Youth and Family Perspectives:
Mental Health Needs and Access

Diana McIntosh, Ph.D., APRN, BC
Vice President, Clinical Services
Hamilton County Mental Health and Recovery Services Board

Julie Geiler, M.A., Consultant
Hamilton County Mental Health and Recovery Services Board

Introduction

- Hamilton County Mental Health and Recovery Services Board
- 3 Year Planning Grant: Improve Access to Mental Health Services for School Aged Youth
- Funded by The Health Foundation of Greater Cincinnati
- Phase I and Phase II Needs Assessments

Needs Assessment Phase I

Phase I
- School personnel in Hamilton County’s 22 Districts, K-12
- Providers of Children’s Mental Health (convenience sample)

Survey
SAMHSA Survey- Characteristics & Funding of School Mental Health Services

Findings
- Youth in grades 9-12 - greatest need and use of resources
- Social, interpersonal or family problems - most reported
- Aggressive/Disruptive behavior, bullying - second
- Mental health needs increase - as students grow older

Needs Assessment Phase II

Phase II Youth and Family Voice
Understanding the mental health needs of youth in grades 7-12 and their families
- What are the problems and how severe are they?
- What are the attitudes about mental health?
- Are those who have needs getting treatment?
- Who do youth and families turn to for help?
- What are the barriers to accessing treatment?
- Where would youth and families want services?

Phase II Survey

1. Ohio Consumer Outcomes (items)
   - Problem Severity Subscale (20)
   - Functioning Subscale (20)
   - Hopefulness Subscale (4)
2. Incidence and Treatment last 6 months (2)
3. Attitudes and Emotional Wellbeing (14)
4. Past and Future Help Seeking Behaviors (16)
5. Service Location Preference (4)
6. Barriers (6)
7. General Demographics (6)

Phase II Population and Sample

- Population was 7-12 graders and their parents in Hamilton County, Ohio public schools
- Sample was random and representative of Hamilton County’s 7-12th grade general education students
Phase II Sampling Procedure

To assure a random selection of students:

- Demographic data was collected from Ohio Department of Education related to the 22 public school districts in Hamilton County, Ohio (specialty schools excluded).
- The demographic data (race, grade and district typology) and the school district's proportional representation of the County was used in sampling and data analysis.
- Each school's grade level, 7 through 12, was assigned a number on the sampling frame and a random number generator was used to select the school and grade until the quota within each grade was met. Primary and alternate classrooms were selected.
- A random, representative sample of 5,000 Hamilton County students in grades 7-12 were selected. The sampling procedure is 95% confident of accuracy with a +/- 3% margin of error.

Phase II Survey implementation

- Superintendent support was elicited
- Sampling process completed by local university faculty
- Distributed 5000 matched (youth and parent) surveys to targeted schools and classrooms
- Surveys completed in March-May 2007
- Challenges in getting responses

Phase II Survey Responses

2630 Youth
468 Parents

Phase II Data Analysis

- Data was weighted to represent county demographics
- Ohio Scales were calculated by prescribed methodology
- Descriptive Statistics
- T Tests

Phase II Findings - Ohio Scales Problem Severity

Mean differences significantly higher for youth than parents

Phase II Demographics

- Participants Youth n = 2630
- Gender ♂ = 51%
♀ = 49%
- Race White = 67%
Nonwhite = 33%
- Grades 7-8 = 44%
9-12 = 56%
- Cluster 1 = 32%
3 = 37%
2 = 10%
4 = 22%
**Phase II Findings**  
**Ohio Scales Problem Severity**

Problem Severity mean scores were higher in:

- Youth (16.5) than Parents (9.7)  \( P<.001 \)
- Females (17.1) than Males (15.9)  \( P<.05 \)
- Students in grades 9th-12th (16.9) than 7th-8th (15.8)  \( P<.05 \)
- Students with grades of D-F (23.6) than A-C (14.4)  \( P<.001 \)
- Districts with lower median incomes:
  - Cluster 1: Major Urban - very high poverty (18.7)  \( P<.001 \)
  - Cluster 2: Urban - low median income, high poverty (17.1)
  - Cluster 3: Suburban - high median income (15.5)
  - Cluster 4: Suburban - very high median income (14.8)

**Phase II Findings**  
**Incidence of Recent Problem and Treatment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Youth</th>
<th>Parent</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth has experienced a mental health or emotional problem in the last 6 months.</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth has received professional mental health treatment in the last 6 months.</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase II Findings**  
**Ohio Scales Functioning**

Degree which youth’s problems affect everyday activities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Youth</th>
<th>Parent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being motivated and finishing projects</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to express feelings</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting along with family</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase II Findings**  
**Ohio Scales Functioning Subscale**

Functioning mean scores were higher for:

- Parents (64.0) than Youth (62.7)  \( P<.001 \)
- Nonwhites (63.4) than Whites (62.1)  \( P<.01 \)
- Students with grades of A-C (65.0) than D-F (54.7)  \( P<.001 \)
- Districts with higher median incomes:
  - Cluster 1: Major Urban - very high poverty (60.4)
  - Cluster 2: Urban - low median income, high poverty (62.7)
  - Cluster 3: Suburban - high median income (63.1)
  - Cluster 4: Suburban - very high median income (65.2)  \( P<0.01 \)

**Phase II Findings**  
**Ohio Scales Hopefulness Subscale**

Hopefulness mean scores were higher for:

- Males (9.9) than females (10.2)  \( P<.05 \)
- Students in grades 7th-8th (9.6) than 9th-12th (10.3)  \( P<.001 \)
Phase II Findings - Past and Future Help Seeking Preferences

Youth and Parents prefer to seek help from friends and family:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Provider</th>
<th>Youth (n=2630)</th>
<th>Parent (n=483)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>82% Past</td>
<td>63% Parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93% Future</td>
<td>92% Parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/Caregiver or other trusted family member</td>
<td>79% Past</td>
<td>44% Parent/Caregiver or other trusted family member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other trusted adult</td>
<td>49% Past</td>
<td>48% Parent/Caregiver or other trusted family member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Future help seeking significantly higher than actual past experience:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Provider</th>
<th>Youth (n=2630)</th>
<th>Parent (n=483)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher, School Counselor or other school personnel</td>
<td>45% Past</td>
<td>36% Parent/Caregiver or other trusted family member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor/Social worker/Therapist/Outside of school</td>
<td>25% Past</td>
<td>25% Parent/Caregiver or other trusted family member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy, pastor or spiritual advisor</td>
<td>17% Past</td>
<td>18% Clergy, pastor or spiritual advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet based information or resources</td>
<td>23% Past</td>
<td>16% Internet based information or resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Future help seeking significantly higher than actual past experience:

Phase II Findings - Mental Health Service Location Preference

Youth and parents prefer services in an office or their homes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Location</th>
<th>Youth</th>
<th>Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In a doctor/therapist/ counselor’s office</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my home</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at home or school but in my community</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phase II Findings - Mental Health Service Location Preference

Percentage of respondents who selected “yes definitely” or “yes maybe.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Location</th>
<th>Youth</th>
<th>Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctor’s office</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phase II Findings - Barriers parents and youth report which may impact access to services

- Transportation: 29% Parents, 48% Youth
- Appointments: 29% Parents, 55% Youth
- What others think of me: 29% Parents, 64% Youth
- Whether anyone could help me: 29% Parents, 64% Youth
- Cost: 70% Parents, 70% Youth
- Privacy: 82% Parents, 82% Youth

Implications and Conclusions

- It is critical to listen to the voice of youth and parents recognizing they may be different from the professional and from each other.
- System planning needs to consider that 7-12th grade youth may:
  - report higher problem severity than parents,
  - not want mental health services in schools,
  - prefer seeking help from peers and family members,
  - be harder to engage as they get older.
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