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Introduction

- SIROW, PCJCC & AzCA worked out an agreement to utilize data from a CSAT-sponsored project to examine outcomes from the Making a Change (MAC) program. The agreement was official in February, 2009.
- Permission forms and assent are collected from both youth and caregivers
- The parent grant has 290 youth enrolled
- Data are collected from youth at intake to AzCA and at 3-, 6-months post intake.
- Currently there are 63 youth enrolled in the parent grant that also participated in MAC.
Significance

- The Making a Change (MAC) unit at Pima County Juvenile Detention is a treatment readiness unit for youth slated to go to treatment.
- Studies have found that motivation improves treatment engagement.
- Adolescent typically enter treatment “unwillingly.”
- Juvenile justice is the primary referral to substance abuse treatment.
- Juvenile justice helping to motivate youth to “get ready” for treatment is a promising model for improving motivation.
Methods

- Global Appraisal of Individual Needs (GAIN)
- Trained interviewers
- All the MAC youth that went to AzCA included.
- Comparison group: randomly selected from larger dataset
- Descriptive and inferential statistics used
MAC vs Comparison Baseline Age

n=63

Mac: Mean=16.01; Median=16.00; Mode=17.00
Comparison: Mean=15.66; Median=16.00; Mode=16.00
p<.05
### MAC vs Comparison Baseline Days Used Drugs: Past 90-days

- **Number of Days**
- **Type**: Alcohol, Alcohol to Intoxication, Marijuana, Crack, Heroin, Days in Controlled Environment, Drug Tested

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>MAC</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>9.11</td>
<td>7.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol to Intoxication</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana</td>
<td>34.60</td>
<td>34.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crack</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heroin</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days in Controlled Environment</td>
<td>34.05</td>
<td>29.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Tested</td>
<td>9.27</td>
<td>10.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MAC vs. Comparison Treatment Motivations

- Treatment Too Demanding: 70% (MAC) vs. 71% (Comparison)
- Too many other responsibilities: 70% (MAC) vs. 71% (Comparison)
- There is a lot of pressure to be in tx: 62% (MAC) vs. 64% (Comparison)
- Can get help in tx: 13% (MAC) vs. 11% (Comparison)
- Need at least 1 mo: 18% (MAC) vs. 19% (Comparison)
Days Used AOD: Past 90-days
MAC n=49; Comparison n=60

Days AOD Baseline
Days AOD 3-Month

MAC
Comparison
44.16
13.30
49.77
16.76
MAC vs Comparison Juvenile Justice Involvement and Controlled Environment: Past 90-days

Days with JJ Involvement

- Baseline: MAC 83.51, Comparison 59.78
- 3-Month: MAC 87.71, Comparison 77.00

Days in Controlled Environment

- Baseline: MAC 34.49, Comparison 22.5
- 3-Month: MAC 42.47, Comparison 38.11
MAC v. Comparison: Crime Changes over Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>3-Month</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>3-Month</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>3-Month</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>3-Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Crime</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Crime</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

- Youth in both the MAC and Comparison group are making positive changes over time.
- MAC youth are, in general:
  - Older than the comparison group.
  - Have fewer treatment experiences.
  - Slightly better motivation.
  - Reducing substance use and delinquency.
- These results are promising but additional analyses are necessary.