Recommendation	Massuras	Reporting Dates	Outcomes	
Recommendation	ricasures	Reporting Dates	Outcomes	
	Distribution Amounts		Table 1. SSP Supplies Distributed Amounts	
	~Distribution Amounts		Agency	Amount
	~Estimated Individuals Served		Connecticut Harm Reduction Alliance Liberation Programs	\$260,000 \$50,000
	~Annual CT SSP Report (available each June/July) includes #		Naloxone	\$60,000
	served, # visits, # new SSP clients, demographics (gender, age,		Yale University CHCV	\$50,000
	race/ethnicity), services info (# tested HIV/Hep C, treatment		APEX Community Care	\$35,000
	referrals, supply distributions), primary substance reported		Alliance for Living Waterbury HD	\$25,000 \$20,000
	* Note: This report cannot be broken down by funder but provides a	Yearly and/or	Total:	\$500,000
	comprehensive outline of SSP supply distribution.	_	From Initial Funding: served an es	
SSP Supplies	comprehensive dutance of deriversity distribution.	all funds	individuals	
ос. оприне	~DDaP Data			
	~Connections to Treatment (number and type)			
	~MOUD inductions on vehicle vs referral			
	~Engagement Retention in MOUD			
	~Harm Reduction Supplies dispersement (syringes, Naloxone kits)			
	~Van location (days, hours) & Individuals Served: Per			
	Day/Location, identify number individuals prescribed			
	MOUD/MOUD type, number individuals dosed, number individuals	July 15		
	provided education or resources but not started on MOUD	January 15		
Mobile OTP	~# individuals with reduced or eliminated substance use			
	~DDaP Data			
	~New individuals in reporting period per court			
	~Number individuals connected to treatment through TPP per			
	court	July 15		
	~Number of planned successful discharges	January 15		
TPP	~Numer of clinical assessments completed	-		
DOC OTP		Upon completion		
Expansion	Build out completion dates	of build out		
		Yearly and/or		
Naloxone	~Number of Kits purchased and distributed	upon utilization of		
Saturation	~Agency/facility type (PNP, Hospitals, School, etc)	all funds		

	T	
	~VM locations	
	~Supplies Provided by count (by VM location)	Every 6 months
Harm Reduction	~# Unique Individuals Served (by VM location)	upon
Vending Machines	~Participant Zip Codes Served (by VM location)	implementation
		Every 6 months
	~Naloxbox locations and kits disseminated per box	upon
	~Services provided and individuals reached	implementation;
	~Supplies disseminated	presentation to
Primary	~Events (location, type, number engaged)	OSAC after 18m of
Prevention	~Advertising communications for events hosted	data collection
		Yearly and/or
Deactivation		upon utilization of
Pouch Campaign	~Number pouches disseminated by zip code	all funds
	~# Individuals served	
	~Incentives Provided (average per person, total incentive	
	dispersed)	
	~CM Program Treatment Outcomes/Discharge Reasons	Every 6 months
Contingency	~Average number of visits attended per individual engaged	upon
Management	~Substance Use Reduction Outcomes	implementation
	~Engagement/Reach Data per tactic (include breakdown by	
	language)	
	~Communities reached per tactic	
	~Outline of tactics used	Upon completion
LiveLOUD		of each campaign
	# trainings provided/attendees	
	# individuals served	
	# individuals inducted on MOUD	
	# individuals connected to community tx	Every 6 months
	% retained in MOUD at 3m, 6m	upon
ED Bridge	If return admission, reason for re-admission	implementation

Housing	~Demographics	year 3	
Supportive	~Exit destinations for people leaving the program	for report out at	
	~Referrals and connection to treatment	implementation	
	~Length of time from voucher approval to housed	months from	
	~Number served	eval starting at 2.5	
		comprehensive	
		implementation;	
		upon	
		Every 6 months	
SafeSpot	~Linkages to Care/Resources	implementation	
	~Safety Actions Taken	upon	
	~Call outcome (Mark Safe vs Overdose vs Disconnect)	Every 3 months	
	~Hold time		
	~Route of use		
	~Type of Substance Used		
	~Zip Code (for understanding how our marketing is working)		
	~Use Events (how many times someone uses on the call)		
	~Number of calls		
College TA	g. o as o as a singular o	completion	
	A: CRC growth as evidenced by new student engagement	and upon project	
	between training pre/post surveys	implementation	
	C: Individual stigma reduction, as quantified by movement	months post-	
	staff, organizations	6 months and 12	
	A, B: Each engaged campus builds a coalition of supportive offices,		
	B, C: Faculty, Staff, and Students Impacted by Trainings		
	B: Increase in checklist items for each campus (NASPA Checklist)		
	implemented		
	A, B, C: Percent of involved campuses with action plans drafted  A, B, C: Percent of drafted action plans that have been		
	A, B, C: Percent of involved campuses with action plans drafted		
	designed and implemented  Example benchmarks of these outcomes include:		
	C: Stigma reduction strategies (campaigns, training programs, etc)		
	B: Opioid Overdose Prevention/Response Programs implemented		
	A: Collegiate Recovery Programs/Communities built		
	Outcome Targets:		

	~Total Visits	
	~Unique Individuals	
	~Naloxone Kits Distributed	
	~Harm Reduction Supplies Dispensed	
	~Client Demographics	
	~Connections to Care and Medical Support	
Harm Reduction	~Medical Treatment Received (MAT Induction, Testing/Screening	April 15th,
Centers	for HIV, Hep C, etc, Wound Care)	October 15th