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CJ-DATS is funded by NIDA in collaboration with SAMHSA and BJA.
Criminal Justice Drug Abuse Treatment Studies (CJ-DATS)

- Research cooperative funded by NIDA, in collaboration with SAMHSA and BJA
- 9 Research Centers
- Goals
  - Evaluate implementation strategies for introducing or improving evidence-based practices for drug abuse & HIV services in CJ settings
  - Develop partnerships between researchers and CJ organizations
  - Improve delivery of drug abuse treatment and HIV services in CJ settings

CJ-DATS is funded by NIDA in collaboration with SAMHSA and BJA.
Organizational Process Improvement Intervention (OPII)

- **Research question**: Does an organizational improvement strategy improve the quality of assessment and case planning procedures?

- **Strategy**: Local Change Team & Facilitator

- **Target population**: Correctional and treatment staff who work with offenders with substance-use disorders who are transitioning to community supervision and treatment.
21 sites randomized to Early Start or Delayed Start condition
- 2 sites per Research Center (1 RC had 3 sites; 1 RC had 4)
- Correctional agencies were partnered with 1 or more community treatment providers

Prison, probation, parole, & TASC settings
- Mostly adult men; juveniles (2 sites), women (2 sites)
## Dimensions of the Assessment Continuum

| **Measurement & Instrumentation** | ✓ Breadth & quality of the screening & assessment processes  
|                                  | ✓ Identify strengths, weaknesses, and service needs of clients |
| **Integration with the Case Plan** | ✓ Extent to which the case plan explicitly addresses needs identified in the assessments by recommending treatment & services |
| **Conveyance & Utility**         | ✓ Extent to which assessment & case plans are shared with community treatment programs  
|                                  | ✓ Perceived usefulness of case plan |
| **Service Activation & Provision** | ✓ Extent to which community treatment programs provide recommended services from the case plan |

CJ-DATS is funded by NIDA in collaboration with SAMHSA and BJA.
## OPII Phases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Start-up**              | ✓ Local Change Team (LCT) formed  
                           | ✓ Project introduced at Kick-Off Meeting                                    |
| **Needs Assessment**      | ✓ LCT identifies relative strengths & weaknesses in current assessment & case planning processes |
| **Process Improvement Planning** | ✓ LCT identifies goals for improvement in 1 or more dimensions of the assessment continuum |
| **Implementation**        | ✓ LCT implements identified goals and objectives                           |
| **Follow-Up**             | ✓ LCT assesses the sustainability of goals achieved  
                           | ✓ LCT assesses OPII implementation strategy                                |

---

*CJ-DATS is funded by NIDA in collaboration with SAMHSA and BJA.*
Success in achieving the goals of Process Improvement Plan is dependent, in part, on:

1. Characteristics of the organizations within which the initiative takes place and
2. Attitudes of staff within the organizations

**Research Question**: Which organizational characteristics and staff attitudes are related to the success of Change Teams in achieving planned improvements in assessment and case planning?
Variables: Organizational and Staff Characteristics

- Baseline Survey of Organizational Characteristics (BSOC)
  - 30 scales on organizational climate and staff attitudes; response categories range from 1 to 5
  - Four versions administered at baseline to Treatment Staff, Correctional Staff, Treatment Directors, and Correctional Directors in the participating agencies
BSOC Scales Selected for Analysis

- **Agency Resources**: 14 items; alpha = .81
- **Communication**: 17 items; alpha = .92
- **Leadership**: 9 items; alpha = .90
- **Stress**: 4 items; alpha = .83
- **Burnout**: 7 items; alpha = .79
- **Influence on Others**: 6 items; alpha = .81
- **Belief in Rehabilitation**: 3 items; alpha = .75
- **Readiness for Change**: 4 items; alpha = .65
Variables: Goal Success

- Ratings of Change Team success in achieving the goals in the Process Improvement Plan.

- Change Team reports are available from 9 sites (6 Research Centers) for rating.

- Three people rated the reports on the degree to which each Change Team achieved its goals (0 = Not begun; 6 = Completed).
### Success Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low (0 to 4.0)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Some goals achieved)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (4.1 to &lt; 6.0)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Most goals achieved)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (6.0)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(All goals achieved)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Control Variables

- Staff Type
  - Treatment  N=124
  - Correctional  N=357

- Research Center  N=6
GLM: Are mean BSOC scale scores significantly associated with Success categories, accounting for Staff Type and Research Center?

If overall F-test is significant for a scale, conduct post-hoc analysis across Success categories.

Analysis does not account for nesting of respondents within sites.
The three Success categories differed significantly on the 8 scale scores (F = 2.8, p < .000).

Differences on the 8 scale scores were also found for Staff Type (F = 7.9, p < .000) and Research Center (F = 2.5, p < .000).
### BSOC Scales Associated with Success Category, Accounting for Staff Type and Research Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p value</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Influence on Others</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for Change</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Resources</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.745</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in Rehabilitation</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.745</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.380</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Post-Hoc Tests* between Success Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Success vs. Low Success</th>
<th>Medium Success vs. Low Success</th>
<th>High Success vs. Medium Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Influence on Others</td>
<td>High ≈ Low ((p &lt; 0.30))</td>
<td>Medium ≈ Low ((p &lt; 0.08))</td>
<td>High ≈ Medium ((p &lt; 0.26))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>High &gt; Low ((p &lt; 0.001))</td>
<td>Medium &gt; Low ((p &lt; 0.001))</td>
<td>High ≈ Medium ((p &lt; 0.85))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for Change</td>
<td>High &gt; Low ((p &lt; 0.02))</td>
<td>Medium ≈ Low ((p &lt; 0.10))</td>
<td>High ≈ Medium ((p &lt; 0.10))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>High ≈ Low ((p &lt; 0.13))</td>
<td>Medium ≈ Low ((p &lt; 0.88))</td>
<td>High ≈ Medium ((p &lt; 0.25))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Least Significant Difference test

*CJ-DATS is funded by NIDA in collaboration with SAMHSA and BJA.*
Limitations

- Data from only half of the Change Teams were available for analysis.
- The selected BSOC scales do not capture all relevant variables for assessing influences on Change Team success.
- The analysis did not take into account the nesting of respondents within sites.
Conclusions

- Results are preliminary.
- More success in achieving goals was found for sites where staff reported
  - Higher levels of Communication
  - Greater Readiness for Change
- Communication had the largest effect size (Partial Eta Sq. = .03).
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