

Clayton County Capacity Checklist & Reasons

Introduction

The following are materials that the Strategic Prevention Framework State Incentive Grant (SPF SIG) funded counties will utilize within the Capacity step of the Strategic Prevention Framework process. Complete each section and return to Julie Hibben, SPF SIG Project Director via e-mail at julie.hibben@idph.iowa.gov by the dates below:

- County Resource Mapping – September 16, 2011
- **County Substance Abuse Prevention System Capacity Checklist – September 30, 2011**
- County Substance Abuse Prevention System Organizational Chart – September 30, 2011

The Resource Mapping materials were created by the National Center of Secondary Education and Transition through the University of Minnesota. Some of these materials have been adapted for Iowa's SPF SIG.

Definitions

Substance Abuse Prevention

The Center for Substance Abuse Prevention defines prevention as "a process that empowers individuals to meet the challenges of life by creating and reinforcing healthy behavior and lifestyles and by reducing the risks that contribute to alcohol, tobacco and other drug misuse and abuse."

Substance Abuse Prevention Services

Prevention services are based on the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention's six strategy categories:

Information Dissemination – Involves one-way communication from the source to the audience to provide awareness and knowledge of the nature and extent of substance abuse and addiction and its effects on individuals, families, and communities. It may be a one-time event. It is not organization promotion.

Education - Involves two-way communication with interaction between the facilitator and the participants to improve critical life and social skills. Multiple sessions are usually included.

Alternatives - Provides for the participation of target populations in activities that exclude substance abuse. Providers offer technical assistance to assist in planning community events.

Environmental - Establishes or changes written and unwritten community standards, codes, and attitudes, thereby influencing substance abuse by the general population.

Problem Identification and Referral – Aims to classify those who have used substances inappropriately or illegally and determine whether their behavior can be reversed through education. It does not include any function designed to determine whether a person is in need of treatment.

Community-Based Process – Aims to enhance the ability of the community to more effectively provide substance abuse prevention and treatment through the establishment of collaborative groups.

COUNTY SUBSTANCE ABUSE PREVENTION SYSTEM CAPACITY CHECKLIST

| CORE QUALITY and Systems Change Areas | | INDICATORS | ASSESSMENT SCORE | | IMPORTANCE SCORE | | GAP (Importance Score minus Assessment Score) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|-------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|------------------|---|---|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|---|
| | | | Strongly Disagree ← | → Strongly Agree | Strongly Disagree ← | → Strongly Agree | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CAPACITY | Organizational Structure | There is a lead person/organization that the prevention system partners can identify. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 0 |
| | | Prevention system partners can identify at least two other key organizations in the prevention system. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 2 |
| | | The 12 sectors of the county prevention system are regularly involved in planning and implementing services. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 4 |
| | Communication | County citizens know of resources for substance abuse prevention. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 2 |
| | | Prevention system partners can describe the purpose/mission of the collaboration. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 5 |
| | | Prevention services are well promoted or marketed in the county. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 7 |
| | | Prevention system partners receive adequate information about the prevention services offered in the county. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 5 |
| | | Prevention system partners receive adequate feedback about the service results and outcomes. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 6 |
| | | Prevention results and outcomes are shared with county citizens | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 6 |
| | | Prevention system partners know about current county substance abuse data. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 6 |
| | Knowledge, Skills and Ability | Prevention system partners use data for planning and decision making. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 5 |
| | | Prevention system partners know what is meant by evidence-based prevention strategies. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 8 |
| | | Prevention system partners understand the importance of evaluation and use the results to improve services. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 1 |
| | | Prevention system partners are able to access and attend substance abuse prevention trainings. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 8 |
| | | Prevention system partners are knowledgeable about prevention focused grants and funding in the county. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 4 |
| | Funding and Other Resources | Prevention system partners commit their own resources to further prevention services. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 5 |
| | | Prevention system partners are aware of and pursue available funding opportunities to support system action plans. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 1 |
| | | Prevention system partners have a common definition of cultural competence that is inclusive of more dimensions than race and ethnicity. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 5 |
| | Cultural Competency | Prevention system partners ensure that the prevention strategies implemented are culturally appropriate. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 7 |
| | | The prevention system continuously seeks representation from diverse populations in the county. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 7 |
| Prevention system partners have opportunity for specific training about cultural competency. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 7 | |
| Prevention system partners have developed a written plan to achieve sustainable outcomes over time. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 7 | |
| Sustainability | The prevention system is able to acquire and allocate resources to sustain key prevention initiatives. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 7 | |

County Name: Clayton County

| Core Quality and Systems Change Areas | | <i>Reasons for GAP Score</i> After the countywide coalition or Collaboration Council has completed the checklist, review each section as a group and record key discussion points in the spaces below. |
|--|--|---|
| CAPACITY | Organizational Structure Avg. Gap: 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identified Substance Abuse Services for Clayton County for the lead prevention system organization - For the most part, they can identify two because those people were in attendance at the meeting - Clayton County is still lacking a few key sectors of the community (something that will need to be addressed soon) |
| | Communication Avg. Gap: 5.17 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Most know to go to Substance Abuse Services for resources but other than that the general public doesn't know how to obtain that information - Since we are lacking a few sectors, the rating for describing the purpose/mission of the collaboration is low since this knowledge is not known - Prevention system is not well publicized (something to address in the future) - There is a lack of communication between agencies/organizations so sharing knowledge is not well done - The prevention system doesn't receive much feedback from the general public on their efforts or services - Results are not shared with general public (something to be addressed in the future) |
| | Knowledge, Skills and Abilities Avg. Gap: 5.6 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Data is not readily available to agencies/hard to access - For the most part, agencies use previous data to plan and make decisions - Not all sectors are knowledgeable of evidence-based prevention practices - Almost all understand that evaluation of services and using the results to make changes is a great idea - Any substance abuse training is usually a two to three hour drive and most agencies are hard pressed to afford the cost of transportation and training |

| Core Quality and Systems Change Areas | | <i>Reasons for GAP Score</i> |
|--|--|---|
| CAPACITY | Funding and Other Resources Avg. Gap: 3.3 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A select few are aware of prevention focused grants and funding in the county but most are unaware of these issues - The agencies are hard-pressed to commit their own resources to further prevention services because of the cost and man-power - Most are aware of available funding to support action plans |
| | Cultural Competency Avg. Gap: 6.5 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Knowledge of cultural competence (more than race and ethnicity) is not well known/observed - Hard to ensure strategies that are implemented to be culturally appropriate when the definition is unclear - Cultural diversity is not very high in Clayton County so some cultures are not as well represented as they should be - Clayton County is lacking opportunities to training in reference to cultural competency (webinars would help) |
| | Sustainability Avg. Gap: 7 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A sustainable outcome has been developed by individual agencies but not as a whole - The prevention system has resources available but whether the twelve different sectors are aware of them is another matter |

Summary:

Our county defined our gap score (importance minus assessment) as shown below: (high to low)

| | |
|-------------|----------------------------------|
| Gap | Core Quality |
| 7 | Sustainability |
| 6.5 | Cultural Competency |
| 5.6 | Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities |
| 5.17 | Communication |
| 3.3 | Funding and Other Resources |
| 2 | Organizational Structure |

Clayton County identified that we need to increase our sustainability as a prevention system, our gap score knowledge of cultural differences is very high but might be due to lack of available training, and there is a lack of communication between agencies as well as between agencies and the general public. For the most part, the county leaders are aware of funding sources and can identify the main agencies. However, the general public is not as well informed. These factors are good to identify so that we may address them as a coalition in the future.