

10/4/2018



University of Wisconsin
Population Health Institute
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE AND PUBLIC HEALTH

Youth Empowered Solutions (YES)!
**Evaluation Report Comparing the YES! and Comprehensive
Community Services (CCS) Populations**

October 2018

Prepared by
Delaney Dustman, Project Assistant
Janae Goodrich, Assistant Researcher
Robin Lecoanet, Researcher/Principal Investigator
University of Wisconsin Population Health Institute

Translating Research for Policy and Practice

610 Walnut Street, 575 WARF • Madison, WI 53726-2336
Phone 608.263.6294 • uwphi.pophealth.wisc.edu
[@UWiscPHI](https://twitter.com/UWiscPHI)

Table of Contents

Introduction to the YES! and CCS Comparison Analysis Background and Methods	2
Summary of the Number of Participants Matched to the Functional Screen and PPS	3
Summary of Participants included in the PPS Data Analysis	4
Description of the Participants in the PPS Data Analysis	4
Summary of Participant Admission Characteristics	5
Referral Source Information	7
Mental Health and AODA Diagnosis Information	8
Length of Involvement in Services	11
Summary of Outcomes for Participants in the PPS Data Analysis	12
Changes in Mental Health Status and Level of Need	12
Changes in Living Situation and Employment Status	13
Changes in Criminal Justice System Involvement	16
Summary of Participants Included in the Functional Screen Analysis	18
Description of the Participants in the Functional Screen Data Analysis	18
Summary of Participant Admission Characteristics	19
Referral Source Information	22
Mental Health and AODA Diagnosis Information	23
Crisis and Situational Factors at Admission	24
Risk Factors at Admission	26
Length of Involvement in Services	28
Summary of Outcomes for Participants Included in the Functional Screen Analysis	28
Changes in Mental Health Status and Level of Need	28
Changes in Living Situation	32
Changes in Employment Status and Employment Needs	35
Changes in Criminal Justice System Involvement	37
Changes in Community Living Skills	37

Introduction to the YES! and CCS Comparison Analysis

Background and Methods

Youth Empowered Solutions (YES!), administered by the Wisconsin Department of Health Services (DHS), is funded by the Now is the Time - Healthy Transitions Grant from the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA). The YES! grant began on October 1, 2014, and the two YES! local sites began admitting participants in April 2015. DHS contracted with the University of Wisconsin Population Health Institute (UWPHI) to conduct the program and grant evaluation. UWPHI staff assist the state and local staff with collecting and reporting state- and federally-required data, which is compiled and summarized on an annual basis.

This report is a follow-up to the YES! Years 1-3 Evaluation Report and provides a comparison between YES! and Wisconsin Comprehensive Community Services (CCS) participants and outcomes. The comparison between YES! and CCS was requested by DHS in order to examine participant outcomes for YES! participants, as opposed to those receiving standard services provided through CCS.

CCS participants who are not enrolled in YES! provide a realistic comparison group for participants in YES! services. CCS began in Wisconsin in 2005, and serves individuals who need ongoing services for a mental illness, substance use disorder, or a dual diagnosis beyond occasional outpatient care, but less than the intensive care provided in an inpatient setting. Participants in YES! are usually admitted to CCS, but receive additional, comprehensive services through YES!, including age-appropriate treatment and the opportunity to work with Transition Facilitators.

Data for this report was gathered from the Program Participation System (PPS) and the Wisconsin Functional Screen (FS) Data System. Wisconsin's Functional Screen for Mental Health and Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse (AODA) Services is a needs assessment utilized to determine eligibility for various behavioral health services. The Functional Screen is conducted at participant admission and annually for the duration of involvement in services. PPS is a client-level data collection system for reporting behavioral health services, with updates for participants conducted approximately every six months. Both the FS and PPS data systems cover a wide range of information including living arrangement, vocational information, life skills, crisis factors, mental health and substance use, and more.

Evaluation Report Inclusion Criteria for YES! Participants:

- Admitted to YES! services (April 1, 2015-September 30, 2017)
- PPS:
 - Had a baseline status update while enrolled in YES! services or up to two months prior to entry into YES! services
 - Had a follow-up status update (average 12 months after baseline)
- FS: Had a baseline screen and a one-year follow-up screen (9-15 months)

Evaluation Report Inclusion Criteria for CCS Participants:

- Admitted to CCS between April 1, 2015 and September 30, 2017
- Not admitted to Jefferson CCS or Outagamie CCS
- Age 16-25 at admission to CCS
- PPS: Had a baseline status update and a one-year status update (9-15 months, average 10 months after baseline)
- FS: Had a baseline screen and one-year follow-up screen (9-15 months)

To compile this data, UWPHI worked with staff at DHS to match all participant-level data from the federally-required YES! interviews with data from the Functional Screen and the PPS data system. Similar criteria was then used to create a similar match for CCS participants to obtain similar information.

Summary of the Number of Participants Matched to the Functional Screen and PPS
Summary Includes Data for Participants Admitted to YES! and CCS April 2015 - September 30, 2017

Table 1 summarizes the total number of participants included in the analysis from the PPS Data System and the Functional Screen. There were 25 YES! participants and 259 CCS participants included from the PPS Data System, creating a total of 284 participants. There were 21 YES! and 168 CCS participants included from the Functional Screen, creating a total of 189 participants.

Table 1: Number of Participants Included from the PPS and Functional Screen Data Systems			
Data Set	YES! Participants	CCS Participants	Total Participants
Participants included in the PPS Data System	25 (9%)	259 (91%)	284
Participants included in the Functional Screen	21 (11%)	168 (89%)	189

Summary of Participants included in the PPS Data Analysis
Summary Includes All Data Received by UWPPI Through September 30, 2017

Information gathered from the PPS Data System is included in the analysis below. Analysis of this information allows for a more complete comparison of participants being served through YES! or CCS services. A total of 25 YES! participants and 259 CCS participants who received services during the YES! implementation period were matched with the PPS System to compile the information below.

Description of the Participants in the PPS Data Analysis

Table 2 summarizes the demographic characteristics of YES! and CCS participants upon their entry into the PPS System. Overall, 43% of participants included in the analysis were under the age of 18 when they were first entered in the PPS System. Additionally, 68% of YES! participants were female, while nearly half of CCS participants were males. The majority of both YES! and CCS participants were white and not Hispanic. Finally, participants admitted to YES! were significantly younger than the CCS participants.

Table 2: Summary Admission Demographic Characteristics for Participants Admitted to YES! and CCS through September 30, 2017			
	YES! Participants (N = 25)	CCS Participants (N = 259)	TOTAL Participants (N = 284)
Age at PPS Admission			
15	12%	0%	1%*
16	24	29	29
17	12	13	13
18	20	7	8
19	12	7	7
20	8	5	5
21	4	5	5
22	4	7	7
23	4	8	8
24	0	12	11
25	0	7	6
Average Age at Admission	17.8 years	19.5 years	19.3 years*
Gender			
Female	68%	52%	53%
Male	32	48	47

	YES! Participants (N = 25)	CCS Participants (N = 259)	TOTAL Participants (N = 284)
Race			
White	100%	76%	78%
Black or African American	0	12	11
Asian	0	2	1
American Indian	0	3	3
Biracial	0	5	5
Missing/Unknown	0	2	2
Hispanic/Latino Ethnicity			
Yes	4%	4%	4%*
No	64	90	87
Unknown	32	6	9

**Difference significant at $p < .05$ or better (more than 95% confident that the difference did not occur due to chance).*

Summary of Participant Admission Characteristics

Table 3 shows that the majority of YES! participants (64%) were living in a private residence without supervision at admission, in contrast with just half of CCS participants who had the same living situation. As expected, nearly all of the YES! participants came from Jefferson or Outagamie County; CCS participants were distributed throughout most of the state, with the largest numbers coming from Milwaukee County (13%), Marathon County (9%), and La Crosse County (8%). Though employment information was unknown for several participants, Table 2 shows that YES! participants were more likely to be employed full-time at admission, as compared to CCS participants, although the difference was not statistically significant.

	YES! Participants (N = 25)	CCS Participants (N = 259)	TOTAL Participants (N = 284)
Living Situation at Admission			
Private Residence w/out Supervision (ADULTS ONLY)	64%	50%	51%
Living with Parents (Under AGE 18 ONLY)	20	27	26
Living with Relatives, Friends (Under Age 18 ONLY)	0	4	4
Supervised Licensed Residential Facility	0	3	3
Supported Residence (ADULTS ONLY)	4	1	1
Street, Shelter, No Fixed Address, Homeless	8	3	4
Institutional Setting, Hospital, Nursing Home	0	<1	<1
Crisis Stabilization Home/Center	0	1	1

**Table 3: Summary of Participant Characteristics for YES! and CCS Participants
Admitted through September 30, 2017**

	YES! Participants (N = 25)	CCS Participants (N = 259)	TOTAL Participants (N = 284)
Jail or Correctional Facility	0	1	1
Foster Home	4	1	1
Other Living Arrangement	0	5	4
Unknown	0	3	3
County of Residence			
Adams County	0%	1%	1%*
Ashland County	0	4	4
Barron County	0	1	1
Bayfield County	0	2	2
Buffalo County	0	<1	<1
Calumet County	0	2	1
Chippewa County	0	2	1
Clark County	0	<1	<1
Columbia County	0	1	1
Crawford County	0	<1	<1
Dodge County	0	2	1
Dunn County	0	3	3
Eau Claire County	0	<1	<1
Fond du Lac County	4	<1	1
Forest County	0	<1	<1
Green Lake County	0	2	2
Jackson County	0	1	1
Jefferson County	64	0	6
Juneau County	0	3	3
Kenosha County	0	7	6
Kewaunee County	0	<1	<1
La Crosse County	0	8	7
Langlade County	0	2	1
Lincoln County	0	1	1
Manitowoc County	0	2	1
Marathon County	0	9	8
Marinette County	0	4	3
Milwaukee County	0	13	12
Monroe County	0	1	1
Oneida County	0	2	2
Outagamie County	32	0	3
Ozaukee County	0	1	1
Pierce County	0	2	2
Polk County	0	1	1
Portage County	0	<1	<1
Racine County	0	3	3
Rock County	0	1	1

Table 3: Summary of Participant Characteristics for YES! and CCS Participants Admitted through September 30, 2017			
	YES! Participants (N = 25)	CCS Participants (N = 259)	TOTAL Participants (N = 284)
Rusk County	0	<1	<1
St. Croix County	0	2	2
Sauk County	0	2	2
Shawano County	0	3	3
Sheboygan County	0	<1	<1
Taylor County	0	<1	<1
Trempealeau County	0	<1	<1
Vernon County	0	<1	<1
Vilas County	0	<1	<1
Walworth County	0	2	2
Washington County	0	1	1
Waukesha County	0	<1	<1
Waupaca County	0	<1	<1
Waushara County	0	1	1
Wood County	0	4	4
Red Cliff Indian Reservation	0	<1	<1
Employment at Admission			
Full-Time Competitive Employment (35 or more hours/week)	16%	2%	4%
Part-Time Competitive Employment (Less than 35 hours/week)	8	11	10
Sheltered Employment	0	<1	<1
Unemployed (looking for work past 30 days)	8	13	13
Not in the Labor Force - Student	36	31	31
Not in the Labor Force – Jail, Prison or Institution	0	<1	<1
Not in the Labor Force – Homemaker	0	<1	<1
Not in the Labor Force – Disabled	20	19	19
Not in the Labor Force - Retired	0	<1	<1
Not in the Labor Force – Other Reason	8	14	13
Not Applicable – Children 15 and Under	0	3	3
Unknown	4	5	5
<i>*Difference significant at p<.05 or better (more than 95% confident that the difference did not occur due to chance).</i>			

Referral Source Information

Table 4 summarizes the referral sources for the YES! and CCS participants at admission. Although referral source information was unknown for several individuals, Table 4 reveals that YES! and CCS participants are referred through a variety of sources. A higher percentage of YES! participants were referred through school, law enforcement, and child protective services. A greater percentage of CCS participants were self-referred and referred through

family/friends and mental health providers. Many participants for both YES! and CCS were referred through County Social Services.

Table 4: Referral Source Information from the PPS Data System			
	YES! Participants (N = 25)	CCS Participants (N = 259)	TOTAL Participants (N = 284)
Referral Source			
Self	4%	14%	13%*
Family, Friend or Guardian	0	10	10
County Social Services	20	19	19
School, College	8	<1	<1
Mental Health Program/Provider	12	21	20
Mental Health Court	0	<1	<1
Inpatient Hospital or Residential Facility	0	4	4
Primary Care Physician or Other Healthcare Program/Provider	0	3	3
Hospital Emergency Room	0	1	1
Corrections, Probation, Parole	4	3	3
Law Enforcement, Police	8	4	4
Drug Court	0	1	1
Other Court, Criminal or Juvenile Justice System	4	2	3
Child Protective Services Agency	16	3	4
IDP – Court	0	1	<1
Other	8	8	8
Unknown	16	5	6
<i>*Difference significant at p<.05 or better (more than 95% confident that the difference did not occur due to chance).</i>			

Mental Health and AODA Diagnosis Information

Table 5 summarizes active mental health and AODA diagnoses for YES! and CCS participants at the time that they were first entered into the PPS System. In the first part of Table 5, primary mental health and AODA diagnoses for the participants are presented. As a note, only diagnosis categories that included one or more participants are included in this table. Other diagnoses, such as physical health diagnoses, were not included in this analysis due to small numbers and the focus of the YES! grant on behavioral health diagnoses. Both YES! and CCS participants have diagnoses across a wide range of categories.

In the latter part of Table 5, secondary mental health information, suicide risk, overall assessment of need, and commitment status are presented in order to provide a more complete picture of diagnoses for YES! and CCS participants. In the PPS Data System, participants receive one primary diagnosis and one secondary diagnosis, so this presents an unduplicated count of diagnoses at the time of admission. A greater number of YES!

participants (56%) than CCS participants (23%) were diagnosed with a secondary mental health diagnosis at admission.

Table 5 reveals that 88% of YES! participants had a presence of suicide risk factors or a high potential for suicide at baseline, compared to 50% of CCS participants, although the CCS population includes a large number of “unknown” responses. Both groups demonstrated similar BRC Target Population levels, which assesses overall need; over half of all participants were assessed to be best served by ongoing, high intensity comprehensive services. The vast majority of YES! and CCS participants entered services voluntarily.

Table 5: Primary Mental Health and AODA Diagnosis Information at Admission from the PPS Data System			
	YES! Participants (N= 25)	CCS Participants (N= 259)	TOTAL Participants (N= 284)
Primary Mental Health Diagnosis at Admission from the PPS Data System			
Mental Health Disorders			
Adjustment Disorders	8%	2%	3%
Anxiety Disorders	8	12	12
Attachment Disorders	0	<1	<1
Autism Spectrum Disorders	0	<1	<1
Attention Deficit Disorders	4	10	9
Bipolar I Disorder	12	10	10
Bipolar II Disorder	0	2	2
Bipolar Disorder - Other	0	1	1
Borderline Personality Disorder	4	1	1
Child or Adolescent Antisocial Behavior	0	<1	<1
Conduct Disorder, Childhood-Onset Type	0	<1	<1
Cyclothymic Disorder	0	<1	<1
Dependent Personality Disorder	0	<1	<1
Disruptive Mood Dysregulation Disorder	8	0	1
Impulse Disorder, Unspecified	0	<1	<1
Major Depression/Depressive Disorders	24	19	19
Neurotic Disorder	0	<1	<1
Nonpsychotic Mental Disorder, Unspecified	0	2	2
Obsessive-Compulsive and Related Disorder	0	<1	<1
Oppositional Defiant Disorder	4	2	2
Other	4	10	9
Other Personality Disorders	0	2	2
Post-Traumatic Stress Disorders	12	8	8
Schizophrenia Spectrum Disorders	8	10	10

Table 5: Primary Mental Health and AODA Diagnosis Information at Admission from the PPS Data System			
	YES! Participants (N= 25)	CCS Participants (N= 259)	TOTAL Participants (N= 284)
Stress, Not Elsewhere Classified	0	1	1
Suicidal Ideation	0	1	1
Substance Use Disorders			
Alcohol Use Disorders	0	<1	<1
Amphetamine/Psychostimulant Use Disorders	0	1	1
Cannabis Use Disorders	0	1	1
Opioid Use Disorders	0	1	1
Other (or unknown) Substance-Induced Psychotic Disorder	0	1	1
Other Substance Use Disorder	4	1	1
Secondary Mental Health Diagnosis from the PPS Data System			
No Secondary Mental Health Diagnosis Recorded	44%	77%	74%*
Has Secondary Mental Health Diagnosis	56	23	26
Suicide Risk at Admission			
No Risk Factors	8%	15%	14%*
Presence of Risk Factors	72	47	50
High Potential for Suicide	16	3	4
Unknown	4	35	32
BRC Target Population at Admission (Overall Assessment of Needs)			
Short-Term Situational Services	4%	3%	3%
Ongoing, Low Intensity Services	40	38	38
Ongoing, High Intensity Comprehensive Services	56	59	59
Commitment Status at Admission			
Voluntary	84%	81%	81%
Voluntary with Settlement Agreement	4	4	4
Involuntary – Civil Chapter 51	12	8	8
Involuntary – Criminal	0	1	1
Guardianship Only	0	1	1
Unknown	0	5	5
<i>*Difference significant at p<.05 or better (more than 95% confident that the difference did not occur due to chance).</i>			

Length of Involvement in Services

The following information summarizes the length of involvement in services for YES! and CCS participants, which is defined as the time between the episode start date and episode end date for those participants who had an end date entered in the PPS Data System. For those participants who did not have an episode end date as of September 30, 2017, the length of stay is measured by the time between the episode start date and September 30, 2017. As a note, YES! sites began admitting participants on April 1, 2015; therefore, the longest possible length of involvement is approximately 2 ½ years or 961 days.

Table 6 includes a summary of the length of time between the episode start and end dates for 13 YES! participants and 66 CCS participants discharged from services. This number is presented in months and the number of days included in each month range is included in parentheses after the description of months. This analysis reveals that 70% of discharged YES! participants were active in services for nine months or longer, while 68% of CCS participants were active for nine months or longer. The average length of stay in services was significantly longer for YES! participants than CCS participants.

Table 6: Length of Stay for Participants Discharged from Services (Through September 30, 2017)			
	YES! Participants (N = 13)	CCS Participants (N = 66)	TOTAL Participants (N = 79)
1-3 months (31-90 days)	0%	5%	4%
3-6 months (91-180 days)	15	12	13
6-9 months (181-270 days)	15	15	15
9-12 months (271-365 days)	8	18	16
12 months or more (≥ 366 days)	62	50	52
Average Length of Stay	504.5 days (15.8 months)	357.3 days (11.3 months)	381.6 days* (12.0 months)
<i>Note: This analysis includes only participants who had both a baseline status and a follow-up status update in the PPS Data System.</i>			
<i>*Difference significant at p<.05 or better (more than 95% confident that the difference did not occur due to chance).</i>			

Table 7 summarizes the length of time between the episode start date and September 30, 2017 for those participants who were still involved in services as of September 30, 2017. This table includes the 12 YES! participants and the 193 CCS participants who were still active in services as of September 30, 2017. This table is presented in a similar fashion to Table 6 and includes information regarding how long participants have been involved in services as of September 30, 2017. This shows that 100% of YES! participants involved in services as of September 30, 2017 were involved in services for at least one year, and 80%

of CCS participants were involved in services for at least one year. Similar to the discharged participants, the average length of stay in services was significantly longer for YES! participants than CCS participants.

Table 7: Length of Stay for Participants Still Active in Services as of September 30, 2017 (Through September 30, 2017)			
Length of Stay	YES! Participants (N = 12)	CCS Participants (N = 193)	TOTAL Participants (N = 205)
6-9 months (181-270 days)	0%	7%	7%
9-12 months (271-365 days)	0	13	12
12 months or more (>366 days)	100	80	81
Average Length of Stay	835.5 days (26.7 months)	581.8 days (18.5 months)	596.7 days* (19.0 months)
<i>Note: This analysis includes only participants who had both a baseline status and a follow-up status update in the PPS Data System.</i>			
<i>*Difference significant at $p < .05$ or better (more than 95% confident that the difference did not occur due to chance).</i>			

Summary of Outcomes for Participants included in the PPS Data Analysis
Summary Includes All Data Received by UWPHI Through September 30, 2017

Changes in Mental Health Status and Level of Need

Table 8 presents changes in mental health status and level of participant need for the 284 participants from YES! and CCS between their baseline and follow-up status update. These changes between baseline and follow-up are included for the 25 YES! participants and the 259 CCS participants who participated in services during the YES! implementation period through September 30, 2017. Changes are calculated by comparing each participant’s status recorded at their baseline status update to the status update approximately one year later. Table 8 includes changes in the BRC Target Population, an overall assessment of participant need. Table 8 also includes changes in suicide risk.

Table 8 shows that the vast majority (79%) of CCS participants maintained a level of service need, whereas YES! participants (36%) were more likely than CCS participants to decrease the level of service need. A slightly higher percentage of CCS participants also demonstrated an increased need for services. A higher percentage of YES! participants (40%) as compared to CCS participants (5%) showed reduced level of suicide risk at follow-up, while the largest

percentage in both populations maintained the same level of suicide risk at both baseline and follow-up.

Table 8: Changes in Mental Health Status and Level of Participant Need (Through September 30, 2017)			
	YES! Participants (N = 25)	CCS Participants (N = 259)	TOTAL Participants (N = 284)
Changes in BRC Target Population (Overall Assessment of Need)			
Maintained Level of Services	60%	79%	77%*
Maintained Ongoing, Low Intensity Services	24%	31%	30%
Maintained Ongoing, High Intensity Services	36	48	47
Increased Level of Services	4%	9%	9%
Increased from Low Intensity Services to High Intensity Services	4%	9%	9%
Decreased Level of Services	36%	12%	14%
Decreased from High Intensity Services to Low Intensity Services	36%	12%	14%
Changes in Suicide Risk			
Maintained Level of Risk	44%	51%	51%*
Maintained High Potential of Suicide	4%	2%	2%
Maintained Presence of Risk Factors	36	38	38
Maintained No Risk Factors	4	11	11
Increased Level of Risk	4%	4%	4%
Changed from No Risk Factors to Presence of Risk Factors	4%	3%	3%
Change from Presence of Risk Factors to High Risk for Suicide	0	1	1
Decreased Level of Risk	40%	5%	8%
Changed from High Potential of Suicide to Presence of Risk Factors	8%	1%	1%
Changed from Presence of Risk Factors to No Risk Factors	32	4	7
Unknown/Missing	12%	40%	37%
<i>*Difference significant at $p < .05$ or better (more than 95% confident that the difference did not occur due to chance).</i>			

Changes in Living Situation and Employment Status

Table 9 shows changes in employment status and living situation for the 25 YES! participants and 259 CCS participants between baseline and follow-up. Changes are calculated by comparing each participant's status recorded at their baseline status update in the PPS data system to the participant's status update approximately one year later. Data from April 1, 2015 through September 30, 2017 are included.

Table 9 shows that the largest portion of both YES! and CCS participants maintained unemployment between baseline and follow-up, although more CCS participants (65%) than YES! participants (52%) maintained unemployment. A higher percentage of YES! participants maintained full-time employment (12%), compared to CCS participants (1%). A higher percentage of YES! participants (16%) also increased from unemployment to full-time employment, as compared with CCS participants (1%).

The latter portion of Table 9 lists changes in living situation between baseline and follow-up. Most participants in both populations maintained their living situation between baseline and follow-up. Slightly more YES! participants (32%) changed their living situation during the YES! implementation period than did CCS participants (28%), although this difference was not statistically significant.

Table 9: Changes in Living Situation and Employment Status (Through September 30, 2017)			
	YES! Participants (N = 25)	CCS Participants (N = 259)	TOTAL Participants (N = 284)
Changes in Employment Status			
Maintained Employment Status	68%	72%	72%*
Maintained Unemployment	52%	65%	64%
Maintained Part-Time Employment	4	6	6
Maintained Full-Time Employment	12	1	2
Improved Employment Status	20%	14%	14%
Increased from Unemployment to Part-Time Employment	4%	11%	10%
Increased from Unemployment to Full-Time Employment	16	1	2
Increased from Part-Time Employment to Full-Time Employment	0	1	1
Increased from Unemployment to Supported Employment	0	1	1
Decreased Employment Status	8%	5%	5%
Decreased from Part-Time Employment to Unemployment	4%	4%	4%
Decreased from Full-Time Employment to Part-Time Employment	0	1	1
Decreased from Full-Time Employment to Unemployment	4	0	<1
Unknown/Missing	4%	9%	9%
Changes in Living Situation			
Maintained Living Situation	68%	67%	67%
Maintained Homelessness (Living in Street, Shelter, Homeless, or No Fixed Address)	4%	1%	1%
Maintained a Supervised Licensed Residential Facility	0	1	1

Table 9: Changes in Living Situation and Employment Status (Through September 30, 2017)			
	YES! Participants (N = 25)	CCS Participants (N = 259)	TOTAL Participants (N = 284)
Maintained Living in a Foster Home	0	<1	<1
Maintained Living with Friends/Relatives	0	2	2
Maintained Living with Parents	8	18	17
Maintained Private Residence Without Supervision	52	43	44
Maintained Living in Supported Residence (Adults Only)	4	<1	1
Maintained Living in "Other"	0	1	1
Changed Living Situation	32%	28%	29%
Changed from Living with Relatives/Friends to Living with Parents	0%	<1%	<1%
Changed from Living at Private Residence to Living in Supported Residence	4	2	2
Changed from Living with Parents to Foster Home	0	<1	<1
Changed from Jail to Private Residence	0	1	1
Changed from "Other" to Living with Parents	0	<1	<1
Changed from Private Residence to Living with Parents	0	1	1
Changed from Living with Parents to Supported Residence	0	<1	<1
Changed from Private Residence to Supervised Licensed Residential Facility	4	<1	1
Changed from Homeless/Street/Shelter to Crisis Stabilization Home/Center	0	<1	<1
Changed from Living with Parents to Private Residence	8	5	5
Changed from "Other" to Private Residence	0	2	1
Changed from Homeless/Street/Shelter to Private Residence	4	1	1
Changed from Living with Parents to "Other"	0	1	1
Changed from Living with Parents to Living with Friends/Relatives	0	2	2
Changed from Foster Home to Living with Parents	0	<1	<1
Changed from Crisis Stabilization Home/Center to Private Residence	0	1	1
Changed from Private Residence to Homeless/Street/Shelter	0	1	1
Changed from Living with Friends/Relatives to Private Residence	0	<1	<1
Changed from Supervised Licensed Residential Facility to Private Residence	0	1	1

Table 9: Changes in Living Situation and Employment Status (Through September 30, 2017)			
	YES! Participants (N = 25)	CCS Participants (N = 259)	TOTAL Participants (N = 284)
Changed from Homeless/Street/Shelter to "Other"	0	<1	<1
Changed from Private Residence to Institutional Setting/Hospital/Nursing Home	0	1	1
Changed from "Other" to Homeless/Street/Shelter	0	<1	<1
Changed from Crisis Stabilization Home/Center to Living with Parents	0	<1	<1
Changed from Private Residence to Jail/Correctional Facility	0	1	1
Changed from Foster Home to "Other"	4	<1	<1
Changed from Private Residence to "Other"	0	<1	<1
Changed from Living with Parents to Crisis Stabilization Home/Center	0	<1	<1
Changed from Supervised Licensed Residential Facility to Jail/Correctional Facility	0	<1	<1
Changed from Private Residence to Living with Friends/Relatives	4	0	<1
Changed from Private Residence to Crisis Stabilization Home/Center	0	<1	<1
Changed from Living with Parents to Jail/Correctional Facility	0	<1	<1
Changed from Institutional Setting to Private Residence	0	<1	<1
Changed from Jail to Homeless/Street/Shelter	0	<1	<1
Changed from "Other" to Supported Residence	0	<1	<1
Changed from Homeless/Street/Shelter to Jail/Correctional Facility	0	1	1
Changed from Supervised Licensed Residential Facility to Foster Home	0	<1	<1
Changed from living with parents to living in a supervised residential facility	4	0	<1
Unknown/Missing	0%	5%	4%
<i>*Difference significant at p<.05 or better (more than 95% confident that the difference did not occur due to chance).</i>			

Changes in Criminal Justice System Involvement

Table 10 presents changes in criminal justice system involvement information from the PPS Data System, including level of involvement in the criminal justice system, number of arrests in the past six months, and number of arrests in the past 30 days. The PPS Data System measures the level of criminal justice system involvement in the six months prior to

admission or follow-up update. Table 10 shows the changes for YES! and CCS participants between their baseline update and their follow-up update.

The analyses included in Table 10 revealed that the majority of YES! and CCS participants maintained no involvement in the criminal justice system between baseline and follow-up. Table 10 also shows that while information regarding number of arrests is missing for several individuals, the majority of both YES! and CCS participants maintained zero arrests between baseline and follow-up in the past six months and in the past 30 days.

Table 10: Changes in Involvement in the Criminal Justice System between Baseline and Follow-Up (Through September 30, 2017)			
	YES! Participants (N = 25)	CCS Participants (N = 259)	TOTAL Participants (N = 284)
Changes in Involvement in the Criminal Justice System in the Last Six-Months			
Maintained Level of Involvement	76%	77%	77%
Maintained No Involvement	60%	53%	54%
Maintained Level Involvement	16	24	23
Decreased Level of Involvement	8%	5%	5%
Decreased from Any Involvement to No Involvement	8%	5%	5%
Increased Level of Involvement	12%	4%	5%
Increased from No Involvement to Any Involvement	12%	4%	5%
Unknown/Missing	4%	14%	13%
Number of Arrests in Last 30 Days			
Maintained Zero Arrests in Last 30 Days	44%	85%	81%*
Maintained One or More Arrests in the Last 30 Days	0	2	2
Increased from Zero to One or More Arrest in the Last 30 Days	0	3	3
Decreased from One or More Arrests to Zero Arrests in the Last 30 Days	4	3	3
Unknown/Missing	52	7	11
Number of Arrests in Last Six Months			
Maintained Zero Arrests in Last Six Months	36%	71%	68%*
Maintained More than One Arrest in the Last Six Months	4	7	6
Increased from Zero to One or More Arrests in the Last Six Months	4	5	5
Increased from Fewer Arrests for Many Arrests in the Last Six Months (for those not starting at zero)	0	2	2
Decreased from One or More Arrests to Zero	4	8	7

Table 10: Changes in Involvement in the Criminal Justice System between Baseline and Follow-Up (Through September 30, 2017)			
	YES! Participants (N = 25)	CCS Participants (N = 259)	TOTAL Participants (N = 284)
Arrests in the Last Six Months			
Decreased from Many Arrests to Fewer Arrests in the Last Six Months (for those not going to zero)	0	<1	<1
Unknown/Missing	52	7	11
<i>*Difference significant at p<.05 or better (more than 95% confident that the difference did not occur due to chance).</i>			

<p>Summary of the Participants Included in the Functional Screen Analysis <i>Summary Includes All Data Received by UWPHI through September 30, 2017</i></p>

Information from the Functional Screen Data System is included in the analysis below. UWPHI staff collaborate with DHS staff to match YES! participants to the Adult Functional Screen on an annual basis. CCS participants included in the Functional Screen analysis based upon the criteria outlined in the Introduction section of this report.

A total of 21 YES! participants and 168 CCS participants from the Functional Screen Data System are included in this report, creating a total of 189 participants included in this analysis. Each participant included from the Functional Screen Data System has a baseline interview and a follow-up interview conducted approximately one year later. The Functional Screen data system also includes diagnostic data from the baseline interview for each participant.

Description of the Participants in the Functional Screen Data Analysis

Table 11 summarizes the baseline demographic characteristics for all participants admitted to YES! and CCS between April 1, 2015 and September 30, 2017. Overall, all of the YES! participants and the vast majority of the CCS participants included in this analysis were 18 years old or older. Slightly over half of participants admitted to YES! (57%) and CCS (51%) were females, and the majority of participants were white and not Hispanic. CCS had significantly more Black or African American participants involved in services (20%), compared with YES!. Finally, participants admitted to YES! were significantly younger.

Table 11: Summary Admission Demographic Characteristics for Participants Admitted to YES! and CCS through September 30, 2017			
	YES! Participants (N = 21)	CCS Participants (N = 168)	TOTAL Participants (N = 189)
Age at Functional Screen Baseline			
16	0%	1%	1%*
17	0	5	4
18	33	16	17
19	14	15	15
20	14	11	12
21	29	7	9
22	0	12	11
23	5	11	11
24	0	11	10
25	5	11	10
Average Age at Admission	19.9 years	21.0 years	20.9 years*
Gender			
Female	57%	51%	52%
Male	43	49	48
Race (Select All that Apply)			
White	100%	77%	79%*
Black or African American	0%	20%	18%*
American Indian or Alaska Native	0%	3%	3%
Asian or Pacific Islander	0%	2%	2%
Hispanic/Latino	5%	6%	6%
<i>*Difference significant at p<.05 or better (more than 95% confident that the difference did not occur due to chance). Note: Children's Functional Screen data was not included in this analysis.</i>			

Summary of Participant Admission Characteristics

Table 12 shows that the vast majority of YES! participants (81%) and CCS participants (80%) were living in someone else's home or apartment or were living in a house or apartment that they owned/rented at admission. The majority of YES! (100%) and CCS (92%) participants were not currently experiencing homelessness at the time of admission, nor had they experienced homelessness within the past year. Similarly, both YES! and CCS participants largely did not experience housing instability within the last year, with 19% in each population indicating housing instability. At baseline, most participants from both YES! (95%) and CCS (78%) indicated that living in their own owned/rented home was their preferred living arrangement.

As expected, all YES! participants resided in either Jefferson or Outagamie County. CCS participants were located throughout Wisconsin, with the largest numbers from Milwaukee

County (14%), Marathon County (11%), and La Crosse County (8%). At admission, 52% of YES! participants were unemployed, compared to 73% of CCS participants.

Table 12: Summary of Participant Characteristics for YES! and CCS Participants Admitted through September 30, 2017			
	YES! Participants (N = 21)	CCS Participants (N = 168)	TOTAL Participants (N = 189)
Living Situation at Admission			
Someone Else's Home or Apartment	48%	42%	43%
Own Home or Apartment (Alone or with Someone)	33	38	37
No Permanent Residence (Is Homeless, In a Shelter, or Temporarily in a Motel or with Friends)	0	8	7
Group Home (Community-Based Residential Facility, Child Caring Institution)	0	5	5
Adult Family Home	5	2	3
Transitional Housing – Mental Health, AODA, or Corrections System	9	1	2
Mental Health Institute/State Psychiatric Institution	0	1	<1
Other	5	3	3
Experienced Homelessness within Past Year			
Yes	19%	19%	19%
No	81	81	81
Currently Homeless			
Yes	0%	8%	7%
No	100	92	93
Housing Instability within the Past 12 Months			
No	81%	81%	81%
Yes	19	19	19
Preferred Living Situation at Admission			
Own Home or Apartment (Alone or With Someone)	95%	78%	80%
Someone Else's Home or Apartment	0	19	17
Adult Family Home	5	1	1
Residential Care Apartment Complex or Other Supported Apartment Program	0	1	1
No Permanent Residence (Is Homeless, In a Shelter, or Temporarily in a Motel with Friends)	0	1	1
Unable to Determine Person's Preference for Living Arrangement	0	<1	<1

Table 12: Summary of Participant Characteristics for YES! and CCS Participants Admitted through September 30, 2017

	YES! Participants (N = 21)	CCS Participants (N = 168)	TOTAL Participants (N = 189)
Responsibility County at Admission			
Adams County	0%	1%	1%*
Ashland County	0	2	2
Bayfield County	0	2	2
Brown County	0	2	2
Calumet County	0	1	1
Chippewa County	0	2	2
Crawford County	0	1	1
Dodge County	0	2	2
Door County	0	1	1
Dunn County	0	1	1
Eau Claire County	0	1	1
Fond du Lac County	0	1	1
Forest County	0	1	1
Green County	0	1	1
Green Lake County	0	1	1
Jackson County	0	2	2
Jefferson County	62	0	7
Juneau County	0	1	1
Kenosha County	0	7	6
Kewaunee County	0	2	2
La Crosse County	0	8	7
Lafayette County	0	<1	<1
Lincoln County	0	1	1
Manitowoc County	0	<1	<1
Marathon County	0	11	9
Marinette County	0	1	1
Milwaukee County	0	14	12
Monroe County	0	2	1
Oneida County	0	2	1
Outagamie County	38	0	4
Ozaukee County	0	<1	<1
Pierce County	0	<1	<1
Polk County	0	<1	<1
Racine County	0	2	2
Richland County	0	<1	<1
Rock County	0	4	4
Rusk County	0	<1	<1
St. Croix County	0	<1	<1
Sauk County	0	2	1
Shawano County	0	<1	<1
Sheboygan County	0	1	1
Taylor County	0	<1	<1

	YES! Participants (N = 21)	CCS Participants (N = 168)	TOTAL Participants (N = 189)
Walworth County	0	3	3
Washington County	0	2	2
Waukesha County	0	4	4
Winnebago County	0	<1	<1
Wood County	0	6	5
Lac du Flambeau Reservation	0	<1	<1
Employment at Admission			
Full-Time Competitive Employment (35 or more hours/week)	5%	2%	3%
Part-Time Competitive Employment (Less than 35 hours/week)	33	20	21
Sheltered Workshop, Pre-Voc.	0	2	1
Unpaid Work: Homemaker, Caregiver, Volunteer, Student	10	3	4
Not Employed	52	73	71
<i>*Difference significant at p<.05 or better (more than 95% confident that the difference did not occur due to chance).</i>			

Referral Source Information

Table 13 summarizes the referral sources for the YES! and CCS participants admitted during the YES! implementation period. Table 13 reveals that YES! and CCS participants are referred through a variety of sources. A higher percentage of YES! participants (43%) were self-referred, and a higher number of CCS participants (27%) were referred through a physician or clinic, although these differences were not statistically significant.

	YES! Participants (N = 21)	CCS Participants (N = 168)	TOTAL Participants (N = 189)
Referral Source			
Self	43%	29%	31%
Family/Significant Other	14	12	12
Friend/Neighbor/Advocate	10	10	10
Physician/Clinic	14	27	25
Hospital Discharge Staff	0	1	1
Other	19	21	21

Mental Health and AODA Diagnosis Information

Table 14 summarizes active mental health and AODA diagnoses for 21 YES! and 168 CCS participants at the time that the initial Functional Screen was completed. Note that the current diagnoses from the Functional Screen include a duplicated count as more than one diagnosis could be selected. Only diagnosis categories that included one or more participants are included in this table. Other diagnoses, such as physical health diagnoses, were not included in this analysis due to small numbers and the focus of the YES! grant on behavioral health diagnoses.

Table 14: Active Mental Health and AODA Diagnosis Information from the Functional Screen			
	YES! Participants (N = 21)	CCS Participants (N = 168)	TOTAL Participants (N = 189)
No Current Diagnoses	0%	0%	0%
Adjustment Disorders			
Adjustment Disorder (with anxiety, depressions, disturbance of emotions, or conduct and NOS)	14%	1%	3%*
Anxiety Disorders			
Anxiety Disorder NOS	10%	16%	15%
Generalized Anxiety Disorder	5%	9%	9%
Obsessive Compulsive Disorder	0%	3%	3%
Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder	24%	22%	22%
Social Phobia	5%	3%	3%
Eating Disorders			
Eating Disorders NOS	5%	0%	1%
Impulse-Control Disorders			
Intermittent Explosive Disorder	5%	2%	3%
Impulse-Control Disorder NOS	5%	1%	1%
Mood Disorders			
Bipolar Disorder	14%	22%	21%
Depressive Disorder NOS	5%	11%	11%
Dysthymic Disorder	10%	1%	2%
Major Depressive Disorder – Recurrent	5%	22%	20%*
Major Depressive Disorder – Single Episode	10%	3%	4%
Mood Disorder NOS	33%	11%	13%*
Personality Disorders			
Antisocial Personality Disorder	0%	1%	1%
Borderline Personality Disorder	14%	9%	10%
Dependent Personality Disorder	0%	1%	1%
Personality Disorder NOS	5%	2%	3%

Table 14: Active Mental Health and AODA Diagnosis Information from the Functional Screen			
	YES! Participants (N = 21)	CCS Participants (N = 168)	TOTAL Participants (N = 189)
Schizophrenia and Other Psychotic Disorders			
Delusional Disorder	0%	2%	2%
Psychotic Disorder NOS	5%	8%	8%
Schizoaffective Disorder	0%	11%	10%
Schizoid Personality	0%	1%	1%
Schizophrenia	0%	11%	10%
Schizophreniform Disorder	0%	2%	2%
Somatoform Disorders			
Conversion Disorder	0%	1%	1%
Somatization Disorder	0%	1%	1%
Substance-Related Disorders			
Alcohol Abuse	5%	3%	3%
Alcohol Dependence	0%	1%	1%
Amphetamine Dependence	0%	1%	1%
Cannabis Abuse	10%	11%	11%
Cannabis Dependence	0%	3%	3%
Cocaine Abuse	0%	1%	1%
Hallucinogen Abuse	0%	1%	1%
Nicotine Dependence	0%	2%	2%
Opioid Dependence	0%	1%	1%
Polysubstance Dependence	5%	2%	3%
Other Substance Abuse (Specify - Polysubstance Abuse NOS)	0%	1%	1%
Other Substance Disorder	0%	3%	3%
Developmental Disability			
Autism	24%	7%	9%*
Mental Retardation	5%	2%	3%
<i>*Difference significant at p<.05 or better (more than 95% confident that the difference did not occur due to chance).</i>			

Crisis and Situational Factors at Admission

Table 15 summarizes the crisis and situational risk factors that were identified at the time that the initial Functional Screen was completed. This information is presented overall by factor, and then is further broken down by summarizing the information for each of the factors in the past year. For example, overall, 52% of YES! participants reported psychiatric inpatient stays (voluntary or involuntary), and 64% of those participants reported psychiatric inpatient stays within the last year. Of those YES! participants who reported psychiatric inpatient stays in the past year, 86% reported psychiatric inpatient stays 1-3

times in the past year and 14% reported stays as occurring four or more times in the past year.

The largest number of participants (76% of YES! and 75% of CCS) reported using emergency rooms, crisis intervention, or detox units within the past year. The majority of YES! (67%) and CCS (54%) participants reported zero suicide attempts at baseline. About one-third of YES! participants and just below half of CCS participants reported at least one Chapter 51 emergency detention, with the majority of those (57% for YES! and 77% for CCS) experiencing a Chapter 51 detention within the past year. Suicidal ideation with a feasible plan within the two months prior to admission was fairly low, with 14% of YES! participants and 21% of CCS participants falling into this category.

Table 15: Crisis and Situational Factors Information from the Functional Screen			
	YES! Participants (N = 21)	CCS Participants (N = 168)	TOTAL Participants (N = 189)
Use of Emergency Rooms, Crisis Intervention, or Detox Units			
Unknown	5%	2%	3%
No	19	23	22
Yes	76	75	75
If Yes, number within the past year	69%	85%	83%
If within the past year, number of times:	(N = 11)	(N = 107)	(N = 118)
1-3 times	82%	72%	73%
4 or more times	18	28	27
Psychiatric Inpatient Stays			
Unknown	5%	3%	3%
No	43	33	34
Yes	52	64	63
If Yes, number within the past year	64%	82%	81%
If within the past year, number of times:	(N = 7)	(N = 89)	(N = 96)
1-3 times	86%	88%	88%
4 or more times	14	12	12
Chapter 51 Emergency Detention(s)			
Unknown	5%	2%	2%
No	62	55	56
Yes	33	43	42
If Yes, number within the past year	57%	77%	75%

Table 15: Crisis and Situational Factors Information from the Functional Screen			
	YES! Participants (N = 21)	CCS Participants (N = 168)	TOTAL Participants (N = 189)
If within the past year, number of times:	(N = 4)	(N = 56)	(N = 60)
1-3 times	100%	96%	97%
4 or more times	0	4	3
Suicide Attempts			
Unknown	0%	2%	2%
No	67	54	55
Yes	33	44	43
If yes, number within the past year	57%	73%	72%
If within the past year, number of times:	(N = 4)	(N = 55)	(N = 59)
1-3 times	100%	76%	78%
4 or more times	0	24	22
Percent of Participants who have had suicidal ideation with a feasible plan within the past two months	14%	21%	20%

Risk Factors at Admission

Table 16 shows several risk factors from the initial Functional Screen, including treatment severity, self-injury, aggression, correctional system involvement, and substance abuse. This information is presented overall by factor, and then is further broken down by summarizing the information for each of the factors in the past year. The majority (57%) of YES! participants were indicated as having a high intensity of treatment or functional severity, defined as “consistent and extensive efforts to treat this person for at least a year, or person has had a serious sudden onset of dysfunction requiring services beyond basic outpatient services, *and* the person is dangerous to self and others”. Just below half (41%) of CCS participants met this standard.

Table 16 also reveals that the majority of YES! participants (67%) and just below half of CCS participants (48%) displayed self-injurious behaviors at baseline. A little over one-third of YES! participants (38%) displayed physical aggression at baseline, compared to half of CCS participants (50%). Relatively small percentages of both YES! and CCS participants reported involvement with the corrections system or substance use.

Table 16: Selected Risk Factors at Admission from the Functional Screen			
	YES! Participants (N = 21)	CCS Participants (N = 168)	TOTAL Participants (N = 189)
Intensity of Treatment or Functional Severity – “Consistent and extensive efforts to treat this person for at least a year, or person has had a serious sudden onset of dysfunction requiring services beyond basis outpatient services, and the person is dangerous to self and others.”			
No	43%	59%	57%
Yes	57	41	43
Self-Injurious Behaviors			
Unknown	0%	3%	3%
No	33	49	47
Yes	67	48	50
If Yes, percent within the past year	71%	82%	80%
Physical Aggression			
Unknown	0%	1%	1%
No	62	49	50
Yes	38	50	49
If Yes, percent within the past year	63%	75%	74%
If within the past year, number of times:	(N = 5)	(N = 64)	(N = 69)
1-3 times	80%	72%	73%
4 or more times	20	28	27
Involvement with the Corrections System			
Unknown	5%	1%	2%
No	71	64	65
Yes	24	35	33
If yes, number within the past year	40%	75%	72%
If within the past year, number of times:	(N = 2)	(N = 44)	(N = 46)
1-3 times	100%	91%	91%
4 or more times	0	9	9
Used Alcohol or Drugs Weekly			
In the Last 30 Days	24%	1%	15%
Not in the Last 30 Days, but in the Last Year	19%	20%	20%

Length of Involvement in Services

The following information summarizes the length of involvement in services for YES! and CCS participants, which is defined as the time between the date the Functional Screen baseline interview was conducted through September 30, 2017. The Functional Screen does not provide a notification of whether participants have discharged from services; thus, we list here the length of time in services between the initial Functional Screen date and September 30, 2017. Information related to the length of involvement in services is included for 21 YES! and 168 CCS participants.

Table 17 includes a summary of the length of time between the baseline screen completion date and September 30, 2017. This number is presented in days and the number of months is included in parentheses after the description of days. This analysis reveals that 100% of YES! participants and 94% of CCS participants appeared to be in services for one year or longer.

Table 17: Length of Involvement Since Initial Functional Screen (Time between Functional Screen and 9/30/17) (Through September 30, 2017)			
	YES! Participants (N = 21)	CCS Participants (N = 168)	TOTAL Participants (N = 189)
6-9 months (181-270 days)	0%	2%	2%
9-12 months (271-365 days)	0	4	3
12 months or more (≥ 366 days)	100	94	95
Average Length of Stay	641.2 days (20.6 months)	628.8 days (20.2 months)	630.2 days (20.2 months)
<i>Note: This analysis includes only participants who had both a baseline screen and a one-year screen entered in the Functional Screen Data System.</i>			

<p>Summary of Outcomes for Participants included in the Functional Screen Data Analysis <i>Summary Includes All Data Received by UWPHI Through September 30, 2017</i></p>

Changes in Mental Health Status and Level of Need

Table 18 below presents changes in mental health status and level of participant need for the 189 participants from YES! and CCS between their Functional Screen baseline interview and their one-year follow-up interview. These changes between baseline and follow-up are included for the 21 YES! participants and the 168 CCS participants who participated in services during the YES! implementation period through September 30, 2017. Changes are

calculated by comparing each participant’s status recorded at their baseline Functional Screen to the Functional Screen conducted approximately one year later.

Table 18 includes changes in the intensity of treatment/functional severity, self-injurious behavior, suicide attempts, suicidal ideation, physical aggression, Chapter 51 detentions, emergency room use, psychiatric inpatient stays, and substance use outcomes. Within most of these measures, the largest percentages of participants in both groups maintained the same level of the measure at baseline and at follow-up. One of the largest improvements was in substance use outcomes, with 10% of YES! participants and 9% of CCS participants reporting decreased level of risk. YES! participants showed an 8% decrease in self-injurious behavior and CCS participants showed a 5% decrease. None (0%) of the YES! participants increased self-injurious behavior, compared to 5% of CCS participants. Suicidal ideation was reduced for 5% of YES! participants and 10% of CCS participants. A larger percentage of YES! participants increased in the categories of suicide attempts, physical aggression, and emergency room use between baseline and follow-up, however, these differences were not statistically significant. Note that missing data was removed for several sections in Table 18 to avoid skewing the results.

Table 18: Changes in Mental Health and Substance Use Status and Level of Participant Need (Through September 30, 2017)			
	YES! Participants (N = 21)	CCS Participants (N = 168)	TOTAL Participants (N = 189)
Changes in Intensity of Treatment or Functional Severity – “Consistent and extensive efforts to treat this person for at least a year, or person has had a serious sudden onset of dysfunction requiring services beyond basis outpatient services, and the person is dangerous to self and others.”			
Maintained “No” at Baseline and Follow-Up	33%	56%	54%
Maintained “Yes” at Baseline and Follow-Up	52	33	35
Changed from “No” at Baseline to “Yes” at Follow-Up (Increased/Worsened)	10	3	4
Changed from “Yes” at Baseline to “No” at Follow-Up (Lessened/Improved)	5	8	7
Changes in Self-Injurious Behavior (in the Past Year)	(N=13)	(N=124)	(N=137)
Maintained No Self-Injurious Behavior in the Past Year at Baseline and Follow-Up	54%	61%	61%
Maintained Level of Self-Injurious Behavior in the Past Year at Baseline and Follow-Up	38	29	30
Decreased Level of Self-Injurious Behavior in the Past Year between Baseline and Follow-Up	8	5	5
Increased Level of Self-Injurious Behavior in the Past Year between Baseline and Follow-Up	0	5	4

Table 18: Changes in Mental Health and Substance Use Status and Level of Participant Need (Through September 30, 2017)			
	YES! Participants (N = 21)	CCS Participants (N = 168)	TOTAL Participants (N = 189)
Changes in Suicide Attempts (in the Past Year)	(N=15)	(N=116)	(N=131)
Maintained No Suicide Attempts in the Past Year at Baseline and Follow-Up	73%	72%	72%
Maintained Level of Suicide Attempts in the Past Year at Baseline and Follow-Up	14	20	19
Decreased Level of Suicide Attempts in the Past Year between Baseline and Follow-Up	0	5	4
Increased Level of Suicide Attempts in the Past Year between Baseline and Follow-Up	13	3	5
Changes in Suicidal Ideation			
Maintained No Suicidal Ideation in the Past Year at Baseline and Follow-Up	86%	78%	79%
Maintained Level of Suicidal Ideation the Past Year at Baseline and Follow-Up	9	11	11
Decreased Level of Suicidal Ideation in the Past Year between Baseline and Follow-Up	5	10	9
Increased Level of Suicidal Ideation in the Past Year between Baseline and Follow-Up	0	1	1
Changes in Physical Aggression (in the Past Year)	(N=17)	(N=124)	(N=141)
Maintained No Physical Aggression in the Past Year at Baseline and Follow-Up	70%	62%	63%
Maintained Level of Physical Aggression the Past Year at Baseline and Follow-Up	18	22	22
Decreased Level of Physical Aggression in the Past Year between Baseline and Follow-Up	0	10	9
Increased Level of Physical Aggression in the Past Year between Baseline and Follow-Up	12	6	6
Changes in Chapter 51 Emergency Detentions (ED) (in the Past Year)	(N=15)	(N=121)	(N=136)
Maintained Zero Chapter 51 ED in the Past Year at Baseline and Follow-Up	87%	69%	71%
Maintained Number of Chapter 51 ED in the Past Year at Baseline and Follow-Up	13	24	23
Decreased Number of Chapter 51 ED in the Past Year between Baseline and Follow-Up	0	3	2
Increased Number of Chapter 51 ED in the Past Year between Baseline and Follow-Up	0	4	4

Table 18: Changes in Mental Health and Substance Use Status and Level of Participant Need (Through September 30, 2017)			
	YES! Participants (N = 21)	CCS Participants (N = 168)	TOTAL Participants (N = 189)
Changes in Emergency Room (ER) Use (in the Past Year)	(N=11)	(N=121)	(N=132)
Maintained Zero ER Visits in the Past Year at Baseline and Follow-Up	27%	26%	26%
Maintained Number of ER Visits in the Past Year at Baseline and Follow-Up	55	51	51
Decreased Number of ER Visits in the Past Year between Baseline and Follow-Up	0	15	14
Increased Number of ER Visits in the Past Year Between Baseline and Follow-Up	18	8	9
Changes in Psychiatric Inpatient Stays (in the Past Year)	(N=13)	(N=112)	(N=125)
Maintained Zero Psychiatric Inpatient Stays in the Past Year at Baseline and Follow-Up	69%	46%	48%
Maintained Number of Psychiatric Inpatient Stays in the Past Year at Baseline and Follow-Up	23	38	37
Decreased Number of Psychiatric Inpatient Stays in the Past Year between Baseline and Follow-Up	8	10	10
Increased Number of Psychiatric Inpatient Stays in the Past Year between Baseline and Follow-Up	0	6	5
Changes in Substance Use Outcomes			
Maintained Level of Risk	80%	81%	81%
Maintained No or Low Risk	47%	55%	54%
Maintained Level of Risk	14	8	9
Maintained Experiencing Negative Consequences	19	18	18
Decreased Level of Risk	10%	9%	9%
Changed from Risk to No Risk	5%	1%	1%
Changed from Experiencing Negative Consequences to Risks	5	4	4
Changed from Experiencing Negative Consequences to No or Low Risk	0	4	4
Increased Level of Risk	10%	10%	10%
Changed from No Risk to Increased Level of Risk	5%	5%	4%
Changed from No Risk to Experiencing Negative Consequences	5	2	3
Changed from Risk to Experiencing Negative Consequences	0	3	3

Changes in Living Situation

Table 19 below shows changes in living situation, homelessness, and housing stability from the Functional Screen between baseline and one-year follow-up for YES! and CCS participants. Table 19 reveals that the majority of YES! and CCS participants (61% each) maintained their living situation throughout the course of involvement in services. All YES! participants indicated no current homelessness at baseline and follow-up, compared to 91% of CCS participants, although this was not a statistically significant difference. A greater percentage of YES! participants decreased their homelessness levels within the year prior to the follow-up interview (19%) than CCS participants (8%), although this difference was not statistically significant.

Table 19 also reveals that 90% of YES! participants maintained or achieved stable housing, compared to 87% of CCS participants. Significantly more CCS participants (64%) than YES! participants (38%) achieved living in their preferred living situation by their one-year follow-up interview.

Table 19: Changes in Living Situation from the Functional Screen Data Analysis (Through September 30, 2017)			
	YES! Participants (N = 21)	CCS Participants (N = 168)	TOTAL Participants (N = 189)
Changes in Living Situation			
Maintained Living Situation	61%	61%	61%
Maintained Living in Someone Else's Home or Apartment	28%	26%	27%
Maintained Living in Own Home or Apartment (Alone or with Someone)	28	30	30
Maintained No Permanent Residence (Is Homeless, In a Shelter, or Temporarily in a Motel or with Friends)	0	2	2
Maintained Living in a Group Home (Community-Based Residential Facility, Child Caring Institution)	0	2	2
Maintained Living in an Adult Family Home	5	<1	1
Changed Living Situation	34%	38%	38%
Changed from Someone Else's Home or Apartment to Transitional Housing	5%	0%	1%
Changed from Someone Else's Home or Apartment to "Other"	5	0	1
Changed from Own Home or Apartment to Someone Else's Home or Apartment	4	5	5
Changed from Transitional Housing to Group Home	5	0	<1
Changed from Someone Else's Home or Apartment to Group Home	5	4	4
Changed from Someone Else's Home or	5	10	9

Table 19: Changes in Living Situation from the Functional Screen Data Analysis (Through September 30, 2017)			
	YES! Participants (N = 21)	CCS Participants (N = 168)	TOTAL Participants (N = 189)
Apartment to Own Home or Apartment			
Changed from Transitional Housing to Someone Else's Home or Apartment	5	0	<1
Changed from Own Home or Apartment to "Other"	0	1	1
Changed from No Permanent Residence to Group Home	0	1	1
Changed from No Permanent Residence to Own Home or Apartment	0	3	3
Changed from Adult Family Home to "Other"	0	<1	<1
Changed from "Other" to Adult Family Home	0	<1	<1
Changed from No Permanent Residence to Someone Else's Home	0	1	1
Changed from Group Home to Own Home or Apartment	0	1	1
Changed from Group Home to Mental Health Institute	0	<1	<1
Changed from Own Home or Apartment to No Permanent Residence	0	<1	<1
Changed from Adult Family Home to Own Home or Apartment	0	1	1
Changed from "Other" to Group Home	0	1	1
Changed from Mental Health Institute to "Other"	0	<1	<1
Changed from Someone Else's Home to Adult Family Home	0	<1	<1
Changed from Group Home to Residential Care Apartment Complex	0	<1	<1
Changed from "Other" to Own Home or Apartment	0	1	1
Changed from Someone Else's Home or Apartment to No Permanent Residence	0	<1	<1
Changed from "Other" to Someone Else's Home or Apartment	0	<1	<1
Changed from Someone Else's Home or Apartment to Residential Care Apartment Complex	0	1	1
Changed from Group Home to Someone Else's Home or Apartment	0	2	2
Changed from Own Home or Apartment to Group Home	0	1	1
Changed from Transitional Housing to Own Home or Apartment	0	1	1
Unknown/Missing	5%	1%	1%

Table 19: Changes in Living Situation from the Functional Screen Data Analysis (Through September 30, 2017)			
	YES! Participants (N = 21)	CCS Participants (N = 168)	TOTAL Participants (N = 189)
Changes in Current Homelessness			
Not Currently Homeless at Baseline and Follow-Up	100%	91%	92%
Currently Homeless at Baseline and Follow-Up	0	2	2
Not Currently Homeless at Baseline, but Homeless at Follow-Up	0	1	1
Currently Homeless at Baseline, but not Currently Homeless at Follow-Up	0	6	5
Changes in Homelessness in the Past Year			
Not Homeless in Past Year at Baseline or Follow-Up	76%	82%	82%
Homeless Less than Half the Year at Baseline and Follow-Up	0	1	1
Homeless More than Half the Year at Baseline and Follow-Up	0	2	2
Increased Homelessness	5	7	7
Decreased Homelessness	19	8	8
Changes in Housing Stability (in the Past Year)			
Maintained Housing Stability in the Past Year at Baseline and at Follow-Up	76%	77%	77%
Maintained Unstable Housing in the Past Year at Baseline and at Follow-Up	5	9	9
Housing was Unstable at in the Past Year at Baseline, but was Stable in the Past Year at Follow-Up	14	10	10
Housing was Stable in the Past Year at Baseline, but was Unstable in the Past Year at Follow-Up	5	4	4
Participant Achieved Preferred Living Situation			
Participant Achieved the Preferred Living Situation that was Selected at Baseline	38%	64%	61%*
Participant Did Not Achieve the Preferred Living Situation that was Selected at Baseline	57	36	38
Missing/Unknown	5	0	1
<i>*Difference significant at $p < .05$ or better (more than 95% confident that the difference did not occur due to chance).</i>			

Changes in Employment Status and Employment Needs

Table 20 below presents changes in participant employment status and needs from the Functional Screen between baseline and one-year follow-up interview. The table shows that more YES! participants (29%) improved their employment status during involvement in services than CCS participants (13%), although a greater percentage of YES! participants than CCS participants also decreased their employment status during that time, though these differences were not statistically significant. Also, 19% of YES! participants increased from unemployment to either part-time or full-time employment, compared to 11% of CCS participants.

A significantly greater percentage of YES! participants (38%) also maintained independence to work, compared to 10% of CCS participants. The largest percentage of participants in both populations maintained a need for assistance with finding employment and demonstrated an interest in having a job or a new job. Significantly more YES! participants maintained independence in finding employment, as compared to CCS participants. As a note, missing information was removed from the Assistance with Finding a Job section to avoid skewing the results.

	YES! Participants (N = 21)	CCS Participants (N = 168)	TOTAL Participants (N = 189)
Changes in Employment Status			
Maintained Employment Status	52%	77%	74%
Maintained Unemployment	42%	64%	61%
Maintained Sheltered Employment	0	1	1
Maintained Part-Time Employment	10	10	10
Maintained Full-Time Employment	0	2	2
Improved Employment Status	29%	13%	15%
Increased from Sheltered Employment to Competitive Part-Time Employment	0%	0%	0%
Increased from Unemployment to Part-Time Employment	14	8	9
Increased from Unemployment to Full-Time Employment	5	3	3
Increased from Part-Time Employment to Full-Time Employment	10	2	3
Decreased Employment Status	19%	10%	11%
Decreased from Sheltered Employment to Unemployment	0%	1%	1%
Decreased from Part-Time Employment to Unemployment	14	8	8
Decreased from Full-Time Employment to Unemployment	5	0	1

Table 20: Changes in Employment Status and Employment Needs (Through September 30, 2017)			
	YES! Participants (N = 21)	CCS Participants (N = 168)	TOTAL Participants (N = 189)
Decreased from Full-Time Employment to Part-Time Employment	0	1	1
Changes in Employment Interest			
Maintained No Interest in Having a Job	14%	17%	17%
Maintained Interest in Having a Job	47	55	54
Maintained Interest in Having a New Job	5	6	6
Changed from No Interest to Interest in Having a Job	14	8	9
Changed from Interest to No Interest in Having a Job	10	10	10
Changed from Interest to Interest in Having a New Job	5	1	2
Changed from Interest in a New job to Interest in Having a Job	0	1	<1
Changed from Wanting to Work but Afraid of Losing Benefits to Interest in Having a Job	0	1	<1
Changed from Wanting to Work but Afraid of Losing Benefits to No Interest in Having a Job	0	1	<1
Changed from Interest in Having a Job to Wanting to Work but Afraid of Losing Benefits	5	0	1
Changes in Assistance to Find/Apply for Work			
Maintained Independence	35%	7%	10%*
Maintained Need for Assistance	59	82	79
Changed from Needing Assistance to Independent	6	7	7
Changed from Independent to Needing Assistance	0	4	4
Changes in Assistance to Work			
Maintained Independence	38%	10%	13%*
Maintained Need for Assistance	38	53	52
Changed from Needing Assistance to Independent	5	5	5
Changed from Independent to Needing Assistance	5	3	3
Changed to a Lower Level of Need for Assistance	5	6	6
Changed to a Higher Level of Need for Assistance	0	3	3
NA/Missing	9	20	18
<i>*Difference significant at p<.05 or better (more than 95% confident that the difference did not occur due to chance).</i>			

Changes in Criminal Justice System Involvement

Table 21 presents criminal justice involvement information from the Functional Screen Data System. The Functional Screen measures criminal justice system involvement in the twelve months prior to the screen completion. The analyses included in Table 21 reveal that the majority of both YES! and CCS participants maintained no level of involvement in the criminal justice system during the past year prior to the baseline and follow-up screens.

Table 21: Changes in Involvement in the Criminal Justice System between Baseline and Follow-Up (Through September 30, 2017)			
	YES! Participants (N = 21)	CCS Participants (N = 168)	TOTAL Participants (N = 189)
Changes in Involvement in the Criminal Justice System in the Last Year			
Maintained Level of Involvement	77%	73%	73%
Maintained No Involvement	67%	59%	59%
Maintained Level Involvement	10	14	14
Decreased Level of Involvement	0%	3%	3%
Decreased from Any Involvement to No Involvement	0%	2%	2%
Decreased Number of Times of Involvement	0	1	1
Increased Level of Involvement	5%	5%	5%
Increased from No Involvement to Any Involvement	5%	4%	4%
Increased Number of Times of Involvement	0	1	1
Unknown/Missing	18%	19%	19%

Changes in Community Living Skills

Table 22 below shows changes in community living skills and level of participant need during the past six months between baseline and one-year follow-up.

The majority of both YES! and CCS participants maintained independence in managing hygiene and basic safety. The majority of participants in both groups also maintained independence in managing home hazards. Most participants maintained requiring assistance for managing finances and psychiatric symptoms.

YES! participants maintained a significantly higher level of independence in monitoring medication effects and utilizing social skills, and showed larger, though not significant, improvement levels than CCS participants in general health maintenance, taking medication, managing psychiatric symptoms, managing benefits, managing money, managing home hazards, and maintaining general health. CCS participants showed greater improvement

than YES! participants in basic safety, utilizing social skills, and independently driving, however these differences were not statistically significant.

Table 22: Changes in Community Living Skills and Level of Participant Need in the Past Six Months (Through September 30, 2017)			
	YES! Participants (N = 21)	CCS Participants (N = 168)	TOTAL Participants (N = 189)
Changes in Benefits/Resource Management			
Maintained “No” at Baseline and Follow-Up	5%	4%	4%
Maintained “Yes” at Baseline and Follow-Up	86	83	83
Changed from “No” at Baseline to “Yes” at Follow-Up (Increased/worsened)	0	7	6
Changed from “Yes” at Baseline to “No” at Follow-Up (Lessened/Improved)	9	6	7
Changes in Money Management			
Maintained Independence	14%	11%	11%
Maintained Need for Assistance	52	67	66
Changed from Needing Assistance to Independent	10	7	7
Decreased Number of Times Needing Assistance	10	7	7
Increased Level of Assistance Needed	14	5	6
Changed from Independent to Needing Assistance	0	3	3
Changes in Home Hazards Management			
Maintained Independence	48%	52%	52%
Maintained Need for Assistance	33	26	27
Changed from Needing Assistance to Independent	5	11	10
Decreased Number of Times Needing Assistance	10	2	3
Changed from Independent to Needing Assistance	0	5	4
Increased Number of Times Needing Assistance	4	4	4
Changes in Hygiene and Grooming			
Maintained Independence	60%	59%	59%
Maintained Need for Assistance	10	26	24
Changed from Needing Assistance to Independent	10	4	5
Decreased Number of Times Needing Assistance	10	5	5
Changed from Independent to Needing Assistance	10	5	6
Increased Number of Times Needing Assistance	0	1	1
Changes in General Health Maintenance			
Maintained Independence	28%	28%	28%
Maintained Need for Assistance	33	47	46
Changed from Needing Assistance to Independent	10	7	7
Decreased Number of Times Needing Assistance	14	5	6
Changed from Independent to Needing Assistance	10	6	6
Increased Number of Times Needing Assistance	5	7	7

Table 22: Changes in Community Living Skills and Level of Participant Need in the Past Six Months (Through September 30, 2017)			
	YES! Participants (N = 21)	CCS Participants (N = 168)	TOTAL Participants (N = 189)
Changes in Managing Psychiatric Symptoms			
Maintained Independence	5%	4%	4%
Maintained Need for Assistance	57	74	72
Changed from Needing Assistance to Independent	5	2	2
Decreased Number of Times Needing Assistance	14	12	12
Changed from Independent to Needing Assistance	10	2	3
Increased Number of Times Needing Assistance	9	6	7
Changes in Taking Medications			
Maintained Independence	24%	13%	14%
Maintained Need for Assistance	29	51	49
Changed from Needing Assistance to Independent	0	7	6
Decreased Number of Times Needing Assistance	19	13	14
Changed from Independent to Needing Assistance	9	4	5
Increased Number of Times Needing Assistance	0	4	3
Unknown/Missing	19	8	9
Changes in Monitoring Medication Effects			
Maintained Independence	43%	23%	25%*
Maintained Need for Assistance	19	46	43
Changed from Needing Assistance to Independent	5	5	5
Decreased Number of Times Needing Assistance	14	6	7
Changed from Independent to Needing Assistance	0	8	7
Increased Number of Times Needing Assistance	0	4	4
NA/Unknown/Missing	19	8	9
Changes in Basic Safety			
Maintained Independence	86%	69%	71%
Maintained Need for Assistance	9	20	18
Changed from Needing Assistance to Independent	5	7	7
Changed from Independent to Needing Assistance	0	4	4
Changes in Social Skill Level			
Maintained Independence	43%	20%	23%*
Maintained Need for Assistance	33	64	60
Changed from Needing Assistance to Independent	10	11	11
Changed from Independent to Needing Assistance	14	5	6
Changes in Transportation			
Maintained Driving	19%	13%	14%
Maintained Driving with Safety Concerns	0	1	1
Maintained Inability to Drive	19	16	16

Table 22: Changes in Community Living Skills and Level of Participant Need in the Past Six Months (Through September 30, 2017)			
	YES! Participants (N = 21)	CCS Participants (N = 168)	TOTAL Participants (N = 189)
Maintained Not Driving for Other Reasons	52	55	55
Changed for Driving to Not Driving	5	6	6
Changed from Not Driving to Driving	5	9	8
<i>*Difference significant at $p < .05$ or better (more than 95% confident that the difference did not occur due to chance).</i>			