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Survey Methodology


- Phase I: Key Informant Survey
  - APGSA Survey emailed then completed by key informant from one or more government agencies or a designated third party
  - NCPG Affiliate Survey emailed then completed by key informant

- Phase II: Collateral Information Check
  - Checked for consistent reports between state key informant and affiliate key informant
  - Web search for information, compared survey reports with reports on web

- Phase III: Survey Review Interviews / Verification
  - Interviews were conducted with survey completers to review information, check for question interpretation accuracy, complete missing items, and gain clarification where inconsistencies were found.
Survey Participation

- Information gathered from all 50 U.S. states and D.C.; all active affiliates to the National Council on Problem Gambling
  - 39 states with publicly funded problem gambling services
  - 34 state affiliates to the National Council on Problem Gambling

- Information from all data gathering phases from all NCPG affiliates and from all state agencies with public funding for PGS with the following exceptions:
  - One state (South Dakota) declined to complete survey and declined interview invitations; some survey info gathered from 3rd party sources
  - Two states (Ohio & Illinois) had limited information available.
  - One state completed survey and declined interview invitations (South Carolina)
  - One NCPG affiliate (Arizona) was inactive but held official status as affiliate to the NCPG. As inactive organization, no one to participate in survey.
Problem Gambling Service Funding Levels

2013 APGSA & NCPG Affiliate Surveys
2013 Per Capita Allocation Problem Gambling Services Allocation by U.S. States

Note: Includes only funds line itemed for problem gambling services and passing through a state agency. Missing states do not fund problem gambling services through legislative actions or utilize state agency budgets line itemed for problem gambling services.

If all 50 States included U.S. Average = $0.23 per capita spending on PGS.
2013 Per Capita NCPG State Affiliate Budget

Per Capita

U.S. Average (.14)

Note: Four Affiliates operated without any FY13 revenue (MO, NC, RI, TX)
Combined 2013 Per Capita PGS Allocation by U.S. States and State Affiliates

Note: NCPG Affiliates spending (in red) represents all funds except those derived through contract with state agency.
Comparison between 2010 and 2013: Per Capita Allocation by U.S. States on Problem Gambling Services

Note: Includes only funds line itemed for problem gambling services and passing through a state agency
Are 2013 State PGS Funding LevelsSignificantly Correlated with . . .

1. Numbers treated   __Yes   __No

2. Calls for help in FY2010   __Yes   __No

3. Number of prevalence studies   __Yes   __No

4. Gambling revenue   __Yes   __No

5. Number of problem gamblers   __Yes   __No
Relationship between No. of PG Gamblers and FY12-13 funding

Estimated No. of Problem Gamblers

Relationship is significant, with $r=0.5204$ and $p=0.0001$
Annual Aggregate Budget of State Affiliates to the NCPG

Note: Based on 2013 state administrator survey responses.
Deviating from an upward investment trend from 2006 to 2010, funding for PGS was relatively flat from 2010 ($58.4M) to 2013 ($58.6M).
Substance Use Disorders

- U.S. Pop. With Past Year Problem
  - 18.9 Million

- 2009 Public Funds Invested into SUD Treatment
  - $17 Billion

Gambling Disorders

- U.S. Pop. With Past Year Problem
  - 5.3 Million
  - (3.6 times smaller)

- 2013 Public Funds Invested into Problem Gambling Services
  - $58.6 Million
  - (290 times smaller)

1 Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (2012)  
3 Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (2013).  
4 APGSA & NCPG National Survey (2013) Excludes private insurance payments, client private payments, etc.
Budget Allocations

2013 APGSA & NCPG Affiliate Surveys
Number of States Using Public Funds for Specific Problem Gambling Services

Note: Includes only funds line itemed for problem gambling services and passing through a state agency. Excludes information from APGSA SD Survey.
Allocation by Service Category

**State Agency**
- Treatment: 35.04%
- Prevent: 19.78%
- Media: 13.91%
- Other: 11.68%
- Admin: 6.84%
- Eval: 1.86%
- Research: 2.06%
- Helpline: 10.14%
- Training: 14.92%

**Affiliate to NCPG**
- Treatment: 13.35%
- Training: 19.43%
- Prevention: 15.46%
- Media: 13.91%
- Other: 18.91%
- Admin: 28.60%
- Evaluation: 2.52%
- Research: 1.48%
- Helpline: 10.41%
Number of State Employee FTE Dedicated to PGS  48 States Reporting

Only 18 states fund one or more dedicated position(s) to administer problem gambling programs.

Note: Mississippi and South Dakota did not report
Number of FTE Dedicated to PGS

34 NCPG Affiliates Reporting

Note: Some respondents counted volunteer board members as staff, other did not.
For service to be included must be operationally standardized. Web=online live chat
On average, 15% of calls are for help ranging from 4% (MI) to 73% (IA)
Calls for Help Compared to Tx Enrollments

In U.S., about four times as many persons call for help (37,541) than enroll in treatment (10,192)

Note: Treatment includes programs that are sponsored by both affiliates and states.
Are the Number PG Helpline Calls for Help Significantly Correlated with . . .

1. Gambling treatment utilization  XYes  __No
2. Number of types of gambling  XYes  __No
3. Gambling revenue  XYes  __No
4. Number of EMGs  __Yes  XNo
5. Number of problem gamblers  XYes  __No
Relationship statistically significant.
Relationship between Number of Types of Legalized Gambling and Helpline Call Volume
Includes only those states offering publicly funded gambling treatment and reported on levels of care (N = 29)
FY 2012 Numbers Treated with PG Funds

Note: MA & IL provide publicly funded gambling treatment, declined to report numbers. WA affiliate provides residential treatment (n=16)
Enrollment Changes

“Over the past year, has the number of consumers receiving outpatient publicly funded gambling treatment increased, decreased, stayed the same?”

Total Enrollments 2010 = 10,930
Total Enrollment 2013 = 10,387
1. Calls to Helpline __X Yes __No
2. Number of EMGs in state __Yes __X No
3. Gambling revenue __X Yes __No
4. Number of problem gamblers __Yes __X No
5. State PGS Budget __X Yes __No
Total funding for FY 12-13 is significantly correlated with numbers served, with \( p=0.0008 \) and \( r=0.6290 \).
FY13 Reimbursement Rates

Note: Group rates are per client hour/session except for DE where rates are per counselor hour and NJ where rates are per group. Average group rate excludes DE and NJ. Assessment rates per hour. The following state reimburse assessment per event: AZ, IA, KS, NE, NV, WA. MN reimbursement rates differ by provider qualifications, the reported rate is the average reimbursement for MN providers.
Cost Containment Measures

2013 Survey of State Agencies Providing Problem Gambling Services; Duration Cap includes only those states reporting a maximum treatment duration of less than one year.
Identified Gaps in Services

“What is your state’s largest gap in problem gambling services?”

- Inadequate Funding
- Poor Service Evaluation System
- Lack of Useful Research
- Poor Treatment Access
- Inadequate Problem Gambling Prevention Effort
- Poor Support System
- Poor Public Awareness
- Other

32 APGSA responses (7 refusals); 34 NCPG affiliates responses
Infrastructure Needs

0 = no need, 3 = somewhat needed, 5 = critically needed

- Improved Helpline
- Improve Admin Structure
- Collaboration with Other...
- Collaboration with Gaming...
- Increase Technical Assistance
- Improve National...
- Increase Admin Staff
- Improved IMS
- Improve Research
- Increase Treatment Providers
- Increase Prevention...

- State
- Affiliate
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