

# Healing Trauma Evaluation Triannual Progress Report

Linda Frisman

June 1, 2015

1. Evaluation Activities. From February 1, 2015 through May 2015, evaluation activities included:
  - a. Working with facilitators to simplify data submission and to alert the evaluator of group completion.
  - b. Cross-checking information from the DPH Summary Reports and the Facilitators' group reports.
  - c. Development and distribution of a Spanish language version of the surveys.
  - d. Answering facilitators' questions about the new process and forms.
  - e. Data entry for groups completed during the second 4 months of this funding year.
  - f. Review of group reports from the facilitators and preparation of group reports, including additional qualitative data on client feedback.

2. Summary of Healing Trauma for this period. During this period, another 8 clinicians from the STAR program were trained to be facilitators of Healing Trauma. Also, 13 staff members from the 'R Kids Family Center in New Haven trained as facilitators. This program provides services to families in transition, including families affected by foster and kinship placements.

With respect to intervention delivery, 13 groups (#65 – #76, plus one unnumbered group) were conducted during this 4-month period. (The unnumbered group did not meet for a final session due to unavoidable disruptions at York Correctional Institution; that group was not assigned a number. Since no post-tests could be administered for the unnumbered group, the data are not included in the analyses.) At York CI, 5 groups were conducted (3 at the Charlene Perkins Center and 2 on the West Side). Another 5 groups were conducted at the STAR program at CVH; and one group each was held at Bethsaida Community Center, at Liberty Services, and at Help, Inc. The data indicate:

- a. A total of 119 women were served in these 13 groups, bringing the total served to date to 650.
- b. Demographic characteristics for the women served in this period are shown in Table 1.
- c. Participants expressed an enthusiastic recommendation for the program. They appreciated the facilitators, the experience of open discussion with women who had a similar history, and developing an understanding of the difference between healthy and unhealthy relationships. Many of the participants also commented on the value of exercises that allow them to cope with stress, and information about types of abuse in relationships. A very common theme was disappointment that the group did not continue into more sessions.
- d. Overall, scores on the knowledge test showed improvement, even though some women were taking Healing Trauma for a second time. The average percentage of correct answers from pre-tests was 81.2, and on the post-test was 95.0. These percentages correspond to 4.1 of 5 correct answers on the pre-test, and 4.75 of 5 correct answers on the post-test.

- e. To measure symptoms of depression, the pre- and post-surveys include the CES-D scale.<sup>1</sup> Developers suggest a score of 22 or higher is likely to translate to a diagnosis of depression, and a score of 16 or higher is considered at risk for depression. Considering all cases with full data for each depression scale, the average depression score declined from 24.0 on pre-surveys, to 18.2 on post-surveys. At the time of the pre-survey, only 24.0% of participants from these groups were considered *not* to be at risk for depression; but at the time of the post-survey, 41.5% met criteria for no depression. See Figure 1.
  - a. To measure severity of trauma symptoms, the surveys employ the PCL-C scale, which includes 17 items. Although the published version includes a 1 – 5 scale, this survey uses 0 – 3, in order to have uniformity with the response anchors of the CES-D. Because of the change in the number of points on the scale, our best use is to compare the means, rather than estimating the number of participants who reach the threshold for post-traumatic stress disorder. Considering all cases with full data for each trauma scale, the average trauma score declined from 21.4 to 17.0, which are approximately the equivalent of 22.4 and 18.0 on the published scales, respectively.
3. Activities planned for coming 4 months.
- a. Continued data collection, with revisions to process and forms if problems are indicated.
  - b. Obtain feedback from facilitators and trainer on narrative descriptions of quotes in group reports, to determine whether additional work on qualitative analyses are needed.
  - c. Develop a follow-up to find out whether agencies that have been trained to use Healing Trauma independently, to determine the rate of use and fidelity to the model.

---

<sup>1</sup> Note that it is not possible to directly compare CES-D scores in this report with previous reports, because the CES-D should include 20 items and previous versions of the pre-survey mistakenly omitted item 7 of the 20 items. We inserted the previously missing item in the surveys that began to be used on January 1, 2015.

Table 1. TOTAL FEMALES BY AGE, RACE & ETHNICITY									
Age in Years	Total Number of Females served	ETHNICITY			RACE				
		Hispanic or Latino (If Yes, include Race)	Not Hispanic or Latino (If No, include Race)	Hispanic Ethnicity Unknown	White	Black	Asian/Pacific Islander	Am. Indian	Other/Unknown
<10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11-14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
15-19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20-24	2	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0
25-29	13	0	13	0	8	2	0	0	3
30-34	20	2	18	0	16	0	0	1	3
35-39	23	4	19	0	16	4	0	0	3
40-44	12	1	10	1	8	3	0	0	1
45-49	15	2	13	0	9	3	0	0	3
50-54	11	2	9	0	8	2	0	0	1
55-59	14	3	10	1	9	4	0	0	1
60-64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
65+	2	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
Unknown	7	0	1	6	1	0	0	0	6
<b>TOTAL Females</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>21</b>

