

Assessing the Fidelity of Implementation of the Strategic Prevention Framework in SPF SIG-funded Communities

User's Guide

and

Fidelity Assessment Rubrics

(Version 2)

4/30/2008

Acknowledgements

This User's Guide is a product of a national workgroup of SPF SIG project directors and evaluators, along with evaluation staff from the cross-site evaluation team. The workgroup first developed the rating scales associated with each SPF Step that are provided in this document, and presented these in draft form at a national SPF SIG evaluation meeting convened in October, 2006. Feedback from that meeting suggested the need for expansion of these materials to include instructions and guidelines for use by SPF SIG state project directors and evaluators.

This document, and the rating scales within it, is the products of a lengthy series of nearly monthly conference calls across a 16 month time period. A detailed report on the Strategic Prevention Framework produced by an Expert Workgroup convened by CSAP in 2005 served as a useful resource document in this process (Strategic Prevention Framework (SPF) Expert Workgroup Report, 2005). Convened by CSAP, the workgroup included more than twenty prevention specialists, researchers and practitioners. They used the Strategic Prevention Framework, developed by SAMHSA's Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (CSAP), as a basic structure, to explore how the SPF might look as it is implemented at the community level. Organizations represented on the workgroup included each Center for the Application of Prevention Technologies (CAPTs), CSAP, Community Anti-Drug Coalitions of America (CADCA), KIT Solutions, the University of South Carolina, and Prevention by Design.

Other useful CSAP guidance documents included the original SPF SIG RFA (2004) and the Guidance for Developing the State Strategic Plan (2005). Recent work on comprehensive assessment of fidelity and adaptation in prevention programming (Backer, 2002; Cummins et al., 2003, Owens, 2005); provided the basis for the rating scales for Step 4b.

Table 1 lists principal contributors from the committee and their roles.

Table 1. Committee Members and Their Contributions

Name	Title	Contribution
Roy Gabriel -- Chair	Evaluator, Washington	Step 4a, Users Guide
Linda Becker	Research Supervisor, Wash.	Step 1
Suzanne Kennedy Leahy	Evaluator, Colorado	Step 1
Ann Lamiell Landy	Cross-site team	Steps 1, 3
Jeffrey Metzger	Evaluator, New Hampshire	Steps 2,3
Robert Orwin	Cross-site team	Step 4b, Users Guide
Christine Owens	Project Director, Missouri	Steps 2, 4b, 5
Doug Piper	Evaluator, Nevada and Cross-site team	Step 2
Al Stein-Seroussi	Evaluator, N. Carolina and Cross-site team	Step 5

Additional contributors to the conference calls and/or materials production included David Currey (Evaluator, Nevada and Cross-site team), Susan Depue and Mary Dugan (Evaluators, Missouri), and Janis Wolford, Joe Sonnefeld, and Ann Cleveland (Cross-site team).

Table of Contents

I. Introduction and Purpose.....	5
Importance of measuring implementation of the SPF SIG process.....	5
Importance of measuring implementation comparably across communities	6
Organization of the User’s Guide	6
II. General Guidelines.....	8
Who should conduct these ratings?	8
When should the first assessments occur?.....	9
How often should follow-up assessments be conducted?.....	10
What data sources should be consulted in conducting these ratings?.....	10
How will the data be recorded and submitted?	12
How will the data be used?	12
Will there be a single aggregate fidelity score for each step?	13
Who can I contact for consultation if I’m having trouble applying the rubrics in my state?	14
III. Step-Specific Guidelines.....	15
Step 1: Assessing needs, resources and readiness	15
Step 2: Building capacity.....	23
Step 3: Developing a strategic plan	28
Step 4: Implementing evidence-based programs, policies and practices.....	33
Step 5: Monitoring, evaluating and sustaining.....	43
References	48
Appendix A. Fidelity Data Reporting Form.....	A-1
Appendix B. Contact Information	B-1

I. Introduction and Purpose

Importance of measuring implementation of the SPF SIG process

The prevention research and evaluation community is continually being sensitized to the importance of high quality implementation of a program or strategy for meaningful interpretation of outcomes as well as program effectiveness (Fixsen et al, 2004; Longhi et al., 2005; Pentz et al., 1990; Hansen et al., 1991; Domitrovich and Greenberg, 2000; Tobler and Stratton, 1997). *While it seems straightforward to administer and analyze trends in outcome data collected over time, unless we know what has been implemented it is difficult to know how to attribute the observed change (or absence of change).*

All SPF SIG states and their funded communities are required to implement the 5 steps of the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention's (CSAP) Strategic Prevention Framework (SPF) and the cross-site evaluation is testing the hypothesis that the use of this framework will result in positive prevention outcomes at the state and community levels. *If implementation is not 1) assessed and 2) examined to determine whether higher quality implementation of the SPF is associated with stronger prevention outcomes, the test of the framework will be compromised.*

State-level evaluators are likely to have questions that are similar to those asked by the national, cross-site evaluation above. That is, 1) how well is the SPF being implemented in the funded communities in our state; and 2) is higher quality implementation associated with stronger prevention outcomes? In addition, states are interested in the formative function of fidelity assessment—providing constructive feedback to communities that to improve implementation of the 5 steps.

In response to this need, the implementation fidelity workgroup has put together a series of rating scales to assist in assessing the quality of implementation of the SPF steps at community level. Use of these fidelity rating scales will address two

fundamental questions regarding the implementation of the 5-step SPF in SPF SIG-funded communities:

- Did the community do the essential activities within each SPF step?
- How well did the community do them?

Importance of measuring implementation comparably across communities

The scales enable the assignment of implementation fidelity scores to each community that are comparable to those assigned to other communities within the state and across states; i.e., a uniform score. This will enable state evaluators to incorporate fidelity into analyses of SPF effects in their state, and cross-site evaluators to do the same across states.

The committee recognizes the tradeoff between standardization (uniformity) and tailoring, in that some sensitivity to local factors may be lost with the standardized approach. However, standardization is essential for comparability across communities in the analysis phase, for state as well as cross-site evaluators. Within the committee, every effort was made to make the scales as generalizable across states and communities as possible. The direct participation of a diverse cross-section of states in the development and revision process, in addition to feedback received from other state evaluators at the October, 2006 meeting and afterwards, have been extremely helpful in this regard.

Organization of the User's Guide

The User's Guide is intended to provide state-level project directors, evaluators and other key staff associated with Strategic Prevention Framework (SPF) State Incentive Grants (SIG) with guidelines for using the rating scales to assess the fidelity of implementation of the SPF process within their funded communities. Section I has covered the purpose. Section II presents general guidelines for carrying out the

assessments and the use of the materials. Section III contains step-specific guidelines for use of the fidelity rating scales.

II. General Guidelines

This section contains some general guidelines for use of the fidelity rating scales. There are a number of basic decisions to make and approaches to consider in conducting this fidelity assessment that are generic across steps. These include:

- Who should conduct the ratings?
- When should they be conducted?
- What data sources should be used?
- How will the ratings data be recorded and submitted?
- How will the data be used?
- What about implementation of environmental strategies?
- Who should be contacted for technical assistance?

Who should conduct the ratings?

While there are many options one could consider, the *state-level evaluator is typically in the best position to do these ratings*. Just as the state-level evaluator is likely to be responsible for assembling prevention outcome data from all funded communities to arrive at an overall evaluation of the effectiveness of the communities' prevention efforts, this responsibility for evaluating the implementation of the framework is likely to rest with the state-level evaluator.

In some instances the state evaluator may choose to collaborate with the community evaluators in their state. In particular, assessing the implementation of interventions and strategies (SPF Step 4b) may require more time in each community and/or contact with the program providers than the state evaluator can offer. To accommodate this, the fidelity rubric for Step 4b is divided into two parts: data collection and scoring. The data collection part does not require any special program expertise or familiarity with fidelity assessment, and therefore could be completed by local evaluators at various skill

levels. See specific instructions associated with SPF Step 4b for further details on this approach.

It is also recommended that some inter-rater reliability measures be put in place, in order to increase state confidence in fidelity scores. For example, it will be helpful to provide training to raters on the purpose of fidelity scoring, the core activities within each SPF step, and the layout of the rubric. It also may be advisable to have a few communities rated by more than one rater, followed by consultation and reconciliation among the raters to inform the subsequent, independent rating of communities by these same raters.

Finally, these fidelity rubrics are not validated instruments, nor do they administer themselves. *Even with a well-documented protocol and inter-rater reliability checks in place, the rating process will require a certain amount of subjectivity in evaluators' judgments.* At the same time, we believe the state evaluator's judgment provides a valid and important qualitative reality check on the quantitative scoring process. An additional reason to place responsibility with the state evaluator is to ensure that any subjective biases an evaluator may have are at least consistently applied across that state's communities.

When should the first assessments occur?

This will, of course, vary from state to state depending upon the state's progress in selecting communities for funding, providing assistance to them in their planning and implementation processes, etc. However, *if each state requires its communities to submit a strategic plan for review and approval by the state, then this would be a natural time to assess the quality of implementation of SPF Steps 1-3, 4a, and 5.* In theory, the completion of a Strategic Plan only encompasses Steps 1-3. In practice, however, it also encompasses Step 4a, because communities are expected to select evidence-based strategies as part of their plans, and Step 5, because community evaluation-related activities should begin immediately upon funding (e.g., hiring an evaluator).

Assessing the fidelity of evidence-based intervention and strategy implementation (Step 4b) requires a different schedule. *We suggest that assessment of SPF Step 4b occur six months after the communities begin implementing their evidence-based practices.* It will also be useful to consider the timing of the semi-annual administration of the cross-site evaluation's Community-Level Instrument (CLI) — currently scheduled for January and July of each year. As discussed below, using the information collected in the CLI to as a data source for the SPF fidelity assessment is highly recommended. So, conducting the assessment of the SPF steps coincident with the completion of one of these assessment points in time may also be beneficial.

How often should follow-up assessments be conducted?

Beyond the initial assessment, *we recommend that the fidelity assessment be repeated on an annual basis, i.e., one-year after the prior assessment has taken place for each step.* This reflects our view that the initial steps in the SPF are not one-time events, but are revisited and refined throughout the course of SPF implementation (as new data become available, as new stakeholders are introduced to the process, etc.). The schedule for assessing Steps 1-3 might continue on a different cycle than for Steps 4-5. Alternatively, there may be reasons, based on specific state issues and interests, to adjust this timing so that the assessment of all 5 steps eventually occurs simultaneously. The important principles here are that (a) the assessment occurs on an ongoing basis through the life of the project, and (b) it occurs at times when a sufficient amount of work has gone on for each of the assessed steps.

What data sources should be consulted in conducting these ratings?

While we strongly advocate using the rating scales as they exist, we believe that prescribing a single, uniform set of data sources across states is not justified. *Different data collection methods and data sources may be differentially useful or efficient in different states.*

Potential variations in data collection approaches notwithstanding, *using the information collected in the cross-site Community-Level Instrument (CLI) is highly recommended.*

The CLI does a comprehensive job of documenting whether certain key activities associated with each SPF Step occur in the SPF SIG communities, i.e., addressing the first question for this fidelity assessment (see Introduction). However, the CLI was not designed to assess how well an activity has been done, i.e., the second question for this fidelity assessment. In contrast, the fidelity assessment rating scales presented in this Guide attempt to differentiate communities that have done a given activity, for example, “moderately well” from those that have done an “exemplary” job on it.

Table 2 attempts to identify the CLI item groups that correspond to the fidelity rating scales for each SPF step contained in this Guide. Because of the overlap across steps, some items may be relevant to more than one step. In these cases we chose the step that seemed the best fit. It is also likely that individual communities will find some items more relevant than others, depending on their particular approach to implementing the SPF.

Table 2. Community-Level Instrument (CLI) Items by SPF Step

SPF STEP	CLI ITEMS
1. Assessment	Part I: 32a, 34-66, 203-209
2. Capacity Building	Part I: 32b, 67-159
3. Strategic Planning	Part I: 160-178, 198-202
4a. Strategy Selection	Part I: 32c, 175-176 Part II: 1-11
4b. Strategy Implementation	Part I: 32d, 179-184 Part II: 12-42, 47-283
5. Monitoring and Evaluation	Part I: 32e, 185-197 Part II: 43-46

There may be other documents that can also provide useful information for these ratings. Each community’s strategic plan or communities’ periodic reports to the state SPF SIG project director are other potential sources of data that can inform these fidelity ratings.

Finally, structured interviews with key informants in each community-level SPF SIG project (e.g., the local project coordinator, the local evaluator) can provide further information as to the quality of SPF implementation in the community. *We highly recommend at least one key informant interview for each community to clarify or elaborate on information taken from extant sources. Furthermore, for Step 4b (participant-based Intervention and environmental strategy Implementation), we recommend interviewing at least one person responsible for each intervention or strategy.* Doing multiple interviews per community (e.g., to obtain multiple perspectives from individuals from different organizations or with different involvement in the project) will also add value to the assessment.

How will the data be recorded and submitted?

The cross-site evaluation team has devised a protocol for state evaluators to submit their SPF fidelity assessment data electronically to the cross-site team at Westat. (see Appendix A). Each state will need to use a consistent identifier for its communities and their interventions to track changes over time and relate these data to prevention outcome data. The CLI auto-assigns ID numbers to communities for Part I and interventions for Part II, so it would be most efficient to use those same IDs for this fidelity assessment. Alternatively, states can use a system of their own choosing and provide the key to the cross-site team. The cross-site team will design summary reports of these data for each state, and assist state evaluators and SPF SIG project directors in the interpretation and use of these data if requested. Data specific to environmental strategy core activities can be submitted electronically to Westat. (see Appendix C)

How will the data be used?

The fidelity assessment data will be used in both state and national level evaluation analyses. To the extent that there is variation across the funded communities within each state in the quality of their implementation of the SPF, it will be possible to relate

this variation to variation in prevention outcomes in that state. If the state evaluation finds a positive relationship between SPF implementation and prevention outcomes, then that finding provides useful guidance to the state in promoting further quality implementation of the SPF across communities.

The uses the cross-site evaluation will make of the implementation fidelity data from all states are similar, but will focus on relationships between community implementation and outcomes that generalize across states. For further information on the cross-site evaluation analysis plans, see the SPF SIG National Evaluation Design at: https://www.spfsig.net/public_folder/Evaluation%20Design%202-10-06.pdf.

Will there be a single aggregate fidelity score for each step?

This will depend on the intended use of these data. For example, formative feedback to community programs is likely to be more useful if ratings of the key activities are reported separately, while outcome analysis might utilize the more reliable and statistically powerful aggregate score across activities within an SPF Step. Whether this aggregate score is computed as a simple sum or average of the ratings of individual activities within a step; or some of the activities are weighted more heavily in the aggregate is a decision to be made within each state. There is no need to have a uniform recommendation on this right now. If we can assure quality data collection on this fidelity assessment process across SPF SIG communities and states, we can consider and discuss alternative ways of combining and weighting the scores in the future.

Who can I contact for consultation if I'm having trouble applying the rubrics in my state?

Although the implementation fidelity workgroup included SPF SIG directors and evaluators from many states, there will undoubtedly be instances in which the core

activities or response options for a give SPF Step are difficult to apply. The implementation fidelity workgroup is willing to serve as a sounding board for these questions on an ongoing basis. State evaluators who have questions about the application of any of the rubrics or scales within their state's context are invited to contact any member of the workgroup for discussion. Note that in the Acknowledgments for this report, we identified specific individuals on the workgroup related to each SPF SIG Step. Appendix B provides full contact information for all workgroup members.

III. Step-Specific Guidelines

This section contains step-specific guidelines for use of the fidelity rating scales. For each step, the section includes:

- An overview of the SPF step
- Step-specific terminology, as needed
- A table showing core activities and rationale for assessing each one
- A table containing the fidelity rubric

Step 1: Assessing needs, resources and readiness

Strategic Prevention Framework Step 1 involves a needs assessment of community needs, resources and readiness. The needs assessment, in turn, involves several critical functions, including data collection or acquisition, data management, analyses and the specification and prioritization of target issues and populations or geographic areas based on needs assessment data. The needs assessment may be documented in the strategic plan submitted by communities or in a separate document. Measuring the fidelity of Step 1 implementation is important, because significant in that the Strategic Prevention Framework directs communities to use Step 1 results to guide planning and activity in each of the other Framework steps, Steps 2-5.

In most cases, the primary data sources for Step 1 fidelity assessment will be the community needs assessment reports and/or community strategic plans. It is also recommended that, in conjunction with these documents, responses to the Community Level Instrument (the cross-site survey instrument completed semi-annually by community partners) and key informant interviews are used. Please see Table 2 on page 9 for a list of CLI items that can inform fidelity assessment.

As noted in Section II, we recommend the baseline assessment take place following the communities' completion of its strategic plan (SPF Step 3), and should be re-administered annually thereafter.

Table 3 lists the 10 core activities involved in Step 1 and specifies the corresponding fidelity questions that can be used to assess different levels of fidelity relative to each core activity. In addition, Table 3 provides a rationale to explain why these fidelity questions are critical to consider in assessing Step 1 fidelity. to be rated by evaluators in assigning fidelity scores on SPF Step 1. It also lists the fidelity questions and rationale associated with each activity. Table 4 contains the fidelity assessment rubric itself, which illustrates how evaluators can distinguish between scores of no to high fidelity on each core activity.

The development of Tables 3 and 4 was based on documents regarding CSAP's expectations of Step 1 implementation as well as logical inference by the cross-site workgroup based on these same expectations. Two underlying SPF Step 1 principles guided the specification of fidelity criteria and the measurement rubric: (1) Needs assessment should be enhanced over time, for example, data access might be improved to enhance the overall assessment; and, (2) Target issues, populations and geographic areas should be prioritized based on data and existing research rather than political or other considerations.

Table 3: Rationale used to guide fidelity assessment of SPF Step 1 core activities

Core Activity	Fidelity Questions	Rationale
1. Needs assessment management	<p>Has an entity been authorized to carry out needs assessment activities on behalf of the community project?</p> <p>Has the entity been charged with needs assessment activities in each of the six core data areas (i.e., 1. consequences, 2. consumption patterns, 3. geographic/ target population differences, 4. intervening variables, 5. prevention resources and infrastructure, and 6. community readiness)?</p>	<p>An entity must be given the authority to conduct the needs assessment that will be used to guide the community project</p> <p>The needs assessment responsibilities must cover the 6 data areas that CSAP has specified</p>
2. Requisite skills	<p>Does the entity possess the requisite skills with regards to needs assessment data collection, management and analysis?</p> <p>Does the needs assessment entity have the requisite skills with regards to local substance abuse data and cultural issues?</p> <p>Does the entity develop its membership to address gaps in expertise?</p>	<p>Members of the group responsible for carrying out the needs assessment must have the skills required to conduct data collection/acquisition, management and analysis activities.</p> <p>Members of the group must have knowledge of local substance abuse data and cultural issues in order to appropriately interpret data.</p> <p>As the needs assessment proceeds, gaps in the group's expertise to carry out the needs assessment are likely to be identified. To facilitate the needs assessment process, the group should expand its membership to help fill some of these gaps in expertise.</p>
3. Data acquisition	<p>Were data obtained on each of the 6 core data areas specified by the Framework: (1) causes (also intervening variables), (2) consequences, (3) consumption patterns, (4) variation by sub-populations and/or geographic regions, (5) prevention resources and (6) community readiness?</p> <p>Are the acquired data of sufficient quality to reach solid conclusions about community needs and to inform strategic planning?</p> <p>Were gaps in available information and/or data limitations identified?</p> <p>Were new data sources identified to address these gaps?</p> <p>Were new data acquired as a result of identifying data limitations and new sources of data?</p>	<p>Needs assessment data should address each of the six data areas in order to inform the community project regarding the nature and scope of the problem, community needs (given the problem and gaps in resources), and community readiness to take action on the issue.</p> <p>Needs assessment data should represent reliable and valid information about community needs, so that it can drive effective decision making.</p> <p>There must be sufficient data to support the assessment of community needs. For example, trend data should be used in the needs assessment rather than single year measures. Needs assessments will be limited by the availability or other constraints of the data. It is important that these limitations are identified, so that data are appropriately interpreted given data limitations.</p> <p>New data sources should be identified and acquired to fill in gaps in the data where they exist, as well as to validate data trends identified through other data sources.</p>

Core Activity	Fidelity Questions	Rationale
4. Data analyses	<p>Were data analyses conducted to examine the relationship between causes, consumption and consequences?</p> <p>Does the data and research support the types of relationships examined and conclusions drawn?</p>	<p>The relationships between causal factors, consumption patterns and consequences should be examined through data analyses in order to illuminate the scope and nature of the substance abuse problem and community needs.</p> <p>Analyses should be guided by the data and research. When popularly held beliefs guide analyses (in spite of data and research evidence), this may lead to treatment of so that unrelated correlations are not treated as causes or consequences of substance abuse.</p>
5. Use of needs assessment results to specify and prioritize the target issue(s)	<p>Were target issues specified based on needs assessment results, or did other factors (not data based) enter into the consideration?</p> <p>Were needs assessment results used to prioritize the different issues identified?</p>	<p>The Framework directs communities to make data-driven decisions about the issues to be targeted by the project. Therefore, needs assessment results should be used to specify the target issue. If other factors enter into consideration, it may not be reasonable to expect that community level change will be achieved. It is likely that many potential target issues will be identified through the community needs assessment. In order to effect community change with limited resources, data-driven decisions should be made about the relative priority of different community issues.</p>
6. Use of needs assessment results to identify and prioritize the target geographic area and/or population	<p>Was a target geographic area or population identified based on needs assessment results, or did other factors (not data based) enter into the consideration?</p> <p>Were needs assessment results used to prioritize different target geographic areas or populations?</p>	<p>The Framework directs communities to make data-driven decisions about the geographic areas or sub-populations to be targeted by the project. Therefore, needs assessment results should be used to specify these. If other factors enter into consideration, it may not be reasonable to expect that community level change will be achieved.</p> <p>It is likely that several potential geographic areas or sub-populations will be identified through the community needs assessment. In order to effect community change with limited resources, data-driven decisions should be made about the relative priority of different community issues.</p>

<p>7. Use of needs assessment results to specify and prioritize the target intervening variables</p>	<p>Were results used to identify and specify target intervening variables (i.e., causal or contributing factors), or did other factors (not data-based) enter into the consideration? Were needs assessment results used to prioritize different intervening variables?</p>	<p>The Framework directs communities to make data-driven decisions about the intervening variables to be targeted by the project. Therefore, needs assessment results should be used to specify these. If other factors enter into consideration, it may not be reasonable to expect that community level change will be achieved. It is likely that several potential intervening variables will be identified through the community needs assessment. In order to effect community change with limited resources, data-driven decisions should be made about the relative priority of different community issues.</p>
<p>8. Identification of gaps in substance abuse prevention resources and infrastructure needed to address the target issues and populations</p>	<p>Were results used to identify gaps in substance abuse prevention resources and infrastructure, or did other factors (not data-based) enter into the consideration?</p>	<p>The Framework directs communities to make data-driven decisions about the substance abuse prevention resources and infrastructure to be addressed by the project. Therefore, needs assessment results should be used to specify these. If other factors (non-data) enter into consideration, it may not be reasonable to expect that community level change will be achieved.</p>
<p>9. Assessment of community readiness to address the target issue and population, and use of these data to prioritize community prevention needs and resources</p>	<p>Were results used to identify gaps in community readiness to address the target issue(s), or did other factors (not data-based) enter into the consideration? Were readiness assessment results used to prioritize community prevention needs and resources?</p>	<p>Community readiness assessment will provide information about how ready the community is to take action on an issue.</p>
<p>10. Needs assessment data are updated and re-analyzed on a regular basis (e.g., annual basis)</p>	<p>Are needs assessment activities ongoing? Are results updated on a regular basis?</p>	<p>The SPF indicates that needs assessment should be conducted and refined throughout the SPF implementation process. The SPF assumes that needs assessment results are updated on a regular basis to continue to inform implementation of subsequent steps.</p>

Table 4: SPF Step 1 Fidelity Assessment Rubric

Core Activity	Missing	Weak Fidelity	Moderate Fidelity	Strong Fidelity
	0	1	2	3
1. Needs assessment management: an authorized entity (e.g., a data management workgroup or individual) has been identified and charged with collecting, reviewing, and analyzing community-level data on substance abuse-related (1) consequences, (2) consumption patterns, (3) geographic/target population differences, (4) intervening variables (such as risk and protective factors), (5) prevention resources, and (6) community readiness to address the targeted issue and/or contributing factors.	No organization or individual has been identified to perform this role.	An existing or new group/individual has been tasked with some of these responsibilities but the charge does not include collecting/acquiring, analyzing and reporting data necessary to address all six of core data areas.	The entity has been identified and the charge clearly incorporates data collection/acquisition, analysis, and reporting on all six of the core data areas, but the project provides limited support for data acquisition.	The entity has been identified and the charge clearly incorporates all essential activities to collect/acquire, analyze, and report data on the six core data areas.
2. Requisite skills: an authorized entity (e.g., data- management work group or individual) has the expertise to collect, review, and analyze community-level data on substance abuse (1) consequences, (2) consumption patterns, (3) geographic/target population differences, (4) intervening variables (such as risk and protective factor), (5) prevention resources, and (6) community readiness to address the targeted issue and/or contributing factors.	No entity is performing this role in the local SPF SIG process or group members lack necessary data collection and analytic skills.	Group members possess some skills necessary to identify substance abuse-related issues in the six core domains but lack experience with relevant data.	Members possess expertise in local substance abuse data. Gaps exist in ability to access data and/or in analytical skills.	Group members possess expertise in all relevant areas including substance abuse, data management and cultural issues. Decision-makers have recruited new members or enhanced group networks to address any gaps in expertise needed to support the needs assessment process.

Core Activity	Missing	Weak Fidelity	Moderate Fidelity	Strong Fidelity
	0	1	2	3
3. Data acquisition: all data necessary to assess substance abuse (1) consequences, (2) consumption patterns, (3) geographic/target population differences, and (4) intervening variables (such as risk and protective factors), (5) prevention resources, and (6) community readiness are acquired to address the targeted issue.	No primary data were obtained for assessing any of the six core data areas.	Data obtained did not address all six core data areas or were inadequate (e.g., did not include trend data, data were not comparable to national or state data, data were not generalizable, data did not have acceptable validity or reliability estimates, etc.).	Obtained quality data for each of the six core data areas (e.g., trend data, comparable data, generalizable data, data with acceptable reliability and validity estimates, etc.). Data access issues limit the ability to obtain multiple estimates (i.e., different data sources and/or measures) for each core data area.	All data needed to assess the six core data areas and support local SPF SIG decisions were obtained (i.e., included trend data, comparable data, data with acceptable reliability and validity estimates, and data from multiple sources). The project helped identify new data sources and facilitate data acquisition.
4. Data analyses examine patterns in substance abuse consequences, consumption, and intervening variables in relation to geographic/target population differences.	No data analyses were reported.	Some patterns in local consumption and/or consequence data were identified. Few, if any, variations by geographic area or populations were identified. The relationship between intervening variables and consumption and/or consequence data was not examined or the relationships examined are not supported by data.	Local patterns in consumption and/or consequence data and their variation by geographic area and/or populations were identified. Relationships between causes, consumption and consequences were examined and supported by data. However, there is strong research support for some relationships that were not examined (e.g., there was bias in the relationships they chose to examine).	Local patterns in consumption and/or consequence data and their variation by geographic area and/or populations were identified. Analyses conducted on the relationship between causes, consumption and consequences were supported by data.
5. Needs assessment results are used to specify the target issue(s). The target issue(s) that are specified are <i>clearly linked</i> to identified substance abuse target consequence and consumption patterns.	Results were not used to specify the target consumption and/or consequence issue(s).	Needs assessment results were used to specify the target issue(s). However, results yielded stronger support for the prioritization of other target issue(s).	Needs assessment results were used to specify the target issue(s) based on the strength of the data. However, some non-data based considerations also influenced prioritization.	The specification of the target issue(s) was based solely on the data.
6. Needs assessment results are used to specify the target geographic area and/or population.	Results were not used to specify the target geographic area and/or population.	Needs assessment results were used to specify the target geographic area and/or population. However, results yielded stronger support for the prioritization of other target geographic areas and/or populations.	Needs assessment results were used to specify the target geographic area and/or population. However, some non-data based considerations also influenced prioritization.	The specification of the target geographic area and/or population was based solely on the data.

Core Activity	Missing	Weak Fidelity	Moderate Fidelity	Strong Fidelity
	0	1	2	3
7. Data are used to specify intervening variables that should be addressed in order to change target issues.	Results were not used to specify the intervening variables that should be addressed to change target issues.	Needs assessment results were used to specify the intervening variables that should be addressed to change target issue(s). However, results yielded stronger support for prioritization of other intervening variables.	Needs assessment results were used to specify intervening variables. However, some non-data based considerations also influenced prioritization.	The specification of intervening variables was based solely on the data.
8. Gaps in substance abuse prevention resources and infrastructure needed to address substance abuse consequences, consumption patterns, and intervening variables in the target geographic area and/or population were identified.	Gaps in substance abuse prevention resources and infrastructure were not identified.	Gaps in resources and infrastructure were identified but based on incomplete resource information and/or an unsystematic process. Also, data and/or research do not indicate that addressing this gap will prevent the target issue.	Gaps in resources and infrastructure were identified based on a systematic process. There is research support that indicates that addressing these gaps will strengthen prevention of the target issue(s). However, the data and research supports addressing additional gaps that were not prioritized.	The needs assessment was comprehensive in specifying gaps in resources and infrastructure that should be addressed to strengthen prevention of the target issue(s). The gaps identified are supported by the data and prevention research.
9. Community readiness to address the target issue(s) was assessed, and data were used to help specify community prevention needs and resources.	Community readiness was not assessed.	Community readiness was informally or unsystematically assessed (e.g., a systematic process and/or validated tool were not utilized).	Community readiness data were collected systematically and a validated instrument was used. However, the needs assessment does not clearly link the readiness level to other needs assessment data in order to help specify community prevention needs and resources.	Community readiness to address the specified target issue(s) was assessed. These data were used in conjunction with other needs assessment data to help specify community prevention needs and resources.
10. Needs assessment data (consequences, consumption patterns, resource gaps and readiness) are updated and re-analyzed on a regular basis. NOTE: This item is not applicable (NA) in the initial Step 1 assessment.	There is no apparent plan to review and update the community needs assessment.	Data and analytic limitations of the original needs assessment are not identified. Some data elements included in the original needs assessment are updated based on new population estimates and/or new data available, but this is not performed on a regular basis (e.g., once a year).	Data and analytic limitations of the original needs assessment are noted and a plan to address these limitations is under development. Data elements included in the original needs assessment are updated based on new population estimates and/or new data available on a regular basis (e.g., once a year).	Plans to address data and analytic limitations have been implemented, and the needs assessment has been updated based on newly acquired data or analytic improvements. Refinement of the target issue(s), causal/ contributing/intervening factors, geographic area/population(s), resource gaps analysis, and readiness level have been made based on revised results.

Step 2: Building capacity

Strategic Prevention Framework Step 2 involves identifying and mobilizing the various types and levels of resources available to establish and maintain a community prevention system that can identify and respond to community needs. These resources must support effective strategies aimed at the priority problems at the appropriate population level in the community. The concepts in the Step 2 rubric are primarily drawn from the Strategic Prevention Framework (SPF) Expert Workgroup Report (SAMHSA, 2005).

Specific Terms used in Step 2 Fidelity Assessment Rubric

1. What is “capacity?” The following are different types of capacities:

- Skills
- Programs, policies, practices, or strategies
- Personnel & human resources (for example, people and time)
- Facilities
- In-kind goods (for example, equipment, furniture, supplies) or services (such as, meeting space or transportation)
- Monetary resources (for example, local foundations, industry aspiring to be a “good neighbor”)
- Institutional resources (for example, the capacity to support and/or absorb programs, policies and practices in the future)
- Data availability, collection, analysis, and reporting

2. What is the “capacity spectrum?” The capacity spectrum includes all of the capacity types listed in the above item (skills, programs, etc.).

3. Who are “missing partners?” Missing partners are potential coalition members that are not engaged in the prevention project and whose presence is immediately critical to success. Missing partners are identified by reviewing resource and readiness assessments.

4. What are “formal recruitment and membership procedures?” Formal recruitment and membership procedures could include the following: identifying the most appropriate member of the coalition for recruitment of a specific missing partner; providing the missing partner with a description of identified gaps that the partner can fill; and creating written role expectations for representatives of community segments. Membership procedures could include everything from a welcome statement and a handshake to formal memos of agreement/understanding regarding individual and organizational roles.

Table 5 lists the core activities to be rated by evaluators in assigning fidelity scores on SPF Step 2. It also lists the fidelity questions and rationale associated with each activity. Table 6 contains the actual assessment rubric. It illustrates how evaluators can distinguish between scores of no to high fidelity on each core activity.

Table 5: Rationale used to guide fidelity assessment of SPF Step 2 core activities

Core Activity	Fidelity Questions	Rationale
1. Implementation and documentation of efforts to address resource gaps and redundancies identified in the resource assessment	<p>Are capacity building efforts directed at resource gaps and redundancies identified in the resource assessment?</p> <p>Are capacity building efforts clearly documented?</p>	<p>Documenting efforts is essential to determining outcomes and providing proof of work done. Documenting a link to resource gaps or redundancies ensures that efforts are on target, rather than responsive to external forces.</p> <p>Capacity building efforts should be based on resource assessment results rather than responsive to external forces.</p>
2. Implementation and documentation of efforts to address readiness assessment results	<p>Are community education and recruitment efforts directed at weaknesses identified in the readiness assessment?</p> <p>Are community education and recruitment efforts clearly documented?</p>	<p>Documenting efforts is essential to determining outcomes and providing proof of work done. Documenting a link to readiness assessment results ensures that efforts are on target, rather than responsive to external forces.</p> <p>Community education and recruitment efforts should be based on readiness assessment results rather than responsive to external forces.</p>
3. Integration and use of resource and readiness assessment results	<p>Are missing partners systematically identified and recruited?</p> <p>Are formal recruitment and membership procedures established and observed?</p>	<p>Resource and readiness assessment results should be integrated to identify missing prevention partners.</p> <p>Re-write: Formal recruitment method and membership process makes it easier to insure that appropriate people are at the table to make sure that resource needs are met.</p>
4. Lead organization or coalition development	<p>Is lead organization or coalition meeting infrastructure established, including identified procedures for communication, decision making, conflict resolution, and leadership?</p> <p>Is guidance from target populations sought and used in planning and implementation?</p> <p>Is capacity for sustainability of the prevention project being built (documenting process, leveraging resources, building buy-in)?</p>	<p>Adopting formal rules of group function help members and staff members make consistent decisions and weather staff transitions smoothly. Guidance from target population is essential to making prevention efforts acceptable and useful to the community.</p> <p>Documenting the SPF implementation process and gaining buy-in from prevention partners is essential to build sustainability of programs and outcomes.</p>

Table 6: SPF Step 2 Fidelity Assessment Rubric

Core Activity		Missing from Plan	Weak Fidelity	Moderate Fidelity	Strong Fidelity
		0	1	2	3
1. Identify capacities to address prioritized problems	Are capacity building efforts directed at resource gaps and redundancies identified in the resource assessment?	Capacity building efforts are not directed at resource gaps or redundancies	At least one capacity building effort is directed at a resource gap or redundancy	More than one, but not all, capacity building efforts address resource gaps and redundancies	Capacity building efforts address resource gaps and redundancies identified in the resource assessment
	Are capacity building efforts clearly documented?	Capacity building efforts are not documented	Documentation of capacity building efforts includes measurable process or outcomes; does not show a link to a resource gap or redundancy	Documentation of capacity building efforts includes link to resource gap or redundancy but lacks measurable process and outcomes	Documentation of capacity building efforts includes link to resource gap or redundancy from resource assessment and measurable process and outcomes
2. Mobilize community capacity	Are community education and recruitment efforts directed at weaknesses identified in the readiness assessment?	Education and recruitment efforts are not directed at readiness assessment results	At least one education and recruitment effort is directed toward weaknesses identified in the readiness assessment	More than one, but not all, education and recruitment efforts address readiness assessment results	Education and recruitment efforts address readiness assessment results
	Are community education and recruitment efforts clearly documented?	Community education and recruitment are not documented	Documentation of education & recruitment efforts includes measurable process or outcomes; does not show a link to readiness assessment results	Documentation of education & recruitment efforts includes link to readiness assessment results but lacks measurable process and outcomes	Documentation of education & recruitment efforts includes link to readiness assessment results and measurable process and outcomes

Core Activity		Missing from Plan	Weak Fidelity	Moderate Fidelity	Strong Fidelity
		0	1	2	3
3. Reach out to new partners (Recruitment)	Are missing partners systematically identified and recruited?	No review of resource & readiness assessments to determine missing partners	Additional partners are sought based on general notion of community sectors that ought to be at the table	Additional partners are sought only at project initiation	Missing partners are determined by reviews of resource and readiness assessments and are actively recruited throughout the project
	Are formal recruitment and membership procedures established and observed?	No formal recruitment or membership procedures established	Coalition director conducts all recruitment; no formal membership procedures are established	Formal recruitment and membership procedures are established but not observed beyond project initiation	Formal recruitment and membership procedures are established and observed throughout the project
4. Nurture coalition capacity	Is coalition meeting infrastructure established, including identified procedures for communication, decision making, conflict resolution, and leadership?	No meeting infrastructure is established; leadership is unclear and no operating procedures are identified	A leader is identified, but no operating procedures are established	Training and technical assistance are sought regarding establishing operating procedures	Coalition meeting infrastructure is established, including procedures for communication, decision making, conflict resolution, and leadership
	Is guidance from target populations sought and used in planning and implementation?	No guidance sought from target populations	Guidance from target populations is sought but not used in planning and implementation	Cultural competency or responsiveness training is sought	Guidance from target populations is sought and used in planning and implementation
	Are the prevention project and outcomes sustainable?	No awareness of the need to plan for sustainability	Knowledge of the need to seek continued funding and project institutionalization is apparent; no actions evident	Training and technical assistance are sought regarding sustainability	The prevention project and outcomes are sustainable

Step 3: Developing a strategic plan

Strategic Prevention Framework Step 3 is the development of a strategic plan. A strategic plan includes policies, programs, and practices that create a logical, data-driven plan to address the problems identified in Step 1 of the SPF. The planning process produces Strategic Goals, Objectives, and Performance Targets as well as Logic Models and in some cases preliminary Action Plans. In addition to the Strategic Goals, Objectives, and Performance Targets, at the community level Step 3 also involves the selection of evidence-based policies, programs, and practices (EBPPPs).

Table 7 lists the core activities to be rated by evaluators in assigning fidelity scores on SPF Step 3. It also lists the fidelity questions and rationale associated with each activity. Table 8 contains the assessment rubric. It illustrates how evaluators can distinguish between scores of no to high fidelity on each core activity.

Table 7: Rationale used to guide fidelity assessment of SPF Step 3 core activities

Core Activity	Fidelity Questions	Rationale
1. Vision	<p>Does the community strategic plan include a description of the vision for prevention activities?</p> <p>Does the statement clearly describe the scope of planned prevention activities?</p> <p>Does the statement contain adequate detail about the activities?</p>	<p>A statement describing the overall vision for prevention efforts in the community will help guide the community activities and will serve as an anchor for assessments. The statement should be clear and comprehensive in scope</p>
2. Needs assessment results	<p>Does the community strategic plan describe the needs assessment results?</p> <p>Does the plan include evidence that needs assessment results were used to make decisions?</p> <p>Did plans clearly identify target populations, consumption patterns and consequences on the basis of the needs assessment results?</p>	<p>Community needs assessment results provide helpful direction for identifying to prevention priorities. Plan specifications should be clearly linked to need assessment results</p>
3. State priorities	<p>Does the community strategic plan include statements about the relevance of planned activities to State prevention priorities?</p> <p>Were local priorities linked to State priorities?</p> <p>Was the linkage between local and State priorities logical and supported by evidence?</p>	<p>Community activities that address state priorities will help the entire state achieve prevention results. As much as possible, plans should logically link local priorities to State priorities.</p>
4. Infrastructure needs	<p>Were community capacity and infrastructure assessed?</p> <p>Were strategies to address capacity and infrastructure needs described?</p> <p>Are the planned strategies logically linked to the identified needs?</p>	<p>To be effective, prevention activities should be implemented by skilled practitioners with sufficient resources. Therefore, the plan should describe the assessment of community-level capacity and infrastructure needs, and should include a description of planned activities to address identified capacity and infrastructure needs.</p>

Core Activity	Fidelity Questions	Rationale
5. Evidence-based strategies	<p>Were prevention strategies specified in the plan?</p> <p>Do the specified strategies appear to address the identified priorities?</p> <p>Was evidence presented indicating that selected strategies were evidence-based?</p>	<p>Prevention activities are more likely to achieve visible results when they specifically target community prevention needs and have been proven effective in similar circumstances. The plan should specify community-level substance use-related priorities and should identify appropriate, evidence-based strategies for addressing the community-level priorities.</p>
6. Cultural appropriateness and competence	<p>Does the plan include a description of the culturally appropriate strategies?</p> <p>Are specific action steps described?</p> <p>Does the description of the action steps suggest that the activities will be implemented in a competent manner?</p>	<p>Strategies that appropriately address specific cultural differences are likely to be more effective. The description of planned activities should clearly indicate how culturally appropriate strategies will be implemented. Also, the description of selection and implementation of the strategies should provide evidence of competence of the implementers.</p>
7. Monitoring and evaluation	<p>Does the plan specify the methods for monitoring community-level outcomes?</p> <p>Does the plan describe existing data sources and data collection instruments that will be developed?</p> <p>Does the plan include a clear description of how the data will be used to monitor community outcomes?</p>	<p>By carefully identifying and measuring the factors that will change as a result of strategy implementation, communities are more likely to demonstrate direct impact. The plan should describe the indicators that are expected to change. The plan should specify instruments and procedures for tracking progress toward goals and objectives</p>
8. Sustainability plan	<p>Does the plan include a description of procedures for developing a plan for sustaining strategies after the funding period?</p> <p>Does the discussion include specific steps?</p> <p>Are the proposed steps feasible?</p>	<p>Continued improvement in prevention service delivery will occur if capacity and infrastructure improvements are sustained. The plan should describe how effective strategies will be sustained.</p>

Table 8: SPF Step 3 Fidelity Assessment Rubric

Core Activity	Missing from Plan	Weak Fidelity	Moderate Fidelity	Strong Fidelity
	0	1	2	3
1. To what extent does the community strategic plan (SP) include a vision for prevention activities at the community level?	Includes no vision statement.	Includes a vision statement that is unclear or poorly formulated.	Includes a vision statement that is clear and developed.	Includes a vision statement that is very precise and highly developed.
2. To what extent does the community strategic plan use assessment results?	Includes no use of assessment results	Includes assessment results but there is no evidence of their use in decision making	Includes assessment results and brief or occasional references are made to them	Presents assessment results and uses them logically for decision making (e.g., priority setting, target population identification, need for capacity building, program selection)
3. To what extent does the community strategic plan include the State's priorities for prevention?	Includes no acknowledgment of State's priorities	Includes mention of State's priorities, but provides no connection between local priorities (or intervening variables, etc.) and State priorities	Mentions state priorities and attempts to show link with local priorities, but uses faulty reasoning	Shows evidence for link between local priorities and State's priorities using logic, research, or data
4. To what extent are there measures of community capacity and infrastructure accompanied by plans to increase capacity and infrastructure, where needed?	Community capacity and infrastructure are not addressed.	Community capacity and infrastructure mentioned but no specific indicators mentioned	Community capacity and infrastructure indicators are included with no plans for improvement mentioned	Community capacity and infrastructure indicators are included with strategies to improve levels listed.
5. To what extent does the plan identify appropriate (i.e., logically connected) evidence-based strategies for addressing the community priorities?	Strategies are not identified.	Strategies are identified, but it is not clear how they address the problem OR strategies are identified, but they do not appear to be evidence-based.	Strategies are identified without a clear alignment to the identified problem OR strategies that are identified are not shown to be evidenced based.	Strategies are identified that align with the problem and have research to show effectiveness in similar communities
6. To what extent is there discussion of how the community will implement culturally appropriate strategies with competence?	There is no discussion of how the community will implement culturally appropriate strategies with competence.	There is a limited and poorly formulated discussion of cultural competence (i.e., it does not contain specific action steps for implementing culturally appropriate strategies).	There is a formulated discussion of cultural competence but few or no specific action steps for implementing culturally appropriate strategies.	There is a well-formulated discussion of cultural competence with specific action steps for implementing culturally appropriate strategies.
7. To what extent are there methods and measures for monitoring community level outcomes?	There are no measures/ methods identified for monitoring community-level outcomes.	Measures are identified, but they are not readily attainable (e.g., a new survey may need to be created or new sources need to be generated).	Measures are identified and available, but capacity to collect data using them is dubious	Measures are identified that are readily attainable and that can be used to monitor community level outcomes.

Core Activity	Missing from Plan	Weak Fidelity	Moderate Fidelity	Strong Fidelity
	0	1	2	3
8. To what extent is there a discussion of how the community will develop a plan for sustaining the strategies after SPF SIG funding has been depleted?	There is no discussion of how the community will develop a plan for sustaining the strategies after SPF SIG funding has been depleted.	There is a discussion of sustainability, but it is limited in scope (i.e., it does not contain specific action steps for developing a sustainability plan).	There is a discussion of sustainability that contains action steps that may be difficult to implement (i.e., action steps for developing a sustainability plan will be too costly to be realized).	There is a well-formulated discussion of sustainability that articulates specific doable action steps for developing a sustainability plan.

Step 4: Implementing evidence-based programs, policies and practices

The Strategic Prevention Framework Step 4 is the point at which the prevention activities are selected and implemented. In this section of the User's Guide, we describe procedures for assessing Step 4 implementation fidelity. The fidelity assessment for SPF Step 4 is a two-stage process. In stage 1 (**Step 4a**), we assess the processes used to **select** the set of evidence-based programs, policies and practices (EBPPPs). The fidelity assessment rubric follows the same format used for SPF Steps 1-3: it includes six core activities, each of which are rated on a 0 (missing) to 3 (strong fidelity) scale. In stage 2, (**Step 4b**), we assess **implementation fidelity** for *each* EBPPP¹ selected by the community. A Step 4b assessment will be completed for each implemented intervention and strategy. Guidelines for assessing selection implementation fidelity are presented first followed by guidelines for assessing implementation fidelity for participant-based interventions and environmental strategies.

Step 4a: EBPPP Selection Fidelity Assessment

Table 9 lists the core activities to be rated by evaluators in assigning selection fidelity along with fidelity questions and rationale associated with each activity. Table 10 contains the assessment rubric (scoring rules) for determining 'no' to 'high' fidelity for each core activity.

¹ EBPPPs include participant-based interventions and environmental strategies

Table 9: EBPPP Selection Core Activities, Fidelity Questions, and Rationale

Core Activity	Fidelity Questions	Rationale
1. Identification of candidate interventions and strategies	To what extent were the results of needs assessment used to identify potential EBPPPs?	The use of needs assessment used to identify potential EBPPPs is critical to implementing data-driven planning at the community level, which is fundamental to the SPF model.
	To what extent was Identification of EBPPPs consistent w/ the overarching logic model	The community logic model identifies the community's problem priority(s), hypothesizes the intervening variables linking potential interventions/strategies to problems, and specifies causal factors contributing to intervening variables. If selected strategies are inconsistent w the logic model, they will be unlikely to impact the problem priority, even if well implemented.
2. Selection of interventions and strategies	To what extent were the interventions identified selected from credible sources?	Communities are encouraged to select their interventions/strategies from those recognized as having a sufficient basis of scientific evidence attesting to their effectiveness. However, it is recognized that not all priority community needs can be addressed by limiting the search to programs and strategies with a sufficient evidence base (see next fidelity question).
	Are other (non EBPPP) programs selected or designed consistent w/assessed needs, identified target populations and current prevention theory?	Interventions/strategies that do not meet traditional standards for effectiveness should only be selected if 1) the strategy is consistent w/assessed needs and current prevention theory for the identified target populations, and 2) no EB strategy that fits the assessed need is available. This may be most often true with certain environmental strategies.
	Were implementation requirements (training, materials, logistics) considered in selecting EBPPPs and other prevention programs?	Successful implementation of the selected intervention/strategy is critical to its success. Consequently, the feasibility of implementation must be assessed as part of the selection process, including due consideration of any cultural and related barriers specific to the implementing community.
3. Planned adaptation of interventions and strategies	To what extent were needed adaptations in EBPPP implementation (cultural or otherwise) determined and planned for?	It is generally recognized that even evidence-based interventions/strategies cannot succeed without appropriate adaptation to the culture, norms, and other characteristics of the implementing community. While the need for some post-implementation adaptation may be unavoidable, Implementation will be more uniform, and results stronger, if needed adaptations are determined and planned for in advance to the extent possible.

Table 10: Rubric for Assessing EBPPP Selection Fidelity

Core Activity	Missing	Weak Fidelity	Moderate Fidelity	Strong Fidelity
	0	1	2	3
1. Results of needs assessment are used to identify potential EBPPPs	There is no mention of assessment results in identifying potential EBPPPs	Some data are referenced, but there is no apparent connection to the selected EBPPPs	Data are referenced for some and the connection is clear for some, but not all, EBPPPs	Assessment data are clearly connected to all EBPPPs identified
2. Identification of EBPPPs is consistent w/overarching logic model	There is no reference to the project's logic model in relation to EBPPP selection	The logic model is referenced, but its connection with the EBPPPs is unclear	Some, but not all, of the EBPPPs identified are connected to the project's logic model	All EBPPPs identified are clearly consistent with the project's logic model
3. The EBPPPs identified are selected from credible sources	There is no mention of where the community has gotten the EBPPPs they identified	Sources are mentioned, but they contain little or not credible evidence of effectiveness of the EBPPPs	Some, but not all, of the sources for EBPPPs are mentioned and have credible data establishing the effectiveness of these programs	All EBPPPs identified are drawn from well established, credible sources
4. Other (non EBPPP) programs selected or designed are consistent w/assessed needs, identified target populations and current prevention theory	There is no information on how or why other prevention programs proposed are selected or designed	There is minimal evidence that other prevention programs being planned are well designed	Some, but not all, of the other prevention programs identified are well designed	All of the other prevention programs identified are well designed in terms of alignment w/assessed needs, target populations, and in concert with current prevention theory
5. Implementation requirements (training, materials, logistics) were considered in selecting EBPPPs and other prevention programs	There is no mention of the requirements for proper implementation of identified programs	Implementation requirements are briefly mentioned, but there is no evidence that the community can meet these or will build their capacity to do so	Implementation requirements are mentioned and assurances are given, but no convincing evidence that they will be met	All implementation requirements are discussed and sufficient evidence of the community's ability to meet them is provided.
6. Needed adaptations in EBPPP implementation (cultural or otherwise) were determined and planned for	There is no discussion of ways in which the identified EBPPPs will be adapted	Needed adaptations are mentioned, but no rationale is given and specific procedures are not provided	Some adaptations are described, but without sufficient rationale or planning	Needed adaptations in EBPPP implementation are sufficiently described with reasonable rationale

Record selection fidelity scores in worksheet 4a in Appendix A.

Step 4b. Implementation Fidelity Assessment: Participant-based Interventions and Environmental Strategies

In this section, the guidelines for assessing implementation of participant-based interventions are presented first followed by guidelines for assessing implementation of environmental strategies. In both cases, actual implementation is compared to planned program design. Semi-structured interviews are conducted to obtain information about the consistency between planned and implemented program design. Interviews are structured on rubrics to determine degree of fidelity. The completion of interviews and the rubrics precede the calculation of aggregate implementation fidelity scores.

General Guidance for Interviews

1. Who should conduct interviews? In most cases, the *local evaluator* for the funded community is in the best position to complete the interview relating to the fidelity of implementation of each EBPPP. Most state evaluators will not have the financial or human resources to interview program officials from every intervention in every funded community in the state. In addition, the local evaluators will be working with the community programmers and therefore have more opportunity to establish rapport and see the programs up close. *Consequently, the local evaluator is usually better suited to complete the interviews*, although, in some cases, State evaluators may station their own people in the funded communities rather than hire local evaluators.

2. Who should be interviewed? Staff members who are responsible for the implementation of each intervention will most likely respond to the interview questions. The minimum level of effort needed to make the data usable is one interview with one key program informant per implemented program, policy or practice. Exceeding the minimum requirement is preferable, and may improve the validity of the score. Examples would be interviewing multiple key informants with different affiliations and/or perspectives on the interventions being implemented,

3. When and how often should these interviews take place? The minimum level of effort would be conducting these interviews once a year, with the initial interview conducted after the intervention is well under way. Interviewing more frequently over the life of the program to track implementation changes may be beneficial because implementation fidelity can clearly change over time. Anything more, up to and including participant observation, multiple raters, the use of more sensitive program-specific fidelity tools as an intermediate step, and more direct involvement from the state evaluator would also be a plus, and may be feasible in some states for some interventions. By recording the mode of fidelity assessment, that information can also be incorporated into the analysis, much like study quality in a meta-analysis. Ultimately, it is an empirical question whether more intensive fidelity assessments predict outcomes any better than less intensive.

4. Scoring? The interview questions are purely descriptive, but the scoring requires some judgment. Many local evaluators will not have the experience or confidence to make such judgments reliably. They also may lean toward a positive bias in their scoring -- the undesirable consequence of rapport or, in more extreme cases, a direct conflict of interest, e.g., if the local evaluator's position is administratively housed within the program provider organization. Finally, even without bias, random differences in rater style and interpretation will add a source of method variance to the distribution of scores across communities within a state. *For all these reasons, the state evaluator is usually better suited to complete ratings.*

Step 4b1: Implementation Fidelity Assessment for Participant-Based Interventions

Implementation fidelity assessment for participant-based interventions involves an interview to determine the extent to which core program design dimensions are implemented and calculation of an aggregate implementation fidelity scores.

What is meant by planned program design? The “planned program design” refers to the plans for implementation made by the community, as opposed to the original program design of the program developer. This explicitly takes into account that the community may intentionally be altering the original intervention design. Comparing implementation against the developer’s program specifications is not meaningful if the community has already decided that some adaptation or innovation will be needed to implement it there. The fidelity assessment should compare actual implementation with what was proposed and approved by the community. In the larger context, the decision to make an adaptation and the rationale behind the adaptation are also central to SPF fidelity, but represent an earlier stage in the community’s process, and are directly assessed by the Step 4a rubric: Selecting and Planning EBPPP Implementation.

Core implementation dimensions? Following the lead of Cummins et al. (2003), six core dimensions related to program design are assessed:

1. Program Intensity — e.g., the number and length of sessions
2. Program Content — e.g. what is covered in the program as delivered
3. Program Location — e.g., where the program is delivered
4. Program Recipients — e.g., who participates in the program
5. Program Deliverer — e.g., the qualifications and training of the person delivering the program
6. Other Issues — anything of import not covered in the above

The Fidelity Assessment rubric for participant-based Interventions is shown in Table 11.

Table 11: Fidelity Assessment Rubric for Participant-based Interventions

Name of Intervention: _____

Program Intensity Issues		
PI.1. How many sessions were in the planned program design?	How many sessions were actually held?	If the number of intended and actual sessions differed, what was the reason?
PI.2. How long were the sessions meant to be in the planned program design?	What was the actual length of program sessions – or did they vary?	If intended and actual session length differed, what was the reason?
PI.3. What was the intended frequency of the sessions in the planned program design?	What was the actual frequency of program sessions – or did it vary?	If intended and actual session frequency differed, what was the reason?
PI.4. Were all topics from the planned curriculum covered in the sessions?	If not, how did the actual coverage differ?	If intended and actual topic coverage differed, what was the reason?
Program Content Issues		
PC.1. Were sessions delivered in the same order as in the planned curriculum?	If not, how did they differ?	If intended and actual session order differed, what was the reason?
PC.2. Were the materials or handouts the same as in the planned program design?	If not, how did they differ?	If intended and actual materials differed, what was the reason?
PC.3. Were there other ways in which the delivered program content differed from the intended?	If so, how?	What was the reason?
Program Location Issues		
PL.1. Did the program design specify a location for the program, e.g., a school?	If so, was the program actually conducted in the intended location?	If intended and actual location differed, what was the reason?
Program Recipient Issues		
PR.1. Did participant characteristics differ from the program’s targeted participants in significant ways, e.g., age, ethnicity, level of risk, language, maturity?	If so, how did they differ?	If intended and achieved participant characteristics differed, what was the reason?
PR.2. Did the actual number of participants differ from the intended number?	If so, how it differ?	If intended and actual numbers of participants differed, what was the reason?
Program Deliverer Issues		
PD.1. Was the program delivered by the intended instructors, provider, staff, and/or volunteers?	If not, how did they differ?	If intended and actual program deliverers differed, what was the reason?
PD.2. Did program deliverer(s) have the intended characteristics (age, gender, ethnicity, experience, role, etc.)?	If not, how did they differ?	If intended and actual characteristics differed, what was the reason?
PD.3. If the program design suggested that the deliverer(s) receive training, was the suggested training received prior to implementation?	If not, how did the received training differ?	If received training differed from intended training, what was the reason?
PD.4. Did the deliverer/recipient ratio differ from the ratio specified in the program design?	If so, how did it differ?	If the actual ratio differed from the planned ratio, what was the reason?
Other issues		
PO.1. Were there other aspects of the program as implemented that differed from the program design?	If so, what were they?	If these other aspects of the program as implemented that differed from the program design, what was the reason?

Following completion of the rubric, the aggregate implementation fidelity score is computed using the scoring protocol in Table 12.

Table 12: Scoring Protocol for Assessing Implementation Fidelity of Participant-based Interventions

Program Intensity Issues

PI.1.

If the *number of sessions held equaled or exceeded the number of sessions intended*, then varPI1=1.

If the *number of sessions held was less than the number of sessions intended*, but this resulted from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then varPI1=1.

If the *number of sessions held was less than the number of sessions intended*, and did not result from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then varPI1=0.

PI.2.

If the *length of sessions held equaled or exceeded the length of sessions intended*, then varPI2=1.

If the *length of sessions held was less than the length of sessions intended*, but this resulted from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then varPI2=1.

If the *length of sessions held was less than the length of sessions intended*, and did not result from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then varPI2=0.

PI.3.

If the *frequency of sessions held equaled or exceeded the frequency of sessions intended*, then varPI3=1.

If the *frequency of sessions held was less than the frequency of sessions intended*, but this resulted from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then varPI3=1.

If the *frequency of sessions held was less than the frequency of sessions intended*, and did not result from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then varPI3=0.

PI.4.

If the *topic coverage of sessions held equaled or exceeded the topic coverage of sessions intended*, then varPI4=1.

If the *topic coverage of sessions held was less than the topic coverage of sessions intended*, but this resulted from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then varPI4=1.

If the *topic coverage of sessions held was less than the topic coverage of sessions intended*, and did not result from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then varPI4=0.

IF SUM(varPI1, varPI2, varPI3, varPI4) ≥ 3, varPItot=1; ELSE varPItot=0.

Program Content Issues

PC.1.

If the *order of sessions held was the same as the order of sessions intended*, then varPC1=1.

If the *order of sessions differed from the order of sessions intended*, but this resulted from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then varPC1=1.

If the *order of sessions differed from the order of sessions intended*, and did not result from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then varPC1=0.

PC.2.

If the *materials used were the same as the materials intended*, then varPC2=1.

If the *materials used differed from the materials intended*, but this resulted from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then varPC2=1.

If the *materials used differed from the materials intended*, and did not result from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then varPC2=0.

PC.3

If there were no other ways that actual program content differed from intended program content, then varPC3=1.

If actual program content differed from intended program content, but this resulted from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then varPC3=1.

If actual program content differed from intended program content, and did not result from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then varPC3=0.

IF SUM(varPC1, varPC2, varPC3) = 3, varPCtot=1; ELSE varPCtot=0.

Program Location Issues

PL.1.

If the program was conducted in the intended location, then varPL1=1.

If the intended and actual location differed, but this resulted from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then varPL1=1.

If the intended and actual location differed, and did not result from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then varPL1=0.

IF varPL1 = 1, varPLtot=1; ELSE varPLtot=0.

Program Recipient Issues

PR.1

If actual participant characteristics did not significantly differ from the targeted participant characteristics, then varPR1=1.

If actual participant characteristics significantly differed from targeted participant characteristics, but this resulted from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then varPR1=1.

If actual participant characteristics significantly differed from targeted participant characteristics, and did not result from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then varPR1=0.

PR.2

If the actual number of participants approximately equaled or exceeded the intended number, then varPR2=1.

If the actual number of participants was significantly less than the intended number, but this resulted from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then varPR2=1.

If the actual number of participants was significantly less than the intended number,, and did not result from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then varPR2=0.

IF SUM(varPR1, varPR2) = 2, varPRtot=1; ELSE varPRtot=0.

Program Deliverer Issues

PD.1.

If actual program deliverers did not significantly differ from the intended program deliverers, then varPD1=1.

If actual program deliverers differed significantly from intended program deliverers, but this resulted from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then varPD1=1.

If actual program deliverers differed significantly from intended program deliverers, and this did not result from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then varPD1=0.

PD.2

If the actual deliverer characteristics did not significantly differ from the intended deliverer characteristics, then varPD2=1.

If the actual deliverer characteristics differed significantly from intended characteristics, but this resulted from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then varPD2=1.

If the actual deliverer characteristics differed significantly from intended characteristics, and this did not result from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then varPD2=0.

PD.3.

If the actual deliverer training did not differ from the intended deliverer training, then $\text{varPD3}=1$.

If the actual deliverer training differed from intended training, but this resulted from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then $\text{varPD3}=1$.

If the actual deliverer training differed from intended training, and this did not result from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then $\text{varPD3}=0$.

PD.4.

If the actual deliverer/recipient ratio equaled or exceeded the intended ratio, then $\text{varPD4}=1$.

If the actual deliverer/recipient ratio was less than the intended ratio, but this resulted from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then $\text{varPD4}=1$.

If the actual deliverer/recipient ratio was less than the intended ratio, and this did not result from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then $\text{varPD4}=0$.

IF $\text{SUM}(\text{varPD1}, \text{varPD2}, \text{varPD3}, \text{varPD4}) \geq 3$, $\text{varPDtot}=1$; ELSE $\text{varPDtot}=0$.

Other issues**PO.1.**

If there were no other aspects of the program that were not implemented as planned, then $\text{varPO1}=1$.

If other aspects of the program were not implemented as planned, but this resulted from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then $\text{varPO1}=1$.

If other aspects of the program were not implemented as planned, and this did not result from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then $\text{varPO1}=0$.

IF $\text{varPO1} = 1$, $\text{varPOtot}=1$; ELSE $\text{varPOtot}=0$.

Computation of Total Program Implementation Fidelity Score

$\text{PIFid} = \text{SUM}(\text{varPItot}, \text{varPCtot}, \text{varPLtot}, \text{varPRtot}, \text{varPDtot}, \text{varPOtot})$

Record the scores in the Worksheet 4b1 in Appendix A.

4b2: Implementation Fidelity Assessment for Environmental Strategies

The procedure for assessing implementation fidelity for environmental strategies also involves (1) interviews using a fidelity rubric and (2) computation of an aggregate fidelity score. Additional support is provided to the state evaluator in the form of guideline tables for 22 environmental strategies (Appendix C). Each table lists core activities for a type of strategy and includes fields for recording justification statements when activities were not implemented, and fidelity scores for implemented activities. The evaluator should use the core activity lists in conjunction with the interview as follows:

- Select the appropriate guideline table from Appendix C (e.g., Fidelity Measure for Compliance Checks)
- During the interview, determine:
 - Which core activities were implemented
 - Why a particular activity was not implemented.

Environmental Strategy Interview Guide

The Fidelity Assessment Rubric for Environmental Strategies, Table 13, covers nine core components:

- **Preparation (P)**
 - Key player involvement (P-KP) — e.g., involvement of groups or organizations (merchants or public safety) specified in the strategy model
 - Research (P-R)— e.g., recommended information gathering activities specified in the model
 - Capacity-building (P-C)— e.g., provide training/secure resources as model specifies

- **Implementation (I)**
 - Content (I-C) —Policy stipulations/planned activities/guidance documents conform to model specifications
 - Implementation activities (I-A)— enacted/adopted policy or activities conform to model (e.g., proposed policy is enacted/adopted; keg number and purchaser information are recorded)
 - Implementer Qualification (I-Q) — persons or organizations with particular expertise or persons with appropriate authority (e.g., particular community organizations, persons with policy expertise, law enforcement agencies) conform to model specifications
- **Targets**
 - Population characteristics (T-PC) — number of participants, age, ethnicity, level of risk, language, maturity
 - Geographic scope (T-GS) — a school, neighborhood, or zip code
- **Other Issues (T-OI)** — anything of import not covered in the above.

Evaluators should use the rubric in Table 13 to cover these topics during the interview. The rubric captures planned deviation from the model as well as unplanned deviation from planned activities.

Table 13: Fidelity Assessment Rubric for Environmental Strategies

Name of Strategy: _____

Preparation Issues		
P.1. Key Player involvement Did preparation involve all model-specified groups/stakeholders/ organizations (e.g., merchants, law enforcement agencies, and/or parents)?	Which model-specified groups were not involved in preparation, if any?	If model-specified and actual group participation differed, what was the reason?
P.2. Research Were all information-gathering activities specified in the model (e.g., on existing legislation and policies) performed during preparation?	What model-specified information gathering activities were excluded?	If model-specified and actual information-gathering activities differed, what was the reason?
P.3. Capacity-building. Did model-specified training and resource development occur (e.g. a written protocol for selecting retailer sites was developed; required training was provided prior to implementation)?	What model-specified training and resource development activities were excluded from preparation, if any?	If model-specified and actual capacity-building differed, what was the reason?
Implementation Issues		
I.1. Content ² What model-specified policy stipulations and/or guidance documents were developed?	What model-specified content was excluded, if any?	If model-specified and actual policy stipulations and/or guidance documents differed, what was the reason?
I.2. Activities. Did planned implementation activities include all model-specified activities?	What model-specified activities were excluded from the plan, if any?	If model-specified and actual activities differed from planned activities, what was the reason?
I.3. Implementer Qualifications Did the implementation plan include all model-specified implementer qualifications (e.g., persons with particular expertise or persons with appropriate authority such as community organization, policy expertise, law enforcement agencies)?	What implementer qualifications, if any, were excluded from the plan?	If model-specified and actual implementer qualifications differed, what was the reason?
Target Issues		
T1. Population characteristics Did proposed target population characteristics and/or number of participants specified (e.g., age, ethnicity, level of risk, language, maturity) include all model-specified characteristics?	What target population numbers and/or characteristics, if any, were excluded from the plan?	If model-specified and actual target population characteristics differed, what was the reason?
T.2 Geographic scope What target geographical area was specified for the strategy?	What geographic target area (e.g. a school or neighborhood), if any, was excluded from the plan?	If model-specified and actual geographic areas differed, what was the reason?
Other Issues		
Were there other ways in which the planned strategy delivered from the model?	If so, what were they?	If these other aspects of the strategy, as implemented, that differed from the program design, what was the reason?

² Pertains most often to policy and legislation.

Following the interview, calculate the aggregate fidelity score using Table 14.

Following the interview and aggregate score calculation, return to the guideline table and record information for each activity:

- If an activity was not implemented, and the exclusion was justified, enter a justification statement in the “Comments” column: **do not supply a rating.**
- If an activity was implemented, rate the fidelity using the scale in the table (e.g., for compliance checks, 0-missing; 1-weak fidelity; 3- strong fidelity) and enter the rating in the “Ratings” column
- Calculate the core activity score by averaging the ratings.

Table 14: Environmental Strategy Scoring Protocol

Preparation Issues

P.1. Key player involvement

If all *model-specified groups/stakeholders/organizations involved in preparation*, then varP1=1.

If the *groups/stakeholders/organizations was less than or different from the number and type specified by the model*, but this resulted from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then varP1=1.

If the *groups/stakeholders/organizations was less than or different from the number and type specified by the model*, and the difference did not result from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then varP1=0.

P.2. Research

If all *model-specified research activities* were included, then varP2=1.

If the *frequency of planning sessions held was less than the frequency of sessions intended*, but this resulted from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then varP2=1.

If the *frequency of planning sessions held was less than the frequency of sessions intended*, and did not result from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then varP2=0.

P.3. Capacity-building

If the *frequency of planning sessions held equaled or exceeded the frequency of sessions intended*, then varP3=1.

If the *frequency of planning sessions held was less than the frequency of sessions intended*, but this resulted from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then varP3=1.

If the *frequency of planning sessions held was less than the frequency of sessions intended*, and did not result from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then varP3=0.

IF SUM(varP1, varP2, varP3) ≥2, varPtot=1; ELSE varPtot=0.

Implementation Issues

I.1 Content

If all *model-specified core content was included in policy statements and implementation guidance documents*, then varI1=1.

If the *core content included in policy statements and implementation guidance documents that differed from core content prescribed by the model*, but this resulted from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then varI1=1.

If the *core content included in policy statements and implementation guidance documents differed from the core content prescribed by the model* and did not result from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then varI1=0.

I.2 Activities

If all *model-specified core activities were implemented*, then varI2=1.

If *actual core activities differed from the model*, but this resulted from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then varI2=1.

If *core activities differed from the model*, and did not result from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then varI2=0.

I.3 Implementer Qualifications

If the implementer qualifications matched the model (or implementer plans, if not specified in the model) then varI3=1.

If implementer qualifications differed from the model (or implementer plans, if not specified in the model) but this resulted from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then varI3=1.

If implementer qualifications differed from the model (or implementer plans, if not specified in the model), and did not result from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then varI3=0.

IF SUM (varI1, varI2, varI3) ≥ 2, varItot=1; ELSE varItot=0.

Target Issues

T.1 Population characteristics

If specific target population characteristics and/or number of participants were incorporated in implementation based on the model (or on implementer plans, if not specified in the model) then varT1=1.

If model-specified or planned target population characteristics and/or number of participants differed from the model, but this resulted from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then varT1=1.

If model-specified target population characteristics and/or number of participants differed from the model, and did not result from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then varT1=0.

T.2. Geographic scope

If the implementation geographic scope matched the model (or implementer plans, if not specified in the model) then varT2=1.

If actual core activities differed from the model (or implementer plans) but this resulted from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then varT2=1.

If core activities differed from the model (or implementer plans), and did not result from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then varT2=0.

IF SUM (varT1, varT2) ≥ 1, varTtot=1; ELSE varTtot=0.

Other issues

If there were no other ways that the core activities differed from the model, then varOI=1.

If actual core activities differed from the model, but this resulted from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then varOI=1.

If core activities differed from the model, and did not result from an intentional and appropriate adaptation, then varOI=0.

Computation of Total Program Implementation Fidelity Score

ESFid = SUM (varPtot, varItot, varTtot, varIO)

Enter fidelity ratings into the Worksheet 4b2 in Appendix A.

Step 5: Monitoring, Evaluating and Sustaining

Strategic Prevention Framework Step 5 involves conducting, analyzing, reporting and using the results of the community-level process and outcome evaluation activities associated with the SPF SIG prevention work. These results should identify areas where modifications to existing prevention strategies may be needed, and can be used to help plan for sustaining the prevention programs, policies and practices implemented under the SPF SIG project.

Specific Terms Used in Step 5 Fidelity Assessment Rubric

1. Hired, involved, or consulted evaluators. If local communities are not hiring a local evaluator, these questions relating to core activities 2, 7, and 8 assume that their state-level evaluation staff will be “involved” or “consulted” in assisting the local community or coalition in logic model development, establishing measures for priorities, and developing evaluation capacity and implementation plans for local evaluation.

2. Local priorities, intervening variables, risk and protective factors, and causal factors. These terms are used somewhat synonymously in core activities 3 and 4 to refer to the community, school, family, and individual/peer characteristics that are thought to increase the likelihood of inappropriate or excessive substance use, leading to undesirable social and health consequences.

3. Linking local and state priorities and federal outcomes. Communities funded through SPF SIG are expected to address local priorities (see synonyms in #3, above) that are thought to increase the likelihood of inappropriate or excessive substance use, leading to undesirable social and/or health consequences that have been identified by the State as priorities. Communities are expected to examine recent, local data in order to identify these local priorities. Arguments or explanations of the relationship between local and State priorities can be based on data, logic, research, and/or expert consultation. CSAP requires that each funded community measure the community level

outcomes that are relevant to their project. The selected measures should be stated and the reason(s) for their selection explained.

4. CQI. CQI, referred to in core activity 7, stands for Continuous Quality Improvement, a method of examining process and incremental outcomes in order to modify plans and implement indicated activity changes to improve the likelihood of success.

Table 13 lists the core activities to be rated by evaluators in assigning fidelity scores on SPF Step 5. It also lists the fidelity questions and rationale associated with each activity. Table 14 contains the actual assessment rubric. It illustrates how evaluators can distinguish between scores of no to high fidelity on each core activity.

Table 15: Rationale used to guide fidelity assessment of SPF Step 5 core activities

Core Activity	Fidelity Questions	Rationale
1. Logic model development	To what extent has logic model been developed?	Developing a complete logic model helps ensure strong relationships between assessment, capacity building, planning, implementation, and evaluation.
2. Evaluator role	Has the community hired or consulted with an evaluator?	The formal hiring of or consultation with a qualified evaluator increases the likelihood of gaining useful feedback on process and outcomes and the selection of measurable outcomes.
3. Understanding of multiple levels of purpose	To what extent does the local community understand the relationships between local and state priorities and federal outcomes?	Placing local priorities within the context of federal outcomes and state priorities is essential to achieving state and national goals.
4. Integration of multiple levels of purpose	To what extent are the measures identified for local and state priorities and federal outcomes appropriate?	Linking the measurement of local priorities to the measurement of state priorities and federal outcomes is essential to achieving national and state goals.
5. Outcome data collection	To what extent are outcome data collection procedures developed?	Developing written outcome data collection procedures provides guidance, expectations, and a basis for evaluation accountability.
6. Fidelity data collection	To what extent are fidelity data collection procedures developed?	Developing written fidelity data collection procedures provides guidance, expectations, and a basis for evaluation accountability.
7. Evaluation capacity	To what extent is evaluation capacity developed?	Internal evaluation capacity is essential to improving the use of evaluation results and institutionalizing evaluation as an essential component of prevention efforts.
8. Evaluation procedures	To what extent are implementation plans developed for local evaluation procedures?	Developing written evaluation implementation plans provides guidance, expectations, and a basis for evaluation accountability.
9. Evaluation reporting	To what extent are plans developed for feedback from evaluator to community?	Developing written evaluation reporting plans provides guidance, expectations, and a basis for evaluation accountability.
10. Use of evaluation results	To what extent does community intend to use feedback to inform future prevention programming?	Developing written plans for use of evaluation feedback on programming provides community guidance and establishes expectations.
11. Monitoring fidelity to SPF	To what extent is process identified for monitoring 5 SPF steps (using the CLI as much as possible)?	Developing written monitoring process provides guidance, expectations, and a basis for evaluation accountability. Using the CLI avoids monitoring gaps and redundancies.

Table 16: Step 5 Fidelity Assessment Rubric

Core Activity	Missing from Plan	Weak Fidelity	Moderate Fidelity	Strong Fidelity
	0	1	2	3
1. To what extent has a logic model been developed?	No plans to create a logic model	Community plans to create a logic model	Logic model creation underway; incomplete	Completed logic model in place
2. Has the community hired or consulted with an evaluator?	Evaluator not hired (consulted with) and no intent to hire (consult with)	Evaluator hired; no written role/job description; minimal communication b/w evaluator and community	Evaluator hired; written role/job description involves only outcome evaluation, reports	Evaluator hired; written role/job description includes full participation with community including process evaluation, measure and plan development
3. To what extent does the local community understand the relationships between local and state priorities and federal outcomes?	Local priorities are established; no mention of state priorities or federal outcomes	Local priorities are linked to the state; no mention of federal outcomes	Local priorities are presented as linked to state priorities and federal outcomes, but argument is weak	Local priorities are shown to be clearly linked to state priorities (if required) and federal outcomes. If not required to be linked to state priorities, an understanding of state priorities and federal outcomes is apparent in the plan.
4. To what extent are the measures identified for local and state priorities and federal outcomes appropriate?	No measures identified	Measures identified; none are appropriate	Measures identified; some or most are appropriate	Measures identified; all are appropriate
5. To what extent are outcome data collection procedures developed?	No procedures defined	Plan to develop procedures	Procedures in place, stated in general terms	Procedures in place with timeline, responsible parties, and breakdown of tasks
6. To what extent are fidelity data collection procedures developed?	No procedures defined	Plan to develop procedures	Procedures in place, stated in general terms	Procedures in place with timeline, responsible parties, and breakdown of tasks
7. To what extent is evaluation capacity developed?	No evaluator hired (or involved); to be hired (consulted) after plan creation	Evaluator hired (or involved); no knowledge of local community; agrees to collect required data	Evaluator hired (or involved); local knowledge; agrees to collect required data	Evaluator hired (or involved); plans to build internal evaluation capacity within programs and infrastructure via CQI, empowerment evaluation, or other method
8. To what extent are implementation plans developed for local evaluation procedures?	No evaluator hired or consulted; no implementation plan	Evaluator hired or consulted; no implementation plan	Evaluator hired or consulted; general evaluation implementation procedures developed	Evaluation procedures agreed upon by community and evaluator; implementation plans are detailed in plan (timeline, responsible parties, tasks)
9. To what extent are plans developed for feedback from evaluator to community?	No plans established for feedback	Mention that feedback will be provided; no process or timeline identified	General procedure for feedback established; no details	Timeline established for feedback with procedures, responsible parties, and topics identified

Core Activity	Missing from Plan	Weak Fidelity	Moderate Fidelity	Strong Fidelity
	0	1	2	3
10. To what extent does community intend to use feedback to inform future prevention programming?	No plans to use feedback to inform future prevention programming	Mentions that feedback will be provided; no method identified	Method for providing feedback on programs identified; but no mention of how feedback will be used	Detailed method identified for using feedback, including timeline, parties or involved, topics, and purpose of topics
11. To what extent is process identified for monitoring 5 SPF steps (using the CLI as much as possible)?	No monitoring process identified or need for process acknowledged	Mentions that monitoring will be conducted; no process identified	General monitoring process identified; no details	Monitoring process clearly identified, including timeline, responsible parties, and steps/tasks (including feedback?)

References

- Backer, T.E. (2002). Finding the balance: Program fidelity and adaptation in substance abuse prevention: A state-of-the art review. Rockville, MD: Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (CSAP).
- Cummins, M., Goddard, C., Formica, S., Cohen, D., and Harding, W. (2003). Assessing Program Fidelity and Adaptations: A Toolkit. Newton, MA: Education Development Center, Inc.,
- Domitrovich, C. E., & Greenberg, M. T. (2000). The study of implementation: Current findings from effective programs that prevent mental disorder in school-aged children. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 11(2), 193-221.
- Hansen, W. B., Graham, J. W., Wolkenstein, B. H., & Rohrbach, L.A. (1991). Program integrity as a moderator of prevention program effectiveness: Results for fifth grade students in the Adolescent Alcohol Prevention Trial. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 52(6), 568-579.
- Fixsen, D.L., Naoom, S.F., Blasé, K.A., Friedman, R.M. & Wallace, F. (2005). Implementation research: A synthesis of the literature. Tampa, FL: University of South Florida, Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute, The National Implementation Research Network (FMHI Publication #231). Available at <http://nirn.fmhi.usf.edu>.
- Longhi, D., with Owens, C., Shaklee, M., and Becker, L. (2006). Substance Use Outcomes Among Adolescents in Communities that Received State Incentive Grants. Olympia, WA: Washington Department of Social and Health Services Research and Data Analysis Division.
- Owens, Christine (2005). Program Implementation Record. Missouri Institute of Mental Health, University of Missouri. (available from author).

Pentz, M. A., Trebow, E. A., Hansen, W. B., MacKinnon, D. P., Dwyer, J. H., & Johnson, C. A. (1990). Effects of program implementation on adolescent drug use behavior. *Evaluation Review*, 14(3), 264-289.

Tobler, N. S., & Stratton, H. H. (1997). Effectiveness of school-based drug prevention programs: A meta-analysis of the research. *Journal of Primary Prevention*, 18(1), 71-128.

Appendix A
Fidelity Data Reporting Form

Appendix B
Contact Information

APPENDIX B - CONTACT INFORMATION

Roy M. Gabriel, Ph.D.
(Chair)
Senior Research Associate
RMC Research Corporation
111 SW Columbia Street, Suite 1200
Portland, OR 97204-5843
Phone: 503-223-8248
E-mail: rgabriel@rmccorp.com

Linda Becker, Ph.D.
Prevention Research Manager
Division of Alcohol & Substance Abuse
P.O. Box 45330
Olympia, WA 98504-5330
Phone: 360-725-3705
Fax: 360-407-1044
E-mail: beckelg@dshs.wa.gov

David Currey, Ph.D.
Senior Program Evaluator
Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation
1516 East Franklin Street, Suite 200
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514-2812
Phone: 919-265-2617
Fax: 919-265-2659
E-mail: currey@pire.org

Susan Depue, M.A.
Research Specialist
Missouri Institute of Mental Health
University of Missouri - Columbia
5400 Arsenal St.
St. Louis, MO 63139
Phone: 314-877-5942
Fax: 314-877-6477
E-mail: Susan.Depue@mimh.edu

Mary C. Dugan, Ph.D., M.S.W.
Research Assistant Professor
Evaluation Director
Missouri Institute of Mental Health
University of Missouri - Columbia
5400 Arsenal St.
St. Louis, MO 63139
Phone: 314-877-6451
E-mail: mary.dugan@mimh.edu

Suzanne Kennedy Leahy, Ph.D.
Evaluator Manager
OMNI Institute
899 Logan Street Suite 600
Denver, CO 80203
Phone: 303-839-9422 or 800-279-2070 x124
E-mail: sleahy@omni.org

Ann Lamiell Landy, Ph.D.
Senior Evaluator
Westat
RB 3147
1700 Research Blvd.
Rockville, MD 20850
Phone: 301-251-2219
Fax: 240-314-2393
E-mail: annlandy@westat.com

Jeffrey L. Metzger, Ph.D., MEd
Senior Management Analyst
SPF Epidemiologist / Evaluator
Bureau of Preventive Services
Division of Public Health Services
Department of Health and Human Services
29 Hazen Drive - 2nd Floor East
Concord, NH 03301
Phone: 603-271-6740
E-mail: Jeffrey.L.Metzger@dhhs.state.nh.us

Robert G. Orwin, Ph.D.
Senior Study Director
Substance Abuse Research Group
Westat
1700 Research Blvd., Rm. RB3145
Rockville, MD 20850
Phone: 301-251-2277
Fax: 240-314-2393
E-mail: robertorwin@westat.com

Christine Owens, Ph.D.
Project Director
Research Assistant Professor
Missouri Institute of Mental Health
University of Missouri-Columbia
5400 Arsenal St.
St. Louis, MO 63139
Phone: 314-877-6474
Fax: 314-877-6477
E-mail: Christine.Owens@mimh.edu

Douglas Piper, Ph.D.
Cross Site Evaluator
Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation
437 S. Yellowstone Drive, Suite 201
Madison, Wisconsin 53719
Phone: 608-819-0109 x12
E-mail: Piper@pire.org

Alan Stein-Seroussi, Ph.D.
Cross Site Evaluator
1516 East Franklin Street, Suite 200
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514-3307
Phone: 919-265-2616
Fax: 919-265-2659
E-mail: stein@pire.org

Appendix C
Environmental Strategies Guidelines

Instructions for Using the Environmental Strategies Implementation Guidelines

Guidelines for implementing 22 environmental strategies, to be used in conjunction with environmental strategy implementation fidelity assessment, are included in this section. The list of strategies is not exhaustive: we included only those strategies for which we could find appropriate documentation. Also, the list tends to focus on environmental strategies that relate to alcohol and tobacco use. Many of these strategies could be adapted to address a different substance, but we recommend conversations with experts on these strategies before making broad adaptations.

The core activities for each strategy, identified through a review of the research literature, are listed in each table. They form the basis for implementation fidelity assessment.

Comparing implementation against the research-defined specifications is not meaningful if the community has decided that some adaptation or innovation is necessary. Communities may engage in activities that are not included in the list or may modify core activities to accommodate circumstances. These should be added to the table in the rows provided. The lists do not include specifications regarding target populations and geographic scope that should be incorporated in implementation plans.

Instructions

The evaluator should use the Environmental Strategy Implementation Guidelines conjunction with the assessment interview and scoring process as follows:

1. Select the guideline table for the environmental strategy being implemented (e.g., policies governing alcohol home delivery) and review the list of core activities³

³ Notations for each activity suggest relevant core components, (e.g., P-KP FOR PREPARATION-Key Player and I-A for Implementation Activity)

2. Using the guide in Table 13, complete the interview and record responses /observations for each core component
3. Using the protocol in Table 14, calculate the implementation fidelity score for each component and the aggregate fidelity score
4. Record the component scores and aggregate score in the spreadsheet (4b2) found in Appendix A.

Core Activity Ratings

Following completion of the interview and scoring process, return to the guideline table and complete core activity ratings using the scales provided. (Use the companion Excel spreadsheets to record ratings.) The fidelity assessment should compare actual implementation with what was proposed and approved by the community. For each core activity:

- Determine if the core activity occurred
- If the activity occurred, select the rating that best reflects fidelity for the core activity and enter the rating into the “Rating” column.
- If the activity did not occur but the exclusion is reasonable, given local conditions, include a justification statement in the “Comments” column

The evaluator should note adaptations to each core activity in the “Comments” column in each guideline table. For example, a core activity for land use ordinances is:

Learn how state and local policies (laws, regulations, enforcement, etc.) are implemented in your area by contacting a variety of sources, including: 1) your city’s planning department, 2) your city attorney, 3) your state’s office of alcohol control, 4) or the association of city and county governments.

The highest fidelity rating is awarded for implementation that includes all components of a core activity. However, the evaluator has the option of assigning a rating based on partial completion of the components of a core activity. For example, an “association of city and county governments” may not exist in the implementing community. The

evaluator should note the fact in the “Comments” column and should assign ratings based on the number of relevant information sources contacted. If the core activity did not occur, (e.g., because planning department and office of alcohol control representatives sit on an advisory council and can provide the information directly rather than in response to a request), this information should be noted in the “Comments” column and no rating should be assigned.

Using the Data

The materials in this user’s guide allow the evaluator to generate multiple scores per strategy. The first is a general fidelity score based on the nine dimensions in Table 13. Implementation fidelity of communities, regardless of strategy, can be assessed by comparing these ratings (i.e., data recorded in 4b2 worksheet). One could also assess the overall fidelity for a single strategy using ratings for multiple communities. In addition, the relationship between core activities for each strategy and outcomes could be assessed. The SPF SIG cross-site evaluation would benefit from the availability of these data.

Fidelity Measure for Land Use Ordinances

Core Activity	Rationale	Missing	Weak Fidelity	Moderate Fidelity	Strong Fidelity	Comments <i>(Use this space to indicate why a core activity was not appropriate for your community or why the highest implementation level was not possible.)</i>	Rating
		0	1	2	3		
Learn how state and local policies (laws, regulations, enforcement, etc.) are implemented in your area by contacting as many sources of information as possible, including: 1) your city's planning department; 2) your city attorney; 3) your state's office of alcohol control; or 4) the association of city and county governments. (P-R)	States vary in terms of the interplay between state-level control over alcohol sales and distribution (i.e., licensing), and local options for controlling alcohol availability (i.e., land use policies, local enforcement, etc.). Before establishing a plan for how to use land use as a tool for addressing alcohol-related problems, it is important to understand the opportunities and limits of local control in your own state.	Did not take any action to learn how state and local policies are implemented.	Contacted only one of the sources of information identified as relevant.	Contacted more than one of the information sources identified as relevant.	Contacted all sources of information identified as relevant.		
Find out what land use policies already exist by contacting a variety of sources, including: 1) your city's planning department; 2) your city attorney; 3) your state's office of alcohol control; or 4) the association of city and county governments (P-R)	Before establishing a plan for how to use land use as a tool for addressing alcohol-related problems, it is important to understand the policies that are already in place, keeping in mind that there may be many sources of this type of policy.	Did not take any action to learn what state and local land use policies already exist.	Contacted 1 of the 4 agencies or associations listed.	Contacted 2 or 3 of the agencies or associations listed.	Contacted all 4 of the agencies or associations listed.		
Determine goals and objectives by identifying what you want to accomplish through new or revised zoning ordinances in your community. Your goals and objectives should 1) be guided by a review of literature and of successful programs; 2) include community advocates, ATOD specialists and others; and 3) be written and documented. (P-C)	It is important to identify preliminary goals at the start, even if they change as you work with your community. Additionally, goals and objectives should be informed by literature and reviews of other successful programs. Goal setting will also be most beneficial if multiple voices are involved in the process. Finally, these goals and objectives must be written and documented so that others can review them.	Did not identify any goals for new or revised zoning ordinances.	Determined goals for zoning ordinances, but only addressed 1 of the 3 guidelines provided.	Determined goals for zoning ordinances, but only addressed 2 of the 3 guidelines provided.	Determined goals for zoning ordinances and addressed all 3 guidelines provided.		
Get the issue on the city/state agenda by 1) meeting with elected officials; 2) discussing the issue with staff, planning committees; 3) using the media to publicize the issue; 4) educating the public about the issue; or 5) seeking pro bono legal assistance to draft the ordinance. (I-A)	Cities often will not proactively take up the issue of zoning and alcohol availability. Staff and elected officials are busy, and are not necessarily experts at preventing alcohol-related problems in communities. It also can take significant city resources to draft and approve a new zoning ordinance. Thus, zoning policies intended to address alcohol-related problems often must be initiated by concerned community members, with support from prevention experts and alcohol policy advocates. To get the issue on your city/county's agenda, show the relationships between alcohol availability and community problems—and how local zoning authority can create solutions.	Not able to get the issue on the city agenda.			Able to get the issue on the city agenda.		
Promote support of the policies by 1) arranging for several community members to speak before the policy makers; 2) presenting data that are clear and convincing; 3) using visuals and handouts to make your case; 4) framing your message in terms of community benefits. (I-A)	A new zoning ordinance must be approved by the appropriate local legislative body—i.e., the city council or the county board of supervisors—often with an initial review by the local planning commission. When the local governing body or planning commission takes up the new ordinance, it is important that your group work for a favorable result. In addition to speaking individually with council members in the days or weeks prior to the council meeting, arrange for a formal presentation to the council.	Did not conduct any of the 4 activities listed to promote support of the policies.	Conducted 1 of the 4 activities listed to promote support of the policies.	Conducted 2 or 3 of the 4 activities listed to promote support of the policies.	Conducted all 4 of the activities listed to promote support of the policies.		

Fidelity Measure for Land Use Ordinances

Core Activity	Rationale	Missing	Weak Fidelity	Moderate Fidelity	Strong Fidelity	Comments <i>(Use this space to indicate why a core activity was not appropriate for your community or why the highest implementation level was not possible.)</i>	Rating
		0	1	2	3		
Establish and ensure enforcement of land use ordinances by 1) following up with city staff to learn which specific agency has responsibility for enforcing the new ordinance and ensuring that procedures are actively enforced; 2) mobilizing community members to assist law enforcement and city staff in monitoring outlets; 3) working with problem retailers to help them voluntarily comply with ordinances; 4) educating merchants about the new conditions for which they are accountable; and/or 5) developing a method for rewarding compliant retailers. I-A	The effect of the new ordinance is only as strong as the follow-through and enforcement. Although the city is responsible for enforcing zoning ordinances, community members and a variety of organizations play important roles in this process.	Did not conduct any of the 5 activities listed to establish and ensure enforcement procedures.	Conducted 1 or 2 of the 5 activities listed to establish and ensure enforcement procedures.	Conducted 3 or 4 of the 5 activities listed to establish and ensure enforcement procedures.	Conducted 5 or more of the activities listed to establish and ensure enforcement procedures.		
Additional Core Activities - Please describe and provide potential fidelity measure scores: (I-A)							
Additional Core Activities - Please describe and provide potential fidelity measure scores: (I-A)							
<small>Source: The Marin Institute. (2006). Land-Use Ordinances Action Pack. 7-27-2006. http://www.marininstitute.org/action_packs/land_use.htm</small>							#DIV/0!

Fidelity Measure for Alcohol Home Delivery

Core Activity	Rationale	Missing 0	Weak Fidelity 1	Moderate Fidelity 2	Strong Fidelity 3	Comments <i>(Use this space to indicate why a core activity was not appropriate for your community or why the highest implementation level was not possible.)</i>	Rating
Make an informed decision about whether you need support from local and state level. (P-KP)	*This activity is not included in the article about home delivery restrictions. A first step is to decide which level is the most appropriate to bring about change. This decision should be based on: 1) research on the current status of state and local laws; and 2) communications with potential supporters at both levels.	No decision made about level of support needed.	Decision made, but only researched current laws or communicated with local or state potential supporters, but not both.		Decision made based on both research on the status of current laws and on communications with potential supporters at the appropriate level(s).		
Work to build support for the policy within the community. <i>(Note: Each community will identify different activities necessary to build support.)</i> (P-KP)	*This activity is not included in the article about home delivery restrictions. Gathering support for a policy helps ensure that there is enough interest to get the policy passed.	Potential supporters were not identified.	Supporters were identified, but did not include key decision makers, individuals, or organizations.		Supporters were identified and included key decision makers, individuals, and organizations.		
Implement a model Alcohol Home Delivery Restrictions Policy that includes the following 4 components. <i>(Note: Implementation of the policy means that it was adopted/enacted as an organizational, local or state law, policy, ordinance, regulation, etc., that is documented and available to the public.)</i> (I-A)		Not adopted	Adopted with modified and weaker specifications		Adopted as proposed		
1) Requires that delivery personnel be age 21 years or older. (I-C)	An age requirement for delivery persons may decrease sales to youth because an older person may be less likely to sell alcohol to underage people.	Delivery personnel not required to be 21 years of age or older.		Delivery personnel must be at least 21 years of age.	Delivery personnel must be at least 21 years of age AND there is some evidence of enforcement of this component of the policy.		
2) Restricts the days of the week and times of the day during which alcohol can be delivered to residential addresses. (I-C)	Limiting access to alcohol delivery may help to avoid times of the day when underage youth are likely to be home alone and unsupervised.	No restrictions were established in terms of when alcohol can be delivered to residential addresses.	Either the days of the week that alcohol can be delivered OR the time of day was restricted.	Restrictions were established for both the days of the week and time of day that alcohol can be delivered to residential addresses.	Restrictions were established for both the days of the week and time of day that alcohol can be delivered to residential addresses AND there is some evidence of enforcement of this component of the policy.		
3) Restricts the amount of alcohol that can be delivered. (I-C)	Limiting the amount of alcohol sold during home deliveries may deter underage youth from ordering it, if their intent was to use it for a party or a large group of people.	The amount of alcohol that can be delivered to residential addresses was not restricted.		The amount of alcohol that can be delivered to residential addresses was restricted.	The amount of alcohol that can be delivered to residential addresses was restricted AND there is some evidence of enforcement of this component of the policy.		

Fidelity Measure for Alcohol Home Delivery

Core Activity	Rationale	Missing 0	Weak Fidelity 1	Moderate Fidelity 2	Strong Fidelity 3	Comments <i>(Use this space to indicate why a core activity was not appropriate for your community or why the highest implementation level was not possible.)</i>	Rating
4) Requires delivery people to verify that the buyer is 21 or older and requires the delivery person to document the purchaser's contact information, time, date, and place of delivery, and quantity and brand of alcohol delivered. (I-C)	Requiring delivery people to verify a purchaser's ID will help lessen the occurrence of sales to youth. Also, purchasers (of age) may be discouraged from providing alcohol to underage people when they cannot do so anonymously.	No requirement to verify that the purchaser is 21 or older or to collect the purchaser's contact information and sale information.	Either the delivery person confirmed the age of the purchaser, or collected the contact and sale information, but not both.	The delivery person verified the purchaser's age, as well as collected contact information and sale information.	The delivery person verified the purchaser's age, as well as collected contact information and sale information AND there is some evidence of enforcement of this component of the policy.		
Identify sources of funding to ensure that publicity and enforcement of the policy can continue.	This strategy will be most effective if it is an ongoing activity and not just a one-shot activity. Working to secure funding for publicity and enforcement will ensure that this prevention effort is continued.	No sources of funding have been identified.	Some additional sources of funding have been identified.		Enough funding has been obtained to ensure continued publicity, monitoring and enforcement of this policy.		
Additional Core Activities Please describe and provide potential fidelity measure scores: (I-A)							
Additional Core Activities Please describe and provide potential fidelity measure scores: (I-A)							

Source: University of Minnesota Alcohol Epidemiology Program. (1-6-2006). Alcohol Home Delivery Restrictions. 7-28-2006. <http://www.epi.umn.edu/alcohol/policy/homdeliv.shtml>

#DIV/0!

Fidelity Measure for Meth Precursor Prohibition

Core Activity	Rationale	Missing 0	Weak Fidelity 1	Moderate Fidelity 2	Strong Fidelity 3	Comments <i>(Use this space to indicate why a core activity was not appropriate for your community or why the highest implementation level was not possible.)</i>	Rating
Make an informed decision about whether you need support from the local or state level. (P-R)	*This activity is not included in the article about home delivery restrictions. A first step is to decide which level is the most appropriate to bring about change. This decision should be based on: 1) research on the current status of state and local laws; and 2) communications with potential supporters at both levels.	No decision made about level of support needed.	Decision made, but only researched current laws or communicated with potential supporters, but not both.		Decision made based on both research on the status of current laws and on communications with potential supporters at both levels.		
Work to build support for the policy within the community. <i>(Note: Each community will identify different activities necessary to build support.)</i> (P-KP)	*This activity is not included in the literature. Gathering support for a policy helps ensure that there is enough interest to get the policy passed.	Potential supporters were not identified.	Supporters were identified, but did not include key decision makers, individuals, or organizations.		Supporters were identified and included key decision makers, individuals, and organizations.		
Implement a law, regulation or policy passed to restrict meth precursor sales, that includes the following 21 components: <i>(Note: Implementation of the policy means that it was adopted/enacted as an organizational, local or state law, policy, ordinance, regulation, etc., that is documented and available to the public.)</i> (I-A)		Not adopted	Adopted with modified and weaker specifications		Adopted as proposed		
1) Targeted meth precursors (TMP) can only be administered, dispersed, or distributed by a pharmacist, practitioner, a drug treatment program, pharmacy, certain retailers, and wholesale distributors authorized by the DEA. (I-C)		Targeted meth precursors can be administered by anyone.		Targeted meth precursors can only be administered by a pharmacist, practitioner, a drug treatment program,	All of the previous conditions AND show some evidence of enforcement of this component.		
Pharmacy Guidelines							
2) TMP must be packaged in blister packs, containing no more than two dosage units. It can contain no more than 3000 mg of ephedrine or pseudoephedrine. (I-C)		The packaging of TMP is not restricted.	TMP is packaged so that it contains no more than two units OR no more than 3000 mg of ephedrine or pseudoephedrine, but	TMP is packaged so that it contains no more than two units AND contains no more than 3000 mg of ephedrine or	All of the previous conditions AND show some evidence of enforcement of this component.		
3) TMP must be stored behind a pharmacy counter. (I-C)		TMP is not stored behind a pharmacy counter.		TMP is stored behind a pharmacy counter.	All of the previous conditions AND show some evidence of enforcement of this component.		
4) Only persons 18 years of age or older may purchase TMP. (I-C)		TMP may be purchased by persons of any age.		TMP may only be purchased by those 18 years of age or older.	All of the previous conditions AND show some evidence of enforcement of this component.		

Fidelity Measure for Meth Precursor Prohibition

Core Activity	Rationale	Missing 0	Weak Fidelity 1	Moderate Fidelity 2	Strong Fidelity 3	Comments <i>(Use this space to indicate why a core activity was not appropriate for your community or why the highest implementation level was not possible.)</i>	Rating
5) A pharmacist may not knowingly sell products containing more than 7500 mg of ephedrine or PSE to a single person in a 30-day period. He/she may not sell more than 2 targeted packages in a single retail transaction. (I-C)		There are no restrictions for how much TMP may be sold in a 30-day period to a single person.	A pharmacist is restricted from selling products containing more than 7500 mg of ephedrine or PSE in a 30-day period, but may sell more than 2 packages in a single transaction.	A pharmacist is restricted from selling products containing more than 7500 mg of ephedrine or PSE in a 30-day period, and cannot sell more than 2 packages in a single transaction.	All of the previous conditions AND show some evidence of enforcement of this component.		
6) Customer must present a driver's license or other government-issued ID showing name, date of birth, and photograph. (I-C)		Customer identification is not required.		Customer must provide personal identification.	All of the previous conditions AND show some evidence of enforcement of this component.		
7) Customer must sign a log documenting the name and address of the customer, date, and time of the transaction, and brand and product name and total quantity distributed of ephedrine or pseudoephedrine. (I-C)		Customer not required to sign a log when TMPs are purchased.		Customer required to sign a log when TMPs are purchased.	All of the previous conditions AND show some evidence of enforcement of this component.		
Retailer Guidelines							
8) A package must contain 360 mg or less of ephedrine or pseudoephedrine in liquid or liquid-filled capsule form. (I-C)		There are no restrictions on the amount of ephedrine or PSE that a package of TMP can contain.		A TMP package must contain 360 mg or less of ephedrine or PSE.	All of the previous conditions AND show some evidence of enforcement of this component.		
9) Packages must be displayed behind store counters or in locked cases, so that customers are not able to reach the product without assistance. (I-C)		Packages of TMP are not kept behind counters or locked in cases, out of the reach of customers.		Packages of TMP are kept behind counters or locked in cases, out of the reach of customers.	All of the previous conditions AND show some evidence of enforcement of this component.		
10) Only persons 18 years of age or older may purchase TMP.(I-C)		TMP may be purchased by persons of any age.		TMP may only be purchased by those 18 years of age or older.	All of the previous conditions AND show some evidence of enforcement of this component.		
11) Packages sold away from pharmacy counters must be sold by store employees or agents who have been trained.		TMP may be sold by any store employees.		TMP must be sold by store employees who have been trained.	All of the previous conditions AND show some evidence of enforcement of this component.		

Fidelity Measure for Meth Precursor Prohibition

Core Activity	Rationale	Missing 0	Weak Fidelity 1	Moderate Fidelity 2	Strong Fidelity 3	Comments <i>(Use this space to indicate why a core activity was not appropriate for your community or why the highest implementation level was not possible.)</i>	Rating
12) A retailer may not sell more than one convenience package to a single person in a 24-hour period. (I-C)		There is no restriction on the number of TMP packages that can be sold to a single person in a 24-hour period.		A retailer is restricted to selling one TMP package to a single person in a 24-hour period.	All of the previous conditions AND show some evidence of enforcement of this component.		
13) A retailer may not knowingly sell products containing more than 7500 mg of ephedrine or pseudoephedrine or PSE to a single person in a 30-day period. (I-C)		There are no restrictions for how much TMP may be sold in a 30-day period to a single person.		A pharmacist is restricted from selling products containing more than 7500 mg of ephedrine or PSE in a 30-day period to a	All of the previous conditions AND show some evidence of enforcement of this component.		
14) A retailer wishing to sell convenience packages away from pharmacy counters must provide training to each employee or agent who at any time operates a cash register, works behind a pharmacy counter, or stocks shelves containing TMP, trains or supervises any other employee or agent who engages in any of these activities excluding pharmacists and pharmacy techs. (I-C)		Training is not required of those retail employees operating a cash register, working behind a pharmacy counter, or stocking shelves containing TMP, who wish to sell TMP convenience packages away from the pharmacy	Training is provided to some retail employees operating a cash register, working behind a pharmacy counter, or stocking shelves containing TMP, who wish to sell TMP convenience packages.	Training is required of all retail employees who operate a cash register, work behind a pharmacy counter, or stock shelves containing TMP, who wish to sell TMP convenience packages.	All of the previous conditions AND show some evidence of enforcement of this component.		
15) The training must be completed within 30 days of the date that each sales employee begins working for the retailer. (I-C)		Retail employee training not completed within 30 days of the date of hire.		Retail employee training within 30 days of the date of hire.	All of the previous conditions AND show some evidence of enforcement of this component.		
16) The retailer must train each sales employee on defined topics described in the Meth Precursor Law. (I-C)		Sales employees were not trained on defined topics described in the Meth Precursor Law.		Sales employees were trained on defined topics described in the Meth Precursor Law.	All of the previous conditions AND show some evidence of enforcement of this component.		
17) The retailer shall have each sales employee read, sign, and date a certification form. These forms must be retained by the retailer for each employee for the duration of his/her employment and for at least 30 days following the end of his/her employment. (I-C)		The retailer did not require sales employees to sign a certification form.	The retailer required sales employees to sign a certification form, but did not retain the forms for the duration of his/her employment.	The retailer required sales employees to sign a certification form, and retained the forms for the duration of his/her employment.	All of the previous conditions AND show some evidence of enforcement of this component.		
18) Any pharmacy or retailer that violates the MPCA is subject to a fine of \$500 for a first offense, \$1000 for a second offense occurring within 3 years of the prior offense, and \$5000 for a third or subsequent offense. (I-C)		A pharmacy or retailer that violates the MPCA is not subject to any fines.		A pharmacy or retailer that violates the MPCA is subject to fines based on the number of offenses.	All of the previous conditions AND show some evidence of enforcement of this component.		

Fidelity Measure for Meth Precursor Prohibition

Core Activity	Rationale	Missing 0	Weak Fidelity 1	Moderate Fidelity 2	Strong Fidelity 3	Comments <i>(Use this space to indicate why a core activity was not appropriate for your community or why the highest implementation level was not possible.)</i>	Rating
19) An employee or agent of a pharmacy or retailer who violates the MPCA is guilty of a Class A misdemeanor for a first offense, a Class 4 felony for a second offense and a Class 1 felony for a third offense. (I-C)		An employee who violates the MPCA is not punished.		An employee who violates the MPCA is guilty of a Class A misdemeanor and will be punished accordingly.	All of the previous conditions AND show some evidence of enforcement of this component.		
20) A violation of the MPCA may result in the suspension or revocation of a registration to distribute or dispense controlled substances. (I-C)		A violation of the MPCA does not result in any action.		A violation of the MPCA will result in the suspension or revocation of a registration to distribute controlled	All of the previous conditions AND show some evidence of enforcement of this component.		
Identify sources of funding to ensure that publicity and enforcement of the policy can continue. (I-A)	This strategy will be most effective if it is an ongoing activity. Working to secure funding for publicity and enforcement will ensure that this prevention effort is continued.	No sources of funding have been identified.	Some additional sources of funding have been identified.		Enough funding has been obtained to ensure continued publicity, monitoring and enforcement of this policy.		
Additional Core Activities Please describe and provide potential fidelity measure scores:(I-A)							
Additional Core Activities Please describe and provide potential fidelity measure scores:(I-A)							
Source: State of Illinois, Office of the Attorney General. (2005). Training for Retailers on the Methamphetamine Precursor Control Act (MPCA). State of Illinois, Office of the Attorney General. http://www.illinoisattorneygeneral.gov/methnet/laws_legislation/MPCA_retailer_training.pdf							#DIV/0!

Fidelity Measure for Alcohol Restrictions at Community Events

Core Activity	Rationale	Missing 0	Weak Fidelity 1	Moderate Fidelity 2	Strong Fidelity 3	Comments <i>(Use this space to indicate why a core activity was not appropriate for your community or why the highest implementation level was not possible.)</i>	Rating
Make an informed decision about whether you need support from the local or state level. P-R	*This activity is not included in the article about home delivery restrictions. A first step is to decide which level is the most appropriate to bring about change. This decision should be based on: 1) research on the current status of state and local laws; and 2) communications with potential supporters at both levels.	No decision made about level of support needed.	Decision made, but only researched current laws or communicated with potential supporters, but not both.		Decision made based on both research on the status of current laws and on communications with potential supporters at both levels.		
Work to build support for the policy within the community. <i>(Note: Each community will identify different activities necessary to build support.) P-KP</i>	*This activity is not included in the literature. Gathering support for a policy helps ensure that there is enough interest to get the policy passed.	Potential supporters were not identified.	Supporters were identified, but did not include key decision makers, individuals, or organizations.		Supporters were identified and included key decision makers, individuals, and organizations.		
Implement policy that addresses content of alcohol advertising at events, and includes the following 9 components: <i>(Note: Implementation of the policy means that it was adopted/enacted as an organizational, local or state law, policy, ordinance, regulation, etc., that is documented and available to the public.) (I-A)</i>		Not adopted	Adopted with modified and weaker specifications		Adopted as proposed		
1) Policy prohibits alcohol advertising that promotes underage drinking. (I-C)	Messages that promote underage drinking can lead to dangerous expectations.	Policy does not address promotion of underage drinking.	Policy prohibits promotion of underage drinking.	Policy prohibits promotion of underage drinking and clearly defines what is prohibited.	All of the previous conditions AND show some evidence of enforcement of this component.		
2) Policy prohibits free alcohol samples and/or promotional materials.(I-C)	Free samples can contribute to excess consumption of alcohol.	Policy does not address distribution of free samples or promotional materials.	Policy prohibits distribution of free samples or promotional materials.	Policy prohibits distribution of free samples or promotional materials and clearly defines what is considered a free sample or promotional material.	All of the previous conditions AND show some evidence of enforcement of this component.		
3) Policy requires event organizers to obtain approval in advance for all alcohol advertising.(I-C)	By approving all advertising, the message can be controlled.	Policy does not require approval of alcohol advertising.		Policy requires approval of alcohol advertising.	All of the previous conditions AND show some evidence of enforcement of this component.		
4) Policy limits alcohol advertising to areas restricted to adults.(I-C)	Advertising in areas accessible to youth can promote underage drinking.	Policy does not limit advertising to areas restricted to adults.		Policy limits alcohol advertising to areas restricted to adults.	All of the previous conditions AND show some evidence of enforcement of this component.		
5) Establish guidelines and limits on the nature of sponsorship from the alcohol industry. Guidelines address: 1) a limit on how much of the event budget may be underwritten by alcohol interests; and 2) clearly defines what sponsors will receive in return for their sponsorship. (I-C)	Setting a standard for the amount of money received from alcohol sponsors prevents sponsors from gaining an inappropriate level of say regarding the event. Clear guidelines will avoid confusion regarding unacceptable sponsor demands.	Policy does not set guidelines or limits on the nature of the alcohol sponsorships.	Policy addresses one of the components, but not both.	Policy addresses both components.	All of the previous conditions AND show some evidence of enforcement of this component.		

Fidelity Measure for Alcohol Restrictions at Community Events

Core Activity	Rationale	Missing 0	Weak Fidelity 1	Moderate Fidelity 2	Strong Fidelity 3	Comments <i>(Use this space to indicate why a core activity was not appropriate for your community or why the highest implementation level was not possible.)</i>	Rating
6) Post signs throughout event area regarding alcohol policy. Signs should: 1) be clearly posted; and 2) designate areas where drinking is permitted/not permitted. (I-A)	Sign posting helps ensure that drinking policies are adhered to by staff and event attendees.	Signs regarding alcohol policy are not posted.	Signs are posted, but are not clearly posted or do not designate areas where drinking is permitted or not permitted.	Signs are clearly posted and designate where drinking is permitted and not permitted.	All of the previous conditions AND show some evidence of enforcement of this component.		
7) Policies regarding enforcement are standardized and in place prior to an event and on-site security is required. (I-C)	Security and active enforcement ensure that rules are followed.	No enforcement procedures in place or security required.	Enforcement policies are not standardized OR on-site security is not required.	Enforcement is standardized and in place prior to the event and on-site security is required.	All of the previous conditions AND show some evidence of enforcement of this component.		
8) Provide staff with training and guidelines regarding alcohol service. (I-A)	Training helps sellers and servers become familiar with rules, identify fake IDs, and refuse service to intoxicated patrons.	No training provided.	Staff provided with written materials to review regarding alcohol service.	Staff provided with in-person training from a qualified trainer regarding alcohol service.	All of the previous conditions AND show some evidence of enforcement of this component.		
9) Establish policies for alcohol sales to include: 1) price; 2) ID checking requirements and procedures; 3) drink limits; and 4) sales area to minimize inappropriate and excess alcohol consumption. (I-A)	Alcohol sales can be controlled through these measures.	No alcohol sales policy established.	Alcohol sales policy addresses 2 or fewer of the components.	Alcohol policy addresses 3 or more of the components.	All of the previous conditions AND show some evidence of enforcement of this component.		
Identify sources of funding to ensure that publicity and enforcement of the policy can continue. (I-A)	This strategy will be most effective if it is an ongoing activity and not just a one-shot activity. Working to secure funding for publicity and enforcement will ensure that this prevention effort is continued.	No sources of funding have been identified.	Some additional sources of funding have been identified.		Enough funding has been obtained to ensure continued publicity, monitoring, and enforcement of this policy.		
Additional Core Activities Please describe and provide potential fidelity measure scores: (I-A)							
Additional Core Activities Please describe and provide potential fidelity measure scores: (I-A)							
Source: Institute for Public Strategies. (2003). Issue briefing: Keeping your special event festive and safe: A planning guide for Ventura County communities. http://www.publicstrategies.org/pdfs/ventura_special_events_updated.pdf							#DIV/0!

Fidelity Measure for Keg Registration

Core Activity	Rationale	Missing	Weak Fidelity	Moderate Fidelity	Strong Fidelity	Comments	Rating
		0	1	2	3	<i>(Use this space to indicate why a core activity was not appropriate for your community or why the highest implementation level was not possible.)</i>	
Make an informed decision about whether you need support from the local or state level. (P-R)	*This activity is not included in the article about home delivery restrictions. A first step is to decide which level is the most appropriate to bring about change. This decision should be based on: 1) research on the current status of state and local laws; and 2) communications with potential supporters at both levels.	No decision made about level of support needed.	Decision made, but only researched current laws or communicated with potential supporters, but not both.		Decision made based on both research on the status of current laws and on communications with potential supporters at both levels.		
Work to build support for the policy within the community. <i>(Note: Each community will identify different activities necessary to build support.)</i> (P-C)	*This activity is not included in the literature. Gathering support for a policy helps ensure that there is enough interest to get the policy passed.	Potential supporters were not identified.	Supporters were identified, but did not include key decision makers, individuals, or organizations.		Supporters were identified and included key decision makers, individuals, and organizations.		
Create a policy that addresses registration of kegs, including the following 4 components: <i>(Note: Implementation of the policy means that it was adopted/enacted as an organizational, local or state law, policy, ordinance, regulation, etc., that is documented and available to the public.)</i> (I-A)		Not adopted	Adopted with modified and weaker specifications		Adopted as proposed		
1) Kegs are marked with a unique identification number. (I-C)	Beer kegs are often a main source of alcohol at teenage parties. Identifying each keg with a unique number, allows the keg and keg purchaser to be tracked in the event that underage youth are being served.	No kegs have unique ID numbers.		All kegs have unique ID numbers.	All of the previous conditions AND show some evidence of enforcement of this component.		
2) Record keg ID number, along with the keg purchaser's contact information and driver's license number at time of purchase. (I-C)	When police arrive at an underage keg party, people often scatter. Without keg tagging, there is no way to trace who purchased the keg.	No ID number or contact information recorded.	Either the ID number is recorded or the purchaser's contact information is recorded, but not both.	Both the keg ID number and the purchaser's contact information are recorded.	All of the previous conditions AND show some evidence of enforcement of this component.		
3) Keep a record of each keg purchase for a specified length of time (preferably 6 months or more). (I-C)	A keg might not be immediately used and/or immediately returned after use. Keeping records on file for 6 months to a year allows police to follow up with a retailer in the event that a keg was confiscated from an underage party, regardless of when it occurred.	No records of keg purchases kept.	Records of keg purchases kept for less than 6 months.	Records of keg purchases kept 6 months or more.	All of the previous conditions AND show some evidence of enforcement of this component.		
4) Withhold keg deposit if keg returned with ID number removed. (I-C)	Adults who illegally provide alcohol to underage youth may be deterred if they believe they will face legal or financial consequences for providing alcohol to people under 21.	Keg deposit not withheld for kegs returned without an ID number.		All keg deposits withheld for kegs returned without an ID number.	All of the previous conditions AND show some evidence of enforcement of this component.		
Identify sources of funding to ensure that publicity and enforcement of the policy can continue. (I-C)	This strategy will be most effective if it is an ongoing activity and not just a one-shot activity. Working to secure funding for publicity and enforcement will ensure that this prevention effort is continued.	No sources of funding have been identified.	Some additional sources of funding have been identified.		Enough funding has been obtained to ensure continued publicity, monitoring, and enforcement of this policy.		

Fidelity Measure for Keg Registration

Core Activity	Rationale	Missing 0	Weak Fidelity 1	Moderate Fidelity 2	Strong Fidelity 3	Comments <i>(Use this space to indicate why a core activity was not appropriate for your community or why the highest implementation level was not possible.)</i>	Rating
Additional Core Activities - Please describe and provide potential fidelity measure scores: (I-A)							
Additional Core Activities - Please describe and provide potential fidelity measure scores:(I-A)							
<small>Source: University of Minnesota Alcohol Epidemiology Program. (1-6-2006). Beer Keg Registration. 8-1-2006. http://www.epi.umn.edu/alcohol/policy/beerkeg.shtm</small>							#DIV/0!

Fidelity Measure for Social Norms Campaigns/Social Marketing/Mass Media

Core Activity	Rationale	Missing	Weak Fidelity	Moderate Fidelity	Strong Fidelity	Comments <i>(Use this space to indicate why a core activity was not appropriate for your community or why the highest implementation level was not possible.)</i>	Rating
		0	1	2	3		
Mass media/social marketing/social norms plan has been written and documented and identifies: 1) goals and objectives; 2) the target audience; 3) behaviors or norms targeted; and 4) strategy to be used.(I-A)	A written plan ensures that a strategy has been thought out and that key aspects of the campaign have been considered. This process will help assess readiness to implement a mass media campaign strategy and ensure that it is well-researched and well-designed.	No plan written.	Plan in place, but only addresses 1 of the 4 components.	Plan in place, but only addresses 2 or 3 of the 4 components.	Plan in place, and addresses all 4 components.		
Formative research conducted to understand and test the target audience responses to the messages, media channels (web, TV, billboards, person-to-person, etc.), and messenger/spokesperson (if applicable).(I-A)	Formative research on the actual message, medium, spokesperson, etc., ensures that the message is credible with the target audience. In addition, formative research should be conducted with non-target audience to ensure that the campaign does not have any unintended consequences.	No formative research conducted.	Formative research conducted on 1 of the 3 components.	Formative research conducted on 2 of the 3 components.	Formative research conducted on all 3 components.		
Collect and report local data to reinforce message prior to, and after the campaign.(P-R)	The use of local data will help ensure that the target population believes or buys into the message. Data from other areas/schools/regions allow target populations to think that the data do not apply to them.	No data collected.	Non-local data reported.	Data collected, but not reported, or only reported prior to OR after the campaign.	Local data collected and reported both prior to, and after the campaign.		
Campaign employs multiple media channels. (I-A)	The use of multiple channels helps reinforce the message. The more frequently a message is viewed, the more opportunity it has to be processed by the target population. In addition,	Campaign not implemented.	Campaign employs 1 media channel.	Campaign employs 2 media channels.	Campaign employs 3 or more media channels.		
Research (literature review, focus groups, testing with surveys, etc.) conducted to determine appropriate frequency of exposure for target audience. (P-R)	The appropriate frequency of exposure will vary depending on the channel, purpose of the campaign, and other factors. Researching the appropriate level of exposure will ensure a successful campaign.	No research conducted on appropriate frequency of exposure for target audience.			Research conducted to determine appropriate frequency of exposure.		
Message repeated appropriately, as determined by research.(I-A)	The campaign should be repeated to ensure message retention. The frequency of exposure should be implemented according to the research results.	Campaign message not repeated.	Message repeated, but less frequently than research suggests will result		Message repeated at frequency research suggests is appropriate to ensure a successful		
Additional Core Activities - Please describe and provide potential fidelity measure scores: (I-A)							
Additional Core Activities - Please describe and provide potential fidelity measure scores: (I-A)							
Sources:Haines, M. P., Perkins, H. W., Rice, R. M., and Barker, G. (2005). A Guide to Marketing Social Norms for Health Promotion in Schools and Communities . National Social Norms Resource Center. http://www.socialnorms.org/pdf/Guidebook.pdf ---- Higher Education Center. (12-12-2002). Research and Evaluation of Social Norms Campaigns. http://www.higheredcenter.org/socialnorms/research.html ----Lin, C. A. and Hullman, G. A. (2005). Tobacco-Prevention Messages Online: Social Marketing via the Web. Health Communication, 18, 77-193. ---Martino-McAllister, J. and Wessel, M. T. (2005). An evaluation of a social norms marketing project for tobacco prevention with middle, high, and college students; use of funds from the Tobacco Master Settlement (Virginia). J Drug Educ., 35, 185-200. ---National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation. (2001). Community How to Guide On Media Relations (Rep. No. DOT HS 809 209). National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation.							#DIV/0!

Fidelity Measure for Advertising Restrictions on Billboards and Public Places

Core Activity	Rationale	Missing 0	Weak Fidelity 1	Moderate Fidelity 2	Strong Fidelity 3	Comments <i>(Use this space to indicate why a core activity was not appropriate for your community or why the highest implementation level was not possible.)</i>	Rating
Identify appropriate law-making body in charge of governing billboard signs in your community. (IP-R)	Before you can implement a policy, you must understand who is responsible for making and implementing the policy.	The law-making body in charge of governing billboard signs in the community was not identified.			The law-making body in charge of governing billboard signs in the community was not identified.		
Make an informed decision about whether you need support from the local or state level.(P-R)	*This activity is not included in the article about home delivery restrictions. A first step is to decide which level is the most appropriate to bring about change. This decision should be based on: 1) research on the current status of state and local laws and 2) communications with potential supporters at both levels.	No decision made about level of support needed.	Decision made, but only researched current laws or communicated with potential supporters, but not both.		Decision made based on both research on the status of current laws and on communications with potential supporters at both levels.		
Work to build support for the policy within the community. For this activity, you will want to be sure to identify any organizational groups that may support your intervention, such as a local advertising or marketing group. <i>(Note: Each community will identify different activities necessary to build support.)</i> (P-KP)	Gathering support for a policy helps ensure that there is enough interest to get the policy passed. In many areas, one or two major marketing companies own all of the billboards. Rather than working to get a law passed restricting advertising, it may be more feasible to work with the group that owns the billboards to get them to act according to the restrictions outlined below.	Potential supporters were not identified.	Supporters were identified, but did not include key decision makers, individuals, or organizations.		Supporters were identified and included key decision makers, individuals, and organizations.		
Implement a model policy that limits alcohol and tobacco advertising in public places (billboards), and includes the following 3 components: <i>(Note: Implementation of the policy means that it was adopted/enacted as an organizational, local or state law, policy, ordinance, regulation, etc., that is documented and available to the public.)</i> (I-A)		Not adopted	Adopted with modified and weaker specifications		Adopted as proposed		
1) Establishes exclusionary zones that prohibit outdoor (billboard) advertising of age-restricted products within 500 feet of places frequented by children, including schools, playgrounds, and places of worship. (I-C)	Prohibiting advertising in locations that children are known to frequent can reduce the influence on children to purchase or use age-restricted products such as tobacco or alcohol.	No exclusionary zones were established to prohibit outdoor billboard advertising of age-restricted products within a certain distance of places frequented by children.	Exclusionary zones were established to prohibit outdoor billboard advertising of age-restricted products within 500 feet of places frequented by children.	Exclusionary zones were established to prohibit outdoor billboard advertising of age-restricted products within more than 500 feet of places frequented by children.	All of the previous conditions AND show some evidence of enforcement of this component.		
2) Includes the international "child" symbol on any billboard that is included in the exclusionary zone.(I-C)	Clearly marking outdoor advertising venues with the international "child" symbol will make it clear when an advertiser is violating the restriction on outdoor advertising near places children frequent.	The international "child" symbol is not used on billboards included in the exclusionary zone.		The international "child" symbol is used on billboards included in the exclusionary zone.	All of the previous conditions AND show some evidence of enforcement of this component.		

Fidelity Measure for Advertising Restrictions on Billboards and Public Places

Core Activity	Rationale	Missing 0	Weak Fidelity 1	Moderate Fidelity 2	Strong Fidelity 3	Comments <i>(Use this space to indicate why a core activity was not appropriate for your community or why the highest implementation level was not possible.)</i>	Rating
3) Establishes reasonable limits on the total number of outdoor advertisements that carry messages about products that are illegal for sale to minors, outside of the exclusionary zone.(I-C)	Establishing prohibitions on billboards near children is one step in the intervention. Establishing limits on the number of age-restricted products, in general, can also help reduce the influence on children.	No limits were established regarding the total number of outdoor advertisements carrying messages about products that are illegal for sale to minors, outside the exclusionary zone.		Limits were established regarding the total number of outdoor advertisements carrying messages about products that are illegal for sale to minors, outside the exclusionary zone.	All of the previous conditions AND show some evidence of enforcement of this component.		
Identify sources of funding to ensure that publicity and enforcement of the policy can continue.(I-A)	This strategy will be most effective if it is an ongoing activity and not just a one-shot activity. Working to secure funding for publicity and enforcement will ensure that this prevention effort is continued.	No sources of funding have been identified.	Some additional sources of funding have been identified.		Enough funding has been obtained to ensure continued publicity, monitoring, and enforcement of this policy.		
Additional Core Activities - Please describe and provide potential fidelity measure scores: (I-A)							
Additional Core Activities - Please describe and provide potential fidelity measure scores: (I-A)							
<small>Source: Hackbarth, D. P., Schnopp-Wyatt, D., Katz, D., Williams, J., Silvestri, B., and Pfeleger, M. (2001). Collaborative research and action to control the geographic placement of outdoor advertising of alcohol and tobacco products in Chicago. Public Health Rep., 116, 558-567.</small>							#DIV/0!

Fidelity Measure for Prohibition of Alcohol or Tobacco Sponsorship of Public Events

Core Activity	Rationale	Missing 0	Weak Fidelity 1	Moderate Fidelity 2	Strong Fidelity 3	Comments <i>(Use this space to indicate why a core activity was not appropriate for your community or why the highest implementation level was not possible.)</i>	Rating
Make an informed decision about whether you need support from the local or state level.(IP-R)	*This activity is not included in the article about home delivery restrictions. A first step is to decide which level is the most appropriate to bring about change. This decision should be based on: 1) research on the current status of state and local laws; and 2) communications with potential supporters at both levels.	No decision made about level of support needed.	Decision made, but only researched current laws or communicated with potential supporters, but not both.		Decision made based on both research on the status of current laws and on communications with potential supporters at both levels.		
Work to build support for the policy within the community. <i>(Note: Each community will identify different activities necessary to build support.) (P-KP)</i>	*This activity is not included in the article about home delivery restrictions. Gathering support for a policy helps ensure that there is enough interest to get the policy passed.	Potential supporters were not identified.	Supporters were identified, but did not include key decision makers, individuals, or organizations.		Supporters were identified and included key decision makers, individuals, and organizations.		
Implement a model policy that prohibits alcohol and tobacco sponsorship of public events (racing, concerts etc.), and includes the following 6 components: <i>(Note: Implementation of the policy means that it was adopted/enacted as an organizational, local or state law, policy, ordinance, regulation, etc., that is documented and available to the public.) (I-A)</i>		Not adopted	Adopted with modified and weaker specifications		Adopted as proposed		
Prohibits compensation from tobacco and alcohol companies. (I-C)	Event planners may feel obliged to give something to companies in return for sponsorship funds.	Compensation from tobacco and alcohol companies not prohibited.		Compensation from tobacco and alcohol companies prohibited.			
Prohibits tobacco- and alcohol-related promotional displays.(I-C)	Displays and advertising may encourage tobacco and alcohol use.	Tobacco- and alcohol-related promotional displays are not prohibited.		Tobacco- and alcohol-related promotional displays are prohibited.	All of the previous conditions AND show some evidence of enforcement of this component.		
Prohibits all benefits (scoreboards, etc.) that promote tobacco or alcohol companies.(I-C)	Items that display alcohol or tobacco advertising, branding, images, or names may encourage tobacco and alcohol use.	Benefits that promote tobacco or alcohol companies not prohibited.		Benefits that promote tobacco or alcohol companies prohibited.	All of the previous conditions AND show some evidence of enforcement of this component.		
Prohibits the sale and distribution of samples of tobacco and alcohol products.(I-C)	Samples and sales will encourage alcohol and tobacco use.	The sale and distribution of samples of tobacco and alcohol products not prohibited.		The sale and distribution of samples of tobacco and alcohol products prohibited.	All of the previous conditions AND show some evidence of enforcement of this component.		

Fidelity Measure for Prohibition of Alcohol or Tobacco Sponsorship of Public Events

Core Activity	Rationale	Missing 0	Weak Fidelity 1	Moderate Fidelity 2	Strong Fidelity 3	Comments <i>(Use this space to indicate why a core activity was not appropriate for your community or why the highest implementation level was not possible.)</i>	Rating
Prohibits tobacco and alcohol ads in programs.(I-C)	Displays and advertising may encourage tobacco and alcohol use.	Tobacco and alcohol ads in programs not prohibited.		Tobacco and alcohol ads in programs prohibited.	All of the previous conditions AND show some evidence of enforcement of this component.		
Keeps events free of any mention of tobacco or alcohol companies.(I-C)	Displays and advertising may encourage tobacco and alcohol use.	Events are not kept free of any mention of tobacco or alcohol companies.		Events are kept free of any mention of tobacco or alcohol companies.	All of the previous conditions AND show some evidence of enforcement of this component.		
Identify sources of funding to ensure that publicity and enforcement of the policy can continue.(I-A)	This strategy will be most effective if it is an ongoing activity and not just a one-shot activity. Working to secure funding for publicity and enforcement will ensure that this prevention effort is continued.	No sources of funding have been identified.	Some additional sources of funding have been identified.		Enough funding has been obtained to ensure continued publicity, monitoring, and enforcement of this policy.		
Additional Core Activities - Please describe and provide potential fidelity measure scores: (I-A)							
Additional Core Activities - Please describe and provide potential fidelity measure scores:(I-A)							
Sources: Public Health Institute, Technical Assistance Legal Center. (6-24-2003). Model Policy for Motor Sports: Prohibiting Tobacco Sponsorship. http://talc.phlaw.org/pdf_files/0004.pdf ---Public Health Institute, Technical Assistance Legal Center. (6-24-2003). Model Policy for Rodeos: Prohibiting Tobacco Sponsorship. http://talc.phlaw.org/pdf_files/0003.pdf							#DIV/0!

Fidelity Measure for Media Advocacy

Core Activity	Rationale	Missing	Weak Fidelity	Moderate Fidelity	Strong Fidelity	Comments	Rating
		0	1	2	3	<i>(Use this space to indicate why a core activity was not appropriate for your community or why the highest implementation level was not possible.)</i>	
Get to know media contacts. (O-KP)	Building relationships with news reporters is essential to any media advocacy effort. Developing a media contact list is an important step to enhance an organization's ability to contact reporters when an important news event develops. Contacting local reporters with newsworthy stories will help build a reciprocal working relationship and increase an organization's credibility as a good source of	Media contacts not identified.	Media contact list developed.	Organization contacts media with potential stories once or more per year.	Media contacts organization for information on stories.		
Monitor the media, including: 1) alcohol and tobacco industry ads; 2) research reports on ATOD; and 3) local news stories. (P-R)	Monitoring multiple types of news stories will increase the chances of identifying a news story that can serve as a springboard for an organization's issue.	Media not monitored.	Monitors 1 of the types of media described.	Monitors 2 of the types of media described.	Monitors all 3 of the types of media described.		
Frame the issue. Are you able to communicate the following 3 components: 1) describing the issue at hand; 2) describing what you want to change and what to do to change the issue; and 3) knowing who can make the change (understanding your target). This is known as the issue, the solution, and who can make the change. (I-A)	Clearly and concisely framing the issue is the key to successful media advocacy. Strong messages describe the issue, the solution, and the target audiences of the message.	Issue did not address framing components.	Only addresses 1 of the 3 components.	Only addresses 2 of the 3 components.	Addresses all 3 components.		
Stay on message by keeping to the 3 framing components and repeat them if time permits.(I-A)	Repeating the same message is essential to building a consistent, memorable message. Deviating from the 3 framing components may cause confusion and diminish media focus on the key issues.	Message did not contain framing components.	Message includes extraneous information than the 3 framing components.	Message only includes 3 framing components.	Message includes 3 framing components and repeats key issue.		
Message linked to issues in public consciousness. (I-C)	It is easier to gain media attention when the message is linked to an issue that the public is already concerned about.	Message not linked to issues.			Message linked to issues.		
Use local statistics to tell story, when available. Otherwise, use state data.(I-A)	It is easier to gain the media's attention when local statistics are used to tell a story. News reporters (and the public) find news stories that contain local statistics more interesting because they reveal the scope of the issue at the local level.	No data used to tell story.			Local (or state, if no local data available) data used to tell story.		
Additional Core Activities - Please describe and provide potential fidelity measure scores:(I-A)							
Additional Core Activities - Please describe and provide potential fidelity measure scores: (I-A)							
Sources: The Marin Institute. (2006). Media Advocacy Action Pack. (7-27-2006). http://www.marininstitute.org/action_packs/media_advocacy.htm ---Wilbur, P. M. and Stewart, K. (1999). Strategic Media Advocacy for Enforcement of Underage Drinking Laws. Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation in support of the OJIDP Enforcing the Underage Drinking Laws Program. http://prev.org/documents/mediaadvocacy.pdf							#DIV/0!

Fidelity Measure for Graduated Licensing

Core Activity	Rationale	Missing 0	Weak Fidelity 1	Moderate Fidelity 2	Strong Fidelity 3	Comments <i>(Use this space to indicate why a core activity was not appropriate for your community or why the highest implementation level was not possible.)</i>	Rating
Make an informed decision about whether you need support from the local or state level. <i>Graduated licensing is almost always a state law and, as such, any advocacy work should be targeted at the state level.</i> (P-R)	*This activity is not included in the article about graduated licensing. A first step is to decide which level is the most appropriate to bring about change. This decision should be based on: 1) research on the current status of state and local laws; and 2) communications with potential supporters at both levels.	No decision made about level of support needed.	Decision made, but only researched current laws or communicated with potential supporters, but not both.		Decision made based on both research on the status of current laws and communications with potential supporters at both levels.		
Work to build support for the policy within the community. <i>(Note: Each community will identify different activities necessary to build support.)</i> (P-KP)	*This activity is not included in the article about graduated licensing. Gathering support for a policy helps ensure there is enough interest to get the policy passed.	Potential supporters were not identified.	Supporters were identified, but did not include key decision makers, individuals, or organizations.		Supporters were identified and included key decision makers, individuals, and organizations.		
Implement a law for a graduated licensure program meeting criteria as set forth in the Transportation Equity Act for the 21 st Century (HR 2400), and include the following 5 components: <i>(Note: Implementation of the policy means it was adopted/enacted as an organizational, local or state law, policy, ordinance, regulation, etc., that is documented and available to the public. (I-A)</i>		Not adopted	Adopted with modified and weaker specifications		Adopted as proposed		
1) Creates a three tiered permit system, with a learner's permit (stage 1), intermediate license (stage 2), and final stage with no additional restrictions (stage 3). (I-C)	Young drivers are given the opportunity to improve their driving skills in a safer and more controlled environment.	No tiered permit system created.	A tiered permit system is created, but only includes 2 tiers.	The permit system includes 3 or more tiers of licensing.	All of the previous conditions AND show some evidence of enforcement of this component.		
2) Prohibits stage 1 permit holders from driving without a licensed driver over age 21. (I-C)	An older licensed driver can supervise driving behavior.	The permit system does not prohibit stage 1 permit holders from driving without a licensed driver over age 21.		The permit system prohibits stage 1 permit holders from driving without a licensed driver over age 21.	All of the previous conditions AND show some evidence of enforcement of this component.		
3) Prohibits stage 2 permit holders from driving without a licensed driver over age 21 during nighttime hours. (I-C)	States with nighttime driving restrictions show crash reductions up to 60 percent during restricted hours.	The permit system does not prohibit stage 2 permit holders from driving without a licensed driver over age 21 during nighttime hours.		The permit system prohibits stage 2 permit holders from driving without a licensed driver over age 21 during nighttime hours.	All of the previous conditions AND show some evidence of enforcement of this component.		
4) Requires stage 1 and 2 permit holders to follow seat belt and zero tolerance laws. (I-C)	In 2002, 65 percent of youth who died in passenger vehicles were not wearing safety belts and 23 percent who were involved in fatal crashes had been drinking.	The permit system does not require stage 1 and 2 permit holders to follow seat belt and zero tolerance laws.		The permit system requires stage 1 and 2 permit holders to follow seat belt and zero tolerance laws.	All of the previous conditions AND show some evidence of enforcement of this component.		

Fidelity Measure for Graduated Licensing

Core Activity	Rationale	Missing 0	Weak Fidelity 1	Moderate Fidelity 2	Strong Fidelity 3	Comments <i>(Use this space to indicate why a core activity was not appropriate for your community or why the highest implementation level was not possible.)</i>	Rating
5) Ensures the 3 types of permits are distinguishable. (I-C)	Clear differences will allow police to easily identify the type of license.	The 3 types of permits are not distinguishable.		The 3 types of permits are distinguishable.	All of the previous conditions AND show some evidence of enforcement of this component.		
Additional Core Activities - Please describe and provide potential fidelity measure scores: (I-A)							
Additional Core Activities - Please describe and provide potential fidelity measure scores: (I-A)							
<small>Source: U.S. Department of Transportation, N. H. T. S. A. (2004). Graduated Driver Licensing System. (8-2-2006). http://www.nhtsa.dot.gov/people/injury/new-fact-sheet03/GraduatedDriver.pdf</small>							#DIV/0!

Fidelity Measure for an Administrative License Revocation for Impaired Drivers

Core Activity	Rationale	Missing 0	Weak Fidelity 1	Strong Fidelity 3	Comments <i>(Use this space to indicate why a core activity was not appropriate for your community or why the highest implementation level was not possible.)</i>	Rating
Make an informed decision about whether you need support from the local or state level. <i>An administrative license revocation is implemented at the state level and is different than criminal proceedings and penalties. As such, any advocacy work should be targeted at the state level.</i> (P-R)	*This activity is not included in the article about graduated licensing. A first step is to decide which level is the most appropriate to bring about change. This decision should be based on: 1) research on the current status of state and local laws and administrative rulings; and 2) communications with potential supporters	No decision made about level of support needed.	Decision made, but only researched current laws or communicated with potential supporters, but not both.	Decision made based on both research on the status of current laws and communications with potential supporters at both levels.		
Work to build support for the policy within the community. <i>(Note: Each community will identify different activities necessary to build support.)</i> (P-KP)	*This activity is not included in the article about graduated licensing. Gathering support for a policy helps ensure there is enough interest to get the policy passed.	Potential supporters were not identified.	Supporters were identified, but did not include key decision makers, individuals, or organizations.	Supporters were identified and included key decision makers, individuals, and organizations.		
Utilize the media to increase awareness and gain support. (I-A)	For laws to be effective, publicity is an important factor because drivers must know and understand the consequences of their actions.	Media not utilized.	Limited use of the media to publicize activities.	Media actively used to publicize activities and gain awareness on a regular, on-going basis.		
Implement an administrative action to revoke the license of impaired drivers that includes the following 8 components: <i>(Note: Implementation of the policy means it was adopted/enacted as an organizational, local or state law, policy, ordinance, regulation, etc., that is documented and available to the public.</i> (I-A)		Not adopted	Adopted with modified and weaker specifications	Adopted as proposed		
1) Language of the administrative ruling should be consistent with provisions of the State's administrative procedures acts. (I-C)	Legislation consistent with administrative procedures acts will ensure consistent enforcement of the law.	Language of the administrative license revocation is not consistent with the State's administrative procedures acts.		Language of the administrative license revocation is consistent with the State's administrative procedures acts.		
2) Language of the administrative ruling should include a provision that the arresting officer, at the time of arrest, should: 1) serve the notice of revocation (suspension); 2) take the offender's license; and 3) issue a temporary permit. (I-C)	The law needs to be adhered to, and following protocol helps to ensure the proper penalty is being applied and in a timely fashion.	Language of the administrative ruling does not address the actions the arresting officer should take.	Language of the administrative ruling addresses 1 or 2 of the actions the arresting officer should take.	Language of the administrative ruling addresses all 3 of the actions the arresting officer should take.		
3) The driver should have the opportunity for an administrative hearing and the hearing should not be allowed to delay the revocation. (I-C)	As in any arrest, an offender has the right to defend oneself, if he/she chooses to do so.	The driver does not have the opportunity for an administrative hearing.	The driver has the opportunity for an administrative hearing, but the hearing delays the revocation.	The driver has the opportunity for an administrative hearing and the hearing is not allowed to delay the revocation.		
4) The initial administrative revocation for test failure should be at least 90 days with full revocation for 30 days, followed by at least 60 days of restricted driving. (I-C)	If the penalties are not strict enough, offenders will continue to commit the same offenses without fear of the consequences.	The law does not specify a certain number of days for the license revocation.	The law specifies a number of days for the full revocation, but not for restricted driving.	The law specifies at least 90 days revocation, with full revocation for 30 days, followed by at least 60 days of restricted driving.		

Fidelity Measure for an Administrative License Revocation for Impaired Drivers

Core Activity	Rationale	Missing 0	Weak Fidelity 1	Strong Fidelity 3	Comments <i>(Use this space to indicate why a core activity was not appropriate for your community or why the highest implementation level was not possible.)</i>	Rating
5) The initial revocation for a test refusal should be a full 90 days, with no restricted driving privileges. (I-C)	If the penalties are not strict enough, offenders will continue to commit the same offenses without fear of the consequences.	The law does not specify penalties for refusing a sobriety test.	The law specifies penalties for refusing a sobriety test, but the penalty is less than the penalty for failing the sobriety test.	The law specifies that for refusing a sobriety test, the driver's license is revoked for a full 90 days, with no restricted driving privileges.		
6) The offenders, rather than taxpayers, should pay for these programs. (I-C)	If the penalties are not strict enough, offenders will continue to commit the same offenses without fear of the consequences.	Payment for these programs is not covered by the offender.		Payment for these programs is covered by the offender.		
7) The administrative sanction should be handled separately from the criminal proceeding. (I-C)	The outcome of the administrative action should have no bearing on the criminal proceedings, including sanctions.	The administrative sanction is handled with the criminal proceedings.		The administrative sanction is handled separately from the criminal proceedings.		
Additional Core Activities - Please describe and provide potential fidelity measure scores: (I-A)						
Additional Core Activities- Please describe and provide potential fidelity measure scores: (I-A)						
Source: U.S. Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. (2003). Administrative License Revocation (Suspension). (8-3-2006). http://www.nhtsa.dot.gov/people/injury/New-fact-sheet03/AdminLicenseRevocn.pdf						#DIV/0!

Fidelity Measure for Increase Price Or Taxes on Alcohol or Tobacco

Core Activity	Rationale	Missing 0	Weak Fidelity 1	Strong Fidelity 3	Comments <i>(Use this space to indicate why a core activity was not appropriate for your community or why the highest implementation level was not possible.)</i>	Rating
Consult with supporters of successfully developed initiatives. (P-R)	These supporters can provide valuable advice about how to proceed and what pitfalls to avoid.	No one from any successfully developed price/tax initiatives was consulted.		Consulted with those who have successfully developed price/tax initiatives.		
Build a coalition of organizations concerned about children and the public's health. (I-A)	Promotes strong public support.	No coalition of organizations concerned about children and the public's health was built.	A coalition was built, but did not include key individuals or organizations.	A coalition of organizations concerned about children and the public's health was built and included key individuals and organizations.		
Pay for good polling to assess the level of community support behind the specific wording of a referendum or bill to increase taxes. (I-A)	Ensures the wording of a proposal clearly states a supportable message.	Did not invest in good polling before starting the initiative.	Relied on non-paid polling.	Invested in good polling before starting the initiative.		
Provide talking points for supporters to use when discussing price or tax increases for alcohol and tobacco. (I-C)	A unified message ensures key points are communicated and helps build strong public support.	Talking points were not created.	Talking points were created, but not all supporters used the talking points when communicating with the public.	Talking points were created AND all supporters use them when communicating with the public.		
Identify and work with legislators who will actively support pricing changes. (P-KP)	Pricing and tax changes need the support of legislators who will be able to implement the change.	No legislators have been identified.	Legislators have been identified, but are not yet committed.	Legislators have been identified and have indicated they will support price/tax changes for alcohol and/or tobacco.		
Identify all potential enemies and be prepared to confront their arguments with prepared responses based on research and reliable data. (P-R)	Opponents of tax increases typically raise 4 objections focusing on: negative effects of an increase on current levels of tax revenues; cost to users; possible job losses associated with reduced consumption; and the fact that products available via the Internet escape the same tax burden.	Potential opponents of the initiative were not identified.	Potential enemies were identified, but responses to their potential arguments were not prepared or were not based on research/data.	Potential enemies against the initiative were identified and responses were prepared to confront their potential arguments using research and reliable data.		

Fidelity Measure for Increase Price Or Taxes on Alcohol or Tobacco

Core Activity	Rationale	Missing 0	Weak Fidelity 1	Strong Fidelity 3	Comments <i>(Use this space to indicate why a core activity was not appropriate for your community or why the highest implementation level was not possible.)</i>	Rating
Work to develop a bill specifying that most of the revenue generated from the increase would be utilized for services to improve public health, public safety, or other socially desirable activities. (I-A)	Using the funding for the public good can increase public support of increases in price or taxes.	Did not work to include component of a bill specifying that the revenue would be used for improving public health, public safety, or other activities towards the public good.		Worked to include component of a bill specifying that the revenue would be used for improving public health, public safety, or other activities towards the public good.		
Work to increase interstate cooperation on prices by contacting neighboring states for cooperation and involvement. (I-A)	Neighboring states should be encouraged to work together to increase taxes to diminish the lure of interstate sales to individuals. This can be important in areas where several states come together, such as Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas; or Maryland, Virginia, and Washington, D.C.	Neighboring states have not been contacted.		Neighboring states have been contacted and are working together.		
Require licensing of tobacco retailers, similar to alcohol retailers. (I-A)	Licensing helps ensure law enforcement and tobacco control agencies are able to track the sale of tobacco products.	Licensing of tobacco retailers is not required.		Licensing of tobacco retailers is required.		
Additional Core Activities - Please describe and provide potential fidelity measure scores: (I-A)						
Additional Core Activities - Please describe and provide potential fidelity measure scores: (I-A)						

Source: Leverett, M., Ashe, M., Gerard, S., Jenson, J., and Woollery, T. (2002). Tobacco use: the impact of prices. J Law Med Ethics, 30, 88-95.

#DIV/0!

Fidelity Measure for Compliance Checks

Core Activity	Rationale	Missing 0	Weak Fidelity 1	Strong Fidelity 3	Comments <i>(Use this space to indicate why a core activity was not appropriate for your community or why the highest implementation level was not possible.)</i>	Rating
Determine if any laws in your state require involvement of law enforcement in compliance checks. (P-R)	In some states, it is illegal to conduct compliance checks without law enforcement. Communities implementing a compliance check strategy need to determine if law enforcement officials are required to participate in compliance checks.	Did not find out if law enforcement is required for compliance checks or not.		Determined if law enforcement is required to be involved in compliance checks.		
Decide if compliance checks are for data collection purposes or will also include law enforcement. (P-R)	The manner in which a compliance check is conducted varies depending on whether the purpose is strictly for data collection or if it will also include law enforcement. Deciding this early in the implementation process will ensure a successful intervention.	No decision was made as to purpose of compliance checks.		Decision was made as to purpose of compliance checks.		
Identify law enforcement officers to participate in the program. (If law enforcement purpose is decided.) (P-KP)	Selecting officers who are interested in this type of specialized work may lead to a more successful intervention.	Law enforcement officers are not identified to participate in the program.	Law enforcement officers are identified to participate in the program.	Law enforcement officers with a specific interest in alcohol or tobacco prevention are identified to participate in the program.		
Develop a written protocol for selecting retailer sites. Selection may be based on random selection, stratified selection within a region, based on type of outlet, or another selection strategy. (I-A)	A written site selection policy will help ensure sites are selected fairly and certain types of retailers or locations are not targeted for compliance checks.	No written protocol is developed for selecting retailer sites for compliance checks.		A written protocol is developed for selecting retailer sites for compliance checks.		
Review plan with prosecutors, licensing officers, and city/town council/board. (I-A)	In order for compliance checks to be successful, a community must have the full support of those involved in the process, including those who will be prosecuting the offenders, those who work with the alcohol and tobacco retailers, and those elected officials who are responsible for implementing policy.	The plan is not reviewed with prosecutors, licensing officers, or city/town council/board members.	The plan is reviewed with 1 of the individuals/groups listed, but not all.	The plan is reviewed with 2 or more of the individuals/groups listed.		
Utilize the media to provide prior notice to the community about upcoming enforcement tactics. (I-A)	Although one goal of compliance checks is to either collect data or hold those responsible for selling alcohol and tobacco to underage youth, another goal is publicizing the law and penalties for selling to minors. The threat of compliance checks can often be enough to encourage responsible behavior among retailers.	The community is not notified by the media about the upcoming enforcement tactics.		The community is notified by the media of upcoming enforcement tactics.		
Recruit underage youth to conduct the activity. (I-A)	Research indicates that buyers age 18 to 19 for alcohol and 14 to 17 for tobacco are ideal. In addition, buyers should not try to appear older. They should look and act like a typical underage youth. In addition, research indicates that paid buyers may be more successful than volunteers, especially if retailers will be prosecuted. Paid buyers are more able to commit to time in court, and are not viewed as having an agenda, as volunteers might.	Underage youth are not recruited for the activity.		Underage youth are recruited for the activity.		
Train buyers and law enforcement or lay escorts. (I-A)	Trained buyers and escorts (either law enforcement or lay) will be better able to deal with any challenges. In addition, trained individuals who follow a written compliance check protocol are more credible. This credibility is important in reporting data or in prosecuting retailers.	No training is conducted for buyers, law enforcement, or lay escorts.	Compliance check participants are provided with written material to review as their training.	In-person training by a qualified trainer is conducted for buyers, law enforcement, and lay escorts.		
Prepare site packets. (I-A)	Documenting logistics of the compliance check ensures each compliance check is implemented the same way every time.	Site packets not prepared.		Site packets prepared.		

Fidelity Measure for Compliance Checks

Core Activity	Rationale	Missing	Weak Fidelity	Strong Fidelity	Comments <i>(Use this space to indicate why a core activity was not appropriate for your community or why the highest implementation level was not possible.)</i>	Rating
		0	1	3		
Plan routes.		Routes not planned.		Routes planned.		
Obtain/prepare evidence containers. (I-A)		Evidence containers not obtained/prepared.		Evidence containers obtained/prepared.		
Prepare written reports/documents. (I-A)	Documentation of findings of the compliance check is important. Formal documentation will ensure credibility and reliability in reporting data or in prosecuting retailers.	Written reports/documents not prepared.		Written reports/documents prepared.		
Submit written reports/documents.	Formal documentation of findings must be submitted to the proper individuals to ensure they are used.	Written reports/documents not submitted.		Written reports/documents submitted.		
Communicate findings with businesses and community.	If findings from the compliance checks are positive, then it benefits the retailers and community to publicize those results to encourage continued compliance. If the results were not positive, these findings need to be publicized to help ensure retailers understand the importance of complying with laws and regulations about selling alcohol and tobacco to minors and there are consequences if they do not follow these laws and regulations.	Findings not communicated to businesses and community.		Findings communicated to businesses and community.		
Work to ensure institutionalization of this strategy by: 1) developing an organizational policy that can be adopted by participating organizations OR formalizing the strategy into a local or state law or regulation; and 2) identifying sources of funding to ensure the strategy and enforcement of the strategy can continue. (I-A)	This strategy will be most effective if it is an ongoing activity and not just a one-shot activity. Working to ensure the strategy is institutionalized will ensure this prevention effort is continued.	Have not worked to ensure institutionalization of the strategy.	Only addressed 1 aspect of institutionalization.	Addressed both aspects of institutionalization.		
Additional Core Activities - Please describe and provide potential fidelity measure scores:						
Additional Core Activities - Please describe and provide potential fidelity measure scores: (I-A)						

Sources: Alcohol Epidemiology Program (2000). Alcohol compliance checks: A procedures manual for enforcing alcohol age-of-sale laws. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota. <http://www.epi.umn.edu/alcohol/manual/manual.pdf> --- Grube, J. W. and Stewart, K. (1999). Guide to Conducting Alcohol Purchase Surveys. The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention and the Underage Drinking Enforcement Training Center. <http://www.udetc.org/documents/purchase.pdf> --- Natanblut, S. L., Mital, M., and Zeller, M. R. (2001). The FDA's enforcement of age restrictions on the sale of cigarettes and smokeless tobacco. J Public Health Manag. Pract., 7, 1-10. --- National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation. (2001). Community How to Guide On Enforcement (Rep. No. DOT HS 809 209). National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation. http://www.nhtsa.dot.gov/people/injury/alcohol/Community%20Guides%20HTML/Book5_Enforcement.html ---University of Minnesota Alcohol Epidemiology Program. (1-6-2006). Compliance Checks. <http://www.epi.umn.edu/alcohol/policy/compchks.shtm> ---Washington State Department of Health (2006). Tobacco Compliance Check Guidelines. <http://www.doh.wa.gov/tobacco/compliance/ProtocolFinal.pdf> ---Willingham, M. Reducing Alcohol Sales to Underage Purchasers: A Practical Guide to Compliance Investigations. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, C

#DIV/0!

Fidelity Measure for Party Patrols

Core Activity	Rationale	Missing 0	Weak Fidelity 1	Strong Fidelity 3	Comments <i>(Use this space to indicate why a core activity was not appropriate for your community or why the highest implementation level was not possible.)</i>	Rating
Establish a relationship with the agency that has primary responsibility for responding to calls for parties. (P-KP)	Learning how law enforcement agencies are structured and how they operate helps in the development of realistic strategies they can employ.	Relationship with law enforcement agency not established.		Relationship with law enforcement agency established.		
Establish a relationship with an Alcohol Unit with law enforcement if appropriate. (See Alcohol Unit strategy). (P=KP)	Establishing a relationship with an Alcohol Unit will ensure those who are specially trained in dealing with alcohol violations are involved in the activity.	No relationship with Alcohol Unit established.		Relationship with Alcohol Unit established.		
Establish a relationship with high schools and a local college or university, if appropriate. (P-KP)	* This core activity was not identified in the literature, but was recommended for inclusion by experts in the field. High school and college students may engage in underage drinking at parties in residential homes. It is helpful to establish a relationship with the schools and colleges in your community to ensure open communication between all involved.	No relationship with high schools, college or university established.		Relationship with high schools, college or university was established.		
Create a "party buster hotline" so that people may report information on underage drinking parties and publicize the hotline. (I-A)	A hotline will allow for improved prevention of underage drinking parties.	Party buster hotline not established.	Party buster hotline established.	Party buster hotline established and is publicized in the community.		
Establish procedures for controlled dispersal that include: surveillance, traffic monitoring, scene security, and processing and training officers in following the procedures.(I-C)	A clear plan will allow for a safe and orderly party dispersal.	No controlled dispersal procedures developed.	Controlled dispersal procedures developed, but are not documented and/or officers are not trained in the procedures.	Controlled dispersal procedures developed and documented and officers are trained in the procedures.		
Establish an alcohol citation database to track the number and type of alcohol citations issued.(I-A)	A database allows communities to determine if specific areas are having more trouble with underage drinking parties than others so they may be targeted for additional enforcement and prevention.	Alcohol citation database not created.	Alcohol citation database created, but citations not entered regularly, or in a timely manner.	Alcohol citation database created, and citations entered regularly and in a timely manner.		

