Survey Data from Five Years of Consumer Sampling

The following charts represent five years of survey data obtained annually through random, stratified sampling of adult consumers and the parent/guardians of children and adolescents (C&A) who received mental health services through providers certified by the Ohio Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services (OhioMHAS). Each year, respondents were asked to report on the occurrence of arrests within a 24-month period. The Time 1 (T1) question asked respondents if there had been an arrest during the year prior the current year. The Time 2 (T2) question asked if there had been an arrest during the current year. The term “current year” refers to the 12 months prior to being asked the question on the survey. Respondents with arrests reported at T1 are referenced in the following charts as “Consumers with Arrest Histories,” while the 12 months measured as T2 is referred to as the “Treatment Period.”

These data are reported annually to the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) as National Outcome Measures. Although sample sizes vary somewhat from year to year, sufficient samples are collected annually for a confidence interval (CI) of +/- 3 percentage points. CI are indicated in the charts by an “I” bar passing through the data point for each year.

Adult Consumer Trends in Arrests and Police Encounters

Chart 1 shows the annual percentages of adult consumers with an arrest at Time 1 who did not have new arrests at Time 2. Over the five-year period depicted, the trend line shows a decline in the percentage of adult consumers who did not have new arrests during the treatment period. The five-year average for the measure (not shown on the chart) is 4.1 percent, with standard deviation (SD) = 0.7 percent. Although the SFY 2015 data point of 2.8 percent (CI = -0.2% – 5.8%) is lower than any of the previous years, the confidence interval for SFY 2015 falls within the range of every other year’s confidence interval. The downward trend is not statistically significant.
Chart 2 shows the percent of adults who reported arrests at Time 1 and at Time 2. Over the five-year period depicted, the trend line shows increased percentages of consumers with arrest histories reporting new arrests during treatment. The five-year average is 3.1 percent, with SD = 0.6 percent. Although the SFY 2015 result of 4.1 percent (CI = 1.1% - 7.1%) is higher than results for each of the preceding four years, the SFY 2015 CI is within the range of the other years’ CIs. The upward trend shown in Chart 2 is not statistically significant.

Chart 3 shows the percent of adult consumers reporting no arrests before or during the treatment period. In overall percentages, Chart 3 shows that the majority of adult consumers in treatment do not have a problem with law enforcement. The five-year average is 87.6 percent, with SD = 1.2 percent. The CI for all five years’ results have overlapping ranges. The slight downward trend shown by Chart 3 is not statistically significant.

**Child and Adolescent (C&A) Consumer Trends in Arrests and Police Encounters**

Chart 4 shows the SFY 2011 – 2015 data points for the percent of the Child and Adolescent (C&A) consumers with an arrest history who had no arrests during the treatment period. The five-year average is 3.7 percent, with SD = 0.6 percent. The trend line is flat, and the decline in SFY 2015 is not statistically significant.

Chart 5 shows the percent of C&A consumers with arrest histories who report new arrests during the treatment period. The five-year average is 3.5 percent, with SD = 0.68 percent. The trend line shown in the chart has a very slight increase. The year-to-year changes shown in Chart 5 are not statistically significant.
Chart 6 shows the percent of C&A consumers without arrests before or during the treatment period. The data indicate that the majority of C&A consumers do not have a problem with law enforcement. The five-year average is 88.8 percent, with SD = 1.48 percent. The variation in the data points is minimal between SFY 2011 and SFY 2014, then there is a rise of three points to 91.4 percent (CI = 88.4% - 94.4%) in SFY 2015. The upward trend in SFY 2015 is not statistically significant.

**Limitations**

Survey data are problematic in that there is always a risk that a sample does not represent the entire population. Low survey response rates also pose a threat to the validity of results, inasmuch as there could be a difference between responders and non-responders. Randomization and stratification of the survey samples help to reduce the risk of misrepresentation somewhat. There is also a problem posed by asking for respondents to self-report on arrests prior to and during the treatment period addressed by the survey. Respondents may be under-reporting arrest events for any number of reasons. This problem is partially addressed by looking at the annual data points in relation to each other. Low variation from year-to-year suggests the measure is reliable, even if the accuracy may be questioned.

**Discussion**

The five years of adult consumer samples depicted in Charts 1 through 3 appear to tell a story of downward trends where improved outcomes would be indicated by upward trends, and upward trends where improved outcomes would be indicated by downward lines. Because of the overlap of confidence intervals across all five years in all three charts, a more accurate conclusion is that no change has occurred. With five years of data showing no significant change, we can say with some confidence that between 85 percent and 91 percent of adult consumers represented by the annual surveys do not have problems with law enforcement. Conversely, we can estimate that somewhere between 9 percent and 15 percent of adult consumers do have problems with law enforcement prior to and/or during treatment. Of those coming into treatment with arrest histories, an average 4.1 percent (CI = 1.1% - 7.1%) report decreased police involvement, and an average 3.1 percent (CI = 0.1% - 6.1%) report no change in arrests. There is only a one percent difference between those who report improved outcomes and those who do not.
In view of widespread implementation of Crisis Intervention Training (CIT) with law enforcement over the same five-year time period, the question arises as to whether the findings in this report reflect on these programmatic and policy initiatives for adult consumers. CIT focuses on improving communication between law enforcement officers and persons with serious mental illnesses. While diversion to treatment is a desired outcome of improved communication, diversion is not the only course of action available to officers when faced with criminal activity and the need to ensure public safety. Diversion may occur after arrest and adjudication. The data presented in this report suggest that if widespread diversion to treatment is happening, it is not having an effect of police involvement.

The five years of C&A consumer samples depicted in Charts 4 through 6 tell a similar story to that of the adult samples shown in Charts 1 through 3. Over the five years of data collection, there have been no substantial changes in the outcome measures for arrests. Although the arrest measures reported in this study say little about change, they do provide fairly reliable status measures. Based on the five-year average of 88.8 percent, we can estimate that between 86 percent and 92 percent of C&A consumers have no police involvement while in treatment. This is a very similar estimate to that found for the adult consumers. Conversely, the percentage of C&A consumers who have problems with law enforcement is between 8 percent and 14 percent. Of those coming into treatment with arrest histories, 3.6 percent report decreased police involvement and 3.6 percent report no change.

During the five-year span of survey data collection, there have been sustained efforts at collaboration between OhioMHAS and the Department of Juvenile Justice on the BH/JJ initiative, with program implementation limited to ten of the state's 50 County Behavioral Health Authorities. Given the limited implementation of BH/JJ, it would be surprising to see effect on C&A arrest outcomes derived through statewide survey sampling.