



PACIFIC INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

SUSTAINABILITY READINESS EVALUATION GUIDE

2019

Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation – Louisville Center
401 West Main Street
Suite 2100
Louisville, KY 40202
Contact: David Collins (502) 238-7338

David Collins, Ph.D.
Knowlton Johnson, Ph.D.
Steve Shamblen, Ph.D.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
External Evaluator	1
Overview of Evaluation.....	1
Measures.....	2
Instrument.....	6
Data Collection	6
Data Preparation and Analysis	7
Reporting.....	10
Appendix A: Readiness Survey	12
Appendix B: Readiness Survey Addendum: Intentions to Sustain EBPI	15
Appendix C: Sustainability Readiness Outcomes Report for Sustainability Readiness Questions 2 & 9	20
Appendix D: Six-Month Follow-Up Report for Sustainability Readiness Question 11	23

Introduction

PIRE's Prevention Sustainability Readiness Strategy for Substance Abuse Prevention will be implemented by sustainability workgroups within organizations that are working to sustain EBPIs (evidence-based prevention interventions). We refer to these organizations as "EBPI implementing organizations". Within the EBPI implementing organizations, the sustainability workgroups will be convened by a sustainability leadership committee. A key document used by the sustainability workgroups is the *Sustainability Readiness Strategy for Substance Abuse Prevention Toolkit (2019)*.

The sustainability strategy support system consists of Excel tools, training and technical assistance (TTA), and evaluation. This document is designed to guide the external evaluator's activities that make up part of the sustainability strategy support system. The Training and Technical Assistance Guide provides details on the provision of TTA. The external evaluator shall read the entire Toolkit before using this Evaluation Guide.

The Sustainability Toolkit uses 11 Sustainability Readiness Questions that are based on the evidence-based Getting to Outcomes process that has been used successfully in substance abuse prevention and other areas. Three of the toolkit questions use results that stem from the external evaluator's activities that are described in detail in this guide. These questions are:

- Sustainability Readiness Question 2: What EBPI implementing organization infrastructure and membership advocacy must be assessed to determine if the sustainability strategy is possible? (PRE-READINESS ASSESSMENT)
- Sustainability Readiness Question 9: How well did the sustainability plan achieve sustainability readiness? (POST-READINESS ASSESSMENT)
- Sustainability Readiness Question 11: Six months later, what is the level of EBPI sustainability readiness and intentions following implementation of the readiness strategy (SIX-MONTH FOLLOW-UP)

Next, we describe the skills and experience that are required for the external evaluator to implement the evaluation activities described in this Evaluation Guide.

External Evaluator

The external evaluator must have skills and experience in quantitative data analysis. The evaluator should have the ability to use Microsoft Excel or a statistical analysis package (e.g., SPSS, SAS) to enter and analyze data and produce reports. It is very important that data quality checks be conducted when entering data, and that the data be cleaned and reviewed carefully (e.g., checked for missing values and out-of-range values) prior to analyzing the data and producing reports. The following sections of this guide are an Overview, followed by sections on Measures, Instruments, Data Collection, Data Preparation, Analysis and Reporting.

Overview of Evaluation

The external evaluator shall collect data using a Readiness Survey (including an addendum to the survey for Questions 2 and 11 that measures intentions to sustain an EBPI) from members of the EBPI implementing organization's sustainability leadership committee, analyze the results, and provide

reports to the sustainability workgroups. Results from the Question 2 and Question 9 reports will be entered into Excel tools by the workgroup’s data coordinator. Results related to Question 11 (on readiness and intentions to change) will be presented in a single report produced by the external evaluator.

The following sections describe the Measures, Instrument, Data Collection, Data Preparation, Analysis and Reporting.

Measures

Two sets of measures will be used by the external evaluator: Sustainability Readiness and Intentions to Sustain EBPI. An item-construct dictionary is provided below for each set of measures.

Sustainability Readiness

The readiness measures consist of EBPI implementing organization infrastructure capacity and member advocacy outcomes. There are five infrastructure capacity outcomes (Data Resources, Expertise, Formalization, Funding Resources, and Policies) and two member advocacy outcomes (EBPI Champions and Sustainability Champions).

Table 1. Item-Construct Dictionary for Sustainability Readiness

Data Resources (0=no, 1=yes) (5 items) (<u>Computed as a count of a through e</u>)
1. In the past year, has your EBPI implementing organization had access to ...
a) county-level statistics from archival data that can be used for substance abuse prevention planning?
b) county-level student survey results that can be used for substance abuse prevention planning?
c) county-level household survey results that can be used for substance abuse prevention planning?
d) evaluation results on substance abuse prevention interventions that have been implemented with a specific population or group in your county?
e) State or regional level substance abuse related data?
Expertise (0=poor, 1=fair, 2=good, 3=excellent) (4 items)
2. Please rate your EBPI implementing organization’s current level of expertise for ...
a) obtaining funding for substance abuse prevention programs, policies, or environmental strategies.
b) implementing evidence-based prevention interventions (EBPIs).
c) monitoring the quality of implementation of prevention interventions.
d) continuing EBPIs.
Formalization (0=no, 1=yes) (7 items) (<u>computed as a count of a through g</u>)
3. My EBPI implementing organization currently ...
a) has regularly scheduled meetings.
b) has a standard way to remind members of upcoming meetings or events.
c) has developed written bylaws.
d) has created an organizational chart.

e) has a written policy that defines membership.
f) maintains an up-to-date membership list.
g) provides a standard orientation about the organization to new members.
Funding Resources (0=no, 1=yes) (6 items) <u>(computed as a count of a through f)</u>
4. Does your EBPI implementing organization currently receive ...
a) federal funding (other than substance abuse block grant) that is used to fund prevention interventions?
b) state funding (other than pass-through federal block grant funding) that is used to fund prevention interventions?
c) county, municipal or other local funding that is used to fund prevention interventions?
d) foundation funding that is used to fund prevention interventions?
e) external funding (besides federal, state, local government, or foundation funding) that is used to fund prevention interventions?
f) funding for continuing EBPIs?
Policies (0=no, 1=yes) (3 items) <u>(computed as a count of a through c)</u>
5. Does your EBPI implementing organization currently have a written policy ...
a) specifying that EBPIs be given priority for implementation?
b) for monitoring the quality of implementation of prevention interventions?
c) for supporting continuation of effective EBPIs in your community?
EBPI Champions (0=none, 1=one or two, 2 = 3 or more) (3 items)
6. In the past year, how many EBPI implementing organization members have actively advocated for ...
a) identifying EBPI(s) to meet community needs?
b) implementing EBPIs?
c) monitoring implementation quality of interventions?
Sustainability Champions (0=none, 1=one or two, 2 = 3 or more) (15 items)
7. In the past year, how many EBPI implementing organization members have actively advocated for ...
a) the EBPI's goals and/or objectives being put into writing?
b) the plans or procedures used for implementing this EBPI being put in writing?
c) a schedule (e.g. timetable, plan of action) for implementing EBPI activities being put in writing?
d) the strategies for implementing this EBPI being adapted to fit local circumstances?
e) a formal evaluation of the EBPI being conducted?
f) a supervisor (e.g., section chief, department head) being formally assigned to oversee the EBPI?
g) formalized job descriptions being written for staff involved with this EBPI?
h) evaluation reports of this EBPI being done on a schedule similar to evaluation reports for most other interventions in the EBPI implementing organization?

i) permanent staff being assigned to implement this EBPI?
j) an administrative-level, individual within the EBPI implementing organization being actively involved in advocating for this EBPI's continuation?
k) staff in the EBPI implementing organization, other than those actually implementing the EBPI, actively contributing to the EBPI's operations?
l) the EBPI making a transition from trial or pilot status to permanent status in the EBPI implementing organization?
m) the EBPI being assigned permanent physical space within the EBPI implementing organization?
n) the EBPI having a source of funding similar to the funding sources for other established interventions within the EBPI implementing organization?
o) the staff most closely associated with this EBPI's implementation being hired from a stable funding source?

Intentions to Sustain EBPI

The Intentions to Sustain EBPI measures (to be included in an addendum to the Readiness Survey for Sustainability Readiness Questions 2 and 11) were adapted from the Level of Institutionalization (LoIn) scales for health promotion programs described in Goodman, McLeroy, Steckler, & Hoyle (1993). The item-construct dictionary in Table 2 shows all Intentions to Sustain EBPI items.

Table 2. Item-Construct Dictionary for Intentions to Sustain EBPI

<p>Intentions to Sustain EBPI Coding: 0 = 'No' to Stem and 'No' to (a) 1 = 'No' to Stem, 'Yes' to (a), and 'No' to (b) 2 = 'No' to Stem, 'Yes' to (a), and 'Yes' to (b) 3 = Yes to stem</p>
1. Have the EBPI's goals and/or objectives been put into writing?
a. (If No to stem) Has the EBPI implementing organization discussed putting the EBPI's goals and/or objectives into writing?
b. (If Yes to a) Has the EBPI implementing organization made a decision to put the EBPI's goals and/or objectives into writing?
2. Have any of the plans or procedures used for implementing this EBPI been put in writing?
a. (If No to stem) Has the EBPI implementing organization discussed putting plans or procedures used for implementing this EBPI into writing?
b. (If Yes to a) Has the EBPI implementing organization made a decision to put the plans or procedures used for implementing this EBPI into writing?
3. Has a schedule (e.g. timetable, plan of action) used for implementing EBPI activities been put in writing?
a. (If No to stem) Has the EBPI implementing organization discussed putting the schedule used for implementing EBPI activities into writing?
b. (If Yes to a) Has the EBPI implementing organization made a decision to put the schedule used for implementing EBPI activities into writing?
4. Have the EBPI recommended procedures for implementing this EBPI been adapted to fit local circumstances?

a.	(If No to stem) Has the EBPI implementing organization discussed adapting the EBPI recommended procedures for implementing the EBPI to fit local circumstances?
b.	(If Yes to a) Has the EBPI implementing organization made a decision to adapt the EBPI recommended procedures for implementing the EBPI to fit local circumstances?
5.	Is there a written plan for evaluating or monitoring the EBPI implementation?
a.	(If No to stem) Has the EBPI implementing organization discussed putting a plan for evaluating or monitoring the EBPI into writing?
b.	(If Yes to a) Has the EBPI implementing organization made a decision to put a plan for evaluating or monitoring the EBPI into writing?
6.	Has a supervisor (e.g., section chief, department head) been formally assigned to oversee the EBPI?
a.	(If No to stem) Has the EBPI implementing organization discussed formal assignment of a supervisor to oversee the EBPI?
b.	(If Yes to a) Has the EBPI implementing organization made a decision to formally assign a supervisor to oversee the EBPI?
7.	Have formalized job descriptions been written for staff involved with this EBPI?
a.	(If No to stem) Has the EBPI implementing organization discussed putting plans or procedures used for implementing this EBPI into writing?
b.	(If Yes to a) Has the EBPI implementing organization made a decision to put the plans or procedures used for implementing this EBPI into writing?
8.	Are evaluation reports of this EBPI done on a schedule similar to evaluation reports for most other interventions in the implementing agency?
a.	(If No to stem) Has the EBPI implementing organization discussed putting plans or procedures used for implementing this EBPI into writing?
b.	(If Yes to a) Has the EBPI implementing organization made a decision to put the plans or procedures used for implementing this EBPI into writing?
9.	Have permanent staff been assigned to implement this EBPI?
a.	(If No to stem) Has the EBPI implementing organization discussed putting plans or procedures used for implementing this EBPI into writing?
b.	(If Yes to a) Has the EBPI implementing organization made a decision to put the plans or procedures used for implementing this EBPI into writing?
10.	Has an administrative-level individual within the implementing agency been actively involved in advocating for this EBPI's continuation?
a.	(If No to stem) Has the EBPI implementing organization discussed putting plans or procedures used for implementing this EBPI into writing?
b.	(If Yes to a) Has the EBPI implementing organization made a decision to put the plans or procedures used for implementing this EBPI into writing?
11.	Do staff in the EBPI implementing organization, other than those actually implementing the EBPI, actively contribute to the EBPI's operations?
a.	(If No to stem) Has the EBPI implementing organization discussed putting plans or procedures used for implementing this EBPI into writing?
b.	(If Yes to a) Has the EBPI implementing organization made a decision to put the plans or procedures used for implementing this EBPI into writing?
12.	Has the EBPI made a transition from trial or pilot status to permanent status in the implementing agency?

a. (If No to stem) Has the EBPI implementing organization discussed this EBPI transitioning from trial or pilot status to permanent status?
b. (If Yes to a) Has the EBPI implementing organization made a decision to transition the EBPI from trial or pilot status to permanent status?
13. Has the EBPI been assigned permanent physical space within the implementing agency?
a. (If No to stem) Has the EBPI implementing organization discussed assigning permanent physical space to the EBPI?
b. (If Yes to a) Has the EBPI implementing organization made a decision to assign permanent physical space to the EBPI?
14. Is this EBPI's source of funding similar to the funding sources for other established interventions within the EBPI implementing organization?
a. (If No to stem) Has the EBPI implementing organization discussed implementing funding similar to the funding sources for other established interventions?
b. (If Yes to a) Has the EBPI implementing organization made a decision to implementing funding similar to the funding sources for other established interventions?
15. Is the staff most closely associated with this EBPI's implementation hired from a stable funding source?
a. (If No to stem) Has the EBPI implementing organization discussed having the staff most closely associated with this EBPI's implementation hired from a stable funding source?
b. (If Yes to a) Has the EBPI implementing organization made a decision to have the staff most closely associated with this EBPI's implementation hired from a stable funding source?

Instrument

The following describes the survey (plus addendum) that the external evaluator shall use to collect data. The Readiness Survey (see Appendix A) includes the 43 Sustainability Readiness measures described in the Measures section above. The external evaluator shall use the Readiness Survey to collect evaluation data for Sustainability Readiness Questions 2, 9, and 11. The Intentions to Sustain EBPI Addendum to the Readiness Survey (see Appendix B) includes the 15 Intentions to Sustain EBPI measures described in the Measures section above. The external evaluator shall use the Intentions to Sustain EBPI Addendum to the Readiness Survey to collect data for Sustainability Readiness Questions 2 and 11.

Data Collection

The following describes (1) the timeframe for data collection, and (2) the steps to be used by the external evaluator in collecting the data.

Timeframe

The timeframe for collecting data through the Readiness Survey is as follows. It should be noted that the external evaluator will need to ensure that there is sufficient time for follow-up data collection.

- To provide results for the workgroup as they implement Sustainability Readiness Question 2, the external evaluator shall collect data **by Month 2** of the Calendar Snapshot provided in the Introduction of the *Sustainability Readiness Strategy for Substance Abuse Prevention: Toolkit* (Johnson, Collins, Shamblen, & Wandersman, 2019).

- To provide results for the workgroup as they implement Sustainability Readiness Question 9, the external evaluator shall collect data **prior to Month 12** of the Calendar Snapshot provided in the Introduction of the *Sustainability Readiness Strategy for Substance Abuse Prevention: Toolkit* (Johnson, Collins, Shamblen, & Wandersman, 2019).
- To provide results for the workgroup as they implement Sustainability Readiness Question 11, the external evaluator shall collect data **prior to Month 18** of the Calendar Snapshot provided in the Introduction of the *Sustainability Readiness Strategy for Substance Abuse Prevention: Toolkit* (Johnson, Collins, Shamblen, & Wandersman, 2019).

The following data collection steps will be implemented at each of the timeframes shown above:

Data Collection Steps for Sustainability Readiness (Question 2)

1. The workgroup will provide its sustainability leadership committee members' contact information to the external evaluator. The leadership committee will also provide the external evaluator with the name of the committee member who is considered the senior member.
2. The external evaluator will survey the leadership committee membership through a web survey, telephone interview, or in-person survey administration, to assess sustainability readiness and sustainability intentions immediately after the workgroup completes Question 1.

Data Collection Steps for Sustainability Readiness (Question 9)

1. The workgroup will provide its sustainability leadership committee members' contact information to the external evaluator. As for Sustainability Readiness Question 2, the leadership committee will again provide the external evaluator with the name of the committee member who is considered the senior member.
2. The external evaluator will survey the leadership committee membership through a web survey, telephone interview, or in-person survey administration, to assess sustainability readiness.

Data Collection Steps for Sustainability Readiness and Intentions (Question 11)

1. The workgroup will provide its sustainability leadership committee members' contact information to the external evaluator. As for Sustainability Readiness Questions 2 and 9, the leadership committee will again provide the external evaluator with the name of the committee member who is considered the senior member.
2. The external evaluator will survey the sustainability leadership committee membership through a web survey, telephone interview, or in-person survey administration, to assess sustainability readiness and sustainability intentions.

Data Preparation and Analysis

The following steps shall be implemented by the external evaluator to prepare the data and conduct necessary analyses.

Readiness Survey

The following data preparation and analysis steps will be implemented for the Readiness Survey data collected at each of the points in time (see Data Collection section above):

Data Preparation

1. Enter data from the responses for each item in a spreadsheet or data file that allows the evaluator to compute composite variables (a) through counts of specific values based on responses, and (b) by taking the average of responses to survey items that make up a latent variable.
2. Use an ID system in which the committee member who is considered the senior member is assigned a “1” and all other members are assigned higher numbers.
3. Clean the survey data to ensure that there are no out-of-range values.

Analysis

4. Produce frequencies of values for each of the 43 Readiness Survey items. Go into the data file and create a new case (representing the group response) in which you will enter the data to be used for the analysis and reporting. For all variables in which there is some variation in responses, you will use the response that was selected by the majority of the committee members. If there is not a majority that has selected one response, you will need to enter the value that corresponds to the senior member (e.g., the case with an ID of “1”).
5. Save the data file and then save the file with another file name; in the new file, delete all cases except the one that you created (representing the group response) that has values for the response that was selected by the majority OR the response that was selected by the senior member.
6. Using the data file that contains the one case (group response), compute composite variables that are counts of “1” values (which correspond to “Yes” responses) for items that make up the following outcomes: Data Resources, Funding Resources, Formalization, and Policies.
 - a. *The following provides an example for Data Resources.* If the group response values for the five Data Resources items (items 1a through 1e in Table 1) are 1, 1, 0, 0, and 1 (where 1 represents ‘Yes’), compute the count of 1 responses (which is 3).
7. Compute composite variables that are averages (i.e., the mean) for items that make up the following outcomes: Expertise, EBPI Champions, and Sustainability Champions.
 - a. *The following provides an example for Expertise.* If the group response values for the four Expertise items (items 2a through 2d in Table 1) are 1, 2, 2 and 2, compute the average by summing these values and dividing by the number of items (7 divided by 4 = 1.75).
8. Next, for all computed composite variables, compute the percent that the score represents of the highest possible score for that composite variable. For Data Resources, the percent would be 60% (3 divided by 5, which is the maximum possible score). For Expertise, the percent would be 58% (1.75 divided by 3, which is the maximum possible score). (This percent for each of the seven readiness outcomes will be entered into Excel Tools 2 and 9 by the workgroup data coordinator.)
9. Finally, score the adequacy of each composite variable using the following criteria: Not adequate – the percent is in the lower third of the range; Marginally adequate – the percent is in the middle third of the range; Adequate – the percent is in the upper third of the range. Using the Data

Resources example, 3 falls in the middle range (between 1.65 and 3.35, which represent .33 and .67 of the 5-point range). Using the Expertise example, 1.75 falls in the middle range (between 1 and 2, which represent .33 and .67 of the 3-point range).

Analysis

10. Produce a report of the results as described in the Reporting section below.

Addendum for Question 11

The following data preparation and analysis steps will be implemented for the Intentions to Sustain EBPI data that is collected prior to Month 18 (see Data Collection section above):

Data Preparation

1. Enter the response data into an SPSS data entry file.
2. Use an ID system in which the committee member who is considered the senior member is assigned a “1” and all other members are assigned higher numbers.
3. Clean the survey data to ensure that there are no out-of-range values.

Analysis

4. Produce frequencies of values for each of the 45 survey addendum items. Go into the data file and create a new case (representing the group response) in which you will enter the data to be used for the analysis and reporting. For all variables in which there is some variation in responses, you will use the response that was selected by the majority of the committee members. If there is not a majority that has selected one response, you will need to enter the value that corresponds to the senior member (e.g., the case with an ID of “1”).
5. Save the data file and then save the file with another file name; in the new file, delete all cases except the one that you created (representing the group response) that has values for the response that was selected by the majority OR the response that was selected by the senior member.
6. Using the data file that contains the one case (group response), compute scores for each of the 15 stem questions in the Intentions to Sustain EBPI Survey where:

A score of 0 is assigned if the response to the stem and the ‘a’ sub-question are both ‘No’.

A score of 1 is assigned if the response to the stem is ‘No’ and the response to the ‘a’ sub-question is ‘Yes’ but the response to the ‘b’ sub-question is ‘No’.

A score of 2 is assigned if the response to the stem is ‘No’, and the response to the ‘a’ sub-question is ‘Yes’, and the response to the ‘b’ sub-question is ‘Yes’.

A score of 3 is assigned if the response to the stem is ‘Yes’.

7. Next, compute the mean across all 15 questions. This is done by summing the group responses (see step 6 above) to the 15 questions and dividing by 15.
8. Next, compute the percent that the score represents of the highest possible score for intentions. The highest possible score is a 3, which would indicate that according to the group responses, there was a ‘Yes’ response to each of the 15 stem questions.

9. Finally, score the adequacy of each composite variable using the following criteria: Not adequate – the percent is in the lower third of the range; Marginally adequate – the percent is in the middle third of the range; Adequate – the percent is in the upper third of the range.

Analysis

10. Produce a report of the results as described in the Reporting section below.

Reporting

The following steps shall be completed by the external evaluator to produce three reports.

Readiness Outcomes Reports for Question 2 and Question 9

The external evaluator will prepare brief reports for Questions 2 and 9 that show the readiness survey results (the percentage of the highest score possible) for each capacity and advocacy factor. The report will also include the values for each separate item that makes up each capacity and member advocacy score. The workgroup data coordinator will transfer the leadership committee assessment of sustainability capacity and advocacy results (percentage scores) from the brief report into Excel Tool 2: Pre-Readiness (Baseline) Assessment Results, and the tool will calculate adequacy scores. The same process is repeated as part of Question 9 with Tool 9: Post-Readiness Assessment Results.

The steps to complete the Sustainability Readiness Outcomes Report for Questions 2 and 9 are as follows. Using the data collected by Month 2 (for Question 2) and prior to Month 12 (for Question 9):

1. Use the report template in Appendix C of this document.
2. Fill in the fields in the Data Collection section for dates of data collection from sustainability leadership committee members.
3. **Produce scores for all survey items and for all composite variables. Remember that the data you will be using will come from the case in the data file that represents the group response (either the majority response or the response of the senior member).**
4. Fill in the scores for all survey items.
5. For all composite variables, fill in the percent that the score represents of the highest possible score.

Six-Month Follow-up Report for Question 11

The external evaluator will prepare a brief report for Question 11 that includes results from pre-assessment, post- assessment, and follow-up for both Readiness and Intentions to Sustain EBPI items. Note that if more than one EBPI was selected for sustainability, the report would include results for each EBPI.

For this report, the external evaluator shall use the template in Appendix D of this document.

Readiness

The steps to complete the Readiness portion of the report are as follows. Using the data from the readiness items collected prior to Month 18:

1. Fill in the fields in the Data Collection section for dates of data collection from sustainability leadership committee members.
2. In Table 1, for each composite variable and each time period (pre- assessment, post- assessment and follow-up), fill in the percent the score represents of the highest possible score.
3. For each composite variable, fill in the computed adequacy level.

Intentions

The steps to complete the Intentions to Sustain portion of the report are as follows. Using the data from the Intentions to Sustain EBPI items collected prior to Month 18:

- 1. Produce scores for all survey items. Remember that the data you will be using will come from the case in the data file that represents the group response (either the majority response or the response of the senior member).**
2. In Table 2, fill in for pre- assessment and follow-up time periods the percent the score represents of the highest possible score for intentions to sustain EBPIs.
3. In Table 2, fill in for pre- assessment and follow-up time periods the adequacy level that the percent represents.

References

- Goodman, R.M., McLeroy, K.R., Steckler, A., Hoyle, R.H. (1993). Development of Level of Institutionalization (LoIn) Scales for Health Promotion Programs. *Health Education Quarterly*, 20 (2), 1993, 161-178.
- Johnson, K., Collins, D., Shamblen, S., & Wandersman, A. (2019). *Sustainability Readiness Strategy for Substance Abuse Prevention: Toolkit*. Louisville, KY: Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation.
- Johnson, K., Collins, D., Shamblen, S., Kenworthy, T., & Wandersman, A. (2017). Long-term sustainability of evidence-based prevention interventions and community coalition survival: A five and one-half year follow-up study. *Prevention Science*, 18(5), 610-621.

Appendix A: Readiness Survey

We'd like to ask you to take a few minutes to complete this brief survey about your EBPI implementing organization that is working to sustain an EBPI. Taking this survey is completely voluntary. Your survey responses and any identifying information contained in the survey will be kept completely confidential. Any responses will only be reported in aggregate.

In this survey, we ask about various types of capacities of the EBPI organization—for example, data resources, expertise, level of formalization, policies and several others. We also ask questions related to evidence-based prevention interventions (or EBPIs). While you may not have complete knowledge related to these capacities of your organization or the degree to which its members advocate for EBPIs, please answer each question as best you can.

Data Resources

1. In the past year, has your EBPI implementing organization had access to...	Yes	No
a. county-level statistics from archival data that can be used for substance abuse prevention planning?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. county-level student survey results that can be used for substance abuse prevention planning?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. county-level household survey results that can be used for substance abuse prevention planning?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. evaluation results on substance abuse prevention interventions that have been implemented with a specific population or group in your county?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e. State or regional level substance abuse related data?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Expertise

2. Please rate your EBPI implementing organization's current level of expertise for...	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
a. obtaining funding for substance abuse prevention programs, policies, or environmental strategies.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. implementing evidence-based prevention interventions (EBPIs).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. monitoring the quality of implementation of prevention interventions.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. continuing EBPIs.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Formalization

3. My EBPI implementing organization currently...	Yes	No
a. has regularly scheduled meetings.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. has a standard way to remind members of upcoming meetings or events.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. has developed written bylaws.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. has created an organizational chart.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e. has a written policy that defines membership.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f. maintains an up-to-date membership list.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
g. provides a standard orientation about the organization to new members.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Funding Resources

4. Does your EBPI implementing organization currently receive...	Yes	No
a. federal funding (other than substance abuse block grant) that is used to fund prevention interventions?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. state funding (other than pass-through federal block grant funding) that is used to fund prevention interventions?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. county, municipal or other local funding that is used to fund prevention interventions?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. foundation funding that is used to fund prevention interventions?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e. external funding (besides federal, state, local government, or foundation funding) that is used to fund prevention interventions?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f. funding for continuing EBPIs?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Policies

5. Does your EBPI implementing organization currently have a written policy...	Yes	No
a. specifying that EBPIs be given priority for implementation?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. for monitoring the quality of implementation of prevention interventions?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. for supporting continuation of effective EBPIs in your community?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

EBPI Champions

6. In the past year, how many EBPI implementing organization members have actively advocated for...	None	One or two	Three or more
a. identifying EBPI(s) to meet community needs?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. implementing EBPIs?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. monitoring implementation quality of interventions?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Sustainability Champions

7. In the past year, how many EBPI implementing organization members have actively advocated for ...	None	One or two	Three or more
a. an EBPI's goals and/or objectives being put into writing?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. the plans or procedures used for implementing an EBPI being put in writing?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. a schedule (e.g. timetable, plan of action) for implementing EBPI activities being put in writing?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. the strategies for implementing an EBPI being adapted to fit local circumstances?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e. a formal evaluation of an EBPI being conducted?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f. a supervisor (e.g., section chief, department head) being formally assigned to oversee an EBPI?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
g. formalized job descriptions being written for staff involved with an EBPI?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Question 7 continues next page...

Sustainability Champions (cont.)

7. In the past year, how many EBPI implementing organization's members have actively advocated for...	None	One or two	Three or more
h. evaluation reports of an EBPI being done on a schedule similar to evaluation reports for most other interventions in your organization?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
i. permanent staff being assigned to implement an EBPI?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
j. an administrative-level, individual within your organization being actively involved in advocating for an EBPI's continuation?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
k. staff in your organization, other than those actually implementing an EBPI, actively contributing to an EBPI's operations?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
l. an EBPI making a transition from trial or pilot status to permanent status in your organization?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
m. an EBPI being assigned permanent physical space within your organization?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
n. an EBPI having a source of funding similar to the funding sources for other established interventions within your organization?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
o. the staff most closely associated with an EBPI's implementation being hired from a stable funding source?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey!

Appendix B: Readiness Survey Addendum: Intentions to Sustain EBPI

The purpose of this survey addendum is to gather additional information about evidence-based prevention interventions (or EBPIs). Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability thinking about [NAME OF EVIDENCE-BASED PREVENTION INTERVENTION].

1. Have the EBPI's goals and/or objectives been put into writing?

No Yes

 → If **Yes**, SKIP to Question 2. If **No**, proceed with Question 1a.

1a. Has your organization discussed putting the EBPI's goals and/or objectives into writing?

No Yes

 → If **No**, SKIP to Question 2. If **Yes**, proceed with Question 1b.

1b. Has your organization made a decision to put the EBPI's goals and/or objectives into writing?

No Yes

2. Have any of the plans or procedures used for implementing this EBPI been put in writing?

No Yes

 → If **Yes**, SKIP to Question 3. If **No**, proceed with Question 2a.

2a. Has your organization discussed putting plans or procedures used for implementing this EBPI into writing?

No Yes

 → If **No**, SKIP to Question 3. If **Yes**, proceed with Question 2b.

2b. Has your organization made a decision to put the plans or procedures used for implementing this EBPI into writing?

No Yes

3. Has a schedule (e.g. timetable, plan of action) used for implementing EBPI activities been put in writing?

No Yes

 → If **Yes**, SKIP to Question 4. If **No**, proceed with Question 3a.

3a. Has your organization discussed putting the schedule used for implementing EBPI activities into writing?

No Yes

 → If **No**, SKIP to Question 4. If **Yes**, proceed with Question 3b.

3b. Has your organization made a decision to put the schedule used for implementing EBPI activities into writing?

No Yes

4. Have the EBPI recommended procedures for implementing this EBPI been adapted to fit local circumstances?

No Yes
 → If **Yes**, SKIP to Question 5. If **No**, proceed with Question 4a.

4a. Has your organization discussed adapting the EBPI recommended procedures for implementing the EBPI to fit local circumstances?

No Yes
 → If **No**, SKIP to Question 5. If **Yes**, proceed with Question 4b.

4b. Has your organization made a decision to adapt the EBPI recommended procedures for implementing the EBPI to fit local circumstances?

No Yes

5. Is there a written plan for evaluating or monitoring the EBPI implementation?

No Yes
 → If **Yes**, SKIP to Question 6. If **No**, proceed with Question 5a.

5a. Has your organization discussed putting a plan for evaluating or monitoring the EBPI into writing?

No Yes
 → If **No**, SKIP to Question 6. If **Yes**, proceed with Question 5b.

5b. Has your organization made a decision to put a plan for evaluating or monitoring the EBPI into writing?

No Yes

6. Has a supervisor (e.g., section chief, department head) been formally assigned to oversee the EBPI?

No Yes
 → If **Yes**, SKIP to Question 7. If **No**, proceed with Question 6a.

6a. Has your organization discussed formal assignment of a supervisor to oversee the EBPI?

No Yes
 → If **No**, SKIP to Question 7. If **Yes**, proceed with Question 6b.

6b. Has your organization made a decision to formally assign a supervisor to oversee the EBPI?

- No Yes

7. Have formalized job descriptions been written for staff involved with this EBPI?

- No Yes
 → If **Yes**, SKIP to Question 8. If **No**, proceed with Question 7a.

7a. Has your organization discussed putting plans or procedures used for implementing this EBPI into writing?

- No Yes
 → If **No**, SKIP to Question 8. If **Yes**, proceed with Question 7b.

7b. Has your organization made a decision to put the plans or procedures used for implementing this EBPI into writing?

- No Yes

8. Are evaluation reports of this EBPI done on a schedule similar to evaluation reports for most other interventions in your organization?

- No Yes
 → If **Yes**, SKIP to Question 9. If **No**, proceed with Question 8a.

8a. Has your organization discussed putting plans or procedures used for implementing this EBPI into writing?

- No Yes
 → If **No**, SKIP to Question 9. If **Yes**, proceed with Question 8b.

8b. Has your organization made a decision to put the plans or procedures used for implementing this EBPI into writing?

- No Yes

9. Have permanent staff been assigned to implement this EBPI?

- No Yes
 → If **Yes**, SKIP to Question 10. If **No**, proceed with Question 9a.

9a. Has your organization discussed putting plans or procedures used for implementing this EBPI into writing?

- No Yes
 → If **No**, SKIP to Question 10. If **Yes**, proceed with Question 9b.

9b. Has your organization made a decision to put the plans or procedures used for implementing this EBPI into writing?

No Yes

10. Has an administrative-level, individual within your organization been actively involved in advocating for this EBPI's continuation?

No Yes
 → If **Yes**, SKIP to Question 11. If **No**, proceed with Question 10a.

10a. Has your organization discussed putting plans or procedures used for implementing this EBPI into writing?

No Yes
 → If **No**, SKIP to Question 11. If **Yes**, proceed with Question 10b.

10b. Has your organization made a decision to put the plans or procedures used for implementing this EBPI into writing?

No Yes

11. Do staff in your organization, other than those actually implementing the EBPI, actively contribute to the EBPI's operations?

No Yes
 → If **Yes**, SKIP to Question 12. If **No**, proceed with Question 11a.

11a. Has your organization discussed putting plans or procedures used for implementing this EBPI into writing?

No Yes
 → If **No**, SKIP to Question 12. If **Yes**, proceed with Question 11b.

11b. Has your organization made a decision to put the plans or procedures used for implementing this EBPI into writing?

No Yes

12. Has the EBPI made a transition from trial or pilot status to permanent status in your organization?

No Yes
 → If **Yes**, SKIP to Question 13. If **No**, proceed with Question 12a.

12a. Has your organization discussed this EBPI transitioning from trial or pilot status to permanent status?

No Yes
 → If **No**, SKIP to Question 13. If **Yes**, proceed with Question 12b.

12b. Has your organization made a decision to transition the EBPI from trial or pilot status to permanent status?

No Yes

13. Has the EBPI been assigned permanent physical space within your organization?

No Yes

→ If **Yes**, SKIP to Question 14. If **No**, proceed with Question 13a.

13a. Has your organization discussed assigning permanent physical space to the EBPI?

No Yes

→ If **No**, SKIP to Question 14. If **Yes**, proceed with Question 13b.

13b. Has your organization made a decision to assign permanent physical space to the EBPI?

No Yes

14. Is this EBPI's source of funding similar to the funding sources for other established interventions within your organization?

No Yes

→ If **Yes**, SKIP to Question 15. If **No**, proceed with Question 14a.

14a. Has your organization discussed implementing funding similar to the funding sources for other established interventions?

No Yes

→ If **No**, SKIP to Question 15. If **Yes**, proceed with Question 14b.

14b. Has your organization made a decision to implementing funding similar to the funding sources for other established interventions?

No Yes

15. Is the staff most closely associated with this EBPI's implementation hired from a stable funding source?

No Yes

→ If **Yes**, you are finished with the survey. If **No**, proceed with Question 15a.

15a. Has your organization discussed having the staff most closely associated with this EBPI's implementation hired from a stable funding source?

No Yes

→ If **No**, SKIP to Question 16. If **Yes**, you are finished with the survey.

15b. Has your organization made a decision to have the staff most closely associated with this EBPI's implementation hired from a stable funding source?

No Yes

Appendix C: Sustainability Readiness Outcomes Report for Sustainability Readiness Questions 2 & 9

Sustainability Readiness Outcomes Report [insert name of EBPI implementing organization]

Instrument and Measures

The Readiness Survey contains items measuring five EBPI implementing organization infrastructure capacity outcomes and two member advocacy outcomes. These same outcomes are assessed in Sustainability Readiness Question 2 and Sustainability Readiness Question 9. These measures are adapted from those included in the Johnson et al., (2017) study of long-term coalition survival and EBPI sustainability. These measures were drawn from prior studies referenced elsewhere in this guide.

- Data Resources (5 items; responses are Yes, No)
- Expertise (4 items; responses are Poor, Fair, Good, Excellent)
- Formalization (7 items; responses are Yes, No)
- Funding Resources (6 items; responses are Yes, No)
- Policies (3 items; responses are Yes, No)
- EBPI Champions (3 items; responses are None, One or Two, Three or More)
- Sustainability Champions (15 items; responses are None, One or Two, Three or More)

Data Collection

The external evaluator obtained contact information for all sustainability leadership committee members. The evaluator then surveyed the leadership committee membership through a web survey, telephone interview, or in-person survey administration, to assess sustainability readiness.

Data Preparation and Analyses

The data from the responses for all survey items were entered in an SPSS data file and the data were cleaned to ensure that there were no out-of-range values. Where there was variation across committee members, we used the data from the senior committee member. We computed composite variables that were counts of “1” values (which correspond to “Yes” responses) for items that made up the following outcomes: Data Resources, Funding Resources, Formalization, and Policies. We computed composite variables that were averages for the following outcomes: Expertise, EBPI Champions, and Sustainability Champions. For the outcomes (composite variables), we computed the percentage of the highest possible score.

Results

Table 1 below presents the responses for the individual survey items. In addition, for each of the seven outcomes, Table 1 shows the percentage of the total possible score that the value represents.

Table 1. EBPI implementing organization infrastructure capacity and member advocacy outcomes (and percent of possible score).

Outcome and Items	Score	Percent of Possible Score
Data Resources		
1. County-level statistics from archival data that can be used for substance abuse prevention planning		
2. County-level student survey results that can be used for substance abuse prevention planning		
3. County-level household survey results that can be used for substance abuse prevention planning		
4. Evaluation results on substance abuse prevention interventions that have been implemented with a specific population or group in your county		
5. State or regional level substance abuse related data		
Expertise		
6. Obtaining funding for substance abuse prevention programs, policies, or environmental strategies		
7. Implementing evidence-based prevention interventions (EBPIs)		
8. Monitoring the quality of implementation of prevention interventions		
9. Continuing EBPIs		
Formalization		
10. Has regularly scheduled meetings		
11. Organization members are reminded in standard ways of upcoming meetings or events		
12. Written bylaws have been developed		
13. An organizational chart has been created		
14. Written policy exists that defines organization membership		
15. An up-to-date membership list is maintained		
16. A standard orientation about the organization is provided to new members		
Funding Resources		
17. Federal funding (other than substance abuse block grant) is used to fund prevention interventions		
18. State funding (other than pass-through federal block grant funding) is used to fund prevention interventions		
19. County, municipal, or other local funding is used to fund prevention interventions		
20. Foundation funding is used to fund prevention interventions		
21. External funding (besides federal, state, local government, or foundation funding) is used to fund prevention interventions		
22. Funding is available for continuing EBPIs		

Outcome and Items	Score	Percent of Possible Score
Policies		
23. Specify that EBPIs be given priority for implementation		
24. Guide the monitoring of prevention interventions implementation quality		
25. Support continuation of effective EBPIs in your community		
EBPI Champions		
26. Identify EBPIs to meet community needs		
27. Implement EBPIs		
28. Monitor implementation quality of interventions		
Sustainability Champions		
29. EBPI goals and/or objectives have been put into writing		
30. Plans or procedures used for implementing EBPIs have been put in writing		
31. A written schedule (e.g., timetable, plan of action) used for implementing EBPI activities has been developed		
32. Strategies for implementing EBPIs has been adapted to fit local circumstances		
33. Formal evaluation of EBPIs has been conducted		
34. A supervisor (e.g., section chief, department head) has been formally assigned to oversee the EBPIs		
35. Formalized job descriptions has been written for staff involved with EBPIs		
36. Evaluation reports of EBPIs have been done on a schedule similar to evaluation reports for most other interventions in your organization		
37. Permanent staff has been assigned to implement EBPIs		
38. An administrative-level individual within your organization has been actively involved in advocating for continuation of EBPIs		
39. Staff in your organization, other than those actually implementing EBPIs, actively contribute to operations		
40. The EBPIs are transitioning from trial or pilot status to permanent status in your organization		
41. EBPIs are assigned permanent physical space within your organization		
42. EBPIs have a source of funding similar to the funding sources for other established interventions within your organization		
43. The staff most closely associated with implementation of EBPIs are financially supported from a stable funding source		

Appendix D: Six-Month Follow-Up Report for Sustainability Readiness Question 11

Six-Month Follow-Up Report Sustainability Readiness & Intentions to Sustain EBPI [insert name of EBPI implementing organization] [insert name of EBPI]

Instrument and Measures

The Readiness Survey, including the Intentions to Sustain EBPI Addendum, as used. The Readiness Survey contains items measuring five EBPI implementing organization infrastructure capacity outcomes and two member advocacy outcomes. These same outcomes are assessed in Sustainability Readiness Question 2 and Sustainability Readiness Question 9. These measures are adapted from those included in the Johnson et al., (2017) study of long-term coalition survival and EBPI sustainability. These measures were drawn from prior studies referenced elsewhere in this guide.

- Data Resources (5 items; responses are Yes, No)
- Expertise (4 items; responses are Poor, Fair, Good, Excellent)
- Formalization (7 items; responses are Yes, No)
- Funding Resources (6 items; responses are Yes, No)
- Policies (3 items; responses are Yes, No)
- EBPI Champions (3 items; responses are None, One or Two, Three or More)
- Sustainability Champions (15 items; responses are None, One or Two, Three or More)

The addendum includes a set of 15 items from the Level of Institutionalization (LoIn) scales for health promotion programs (Goodman, McLeroy, Steckler & Hoyle, 1993). These 15 items form stem questions and we have added two sub-questions for each of the 15. The sub-questions ask whether there have been any discussions related to the topic of the stem question and whether a decision has been made related to the topic of the stem question.

Data Collection

The external evaluator obtained contact information for all sustainability leadership committee members. The evaluator then surveyed the leadership committee membership through a web survey, telephone interview, or in-person survey administration, to assess sustainability readiness.

Data Preparation and Analyses

The data from the responses for all survey items were entered in an SPSS data file and the data were cleaned to ensure that there were no out-of-range values. Where there was variation across committee members, we used the data from the senior committee member. We computed composite variables that were counts of “1” values (which correspond to “Yes” responses) for items that made up the following outcomes: Data Resources, Funding Resources, Formalization, and Policies. We computed composite variables that were averages for the following outcomes: Expertise, EBPI Champions, and Sustainability Champions. For each outcome (composite variable), we computed the percentage of the highest possible score.

For intentions to sustain an EBPI, we coded responses from ‘0’ to ‘3’ for each of 15 stem questions about EBPI sustainability intentions, where a ‘0’ indicates that the EBPI implementing agency has not discussed the indicator of EBPI sustainability intentions, a ‘1’ indicates that the agency has engaged in discussion but has not made a decision, a ‘2’ indicates that the agency has made a decision, and a ‘3’ indicates that the agency has implemented the indicator of sustainability intentions. We then computed the mean across all 15 stem questions by summing the scores and dividing by 15 (number of stem questions). Next, we computed the percentage the mean represented of the possible score. Finally, we computed the adequacy of the percentage where Not adequate – the percent is in the lower third of the range; Marginally adequate – the percent is in the middle third of the range; Adequate – the percent is in the upper third of the range.

Results

Table 1 presents (for pre- assessment, post- assessment, and follow-up) the percent each score represents of the maximum possible score, and the computed adequacy level.

Table 1. Infrastructure capacity and member advocacy (percent of maximum possible score & adequacy level)

Outcome	Pre- Assessment		Post- Assessment		Follow-Up	
	Percent	Adequacy	Percent	Adequacy	Percent	Adequacy
Data Resources						
Expertise						
Formalization						
Funding Resources						
Policies						
EBPI Champions						
Sustainability Champions						

Intentions to Sustain EBPI

Table 2 presents (for pre-assessment and follow-up) the percent that the mean value of intentions to sustain represents of the maximum possible score, and the computed adequacy level.

Table 2. Intentions to Sustain EBPI (percent of maximum possible score & adequacy level)

Outcome	Pre- Assessment		Follow-Up	
	Percent	Adequacy	Percent	Adequacy
Intentions to Sustain EBPI				