



YOUTH SUICIDE PREVENTION PROGRAM
ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT 2003-2005
EVALUATION OF PROGRAM TRAINING WORKSHOPS

Prepared for

The Youth Suicide Prevention Program

June 2005

Prepared by

*Organizational Research Services
Seattle, Washington*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Report

SECTION 1:

Introduction.....	1
Methodology.....	2
Methods of Analysis.....	2
Key Findings.....	4
Recommendations.....	6

SECTION 2: Baseline vs. Post Comparison.....	7
--	---

SECTION 3: Baseline vs. Post vs. Three Month Follow-Up Comparison.....	12
--	----

SECTION 4: Baseline vs. Post vs. Six Month Follow-Up Comparison.....	17
--	----

Appendices

APPENDIX A: Youth Suicide Prevention Program Baseline ASIST Workshop Survey	
APPENDIX B: Youth Suicide Prevention Program Post ASIST Workshop Survey	
APPENDIX C: Washington State Youth Suicide Prevention Program ASIST Training Workshop Survey – Three Month Follow-Up	
APPENDIX D: Washington State Youth Suicide Prevention Program ASIST Training Workshop Survey – Six Month Follow-Up	
APPENDIX E: Washington State Youth Suicide Prevention Program ASIST Training Workshop Survey – Twelve Month Follow-Up	

TABLE OF TABLES

TABLE 1.1: Youth Suicide Prevention Program Response Rates – 2003-2005	2
TABLE 2.1: YSPP Workshop Locations.....	8
TABLE 2.2: Level of Comfort, Competence and Confidence in Helping Suicidal Youth.....	8
TABLE 2.3: Level of Knowledge about General Suicide Facts, Signs and Resources.....	8
TABLE 2.4: Knowledge of Suicide Prevention and Intervention – Multiple Choice Items.....	9
TABLE 2.5: Knowledge of Suicide Prevention and Intervention – Multiple Choice or Open-Ended Items (POST ONLY).....	10
TABLE 3.1: Level of Comfort, Competence and Confidence in Helping Suicidal Youth – Baseline, Post and Three Months.....	13
TABLE 3.2: Level of Knowledge about General Suicide Facts, Signs and Resources – Baseline, Post and Three Months.....	13
TABLE 3.3: Knowledge of Suicide Prevention and Intervention – Multiple Choice Items – Baseline, Post and Three Months.....	14
TABLE 3.4: Knowledge of Suicide Prevention and Intervention – Multiple Choice or Open-Ended Items – Post and Three Months	15
TABLE 3.5: Number of Contacts with Suicidal Youth in Last Month (Three Month Follow-Up Assessment).....	16
TABLE 3.6: Have Connected Suicidal Youth to the Following Resources (Three Month Follow-Up).....	16
TABLE 4.1: Level of Comfort, Competence and Confidence in Helping Suicidal Youth – Baseline, Post and Six Months.....	18
TABLE 4.2: Level of Knowledge about General Suicide Facts, Signs and Resources – Baseline, Post and Six Months.....	18
TABLE 4.3: Knowledge of Suicide Prevention and Intervention – Multiple Choice Items – Baseline, Post and Six Months.....	19
TABLE 4.4: Knowledge of Suicide Prevention and Intervention – Multiple Choice or Open-Ended – Post and Six Months	20
TABLE 4.5: Number of Contacts with Suicidal Youth in Last Month (Six Month Follow-Up Assessment).....	20
TABLE 4.6: Have Connected Suicidal Youth to the Following Resources (Six Month Follow-Up).....	21

SECTION 1

2003-2005 ANNUAL REPORT

EVALUATION OF PROGRAM TRAINING WORKSHOPS

INTRODUCTION

The goal for this evaluation was to assess the impact of the training workshops sponsored by the Youth Suicide Prevention Program (YSPP). YSPP conducts two-day Living Works ASSIST training workshops in various communities throughout the state. A survey, drawn in part from a prior assessment tool created by the University of Washington School of Nursing in an earlier evaluation, was utilized to assess the impact of training on individuals' knowledge about how to identify suicide-warning signs, how to help suicidal persons in need, and how to better assess and intervene in situations where there is a suicidal person in need. In this evaluation, we examined changes in these program outcomes between the beginning and end of the training workshops, and extended out to three and six months after the completion of the workshop.

METHODOLOGY

A longitudinal design was used to collect information from participants in the ASIST training workshops. Participants provided a code number in order to track the surveys and to assure confidentiality. Code numbers consisted of the participants' second letter in first name, the two digits of their birth year, the two digits of their birth date and the last letter in their last name. The workshop presenter administered a Baseline survey prior to the first day of the workshop, and then the Post at the conclusion of the second day of the workshop. The Post Survey asked participants for contact information so that a Follow-Up survey could be sent to them.

The Follow-Up surveys were sent to those participants who included contact information at three, six and 12 months after the workshop. It was conceivable that a participant could complete a Follow-Up survey at three different time points (i.e., three, six, and 12 months), though in most instances the participants had only completed one of these Follow-Up surveys. Incentives were provided to ensure a high response rate. The response rates for the Follow-Up mailings are shown in **TABLE 1.1** below. We were successful in getting over 58.3 percent response rate at the Three-Month Follow-Up period, and almost 20 percent 12 months after the workshop. The surveys we used in the current evaluation were modified from the past evaluation, and the trainers first started using these surveys in late 2003, carrying forward into 2004 and 2005. Examples of each of the survey instruments are presented in **APPENDICES A - E**.

TABLE 1.1: Youth Suicide Prevention Program Response Rates – 2003-2005

Number of Months after Pre/Post Survey	Mailed Out	Responded	Response rate
3 months	193	74	38.3%
6 months	193	45	23.3%
12 months*	120	23	19.2%

** There are still individuals who participated in the ASIST Workshops after June 2004 who we have yet to attempt to contact for a 12-month Follow-Up. These surveys will be administered during the 2005-2006 program year.*

METHODS OF ANALYSIS

There were three primary analyses in this study. We first examined the change over time in knowledge and beliefs between the Baseline and Post assessments, (i.e., over the course of the two-day workshop). We gathered Baseline and Post data from **287** participants. In the second analysis, we focused on the sample of participants who also provided Three-Month Follow-Up data. The intent was to examine whether the improvements demonstrated at Post persisted when the participants were three months removed from the workshop. We gathered Baseline, Post, and Three-Month Follow-Up data from a total of **67** participants. In the third analysis we examined a sample of participants with data at Baseline, Post, and six months after the workshop. The intent was to explore the persistence of the changes observed from Baseline to

Post a number of months after the workshop. We gathered Baseline, Post, and Six Month Follow-Up data from a total of **47** participants.

A combination of analytic approaches was used to compare changes over time. We calculated frequencies and means, and used cross-tabulations and paired T-tests to explore differences in knowledge and beliefs over time.

KEY FINDINGS

- ◊ **The results illustrate the strong positive impact of workshops and training on knowledge of suicide issues, prevention, intervention and assessment.**
 - ◆ We observe many instances of significant increases in knowledge over time among participants. This change is most evident in the comparison of the “three C’s” (i.e., comfort, competence and confidence) and the participants’ ability to correctly answer questions about suicide prevention and intervention.
 - ◆ The findings suggest that assessments of the “three C’s” and knowledge of prevention and intervention stay higher three to six months after the workshop. While there is some drop off between the Post and Follow-Up assessment points, respondents maintain a greater understanding of prevention and intervention issues than observed at the Baseline assessment point.
 - ◆ At the Post assessment the respondents demonstrate the ability to link caregiver tasks to risk alerts (i.e., they correctly link an average of 2.92 tasks to a possible five risk alerts), and can identify the CPR++ factors for suicide assessment (i.e., 52.4 percent identify all five factors correctly).
- ◊ **In general, knowledge of prevention and intervention persists for those participants responding three to six months after the workshop.**
 - ◆ The increases in knowledge of suicide prevention and intervention demonstrated on the multiple choice items between Baseline and Post continue at the three-month and six-month assessment point.
 - ◆ There is some slight decline from the Post assessment at both three and six months in the participants’ ability to correctly identify “two background factors that a caregiver needs to consider in assessing someone’s level of risk.” We should note that the knowledge on this item at the Follow-Up assessment is still significantly greater than observed at Baseline.
 - ◆ Interestingly, the participants increase their ability to link caregiver tasks to risk alerts between Post and the three and six month assessments. In comparing the Post and Three Month time points we observe an increase in the percent correctly linking all five tasks to alerts from 28.6 to 39.7 percent. Similarly, the percent between Post and Six Month increases from 38.6 to 44.4 percent.
 - ◆ In contrast, we observe significant declines in the participants’ ability to correctly identify the factors in the CPR++ model. Between Post and Three Months the average number of correct answers decreases from 4.02 to 2.94. Between Post and Six Months, there is a decrease from 3.77 to 2.39.

- ◆ **At the follow-up assessment point many participants report having contact and connections with suicidal youth.**
 - ◆ At the Three Month assessment over 70 percent (47 individuals) of the participants reported they had at least one contact with a suicidal youth in the last month. Almost 39 percent had more than one contact.
 - ◆ At the Six Month assessment almost 48 percent (22 individuals) of the participants reported they had at least one contact with a suicidal youth in the last month. Almost 30 percent had more than one contact.
 - ◆ At both time periods the participants were most likely to connect a suicidal youth with Mental Health or Family resources.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- ◇ **Continue with workshop and follow-up assessments of participants.** The current program year analysis continues to show that the knowledge and skills attained in the training workshop is sustained three to six months after the workshop. The current evaluation plan is to finish with 12 Month Follow-Up surveys, though the program should continue to encourage data collection at workshops and have some mechanism for follow-up.
- ◇ **Consider ways of follow-up contact with participants after the completion of the workshop.** The slight drop off for participants at three to six months, coupled with past evidence of declines observed 12 months after the workshop suggest that participants could benefit from some kind of booster training. Perhaps such a booster training could come in the form of a follow-up phone call, a mailing with factual information about suicide issues, or invitations to participate in additional training sessions.
- ◇ **Consider using qualitative methods to gather more insight about long-term impact.** The program might think about utilizing a small number of phone interviews with program participants to better understand how individuals are turning knowledge and skills into practice in real world settings.