

**THE IOWA
CONSORTIUM**
FOR SUBSTANCE ABUSE RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

— **JAIL-BASED SUBSTANCE ABUSE** —
TREATMENT PROGRAM

**QUARTERLY
PROGRESS
REPORT**

PREPARED BY:

IOWA CONSORTIUM FOR SUBSTANCE ABUSE RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
UNIVERSITY OF IOWA, IOWA CITY, IOWA 52242-5000

WITH FUNDS PROVIDED BY: IOWA DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH, DIVISION OF BEHAVIORAL HEALTH AND
PROFESSIONAL LICENSURE;
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS, BUREAU OF JUSTICE ASSISTANCE

Citation of references related to this report is appreciated. Suggested citation:

Hedden, S., Barber, K., & Arndt, S. (2006). Jail Based Substance Abuse Treatment Program: Quarterly Report, November 1, 2002 through September 30, 2006 (Iowa Department of Public Health, Contract No. 5887JT04). Iowa City, IA: Iowa Consortium for Substance Abuse Research and Evaluation. <http://iconsortium.subst-abuse.uiowa.edu/>



**THE IOWA
CONSORTIUM**
FOR SUBSTANCE ABUSE RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

— **JAIL-BASED SUBSTANCE ABUSE** —
TREATMENT PROGRAM

**NOVEMBER 1, 2002
THROUGH
SEPTEMBER 30, 2006**

**PREPARED BY:
SUZY HEDDEN, BS, PROGRAM EVALUATION COORDINATOR
KRISTINA BARBER, MSM, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR
STEPHAN ARNDT, PHD, DIRECTOR**

Table of Contents

Background.....	1
Program and Evaluation Protocol Changes.....	1
Clients.....	2
Table 1. Gender.....	2
Table 2. Age.....	2
Table 3. Length of Stay in Jail.....	2
Table 4. Length of Stay in Treatment for Clients Discharged from Treatment.....	3
Outcomes.....	3
Table 5. Primary Substance at Admission.....	5
Table 6. Secondary Substance at Admission.....	6
Table 7. Arrests at Admission.....	7
Table 8. Employment Status at Admission.....	7
Table 9. Outcomes at Admission, 6-Months Post Admission, and 12-Months Post Admission.....	8
Table 10. Primary Substance.....	10
Table 11. Secondary Substance.....	11
Table 12. Arrests.....	12
Table 13. Employment Status.....	12
Primary Substance Use By Outcome Variables.....	13
Table 14. Abstinence at Follow-Up by Primary Substance at Admission.....	15
Table 15. No Arrests at Follow-Up by Primary Substance at Admission.....	16
Table 16. Full-Time Employment at Follow-Up by Primary Substance at Admission.....	17
Discharge Status by Outcome Variables.....	18
Table 17. Discharge Status by Outcomes at 6-Months Post Admission.....	18
Table 18. Discharge Status by Outcomes at 12-Months Post Admission.....	19
Clients Perceived Benefits.....	20
Table 19. Perceived Benefit of Counseling at Interview 1.....	20
Table 20. Perceived Benefit of Counseling at Interview 2.....	20
Jail-Based Treatment Program Enhancements.....	21
Criminal Thinking Assessment.....	21
Table 21. Criminal Thinking Scales.....	22
Table 22. Changes in Criminal Thinking Scales.....	23
Table 23. Mean Scores at Admission, Jail Release, and 3 Months Post-Jail Release.....	23
Cost Analysis of Jail Treatment Program versus Prison Time.....	24
Jail Treatment and SARS Client Comparison on Outcomes.....	24

Background

In September 2002, the Iowa Department of Public Health, Division of Behavioral Health and Professional Licensure (IDPH) was awarded a grant from the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance to implement substance abuse treatment services in a jail setting. The purpose of the grant is to deliver and evaluate substance abuse treatment services to clients during incarceration and after release from jail. In November 2002, IDPH contracted with the Iowa Consortium for Substance Abuse Research and Evaluation (Consortium) to conduct the evaluation component of the project. The Consortium's role is to conduct two follow-up interviews with clients in the Jail-Based Substance Abuse Treatment program to determine effectiveness of treatment services. The interviews occur approximately 6 and 12 months after admission to the treatment program and provide follow-up data to determine outcomes related to arrests, employment, and abstinence. This report presents follow-up results from November 1, 2002 through September 30, 2006.

In November 2002, one month after receiving the grant, IDPH contracted with United Community Services, Inc. (UCS), a Des Moines-based agency, to deliver treatment to clients at the Polk County Jail. UCS began client admissions in December 2002. In October 2003, IDPH contracted with Center for Alcohol and Drug Services, Inc. (CADS), an agency located in Davenport, Iowa to deliver treatment to clients at the Scott County Jail. CADS began admitting clients in January 2004. IDPH also contracted with Jackson Recovery Centers based in Sioux City, Iowa in October 2003 to deliver treatment to clients in the Woodbury County Jail. Jackson Recovery Centers began client admissions in February 2004.

Program and Evaluation Protocol Changes

Two changes were made to the program in January 2004. Initially, treatment was defined as the time from admission to the date the client completed clinical counseling services. Follow-up interview data were collected at 6-months post admission and 6-months post discharge. The treatment definition was modified to include aftercare treatment services. Therefore, clients are not formally discharged until their contact with the program is completely finished. Thus, clients in extended outpatient services remain in the program, which includes peer-facilitated groups, case management, continuing care and other clinical services with case management. The change in treatment definition necessitated a change in the evaluation design. To maximize follow-up evaluation success rate, the revised time frame for follow-up interviews is 6-months and 12-months post admission. Fortunately, the change occurred early in the evaluation process and 12-month post admission data was not adversely affected.

A third change resulted when agencies began re-admitting clients who had been discharged. Initially, the evaluation was not designed to accommodate clients with multiple admissions. Although infrequent, such situations did occur and 43 clients have been re-admitted. For the purpose of evaluation and record keeping, re-admissions are excluded and only the first admission data are included in this report. This could possibly make the estimates of treatment success cases conservative. For example, a client might not have maintained abstinence after the first admission, did not successfully complete the program, be re-admitted with a successful discharge and abstinence record. This successful outcome would be omitted from the report since only the first admission and discharge are recorded.

Clients

This report describes the group of clients who had treatment admission dates between November 1, 2002 and September 30, 2006 in Polk, Scott, and Woodbury counties. During this period, 1,286 individuals were admitted to the program: 644 in Polk County, 388 in Scott County, and 254 in Woodbury County. Three hundred forty-two (26.6%) of the clients were female and 944 (73.4%) were male. Table 1 shows gender by county.

Table 1. Gender

	TOTAL % (N=1,286)	Polk County % (N=644)	Scott County % (N=388)	Woodbury County % (N=254)
Male	73.4 (944)	70.5 (454)	76.3 (296)	76.4 (194)
Female	26.6 (342)	29.5 (190)	23.7 (92)	23.6 (60)

Clients ranged in age from 18 to 61 years of age with a median age of 31 years. Table 2 shows the age range and median age by county.

Table 2. Age

	TOTAL N=1,286			Polk County N=644			Scott County N=388			Woodbury County N=254		
	Min	Max	Median	Min	Max	Median	Min	Max	Median	Min	Max	Median
Years of Age	18	61	31	18	60	31	18	61	31	18	55	33

Of the 1,286 clients who have been admitted into the treatment program, 96 clients are still receiving treatment in jail and 1,190 clients have been released from the in-jail treatment portion of the program. Following their release from jail, clients continue to receive treatment while on probation, therefore, jail release date and treatment discharge date do not coincide. Table 3 shows the mean length of stay in jail by county for the 1,190 released clients from the onset of treatment until their release from jail.

Table 3. Length of Stay in Jail

	TOTAL N=1,190			Polk County N=597			Scott County N=354			Woodbury County N=239		
	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean
Days	1	230	79	3	230	108	3	130	51	1	109	46

Of the 1,190 clients released from jail, 1,057 clients have been discharged from the treatment program. When completing the discharge forms for the 1,057 clients, agency staff indicated whether or not the client was a successful treatment case. Three hundred seventy (35%) of the clients were discharged as “successful,” and 458 (43.3%) clients were discharged from the program due to noncompliance and were designated as “terminated.” Two hundred twenty-nine (21.7%) clients were discharged for “neutral” reasons (this category includes, but is not limited to clients who were discharged due to: legal issues related to a sentence; medical reasons; receipt of maximum benefits; or death). The remaining 133 clients, who were released from jail, continue to receive treatment while on probation. Table 4 describes the mean length of stay in the treatment program by county for the 1,057 clients discharged from the onset of treatment until their discharge from treatment.

Table 4. Length of Stay in Treatment for Clients Discharged from Treatment

	TOTAL N=1,057			Polk County N=524			Scott County N=315			Woodbury County N=218		
	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean
Days	1	547	195	3	532	252	3	547	147	1	315	129

One thousand one hundred ninety clients have been released from jail through September 30, 2006 and are eligible to participate in the follow-up study. Staff has recruited 797 clients to participate in Interview 1: 25 clients have declined participation. An additional 55 clients who were not recruited for Interview 1 were contacted to participate in Interview 2 — 51 of these have consented to participate in Interview 2, and 4 declined participation.

Of the 1,033 clients who were eligible for Interview 1, 620 clients have completed the first interview. Seventy-five clients became incarcerated after recruitment into the follow-up study and 53 recruited clients could not be located for Interview 1. Of the recruited clients eligible for follow-up Interview 1 (successfully recruited who were not incarcerated and with an interview due date that had arrived), 92.1% received an interview. The remaining 49 individuals, who have been recruited and are not yet eligible for an interview, are receiving regular update calls from staff as their interview date nears.

There were 285 clients classified as “not able to recruit” for Interview 1. Of these 285 individuals, 177 were incarcerated and staff is not allowed to recruit or interview incarcerated individuals, 106 clients could not be located, and 2 clients are deceased. Staff is in the process of attempting to locate and recruit the remaining clients who are eligible to complete Interview 1. Clients who do not complete Interview 1 remain eligible to complete Interview 2.

Of the 832 clients who were eligible for Interview 2, 433 clients have completed the second interview. One hundred forty-two clients became incarcerated after recruitment into the follow-up study and 72 recruited clients could not be located for Interview 2. One client who was recruited and completed Interview 1 subsequently died. Of the recruited clients eligible for follow-up Interview 2 (successfully recruited who are not incarcerated and with an interview due date that had arrived), 85.7% received an interview. There were 184 clients classified as “not able to recruit” for Interview 2. Of these 184 individuals, 117 were incarcerated, 65 clients could not be located and 2 clients are deceased. The remaining 200 individuals, who have been recruited and are not yet eligible for Interview 2, are receiving regular update calls from staff as their interview date nears.

Outcomes

Tables 5 through 8 show 1,286 client responses at admission related to questions regarding primary and secondary substance usage, employment status, and number of arrests in the previous 12 months. The first column shows all responses for the Substance Abuse Reporting System (SARS/I-Smart) question at admission. The second column describes the responses for all clients in the Jail-Based Substance Treatment Program that answered the item at admission. The third column describes the responses for the 644 clients who were admitted in Polk County; the fourth column describes the responses for the 388 clients who were admitted in Scott County; and the fifth column describes the responses for the 254 clients who were admitted in Woodbury County.

Upon admission, 100% of the clients in the 3 counties indicated a primary substance. Methamphetamine was the most common with 28.8% of the clients reporting it as their primary substance. A secondary substance was reported by 71.2% of the clients at admission — marijuana was the most commonly used secondary substance indicated by 27.2% of the clients. At admission all clients, with the exception of 6, reported one or more arrests in the previous 12 months (Table 7). Four of the 6 clients who reported no arrests in the previous 6 months were incarcerated due to drug court probation violations, 1 client entered the program after being transferred to the county jail due to other charges, and 1 client was a federal parolee placed in the program by a probation officer. At admission, 29.2% of the clients were employed full-time (Table 8).

Table 5. Primary Substance at Admission

Primary Substance	All Clients at Admission % (N=1,286)	Polk County Clients at Admission % (N=644)	Scott County Clients at Admission % (N=388)	Woodbury County Clients at Admission % (N=254)
None	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Methamphetamine	28.8 (371)	45.7 (294)	2.6 (10)	26.4 (67)
Marijuana	21.8 (280)	20.3 (131)	23.7 (92)	22.4 (57)
Alcohol	23.1 (297)	16.0 (103)	22.7 (88)	41.7 (106)
Cocaine	20.9 (269)	13.7 (88)	41.8 (162)	7.5 (19)
Heroin	1.9 (25)	0.6 (4)	5.4 (21)	0.0 (0)
Other Opiates and Synthetics	1.3 (17)	0.8 (5)	2.8 (11)	0.4 (1)
Non-Prescription Methadone	0.2 (3)	0.0 (0)	0.8 (3)	0.0 (0)
PCP	0.2 (2)	0.3 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Other Hallucinogens	0.2 (2)	0.3 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Other Amphetamine	0.9 (12)	1.1 (7)	0.3 (1)	1.6 (4)
Other Stimulants	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Benzodiazepines	0.2 (3)	0.5 (3)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Other Tranquilizers	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Barbiturates	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Other Sedatives/Hypnotics	0.1 (1)	0.2 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Inhalants	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Over-the-Counter	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Steroids	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Ecstasy	0.3 (4)	0.6 (4)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Other	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)

† Due to rounding, percentages may not add up to exactly 100%.

Table 6. Secondary Substance at Admission

Secondary Substance	All Clients at Admission % (N=1,286)	Polk County Clients at Admission % (N=644)	Scott County Clients at Admission % (N=388)	Woodbury County Clients at Admission % (N=254)
None	28.8 (371)	32.0 (206)	23.5 (91)	29.1 (74)
Methamphetamine	8.2 (105)	9.9 (64)	2.3 (9)	12.6 (32)
Marijuana	27.2 (350)	30.9 (199)	20.9 (81)	27.6 (70)
Alcohol	19.9 (256)	15.1 (97)	27.8 (108)	20.1 (51)
Cocaine	11.7 (151)	8.1 (52)	19.6 (76)	9.1 (23)
Heroin	0.6 (8)	0.3 (2)	1.5 (6)	0.0 (0)
Other Opiates and Synthetics	0.8 (10)	0.8 (5)	1.0 (4)	0.4 (1)
Non-Prescription Methadone	0.1 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.3 (1)	0.0 (0)
PCP	0.3 (4)	0.6 (4)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Other Hallucinogens	0.4 (5)	0.5 (3)	0.5 (2)	0.0 (0)
Other Amphetamine	0.6 (8)	0.5 (3)	0.5 (2)	1.2 (3)
Other Stimulants	0.1 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.3 (1)	0.0 (0)
Benzodiazepines	0.5 (6)	0.8 (5)	0.3 (1)	0.0 (0)
Other Tranquilizers	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Barbiturates	0.2 (2)	0.2 (1)	0.3 (1)	0.0 (0)
Other Sedatives/Hypnotics	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Inhalants	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Over-the-Counter	0.1 (1)	0.2 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Steroids	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Ecstasy	0.5 (6)	0.2 (1)	1.3 (5)	0.0 (0)
Other	0.1 (1)	0.2 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)

† Due to rounding, percentages may not add up to exactly 100%.

Table 7. Arrests at Admission

Number of Arrests	All Clients at Admission % (N=1,286)	Polk County Clients at Admission % (N=644)	Scott County Clients at Admission % (N=388)	Woodbury County Clients at Admission % (N=254)
None	0.5 (6)	0.2 (1)	1.3 (5)	0.0 (0)
1-3 times	88.0 (1,132)	90.1 (580)	84.0 (326)	89.0 (226)
4 times or more	11.5 (148)	9.8 (63)	14.7 (57)	11.0 (28)

† Due to rounding, percentages may not add up to exactly 100%.

Table 8. Employment Status at Admission

Employment Status	All Clients at Admission % (N=1,286)	Polk County Clients at Admission % (N=644)	Scott County Clients at Admission % (N=388)	Woodbury County Clients at Admission % (N=254)
Employed Full-Time (>35 hrs/ wk)	29.2 (375)	32.1 (207)	28.1 (109)	23.2 (59)
Employed Part-Time (<35 hrs/ wk)	9.6 (124)	10.4 (67)	9.8 (38)	7.5 (19)
Unemployed (looking for work in the past 30 days)	21.6 (278)	22.5 (145)	21.4 (83)	19.7 (50)
Not in labor force	39.6 (509)	34.9 (225)	40.7 (158)	49.6 (126)

† Due to rounding, percentages may not add up to exactly 100%.

Table 9 shows client outcomes by comparing admission data and follow-up interview data. Three outcome variables are presented — abstinence, no arrests, and full-time employment. Abstinence is defined as a response of “none” when asked at follow-up to name a primary substance of use, and it refers to abstinence from all substances. The outcome “no arrests” is defined as not having been arrested during the previous six months. Working full-time is defined as working at least 35 hours per week.

At admission, 1,267 (98.5%) clients reported substance use in the previous six months. The 19 clients who reported no substance use in the previous 6 months did, however, report arrests for substance abuse related crimes or were under the influence when arrested in the previous 12 months. At admission all clients, with the exception of 6, reported one or more arrests in the previous 12 months. Four of the 6 clients who reported no arrests in the previous 12 months were incarcerated due to drug court probation violations, 1 client entered the program after being transferred to the county jail due to other charges, and 1 client was a federal parolee placed in the program by a probation officer. Three hundred seventy-five (29.2%) clients were employed full-time at admission. Six months after admission, 77.1% of the clients interviewed reported abstinence, 93.4% had not been arrested, and 51.1% were working full-time. Results from the 433 clients who completed the second follow-up interview (12 months following

admission to treatment) indicate that 71.4% of the clients were abstinent, 82.9% had not been arrested in the previous six months, and 57.5% were working full-time.

Table 9. Outcomes at Admission, 6-Months Post Admission, and 12-Months Post Admission

Outcomes at Admission, 6-Months Post Admission, and 12-Months Post Admission				
	N	% Abstained	% No Arrest	% Employed Full-Time
Admission	1,286	1.5 (19)	0.5 (6)	29.2 (375)
Interview 1	620	77.1 (478)	93.4 (579)	51.1 (317)
Interview 2	433	71.4 (309)	82.9 (359)	57.5 (249)

Tables 10 through 13 reflect outcomes based on a comparison of the SARS/I-Smart admission data and the follow-up interview data collected approximately 6 months after admission for Interview 1 and 12 months after admission for Interview 2. The follow-up period refers to the 6 months preceding the interview (admission to 6-months post admission for Interview 1, and 6 to 12 months post admission for Interview 2.) The three outcomes identified for comparison from the SARS/I-Smart admission and follow-up forms are abstinence, arrests, and employment. Comparisons on individual variables are made between status at admission and status at follow-up on those clients who had a response at *both* admission and follow-up. The first column describes the responses, or categories of responses, for the SARS/I-Smart question. The second column describes the responses for 1,286 clients in the Jail-Based Substance Abuse Treatment Program admitted between November 1, 2002 and September 30, 2006. The third and fourth columns describe the client responses who answered the particular item both at admission and at Interview 1 — a group of 620 clients. The number of clients in this group is smaller because it represents only those clients who completed the first follow-up interview. The fifth and sixth columns describe the responses for clients that answered the particular item both at admission and at Interview 2 — a group of 433 clients.

Changes between admission and follow-up data include the following highlights.

Primary Substance

- Interview 1: Four hundred seventy-eight (77.1%) clients indicated abstinence. Of the 142 non-abstinent clients, 55.6% indicated alcohol as the primary substance at follow-up. Of the 142 clients who reported use, 62 (43.7%) indicated no use during the 30 day period prior to their interview.
- Interview 2: Three hundred nine (71.4%) clients indicated abstinence. Of the 124 clients who reported use during the past 6 months, alcohol was the most often reported substance indicated by 63.7% of non-abstinent clients. Nearly half (48.8%) of the non-abstinent clients indicated no use during the 30 days prior to the interview.

Secondary Substance

- Interview 1: Five hundred eighty-five (94.4%) clients reported no secondary substance. Thirty-five clients reported use — 16 had used alcohol, 12 had used marijuana, 5 had used methamphetamine, 1 used cocaine, and 1 had used other hallucinogens.
- Interview 2: Three hundred eighty-eight (89.6%) clients reported no secondary substance. Nineteen clients reported use of alcohol, 14 had used marijuana, 7 clients

reported use of cocaine, and 5 used methamphetamine. Of these 45 clients, 27 (60%) indicated no use in the 30 day period prior to their interview.

No Arrests

- Interview 1: Clients indicating “no arrests” increased by 92.7 percentage points from admission. Forty-one (6.6%) clients had been arrested during the 6 months following admission to treatment.
- Interview 2: Three hundred fifty-nine (82.9%) clients interviewed were arrest-free during the 6 to 12 month post-admission period.

Employment Status

- Interview 1: Three hundred seventeen (51.1%) clients were working full-time, which is an increase of 18.7 percentage points from admission. In addition, 111 (17.9%) clients were employed part-time. Compared to admission data, there was more than a three-fold reduction in the number of clients “not in labor force” at Interview 1.
- Interview 2: Two hundred forty-nine (57.5%) clients indicated full-time employment, representing an increase of 22.6 percentage points from admission; 65 (15%) clients were employed part-time.

Table 10. Primary Substance

No primary substance was indicated by 77.1% of clients at Interview 1 (6 months after admission). No primary substance was indicated by 71.4% of the clients at Interview 2 (12 months after admission). Alcohol was the most frequently reported substance at follow-up, indicated by 12.7% at Interview 1 and 18.2% at Interview 2.

Primary Substance	All Clients at Admission % (N=1,286)	Clients with Completed Follow-Up Interviews			
		Interview 1 % (N=620)		Interview 2 % (N=433)	
		Admission	Follow-Up	Admission	Follow-Up
None	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	77.1 (478)	0.0 (0)	71.4 (309)
Methamphetamine	28.8 (371)	35.7 (221)	4.0 (25)	35.3 (153)	2.5 (11)
Marijuana	21.8 (280)	22.3 (138)	2.7 (17)	20.6 (89)	3.9 (17)
Alcohol	23.1 (297)	20.5 (127)	12.7 (79)	19.6 (85)	18.2 (79)
Cocaine	20.9 (269)	17.9 (111)	2.9 (18)	19.4 (84)	3.5 (15)
Heroin	1.9 (25)	1.1 (7)	0.0 (0)	1.2 (5)	0.2 (1)
Other Opiates and Synthetics	1.3 (17)	1.1 (7)	0.3 (2)	1.6 (7)	0.0 (0)
Non-Prescription Methadone	0.2 (3)	0.2 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.5 (2)	0.0 (0)
PCP	0.2 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Other Hallucinogens	0.2 (2)	0.2 (1)	0.2 (1)	0.2 (1)	0.0 (0)
Other Amphetamine	0.9 (12)	0.5 (3)	0.0 (0)	0.9 (4)	0.0 (0)
Other Stimulants	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Benzodiazepines	0.2 (3)	0.3 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.2 (1)	0.0 (0)
Other Tranquilizers	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Barbiturates	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Other Sedatives/Hypnotics	0.1 (1)	0.2 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.2 (1)	0.2 (1)
Inhalants	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Over-the-Counter	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Steroids	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Ecstasy	0.3 (4)	0.2 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.2 (1)	0.0 (0)
Other	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)

† Due to rounding, percentages may not add up to exactly 100%.

Table 11. Secondary Substance

At Interview 1, clients responding to “no secondary substance” category increased by 63.9 percentage points from 30.5% to 94.4% 6-months post admission. Thirty-five (5.6%) clients reported using more than one substance 6-months post admission. Three hundred eighty-eight (89.6%) clients reported no secondary substance in the 6 to 12 months following admission to treatment.

Secondary Substance	All Clients at Admission % (N=1,286)	Clients with Completed Follow-up Interviews			
		Interview 1 % (N=620)		Interview 2 % (N=433)	
		Admission	Follow-Up	Admission	Follow-Up
None	28.8 (371)	30.5 (189)	94.4 (585)	32.3 (140)	89.6 (388)
Methamphetamine	8.2 (105)	8.1 (50)	0.8 (5)	8.5 (37)	1.2 (5)
Marijuana	27.2 (350)	27.4 (170)	1.9 (12)	25.6 (111)	3.2 (14)
Alcohol	19.9 (256)	21.3 (132)	2.3 (16)	21.9 (95)	4.4 (19)
Cocaine	11.7 (151)	9.8 (61)	0.2 (1)	10.2 (44)	1.6 (7)
Heroin	0.6 (8)	0.5 (3)	0.0 (0)	0.2 (1)	0.0 (0)
Other Opiates and Synthetics	0.8 (10)	1.0 (6)	0.0 (0)	0.2 (1)	0.0 (0)
Non-Prescription Methadone	0.1 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
PCP	0.3 (4)	0.3 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Other Hallucinogens	0.4 (5)	0.0 (0)	0.2 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Other Amphetamine	0.6 (8)	0.2 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.5 (2)	0.0 (0)
Other Stimulants	0.1 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Benzodiazepines	0.5 (6)	0.5 (3)	0.0 (0)	0.5 (2)	0.0 (0)
Other Tranquilizers	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Barbiturates	0.2 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Other Sedatives/Hypnotics	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Inhalants	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Over-the-Counter	0.1 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Steroids	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Ecstasy	0.5 (6)	0.3 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Other	0.1 (1)	0.2 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)

† Due to rounding, percentages may not add up to exactly 100%.

Table 12. Arrests

Five hundred seventy-nine (93.4%) clients were arrest-free at Interview 1. Forty-one (6.6%) clients had been arrested during the 6 months following admission. Three hundred fifty-nine (82.9%) clients were arrest-free during the 6 to 12 month post-admission period, an 82 percentage point increase from admission.

Number of Arrests	All Clients at Admission % (N=1,268)	Clients with Completed Follow-Up Interviews					
		Interview 1 % (N=620)			Interview 2 % (N=433)		
		Admission	Follow-Up	Change	Admission	Follow-Up	Change
None	0.5 (6)	0.7 (4)	93.4 (579)	+92.7	0.9 (4)	82.9 (359)	+82.0
1-3 times	88.0 (1,132)	91.9 (570)	6.5 (40)	-85.4	92.6 (401)	16.9 (73)	-75.7
4 times or more	11.5 (148)	7.4 (46)	0.2 (1)	-7.2	6.5 (28)	0.2 (1)	-6.3

† Due to rounding, percentages may not add up to exactly 100%.

Table 13. Employment Status

At 6-months post admission, 51.1% of the clients were employed full-time, which represents an increase of 18.7 percentage points. In addition, 111 (17.9%) clients were employed part-time and 127 (20.5%) clients were looking for work. Compared to admission data, there were over 3 times fewer clients “not in the labor force” at Interview 1, and over 2 times fewer at Interview 2. Twelve months post admission, 249 (57.5%) clients indicated full-time employment, 65 (15%) clients were employed part-time, and 52 (12%) clients were looking for work.

Employment Status	All Clients at Admission % (N=1,268)	Clients with Completed Follow-Up Interviews					
		Interview 1 % (N=620)			Interview 2 % (N=433)		
		Admission	Follow-Up	Change	Admission	Follow-Up	Change
Employed Full-Time (>35 hrs/ wk)	29.2 (375)	32.4 (201)	51.1 (317)	+18.7	34.9 (151)	57.5 (249)	+22.6
Employed Part-Time (<35 hrs/ wk)	9.6 (124)	8.7 (54)	17.9 (111)	+9.2	9.9 (43)	15.0 (65)	+5.1
Unemployed (looking for work in the past 30 days)	21.6 (278)	22.1 (137)	20.5 (127)	-1.6	21.0 (91)	12.0 (52)	-9.0
Not in labor force	39.6 (509)	36.8 (228)	10.5 (65)	-26.3	34.2 (148)	15.5 (67)	-18.7

† Due to rounding, percentages may not add up to exactly 100%.

Primary Substance Use By Outcome Variables

In tables 14 through 16, primary substance use at admission is shown in relation to the 3 key outcome variables — abstinence, arrests, and employment. For both follow-up interviews, methamphetamine clients had the highest number of completed interviews (35.6% at Interview 1 and 35.3% at Interview 2). Some of the more interesting findings are reported below.

Abstinence

- Interview 1: Of the 620 clients interviewed, 77.1% indicated abstinence 6-months post admission. The most frequently used substance at admission was methamphetamine. Clients who indicated methamphetamine as the primary substance had a 79.6% rate of abstinence during the follow-up period (176 out of 221). Ninety-seven of the 127 (76.4%) clients who indicated alcohol were abstinent; 84 of 111 (75.7%) clients who indicated cocaine as their primary substance were abstinent; and 104 of the 138 (75.4%) clients who indicated marijuana as their primary substance at admission were abstinent.
- Interview 2: Clients who indicated methamphetamine as the primary substance at admission had an 82.4% rate of abstinence (126 of 153 clients indicated abstinence), which is a statistically significant higher abstinence rate than clients reporting other primary substances at admission (Fisher's Exact Test, $p < 0.01$). Sixty of the 89 (67.4%) clients reporting marijuana as the primary substance at admission were abstinent; 56 of the 84 (66.7%) clients indicating cocaine; and 53 of 85 (62.4%) of clients reporting alcohol as the primary substance at admission were abstinent. Additional analysis on clients who indicated alcohol as the primary substance at admission shows that this subgroup of 85 clients has a significantly lower rate of abstinence (62.4%) at Interview 2 than clients reporting other primary substances at admission (73.6%); Fisher's Exact Test, $p < 0.05$.

Arrests

- Interview 1: Five hundred seventy-nine (93.4%) clients were arrest-free. Two hundred seven of the 221 (93.7%) clients who indicated methamphetamine as the primary substance at admission were arrest-free. Forty-one clients had been arrested: 14 clients who had an arrest indicated methamphetamine as the primary substance at admission; 11 clients indicated alcohol; 10 clients indicated cocaine; and 6 clients indicated marijuana.
- Interview 2: One hundred thirty of the 153 (85%) clients who reported methamphetamine as the primary substance at admission were arrest-free. Seventy-four clients interviewed had been arrested during the follow-up period: 23 clients indicated methamphetamine as the primary substance at admission; 15 indicated cocaine; 15 indicated marijuana; 15 indicated alcohol; 2 indicated other opiates and synthetics; 1 indicated heroin; 1 indicated other sedatives and hypnotics; 1 indicated other amphetamines; and 1 indicated ecstasy.

Employment Status

- Interview 1: Of the 317 clients who indicated full-time employment 6-months post admission: 101 clients indicated methamphetamine as the primary substance at admission; 83 clients indicated marijuana; 70 indicated alcohol; 54 indicated cocaine; 2 indicated heroin; 2 indicated other opiates and synthetics; 2 indicated other amphetamines; 1 indicated other hallucinogens; 1 indicated non-prescription methadone; and 1 indicated benzodiazepines. Further analysis of clients who indicated marijuana as the primary substance at admission show that this subgroup of 138 clients

has a significantly higher rate of employment (60.1%) at Interview 1 than clients reporting other primary substances at admission (48.6%); Fisher's Exact Test, $p < 0.05$.

- Interview 2: Ninety-five (62.1%) clients who indicated methamphetamine as the primary substance at admission were employed full-time at the second follow-up interview. Of the remaining 154 clients employed full-time: 60 indicated marijuana; 49 indicated alcohol; 34 indicated cocaine; 4 indicated other opiates and synthetics; 2 indicated other amphetamines; 2 indicated heroin; 1 indicated non-prescription methadone; 1 indicated benzodiazepines; and 1 indicated other hallucinogens as the primary substance at admission. Analysis of clients who indicated cocaine as the primary substance at admission continues to show that this subgroup of 84 clients has a significantly lower rate of employment (40%) at Interview 2 than clients reporting other primary substances at admission (61.6%); Fisher's Exact Test, $p < 0.01$.

Table 14. Abstinence at Follow-Up by Primary Substance at Admission

Clients who reported methamphetamine as the primary substance at admission had a significantly higher abstinence rate (82.4%) at Interview 2 than clients who reported other primary substances at admission (Fisher's Exact Test, $p < 0.01$). At Interview 1, clients who indicated methamphetamine as the primary substance at admission had a 79.6% rate of abstinence. Clients who indicated alcohol as their primary substance at admission abstained at a rate of 76.4%; cocaine clients abstained at a rate of 75.7%; and clients indicating marijuana as their primary substance at admission abstained at a rate of 75.4%.

Clients with Follow-Up Interviews Completed		
Primary Substance at Admission	Abstinence at Interview 1 6-Months Post Admission % (N=620)	Abstinence at Interview 2 12-Months Post Admission % (N=433)
Methamphetamine	79.6 (176/221)	82.4 (126/153)
Marijuana	75.4 (104/138)	67.4 (60/89)
Alcohol	76.4 (97/127)	62.4 (53/85)
Cocaine	75.7 (84/111)	66.7 (56/84)
Heroin	57.1 (4/7)	80.0 (4/5)
Other Opiates and Synthetics	85.7 (6/7)	71.4 (5/7)
Non-Prescription Methadone	100.0 (1/1)	100.0 (2/2)
PCP	0.0 (0/0)	0.0 (0/0)
Other Hallucinogens	0.0 (0/1)	0.0 (0/1)
Other Amphetamine	100.0 (3/3)	50.0 (2/4)
Other Stimulants	0.0 (0/0)	0.0 (0/0)
Benzodiazepines	100.0 (2/2)	100.0 (1/1)
Other Tranquilizers	0.0 (0/0)	0.0 (0/0)
Barbiturates	0.0 (0/0)	0.0 (0/0)
Other Sedatives/Hypnotics	100.0 (1/1)	0.0 (0/1)
Inhalants	0.0 (0/0)	0.0 (0/0)
Over-the-Counter	0.0 (0/0)	0.0 (0/0)
Steroids	0.0 (0/0)	0.0 (0/0)
Ecstasy	0.0 (0/1)	0.0 (0/1)
Other	0.0 (0/0)	0.0 (0/0)

Table 15. No Arrests at Follow-Up by Primary Substance at Admission

At 6-months post admission, 93.7% of the clients who reported methamphetamine as the primary substance at admission were arrest-free. At 12-months post admission, 85% of the methamphetamine clients were arrest-free.

Clients with Follow-Up Interviews Completed		
Primary Substance at Admission	No Arrest at Interview 1 6-Months Post Admission % (N=620)	No Arrest at Interview 2 12-Months Post Admission % (N=433)
Methamphetamine	93.7 (207/221)	85.0 (130/153)
Marijuana	95.7 (132/138)	83.2 (74/89)
Alcohol	91.3 (116/127)	82.4 (70/85)
Cocaine	91.0 (101/111)	82.1 (69/84)
Heroin	100.0 (7/7)	80.0 (4/5)
Other Opiates and Synthetics	100.0 (7/7)	71.4 (5/7)
Non-Prescription Methadone	100.0 (1/1)	100.0 (2/2)
PCP	0.0 (0/0)	0.0 (0/0)
Other Hallucinogens	100.0 (1/1)	100.0 (1/1)
Other Amphetamine	100.0 (3/3)	75.0 (3/4)
Other Stimulants	0.0 (0/0)	0.0 (0/0)
Benzodiazepines	100.0 (2/2)	100.0 (1/1)
Other Tranquilizers	0.0 (0/0)	0.0 (0/0)
Barbiturates	0.0 (0/0)	0.0 (0/0)
Other Sedatives/Hypnotics	100.0 (1/1)	0.0 (0/1)
Inhalants	0.0 (0/0)	0.0 (0/0)
Over-the-Counter	0.0 (0/0)	0.0 (0/0)
Steroids	0.0 (0/0)	0.0 (0/0)
Ecstasy	100.0 (1/1)	0.0 (0/1)
Other	0.0 (0/0)	0.0 (0/0)

Table 16. Full-Time Employment at Follow-Up by Primary Substance at Admission

At 12-months post admission, 62.1% of the clients who reported methamphetamine as the primary substance at admission were employed full-time. At Interview 1, 317 (51.1%) of the interviewed clients were working full-time. Clients whose primary substance at admission was marijuana were working full-time at a rate of 60.1%, followed by alcohol (55.1%), cocaine (48.7%), and methamphetamine (45.7%).

Clients with Follow-Up Interviews Completed		
Primary Substance at Admission	Employed Full-Time at Interview 1 6-Months Post Admission % (N=620)	Employed Full-Time at Interview 2 12-Months Post Admission % (N=433)
Methamphetamine	45.7 (101/221)	62.1 (95/153)
Marijuana	60.1 (83/138)	67.4 (60/89)
Alcohol	55.1 (70/127)	57.7 (49/85)
Cocaine	48.7 (54/111)	40.5 (34/84)
Heroin	28.6 (2/7)	40.0 (2/5)
Other Opiates and Synthetics	28.6 (2/7)	57.1 (4/7)
Non-Prescription Methadone	100.0 (1/1)	50.0 (1/2)
PCP	0.0 (0/0)	0.0 (0/0)
Other Hallucinogens	100.0 (1/1)	100.0 (1/1)
Other Amphetamine	66.7 (2/3)	50.0 (2/4)
Other Stimulants	0.0 (0/0)	0.0 (0/0)
Benzodiazepines	50.0 (1/2)	100.0 (1/1)
Other Tranquilizers	0.0 (0/0)	0.0 (0/0)
Barbiturates	0.0 (0/0)	0.0 (0/0)
Other Sedatives/Hypnotics	0.0 (0/1)	0.0 (0/1)
Inhalants	0.0 (0/0)	0.0 (0/0)
Over-the-Counter	0.0 (0/0)	0.0 (0/0)
Steroids	0.0 (0/0)	0.0 (0/0)
Ecstasy	0.0 (0/1)	0.0 (0/1)
Other	0.0 (0/0)	0.0 (0/0)

Discharge Status by Outcome Variables

Tables 17 and 18 show discharge status by the three outcome variables — abstinence, no arrests, and full-time employment for Interview 1 and Interview 2. There are 3 discharge categories: successful; terminated (clients discharged from the program due to noncompliance); and neutral (this category includes, but is not limited to those who are discharged due to: legal issues related to a sentence; medical reasons; receipt of maximum benefits; or death). It is important to note that while some clients have completed treatment or been discharged prior to their interview, other clients are still engaged in treatment at the time their interview is conducted. Some of the more interesting findings are reported below.

- **Interview 1:** At 6-months post admission, 87.2% of the clients who are considered successfully discharged were abstinent; 96.5% had not been arrested; and 55.9% were working full-time. Successfully discharged clients were significantly more likely to be abstinent than clients who do not complete the program (Fisher's Exact Test, $p < 0.0001$), more likely to be arrest-free (Fisher's Exact Test, $p < 0.01$), and more likely to be employed full-time (Fisher's Exact Test, $p < 0.05$) than clients who did not successfully complete the treatment program.
- **Interview 2:** At 12-months post admission, 80.5% of the clients who are considered successfully discharged were abstinent; 91.2% of clients had not been arrested; and 69.4% were working full-time. There is a significant difference between clients who are discharged successfully and those who did not complete the treatment program regarding the 3 outcome variables: clients who successfully complete treatment are 2.2 times more likely to be abstinent (Fisher's Exact Test, $p < 0.0001$); 2 times more likely to be arrest-free (Fisher's Exact Test, $p < 0.0001$); and 2.7 times more likely to be employed full-time (Fisher's Exact Test, $p < 0.0001$) than clients who did not successfully complete the treatment program.

Of the 1,057 discharged clients, 568 clients have completed Interview 1 and 431 clients have completed Interview 2. Fifty-two clients who completed Interview 1 are still receiving treatment, therefore are not included in Table 17. Of the 568 discharged clients represented in Table 17, 313 (55.1%) were discharged as successful cases and 255 (44.9%) did not successfully complete the treatment program. Of the 255 clients who did not complete treatment, 180 were terminated for non-compliance and 75 were neutral discharges.

Table 17. Discharge Status by Outcomes at 6-Months Post Admission

Discharge Status by Outcomes at 6-Months Post Admission				
Recorded Discharge Status	N	% Abstained	% No Arrest	% Employed Full-Time
Successful Completion	313	87.2 (273)*	96.5 (302)**	55.9 (175)***
Terminated	180	62.8 (113)	90.6 (163)	43.3 (78)
Neutral Discharge	75	68.0 (51)	84.0 (63)	53.3 (40)
Total	568	76.7 (437)	92.8 (528)	51.5 (293)

*Statistically significant (Fisher's Exact Test, $p < 0.0001$).

**Statistically significant (Fisher's Exact Test, $p < 0.01$).

***Statistically significant (Fisher's Exact Test, $p < 0.05$).

Two clients who completed Interview 2 are still receiving treatment, therefore are not included in Table 18, which shows discharge status by the three outcome variables. Of the 431 clients represented in Table 18, 261 (60.6%) were discharged as successful cases and 170 (39.4%) did not successfully complete treatment. Of the 170 clients who did not successfully complete the program, 113 were terminated for non-compliance and 57 were discharged for neutral reasons.

Table 18. Discharge Status by Outcomes at 12-Months Post Admission

Discharge Status by Outcomes at 12-Months Post Admission				
Recorded Discharge Status	N	% Abstained	% No Arrest	% Employed Full-Time
Successful Completion	261	80.5 (210)*	91.2 (238)*	69.4 (181)*
Terminated	113	50.4 (57)	69.0 (78)	33.6 (38)
Neutral Discharge	57	70.2 (40)	71.9 (41)	50.9 (29)
Total	431	71.1 (307)	82.6 (357)	57.5 (248)

*Statistically significant (Fisher's Exact Test, $p < 0.0001$).

Clients Perceived Benefits

Tables 19 and 20 indicate client responses when asked their opinion of the various types of treatment received in the Jail-Based Substance Abuse Treatment Program at Interview 1 and Interview 2.

- Interview 1: Results from 620 completed interviews at 6-months post admission show that 591 (95.3%) of the clients feel that the jail-based treatment program was either very beneficial or beneficial overall.
- Interview 2: Results from 433 interviews 12-months post admission indicate that 409 (94.5%) clients feel the program was either very beneficial or beneficial.

Table 19. Perceived Benefit of Counseling at Interview 1

Perceived Benefit of Counseling	Individual Counseling % (N=620)	Group Counseling % (N=620)	Educational Counseling % (N=620)	Family Counseling* % (N=620)	Overall Rating of Treatment Program % (N=620)
Very Beneficial	39.5 (245)	42.7 (265)	45.3 (281)	4.0 (25)	61.0 (378)
Beneficial	49.2 (305)	50.8 (315)	46.1 (286)	5.5 (34)	34.4 (213)
Not Beneficial	7.1 (44)	6.3 (39)	8.2 (51)	0.5 (3)	4.7 (29)
Did Not Receive	4.2 (26)	0.1 (1)	0.3 (2)	90.0 (558)	0.0 (0)

Due to rounding, percentages may not add up to exactly 100%.

*Family counseling is not available in jail due to security issues and is available for clients who choose to participate following jail release.

Table 20. Perceived Benefit of Counseling at Interview 2

Perceived Benefit of Counseling	Individual Counseling % (N=433)	Group Counseling % (N=433)	Educational Counseling % (N=433)	Family Counseling* % (N=433)	Overall Rating of Treatment Program % (N=433)
Very Beneficial	41.3 (179)	45.0 (195)	43.6 (189)	4.9 (21)	58.0 (251)
Beneficial	49.0 (212)	45.7 (198)	46.4 (201)	5.8 (25)	36.5 (158)
Not Beneficial	7.4 (32)	9.2 (40)	8.8 (38)	1.2 (5)	5.5 (24)
Did Not Receive	2.3 (10)	0.0 (0)	1.2 (5)	88.2 (382)	0.0 (0)

[†]Due to rounding, percentages may not add up to exactly 100%.

*Family counseling is not available in jail due to security issues and is available for clients who choose to participate following jail release.

Client Comments

"They did an excellent job. This program is the reason I am still clean today."

"I really liked going to groups, they were really good and informative. This was the first time in my life I really felt I had a chance to stay sober."

"They did a wonderful job showing they care and they challenge the way you think."

"I was able to relate to and trust the other people in the group. I have not had this experience in other groups I have been in."

"They made me understand the 'whys' of how I became addicted. No treatment program I've been in has ever done that before."

"They stuck with us, despite our attitude."

"This was the best treatment program I have ever been to. They truly seem to care about the individual."

"They did a good job; it was just long enough to get you away from drugs. The in-custody portion is the only way I could have broken the cycle. Other programs I've been in are not long enough. I have been clean for one year now, thanks to the jail treatment program."

Jail-Based Treatment Program Enhancements

Criminal Thinking Assessment

In October 2005, agency staff began administering the Criminal Thinking Scales developed by Texas Christian University (TCU), Institute of Behavioral Research (Simpson, D. D. & Hiller, M. [1999]. TCU data collection forms for correctional outpatient treatment. Fort Worth: Texas Christian University, Institute of Behavioral Research. [On-line]. Available: www.ibr.tcu.edu). The survey is administered to clients at admission, jail release, and 3 months post-jail release. The two-page instrument contains 37 items and measures 6 criminal thinking scales: entitlement, justification, personal irresponsibility, power orientation, cold heartedness, and criminal rationalization. Scores are obtained by averaging the ratings on items that make up each scale (after reversing scores on reflected items), and then multiplying this mean score by 10 in order to rescale the final scores that range from 10 to 50; higher scores are stronger indications of the corresponding personality trait. The Consortium developed a software application for scoring the instrument.

Entitlement conveys a sense of ownership and privilege, and misidentifies wants as needs. Offenders who score high on the entitlement scale believe that the world “owes them” and they deserve special consideration.

Justification reflects a thinking pattern characterized by the offender minimizing the seriousness of antisocial acts and by justifying actions based on external circumstances. High scores on this scale suggest that antisocial acts are justified because of perceived social injustice.

Power Orientation is a measure of need for power and control. Offenders who score high on this scale typically show an outward display of aggression in an attempt to control their external environment and they try to achieve a sense of power by manipulating others.

Cold Heartedness addresses callousness and high scores on this scale reflect a lack of emotional involvement in relationships with others.

Criminal Rationalization displays a generally negative attitude toward the law and authority figures. Offenders who score high on this scale view their behaviors as being no different than the criminal acts they believe are committed every day by authority figures.

Personal Irresponsibility assesses the degree to which an offender is willing to accept ownership for criminal actions. High scores suggest an offender’s unwillingness to accept responsibility and are associated with the offender casting blame on others.

Three hundred eight completed the criminal thinking survey at admission, 205 clients have completed the survey at jail release, and 61 clients have completed the survey 3 months post-jail release. Table 21 shows the mean score for each of the 6 criminal thinking scales at the 3 survey points. The highest mean scores at all 3 data collection points were on the criminal rationalization scale with clients scoring a mean score of 25.4 at admission, 21.8 at jail release, and 23.4 at 3 months post-jail release. Clients scored lowest on the entitlement scale averaging 17.4 at admission, 15.3 at jail release, and 16.2 at 3 months post-jail release.

Table 21. Criminal Thinking Scales

Criminal Thinking Scale	Mean Score for All Clients at Admission (N=308)	Mean Score for All Clients at Jail Release (N=205)	Mean Score for All Clients at 3 Months Post-Jail Release (N=61)
Entitlement	17.4	15.3	16.2
Justification	20.1	17.3	17.6
Power Orientation	24.6	21.7	21.8
Cold Heartedness	21.6	20.7	19.9
Criminal Rationalization	25.4	21.8	23.4
Personal Irresponsibility	18.9	16.3	17.6

[†]Higher scores are stronger indications of the corresponding personality trait.

Table 22 shows the comparison of the mean scores for the 6 criminal thinking scales. Comparisons of mean scores are made between admission and jail release on those clients who had a response at *both* admission and jail release, as well as jail release and 3 months post-jail release for clients who had a response at *both* jail release and 3 months post-jail release. The first column lists the criminal thinking scale. The second and third columns describe the mean scores of clients who completed the survey both at admission and at jail release — a group of 152 clients. The fifth and sixth columns describe the mean scores for clients that answered the particular item both at jail release and at 3 months post-jail release — a group of 61 clients.

The mean scores for the 6 scales decreased at jail release indicating improvement in criminal thinking. Criminal rationalization had the largest decrease (3.3). When comparing admission and jail release scores, significant differences were found on the following measures: entitlement, justification, power orientation, criminal rationalization, and personal irresponsibility (see Table 22). Additional analyses show there are statistically significant changes in mean scores from admission to subsequent survey points for all scales, except cold heartedness (Freidman Test, $p < .0001$).

Sixty-one clients have completed the survey at both jail release and 3 months post-jail release. The mean scores decreased for 3 of the scales at 3 months post-jail release indicating improvement in criminal thinking: justification, power orientation, and cold heartedness. No significant differences were found on these 3 measures.

Table 22. Changes in Criminal Thinking Scales

Criminal Thinking Scale	Clients with Criminal Thinking Survey Completed at Admission and Jail Release (N=152)			Clients with Criminal Thinking Survey Completed at Jail Release and 3 Months Post-Jail Release (N=61)		
	Mean Score for Clients at Admission	Mean Score for Clients at Jail Release	Change	Mean Score for Clients at Jail Release	Mean Score for Clients at 3 Months Post-Jail Release	Change
Entitlement	17.1	14.9	-2.2*	15.6	16.2	+0.7
Justification	19.7	16.9	-2.8*	17.8	17.6	-0.3
Power Orientation	24.5	21.5	-3.0*	21.9	21.8	-0.1
Cold Heartedness	21.3	20.5	-0.8	20.5	19.9	-0.7
Criminal Rationalization	24.8	21.5	-3.3*	22.9	23.4	+0.5
Personal Irresponsibility	18.7	16.2	-2.5*	16.7	17.6	+0.9

† Negative change indicates improvement. Due to rounding, change column may not equal the actual difference between mean scores.

*Statistically significant (Wilcoxon Rank Sum Test, $p < 0.0001$).

Thirty-seven clients have completed the criminal thinking survey at the 3 survey points: admission, jail release, and 3 months post jail release. Table 23 shows the comparison of the mean scores for the 6 criminal thinking scales. Although there are too few clients to make any inferences, the mean scores for all 6 scales are lower at 3 months post-jail release compared to admission, indicating these 37 clients are becoming less criminally oriented in their thinking.

Table 23. Mean Scores at Admission, Jail Release, and 3 Months Post-Jail Release

Criminal Thinking Trait	Clients with Criminal Thinking Survey Completed at Admission and Jail Release (N=37)		
	Mean Score for Clients at Admission	Mean Score for Clients at Jail Release	Mean Score for Clients at 3 Months Post-Jail Release
Entitlement	16.7	14.8	15.1
Justification	18.4	17.2	16.1
Power Orientation	23.5	21.5	21.0
Cold Heartedness	20.4	19.7	19.6
Criminal Rationalization	23.5	21.9	21.5
Personal Irresponsibility	18.7	16.5	16.4

† Higher scores are stronger indications of the corresponding personality trait.

Cost Analysis of Jail Treatment Program versus Prison Time

The Consortium is conducting a cost analysis of the clients admitted to the Jail-Based Substance Abuse Treatment Program. The costs of the jail treatment program will be compared to the costs related to incarceration — if the program did not exist as a diversion opportunity to prison and clients served prison terms versus the program. The Consortium is examining the costs of treatment, jail time, and recidivism compared to the costs of time in prison. The purpose of this project is to determine differences in the cost of the program, which involves treatment, support, and aftercare services, versus the cost of a prison sentence.

The sample for this project includes all clients admitted to treatment between July 1, 2004 and June 30, 2005. Four hundred eight clients were admitted during this time period. Since the cost analysis enhancement was initiated, primary activities have involved gathering data related to the costs of treatment, jail, and prison. The Consortium has worked with the treatment agencies, county jails, and state corrections to obtain cost data. The Consortium is in the final stages of collecting and analyzing the cost data. The cost analysis report will be completed by December 31, 2006.

Jail Treatment and SARS Client Comparison on Outcomes

The Consortium is currently conducting a comparison of clients in the Jail-Based Substance Abuse Treatment Program with clients who have been selected to participate in the Consortium's Outcomes Monitoring System (OMS) project. The two groups will be compared to determine if there are any differences between the groups regarding 3 outcome variables: abstinence, arrests, and full-time employment. OMS data are obtained through a random sample of publicly-funded substance abuse treatment clients in Iowa. The Consortium is utilizing the Substance Abuse Reporting System (SARS) admission data provided by IDPH to match OMS clients admitted since January 1, 2002 with jail treatment clients. Matching criteria are identified to make the two samples more homogenous for closer comparisons. The clients are matched on: ethnicity, race, age at admission, gender, primary substance at admission, number of arrests, and exposure time. Since jail treatment clients spend a portion of their treatment time in jail, exposure time has been determined to be the time from jail release to the date of the interview, while exposure time for OMS clients is the time from treatment admission to the time of the follow-up interview. The matched sample has continued to grow over time. The last match procedure conducted in May 2006 produced a match of 174 clients. This number is anticipated to increase as data collection continues. The Consortium is in the process of drawing the final matched data sample. The final report will be completed by December 31, 2006.