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CSAP State Incentive Grants (SIGs): Initiatives for Prevention System Change

- Intended to improve the effectiveness of prevention resource distribution and management
- First SIG implemented in 1997
- Most recent SIG: Strategic Prevention Framework (SPF), implemented in 2004
- SPF SIG cross-site evaluation informed by:
  - Community Partnership Program (1990–1996)
  - Community Coalitions Program (1994–1998)
The SPF Model

1. Profile population needs, resources, and readiness to address needs and gaps
2. Mobilize and/or build capacity to address needs
3. Develop a Comprehensive Strategic Plan
4. Implement evidence-based prevention programs and activities
5. Monitor, evaluate, sustain, and improve or replace those that fail

Cultural Competence Sustainability
How Does SPF Differ From Prior Federal Prevention Efforts?

There are many novel aspects of SPF but two in particular stand out:

- the required use of epidemiological data to set state priorities and justify resource allocation to communities (so-called “data-driven planning”)
- reliance on population-based outcomes to estimate the initiative’s effectiveness, in contrast to the more traditional reliance on program-level effects on individual participants
Strategic Prevention Framework (SPF) Goals

1. Build prevention capacity and infrastructure at the state/territory and community levels
2. Reduce substance abuse-related problems in communities; and
3. Prevent the onset and reduce the progression of substance abuse, including childhood and underage drinking;

CSAP funded the States to implement the SPF model.

NIDA funded a national evaluation of SPF SIG through an interagency agreement.
Strategic Prevention Framework
SIG Grantees Cohorts I & II (N=26)

NOTE: Dark solid colors indicate grantees.

- Western CAPT
- Southwest CAPT
- Central CAPT
- Northeast CAPT
- Southeast CAPT

450 communities
2000+ interventions
Infrastructure Domain Scores at Round 1 and Round 2 (N=26)

* $p < .10$, paired t-test, two-tailed
** $p < .05$, paired t-test, two-tailed
Infrastructure Integration Scores at Round 1 and Round 2 (N=26)

* $p < .10$, paired t-test, two-tailed
** $p < .05$, paired t-test, two-tailed
Changes in Domain and Integration Capacity Scores (N=26)

- Across domain and integration scores, **25-45%** of low or moderate capacity States increased capacity (that is, of States with the potential to increase), compared to **0-24%** of moderate or high States that decreased.

- For all domains except Evaluation/Monitoring, at least **40%** of the States that were low or moderate capacity at R1 increased their capacity level at R2.

- There was consistent improvement across all domains among low capacity States. These data indicate that improvement in State prevention infrastructure was experienced by those States that needed such improvement the most.
Changes in Organizational Structure (N=26)

- The number of States with a coordinating body to help integrate substance abuse prevention efforts across State agencies increased from 11 to 14.
- The number of SPF SIG States with regional entities to provide TA and training to community organizations and providers increased from 14 to 15.
- The number of States with a line-item in their State budgets for substance abuse prevention increased from 14 to 16.
Mean Scores for SPF Steps, Cultural Competence, and Sustainability (N=26)
Distribution of Scores for SPF Steps, Cultural Competence and Sustainability (N=26)
Factors That Helped Facilitate Implementation of the SPF SIG

- Strong collaboration among stakeholders,
- Training and technical assistance received,
- Work of the SEOW and project evaluators.
- Data-driven nature of the prioritization process was advantageous when stakeholders disagreed on prevention priorities, in that the data-driven process was seen as objective and fair.
Challenges Encountered

- Leadership and staffing issues within the agency implementing the SPF SIG.
- Data limitations that hindered States’ ability to fully engage in data-driven planning.
  - In States that lacked a well established data infrastructure for prevention such as school surveys capable of county-level estimates), SEOWs and SACs were at a decided disadvantage in implementing the model.
The States Say …

- **450 CPs funded.**

- **All 26 state administrators** require CPs to:
  - submit formal results of a needs assessment;
  - submit a formal Strategic Plan;
  - obtain approval of their Strategic Plan.

- **All 26 States** also monitor the CPs’ intervention selection.
The Community Partners (CPs) Say

- **424 (94%)** CPs completed a community needs assessment by the end of the 4th reporting period.

- **408 (98%)** CPs had their Strategic Plans reviewed by the State.
  - 97% received feedback from the State; 91% CPs received approval for their Plan.

- **365 (88%)** CPs revisited their Strategic Plan at least once.
  - 79% made changes to their Plan.
The Community Partners (CPs) Say

State provision/facilitation of guidance, training, and technical assistance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of guidance/training/technical assistance</th>
<th>Number of CPs Receiving the assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff/task force/coalition member training</td>
<td>437 (97%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs assessment</td>
<td>431 (96%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic plan development</td>
<td>423 (94%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting interventions</td>
<td>419 (93%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural competence</td>
<td>409 (91%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building relationships</td>
<td>395 (88%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation activities</td>
<td>389 (86%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustaining intervention activities</td>
<td>363 (81%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting participants</td>
<td>334 (76%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Community Partners (CPs) Say

- **446 (99%)** conducted organizational / coalition capacity building activities.
  - 96% identified key organizational or coalition activities and goals; 390 (87%) trained staff; 386 (87%) identified a coalition leader.

- **448 CPs (99+%)** identified key stakeholders or partners to participate in their SPF SIG activities.
  - 98% partnered with Law enforcement agencies; 95% partnered with Schools/School districts; 94% partnered with media; 92% partnered with Youth Groups.
  - 89%, 85%, and 84% partnered with Healthcare professionals, Faith-based organizations, and Business groups, respectively.
Interventions by Strategy Type (N=2,014)

- Environmental: 868 (44%)
- Information Dissemination: 148 (8%)
- Prevention Education: 33 (2%)
- Community-Based Processes: 318 (16%)
- Alternative Drug-Free Activities: 325 (16%)
- Problem Identification and Referral: 9 (0%)
- Other: 276 (14%)

Total: 2,014
Summary

- State-level infrastructure data confirmed that most states improved their status on most infrastructure domains.

- State-level implementation data confirmed that most states implemented the 5 steps with high fidelity, consistent with the model.

- Community-level instrument (CLI) data shows States being highly proactive and community partners (CPs) being highly responsive in making the model a reality.

- CLI data has revealed a large and diverse amount of intervention activity.
Still to Answer

- How well were the 5 steps (including the interventions) implemented in the 450 communities?
- Did the interventions impact intervening variables as proposed in the logic models?
- Did SPF funding lead to change in community-level consumption and consequence outcomes?
- What accounted for variation in outcomes change across funded communities?
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