



Therapeutic Behavioral Services Accountability Structure Report to the Department of Mental Health

Purpose: The goal of the Therapeutic Behavioral Services (TBS) Accountability Structure is to identify and develop a statewide practice and performance improvement structure. This structure will include outcome and utilization measures and a continuous quality improvement process that will allow the California State Department of Mental Health (CDMH) to effectively ensure that TBS are accessible, effective, and sustained for the Emily Q class members as outlined in the Court-approved TBS Plan.

The accountability structure, to be implemented by CDMH, will be accomplished through annual reports submitted by the county Mental Health Plans (MHPs). This new report utilizes a quality improvement process based on principles and accountability activities that focus on practice and service coordination, rather than compliance and disallowances. The report is designed to increase Emily Q class access to appropriate TBS services. This approach requires an interagency review of relevant data in response to four questions, utilizing a standard report format.

—Nine Point Plan, Appendix C

Directions: Please provide a brief summary of the answers to the following four questions as discussed in your local learning conversation (both Level I and Level II counties). Per the Nine Point Plan, it is the Mental Health Director's responsibility to submit the completed form. Please save this form to your computer then submit, along with a list of attendees, to TBS@dmh.ca.gov.

County MHP: Kern

Date of Meeting: 12-8-09

MHP Contact (name, phone, e-mail): Deanna Cloud, 661-868-6707, dcloud@co.kern.ca.us

Was this a Stakeholder or Decision-Maker meeting? Decision-Maker Meeting

1. Are the children and youth in the county who are Emily Q class members and who would benefit from TBS, getting TBS?

Kern County does not utilize enough TBS but that other intensive services are provided to Emily Q class members. TBS is often discussed regularly but not implemented. Deanna explained that for CY07, Kern's TBS rate was .38%. For CY08, Kern increased services to .58% and as of October 31, 2009, Kern's TBS rate was .62%. Kern will continue its effort to increase TBS for Emily Q class members.

2. Are the children and youth who get TBS experiencing the intended benefits?

The youth who receive TBS are experiencing the intended benefits. Barriers to TBS were discussed. Some suggested that if there was a better “buy in” from parents and/or groups homes would lead to a more positive experience for youth.

3. What alternatives to TBS are being provided in the county?

In Kern County, Dialectic Behavior Therapy, Multi-dimensional Treatment Foster Care, Functional Family Therapy and Wraparound services are being used. In other cases, clinicians have been just intensifying services and seeing the youth more often instead of doing a TBS plan.

4. What can be done to improve the use of TBS and/or alternative behavioral support services in the county?

In addition to TBS meetings with partner agencies and providers, continued training and education on TBS will help improve services.

Additional Comments: