74.0%	10,103	26.0%	1,071	95.8%	47	4.2%
	Race/Ethnic	27,078	94.2%	1,655	5.8%	1,038	96.9%	33	3.1%
	Gender	27,078	94.2%	1,655	5.8%	1,031	96.3%	40	3.7%
CPS - Youth	Total (CPS)	22,093	100%	*	*				
	Total (Access)	16,942	76.7%	5,151	23.3%				
	Timegood	16,942	76.7%	5,151	23.3%				
	Location	16,942	76.7%	5,151	23.3%				
	Race/Ethnic	15,308	90.4%	1,634	7.4%				
	Gender	15,596	92.1%	1,346	6.1%				

Database	Variables	FY 10-11				FY 11-12			
		Valid		Missing		Valid		Missing	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CPS - Adults	Total (CPS)	5,387	100%	*	*	9,363	100%	*	*
	Total (Access)	2,819	52.3%	18,617	345.6%	4,084	43.6%	5,279	56.4%
	Timegood	2,819	52.3%	18,617	345.6%	4,084	43.6%	5,279	56.4%
	Location	2,819	52.3%	18,617	345.6%	4,084	43.6%	5,279	56.4%
	Staffwill	2,819	52.3%	18,617	345.6%	4,084	43.6%	5,279	56.4%
	Returncall	2,819	52.3%	18,617	345.6%	4,084	43.6%	5,279	56.4%
	Getservices	2,819	52.3%	18,617	345.6%	4,084	43.6%	5,279	56.4%
	Seepsychiatrist	2,819	52.3%	18,617	345.6%	4,084	43.6%	5,279	56.4%
	Race/Ethnic	1,321	46.9%	1,498	27.8%	3,283	80.4%	801	19.6%
	Gender	1,617	57.4%	1,202	22.3%	3,740	91.6%	344	8.4%
CPS - Older Adults	Total (CPS)	703	100%	*	*	1,228	100%	*	*
	Total (Access)	315	44.8%	388	55.2%	327	26.6%	901	73.4%
	Timegood	315	44.8%	388	55.2%	327	26.6%	901	73.4%
	Location	315	44.8%	388	55.2%	327	26.6%	901	73.4%
	Staffwill	315	44.8%	388	55.2%	327	26.6%	901	73.4%

	Returncall	315	44.8%	388	55.2%	327	26.6%	901	73.4%
	Getservices	315	44.8%	388	55.2%	327	26.6%	901	73.4%
	Seepsychiatrist	315	44.8%	388	55.2%	327	26.6%	901	73.4%
	Race/Ethnic	270	85.7%	45	6.4%	306	93.6%	21	6.4%
	Gender	209	66.3%	106	15.1%	208	63.6%	119	36.4%
CPS - Family	Total (CPS)	2,457	100%	*	*	2,732	100%	*	*
	Total (Access)	1,781	72.5%	676	27.5%	2,564	93.9%	168	6.1%
	Timegood	1,781	72.5%	676	27.5%	2,564	93.9%	168	6.1%
	Location	1,781	72.5%	676	27.5%	2,564	93.9%	168	6.1%
	Race/Ethnic	1,656	93.0%	125	7.0%	2,419	94.3%	145	5.7%
	Gender	1,762	98.9%	19	1.1%	2,462	96.0%	102	4.0%
CPS - Youth	Total (CPS)	8,288	100%	*	*	2,353	100%	*	*
	Total (Access)	5,080	61.3%	3,208	38.7%	2,166	92.1%	187	7.9%
	Timegood	5,080	61.3%	3,208	38.7%	2,166	92.1%	187	7.9%
	Location	5,080	61.3%	3,208	38.7%	2,166	92.1%	187	7.9%
	Race/Ethnic	4,837	95.2%	243	2.9%	1,963	90.6%	203	9.4%
	Gender	5,018	98.8%	62	0.7%	1,983	91.6%	183	8.4%

* Missing is not applicable (complete dataset)

Implications for Indicator Calculation

Fiscal Years:

- **FY 2009-10:** Because the scores are so different in FY 2009-10 and it appears to be a result of methodological change rather than actual change in the indicator, FY 2009-10 should be excluded from any trend report over time
- **FY 2010-11:** Because scores (depending upon the demographic group), county participation and demographics are different when compared to earlier fiscal years and it appears to be a result of methodological change rather than actual change in the indicator, FY 2010-11 should be excluded from any trend report over time.
- **FY 2011-12:** Depending upon the demographic group, scores trend higher than the stable fiscal years (FY 2004-05 through FY 2008-09). In addition, the demographics for many groups (proportional representation) are very different from the stable fiscal years. Although it may be possible for UCLA to pull out data that appears to be representative for some counties (selecting only results that trend with the stable fiscal years), whether such undertaking represents a valid statewide picture is questionable.

Missing Data:

The typical standard for “not-to-exceed” is ten percent. However, if this standard is applied to the CPS datasets, none would be usable for the purpose of calculating Indicator 9.

Examination of Indicator 9 for each age group in Fiscal Years 2004-05 through 2008-09 reveals missing close to, or exceeding 40 percent for adults and older adults. Generalizability of the indicator becomes problematic when the percentage of missing data is so high.

For families and youth, the percentage of missing data is approximately 25 percent.

Recommended Calculation

Race/Ethnicity:

Include multirace as a racial category to be consistent with other surveys.

Missing Data:

Only include respondents with complete data. This is particularly important for the two (2) item Family and Youth Indicator.

In the interest of generalizability, analysis of demographics should compare respondents with missing data for this indicator to respondents with complete data in order to determine comparability. If respondents for Indicator 11 are different from overall CPS respondents, the differences must be reported and lack of generalizability noted in the final report.

In addition, data collection methodology for the CPS must be improved in order to minimize the percentage of respondents with missing data.

Fiscal Years:

The trend report should only display FY 2004-05 through FY 2008-09. Later FY should not be included because any indicator changes are most likely due to methodology.

Priority Indicator 10: Involuntary Status

Indicator Definition

This indicator provides insight into the rates of involuntary status among all mental health consumers during 2004-05 through 2011-12. Involuntary status refers to a legal designation that can be applied to individuals who are found to be a danger to themselves and/or others, and/or gravely disabled.

Recommended Data for Calculating Indicator

The California Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) reports incidents of involuntary status per 10,000 consumers.

The California Department of Health Care Services provides reports of incidents of involuntary status (see http://www.dmh.ca.gov/statistics_and_data_analysis/Involuntary_Detention.asp)

Variables include:

- Number of Adults in 72-Hour Inpatient Treatment Facilities
- Number of Children in 72-Hour Inpatient Treatment Facilities
- Number of Individuals in 14-Day Treatment Facilities
- Number of Individuals receiving 14-Day Intensive Treatment (Suicide)

An inconsistency was uncovered related to the manner in which age is factored into 14-Day Treatment (see Implications).

Completeness & Quality of Recommended Data

UCLA calculated the rates independently using the numbers of persons and population data, with the exception of FY 11-12 because the Department of Finance has not yet released breakouts of adults and children (only total population is available). For FY 11-12 we relied upon the rates per 10,000 provided by DHCS.

Database	Variables	FY 04-05		FY 05-06		FY 06-07		FY 07-08	
		Valid		Valid		Valid		Valid	
		N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate
Aggregate reports provided by DHCS	Adult 72-Hour Treatment	142,723	53.8	138,295	50.8	135,243	49.4	142,551	51.3
	Child 72-Hour Treatment	20,284	19.5	18,794	19.5	17,301	17.3	17,520	17.5
	14-Day Treatment	68,901	18.7	57,386	15.6	56,522	15.1	60,254	21.7
	14-Day Intensive (Suicide)	328	0.1	269	0.1	369	0.1	431	0.1

Database	Variables	FY 08-09		FY 09-10		FY 10-11		FY 11-12	
		Valid		Valid		Valid		Valid	
		N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate
Aggregate reports provided by DHCS	Adult 72-Hour Treatment	137,175	48.6	139,388	48.6	133,913	47.7	109,583	38.7
	Child 72-Hour Treatment	18,427	18.4	19,057	19.1	19,960	21.4	16,115	17.1
	14-Day Treatment	56,620	20.0	60,579	21.1	68,469	24.4	51,948	18.4
	14-Day Intensive (Suicide)	485	0.1	313	0.1	231	0.1	203	0.1

Implications for Indicator Calculation

Rate Per 10,000 - 14-Day Treatment Facilities:

DCHS switched methods in FY 07-08 from relying upon the total population when calculating the rates per 10,000 for 14-Day Treatment Facilities to only including individuals over the age of 18. The time frame is displayed below:

Year	14-Day	14-Day Intensive
0405	Total	Total
0506	Total	Total
0607	Total	Total
0708	>18	Total
0809	>18	Total
0910	>18	Total
1011	>18	Total

For the statewide summary we present the data as DHCS provided it. The difference that appears in FY 07-08 is evident but it is an artificial difference due to DCHS' change in methodology (provided for illustrative purposes). For the county breakouts, UCLA provided both calculations for review.

Recommended Calculation:

The rates tend to be low and do not change much from year to year, but the issue of involuntary commitment is very sensitive to stakeholders and therefore should continue to be tracked from year to year.

Recommendation: Rate Per 10,000 - 14-Day Treatment Facilities - Use the Total population when calculating the rate in order to be consistent with earlier fiscal years and the manner in which the 14-Day Intensive rate is calculated.

Priority Indicator 11: Consumer Perceptions of Improvement in Well-Being as a Result of Services

Indicator Definition:

This indicator provides insight into consumer and family perceptions of well-being (i.e., outcomes, functioning, and social connectedness) as a result of mental health services.

Recommended Data for Calculating Indicator

Family members/caregivers and youth respondents' ratings (1–*Strongly Disagree* to 5–*Strongly Agree*) of 11 self-report items (specified in the *Data Sources* section below) are averaged to calculate aggregate ratings of perceptions of well-being as a result of mental health services. Ratings of 3.5 or greater generally indicate positive perceptions.

- In FY 2004-05 and FY 2005-06 only six (6) of the 11 self-report items that comprise the indicator were included on the Consumer Perception Survey.

Adult and older adult respondents' ratings (1–*Strongly Disagree* to 5–*Strongly Agree*) of 14 self-report items (specified in the *Data Sources* section below) are averaged to calculate aggregate ratings of perceptions of well-being as a result of mental health services. Ratings of 3.5 or greater generally indicate positive perceptions.

- In FY 2004-05 and FY 2005-06 only six (6) of the 14 self-report items that comprise the indicator were included on the Consumer Perception Survey.

The variable name as it most commonly appears in the dataset is shown next to each survey question. Each question is identified by variable in the tables showing the number of respondents per variable (space limitations preclude display of the full question). It may be helpful to refer back to this brief summary when viewing the Indicator 11 summary table due to the number of survey questions and similarly-named variables.

The fiscal years each variable is present is noted next to the variable name.

Consumer Perception Surveys

- Family members/caregivers and youth self-report items analyzed (YSS/YSS-F):
 - My child is better at handling daily life (DAILYLIF-All fiscal years)
 - My child gets along better with family members (BETTRFAM-All fiscal years)
 - My child gets along better with friends and other people (BETTRFRN-All fiscal years)
 - My child is doing better in school and/or work (BETTRSCH-All fiscal years)
 - My child is better able to cope when things go wrong (COPE-All fiscal years)
 - I am satisfied with our family life right now (SATFAMILY-All fiscal years)
 - My child is better able to do things he or she wants to do (DOWANTS-FY 2006-07 through FY 2011-12 only)
 - I know people who will listen and understand me when I need to talk (LISTEN- FY 2006-07 through FY 2011-12 only)
 - I have people that I am comfortable talking with about my child's problems (COMFTALK- FY 2006-07 through FY 2011-12 only)
 - In a crisis, I would have the support I need from family or friends (SUPPORT- FY 2006-07 through FY 2011-12 only)
 - I have people with whom I can do enjoyable things (DOTHINGS-FY 2006-07 through FY 2011-12 only)

- Adult and older adult self-report items analyzed (MHSIP):
 - I deal more effectively with daily problems (DAILYPRB -All fiscal years)
 - I am better able to control my life (CONTROL-All fiscal years)
 - I am better able to deal with crisis (CRISIS -All fiscal years)
 - I am getting along better with my family (BETTRFAM -All fiscal years)
 - I do better in social situations (BETTRSOC -All fiscal years)
 - I do better in school and/or work (BETTRSCH-All fiscal years)
 - I do things that are more meaningful to me (MEANINGFUL -FY 2006-07 through FY 2011-12 only)
 - I am better able to take care of my needs (BETTRNEED-FY 2006-07 through FY 2011-12 only)
 - I am better able to handle things when they go wrong (BETTRHANDLE -FY 2006-07 through FY 2011-12 only)
 - I am better able to do things that I want to do (DOWANTS -FY 2006-07 through FY 2011-12 only)
 - I am happy with the friendships I have (HAPYFRIEND -FY 2006-07 through FY 2011-12 only)
 - I have people with whom I can do enjoyable things (DOTHINGS -FY 2006-07 through FY 2011-12 only)
 - I feel I belong in my community (BELONG -FY 2006-07 through FY 2011-12 only)
 - In a crisis, I would have the support I need from family or friends (SUPPORT -FY 2006-07 through FY 2011-12 only)

The same individual can take the survey more than once within a fiscal year. In order to prevent duplicated individuals from biasing response patterns, only the first survey for each respondent was retained and summarized for this report (see the discussion under Indicator 9).

Completeness & Quality of Recommended Data

Race/Ethnicity:

Race and ethnicity information is contained within seven discrete variables. As is allowed in the DCR and CSI, a respondent may choose up to seven choices.

- American Indian
- Asian
- Black
- Hispanic
- Other
- Pacific Islander
- White

Because race and ethnicity information is contained across seven different variables, UCLA wrote programming to account for all of the various combinations of race-ethnicity. The various combinations include the addition of “multirace” as in the CSI and DCR.

Missing Data:

In order to calculate the indicator in each fiscal year, only respondents with complete data (i.e., no missing questions) were included.

Fiscal Years:

Only state-level analysis is possible in FY 2009-10 (random sample). UCLA recommended in the last report that data collected in FY 2008-09 and 2009-10 must be interpreted separately because a convenience sampling method was used to gather FY 2008-09 data and random sampling was used to gather data in FY 2009-10.⁷ Examination of scores longitudinally (beginning with FY 2004-05) shaped our final recommendations regarding FY 2009-10 are addressed below.

County-by-county breakouts are likewise not presented for FY 2010-11 and FY 2011-12. Although convenience sampling resumed, anomalies in sample size and county participation (particularly in FY 2010-11) make county breakouts questionable. In addition, variations in scores and demographics (compared to the relatively stable period of time represented from FY 2004-05 through 2008-09) that characterized FY 2010-11 and FY 2011-12 are such that UCLA will only present statewide results at this time – and only for discussion purposes (see *Implications for Indicator Calculation and Recommended Calculation*).

Database	Variables	FY 04-05				FY 05-06			
		Valid		Missing		Valid		Missing	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CPS - Adults	Total (CPS)	50,310	100%	*	*	53,021	100%	*	*
	Total (Well-Being)	44,898	89.2%	5,412	10.8%	27,232	51.4%	25,789	48.6%
	Dailyprob	44,898	89.2%	5,412	10.8%	27,232	51.4%	25,789	48.6%
	Control	44,898	89.2%	5,412	10.8%	27,232	51.4%	25,789	48.6%
	Crisis	44,898	89.2%	5,412	10.8%	27,232	51.4%	25,789	48.6%
	Bettrfam	44,898	89.2%	5,412	10.8%	27,232	51.4%	25,789	48.6%
	Bettrsoc	44,898	89.2%	5,412	10.8%	27,232	51.4%	25,789	48.6%
	Bettrschr	44,898	89.2%	5,412	10.8%	27,232	51.4%	25,789	48.6%
	Meaningful								
	Bettrneed								
	Bettrhandle								
	Dowants								
	Hapyfrend								
	Dothings								
	Belong								
	Support								
	Race/Ethnic	41,392	92.2%	3,506	7.8%	25,133	92.3%	2,099	7.7%
Gender	40,991	91.3%	3,907	8.7%	24,892	91.4%	2,340	8.6%	

⁷ Cowles, E. L., Harris, K., Larsen, C., and Prince, A. (2010). *Assessing Representativeness of the Mental Health Services Consumer Perception Survey*.

CPS - Older Adults	Total (CPS)	4,213	100%	*	*	4,546	100%	*	*
	Total (Well-Being)	1,514	35.9%	2,699	64.1%	1,704	37.5%	2,842	62.5%
	Dailyprob	1,514	35.9%	2,699	64.1%	1,704	37.5%	2,842	62.5%
	Control	1,514	35.9%	2,699	64.1%	1,704	37.5%	2,842	62.5%
	Crisis	1,514	35.9%	2,699	64.1%	1,704	37.5%	2,842	62.5%
	Bettrfam	1,514	35.9%	2,699	64.1%	1,704	37.5%	2,842	62.5%
	Bettrsoc	1,514	35.9%	2,699	64.1%	1,704	37.5%	2,842	62.5%
	Bettrsch	1,514	35.9%	2,699	64.1%	1,704	37.5%	2,842	62.5%
	Meaningful								
	Betrneed								
	Betrhandle								
	Dowants								
	Hapyfrend								
	Dothings								
	Belong								
Support									
Race/Ethnic	1,381	91.2%	133	8.8%	1,538	90.3%	166	9.7%	
Gender	1,378	91.0%	136	9.0%	1,499	88.0%	205	12.0%	
CPS - Family	Total (CPS)	27,223	100%	*	*	31,189	100%	*	*
	Total (Well-Being)	18,401	67.6%	8,822	32.4%	20,763	66.6%	10,426	33.4%
	Dailylif	18,401	67.6%	8,822	32.4%	20,763	66.6%	10,426	33.4%
	Bettrfam	18,401	67.6%	8,822	32.4%	20,763	66.6%	10,426	33.4%
	Bettrfrn	18,401	67.6%	8,822	32.4%	20,763	66.6%	10,426	33.4%
	Bettrsch	18,401	67.6%	8,822	32.4%	20,763	66.6%	10,426	33.4%
	Cope	18,401	67.6%	8,822	32.4%	20,763	66.6%	10,426	33.4%
	Satfamily	18,401	67.6%	8,822	32.4%	20,763	66.6%	10,426	33.4%
	Dowants								
	Listen								
	Comtalk								
	Support								
	Dothings								
	Race/Ethnic	17,337	94.2%	1,064	5.8%	19,514	94.0%	1,249	6.0%
	Gender	17,502	95.1%	899	4.9%	19,789	95.3%	974	4.7%

CPS - Youth	Total (CPS)	18,308	100%	*	*	21,345	100%	*	*
	Total (Well-Being)	13,268	72.5%	5,040	27.5%	15,460	72.4%	5,885	27.6%
	Dailylif	13,268	72.5%	5,040	27.5%	15,460	72.4%	5,885	27.6%
	Bettrfam	13,268	72.5%	5,040	27.5%	15,460	72.4%	5,885	27.6%
	Bettrfrn	13,268	72.5%	5,040	27.5%	15,460	72.4%	5,885	27.6%
	Bettrschr	13,268	72.5%	5,040	27.5%	15,460	72.4%	5,885	27.6%
	Cope	13,268	72.5%	5,040	27.5%	15,460	72.4%	5,885	27.6%
	Satfamily	13,268	72.5%	5,040	27.5%	15,460	72.4%	5,885	27.6%
	Dowants								
	Listen								
	Comtalk								
	Support								
	Dothings								
	Race/Ethnic	12,218	92.1%	1,050	7.9%	14,274	92.3%	1,186	7.7%
	Gender	12,396	93.4%	872	6.6%	14,565	94.2%	895	5.8%

Database	Variables	FY 06-07				FY 07-08			
		Valid		Missing		Valid		Missing	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CPS - Adults	Total (CPS)	48,988	100%	*	*	50,347	100%	*	*
	Total (Well-Being)	11,564	23.6%	37,424	76.4%	21,035	41.8%	29,312	58.2%
	Dailyprob	11,564	23.6%	37,424	76.4%	21,035	41.8%	29,312	58.2%
	Control	11,564	23.6%	37,424	76.4%	21,035	41.8%	29,312	58.2%
	Crisis	11,564	23.6%	37,424	76.4%	21,035	41.8%	29,312	58.2%
	Bettrfam	11,564	23.6%	37,424	76.4%	21,035	41.8%	29,312	58.2%
	Bettrsoc	11,564	23.6%	37,424	76.4%	21,035	41.8%	29,312	58.2%
	Bettrschr	11,564	23.6%	37,424	76.4%	21,035	41.8%	29,312	58.2%
	Meaningful	11,564	23.6%	37,424	76.4%	21,035	41.8%	29,312	58.2%
	Bettrneed	11,564	23.6%	37,424	76.4%	21,035	41.8%	29,312	58.2%
	Bettrhandle	11,564	23.6%	37,424	76.4%	21,035	41.8%	29,312	58.2%
	Dowants	11,564	23.6%	37,424	76.4%	21,035	41.8%	29,312	58.2%
	Hapyfrend	11,564	23.6%	37,424	76.4%	21,035	41.8%	29,312	58.2%
	Dothings	11,564	23.6%	37,424	76.4%	21,035	41.8%	29,312	58.2%
	Belong	11,564	23.6%	37,424	76.4%	21,035	41.8%	29,312	58.2%
	Support	11,564	23.6%	37,424	76.4%	21,035	41.8%	29,312	58.2%

	Race/Ethnic	10,862	93.9%	702	6.1%	19,649	93.4%	1,386	6.6%	
	Gender	10,891	94.2%	673	5.8%	19,769	94.0%	1,266	6.0%	
CPS - Older Adults	Total (CPS)	4,336	100%	*	*	5,168	100%	*	*	
	Total (Well-Being)	776	17.9%	3,560	82.1%	1,590	30.8%	3,578	69.2%	
	Dailyprob	776	17.9%	3,560	82.1%	1,590	30.8%	3,578	69.2%	
	Control	776	17.9%	3,560	82.1%	1,590	30.8%	3,578	69.2%	
	Crisis	776	17.9%	3,560	82.1%	1,590	30.8%	3,578	69.2%	
	Bettrfam	776	17.9%	3,560	82.1%	1,590	30.8%	3,578	69.2%	
	Bettrsoc	776	17.9%	3,560	82.1%	1,590	30.8%	3,578	69.2%	
	Bettrschr	776	17.9%	3,560	82.1%	1,590	30.8%	3,578	69.2%	
	Meaningful	776	17.9%	3,560	82.1%	1,590	30.8%	3,578	69.2%	
	Bettrneed	776	17.9%	3,560	82.1%	1,590	30.8%	3,578	69.2%	
	Bettrhandle	776	17.9%	3,560	82.1%	1,590	30.8%	3,578	69.2%	
	Dowants	776	17.9%	3,560	82.1%	1,590	30.8%	3,578	69.2%	
	Hapyfrend	776	17.9%	3,560	82.1%	1,590	30.8%	3,578	69.2%	
	Dothings	776	17.9%	3,560	82.1%	1,590	30.8%	3,578	69.2%	
	Belong	776	17.9%	3,560	82.1%	1,590	30.8%	3,578	69.2%	
	Support	776	17.9%	3,560	82.1%	1,590	30.8%	3,578	69.2%	
		Race/Ethnic	713	91.9%	63	8.1%	1,477	92.9%	113	7.1%
		Gender	706	91.0%	70	9.0%	1,484	93.3%	106	6.7%
CPS - Family	Total (CPS)	33,157	100%	*	*	35,236	100%	*	*	
	Total (Well-Being)	21,459	64.7%	11,698	35.3%	21,459	60.9%	13,777	39.1%	
	Dailylif	21,459	64.7%	11,698	35.3%	21,459	60.9%	13,777	39.1%	
	Bettrfam	21,459	64.7%	11,698	35.3%	21,459	60.9%	13,777	39.1%	
	Bettrfrn	21,459	64.7%	11,698	35.3%	21,459	60.9%	13,777	39.1%	
	Bettrschr	21,459	64.7%	11,698	35.3%	21,459	60.9%	13,777	39.1%	
	Cope	21,459	64.7%	11,698	35.3%	21,459	60.9%	13,777	39.1%	
	Satfamily	21,459	64.7%	11,698	35.3%	21,459	60.9%	13,777	39.1%	
	Dowants	21,459	64.7%	11,698	35.3%	21,459	60.9%	13,777	39.1%	
	Listen	21,459	64.7%	11,698	35.3%	21,459	60.9%	13,777	39.1%	
	Comtalk	21,459	64.7%	11,698	35.3%	21,459	60.9%	13,777	39.1%	
	Support	21,459	64.7%	11,698	35.3%	21,459	60.9%	13,777	39.1%	
	Dothings	21,459	64.7%	11,698	35.3%	21,459	60.9%	13,777	39.1%	

	Race/Ethnic	10,748	50.1%	10,711	49.9%	20,010	93.2%	1,449	6.8%
	Gender	10,904	50.8%	10,555	49.2%	20,361	94.9%	1,098	5.1%
CPS - Youth	Total (CPS)	20,181	100%	*	*	21,860	100%	*	*
	Total (Well-Being)	8,174	40.5%	12,007	59.5%	14,933	68.3%	6,927	31.7%
	Dailylif	8,174	40.5%	12,007	59.5%	14,933	68.3%	6,927	31.7%
	Bettrfam	8,174	40.5%	12,007	59.5%	14,933	68.3%	6,927	31.7%
	Bettrfrn	8,174	40.5%	12,007	59.5%	14,933	68.3%	6,927	31.7%
	Bettrsch	8,174	40.5%	12,007	59.5%	14,933	68.3%	6,927	31.7%
	Cope	8,174	40.5%	12,007	59.5%	14,933	68.3%	6,927	31.7%
	Satfamily	8,174	40.5%	12,007	59.5%	14,933	68.3%	6,927	31.7%
	Dowants	8,174	40.5%	12,007	59.5%	14,933	68.3%	6,927	31.7%
	Listen	8,174	40.5%	12,007	59.5%	14,933	68.3%	6,927	31.7%
	Comtalk	8,174	40.5%	12,007	59.5%	14,933	68.3%	6,927	31.7%
	Support	8,174	40.5%	12,007	59.5%	14,933	68.3%	6,927	31.7%
	Dothings	8,174	40.5%	12,007	59.5%	14,933	68.3%	6,927	31.7%
	Race/Ethnic	7,572	92.6%	602	7.4%	13,731	92.0%	1,202	8.0%
	Gender	7,691	94.1%	483	5.9%	13,962	93.5%	971	6.5%

Database	Variables	FY 08-09				FY 09-10			
		Valid		Missing		Valid		Missing	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CPS - Adults	Total (CPS)	50,381	100%	*	*	1,623	100%	*	*
	Total (Well-Being)	21,330	42.3%	29,051	57.7%	978	60.3%	645	39.7%
	Dailyprob	21,330	42.3%	29,051	57.7%	978	60.3%	645	39.7%
	Control	21,330	42.3%	29,051	57.7%	978	60.3%	645	39.7%
	Crisis	21,330	42.3%	29,051	57.7%	978	60.3%	645	39.7%
	Bettrfam	21,330	42.3%	29,051	57.7%	978	60.3%	645	39.7%
	Bettrsoc	21,330	42.3%	29,051	57.7%	978	60.3%	645	39.7%
	Bettrsch	21,330	42.3%	29,051	57.7%	978	60.3%	645	39.7%
	Meaningful	21,330	42.3%	29,051	57.7%	978	60.3%	645	39.7%
	Bettrneed	21,330	42.3%	29,051	57.7%	978	60.3%	645	39.7%
	Bettrhandle	21,330	42.3%	29,051	57.7%	978	60.3%	645	39.7%
	Dowants	21,330	42.3%	29,051	57.7%	978	60.3%	645	39.7%
	Hapyfrend	21,330	42.3%	29,051	57.7%	978	60.3%	645	39.7%
	Dothings	21,330	42.3%	29,051	57.7%	978	60.3%	645	39.7%

	Belong	21,330	42.3%	29,051	57.7%	978	60.3%	645	39.7%	
	Support	21,330	42.3%	29,051	57.7%	978	60.3%	645	39.7%	
	Race/Ethnic	19,703	92.4%	1,627	7.6%	952	97.3%	26	2.7%	
	Gender	19,757	92.6%	1,573	7.4%	959	98.1%	19	1.9%	
CPS - Older Adults	Total (CPS)	6,152	100%	*	*	2,522	100%	*	*	
	Total (Well-Being)	1,942	31.6%	4,210	68.4%	1,139	45.2%	1,383	54.8%	
	Dailyprob	1,942	31.6%	4,210	68.4%	1,139	45.2%	1,383	54.8%	
	Control	1,942	31.6%	4,210	68.4%	1,139	45.2%	1,383	54.8%	
	Crisis	1,942	31.6%	4,210	68.4%	1,139	45.2%	1,383	54.8%	
	Bettrfam	1,942	31.6%	4,210	68.4%	1,139	45.2%	1,383	54.8%	
	Bettrsoc	1,942	31.6%	4,210	68.4%	1,139	45.2%	1,383	54.8%	
	Bettrsch	1,942	31.6%	4,210	68.4%	1,139	45.2%	1,383	54.8%	
	Meaningful	1,942	31.6%	4,210	68.4%	1,139	45.2%	1,383	54.8%	
	Betrtned	1,942	31.6%	4,210	68.4%	1,139	45.2%	1,383	54.8%	
	Betrthandle	1,942	31.6%	4,210	68.4%	1,139	45.2%	1,383	54.8%	
	Dowants	1,942	31.6%	4,210	68.4%	1,139	45.2%	1,383	54.8%	
	Hapyfrend	1,942	31.6%	4,210	68.4%	1,139	45.2%	1,383	54.8%	
	Dothings	1,942	31.6%	4,210	68.4%	1,139	45.2%	1,383	54.8%	
	Belong	1,942	31.6%	4,210	68.4%	1,139	45.2%	1,383	54.8%	
	Support	1,942	31.6%	4,210	68.4%	1,139	45.2%	1,383	54.8%	
	Race/Ethnic	1,757	90.5%	185	9.5%	1,091	95.8%	48	4.2%	
	Gender	1,779	91.6%	163	8.4%	1,092	95.9%	47	4.1%	
	CPS - Family	Total (CPS)	38,836	100%	*	*	1,118	100%	*	*
		Total (Well-Being)	23,985	61.8%	14,851	38.2%	949	84.9%	169	15.1%
Dailylif		23,985	61.8%	14,851	38.2%	949	84.9%	169	15.1%	
Bettrfam		23,985	61.8%	14,851	38.2%	949	84.9%	169	15.1%	
Betrfrn		23,985	61.8%	14,851	38.2%	949	84.9%	169	15.1%	
Bettrsch		23,985	61.8%	14,851	38.2%	949	84.9%	169	15.1%	
Cope		23,985	61.8%	14,851	38.2%	949	84.9%	169	15.1%	
Satfamily		23,985	61.8%	14,851	38.2%	949	84.9%	169	15.1%	
Dowants		23,985	61.8%	14,851	38.2%	949	84.9%	169	15.1%	
Listen		23,985	61.8%	14,851	38.2%	949	84.9%	169	15.1%	
Comtalk		23,985	61.8%	14,851	38.2%	949	84.9%	169	15.1%	

	Support	23,985	61.8%	14,851	38.2%	949	84.9%	169	15.1%
	Dothings	23,985	61.8%	14,851	38.2%	949	84.9%	169	15.1%
	Race/Ethnic	22,438	93.6%	1,547	6.4%	920	96.9%	29	3.1%
	Gender	22,790	95.0%	1,195	5.0%	917	96.6%	32	3.4%
CPS - Youth	Total (CPS)	22,093	100%	*	*				
	Total (Well-Being)	15,049	68.1%	7,044	31.9%				
	Dailylif	15,049	68.1%	7,044	31.9%				
	Bettrfam	15,049	68.1%	7,044	31.9%				
	Bettrfrn	15,049	68.1%	7,044	31.9%				
	Bettrsch	15,049	68.1%	7,044	31.9%				
	Cope	15,049	68.1%	7,044	31.9%				
	Satfamily	15,049	68.1%	7,044	31.9%				
	Dowants	15,049	68.1%	7,044	31.9%				
	Listen	15,049	68.1%	7,044	31.9%				
	Comtalk	15,049	68.1%	7,044	31.9%				
	Support	15,049	68.1%	7,044	31.9%				
	Dothings	15,049	68.1%	7,044	31.9%				
	Race/Ethnic	13,788	91.6%	1,261	8.4%				
	Gender	14,024	93.2%	1,025	6.8%				

Database	Variables	FY 10-11				FY 11-12			
		Valid		Missing		Valid		Missing	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CPS - Adults	Total (CPS)	5,387	100%	*	*	9,363	100%	*	*
	Total (Well-Being)	611	11.3%	4,776	88.7%	2,786	29.8%	6,577	70.2%
	Dailyprob	611	11.3%	4,776	88.7%	2,786	29.8%	6,577	70.2%
	Control	611	11.3%	4,776	88.7%	2,786	29.8%	6,577	70.2%
	Crisis	611	11.3%	4,776	88.7%	2,786	29.8%	6,577	70.2%
	Bettrfam	611	11.3%	4,776	88.7%	2,786	29.8%	6,577	70.2%
	Bettrsoc	611	11.3%	4,776	88.7%	2,786	29.8%	6,577	70.2%
	Bettrsch	611	11.3%	4,776	88.7%	2,786	29.8%	6,577	70.2%
	Meaningful	611	11.3%	4,776	88.7%	2,786	29.8%	6,577	70.2%
	Bettrneed	611	11.3%	4,776	88.7%	2,786	29.8%	6,577	70.2%
	Bettrhandle	611	11.3%	4,776	88.7%	2,786	29.8%	6,577	70.2%
	Dowants	611	11.3%	4,776	88.7%	2,786	29.8%	6,577	70.2%

	Hapyfrend	611	11.3%	4,776	88.7%	2,786	29.8%	6,577	70.2%
	Dothings	611	11.3%	4,776	88.7%	2,786	29.8%	6,577	70.2%
	Belong	611	11.3%	4,776	88.7%	2,786	29.8%	6,577	70.2%
	Support	611	11.3%	4,776	88.7%	2,786	29.8%	6,577	70.2%
	Race/Ethnic	575	94.1%	36	5.9%	2,373	85.2%	413	14.8%
	Gender	571	93.5%	40	6.5%	2,650	95.1%	136	4.9%
CPS - Older Adults	Total (CPS)	703	100%	*	*	1,228	100%	*	*
	Total (Well-Being)	59	8.4%	644	91.6%	328	26.7%	900	73.3%
	Dailyprob	59	8.4%	644	91.6%	328	26.7%	900	73.3%
	Control	59	8.4%	644	91.6%	328	26.7%	900	73.3%
	Crisis	59	8.4%	644	91.6%	328	26.7%	900	73.3%
	Bettrfam	59	8.4%	644	91.6%	328	26.7%	900	73.3%
	Betrtsoc	59	8.4%	644	91.6%	328	26.7%	900	73.3%
	Betrtsch	59	8.4%	644	91.6%	328	26.7%	900	73.3%
	Meaningful	59	8.4%	644	91.6%	328	26.7%	900	73.3%
	Betrtnneed	59	8.4%	644	91.6%	328	26.7%	900	73.3%
	Betrtrhandle	59	8.4%	644	91.6%	328	26.7%	900	73.3%
	Dowants	59	8.4%	644	91.6%	328	26.7%	900	73.3%
	Hapyfrend	59	8.4%	644	91.6%	328	26.7%	900	73.3%
	Dothings	59	8.4%	644	91.6%	328	26.7%	900	73.3%
	Belong	59	8.4%	644	91.6%	328	26.7%	900	73.3%
	Support	59	8.4%	644	91.6%	328	26.7%	900	73.3%
	Race/Ethnic	56	94.9%	3	5.1%	266	81.1%	62	18.9%
	Gender	56	94.9%	3	5.1%	310	94.5%	18	5.5%
	CPS - Family	Total (CPS)	8,288	100%	*	*	2,732	100%	*
Total (Well-Being)		4,225	51.0%	4,063	49.0%	2,141	78.4%	591	21.6%
Dailylif		4,225	51.0%	4,063	49.0%	2,141	78.4%	591	21.6%
Bettrfam		4,225	51.0%	4,063	49.0%	2,141	78.4%	591	21.6%
Betrtrfrn		4,225	51.0%	4,063	49.0%	2,141	78.4%	591	21.6%
Betrtsch		4,225	51.0%	4,063	49.0%	2,141	78.4%	591	21.6%
Cope		4,225	51.0%	4,063	49.0%	2,141	78.4%	591	21.6%
Satfamily		4,225	51.0%	4,063	49.0%	2,141	78.4%	591	21.6%
Dowants		4,225	51.0%	4,063	49.0%	2,141	78.4%	591	21.6%

	Listen	4,225	51.0%	4,063	49.0%	2,141	78.4%	591	21.6%
	Comtalk	4,225	51.0%	4,063	49.0%	2,141	78.4%	591	21.6%
	Support	4,225	51.0%	4,063	49.0%	2,141	78.4%	591	21.6%
	Dothings	4,225	51.0%	4,063	49.0%	2,141	78.4%	591	21.6%
	Race/Ethnic	4,049	95.8%	176	4.2%	2,029	94.8%	112	5.2%
	Gender	4,179	98.9%	46	1.1%	2,066	96.5%	75	3.5%
CPS - Youth	Total (CPS)	2,457	100%	*	*	2,353	100%	*	*
	Total (Well-Being)	1,650	67.2%	807	32.8%	1,953	83.0%	400	17.0%
	Dailylif	1,650	67.2%	807	32.8%	1,953	83.0%	400	17.0%
	Bettrfam	1,650	67.2%	807	32.8%	1,953	83.0%	400	17.0%
	Bettrfrn	1,650	67.2%	807	32.8%	1,953	83.0%	400	17.0%
	Bettrsch	1,650	67.2%	807	32.8%	1,953	83.0%	400	17.0%
	Cope	1,650	67.2%	807	32.8%	1,953	83.0%	400	17.0%
	Satfamily	1,650	67.2%	807	32.8%	1,953	83.0%	400	17.0%
	Dowants	1,650	67.2%	807	32.8%	1,953	83.0%	400	17.0%
	Listen	1,650	67.2%	807	32.8%	1,953	83.0%	400	17.0%
	Comtalk	1,650	67.2%	807	32.8%	1,953	83.0%	400	17.0%
	Support	1,650	67.2%	807	32.8%	1,953	83.0%	400	17.0%
	Dothings	1,650	67.2%	807	32.8%	1,953	83.0%	400	17.0%
	Race/Ethnic	1,547	93.8%	103	6.2%	1,798	92.1%	155	7.9%
	Gender	1,637	99.2%	13	0.8%	1,821	93.2%	132	6.8%

Implications for Indicator Calculation

Fiscal Years:

- **FY 2009-10:** Because the scores are so different in FY 2009-10 and it appears to be a result of methodological change rather than actual change in the indicator, FY 2009-10 should be excluded from any trend report over time
- **FY 2010-11:** Because scores (depending upon the demographic group), county participation and demographics are different when compared to earlier fiscal years and it appears to be a result of methodological change rather than actual change in the indicator, FY 2010-11 should be excluded from any trend report over time.
- **FY 2011-12:** Depending upon the demographic group, scores trend higher than the stable fiscal years (FY 2004-05 through FY 2008-09). In addition, the demographics for many groups (proportional representation) are very different from the stable fiscal years. Although it may be possible for UCLA to pull out data that appears to be representative for some counties (selecting only results that trend with the stable fiscal years), whether such undertaking represents a valid statewide picture is questionable.

Missing Data:

The typical standard for “not-to-exceed” is ten percent. However, if this standard is applied to the CPS datasets, none would be usable for the purpose of calculating Indicator 11. A high percentage of missing data calls into question the generalizability of the indicator.

Recommended Calculation**Race/Ethnicity:**

Include multirace as a racial category to be consistent with other surveys.

Missing Data:

Only include respondents with complete data.

In the interest of generalizability, analysis of demographics should compare respondents with missing data for this indicator to respondents with complete data in order to determine comparability. If respondents for Indicator 11 are different from overall CPS respondents, the differences must be reported and lack of generalizability noted in the final report.

In addition, methodology for CPS data collection must be improved in order to minimize the percentage of missing data.

Fiscal Years:

The trend report should only display FY 2004-05 through FY 2008-09. Later FY should not be included because any indicator changes are most likely due to methodology.

Priority Indicator 12: Satisfaction with Services

Indicator Definition

This indicator provides insight into consumer and family perceptions of satisfaction with mental health services.

Recommended Data for Calculating Indicator

Family members/caregivers and youth respondents' ratings (1–*Strongly Disagree* to 5–*Strongly Agree*) of six (6) self-report items (specified in the *Data Sources* section below) are averaged to calculate aggregate ratings of perceptions of access to mental health services. Ratings of 3.5 or greater generally indicate positive perceptions. This calculation method is in line with previous DHCS practices.

Adult and older adult respondents' ratings (1–*Strongly Disagree* to 5–*Strongly Agree*) of three (3) self-report items (specified in the *Data Sources* section below) are averaged to calculate aggregate ratings of perceptions of access to mental health services. Ratings of 3.5 or greater generally indicate positive perceptions. This calculation method is in line with previous DHCS practices.

The variable name as it most commonly appears in the dataset is shown next to each survey question. Each question is identified by variable in the tables showing the number of respondents per variable (space limitations preclude display of the full question). It may be helpful to refer back to this brief summary when viewing the Indicator 12 summary table due to the number of survey questions and similarly-named variables.

Consumer Perception Surveys

- Family members/caregivers and youth self-report items analyzed (YSS/YSS-F):
 - Overall, I am satisfied with the services my child received (SATSVCS)
 - The people helping my child stuck with us no matter what (NOMATTER)
 - I felt my child had someone to talk to when he/she was troubled (TRBLTALK)
 - The services my child and/or family received were right for us (RIGHTSVC)
 - My family got the help we wanted for my child (HELPWANT)
 - My family got as much help as we needed for my child (HELPNEED)
- Adult and older adult self-report items analyzed (MHSIP):
 - I like the services that I received here (LIKESVCS)
 - If I had other choices, I would still get services from this agency (CHOICES)
 - I would recommend this agency to a friend or family member (RECOMMEND)

The same individual can take the survey more than once within a fiscal year. In order to prevent duplicated individuals from biasing response patterns, only the first survey for each respondent was retained and summarized for this report (see the discussion under Indicator 9).

Completeness & Quality of Recommended Data

Race/Ethnicity:

Race and ethnicity information is contained within seven discrete variables. As is allowed in the DCR and CSI, a respondent may choose up to seven choices.

- American Indian
- Asian
- Black
- Hispanic

- Other
- Pacific Islander
- White

Because race and ethnicity information is contained across seven different variables, UCLA wrote programming to account for all of the various combinations of race-ethnicity. The various combinations include the addition of “multirace” as in the CSI and DCR.

Missing Data:

In order to calculate the indicator in each fiscal year, only respondents with complete data (i.e., no missing questions) were included.

The typical standard for “not-to-exceed” is ten percent. However, if this standard is applied to the CPS datasets, none would be usable for the purpose of calculating Indicator 12. A high percentage of missing data calls into question the generalizability of the indicator.

Fiscal Years:

Only state-level analysis is possible in FY 2009-10 (random sample). UCLA recommended in the last report that data collected in FY 2008-09 and 2009-10 must be interpreted separately because a convenience sampling method was used to gather FY 2008-09 data and random sampling was used to gather data in FY 2009-10.⁸ Examination of scores longitudinally (beginning with FY 2004-05) shaped our final recommendations regarding FY 2009-10 are addressed below.

County-by-county breakouts are likewise not presented for FY 2010-11 and FY 2011-12. Although convenience sampling resumed, anomalies in sample size and county participation (particularly in FY 2010-11) make county breakouts questionable. In addition, variations in scores and demographics (compared to the relatively stable period of time represented from FY 2004-05 through 2008-09) that characterized FY 2010-11 and FY 2011-12 are such that UCLA will only present statewide results at this time – and only for discussion purposes (see *Implications for Indicator Calculation and Recommended Calculation*).

Database	Variables	FY 04-05				FY 05-06			
		Valid		Missing		Valid		Missing	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CPS - Adults	Total (CPS)	50,310	100%	*	*	53,021	100%	*	*
	Total (Satisfaction)	44,898	89.2%	5,412	10.8%	37,372	70.5%	15,649	29.5%
	Likeservices	44,898	89.2%	5,412	10.8%	37,372	70.5%	15,649	29.5%
	Choices	44,898	89.2%	5,412	10.8%	37,372	70.5%	15,649	29.5%
	Recommend	44,898	89.2%	5,412	10.8%	37,372	70.5%	15,649	29.5%
	Race/Ethnic	41,392	92.2%	3,506	7.8%	33,537	89.7%	3,835	10.3%
	Gender	40,991	91.3%	3,907	8.7%	33,237	88.9%	4,135	11.1%

⁸ Cowles, E. L., Harris, K., Larsen, C., and Prince, A. (2010). *Assessing Representativeness of the Mental Health Services Consumer Perception Survey*.

CPS - Older Adults	Total (CPS)	4,213	100%	*	*	4,546	100%	*	*
	Total (Satisfaction)	1,514	35.9%	2,699	64.1%	2,896	63.7%	1,650	36.3%
	Likeservices	1,514	35.9%	2,699	64.1%	2,896	63.7%	1,650	36.3%
	Choices	1,514	35.9%	2,699	64.1%	2,896	63.7%	1,650	36.3%
	Recommend	1,514	35.9%	2,699	64.1%	2,896	63.7%	1,650	36.3%
	Race/Ethnic	1,381	91.2%	133	8.8%	2,577	89.0%	319	11.0%
	Gender	1,378	91.0%	136	9.0%	2,530	87.4%	366	12.6%
CPS - Family	Total (CPS)	27,223	100%	*	*	31,189	100%	*	*
	Total (Satisfaction)	18,401	67.6%	8,822	32.4%	20,891	67.0%	10,298	33.0%
	Satisfactionw/Services	18,401	67.6%	8,822	32.4%	20,891	67.0%	10,298	33.0%
	Nomatter	18,401	67.6%	8,822	32.4%	20,891	67.0%	10,298	33.0%
	Troubletalk	18,401	67.6%	8,822	32.4%	20,891	67.0%	10,298	33.0%
	Rightsservices	18,401	67.6%	8,822	32.4%	20,891	67.0%	10,298	33.0%
	Helpwant	18,401	67.6%	8,822	32.4%	20,891	67.0%	10,298	33.0%
	Helpneed	18,401	67.6%	8,822	32.4%	20,891	67.0%	10,298	33.0%
	Race/Ethnic	17,337	94.2%	1,064	5.8%	19,635	94.0%	1,256	6.0%
	Gender	17,502	95.1%	899	4.9%	19,905	95.3%	986	4.7%
CPS - Youth	Total (CPS)	18,308	100%	*	*	21,345	100%	*	*
	Total (Satisfaction)	13,268	72.5%	5,040	27.5%	16,010	75.0%	5,335	25.0%
	Satisfactionw/Services	13,268	72.5%	5,040	27.5%	16,010	75.0%	5,335	25.0%
	Nomatter	13,268	72.5%	5,040	27.5%	16,010	75.0%	5,335	25.0%
	Troubletalk	13,268	72.5%	5,040	27.5%	16,010	75.0%	5,335	25.0%
	Rightsservices	13,268	72.5%	5,040	27.5%	16,010	75.0%	5,335	25.0%
	Helpwant	13,268	72.5%	5,040	27.5%	16,010	75.0%	5,335	25.0%
	Helpneed	13,268	72.5%	5,040	27.5%	16,010	75.0%	5,335	25.0%
	Race/Ethnic	12,218	92.1%	1,050	7.9%	14,757	92.2%	1,253	7.8%
	Gender	12,396	93.4%	872	6.6%	15,038	93.9%	972	6.1%

Database	Variables	FY 06-07				FY 07-08			
		Valid		Missing		Valid		Missing	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CPS - Adults	Total (CPS)	48,988	100%	*	*	50,347	100%	*	*
	Total (Satisfaction)	34,386	70.2%	14,602	29.8%	33,821	67.2%	16,526	32.8%
	Likeservices	34,386	70.2%	14,602	29.8%	33,821	67.2%	16,526	32.8%
	Choices	34,386	70.2%	14,602	29.8%	33,821	67.2%	16,526	32.8%

	Recommend	34,386	70.2%	14,602	29.8%	33,821	67.2%	16,526	32.8%
	Race/Ethnic	30,593	89.0%	3,793	11.0%	29,972	88.6%	3,849	11.4%
	Gender	30,557	88.9%	3,829	11.1%	30,155	89.2%	3,666	10.8%
CPS - Older Adults	Total (CPS)	4,336	100%	*	*	5,168	100%	*	*
	Total (Satisfaction)	2,740	63.2%	1,596	36.8%	3,159	61.1%	2,009	38.9%
	Likeservices	2,740	63.2%	1,596	36.8%	3,159	61.1%	2,009	38.9%
	Choices	2,740	63.2%	1,596	36.8%	3,159	61.1%	2,009	38.9%
	Recommend	2,740	63.2%	1,596	36.8%	3,159	61.1%	2,009	38.9%
	Race/Ethnic	2,431	88.7%	309	11.3%	2,814	89.1%	345	10.9%
	Gender	2,424	88.5%	316	11.5%	2,830	89.6%	329	10.4%
CPS - Family	Total (CPS)	33,157	100%	*	*	35,236	100%	*	*
	Total (Satisfaction)	21,709	65.5%	11,448	34.5%	22,993	65.3%	12,243	34.7%
	Satisfactionw/Services	21,709	65.5%	11,448	34.5%	22,993	65.3%	12,243	34.7%
	Nomatter	21,709	65.5%	11,448	34.5%	22,993	65.3%	12,243	34.7%
	Troubletalk	21,709	65.5%	11,448	34.5%	22,993	65.3%	12,243	34.7%
	Rightsservices	21,709	65.5%	11,448	34.5%	22,993	65.3%	12,243	34.7%
	Helpwant	21,709	65.5%	11,448	34.5%	22,993	65.3%	12,243	34.7%
	Helpneed	21,709	65.5%	11,448	34.5%	22,993	65.3%	12,243	34.7%
	Race/Ethnic	20,337	93.7%	1,372	6.3%	21,299	92.6%	1,694	7.4%
	Gender	20,566	94.7%	1,143	5.3%	21,620	94.0%	1,373	6.0%
CPS - Youth	Total (CPS)	20,181	100%	*	*	21,860	100%	*	*
	Total (Satisfaction)	14,676	72.7%	5,505	27.3%	15,909	72.8%	5,951	27.2%
	Satisfactionw/Services	14,676	72.7%	5,505	27.3%	15,909	72.8%	5,951	27.2%
	Nomatter	14,676	72.7%	5,505	27.3%	15,909	72.8%	5,951	27.2%
	Troubletalk	14,676	72.7%	5,505	27.3%	15,909	72.8%	5,951	27.2%
	Rightsservices	14,676	72.7%	5,505	27.3%	15,909	72.8%	5,951	27.2%
	Helpwant	14,676	72.7%	5,505	27.3%	15,909	72.8%	5,951	27.2%
	Helpneed	14,676	72.7%	5,505	27.3%	15,909	72.8%	5,951	27.2%
	Race/Ethnic	13,495	92.0%	1,181	8.0%	14,438	90.8%	1,471	9.2%
	Gender	13,701	93.4%	975	6.6%	14,715	92.5%	1,194	7.5%

Database	Variables	FY 08-09				FY 09-10			
		Valid		Missing		Valid		Missing	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CPS - Adults	Total (CPS)	50,381	100%	*	*	1,623	100%	*	*
	Total (Satisfaction)	34,038	67.6%	16,343	32.4%	1,523	93.8%	100	6.2%

	Likeservices	34,038	67.6%	16,343	32.4%	1,523	93.8%	100	6.2%
	Choices	34,038	67.6%	16,343	32.4%	1,523	93.8%	100	6.2%
	Recommend	34,038	67.6%	16,343	32.4%	1,523	93.8%	100	6.2%
	Race/Ethnic	29,891	87.8%	4,147	12.2%	1,471	96.6%	52	3.4%
	Gender	29,952	88.0%	4,086	12.0%	1,485	97.5%	38	2.5%
CPS - Older Adults	Total (CPS)	6,152	100%	*	*	2,522	100%	*	*
	Total (Satisfaction)	3,716	60.4%	2,436	39.6%	2,264	89.8%	258	10.2%
	Likeservices	3,716	60.4%	2,436	39.6%	2,264	89.8%	258	10.2%
	Choices	3,716	60.4%	2,436	39.6%	2,264	89.8%	258	10.2%
	Recommend	3,716	60.4%	2,436	39.6%	2,264	89.8%	258	10.2%
	Race/Ethnic	3,226	86.8%	490	13.2%	2,138	94.4%	126	5.6%
	Gender	3,268	87.9%	448	12.1%	2,146	94.8%	118	5.2%
CPS - Family	Total (CPS)	38,836	100%	*	*	1,118	100%	*	*
	Total (Satisfaction)	25,851	66.6%	12,985	33.4%	962	86.0%	156	14.0%
	Satisfactionw/Services	25,851	66.6%	12,985	33.4%	962	86.0%	156	14.0%
	Nomatter	25,851	66.6%	12,985	33.4%	962	86.0%	156	14.0%
	Troubletalk	25,851	66.6%	12,985	33.4%	962	86.0%	156	14.0%
	Rightservices	25,851	66.6%	12,985	33.4%	962	86.0%	156	14.0%
	Helpwant	25,851	66.6%	12,985	33.4%	962	86.0%	156	14.0%
	Helpneed	25,851	66.6%	12,985	33.4%	962	86.0%	156	14.0%
	Race/Ethnic	24,395	94.4%	1,456	5.6%	933	97.0%	29	3.0%
	Gender	24,395	94.4%	1,456	5.6%	927	96.4%	35	3.6%
	CPS - Youth	Total (CPS)	22,093	100%	*	*			
Total (Satisfaction)		16,175	73.2%	5,918	26.8%				
Satisfactionw/Services		16,175	73.2%	5,918	26.8%				
Nomatter		16,175	73.2%	5,918	26.8%				
Troubletalk		16,175	73.2%	5,918	26.8%				
Rightservices		16,175	73.2%	5,918	26.8%				
Helpwant		16,175	73.2%	5,918	26.8%				
Helpneed		16,175	73.2%	5,918	26.8%				
Race/Ethnic		14,649	90.6%	1,526	9.4%				
Gender		14,921	92.2%	1,254	7.8%				

Data base	FY 10-11		FY 11-12	
	Valid	Missing	Valid	Missing

	Variables	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CPS - Adults	Total (CPS)	5,387	100%	*	*	9,278	100%	*	*
	Total (Satisfaction)	3,998	74.2%	1,389	25.8%	8,646	93.2%	632	6.8%
	Likeservices	3,998	74.2%	1,389	25.8%	8,646	93.2%	632	6.8%
	Choices	3,998	74.2%	1,389	25.8%	8,646	93.2%	632	6.8%
	Recommend	3,998	74.2%	1,389	25.8%	8,646	93.2%	632	6.8%
	Race/Ethnic	3,616	90.4%	382	9.6%	7,434	86.0%	1,212	14.0%
	Gender	2,630	65.8%	1,368	34.2%	6,397	74.0%	2,249	26.0%
CPS - Older Adults	Total (CPS)	703	100%	*	*	1,228	100%	*	*
	Total (Satisfaction)	500	71.1%	203	28.9%	1,115	90.8%	113	9.2%
	Likeservices	500	71.1%	203	28.9%	1,115	90.8%	113	9.2%
	Choices	500	71.1%	203	28.9%	1,115	90.8%	113	9.2%
	Recommend	500	71.1%	203	28.9%	1,115	90.8%	113	9.2%
	Race/Ethnic	437	87.4%	63	12.6%	941	84.4%	174	15.6%
	Gender	363	72.6%	137	27.4%	920	82.5%	195	17.5%
CPS - Family	Total (CPS)	8,288	100%	*	*	2,732	100%	*	*
	Total (Satisfaction)	4,618	55.7%	3,670	44.3%	2,294	84.0%	438	16.0%
	Satisfactionw/Services	4,618	55.7%	3,670	44.3%	2,294	84.0%	438	16.0%
	Nomatter	4,618	55.7%	3,670	44.3%	2,294	84.0%	438	16.0%
	Troubletalk	4,618	55.7%	3,670	44.3%	2,294	84.0%	438	16.0%
	Rightservices	4,618	55.7%	3,670	44.3%	2,294	84.0%	438	16.0%
	Helpwant	4,618	55.7%	3,670	44.3%	2,294	84.0%	438	16.0%
	Helpneed	4,618	55.7%	3,670	44.3%	2,294	84.0%	438	16.0%
	Race/Ethnic	4,405	95.4%	213	4.6%	2,170	94.6%	124	5.4%
	Gender	4,566	98.9%	52	1.1%	2,205	96.1%	89	3.9%
CPS - Youth	Total (CPS)	2,457	100%	*	*	2,350	100%	*	*
	Total (Satisfaction)	1,722	70.1%	735	29.9%	2,083	88.6%	267	11.4%
	Satisfactionw/Services	1,722	70.1%	735	29.9%	2,083	88.6%	267	11.4%
	Nomatter	1,722	70.1%	735	29.9%	2,083	88.6%	267	11.4%
	Troubletalk	1,722	70.1%	735	29.9%	2,083	88.6%	267	11.4%
	Rightservices	1,722	70.1%	735	29.9%	2,083	88.6%	267	11.4%
	Helpwant	1,722	70.1%	735	29.9%	2,083	88.6%	267	11.4%
	Helpneed	1,722	70.1%	735	29.9%	2,083	88.6%	267	11.4%
	Race/Ethnic	1,600	92.9%	122	7.1%	1,887	90.6%	196	9.4%
	Gender	1,707	99.1%	15	0.9%	1,913	91.8%	170	8.2%

Implications for Indicator Calculation

Fiscal Years:

- **FY 2009-10:** Because the scores are so different in FY 2009-10 and it appears to be a result of methodological change rather than actual change in the indicator, FY 2009-10 should be excluded from any trend report over time
- **FY 2010-11:** Because scores (depending upon the demographic group), county participation and demographics are different when compared to earlier fiscal years and it appears to be a result of methodological change rather than actual change in the indicator, FY 2010-11 should be excluded from any trend report over time.
- **FY 2011-12:** Depending upon the demographic group, scores trend higher than the stable fiscal years (FY 2004-05 through FY 2008-09). In addition, the demographics for many groups (proportional representation) are very different from the stable fiscal years. Although it may be possible for UCLA to pull out data that appears to be representative for some counties (selecting only results that trend with the stable fiscal years), whether such undertaking represents a valid statewide picture is questionable.

Recommended Calculation

Race/Ethnicity:

Include multirace as a racial category to be consistent with other surveys.

Missing Data:

Only include respondents with complete data. This is particularly important for the three (3) item Adult and Older Adult Indicator.

In the interest of generalizability, analysis of demographics should compare respondents with missing data for this indicator to respondents with complete data in order to determine comparability. If respondents for Indicator 12 are different from overall CPS respondents, the differences must be reported and lack of generalizability noted in the final report.

In addition, methodology for CPS data collection must be improved in order to minimize the percentage of missing data.

Fiscal Years:

The trend report should only display FY 2004-05 through FY 2008-09. Later FY should not be included because any indicator changes are most likely due to methodology.

Appendix A – California Mental Health Planning Council’s Proposed Indicators and Definitions

Matrix of California’s Public Mental Health System Prioritized Performance Indicators

To Begin Implementation of California Mental Health Planning Council’s Approved Performance Indicators

Type of Indicator	DOMAIN			
Individual Client Outcomes* (for Full Service Partnerships)	Age Group	Education/Employment	Homelessness/Housing	Justice Involvement
	Children	Indicator #2: Average Attendance—Score per year	Indicator #1: Housing Situation/Index--Score	Indicator #1: Number of Arrests
	TAY	Indicator # 8: Under 18 years—Average Attendance--Score per year 18+ --Proportion participating in paid and unpaid employment*	Indicator #7: Housing Situation/Index--Score	Indicator #7: Number of Arrests
	Adults	Indicator #13: Proportion participating in paid and unpaid employment*	Indicator #12: Housing Situation/Index--Score	Indicator #12: Number of Arrests
	Older Adults	Indicator #13: Proportion participating in paid and unpaid employment* (Explore feasibility of Indicator #20--Instrumental Activities of Daily Living)	Indicator #17: Housing Situation/Index--Score	Indicator #17: Number of Arrests
County Mental Health System Performance	Indicators #5, 6, 11, 16, 21: Family/Youth/Client Perception of Well-Being Indicator # 30: Age, Gender, Race/Ethnicity of entire FSP population Indicator # 31: Access of FSPs to Primary Care Physician Indicator # 33: Penetration Rate → 03/04 and 06/07 data already provided from CSI Indicator # 34: New Clients by county by age, gender, race ethnicity for FY 04/05 and FY 07/08 from CSI. (New clients are those without service for prior 6 months.) Indicator # 35 or # 37: Involuntary Care—3 day and 14 day commitments Indicator # 43: Annual Numbers Served through CSS from Exhibit 6 of FSPs, General System Development and Outreach/Engagement. Workforce Indicators #s 45 & 46: To Be Requested for the Development of Five-Year Plan			
Community Indicators	None At This Time			

Frequency of Data Request: Individual: Baseline and Annual Data (Y1, Y2, etc.); System: Annually Beginning 04/05; Begin with statewide and regional reports; then produce county specific reports.

* Participation in Education not available.

This Matrix contains selected indicators from the "California Mental Health Planning Council's Performance Indicator Proposal for the Mental Health Services Act, September 2009"