



Grant County Prevention and Recovery Center Washington State Incentive Grant 2nd Year Community-Level Evaluation 2000-2001

*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*

Anne D. Strode, M.S.W.,
Christine Roberts, Ph.D.,
with Dario Longhi, Ph.D.

Executive Summary

Grant County Prevention and Recovery Center is one of eighteen recipients of the Washington State Incentive Grant (SIG). SIG funds are allocated to communities to prevent the use, misuse and abuse of alcohol, tobacco, marijuana and other drugs by Washington State youth. Community grantees are expected to make their local prevention system more effective by establishing prevention partnerships, using a risk and protective factor framework for data driven needs assessments, and by implementing and monitoring science-based prevention programs. Grant County's second year experiences with SIG are reported here.

Progress toward SIG Community Level Objectives

Grant County implemented SIG-funded prevention programs in the four widely dispersed, rural communities of Quincy, Warden, Soap Lake, and Grand Coulee. The economy in Quincy and Warden is agricultural-based. Soap Lake and Grand Coulee depend mostly upon tourism. Grant County Prevention and Recovery Center (PARC) manages the local SIG project out of Moses Lake. Grant County's population grew by 36.3% in the past decade, substantially above the statewide growth of 21.1%.¹ Median household money income is \$32,405 compared to the state median income of \$41,715. The percentage of children living below poverty is 20.6%.

Objective 1: *To establish partnerships...to collaborate at the local level to prevent alcohol, tobacco, marijuana, and other drug use, misuse, and abuse by youth.*

Funds from the SIG grant gave the Prevention and Recovery Center the opportunity to partner with local school districts, Grant County Cooperative Extension, the Education Service District, local police departments and the Boys and Girls Club. In Soap Lake, the Mother Theresa Mc-Kay Youth Outreach and Wellness Center is partnering with a wide range of community agencies in Moses Lake and Ephrata to provide information and services to the youth at the center.

¹ <http://quickfacts.census.gov/gfd/states/53/53025.html>, Grant County.

Objective 2: *To use a risk and protective factor framework to develop a community prevention action plan...*

and

Objective 3: *To participate in joint community risk and protective factor and resource assessment...*

Grant County Prevention and Recovery Center has been using a risk and protective factor framework in planning for prevention programs for several years. It acted as the lead in the spring 2001 pilot test of the SIG-sponsored collaborative needs assessment, bringing together multiple prevention partners to conduct a data driven assessment of county prevention needs.

Objective 4: *To select and implement effective prevention actions...*

Each Grant County SIG community planned to feature seven best practice programs. These programs are categorized by rigor based on the extent to which a program has been shown, through scientifically defensible research methods, to be effective in different locales, and with multiple populations. The highest rating is rigor 5, the lowest, rigor 1. Five of the substance abuse prevention programs selected by Grant County were higher level rigor programs: two rigor five programs, Life Skills and Preparing for Drug Free Years, and three rigor four programs, Smart Moves, All Stars, and Reconnecting Youth. Two rigor one programs, Saturday Night and an After-school Enhancement were used to supplement the other programs and to serve as means to attract youth into the prevention programs.

This past year Grand Coulee and Coulee City had an After School or a Summer Program. Quincy, Warden and Soap Lake had one of more sessions of the following six programs: After School, All Stars, Friday or Saturday Night, Life Skills, Smart Moves and Summer Program.

Most participants took a pre- and post-test, but due to data-entry problems with the Everest system, no reports were available at the time of data collection.

Objective 5: *To use common reporting tools...*

A requirement of SIG is that the Washington State Survey of Adolescent Health Behaviors be administered in participating schools. Grant County schools participated in the Washington State Survey of Adolescent Health Behavior in 1998. Prior needs assessments were based on data from the DSHS County Profile and other archival sources. Grand Coulee and Soap Lake participated in the student survey due to the SIG requirements. Quincy and Warden participated due to requirements of another project.

Conclusion

Overall, the Grant County SIG project has improved the quality and the comprehensiveness of the county's prevention system. Major achievements include the initial and continuing administration of the Washington State Survey of Adolescent Health Behavior in Grant County schools, the introduction of science-based programs, and the opening of the youth outreach center in Soap Lake. During the last year of SIG community funding, the prevention community intends to institutionalize some of the changes in the system of prevention planning, funding, implementation, and monitoring developed while participating in SIG.

Grant County Prevention and Recovery Center Year 2 Community Level Evaluation, 2000-01

The Washington State Incentive Grant

Grant County Prevention and Recovery Center is one of eighteen sites engaged in a Washington State Incentive Grant (SIG). The federal grant consists of a three year, \$8.9 million award from the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention to Washington State through a cooperative agreement with Governor Gary Locke's office. State agencies participating in SIG are committed to coordinating resources and reducing duplication of effort. 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. In their efforts to reduce youth substance use, misuse, and abuse, it is expected that community grantees will reduce key risk factors and promote protective factors.

The goals and objectives of the *Washington State Incentive Grant Substance Abuse Plan* are listed in Appendix A.² 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 to develop a community prevention action 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.

Introduction

The SIG evaluation is intended to provide feedback to state agencies and communities on their progress toward the goals and objectives stated in the

² 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.

Washington State Incentive Grant Substance Abuse Plan. Evaluation reports are provided as an integral part of that feedback.

This document is a report of SIG related activities for the second project year in Grant County. It summarizes progress made toward achieving the community level goals and objectives of the Washington State Incentive Grant. The report examines local prevention partners' ongoing challenges and successes in providing substance abuse prevention services for youth. It also presents the substance abuse prevention funding and planning sources that were necessary in order to implement one prevention program in Grant County. Information used here came from face-to-face and telephone interviews, examinations of documents, and data collected from survey instruments. Research methods are described in Appendix B.

SIG-funded substance abuse prevention programs operate in four communities within the county: Quincy, Warden, Soap Lake, and Grand Coulee. The Grant County project is ambitious: the four communities are many miles apart from one another, a large number of programs were selected for each site, and each community faces the challenge of recruiting kids from rural areas for after-school programs. This report gives a brief description of each SIG site within the county, relevant social indicators, and details about program implementation. One community, Soap Lake, is described in more detail to give a more complete sense of how prevention is provided in small communities.

Project Implementation Sites within Grant County

Grant County is the fourth largest county in the state, covering 2,674 square miles. The geology is diverse and includes mountains, coulees, farmland, and desert. Farms mainly produce potatoes, asparagus, onions, cherries, apples, wine grapes, and grains. The primary sources of income are manufacturing, services, and agriculture.

Grant County's population grew by 36% in the past decade.³ This is compared to statewide growth of 21%. Median household money income (1997 model-based estimate) is \$32,405 compared to the state median income of \$41,715. The percentage of children living below poverty is 21%.

The four SIG sites span the county. One site, Grand Coulee, is over eighty miles from the SIG project office in Moses Lake. Two sites, Quincy and Soap Lake, are about forty miles away. Only Warden is relatively close to the project office. The difference in characteristics of these communities is almost as great as the geographical distances between them.⁴ Below is a brief description of each community in the project.

³ [Http://quickfacts.census.gov/gfd/states/53/53025.html](http://quickfacts.census.gov/gfd/states/53/53025.html), Grant County.

⁴ Information source for demographics is Grant County Prevention and Recovery Center. (1999). Proposal to Solicitation No. 991346, for Grant to Communities to Provide Services for the

Grand Coulee

The area around the City of Grand Coulee intersects Grant, Ferry, Lincoln, and Okanogan counties. In addition, four rural towns form the community around Grand Coulee Dam. They include Grand Coulee, Electric City, Coulee Dam, and Elmer City. Grand Coulee and Electric City are in Grant County. Grand Coulee is above the dam and Electric City lies two miles to the west. The towns of Coulee Dam and Elmer City lie down river from the dam. Elmer City lies entirely within the Colville Indian Reservation in Okanogan County. The Columbia River bisects the town of Coulee Dam, which touches the boundaries of three counties and one tribal reservation.

The town of Grand Coulee's population is 897, according to the 2000 Census.⁵ This is down from 1105 in 1990.⁶ The economy depends upon summer tourism from Grand Coulee Dam. The biggest employers are the dam, the school district, and the National Park Service.

The Grand Coulee School District office is in Douglas County. According to the SIG proposal the school district, for all the Grand Coulee communities, has approximately 928 students in one elementary school, a middle school, and one high school.⁷ Schools are scattered around the four towns and reservation. The reservation has a grade school, but no middle or high school. American Indians comprise 47% of the student body. Almost half (47%) of elementary school children are eligible for free or reduced fee lunches.

Quincy

From 1990 to 2000 the in town population of Quincy grew from 4000 to approximately 5044 residents.⁸ Almost 40% of the residents are under the age of nineteen. The area supports corporate farms and potato processing plants dependent upon irrigation and cheap labor. Seasonal field and processing jobs draw many (mostly Hispanic) migrant farm workers into the area.

According to the Grant County SIG proposal the Quincy School District had approximately 2,254 students in three elementary schools, one junior high, and one high school.⁹ The ethnic composition of the student body is 50% Hispanic,

Prevention of Alcohol, Tobacco, Marijuana, and Other Drug Use, Misuse, and Abuse. Unpublished.

⁵ U. S Census Bureau, Profiles of General Demographic Characteristics, 2000, Grant County Washington, Issued May 2001, p. 217.

⁶ Proposal to Solicitation No. 991346, For Grants to Communities to provide services for the Prevention of Alcohol, Tobacco, Marijuana and other Drug Use, Misuse and Abuse, Grant County Department of Human Services, June 1999, p. 5.

⁷ Ibid., p. 6.

⁸ U. S Census Bureau, Profiles of General Demographic Characteristics, 2000, Grant County Washington, Issued May 2001, p. 412.

⁹ Proposal to Solicitation No. 991346, For Grants to Communities to provide services for the Prevention of Alcohol, Tobacco, Marijuana and other Drug Use, Misuse and Abuse, Grant County Department of Human Services, June 1999, p. 5.

44% Caucasian and small percentages of Asian American, Black, and American Indian students. Two-thirds (64%) of the students qualify for participation in the free or reduced fee lunch program.

Soap Lake

A string of lakes dot the Grand Coulee along the eastside of the Cascade Mountains in Central Washington. The town of Soap Lake sits on the shore of one of these lakes. It is a rural community with a population of 1733 up from 1370 in 1990.¹⁰ Twenty-six percent of its residents are under nineteen years of age and over half are over 55. Tourism remains the town's primary income source. The population swells in the summer as people flock to the municipal beaches. An immigrant Ukrainian population began moving to the area in the 1980s. Soap Lake's major employers are a nursing home, the school district, a food market, and city government

According to the Grant County SIG proposal, Soap Lake School District served 523 students in one elementary school, two junior high schools, and one alternative high school.¹¹ A new elementary school opened in the fall of 2000 replacing an old and dreary building.

Warden

Warden, near Moses Lake, is a rural agricultural and farming community of about 2544 residents according to the 2000 Census.¹² It grew from a population of 2190 in 1990.¹³ According to the Grant County SIG proposal the Warden School District served slightly under 1000 students in one elementary school, a middle school, and one high school. Many of the students (59%) are Hispanic, few of whom are proficient in English. Over 80% of the students are eligible for the free or reduced lunch program in the elementary school. Few, if any, of the district's teachers live in Warden.¹⁴

Progress Toward Community-Level Objectives

Grant County Prevention and Recovery Center had a well-developed system of youth services and families before participating in SIG. However, this system was not in place countywide. Substance abuse prevention was new to three of the four Grant County communities participating in SIG. Below is a synopsis of

¹⁰ U. S Census Bureau, Profiles of General Demographic Characteristics, 2000, Grant County Washington, Issued May 2001, p. 460.

¹¹ Proposal to Solicitation No. 991346, For Grants to Communities to provide services for the Prevention of Alcohol, Tobacco, Marijuana and other Drug Use, Misuse and Abuse, Grant County Department of Human Services, June 1999, p. 5.

¹² U. S Census Bureau, Profiles of General Demographic Characteristics, 2000, Grant County Washington, Issued May 2001, p. 527.

¹³ Proposal to Solicitation No. 991346, For Grants to Communities to provide services for the Prevention of Alcohol, Tobacco, Marijuana and other Drug Use, Misuse and Abuse, Grant County Department of Human Services, June 1999, p. 5.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 6.

progress made in Grant County toward achievement of the five community level SIG objectives established by the Governor's Substance Abuse Prevention Advisory Committee.

Objective 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.

SIG provided Grant County the opportunity to partner with local school districts, Grant County Cooperative Extension, the Education Service District office, local Police Departments and the Boys and Girls Club. Here are some specifics on prevention partnerships in the two of the participating communities: Soap Lake and Quincy.

Soap Lake

The development of partnerships and collaborative efforts is progressing well in Soap Lake. People began collaborating with the after school program. This year the school district took over the Reconnecting Youth classes. Last summer, after the Reconnecting Youth classes were over, Youth Services took kids on probation and gave them the Life Skills classes two days a week. This is the first time the school district and Youth Services had worked together. The probation officers are interested in more collaboration. Also, the Alternative School has joined in. The Alternative School principal is very supportive of the SIG project efforts. The prevention specialist works hard to give the youth a picture of an environment without alcohol and drugs. This is a big challenge since community norms do not support this.

SIG contributed about \$1000 to a new youth center in Soap Lake. The Mother Theresa-McKay Youth Outreach and Wellness Center opened last year and now partners with a wide range of community agencies in Moses Lake and Ephrata to provide information to the youth in Soap Lake. This past year, the director brought in health care professionals to discuss topics ranging from substance abuse to natural medicine, CPR, and other health-related services. SIG activities served as a catalyst for this community-oriented youth program.

Five students in the Alternative School in Soap Lake graduated from high school this year. The principal attributes their success to the Reconnecting Youth program.

Quincy

Quincy School District has set aside time and resources to expand the after school program to three days and to use class time for Life Skills and Smart Moves. The Boys and Girls Club will be expanding services in Quincy next year. Community volunteers came forth, including a police officer and his wife, who participated in

the Preparing for Drug Free Years program and offered much supplemental information to the program.

Objective 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.

and

Objective 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.

SIG sites used the risk and protective factor model in planning their prevention approaches. This model, developed by David Hawkins, Richard Catalano, and others at the University of Washington, categorizes 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. Groups of risk and protective factors are categorized into domains of influence: community, school, family, and peer/individual. See Appendix C for a list of risk factors and protective factors, categorized by domain. Within the list, risk and protective factors addressed by SIG funded programs in Grant County are italicized.

Grant County Prevention and Recovery Center has been using the Hawkins and Catalano's risk and protective factor framework for planning prevention programs for several years.¹⁵ However, the first time they had data from Grant County results of the Washington Survey of Adolescent Health Behavior was in 1998. Before then, needs assessments were based on regional data from the DSHS County Profile and other archival sources. Grand Coulee, Soap Lake, and Warden participated in the student survey as a result of SIG requirements. Quincy participated due to requirements of a different project.

Grant County Prevention and Recovery Center was the lead in the pilot test of the SIG-sponsored collaborative needs assessment. Local representatives of the following organizations, worked together to develop the county prevention plan: Division of Alcohol and Substance Abuse, Department of Social and Health Services; Community Mobilization, Office of Community Development, Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development; Family Policy Council; Educational Services District; and the local public health jurisdiction, associated with the Department of Health.

¹⁵ Hawkins, David J., Catalano, Richard F., and Associates. *Communities That Care, Action for Drug Abuse Prevention*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Pub. 1992.

Objective 4: To select and implement effective prevention actions that address priority risk and protective factors in the community by filling identified gaps in resources.

Before receiving the State Incentive Grant, few funds were available for prevention in Grant County. Even now, the county is so large it is difficult to address prevention thoroughly. The Division of Alcohol and Substance Abuse (DASA), part of the Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS), and the Community Mobilization Against Substance Abuse program, part of the Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development (CTED), provide funds for a county prevention specialist. The Washington State University Grant County Cooperative Extension agent provided educational services countywide. Most communities had a D.A.R.E. (Drug Resistance and Education) program. Quincy is the only city that had active after-school prevention programs before SIG funding was received.

Local project administrators planned to have each SIG site provide seven different programs most science-based. Science-based programs are categorized by rigor, based on the extent to which a program has been shown, through research, to be effective in different locales and with multiple populations. The highest rating is rigor 5, the lowest, rigor 1. Five of the substance abuse prevention programs that Grant County selected were higher level rigor programs: two rigor 5 programs, Life Skills and Preparing for Drug Free Years, and three rigor 4 programs, Smart Moves, All Stars, and Reconnecting Youth. Two rigor 1 programs, Saturday Night and an after-school enhancement program, served as fun activities and feeders to the prevention programs. The following table summarizes the programs used in the Grant County sites.

Table 1. Grant County SIG Prevention Programs

Program	Rigor Level	Content
Life Skills	5	Personal and social skills, drug resistance education
Preparing for the Drug-Free Years	5	Drug resistance education and family strengthening
Smart Moves	4	Promotes social skills
All Stars	4	Promotes avoidance of high risk behavior and increases school bonding
Reconnecting Youth	4	Social support and life skills training
Saturday Night	1	Alcohol-free recreation
After-School Enhancement Program	1	Life and communication skills

One or more of these programs were used in each project site. Below is a description of the programs provided in each of the four unique communities.

Grand Coulee/Coulee Dam SIG Programs

Grand Coulee and Coulee Dam were able to implement only two of the planned programs, the After School Program and the Summer Program. Transportation problems and the general geographical layout of the area contributed to lack of program development. Last year it was difficult to recruit and retain students for the After School Program. This year the program was more successful, serving 17 at-risk youth. The Summer Reading program was successful and well attended. Youth improved their reading skills while learning about substance abuse prevention. The following table summarizes the Grand Coulee area programs for year two of the SIG project.

Table 2. Grand Coulee Programs

SIG Program	Sessions	Youth Served	Comments
After School Program	16	17	Successful this year. Snacks and other activities important to engage youth.
Summer Program	32	30	Instruction and activities with reading and prevention the main focus. Attendance a problem.

Source: Wendy Hanover, *State Incentive Grant Six Month Progress Report*, Grant County, submitted February 5, 2001.

Quincy SIG Programs

Quincy was able to implement all of the proposed SIG programs. The number served in most programs was limited due to competition with other school activities and because some families migrated to Mexico for the winter. It was difficult to recruit volunteers for the Saturday Night programs, although they were quite popular with the youth. The following table summarizes the Quincy year-two programs.

Table 3. Quincy Programs

SIG Program	Sessions	Youth Served	Comments
All Stars	13	6	Attendance difficulties due to other school activities and families migrating to Mexico for winter.
Life Skills	15	6	Same as above
Reconnecting Youth	20	5	Staff felt they needed more time with the youth. Some needed intervention services.
Saturday Night	9	438	Consistent participation of youth, but difficult to get volunteers
Smart Moves	7	12	Trivia game most popular
Summer Program	32	30	Worked on conflict resolution and attitudes toward drugs and alcohol

Source: Wendy Hanover, *State Incentive Grant Six Month Progress Report*, Grant County, submitted February 5, 2001.

Soap Lake SIG Programs

Soap Lake youth benefited from all the proposed SIG programs. Attendance and participation was good. The Youth Center and Friday Night programs helped teens deal with racial conflict between Russian and Hispanic youth. All 6th – 8th graders received Life Skills Training. The following table summarizes the SIG programs in Soap Lake for year two of the project.

Table 4. Soap Lake Programs

SIG Program	Sessions	Youth Served	Comments
After School Program	14	44	Great participation with cross section of youth, not just kids at risk.
All Stars	26	17	Two groups
Friday Nights	25	202	Racial tension between Russian and Hispanic youth. Solved problems with competitive tournaments with pool and ping pong.
Life Skills	30	75	ESD did 6 th . grade, SIG did 7-8 th .
Smart Moves	7	11	Kids needed more interpretation than normal for age group.
Summer Program	24	32	Swimming in Moses Lake very popular

Source: Wendy Hanover, *State Incentive Grant Six Month Progress Report*, Grant County, submitted February 5, 2001.

Warden SIG Programs

All of the proposed programs were provided in Warden, and attendance was very good. In some cases, attendance was so good that it put much strain on the limited staff. Participating youth learned conflict resolution and leadership skills. Several youth asked the facilitator for Life Skills to allow them to take class again next year. The reputation of the after school program was so good that sixty youth enrolled in the 2001 summer program. Also, several youth heard about the Reconnecting Youth program from friends and they asked to participate. Unfortunately, they were not able to attend because the program served only 9th graders and these students were older. A few of the youth in Warden were so at-risk that they needed intervention rather than prevention services. The facilitator was able to influence at least one of these youth. The following table summarizes the Warden SIG programs for year two of the project.

Table 5. Warden Programs

SIG Program	Sessions	Youth Served	Comments
After School	16	43	
All Stars	15	13	Challenging program, youth not focused.
Life Skills	29	32	Hard to keep kids focused. Had to supplement with activities and games
Reconnecting Youth	18	18	Attendance a problem because of other school activities
Smart Moves	10	17	Leadership and friendship key components
Summer Program	15	30	Recreation and education and conflict resolution

Source: Wendy Hanover, *State Incentive Grant Six Month Progress Report*, Grant County, submitted February 5, 2001.

Objective 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.

Common reporting tools include the Washington State Survey of Adolescent Health Behaviors and the Everest Prevention Outcome Evaluation System database (hereafter, Everest). Respondents are not aware of any other regularly used common reporting tools. Prevention providers are focused on their own evaluation requirements and reporting.

The Washington State Survey of Adolescent Health Behavior, also referred to as the school survey, is administered every two years in a representative sample of

schools across the state. It is available to any other schools that are interested as well, at no cost. Funding for the survey is provided through tobacco settlement funds administered by the Department of Health. Washington State Survey of Adolescent Health Behaviors data provide cross-sectional substance abuse prevalence rates and measures of risk and protective factors among 6th, 8th, 10th, and 12th grade students. Schools associated with SIG community grantees were required to participate in the survey, as did the schools in Port Townsend, Brinnon, Quilcene, and Chimacum.

Grant County began using the Washington State Adolescent Health Behavior Survey in the four target schools in 1998. The survey was conducted again in 2000. Over time, these data will allow county administrators to examine community level changes in substance abuse prevalence and risk and protective factors.

Everest is a web-based, prevention program outcome monitoring system developed for SIG by the Division of Alcohol and Substance Abuse. SIG community grantees have pilot tested Everest. The database design is based on findings from several prevention research studies in which Division of Alcohol and Substance Abuse has participated. It allows SIG grantees and providers to print out tests to be used as pre-tests and post-tests for measuring program outcomes. After administering the tests, answers for each question are entered by local staff over the web. Test results are immediately available to the community grantee and the program provider. Everest contains no identified data. Questionnaire responses are linked by a confidential code for each participant. This means that anyone reviewing the data in Everest would be unable to identify the answers that any particular person chose.

Grant County Prevention and Recovery Center established pre- and post-tests for all of their SIG programs. At one point, site data was lost in the Everest system so it all had to be re-entered. Data entry was delayed further due to one of the co-director's leave of absence from the project. These data were being re-entered at the time this report was written. Also, in Quincy, the contract with Q-Care was terminated in January and facilitators were hired directly by the Prevention and Recovery Center. Some post-test data was lost from this site due to the change.

Training and Technical Assistance

This past year, training was limited to three people who attended facilitator training classes for the Life Skills Training program. The Outreach Coordinator, trained in best practice procedures, trained local program facilitators who were not able to attend the formal session.

Staff turnover has been a problem. Several facilitators did not return for the second year of the project. The county did not have enough people to train to warrant bringing in outside trainers, and it was too expensive to send people, sometimes to the east coast, to get training.

Project Successes

- The Soap Lake community started the SIG project with few prevention programs. The SIG project provided seed money to start programs, and the community began to support them and created others. This is an example of leveraging, wherein initial successes lead to an expansion of prevention efforts.
- According to the local SIG project director, the Soap Lake After School program was well received by community, the school, and the youth. The elementary school principal facilitated the program. His excitement helped to bring in about 40 kids to the program. At least two youth have given up gang activity during the past two years. During the beginning of the program, there was some concern, expressed by teachers and the school board, that the kids in the program might be labeled as “high-risk”. However, as the program continued, not only were the higher risk youth attending, but also many teachers’ and school board members’ kids. The youth in the program had the opportunity to participate in many different recreational activities, crafts, games, and curriculums. Five students from the Alternative School in Soap Lake graduated from high school this year. The principal attributes their success to the Reconnecting Youth program. The principal commented how personally rewarding it was to see the kids in a positive environment aside from his customary disciplinarian role.
- With a little seed money, including SIG funds, the community opened the Mother Theresa-McKay Youth Outreach and Wellness Center across the street from the Alternative School. The director of the program brought in people from Moses Lake and Ephrata to teach the youth different life skills. The topics included CPR, domestic violence, health care, and tobacco prevention. In addition, organizations, such as the Girls Scouts, S.A.V.E., and S.A.D.D. were represented.
- The Boys and Girls Club will be expanding services into Quincy next year.
- Quincy School District has set aside time and resources to expand the after school program next year to three days and to use class time for Life Skills and Smart Moves programs.
- Volunteers came forth in Quincy, including a police officer and his wife, who participated in the Preparing for the Drug Free Years program. They offered valuable supplemental information to the program.

Project Challenges

- Each participating community had only two staff members working on the SIG programs. Additional staff resources would have made it much easier for the facilitators to manage the classes, especially in Warden, where attendance was very high.

- Irregular attendance by students, while unavoidable due to family migration and competition from school activities, had a negative impact on continuity, according to SIG staff.
- In January 2001, the Prevention and Recovery Center terminated the contract with Q-Care in Quincy and contracted directly with the facilitators. This caused disruption to the program. Although the first sessions of Life Skills and All Stars were completed, there are no post-tests available.
- School districts were good partners at each site, but SIG partnering concepts were slow to evolve, except in Soap Lake.
- Transportation problems limited participation in Grand Coulee.

Baseline Funding and Planning

One program in each SIG site was examined to learn about the funding and planning components necessary to implement a prevention program in Grant County. The All Stars program in Soap Lake was examined to document sources of funding and planning input for the program. Aside from SIG funding, the All Stars program had few other sources of support. The Soap Lake Elementary School provided space and equipment for the program. Besides referring youth, the Soap Lake Elementary School provided space and equipment and some snacks for the program. The Grant County Prevention and Recovery Center provided program management with DASA Prevention and Community Mobilization funds. The All Stars program could not have operated without the after school program, which served as a way to get kids to the program. Grant County and the School District jointly planned for these programs.

Program Fidelity

As part of the evaluation, one program in each SIG community was used to pilot a program fidelity survey known as the Program Implementation Survey (see Appendix E). Program implementation fidelity refers to how closely program providers in a local community follow the original design of the prevention program.¹⁶

The purpose of our inquiry into implementation fidelity was the development of a tool that can be used by local and state researchers to provide self-reported fidelity.¹⁷ Evaluators want to know if pre-test/post-test results were due to the program as it was designed, or were the results of a program unique to the site. The survey tells evaluation staff and local SIG providers and staff what they tested with Everest: the program named in their matrix or some variation of that program. The fidelity survey also gives local SIG providers and staff a

¹⁶ King, Jean A., Morris, Lynn L., and Fitz-Gibbon, Carol T. 1978. *How to Assess Program Implementation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

¹⁷ Goodman, Robert M. 2000. Bridging the gap in effective program implementation: from concept to application. *Journal of Community Psychology*. 28(3): 309-321.

comprehensive record of what was changed. When combined with Everest results, the survey can help determine two things:

1. If Everest results were positive, should this program be used again as it was administered this time?
2. If Everest results were mediocre or negative, should this program be modified, further modified, or abandoned for a different program?

Evaluators wanted to know from the survey if the results we were seeing from pre-test/post-test results were due to the program as it was designed, or were the results due to a program characteristic unique to the program site?¹⁸ The fidelity survey also gave local SIG providers and staff a comprehensive record of what was changed.

The All Stars was chosen to determine the extent to which the science-based program had to be changed to work within the Soap Lake community. The All Stars program is a rigor 4 program that aims to develop protective personal values, build resilience by creating strong personal commitments, establish appropriate group norms and by forge strong bonds between teens and positive institutions. Minor modifications were made to adapt the program to the community:

- Some of the curriculum topics were not considered acceptable to the norms of the community for fifth graders. The program administrator felt that the community had high levels of denial about youth's involvement in sex. They modified the curriculum to meet the local norms.
- Some materials and handouts were enhanced to keep the youth's attention. For example, some incentives were given to encourage kids to bring in their homework. The last five minutes of class were used for fun activities.
- The participants were mostly engaged with the curriculum. The facilitators enjoyed using the curriculum, and they will probably use it again because of the positive response to the program.

Conclusion

Grant County Prevention and Recovery Center was experienced in the use of the risk and protective model for prevention planning at the county level prior to SIG. They used both local and state archival data to prioritize risk and protective factors. SIG gave the Prevention and Recovery Center resources to facilitate partnering with schools and other agencies, and it provided a method for evaluating SIG programs, using pre- and post-tests and the Everest system. SIG was partially responsible for getting two of the four participating school districts (Grand Coulee and Soap Lake) to participate in the school survey.

¹⁸ *Program Implementation Survey*. Washington State Incentive Grant Evaluation Team, September 2000.

SIG brought prevention programs to hundreds of youth in four communities in Grant County. In three of these communities, prevention was a fairly new concept. The project gave the Prevention and Recovery Center something to offer schools and organizations to foster good partnering relationships. Participation in the school survey and pre-and post-test evaluations helped the county to begin evaluating programs over time. Local site facilitators felt that the Prevention and Recovery Center was very supportive and flexible to their needs.

Of the four sites, most prevention system changes occurred in Soap Lake as organizations, such as the police department and local businesses, began to work with the schools to provide youth with alternative activities and information on prevention. The Youth Center provided the teens with healthy ways to deal with diversity and issues of teenagers.

All communities had good participation. Transportation problems limited attendance in Grand Coulee. Staff limitations made management of the programs in Warden a challenge. Termination of the contract of Q-Care in Quincy created administrative challenges. Aside from all these and other challenges, many of Grant County's youth benefited from substance abuse prevention programs that without SIG would not have happened.

A key achievement under the SIG project was to create viable linkages between schools and prevention activities occurring outside the education system. The Grant County SIG project made progress toward achieving the community level objectives, as established by the Governor's Substance Abuse Prevention Advisory Committee. During the last year of SIG community funding, Grant County Prevention and Recovery Center intends to develop methods to maintain some of the changes they have achieved in the system of prevention planning, funding, implementation, and monitoring developed under SIG.

Appendix A:

Community-Level Goals and Objectives¹⁹

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

¹⁹ 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

Sources of Information

Interviews

Interviews were conducted with lead agency contacts, as well as prevention service providers and school district employees. If audio-taped 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.

Program Implementation Survey

Program Implementation Survey was completed on Soap Lake All Stars Program.

Baseline Planning and Funding Survey

Baseline Planning and Funding Survey was conducted on the Soap Lake All Stars Program.

Review of Local Documents

- The PARC Times, Grant County Prevention and Recovery Center newsletter
- Progress Reports
- 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 ESD 123 and the SIG state project director's staff. Matrices were used to guide inquiry into the process of achieving anticipated local outcomes.

Analysis

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. Additional categories were added as it became apparent that they were of importance to the SIG community grantees.

Appendix C: Risk and Protective Factors, Categorized by Domain²⁰

Note: Risk and protective factors addressed by the Grant County Prevention and Recovery Center SIG project are italicized.

Domains	Risk Factors	Protective Factors
Community	Availability of drugs Community laws and norms favorable to drug use Transitions and mobility Low neighborhood attachment and community disorganization Extreme economic deprivation	Opportunities for prosocial involvement Rewards for prosocial involvement
Family	Family history of the problem behavior <i>Family management problems</i> <i>Family conflict</i> Favorable parental attitudes and involvement in the problem behavior	Bonding: family attachment <i>Opportunities for prosocial involvement</i> Rewards for prosocial involvement
School	Early and persistent antisocial behavior <i>Academic failure</i> Lack of commitment to school	<i>Bonding: attachment to school</i> <i>Opportunities for prosocial involvement</i> Rewards for prosocial involvement
Individual	<i>Rebelliousness</i> <i>Friends who engage in the problem behavior</i> <i>Favorable attitudes towards the problem behavior</i> <i>Early initiation of the problem behavior</i> Constitutional factors	<i>Healthy beliefs and clear standards</i> <i>Bonding: attachment to prosocial peers</i> Social skills

²⁰ Modified from *A Guide to the Community Substance Abuse Prevention Projects*. December 2000. Governor's Substance Abuse Prevention Advisory Committee. Available from State Incentive Grant Project, Division of Alcohol and Substance Abuse, Department of Social and Health Services, PO Box 45331, Olympia, WA 98504-5331 (ph: 360 438-8065) or Washington State Alcohol/Drug Clearinghouse (ph: 800 662-9111 in-state; 206 725-9696 Seattle or out of state).

Date _____ Site _____ Program Service _____

Rigor Level _____ Beginning Date of Program Service _____ Ending Date of Program Service _____

Name and position/title of person supplying information _____

Appendix D:
Baseline Planning and Funding Survey

Agency/Organization/ Business/Individual involved in funding, donating to, or planning this program service	Are they a funding source, i.e., were funds applied for through a competitive process, such as an RFP?	Are they a source of in- kind contributions? If so, what type (financial, space, food, volunteer, materials)?	Were they involved in planning?	If they were involved in planning, what was their involvement (in general, e.g., attended meetings, consultant, etc.)?

Note: Listing the SIG planning committee as a group is appropriate because they volunteered their time and effort in planning. If they also held a fundraiser, as a group, or sought additional funding, please list that. If an individual member of the committee put in extra time and effort to arrange for donations of any kind, please list that person separately. The goal is to map the efforts of individuals and groups involved in providing this program service.

Please add more pages as needed.

Date _____ Site _____ Program Service _____

Rigor Level _____ Beginning Date of Program Service _____ Ending Date of Program Service _____

Name of person supplying information _____

Appendix E: Program Implementation Survey

The purpose of this survey is to determine what was measured by the pre-test/post-test associated with your program: was it the program as originally designed and tested, or was it some variation on that program? If program modifications were made, test results may differ from those that would be expected if the program were implemented as originally designed, with the intended target population, taught by a trained instructor. Records of program implementation practices, reviewed in conjunction with program effectiveness measures, can inform future prevention planning. If possible, this form should be completed by the person providing prevention program services.

1. Did this prevention program differ from the original design?

Program Characteristic	Yes	No	Description of change	General reason for change (check one)		Notes on specific reason(s) for change
				Necessity	Program improvement	
1) Number of sessions						
2) Length of sessions						
3) Content of sessions						
4) Order of sessions						
5) Use of materials or handouts						

Program Characteristic	Yes	No	Description of change	General reason for change		Notes on specific reason for change
				Necessity	Program improvement	
6) General location (e.g., at community center instead of school)						
7) Intended population (age, language, level of risk, maturity)						
8) Number of participants						
9) Instructor training						
10) Instructor/student ratio						
11) Anything else?						

2. If this is a Best Practices or science-based program (rigor 5), did you receive guidance from either the program’s designer or from WestCAPT in making changes? _____ Yes _____ No _____ Not applicable
 Is this still considered a best practice (in the opinion of the designer/WestCAPT) after you made these changes? _____ Yes _____ No



3. Instructor training and experience
 - a. Did you receive training for this program? _____ Yes _____ No
 - b. How many years of experience do you have providing substance abuse prevention services?
 ___ <1 ___ 1-3 ___ 4 or more
 - c. How many years of experience providing social services or teaching, outside of prevention services?
 ___ <1 ___ 1-3 ___ 4 or more
4. What was your observation of participants' engagement with the program?
 Mostly engaged Neutral Less than fascinated
5. What was your response to the program?
 Enjoyable Neutral Tedious
6. Would you use this program again, given the opportunity?
 Probably Maybe Unlikely
7. What shaped your opinion about whether or not you would use this program again, given the opportunity? Please select all that apply.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Pre-test/post-test results
<input type="checkbox"/>	Participants' or your own reactions to the program
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other measures (school grades, behavioral responses)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Response from parents, school staff, other community members
<input type="checkbox"/>	Discussion with other prevention professionals
<input type="checkbox"/>	Anything else? Please list:

Please note: Development of this form grew out of the book, *How to Assess Program Implementation*, by Jean A. King, Lynn Lyons Morris, and Carol Taylor Fitz-Gibbon, published in 1978 by Sage, Newbury Park, California.

Created by the Washington State Incentive Grant Evaluation Team, September 2000: Christine Roberts, Ray Mitchell, Kojay Pan, Anne Strode, and Linda Weaver, University of Washington, Washington Institute of Mental Illness Research and Training/Western Branch. Developed under the guidance of the Department of Social and Health Services, Research and Data Analysis Division for the Department of Social and Health Services, Division of Alcohol and Substance Abuse.