

**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.

**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

**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.

**Table 10: Rubric for Assessing EBPPP Selection Fidelity**

<b>Core Activity</b>	<b>Missing</b>	<b>Weak Fidelity</b>	<b>Moderate Fidelity</b>	<b>Strong Fidelity</b>
	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1.</b> 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
<b>2.</b> 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
<b>3.</b> 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
<b>4.</b> 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
<b>5.</b> 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.
<b>6.</b> 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.

**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?)