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Overview

- Review of September 28/29, 2005 Site Visit
- Review of Process Issues and Next Steps
- Review of Outcomes and Strategies to Increase Effectiveness
Goals of September 2005 Site Visit

- Set strategy to identify target population and impact of process issues related to MH PTR
  - Booking, screening and referral process and numbers
  - Characteristics of population
- Set strategy to conduct outcome evaluation of MH PTR
  - “Retrospective” data collection
  - Outcomes related to re-arrests, re-admissions, jail time and clinical outcomes
- Set strategy for program tracking system
Kofler Conducted Extensive Research Working With Jail and Lakeside Staff and Guided by TA Team
Kofler’s Reports Analyzed Variables Impacting the Program

- Population Profile
- Arrest Information
- Time in Program
- Statistically Significant Variables
- Program Outcome Measures
- Recommendations
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TA Team Perspective on Kofler’s Research – Process Issues

Can we tease from the analysis process issues that need to be further examined?
A Small Percentage of Offenders Medically Screened Are Referred to MH PTR and Less Than One-Fourth Are Accepted

- Bookings: 53,091
- Medically Screened: 7,260
  - Not Referred to MH PTR: 5,844 (80.4%)
  - Referred to PTR: 1,416 (19.5%)
    - Denied: 1,101 (77.7%)
    - Accepted: 315 (22.2%)
- Account for 10,026 arrests
Individuals Referred to Program and Accepted to Program Are Similar Along Key Characteristics

- **Medically Screened**: 7,260
- **Referred to PTR**: 1,416 (19.5%)

Offenders referred are more likely to:
- Have previous arrests
- Be older and Black (Race may be seen as a proxy for low socioeconomic status and potential for lack of prior treatment)
- Have more chronic mental health conditions
Low Percentage of Accepted Cases May Be Driven by Capacity But a Process Review May Reveal Ways to Improve Screening

Kofler’s research suggest that:

- Population that can be referred and accepted can substantially increase
- Increased capacity and screening staff is necessary to accomplish this

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Referred to MH PTR</th>
<th>Referred to PTR</th>
<th>Accepted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5,844</td>
<td>1,416</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.4%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Additional number that could be referred and accepted: 1,316
- Additional number that is likely to be successful: 711
Cases Denied Because of Release or Clinical Criteria Should Be Further Analyzed

Denied PTR 1,101

- Denial Reason “Out of Jail” Status
  - 394
  - 36%

- Denial Reason “Clinical Criteria”
  - 209
  - 19%

Kofler’s Research Suggest Need to Examine Process Issues
- 5.9 to 9.6 days before referral is received
- 31 to 38 in days in jail for those accepted

Kofler’s Suggestions
- Generate daily report listing inmates meeting criteria
- Streamline handoff to Lakeside
All Denial Reasons
Accepting Inmates More Quickly Into the Program Will Reduce Jail Costs and Increase Effectiveness

- Accepted
  - 315
  - 22.2%

- 35.6 days in jail before acceptance in the program

- Restructuring the review process may reduce the number of days inmates accepted stay in jail
Next Steps

- Conduct process review to:
  - Determine if criteria for program should be modified
  - Examine processing issues that increase days in jail before program acceptance
  - Analyze use of screening and assessment tools
  - Determine how different courts use process and criteria
  - Determine screening and program capacity needed to expand the number of participants in program
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TA Team Perspective on Kofler’s Research – Outcomes

Outcome Issues

Are the outcomes achieved cost-effective?
Is the analysis suggesting areas to examine to improve effectiveness?
Over Half of PTR Participants Tracked Completed the Program Successfully as Defined by Lakeside

PTR Participants in Study
299

Successful PTR Completion
170
56.8%

Offenders have satisfied their charges with the court system without further arrests

Unsuccessful PTR Termination
129
43.2%

Offenders are returned to jail on an outstanding warrant, another arrest/charge or a revocation due to noncompliance with the conditions of the PTR program prior to the disposition of current charges
Successful Group Has Same Severity of Mental Illness as Unsuccessful Group But Tend to Be Misdemeanants with Less Severe Crime Records

**PTR Participants Tracked for Two Years**
- 299

**Successful PTR Completion**
- 170
  - 56.8%

Successful offenders were more likely to:
- Have less severe substance abuse rating at booking
- Been arrested for misdemeanors
- Had fewer re-arrests, fewer days in jail for re-arrests, and spent more time in the community after release
- Spent fewer days in jail for the precipitating arrest
- Had same global functioning score at booking as those who were unsuccessful
Unsuccessful Group Participated for Almost Two Months in the Program While Successful Participated Almost Three Months
Successful Participants Were Also Older at Time of Precipitating Arrest Than Unsuccessful Participants

Average Age (Years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Average Age (Years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>39.2 (9.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful</td>
<td>36.9 (11.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Inmates 2003-2005</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ F(1, 298) = 3.78, p = .053 \]
Successful Participants Had Fewer Orange Country Arrests Since 1988 Than Unsuccessful Participants
Accepted Inmates Were More Likely to Be Successful When Released to Lakeside Inpatient Than Outpatient
Outcome Tracking

Precipitating Arrest (Arrest of admission to jail)

18 Months Later

Tracked During This Period

- Number of arrests
- Jail days
- Program days
- Number of Days in community
Successful Participants Had Fewer Re-Arrests Eighteen Months After Participation
Successful Participants Have Fewer Jail Days During Eighteen Month Follow-up

- **Denied (217)**:
  - Precipitating Arrest: 67 days
  - 18 Months Later: 537 days
  - Jail: 56 days

- **Unsuccessful (43)**:
  - Precipitating Arrest: 35 days
  - 18 Months Later: 547 days
  - Jail: 84 days

- **Successful (59)**:
  - Precipitating Arrest: 24 days
  - 18 Months Later: 574 days
  - Jail: 23 days

Legend:
- Days in Jail for Precipitating Arrest
- Days in Community Active in MH PTR
- Days in Community
- Days in Jail for Subsequent Arrests
## Estimated Jail and Program Cost During Follow-up for Each Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>#</th>
<th># Days in Jail</th>
<th>Jail Cost at $68.73 Per Day*</th>
<th># Days In Program</th>
<th>Program Cost at $65 Per Day**</th>
<th>Total Cost for Group During 18 Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>$1,834,472</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$1,834,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuc</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>$351,691</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>$117,390</td>
<td>$469,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suc</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>$190,588</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>$222,430</td>
<td>$413,018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**As calculated based on most recent contracted rate

Note: Jail per diem cost for mentally ill population should be higher than average per diem due to higher costs related to this population
Average Cost Per Offender in Each Group Shows That the Successful Group Cost Less Than the Denied and Unsuccessful Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Total Cost for Group During 18 Month</th>
<th>Average Cost for the Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>$1,834,472</td>
<td>$8,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>$469,081</td>
<td>$10,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>$413,018</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES

- Cost differential may or may not equate to actual savings in jail costs during this period as the production of savings is affected by other interrelated factors like the size of the group, ability to impact recurring jail costs and projected growth
- Avoiding additional costs may be a significant financial benefit under certain circumstances
Successful Inmates Averaged The Fewest Number of Re-arrests for Drugs, Violent Felonies, Against Persons
Next Steps

- Conduct case review of successful and unsuccessful participants to:
  - Develop more comprehensive program termination codes that can be used for further tracking and research
  - Determine early indicators of potential program failure
    - Determine “relapse” strategy that can reduce jail utilization days for program participants and reduce negative completions for certain types of low level arrests
Next Steps (cont.)

- **Add substance abuse treatment to program protocol**
  - Successful inmates were rated as having less severe substance abuse problems than all other groups

- **Assess medication type and regimen for complexity and compliance**
  - Not clear why unsuccessful inmates require more frequent med clinic visits despite no differences in illness chronicity or acuity
Next Steps (cont.)

- Review other program factors
  - Use of Lakeside inpatient
  - Case management service process
  - Frequency of group therapy
  - Medication clinic “no show” procedures
  - MH PTR liaison procedures
Next Steps (cont.)

- Conduct budget/expenditures review to:
  - Refine and agree on a cost-per-day figure for the program and jail
  - Determine other potential costs that should be considered and develop related cost figures and tracking of indicators
    - Example, mental health hospitalization
Next Steps (cont.)

- Set up tracking mechanism to:
  - Monitor people after they are referred to MHPTR program
    - Include the type of treatment people admitted to MHPTR program receive and their outcomes
  - Match jail and Lakeside records on key variables to create a seamless record
    - Consider matching and adding information from prior contacts in the public mental health system
Summary

First Research Shows Program to Be Effective in Terms of Reducing Cost/Maintaining Public Safety

Areas to Review to Increase Effectiveness

Expedite Referral and Acceptance Process to Reduce Jail Days

Reduce number of unsuccessful completions or reduce days in program of unsuccessful participants

Modify program selection criteria and/or program design to refer and select offenders that may consume more jail days

Modify intervention to further reduce the re-arrests of program participants
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