



Population Health Proposal Part 3

EVALUATION PLAN AND COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS

YOUNG ADULTS (18–25) WITH SERIOUS MENTAL ILLNESS, SEDGWICK COUNTY, KANSAS

MICHAEL MOATES, ED.D. | NU 780

Problem Identified From Population Data

- ▶ Population: young adults ages 18–25 with serious mental illness in Sedgwick County, Kansas (Sedgwick County Health Department, 2022).
- ▶ Problem: high depression burden and elevated suicide risk within this group (SAMHSA, 2023).
- ▶ Kansas suicide mortality increased faster than national trends across 2001–2021 (Garnett & Curtin, 2023).
- ▶ Local systems impact rising crisis and emergency utilization for depression, suicidal ideation, and self-harm among young adults (Sedgwick County Health Department, 2022).

Selected Intervention Overview

- ▶ Selected intervention: Community gatekeeper training initiative (QPR + Mental Health First Aid).
- ▶ Core components
 - ▶ Train trusted community members (education, workplaces, faith, peers, social service staff) to recognize warning signs and respond.
 - ▶ Standardized response steps: question, persuade, refer (QPR) plus supportive action planning and crisis response skills (MHFA).
 - ▶ Closed-loop referral pathways to 988, local crisis stabilization, and community mental health services.
- ▶ Rationale: gatekeeper programs increase knowledge and self-efficacy for identification and referral (Liu et al., 2025; Kingi-Uluave et al., 2025).

How Outcomes Will Be Evaluated

- ▶ Evaluation approach: mixed-methods process and outcome evaluation using a logic model (inputs → activities → outputs → outcomes).
- ▶ Design
 - ▶ Baseline measurement, then quarterly monitoring for 12–24 months.
 - ▶ Interrupted time series of suicide-related ED visits and crisis encounters, with pre/post trend comparison.
 - ▶ Equity stratification by age, sex, race/ethnicity, and ZIP code when available.
- ▶ Use results for continuous quality improvement (booster trainings, targeted outreach, referral pathway fixes).

Evaluation Measures to Determine Effectiveness

- ▶ Process measures (implementation and reach)
 - ▶ Number trained, completion rate, and workforce/sector distribution (training roster).
 - ▶ Training fidelity (standard curriculum delivered, booster completion at 6–12 months).
 - ▶ Referral actions: number of warm handoffs to 988 or crisis services reported by gatekeepers.
- ▶ Direct measures (knowledge and skill gains)
 - ▶ Pre/post changes in suicide prevention knowledge, stigma, and self-efficacy (validated brief scales).
 - ▶ Skill demonstration via scenario-based assessment or observed role-play (sampled).
- ▶ Outcome measures (population and system indicators)
 - ▶ Suicide-related ED visits, hospitalizations, and self-harm encounters among ages 18–25 (local hospitals, KDHE morbidity data).
 - ▶ Suicide deaths (KDHE vital statistics and CDC mortality reporting) for ages 18–25.
 - ▶ Linkage-to-care within 7 days after a crisis encounter and reduced repeat ED visits within 30 days.
- ▶ Interpretation: sustained downward trends post-implementation, relative to baseline, support positive intervention impact.

Cost-Benefit: Human Resources

- ▶ Human resources (costs)
 - ▶ Program coordinator (0.5–1.0 FTE) for scheduling, partnerships, and QA.
 - ▶ Certified trainers for QPR and MHFA, plus peer co-facilitators and community champions.
 - ▶ Data/evaluation support: analyst (0.2–0.5 FTE) for dashboards, trend analysis, and reporting.
- ▶ Human resources (benefits)
 - ▶ Increased community capacity to recognize risk and initiate timely referral.
 - ▶ Reduced burden on crisis responders through earlier detection and more appropriate routing.
 - ▶ Stronger cross-sector collaboration (health systems, schools, social services, law enforcement).

Cost-Benefit: Capital Resources

- ▶ Capital resources (costs)
 - ▶ Training venues or webinar platform licensing and IT support.
 - ▶ Secure data infrastructure for tracking participation and outcomes (HIPAA-aligned where needed).
 - ▶ Equipment: laptops/tablets, projector, and secure storage for training records.
- ▶ Capital resources (benefits)
 - ▶ Scalable delivery across multiple sectors and ZIP codes.
 - ▶ Reliable data capture enables rapid feedback loops and targeted improvements.
 - ▶ Supports sustainability beyond the initial implementation period.

Cost-Benefit: Material Resources

- ▶ Material resources (costs)
 - ▶ Course fees, manuals, and participant materials for QPR and MHFA.
 - ▶ Marketing and outreach (flyers, social media ads, community events) to recruit gatekeepers.
 - ▶ Incentives (optional) to improve participation, especially in high-need areas.
- ▶ Material resources (benefits)
 - ▶ Higher participation and retention, improving reach and dosage.
 - ▶ Consistent messaging that normalizes help-seeking and reduces stigma.
 - ▶ Clear referral tools (wallet cards, QR codes) increase the likelihood of timely action.

Summary

- ▶ Evaluation will combine process, direct, and outcome indicators to show whether the intervention was delivered as planned and improved population trends.
- ▶ Short-term success indicators: training reach, improved knowledge/self-efficacy, and increased crisis referrals.
- ▶ Medium-term indicators: improved linkage to care and reduced repeat ED utilization for suicide-related crises.
- ▶ Long-term indicators: reduced suicide attempts and deaths among ages 18–25 in Sedgwick County.
- ▶ Cost-benefit expectation: relatively modest training and coordination costs compared with high medical and societal costs of suicide and self-harm (Peterson et al., 2024; CDC, 2025).

References

- ▶ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2025, March 26). Facts about suicide. <https://www.cdc.gov/suicide/facts/index.html>
- ▶ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (n.d.). WISQARS cost of injury. Retrieved December 14, 2025, from <https://wisqars.cdc.gov/cost/>
- ▶ Forthal, S., Sesso, J., & et al. (2022). Mental health first aid: A systematic review of trainee outcomes. Psychiatric Services. <https://psychiatryonline.org/doi/full/10.1176/appi.ps.202100027>
- ▶ Garnett, M. F., & Curtin, S. C. (2023). Suicide mortality in the United States, 2001–2021 (NCHS Data Brief No. 464). National Center for Health Statistics. <https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/databriefs/db464.pdf>
- ▶ Kansas Department of Health and Environment. (n.d.). Suicide-related data (Kansas Suicide-Related Data Dashboard). Retrieved December 14, 2025, from <https://www.kdhe.ks.gov/1974/Suicide-Related-Data>
- ▶ Kingi-Uluave, D., & et al. (2025). A review of systematic reviews: Gatekeeper training for suicide prevention. Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13811118.2024.2358411>

References

- ▶ Liu, H., & et al. (2025). Gatekeeper training for suicide prevention: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. BMC Public Health. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s12889-025-21736-1>
- ▶ Mojtabai, R., & et al. (2021). (Study on serious mental illness and housing instability). Journal of Psychiatric Research. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychires.2021.02.015>
- ▶ Peterson, C., Kresnow, M., & et al. (2024). Economic cost of U.S. suicide and nonfatal self-harm. Injury Prevention. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11193601/>
- ▶ Sedgwick County Health Department. (2022). Wichita–Sedgwick County behavioral health needs assessment. <https://www.sedgwickcounty.org/media/69013/wichita-sedgwick-needs-assessment-final.pdf>
- ▶ Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. (2023). Key substance use and mental health indicators in the United States: Results from the 2022 National Survey on Drug Use and Health. <https://www.samhsa.gov/data/report/2022-nsduh-annual-national-report>
- ▶ Suicide Prevention Resource Center. (n.d.). Economic cost of suicide and self-harm. Retrieved December 14, 2025, from <https://sprc.org/resources/economic-cost-of-suicide-and-self-harm/>