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### The Prevention Project

- Randomized clinical trial
- Evaluation of effectiveness of intensive in-home services in preventing
  - Out-of-home placements with DCS or juvenile justice
  - Juvenile court contact
- Determination of cost-effectiveness
- Examination of long-term clinical effect

### Eligibility

- 15 years of age or younger
- Never been in state custody
- Never been placed in a psychiatric facility
- Had not previously received extensive counseling
- Currently lived with parents, relative, or legal guardian

### Time-line by Quarter

- **Start-up**
- Families Recruited
- Intensive In-Home Services
- 6-Month Follow-up
- 12-Month Follow-up
- 24-Month Follow-up
- Juvenile Court & School Data

### Number of Participants

- **Original Goal**: 280 families (140 in each group) by September 2001
- **Actual Number**: 240 families (120 in each group) by February 2002

### Special Thanks to:

- LHS Foundation, Inc.
- University of Memphis: Center for Community Health
- The Memphis & Shelby County Juvenile Court
- Shelby County School District
- Memphis City School District
- Community Services Agency
Procedures

- **Treatment group** - the family's contact information was provided to the clinical supervisor. A counselor was assigned and contact was made to begin services.

- **Comparison group** - the family was contacted with a list of three to five organizations geographically close to them that dealt with their primary concerns.

Assessment Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Intake</th>
<th>6 Months</th>
<th>12 Months</th>
<th>24 Months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBCL Delinquency Sub-Scale</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPI</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARI-77</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YSR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Question Youth Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Month Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intake Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAFAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YSR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAM:GEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACES III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBCL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The order of the forms was reversed from the order completed at intake.

Response Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Point</th>
<th>6-Month</th>
<th>12-Month</th>
<th>24-Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

181 families (75.4%) completed all 4 interviews

School Information

- Average grades
- Average conduct grades
- Number of excused and unexcused absences
- Number of suspensions

Collected at 12 and 24 months post-intake

72.2% of the information requested was provided by the schools

Juvenile Court Information

- Any contact with juvenile court
- Any custody changes
- Placements by juvenile court
- Type, handling, results, and disposition of any charges
- Date of charges/contacts/placements

Collected at 12 and 24 months post-intake

100% of the information requested was provided by the court

Analytic Approach

- Efficacy of intensive in-home services as a prevention model for children at high risk of out-of-home placement
- Differences in client outcomes between treatment and comparison groups
- Differences across time within groups
- Cost analysis of intensive in-home services as a prevention model
Referral Sources

- Memphis & Shelby County Juvenile Court: 42.5%
- Community Services Agency: 25.8%
- Memphis and Shelby County School Districts: 17.5%
- Self-Referral: 14.2%

Demographics

2000 Census for Shelby County Race/Ethnicity:
- African-American: 48.6%
- Caucasian: 47.3%
- Hispanic: 3.0%
- Other*: 1.5%

*Includes Asian, Hawaiian, and Hispanic

Gender
- Male: 51%
- Female: 49%

Race/Ethnicity
- African American: 49%
- Caucasian: 48%
- Hispanic: 8%
- Other: 5%

Age at Admission

Mean age: 12.9 years

Primary Concerns

- Oppositional Behavior: 12%
- Problems with Peers: 10%
- School Problems: 5%
- Family Problems: 5%
- Illegal Behavior: 3%

Challenges at Admission

- Legal charges/family members in jail
- School problems
- Runaway
- Neighborhood crime
- Low income
- Family history of mental health and/or substance abuse issues
- Single-parent households

Implementation Issues

- Assumption concerning functional status of families
- Staffing reflected assumptions
- Families had more severe challenges than anticipated
- Staffing had to change in order to provide service according to the model
- Effect of changes on evaluation of project
Parent Satisfaction

- Received Treatment: Treatment group 99%, Comparison group 45%
- Would Use Again: Treatment group 95%, Comparison group 76%
- Would Recommend: Treatment group 97%, Comparison group 82%

Juvenile Court Information

- Intake to 24 months:
  - Contact with JC: Treatment group 53%, Comparison group 40%
  - Placement by JC: Treatment group 36%, Comparison group 30%
  - Custody Change: Treatment group 10%, Comparison group 12%

Types of Offenses at 12 Months

- Treatment group: Total Offenses = 86
  - Person: 45%, Property: 30%, Drug/Alcohol: 17%, Public Order: 13%, Status: 1%
- Comparison group: Total Offenses = 76
  - Person: 37%, Property: 38%, Drug/Alcohol: 16%, Public Order: 11%, Status: 1%

Some participants had multiple offenses.

Types of Offenses at 24 Months

- Treatment group: Total Offenses = 83
  - Person: 35%, Property: 33%, Drug/Alcohol: 10%, Public Order: 7%, Status: 1%
- Comparison group: Total Offenses = 90
  - Person: 40%, Property: 12%, Drug/Alcohol: 12%, Public Order: 30%, Status: 6%

Some participants had multiple offenses.

Out of Home Placements

- Intake to 24 months:
  - Detention/Custion: Treatment group 63, Comparison group 69
  - Psych Hospital: Treatment group 8, Comparison group 6
  - Residential Treatment Center: Treatment group 29, Comparison group 31
  - runaway: Treatment group 16, Comparison group 37

Academic Grades

- 12 Months:
  - Treatment group: A, B, or C: 58%, D or F: 42%
  - Comparison group: A, B, or C: 55%, D or F: 45%
- 24 Months:
  - Treatment group: A, B, or C: 60%, D or F: 40%
  - Comparison group: A, B, or C: 45%, D or F: 55%
### Conduct Grades

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Treatment group</th>
<th>Comparison group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 Months</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Months</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SRDS – General Delinquency

- **Treatment group**
  - Admission: 31
  - 6 Months: 31
  - 12 Months: 22
  - 24 Months: 11
  - 36 Months: 14

- **Comparison group**
  - Admission: 31
  - 6 Months: 22
  - 12 Months: 11
  - 24 Months: 10

### CBCL – Externalizing Problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Treatment group</th>
<th>Comparison group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admission</td>
<td>Normal 44%</td>
<td>Clinical 56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Months</td>
<td>Normal 44%</td>
<td>Clinical 56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CBCL – Delinquency

- **Treatment group**
  - Normal: 38%
  - Clinical: 62%
- **Comparison group**
  - Normal: 60%
  - Clinical: 40%

### CAFAS – Severe Impairment in Role Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Treatment group</th>
<th>Comparison group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admission</td>
<td>Normal 38%</td>
<td>Clinical 62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Months</td>
<td>Normal 38%</td>
<td>Clinical 62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cost Analysis

- Costs of services provided to treatment and comparison groups were calculated.
- Cost savings were calculated based on avoidance of delinquent acts (based on methodology from Washington State Public Policy Institute).
- Substantial savings were calculated for treatment group (over $340,000).
- Work continues on this portion of the evaluation.
Summary of Findings

- At intake, groups were similar
- At six months, both had improved – treatment group had generally improved significantly more
- At twelve months, treatment group was still generally doing better, although differences had narrowed
- At 24 months, groups were still better than at intake, although differences between groups were generally not significant

Next Steps

- Explore the relationship between level of therapist adherence and child/family characteristics further
- Examine the impact of multiple therapists on outcome measures for those in the treatment group
- Analyze the data from weekly therapist logs to examine the relationship between these activities and MST adherence
- Utilize sophisticated statistical tools (e.g. regression analysis, structural equation modeling, survival analysis) to determine predictors of treatment success and to understand relationships between client characteristics, program activities, and outcomes for children and families

Further Use of the Data

- Comparison group for another study in the same geographic area with the same population
- Study on social support, parental efficacy, and juvenile delinquency
- Available for researchers interested in many aspects of children’s mental health
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