



Olympic Educational Service District 114, Jefferson County Washington State Incentive Grant 1st 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*

Kojay Pan, M.P.A.,
Christine Roberts, Ph.D.,
with Dario Longhi, Ph.D.

Executive Summary

Olympic Educational Service District 114 (ESD 114) is 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. ESD 114 serves school districts in Kitsap County (except Bainbridge Island), Jefferson County, and Clallam County, in addition to North Mason County School District. Four communities in eastern Jefferson County are receiving SIG-funded services through ESD 114: Port Townsend, Brinnon, Chimacum, and Quilcene.

This document is a baseline community-level evaluation report, examining partnership and substance abuse prevention efforts during the last decade in the four communities in eastern Jefferson County where services are provided. Also reported are the communities' initial challenges and successes in implementing SIG-funded prevention services for youth. Reports are provided as feedback on ESD 114's SIG-related efforts to date and as a partial record of those efforts for state and federal funding agencies.

Isolated from large cities, most Jefferson County residents were required to drive over an hour in order to access prevention programs or services before SIG. This motivated Jefferson County to collaborate with ESD 114 to apply for SIG funding. Prior to SIG, Jefferson County collaborative planning efforts among prevention agencies, organizations, and school districts were limited. The SIG project represents one of the county's first collaborative efforts in grant writing and assessing prevention needs and services. SIG introduced the concept of using data to prioritize risk and protective factors, and to select and evaluate science-based programs. Programs selected by the Jefferson County SIG project address family management skills and family relations.

Community norms in Jefferson County are somewhat permissive toward drug and alcohol use, misuse, and abuse. Use of tobacco, alcohol, and drugs is viewed by youth as an easy way to kill time. There are limited organized activities available for young people after school.

Challenges reportedly experienced by local SIG staff while attempting to implement the SIG project included a limited variety of research-based prevention programs from which to choose, school personnel's uneasiness regarding program scope and target populations, the unexpectedly high amount of travel time required for program providers, and unanticipated training costs.

Olympic Educational Service District, Jefferson County Baseline Community-Level Evaluation

Introduction

Olympic Educational Service District #114 (ESD 114) is one of eighteen Washington State Incentive Grant community grantees. 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. 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 SIG have goals of coordinating resources 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. Here is a summary:

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.

The SIG 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. This document examines the prevention history of the area, relevant social indicators, and SIG-funded program implementation. Future reports will include discussions of program effectiveness, community partnerships, and plans for continued funding beyond SIG.

Description of Jefferson County¹

Jefferson County is a rural county that stretches east to west across the middle of the Olympic Peninsula. The county's size is approximately 1,809 square miles, yet it does not contain any cities larger than 10,000 people. Most Jefferson County residents must drive over an hour in order to reach a large city, such as Silverdale, Bremerton, or Olympia. Residents in the western half of the county drive three hours to access a large city. Within county boundaries lie ocean beaches, mountains, parts of a national park and a national forest, and American Indian tribal reservations.

Jefferson County is one of the fastest growing counties in the State of Washington. The county's population nearly doubled between the years of 1970 through 1990. The current population is 26,908 residents.

Olympic Educational Service District 114 (ESD 114) serves school districts in Kitsap County (except Bainbridge Island), Jefferson County, and Clallam County, in addition to North Mason County School District. Four communities in eastern Jefferson County are receiving SIG-funded services through ESD 114: Port Townsend, Brinnon, Chimacum, and Quilcene.

Port Townsend, the largest community in Jefferson County, is located in the northeastern tip of Jefferson County. Approximately 95% of the county's population is located in eastern Jefferson County, in small towns lying along the Hood Canal and Puget Sound. Port Townsend serves as the county seat, with a population of 9,406. Ten miles south of Port Townsend are the unincorporated communities of Port Hadlock, Irondale, and Chimacum. These three communities have an aggregate population of 4,244 and are known as the "Tri-Area." Twenty miles southeast of Port Townsend is the relatively affluent area of Port Ludlow with a population of 4,258. Southwest of Port Ludlow, along Washington State Highway 101, are the communities of Brinnon and Quilcene, which have a combined population of 3,021.

The remaining 5% of Jefferson County's population resides in the far western half of the county. Western Jefferson County is very sparsely populated with approximately 1,000 residents over a large area. Most of the county's tribal population, which comprises nearly 3% of the total county population, lives in the western half of the county. The Hoh Tribal Reservation is located in Jefferson County, as is part of the Quinault Indian Nation Reservation.

The ESD 114 SIG project serves four communities in eastern Jefferson County: Port Townsend, Chimacum, Brinnon, and Quilcene. Western Jefferson County residents must travel to neighboring counties and communities such as Aberdeen

¹ Descriptive information for sections on Jefferson County and sociodemographics is derived from Olympic Educational Service District. 1999. Proposal to Solicitation No. 991346, for Grant to Communities to Provide Services for the Prevention of Alcohol, Tobacco, Marijuana, and Other Drug Use, Misuse, and Abuse. Unpublished.

to the south in Grays Harbor County, or Port Angeles to the north in Clallum County, in order to access prevention services.

Sociodemographic Characteristics

Racial and Ethnic Diversity

Cultural and ethnic diversity in Jefferson County is relatively low. Ninety-four percent of the county's population is of European-American descent.

Ethnicity	Percentage
Caucasian	94%
American Indian	3%
Asian	1%
Hispanic	1%
Black	1%

Respondents stated that the lack of ethnic and cultural diversity is a concern and that many members of the community are aware of the importance of diversity. However, without considerable in-migration of minorities, the lack of cultural and ethnic diversity is unlikely to change in the near future.

Employment Base

Jefferson County has a healthy economy for a rural county. Respondents report that the county is gaining jobs faster than many other rural counties in Washington State. There are 800 manufacturing jobs available, which is high for a rural county. Jefferson County has a diversified economic base that includes fishing, maritime oriented businesses, tourism, government services, and manufacturing. The public school system employs a significant number of people, as well. Jefferson County is a popular place for retirees and other people seeking to escape city life. Retirees bring expertise in the arts and sciences to the community and often offer their services as mentors to the community.

Some specifics on northeastern Jefferson County's economic status are as follows:

- The Port Townsend Paper Corporation recently increased their number of employees to 470. The paper mill represents the largest private employer in the county. Despite recent cutbacks in the paper mill industry, the paper mill remains as the single largest employer in Jefferson County.
- The U.S. Navy employs over 100 Jefferson County residents at the Port Hadlock Weapons Support Facility Detachment on Indian Island.
- Port Townsend has a prosperous marine trade, which includes world-class sail makers and riggers, as well as accomplished shipwrights. In 1997, Port Townsend expanded its port in order to supplement a more diverse marine trade.

- The tourism industry contributes approximately \$10 million to the Jefferson County economy. In 1994, the tourism industry provided 1,200 jobs, with attractions ranging from parks and marinas to kayaking and art activities.
- The high-tech arena is one of the fastest-growing entrepreneurial sectors in Jefferson County. The county has three Internet service providers as well as over a dozen World Wide Web designers competing for expanding businesses.

Southeastern Jefferson County communities of Brinnon and Quilcene do not have the job opportunities that are available to the communities in the northeastern part of the county. In the past, logging and paper mill industries represented major sources of income for the southeast. However, recent closures of mill and timber related industries have resulted in a loss of job opportunities and income for the area. Communities in the southeastern Jefferson County are attempting to develop new industries to replace the loss of revenue.

Percentage in Poverty

Approximately 11% of all Jefferson County residents are living at or below the federal poverty level,² which is a lower percentage than 23 of the other 38 Washington counties. Jefferson County's percentage of children and teens under the age of 18 living at or below the federal poverty level is approximately 18%.³ Nearly half of Washington State counties have higher percentages of children in poverty than Jefferson County.

Affordable Housing

Respondents report that finding affordable housing is a challenge throughout Jefferson County. Openings for affordable housing are limited, and they are quickly filled. Rental occupancy is high and availability is limited. Low-income households are often relegated to trailers, mobile homes, or old and abandoned homes. Consequently, creating housing that is more adequate for low-income households is a primary concern for the county.

Attitudes about Substance Abuse

Respondents state that the availability of substances in Jefferson County continues to be a problem with both adults and youth. Respondents report that marijuana and methamphetamine use seems prevalent in the communities. Alcohol and tobacco use also appears to be very high in certain areas of the county.

In many Jefferson County communities, substance abuse is viewed as a tolerable activity by many residents and has become a part of the community norm. Many of these communities are relatively small and provide a sense of being tucked

² U.S. Census Bureau website for table, *County Estimates for People of All Ages in Poverty for Washington: 1997*: http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/saife/stcty/a97_53.htm

³ U.S. Census Bureau website for table, *County estimates for people under age 18 in poverty for Washington: 1997*: http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/saife/stcty/d97_53.htm

away from the rest of society. Respondents believe that some adults choose to live in these areas because they know that substance abuse will be more tolerated than in other communities.

Respondents maintain that this adult acceptance of substance abuse by the community has had a negative impact with local young people. Teens now believe that substance abuse is a tolerated and acceptable activity. Favorable parental attitudes and involvement in substance abuse substantially contribute to youth substance misuse and abuse in the community.

For example, 1998 Washington State Survey of Adolescent Health Behavior results show that, among 10th graders at Port Townsend School District, lifetime use of all substances is higher than state levels. In other words, the percentage of students who have used any of the listed substances even once in their lifetime is higher in the Port Townsend School District in comparison to the rest of the state. Similar evidence of use was found in the communities of Quilcene and Chimacum, suggesting a higher substance abuse rate among youth in Jefferson County in comparison to the state.

Child Abuse and Neglect

Jefferson County has significantly higher rates of victims in accepted and unaccepted child abuse and neglect referrals in comparison to the rest of the State. Jefferson County has a rate of child abuse and neglect referrals of 96.1 per 1,000 persons, more than 50% greater than the state rate of 61.5 per 1,000 persons. Of those referrals, Jefferson County also has a higher rate of accepted referrals in comparison to the rest of the State (53.1/1000 for Jefferson County vs. 41.7/1000 for Washington State). The high instances of child abuse and neglect in Jefferson County indicate a need for family therapy, support, and assistance.

Optimism

Respondents report that not all Jefferson County residents are optimistic about the future. Optimism in larger towns, such as Port Townsend, is reportedly much higher than in the smaller communities.

The county is experiencing several difficult restructuring issues because of the Growth Management Act. Since the Jefferson County Planning Commission is located in Port Townsend, the city of Port Townsend has become a center of conflict for rest of the county. Many of the requirements and decisions that are being made by the Planning Commission have an impact on the rest of the county. However, many of the smaller communities in the county believe that the Planning Commission and Port Townsend are not making decisions that are representative of the rest of the county, but rather only represent the best interests of Port Townsend.

The low number of employment opportunities in the southeastern portion of Jefferson County has many people worried about their futures. This situation is further complicated by Growth Management Act requirements that discourage industrial development in rural communities, such as Brinnon and Quilcene.

Community Accomplishments

Jefferson County has many festivals celebrating residents' history and culture. Celebrations such as the Wooden Boat Festival and the Flower Festival draw people together in a positive manner.

Jefferson County is benefiting from a Safe and Drug Free Schools Grant that is resulting in additional resources for the communities and schools. Services and programs such as behavioral intervention specialists for grades K-8, multi-systemic therapy at junior high schools, mental health counseling, and crisis-response planning are being implemented in Jefferson County.

Public Schools

School districts participating in the ESD 114 SIG project include Port Townsend, Chimacum, Quilcene, and Brinnon. Port Townsend and Chimacum School Districts have comparable enrollments: 1,823 students in Port Townsend and 1,450 students in Chimacum. The districts of Quilcene and Brinnon have much smaller enrollments: 280 and 125 students, respectively.

The large differences in size result in discrepancies in programs and services available for youths in the Quilcene and Brinnon communities versus those in the larger towns. Port Townsend and Chimacum School Districts are able to offer more services and programs for youth with special interests or needs. However, the smaller communities lack funding and support for these services and programs. Because of this situation, districts in Quilcene and Brinnon are considering increasing collaboration and perhaps even consolidating the two districts into one.

In many eastern Jefferson County communities, schools play important roles besides that of education. Respondents state that schools are often the central gathering place of many community activities and events, providing the community with recreational activities, including organized sports.

Respondents report that academic standards in Port Townsend and Chimacum School Districts are quite high, and school staff and administration appear to be doing a good job. In the Quilcene and Brinnon districts, there is some concern on the part of a small number of residents that the school districts are not providing a healthy environment. The number of home-schooled children in the Brinnon and Quilcene communities is perceived as high.

However, eastern Jefferson County communities do appear to be supportive of the schools. One respondent stated that the schools have helped bring the community together. For example, in the early months of 2000, the issue of school violence arose after a potentially dangerous situation in the Chimacum School District occurred. The community eagerly came together to address these issues and to educate themselves in order to prevent future potentially violent incidents in the schools.

Parental Involvement with the Schools

Strong Parent Teacher Associations are lacking in the four SIG communities. Parental involvement takes the form of support for extra-curricular activities, such as athletics. Of the four communities, Chimacum School District is reported to have the strongest parental, volunteer, and retiree involvement. Parental involvement is reportedly less apparent in Brinnon and Quilcene.

The schools are providing opportunities for parental involvement. Parent/teacher meetings, clubs, athletics, and concerts are a few examples of how schools try to engage parents.

Olympic ESD 114's SIG Project

Olympic ESD 114's SIG Funding Application Process

The process by which Jefferson County, through Olympic Educational Service District #114 (ESD 114), applied for the State Incentive Grant can be described as an exercise in communication, as this was the first collaborative grant writing effort and joint comprehensive assessment of prevention needs in Jefferson County history. After the Washington State Division of Alcohol and Substance Abuse issued a request for proposals to Solicitation #991346 in March 1999, representatives of these agencies created a partnership for the purposes of applying for SIG funds:

- Jefferson County Health and Human Services Department
- Jefferson County Community Network
- Port Townsend School District
- Chimacum School District
- Quilcene School District
- Brinnon School District
- Olympic Educational Service District #114 (ESD 114)
- Jefferson County Juvenile and Family Court Services

Several meetings were held to discuss the parameters of the project. Establishing the primary applicant for the project was important because the partners recognized that the primary applicant also was likely to manage the project, should funding that be approved. The two organizations that were considered as primary applicants were identified as ESD 114 and Jefferson County Health and

Human Services Department. ESD 114 was chosen because of its successful experience in running an existing Jefferson County Student Assistance Program based within the schools. In addition, the ESD had already established strong relations with social service agencies and school districts in Jefferson County; they were strongly supported by Jefferson County school districts. Support from the schools was seen as important because the group anticipated that partnerships with the schools would be an integral part of the SIG project if funding were received.

Once ESD 114 was identified as the primary applicant, the Jefferson County partnership focused its attention on the specifics of the grant application. The partners worked toward identifying the biggest gaps in prevention services. They identified that the largest gap in services was intervention with parental substance abuse and combating adults' positive attitudes towards use. Therefore, the Jefferson County SIG project has centered its focus on families and intervening on behalf of the families. Respondents report that, before SIG, this type of collaborative effort was not happening.

Role of Olympic Educational Service District #114

Along with several other responsibilities, Olympic Educational Service District #114 is a municipal corporation that writes grants and helps provides services to multiple school districts and counties, including Jefferson County. With offices located in Bremerton, Kitsap County, ESD 114 oversees and approves the budget, expenditures, and financial policies and procedures of the service district. ESD 114 was chosen to manage the Jefferson County SIG project partly because of its experience in collaboration and its strong relationship with the schools and communities of Jefferson County.

ESD 114 provides a Student Assistance Program Director. She supervises the Jefferson County community family resource specialists and is responsible for the general guidelines and documentation of the grant's implementation. Her other duties include developing administrative processes, sharing evaluation results, sharing information with project partners, and preparing required fiscal and programmatic reports.

Concerns raised by respondents are that ESD 114 offices are not located in Jefferson County, and it is neither a county agency nor school district. Some respondents believe that ESD 114, as the managing partner of the grant, would be unable to comprehend many of the issues specific to the communities of Jefferson County. However, ESD 114 has had a strong partnership with several Jefferson County school districts, as well as partnerships with several county agencies, and the Community Public Health and Safety Networks since 1989. ESD staff acknowledge that, because they are not housed within Jefferson County, collaboration with some agencies may be more difficult. They have worked hard to strengthen linkages with the school districts, and increase collaborative efforts with county agencies, as well as the schools. ESD 114 has

specialists who, in addition to delivering services, participate in community prevention planning and activities within the region.

Community Interaction

The communities of Port Townsend, Chimacum, Brinnon, and Quilcene are very different from one other in terms of economic opportunities and ease of access to health and social services. Yet, they are very similar in their insularity.

Residents of each town are described by respondents as unlikely to travel to other towns for activities, services, and meetings of countywide interest. This sense of isolation and independence is especially true in the smaller communities.

Respondents gave two explanations for this:

1. The issues and differences confronting the various communities in Jefferson County are simply too great. Smaller communities do not believe, nor do they often trust, larger communities such as Port Townsend because the problems facing the smaller communities are not same as those facing larger communities.
2. A general mistrust of the system is apparent in some residents of the smaller communities. For example, in some communities, there are residents who do not have the most basic modern technologies, such as phones. They do not want assistance from the government or schools. Respondents stated that the families do not trust the system, and will even go so far as to reject a free and reduced lunch from the schools.

Community Resource Assessment

In April 1999, several focus groups were conducted involving the schools as well as students within the Port Townsend and Chimacum School Districts. These focus groups were formed in order to identify the available prevention resources and gaps in services that exist in the county. Focus groups reviewed the current Jefferson County prevention plan for 1998-2000, as well as the Community Network's needs assessment.

Identified through the groups were several prevention services provided for grades nine through twelve. ESD 114 currently coordinates most of these existing services, which target individuals or subgroups of the student population that are determined to be at higher risk of substance abuse. Activities at the high school include Children of Alcoholics groups, Recovery groups, and individual intervention sessions for students and their families.

At the middle school level (6th through 8th grades), an Intervention Specialist is available for several hours per week to provide Project Alert curriculum to 6th grade classes. Separate from SIG, Jefferson County also funds prevention activities at the middle schools, which include Portable Challenge Activities for the 7th grade classes, Anger Management, HIV/Risky Practices, and other community health issues.

At the elementary level, there are no proven effective prevention activities provided, primarily due to a lack of funding. Available funds are generally used to intervene with either older youth that are considered a high risk of using, misusing, or abusing substances.

Gaps in Available Services

By reviewing the county's prevention plan, focus groups were able to identify two gaps in prevention services:

1. Children in grades 4 through 8 have limited access to proven effective, prevention services.
2. Parents of children in grades 4 through 8 do not have access to proven effective, parenting skills programs that include substance abuse prevention.

Risk and Protective Factors

SIG encourages communities to use a risk and protective factor framework for the analysis of their prevention needs. 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. SIG sites selected their prevention programs to address their local risk and protective factors.

Below is a table of risk factors on which Jefferson County is focusing and for which archival data are available.⁴ Numbers in the table below are summary measures, which compare county data to the state average. Ninety-five percent of county rates will have a summary measure between -2.00 and 2.00 around the state average, which, for these purposes, is zero. These summary measures are based on archival data. Archival data are collected for purposes other than measuring risk factors for substance abuse, but are strongly correlated with direct measures of risk factors for substance abuse, such as those found in the Washington State Survey of Adolescent Health Behavior (WSSAHB).

The far right column of the table below contains summary measures for counties like Jefferson County. These are counties similar to Jefferson County in their population ages 10-24, percentage of deaths related to alcohol and other drugs, and geography. In the table below, Jefferson County summary measures are compared to those of Clallam, Cowlitz, Grays Harbor, Island, San Juan, Lewis, Mason, Pacific, Skagit, and Wahkiakum Counties.

⁴ Becker, Linda et al. 1999. *1999 County Profile on Risk and Protection for Substance Abuse Prevention Planning in Skagit County*. Olympia, WA: Department of Social and Health Services, Research and Data Analysis.

**Standardized Summary Measures for Risk Factors
In Jefferson County and Counties like Jefferson⁵**

Risk Factor	Jefferson County	Counties like Jefferson
Early initiation of problem behavior	0.75	0.55
Favorable parental attitudes and involvement in the problem behavior	0.73	0.23
Family management problems	0.22	1.28

Two of the three risk factors on which Jefferson County is focusing and for which county level data are available are more of a problem in Jefferson County than in similar counties. *Family management problems*, when measured by the rates of children in foster care, children living away from their parents, and victims in accepted child abuse referrals, is less of a problem in Jefferson County than in similar counties. Jefferson County's highest summary measures are *Low school achievement* and *Transitions and mobility*, but prevention planners felt that local data showed that other problems were of greater urgency for the eastern part of the county.

Because Jefferson County is so geographically, economically, and demographically diverse, summary measures for the county as a whole and in comparison to similar counties were not found useful by Jefferson County SIG prevention planners. This is evidence of the need for more data at sub-county levels.

Below is a list of risk and protective factors found to be of greatest priority by Jefferson County SIG project planners:

Risk factors:

- Early initiation of problem behavior
- Favorable parental attitudes and involvement in the problem behavior
- Family management problems

Protective factors:

- Bonding to family
- Healthy beliefs and clear standards
- Bonding to school

⁵ Modified from Becker, Linda et al. 1999. *1999 County Profile on Risk and Protection for Substance Abuse Prevention Planning in Skagit County*. Olympia, WA: Department of Social and Health Services, Research and Data Analysis.

Project Objectives

These are the three project objectives for ESD 114's SIG project:

1. Implementation of effective prevention programs that address priority risk and protective factors.
2. Development of resources that address gaps in prevention services in Jefferson County.
3. Provision of family-centered interventions for youth and families with multiple risk factors.

In order to accomplish these objectives, the planning group selected three programs. These programs were selected for the extent to which they would help address the identified risk and protective factors. Program-level outcomes and community-level results on the Washington State Survey of Adolescent Health Behavior will be used to measure community progress toward these objectives

Current Program Status

The prevention services chosen by the ESD 114 SIG project are programs that focus on strengthening families and parental support for at-risk youth. The three programs chosen are Strengthening Families, Functional Family Therapy, and Take Time Case Management. Evaluation processes and instruments are a part of each program. Each of these programs was chosen to address specific risk and protective factors.

Three family resource specialists have been trained to provide services in the community under the guidelines of the selected programs. Educators and social service professionals refer families for service. In addition to providing instrumental information networking, family resource specialists have provided services and assistance to do the following:

- Provide youth with in-school support
- Work on self-esteem issues with youth
- Help youth make healthy choices
- Help keep youth in school
- Make home visits
- Provide support to parents
- Work with teachers and counselors
- Explain the role of family resource specialists
- Obtain parental permission to work with youth

Progress toward Objectives

Programs selected for the ESD 114 SIG project are designed to strengthen families and help provide support and skills to individual parents and their children. However, some respondents feel that there has been concern on the part of the communities and schools regarding the limited impact of the SIG grant. These respondents expressed a desire to serve higher numbers of students and families. They stated that the current programs selected might not have been the best fit for the communities.

ESD 114 staff and the Student Assistance Program Director are aware of these concerns, but believe that it is too soon to make any judgements regarding the effectiveness and impact of these programs. According to the Student Assistance Program Director, the programs selected for the SIG project are not designed to serve hundreds of students. Rather, effectiveness of programs can only be determined over time as students and families exhibit changes in behaviors and attitudes.

Challenges and Barriers

- One respondent reported the variety of Best Practices programs from which to choose from was limited. Information provided about the Best Practices was seen as insufficient. There was not enough time provided to choose the best and most appropriate programs for the communities.
- Because the schools were not directly involved in the planning and provision of services, some schools have had a more difficult time understanding the dynamics of the project. For example, some school administrators have expressed confusion with the parameters of the grant and have expressed a desire to have the project serve a larger pool of youth and families. However, the target population for this project is quite small, dealing strictly with at-risk youths and families. As a result, the Student Assistance Program Coordinator has made several attempts to increase communication with the schools and answer any questions that the schools might have raised.
- Some respondents expressed concern regarding the lack of services for families during the summer months. Existing services primarily occur during the school year. There are concerns that during the summer months, families and youths that have become dependent on services will no longer have access to those programs.
- Family Resource Specialists must travel to four different communities in order to provide services, which leads to long travel times and less time in which to provide prevention program services.
- The training involved for the three Family Resource Specialists involved higher costs than originally expected. These unexpected costs, along with hidden program costs for supplies, food, and incentives for people to attend sessions, compelled ESD 114 to use alternative funding. In order to cover for these costs, ESD 114 sought additional funding from a Juvenile Justice grant.

Conclusion

As SIG applicants and grantees, the communities of Jefferson County were required to enter a process that involved intense planning, coordination, community assessment, hard work, and collaboration. Communities underwent a thorough assessment of local resources, examining the availability of prevention programs and services for youth as well as families. In conducting a resource assessment, the communities of eastern Jefferson County successfully identified gaps in prevention services, leading to the prioritization of need within the community. They also identified risk and protective factors and target populations that were specific to the communities and, in turn, helped choose the appropriate prevention programs.

SIG helped facilitate collaborative efforts within communities and the county in two ways. Writing the SIG proposal required communication and collaboration among school districts, county agencies, organizations, and community members. Through the course of several meetings, it was decided that ESD 114 would be the primary grant writer, as well as project manager. This decision, along with the creation of focus groups, a needs assessment, and the identification of risk and protective factors involved the collaboration of several agencies and organizations.

Secondly, the Jefferson County Substance Abuse Prevention Coordinating Council was created in order to ensure a broad base of community knowledge regarding the Jefferson County SIG project. This council is working to improve the county coordination and collaboration that was initiated by the writing of the grant. The council is focusing its attention toward coordinating prevention activities, conducting a resource assessment, and responding to the specific needs of the communities.

ESD 114's SIG project is providing programs to strengthen families and help provide support and skills to parents and their children. Although the four participating communities are very different, the need for effective prevention services for young people and parents in the county was proven through a data-driven needs assessment process. Families are receiving SIG funded services in the community through three family resource specialists. By addressing risk and protective factors known to affect the area's at-risk families, and using programs shown to be effective, it is anticipated that long-term changes will occur in the area's risk and protective factor profile: risks will be reduced and protective factors will be enhanced.

What is next?

In addition to carrying out substance abuse prevention services, there are other expectations associated with SIG. 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:** how effective the program was, 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 Olympic Educational Service District 114's SIG project, 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 agreed upon 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 participation of schools in Port Townsend, Chimacum, Brinnon, and Quilcene 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 Plan* (see Appendix A).

Appendix A:

Community-Level Goals and Objectives⁶

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.

⁶ 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

Audiotaped interviews were conducted with lead agency contacts, as well as prevention service providers and community members. 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 were completed based on the evaluation team's ability to obtain the desired information from the questions asked.

Document Review

- a. Proposal: Olympic Educational Service District #114's proposal requesting funds from the Washington State Incentive Grant was used as a primary source for contacts, needs, resources, prioritized risk and protective factors, target populations, and 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 the Community-Based Prevention Action Plan Implementation Matrix, created by local SIG staff 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, Jefferson County*. Olympia, WA: Department of Social and Health Services, Research and Data Analysis.
- d. Local documents reviewed include these items:
 - i. Jefferson County Health and Human Services Programs and Services.
 - ii. School-Based Prevention Programs In Jefferson County. Substance Abuse Prevention Coordinating Council.
 - iii. Programs and Services. Jefferson County Health and Human Services. 1999.
 - iv. North Olympic Peninsula Newcomers' and Visitors' Guide. Peninsula Daily News. Fall/Winter 2000.
 - v. Port Townsend/Jefferson County Guide. Port Townsend Jefferson County Leader. 1999.
 - vi. School-Based Prevention Programs in Jefferson County. Jefferson County Substance Abuse Prevention Coordinating Council. March 2000.

- vii. Youth Yellow Pages, A Resource Guide for Preteens, Teens, Young Adults, and Families. Jefferson County Community Network, Jefferson County Health & Human Services, Jefferson County Substance Abuse Prevention Program. 1998-1999.

Survey

Sub-recipient Checklist: COSMOS Corporation designed the Sub-recipient Checklist under contract with the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention to conduct a cross-site evaluation. It is intended to document prevention activities semi-annually. Questions are asked about the sub-recipient's most important prevention program or actions. More than one form can be completed if the sub-recipient wishes to describe other programs. The "most important" prevention program is defined as that which is most likely to produce measurable outcomes. ESD 114's local SIG staff completed the survey as requested.

Accessing Informants

- a. Key Informants: Initial informants were identified through the Jefferson County/Olympic Educational Service District #114 proposal to solicitation.
- b. Snowball Sampling Strategy: Key informants were asked for names of community members who could provide insight into Jefferson County'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. Additional categories were added, as it became apparent that they were of importance to the SIG community grantees.

