



Seattle Public Schools, King County Washington State Incentive Grant 1st Year Community-Level Evaluation 1999-2000

*Department of Social and
Health Services*

*Research and Data Analysis
Division and the University
of Washington, Washington
Institute for Mental Illness
Research and Training,
Western Branch*

Kojay Pan, M.P.A.,
Christine Roberts, Ph.D.,
with Dario Longhi, Ph.D.

Executive Summary

Seattle Public Schools is one of eighteen Washington State Incentive Grant (SIG) community grantees. Eighty-five percent of SIG funds are allocated to communities to prevent the use, misuse, and abuse of alcohol, tobacco, marijuana, and other drugs by Washington State youth.

This document is a baseline community-level evaluation report, examining the history of Seattle Public School's community partnership and substance abuse prevention efforts in Southeast Seattle within the last decade and the organization's initial challenges and successes in providing SIG-funded prevention services for youth. Reports are provided as feedback on Seattle Public Schools' SIG-related efforts to date and as a partial record of those efforts for state and federal funding agencies.

Seattle Public Schools' SIG project serves an urban community in Southeast Seattle. The community is bounded by Lake Washington to the east, Interstate 5 to the west, Interstate 90 to the north, and the city of Seattle boundary to the south. The cultural diversity in the area requires prevention programs and services that are sensitive to the cultural diversity and language needs of the area. Prevention programs chosen for the Southeast Seattle project are primarily school-based and are provided in local middle and elementary schools. Mercer Middle School is the hub for the Southeast Seattle SIG project.

Prevention History

Prior to the Southeast Seattle SIG project, prevention efforts in the area were primarily provided through programs such as Asian Counseling and Referral Services, Atlantic Street Center, and Washington Asian Pacific Islander Families Against Substance Abuse. However, partnerships between programs and organizations were somewhat limited in their scope and generally only encompassed a few agencies or organizations.

Agencies and organizations in Southeast Seattle were not using science-based programs prior to SIG. Rather, programs were chosen on the merit of past successes and familiarity. Planning did not consistently involve data, nor did planning always involve prevention partners. SIG introduced the concept of using pre-tests and post-tests to measure changes in risk and protective factors as

a result of program participation. After some initial confusion, pre-/post-tests data were collected for selected programs.

Since SIG funding was received, partnerships and communication between the schools and the community service agencies have increased. The extent of collaboration will be examined during the next evaluation period.

Families are now receiving SIG funded services in the community through the culturally sensitive program, Strengthening Multi-ethnic Families. Youth are learning refusal skills around alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs, and assistance in the classroom. The long-term, community-wide effects of these services will be measured through the Washington State Survey of Adolescent Health Behavior.

In addition to serving families through the provision of prevention programs, the State Incentive Grant has helped facilitate partnerships and communication between the schools and some of the neighboring service agencies. The writing of the SIG proposal required strong collaboration between the school districts, county agencies, organizations, and community members. SIG has helped create a greater awareness of the prevention field, particularly an awareness of science-based prevention programs and the use of data in prevention planning.

Challenges

Challenges experienced by local SIG staff in fulfilling SIG requirements included unexpected staff turnover, recruitment difficulties, and difficulty coordinating partners and resources. Programs were more time-consuming than expected. Use of the Everest database for program evaluation was not begun during this initial program implementation phase due to confusion regarding its use by program staff.

Seattle Public Schools, King County

Baseline Community-Level Evaluation

Introduction

What is the Washington State Incentive Grant?

Seattle Public Schools is one of eighteen Washington State Incentive Grant community grantees. Eighty-five percent of State Incentive Grant (SIG) funds are allocated to communities to prevent the use, misuse, and abuse of alcohol, tobacco, marijuana, and other drugs by Washington State youth. The grant consists of a three year, \$8.9 million award from the federal Center for Substance Abuse Prevention to Washington State through a cooperative agreement with Governor Gary Locke's office. State agencies participating in SIG have goals of coordinating resources and reducing duplication of effort. Communities will reduce key risk factors and promote protective factors in their efforts to reduce youth substance use, misuse, and abuse. Specific goals and objectives for state agencies and communities are stated in the *Washington State Incentive Grant Substance Abuse Plan*, pages 4 and 5, published in March 1999, by the Governor's Substance Abuse Prevention Advisory Committee. Appendix A contains a detailed list of those objectives. Here is a summary:

Goals:

1. Prevent alcohol, tobacco, marijuana, and other drug use, misuse, and abuse by the state's youth.
2. Make the community-level system more effective.

Objectives:

1. Establish local prevention partnerships.
2. Use a risk and protective factor framework for the community prevention plan.
3. Participate in joint community risk and protective factor and resource assessment.
4. Select and implement effective prevention actions.
5. Use common reporting tools.

The SIG evaluation, of which this report is a part, is a research evaluation intended to provide feedback to state agencies and communities on their progress toward the goals and objectives stated in the *Washington State Incentive Grant Substance Abuse Plan*. Interim reports are provided as an integral part of that feedback. Research methods are described in Appendix B. This document examines the prevention history of the area, relevant social indicators, and SIG-funded program implementation. Future reports will include discussions of program effectiveness, community partnerships and plans for continued funding beyond SIG.

Seattle Public Schools' Application for SIG Funds

Seattle Public Schools' successful SIG application was the result of several individuals' hard work, combined with the strengthening of partnerships between the Seattle School District and local service providers in the area.

During the early stages of SIG, representatives from various Seattle communities and King County came together for meetings to inform the communities about the SIG application process. Though there was competition among the various Seattle communities regarding which community would apply for funding, the Southeast Seattle area received the most support from Southeast Seattle social service agencies, as well as from the school district. Through a series of meetings, attended by school, city, and county representatives, it was determined that the Southeast Seattle area was an area of great need where funding should be focused. It was through these preliminary meetings and the resolve of Southeast Seattle representatives that the State Incentive Grant was brought to the community.

After conducting a community assessment, it was determined that a large percentage of Southeast Seattle area youths were experiencing risk factors for substance abuse. Using the risk and protective factor model, risk factors such as high student and family mobility were identified as associated with the Southeast Seattle area. Effective substance abuse prevention services to combat these risk factors were found to be limited in the community. The Southeast Seattle community, along with representatives from the Seattle School District, local prevention providers, Harborview Medical Center, King County, and the city of Seattle, joined forces in hopes of bringing SIG funding to the area. A combination of identified need and the dedication of community members led to a SIG award to the Southeast Seattle SIG project.

Description of Southeast Seattle

The boundaries of the Southeast Seattle area are Lake Washington to the east, Interstate 5 to the west, Interstate 90 to the north and the city of Seattle boundary to the south. Several distinct communities are a part of the general Southeast Seattle area and have been included for the purposes of this grant. These smaller communities include Beacon Hill, Martin Luther King Jr. (MLK) at Holly Street, North Rainier Valley Columbia, North Rainier Valley, Columbia City/Genesee/Hillman City, and Rainier Beach. Mercer Middle School, the hub for the Southeast Seattle SIG project, is located in the Beacon Hill Community.

Demographic Characteristics

Age

There are 60,847 adults in Southeast Seattle. Youth ages ranging from 17 and under comprise 38% of the population (22,858). The school age group targeted by SIG is ages 9 through 14, or children in 4th through 9th grade. There are approximately 7,500 children in this age group in Southeast Seattle, about one-third of all young people and one-eighth of the entire population.¹

Race/Ethnicity

Delivering social services in the Southeast Seattle area requires sensitivity to and consideration of multiple cultures and languages. The following table presents the distribution of major racial and ethnic groups at Mercer Middle School, the hub of Southeast Seattle's SIG project.

**Racial and Ethnic Diversity at
Mercer Middle School**

| Race/Ethnicity | Percentage of Students |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 45% |
| African American | 30% |
| White non-Hispanic | 15% |
| Hispanic (of all races) | 9% |
| American Indian | 1% |

For Mercer Middle School students, as well as many of the local elementary-age students, English is a second language, not the primary language spoken in the home. Some of the languages spoken in the community include Chinese Mandarin, Cambodian, Spanish, Somali, Vietnamese, Tagalog/Ilkano, Lao, Hmong, and Mein. The schools, as well as several community agencies, respond to language needs by offering special programs. For example, Mercer Middle School offers an English course as a Second Language (ESL)/Bilingual Education program that caters to the diverse needs of the student population. Maple Elementary has a Bilingual Orientation Center, while Hawthorne Elementary and Dearborn Park Elementary have bilingual staff that assist children and families with language barriers. The elementary schools involved in the State Incentive Grant also provide services and programs directed toward assisting students with special language needs.

¹ Information source for demographics is Seattle Public Schools, Division of Academic Achievement and Instructional Support Services, King County. 1999. *Proposal to Solicitation No. 991346, for Grant to Communities to Provide Services for the Prevention of Alcohol, Tobacco, Marijuana, and Other Drug Use, Misuse, and Abuse*. Unpublished.

Local agencies and community groups also respond to cultural and language differences when providing assistance to families or youth. Agencies such as the Atlantic Street Center and Washington Asian Pacific Islander Families Against Substance Abuse (WAPIFASA) provide curriculum and other prevention services that reflect the cultural diversity and language needs of the area. Neighborhood churches also offer services to many families and youth that have language or cultural differences.

Poverty Levels

Extreme economic deprivation is a key risk factor in the area. According to the 1990 U.S. Census, the number of people in Southeast Seattle living below the poverty level in 1990 was 15,138, or 19%. The number of children, ages birth through 17, living below the poverty level was 5,858, or 29%. Percentages of community members living below the poverty level in 1990 are listed below, categorized by race/ethnicity:

- American Indian 57%
- African-American 27%
- Latino 23%
- Asian/Pacific Islander 16%
- White 11%

Additional evidence of economic deprivation in the area, according to Seattle School District representatives, is that Mercer Middle School has one of the highest percentages in the entire district of students that are involved in a free and reduced fee lunch program: 65%. This program provides assistance to low-income households by either reducing the costs of lunch for students or providing lunches free of charge.

Migratory Population

During the 1997-98 school year, more than a quarter of Mercer Middle School students either moved into or out of the school. This high rate of incoming and outgoing students is evidence for two risk factors identified in Seattle Public Schools' SIG proposal: 1) high transitions and mobility and 2) low neighborhood commitment. People who are in transition may not invest the energy or time that is necessary to create a stable and supportive environment, consequently creating low neighborhood attachment. Without an investment in the community, it is more difficult for communities to create an environment that is supportive of prevention services and activities.

Employment

Employment in the Southeast Seattle community is provided through many small, family-owned businesses including grocery stores, shops, and restaurants. There are also a few factories in the area providing employment to residents. Most community residents work in the larger Seattle metropolitan area.

Schools

Informants stated that the area schools are in need of more community support and financial investment to provide badly needed renovation and improvements.

Despite these and other challenges, informants stated that the schools have taken several positive steps in recent years. The positive momentum is measurable at Mercer Middle School in terms of school reforms and successes with students. Staff and administrators there reportedly appear energized; they work hard at keeping the school a healthy and safe environment for youths. Teachers and administration make a conscious effort to get to know students and to approach unfamiliar faces on campus. Although school safety is still a primary concern with the schools, informants believe that students now feel safer.

Despite the hard work of school staff and administrators, many of the schools in the Southeast Seattle area, including Mercer Middle School, continue to suffer from a public perception that the schools are unsafe. In the past, there were reports of gang activity and trespassing. By heightening awareness and increasing security, the staff made progress toward preventing these negative activities. Gang activity is no longer a pressing issue at Mercer Middle School.

While there is a core group of dedicated, involved parents, the schools in the Southeast Seattle area do not have widespread parental involvement. Informants report that several initiatives to increase parental involvement are being discussed. Currently, parental participation in the classroom and in organized groups, such as the Parent-Teacher Association (PTA), remains limited.

Recent Accomplishments

In recent years, the Southeast Seattle area has made considerable progress in its efforts to create a safer community. The development of community policing has helped facilitate a better relationship and understanding between local law enforcement personnel and community members. The community is very proud of the fact that gang activity has decreased dramatically in recent years. Informants attribute this decrease to the schools identifying gang activity as a primary issue of concern. They then took steps to reduce gang activity, such as creating heightened awareness and security and reaching out to at-risk students.

The number of alternatives for area youth has increased as access to community services has increased. Service providers are now doing a better job of addressing barriers, such as language differences.

The schools are working closely with local treatment agencies and prevention providers to strengthen existing partnerships and increase collaboration in the area. Representatives from local treatment agencies, prevention providers, and the schools are now meeting monthly to discuss prevention activities and SIG related issues. Whether or not non-SIG partners have been incorporated into these partnerships is still in question; however, steps are being taken to increase the number of prevention partners and build community collaboration.

Optimism

Informants maintain that adults in the Southeast Seattle community are fairly optimistic about their futures. Informants state that the direction of the community is positive. Residents can choose from several ethnic-specific programs, places for social gatherings, and religious, educational, and cultural programs.

Many informants stated that there is a general community belief that the area does not receive enough support from the city. This leaves residents with inadequate resources to deal with issues such as continual economic deprivation, difficulty accessing services, and the problem of increasing airplane noise. Many Southeast Seattle community members believe that the rest of the city does not value the Southeast Seattle area. This perception was reinforced, according to informants, when discrepancies between airplane noise in Southeast Seattle and other areas were pointed out to city officials, yet they were ignored and downplayed. These issues, if left unresolved, can contribute to community disorganization, which is another risk factor identified in the area's SIG proposal.

Informants state that community members are concerned that a large number of youth feel hopeless about the future. Some informants stated that many youth appear desensitized and are not even considering the future. Instead, these youth are adopting a "survival mode" mentality in order to cope with their current environment. This has led the community, along with service providers and schools, to focus efforts toward creating a supportive and nurturing environment intended to improve young people's attitudes about their futures.

Available Services

Four local youth drug treatment and prevention organizations provide services in the Southeast Seattle area:

- The Washington Asian Pacific Islander Families Against Substance Abuse (WAPIFASA)
- Central Youth and Family Services
- Southeast Youth and Family Services
- The Seattle Public School Comprehensive Student Assistance Program (CSAP)

The first three organizations deliver services primarily in the community.

WAPIFASA provides prevention programs and cultural awareness curricula in the schools, as well. The Seattle Public School Comprehensive Student Assistance Program provides prevention and intervention specialists at several schools in the community.

Community Sense of Adult and Youth Substance Abuse and Attitudes

Adult substance abuse is reportedly a major problem for the Southeast Seattle area. However, the community as a whole tends to deny adult abuse of alcohol and drugs. Many informants maintain that the Southeast Seattle community is targeted by industries promoting negative behaviors. For example, commercial signs promoting the use of alcohol and tobacco can be found throughout the community and are in front of nearly every convenience store. These attitudes are captured in one of the risk factors identified as a priority by the Southeast Seattle Community: community laws and norms favorable to drug use.

In 1995, the Seattle Teen Health Survey results indicated that nearly one-third of 8th graders in the Seattle area believed that someone in their family has or may have a drinking or substance abuse problem. These perceptions are significant because youth often look to family members as role models. Other results from the Teen Health Survey were that 22% of 8th graders felt that occasional marijuana use had very little or no harm. Another 10% of 8th graders reported that they were not sure of the potential harm. Among high school students surveyed, 42% felt that there was slight or no risk in occasional marijuana use, while 14% reported “not sure.” The Southeast Seattle Community used these findings from the Seattle Teen Health Survey to select the following risk factors among Southeast Seattle youth: parental attitudes favorable toward drug use and favorable attitudes among youth toward alcohol and other drug use. Data from the Washington State Survey of Adolescent Health Behavior (WSSAHB) was not available for prevention planning because Seattle Public Schools had not participated in the WSSAHB before involvement in SIG.

Risk and Protective Factors

David Hawkins, Richard Catalano, and others at the University of Washington developed a research framework about community, school, family, peer, and individual influences that either increase the likelihood that a child will someday abuse substances or that help lessen the impact of those risks. Influences that increase the likelihood of substance abuse are known as risk factors; those that lessen the impact of risk factors are known as protective factors.

Below is a table of risk factors on which Seattle Public Schools is focusing and for which archival data are available.² Numbers in the table below are summary measures, which compare county data to the state average. Ninety-five percent of county rates will have a summary measure between -2.00 and 2.00 around the state average, which, for these purposes, is zero. Since one-third of the state’s population resides in King County, data for King County strongly influence the state average. Therefore, there are few differences between King County and the state average. The differences that do exist are small. These summary measures

² Becker, Linda et al. 1999. *1999 County Profile on Risk and Protection for Substance Abuse Prevention Planning in King County*. Olympia, WA: Department of Social and Health Services, Research and Data Analysis.

are based on archival data. Archival data are collected for purposes other than measuring risk factors for substance abuse, but are strongly correlated with direct measures of risk factors for substance abuse, such as those found in the Washington State Survey of Adolescent Health Behavior (WSSAHB).

The far right column of the table below contains summary measures for counties like King County. These are counties similar to King in their population ages 10-24, percentage of deaths related to alcohol and other drugs, and geography. In the table below, King County summary measures are compared to those of Pierce, Snohomish, and Spokane Counties as a group. The combined population of these three counties is 29% of the state's population; thus, as with King County, we do not expect to find large differences between the state average and summary measures for this group of counties.

**Standardized Summary Measures for Risk Factors
In King County and Counties like King³**

| Risk Factor | King County | Counties like King |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| Family management problems | -0.23 | -0.38 |
| Early initiation of problem behavior | -0.11 | -0.68 |
| Low school achievement | -0.61 | -0.17 |
| Lack of commitment to school | -0.34 | 0.13 |

All four of the risk factors on which Seattle Public Schools is focusing and for which county level data are available are less of a problem in King County as a whole than in the state on average. King County's greatest summary measure, *Transitions and mobility*, is only minimally higher than the state on average. Prevention planners felt that local data showed that the risk factors listed were of greater urgency for southeast Seattle than they were for King County as a whole.

Because King County is so geographically, economically, and demographically diverse, summary measures for the county as a whole and in comparison to similar counties were not found useful by Seattle Public Schools SIG prevention planners. This is evidence of the need for more data at sub-county levels.

Below is a list of risk and protective factors found to be of greatest priority by Seattle Public Schools SIG project planners:

Risk factors:

1. Lack of commitment to school
2. Academic failure
3. Family management problems
4. Early initiation of problem behavior

³ Modified from Becker, Linda et al. 1999. *1999 County Profile on Risk and Protection for Substance Abuse Prevention Planning in King County*. Olympia, WA: Department of Social and Health Services, Research and Data Analysis.

5. Favorable attitudes toward the problem behavior
6. Friends who engage in the problem behavior
7. Alienation, rebelliousness, and lack of social bonding

Protective factors:

1. Opportunities for pro-social involvement in the community
2. Bonding to school
3. Social skills
4. Healthy beliefs and clear standards

Seattle Public Schools’ SIG Project

The table below lists the prevention programs chosen by the Southeast Seattle SIG project to address the prioritized risk and protective factors.⁴ It contains the program name, rigor category, and the risk and protective factors addressed by the program. The scale of rigor categories was created by the federal Center for Substance Abuse Prevention. Rigor is the extent to which the program has been shown, through scientific research methods, to be effective in different locales and with multiple populations. The highest rating is rigor 5, the lowest, rigor 1.

| Program | Rigor | Risk and Protective Factors Addressed |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|--|
| Strengthening Multi-Ethnic Families | 3 | <i>Risk Factors:</i> 1. Family management problems 2. Family conflict 3. Alienation and Rebelliousness |
| | | <i>Protective Factors:</i> 1. Healthy Beliefs and clear standards 2. Opportunities for prosocial involvement |
| Tutoring | 3-5 | <i>Risk Factors:</i> 1. Academic failure 2. Lack of commitment to school |
| | | <i>Protective Factors:</i> 1. High expectations and skills for academic success and active involvement |
| Project Alert | 4 | <i>Risk Factors:</i> 1. Early first use 2. Friends who use 3. Positive attitudes about use |
| | | <i>Protective Factors:</i> 1. Skill building 2. Opportunities for pro-social involvement |

⁴ Community-based prevention action plan implementation matrix for Southeast Seattle SIG

Current Program Status

- Staff was unable to recruit as many parents for the **Strengthening Multi-Ethnic Families** Program as they had anticipated. The low turnout may be due to perceived language or cultural differences. The sessions, however, were offered in several languages to minimize language barriers. Informants stated that scheduling and timing issues have also hindered parental turnout. Recruitment has been conducted through the schools and through referrals and handouts.
- After overcoming start-up issues regarding the hiring and compensation of tutors, the school-run **Tutoring** program promises to be a great success. Staff and administrators have reported that tutoring appears to have increased students' commitment to school and has helped to lower classroom size in some situations. In order to evaluate the Tutoring program, teachers will provide feedback on students, and a rating form will be developed so those teachers can document changes in student performance.
- The **Project Alert** program in Mercer Middle School just finished the first-year classroom sessions. Taught jointly by the school district and the Washington Asian Pacific Islander Families Against Substance Abuse, the curriculum provided students with resistance skills regarding the abuse of alcohol and other drugs. An observation made by instructors of the curriculum is that Project Alert is also being taught at many of the elementary feeder schools, leading students at the middle school level to complain of repetitiveness. Instructors dealt with this issue by telling students that the repetition was due to the importance of the issue, as well as relating the issue to a student's self-development. There are currently no plans to address this issue in any other way.

Following are descriptions of goals and evaluation plans associated with each prevention program that the local SIG project is implementing.

1. **Strengthening Multi-ethnic Families** has these three goals:
 - a. Increase knowledge of parent communication, discipline, and child development skills.
 - b. Increase positive community identification and support.
 - c. Increase knowledge of family rules and appropriate consequences.

In order to evaluate program effectiveness, program providers will use an instrument designed by program creators. It will be administered at the end of the program.

2. The goals of the **Tutoring** program are twofold:
 - a. Increase study skills
 - b. Facilitate teacher reports of student progress

The Tutoring program also uses a pre/post-test to measure effectiveness. Questionnaires address changes in students' perceptions of school and how useful program participation has been to them. Another source of information on the program's effectiveness will be teacher feedback on program participants.

3. The **Project Alert** program seeks to achieve the following:
 - a. Increase resistance skills
 - b. Increase perceptions that tobacco, alcohol, and other drug use is harmful

A questionnaire will be given to participants as a pre/post-test. Changes in attitudes and knowledge will be measured using that instrument. Instructors will keep attendance and document the completion level for each class.

Collaborative Status

Before the State Incentive Grant, partnerships and collaboration in the Southeast Seattle area could be described, as one respondent stated, as "limited in terms of official partnerships, but definitely a strength in terms of community partnerships." Partnerships with agencies, schools, and service providers had primarily existed with the purpose of reaching certain defined goals and objectives. For example, with SIG, the partnerships between agencies and schools exist because that partnership is required by the grant. Principals and other representatives of schools, community agencies, and the hospitals come together regularly to discuss, update, and make decisions regarding about the Southeast Seattle SIG.

However, the partnerships that existed, including the SIG Stakeholders Committee, did not meet with the goal of increasing community collaboration around substance abuse. It was not until recently that the SIG Stakeholder Committee began to shift their prevention approach toward reaching out to the community and perhaps incorporating agencies and groups that are not currently involved in SIG activities. This shift was facilitated by key members of the committee and was instrumental in redefining the grant coordinator position. The SIG Stakeholder Committee is now attempting to expand their prevention scope by increasing collaboration with prevention providers and community stakeholders.

Challenges and Barriers

- Project Alert curriculum is currently being taught at Mercer Middle School. However, many students reported that they had already received the curriculum in the 6th grade and that the sessions were repetitive.
- Project Alert curriculum was more time-consuming than expected. Lessons took more time than anticipated, based on program guidelines.
- The Strengthening Multiethnic Families program had a difficult time recruiting participants.

- Finalizing the grant coordinator position was a difficult process. The responsibilities and scope of the position were not defined at the outset. Once staff and administration better understood the project, the grant coordinator position was developed into a full-time position with more responsibilities and duties than originally anticipated.
- At the beginning of the funding period, the project director had the responsibility of facilitating collaborations and partnerships in the area. However, the project director also acts as a full-time principal at a local middle school and was unable to commit the time necessary to properly facilitate collaboration. As a result, collaboration and partnerships were not being strengthened. The Southeast Seattle SIG project realized that this is a need, and subsequently shifted many of these responsibilities and increased the responsibilities of the project coordinator to include facilitation of coordination and collaboration among community and service provider organizations.
- Informants expressed a sense of confusion and frustration with the Everest Database Program, especially regarding the selection of scales and the data collection process. Internal communication problems prevented attendance of local SIG staff at the Everest training.

Conclusion

As a SIG grantee, the community of Southeast Seattle was required to engage in a process that involved intense planning, coordination, community assessment, hard work, and collaboration. Communities underwent a thorough assessment of local resources, examining the availability of programs and services for both youths and families in the fields of prevention. In conducting a resource assessment, the community of Southeast Seattle successfully identified gaps in prevention services, leading to the prioritization of need within the community. The community used data from the Washington State Survey of Adolescent Health Behavior (WSSAHB) to prioritize risk and protective factors that were specific to the area and, in turn, helped choose the appropriate programs for those in need.

Families are now receiving SIG funded services in the community through the culturally sensitive program, Strengthening Multi-ethnic Families. Youth are learning refusal skills around alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs, and assistance in the classroom. The long-term, community-wide effects of these services will be measured through the WSSAHB.

In addition to serving families through the provision of prevention programs, the State Incentive Grant has helped facilitate partnerships and communication between the schools and some of the neighboring service agencies. The writing of the SIG proposal required strong collaboration between the school districts, county agencies, organizations, and community members. SIG has helped create a greater awareness of the prevention field, particularly an awareness of science-

based prevention programs and the use of data in prevention planning. What is next?

In addition to carrying out substance abuse prevention services, there are other expectations associated with SIG. These involve changes in the system by which local prevention services are planned, delivered, and evaluated. The SIG community-level evaluation has four components:

- **Process evaluation:** examines organizational capacity and prevention planning processes.
- **Program implementation fidelity:** a record of what was actually done in presenting a prevention program and how it compares to what was planned.
- **Program effectiveness:** how effective the program was, measured by participant pre-tests and post-tests and examined in light of program implementation fidelity.
- **Long-term community-wide changes in substance abuse prevalence and risk and protective factors:** measured by the Washington State Survey of Adolescent Health Behavior (WSSAHB), prevalence and risk/protective factor changes are assumed to result from prevention system changes in community organization and planning and from the provision of prevention program services to targeted populations.

For Seattle Public Schools' SIG project, seven items will be important during Year 2:

1. Continued implementation of prevention programs.
2. Continued participation in program effectiveness monitoring (Everest database and other agreed upon measurement methods when the Everest database is inappropriate for use with a particular program).
3. Participation in program implementation fidelity measures.
4. Continued development of a system for community-wide prevention planning, delivery and evaluation.
5. Continued participation in process evaluation, consisting of interviews and document review.
6. Ensuring Seattle School District's Southeast Seattle area schools' participation in the autumn 2000 administration of the Washington State Adolescent Health Behavior Survey (WSSAHB).
7. Developing specific plans to track progress toward and achieve anticipated immediate changes from the Community-Based Prevention Action Plan Implementation Matrix (column 7) and the community-level goals from the *Washington State Incentive Grant Substance Abuse Plan* (see Appendix A).

Appendix A:

Community-Level Goals and Objectives⁵

Goal:

Communities selected to receive State Incentive Grant funds will work to prevent alcohol, tobacco, marijuana, and other drug use, misuse, and abuse by the state's youth in these communities. They will develop and implement prevention plans, which will foster changes in the prevention system at the community level to make the system more effective.

Objectives:

1. To *establish partnerships* which include existing agencies and organizations, and families, youth, school, and workplaces to collaborate at the local level to prevent alcohol, tobacco, marijuana, and other drug use, misuse, and abuse by youth.
2. To *use a risk and protective factor framework* to develop a community prevention action plan which reduces factors which put youth at risk for alcohol, tobacco, marijuana, and other drug abuse and increase factors which protect or buffer youth from these risks.
3. To *participate in joint community risk and protective factor and resource assessment* by collecting, assessing, and prioritizing community-level information for: (a) youth alcohol, tobacco, marijuana, and other drug use, misuse, and abuse; (b) risk and protective factor indicators; and (c) existing resources and service gaps.
4. To *select and implement effective prevention actions* that address priority risk and protective factors in the community by filling identified gaps in resources.
5. To *use common reporting tools* which provide information on what works and what does not work to reduce youth alcohol, tobacco, marijuana, and other drug use, misuse, and abuse.

⁵ Governor's Substance Abuse Prevention Advisory Committee. 1999. *Washington State Incentive Grant Substance Abuse Prevention Plan*. Olympia, WA: Department of Social and Health Services, Division of Alcohol and Substance Abuse, State Incentive Grant Project.

Appendix B:

Methods

Information Sources

Interviews

Interviews were conducted with lead agency contacts, as well as prevention service providers and school district employees. If audiotaped interviews were conducted, interviewees were informed at the beginning of each interview that the audiotapes were confidential, were for the purpose of ensuring accuracy and would be erased as soon as notes were taken from them. Questions were based on an interview guide, as well as related topics that arose during the interviews. Interview guides were modified after initial site visits, based on the interviewer's ability to obtain the desired information from the questions asked.

Document review

- Proposal: The Seattle Public Schools' proposal in response to Solicitation No. 991346 was used as a primary source for contacts, needs, resources, prioritized risk and protective factors, target populations, geography and local plans to meet substance abuse prevention needs.
- Matrices: Prevention programs intended to address desired outcomes and associated risk and protective factors are described in detail in Community-Based Prevention Action Plan Implementation Matrix, created by the local Seattle Public Schools' SIG staff and the SIG state project director. Matrices were used to guide inquiry into the process of achieving anticipated local outcomes.
- Becker, L et al. 1999. *County Profile on Risk and Protection for Substance Abuse Prevention Planning, King County*. Olympia, WA: Department of Social and Health Services, Research and Data Analysis.
- Pollard, JA; Hawkins, JD; and Arthur, MW. 1999. Risk and Protection: are both necessary to understand diverse behavioral outcomes in adolescence, *Social Work Research*, 23(3): 145-158.
- Seattle Public Schools, *Mercer Middle School 1999 Annual Report*.
- Local documents reviewed include the Seattle Public Schools Comprehensive Student Assistance Program, "Feel The Power" Newsletters; Mercer Middle School 1999 Annual Report; Southeast Seattle SIG Expense Budget Summary Inquiry, Seattle Public Schools State Incentive Grant Funds: Budget Summary and Budget Description; *What To Do After School? After School Activities Guide for Middle School Youth*, -Seattle Parks and Recreation, 1999.
- Local Newspapers: Community newspapers were consulted for local news and events.

Observation

Observed numerous SIG Southeast Seattle Stakeholders Committee meetings.

Surveys

Sub-recipient Survey: COSMOS Corporation, survey designers, is under contract with the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (CSAP) to conduct a cross-site evaluation, and the Sub-recipient Survey is part of that evaluation. The survey is intended to document prevention activities semi-annually. Its focus is the sub-recipient's most important prevention program or action. More than one form can be completed if the sub-recipient wants to describe other programs. The "most important" prevention program is defined as that which is most likely to produce measurable outcomes. Southeast Seattle Public Schools' SIG staff completed the survey as requested.

Accessing Informants

- a. Key Informants: Initial informants were identified through the Southeast Seattle Public School's SIG proposal.
- b. Snowball Sampling Strategy: Key informants were asked for names of community members who could provide insight into Southeast Seattle's history of challenges, successes, and substance abuse prevention services.

Analysis

This report is the first step in a case study. Data analysis occurs throughout the research process in a case study, from the process of formulating the topic through the write-up. During and after interviews, information gathered is weighed in light of previous information. Questions and topics are modified as indicated by the new information. Data verification occurs through cross checking information from informants with that from other informants, documents, observation and the researcher's journal entries.

Data analysis in a case study occurs by creating categories of information, broad at first, then becoming more specific. As familiarity with the study topic occurs, categories are related to one another and to theory. The Center for Substance Abuse Prevention and COSMOS Corporation created broad data categories, around which interview questions and inquiry topics were framed. Data were gathered in the process of this evaluation with the intent of answering specific questions about system change in planning, providing and evaluating prevention services for youth in local communities.



Research and Data Analysis
Progress Report Number 4.43-12d pr