

- I. 2000-2001 Grand Jury report on MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES
- II. Published June 25, 2001
- III. The Grand Jury investigated Santa Barbara County’s “Mental Health Services” as a result of complaints by both present and former employees of Alcohol, Drug & Mental Health Services (ADMHS) and also by some clients of ADMHS. Complaints involved not only the administration but the physical building structure itself. It was found that the administration facility needs to be evaluated and action taken to recondition or replace existing buildings. As far as the staff/client relationship goes, heavy caseloads appear to be a major source of concern.

Adult services long term care clinicians have too many clients. Each client requires more time and attention than is often available. Paper work is time consuming. Lack of communication with management also creates a sense of isolation for the clinician.

Having to share offices also is a deterrent to counseling efforts and could compromise clinician-client confidentiality.

There has been a lack of management’s commitment to job training and career advancement for the staff. Supervisory positions may be unavailable due to lack of experience and training.

- IV. Key Grand Jury Recommendations where there is disagreement or need for follow up:

**Recommendation 1: The Labor-Management Team should continue to meet until all processes proposed by the group are underway.**

BOS Response: The Board partially disagrees with this recommendation.

2001-2002 Grand Jury comment: This response does not meet the requirement to specify a rationale for disagreement as required by Section 933.05 (b) (4) of the California Penal Code.

**Recommendation 8: ADMHS should locate satellite counseling sites in downtown Santa Barbara and Santa Maria that are closer to where the clients live.**

ADMHS Response: This will not be implemented in the near future because it cannot be accomplished without an identified source of funding.

**Recommendation 10: ADMHS should undertake data sharing with other departments in client services to assure that the most accurate information is being used to design client Services and to help create reports.**

ADMHS Response: Requires further analysis.

2001-2002 Grand Jury comment: This response does not comply with the requirements of Section 933.05 (b) (3) of the California Penal Code in that the parameters for analysis or study are not described nor is the timeframe for the matter to be presented to the relevant decision maker identified. The maximum time allowed by law for this analysis is six months from the report publication date.

**Recommendation 12a: Management should encourage staff to advance professionally, increase their knowledge and keep up-to-date via courses, seminars, workshops and related activities.**

ADMHS Response: ADMHS partially disagrees.

2001-2002 Grand Jury comment: This response does not meet the requirement to specify a rationale for disagreement as required by Section 933.05 (b) (4) of the California Penal Code.

V. Synopsis:

Number of responses to recommendations required – 68

Number of responses to recommendations in which the respondent agreed with or implemented the recommendation – 46

Number of responses to recommendations in which the respondent disagreed with the recommendation – 3

Number of responses to recommendations in which the respondent requires analysis or study to finalize position -- 18