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Overview of Presentation

• Provide an update on the evaluation activities and present a few interim findings
  – Client Level Evaluation
  – Process Evaluation

• Present an overview of the focus for the Evaluation day meeting tomorrow
JDTR Cross-Site Evaluation Goals

• CMHS funded a National Evaluation of JDTR Program
  – to determine the extent to which trauma-integrated treatment and supports implemented by grantees result in improved client outcomes, particularly for veterans
  – to document grantee implementation of pilot and statewide changes in practice and policies, including expansion of pilot screening and treatment strategies
Client Outcome: Screening/Eligibility Data

• **Initial screens: 2205 individuals**
  – 50% Eligible/Referred for further assessment
  – 1 site accounts for 808 screens; 30% eligible
  – 4 sites with eligibility rates above 80%

• **Court Decision: 908 individuals (6 sites)**
  – 1 site accounts for 513 decisions, 20% eligible
  – Remaining sites, 71-100% eligible
Client Outcome: Program Participation

- 726 Clients enrolled across the diversion programs
- Intercept points: 74% post-booking; 15% pre-booking; 8% parole/probation
- Charge level: 46% Misdemeanor, 45% felony, 5% No Charge/Unspecified, 3% technical violation
- No significant differences between clients and evaluation participants—except charge level in two sites
Client Outcome: Client interviews

- Client Interviews at Baseline, 6mo, 12mo
- 599 enrolled in the evaluation
- 85% military service history
- High rates of childhood and lifetime trauma
  - 95% reported any trauma, 75% reported experiences before the age of 18
- 56% of military service members served in combat zone (N=510)
Client Outcome: Combat trauma

Military trauma among military service members in combat zone (6 month interview, N=139)

- Felt responsible for death of someone
- Wounded/injured
- Provided Aid to seriously wounded
- Cleared homes/blgs/bunkers
- Shot or directed fire at enemy
- Attacked/Ambushed
- Seen, smelled, handled dead bodies
- Shot at/received fire
- Seen someone injured/killed
- Patrol areas with landmines/IEDs
Client Outcome: Treatment history and need

Mental Health

- Treatment History
- PTSD*
- Depression**
- MH Full Scale**

Substance Use

- Treatment History
- Meet CAGE criteria-Alcohol Problem
- Alcohol use in past 30days
- Drug Use in past 30days
- Daily Alcohol use in past 30days

*Based on PCL-C; **Based on BASIS 24
Client Outcomes at 6 months

Significant improvements among clients on a range of outcome measures:

- Reduced trauma symptoms (PCL-C)
- Reduced mental health symptoms (BASIS 24)
- Reduced drug and alcohol use
- Reduced arrests (self-report)
- Improved functioning
- Increased endorsement of recovery indicators (REE)
Process Evaluation: Methods and measures

- Site Visits at 24 months completed; next round to begin Summer 2012
  - Site Visit Reports
  - Implementation Rating Scale
  - Pilot Project Characteristics
  - Trauma Informed Care Scale (Cohort 2 only)

- Semi Annual Progress Reports (SAPR)
  - Seven Administrations; data up to 28 months for both cohorts; months 36 & 40 for cohort 1 only
State and pilot implementation trends

- SAPR collects self reported implementation ratings for Pilot and State Components
  - 12 State and 13 pilot level components (e.g. leadership, stakeholder involvement, action planning, consensus development, consumer involvement, TIC training and trauma screening expansion, etc.)

- Trend lines for each cohort constructed using the means across components, across sites
Trend lines for state and pilot implementation

1=None; 2=Initial; 3=Low; 4=Moderate; 5=High
Overview of implementation
trend lines
Across key components for state and pilot projects:

• Trajectory is moving in the right direction
• Implementation between Low-Moderate
• Cohort 1 accelerates on state level implementation between 24 and 28 months; steady progress for Cohort 2
• State trajectory after 28 months more variable; pilot slow but steady
Evaluation day agenda

• **Findings from process evaluation**
  – Implementation ratings, variations between cohorts, trends over time, discussion of trauma and peer-related components

• **Findings from client outcome data**
  – Differences between sites, outcomes, future analyses

• **Small group discussions**
  – Project Directors and other program staff
  – Veteran Peer Representatives
  – Evaluators