

CPWI OUTCOME EVALUATION

LAURA HILL, GITANJALI SHRESTHA, BRITTANY COOPER, & ANGIE FUNAIOLE
WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY ~ NOV 6, 2016

TODAY'S PRESENTATION

- Brief overview of CPWI
 - Our background
 - The evaluation approach
 - CPWI outcome measures
 - Results
 - Take-home messages
-

BRIEF OVERVIEW OF CPWI



- Targeted prevention efforts in communities designated as “high risk”

BRIEF OVERVIEW OF CPWI



- Targeted prevention efforts in communities designated as “high risk”
- DBHR provided funding, training, and technical assistance to substance abuse prevention coalitions

BRIEF OVERVIEW OF CPWI



- 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

BRIEF OVERVIEW OF CPWI



- 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

OUR BACKGROUND

- IMPACT research group at WSU
 - Improving Prevention through ACTION
 - Prevention Science faculty and graduate students



OUR BACKGROUND

- IMPACT research group at WSU
 - Improving Prevention through ACTION
 - Prevention Science faculty and graduate students
- 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?



OUR BACKGROUND

- IMPACT research group at WSU
 - Improving Prevention through ACTION
 - Prevention Science faculty and graduate students
- 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



EVALUATION APPROACH

- Selected 10th-grade as “sentinel” outcome group

EVALUATION APPROACH

- Selected 10th-grade as “sentinel” outcome group
- Healthy Youth Survey alcohol and risk/protective factors

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)
-

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

Risk Factors	Domain
Favorable attitude towards drug use	Individual and Peer Risk Factor
Low perceived risk of substance use	Individual and Peer Risk Factor
Poor family management	Family Risk Factor





OUTCOMES WHERE CPWI WAS HIGHER IN 2008

Risk Factors/Substance Use	Domain
Fewer opportunities for prosocial involvement	School Risk Factor
Low school commitment	School Risk Factor
Laws and norms favorable to drug use	Community Risk Factor
30-Day Alcohol Use	Substance use outcome

HAVE CPWI COMMUNITIES CLOSED THE GAP?

Risk Factors	Was CPWI higher than other communities in 2008?	Was CPWI higher than other communities in 2014?	Did CPWI close the gap?
Favorable attitude towards drug use	Higher	No	
Low perceived risk of substance use	Higher	No	
Poor family management	Higher	No	

HAVE CPWI COMMUNITIES CLOSED THE GAP?

Risk Factors/Alcohol Use	Was CPWI higher than other communities in 2008?	Was CPWI higher than other communities in 2014?	Did CPWI close the gap?
Fewer opportunities for prosocial involvement (in school)	Higher	No	
Low school commitment	Higher	No	
Laws and norms favorable to drug use	Higher	No	
30-Day Alcohol Use	Higher	No	

A FEW OTHER OUTCOMES

Higher

Even though risk factor “early initiation of substance use” decreased in all communities, in 2014 CPWI communities were higher than others



All family and community risk factors decreased 2008-2014 in CPWI communities



Even though tobacco use decreased in all communities, in 2014 CPWI communities were higher



TAKE-HOME MESSAGES

- 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
-

TAKE-HOME MESSAGES

- 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
 -
-

TAKE-HOME MESSAGES

- 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
-

CPWI Community Reports

Washington State Prevention Provider Meeting
November 6, 2016

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

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

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?