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• Helps communities apply the advances of prevention science to guide youth development and prevention work.
• Measures community levels of protection and risk by surveying young people.
• Matches the community’s profile of risk and protection with tested, effective actions.

• Local control builds ownership to create sustainable change.
• Focuses on outcomes to insure success: Are fewer teens using drugs? Fewer smoking? Fewer committing violent acts?
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What is required to install CTC?

- A coalition of community stakeholders.
- A coordinator for the CTC process.
- Manuals and curriculum materials.
- Training from certified trainers.
- Technical assistance when difficulties are encountered.
- A monitoring system to provide routine feedback on progress and outcomes.
**Communities That Care**

**Theory of Change**

- Adoption of Science-based Prevention Framework
- Collaboration Regarding Prevention Issues
- Appropriate Choice and Implementation of Evidence-based Prevention Programs
- Decreased Risk and Enhanced Protection
- Positive Youth Outcomes

---

**The Community Youth Development Study (CYDS)**

- A 24 community-randomized controlled trial to test the Communities That Care system.

---

**Communities That Care**

**Process and Timeline**


- Measurable Outcomes: Vision for a healthy community.

- Timeline: 6-9 mos. 1 year 2-5 years 5-10 years

---

**CYDS Primary Aim**

To test the efficacy of the Communities That Care system in:

- Reducing levels of risk
- Increasing levels of protection
- Reducing health and behavior problems among adolescents

...using a true experimental design.

---

**STUDY DESIGN**

Randomized Controlled Trial 2003-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>CKI</td>
<td>CRD</td>
<td>CKI</td>
<td>CRD</td>
<td>CKI</td>
<td>CRD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interventions</td>
<td>CTCYS</td>
<td>CTCYS</td>
<td>CTCYS</td>
<td>CTCYS</td>
<td>CTCYS</td>
<td>CTCYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Year Baseline 1997-2002</td>
<td>CKI</td>
<td>CRD</td>
<td>CKI</td>
<td>CRD</td>
<td>CKI</td>
<td>CRD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Demographics of 24 CYDS Communities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>14,616</td>
<td>1,578</td>
<td>40,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Caucasian</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>98.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Hispanic Origin</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent African-American</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Eligible for Free/Reduced Lunch</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Communities That Care
Theory of Change

- Adoption of Science-based Prevention Framework
- Collaboration Regarding Prevention Issues
- Appropriate Choice and Implementation of Evidence-based Prevention Programs
- Decreased Risk and Enhanced Protection
- Positive Youth Outcomes

Adoption of Science-Based Prevention

- Stage 0: No Awareness
- Stage 1: Awareness of Prevention Science Terms and Concepts
- Stage 2: Using Risk and Protection Focused Prevention Approach as a Planning Strategy
- Stage 3: Incorporation of Community Epidemiological Data on Risk and Protection in Prevention System
- Stage 4: Selection and Use of Tested and Effective Preventive Interventions to Address Prioritized Risk and Protective Factors
- Stage 5: Collection and Feedback of Process and Outcome Data and Adjustment of Preventive Interventions Based on Data

Baseline Stages of Adoption by Intervention Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of Adoption</th>
<th>Control Communities</th>
<th>CTC Communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Post-Intervention Stages of Adoption by Intervention Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of Adoption</th>
<th>Control Communities</th>
<th>CTC Communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Communities That Care
Theory of Change

Collaboration on Prevention

- Sectorial Collaboration
  - Assessed by degree to which key leaders report collaborating across seven different community sectors.
  
  In the past year, how much has [your organization] collaborated with [community sector] regarding prevention issues?

  0 = none, 1 = some, 2 = a little, 4 = a lot.

Note: Community Key Informant Survey (CKI).
Collaboration on Prevention

- Prevention Collaboration
  - Assessed by 9 items measuring prevention-specific collaborative activities.
  - There is a network of people concerned about prevention issues who stay in touch with each other.
  - Organizations in [community] share money or personnel when addressing prevention issues.
  - Organizations in [community] participate in joint planning and decision making about prevention issues.
  1= strongly agree, 2= somewhat agree, 3= somewhat disagree, 4= strongly disagree

Note: Community Key Informant Survey (CKI).

Change in Sectorial Collaboration by Intervention Status

Note: Community Key Informant Survey (CKI).

Program Selection

CTC Community Board members selected prevention programs from a menu of programs that:
- Showed significant effects on risk/protective factors, and drug use, delinquency, or violence
- Involved at least one high-quality research study
- Targeted children or families in Grades 5-9
- Provided materials and training

Note: See "http://preventionplatform.samhsa.gov"
Implementation Fidelity
Assessment Checklists

• Obtained from developers (9) or created by research staff (7)
• Provided similar information across all programs to measure 4 elements of fidelity
• Over 6,000 checklists were completed by program implementers and coordinators
  - Minimal missing data (8.2% in 2004-05 and 2.1% in 2005-06)
• Checklists were collected and reviewed by communities, then sent to SDRG

Program Observations

• Observed 10-15% of sessions in 10 of 16 programs
• Completed fidelity checklists to verify adherence information
  - Rate of agreement between observers and implementers was 93% (range: 77%-100%)
• Observers also rated the quality of delivery and participant responsiveness

Participant Exposure

Number of Participants Receiving Prevention Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>2004-05</th>
<th>2005-06</th>
<th>2006-07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Curricula</td>
<td>1432</td>
<td>3886</td>
<td>5165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After-school* Training</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Training</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>476</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Total eligible population of 6th, 7th, and 8th-grade students in 2005-06 was 10,031.
Includes PALS, BBBS, Stay SMART, and Tutoring programs.

Adherence Rates

2004-05 and 2005-06
Percentage of material taught or core components achieved

Dosage: Delivery of Lessons

2004-05 and 2005-06
Percentage of delivery requirements met

Quality of Delivery

2004-05 and 2005-06
Average score on 10 items reported by program observers
Participant Responsiveness

- Observers rated participant responsiveness on two items, using a 1-5 scale (higher scores indicate better responsiveness):
  - To what extent did the participants appear to understand the material?
  - How actively did group members participate in discussions and activities?
- Across all programs, rates were high: 4.38 and 4.52 in 2004-05 and 2005-06

Risk Factors Addressed in CTC Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Targeted Risk Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Favorable attitudes toward problem behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low commitment to school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friends who engage in problem behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Family management problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low commitment to school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friends who engage in problem behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Favorable attitudes toward problem behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Poor family management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low commitment to school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friends who engage in problem behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Favorable attitudes toward problem behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Poor family management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low commitment to school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Low commitment to school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friends who engage in problem behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Academic failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low commitment to school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friends who engage in problem behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Favorable attitudes toward problem behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rebelliousness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pre-post change in community targeted risk factors

- Note: Youth Developmental Study panel sample.

Communities That Care Theory of Change

- Adoption of Science-based Prevention Framework
- Collaboration Regarding Prevention Issues
- Appropriate Choice and Implementation of Evidence-based Prevention Programs
- Decreased Risk and Enhanced Protection
- Positive Youth Outcomes
Note: Youth Developmental Study panel sample. Excludes students who initiated delinquent behavior by Grade 5.

Summary

- Adoption of science-based prevention and collaboration are higher in CTC communities than in control communities.
- CTC communities and schools are implementing tested & effective programs.
- The new programs are being implemented with fidelity.
- Targeted risk factors are increasing less rapidly in CTC than in control communities.
- The rate of initiation of delinquent behaviors are lower in CTC than in control communities.

Study Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CURRENT CYDS Project 2004-2008</th>
<th>PROPOSED Project 2009-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>CKI CRD CKI CRD CKI CRD CKI CRD CKI CRD CKI CRD CKI CRD</td>
<td>CKI CRD CKI CRD CKI CRD CKI CRD CKI CRD CKI CRD CKI CRD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>CTC CTC CTC CTC CTC CTC CTC CTC</td>
<td>CTC CTC CTC CTC CTC CTC CTC CTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randomize</td>
<td>Panel Panel Panel Panel Panel Panel Panel Panel</td>
<td>Panel Panel Panel Panel Panel Panel Panel Panel Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>CKI CRD CKI CRD CKI CRD CKI CRD CKI CRD CKI CRD CKI CRD</td>
<td>CKI CRD CKI CRD CKI CRD CKI CRD CKI CRD CKI CRD CKI CRD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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