



STUDENT ASSISTANCE PREVENTION/INTERVENTION SERVICES PROGRAM 2014–15 EVALUATION HIGHLIGHTS

Jennifer Lembach
RMC Research Corporation
Krissy Johnson

Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction

March 23, 2016



STUDENT ASSISTANCE/PROJECT SUCCESS MULTI-TIERED MODEL

Tier 3: Case Management


- Screening, referral to community services, case management, re-entry assistance

Tier 2: School-based Intervention

- Screening, peer support groups, individual counseling

Tier 1: Prevention

- Prevention Education Series
- School-wide events
- Prevention Club
- Family, Staff and Community Trainings/Curriculum



SERVICE OVERVIEW



SAPISP services provided in **73** schools



Services provided by **53** intervention specialists




Tiers 2 & 3: Direct intervention services provided to **2,319** students



Average of **44** Participants per Specialist

Note. Number of schools and Specialists includes any school or specialist with at least one student reported in the database.

TIER 1: UNIVERSAL PREVENTION SESSIONS




Total: 6,059 sessions

TIERS 2 & 3: SERVICES FOR AT-RISK YOUTH AND THOSE THAT ARE USING SUBSTANCES


- ▶ Characteristics of students served
 - Demographic characteristics
 - Presenting problems
 - GAIN Short Screener results: Student self-report of mental health, substance problem, and crime/violence behavior issues

REFERRAL SOURCE OF STUDENTS PROVIDED SELECTIVE/INDICATED SERVICES




Note. $n = 2,319$.

CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENTS PROVIDED SELECTIVE/INDICATED SERVICES




Note. n = 2,319

PRESENTING PROBLEMS OF STUDENTS PROVIDED SELECTIVE/INDICATED SERVICES




Note. $n = 2,319$. Substance Abuse by Family and Substance Abuse by Others are two subcategories within Home/Community.

GAIN-SS SCREENING RESULTS OF STUDENTS RECEIVING SELECTIVE/INDICATED SERVICES




INTERVENTION SERVICES PROVIDED TO STUDENTS BY PIS

Interventions




Support Groups/Classes



0% 20% 40% 60% 80%

Note. n = 2,319

TIER 3: CASE MANAGEMENT REFERRALS




Note. n = 2,319

STUDENT OUTCOMES: STUDENTS RECEIVING INTERVENTION SERVICES


- ▶ Data represents only students with both a pre and post
- ▶ Trends over last few years
- ▶ 2014-15 Results
 - Substance use in the previous 30 days
 - Protective factors
 - Perceived risk of harm in using substances
 - Problem behaviors in the previous three months
- ▶ One-year follow-up data on number of classes failed for students served in 2013–14 (matched baseline/follow-up)

TRENDS IN PAST 30-DAY SUBSTANCE USE OUTCOMES: CIGARETTES




Note. Pre-post reported for SAPISP students with a substance use reduction goal.

TRENDS IN PAST 30-DAY SUBSTANCE USE OUTCOMES: ALCOHOL




Note. Pre-post reported for SAPISP students with a substance use reduction goal.

TRENDS IN PAST 30-DAY SUBSTANCE USE OUTCOMES: BINGE DRINKING




Note. Pre-post reported for SAPISP students with a substance use reduction goal.

TRENDS IN PAST 30-DAY SUBSTANCE USE OUTCOMES: MARIJUANA



Note. Pre-post reported for SAPISP students with a substance use reduction goal.

CHANGE IN SUBSTANCE USE



Note. $n = 1,256-1,266$.

PROTECTIVE FACTORS DESCRIPTION

▶ Personal Competence

- **Self-concept.** A positive image or "feeling good" about oneself.
- **Self-control.** The ability to control impulses, particularly antisocial impulses such as anger or violence.
- **Self-efficacy.** The sense that life can have a purpose and one can effectively achieve that purpose

▶ Social Competence

- **Assertiveness.** The ability to stand up for oneself in social situations in reasonable ways. It is distinguished from aggressiveness in that it connotes comfort, rather than hostility.
- **Confidence.** The belief that one is liked and will be accepted in a variety of social situations.
- **Cooperation.** The desire to contribute to social groups. It includes a sense of satisfaction that comes with contributing.


▶ Social Bonding

- **School bonding.** A positive attitude and motivation towards school, both now and in the future.

▶ Caring and Support (actions of others rather than the student)


- **Nurturance.** Students have others on whom they can rely for support and assistance.
- **Guidance.** Adults provide direction to the student as well as support.

PROTECTIVE FACTORS: PERSONAL AND SOCIAL COMPETENCE INCREASES AT POST




Note. Scale: 1 (lowest protection) to 4 (highest protection). $n = 1,169-1,239$.

PROTECTIVE FACTORS: CARING AND SUPPORT FROM ADULTS INCREASES AT POST




Note. Scale: 1 (lowest protection) to 4 (highest protection). $n = 1,169-1,239$.

MOST STUDENTS REPORTED MODERATE TO HIGH PERCEIVED RISK IN SUBSTANCE USE AFTER PROGRAM




Note. n = 1,102–1,126

STUDENTS WITH SUBSTANCE USE INTERVENTION GOAL LESS LIKELY TO REPORT 30-DAY USE AFTER PROGRAM




Note. Includes only students with substance use goal. n = 675–678.

SUBSTANCE USE OTHER THAN ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, AND MARIJUANA WAS LOW AT PRE AND POST



Note. Includes only students with substance use goal. $n = 768-789$.

STUDENTS WITH BEHAVIOR INTERVENTION GOAL LESS LIKELY TO REPORT INAPPROPRIATE BEHAVIOR AFTER PROGRAM



Note. Includes only students with behavior goal. $n = 302-307$

STATISTICAL TESTS SUMMARY

- ▶ Changes pre to post were statistically significant for:
 - 7 of 8 protective factor scales (all but school bonding)
 - 5 of 5 perceived risk items
 - Alcohol, binge drinking, and marijuana use (not cigarette use)
 - Behaviors: getting in trouble at school, school suspensions, getting into fights, hitting someone
- ▶ Effect size testing showed a positive program effect for all but four outcomes (school bonding, physical fights, confidence, skipping school).
 - ▶ Effect sizes were small except for marijuana use, which showed a medium effect size.

CLASSES PASSED/FAILED (2013–14 COHORT)


▶ Data Collection:

- ▶ School data collected on number of classes passed and failed in fall term of the year served and again 1 year later
- ▶ Caution: Sample size with baseline and follow-up data is fairly small ($n = 580$); data may not be representative

▶ Results:

- ▶ Percent of students failing any classes decreased slightly from 49% to 47%
- ▶ 64% of students had a positive outcome (23% decreased the percentage of classes failed, 41% continued passing all classes)
- ▶ 36% of students did not show positive changes

CHANGES IN PERCENTAGE OF CLASSES FAILED FROM BASELINE (FALL 2013) TO FOLLOW-UP (FALL 2014)



QUESTIONS?

Gillian Leichtling or Jennifer Lembach, RMC Research

- ▶ gleichling@rmcres.com
- ▶ jlembach@rmcres.com
- ▶ (800) 788-1887

Krissy Johnson, OSPI

- ▶ krissy.johnson@k12.wa.us
- ▶ (360) 725-6045

