Kentucky

UNIFORM APPLICATION FY 2020 Mental Health Block Grant Report COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES BLOCK GRANT

OMB - Approved 06/07/2017 - Expires 06/30/2020 (generated on 07/23/2021 3.26.10 PM)

Center for Mental Health Services
Division of State and Community Systems Development

A. State Information

State Information

State DUNS Number

Number 927049767

Expiration Date

I. State Agency to be the Grantee for the Block Grant

Agency Name Cabinet for Health and Family Services

Organizational Unit Department for Behavioral Health, Developmental and Intellectual Disabilities

Mailing Address 275 East Main Street 4W-G

City Frankfort
Zip Code 40621

II. Contact Person for the Grantee of the Block Grant

First Name Michele

Last Name Blevins

Agency Name Department for Behavioral Health, Development, and Intellectual Disabilities

Mailing Address 275 East Main Street 4W-G

City Frankfort
Zip Code 40621

Telephone 502-782-6150

Fax 502-564-4826

Email Address michele.blevins@ky.gov

III. State Expenditure Period (Most recent State exependiture period that is closed out)

From 7/1/2018

To 6/30/2019

IV. Date Submitted

NOTE: This field will be automatically populated when the application is submitted.

Submission Date 11/26/2019 4:39:04 PM

Revision Date 6/8/2021 4:17:33 PM

V. Contact Person Responsible for Report Submission

First Name Michele

Last Name Blevins

Telephone 502-782-6150 Fax 502-564-4826

Email Address michele.blevins@ky.gov

0930-0168 Approved: 06/07/2017 Expires: 06/30/2020

Footnotes:

Printed: 7/23/2021 3:26 PM - Kentucky - 0930-0168 Approved: 06/07/2017 Expires: 06/30/2020

B. Implementation Report

MHBG Table 1 Priority Area and Annual Performance Indicators - Progress Report

Priority #: 1

Priority Area: Early Serious Mental Illness/First Episode of Psychosis

Priority Type: MHS

Population(s): ESMI

Goal of the priority area:

Increase access to evidence based practices for individuals with early serious mental illness/first episode of psychosis.

Strategies to attain the goal:

Provide training and technical assistance to all outpatient sites funded to provide CSC to this population.

Continue to have consultation from national experts in the field.

Continue biannual meetings with all key contacts from CMHCs regarding this population, to further education on this evidence based practice and this population.

-Annual Performance Indicators to measure goal success-

Indicator #:

Indicator: Coordinated Specialty Care (CSC) as an evidence based practice to individuals with

ESMI/First Episode of Psychosis.

Baseline Measurement:Total number of outpatient sites that have fully implemented Coordinated Specialty Care to

serve individuals with ESMI/First Episode of Psychosis.

First-year target/outcome measurement: By the end of SFY 2018, will have at least one (1) outpatient site offering fully implemented

CSC to individuals with ESMI/First Episode of Psychosis.

Second-year target/outcome measurement: By the end of SFY 2019, will have a total of at least three (3) outpatient sites offering fully

implemented CSC to individuals with ESMI/First Episode of Psychosis.

New Second-year target/outcome measurement(if needed):

Data Source:

DPR Form 113H/CMHC Contract Reporting Requirement MIS Client/Event Data Set used by DBHDID and 14 CMHCs.

New Data Source(if needed):

Description of Data:

Form 113H requires quarterly reporting on the status of the core components of Coordinated Specialty Care (CSC) including:

- 1. Must list the FTE status of each CSC team member, including service role on the team for each core service component (e.g. team leader/outreach; case manager; peer support; supported employment/education; medication management; and therapy.
- 2. Initial contact with all referrals to CSC program must occur within 48 hours.
- 3. Access to a prescriber is required within one week of admission into CSC program.
- 4. Staff to client ratio of 1:10 or less (e.g. if 3.0 FTE on CSC team, then can only serve 30 clients or less)

New Description of Data: (if needed)

Data issues/caveats that affect outcome measures:

Coordinated Specialty Care is a new service for Kentucky. Implementation is in its infancy. Form 113H is a new reporting form that began in SFY 2018.

New Data issues/caveats that affect outcome measures:

		Not Achieved (if not achieved,explain why)
Reason why target was not ac	hieved, and changes propose	d to meet target:
How first year target was achie	eved (optional):	
One CMHCs has fully impleme	nted CSC: Lifeskills.	
Seven CMHCs have programs	that are working towards Full	implementation: Four Rivers, Communicare, Centerstone, Pathways,
Mountain, Cumberland River a	and Bluegrass.	
Second Year Target:	Achieved	Not Achieved (if not achieved, explain why)
Reason why target was not ac	hieved, and changes propose	d to meet target:
How second year target was a	chieved (ontional):	

Priority #: 2

Priority Area: Adults with Serious Mental Illness (SMI)

Priority Type: MHS
Population(s): SMI

Goal of the priority area:

Increase Access to Evidence Based Practices for Adults with SMI

Strategies to attain the goal:

CMHCs are required by contract to employ Adult Peer Support Specialists to serve Adults with SMI.

Continue to provide training and technical assistance to ensure that CMHCs understand how to recruit, retain and support peer support specialists in the workplace and how to appropriately document and bill for services.

Continue to provide awareness activities and training regarding Recovery principles and guidance on the process of fully including peer specialists in the service delivery array.

Continue to provide training and technical assistance regarding the supervision of peer specialists.

Technical assistance to CMHCs regarding accurate coding procedures for reporting peer support services in client/event data set.

-Annual Performance Indicators to measure goal success-

Indicator #:

Indicator: Peer Support Services for Adults with SMI

Baseline Measurement: Total unduplicated number of Adults with SMI who received peer support services, from

the 14 CMHCs in SFY 2017.

First-year target/outcome measurement: Increase by .50% the total unduplicated number of Adults with SMI who receive peer

support services, from the 14 CMHCs, during SFY 2018.

Second-year target/outcome measurement: Increase by .50% the total unduplicated number of Adults with SMI who receive peer

support services, from the 14 CMHCs, during SFY 2019.

New Second-year target/outcome measurement(if needed):

Data Source:

MIS Client/Event Data Set used by DBHDID and the 14 CMHCs.

New Data Source(if needed):

Description of Data:

Data report to show the total number of unduplicated Adults with SMI served by the 14 CMHCs, who receive peer support services during the SFY (July 1 - June 30).

New Description of Data: (if needed)

Data issues/caveats that affect outcome measures: During SFY 2017, peer support as a service was captured in the data system as one code, regardless of age of recipient. For SFY 2018, peer support as a service will be captured by separate codes for Adult Peer Support and Youth Peer Support. Also, it should be noted that peer support as a service can be provided in Kentucky to anyone with a mental health diagnosis, not only individuals with SMI. But this indicator will focus only on measuring Adults with SMI who receive that service. New Data issues/caveats that affect outcome measures: Audited report shows the following total number served with Peer Support. Rpt ID: BG_Adult_2-1 SFY 2017 = 2,044 SFY 2018 = 2,517 SFY 2019 = 2,564 Report of Progress Toward Goal Attainment Achieved Not Achieved (if not achieved, explain why) First Year Target: Reason why target was not achieved, and changes proposed to meet target: How first year target was achieved (optional): In SFY 2018, 2,934 adults with SMI (unduplicated) received a Peer Support service (individual or Group) from a CMHC as compared to SFY 2017, when there were 2604 adults with SMI (unduplicated) who received a Peer Support service from a CMHC. Thus, the goal of .5% between 2017 and 2018 was exceeded. Rpt ID: BG_Child_2_1_1 Achieved Not Achieved (if not achieved, explain why) Second Year Target: Reason why target was not achieved, and changes proposed to meet target: How second year target was achieved (optional): SFY 2018 = 2,517 SFY 2019 = 2,564 1.87% increase Increase reflects target achieved. Priority #: Children with Severe Emotional Disturbance (SED) **Priority Area: Priority Type:** MHS Population(s): SED Goal of the priority area: Increase Access to Evidence Based Practices for Children/Youth with SED Strategies to attain the goal: CMHCs with Transition Age Youth specialized programming are required by contract to have peer support services available to children and youth being served. Continue to provide training and technical assistance to ensure that CMHCs understand how to recruit, retain and support Youth Peer Support Specialists in the workplace and how to appropriately document and bill for services. Continue to provide awareness activities and training regarding resiliency and recovery principles and guidance in the process of fully including peer specialists in the service delivery array. Continue to provide training and technical assistance regarding the supervision of peer specialists. Technical assistance to CMHCs regarding accurate coding procedures for reporting peer support services in client/event data set. Annual Performance Indicators to measure goal success Indicator #: 1

Peer Support Services for Children and Youth with SED.

services, from the 14 CMHCs, in SFY 2017.

Total unduplicated number of Children and Youth with SED who received peer support

Printed: 7/23/2021 3:26 PM - Kentucky - 0930-0168 Approved: 06/07/2017 Expires: 06/30/2020

Indicator:

Baseline Measurement:

	receive peer support services, from the 14 CMHCs, during SFY 2018.				
Second-year target/outcome measurement	Increase by .50% the total unduplicated number of Children and Youth with SED who receive peer support services, from the 14 CMHCs, during SFY 2019.				
New Second-year target/outcome measure	ment(if needed):				
Data Source:					
MIS client/event data set used by DBHDID	and the 14 CMHCs.				
New Data Source(if needed):					
Description of Data:					
Data report to show the total number of usupport services in the SFY.	nduplicated Children and Youth with SED served by the 14 CMHCs, who received peer				
New Description of Data:(if needed)					
Data issues/caveats that affect outcome me	easures:				
captured by separate codes for Adult Peer Also, it should be noted that peer support	was captured in the data system as one code. For SFY 2018, peer support as a service will be Support and Youth Peer Support. as a service can be provided in Kentucky to anyone with a mental health diagnosis, not only ocus only on measuring Children and Youth with SED who receive that service.				
New Data issues/caveats that affect outcon	ne measures:				
Danast of Dragrass Toward Co	aal Attainment				
Report of Progress Toward Go	_				
First Year Target: Achie Reason why target was not achieved, and c	eved Not Achieved (if not achieved,explain why)				
First Year Target: Achie Reason why target was not achieved, and c The data indicates that there has not been a SFY 2018: 679 KY has requested input from providers to try issue, a services issues or if there is some of	eved Not Achieved (if not achieved,explain why) hanges proposed to meet target:				
First Year Target: Achie Reason why target was not achieved, and control of the data indicates that there has not been a service of the service issue, a services issues or if there is some of the collection issue for this service for youth.	eved Not Achieved (if not achieved,explain why) hanges proposed to meet target: In increase but rather a decrease in these services.SFY SFY 2017: 318 y to determine the cause of this decline. it is important to learn if it is a possible data collection				
First Year Target: Achie Reason why target was not achieved, and c The data indicates that there has not been a SFY 2018: 679 KY has requested input from providers to try ssue, a services issues or if there is some of collection issue for this service for youth. Rpt ID: BG_Child_2_1_1	hanges proposed to meet target: In increase but rather a decrease in these services. SFY SFY 2017: 318 If to determine the cause of this decline, it is important to learn if it is a possible data collection ther explanation. DBH has heard from at least one provider (region 10) that there is a data				
First Year Target: Achie Reason why target was not achieved, and c The data indicates that there has not been a SFY 2018: 679 KY has requested input from providers to try	hanges proposed to meet target: In increase but rather a decrease in these services. SFY SFY 2017: 318 by to determine the cause of this decline. It is important to learn if it is a possible data collection ther explanation. DBH has heard from at least one provider (region 10) that there is a data				
First Year Target: Achie Reason why target was not achieved, and control of the data indicates that there has not been a SFY 2018: 679 KY has requested input from providers to trace the same of the collection issue for this service for youth. Rept ID: BG_Child_2_1_1 How first year target was achieved (optional)	hanges proposed to meet target: In increase but rather a decrease in these services. SFY SFY 2017: 318 by to determine the cause of this decline. It is important to learn if it is a possible data collection ther explanation. DBH has heard from at least one provider (region 10) that there is a data by: One of this decline. It is important to learn if it is a possible data collection ther explanation. DBH has heard from at least one provider (region 10) that there is a data by: One of this decline. It is important to learn if it is a possible data collection there explanation. DBH has heard from at least one provider (region 10) that there is a data one of this decline. It is important to learn if it is a possible data collection there explanation. DBH has heard from at least one provider (region 10) that there is a data				
First Year Target: Reason why target was not achieved, and control of the data indicates that there has not been a sery 2018: 679 KY has requested input from providers to transfer a services issues or if there is some of collection issue for this service for youth. Rept ID: BG_Child_2_1_1 How first year target was achieved (optional second Year Target:	hanges proposed to meet target: In increase but rather a decrease in these services. SFY SFY 2017: 318 by to determine the cause of this decline, it is important to learn if it is a possible data collection ther explanation. DBH has heard from at least one provider (region 10) that there is a data by: Color of the proposed to meet target: Not Achieved (if not achieved, explain why) hanges proposed to meet target:				

Priority #: 4

Priority Area: Primary Substance Use Prevention

Priority Type: SAP **Population(s):** PP

Goal of the priority area:

Reduce the Incidence of Underage Drinking

Strategies to attain the goal:

Educate parents about "host parties" and the negative physiological effects of alcohol consumption by minors (children/youth under age 21). Work to establish additional Social Host Ordinances across the Commonwealth. Implement strategies such as "I Won't Be the One" to reduce underage social access to alcohol by minors. Improve early prevention screening and assessment of children/youth in school settings.

	1				
Indicator:	Number of high school students (grades 9-12) who report having consumed an alcoholic beverage in the last 30 days.				
Baseline Measurement:	23.5% as measured by the 2016 KIP Survey.				
First-year target/outcome measurement:	22.5% as measured by the 2018 KIP Survey				
Second-year target/outcome measurement:	21.5% as measured by the KIP 2020 Survey				
New Second-year target/outcome measurer Data Source:	nent(if needed):				
Kentucky Incentives for Prevention (KIP) Survey 2018 YRBS 2017					
New Data Source(if needed):					
Description of Data:					
community. The 2014 survey includes the a ideation. Once the survey data are gathered results, and depicting comparisons to the results.	of risk, peer and parent disapproval), and perceived accessibility of substances in the ddition of several new questions related to heroin use, bullying, dating violence, and suicida d and analyzed, each participating school district receives a report outlining district-specific egion, state and (when available) the rest of the country. The KIP survey is Kentucky's largest ohol, tobacco, and other drugs (ATOD), as well as a number of factors related to potential				
Data issues/caveats that affect outcome me	asures:				
The KIP survey is only provided every two ye is only 1,990 students whereas the number beverages as measured by YRBS is significa stage random sample design. The first step sample of schools (e.g. larger schools are m school, for example selecting from all Engli KIP reports data from all 6th,8th 10, and 12	ears in even numbered years. YRBS is offered in odd numbered years. The sample size for YRBS of students surveyed through KIP in 2016 was 110,387. Past 30 day consumption of alcoholic ntly higher (10 percentage points) than the number reported through KIP. YRBS has a two is to weight all of the public schools based on their enrollment numbers and then select a lore likely to be selected due to their size). Then, they randomly select classes within the sh classes or all from second period classes. KIP, on the other hand, is not a random sample. th graders in every school that participates.				
The KIP survey is only provided every two ye is only 1,990 students whereas the number beverages as measured by YRBS is significal stage random sample design. The first step sample of schools (e.g. larger schools are m school, for example selecting from all Engli KIP reports data from all 6th,8th 10, and 12	ears in even numbered years. YRBS is offered in odd numbered years. The sample size for YRBS of students surveyed through KIP in 2016 was 110,387. Past 30 day consumption of alcoholic ntly higher (10 percentage points) than the number reported through KIP. YRBS has a two is to weight all of the public schools based on their enrollment numbers and then select a lore likely to be selected due to their size). Then, they randomly select classes within the sh classes or all from second period classes. KIP, on the other hand, is not a random sample. th graders in every school that participates.				
The KIP survey is only provided every two ye is only 1,990 students whereas the number beverages as measured by YRBS is significal stage random sample design. The first step sample of schools (e.g. larger schools are m school, for example selecting from all Engli KIP reports data from all 6th,8th 10, and 12 New Data issues/caveats that affect outcom	ears in even numbered years. YRBS is offered in odd numbered years. The sample size for YRBS of students surveyed through KIP in 2016 was 110,387. Past 30 day consumption of alcoholic ntly higher (10 percentage points) than the number reported through KIP. YRBS has a two is to weight all of the public schools based on their enrollment numbers and then select a lore likely to be selected due to their size). Then, they randomly select classes within the sh classes or all from second period classes. KIP, on the other hand, is not a random sample. Ith graders in every school that participates. The measures: The sample size for YRBS is offered in odd numbered years. The sample strong through KIP in the sample strong through KIP. The sample strong through KIP is a sample strong through KIP in the sample strong through KIP in the sample strong through KIP is a sample strong through KIP in the sample strong through the sample strong through the sample strong through the sample strong through through through the sample strong through the sample st				
The KIP survey is only provided every two ye is only 1,990 students whereas the number beverages as measured by YRBS is significal stage random sample design. The first step sample of schools (e.g. larger schools are m school, for example selecting from all Engli KIP reports data from all 6th,8th 10, and 12 New Data issues/caveats that affect outcom Report of Progress Toward Go	ears in even numbered years. YRBS is offered in odd numbered years. The sample size for YRBS of students surveyed through KIP in 2016 was 110,387. Past 30 day consumption of alcoholic ntly higher (10 percentage points) than the number reported through KIP. YRBS has a two is to weight all of the public schools based on their enrollment numbers and then select a lore likely to be selected due to their size). Then, they randomly select classes within the sh classes or all from second period classes. KIP, on the other hand, is not a random sample. The graders in every school that participates. The measures: Oal Attainment Not Achieved (if not achieved, explain why)				
The KIP survey is only provided every two ye is only 1,990 students whereas the number beverages as measured by YRBS is significal stage random sample design. The first step sample of schools (e.g. larger schools are meschool, for example selecting from all Englis KIP reports data from all 6th,8th 10, and 12 New Data issues/caveats that affect outcomes Report of Progress Toward Government of	ears in even numbered years. YRBS is offered in odd numbered years. The sample size for YRBS of students surveyed through KIP in 2016 was 110,387. Past 30 day consumption of alcoholic ntly higher (10 percentage points) than the number reported through KIP. YRBS has a two is to weight all of the public schools based on their enrollment numbers and then select a lore likely to be selected due to their size). Then, they randomly select classes within the sh classes or all from second period classes. KIP, on the other hand, is not a random sample. The graders in every school that participates. The measures: Oal Attainment Not Achieved (if not achieved, explain why) The proposed to meet target:				
The KIP survey is only provided every two ye is only 1,990 students whereas the number beverages as measured by YRBS is significal stage random sample design. The first step sample of schools (e.g. larger schools are measured), for example selecting from all Englic KIP reports data from all 6th,8th 10, and 12 New Data issues/caveats that affect outcomes Report of Progress Toward Government o	ears in even numbered years. YRBS is offered in odd numbered years. The sample size for YRBS of students surveyed through KIP in 2016 was 110,387. Past 30 day consumption of alcoholic ntly higher (10 percentage points) than the number reported through KIP. YRBS has a two is to weight all of the public schools based on their enrollment numbers and then select a lore likely to be selected due to their size). Then, they randomly select classes within the sh classes or all from second period classes. KIP, on the other hand, is not a random sample. It graders in every school that participates. The measures: Oal Attainment Not Achieved (if not achieved, explain why) The manges proposed to meet target: Objective through KIP. YRBS has a two discounts and then select a server of the number of alcoholic numbers and then select a server of the number of the number of alcoholic numbers and the number of alco				
The KIP survey is only provided every two ye is only 1,990 students whereas the number beverages as measured by YRBS is significal stage random sample design. The first step sample of schools (e.g. larger schools are m school, for example selecting from all Engli KIP reports data from all 6th,8th 10, and 12 New Data issues/caveats that affect outcom Report of Progress Toward Go First Year Target: Achie Reason why target was not achieved, and cl	ears in even numbered years. YRBS is offered in odd numbered years. The sample size for YRBS of students surveyed through KIP in 2016 was 110,387. Past 30 day consumption of alcoholic ntly higher (10 percentage points) than the number reported through KIP. YRBS has a two is to weight all of the public schools based on their enrollment numbers and then select a sore likely to be selected due to their size). Then, they randomly select classes within the sh classes or all from second period classes. KIP, on the other hand, is not a random sample. th graders in every school that participates. The measures: Oal Attainment Not Achieved (if not achieved,explain why) The manges proposed to meet target: Objective of the sample size for YRBS in Object (10,000) and the proposed to the proposed to meet target: Objective of the sample size for YRBS in Object (10,000) and the proposed to meet target: Objective of the sample size for YRBS in Object (10,000) and the proposed to the pr				

as baseline and Year 2 outcome measure. 2017 YRBS is utilized for the Year 1 measure. The 2020 KIP will not be conducted until October 2020 and therefore the outcome measure is not available for use in this reporting period.

Indicator #:						
Indicator:		Past 30 day use of alcohol among youth aged 12-17.				
Baseline Measu	rement:	8.24%				
First-year targe	t/outcome measureme	ent: 7.24%				
Second-year ta	rget/outcome measure	rement: 6.24%				
New Second-ye	ear target/outcome me	easurement(if needed):				
Data Source:						
National Surve	ey on Drug Use and He	ealth				
New Data Sour	ce(if needed):					
Description of I	Data:					
(including nor and Mental He	n-medical use of presc ealth Services Administ	Id Health (NSDUH) provides national and state-level data on the use of tobacco, alcohol, illicit d cription drugs) and mental health in the United States. NSDUH is sponsored by the Substance Al tration (SAMHSA), an agency in the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). The ealth (NSDUH), is implemented annually among randomly selected youth aged 12 and older.	_			
New Descriptio	n of Data:(if needed)					
Data issues/caveats that affect outcome measures:						
			ne			
The most rece	nt NSDUH data availab	one measures: Dole is from 2014-2015. Therefore the baseline is not current. Also, the 2014 NSDUH data for the a an our state KIP data for that same age group. This may be because NSDUH uses a much smaller				
The most rece group 12-17 is sample size.	nt NSDUH data availab	ole is from 2014-2015. Therefore the baseline is not current. Also, the 2014 NSDUH data for the a an our state KIP data for that same age group. This may be because NSDUH uses a much smaller				
The most rece group 12-17 is sample size.	nt NSDUH data availab s significantly lower than ss/caveats that affect o	ole is from 2014-2015. Therefore the baseline is not current. Also, the 2014 NSDUH data for the a an our state KIP data for that same age group. This may be because NSDUH uses a much smaller				
The most rece group 12-17 is sample size.	nt NSDUH data availabes significantly lower the significantly lower the significant significant progress that affect of the significant significant progress Towar	ole is from 2014-2015. Therefore the baseline is not current. Also, the 2014 NSDUH data for the a an our state KIP data for that same age group. This may be because NSDUH uses a much smaller butcome measures :				
The most rece group 12-17 is sample size. New Data issue Report of First Year Targ	nt NSDUH data availabes significantly lower that associated that affect of the progress Towar get:	ole is from 2014-2015. Therefore the baseline is not current. Also, the 2014 NSDUH data for the a an our state KIP data for that same age group. This may be because NSDUH uses a much smaller putcome measures:				
The most rece group 12-17 is sample size. New Data issue Report of First Year Tark	nt NSDUH data availabes significantly lower that associated that affect of the progress Towar get:	ole is from 2014-2015. Therefore the baseline is not current. Also, the 2014 NSDUH data for the a an our state KIP data for that same age group. This may be because NSDUH uses a much smaller cutcome measures: rd Goal Attainment Achieved If not achieved, explain why) , and changes proposed to meet target:				
The most rece group 12-17 is sample size. New Data issue Report of First Year Tark	nt NSDUH data availabes significantly lower that affect of the progress Towar get: get was not achieved, target was achieved (o)	ole is from 2014-2015. Therefore the baseline is not current. Also, the 2014 NSDUH data for the a an our state KIP data for that same age group. This may be because NSDUH uses a much smaller cutcome measures: rd Goal Attainment Achieved If not achieved, explain why) , and changes proposed to meet target:				
The most rece group 12-17 is sample size. New Data issue Report of First Year Tark Reason why tark How first year to Second Year	nt NSDUH data available significantly lower that affect of the progress Towar get: Target:	ble is from 2014-2015. Therefore the baseline is not current. Also, the 2014 NSDUH data for the alian our state KIP data for that same age group. This may be because NSDUH uses a much smaller butcome measures: The Goal Attainment Achieved Not Achieved (if not achieved, explain why) The Achieved (if not achieved, explain why) Not Achieved (if not achieved, explain why)				
The most rece group 12-17 is sample size. New Data issue Report of First Year Tark Reason why tark How first year to Second Year The outcome in noted, the me	nt NSDUH data available significantly lower that assignificantly lower that assignificant lower than the second lower than t	ble is from 2014-2015. Therefore the baseline is not current. Also, the 2014 NSDUH data for the a an our state KIP data for that same age group. This may be because NSDUH uses a much smaller butcome measures: rd Goal Attainment Achieved Not Achieved (if not achieved,explain why) , and changes proposed to meet target: ptional): Achieved Not Achieved (if not achieved,explain why) , and changes proposed to meet target: ator was extremely aggressive. Based on the low sample size of the NSDUH and the unstable tree. The baseline measure represented the lowest level the measure had ever been and the project	nds			
The most rece group 12-17 is sample size. New Data issue Report of First Year Tark Reason why tark How first year to Second Year The outcome in noted, the medecrease was	nt NSDUH data available significantly lower that assignificantly lower that assignificant lower than 1 to 1 t	ole is from 2014-2015. Therefore the baseline is not current. Also, the 2014 NSDUH data for the alan our state KIP data for that same age group. This may be because NSDUH uses a much smaller outcome measures: Outcome measures: Outcome measures: Not Achieved (if not achieved,explain why) If and changes proposed to meet target: Optional): Achieved Not Achieved (if not achieved,explain why) If and changes proposed to meet target: Outcome measures: Outcome measures: Not Achieved (if not achieved,explain why) If and changes proposed to meet target: Outcome measure represented the low sample size of the NSDUH and the unstable trees. The baseline measure represented the lowest level the measure had ever been and the project asseline.	nds			
The most rece group 12-17 is sample size. New Data issue Report of First Year Tark Reason why tark How first year to Second Year The outcome in noted, the medecrease was	nt NSDUH data available significantly lower that assignificantly lower that assignificantly lower that assignificantly lower that affect of the second secon	ole is from 2014-2015. Therefore the baseline is not current. Also, the 2014 NSDUH data for the alan our state KIP data for that same age group. This may be because NSDUH uses a much smaller outcome measures: Outcome measures: Outcome measures: Not Achieved (if not achieved,explain why) If and changes proposed to meet target: Optional): Achieved Not Achieved (if not achieved,explain why) If and changes proposed to meet target: Outcome measures: Outcome measures: Not Achieved (if not achieved,explain why) If and changes proposed to meet target: Outcome measure represented the low sample size of the NSDUH and the unstable trees. The baseline measure represented the lowest level the measure had ever been and the project asseline.	nds			
The most rece group 12-17 is sample size. New Data issue Report of First Year Tark Reason why tark How first year to second Year Reason why tark The outcome is noted, the medecrease was to second year.	nt NSDUH data available significantly lower that assignificantly lower that assignificantly lower that assignificantly lower that affect of the second secon	ole is from 2014-2015. Therefore the baseline is not current. Also, the 2014 NSDUH data for the alan our state KIP data for that same age group. This may be because NSDUH uses a much smaller outcome measures: Outcome measures: Outcome measures: Not Achieved (if not achieved,explain why) If and changes proposed to meet target: Optional): Achieved Not Achieved (if not achieved,explain why) If and changes proposed to meet target: Outcome measures: Outcome measures: Not Achieved (if not achieved,explain why) If and changes proposed to meet target: Outcome measure represented the low sample size of the NSDUH and the unstable trees. The baseline measure represented the lowest level the measure had ever been and the project asseline.	nds			
The most rece group 12-17 is sample size. New Data issue Report of First Year Tark Reason why tark How first year to second Year Reason why tark The outcome is noted, the medecrease was How second year #:	nt NSDUH data available significantly lower that a significantly lower that a significantly lower that a significantly lower that affect of the significant is significant. It is significant to significant is significant. The significant is significant to significant is significant. The significant is significantly lower than the significant is significantly lower than the significant is significant. The significant is significantly lower than the significant is significantly lower than the significant is significantly lower that affect of the significant is significantly lower than the significant is significantly lower than the significant is significant. The significant is significant is significant in the significant is significant. The significant is significant in the significant is significant in the significant is significant. The significant is significant in the significant is significant. The significant is significant in the significant is significant in the significant is significant. The significant is significant in the significant is significant in the significant is significant. The significant is significant in the significant is significant in the significant is significant. The significant is significant in the significant is significant in the significant is significant. The significant is significant in the significant is significant in the significant is significant. The significant is significant in the significant is significant in the significant is significant. The significant is significant is significant in the significant is significant. The significant is significant is significant in the significant is significant. The significant is significant is significant in the significant is significant. The significant is significant is significant in the sig	ble is from 2014-2015. Therefore the baseline is not current. Also, the 2014 NSDUH data for the a an our state KIP data for that same age group. This may be because NSDUH uses a much smaller butcome measures: outcome measures: Outcome measures: Not Achieved (if not achieved,explain why) Achieved sample size of the NSDUH and the unstable tree. The baseline measure represented the lowest level the measure had ever been and the project aseline. In the displacement of the sample size of the NSDUH and the unstable tree. The baseline measure represented the lowest level the measure had ever been and the project aseline. In the displacement of the NSDUH and the unstable tree is the sample size of the NSDUH and the unstable tree is the sample size of the NSDUH and the unstable tree is the sample size of the NSDUH and the unstable tree is the sample size of the NSDUH and the unstable tree is the sample size of the NSDUH and the unstable tree is the sample size of the NSDUH and the unstable tree is the sample size of the NSDUH and the unstable tree is the sample size of the NSDUH and the unstable tree is the sample size of the NSDUH and the unstable tree is the sample size of the NSDUH and the unstable tree is the sample size of the NSDUH and the unstable tree is the sample size of the NSDUH and the unstable tree is the sample size of the NSDUH and the unstable tree is the sample size of the NSDUH and the unstable tree is the sample size of the NSDUH and the unstable size of the NSDUH and the unsta	nds			
The most rece group 12-17 is sample size. New Data issue Report of First Year Tark Reason why tark How first year 1 Second Year The outcome in noted, the medecrease was How second year #: Area:	nt NSDUH data available significantly lower that a significantly lower that a significantly lower that a significantly lower that affect of the significant is significant. It is significant to significant is significant. The significant is significant to significant is significant. The significant is significantly lower than the significant is significantly lower than the significant is significant. The significant is significantly lower than the significant is significantly lower than the significant is significantly lower that affect of the significant is significantly lower than the significant is significantly lower than the significant is significant. The significant is significant is significant in the significant is significant. The significant is significant in the significant is significant in the significant is significant. The significant is significant in the significant is significant. The significant is significant in the significant is significant in the significant is significant. The significant is significant in the significant is significant in the significant is significant. The significant is significant in the significant is significant in the significant is significant. The significant is significant in the significant is significant in the significant is significant. The significant is significant in the significant is significant in the significant is significant. The significant is significant in the significant is significant in the significant is significant. The significant is significant is significant in the significant is significant. The significant is significant is significant in the significant is significant. The significant is significant is significant in the significant is significant. The significant is significant is significant in the sig	ole is from 2014-2015. Therefore the baseline is not current. Also, the 2014 NSDUH data for the alan our state KIP data for that same age group. This may be because NSDUH uses a much smaller outcome measures: Outcome measures: Outcome measures: Not Achieved (if not achieved,explain why) If and changes proposed to meet target: Optional): Achieved Not Achieved (if not achieved,explain why) If and changes proposed to meet target: Outcome measures: Outcome measures: Not Achieved (if not achieved,explain why) If and changes proposed to meet target: Outcome measure represented the low sample size of the NSDUH and the unstable trees. The baseline measure represented the lowest level the measure had ever been and the project asseline.	nds			
The most rece group 12-17 is sample size. New Data issue Report of First Year Tark Reason why tark How first year tark Second Year The outcome in noted, the medecrease was How second year #: Area: Type:	nt NSDUH data available significantly lower that is significantly lower that is significantly lower that is significantly lower that is significantly lower that affect of the significant is significant. It is significant in the significant is significant in the significant is significant. It is significant in the significant is significant in the significant is significant. It is significant in the significant in the significant is significant. It is significant in the significant in the significant is significant. It is significantly lower than the significant in the signific	ble is from 2014-2015. Therefore the baseline is not current. Also, the 2014 NSDUH data for the a an our state KIP data for that same age group. This may be because NSDUH uses a much smaller butcome measures: outcome measures: Outcome measures: Not Achieved (if not achieved,explain why) Achieved sample size of the NSDUH and the unstable tree. The baseline measure represented the lowest level the measure had ever been and the project aseline. In the displacement of the sample size of the NSDUH and the unstable tree. The baseline measure represented the lowest level the measure had ever been and the project aseline. In the displacement of the NSDUH and the unstable tree is the sample size of the NSDUH and the unstable tree is the sample size of the NSDUH and the unstable tree is the sample size of the NSDUH and the unstable tree is the sample size of the NSDUH and the unstable tree is the sample size of the NSDUH and the unstable tree is the sample size of the NSDUH and the unstable tree is the sample size of the NSDUH and the unstable tree is the sample size of the NSDUH and the unstable tree is the sample size of the NSDUH and the unstable tree is the sample size of the NSDUH and the unstable tree is the sample size of the NSDUH and the unstable tree is the sample size of the NSDUH and the unstable tree is the sample size of the NSDUH and the unstable tree is the sample size of the NSDUH and the unstable tree is the sample size of the NSDUH and the unstable size of the NSDUH and the unsta	nds			

Strategies to attain the goal:

Outreach to referral sources for women with SUDs (e.g., primary care, pediatricians, OB/GYNs, emergency rooms, law enforcement, clinicians, etc.)

Indicator #:		1				
Indicator:		Increase by 2% the total number of unduplicated PWWDC who receive specialized case management services from the 14 CMHCs from SFY 2017 to SFY 2019.				
Baseline Mea	asurement:	The total numbr of unduplicated PWWDC who received specialized case management services from the 14 CMHCS in SFY 2017.				
First-year target/outcome measurement:		Increase by 1% the total number of unduplicated PWWDC who receive specialized case management services from the 14 CMHCs during SFY 2018.				
Second-year	target/outcome measurement:	Increase by 1% the total number of unduplicated PWWDC who receive specialized case management services from the 14 CMHCs during SFY 2019.				
New Second	-year target/outcome measurem	nent(if needed):				
	event data set used by DBHDID ar data reporting provided by the C	nd the 14 CMHCs. enter for Drug and Alcohol Research.				
New Data So	ource(if needed):					
Description of	of Data:					
	s show the unduplicated number nt services from the 14 CMHCs in	r of PWWDC served who meet the demographics for PWWDC and received specialized case each SFY.				
New Description of Data:(if needed)						
New Descrip	tion of Data:(if needed)					
New Descrip	tion of Data:(if needed)					
	tion of Data:(<i>if needed)</i> caveats that affect outcome mea	sures:				
Data issues/o						
Data issues/o	caveats that affect outcome meas	e measures:				
Data issues/o	sues/caveats that affect outcome measures/caveats that affect outcome	al Attainment				
Data issues/o New Data iss Report o First Year T	sues/caveats that affect outcome measures/caveats that affect outcome	al Attainment The Mot Achieved (if not achieved, explain why)				
New Data iss Report of First Year To Reason why	sues/caveats that affect outcome measures/caveats that affect outcome of Progress Toward Goo	e measures: al Attainment red				
New Data iss Report of First Year To Reason why	sues/caveats that affect outcome measures/caveats that affect outcome of Progress Toward Goararget: Achieved target was not achieved, and character target was achieved (optional)	e measures: al Attainment ded				
New Data iss Report of First Year Transaction why How first year Second Year	sues/caveats that affect outcome measures/caveats that affect outcome of Progress Toward Goararget: Achieved target was not achieved, and character target was achieved (optional)	al Attainment yed				
New Data iss Report of First Year To Reason why How first year Second Year Reason why	sues/caveats that affect outcome measures/caveats that affect outcome of Progress Toward Goa arget: Achieved target was not achieved, and character target: Achieved target was achieved (optional): Achieved target was not achieved, and character target:	al Attainment red				
New Data iss Report of First Year T Reason why How first year Reason why How second 2% for this	caveats that affect outcome measures. Sues/caveats that affect outcome of Progress Toward Good arget: Achieved ar target was not achieved, and characteristic for the companient of the compan	al Attainment red				
New Data iss Report of First Year T Reason why How first year Reason why How second 2% for this	caveats that affect outcome measures. Sues/caveats that affect outcome of Progress Toward Good arget: Achieved ar target was not achieved, and characteristic for the companient of the compan	al Attainment Yed Not Achieved (if not achieved,explain why) anges proposed to meet target: Yed Not Achieved (if not achieved,explain why) anges proposed to meet target: Analy:				
New Data iss Report of First Year T Reason why How first year Reason why How second 2% for this	caveats that affect outcome measures. Sues/caveats that affect outcome of Progress Toward Good arget: Achieved ar target was not achieved, and characteristic for the companient of the compan	al Attainment Yed Not Achieved (if not achieved,explain why) anges proposed to meet target: Yed Not Achieved (if not achieved,explain why) anges proposed to meet target: Analy:				
New Data iss Report of First Year Treason why How first year Reason why How second 2% for this is KY served 88	caveats that affect outcome measures. Sues/caveats that affect outcome of Progress Toward Good arget: Achieved Achieved, and characteristics are target was achieved (optional): Target: Achieved Achieved target was not achieved, and characteristics are target was not achieved, and characteristics are target was not achieved, and characteristics are target was achieved (optional): Target: Achieved target was achieved (optional): Target: Achieved target was not achieved, and characteristics achieved (optional): Achieved target was not achieved, and characteristics achieved (optional): Achieved target was not achieved, and characteristics achieved (optional): Achieved target was not achieved, and characteristics achieved (optional): Achieved target was not achieved, and characteristics achieved (optional): Achieved target was not achieved, and characteristics achieved (optional): Achieved target was not achieved, and characteristics achieved (optional): Achieved target was not achieved, and characteristics achieved (optional): Achieved target was not achieved, and characteristics achieved (optional): Achieved target was not achieved (optional): Achieved target was not achieved (optional): Achieved target was not achieved (optional): Achieved target was achieved (optional): Achieved target was achieved (optional): Achieved target target target target target target was achieved (optional): Achieved target targe	al Attainment Yed Not Achieved (if not achieved,explain why) anges proposed to meet target: Yed Not Achieved (if not achieved,explain why) anges proposed to meet target: Analy:				
Data issues/o New Data iss Report o First Year T Reason why How first yea Second Yea Reason why How second 2% for this is KY served 8i	sues/caveats that affect outcome measures/caveats that affect outcome of Progress Toward God arget: Achieved Achieved, and character was not achieved, and character was not achieved (optional) ar Target: Achieved Achieved (arget was not achieved, and character was not achieved (optional) and character was not	al Attainment Yed Not Achieved (if not achieved,explain why) anges proposed to meet target: Yed Not Achieved (if not achieved,explain why) anges proposed to meet target: Analy:				

Reduce the outbreak of Hepatitis by increasing the availability and awareness of syringe exchange programs statewide.

Strategies to attain the goal:

Collaborate with the Office of Drug Control Policy, the Harm Reduction Coalition and the Department for Public Health to monitor educate

communities and encourage the increase of local ordinances to create local syringe exchange programs.

Indicator #:	1
Indicator:	The number of syringe exchange programs (SEPs) in place across the Commonwealth
Baseline Measurement:	There are currently 30 SEPs statewide in KY
First-year target/outcome measurement:	Increase the number of SEPs from 30 to 32 by the end of state fiscal year 2018
Second-year target/outcome measurement:	Increase the number of SEPs from 30 to 35 by the end of state fiscal year 2019
New Second-year target/outcome measurem Data Source:	ent(if needed):
KY Department for Public Health Surveillance	e data, KY Office of Drug Control Policy, KY Harm Reduction Coalition, and DBHDID
New Data Source(if needed):	
Description of Data:	
operation for each. The ODCP and the KY Ha	rs the number of SEPs statewide and also posts to their web site the days/hours of arm Reduction Coalition and the KY DBHDID work to educate individuals and communities ctice guidelines for initiating and maintaining SEPs.
New Description of Data:(if needed)	
Data issues/caveats that affect outcome mea	sures:
programs that provide access to sterile need safer injection education. SEPs in Kentucky a treatment programs; overdose prevention ed	ted and been studied extensively in the United States since 1988. SEPs are community-based fles and syringes free of cost, facilitate safe disposal of used needles and syringes and offer also provide linkages to critical services and programs, including substance use disorder ducation; screening, care and treatment for HIV and viral hepatitis; prevention of mother-to-B vaccination; screening for other sexually transmitted diseases and tuberculosis; partner all health services.
	during the 2015 regular legislative session, the Kentucky Department for Public Health has ments implementing harm reduction and syringe exchange programs. THE SEPs.
	measures:
New Data issues/caveats that affect outcome	
	al Attainment
Report of Progress Toward Go	_
Report of Progress Toward Go First Year Target: Achiev	Not Achieved (if not achieved,explain why)
Report of Progress Toward Goe First Year Target: Achiev Reason why target was not achieved, and cha	Not Achieved (if not achieved,explain why) anges proposed to meet target:
Report of Progress Toward God First Year Target: Achiev Reason why target was not achieved, and characteristics.	Not Achieved (if not achieved,explain why) anges proposed to meet target:
First Year Target: Reason why target was not achieved, and characterist year target was achieved (optional) Second Year Target: Achiev	Not Achieved (if not achieved,explain why) anges proposed to meet target: anges proposed to meet target: Not Achieved (if not achieved,explain why)
Report of Progress Toward God First Year Target: Achiev Reason why target was not achieved, and character How first year target was achieved (optional)	Not Achieved (if not achieved,explain why) anges proposed to meet target: ed

Priority #: 7

Priority Area: Individuals who receive Substance Use Disorder (SUD) services and have or are at risk for Tuberculosis (TB)

Priority Type: SAT

Population(s): TB

Goal of the priority area:

Improve data collection of individuals with or at risk of TB who receive services for SUDs.

Strategies to attain the goal:

Continue partnering with the Ky Department for Public Health and the CMHCs to improve data collection definitions and screening protocol * Ensure that CMHCs are systematically screening for TB among individuals receiving services for SUDs

Indicator #:	1	
Indicator:	Screen persons	who present for substance use services, at the fourteen CMHCs, for TB.
Baseline Measurement:		IHCs have written policy and procedure regarding the screening for TB for eeking services for substance use disorders.
First-year target/outcome measure		CMHCs will submit their written policies and procedure regarding the B for all individuals seeking services for substance use disorders.
Second-year target/outcome meas		een CMHCs will submit their written policies and procedure regarding the B for all individuals seeking services for substance use disorders.
New Second-year target/outcome	measurement(if needed):	
Data Source:		
CMHC to submit through the Plan	and Budget process reque	sted P&P for TB screening.
New Data Source(if needed):		
Description of Data:		
Written P&P submitted by CMHCs		
Data issues/caveats that affect out	come measures:	
N/A		
New Data issues/caveats that affec	ct outcome measures:	
Report of Progress Tow	ard Goal Attainme	nt
First Year Target:	Achieved	Not Achieved (if not achieved, explain why)
Reason why target was not achieve	ed, and changes proposed t	to meet target:
How first year target was achieved	(optional):	
Second Year Target:	Achieved	Not Achieved (if not achieved,explain why)
	ed, and changes proposed t	o meet target:
Reason why target was not achieve		
Reason why target was not achieve How second year target was achiev	ved (optional):	
How second year target was achiev	•	ne 14 CMHCs during the Plan and Budget process in April 2019.

MHBG Table 2A (URS Table 7) - MHBG State Agency Expenditure Report

This table describes expenditures for public mental health services provided or funded by the State mental health agency by source of funding. Include ONLY funds expended by the executive branch agency administering the MH Block Grant.

Activity (See instructions for using Row 1.)	A. SA Block Grant	B. MH Block Grant	C. Medicaid (Federal, State, and Local)	D. Other Federal Funds (e.g., ACF (TANF), CDC, CMS (Medicare) SAMHSA, etc.)	E. State Funds	F. Local Funds (excluding local Medicaid)	G. Other
1. Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment							
a. Pregnant Women and Women with Dependent Children							
b. All Other							
2. Primary Prevention*		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
3. Evidence-Based Practices for Early Serious Mental Illness**		\$993,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
4. Tuberculosis Services							
5. HIV Early Intervention Services							
6. State Hospital			\$46,385,800	\$12,033,800	\$69,023,700	\$2,526,800	\$57,100
7. Other 24 Hour Care		\$0	\$15,011,900	\$476,100	\$4,914,500	\$2,589,000	\$16,300
8. Ambulatory/Community Non- 24 Hour Care		\$6,866,100	\$276,000	\$1,783,200	\$36,291,200	\$0	\$2,398,100
9. Administration (Excluding Program and Provider Level)		\$60,500	\$97,100	\$3,500	\$11,684,200	\$0	\$79,800
10. Total	\$0	\$7,919,600	\$61,770,800	\$14,296,600	\$121,913,600	\$5,115,800	\$2,551,300

^{*}States may only use MHBG funds to provide primary prevention services to the priority populations of adults with serious mental illness and children with severe emotional disturbance

Actual	C Estimated
0930-0168 App	roved: 06/07/2017 Expires: 06/30/2020
Footnotes:	

Please indicate the expenditures are actual or estimated.

^{**}Column 3B is for expenditures related to ESMI including First Episode Psychosis programs funded through MHBG set-aside. These funds are not to be also counted in #8 Ambulatory/Community Non 24-Hour Care.

MHBG Table 2B (URS Table 7A) - MHBG State Agency Early Serious Mental Illness and First Episode Psychosis Expenditures Report

Source of Funds						
Activity (See instructions for using Row 1.)	A. Mental Health Block Grant	B. Medicaid (Federal State & Local)	C. Other Federal Funds (e.g. ACF (TANF), CDC, CMS (Medicare), SAMHSA, etc.)	D. State Funds	E. Local funds (excluding local Medicaid)	F. Other
1. CSC-Evidences-Based Practices for First Episode Psychosis*	\$918,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Training for CSC Practices	\$40,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Planning for CSC Practices	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other Early Serious Mental Illnesses programs (other than FEP or partial CSC programs)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
3. Training for ESMI	\$35,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
4. Planning for ESMI	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
7. Total	\$993,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

^{**}When reporting CSC-Evidences-Based Practices for First Episode Psychosis, report only those programs that are providing all the components of a CSC model. If the state uses certain components of a CSC model, please report them in 'Other Early Serious Mental Illness program (other than FEP or partial CSC programs)'.

0930-0168 Approved: 06/07/2017 Expires: 06/30/2020
Footnotes:
Totalotes.

MHBG Table 3 - Set-aside for Children's Mental Health Services

Statewide Expenditures for Children's Mental Health Services								
Actual SFY 1994 Actual SFY 2018 Estimated/Actual SFY 2019 Expense Type \$3,832,010 \$7,739,044 \$7,879,497 © Actual © Estin								
							If <u>estimated</u> expenditures are provided, please indicate when <u>actual</u> expenditure data will be submitted to SAMHSA:	
States and jurisdictions are required not to spend less than the amount expended in FY 1994.								
0930-0168 Approved: 06/07/2017 Expires: 06/30/2020								
Footnotes:								

MHBG Table 4 (URS Table 8) - Profile Of Mental Health Block Grant Expenditures for Non-Direct Service Activities

This table is used to describe the use of MHBG funds for non-direct service activities that are sponsored, or conducted, by the State Mental Health Authority

Expenditure Period Start Date: 7/1/2018 Expenditure Period End Date: 6/30/2019

Experialture Feriod Start	Experial tale Feriod End Date: 0/30/2019	
Activity		Total of Block Grant
1. Information Systems		\$97,762
2. Infrastructure Suppor	t	\$75,317
3. Partnerships, Commu	nity Outreach and Needs Assessment	\$44,060
4. Planning Council Activ	vities	\$9,341
5. Quality Assurance and	I Improvement	\$
6. Research and Evaluati	ion	\$
7. Training and Education	on	\$11,717
Total Non-Direct Service	es	\$238,197
Comments on Data:	Significant Changes due to: Information Systems - increased use Infrastructure Support - added training and technical assistance needs assessment - increased training provided through KY MH improvement - closed the "Institute of Excellence".	provided; Partnerships, community outreach and

0930-0168 Approved: 06/07/2017 Expires: 06/30/2020

MHBG Table 5 (URS Table 10) - Profiles of Agencies Receiving Block Grant Funds Directly from the State MHA

Expenditure Period Start Date: 7/1/2018 Expenditure Period End Date: 6/30/2019

								Amount of MH Block Gr	ant Allocation to Agency		
Entity Number	Area Served (Statewide or Sub- State Planning Area)	Provider/Program Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip	Total Block Grant Funds	Adults with Serious Mental Illness	Children with Serious Emotional Disturbance	Set-aside for ESMI/FEP Programs	
14	Sub-State Planning Area	Adanta	130 Souther School Road	Somerset	ку	42501	\$274,943.00	\$187,110.00	\$84,833.00		
6	Sub-State Planning Area	Centerstone	10101 Linn Station Road Suite 600	Louisville	ку	40223	\$1,231,776.00	\$994,558.00	\$187,218.00		
5	Sub-State Planning Area	Communicare	107 Cranes Roost Court	Elizabethtown	ку	42701	\$764,192.00	\$462,875.00	\$101,317.00		
8	Sub-State Planning Area	Comprehend	611 Forest Avenue	Maysville	ку	41056	\$172,384.00	\$89,123.00	\$80,261.00		
13	Sub-State Planning Area	Cumberland River	1203 American Greeting Card Road PO Box 568	Corbin	KY	40702	\$612,663.00	\$335,393.00	\$102,270.00		
1	Sub-State Planning Area	Four Rivers	425 Broadway	Paducah	ку	42001	\$484,262.00	\$297,041.00	\$87,221.00		
16	Statewide	Kentucky Housing Corporation	1231 Louisville Road	Frankfort	ку	40601	\$13,333.00	\$13,333.00	\$0.00		
17	Statewide	Kentucky Partnership for Families & Children (KPFC)	1st Floor 207 Holmes Street	Frankfort	KY	40601	\$143,000.00	\$0.00	\$143,000.00		
12	Sub-State Planning Area	KY River	115 Rockwood lane	Hazard	ку	41701	\$217,222.00	\$133,255.00	\$80,967.00		
4	Sub-State Planning Area	Lifeskills	PO Box 6499	Bowling Green	ку	42102	\$744,847.00	\$481,895.00	\$162,952.00		
11	Sub-State Planning Area	Mountain	104 South Front Street	Prestonsburg	ку	41653	\$446,137.00	\$246,676.00	\$99,461.00		
18	Statewide	NAMI Kentucky	2441 S. Hwy 27	Somerset	ку	42501	\$145,054.00	\$145,054.00	\$0.00		
19	Statewide	NAMI Lexington (KY) Inc.	498 Georgetown St Ste 201	Lexington	ку	40508	\$150,190.00	\$150,190.00	\$0.00		
15	Sub-State Planning Area	New Vista	1351 Newtown Pike	Lexington	KY	40511	\$699,592.00	\$344,291.00	\$155,301.00		
7	Sub-State Planning Area	North Key	502 Farrell Drive PO Box 2680	Covington	ку	41011	\$478,851.00	\$356,966.00	\$118,885.00		
10	Sub-State Planning Area	Pathways	1212 Bath Avenue 8th Floor PO Box 790	Ashland	KY	41105	\$414,829.00	\$268,144.00	\$96,685.00		
2	Sub-State Planning Area	Pennyroyal	3999 Fort Campbell Blvd	Hopkinsville	ку	42241	\$342,053.00	\$263,081.00	\$75,972.00		
3	Sub-State Planning Area	River Valley	1100 Walnut Street PO Box 1637	Owensboro	ку	42302	\$360,015.00	\$271,123.00	\$85,892.00		
21	Statewide	Technical Assistance Collaborative	31 Saint James Ave Ste 950	Boston	МА	2116	\$83,600.00	\$83,600.00	\$0.00		
20	Statewide	Wellspring Inc.	PO Box 1927	Louisville	ку	40201	\$50,000.00	\$50,000.00 \$0.00			
Total							\$7,828,943.00	\$5,173,708.00	\$1,662,235.00	\$0.00	

0930-0168 Approved: 06/07/2017 Expires: 06/30/2020
Footnotes:

MHBG Table 6 - Maintenance of Effort for State Expenditures on Mental Health Services

				Total Expe	nditures for SMH	IA		
Period				Expenditure	es	<u>B1(2017</u>	7) + B2(2018) 2	
(A)				(B)			(C)	
SFY 2017 (1)					\$20,528,760			
SFY 2018 (2)					\$20,546,106			\$20,537,433
SFY 2019 (3)					\$20,551,883			
Are the expenditure amount				ual" expenditures	for the State fisc	al years involved?		
SFY 2017 SFY 2018	Yes Yes	X	No _					
SFY 2019	Yes		No _	_				
If estimated expenditures ar	e provide	ed, pleas	se indicate v	vhen actual expe	nditure data will l	be submitted to SAMHSA:		
0930-0168 Approved: 06/07/	2017 Exp	ires: 06/	30/2020					
Footnotes:								

MHBG Table 7 (URS Table 1) - Profile of the State Population by Diagnosis

Expenditure Period Start Date: Expenditure Period End Date:

	Current Report Year	Three Years Forward
Adults with Serious Illness (SMI)		
Children with Serious Emotional Disturbances (SED)		
Note: This Table will be completed for the States by CMHS. 0930-0168 Approved: 06/07/2017 Expires: 06/30/2020		
Footnotes:		

MHBG Table 8A and MHBG Table 8B (URS Tables 2A and 2B) - Profile of Persons Served, All Programs by Age, Gender and Race/Ethnicity

This table provides an aggregate profile of persons in the reporting year. The reporting year should be the latest state fiscal year for which data are available. This profile is based on a client receiving services in programs provided or funded by the state mental health agency. The client profile takes into account all institutional and community services for all such programs. Please provide unduplicated counts if possible.

Table 8A

Are these numbers

unduplicated?

	Total			Total American Indian or Asian Alaska Native					n 	Black or African Native Hawaiian or White American Other Pacific Islander								Hispanic use only if data for MHBG Table 8B are not available				e Reported			Race Not Available			
	Female	Male	Not Available	Total	Female	Male	Not Available	Female	Male	Not Available	Female	Male	Not Available	Female	Male	Not Available	Female	Male	Not Available	Female		Not Available	Female	Male	Not Available	Female		Not Availabl
0-12 years	12,226	19,607	68	31,901	18	18	0	25	43	0	1,248	2,354	7	13	21	0	9,366	14,683	32	0	0	0	604	943	1	952	1,545	28
13-17 years	10,878	11,074	53	22,005	22	29	0	37	32	1	945	1,073	0	15	13	0	8,604	8,654	36	0	0	0	459	474	2	796	799	14
18-20 years	4,119	3,757	36	7,912	7	6	0	16	14	0	391	348	4	5	1	0	3,155	2,864	19	0	0	0	144	156	0	401	368	13
21-24 years	5,182	4,499	67	9,748	9	7	0	12	25	0	508	489	0	8	1	0	3,967	3,376	46	0	0	0	163	107	1	515	494	20
25-44 years	28,046	25,027	198	53,271	65	50	0	56	63	0	2,446	2,444	6	23	27	0	22,630	19,701	123	0	0	0	506	370	0	2,320	2,372	69
45-64 years	19,444	15,772	78	35,294	52	29	0	61	30	0	1,759	1,710	6	14	19	0	15,950	12,540	44	0	0	0	309	233	0	1,299	1,211	28
65-74 years	2,793	1,730	14	4,537	5	5	0	8	2	0	175	140	0	2	1	0	2,351	1,369	10	0	0	0	32	23	0	220	190	4
75+ years	859	432	41	1,332	2	1	0	1	0	0	41	17	0	1	0	0	629	295	6	0	0	0	7	8	0	178	111	35
Not Available	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(
Total	83,547	81,898	555	166,000	180	145	0	216	209	1	7,513	8,575	23	81	83	0	66,652	63,482	316	0	0	0	2,224	2,314	4	6,681	7,090	21
Pregnant Women	854	0	0	854	1			3			90			0			697			0			30			33		

☐ Duplicated : Among Community Programs

Duplicated : between Hospitals

and Community

Other : describe

Printed: 7/23/2021 3:26 PM - Kentucky - 0930-0168 Approved: 06/07/2017 Expires: 06/30/2020

☐ Duplicated between children

Unduplicated

and adults

Comments on Data (for Age):	
Comments on Data (for Gender):	
Comments on Data (for Race/Ethnicity):	Notice an increase in the number of Race Not Available; will try to identify the cause and improve reporting for next year.
Comments on Data (Overall):	URS 2019 Not Available increased; possible indirect result from several CMHCs implementing a new EHR system; will continue to monitor

Table 8B Of the total persons served, please indicate the age, gender and the number of persons who are Hispanic/Latino or not Hispanic/Latino. Total persons served would be the total as indicated in Table 8A. Expenditure Period Start Date: 7/1/2018 Expenditure Period End Date: 6/30/2019

	Not F	lispanic or l	Latino	His	panic or Lat	ino	Hispanic or L	atino Origin I	Not Available		Total					
	Female	Male	Not Available	Female	Male	Not Available	Female	Male	Not Available	Female	Male	Not Available	Total			
0-12 years	11,527	18,508	29	487	790	3	212	309	36	12,226	19,607	68	31,901			
13-17 years	10,294	10,505	31	440	477	1	144	92	21	10,878	11,074	53	22,005			
18-20 years	3,914	3,545	17	124	105	0	81	107	19	4,119	3,757	36	7,912			
21-24 years	4,946	4,206	35	112	89	3	124	204	29	5,182	4,499	67	9,748			
25-44 years	26,904	23,589	86	437	378	3	705	1,060	109	28,046	25,027	198	53,271			
45-64 years	18,803	15,023	33	246	179	1	395	570	44	19,444	15,772	78	35,294			
65-74 years	2,668	1,615	5	43	21	0	82	94	9	2,793	1,730	14	4,537			
75+ years	812	398	6	10	5	0	37	29	35	859	432	41	1,332			
Not Available	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Total	79,868	77,389	242	1,899	2,044	11	1,780	2,465	302	83,547	81,898	555	166,000			
Pregnant Women	832			13			9			854	0	0	854			

Comments on Data (for Gender):	
Comments on Data (for Race/Ethnicity):	Notice an increase in the number of Ethnicity Not Available; will try to identify the cause and improve reporting for next year.
Comments on Data (Overall):	URS 2019 Not Available increased; possible indirect result from several CMHCs implementing a new EHR system; will continue to monitor.

0930-0168 Approved: 06/07/2017 Expires: 06/30/2020

Footnotes:		

MHBG Table 9 (URS Table 3) - Profile of Persons served in the Community Mental Health Settings, State Psychiatric Hospitals and Other Settings

Expenditure Period Start Date: 7/1/2018 Expenditure Period End Date: 6/30/2019

This table provides a profile for the clients that received public funded mental health services in community mental health settings, in state psychiatric hospitals, in other psychiatric inpatient programs, and in residential treatment centers for children.

Note: Clients can be duplicated between Rows: e.g., The same client may be served in both state psychiatric hospitals and community mental health centers during the same year and thus would be reported in counts for both rows.

Service Setting	Setting Age 0-17				Age 18-20	Age 18-20 Age 21-64 Age 65+					Age	Not Avai	ilable		Total				
	Female	Male	Not Available	Female	Male	Not Available	Female	Male	Not Available	Female	Male	Not Available	Female	Male	Not Available	Female	Male	Not Available	Total
Community Mental Health Programs	23,102	30,680	121	4,084	3,682	36	52,124	44,047	343	3,571	2,069	55	0	0	0	82,881	80,478	555	163,914
State Psychiatric Hospitals	5	4	0	127	215	0	2,115	3,438	0	193	168	0	0	0	0	2,440	3,825	0	6,265
Other Psychiatric Inpatient	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Residential Treatment Centers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Comments on Data (for Age):

Comments on Data (for Gender):

Notice an increase in the number of Gender Not Available; will try to identify the cause and improve reporting for next year.

Comments on Data (Overall):

URS 2019 Not Available increased; possible indirect result from several CMHCs implementing a new EHR system; will continue to monitor.

0930-0168 Approved: 06/07/2017 Expires: 06/30/2020

Footnotes:		

MHBG Table 10A and MHBG Table 10B (URS Tables 5A and 5B) - Profile of Clients by Type of Funding Support

Table 10A 0930-0168 Approved: 06/07/2017 Expires: 06/30/2020

This table provides a summary of clients by Medicaid coverage. Since the focus of the reporting is on clients of the public mental health service delivery system, this table focuses on the clientele serviced by public programs that are funded or operated by the State Mental Health Authority. Persons are to be counted in the Medicaid row if they received a service reimbursable through Medicaid.

Please note that the same person may be served in both Medicaid and Non-Medicaid programs during the same reporting period.

Expenditure Period Start Date: 7/1/2018 Expenditure Period End Date: 6/30/2019

Expenditu	re Perioc	I Start Do	ate. 7/	1/2010	Exper	iditure	Perio	u Enu L	vate. 6,	/30/20	119																	
		То	tal		Amer or Ala				Asian			c or Afr merica			e Haw her Pa lande	cific		White		Hispan if data Table	for M	HBG e not		Than Repor		Race N	lot Ava	ilable
	Female	Male	Not Avail	Total	Female		Not Avail	Female		Not Avail	Female	Male	Not Avail	Female	Male	Not Avail	Female	Male	Not Avail	Female	Male		Female	Male	Not Avail	Female	Male	Not Avail
Medicaid (only Medicaid)		39,440	152	82,413	102	72	0	98	83	0	4,460	4,812	8	41	49	0	33,374	29,757	108	0	0	0	1,190	1,297	2	3,556	3,370	34
Non- Medicaid Sources (only)	24,376	25,367	306	50,049	48	42	0	72	70	1	1,716	2,074	7	28	19	0	19,612	19,816	139	0	0	0	574	549	1	2,326	2,797	158
People Served by Both Medicaid and Non- Medicaid Sources		15,671	97	31,452	29	28	0	42	47	0	1,271	1,466	8	12	15	0	13,104	12,789	69	0	0	0	451	454	1	775	872	19
Medicaid Status Not Available	666	1,420	0	2,086	1	3	0	4	9	0	66	223	0	0	0	0	562	1,120	0	0	0	0	9	14	0	24	51	0
Total Served	83,547	81,898	555	166,000	180	145	0	216	209	1	7,513	8,575	23	81	83	0	66,652	63,482	316	0	0	0	2,224	2,314	4	6,681	7,090	211
				□ Da	ta Based	d on M	edicai	d Servi	ces		□ Da	ta Base	ed on I	Medical	Eligib	ility, n	ot Medi	caid Paid	d Serv	ices	V	Peopl	e Serve	d By Bo	oth' in	cludes p	people	with a
Comments Notice an		•		of Race	Not Ava	ilable;	will tr	y to ide	entify t	he ca	use and	improv	/e rep	orting f	or nex	t year.												

Comments on Data (for Gender):

Comments on Data (Overall):

URS 2019 Not Available increased; possible indirect result from several CMHCs implementing a new EHR system; will continue to monitor.

their treatment, and (4) Medicaid Status Not Available.

If a state is unable to unduplicate between people whose care is paid for by Medicaid only or Medicaid and other funds, then all data should be reported into the 'People Served by Both Medicaid and Non-Medicaid Sources' and the 'People Served by Both includes people with any Medicaid' check box should be checked.

Table 10B

Of the total persons covered by Medicaid, please indicate the gender and number of persons who are Hispanic/Latino or not Hispanic/Latino. Total persons covered by Medicaid would be the total indicated in Table 10A.

Please note that the same person may be served in both Medicaid and Non-Medicaid programs during the same reporting period.

Expenditure Period Start Date: 7/1/2018 Expenditure Period End Date: 6/30/2019

ļ	Not Hispanic or Latino			Lien	anic or La			c or Latino	Origin		То	tal	
	NOLH	ispanic or i	.auno	пізр	dilic or La	uno		Unknown	Origin		10	lai	
	Female	Male	Not Avail	Female	Male	Not Avail	Female	Male	Not Avail	Female	Male	Not Avail	Total
Medicaid Only	41,144	37,734	98	1,179	1,206	7	498	500	47	42,821	39,440	152	82,413
Non- Medicaid Only	23,384	24,240	90	441	514	4	551	613	212	24,376	25,367	306	50,049
People Served by Both Medicaid and Non- Medicaid Sources	15,214	15,143	54	278	319	0	192	209	43	15,684	15,671	97	31,452
Medicaid Status Unknown	126	272	0	1	5	0	539	1,143	0	666	1,420	0	2,086
Total Served	79,868	77,389	242	1,899	2,044	11	1,780	2,465	302	83,547	81,898	555	166,000

Comments on Data (for Ethnicity):

Comments on Data (for Gender):

Notice an increase in the number of Gender Not Available; will try to identify the cause and improve reporting for next year.

Comments on Data (Overall):

URS 2019 Not Available increased; possible indirect result from several CMHCs implementing a new EHR system; will continue to monitor.

Each row should have a unique (unduplicated) count of clients: (1) Medicaid Only, (2) Non-Medicaid Only, (3) Both Medicaid and Other Sources funded their treatment, and (4) Medicaid Status Unknown.

Footnotes:			

MHBG Table 11 (URS Table 6) - Profile of Client Turnover

Expenditure Period Start Date: 7/1/2018 Expenditure Period End Date: 6/30/2019

Profile of Service Utilization	Total Served at Beginning of Year (unduplicated)	Admissions During the year (duplicated)	Discharges During the year (duplicated)		f Stay (in scharged ents	Average I Stay (ir	r or Less: Length of Days): at end of	More Tha Average I Stay (in	at end of
				Average (Mean)	Median	Average (Mean)	Median	Average (Mean)	Median
State Hospitals	414	7,860	7,876	0	0	0	0	0	0
Children (0 to 17 years)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Adults (18 yrs and over)	414	7,853	7,870	18	7	36	13	1,377	666
Age Not Available	0	7	6	10	7	4	4	0	0
Other Psychiactric Inpatient	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Children (0 to 17 years)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Adults (18 yrs and over)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Age Not Available	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Residential Tx Centers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Children (0 to 17 years)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Adults (18 yrs and over)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Age Not Available	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Community Programs	54,372	109,542	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Children (0 to 17 years)	20,567	33,336							
Adults (18 yrs and over)	33,803	76,164							
Age Not Available	2	42							

Comments on Data (State Hospital):

Comments on Data (Other Inpatient):

Comments on Data (Residential Treatment):

Comments on Data (Community Programs):

Community Program admission reduced from 2018. Causes may include: lack of outreach by CMHCs; increased business

Printed: 7/23/2021 3:26 PM - Kentucky - 0930-0168 Approved: 06/07/2017 Expires: 06/30/2020

competition of MH/SA private providers, Medicaid policy increased eligibility requirements.

Comments on Data (Overall):

0930-0168 Approved: 06/07/2017 Expires: 06/30/2020

Footnotes:

Printed: 7/23/2021 3:26 PM - Kentucky - 0930-0168 Approved: 06/07/2017 Expires: 06/30/2020

MHBG Table 12 (URS Table 12) - State Mental Health Agency Profile

Expenditure Period Start Date: 7/1/2018 Expenditure Period End Date: 6/30/2019

Populations Served

Which of the following populations receive services operated or funded by the state mental health agency? Please indicate if they are included

	in the data provided in the table	•	ated of familiated by the state	mental neural agency. The	ase maleute if they are melat	acu .
		Population	ons Covered:	Included	in Data	
		State Hospitals	Community Programs	State Hospitals	Community Programs	
1. Ag	ed 0 to 3	☐ Yes	▼ Yes	☐ Yes	▼ Yes	
2. Ag	ed 4 to 17	☐ Yes	✓ Yes	☐ Yes	▼ Yes	
3. Ad	ults Aged 18 and over	▼ Yes	▼ Yes	▼ Yes	▼ Yes	
4. For	ensics	▼ Yes	Yes	✓ Yes	☐ Yes	
Comr	nents on Data:					
2.	Do all of the adults and children	_	e mental health agency mee	t the Federal definitions of	serious mental illness and	
		☐ Seriou	s Mental Illness			
			s Emotional Disturbances			
2.a.	If no, please indicate the percen serious emotional disturbance?	tage of persons served fo	or the reporting period who	met the federal definitions	of serious mental illness and	ı
2.a.1.	Percent of adults meeting Feder	al definition of SMI				
	refeelit of addits meeting reder	ar definition of 5im.		39.0 %		
2.a.2.	Percentage of children/adolesce	ents meeting Federal defir	nition of SED:	53.0 %		
3.	Co-Occurring Mental Health and	d Substance Abuse:				
3.a.	What percentage of persons ser		reporting period have a dua	Il diagnosis of mental illnes	s and substance abuse?	
3.a.1.	Percentage of adults served by t	he SMHA who also have a	a diagnosis of substance abu	use problem:	17.0 %	
3.a.2.	Percentage of children/adolesce	ints served by the SMHA i	who also have a diagnosis of	substance abuse problem:	1.0 %	
3.b.	What percentage of persons ser SED have a dual diagnosis of me	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		finitions of adults with SMI	and children/adolescents wi	th
3.b.1.	Percentage of adults meeting Fe	ederal definition of SMI w	ho also have a diagnosis of	substance abuse problem:	7.0 %	
3.b.2.	Percentage of children/adolesce abuse problem:	ents meeting the Federal o	definition of SED who also h	ave a diagnosis of substand	1.0 %	
3.b.3.	Please describe how you calcula the number of persons with co- disorders.	occurring both MH-re Children: 4	ecord and SA-record markers	s true divided by total served dults with SMI and children	d (Adults:19425/113002); with SED with co-occurring S	
4.	State Mental Health Agency Res		Sivil alia SED + DOUI (MIA-190	.ora + 3A-record), rptiD= Cl	VIIIC_CEIL_DU (3030/431/9)	
	a. Medicaid: Does the State Mer Medicaid? (Check All that Apply)	= -		bilities for mental health se	rvices provided through	
	1. State Medicaid Operating Age	ency				

2. Setting Standards

	3. Quality Improvement/Program Compliance4. Resolving Consumer Complaints5. Licensing6. Sanctions7. Other					
	b. Managed Care (Mental Health Managed Care)				Are Data for programs on URS Ta	reported
4.b.1	Does the State have a Medicaid Managed Care initiat	tive?	~	Yes	✓ Yes	
4.b.2	Does the State Mental Health Agency have any responsible through Medicaid Managed Care?	onsibilities for mental health services provided	~	Yes		
If yes, 4.b.3	please check the responsibilities the SMHA has: Direct contractual responsibility and oversight of the	MCOs or BHOs		Yes		
4.b.4	Setting Standards for mental health services	i Micos of Brios		Yes		
4.b.5	Coordination with state health and Medicaid agenci	es		Yes		
4.b.6	Resolving mental health consumer complaints			Yes		
4.b.7	Input in contract development			Yes		
4.b.8	Performance monitoring			Yes		
4.b.9	Other					
5.a. 5.b. 5.c. 5.d. 5.e.	Are the data reporting in the tables? Unduplicated: counted once even if they were served community mental health agencies responsible for d Duplicated: across state hospital and community pro Duplicated: within community programs Duplicated: Between Child and Adult Agencies Plans for Unduplication: If you are not currently ablest system, please describe your plans to get unduplicated.	ifferent geographic or programmatic areas. grams e to provide unduplicated client counts across	all pa	rts of your mental]
	•					
6.a.	Report Year:	2019				
6.b.	State Identifier:	КУ				
6.c.	Summary Information on Data Submitted by SMHA: Year being reported:	7/1/2018 12:00:00 AM to 6/30/2019 12:00:00 A	M			
6.d.	Person Responsible for Submission:	Hope Beatty				
6.e.	Contact Phone Number:	(502) 782-6147				
6.f.	Contact Address:	275 E. Main Street 4W-G Frankfort, KY 40601				
6.g.	E-mail:	HopeB.Beatty@Ky.Gov				
0930-0	0168 Approved: 06/07/2017 Expires: 06/30/2020					1
Foot	inotes:					

MHBG Tables 13A and 13B (URS Tables 14A and 14B) - Profile of Persons with SMI/SED Served By Age, Gender and Race/Ethnicity

Table 13A

This table requests counts for persons with SMI or SED using the definitions provided by the CMHS. URS Table's 2A and 2B included all clients served by publicly operated or funded programs. This table counts only clients who meet the CMHS definition of SMI or SED. For many states, this table may be the same as URS Table's 2A and 2B. For 2007, states should report using the Federal Definitions of SMI and SED if they can report them, if not, please report using your state's definitions of SMI and SED and provide information below describing your state's definition.

Expenditure Period Start Date: 7/1/2018 Expenditure Period End Date: 7/1/2019

		Т	otal			ican Ir ska N	ndian or ative		Asiar	1		k or A Americ	frican			aiian or Islander		White		data fo	or MH	e only if BG Table available		Than (Report	One Race ted	Race	Not A	vailable
	Female	Male	Not Available	Total	Female	Male	Not Available	Female	Male	Not Available	Female	Male	Not Available	Female	Male	Not Available	Female	Male	Not Available	Female	Male	Not Available	Female	Male	Not Available	Female	Male	Not Available
0-12 years	5,388	9,755	15	15,158	5	8	0	7	15	0	672	1,434	5	4	15	0	4,068	7,157	3	0	0	0	332	557	0	300	569	7
13-17 years	5,142	5,493	13	10,648	9	14	0	14	16	1	513	594	0	8	5	0	4,112	4,332	7	0	0	0	245	270	1	241	262	4
18-20 years	1,570	1,297	1	2,868	4	3	0	1	5	0	158	132	1	1	0	0	1,282	1,031	0	0	0	0	57	62	0	67	64	0
21-24 years	1,581	1,143	12	2,736	6	2	0	4	7	0	178	133	0	2	0	0	1,267	911	10	0	0	0	55	23	1	69	67	1
25-44 years	10,140	7,555	31	17,726	23	14	0	26	20	0	1,133	906	1	7	9	0	8,322	6,162	21	0	0	0	197	104	0	432	340	9
45-64 years	10,366	6,773	14	17,153	32	11	0	41	13	0	1,094	766	1	6	7	0	8,667	5,652	10	0	0	0	140	99	0	386	225	3
65-74 years	1,464	747	1	2,212	3	2	0	8	1	0	113	65	0	0	0	0	1,279	646	1	0	0	0	13	11	0	48	22	0
75+ years	268	92	1	361	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	2	0	0	0	0	222	77	0	0	0	0	4	3	0	21	10	1
Not Available	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pregnant Women	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	35,919	32,855	88	68,862	82	54	0	101	77	1	3,882	4,032	8	28	36	0	29,219	25,968	52	0	0	0	1,043	1,129	2	1,564	1,559	25
Comments	s on Dat	a (for A	(ge):																									
Comments	s on Dat	a (for C	Gender):				Notic next y		rease i	n the nun	nber of	Gende	r Not Ava	ilable; w	vill try	to identify	y the ca	use and	improve	reportin	g for							
Comments	s on Dat	a (for R	Race/Ethni	city):			Notic year.	e an inc	rease i	n the nun	nber of I	Race N	lot Availa	ble; will	try to	identify th	ne cause	and im	iprove rep	porting f	or nex	t						

1. Stat	e Defi	nition	s Mat	ch the Federal Definitions		
0	Yes	•	No	Adults with SMI, if No describe or attach state definition:	See General Notes	\(\)
				Diagnoses included in the state SMI definition:		\$
0	Yes	•	No	Children with SED, if No describe or attach state definition:	See General Notes	\(\)

Diagnoses included in the state SED definition:

Table 13B

Comments on Data (Overall):

Of the total persons served, please indicate the age, gender and the number of persons who meet the Federal definition of SMI and SED and who are Hispanic/Latino or not Hispanic/Latino. The total persons served who meet the Federal definition of SMI or SED should be the total as indicated in Table 14A. Please report the data under the categories listed - "Total" are calculated automatically.

Expenditure Period Start Date: 7/1/2018 Expenditure Period End Date: 7/1/2019

	Not F	lispanic or	Latino	His	panic or La	tino	Hispanic or L	atino Origin	Not Available		То	tal	
	Female	Male	Not Available	Female	Male	Not Available	Female	Male	Not Available	Female	Male	Not Available	Total
0-12 years	5,108	9,224	7	219	413	1	61	118	7	5,388	9,755	15	15,158
13-17 years	4,885	5,224	8	207	238	1	50	31	4	5,142	5,493	13	10,648
18-20 years	1,515	1,254	1	42	33	0	13	10	0	1,570	1,297	1	2,868
21-24 years	1,527	1,098	11	37	27	0	17	18	1	1,581	1,143	12	2,736
25-44 years	9,804	7,334	19	194	112	0	142	109	12	10,140	7,555	31	17,726
45-64 years	10,136	6,590	6	137	82	1	93	101	7	10,366	6,773	14	17,153
65-74 years	1,434	724	1	20	11	0	10	12	0	1,464	747	1	2,212
75+ years	260	90	1	8	1	0	0	1	0	268	92	1	361
Not Available	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pregnant Women	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	34,669	31,538	54	864	917	3	386	400	31	35,919	32,855	88	68,862
Comments on Data (for Age)	Comments on Data (for Age):												
l Comments on Data (for Gender):			ice an increa	ase in the n	umber of Ge	ender Not A	vailable; will t	ry to identify	the cause and	improve re	porting for		

Comments on Data (for Race/Ethnicity):	Notice an increase in the number of Ethnicity Not Available; will try to identify the cause and improve reporting for next year.	
Comments on Data (Overall):		

0930-0168 Approved: 06/07/2017 Expires: 06/30/2020

Footnotes:	

MHBG Table 14 (URS Table 15A) - Profile of Persons served in the community mental health setting, State Psychiatric Hospitals and Other Settings for Adults with SMI and Children with SED

Expenditure Period Start Date: 7/1/2018 Expenditure Period End Date: 6/30/2019

Service Setting		Age 0-17	,		Age 18-2	0		Age 21-6	4		Age 65+		Age	e Not Ava	ilable		To	otal	
	Female	Male	Not Available	Female	Male	Not Available	Female	Male	Not Available	Female	Male	Not Available	Female	Male	Not Available	Female	Male	Not Available	Total
Community Mental Health Programs	10,530	15,248	28	1,570	1,297	1	22,087	15,471	57	1,732	839	2	0	0	0	35,919	32,855	88	68,862
State Psychiatric Hospitals	0	0	0	50	62	0	822	1,070	0	57	36	0	2	1	0	931	1,169	0	2,100
Other Psychiatric Inpatient	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Residential Treatment Centers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Comments on Data (for Age):

Comments on Data (for Gender):

Notice an increase in the number of Gender Not Available; will try to identify the cause and improve reporting for next year.

Comments on Data (Overall):

Note: Clients can be duplicated between Rows (e.g. The same client may be served in both state psychiatric hospitals and community mental health centers during the same year and thus would be reported in counts for both rows). 0930-0168 Approved: 06/07/2017 Expires: 06/30/2020

Footnotes:			

E. Performance Indicators and Accomplishments

MHBG Table 15A (URS Table 4) - Profile of Adult Clients by Employment Status

This table describes the status of adult clients served in the reporting year by the public mental health system, in terms of employment status. The focus is on employment for the working age population, recognizing, however, there are clients who are disabled, retired, or who are homemakers, care-givers, etc., and not a part of the workforce. These persons should be reported in the "Not in Labor Force" category. Unemployed refers to persons who are looking for work but have not found employment. Data should be reported for clients in non-institutional settings at time of discharge or last evaluation.

Expenditure Period Start Date: 7/1/2018 Expenditure Period End Date: 6/30/2019

Adults Served		18-20			21-64			65+		Ag	e Not Availa	ble			Total	
	Female	Male	Not Available	Female	Male	Not Available	Female	Male	Not Available	Female	Male	Not Available	Female	Male	Not Avail	Total
Employed: Competitively Employed Full or Part Time (includes Supported Employment)	936	666	16	13,701	12,439	123	254	205	5	0	0	0	14,891	13,310	144	28,345
Unemployed	939	895	2	14,374	13,837	59	182	151	8	0	0	0	15,495	14,883	69	30,447
Not In Labor Force: Retired, Sheltered Employment, Sheltered Workshops, Other (homemaker, student, volunteer, disabled, etc.)	2,069	1,943	9	21,999	15,304	79	2,905	1,564	10	0	0	0	26,973	18,811	98	45,882
Not Available	140	178	9	2,050	2,467	82	230	149	32	0	0	0	2,420	2,794	123	5,337
Total	4,084	3,682	36	52,124	44,047	343	3,571	2,069	55	0	0	0	59,779	49,798	434	110,011
How Often Does your State Measure Employment Status?	☑ At Ac	Imission 🗆	At Discharge	☐ Monthly	Quarterl	y 🗆 Other, o	describe:						•			
What populations are included:	· All cli	ents © Onl	y selected gr	oups, descri	be:											
Comments on Data (for Age):																
Comments on Data (for Gender) Notice an increase in the number next year.		Not Availabl	e; will try to i	dentify the o	ause and im	prove reporti	ng for									
Comments on Data (Overall): URS 2019 Not Available increase will continue to monitor	ed; possible ir	ndirect result	t from severa	I CMHCs imp	lementing a	new EHR syst	tem;									
0930-0168 Approved: 06/07/2017	Expires: 06/3	0/2020														
Footnotes:																

E. Performance Indicators and Accomplishments

MHBG Table 15B (URS Table 4A) - Optional Profile of Adult Clients by Employment Status by Primary Diagnosis Reported

Expenditure Period Start Date: 7/1/2018 Expenditure Period End Date: 6/30/2019

Clients Primary Diagnosis	Employed: Competitively Employed Full or Part Time (includes Supported Employment)	Unemployed	Not In Labor Force: Retired, Sheltered Employment, Sheltered Workshops, Other (homemaker, student, volunteer, disabled, etc.)	Employment Status Not Available	Total
Schizophrenia & Related Disorders (F20, F25)	440	834	4,009	356	5,639
Bipolar and Mood Disorders (F30,F31,F32,F33,F34.1,F60.89,F34.0,F32.9)	8,703	8,708	17,428	1,579	36,418
Other Psychoses (F22,F23,F24,F28,F29)	275	438	882	277	1,872
All Other Diagnoses	18,927	20,467	23,563	3,125	66,082
No DX and Deferred DX (R69,R99,Z03.89)	0	0	0	0	0
Diagnosis Total	28,345	30,447	45,882	5,337	110,011

Comments on Data (for Diagnosis):

0930-0168 Approved: 06/07/2017 Expires: 06/30/2020

Footnotes:

MHBG Table 16 (URS Table 9) - Social Connectedness and Improved Functioning

Expenditure Period Start Date: 7/1/2018 Expenditure Period End Date: 6/30/2019

Adult Co	onsumer Survey Results	Number of Positive Responses	Responses	Percent Positive (calculated)
1. Social Connectednes	SS .	4,798	6,327	76%
2. Functioning		4,685	6,324	74%
Child/Adolesco	ent Consumer Survey Results	Number of Positive Responses	Responses	Percent Positive (calculated)
3. Social Connectednes	ss	2,578	2,817	92%
4. Functioning		1,947	2,822	69%
Comments on Data:		'		1
 Did you use the reco Did you use the reco 	Iness and Functioning Measures Commended new Social Connectedness Commended new Functioning Domain Commended new Function New F	Measure used Questions? • Yes • N Measure used er Survey? • Yes • N	l lo	
4. Did you use the reco	nnectedness and Functioning Measure ommended new Social Connectedness ommended new Functioning Domain C	Questions? • Yes • N Measure used	0	
6. Did you collect these	e as part of your YSS-F Survey?	● Yes ○ N		

0930-0168 Approved: 06/07/2017 Expires: 06/30/2020

Footnotes:	

MHBG Table 17A (URS Table 11) - Summary Profile of Client Evaluation of Care

Expenditure Period Start Date: 7/1/2018 Expenditure Period End Date: 6/30/2019

Adult Consumer Survey Results:	Number of Positive Responses	Responses	Confidence Interval*
1. Reporting Positively about Access.	5,877	6,529	89%-91%
2. Reporting Positively about Quality and Appropriateness for Adults.	6,016	6,426	93%-94%
3. Reporting Positively about Outcomes.	4,589	6,218	73%-75%
4. Adults Reporting on Participation In Treatment Planning.	5,351	6,282	84%-86%
5. Adults Positively about General Satisfaction with Services.	6,056	6,582	91%-93%

Child/Adolescent Consumer Survey Results:	Number of Positive Responses	Responses	Confidence Interval*
1. Reporting Positively about Access.	2,630	2,876	90%-92%
2. Reporting Positively about General Satisfaction for Children.	2,654	2,869	92%-93%
3. Reporting Positively about Outcomes for Children.	1,990	2,815	69%-72%
4. Family Members Reporting on Participation In Treatment Planning for their Children.	2,707	2,881	93%-95%
5. Family Members Reporting High Cultural Sensitivity of Staff.	2,629	2,715	96%-97%

Please enter the number of persons responding positively to the questions and the number of total responses within each group. Percent positive will be calculated from these data.

* Please report Confidence Intervals at	the 95% level. See directions below r	regarding the calculation o	of confidence intervals

Comments on Data:

Adult Consumer Surveys

- 1. Was the Official 28 Item MHSIP Adult Outpatient Consumer Survey Used?

 Yes
 - 1.a. If no, which version:
 - Original 40 Item Version
 Yes
 21-Item Version
 Yes
 State Variation of MHSIP
 Other Consumer Survey
 Yes
 - 1.b. If other, please attach instrument used.

Adult Survey Approach				
2. Populations covered in survey? (Note all surveys should cove	r all regions of stat	e) C 1. All Consumers	In State © 2.	Sample of MH Consumers
2.a. If a sample was used, what sample methodology was		ndom Sample		
		atified / Random Stratified S nvenience Sample	Sample	
		nvenience Sample her Sample:		
	1.00	ier sumple.		
2.b. Do you survey only people currently in services, or do	you also survey p	ersons no longer in service?	✓ 1. Perso	ns Currently Receiving Services
			☐ 2. Perso	ns No Longer Receiving Services
3. Please describe the populations included in your sample: (e.	g., all adults, only a	ndults with SMI, etc.) 🔽 1	. All Adult Con	sumers In State
		□ 2	. Adults With S	erious Mental Illness
		□ 3	. Adults Who V	Vere Medicaid Eligible Or In Medicaid Managed Care
		□ 4	. Other (for exa	ample, if you survey anyone served in the last 3 months, describe that here):
4. Methodology of collecting data? (Check all that apply)		Self-Administered	Interview	
	Phone	☐ Yes	☐ Yes	
	Mail	☐ Yes		
	Face-to-face	▼ Yes	☐ Yes	
	Web-Based	▼ Yes	☐ Yes	
4.b. Who administered the survey? (Check all that apply)	☐ 1. MH Cons	umers		
	2. Family M	embers		
	3. Profession	nal Interviewers		
	4. MH Clinic	cians		
		ct Treatment Staff		
	6. Other, de			
	i o. Other, de	SCHDE.		

 \square 2. Responses are Confidential

	☐ 3. Responses	s are Matched to Client Da	atabases		
6. Sample Size and Response Rate					
6.a. How Many surveys were Attempted (sent out or calls initiated)?					
6.b. How many survey Contacts were made? (surveys to valid phone n	umbers or addresses)?				
6.c. How many surveys were completed? (survey forms returned or cal			6,614		
6.d. What was your response rate? (number of Completed surveys div	rided by number of Contacts)				
6.e. If you receive "blank" surveys back from consumers (surveys with	no responses on them), did you co	ount these surveys as "con	npleted" for the calculation of resp	onse rates? © Yes • No	
7. Who Conducted the survey					
7.a. SMHA Conducted or contracted for the survey (survey done at	state level)	○ Yes	• No		
7.b. Local Mental Health Providers/County mental health providers (survey was done at the local or regional level)	s conducted or contracted for the s	survey • Yes	○ No		
7.c. Other, describe:					
* Report Confidence Intervals at the 95% confidence level					
you had asked the question of the entire relevant population between 43% (The confidence level tells you how sure you can be. It is expressed as a perce can be 95% certain; the 99% confidence level means you can be 99% certain When you put the confidence level and the confidence interval together, you Child / Family Consumer Surveys 1. Was the MHSIP Children / Family Survey (YSS-F)	entage and represents how often the tr n. Most researchers use the 95% confid	rue percentage of the populo dence level.	·		confidence level means y
Used?	16				
If no, please attach instrument used.	If no, what survey did you use?				
1.c. Did you use any translations of the Child MHSIP into another land	guage? 🗹 1. Spanish				
	2. Other Langu	uage:			
Child Survey Approach 2. Populations covered in survey? (Note all surveys should cover all regions)	ons of state) O 1. All Consume	ers In State 🌘 2. Sampl	le of MH Consumers		
2.a. If a sample was used, what sample methodology was used?	C 1. Random Sample				
	C 2. Stratified / Random Stratifie	ed Sample			
	3. Convenience Sample				
	C 4. Other Sample:				
2.b. Do you survey only people currently in services, or do you also	survey persons no longer in servi	ce? 🔽 1. Persons Cur	rently Receiving Services		
		2. Persons No	Longer Receiving Services		
2a. If yes to 2, please describe how your survey persons no lor	nger receiving services.				
Please describe the populations included in your sample: (e.g., all chi	ldren, only children with SED. etc.)	✓ 1. All Child Co	nsumers In State		
, ,	. , , 		th Sarious Emotional Disturbances		

			☐ 3. Children	who were Medicaid E	Eligible or in Medicaid M	lanaged Care
			4. Other (fo	or example, if you surv	rey anyone served in the	last 3 months, describe that here)
4. Methodology of collecting data? (Check all that apply)		Self-Administered	Interview			
	Phone	Yes	Yes			
		Tes	i res			
	Mail	☐ Yes				
	Face-to-face	▼ Yes	☐ Yes			
	Web-Based	▼ Yes	☐ Yes			
4.b. Who administered the survey? (Check all that apply)	☐ 1. MH Cons	umers				
	2. Family M	embers				
	3. Professio	nal Interviewers				
	4. MH Clinic	cians				
	▼ 5. Non Dire	ct Treatment Staff				
	☐ 6. Other, de	escribe:				
5. Are Responses Anonymous, Confidential and/or Linked to otl	her Patient Databa	ses? 🔽 1. Responses a	re Anonymous			
		✓ 2. Responses a	re Confidential			
		·	re Matched to Clien	t Databases		
		·				
6. Sample Size and Response Rate						
6.a. How Many surveys were Attempted (sent out or calls initi	ated)?					
6.b. How many survey Contacts were made? (surveys to valid						
6.c. How many surveys were completed? (survey forms returned				2,9	12	
6.d. What was your response rate? (number of Completed sur 6.e. If you receive "blank" surveys back from consumers (surve			at those surveys as "	completed" for the col	laulation of rosponse rat	as? O Vas O Na
o.e. if you receive blank surveys back from consumers (surv	eys with no respon	ises on them, ald you coul	it these surveys as	completed for the cal	iculation of response rat	es: © les © NO
7. Who Conducted the survey						
7.a. SMHA Conducted or contracted for the survey (survey	done at state leve	·l)	○ Yes	No		
7.b. Local Mental Health Providers/County mental health p (survey was done at the local or regional level)	providers conducte	ed or contracted for the sur	vey • Yes	○ No		
7.c. Other, describe:						
0930-0168 Approved: 06/07/2017 Expires: 06/30/2020						

Footnotes:
Printed: 7/23/2021 3:26 PM - Kentucky - 0930-0168 Approved: 06/07/2017 Expires: 06/30/2020

Printed: 7/23/2021 3:26 PM - Kentucky - 0930-0168 Approved: 06/07/2017 Expires: 06/30/2020

MHBG Table 17B (URS Table 11A) - Consumer Evaluation of Care by Consumer Characteristics: (Optional Table by Race/Ethnicity)

Expenditure Period Start Date: 7/1/2018 Expenditure Period End Date: 6/30/2019

Adult Consumer Survey Results:

*State used the 2 question version for Figs No Please check the appropriate box on the left. The "Totals" formula will automatically adjust to account for which method your state used to ask about Hispanic Origin Hispanic Origin/Status

Indicators	Т	otal		n Indian or a Native	А	sian		or African erican	Othe	awaiian or Pacific Inder	White		White More Than One Race Reported		Other / Not Available		Hispar	nic Origin
	# Positive	Responses	# Positive	Responses	# Positive	Responses	# Positive	Responses	# Positive	Responses	# Positive	Responses	# Positive	Responses	# Positive	Responses	# Positive	Responses
1. Reporting Positively About Access.	5,877	6,529	100	122	21	23	354	406	8	9	4,926	5,440	0	0	468	529	114	138
Reporting Positively About Quality and Appropriateness.	6,016	6,426	108	121	20	22	368	401	8	8	5,035	5,356	0	0	477	518	119	138
3. Reporting Positively About Outcomes.	4,589	6,218	84	118	16	21	271	381	8	9	3,872	5,210	0	0	338	479	91	138
4. Reporting Positively about Participation in Treatment Planning	5,351	6,282	90	115	17	21	317	391	8	8	4,489	5,238	0	0	430	509	105	135
5. Reporting Positively about General Satisfaction	6,056	6,582	107	122	21	23	378	414	8	9	5,059	5,481	0	0	483	533	121	139
6. Social Connectedness	4,798	6,327	88	118	16	22	282	391	7	9	4,048	5,294	0	0	357	493	100	140
7. Functioning	4,685	6,324	81	120	14	21	274	389	7	9	3,969	5,299	0	0	340	486	89	140

Child/Adolescent Family Survey Results:

*State used the 2 question version for Figs No Please check the appropriate box on the left. The "Totals" formula will automatically adjust to account for which method your state used to ask about Hispanic Origin Hispanic Origin/Status

Indicators	Т	otal		n Indian or a Native	А	sian		or African erican	Othe	lawaiian or r Pacific ander			More Than One Race Reported		Other / Not Available		Hispanic Origi	
	# Positive	Responses	# Positive	Responses	# Positive	Responses	# Positive	Responses	# Positive	Responses	# Positive	Responses	# Positive	Responses	# Positive	Responses	# Positive	Responses
1. Reporting Positively About Access.	2,630	2,876	24	31	10	10	243	264	2	2	2,140	2,340	0	0	211	229	81	90

Reporting Positively About General Satisfaction	2,654	2,869	27	31	10	10	244	261	2	2	2,166	2,337	0	0	205	228	85	94
3. Reporting Positively About Outcomes.	1,990	2,815	23	30	8	10	170	260	2	2	1,666	2,300	0	0	121	213	65	94
Reporting Positively Participation in Treatment Planning for their Children.	2,707	2,881	26	31	10	10	248	263	2	2	2,209	2,343	0	0	212	232	84	94
5. Reporting Positively About Cultural Sensitivity of Staff.	2,629	2,715	24	28	10	10	243	248	2	2	2,141	2,205	0	0	209	222	82	87
6. Social Connectedness	2,578	2,817	29	31	8	10	235	259	2	2	2,150	2,339	0	0	154	176	79	94
7. Functioning	1,947	2,822	23	30	8	10	168	260	2	2	1,625	2,306	0	0	121	214	65	94

Comments on Data:

Please enter the number of persons responding positively to the questions and the number of total responses within each group. Percent positive will be calculated from these data. 0930-0168 Approved: 06/07/2017 Expires: 06/30/2020

Footnotes:	

MHBG Table 18 (URS Table 15) - Living Situation Profile

Number of Clients in Each Living Situation as Collected by the Most Recent Assessment in the Reporting Period All Mental Health Programs by Age, Gender, and Race/Ethnicity

Please provide unduplicated counts, if possible. This table provides an aggregate profile of persons served in the reporting year. The reporting year should be the latest state fiscal year for which data are available. This profile is based on a client's last known Living Situation.

Please report the data under the Living Situation categories listed - "Total" are calculated automatically.

Expenditure Period Start Date: 7/1/2018 Expenditure Period End Date: 6/30/2019

Private Residence	Foster Home	Residential Care	Crisis Residence	Children's Residential Treatment	Institutional Setting	Jail / Correctional Facility	Homeless / Shelter	Other	NA	Total
51,014	1,370	403	0	0	17	35	130	0	937	53,906
55,238	217	4,346	0	0	4,004	998	5,653	0	35,769	106,225
3,993	13	363	0	0	586	7	75	0	832	5,869
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
110,245	1,600	5,112	0	0	4,607	1,040	5,858	0	37,538	166,000
_										
57,356	738	2,437	0	0	1,761	344	2,476	0	18,435	83,547
52,632	857	2,673	0	0	2,846	694	3,374	0	18,822	81,898
257	5	2	0	0	0	2	8	0	281	555
110,245	1,600	5,112	0	0	4,607	1,040	5,858	0	37,538	166,000
195	5	17	0	0	6	4	17	0	81	325
274	2	14	0	0	17	1	4	0	114	426
10,050	126	531	0	0	556	101	1,108	0	3,639	16,111
106	10	3	0	0	2	0	5	0	38	164
86,838	1,258	4,117	0	0	3,605	878	4,194	0	29,560	130,450
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	51,014 55,238 3,993 0 110,245 57,356 52,632 257 110,245 195 274 10,050 106 86,838 0	51,014 1,370 55,238 217 3,993 13 0 0 0 110,245 1,600 57,356 738 52,632 857 257 5 110,245 1,600 195 5 274 2 10,050 126 106 10 86,838 1,258	sesidence Care 51,014 1,370 403 55,238 217 4,346 3,993 13 363 0 0 0 110,245 1,600 5,112 57,356 738 2,437 52,632 857 2,673 257 5 2 110,245 1,600 5,112 195 5 17 274 2 14 10,050 126 531 106 10 3 86,838 1,258 4,117 0 0 0	sidence Care Residence 51,014 1,370 403 0 55,238 217 4,346 0 3,993 13 363 0 0 0 0 0 110,245 1,600 5,112 0 57,356 738 2,437 0 52,632 857 2,673 0 257 5 2 0 110,245 1,600 5,112 0 195 5 17 0 274 2 14 0 10,050 126 531 0 86,838 1,258 4,117 0	cesidence Care Residence Residential Treatment 51,014 1,370 403 0 0 55,238 217 4,346 0 0 3,993 13 363 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 110,245 1,600 5,112 0 0 57,356 738 2,437 0 0 257 5 2 0 0 110,245 1,600 5,112 0 0 195 5 17 0 0 274 2 14 0 0 10,050 126 531 0 0 106 10 3 0 0 86,838 1,258 4,117 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Setting Setting Treatment Setting Treatment Setting Setting	Sesidence Care Residence Residential Treatment Setting Correctional Facility	esidence Care Residence Residental Treatment Setting Correctional Facility Shelter Facility 51,014 1,370 403 0 0 17 35 130 55,238 217 4,346 0 0 0 4,004 998 5,653 3,993 13 363 0 0 586 7 75 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 110,245 1,600 5,112 0 0 4,607 1,040 5,858 57,356 738 2,437 0 0 1,761 344 2,476 52,632 857 2,673 0 0 2,846 694 3,374 257 5 2 0 0 4,607 1,040 5,858 195 5 17 0 0 4,607 1,040 5,858 195 5 17 0	Sesidence Care Residence Residental Treatment Treatmen	St. Setting Care Residence Residented Treatment Treatment Setting Carrectional Setting Setting

Printed: 7/23/2021 3:26 PM - Kentucky - 0930-0168 Approved: 06/07/2017 Expires: 06/30/2020

More than One Race Reported	3,215	95	141	0	0	63	24	107	0	897	4,542
Race/Ethnicity Not Available	9,567	104	289	0	0	358	32	423	0	3,209	13,982
TOTAL	110,245	1,600	5,112	0	0	4,607	1,040	5,858	0	37,538	166,000

	Private Residence	Foster Home	Residential Care	Crisis Residence	Children's Residential Treatment	Institutional Setting	Jail / Correctional Facility	Homeless / Shelter	Other	NA	Total
Hispanic or Latino Origin	2,950	63	71	0	0	36	18	93	0	723	3,954
Non Hispanic or Latino Origin	105,784	1,515	4,931	0	0	2,750	1,003	5,615	0	35,901	157,499
Hispanic or Latino Origin Not Available	1,511	22	110	0	0	1,821	19	150	0	914	4,547
TOTAL	110,245	1,600	5,112	0	0	4,607	1,040	5,858	0	37,538	166,000

Comments on Data:	BHDID does not fund children's State Psych Hospitals. Gender & Hispanic: Not Available more than in 2018-will study to improve reporting next year. We'll continue to monitor internally. In Jail: more than in 2018 due to new re-entry programs.
How Often Does your State Measure Living Situation?	At Admission At Discharge Monthly Quarterly Other: Describe

0930-0168 Approved: 06/07/2017 Expires: 06/30/2020

the state of the s
Footnotes:
rootnotes:

^{*}Hispanic: Only use the "Hispanic" row under Race if data for Hispanic as an Ethnic Origin are not available

MHBG Table 19 (URS Table 16) - Profile of Adults With Serious Mental Illnesses And Children With Serious Emotional Disturbances Receiving Specific Services

Expenditure Period Start Date: 7/1/2018 Expenditure Period End Date: 6/30/2019

Age	Adults with Serious	Mental Illnesses (SMI)			Children with Serious	Emotional Disturbance	es (SED)	
	N Receiving Supported Housing	N Receiving Supported Employment	N Receiving Assertive Community Treatment	Total unduplicated N - Adults with SMI Served	N Receiving Therapeutic Foster Care	N Receiving Multi- Systemic Therapy	N Receiving Family Functional Therapy	Total unduplicated N - Children with SED
0-12 years					182	0	0	15,158
13-17 years					108	0	0	10,648
18-20 years	3	1	17	1,713	8	0	0	1,155
21-64 years	525	112	534	37,615				
65-74 years	27	2	10	2,212				
75+ years	1	0	0	361				
Not Available	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	556	115	561	41,901	298	0	0	26,961

Gender	Adults with Serious	Mental Illnesses (SMI)			Children with Serious Emotional Disturbances (SED)					
	N Receiving Supported Housing	N Receiving Supported Employment	N Receiving Assertive Community Treatment	Total unduplicated N - Adults with SMI Served	N Receiving Therapeutic Foster Care	N Receiving Multi- Systemic Therapy	N Receiving Family Functional Therapy	Total unduplicated N - Children with SED		
Female	228	72	279	24,833	132	0	0	11,086		
Male	328	43	281	17,009	166	0	0	15,846		
Not Available	0	0	1	59	0	0	0	29		

Race/Ethnicity Adults with Serious Mental Illnesses (SMI) Children with Serious Emotional Disturbances (SED)

	N Receiving Supported Housing	N Receiving Supported Employment	N Receiving Assertive Community Treatment	Total unduplicated N - Adults with SMI Served	N Receiving Therapeutic Foster Care	N Receiving Multi- Systemic Therapy	N Receiving Family Functional Therapy	Total unduplicated N - Children with SED
American Indian / Alaska Native	0	1	0	97	1	0	0	39
Asian	2	0	0	124	0	0	0	55
Black / African American	106	15	93	4,550	22	0	0	3,372
Hawaiian / Pacific Islander	0	0	0	31	0	0	0	33
White	422	94	438	34,665	200	0	0	20,574
Hispanic *	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
More than one race	11	4	14	707	23	0	0	1,467
Not Available	15	1	16	1,727	52	0	0	1,421

Hispanic/Latino Origin	Adults with Serious	Mental Illnesses (SMI)			Children with Serious Emotional Disturbances (SED)				
	N Receiving Supported Housing	N Receiving Supported Employment	N Receiving Assertive Community Treatment	Total unduplicated N - Adults with SMI Served	N Receiving Therapeutic Foster Care	N Receiving Multi- Systemic Therapy	N Receiving Family Functional Therapy	Total unduplicated N - Children with SED	
Hispanic / Latino origin	10	1	6	675	17	0	0	1,109	
Non Hispanic / Latino	528	114	550	40,688	281	0	0	25,573	
Not Available	18	0	5	538	0	0	0	279	

	Adults with Seriou	s Mental Illnesses (SMI)		Children with Serious Emotional Disturbances (SED)				
	N Receiving Supported Housing	N Receiving Supported Employment	N Receiving Assertive Community Treatment	Total unduplicated N - Adults with SMI Served	N Receiving Therapeutic Foster Care	N Receiving Multi-Systemic Therapy	N Receiving Family Functional Therapy	Total unduplicated N - Children with SED
Do you monitor fidelity for this service?	C Yes ● No	● Yes ○ No	• Yes • No		C Yes ● No	C Yes ● No	○ Yes • No	
IF YES,								

What fidelity measure do you use?		Individual Placement & Support (IPS) Supported Employment Fidelity Tool	Dartmouth Assertive Community Treatment Scale						
Who measures fidelity?		SMHA Staff	SMHA Staff						
How often is fidelity measured?		every other year	annually						
Is the SAMHSA EBP Toolkit used to guide EBP Implementation?	○ Yes • No	● Yes ○ No	● Yes © No		○ Yes ● No	○ Yes • No	○ Yes ● No		
Have staff been specifically trained to implement the EBP?	C Yes ● No	● Yes ○ No	• Yes C No		○ Yes ● No	C Yes ● No	○ Yes • No		
* Hispanic is part of the total served.	● Yes ○ No								
Comments on Data (overall):									
Comments on Data (Supported Housing): SMHA does not conduct fidelity assessment on programs; yet, requires that programs conduct a self-assessment annually using the SAMHSA Permanent Supported Housing Toolkit.									
		SE are not entering data in state re of SE thus not reporting to state as		g,					
		number may increase with time. Du bundled to bill making service cod		d.					
Comments on Data (Theraputic Foster Care):									
Comments on Data (Multi-Systemic Therapy): KY BHDID does not have funding needed to support MST									
Comments on Data (Family Functional Therapy): KY BHDID does not have funding needed to support FFT									
* Hispanic: Only use the "Hispan	nic" row under Race i	if data for Hispanic as a Ethnic Orig	jin are not available						
0930-0168 Approved: 06/07/2017	' Expires: 06/30/2020								
Footnotes:	Footnotes:								

MHBG Table 19A (URS Table 16A) - Adults with Serious Mental Illness and Children with Serious Emotional Disturbances Receiving Evidence-Based Services for First Episode Psychosis

Expenditure Period Start Date: 7/1/2018 Expenditure Period End Date: 6/30/2019

Program Name	Number of Adult Admissions into CSC Services During FY	Current Number of Adults with FEP Receiving CSC FEP Services	Number of Child/Adolescents Admissions into CSC Services During FY	Current number of Children/Adolecents with FEP Receiving CSC FEP Services	Do you moniter fidelity for this service?	What fidelity measure do you use?	Who measures fidelity?	How often is fidelity measured?	Has staff been specifically trained to implement the CSC EBP?
LifeSkills iHOPE	5	8	6	3	Yes No	The Kentucky revised EASA fidelity tool	Kentucky DBHDID (the state SMHA)	every 2 years with coaching and support based on fidelity review results/needs.	Yes ® No ©
New Vista (formerly Bluegrass) iHOPE	6	5	1	2	Yes © No ©	The Kentucky revised EASA fidelity tool	Kentucky DBHDID (the state SMHA)	every 2 years with coaching and support based on fidelity review results/needs.	Yes No
Pathways iHOPE	2	12	1	7	Yes © No ©	The Kentucky revised EASA fidelity tool	Kentucky DBHDID (the state SMHA)	every 2 years with coaching and support based on fidelity review results/needs.	Yes No
Four Rivers iHOPE	17	9	1	1	Yes © No ©	The Kentucky revised EASA fidelity tool	Kentucky DBHDID (the state SMHA)	every 2 years with coaching and support based on fidelity review results/needs.	Yes [®] No [©]
Cumberland River iHOPE	5	6	1	1	Yes © No ©	The Kentucky revised EASA fidelity tool	Kentucky DBHDID (the state SMHA)	every 2 years with coaching and support based on fidelity review results/needs.	Yes ® No ©
Centerstone iHOPE	8	6	7	5	Yes © No ©	The Kentucky revised EASA fidelity tool	Kentucky DBHDID (the state SMHA)	every 2 years with coaching and support based on fidelity review results/needs.	Yes No
Communicare iHOPE	4	6	0	0	Yes © No ©	The Kentucky revised EASA fidelity tool	Kentucky DBHDID (the state SMHA)	every 2 years with coaching and support based on fidelity review results/needs.	Yes No □
Mountain iHOPE	3	8	1	1	Yes © No ©	The Kentucky revised EASA fidelity tool	Kentucky DBHDID (the state SMHA)	every 2 years with coaching and support based on fidelity review results/needs.	Yes ® No ©

0930-0168 Approved: 06/07/2017 Expires: 06/30/2020
Footnotes:
Toothores.

MHBG Table 20 (URS Table 17) - Profile of Adults with Serious Mental Illnesses Receiving Specific Services during the Year

This table provides a profile of adults with serious mental illness receiving specific evidence-based practices in the reporting year. The reporting year should be the latest state fiscal year for which data are available.

Expenditure Period Start Date: 7/1/2018 Expenditure Period End Date: 6/30/2019

	ADULTS WITH SERIOUS MENTAL ILLNESS										
	Receiving Family Psychoeducation	Receiving Integrated Treatment for Co- occurring Disorders (MH/SA)	Receiving Illness Self Management and Recovery	Receiving Medication Management							
Age											
18-20	0	0	0	0							
21-64	0	0	0	0							
65-74	0	0	0	0							
75+	0	0	0	0							
Not Available	0	0	0	0							
TOTAL	0	0	0	0							

Gender										
Female	0	0	0	0						
Male	0	0	0	0						
Not Available	0	0	0	0						

Race											
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0	0							
Asian	0	0	0	0							
Black or African American	0	0	0	0							
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0							
White	0	0	0	0							
Hispanic*	0	0	0	0							
More Than One Race	0	0	0	0							
Unknown	0	0	0	0							

Hispanic / Latino Origin

Hispanic / Latino origin	0	0	0	0
Non Hispanic / Latino	0	0	0	0
Not Available	0	0	0	0
Do you monitor fidelity for this service?	○ Yes ○ No	C Yes C No	○ Yes ○ No	○ Yes ○ No
IF YES,				
What fidelity measure do you use?				
Who measures fidelity?				
How often is fidelity measured?				
Is the SAMHSA EBP Toolkit used to guide EBP Implementation?	○ Yes ○ No	C Yes C No	○ Yes ○ No	○ Yes ○ No
Have staff been specifically trained to implement the EBP?	○ Yes ○ No	C Yes ○ No	○ Yes ○ No	○ Yes ○ No
*Hispanic is part of the total served. Yes No				
Comments on Data (overall):				
KY has not implemented these EBPs according to the defini	tions in URS.			
Comments on Data (Family Psychoeducation):				

Comments on Data (Integrated Treatment for Co-occurring Disorders):

CMHCs are billing this as ACT; IDDT is performed by ACT teams and fidelity is monitored.	
Comments on Data (Illness Self Management and Recovery):	
CMHCs are billing IMR as Group Therapy.	
Comments on Data (Medication Management):	
]
*Hispanic: Only use the "Hispanic" row under Race if data for Hispanic as a Ethnic Origin are not available	
0930-0168 Approved: 06/07/2017 Expires: 06/30/2020	

Footnotes:

MHBG Table 21 (URS Table 19A) - Profile of Criminal Justice or Juvenile Justice Involvement

- 1. The SAMHSA National Outcome Measure for Criminal Justice measures the change in Arrests over time. The DIG Outcomes Workgroup pilot tested 3 consumer self-report items that can be used to provide this information. If your state has used the 3 Consumer self-report items on criminal justice, you may report them here.
- 2. If your SMHA has data on Arrest records from alternatives sources, you may also report that here. If you only have data for arrests for consumers in this year, please report that in the T2 columns. If you can calculate the change in Arrests from T1 to T2, please use all those columns.
- 3. Please complete the check boxes at the bottom of the table to help explain the data sources that you used to complete this table.
- 4. Please tell us anything else that would help us to understand your indicator (e.g., list survey or MIS questions; describe linking methodology and data sources; specify time period for criminal justice involvement; explain whether treatment data are collected).

Expenditure Period Start Date: 7/1/2018 Expenditure Period End Date: 6/30/2019

For Consumers in Service for at least 12 months

		T1		T2 T1 to T2 Change						Assessment of the Impact of Services									
	"T1" Prior 12 months (more than 1 year ago)			"T2" Most Recent 12 months (this year)			If Arre	If Arrested at T1 (Prior 12 Months)			If Not Arrested at T1 (Prior 12 Months)			Over the last 12 months, my encounters with the police have					
	Arrested Not No Arrested Response		No Response	Arrested	Not Arrested	No Response	# with an Arrest in T2	# with No Arrest at T2	No Response	# with an Arrest in T2	# with No Arrest at T2	No Response	# Reduced (fewer encounters)	# Stayed the Same	# Increased	# Not Applicable	No Response	Total Responses	
Total 397 52317		0	426	52288	0	184	213	0	242	52075	0	275	52114	153	0	0	52542		
Total Children/Youth (under age 18)	31	19825	0	43	19813	0	19	12	0	24	19801	0	18	19806	32	0	0	19856	
Male	14	7852	0	14	7852	0	8	6	0	6	7846	0	9	7847	10	0	0	7866	
Female	17	11971	0	29	11959	0	11	6	0	18	11953	0	9	11957	22	0	0	11988	
Not Available	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	
Total Adults (age 18 and over)	366	32492	0	383	32475	0	165	201	0	218	32274	0	257	32308	121	0	0	32686	
Male	207	18795	0	223	18779	0	94	113	0	129	18666	0	146	18684	0	0	0	18830	
Female	159	13691	0	160	13690	0	71	88	0	89	13602	0	111	13618	121	0	0	13850	
Not Available	0	6	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	6	0	0	0	6	

For Consumers Who Began Mental Health Services during the past 12 months

T1 T2 T1 to T2 Change Assessment of the Impact of Services

	"T1" 12 months prior to beginning services			"T2" Sino	e Beginnin (this year)	•	If Arres	If Arrested at T1 (Prior 12 Months)			If Not Arrested at T1 (Prior 12 Months)			Since starting to receive MH Services, my encounters with the police have					
	Arrested	Not Arrested	No Response	Arrested	Not Arrested	No Response	# with an Arrest in T2	# with No Arrest at T2	No Response	# with an Arrest in T2	# with No Arrest at T2	No Response	# Reduced (fewer encounters)	# Stayed the Same	# Increased	# Not Applicable	No Response	Total Responses	
Total	7	75	0	2	80	0	2	5	0	0	75	0	7	75	0	0	0	82	
Total Children/Youth (under age 18)	0	21	0	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	21	0	0	21	0	0	0	21	
Male	0	12	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	12	0	0	0	12	
Female	0	9	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	9	0	0	0	9	
Not Available	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Total Adults (age 18 and over)	7	54	0	2	59	0	2	5	0	0	54	0	7	54	0	0	0	61	
Male	4	27	0	1	30	0	1	3	0	0	27	0	4	27	0	0	0	31	
Female	3	27	0	1	29	0	1	2	0	0	27	0	3	27	0	0	0	30	
Not Available	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Time period in which services were received: 7/1,

7/1/2018 - 6/30/2019

Please Describe the Sources of your Criminal Justice Data

Source of adult criminal justice information:		1. Consumer survey (recommended questions)		2. Other Consumer Survey: Please send copy of questions	~	3. Mental health MIS
		4. State criminal justice agency		5. Local criminal justice agency		6. Other (specify)
Sources of children/youth criminal justice information:		1. Consumer survey (recommended questions)		2. Other Consumer Survey: Please send copy of questions	~	3. Mental health MIS
		4. State criminal/juvenile justice agency		5. Local criminal/juvenile justice agency		6. Other (specify)
Measure of adult criminal justice involvement:	•	1. Arrests C 2. Other (specif	·y)		
Measure of children/youth criminal justice involvement:	•	1. Arrests C 2. Other (s	specif	y)		
Mental health programs included:		1. Adults with SMI only 2. Other a	dults	(specify)		3. Both (all adults)
		1. Children with SED only 2. Other C	Childr	en (specify)		3. Both (all Children)
Region for which adult data are reported:	•	1. The whole state C 2. Less than the w	/hole	state (please describe)		
Region for which children/youth data are reported:	•	1. The whole state C 2. Less than the w	/hole	state (please describe)		

What is the Total Number of Persons Surveyed or for whom Criminal Justice Data Are Reported

Child/Adolescents Adult

- 1. If data is from a survey, What is the total Number of people from which the sample was drawn?
- 2. What was your sample size? (How many individuals were selected for the sample)?
- 3. How many survey Contacts were made? (surveys to valid phone numbers or addresses)
- 4. How many surveys were completed? (survey forms returned or calls completed) If data source was not a Survey, How many persons were CJ data available for?
- 5. What was your response rate? (number of Completed surveys divided by number of Contacts)

State Comments/Notes: Data is collected in MIS by a self-reported question "Have you been arrested in the past 30 days?". 2019 has fewer arrests are reported; may be impacted by new re-entry programs which are funded partial with new grants (e.g., KY Opioid Response Effort.)

0930-0168 Approved: 06/07/2017 Expires: 06/30/2020

Footnotes:

MHBG Table 22 (URS Table 19B) - Profile of Change in School Attendance

- 1. The SAMHSA National Outcome Measure for School Attendance measures the change in days attended over time. The DIG Outcomes Workgroup pilot tested 3 consumer self-report items that can be used to provide this information. If your state has used the 3 Consumer Self-Report items on School Attendance, you may report them here.
- 2. If your SMHA has data on School Attendance from alternative sources, you may also report that here. If you only have data for School attendance for consumers in this year, please report that in the T2 columns. If you can calculate the change in the Attendance from T1 to T2, please use all these columns.
- 3. Please complete the check boxes at the bottom of the table to help explain the data sources that you used to complete this table.
- 4. Please tell us anything else that would help us to understand your indicator (e. g., list survey or MIS questions; describe linking methodology and data sources; specifiy time period for criminal justice involvement; explain whether treatment data are collected).

Expenditure Period Start Date: 7/1/2018 Expenditure Period End Date: 6/30/2019

For Consumers in Service for at least 12 months

		T1			T2		T1 to T2 Change							Impact of Services					
		12 months (n 1 year ago)	nore than	"T2" Most Recent 12 months (this year)			If Suspended at T1 (Prior 12 If Not Months)			If Not Sus	If Not Suspended at T1 (Prior 12 Over th Months)			e last 12 months, the number of days my child was in school have				d was in	
	# Suspended or Expelled	# Not Suspended or Expelled	No Response	# Suspended or Expelled	# Not Suspended or Expelled	No Response	# with an Expelled or Suspended in T2	# with No Suspension or Expulsion at T2	No Response	# with an Expelled or Suspended in T2	# with No Suspension or Expulsion at T2	No Response	# Greater (Improved)	# Stayed the Same	# Fewer days (gotten worse)	# Not Applicable	No Response	Total Responses	
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Gender	Gender																		
Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Not Available	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Age																			
Under 18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

For Consumers Who Began Mental Health Services during the past 12 months

		T1			T2				T1 to T2	? Change					Impact	of Services		
		12 months pri		"T2" Sino	ce Beginning (this year)	Services	If Suspe	nded at T1 (P Months)	rior 12	If Not Sus	pended at T1 Months)	(Prior 12	Since star			Services, the		days my
	# Suspended or Expelled	# Not Suspended or Expelled	No Response	# Suspended or Expelled	# Not Suspended or Expelled	No Response	# with an Expelled or Suspended in T2	# with No Suspension or Expulsion at T2	No Response	# with an Expelled or Suspended in T2	# with No Suspension or Expulsion at T2	No Response	# Greater (Improved)	# Stayed the Same	# Fewer days (gotten worse)	# Not Applicable	No Response	Total Responses
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gender																		
Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not Available	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Age																		
Under 18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Source of	School Atten	dance Inform	nation:		. Consumer su . State Educat		imended item nent	s)			ease send us i				tal health ! r (specify)			
Measure o	of School Atte	endance:		© 1.	. School Atter	ndance			© 2. Otl	ner (specify):								

2. Other Children (specify)

C 2. Less than the whole state (please describe)

What is the Total Number of Persons Surveyed or for whom School Attendance Data Are Reported?

Child/Adolescents:

Mental health programs include:

Region for which data are reported:

1. If data is from a survey, what is the total number of people from which the sample was drawn?

	\neg

1. Children with SED only

4. How many surveys were completed? (survey forms returned or calls completed) If data source was not a Survey, how many persons were data available for?				
5	What was your response rate? (number of Completed surveys divided by number of Contacts)			
	State Comments/Notes:			
Prior to 2014, this data was collected on a subset of KY SED population via an outcomes instrument. In 2014 the instrument was changed and since then the data for school suspensions & expulsions has not otherwise bee collected.				
0	930-0168 Approved: 06/07/2017 Expires: 06/30/2020			
	Footnotes:			

2. What was your sample size? (How many individuals were selected for the sample)?3. How many survey contacts were made? (surveys to valid phone numbers or addresses)

MHBG Table 23A (URS Table 20A) - Profile of Non-Forensic (Voluntary and Civil-Involuntary) Patients Readmission to Any State Psychiatric Inpatient Hospital within 30/180 Days of Discharge

Expenditure Period Start Date: 7/1/2018 Expenditure Period End Date: 6/30/2019

	Total number of Discharges in	Discharges in STATE Hospi		Percent Readmitted	
	Year	30 days	180 days	30 days	180 days
TOTAL	7024	535	1555	7.62 %	22.14 %
Age					
0-12 years	0	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
13-17 years	6	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
18-20 years	374	23	71	6.15 %	18.98 %
21-64 years	6241	477	1409	7.64 %	22.58 %
65-74 years	317	31	66	9.78 %	20.82 %
75+ years	86	4	9	4.65 %	10.47 %
Not Available	0	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Gender					
Female	2889	188	596	6.51 %	20.63 %
Male	4133	347	958	8.40 %	23.18 %
Gender Not Available	2	0	1	0.00 %	50.00 %
Race					
American Indian/Alaska Native	18	1	5	5.56 %	27.78 %
Asian	41	4	6	9.76 %	14.63 %
Black/African American	930	53	241	5.70 %	25.91 %
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
White d: 7/23/2021 3:26 PM - Kentucky - 0930-0168	5822	470	1269	8.07 %	21.80 % Page

Hispanic *	66	2	12	3.03 %	18.18 %		
More than one race	71	4	12	5.63 %	16.90 %		
Race Not Available	76	1	10	1.32 %	13.16 %		
	•						
Hispanic/Latino Origin							
Hispanic/Latino Origin							
Hispanic/Latino Origin Hispanic/Latino Origin	66	2	12	3.03 %	18.18 %		
	66 6882	2 532	12 1533	3.03 % 7.73 %	18.18 %		

Are Forensic Patients Included	
	2

0	Yes	(No

Comments on Data:

ARH, CSH, ESH, WSH only. Hispanic is reported as Race by Facilities. Asian and Pacific Islander are reported as same category by Facilities; Hawaiian is not collected by facilities. Change in 180-readmission rate for American Indian & Asia due to low n.

0930-0168 Approved: 06/07/2017 Expires: 06/30/2020

_						
С	_	-	tn	_	+^	
г	u	u	ш	u	ue	ъ.

^{*}Hispanic: Only use the "Hispanic" row under Race if data for Hispanic as a Ethnic Origin are not available

MHBG Table 23B (URS Table 20B) - Profile of Forensic Patients Readmission to Any State Psychiatric Inpatient Hospital within 30/180 Days of Discharge

Expenditure Period Start Date: 7/1/2018 Expenditure Period End Date: 6/30/2019

	Total number of Discharges in	Discharges in STATE Hospital within		Percent R	t Readmitted	
	Year	30 days	180 days	30 days	180 days	
TOTAL	852	0	15	0.00 %	1.76 %	
Age						
0-12 years	0	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %	
13-17 years	0	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %	
18-20 years	33	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %	
21-64 years	799	0	14	0.00 %	1.75 %	
65-74 years	18	0	1	0.00 %	5.56 %	
75+ years	2	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %	
Not Available	0	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %	
Gender						
Female	162	0	5	0.00 %	3.09 %	
Male	690	0	10	0.00 %	1.45 %	
Gender Not Available	0	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %	
Race						
American Indian/Alaska Native	0	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %	
Asian	2	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %	
Black/African American	203	0	9	0.00 %	4.43 %	
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %	
White d: 7/23/2021 3:26 PM - Kentucky - 0930-0168	641	0	6	0.00 %	0.94 % Page	

Hispanic *	5	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %		
More than one race	0	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %		
Race Not Available	1	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %		
	•						
Hispanic/Latino Origin							
Hispanic/Latino Origin							
Hispanic/Latino Origin Hispanic/Latino Origin	5	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %		
	5 846	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %		

Comments on Data:

KCPC serves adults only and is the only state supported forensic psychiatric facility in Kentucky. Notice 2019 fewer 180-day readmissions; low n. Also, we'll study to identify other causes.

0930-0168 Approved: 06/07/2017 Expires: 06/30/2020

Footnotes:

^{*}Hispanic: Only use the "Hispanic" row under Race if data for Hispanic as a Ethnic Origin are not available

MHBG Table 24 (URS Table 21) - Profile of Non-Forensic (Voluntary and Civil-Involuntary Patients) Readmission to Any Psychiatric Inpatient Care Unit (State Operated or Other Psychiatric Inpatient Unit) within 30/180 Days of Discharge

Expenditure Period Start Date: 7/1/2018 Expenditure Period End Date: 6/30/2019

	Total number of Discharges in Year	Number of Readmissions to ANY Psychiatric Inpatient Care Unit Hospital within		Percent Readmitted	
		30 days	180 days	30 days	180 days
TOTAL	7876	540	1635	6.86 %	20.76 %
Age					
0-12 years	0	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
13-17 years	6	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
18-20 years	407	23	72	5.65 %	17.69 %
21-64 years	7040	482	1484	6.85 %	21.08 %
65-74 years	335	31	70	9.25 %	20.90 %
75+ years	88	4	9	4.55 %	10.23 %

Not Available	0	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %			
Gender								
Female	3051	188	614	6.16 %	20.12 %			
Male	4823	352	1020	7.30 %	21.15 %			
Gender Not Available	2	0	1	0.00 %	50.00 %			
Race								
American Indian/Alaska Native	18	1	5	5.56 %	27.78 %			
Asian	43	4	6	9.30 %	13.95 %			
Black/African American	1133	56	270	4.94 %	23.83 %			
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %			
White	6463	472	1320	7.30 %	20.42 %			
Hispanic *	71	2	12	2.82 %	16.90 %			
More than one race	71	4	12	5.63 %	16.90 %			
Race Not Available	77	1	10	1.30 %	12.99 %			

Hispanic/Latino Origin					
Hispanic/Latino Origin	71	2	12	2.82 %	16.90 %
Non Hispanic/Latino	7728	537	1613	6.95 %	20.87 %
Hispanic/Latino Origin Not Available	77	1	10	1.30 %	12.99 %

1. Does this table include readmission from state	Yes	O No
psychiatric hospitals?		

2. Are Forensic Patients Included?	Yes No
------------------------------------	--------

Comments on Data:

ARH, CSH, ESH, WSH & KCPC. Hispanic is reported as a Race in KY Facility data. Asian & Pacific Islander are reported in the same category; Hawaiian is not collected by facility data.

*Hispanic: Only use the "Hispanic" row under Race if data for Hispanic as a Ethnic Origin are not available

0930-0168 Approved: 06/07/2017 Expires: 06/30/2020

Footnotes:

Renticky Behavioral Health Flanning & Advisory Council

275 East Main Street, 4W-G, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

November 14, 2019

Grants Management Officer
Office of Financial Resources, Division of Grants Management
Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration
5600 Fisher Lane, Rm 17E20
Rockville, MD 20857

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing on behalf of Kentucky's Behavioral Health Planning and Advisory Council to confirm that Council members have reviewed Kentucky's FY 2019 SAPT and CMHS Block Grant Behavioral Health Report, which reports on the federal funds expended during state fiscal year 2019 and prior. Time was allocated at today's Council meeting to discuss the report, including the data tables required for submission on December 1, 2019. The Department for Behavioral Health, Developmental and Intellectual Disabilities welcomes recommendations and comments prior to and after submission of the 2020 Behavioral Health Report.

Thank you for the continued support of community-based services for adults and youth with behavioral health disorders. Our Council membership is honored to serve as advisors for planning in Kentucky.

Sincerely,

Gayla Lockhart

Chair, Kentucky Behavioral Health Planning and Advisory Council

Cc: Michele Blevins, Assistant Director, Division of Behavioral Health