



ASSESSMENT OF COMMUNITY READINESS FOR
POLICY-FOCUSED ENVIRONMENTAL PREVENTION

Anchored Grading Scale for POLICY Component

Readiness
Level

Level Description

0 --

Prevention programs comprised primarily of education and information dissemination efforts.
No exposure / awareness of policy-based prevention efforts.

1 --

More action-oriented prevention programs, but still focused on individual behaviors and responsibilities.

2 --

Some recognition that individual-focused prevention efforts not sufficient; preliminary research on policy-focused prevention solutions.
General belief that adequate policies already exist, better enforcement would solve the problem.
Ownership for policy solutions viewed by community as preventionists or project staff by community.
Informal or voluntary policy solutions pursued in lieu of additional formal laws.

3 --

Growing appreciation of policy solutions, but focus on punitive or enforcement policies.
Increased understanding and support of policy solutions through learning about other communities.
Policy selected to address *a specific* problem.
Policy selection based on environmental scan of community, and evidence-based solutions.
Proposed policy solution owned by / lead by individual or small group within community.

4 --

Need for a menu of policy choices (vs single policy) for community consideration recognized.
Policies considered are broadened to include institutional and environmental issues.
What is 'doable' within local political system is considered when making policy recommendations.
Policy proposals championed by community / political leaders.
Policy solutions debated among policy makers and community members.
Cost of implementing policy change, how to do it, and by whom has been defined.
Strategies developed for moving policy changes through political system.

5--

Policies proposed and formally considered. Ordinances / legislative actions pass.
Policy change process is on-going (one policy does not solve problem completely).
Policy solutions (and env prevention) accepted as effective component of overall prevention efforts in the community.



**ASSESSMENT OF COMMUNITY READINESS FOR
POLICY-FOCUSED ENVIRONMENTAL PREVENTION**
Anchored Grading Scale for APPLIED DATA Component

Readiness
Level

Level Description

0 --

No data collected; only anecdotal data about the issue is available.

1 --

Minimal required data collected; usually that required by government agencies (e.g. youth consumption surveys through public school).
Community not aware of or familiar with any data that may be collected.

2 --

Data needs to support policy-focused solution defined by preventionist initially. Expands to include Local Strategy Team discussion and input on data needs for project.
Data collection may occur sporadically or on an ad-hoc basis.
Data collected helps define magnitude of problem in the community.
Data used in media advocacy to increase community awareness of problem.

3 --

Discussion of data needs for project expanded to include evaluator, analysts, etc; now defined for all components of prevention model.
Data now being compiled from various sources / agencies, as needed, and *analyzed centrally* within community.
Some effective but sporadic use of data; used in intentional organizing to support discussions with community policy makers and also used to identify potential policy solutions, not just the problem.

4 --

Focused attention paid to define / refine and collect meaningful outcome and process evaluation data.
Comprehensive *systemic data collection process* in place.
Data used *strategically* on regular basis to support media advocacy, policy work, and intentional organizing.

5--

Effective, systemic use of data is norm for prevention projects.
Effort to define and measure changes in community / cultural norms related to project issue.



**ASSESSMENT OF COMMUNITY READINESS FOR
POLICY-FOCUSED ENVIRONMENTAL PREVENTION**

Anchored Grading Scale for MEDIA ADVOCACY Component

Readiness
Level

Level Description

0 --

No media inputs provided by Local Strategy Team / prevention coalition within the community. Media outlets do not view preventionists or LSTeam members as spokespersons for news related to the issue.
News reporting related to the issue is for sensational value only (e.g. latest celebrity DUI).

1 --

News reporting related to issue is problem-focused only.
Local Strategy Team / coalition utilizes “newsmaking” for announcements of meeting dates and activities.

2 --

Newsmaking has increased but remains episodic and random.
News articles tend to be very broad, general pieces with little local data or relevance.
LSTeam utilizes newsmaking as either a public relations tool with objective of keeping their name visible to the public, or for educational / information dissemination purposes.
Project staff serve as media spokespeople when needed.

3 --

The content of project newsmaking includes both local problem definition and possible policy solutions.
The LSTeam utilizes newsmaking as a tool for getting their issue and potential policy solutions before the public *for discussion and debate*.
While still sporadic, LSTeam utilize well-crafted letters to the editor and feature articles to engage the public.

4 --

LSTeam generates regular newsmaking, using various issue ‘frames’ and ‘foci’ for newsmaking.
Authorship broadened beyond LSTeam membership.
Spokespersons for media events are authentic community voices who have been well-prepared and trained.
LSTeam participates in national and other collaborative newsmaking opportunities.

5--

LS Team generates clear and highly focused newsmaking on a consistent basis, essentially at will.
It is a norm that spokespersons for the LSTeam are well-trained, experienced community voices who consistently stay on message.



ASSESSMENT OF COMMUNITY READINESS FOR
POLICY-FOCUSED ENVIRONMENTAL PREVENTION

Anchored Grading Scale for INTENTIONAL ORGANIZING Component

Readiness
Level

Level Description

0 --

LSTeam is comprised of anyone in the community interested in the issues; objective is to get as many community members involved as possible.
There is no strategy or focus for the LSTeam.

1 --

LSTeam is comprised of representatives from all nonprofits in community.
LSTeam supports individual-focused prevention services or broad mix of approaches.

2 --

LSTeam is comprised of a reasonable mix of community members and nonprofit organizations.
There is increased awareness that individual-focused prevention approach is not sufficient; interest / desire to consider environmental prevention approach.
Research conducted and/or speakers invited on different prevention approaches.
Leadership of LSTeam provided by one or two strong individuals, most likely the preventionist.

3 --

Intentional evaluation of LSTeam membership mix; effort to increase membership to include broader institutional and business representatives.
Polarization among members begins over preferred prevention approach for LSTeam.
Restructure of larger coalition (if exists); and emergence of LSTeam as policy-focused environmental prevention project.
Effective (visible) use of LSTeam members in leadership roles.
Strategic Plan developed based on community specific data.

4 --

Clear objectives for LSTeam work; operating as cohesive group.
Intentional effort by LSTeam to build policy support / alliance with community decision makers as well as key informal community leaders.
Informal community leaders active in LSTeam; Formal community leaders supportive.
LSTeam leadership moves to capable community leaders (from preventionist).
Strategic Plan recognized as fluid and dynamic document; updated and revised as needed.

5--

Regular flow of capable change agents being developed through LSTeam participation.
LSTeam openly and actively critiques and evaluates the internal processes of the group.
LSTeam participates in the analysis and evaluation of the project.



**ASSESSMENT OF COMMUNITY READINESS FOR
POLICY-FOCUSED ENVIRONMENTAL PREVENTION**
Anchored Grading Scale for ENFORCEMENT Component

Readiness
Level

Level Description

0 --

Law Enforcement not included on local prevention coalitions Local Strategy Teams.
Crimes and ‘calls for service’ deemed higher priority; limited / no time to proactively address alcohol-related problems.
No baseline AOD enforcement data; anecdotal data only.

1 --

Enforcement participates on LSTeam but member is lower level representative or school resource officer.
Enforcement resources directed toward individual enforcement efforts (DUI, MIP).
Enforcement data collected is minimum required.

2 --

Enforcement participates on LSTeam but does not integrate group issues/ priorities into Enforcement activities or priorities. Does not share LSTeam issues via standard “Department” communications.
General belief by enforcement that solution is to apply additional resources to existing alcohol-related enforcement efforts.
Intentional increase in collection and sharing of enforcement data.

3 --

Enforcement participation on LSTeam is via high level enforcement staff (ability to make decisions / speak for enforcement department..
LSTeam discussion of broader Enforcement responsibility beyond just individual focused enforcement; community policing or other community program may be initiated.
Enforcement comfortable using enforcement data to make case for change in enforcement policy or practice.
Continued increase in collection and sharing of enforcement data.

4 --

Enforcement participation on LSTeam moves to proactive; activities and focus areas of LSTeam are integrated into daily operations of law enforcement.
Increased enforcement visible to the community.
Enhanced or new individual-focused enforcement strategy implemented.
Enforcement strategies expanded to include focus on contributors to problem not just individuals (e.g., alcohol establishments).
Comparison of baseline enforcement data with other communities; looking for best practices.

5--

Enforcement is integrated into all environmental prevention efforts within the community.
Cop on the street is equally fluent in describing tactics of ‘managing settings’ as he is in ‘controlling and arresting individual’s
Enforcement of formal and informal Enforcement policies are actively monitored on-goingly.