



# **TOGETHER!/ROOF, Thurston County Washington State Incentive Grant 1<sup>st</sup> 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*

Christine Roberts, Ph.D.,  
with Dario Longhi, Ph.D.

## **Executive Summary**

The TOGETHER! organization and the Rochester Organization of Families (TOGETHER!/ROOF) are 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 substance abuse prevention efforts in Rochester within the last decade, the community's partnership efforts, and its initial challenges and successes in SIG-funded prevention services for youth. Reports are provided as feedback on TOGETHER!/ROOF's SIG-related efforts to date and as a partial record of those efforts for state and federal funding agencies.

## **Challenges**

Rochester is an unincorporated community in southeastern Thurston County, one of seven Washington counties federally designated as the Northwest High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area (HIDTA). Rochester students begin using drugs at early ages, they perceive drugs as easily available, and many report that their friends use drugs. Prevalence rates of drug use in Rochester are higher than state averages among 6<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> graders. The area's poverty rates are high. Limited public transportation services are a barrier to accessing services in Olympia, the nearest city. The greatest challenge faced by ROOF in the last year was initiating science-based prevention programs. The organization also had difficulty finding a person with the appropriate skills, knowledge, and attitudes to provide prevention services to middle school youth.

## **Prevention History**

Rochester has a ten-year history of providing prevention services for youth through the countywide TOGETHER! organization. Rochester was one of the initial Thurston County communities to do prevention planning using the Communities that Care model. Prior to SIG, services were provided only for elementary school students; SIG allowed expansion of prevention programs to include middle school age youth. It has also provided motivation to include more science-based prevention programs and evaluation tools. Substance abuse prevention services for Rochester youth have been and remain primarily provided through ROOF. Elementary school children gather at the ROOF

building after school and during the summer, while middle school age youth meet at the middle school.

ROOF is one of the few formal social service agencies in Rochester. Services provided by the organization, in addition to substance abuse prevention programs, include providing a meeting place for alternative high school students, running one of the two food banks in town, and emergency services, such as collecting and delivering community donations after a house fire.

ROOF staff, the ROOF Advisory Board, and TOGETHER! are all involved in planning substance abuse prevention services in Rochester. ROOF works closely with the Rochester School District to track students who attend ROOF programs. The high school has a prevention and intervention specialist once weekly, provided through Educational Service District #113. School counselors, one per building, are expected to address substance use, misuse, and abuse issues among their other duties. Tobacco Free Thurston County has a limited presence in Rochester.

### **Successes**

At the end of the State Incentive Grant's first year, the most visible evidence of progress is the initiation of prevention programs for middle school youth. SIG provided funding for staff, supplies, professional services, and transportation. Tutoring and GREAT (Gang Resistance Education and Training) prevention programs were provided to middle school youth. Kid's Place, the ROOF program for younger age children, received additional staff and resources through SIG. Tutoring, Get Real About Violence, and Strengthening Families prevention programs were presented to Kid's Place participants.

# **TOGETHER!/ROOF, Thurston County Baseline Community-Level Evaluation**

## **Introduction**

### **What is the Washington State Incentive Grant?**

TOGETHER!/ROOF (Rochester Organization of Families) are one of eighteen Washington State Incentive Grant community grantees. Eighty-five percent of State Incentive Grant 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 the State Incentive Grant (SIG) have goals of coordinating resource 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. They are summarized here:

#### **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.

### **What is the purpose of this report?**

The State Incentive Grant 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.

TOGETHER! is a non-profit youth violence, alcohol and other drug prevention organization in Thurston County. It performs grant management for local communities around prevention. The site of SIG-sponsored prevention efforts is the unincorporated community of Rochester in southeastern Thurston County. This document is a baseline community-level evaluation report, examining the history of substance abuse prevention efforts in Rochester within the last decade, the community's partnership efforts, and their initial challenges and successes in prevention services for youth.

Although TOGETHER! has played an important role in those efforts, it is a countywide organization. This report's focus is prevention activities in Rochester, mediated through the Rochester Organization of Families (ROOF). ROOF is the only provider of formal substance abuse prevention services in Rochester. Reports are provided as feedback on Rochester's efforts to date and as a record of those efforts for state and federal funders. Future reports will include discussions of program effectiveness, community partnerships, and plans for continued funding beyond SIG.

### **What challenges does Rochester experience and ROOF address?**

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. Rochester's social challenges to providing a healthy environment for children are categorized by risk and protective factors in Appendix C. This section of the report describes those challenges, using information gathered through interviews and the SIG proposal.

Rochester has a rural character, despite its location only thirty miles from Olympia and four miles west of I-5. The employment base used to be primarily agricultural. That changed as it developed into a bedroom community for people working in Olympia, Centralia, or Chehalis. Most residents have jobs outside the area, and the majority of the schoolteachers live outside the community. The few local employment opportunities are limited to either professional positions related to the schools or low wage, service level employment, primarily agriculture, but including small businesses such as auto repair shops. Unfortunately, the professional positions related to the schools require a higher level of education than that achieved by most local residents. The casino, located on the Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation, provides some jobs for Rochester residents. While the casino's presence has resulted in some negative effects, such as increased traffic through Rochester, it has had more positive than negative effects for ROOF. The casino donates to ROOF's food bank, to Operation Santa during the Christmas season, and to Safe Graduation Night.

School buildings in Rochester serve two to three times more students than their intended capacity. Levies do not pass. The school population is increasing by eight percent a year. Only a small percentage of the top ten high school graduates in each graduating class finish college. One informant stated that most go away to a college or university for a semester or two and then return home.

On a more positive note, there is a solid relationship between ROOF and the schools. The Rochester School district shares the results from the Washington State Survey of Adolescent Health Behavior with ROOF. Information about students is shared between the two so that everyone working with bilaterally enrolled youngsters will act in concert. Parents sign authorization for this sharing of information. However, ROOF staff does not allow a student's behavioral difficulties on any particular school day to determine the quality of staff interactions with that child. For example, just because a child has had a hard day at school does not mean he or she is greeted with anything other than the usual welcome. Each session at ROOF is begun with the same expectations: that a safe and drug-free environment will be provided and that children will follow the rules. Children are made aware that violations of the rules have consequences, such as losing the opportunity to go on field trips.

Children sometimes begin engaging in risky behavior during the transition from elementary to middle school. This period of a child's life can be difficult in any setting, but in Rochester, as in other small towns, it includes a change in teacher-student relationships. Rochester elementary school teachers are able to get to know children well because of the small population and the number of years they are in contact with them. Teachers reportedly do not hesitate to monitor and guide children's behavior, regardless of whether or not the child is actually enrolled in their class. This creates a setting where children know their behavior will have consequences because those in authority know who they are and will take action if they observe inappropriate activities or will simply check up on them to see how they are doing. In middle school, however, students and teachers have short class periods, rather than exposure to one another all day, and are together for only a couple of years. Regardless of the small community, even the best teachers cannot see so many students a day and keep track of all of them. In addition, middle school students are beginning to move toward independence, and monitoring their behavior as closely as when they were younger probably doesn't seem as appropriate. So students in Rochester lose the close relationship they had with their elementary teachers as they move into middle school. Interviewees felt that this transition is a strong contributor to students' increased risk of experimentation with ATOD and other problem behaviors.

Mass transportation services in Rochester disappeared with the passage of I-695. Children are now dependent on their parents or their friends' parents for activities and shopping outside the area. Transportation is provided from the ROOF center to home for children attending the Kids' Place or Teen Zone groups. ROOF hires school buses, drivers, and aides to transport children home. This is their biggest expense.

People of Hispanic descent, many of whom speak English as a second language, if at all, have reportedly moved into Rochester in greater numbers during the last decade. Language and cultural differences between longer-term Rochester residents and these relative newcomers led to a need to build a common sense of community. ROOF contributed to this effort through persistent outreach to the Hispanic population, offering English as a Second Language classes to parents of Kids' Place participants.

County level data for 1996 county-level risk factor and protective factor data was not found useful at the Rochester community level.<sup>1</sup> The risk factors markedly higher in Thurston County than the state average were *community laws and norms favorable to drug abuse* and individual *constitutional factors*, such as impulsiveness and sensation seeking. All protective factors were lower in Thurston County than the state average: *rewards for conventional involvement* in the community and family and at school, *opportunities for involvement* in the family and at school, *belief in the moral order*, and *social skills*. The lack of relevance of county data at the local level indicates the need for such data at sub-county levels.

### **How did TOGETHER! and ROOF come to apply for SIG Funds?**

ROOF has a decade-long history of working with TOGETHER! in a search of funding for prevention services. Because Rochester is unincorporated, the attitude is, "If you want something done, do it yourself," even when it comes to grant writing. Although ROOF staff receive guidance from the TOGETHER! organization, they have been responsible for writing grants to fund activities. Linda Clark, ROOF's Director, wrote the SIG proposal. She received editorial assistance from Earlyse Swift, Executive Director of TOGETHER!.

TOGETHER! and ROOF have followed the Communities that Care model of community organizing around prevention. TOGETHER! has led a number of small communities in Thurston County, both incorporated and unincorporated, in this effort of community change during the last ten years. Rochester was one of them. Because of their history with TOGETHER!, the concept of using data to prioritize community risk and protective factors, as required in the SIG Request for Proposals, was not new to ROOF.

At the same time as the availability of SIG funds was announced, ROOF staff recognized a need for funding to follow Kids' Place participants through into middle school, to provide science-based prevention programming for either or both groups and for more staff to enable provision of these services.

One of the requirements to receive SIG funding was to gain the agreement of local school districts to participate in the Washington State Survey of Adolescent Health Behavior. This was no problem for ROOF staff, as the Rochester School

---

<sup>1</sup> Kabel, Joseph, et al. 1996. *County Profile on Risk and Protection for Substance Abuse Prevention Planning in Thurston County*. Washington State Department of Social and Health Services, Division of Alcohol and Substance Abuse, Office of Research and Data Analysis.

District has participated in the survey since its inception and plans to continue doing so.

There are thirty-eight members of the TOGETHER! Coalition Board and Executive Committee. Please see Appendix D for a list of their affiliations. Letters of support for the TOGETHER! SIG proposal were written by members of the following organizations:

- Rochester School District
- Thurston County Sheriff's Office
- Student Assistance Program, ESD 113
- Community Youth Services

The proposal underwent a challenging review process and was selected as one of the top applications out of the thirty-four received. The review committee made recommendations to the Governor's Substance Abuse Prevention Advisory Committee, which chose TOGETHER!/ROOF as one of the eighteen grantees. Governor Gary Locke announced the SIG awards in June 1999.

### **What was happening in Rochester prevention prior to SIG?**

ROOF is the primary provider of substance abuse prevention services in Rochester. At its inception, eight years ago, ROOF focused on substance abuse prevention by providing a safe and drug-free place for children to hang out after school. It switched to violence prevention for a couple of years, as required by its funding sources. ROOF programs now address both types of prevention: substance abuse and violence.

The ROOF Community Resource Center opened in its present location, four miles west of I-5 on Highway 12, four years ago. Before then, services were offered out of a storefront in downtown Rochester. The Center was the 1995 recipient of the Governor's Award from the Washington State Substance Abuse Council and the 1998 recipient of the Distinguished Youth Service award from Community Youth Services. Several purposes are served by the building. It provides space for the thirty to forty Kids' Place (elementary age) participants to meet after school, as well as space for the alternative high school, staff offices, and one of two community food banks. The Teen Zone group for middle school students meets at Rochester Middle School.

It took years to accomplish the goals of acquiring the community center, building a consistent group of skilled staff members, and connecting to other agencies and services, including law enforcement and counseling. Trust among community members had to be established. The staff had to make themselves known through actions, not only promises. A boost to their efforts was that Linda Clark, the ROOF Director, has been a community member for many years and that her children, two sets of twin boys, went to Rochester schools. She did not have to establish credibility in the community as an outsider or a newcomer would have.

Linda feels that an essential component to accomplishing these goals is the recognition that such efforts take time.

Children initially felt stigmatized when they attended ROOF's Kids' Place. However, children not attending the center soon learned about and sought the rewards received by participants for regular attendance and good behavior. Kids' Place participants gained a certain status among their peers because of all the fun things they did through ROOF, and Kids' Place gradually lost its negative associations. A sign of ROOF's progress with Kids' Place is its inclusion in the January 1999 issue of Northwest Research Laboratories' *What's working: Community after-school programs*.

ROOF works closely with the Rochester School District to track students who attend ROOF programs. The district serves 1,866 students in one primary school (first and second grades), an elementary school (second through fifth grades), a middle school (sixth through eighth grades), an alternative high school (grades nine through twelve), and a traditional high school (also grades nine through twelve). The high school has a prevention and intervention specialist once weekly, provided through Educational Service District #113. Students in each school building are assigned one counselor, whose assigned duties include substance use and abuse issues.

Other than the school district, there are no organizations or agencies offering prevention services in Rochester with which ROOF can partner. There is no local government, as Rochester is unincorporated. The Thurston County Sheriff's Office is supportive of ROOF's services, but does not offer prevention services itself. ROOF relies on volunteers to provide assistance with many activities, including Operation Santa at Christmas time – hours and hours are spent collecting and wrapping gifts. Then a parade is held and the Sheriff, metamorphosed into Santa, distributes the gifts to community children in need. A recent donation from students and staff at Maple Lane School was in the form of a playhouse that the students built. ROOF held a raffle and the person who won the playhouse donated it back to ROOF for use by children who attend Kids' Place. Thus, the community partners for ROOF have been and continue to be primarily community members, rather than other prevention service agencies.

### **What has happened since ROOF received SIG funds?**

ROOF's focus has been twofold since receiving SIG funds: to hire staff for Teen Zone and to select and institute science-based prevention programming. As stated above, learning how to use data for prevention planning and creating partnerships with other prevention providers was not new for ROOF.

Finding a person with the skills, knowledge, experience, and attitude needed for working with middle school youth took three tries. This is reportedly a challenging age group to cope with. What has seemed to work is a clear statement of rules and expectations at the outset, with consistent follow through when those rules are observed and when they're not. Rewards for observing



rules include recreation activities, such as field trips. The Rochester Middle School principal, Greg McDaniels, stated that some Teen Zone participants have exhibited markedly improved behavior since the program began.

Instituting science-based prevention programming was not straightforward. It was difficult to find prevention programs that would fit within the budget and that would address Rochester's prioritized risk and protective factors and anticipated immediate changes. Most that required staff training were too expensive. One program was found that was affordable and that staff could learn how to present from a training manual. However, it turned out to be too difficult to learn without some formal training. This was Project Northland. The issue was resolved by sending staff to training during the summer.

ROOF staff selected pre-tests and post-tests to measure program effectiveness with the assistance of Jean Lanz, Ph.D. She is associated with the Social Development Research Group in Seattle, Washington and was hired to assist SIG sites with this task. Tests were selected for all programs listed below. Get Real About Violence came with its own measurement instrument, but staff chose to use risk and protective factor scales to measure results as well. ROOF staff administered pre-tests and post-tests and entered scores into the Everest database for the Get Real About Violence program and the student section of the Strengthening Families program. Pre-test scores were entered for the Tutoring–Teen Zone program, but no post-test scores have been entered to date. Staff had inadequate time for data entry.

ROOF staff offered the following prevention programs with the first year of SIG funding: Tutoring, Get Real About Violence, Strengthening Families, and Gang Resistance Education and Training (GREAT). They had planned on offering Project Northland with their Teen Zone participants, but it proved too difficult to master without formal training, despite being advertised otherwise.

A brief description of the immediate changes expected from the use of these programs, how changes will be measured, and the risk and protective factors associated with each program are provided below. Included in the descriptions are categorizations of the programs according to rigor level. Rigor refers to the amount of research that has been done about a prevention program's effectiveness. Programs are rated on a scale from 1 to 5. Those with the strongest evidence of effectiveness are rated as rigor 5; those with the least amount are rated as rigor 1.

## **Tutoring**

### ***Kids' Place***

The immediate change sought from the Tutoring program for elementary age participants of Kids' Place is increasing participants' reading levels by one grade level for each year of participation. This will be measured through students' reading grades. Target populations are Kids' Place attendees, which are drawn from first and second grade classes in Rochester Primary School and third

through fifth grades at Grand Mound Elementary. Parents of these students are included in monthly family night gatherings that include food, story time and a craft project. The risk factor that this rigor 5 prevention program was selected to address is *early academic failure*. The protective factors addressed are *opportunities for positive involvement, skill building, and recognition; healthy beliefs and clear standards; and bonding*.

### ***Teen Zone***

The target population for Teen Zone tutoring is sixth and seventh grade participants of Teen Zone, all of whom are students at Rochester Middle School. Students' teachers provide the topics and materials for tutoring sessions.

### ***Get Real About Violence***

The Get Real About Violence program was used with Kids' Place participants. Three immediate changes were expected from this program: increased knowledge about solving conflicts without using violence; increased knowledge about how violence affects violent individuals and those around them; and a twenty-five percent decrease in playground citations, office referrals and bus citations at the end of the first year. Get Real About Violence has a measurement instrument that focuses on class satisfaction (i.e., what things did you like/dislike about the class?), rather than changes in knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behavior. If this program is used again, selecting scales related to the risk and protective factors addressed by the class or that are related to the anticipated immediate changes might yield more useful information for either improving the class or determining meaningful change among the participants. Concrete behavior measures include frequency of playground citations, office referrals and bus citations. These are meaningful measures, understandable by parents, school officials, and ROOF staff, but most importantly, by the children. The risk factor that this rigor 2 program was selected to address is *early initiation of problem behavior*. The protective factors are the same for all of the prevention programs that ROOF is using: *opportunities for positive involvement, skill building and recognition; healthy beliefs and clear standards; and bonding*.

## **Strengthening Families**

### ***Kids' Place***

There are three anticipated immediate changes associated with the Kids' Place section of Strengthening Families. They include increasing by 50% the number of parents who complete a skill building program to improve their parenting skills and promote bonding within the family; improving family communication and organization; and improving the behavior of children, specifically, reducing conduct disorders, aggressiveness and emotional problems. Changes will be monitored through the number of program participants in comparison to previous parenting skill programs, observation and documentation of family communication and organization, and observation and documentation of children's behavior, focusing on conduct disorders, aggressiveness, and emotional problems. The behavior measures listed above (frequency of playground citations, office referrals and bus citations) will also be used to measure the effects of Strengthening Families. Another program effectiveness measure is a pre-test/post-test from the Everest database that is related to the risk and protective factors addressed by this prevention program. However, they are not the scales that the Strengthening Families program was selected to address. If this program is used again, it would be worthwhile to include one or two scales in the pre-test/post-test that measure these risk and protective factors. The risk factor that Strengthening Families, a rigor 5 program, was chosen to address is *early initiation of problem behavior*. The protective factors are listed in descriptions of the above programs.

### ***Teen Zone, student and parent sections***

These sections of Strengthening Families were cancelled due to difficulty of hiring staff to work effectively with middle school age students. That issue has now been resolved and the program will be used in year two.

### ***Project Northland***

This program was scheduled for the middle school students. However, a combination of difficulty hiring staff to work effectively with this age group and some misleading information about the training required for the program led to its cancellation for the first year. Skilled staff has now been hired. This rigor 5 program was purchased with a self-instruction manual, which was found to be inadequate. Staff participated in a training seminar during the summer of 2000 in preparation for year two.

### ***GREAT – Gang Resistance Education and Training***

Two immediate changes were expected from the GREAT program, used with middle school youth: an increase of drug/alcohol and violence awareness by all Rochester 6<sup>th</sup> grade students and an increase in 6<sup>th</sup> grade youth participation in positive activities. The first anticipated change, increased ATOD and violence awareness, will be measured through the questionnaire created by the program's designers. A measurement method for the second anticipated change, increased

participation in positive activities, has yet to be determined. As with the questionnaires used for Strengthening Families, it would be useful to use risk and protective factor scales that are associated with the factors prioritized in the matrix. Using these scales can help determine if program participants have the targeted characteristics reflected in the prioritized risk and protective factors. The scales also provide a record of program-level change, which can be compared to future school survey results for the same risk and protective factors. The risk factors that the rigor 2 program, GREAT, was selected to address are *early initiation of the problem behavior* and *friends who use*. Protective factors are listed in prior program descriptions (above).

### **What are the next steps?**

The first year of SIG funding is now complete. Additional staff has been hired. Middle school students are now receiving prevention services through the newly established Teen Zone. Elementary school students are participating in the enhanced Kids' Place. Program effectiveness measures have been selected and are in use. Implementation of prevention programs is proceeding after some initial delays due to locating skilled staff and training acquisition. ROOF continues to use data for prevention planning and to collaborate with available prevention partners, primarily the Rochester School District. Outreach to the community has been effective in recruiting appropriate target populations.

In sum, most of the prevention programs funded by SIG have begun and the staff is in place to serve middle school, as well as elementary school students. What is next?

There are other expectations associated with SIG, in addition to carrying out substance abuse prevention services. 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:** changes occurring in program participants, 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 ROOF, 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 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 Rochester School District's 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 Prevention Plan* (see Appendix A).



## **Appendix A:**

### **Community-Level Goals and Objectives<sup>2</sup>**

#### **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.

---

<sup>2</sup> 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**

- a. Proposal: The TOGETHER!/ROOF 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.
- b. 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 staff of ROOF and the SIG state project director. Matrices were used to guide inquiry into the process of achieving anticipated local outcomes.
- c. Linda Becker et al. 1999. *County Profile on Risk and Protection for Substance Abuse Prevention Planning, Thurston County*. Olympia, WA: Department of Social and Health Services, Research and Data Analysis.

#### **Observation**

- ROOF Community Resource Center
- Rochester Middle School
- Town of Rochester and surrounding areas

#### **Sub-Recipient Survey**

COSMOS Corporation, designers of the Sub-Recipient Survey, is under contract with the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (CSAP) to conduct a cross-site evaluation; 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, although 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. ROOF staff completed the survey as requested.

### **Accessing Informants**

- a. Key Informants: Initial informants were identified through the TOGETHER!/ROOF SIG proposal.
- b. Snowball Sampling Strategy: Key informants were asked for names of community members who could provide insight into Rochester’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. CSAP 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.

## Appendix C: Challenges – Categorized by Risk Factors and Protective Factors

**Table 1. Challenges Categorized by Risk Factors**

Domain	Risk Factors	Rochester Challenges	Addressed by SIG?
Community	Availability of substances	High levels of drug trafficking (HIDTA designation)	No
	Extreme economic deprivation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. One-fifth of population lives at federal poverty rate or below, compared to 10% of Thurston County as a whole</li> <li>2. Twice as many children age 18 or less live in poverty (27% compared to 13% in the county)</li> <li>3. Half of the single women with children live in poverty, compared to 35% in the entire county</li> </ol>	<b>No (the ROOF Community Center provides a food bank and emergency supplies, but these are not funded through SIG)</b>
	Lack of community involvement	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Generational split perceived between original settlers (farmers) and later immigrants (employed in nearby towns; local professionals)</li> <li>2. Most residents have jobs outside the area; teachers live outside the area</li> <li>3. School levies rarely pass</li> <li>4. PTSA disbanded</li> </ol>	<b>Numbers 1-3: No Number 4: Indirectly (parents are required to agree to attend monthly meetings at ROOF as a condition of their child's acceptance into the programs)</b>
School	Academic failure	State standardized reading and math test scores for 4 <sup>th</sup> and 8 <sup>th</sup> graders are below the state average (range: 7% to 15% below state avg.)	<b>Yes (through tutoring programs in Kids' Place and Teen Zone)</b>
	Lack of commitment to school	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Higher yearly suspension rate among 6<sup>th</sup> graders (13%) than among seniors (8%)</li> <li>2. Nearly a third of sixth graders often or almost always hate being in school</li> </ol>	<b>Numbers 1 and 2: Yes (through violence prevention and tutoring programs)</b>
Family	Favorable parental attitudes and involvement in problem behavior	Anecdotal reports of high rates of use among adults living with children and parents of schoolchildren	Yes (through Strengthening Families program)
	Family management problems	Many low-income families lack the support, education, and resources to provide healthy home environments	Yes (through Strengthening Families program)

*Note:* Table is continued on the next page.

Domain	Risk Factors	Rochester Challenges	Addressed by SIG?
Peer/ Individual	Friends who engage in the problem behavior	Nearly half of sixth graders report friends who use drugs; four-fifths of high school seniors report the same	Yes (through Project Northland)
	Alienation, rebelliousness, and lack of social bonding	Between 17% and 25% of 6 <sup>th</sup> , 8 <sup>th</sup> , 10 <sup>th</sup> , and 12 <sup>th</sup> , grade students reported attacking others with the intention of hurting them; between 8% and 13% reported carrying handguns	Yes (through GREAT [Gang Resistance Education and Training] and Get Real About Violence programs)

**Table 2. Challenges Categorized by Protective Factors**

Domain	Protective Factors	Rochester Challenges	Addressed by SIG?
Community	Opportunities for pro-social involvement	Opportunities for positive involvement and bonding with pro-social adults are limited for Rochester youth	Yes (through Project Northland and Strengthening Families programs)
	Rewards for pro-social involvement	Sixth and eighth grade students report less rewards for accomplishments or jobs well done than do 10 <sup>th</sup> and 12 <sup>th</sup> graders	Yes (through Project Northland and Strengthening Families programs)
School	Bonding to school	Nearly a third of sixth graders often or almost always hate being in school	Yes (through tutoring programs)
Peer/ Individual	Healthy beliefs and clear standards	Washington State Survey of Adolescent Health Behavior scores for this protective factor were lower for older age students than for younger	Yes (through all of the programs in use)

*Note:* Data for Appendix C are from the TOGETHER!/ROOF SIG Proposal and interviews with key informants.

## **Appendix D:**

### **Affiliations of TOGETHER! Board Members**

Coast Office Equipment	Private citizens (2)
Community Action Council	Providence/St. Peter Hospital
Community Youth Services	Rainier Community Cares
CrimeStoppers	Refugee and Immigrant Services Center
First United Methodist Church	Rochester Organization of Families
Griffin Middle School	Rochester School District
Group Health	Salvation Army
Hispanic Women's Network	South Sound YMCA
Kirkpatrick & Alexander, PLLC	Stop the Violence!
Lacey City Council	Tenino School District
Lacey Parks & Recreation Department	<i>The Olympian</i> newspaper
Law enforcement agencies	Thurston County Commissioner
North Thurston School District	Thurston County Health Department
Olympia City Council	Thurston County United Way
Olympia Safe and Sober Driving	Tumwater City Council
Olympia School District	Tumwater School District
Pacific Peaks Girl Scouts	Yelm Community Cares
Partners for Children, Youth & Families	Yelm Community Schools
	Yelm Police Department



**Research and Data Analysis**  
**Progress Report Number 4.43-16d pr**