

APPENDICES

Appendix I: Follow-up Quality Control

One of the traditional weaknesses of follow-up and treatment outcome studies is the follow-up rate and procedures for contacting and interviewing participants. With the FY 2004 KTOS Project, new procedures were established to oversee follow-up interviews. Research assistants were hired to conduct follow-up interviews, record interview responses and enter data. The research assistants were trained and closely supervised by one of the study co-investigators (Logan) to ensure close fidelity to the study protocol.

The first step in the follow-up process is a colorful mail-out to potential subjects reminding them of the health follow-up study and giving them an 800 number to call and respond to the need for interviews. About 30% of the follow-up sample responded by calling. Interviews were done by telephone during the day, evenings, and weekends to ensure opportunity to reach people with late shift work. Each research assistant also recorded every step in trying to make contact with participants. When the initial mail-outs had been given sufficient time, the staff began making calls. During training, calls were monitored by the co-investigator to verify compliance with the training and the protocol. In addition, research staff used the internet, the motor licensing bureau of state government, and corrections data bases to track participant locations. The staff were also trained to record every participant location activity and every phone call made to or on behalf of participants.

To provide control over the follow-up process, a random sample of each category of follow-up records was reviewed to examine the level of effort used in tracking and reaching participants. About 25% of records in each group were examined so that statistical data were available to show the level of effort needed for completed interviews, uncompleted interviews, and various types of ineligible participants. In this way, this study can show the boundaries for when effort was terminated and detail can be presented on the reasons for not completing the interviews. It also means that the study can account for over 75% of cases even though the follow-up rate is just over 67%.

The following tables show the findings from an internal audit and examination of follow-up process records for the FY 2004 sample.

Contact database (FY 2004-2005): Completed interviews
Randomly selected 24.3% of completed interviews (216 out of 888)

	Number	%	Average
Number of total phone calls made to reach client	1153		5.34
Clients who called in	84	38.9%	
Number of mailings sent	281		1.3
Clients who had returned mail	24	11.1%	
Clients 1411 called	17	7.9%	
Clients with DMV searches	34	15.7%	
Clients with Transunion searches	15	6.9%	
Clients with internet searches	51	23.6%	
Clients with VINE, KOOL, and/or BOP	393		1.8
Complete unique address listed for client	197	91.2%	
Unique phone number listed	213	98.6%	
Of those with phone number:			
Those with a working number	161	75.6%	
1 st contact unique name listed	209	96.8%	
Complete unique address listed (n=209)	66	31.6%	
Unique phone number listed	118	56.5%	
Of those with phone number:			
Those with a working number	43	36.4%	
2 nd contact unique name listed	60	27.8%	
Complete unique address listed (n=60)	15	25.0%	
Unique phone number listed	48	80.0%	
Of those with phone number:			
Those with a working number	15	31.0%	

 APPENDICES

Contact database (FY 2004-2005): Expired interviews
Randomly selected 25.9% of expired records (104 out of 401)

	Number	%	Average
Number of total phone calls made to reach client	1041		10
Clients who called in	2	1.9%	
Number of mailings sent	259		4
Clients who had returned mail	40	38.5%	
Clients 1411 called	44	42.3%	
Clients with DMV searches	87	83.7%	
Clients with Transunion searches	56	53.8%	
Clients with internet searches	94	90.4%	
Clients with VINE, KOOL, and/or BOP	269		3.9
Complete unique address listed for client	87	83.7%	
Unique phone number listed	98	94.2%	
Of those with phone number:			
Those with a working number	52	53.1%	
1 st contact unique name listed	97	93.3%	
Complete unique address listed for client	31	32.0%	
Unique phone number listed	54	55.7%	
Of those with phone number:			
Those with a working number	37	68.5%	
2 nd contact unique name listed	19	18.3%	
Complete unique address listed for client	7	36.8%	
Unique phone number listed	14	73.7%	
Of those with phone number:			
Those with a working number	10	71.4%	

*Overall interrater reliability for completed and expired: 82 cases (25.6%), 50 opportunities for disagreement per chart (4,100 total); 41 disagreements = 1%; reliability = 99%.

Contact database: Participants who Refused
Randomly selected 33.3% of Refusals (10 out of 30)

	Number	%	Average
Number of total phone calls made to reach client	75		7.5
Clients who called in	1	10.0%	
Number of mailings sent	16		1.6
Clients who had returned mail	1	10.0%	
Clients 1411 called	2	20.0%	
Clients with DMV searches	4	40.0%	
Clients with Transunion searches	1	10.0%	
Clients with internet searches	4	40.0%	
Clients with VINE, KOOL, and/or BOP	20		2
Complete unique address listed for client	9	90.0%	
Unique phone number listed	10	100.0%	
Of those with phone number:			
Those with a working number	10	100.0%	
1 st contact unique name listed	9	90.0%	
Complete unique address listed for client	3	33.3%	
Unique phone number listed	2	22.2%	
Of those with phone number:			
Those with a working number	1	50.0%	
2 nd contact unique name listed	2	20.0%	
Complete unique address listed for client	2	100.0%	
Unique phone number listed	1	50.0%	
Of those with phone number:			
Those with a working number	0	0.0%	

Contact database: Participants who were Unable to be Completed
Random Sample of 24.5% of Unable to Complete (61 out of 249)

	Number	%	Average
Number of total phone calls made to reach client	89		1.5
Clients who called in	0	0%	
Number of mailings sent	61		1
Clients who had returned mail	6	9.8%	
Clients 1411 called	3	4.9%	
Clients with DMV searches	4	6.6%	
Clients with Transunion searches	3	4.9%	
Clients with internet searches	9	14.8%	
Clients with VINE, KOOL, and/or BOP	97		1.6
Complete unique address listed for client	55	90.2%	
Unique phone number listed	61	100.0%	
Of those with phone number (n=61):			
Working #	24	39.3%	
1 st contact unique name listed	58	95.1%	
Complete unique address listed (n=58)	22	37.9%	
Unique phone number listed	26	44.8%	
Of those with phone number (n=26):			
Working #	8	30.8%	
2 nd contact unique name listed	17	27.9%	
Complete unique address listed (n=17)	4	23.5%	
Unique phone number listed	12	70.6%	
Of those with phone number (n=12):			
Working #	2	16.7%	

*Overall interrater reliability for refused and unable to complete: 21 cases (25.5%), 50 opportunities for disagreement per chart (1,050 total); 2 disagreements = .2%; reliability = 99.8%.

Contact database: Reason Interview Unable to be Completed
Random sample of 24.5% of completed interviews (61 out of 249)

	Number	%
Incarcerated	49	80.3%
Residential Treatment	5	8.2%
Deceased	3	4.9%
Health Condition/Hospitalization	3	4.9%
Ineligible (no name)	1	1.6%
Total	61	100%

Contact database (FY 2004-2005): Completed interviews
Randomly selected 24.3% of completed interviews (216 out of 888)

	Number	%
*Day of the week interview completed		
Monday	28	13%
Tuesday	38	17.6%
Wednesday	35	16.2%
Thursday	54	25%
Friday	22	10.2%
Saturday	17	7.9%
Sunday	22	10.2%
*Weekday	177	81.9%
*Weekend	39	18.1%
*Time of day interview completed		
8am-12pm	19	8.9%
12pm-4pm	60	27.8%
4pm-8pm	64	29.6%
8pm-9pm	7	3.2%
9pm+	0	0%

*the dates and times are influenced both by client availability and by staff days and hours

*some times are missing especially for call ins

Appendix II: Rating of Treatment Experience At Follow Up By Gender

The mean rating of the treatment experience was high, 7.9, with significant difference by gender. Specifically, women gave higher ratings of the treatment experience than men. Participants' ratings of various aspects of the treatment experience were typically positive. The vast majority of participants agreed or strongly agreed that they were treated with respect, staff members explained their rights, the facility was clean, they understood their treatment plan, they understood what was expected of them during treatment, they received the services they needed to get better, and they felt better about themselves as a result of treatment. More women strongly agreed with the statements that they understood their treatment plan, they received the services they needed to get better, and they felt better about themselves compared to men.

Treatment Variable	Response Options	Male	Female	Statistical test
Mean rating of treatment experience	[1 = Worst treatment, 10 = Best treatment]	7.71	8.10	F(1, 855) = 8.087*
Participant was treated with respect	1. Strongly disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neutral 4. Agree 5. Strongly agree	0.4% 2.2% 0.4% 52.0% 45.1%	0.6% 3.3% 1.2% 44.4% 50.5%	$\chi^2(1, 883) = 7.074$
Staff explained participants rights as a client	1. Strongly disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neutral 4. Agree 5. Strongly agree	0.0% 2.9% 0.0% 56.6% 40.5%	0.3% 2.1% 0.0% 48.2% 49.4%	$\chi^2(1, 880) = 8.610$
The facility was clean	1. Strongly disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neutral 4. Agree 5. Strongly agree	0.2% 1.8% 0.7% 54.2% 43.1%	0.9% 1.5% 0.3% 50.3% 47.0%	$\chi^2(1, 882) = 4.457$
Participant understood his/her treatment plan	1. Strongly disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neutral 4. Agree 5. Strongly agree	0.4% 2.9% 0.4% 58.9% 37.5%	1.5% 4.5% 0.9% 47.4% 45.6%	$\chi^2(1, 883) = 14.373^*$
Participant understood what was expected of him/her during treatment	1. Strongly disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neutral 4. Agree 5. Strongly agree	0.4% 2.5% 0.2% 57.8% 39.1%	1.2% 2.4% 0.0% 49.5% 46.8%	$\chi^2(1, 883) = 8.326$
Participant received the services he/she needed to get better	1. Strongly disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neutral 4. Agree 5. Strongly agree	0.7% 6.6% 1.3% 55.7% 35.7%	2.1% 5.7% 0.9% 44.6% 46.7%	$\chi^2(1, 881) = 14.903^*$
Participant feels better about self as a result of treatment	1. Strongly disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neutral 4. Agree 5. Strongly agree	0.7% 5.6% 2.4% 51.0% 40.3%	1.8% 5.1% 1.5% 38.1% 53.5%	$\chi^2(1, 882) = 18.414^*$

*p < .01. **p < .001