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INTRODUCTION

The Center for Health and Justice Research at the Indiana University Public Policy Institute (PPI) was contracted to conduct the evaluation for the Indiana State Department of Health’s (ISDH) First Responder Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Program (CARA). With CARA funding, ISDH aims to do the following:

1) Provide resources through the Indiana Naloxone Kit Distribution Program for First Responders in rural communities;
2) Train and provide resources to rural first responders on carrying and using naloxone;
3) Expand the Indiana Recovery and Peer Support Initiative for referral to appropriate treatment and recovery communities.

To evaluate these efforts, researchers have completed data collection activities, including a naloxone postcard survey for first responders (Activity 1), naloxone training satisfaction survey (Activity 2), and naloxone training follow-up qualitative interviews (Activity 3). This report includes a final, cumulative analysis of the CARA naloxone postcard survey for rural first responders as well as training satisfaction survey results for rural first responders who attended naloxone training.

Background

To assess ISDH’s efforts to provide naloxone to first responders in rural counties through the Indiana Naloxone Kit Distribution Program, researchers developed a post-naloxone use survey postcard which is to be completed by the first responder team following each incident requiring naloxone.

ISDH began distributing naloxone doses to first responders throughout Indiana, utilizing CARA funding, in February 2018. Various first responder agencies in rural Indiana counties, including police, fire, and other emergency medical services agencies, received the doses, as well as a corresponding stack of naloxone survey postcards. Since February 2018, the same version of the postcard has been utilized; each postcard continues to include a description of the research study, the confidential nature of the study, when and how to complete the postcard survey, and how to return the postcard to the research team. Further, agencies continue to be instructed to complete one postcard survey per overdose incident (e.g. if multiple naloxone doses are administered, only one survey must be completed). All postcards are pre-addressed and include pre-paid postage, and the participant is asked to return the postcard via any USPS postbox. When the postcards are returned to the researchers, the data is entered into an Excel database and analyzed using SPSS Software (Version 28).
CARA NALOXONE POSTCARDS

General Information
Between February 2018 and August 2021, at least 14,554 naloxone kits were distributed by ISDH to first responder agencies in 56 Indiana counties, each including naloxone survey postcards. As of August 2021, 1,036 postcard surveys from 47 counties were returned (Table 1). Figure 1 displays which counties received naloxone from ISDH and returned postcards (orange) and which counties received naloxone from ISDH but have not yet returned postcards (gray).

Figure 2 shows the month by month administrations of naloxone by rural first responders according to postcard data. The data suggests marked increases in reported naloxone administrations in 2020 as compared to 2019 and 2018. In some months (January, September, and November 2020), reported naloxone administrations more than doubled. This trend continued for the majority of the first half of 2021 (most markedly in January 2021), with most months matching or exceeding 2020 counts.

Please note that these results do not fully represent the number of naloxone administrations that were given by these agencies, only the number of postcard surveys returned.

Table 1: Number of Naloxone Kits and Postcards Sent and Received (February 2018 – August 2021)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County of Distribution</th>
<th>Naloxone Doses Received</th>
<th>Survey Postcards Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackford</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cass</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daviess</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decatur</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeKalb</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubois</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulton</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendricks</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasper</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosciusko</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaGrange</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaPorte</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

continued -->

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County of Distribution</th>
<th>Naloxone Doses Received</th>
<th>Survey Postcards Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noble</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parke</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulaski</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putnam</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randolph</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ripley</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rush</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spencer</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starke</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steuben</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tippecanoe</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tipton</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wabash</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 14,544* 1,036**

*Includes 1,009 cards with no specific county designation (e.g. “IDOC extra stock”)
**Includes 187 cards for which there was no specific county designation (e.g. “IDOC stock”) or county designation could not be determined (e.g. torn postcard)
Figure 2: Naloxone Administrations by Month and Year (n=1,036*)

*Figure does not include 1 postcard with no date of naloxone administration indicated
Naloxone Postcard Survey Results

**DEMOGRAPHICS**

From the 1,036 returned postcards, responses indicate that individuals completing the survey card consisted primarily of police (n=409, 36%), followed by members of emergency medical services (EMS) (n=269, 26%), other professionals (such as correctional officers) (n=241, 23%), and firefighters (n=111, 11%) (Table 2). This was the only information the postcard requests regarding respondent demographics; however, demographics are also recorded for overdose victims who had the naloxone used on them (Table 2). This data suggests that three-quarters of individuals who had the naloxone used on them were male (n=784, 76%), almost half were between the ages of 25-34 years old (n=445, 43%), and the overwhelming majority were white (n=887, 86%). These demographic trends (for both first responders and overdose victims) have remained consistent throughout the duration of the CARA evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Demographics of Postcard Survey (n=1,036)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Who Administered Naloxone</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Responder Agency</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firefighter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Who Naloxone Was Used On</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESULTS FOLLOWING NALOXONE ADMINISTRATION

Postcards also ask first responders several questions about the overdose incident itself, including how many doses were used, whether the naloxone revived the person, the place where the naloxone was administered, whether the person was alone at the time of overdose, whether naloxone was administered by a layperson prior to first responder arrival on scene, and what happened as a result of the overdose (Table 3).

Over half of postcard respondents indicated that they only used one dose of naloxone at the overdose event (n=664, 64%), followed by about a third using two naloxone doses (n=283, 27%), and the remaining using three or more doses (n=85, 8%). The vast majority of respondents indicated that naloxone was able to successfully revive the overdose victim (n=784, 76%). Most respondents indicated that the overdose occurred at a residence (n=585, 56%), followed by other places not listed (such as correctional facilities) (n=277, 27%). The majority of overdose victims were not alone when they overdosed (n=618, 60%), and a very small percentage of overdose victims had had a layperson administer naloxone prior to first responder arrival (n=61, 6%). Following naloxone administration, a majority of overdose victims were transported to the hospital by EMS (n=637, 61%), while others refused EMS transport (n=97, 9%) or were involuntarily detained by police (n=76, 7%). Only 3% of overdose victims were arrested (n=34), and the majority of postcard respondents indicated that no one else was arrested at the scene (n=963, 93%). When other individuals were arrested at the scene, about half of those arrests were for paraphernalia or drug possession.

| Table 3: Postcard Survey Results after Administering Naloxone (n=1,036) |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| **Doses of Naloxone**                          | n   | Percent |
| One                                            | 664 | 64%     |
| Two                                            | 283 | 27%     |
| Three or more                                  | 85  | 8%      |
| **Did naloxone revive the person? (Yes)**      | n   | Percent |
| Residence                                      | 585 | 56%     |
| Hotel                                          | 33  | 3%      |
| Public Place                                   | 38  | 4%      |
| Business                                       | 37  | 4%      |
| Vehicle                                        | 57  | 6%      |
| Other/Multiple                                 | 277 | 27%     |
| **Was person alone at time of overdose?**      | n   | Percent |
| No                                             | 618 | 60%     |
| Yes                                            | 296 | 29%     |
| Don't know                                     | 121 | 11%     |
| **Was naloxone administered by lay person prior to arrival (Yes)** | n | Percent |
| Involuntary Detention                          | 76  | 7%      |
| Arrest                                         | 34  | 3%      |
| Transported by EMS                             | 637 | 61%     |
| Refused to Transport                           | 97  | 9%      |
| **What happened to person after receiving naloxone?** | n | Percent |
| Involuntary Detention                          | 76  | 7%      |
| Arrest                                         | 34  | 3%      |
| Transported by EMS                             | 637 | 61%     |
| Refused to Transport                           | 97  | 9%      |
| **Was anyone else arrested at the scene?**     | n   | Percent |
| No                                             | 963 | 93%     |
| Yes, for paraphernalia or drug possession      | 29  | 3%      |
| Yes, for other reason                          | 29  | 3%      |
CARA NALOXONE TRAINING AND SURVEYS FOR FIRST RESPONDERS

General Information
To evaluate efforts to train and provide resources to rural first responders on carrying and using naloxone (Activity 2), researchers developed and implemented a naloxone training satisfaction survey. Naloxone training sessions are conducted with first responder agencies receiving the naloxone kits to ensure proper use. All training sessions were conducted by Overdose Lifeline (ODL), an Indiana non-profit dedicated to helping communities combat the overdose epidemic. Sessions are designed to provide general information on what naloxone is, to teach individuals how to use and administer naloxone, and to provide information on identifying an individual who is overdosing. To examine first responder experiences and satisfaction with the naloxone training provided, ODL distributes a satisfaction survey immediately following the completion of each agency’s training. A 12-item Training Satisfaction Rating Scale was utilized to measure satisfaction with the following:

1) Training objectives and content;
2) Methods and training context;
3) Usefulness and overall training rating, using a scale of 1 (totally disagree) to 5 (totally agree)

Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, all training surveys were conducted on paper and training participants were asked to complete the survey immediately following the completion of training and place the completed survey back in a concealed envelope. During the pandemic, both training and surveys have transitioned to an online format.

The results of the survey indicate that over 1700 first responders from 98 agencies across 46 counties received naloxone training (Tables 4, 5, and 6). The majority of naloxone training sessions were conducted with law enforcement (police and sheriff’s departments), with remaining sessions conducted with fire departments, corrections agencies, EMS, and other agencies. Grant County had the highest number of training session participants (n=151), the majority of whom were law enforcement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Department</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMS</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections/Probation</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1713</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Police</td>
<td>Fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackford</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cass</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daviess</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decatur</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dekalb</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubois</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fountain</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington and Wells</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosciusko</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaGrange</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noble</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parke</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulaski</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putnam</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randolph</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rush</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelby</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spencer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steuben</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tipton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wabash</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>309</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 6: Locations Participating in Naloxone Training for First Responders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams County Probation Department</td>
<td>Jefferson County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>Jennings County Probation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albion Fire Department</td>
<td>Jonesboro Fire/Rescue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Township Volunteer Fire Department</td>
<td>Kosciusko County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>LaGrange County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn Police Department</td>
<td>LaGrange County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont High School</td>
<td>Lawrence County Probation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berne Police Department</td>
<td>Lawrence County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blountsville-Stoney Creek Volunteer Fire Department</td>
<td>Ligonier Fire Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler Police Department</td>
<td>Logansport Fire Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadiz</td>
<td>Logansport Police Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cass County Probation Department</td>
<td>Madison Township</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cicero</td>
<td>Markle Fire Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton County Community Corrections</td>
<td>Marshall County Volunteer Fire Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>Milltown Police Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal Creek</td>
<td>Milton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawfordsville Police Department</td>
<td>Modoc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daviess County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>Montgomery County Probation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decatur County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>Noble County Probation/Community Corrections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dekalb County Probation</td>
<td>Noble County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dekalb County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>Northeast Dubois High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubois County Health Department</td>
<td>Oldenburg Police Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubois Corrections</td>
<td>Orange County Probation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubois County Probation</td>
<td>Parke County Probation Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubois County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>Petersburg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dupont-Lancaster Township Volunteer Fire Department</td>
<td>Pike County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairplay Grant Fire Protection Territory</td>
<td>Princeton Police Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairplay Volunteer Fire Department</td>
<td>Pulaski County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmland Volunteer Fire Department</td>
<td>Randolph County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco Police Department</td>
<td>Roanoke Police Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulton County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>Rush County Probation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett</td>
<td>Seymour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geneva Fire Department</td>
<td>Shipshewana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>Spencer County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton and Harrison Township</td>
<td>St. Anthony Fire Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover</td>
<td>St. Paul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7: Naloxone Training for First Responders Satisfaction Survey Items and Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Totally Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Totally Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In my opinion, the planned objectives of the training were met.</td>
<td>18 (1.4%)</td>
<td>2 (0.2%)</td>
<td>83 (6.4%)</td>
<td>400 (30.8%)</td>
<td>796 (61.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The issues were dealt with, in as much depth as the length of the training allowed.</td>
<td>19 (1.5%)</td>
<td>3 (0.2%)</td>
<td>98 (7.5%)</td>
<td>390 (30.0%)</td>
<td>789 (60.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The length of the training was adequate for the objectives and content.</td>
<td>19 (1.5%)</td>
<td>7 (0.5%)</td>
<td>104 (8.0%)</td>
<td>379 (29.2%)</td>
<td>790 (60.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The training method was well suited to the objectives and content.</td>
<td>17 (1.3%)</td>
<td>7 (0.5%)</td>
<td>97 (7.5%)</td>
<td>387 (29.8%)</td>
<td>791 (60.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The method used enabled us to take an active part in training.</td>
<td>5 (0.7%)</td>
<td>8 (1.0%)</td>
<td>53 (6.9%)</td>
<td>171 (22.3%)</td>
<td>529 (69.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The training enabled me to share professional experiences with colleagues.</td>
<td>5 (0.7%)</td>
<td>11 (1.4%)</td>
<td>69 (9.0%)</td>
<td>167 (21.8%)</td>
<td>514 (67.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The training was realistic and practical.</td>
<td>18 (1.4%)</td>
<td>9 (0.7%)</td>
<td>116 (8.9%)</td>
<td>409 (31.5%)</td>
<td>747 (57.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The documentation given out was of good quality.</td>
<td>7 (0.8%)</td>
<td>9 (1.0%)</td>
<td>75 (8.2%)</td>
<td>211 (23.0%)</td>
<td>616 (67.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The context was well suited to the training process.</td>
<td>18 (1.4%)</td>
<td>6 (0.5%)</td>
<td>100 (7.7%)</td>
<td>394 (30.4%)</td>
<td>780 (60.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The training received is useful for my specific job.</td>
<td>19 (1.5%)</td>
<td>6 (0.5%)</td>
<td>135 (10.4%)</td>
<td>336 (25.9%)</td>
<td>801 (61.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The training received is useful for my personal development.</td>
<td>20 (1.5%)</td>
<td>9 (0.7%)</td>
<td>128 (9.9%)</td>
<td>385 (29.5%)</td>
<td>757 (58.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The training merits a good overall rating.</td>
<td>19 (1.5%)</td>
<td>5 (0.4%)</td>
<td>96 (7.4%)</td>
<td>362 (27.9%)</td>
<td>817 (62.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not all survey respondents answered every item
Naloxone Training for First Responders Satisfaction Survey Results

As of August 2021, at least 1,299 participants completed satisfaction surveys after receiving naloxone training from ODL.

Looking at responses from the survey overall, an overwhelming majority of respondents had favorable views about the naloxone training (see Table 7). About 90% of respondents answered either “agree” or “totally agree” to various items regarding training objectives, quality, and usefulness on the naloxone training satisfaction survey, indicating high satisfaction. The items that were most commonly answered with “totally disagree” or “disagree” were “The training enabled me to share professional experiences with colleagues” (n=29, 2.1%) and “The training was realistic and practical” (n=27, 2.1%).

Trainers note that, since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic in March 2020, all naloxone trainings for first responders have shifted to an online format. This change of format may affect trainee perceptions regarding the practical nature of the training and their ability to share training experiences with colleagues.
DISCUSSION

Summary
As the CARA evaluation concludes in 2021, researchers observed a record number of naloxone postcards returned in 2020 (428 postcards in 2020 compared to 241 postcards in 2019) and the first half of 2021 (141 in the first five months of 2021 compared to 88 in 2019), indicating that the naloxone provided by Indiana’s First Responder CARA program is needed now more than ever. Additionally, the sheer number of postcards returned over the last four years indicates that Indiana first responders (including police, EMS, correctional officers, and firefighters) continue to see the value in supporting research around naloxone administration in the rural communities they serve.

In terms of Year 4 trends, results from the latest analysis of naloxone postcard data have closely aligned with results of previous reports in Years 1, 2, and 3 of the CARA evaluation. While naloxone kits are distributed to many different kinds of first responder agencies, the majority of those who return the naloxone postcard survey have been police, followed by EMS. Postcard survey respondents indicate that recipients of naloxone are most commonly white males ages 25 to 34. Further, regarding the overdose incident, respondents most commonly indicate that the overdose occurred at a residence and required only one or two doses of naloxone to reverse the effects. Perhaps most importantly, data from all four years of the First Responder CARA evaluation indicates that naloxone successfully revives overdose victims an overwhelming majority of the time. Subsequent to the event, a majority of overdose victims are transported by EMS to a hospital, and only a small percentage of overdose victims are arrested; we believe this to be an important finding, as fear of arrest could potentially deter individuals from calling 911 at the scene of an overdose.

Another important finding from the First Responder CARA evaluation continues to be that the majority of individuals receiving the naloxone are not alone when they overdose, but only a small number of these individuals receive naloxone prior to the arrival of first responders. This data highlights a need for targeted naloxone distribution to individuals with opioid use disorder, or their family and friends, in rural areas. It is also possible that naloxone is on-site during the overdose, but bystanders are unaware of its availability or uneducated on how to administer it, thus highlighting the need for all naloxone distribution efforts to include educational materials on how to inform others of where naloxone is stored and how to administer it. Considering the majority of individuals who received naloxone were transported by EMS to care, it is possible that the emergency department could be a natural and critical location for naloxone distribution and education efforts.

Further, concerning naloxone training satisfaction surveys, the large majority of participants overall reported high satisfaction with all areas of the training, despite the move to a virtual format due to COVID-19. Respondents believed the training merits a good rating overall and is useful for their specific job. The only areas of the survey that respondents indicated there was room for improvement were the lack of opportunities for sharing of training experiences with colleagues and the practicality of the training. Trainers note that, most recently, online training formats implemented in the wake of COVID-19 may have negatively affected trainees’ perceptions of these areas.

Changes in Trends
Although many past trends have continued, the latest analysis of naloxone postcard data has identified some new trends that have continued from 2020 into 2021. For example, increased numbers of postcards provided to and returned by Indiana Department of Correction (IDOC) facilities across the state may be changing demographics of overdose victims and circumstances of naloxone administrations. For example, males made up a higher percentage of overdose victims than in the last two reports (76% now compared to 72% in August 2020) and more individuals were alone at the time...
of the overdose incident (29% now compared to 23% in August 2020). These trends highlight the unique experiences of correctional officers and justice-involved individuals who experience overdose events in correctional settings and deserve further research.

Researchers also identified a change in trends in terms of what happens after naloxone administration. Specifically, increasingly fewer individuals are being transported to care by EMS after an overdose incident (61%) compared to August 2020 (71%) and February 2020 (82%). Whether these changes reflect COVID-19-related changes in first responder policies, individual concern over risk of contracting COVID-19 in a hospital care setting, or both is unclear, but should be studied further.

Future Research
Record overdose events in 2020 and 2021, as well as the ongoing public health crisis presented by the COVID-19 pandemic, suggest that the provision of naloxone to and appropriate training for first responders in rural agencies may be more important now than ever before. Continued research around naloxone administration in rural areas, including demographics of overdose victims and experiences of first responders who administer naloxone, will allow Indiana stakeholders to explore trends and make informed decisions to mitigate increasing overdose events during the pandemic.
APPENDIX

CARA POSTCARD EXAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please complete <strong>one survey per overdose incident</strong> (circle response).</th>
<th>CARA#0001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of naloxone use? ______ /_<strong><strong>/</strong></strong>__</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many doses of naloxone did you administer to this person? ___________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the naloxone successfully revive the person? • YES • NO • Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What type of first responder are you? • Police • EMS • Fire • Other ___________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of person who received the naloxone dose(s)? • Male • Female • Transgender • Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity of person who received the naloxone dose(s)? • White • Hispanic/Latino • Black/African American • Other • Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate age of person who received the naloxone dose(s)? • 0-17 yrs • 18-24 yrs • 25-34 yrs • 35-44 yrs • 45-54 yrs • 55-64 yrs • 65 yrs+ • Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of naloxone administration? • Residence • Hotel/Motel • Public Place (e.g. Park) • Business • Vehicle • Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the person who received the naloxone dose(s) alone at the time of overdose? • YES • NO • Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was naloxone administered by a lay responder prior to your arrival? • YES • NO • Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What happened to the person after receiving the naloxone dose(s)? • Involuntary Detention • Arrest • Transported by EMS • Refused to transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was anyone else arrested at the scene? • NO • YES, for paraphernalia or drug possession • YES, for other reason ___________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NALOXONE TRAINING SATISFACTION SURVEY EXAMPLE

Naloxone Training Satisfaction Survey

Your feedback is important to us.
Please take a few seconds to let us know what you thought about today’s training.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Totally Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Totally Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. In my opinion, the planned objectives of the training were met.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The issues were dealt with in as much depth as the length of the training allowed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The length of the training was adequate for the objectives and content.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The training method was well suited to the objectives and content.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The method used enabled us to take an active part in training.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The training enabled me to share professional experiences with colleagues.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The training was realistic and practical.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The documentation given out was of good quality.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The context was well suited to the training process.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The training received is useful for my specific job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The training received is useful for my personal development.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The training merits a good overall rating.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please continue on back)

13. What about the training was most useful in supporting your future work as a first responder?

14. How could this training be improved?

15. What type of first responder are you? (Please circle)
   - Police
   - EMS
   - Fire
   - Other __________

Thank you!
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