

Background

A growing gap exists between the need for and availability of pediatric mental health services. Child Psychiatry Access Programs, like Maryland Behavioral Health Integration in Pediatric Primary Care (BHIPP), have been instrumental in addressing this need. BHIPP supports providers in addressing pediatric mental health concerns in their practices through provider education and 3 patient-specific services: telephone consultation with a psychiatrist, referral support, and social work co-location.

Purpose

This study describes characteristics of patients for whom PCPs sought support via BHIPP and examines whether patient characteristics vary by service.

Methods

N= 9,261 patient-specific contacts with BHIPP from October 2012- March 2020 were examined using the following measures:

- •Service type (e.g., face to face social-work visit)
- Patient demographics (e.g., gender)
- Patient presenting problems and medication use
- •Clinical severity rating by BHIPP consultant/social worker using CGI-S

Descriptive statistics were used to examine patient characteristics by BHIPP service. Latent class analysis using presenting symptoms as class indicators was conducted to identify subgroups of patients for whom PCPs sought BHIPP services. Logistic regression was used to examine class differences on demographic and clinical service variables.

PCPs are seeking CPAP support for patients with common internalizing symptoms. Social work services are sought more for patients with mild internalizing symptoms whereas consultations with a psychiatrist are used more often for moderate to severely ill patients with externalizing symptoms who are more often taking medication. Findings and severity levels.

This poster is supported in part by the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

Characteristics of Patients Served by a Statewide Child Psychiatry Access Program (CPAP) Amie F. Bettencourt PhD, Kelly Coble LCSW-C, Sneha Jadhav MD, Shauna P. Reinblatt MD DFAACAP, Mark A. Riddle MD, Teresa Simmons LCSW-C, Jami-Lin Williams MA

Maryland-Behavioral Health Integration in Pediatric Primary Care (MD-BHIPP)

	Results						
Table 1. Characteristics of Parameter	Elevere 1	Conditional Itom Dualsa	hilim Diana f				
Characteristics	Consultation (N=1885)	Referral (N=2379)	Social work (N=4997)	Chi Square	1	Conditional Item Proba	bility Plots to
Sex				74.38*	0.9		
Male	993 (52.7%)	1104(46.4%)	2123 (42.5%)		0.7		/
Female	875 (46.4%)	1223 (51.4%)	2734 (54.7%)		20.6		_//
Other/Unknown	17 (0.9%)	51(2.1%)	140 (2.8%)		다. 아이 (10.6 이 (10.6)		
Age				360.56*			
0 – 5 years	185 (9.8%)	223 (9.4%)	894 (17.9%)		E ^{0.3}		
6 – 12 years	753 (39.9%)	927 (39.0%)	2277 (45.6%)		0.1		
13 – 18 years	797 (42.3%)	1059 (44.5%)	1589 (31.8%)		0		
> 18 years	143 (7.6%)	145 (6.1%)	122 (2.4%)		Anxiety Mod	od Self-injury	
Unknown	7 (0.4%)	25 (1.1%)	115 (2.3%)				prot
Patient Insurance Type				1058.2*			
Private or both	867 (46.0%)	1456 (61.2%)	1392 (27.9%)		Mood & anxiety class (16.8%)		-Attenti
Public	573 (30.4%)	838 (35.2%)	2046 (40.9%)		Anxiety class (42.7%)		Behavi
None/unknown	445 (23.6%)	85 (3.6%)	1559 (31.2%)		Table 2. Lataut Class Diff		
Already Receiving Mental Health Services				1148.1*	Table 2. Latent Class Diff	erences on Char	acteristi
Yes	1302 (69.1%)	514 (21.6%)	1596 (31.9%)			Mood &	Atten
Νο	562 (29.8%)	1712 (72.0%)	3200 (64.0%)		Patient Characteristic	Anxiety	Behav
Unknown	21 (1.1%)	153 (6.4%)	201 (4.0%)			Problems	learr Probl
Taking Medications				2282.65*			
Yes	1112 (59.0%)	369 (15.5%)	829 (16.6%)		Male	0.75*	3.34
No	689 (36.6%)	1162 (48.8%)	3630 (72.6%)		< 8 years old	0.00**	1.3
Unknown	84 (4.5%)	848 (35.6%)	538 (10.8%)		Has private insurance	0.54**	0.40
CGI-S Rating by BHIPP**				2387.67*			
Normal	9 (0.5%)	1 (0.4%)	539 (10.9%)		Already receiving		
Borderline mentally ill	30 (1.7%)	11 (4.6%)	1915 (38.6%)		mental health	1.94**	2.12
Mildly ill	176 (9.8%)	47 (19.5%)	1228 (24.8%)		services		
Moderately ill	1019 (56.5%)	116 (48.1%)	1012 (20.4%)		Received BHIPP social		
Markedly ill	463 (25.7%)	49 (20.3%)	215 (4.3%)		work visit	2.26**	0.5
Severely ill	91 (5.0%)	15 (6.2%)	35 (0.7%)		Notes: Values shown in tabl	e are Odds ratios a	and the la
Extremely ill	17 (0.9%)	2 (0.8%)	13 (0.3%)		reference group. *p<.05; **		
Notes. *p<.001; **CGI-S only a	vailable for N=7003 cas	e-specific contacts.					

Conclusions

