Partnerships in Support of Ohio’s SAMHSA Grant

The Ohio Suicide Prevention Foundation

Columbia University TeenScreen® Program

The Ohio State University

Department of Mental Health
Purpose Statement

• Provide a statewide coordinated suicide prevention screening program
  – Target youth ages 11-18 in Ohio’s highest risk counties
  – Encourage immediate linkage to appropriate behavioral health care.
  – Insure fidelity of screening programs across the state
  – Improve access to care for youth and families
In 2005-2006 School Year Ohio had 39 TeenScreen screening sites.

5,333 screenings were offered and 1,189 youth were screened.

At the end of 2006-2007, year 1 of the Ohio SAMHSA Garrett Lee Smith Grant, Ohio has 110 SOS and TeenScreen screening sites.

Thus far, 9,666 screenings have been offered and 3,468 youth have been screened.
Ohio’s Current Screening Program

Ohio’s SAMHSA, Garrett Lee Smith Grant

Ohio’s Program: 110 Adolescent Screening Sites Total
Screening Program Components

1. Offer Screening
2. Obtain Parental Consent
3. Conduct Screenings
4. Conduct Clinical Interviews
5. Refer for Counseling
Current Data: Year 1 Consents

Consents offered: 9,666

- Consents not returned: 2,692 (28%)
- Consents returned no: 2,567 (27%)

Consents Granted: 4,407 (46%)
Lesson Learned:
• Individual screening programs need to provide data on both youth who are offered as well as those who return granted consents
• Providing an education component prior to screening results in higher active parental consent

Future Strategy:
• Offer several options for curriculum on suicide prevention for Ohio screening sites (i.e. SOS, Jason Foundation, ODE, etc)
Objective
The rate of active consents obtained will increase by 10% each year
Year 1 Progress:
46% Average Consent Rate (baseline)
Year 2 Goal:
51% Average Consent Rate
Current Data: Year 1 Screening Results

- Screened: 3468 (79%)*
- Screened Negative: 2511 (72%)
- Screened Positive: 957 (28%) youth need Clinical interview

*Difference in # of youth with consent granted and # of youth screened is because screening is scheduled (program in progress)
Lessons Learned & Future Strategies

Lesson Learned:
• More education to parents on the benefits to having their youth participate in a screening program, they will be more likely to be grant consent so that more youth may be screened
• Screening results are consistent across the state when comparing similar types of sites (schools, juvenile justice)
• Preliminary results lead us to believe that sites where staff is more accepting of a screening program results in higher referral completion rates
Lessons Learned & Future Strategies

Future Strategy:

• Programs that currently have strategies to educate parents on screening programs are sharing with other programs at Bi Annual Ohio grantee meetings

• Consistent screening results will be used to project demand in future sites

• Staff implementing screening will be surveyed to determine their acceptance of implementing a screening program (Perception of Innovation of Adoption)
Current Data: Interview Results

Clinical Interviews Completed: 934 (98%)

- Low Risk: 697 (75%)
- Medium Risk: 121 (13%)
- High Risk: 52 (6%)
Lesson Learned:
• High, Medium and Low risk determined by Clinical Interviewers were not consistent across the state
• We learned that the myth of flooding the mental health system due to a statewide screening program was not true. Only 173 youth were identified as moderate to high risk

Future Strategy:
• To train all programs in the state to use the same rubric for determining level of risk
SPRC Training

Performance Target:
Train 150 clinicians to do assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRAINING</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>ATTENDEES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Train the Trainers</td>
<td>January 2007</td>
<td>22 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stark County</td>
<td>June 2007</td>
<td>20 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clermont</td>
<td>August 2007</td>
<td>60 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross, Pickway, Fayette,</td>
<td>Oct 2007</td>
<td>40 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland &amp; Pike</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>Sept 2007</td>
<td>60 attendees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objective

100% of youth identified at risk will be interviewed by a licensed professional

Year 1 Progress:
98%

Year 2 Goal:
100%
Current Data: Referrals

- Positives referred: 707 (74%)
- Low Risk: 499
- Medium Risk: 99
- High Risk: 37
- Data missing: 52
Lesson Learned:
• Juvenile Justice populations have increased positive rates (approx. double) compared to general school population
• Instrument produces 24% false positives

Future Strategy:
• When choosing a Juvenile Justice site you must have increased community clinical resources to meet the needs identified
• To share our state data with the creators of the screening instruments to improve accuracy
Current Data: Referral Completions

Completed Referrals: 218 (31%)

Low Risk: 159 (32%)
Medium Risk: 38 (38%)
High Risk: 21 (57%)
Lessons Learned & Future Strategies

**Lesson Learned:**
- We have low referral completion rates in Ohio
- We have to improve our linking parents to services and accuracy of data collection

**Future Strategy:**
- Referral Health Care Climate surveys of referred youth and their parents to gain valuable information on reasons for lack of follow through
- Learn from cross site evaluation results re: constituent feedback to referral completions
Objective
Increased percentage of referral completions

Year 1 Progress:
31% referral completions

Year 2 Goal:
50% referral completions
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