



**LAC
DMH**
LOS ANGELES COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF
MENTAL HEALTH

Mental Health Services for Children and Youth in D-Rate and FFA Placements

June 2012

INTRODUCTION

At the request of the Katie A. Panel, we conducted an analysis of the mental health services provided to children and youth in D-Rate and Foster Family Agencies (FFA) placements. We were particularly interested to identify the more intensive services provided to this population either through enrollee based programs or particular service models/arrays. In part, we wanted to see how these programs/services compared to the concepts of Intensive Care Coordination and Intensive Home Based Services that are contained in the Katie A. State Case Settlement Agreement (2011).

More specifically, this analysis examined youth who were in D-Rate and FFA homes on January 31, 2011 and the mental health services they received six months prior or post this date. Of particular interest were the intensive mental health services provided to this population. Intensive services are defined as enrollee and non-enrollee based program services that include Wraparound and Full Service Partnership (FSP) in addition to service arrays under Comprehensive Children's Services Program (CCSP), Field Capable Clinical Services (FCCS) and other mental health services, such as Therapeutic Behavioral Services (TBS) consistent with the principles of Intensive Home Based Services (IHBS) model. The programs and models that we have identified as "intensive services" are those service arrays that we might expect to be consistent in offering the intensity of services that is provided in IHBS, as defined for this analysis. Please note that Intensive Home-Based Services is not a program but an array of services which we believe is consistent with the IHBS and ICC service elements outlined in the Katie A. State Case Settlement Agreement.

Using these parameters, we found that there were 1,391 youth in D-Rate placements and 4,312 youth in FFA placements. This report will examine the frequency, type and location of mental health services provided to these youth during the identified time frame. Comparisons will be made between intensive service approaches and non-intensive services, e.g., those mental health services not captured in one of the seven mental health service categories named above. Please see addendum for a specific definition of these programs and services.

We would expect that these more intensive service programs and service arrays would provide a higher frequency of services, a more robust mix of services, and often be provided in the home or a suitable home-like setting. In short, these programs and services would be more in line with the kinds of services and supports identified in the County and State Katie A. Settlement Agreements.

Methodology

The D-Rate/FFA report details mental health services received by children (at least four years of age) in a D-Rate or FFA placement. For the current report, the child was categorized as D-Rate or FFA, when in such a placement as of January 31, 2011. Data was provided in collaboration with the Department of Children and Family Services. Once the placement cohorts were established, children were placed in cross sectional cohorts by mental health program enrollment. This cross sectional analysis is made possible by the weekly Katie A client match which occurs between the Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) and the Department of Mental Health (DMH). This match allows for each respective Department to identify clients with concomitant cases.

Enrollment is utilized in the reporting to establish a period of time within the study period to calculate frequency and intensity of services. This is accomplished by summarizing service types, durations, and costs between the enrollment and disenrollment dates by client. Clients may have received additional services not included in the report due to the service delivery date being outside of the enrollment period. For example, they may have terminated Wraparound services shortly after the beginning of the time period or initiated such services just prior to the end of the study period. The study period for the D-Rate/FFA report was August 1, 2010 through July 31, 2011. The study period allowed DMH staff to examine and summarize services rendered during this time period. DMH was particularly interested to identify the more intensive services provided to this population. It is important to note that some of the programs in this analysis had a small number of youth enrolled and this should be considered when comparing the results across programs.

Client enrollment was determined using the following sources:

Mental Health Enrollment Categories	Source	Criteria where applicable
Comprehensive Children's Services Program (CCSP)	DMH - Child Welfare Division Enrollment Roster	Clients were enrolled in CCSP, receiving some combination of Functional Family Therapy (FFT), Incredible Years (IY) or Trauma-Focused Cognitive Behavior Therapy (TF-CBT).
Field Capable Clinical Services	Integrated System	Clients with at least one FCCS service (plan id 2,058, 2,078) during the study period (08/2010-07/2011) and age 4 and over
Full Service Partnership - Child	FSP Authorization System	Clients were authorized and Enrolled in the Full Service Partnership
Full Service Partnership - TAY	FSP Authorization System	Clients were authorized and Enrolled in the Full Service Partnership
Intensive Home-Based Services	Integrated System	Clients who have received IHBS type services defined as: at least 8 face-to-face visits within a month (a minimum of 4 visits need to be Rehabilitation Services received at home), and at least 2 occurrences of Targeted Case Management, and at least 2 occurrences of Team Conference/Case Consultation
Treatment Foster Care	DMH - Child Welfare Division Roster	Children and Youth enrolled in ITFC or MTFC programs
Wraparound	DCFS - BIS	Children enrolled in either Tier I or Tier II Wraparound

Lastly services compiled during the study period were grouped by type of procedure and categorized in one of the following groups:

Service Type Categories
Collateral
Individual
Individual Rehabilitation
Medication Support
Other Treatment
Targeted Case Management
Team Consultation

**Mental Health Services for Children and Youth in D-Rate and FFA
Placements
Table and Graph Breakdown**

Table 1:

These tables are a breakdown of the number of children that received mental health services from August 1, 2010 to July 31, 2011. There were 1,232 (89%) children and youth in D-Rate homes and 2,998 (70%) children and youth in FFAs that received mental health services during this time period. These tables also show a breakdown of the number of children between various age ranges in these homes. The majority of children and youth at these placements were at least age 14.

Table 1D:

For D-Rate placements, the majority of youth were placed in a D-Rate/Guardian Home, while D-Rate/Relative Home was used less than any of the other D-Rate homes.

Table 2A:

This table shows the number of children and youth in D-Rate homes that received intensive services during this time period. TFC, FSP-TAY and CCSP had 2, 6 and 10 children and youth, respectively enrolled in their programs. Most of the children and youth in D-Rate homes received Intensive Home-Based Services and/or Wraparound. These small numbers should be considered when making comparisons across programs. The average cost per child is highest in the Wraparound and FSP-TAY programs. While the number of youth served in Intensive Home Based Services was similar to the number served in Wraparound, the total amount of charges incurred was drastically lower with the average cost per child around \$12,000 as compared to an average Wraparound cost of almost \$19,000.

Table 2B

This table shows the number of children and youth in FFA homes that received intensive services during this time period. There were only 8 children and youth enrolled in FSP-TAY, while the majority received Intensive Home-Based Services and/or Wraparound during this time period. The average service cost was highest for Treatment Foster, followed by Wraparound and Full Service Partnership (Child).

Table 3A:

This table is a breakdown of the types of services provided for children and youth that received Non Intensive Services in D-Rate homes. It also includes the total charges for these services. Over half of the charges for non-intensive services are associated with individual therapy. For children and youth in D-Rate placements, there were also significant costs for individual rehabilitation and medication support.

Table 3B:

This table is a breakdown of the types of services provided for children and youth that received Non-Intensive Services in FFA placements. It also includes the total charges for these services. Over 65% of the costs associated with non-intensive services for youth in FFAs are associated with individual therapy.

Graph 1:

This graph shows the frequency of services provided for each program for children and youth in D-Rate and FFA placements. Children and youth enrolled in TFC, Wraparound and FSP-Child (D-Rate), had higher frequencies of service, on average, than children and youth in CCSP, Field Capable Services, FSP-TAY or FSP-Child (FFA).

Graph 2:

This graph shows the frequency of services provided for Intensive Home-Based Services and Non-Intensive Services for children and youth in D-Rate and FFA placements. Children and youth enrolled in Intensive Home-Based Services received a higher frequency of services than children and youth that received Non-Intensive Services.

Graph 3:

This graph shows, on average, the services that children and youth received during this time period. Overall, children and youth received more Individual Therapy than any other service type. On average, children and youth enrolled in TFC, Wraparound and FSP –TAY (FFA) received Individual Rehabilitation more than children and youth in other programs. In addition, there was a greater percentage of Team Consultation being provided for children and youth enrolled in Wraparound than in other programs.

Graph 4:

This graph shows, on average, the services that children and youth received for Intensive Home-Based Services and Non-Intensive Services during this time period. TBS is the largest component of services provided in the Intensive Home-Based category while Individual Rehabilitation is the primary modality of service provided for children and youth in Non-Intensive Services. Intensive Home-Based services also tend to provide more Team Consultation than Non-Intensive Services while children and youth in the Non-Intensive Services received more Medication Support, on average, than those in the Intensive Home-Based Services category.

Graph 5

This graph is a breakdown of the location of services by each program/category. The graph shows that FCCS, FSP-TAY, FSP-Child, Wraparound and IHBS provided the highest amount of services in the home and community. This graph does not provide the breakdown of the types of services being provided in the office (e.g., note writing, team consultation, Medication Support, phone contact, etc.).



Los Angeles County - Department of Mental Health
Children in D-Rate and FFA Placement on 01/31/2011 receiving
Mental Health Services 6 months prior or post placement report



Table 1A

Placement Type	Number of Children in Placement	Number of Children Receiving Mental Health Services	Percentage of Children Receiving Mental Health Services*	Number of Children Matched by DataFlux Match**	Number of Children Not Matched by DataFlux Match***
D-Rate	1,391	1,232	89%	1,353	38
Foster Family Agency Certified Home	4,312	2,998	70%	3,893	419

Table 1B

Placement Type	Number of Children Receiving Intensive Services	Number of Children Receiving Non-Intensive Services	Number of Children Receiving Mental Health Services
D-Rate	455	777	1,232
Foster Family Agency Certified Home	745	2,253	2,998

Table 1C

Placement Type	Number of Children age 4-8 yrs at placement +	Number of Children age 9-13 yrs at placement +	Number of Children age 14+ yrs at placement +	Total Children
D-Rate	139	441	811	1,391
Foster Family Agency Certified Home	1,465	1,055	1,792	4,312

Table 1D

Placement Type / Facility Type	Number of Children age 4-8 yrs at placement +	Number of Children age 9-13 yrs at placement +	Number of Children age 14+ yrs at placement +	Total Children
D-Rate / Foster Family Home	46	111	243	400
D-Rate / Guardian Home	46	233	426	705
D-Rate / Small Home	0	93	136	229
D-Rate / Relative Home	47	4	6	57
FFA / FFA Certified Home	1,465	1,055	1,792	4,312

*Percentage derived from Number of Children receiving Mental Health Services compared to Number of Children in Placement.

**Numbers derived from client match conducted by DMH - BI using Feb 2012 data.

***Numbers derived from clients not matched by DMH - BI using Feb 2012 data.

+Age calculated at January 31, 2011 while child was in placement



**Los Angeles County - Department of Mental Health
Children in D-Rate and FFA Placement on 01/31/2011 receiving
Mental Health Services 6 months prior or post placement report**



Table 2A

D-Rate				
Intensive Services	Number of Children*	Total Charges	Total Charges %	Average Cost Per Child
Comprehensive Children's Services Program	10	\$ 65,296.88	0.7%	\$ 6,529.69
Field Capable Clinical Services	46	\$ 253,969.20	2.8%	\$ 5,521.07
Full Service Partnership - Child	53	\$ 749,668.13	8.4%	\$ 14,144.68
Full Service Partnership - TAY	6	\$ 102,884.85	1.2%	\$ 17,147.48
Intensive Home-Based Services	255	\$ 3,039,479.14	34.0%	\$ 11,919.53
Treatment Foster Care	2	\$ 6,212.34	0.1%	\$ 3,106.17
Wraparound	250	\$ 4,727,065.02	52.8%	\$ 18,908.26
Totals		\$ 8,944,575.56	100.0%	

Table 2B

Foster Family Agency Certified Home				
Intensive Services	Number of Children*	Total Charges	Total Charges %	Average Cost Per Child
Comprehensive Children's Services Program	59	\$ 294,591.43	3.0%	\$ 4,993.08
Field Capable Clinical Services	74	\$ 252,395.23	2.5%	\$ 3,410.75
Full Service Partnership - Child	62	\$ 831,471.29	8.3%	\$ 13,410.83
Full Service Partnership - TAY	8	\$ 44,001.85	0.4%	\$ 5,500.23
Intensive Home-Based Services	360	\$ 3,138,646.87	31.4%	\$ 8,718.46
Treatment Foster Care	52	\$ 990,238.46	9.9%	\$ 19,043.05
Wraparound	280	\$ 4,434,514.24	44.4%	\$ 15,837.55
Totals		\$ 9,985,859.37	100.0%	

*Children may have overlapping enrollment periods and summary of child counts does not reflect unique children in placement.

** See Definitions for Program descriptions



**Los Angeles County - Department of Mental Health
Children in D-Rate and FFA Placement on 01/31/2011 receiving
Mental Health Services 6 months prior or post placement report**



Table 3A

D-Rate			
Non-Intensive Services - Service Type Category**	Number of Children*	Total Charges	Total Charges %
Collateral	604	\$ 507,433.38	9.1%
Individual	697	\$ 3,068,387.49	55.0%
Individual Rehabilitation	220	\$ 603,314.54	10.8%
MedicationSupport	509	\$ 684,716.95	12.3%
Targeted Case Management	225	\$ 324,117.39	5.8%
Team Consultation	385	\$ 161,038.75	2.9%
Other Treatment	430	\$ 229,557.88	4.1%
Totals		\$ 5,578,566.38	100.0%

Table 3B

Foster Family Agency Certified Home			
Non-Intensive Services - Service Type Category**	Number of Children*	Total Charges	Total Charges %
Collateral	1718	\$ 1,280,574.13	10.1%
Individual	2159	\$ 8,291,763.11	65.6%
Individual Rehabilitation	463	\$ 864,427.61	6.8%
MedicationSupport	355	\$ 412,708.35	3.3%
Targeted Case Management	927	\$ 778,785.85	6.2%
Team Consultation	908	\$ 310,987.77	2.5%
Other Treatment	1590	\$ 705,381.91	5.6%
Totals		\$ 12,644,628.73	100.0%

*Children may have overlapping enrollment periods and summary of child counts does not reflect unique children in placement.


** See Appendix A for Procedures included under each Service Type Category



Los Angeles County - Department of Mental Health



Graph 1: D-Rate and FFA Service Frequency in January 2011, Comparison by Service




* Service Frequency Category: The number of services provided to an individual client receiving Intensive Services in a single month.
 ** Service Frequency Distribution: An average monthly percentage of clients in each Service Frequency Category within an individual Intensive Service.



Los Angeles County - Department of Mental Health



Graph 2: D-Rate and FFA Service Frequency in January 2011, Comparison by Service



* Service Frequency Category: The number of services provided to an individual client receiving Intensive Services in a single month.


** Service Frequency Distribution: An average monthly percentage of clients in each Service Frequency Category within an individual Intensive Service.



Los Angeles County - Department of Mental Health



Graph 3: D-Rate and FFA Average Client Services Mix



* Numbers derived from averaging individual client's Service Type received for the time period 08/2010-07/2011


** See Appendix A for Procedures included under each Service Type Category



Los Angeles County - Department of Mental Health



Graph 4: D-Rate and FFA Average Client Services Mix



* Numbers derived from averaging individual client's Service Type received for the time period 08/2010-07/2011


** See Appendix A for Procedures included under each Service Type Category



Los Angeles County - Department of Mental Health



Graph 5: D-Rate and FFA Location of Service In January 2011, Comparison by Service Location



* Service Location: An average amount of services provided in the various locations

** See Appendix A for description of Office and Other Facility

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

This section is a summary of the mental health services provided to youth in D-Rate and FFA placements.

We found that 89% of the children and youth placed in D-Rate homes received mental health services (both intensive and non-intensive) compared to 70% of the children and youth in FFAs. Thirty-seven percent of children and youth in D-Rate placements received intensive services with the Intensive Home-Based Services array and Wraparound being most commonly provided. The least common intensive service modality for children and youth in D-Rate homes was Treatment Foster Care with less than 1% of this population receiving this service model. (It should be noted that TFC services are only available to children/youth placed in FFAs.)

By comparison, 25% of the children and youth in FFAs received intensive services with, again, the most common service vehicles being our Intensive Home-Based Services array and Wraparound. The least common intensive service model provided to children and youth in FFAs was FSP-TAY, with less than 1% of this population receiving this service model.

Non-Intensive mental health services were provided to 63% of the D-Rate population and 75% of the FFA population over this period of time. Children and youth that received mental health services while placed in D-Rate or FFA homes, more often than not received non-intensive mental health services.

Prior to data analysis, our hypothesis was that those programs/models that were included in the “intensive services” would be closely in line with the concept of Intensive Care Coordination and Intensive Home-Based Services that are contained in the Katie A. State Case Settlement Agreement (2011). While some of the programs and models that we have identified as “intensive services” seem to provide the depth of services similar to those that are provided in IHBS (e.g., TFC and Wraparound), other programs and models that we have included in this category, have not provided the intensity of services originally hypothesized (e.g., CCSP and FCCS).

Service Frequency

When analyzing the frequency of services youth received while in D-Rate and FFA placements, youth in the more intensive service programs consistently received a greater frequency of services than youth that were engaged in Non-Intensive Services. In particular, Wraparound, Treatment Foster Care (FFA), FSP-Child, and Intensive Home-Based Services had more than half the youth in their respective programs receive six or more services in a given month. More specifically, Treatment Foster Care and Intensive Home-Based Services (D-Rate) had more than 50% of youth receive ten or more services in a given month.

Not surprisingly, for D-Rate homes, some of the most intensive service models carried the highest costs - Wraparound followed by FSP-Child and Intensive Home-Based Services. While FSP-TAY (D-Rate) did not provide a high frequency of services, it had one of the highest service costs. For FFAs, some of the most intensive service models also carried some of the highest costs – Treatment Foster Care followed by Wraparound and FSP-Child. The least costly “intensive” programs were the Children’s Comprehensive Services Program and Field Capable Clinical Services.

In comparison, youth not receiving intensive services, the “Non-Intensive group”, had more than 80% of youth receive less than six services in a given month. Over half the costs of these non-intensive services was associated with individual therapy.

Service Type

This analysis also examined the various types of mental health services offered to youth in D-Rate homes and FFAs such as Individual Therapy, Collateral, Individual Rehabilitation, Medication Support, Targeted Case Management, Team Consultation, Therapeutic Behavior Services and Other Treatment. For the purpose of this report, we have identified support services that may be a greater indicator of intensive services being provided such as Targeted Case Management, Rehabilitation Services, and Therapeutic Behavioral Services.

Essentially, Targeted Case Management are services that a family might need to assist in accessing resources aimed at helping the youth build the necessary skills to function successfully in the home and community. Rehabilitation services, on the other hand, are services aimed at improving, maintaining, or restoring daily living, social and leisure activities. Within the “intensive” programs, ample use of Rehabilitation and Targeted Case Management was made by Wraparound, Treatment Foster Care, and just to a lesser extent by Full Service Partnership Programs. We also see that in some instances these intensive service models are augmented with Therapeutic Behavioral Services, which include within them Targeted Case Management and Rehabilitation elements.

Of course, children and youth who received our Intensive Home Based Services model received significant amounts of Targeted Case Management, Rehabilitation and Therapeutic Behavioral Services.

Interestingly, children and youth who did not receive intensive services had a significant portion of their treatment provided through Rehabilitative Services and Targeted Case Management.

Overall, the data shows that although youth in some of the intensive services, such as Treatment Foster Care and Wraparound, were provided a greater amount of Rehabilitation services when compared with Non-Intensive Services, youth in the Non-Intensive Services received more Targeted Case Management.

While some of the intensive services provided more in-depth services to youth through models/service arrays such as TFC, Wraparound and Intensive Home-Based Services, others are lacking in providing the array of services that are expected in an intensive service.

Service Location

For the purpose of this analysis, service location was divided into four categories; services provided in the youth's home, services provided in the youth's school, services provided in the office and services provided in any other facility (group home, emergency room, psychiatric residential treatment center, unlisted facility, etc.). When compared to the more intensive programs and services, Non-Intensive Services were provided, on average, more frequently in the office. Further analysis might be beneficial to gain a more complete understanding of the specific types of services being offered in the various locations.

Overall, based on this data, clients in the more intensive service models received more intensive services than youth that received Non-Intensive Services, evidenced by youth receiving a greater frequency of services, services typically geared toward improving daily living skills and access to community resources, as well as, receiving a greater proportion of services in their home and community. Finally, it is important to note that a significant number of children and youth receive an intensive level of a service array that is consistent with the Katie A. State and County cases while not being enrolled in one of the County's intensive service models.

APPENDIX

DEFINITIONS

D-Rate – DCFS client found to be in a D-Rate level placement on January 31, 2011

FFA – DCFS client found to be in a Foster Family Agency placement on January 31, 2011

Intensive Services: Client found to be a concomitant client of DCFS and DMH. Client is also receiving one of the following Intensive Services:

- **Comprehensive Children’s Services Program** – CCSP provides 24/7 intensive case management for children ages 3-17, as well as access to one or more of the following EBPs**:
 - Incredible Years (IY)
 - Trauma Focused Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (TFCBT)
 - Functional Family Therapy (FFT)
- **Field Capable Clinical Services** - The FCCS program is designed to provide services to individuals who are isolated, unwilling or unable to access traditional mental health outpatient services due to location/distance barriers, physical disabilities, or because of the stigma associated with receiving clinic-based services.
- **MHSA Full Service Partnership – Child** - The FSP program is for children ages 0-15 and their families who would benefit from, and are interested in participating in, a program designed to address the total needs of a family whose child (and possibly other family members) is experiencing significant emotional, psychological or behavioral problems that are interfering with their wellbeing. The FSP program provides comprehensive, intensive mental health services for children and their families in their homes and communities. **
- **MHSA Full Service Partnership – Transition Age Youth (TAY)** - The FSP Program is designed for Transition Age Youth ages 16-25 who could benefit from and are interested in participating in a program that can help address emotional, housing, physical health, transportation, and other needs that will help them function independently in the community. The FSP program provides comprehensive, intensive mental health services for individuals in their homes and communities. **

- **Intensive Home-Based Services** – A client is considered to be receiving intensive home-based services if
 1. The client has received Therapeutic Behavioral Services during the study period, or
 2. For any 30-day period, intensive home-based services are defined as receiving the following:
 - At least 8 face-to-face visits (a minimum of 4 visits need to be Rehabilitation Services received at home), and
 - At least 2 occurrences of Targeted Case Management, and
 - At least 2 occurrences of Team Conference/Case Consultation

- **Treatment Foster Care (TFC)** - provides a cost-effective individualized treatment alternative to children and youth whose psychosocial and/or behavioral needs can not be met in their current home setting. Due to the severity of needs, these youth would be at risk for more restrictive placement settings in the absence of a TFC home. TFC provides individualized Intensive Home Based Services and Intensive Care Coordination where children learn and practice appropriate behavioral and social skills in a supportive, home-like environment, generally in their own community and close to their own family and school. TFC foster parents are professionally trained caregivers who are supported by their Foster Family Agency TFC team 24 hours per day.

- **Wraparound** - Wraparound is an integrated, strength-based, family and community centered approach designed to stabilize children into long-term and permanent settings with the support of specialized comprehensive services. It includes a commitment to create a Child and Family Team to develop and implement uniquely tailored Plans of Care that include the strategies, services and supports to provide “whatever it takes” to address the needs of the child and family in order to maintain the child in a safe, nurturing, permanent community-based setting. **

- **Non-Intensive Services** - Client found to be a concomitant client of DCFS and DMH who is not receiving one of the following mental health programs: CCSP, FCCS, FSP, TFC, Wraparound and IHBS, but may be receiving other mental health services provided by Los Angeles County Department of Mental Health.

** Source of definitions - <http://lacdcfs.org/katieA/LOG/>

Service Type Categories by Procedure Codes

Service Type	Code	Procedure Description
Collateral	90887	Collateral
Individual	H2011	Crisis Intervention
	S9484	Crisis Stabilization in ER
	90847	Family Therapy with Client
	H0046	Indiv Ther minimum 0-19
	90804	Indiv Ther minimum 20
	90806	Indiv Therapy 45-74 min
	90808	Indiv Therapy 75+ min
	90802	Interactive Psych Diag
	90810	Play Therapy minimum 20
	90812	Play Therapy 45-74 min
	90814	Play Therapy 75+ min
	90801	Psych Diagnostic Serv
	90805	Ther-E&M minimum 20
	90807	Ther-Eval&Man 45-74 min
	90809	Ther-Eval&Man 75+ min
Individual Rehabilitation	H2025	Emp Maintenance Support
	H2015	Indiv/Gp Rehab
Medication Support	M0064	Brief Med Visit
	H2010	Indiv/Gp Rehab Med
	90862	Indiv Medication
	H0033	Oral Medication Administration
Targeted Case Management	T1017	Targeted Case Management
Team Consultation	G9007	Case Conference Attendance
	99361	Case Consult to 59 min
	99362	Case Consult 60 min or more
	H0032	Team Plan Development
Therapeutic Behavior Services	H2019	Therapeutic Behavior Serv

Service Type Categories by Procedure Codes

Service Type	Code	Procedure Description
Other Treatment	0101	Acute Hosp-Admin Day
	0100	Acute General Hospital - PDP
	H0002	Behavioral Health Screening
	H2012	Day Rehabilitation, Full Day
	99261	E&M Consult Follow - low
	99255	E&M Consult New IP 110+
	99243	E&M Consult OP 40-59 min
	99244	E&M Consult OP 60-79 min
	99245	E&M Consult OP 80+ min
	90853	Group Therapy
	0183	IMD Pass Day
	90857	Interactive Gp Therapy
	90849	Multi-fam Gp Therapy
	90889	No Contact – Report Writing
	06057	PG Administration
	H2013	Psychiatric Health Fac
	96101	Psych Testing by psych or psychol
	96102	Psych Testing by technician
	90885	Record Review
	H0019	Semi-Supervised Living

Service Location

Service Location	Description
Other Facility	Assisted Living Facility
	Custodial Care Facility
	Emergency Room - Hospital
	Group Home
	Homeless Shelter
	Inpatient Hospital
	Inpatient Psychiatric Facility
	Nursing Facility - with STP
	Other Unlisted Facility
	Outpatient Hospital
	Prison/Correctional Facility
	Psychiatric Residential Treatment Center
	Residential Substance Abuse Treatment Facility
	Skilled Nursing Facility - w/o STP
	State or Local Public Health Clinic
	Temporary Lodging
	Urgent Care
Office	Office
	Community Mental Health Center