

PROPOSITION 36 TODAY:

A STUDY OF STAKEHOLDERS IN TEN CALIFORNIA COUNTIES

Suzanne Gelber, Ph.D.
David Rinaldo, Ph.D.
The Avisa Group

APRIL 2005

Agenda

- Introduction and Methods
- Stakeholder Proposals that would Require Statutory Change
- Stakeholder Suggestions for Operational Improvements
- Stakeholder Suggestions for Changes in ADP Processes
- Stakeholder Rankings of Proposed Changes to Proposition 36

Introduction

- Reauthorization of funding under Proposition 36 currently under consideration, along with suggestions for program changes
- Full results of comprehensive UCLA evaluation not available until 2006
- CSAT asked Avisia to perform study of “what works and what doesn’t work” through interviews with Proposition 36 stakeholders to inform ongoing discussions of the initiative

Methods

- Avisa identified 10 Counties in conjunction with ADP and other major stakeholders
- Counties were chosen to be broadly representative of California; all counties selected agreed to participate
- Avisa conducted confidential, non-random interviews with 111 stakeholders from the 10 study Counties during January-February 2005

Study Counties

COUNTY	POPULATION (2004)	REGION	SIZE
ALAMEDA	1,501,952	North	Large
HUMBOLDT	130,953	North	Small
KERN	744,325	South	Medium
LAKE	63,110	North	Small
LOS ANGELES	10,179,716	South	Large
SACRAMENTO	1,360,346	North	Medium
SAN BERNADINO	1,930,416	South - East	Large
SAN LUIS OBISPO	259,924	South	Small
SANTA CLARA	1,749,365	North	Large
STANISLAUS	500,172	North	Medium

Stakeholders

Stakeholder Group	Number of Respondents	Percent of Respondents
County Alcohol and Drug Program Department Administrators	23	20.7%
District Attorney's Office	9	8.1%
Judges	11	9.9%
Others	13	11.7%
Parole Officers	3	2.7%
Police Officers	3	2.7%
Probation Agents	16	14.4%
Public Defenders	5	4.5%
Sheriffs	7	6.3%
Treatment Providers	21	18.9%
TOTAL	111	100.0%

Limitations of Study

- Qualitative study is based on perspectives of stakeholders in ten Counties during January and February 2005
- A purposive sample, not random – limits generalizations
- Not an evaluation of client outcomes
- Response bias unknown

Summary: Potential Changes to Proposition 36 Supported by Stakeholders

- Proposals requiring statutory change
 - Increased Funding
 - Graduated Sanctions
 - Clinical Resources Focused on Clients Most Motivated to Change (Eligibility)
 - Intensified Drug Testing and Case Management
- Suggestions for operational improvements
 - Sustain or Reinvigorate Interagency Collaboration
 - Assure Availability of a Broad Range of Treatment
 - Identify and Reward the Most Effective Treatment Practices
 - Reduce Time Between Court Determination of Eligibility and Initiation of Treatment
 - Provide Aftercare Based on Clinical Necessity
- Suggestions for changes in ADP processes
 - Ensure that Proposition 36 local administrative and oversight processes are more timely, consistent and clearly defined at the county level

Proposals Requiring Statutory Change

- Increased Funding
 - Most strongly supported change; strongest support of all 9 changes studied
 - Many respondents insisted that increased funding be tied to better measurement and management of Proposition 36 results
 - Many respondents wanted to target increased funding only to more effective practices and programs

Proposals Requiring Statutory Change

- Provide Judges with the ability to impose graduated sanctions
 - Second most strongly supported change to Proposition 36
 - Broadly supported by a wide range of stakeholder categories; 75% of respondents assigned a score of “4” or “5” to this change (1 = weak support; 5 = great support)
 - Some supporters of graduated sanctions also support increased funding but only if measures of program quality and treatment effectiveness are used to do the allocation
 - Some support for sanctions explicitly conditioned on carefully defined, written sanction protocols, guidelines and training from judicial sources

Proposals Requiring Statutory Change

- Clinical resources focused on clients who are most motivated to change
 - Changing eligibility criteria to screen out clients presumed or shown to have little interest in recovery
 - Many stakeholder groups voiced some support for this proposed change

Proposals Requiring Statutory Change

- Intensified Case Management Services and Drug Testing
 - Most respondents believed that case management and drug testing are critical components to include in Proposition 36
 - There was widespread agreement at the county stakeholder level on the importance of funding drug testing statewide to accompany the Proposition 36 activities
 - Moderate score (Mean=3.34 out of 5) for responses to this proposed change are a result of a divergence of opinions on whether or not the source of funding for drug testing is an important issue that needs to be addressed within or outside the Proposition 36 program

Suggestions for Operational Improvements

- Sustain or Reinvigorate Interagency Collaboration to Improve Proposition 36
 - About 85 percent of respondents valued the interagency communication and collaboration involved with Proposition 36 and wanted it to continue and/or to be reinvigorated as implementation continues
 - Law enforcement stakeholders and several judges interviewed for this study felt that their input was either not sought or not valued sufficiently by the steering committees in their counties; some felt excluded from a valuable collaboration due to what they felt were inconvenient meeting times set by the county's lead agency

Suggestions for Operational Improvements

- Assure Availability of a Broad Range of Treatment and Other Services Necessary to Retain Clients in Treatment
 - Many respondents expressed concern about the lack of availability of intensive outpatient or residential programs and wanted funding to address these gaps
 - Some respondents expressed concerns about unmet clinical needs of specific client categories: women, opiate-dependent individuals on methadone; African-American and Native American client issues were also mentioned, with a request to direct attention to these issues
 - Interviewees also said that client transportation to treatment sites needed improvement, particularly in areas without good public transportation and for low income or rural clients, many of whom had lost driving licenses and/or had no private transportation; failure to appear at treatment can lead to incarceration

Suggestions for Operational Improvements

- Identify and Reward the Most Effective Treatment Practices and Outcomes
 - Respondents valued the state CLAIM meetings as source of information on best practices but some said they could not attend these meetings and wanted information disseminated to them directly
 - Respondents asked for more information and guidelines from ADP and the counties about measuring outcomes and broadly disseminating identification of best practices
 - Respondents suggested having more frequent, consistent and standardized data amongst the counties on treatment programs and client outcomes and suggested rewards or additional budget for meeting outcome targets, once information and standardization of definition issues have been solved

Suggestions for Operational Improvements

- Reduce Time Between Court Determination of Eligibility and Initiation of Treatment
 - Interviewees wanted to measure and minimize drop-out prior to initiation of treatment by shortening time from adjudication and assessment to entry into treatment (waiting list issues)
 - In some counties, waits between clients' court adjudication and assessment and treatment entry can extend to longer than a month in some circumstances, according to survey respondents who said that gap resulted in preventable higher client drop out rates prior to treatment entry
 - Some Counties have co-located various Proposition 36 functions so that court appearance, assessment and referral occur at or near the same physical location to minimize travel and drop outs

Suggestions for Operational Improvements

- Provide Aftercare Based on Clinical Necessity
 - A few counties are reported to have reduced duration of aftercare from 6 months to 3 months for fiscal reasons; stakeholders thought 6 months was important to client success
 - Stakeholders in some counties complained of a long wait without sufficient aftercare between completion of active or intensive treatment and client's appearance before judge to dismiss charges; stakeholders wanted guidelines about maximum duration between treatment completion and court appearance to request dismissal

Suggestions for Changes in ADP Processes

- Ensure that Proposition 36 local administrative and oversight processes are more timely, consistent and clearly defined at the county level
 - Issues may exist between continued desire for local control and flexibility and ADP/state oversight to achieve greater consistency but respondents wanted consistency
 - Many respondents thought that some increase in ADP guidance and training, not necessarily regulation, would be helpful to program success

Stakeholder Rankings of Nine Proposed Changes to Proposition 36

Potential Change	Mean Score	N	Std. Deviation
Increased Funding	4.22	100	1.219
Graduated Sanctions	4.13	102	1.318
Modify Eligibility	3.47	105	1.569
Drug Testing	3.34	100	1.810
Custody Treatment	3.23	101	1.568
Modify System for Parolees	3.02	96	1.596
Change Definition of Successful Completion	3.00	95	1.537
Increase Maximum Length of Treatment	2.63	95	1.618
Require Standardized Reporting to Courts	2.38	87	1.623