COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH PROGRAM SUPPORT BUREAU - MHSA IMPLEMENTATION AND OUTCOMES DIVISION





Prevention & Early Intervention: Child Parent Psychotherapy (CPP) **Countywide Aggregate Practice Outcomes Dashboard Report**

Outcome Data Submission through August 27, 2012

Participating Legal Entities Include:

Aviva Community Mental Health Center Child and Family Guidance Center Childnet Youth and Family Services

Children's Hospital of Los Angeles Children's Institute Inc.

Didi Hirsch

Foothill Family Services

For the Child

Hathaway Sycamores Child & Family Services

Hillsides

Los Angeles Child Guidance

Providence Community Services

Roybal Family Mental Health Services

San Fernando Valley Community Mental Health Clinic

Shields for Families Spiritt Family Services

Star View Community Services

St Anne's

St Johns Child and Family Development Center

The Guidance Center The Help Group **TIES for Families**

Version: 8/27/12

Table 1. CPP State	Table 1. CPP Status since inception to August 27, 2012							
# of Clients Claimed to Practice	# of Clients entered into PEI OMA	# of Tx cycles in PEI OMA	Clients with Multiple Tx Cycles	Clients Completing Tx	Clients Dropping-Out of Tx			
n=1,495	26.62% n=398	n=400	0.50% (n=2)	10.55% (n=42)	9.55% (n=38)			

Note 1: Clients Claimed is reported based on CPP being selected as the EBP in the PEI Plan and has ≥ 1

Note 2: Completion and Drop Out are reported based on responses indicated of "yes" or "no" in the PEI OMA for EBP completed.

Table 2. (Table 2. Child Demographics – Clients Who Entered CPP										
	Age	Ger	nder	Ethnicity				Primary Language			
Total Clients	Average	Female	Male	African- American	Asian/ Pacific Islander	Caucasian	Hispanic/ Latino	Other	English	Spanish	Other
n=398	4.8	50.25% (n=200)	49.75% (n=198)	18.34% (n=73)	0.5% (n=2)	8.79% (n=35)	66.33% (n=264)		64.32% (n=256)	34.92% (n=139)	0.75% (n=3)

Note1: Age is calculated at the date of the first EBP. Note2: Percentages may not total 100 due to missing data.

Table 3.	Top 5 most frequently	reported DSM-IV	Primary Axis	l Diagnosis – Cli	ents Who Ente	ered CPP
Total Clients	Disruptive Behavior Disorder NOS	Disorder of Infancy, Childhood, or Adolescence NOS	Post- Traumatic Stress Disorder	Anxiety Disorder NOS	Adjustment Disorder W/Mixed Disturbanc e Emotion and Conduct	Other Diagnosis
n=398	19.10% (n=76)	14.82% (n=59)	13.32% (n=53)	11.81% (n=47)	8.79% (n=35)	32% (n=128)

Table 4. CPP Program Process Data – Clients Who Entered CPP					
Outcome measures administered	Pre-test with scores	Post-test with scores	Clients who completed both a Pre and Post measure with scores		
Trauma Symptom	57.49%	49.02%	3.24%		
Checklist for Young	(n=142)	(n=25)	(n=8)		
Children (TSCYC)	Ackn= 247	Ackn= 51	Ackn= 298		
Youth Outcome	69.49%	58.06%	6.21%		
Questionnaire (YOQ) -	(n=123)	(n=18)	(n=11)		
2.01 (Parent)	Ackn= 177	Ackn= 31	Ackn= 208		

Note 1: The % indicated for Pre-test with scores, Post-test with scores, and both a Pre and Post measure with scores is calculated by dividing the n=# w/ scores by the number acknowledge (Ackn=) in the PEI OMA system for each measure.

system for each measure.

Note 2: Number of acknowledged measures (Ackn=) is determined by the number of required measures that receive a score or an unable to collect reason code.

Table	Table 5a. Top Reasons Given for "Unable to Collect"						
	PRE	Outcome measure unavailable	Administration date exceeds acceptable range	Clinician not trained in outcome measure	Not available in primary language	Invalid outcome measure	Other reasons
λC	(n=105)	30.48% (n=32)	21.90% (n=23)	17.14% (n=18)	10.48% (n=11)	4.76% (n=5)	15.24% (n=16)
TSCYC	POST	Premature termination	Not available in primary language	Administration date exceeds acceptable range	Clinician not trained in outcome measure	Lost contact with parent/care provider	Other reasons
	(n=26)	23.08% (n=6)	19.23% (n=5)	15.38% (n=4)	11.54% (n=3)	11.54% (n=3)	19.23% (n=5)

	PRE	Administration date exceeds acceptable range	Outcome measure unavailable	Not available in primary language	Parent/care provider refused	Parent/care provider unavailable	Other reasons
Parent	(n=54)	44.44% (n=24)	22.22% (n=12)	9.26% (n=5)	5.56% (n=3)	5.56% (n=3)	12.96% (n=7)
YOQ-2.01	POST	Premature termination	Parent/care provider unavailable	Administration date exceeds acceptable range	Lost contact with parent/care provider	Outcome measure unavailable	Other reasons
	(n=13)	16.15% (n=6)	15.38% (n=2)	15.38% (n=2)	15.38% (n=2)	7.69% (n=1)	0% (n=0)

Table 6. Service Delivery Data – Clients Who Completed CPP						
Total Clients	Average Length of Treatment	Average Number of Sessions				
(n=42)	29 weeks Range: 4 -74 weeks (n=42)	25 sessions Range: 1– 69 sessions (n=42)				

Note: Completed CPP is defined as having a 'yes' for completion indicated in the PEI OMA.

***Due to limited matched pairs being < 20, table 7 could not be calculated.

All Clients (n=42)									
		Percent of Clients Showing Reliable Change [±] from Pre-CPP to Post-CPP							
		Positive Change	No Change	Negative Change					
	Anxiety (ANX)	00.0% (n=00)	00.0% (n=00)	00.0% (n=00)					
	Depression (DEP)	00.0% (n=00)	00.0% (n=00)	00.0% (n=00)					
	Anger/Aggression (ANG)	00.0% (n=00)	00.0% (n=00)	00.0% (n=00)					
	Posttraumatic Stress-Intrusion (PTS-I)	00.0% (n=00)	00.0% (n=00)	00.0% (n=00)					
тѕсүс	Posttraumatic Stress-Avoidance (PTS-AV)	00.0% (n=00)	00.0% (n=00)	00.0% (n=00)					
	Posttraumatic Stress-Arousal (PTS-AR)	00.0% (n=00)	00.0% (n=00)	00.0% (n=00)					
	Posttraumatic Stress-Total (PTS- TOT)	00.0% (n=00)	00.0% (n=00)	00.0% (n=00)					
	Dissociation (DIS)	00.0% (n=00)	00.0% (n=00)	00.0% (n=00)					
	Sexual Concerns (SC)	00.0% (n=00)	00.0% (n=00)	00.0% (n=00)					
YC	OQ-2.01 Parent	00.0% (p=00)	00.0% (n=00)	00.0% (n=00)					

[±]Please see Appendix A. for a description of the CPP outcome measures and the outcome indicators (percent improvement in average scores; and, percent of clients showing reliable change).

(n=00)

(n=00)

(n=00)

Note1: Possible ECBI Intensity Raw Scores range from 36-252, with a clinical cutpoint of 131; and possible ECBI Problem Raw Scores range from 0-36, with a clinical cutpoint of 15.

Note2: Possible YOQ Total Scores range from -16-240, with a clinical cutpoint of 46.

Note3: Aggregate outcome data based on fewer than 20 children are not reported.

Note4: Positive Change indicates that the scores decreased from the pre to the post measures.

Appendix

Trauma Symptom Checklist for Young Children (TSCYC) The Trauma Symptom Checklist for Young Children is a 90-item parent/caregiver report measure that assesses trauma-related symptoms in children from the ages of 3 through 12. For the Los Angeles County PEI Plan, the TSCYC is utilized for the age range of 3 through 6. The TSCYC is the first fully standardized and normed measure of trauma-related symptoms for young children. The TSCYC contains 2 validity scales, 8 clinical scales, and a summary scale (comprising 3 of the clinical scales). Each trauma symptom is rated on a 4 point scale. Each TSYCY clinical scale score can range from 9 to 36. The summary scale (PTS-TOT) score can range from 27 to 108. The clinical cut points can be obtained in the TSCYC manual and can vary depending on the age and gender of the child.

Youth Outcomes Questionnaires (YOQ)

The Youth Outcome Questionnaire is a 64-item parent-report that assesses global distress in a child's/adolescent's life from 4-17 years of age. Scores on the measure can range from -16 to 240. Scores of 46 or higher are most similar to a clinical population on the YOQ.

Reliable Change Index

When comparing Pre and Post scores, it is very helpful to know whether the change reported represents the real effects of the treatment or errors in the system of measurement. The Reliability of Change Index (RCI) is a statistical way of helping to insure that the change recorded between pre and post assessments exceeds that which would be expected on the basis of measurement error alone. The RCI has been calculated using the Jacobson and Truax (1991) method and indicates when change exceeds that which would be expected on the basis of error at the p<.05 probability level. For a more in-depth discussion of Reliability of Change see Jacobson, N. S., & Truax. P. (1991). Clinical Significance: A statistical approach to defining meaningful change in psychotherapy research. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 59, 12-19. Also see Wise, E. A. (2004). Methods for analyzing psychotherapy outcomes: A review of clinical significance, reliable change, and recommendations for future directions. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 82(1), 50-59.

The number and percent of clients experiencing positive change, no change and negative change are recorded in table 6. Healthful change in each of the measures cited here means that scores have <u>decreased</u> in value from pre to post test administrations (i.e. recorded a negative change on the RCI). To help avoid confusion, healthful reliable change is presented as positive while unhealthful reliable change is presented as negative change.