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- Targeted prevention efforts in communities designated as “high risk”
- DBHR provided funding, training, and technical assistance to substance abuse prevention coalitions
- All CPWI communities required to implement evidence-based programs and practices
  - Family, School, Environmental
- Now 4 cohorts and 52 CPWI communities across the state
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• Primary interest is translation of research to real-world practice
  • How can we close the gap?
  • How can we help effective prevention reach the widest audience possible?

• Collaboration with DBHR since 2003
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EVALUATION APPROACH

• Selected 10th-grade as “sentinel” outcome group
• Healthy Youth Survey alcohol and risk/protective factors
• Cohort 1 only
  • Risk assessed on basis of 30-day alcohol use + community factors
  • Initial funding: 2011
  • Used 2014 HYS data (would not expect to see outcomes in 2012)
• Used a method called propensity scoring to compare CPWI with other communities while controlling for initial differences
CPWI OUTCOME MEASURES

• Risk factors:
  • Individual/peer, family, school, and community domains

• Substance use
  • Alcohol use was primary target
  • Also examined rates of use on other substances
EVALUATION QUESTION

• In 2008, CPWI communities significantly higher on
  • 6 risk factors
  • 30-day alcohol use

• Had CPWI communities closed the gap with other communities by 2014?
## OUTCOMES WHERE CPWI WAS HIGHER IN 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Factors</th>
<th>Domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favorable attitude towards drug use</td>
<td>Individual and Peer Risk Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low perceived risk of substance use</td>
<td>Individual and Peer Risk Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor family management</td>
<td>Family Risk Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Factors/Substance Use</td>
<td>Domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer opportunities for prosocial involvement</td>
<td>School Risk Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low school commitment</td>
<td>School Risk Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laws and norms favorable to drug use</td>
<td>Community Risk Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Day Alcohol Use</td>
<td>Substance use outcome</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## HAVE CPWI COMMUNITIES CLOSED THE GAP?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Factors</th>
<th>Was CPWI higher than other communities in 2008?</th>
<th>Was CPWI higher than other communities in 2014?</th>
<th>Did CPWI close the gap?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favorable attitude towards drug use</td>
<td><strong>Higher</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low perceived risk of substance use</td>
<td><strong>Higher</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor family management</td>
<td><strong>Higher</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### HAVE CPWI COMMUNITIES CLOSED THE GAP?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Factors/Alcohol Use</th>
<th>Was CPWI higher than other communities in 2008?</th>
<th>Was CPWI higher than other communities in 2014?</th>
<th>Did CPWI close the gap?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fewer opportunities for prosocial involvement (in school)</td>
<td><strong>Higher</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low school commitment</td>
<td><strong>Higher</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laws and norms favorable to drug use</td>
<td><strong>Higher</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Day Alcohol Use</td>
<td><strong>Higher</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### A FEW OTHER OUTCOMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Higher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Even though risk factor “early initiation of substance use” decreased in all communities, in 2014 CPWI communities were higher than others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All family and community risk factors decreased 2008-2014 in CPWI communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even though tobacco use decreased in all communities, in 2014 CPWI communities were higher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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• Targeted prevention efforts were successful
  • The 2008 gaps between CPWI and other communities in risk factors were eliminated
  • 30-Day Alcohol Use gap also eliminated; all alcohol measures decreased
• Most other risk factors in CPWI communities decreased significantly between 2008-2014
• Tobacco use decreased and marijuana stayed the same 2008-2014, but CPWI still higher than other communities
CONCLUSION

• Early findings suggest that CPWI is effective in achieving targets

• Most risk factors (leading indicators) are decreasing; effects on substance use (lagging indicators) may take longer

• Other substances should received increased focus in CPWI communities to equalize remaining gaps
Background on Report Development

- Goal: Communicate about local prevention efforts and outcomes
- Layout and content informed by focus groups
- The focus groups aimed to:
  - understand how coalitions communicate with stakeholders about their impact
  - learn about the types of data most relevant to stakeholder groups
  - obtain feedback on the layout of sample reports
## Focus Group Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPWI Community</th>
<th># Participants</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach, Tekoa, Washougal, Pomeroy, Walla Walla, Klickitat/Lyle, Forks, Spokane (West Central)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Focus group of coalition leaders at the DSHS/DBHR Summer Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakima</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Participants included coalition leaders from Yakima, White Swan, and Wapato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellingham</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Participants included coalition leaders from Bellingham and Ferndale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarkston</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Participants were current/former board members and the coalition leader</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Focus Group Takeaways

- Ability to adapt content/layout for different audiences
- 1-pager with graphics & supporting text = reach more stakeholders
- Present key community stats in multiple formats (e.g., text, graphics)
- Testimonials & quotes are helpful to communicate benefits
CPWI Community Report

**Front Page**
- Overview of CPWI and key findings from the state evaluation
- Data reflects Healthy Youth Survey (HYS) for 10th grade students in CPWI Cohort 1 communities

**Back Page**
- Customized to reflect HYS outcomes at the community level
- A description of the community/coalition can be included at the top
- Space is available to incorporate a testimonial or quote (top right)
- Text and charts are used to communicate changes in substance use and related risk factors
We Need Your Feedback!

- Would this report be helpful in communicating with your stakeholders?
- Which specific stakeholder groups would find this report useful? Why?
- Which stakeholder groups would not find this report useful? Why?
- What are the strengths of this report? Content and visuals?
- How can we improve this report? Content and visuals?