

CHAPTER VI. CHARACTERISTICS OF CLIENTS

The CalTOP study collected data from adult clients at multiple time points, including treatment admission, during treatment, and at discharge. In addition, the study included follow-up interviews with approximately 2,700 clients at 3 and 9 months post-admission and further 12-month post-admission outcome and cost-offset analyses using cross-system linkage with other social services databases (e.g., criminal justice, hospital, employment, social welfare). The purpose of this chapter is to describe the characteristics of clients who were a part of the CalTOP data collection at each data collection stage. Not only will this allow us to obtain a more complete picture of the characteristics of the CalTOP client sample, but by comparing the characteristics of the CalTOP clients with characteristics of the statewide client population, we will be able to infer how well CalTOP represents California's clients.

Methods

Selection of Participating Counties, Providers, and Clients

Thirteen counties were selected from the 19 that volunteered to participate in CalTOP using the following criteria: county demographics, client flow, automation readiness, familiarity with assessment tools, geographic location, and commitment to CalTOP. Once the counties were selected, the counties asked providers within their borders to volunteer, and providers were selected based upon the same criteria used at the county level. All sites were at least partly publicly funded. As the implementation start date approached, three of the counties and several provider sites decided not to participate, and were replaced with alternates. By April 2000, when data collection officially started, 44 treatment provider sites in 13 counties had committed to participating in CalTOP (See Appendix G for a list of participating provider sites).

Data collection started in April 2000 with a small set of providers and gradually increased in number as sites became proficient in implementing the program. As of May 31, 2002, 15,618 admissions representing 14,420 clients were recorded over the two-year period. Three-month and nine-month follow-up interviews were conducted with clients that were admitted during the first year (from the start of the study through May 2001).

Data Sources

Statewide CADDs

Statewide data on the treatment client population were extracted from the statewide CADDs database maintained by the California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs (ADP). CADDs was developed in response to data collection requirements contained in the federal Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988. CADDs also satisfies state requirements to collect information on the number and characteristics of clients who receive treatment services from publicly funded (state or federal) or state-licensed alcohol and drug programs.

Treatment programs submit CADDs data on a monthly basis. Client data are collected each time a client enrolls for services in a reporting facility. Initial admissions and any subsequent

transfers or changes in modality type are each recorded separately. CADDs covers the following ADP-funded alcohol and other drug (AOD) services: non-residential recovery or treatment, detoxification, recovery homes, residential treatment, outpatient drug free, day care, narcotic treatment, and hospitals. All licensed methadone providers are included, whether publicly or privately funded. Drinking driver and neighborhood recovery drop-in centers are not included (ADP, 2001). UCLA ISAP receives CADDs data from ADP on a regular basis. The statistics reported in this report are based upon unique clients (identified using a unique CADDs identification code assigned to each client), excluding codependents, non-adults (<18), and clients from alcohol-only treatment programs¹ or detoxification programs. Clients also must have been admitted from April 1, 2000 through May 31, 2002, paralleling the period in which first year CalTOP data was collected. The CADDs database used had last been updated in July 2002.

The CADDs data collection instrument is a one-page form that includes a number of questions regarding demographic and treatment-related characteristics of the client. Questions inquire about the client's race, ethnicity, employment status, legal status, and primary and secondary drug problems. Information on the type of treatment ("modality") clients received (e.g., outpatient day programs, residential treatment/recovery) and whether methadone was prescribed are also included.

Once collected, CADDs information can be recoded in order to quantify characteristics that are not directly measured. For example, treatment modalities are frequently classified differently by different data collection instruments, so in order to parallel measures collected by other means, the four non-detoxification treatment modalities recorded by CADDs were re-categorized into three modalities: outpatient drug free, residential, and narcotic treatment. Clients who were identified in CADDs as receiving outpatient treatment/recovery and were prescribed methadone were classified as narcotic treatment clients, as recommended by ADP (A. Smith, personal communication, 7/5/01). All other clients who were admitted to outpatient treatment/recovery or day program-intensive were classified as outpatient drug free clients. The two CADDs residential treatment categories (30 days or less, 31 days or more) were combined to form the single residential modality.

CalTOP Data

CalTOP data collection involved the completion of several standardized forms at admission, during treatment, at discharge from treatment, and at follow-up. At admission and discharge, data collection included questions from CADDs. Participating treatment provider staff were responsible for completing all data collection up through client discharge. In addition, ISAP researchers collected data through two follow-up participant interviews and by linking participant data with information maintained in other health and social service systems databases. This follow up data will be discussed in subsequent chapters. (A detailed description of the overall study design can be found in Chapter III.)

¹ Although alcohol-only treatment programs were not excluded by design, almost none of the CalTOP providers were alcohol-only programs.

Results

Inferential statistics were of limited use in examining the present data because of the very large sample sizes involved, particularly at the statewide level (N=161,611). Due to the large sample sizes, some small differences would likely be identified as statistically significant even if they were too small to be of any real practical significance. Therefore, discussion of differences will focus on those instances in which the characteristics of clients diverged by more than 5% of the total sample between groups (e.g., if 50% of statewide clients belong to category A but over 55% of CalTOP clients belong to category A). Furthermore, the large number of groups and characteristics being compared raises the study-wise likelihood of type I errors. That is, because of the large number of groups and characteristics that could be examined, the number of resulting comparisons raises the probability of “false positives”, or the probability that random differences would be mistakenly identified as significant. In order to reduce the number of comparisons to be examined, the discussion of results will focus primarily on differences between the five CalTOP groups and statewide client characteristics.

Clients and Admissions

It is possible to describe the CalTOP sample using either counts of unique clients or by using counts of total admissions (i.e. counting the same clients more than once if they admit for treatment more than once during the sampling period). However, the results using each method are ultimately nearly identical and therefore redundant. Side by side comparisons of characteristics derived from admissions and unique clients, based upon CADDs data, are shown in Attachment A. At the statewide level, opiates as a primary drug problem comprised approximately 7% more of the total sample when admissions are counted rather than unique clients, meaning that opiate users tend to re-admit often. This also means that narcotic treatment appears less common when counted by the client rather than by the admission (and therefore other modalities such as outpatient drug free will represent a larger proportion of the sample). However, this phenomenon was only prominent at the statewide level, and not at the county or facility level. Admission and client characteristics did not diverge by more than 5% of the sample for any characteristic examined. Therefore, in the interest of brevity the results discussed below will be based solely upon counts of unique clients.

Sampling Time Frame

The CalTOP sample was collected over a two-year period during which the Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act of 2000 (SACPA) was implemented. Due to SACPA implementation, changes occurred within the treatment system that had the potential to change the composition of the client population in treatment. For comparison, client characteristics of the first year of SACPA are shown in Attachment B. Three changes stand out. Not surprisingly, in Year Two, relative to Year One, a larger proportion of clients reported being involved with the criminal justice system. Other changes include an increase in methamphetamines as a primary drug (and a concurrent drop in opiates) and an increase in outpatient drug free treatment as a proportion of treatment modalities. Otherwise, measured client characteristics between years one and two were largely identical.

Sample Coverage

Taken together, the counties selected for participation in CalTOP served 50% of all comparable statewide clients (that is, adults receiving CalTOP criteria during the same period). Within each county, CalTOP sites served 22% of the county's comparable clients, while CalTOP participants represented 80% of all clients within these sites.

Client demographic and treatment characteristics are shown in tables 6.1-6.4. In each table, the statewide columns show the number and percentage of clients falling into each category from April 1, 2000 through May 31, 2002 based on the statewide CADDSS database. The next two columns show the CADDSS statistics for the 13 counties selected for participation in CalTOP. The next two columns show the CADDSS breakdowns for the 44 treatment providers participating in CalTOP. The next columns show information on the clients for whom CalTOP data were collected at admission. These are followed by characteristics of all clients for whom we were able to successfully collect data through data linkage to outside data sources (see Chapter XI). The next two columns describe the subset of clients for whom complete admission data were collected (e.g., Addiction Severity Index Lite, California's version of the American Society of Addiction Medicine Patient Placement Criteria). This group is discussed further in Chapter VII. The last sets of columns describe participants in 3-month and 9-month follow-up interviews. These groups are discussed further in Chapters VIII and IX, respectively.

Gender

Overall, male clients outnumbered female clients statewide, reflecting the larger number of males in need of treatment in the state (Brecht, Anglin, Shen, Urada, & Hser, 2001) and nationwide (Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, 2002). Although this trend was also apparent among CalTOP clients at baseline, more females than males participated in the 3- and 9- month follow-up interviews.

Ethnicity

About half of all clients were non-Hispanic Whites followed by Hispanics of any race, African Americans, Asians, Native Americans, and others. Hispanics were slightly underrepresented in the 9-month follow-up interview, where they represented 22% of the sample compared to 27.3% of clients statewide. Compared to the statewide proportion of 49%, Whites were slightly over-represented in the sample of clients with full admission data (55%). There were no other substantial ethnic differences between the groups.

Education

Approximately one third of all clients had less than a high school education, while two thirds had high school, high school equivalent, or a college education. Participants in the 3-month follow-up interviews were more likely to have had at least some college education (29%) and less likely to have less than a high school education (31%) compared to statewide clients (19% and 37%, respectively).

Marital Status

CADDS does not collect marital status data, so marital status information was only available for clients at CalTOP data collection points. Little difference was found in marital status between these points. Just under half of all participants were never married, slightly more than one third were divorced, separated, or widowed, and approximately one fifth were married.

Age

Clients were most commonly between 36 and 45 years of age at admission. This age group represented more than one third of all clients. Clients among the 26-35 group followed closely behind. Age did not differ substantially between any of the groups examined.

Legal Status

Approximately half of all clients had some type of involvement with the criminal justice system (probation, parole, diversion, or incarceration). Among clients within the criminal justice system, the majority were on probation. While CalTOP participants in the data linkage, 3-month follow-up, and 9-month follow-up were somewhat more likely to report no involvement with the criminal justice system compared to clients statewide, much of this difference is due to the previously described recent shift in statewide client legal status that occurred in Year Two of the CalTOP study, probably due to the implementation of SACPA. Since legal status data was collected for the CalTOP data linkage and follow-up clients in Year One (prior to SACPA implementation), it is more appropriate to compare these clients to those found in CADDS during that time period. While 43% of statewide clients report having no criminal justice status over the two year period of the study, in Year One a greater proportion of statewide clients (47%) reported having no criminal justice status, which is closer to the proportions found in the data linkage and follow-up CalTOP groups (52%, 53%, 54%). The remaining gap is likely due to difficulties in recruiting clients involved in the criminal justice system. Some treatment providers did report difficulties recruiting among these clients.

Employment Status

Admitted CalTOP clients were less likely to report “not in the labor force” (43%) compared to clients statewide (48%). That is, admitted CalTOP clients were more likely to be working or seeking employment. However, clients in all other CalTOP groups were fairly similar to the statewide clients in this regard.

AOD Problems at Admission

Table 6.3 shows clients' primary and secondary drug problems at admission. Amphetamines (including methamphetamines) were the most common primary drug problem, followed by alcohol, crack/cocaine, opiates, and marijuana. Note that this is a population of drug treatment clients, which excludes alcohol-only and detoxification programs which serve additional clients with primary alcohol and opiate problems that fall outside the scope of this study.

There was little difference between groups in terms of primary drug problems reported at admission. However, CalTOP clients were more likely to also report a secondary drug problem

(73%-76%) compared to the statewide client population (62%). CalTOP clients had higher reported secondary use of alcohol, marijuana, and amphetamines.

Treatment Modalities

About two thirds of all clients were admitted to outpatient drug free treatment, with most of the remaining clients entering residential treatment and a minority participating in narcotic treatment. As previously noted, narcotic treatment programs were less likely to volunteer for CalTOP participation, resulting in a slightly lower proportion of narcotic treatment clients in CalTOP compared to the statewide population, though the difference only exceeded 5% of the sample at the 3-month follow-up. CalTOP participants were also generally more likely to have been in residential treatment and less likely to be in outpatient drug free treatment when compared to the statewide client population.

Table 6.1. Basic Demographics

	Clients Statewide (CADDs) April 2000-May 2002		Clients in CalTOP Counties (CADDs) April 2000-May 2002		Clients in CalTOP Facilities (CADDs) April 2000-May 2002		CalTOP Admitted Clients April 2000-May 2002		Admitted Clients successful data linkage April 2000-June 2001		Admissions with complete Admission Data		3-Month Followup Interviews: April 2000-May 2001 admissions		9-Month Followup Interviews: April 2000-May 2001 admissions	
	(N = 161,611)		(N = 81,295)		(N = 18,079)		(N = 14,420)		(N = 6,545)		(N = 12,498)		(N = 2,677)		(N = 2,639)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Gender																
Male	97,732	60.4	49,080	60.4	10,675	59.1	8,048	57.8	3,597	55.0	7,011	56.1	1,310	48.9	1,307	49.5
Female	63,979	39.6	32,215	39.6	7,404	41.0	5,868	42.2	2,948	45.0	5,487	43.9	1,367	51.0	1,332	50.4
Race/Ethnicity																
African American	26,929	16.7	15,927	19.7	2,828	15.7	2,449	16.8	1,102	17.0	2,012	16.1	499	18.7	479	18.2
White	79,555	49.3	40,140	49.6	9,652	53.5	7,738	53.0	3,437	53.0	6,789	54.5	1,427	53.6	1,413	53.8
Hispanic	44,066	27.3	19,560	24.2	4,381	24.3	3,423	23.5	1,516	23.4	2,813	22.5	596	22.4	577	21.9
Asian	4,425	2.7	2,611	3.2	448	2.5	445	3.1	196	3.0	368	2.9	59	2.2	62	2.3
Native American	3,167	2.0	1,468	1.8	416	2.3	352	2.4	157	2.4	306	2.4	59	2.2	68	2.5
Other	3,190	2.0	1,293	1.6	316	1.8	187	1.3	77	1.2	165	1.3	25	0.9	26	0.9
Educational Status																
Less than high school	59,184	36.6	27,584	34.0	6,269	34.7	3,954	33.8	1,843	34.3	4,218	33.9	832	31.4	821	34.5
High school/GED	69,873	43.3	35,249	43.4	7,800	43.2	5,162	44.1	2,375	44.2	5,480	44.1	1,050	39.6	1,020	42.8
At least some college	30,648	19.0	17,466	21.5	3,771	20.9	2,520	21.6	1,127	21.0	2,660	21.4	766	28.9	531	22.3
None	1,823	1.1	940	1.2	209	1.2	58	<1	32	<1	61	0.4	4	<1	6	0.2
Current Marital Status																
Single/never married	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	5,270	45.6	2,425	45.3	5,620	45.3	1,084	45.0	1,062	44.8
Divorce/separate/widow	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	4,083	35.3	1,880	35.1	4,421	35.6	844	35.1	841	35.5
Married	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	2,200	19.0	1,052	19.6	2,349	18.9	480	19.9	464	19.6
Age																
18 – 25	35,157	21.8	16,214	19.9	3,851	21.3	2,994	20.8	1,291	19.9	2,536	20.3	531	19.9	447	16.9
26 – 35	45,093	27.9	21,814	26.8	4,999	27.7	4,519	31.4	2,096	32.4	3,893	31.2	856	32.0	807	30.6
36 – 45	58,284	36.1	30,261	37.2	6,695	37.0	4,804	33.4	2,224	34.3	4,227	33.8	944	35.3	957	36.3
46 +	23,077	14.3	13,006	16.0	2,534	14.0	2,080	14.5	866	13.4	1,823	14.6	340	12.7	421	16.0
Average age	34.7		35.4		34.8		35.4		35.6		35.5		35.3		36.4	

Table 6.2. Legal and Employment Status

	Clients Statewide (CADDs) April 2000-May 2002		Clients in CalTOP Counties (CADDs) April 2000-May 2002		Clients in CalTOP Facilities (CADDs) April 2000-May 2002		CalTOP Admitted Clients April 2000-May 2002		Admitted Clients successful data linkage April 2000-June 2001		Admissions with complete Admission Data		3-Month Followup Interviews: April 2000-May 2001 admissions		9-Month Followup Interviews: April 2000-May 2001 admissions	
	(N = 161,611)		(N = 81,295)		(N = 18,079)		(N = 14,420)		(N = 6,545)		(N = 12,498)		(N = 2,677)		(N = 2,639)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Legal Status																
None	69,068	42.8	38,244	47.1	7,504	41.5	6,361	45.4	3,205	52.2	5,435	45.5	1,400	52.8	1,411	54.4
Probation	58,008	35.9	26,479	32.6	7,365	40.7	5,619	40.1	2,038	33.2	4,747	39.7	869	32.7	843	32.5
Parole/CDC	14,702	9.1	7,484	9.2	1,622	9.0	971	6.9	383	6.2	797	6.6	171	6.4	147	5.7
Parole/Other	3,292	2.0	1,630	2.0	369	2.0	259	1.9	191	3.1	245	2.0	83	3.1	63	2.4
Diversion	12,222	7.6	5,652	7.0	1,076	6.0	708	5.1	306	5.0	640	5.3	123	4.6	124	4.8
Incarcerated	4,283	2.7	1,795	2.2	143	<1	90	<1	22	<1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Employment Status																
Full-time	33,095	20.5	16,192	19.9	3,749	20.7	2,703	23.0	1,321	24.3	2,810	22.4	542	22.1	539	22.3
Part-time	13,728	8.5	6,490	8.0	1,495	8.3	1,319	11.2	581	10.7	1,398	11.1	265	10.8	260	10.8
Unemployed	37,020	22.9	18,481	22.7	4,395	24.3	2,693	22.9	1,173	21.6	2,867	22.9	484	19.8	485	20.1
Not in the Labor Force	77,698	48.1	40,103	49.4	8,434	46.7	5,053	42.9	2,364	43.5	5,423	43.3	1,151	47.1	1,123	46.6

Table 6.3. AOD Problems at Admission

	Clients Statewide (CADDs) April 2000-May 2002		Clients in CalTOP Counties (CADDs) April 2000-May 2002		Clients in CalTOP Facilities (CADDs) April 2000-May 2002		CalTOP Admitted Clients April 2000-May 2002		Admitted Clients successful data linkage April 2000-June 2001		Admissions with complete Admission Data		3-Month Followup Interviews: April 2000-May 2001 admissions		9-Month Followup Interviews: April 2000-May 2001 admissions	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
	(N = 161,611)		(N = 81,295)		(N = 18,079)		(N =14,420)		(N = 6,545)		(N = 12,498)		(N = 2,677)		(N = 2,639)	
Primary Drug																
Amphetamines	54,408	33.7	25,114	30.9	6,575	36.4	3,896	33.1	1,770	30.7	4,163	33.4	787	32.4	749	31.3
Alcohol	40,403	25.0	19,702	24.2	4,482	24.8	3,241	27.5	1,670	29.0	3,405	27.3	637	26.2	657	27.5
Crack/cocaine	23,118	14.3	11,013	13.6	2,136	11.8	1,336	11.4	703	12.4	1,409	11.3	332	13.7	322	13.5
Heroin/other opiates	22,495	13.9	16,262	20.0	2,557	14.2	1,706	14.5	808	14.0	1,862	14.9	388	16.0	381	15.9
Marijuana	18,066	11.2	7,885	9.7	2,025	11.2	1,342	11.4	651	11.3	1,404	11.2	239	9.9	235	9.8
Other	3,063	1.9	1,301	1.6	298	1.7	198	1.7	146	2.5	204	1.6	43	1.8	42	1.7
Secondary Drug																
Amphetamines	15,052	9.4	6,984	8.6	1,904	10.6	1,356	11.5	647	11.2	1,468	11.8	276	11.3	270	11.3
Alcohol	34,069	21.2	15,569	19.2	3,938	21.9	2,805	23.8	1,394	24.2	2,994	24	582	24.0	573	24
Crack/cocaine	15,176	9.4	8,249	10.2	1,536	8.5	1,187	10.1	618	10.7	1,274	10.2	292	12.1	278	11.6
Heroin/other opiates	3,822	2.4	2,077	2.6	484	2.7	391	3.3	180	3.1	426	3.4	88	3.6	82	3.4
Marijuana	29,281	18.2	13,152	16.2	3,498	19.5	2,521	21.4	1,194	20.7	2,662	21.4	477	19.7	482	20.2
Other	3,475	2.2	1,750	2.2	384	2.1	281	2.4	131	2.3	296	2.3	58	2.4	56	2.3
None Reported	60,086	37.3	33,309	41.1	6,245	34.7	3,227	27.4	1,589	27.6	3,322	27	651	26.9	644	27

Table 6.4. Treatment Modalities

	Clients Statewide (CADDs) April 2000-May 2002		Clients in CalTOP Counties (CADDs) April 2000-May 2002		Clients in CalTOP Facilities (CADDs) April 2000-May 2002		CalTOP Admitted Clients April 2000-May 2002		Admitted Clients successful data linkage April 2000-June 2001		Admissions with complete Admission Data		3-Month Followup Interviews: April 2000-May 2001 admissions		9-Month Followup Interviews: April 2000-May 2001 admissions	
	(N = 161,611)		(N = 81,295)		(N = 18,079)		(N = 14,420)		(N = 6,545)		(N = 12,498)		(N = 2,677)		(N = 2,639)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Modality																
Outpatient Drug Free	113,257	70.1	52,029	64.0	12,648	70.0	9,185	65.6	4,508	69	7,825	62.6	1,621	60.6	1,593	60.4
Residential	36,567	22.6	20,373	25.1	4,419	24.4	4,052	28.9	1,721	26	3,945	31.6	954	35.6	927	35.1
Narcotic Treatment	11,787	7.3	8,893	10.9	1,012	5.6	771	5.5	316	5	728	5.8	102	3.8	119	4.5

Limitations, Summary, and Discussion

CalTOP took place within a unique context of change within the treatment and criminal justice systems. Because of SACPA, which came into effect in July 2001, thousands of non-violent drug offenders were given a new option of receiving drug treatment rather than incarceration. The first year of CalTOP data collection occurred prior to the implementation of SACPA, while the second year of data collection took place with the new law in effect. A few clues as to the extent of the law's impact can be seen when comparing client characteristics between the first and second years of data. Not surprisingly, in the second year a larger proportion of clients had involvement with the criminal justice system. Other changes included an increase in methamphetamines as a primary drug and an increase in outpatient drug free treatment as a proportion of treatment. These differences may be related to continuing general AOD trends, but may also be related to the recent SACPA implementation. For instance, those referred from the criminal justice system are most often referred to outpatient drug free treatment, so SACPA may have contributed to the increase in outpatient drug free treatment. Likewise, the increase of reports of methamphetamines as a primary drug problem may be due to a general increased prevalence of methamphetamine use but might also be a result of a greater focus on methamphetamine use by law enforcement. In any case, while it appears that SACPA is having immediate effects at the level of client characteristics, a more critical unknown is what implications SACPA will have for long term outcomes. In order to monitor these changes, it will be important to conduct follow-up interviews of clients who entered the treatment system after SACPA implementation and to compare their outcomes to those of clients who entered prior to SACPA implementation. The current CalTOP report has established an important baseline using outcome data for the pre-SACPA period, but further data collection is required in order to study client outcomes in the SACPA era.

The primary question this chapter seeks to answer is whether the clients sampled for this study were representative of the general population at the time of data collection. In general, differences were few, and where differences were found, they were small. The four largest differences (and the only ones involving a difference larger than 10% of the sample) involved gender, legal status, secondary drug problems, and treatment modality.

The gender composition of admitted CalTOP clients closely matched that of the statewide population, but at follow-up more females than males participated in the 3- and 9- month interviews. Thus, it appears that female clients were easier to locate and interview at follow-up than males. This gender difference affects only the generalization of the follow-up results, and the association between gender and outcomes will therefore need to be examined at these time points before these outcomes can be generalized to the larger client population.

Similar to the gender composition, CalTOP clients closely matched the statewide population in terms of legal status. However, the data-linkage and follow-up CalTOP clients were more likely to report no involvement in the criminal justice system. This is partly due to a shift in statewide criminal justice involvement in Year Two that is not reflected in these CalTOP follow-up samples. As discussed earlier, for these samples pre-treatment legal status data were collected in the year prior to SACPA implementation. The ongoing statewide shift in client legal status is likely due to changes in policy that are having and will continue to have a substantial impact on the treatment system. These changes, and their effects on treatment outcomes, need to be studied further.

CalTOP clients were more likely to report a secondary AOD problem compared to statewide participants. However, there were no large differences among clients' primary drug problems. This suggests that the secondary drug problem differences may be an artifact of measurement. That is, because of the assessments required for CalTOP clients, CalTOP providers were likely to have more thorough data on CalTOP clients than non-CalTOP providers may have had on their clients. A logical result would be a tendency for CalTOP providers to more frequently record secondary drug problems, not because these problems were necessarily more frequent per se, but rather because they were more likely to be detected and recorded by the providers.

Participants in the 3- and 9-month interviews were also more likely to have enrolled in residential treatment compared to the statewide client population. However, as long as outcome results are examined within modalities at these time points, this has no impact on the ability to generalize these results.

In summary, while it is impossible to measure all potential characteristics on which clients may differ, CalTOP clients overall were generally quite similar at each data collection point and when compared to the client population statewide. Overall, it is reasonable to conclude that, with the above caveats, CalTOP clients are largely representative of the broader client population, and that conclusions regarding AOD treatment outcomes among CalTOP clients are reasonably generalizable to the larger client population represented by CADDs. The comparisons reported here suggest that CalTOP results can be reasonably generalized to the population of adult drug treatment clients in publicly funded California facilities, excluding clients in detoxification, private treatment, or alcohol-only treatment, that existed during data collection. As the client population evolves, however (e.g., due to SACPA) further data collection will be needed in order to accurately generalize to the changing population.

References

- Brecht, M-L., Anglin, M. D., Shen, H., Urada, D., & Hser, Y-I. (2001). *Integration of Results – California State Treatment Needs Assessment Program*. Sacramento: Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs.
- State of California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs (2001). *California Alcohol and Drug Data System (CADDs), Instruction Manual*. Sacramento: CDADP.
- Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (2002). *Summary of findings from the 2000 National Household Survey on Drug Abuse*. Department of Health and Human Services. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. (<http://www.samhsa.gov/oas/NHSDA/2kNHSDA/chapter2.htm>).

**Attachment A:
Comparison of CADDs Characteristics for Unique Clients and Admissions**

	Clients Statewide (CADDs) April 2000-May 2002		Admissions Statewide (CADDs) April 2000-May 2002		Clients in CalTOP Counties (CADDs) April 2000-May 2002		Admissions in CalTOP Counties (CADDs) April 2000-May 2002		Clients in CalTOP Facilities (CADDs) April 2000-May 2002		Admissions in CalTOP Facilities (CADDs) April 2000-May 2002	
	(N = 161,611)		(N = 270,411)		(N = 81,295)		(N = 113,860)		(N = 18,079)		(N = 22,421)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Gender												
Male	97,732	60	157,673	58	49,080	60	65,933	58	10,675	59	12,911	58
Female	63,979	40	112,738	42	32,215	40	47,927	42	7,404	41	9,510	42
Race/Ethnicity												
African American	26,929	17	45,831	17	15,927	20	23,443	21	2,828	16	3,525	16
White	79,555	49	133,959	50	40,140	50	55,587	49	9,652	54	11,875	53
Hispanic	44,066	27	73,352	27	19,560	24	27,137	24	4,381	24	5,542	25
Asian	4,425	3	6,516	2	2,611	3	3,451	3	448	2	515	2
Native American	3,167	2	5,055	2	1,468	2	2,049	2	416	2	521	2
Other	3,190	2	5,338	2	1,293	2	1,841	2	316	2	404	2
Educational Status												
Less than high school	59,184	37	99,409	37	27,584	34	39,176	34	6,269	35	7,883	35
High school/GED	69,873	43	117,026	43	35,249	43	49,118	43	7,800	43	9,592	43
At least some college	30,648	19	51,036	19	17,466	22	24,230	21	3,771	21	4,621	21
Trade/tech school	n/a	n/a	n/a	N/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
None	1,823	1	2,787	1	940	1	1,259	1	209	1	292	1
Age												
18 – 25	35,157	22	54,417	20	16,214	20	22,309	20	3,851	21	4,787	21
26 – 35	45,093	28	74,845	28	21,814	27	31,319	28	4,999	28	6,298	28
36 – 45	58,284	36	100,872	37	30,261	37	42,652	37	6,695	37	8,268	37
46 +	23,077	14	40,277	15	13,006	16	17,580	15	2,534	14	3,068	14
Average age	34.7		35.1		35.4		35.4		34.8		34.7	

	Clients Statewide (CADDs) April 2000-May 2002		Admissions Statewide (CADDs) April 2000-May 2002		Clients in CalTOP Counties (CADDs) April 2000-May 2002		Admissions in CalTOP Counties (CADDs) April 2000-May 2002		Clients in CalTOP Facilities (CADDs) April 2000-May 2002		Admissions in CalTOP Facilities (CADDs) April 2000-May 2002	
	(N = 161,611)		(N = 270,411)		(N = 81,295)		(N = 113,860)		(N = 13,634)		(N = 22,421)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Legal Status												
None	69,068	43	121,705	45	38,244	47	52,317	46	7,504	42	9,273	41
Probation	58,008	36	94,920	35	26,479	33	38,373	34	7,365	41	9,300	41
Parole/CDC	14,702	9	23,683	9	7,484	9	10,186	9	1,622	9	1,919	9
Parole/Other	3,292	2	5,335	2	1,630	2	2,231	2	369	2	461	2
Diversion	12,222	8	18,180	7	5,652	7	8,249	7	1,076	6	1,282	6
Incarcerated	4,283	3	6,524	2	1,795	2	2,486	2	143	1	186	1
Employment Status												
Full-time	33,095	20	49,472	18	16,192	20	20,941	18	3,749	21	4,504	20
Part-time	13,728	9	21,416	8	6,490	8	8,726	8	1,495	8	1,832	8
Unemployed	37,020	23	61,144	23	18,481	23	25,181	22	4,395	24	5,542	25
Not in the Labor Force	77,698	48	138,244	51	40,103	49	58,966	52	8,434	47	10,536	47

	Clients Statewide (CADDs) April 2000-May 2002		Admissions Statewide (CADDs) April 2000-May 2002		Clients in CalTOP Counties (CADDs) April 2000-May 2002		Admissions in CalTOP Counties (CADDs) April 2000-May 2002		Clients in CalTOP Facilities (CADDs) April 2000-May 2002		Admissions in CalTOP Facilities (CADDs) April 2000-May 2002	
	(N = 161,611)		(N = 270,411)		(N = 81,295)		(N = 113,860)		(N = 18,079)		(N = 22,421)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Modality												
Outpatient Drug Free	113,257	70	168,421	62	52,029	64	71,532	63	12,648	70	15,857	71
Residential	36,567	23	69,248	26	20,373	25	29,926	26	4,419	24	5,360	24
Narcotic Replacement Therapy	11,787	7	32,742	12	8,893	11	12,402	11	1,012	6	1,204	5

	Clients Statewide (CADDs) April 2000-May 2002		Admissions Statewide (CADDs) April 2000-May 2002		Clients in CalTOP Counties (CADDs) April 2000-May 2002		Admissions in CalTOP Counties (CADDs) April 2000-May 2002		Clients in CalTOP Facilities (CADDs) April 2000-May 2002		Admissions in CalTOP Facilities (CADDs) April 2000-May 2002	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
	(N = 161,611)		(N = 270,411)		(N = 81,295)		(N = 113,860)		(N = 18,079)		(N = 22,421)	
Primary Drug												
Amphetamines	54,408	34	86,038	32	25,114	31	35,701	31	6,575	36	8,275	37
Alcohol	40,403	25	61,003	23	19,702	24	25,923	23	4,482	25	5,402	24
Crack/cocaine	23,118	14	37,374	14	11,013	14	16,203	14	2,136	12	2,642	12
Heroin/other opiates	22,495	14	56,395	21	16,262	20	24,046	21	2,557	14	3,135	14
Marijuana	18,066	11	24,863	9	7,885	10	10,161	9	2,025	11	2,543	11
Other	3,063	2	4,665	2	1,301	2	1806	2	298	2	416	2
Secondary Drug												
Amphetamines	15,052	9	25,034	9	6,984	9	9,801	9	1,904	11	2,389	11
Alcohol	34,069	21	55,166	20	15,569	19	22,151	20	3,938	22	4,968	22
Crack/cocaine	15,176	9	29,391	11	8,249	10	12,592	11	1,536	9	1,926	9
Heroin/other opiates	3,822	2	7,464	3	2,077	3	3,161	3	484	3	608	3
Marijuana	29,281	18	45,805	17	13,152	16	18,402	16	3,498	19	4,359	20
Other	3,475	2	5,742	2	1,750	2	2,462	2	384	2	494	2
None Reported	60,086	37	100,835	37	33,309	41	45,047	40	6,245	35	7,581	34

**Attachment B:
Client Characteristics in Year One of Data Collection (April 2000-May 2001)**

	Clients Statewide (CADDs)		Clients in CalTOP Counties (CADDs)		Clients in CalTOP Facilities (CADDs)		CalTOP Admitted Clients		Admitted Clients w/ successful data linkage		Admitted Clients with complete Admission Data		3-Month Followup Interviews		9-Month Followup Interviews	
	(N = 92,996)		(N = 39,479)		(N = 7,399)		(N = 6,898)		(N = 6,545)		(N = 5,476)		(N = 2,470)		(N = 1,935)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Gender																
Male	54,482	59	23,095	59	4,239	57	3,790	55	3,582	55	3,026	55	1,206	49	936	48
Female	38,514	41	16,384	42	3,160	43	3,108	45	2,918	45	2,450	45	1,264	51	999	52
Race/Ethnicity																
African American	16,178	17	7,965	20	1,117	15	1,189	17	1,100	17	1,000	18	464	19	358	19
White	46,074	50	19,419	50	4,131	56	3,630	53	3,432	53	2,820	52	1,324	54	1,060	55
Hispanic	24,455	26	9,188	23	1,596	22	1,597	23	1,513	23	1,245	23	538	22	389	20
Asian	2,457	3	1,327	3	207	3	207	3	196	3	182	3	56	2	51	3
Native American	1,838	2	721	2	198	3	165	2	157	2	134	2	53	2	45	2
Other	1,723	2	591	2	119	2	81	1	76	1	71	1	23	1	21	1
Educational Status																
Less than high school	33,853	36	13,322	34	2,457	33	1,954	34	1,841	34	1,863	34	741	30	644	34
High school/GED	40,378	43	17,098	43	3,253	44	2,515	44	2,382	44	2,411	44	958	39	825	43
At least some college	17,748	19	8,545	22	1,586	22	1,194	21	1,125	21	1,124	21	743	30	439	23
Trade/tech school	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3,047	45	2,916	45	1,819	34	1,058	43	689	36
None	962	1	479	1	80	1	31	<1	30	<1	29	1	4	<1	6	<1
Current Marital Status																
Single/never married	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	2,564	45	2,425	45	2,432	45	983	45	832	44
Divorce/separate/widow	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1,999	35	1,880	35	1,901	35	776	36	707	37
Married	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1,109	20	1,052	20	1,072	20	421	19	366	19
Age																
18 – 25	19,018	20	7,797	20	1,588	21	1,376	20	1,064	20	1,057	19	485	20	368	19
26 – 35	23,142	28	10,973	28	2,103	28	2,196	32	1,742	32	1,735	32	789	32	588	30
36 – 45	34,556	37	14,753	37	2,746	37	2,376	35	1,888	35	1,906	35	875	35	690	36
46 +	13,280	14	5,956	15	962	13	937	14	739	14	770	14	317	13	286	15

Average age	35.0	35.2	34.6	35.4	35.7	35.6			35.8
-------------	------	------	------	------	------	------	--	--	------

	Clients Statewide (CADDs)		Clients in CalTOP Counties (CADDs)		Clients in CalTOP Facilities (CADDs)		CalTOP Admitted Clients		Admitted Clients with successful data linkage		Admitted Clients with complete Admission Data		3-Month Followup Interviews		9-Month Followup Interviews	
	(N = 92,996)		(N = 39,479)		(N = 7,399)		(N = 6,898)		(N = 6,545)		(N = 5,476)		(N = 2,470)		(N = 1,935)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Legal Status																
None	43,619	47	19,189	49	3,372	46	3,463	53	3,236	53	2,805	52	1,310	53	1,049	54
Probation	28,811	31	11,684	30	2,712	37	2,076	32	1,980	32	1,787	33	803	33	634	33
Parole/CDC	8,866	10	3,738	9	574	8	404	6	390	6	331	6	154	6	103	5
Parole/Other	1,908	2	807	2	191	3	202	3	190	3	186	3	83	3	54	3
Diversion	7,212	8	3,220	8	495	7	311	5	299	5	264	5	116	5	92	5
Incarcerated	2,553	3	837	2	55	1	25	<1	22	<1	0	<1	0	<1	0	<1
Employment Status																
Full-time	19,079	21	7,191	21	1,722	23	1,371	24	1,321	24	1,309	24	498	23	441	23
Part-time	7,402	8	2,701	8	631	9	610	11	581	11	585	11	239	11	208	11
Unemployed	19,965	21	7,489	22	1,741	24	1,258	22	1,173	22	1,184	22	428	19	377	19
Not in the Labor Force	46,505	50	16,969	49	3,302	45	2,521	44	2,364	43	2,398	44	647	47	909	47

	Clients Statewide (CADDs)		Clients in CalTOP Counties (CADDs)		Clients in CalTOP Facilities (CADDs)		CalTOP Admitted Clients		Admitted Clients with successful data linkage		Admitted Clients with complete Admission Data		3-Month Followup Interviews		9-Month Followup Interviews	
	(N = 92,996)		(N = 39,479)		(N = 7,399)		(N = 6,898)		(N = 6,545)		(N = 5,476)		(N = 2,470)		(N = 1,935)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Modality																
Outpatient Drug Free	59,459	64	25,348	64	5,505	74	4,685	68	3,557	66	3,575	65	1,511	61	1,141	59
Residential	23,844	26	10,248	26	1,502	23	1,807	26	1,574	29	1,559	28	872	35	702	36
Narcotic Replacement Therapy	9,693	10	3,883	10	214	3	379	6	297	5	342	6	87	4	92	5

	Clients Statewide (CADDs)		Clients in CalTOP Counties (CADDs)		Clients in CalTOP Facilities (CADDs)		CalTOP Admitted Clients		Admitted Clients with successful data linkage		Admitted Clients with complete Admission Data		3-Month Followup Interviews		9-Month Followup Interviews	
	(N = 92,996)		(N = 39,479)		(N = 7,399)		(N = 6,898)		(N = 6,545)		(N = 5,476)		(N = 2,470)		(N = 1,935)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Primary Drug																
Amphetamines	27,669	30	11,643	30	2,659	36	1,760	31	1,677	31	1,753	31	712	29	610	32
Alcohol	23,886	26	10,328	26	2,115	29	1,603	28	1,509	28	1,549	28	564	23	514	27
Crack/cocaine	13,619	15	5,753	15	883	11	731	13	703	13	717	13	310	13	263	14
Heroin/other opiates	16,613	18	7,272	18	759	10	866	15	786	14	870	15	349	14	298	16
Marijuana	9,474	10	3,791	10	896	12	639	11	616	11	625	11	216	9	190	10
Other	1,703	2	683	2	134	3	161	3	148	3	110	2	300	12	38	2
Secondary Drug																
Amphetamines	8,475	9	3,372	9	794	11	639	11	604	11	634	12	250	10	217	11
Alcohol	19,162	21	7,730	20	1,711	23	1,417	25	1,332	24	1405	26	526	21	461	24
Crack/cocaine	9,920	11	4,254	11	600	8	621	11	590	11	590	11	263	11	227	12
Heroin/other opiates	2,437	3	1,039	3	182	2	181	3	171	3	173	3	78	3	73	4
Marijuana	15,836	17	6,459	16	1,482	20	1,176	20	1,108	20	1161	21	439	18	382	20
Other	1,992	2	819	2	169	2	298	5	336	6	136	2	37	2	41	2
None Reported	34,777	38	15,684	40	2,399	33	1,428	25	1,298	24	1,377	25	586	24	512	27