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Tribal Personal Responsibility Education Program (PREP)

Overview
APP Program Funding Streams

**State PREP**
- $43,700,632

**Competitive PREP**
- $10,000,000 of available State PREP funding
  - (Florida, Indiana, North Dakota, Texas, Virginia, Guam, American Samoa, Palau, Northern Mariana Islands, Marshall Islands)

**Tribal PREP**
- $3,250,000

**PREP Innovative Strategies (PREIS)**
- $8,200,000

**Title V State Abstinence**
- $50,000,000

**Competitive Abstinence**
- $4,600,000
Funds Tribes’ and Tribal communities’ efforts to develop and implement comprehensive adolescent pregnancy prevention programs

- Number of 2015 Grantees: 15 Tribes/Tribal Organizations
- Grant Duration: 5 years
- FY 2015 Funding: $3.25 million
Gaps in Data

Concerns

• Absence of data to document the needs of Tribal youth for pregnancy prevention and adult preparation subjects

• Gaps in models validated among AI/AN youth:
  – How can grantees adapt existing evidence based programs (EBP)?
  – Can we help identify **culturally appropriate and effective** programs or **promising practices**?
  – What promising or emerging practices can be tailored to address specific needs discovered by local assessments?
Grantee Highlights

• **Intertribal Council of Arizona** adapted *It’s Your Game Keep it Real* for middle school youth to include culturally appropriate images (e.g., Native youth in some of the videos).

• **Riverside San Bernardino County Indian Health** uses *Native STAND* (Students Together Against Negative Decisions), a promising curriculum previously piloted among Native youth.

• **Tewa Women United** is piloting *Discovery Dating* for youth ages 11-14.

• **Mooretown Rancheria of Maidu Indians** is implementing *Project AIM* for youth ages 11-14.
Challenges

- Rural isolation for some grantees adds to challenges (low density of trained professionals, high cost to train)
- Government sequester in past years reduced operating budgets
- Staffing among smaller programs is significantly impacted by turnover
- Absence of prevention curricula designed to serve AI/AN youth
Considerations

- Grantees indicate they valued:
  - Needs assessment planning year
  - Community readiness assessment training
  - Flexibility in operation and in working with Project Officers
  - “Face to face” training and in person TA

- Tribal Organizations may act as early adopters who facilitate diffusion of EBPs among Tribal populations

- Fit and selection: Finding an appropriate intervention or working with developers is a major challenge. Data collection strategies are needed to address this concern.
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Overview of Measures
Three Categories of Performance Measures

• Structure and support for program implementation

• Participant characteristics, perceptions of program experiences, perceptions of program effects

• Attendance, reach, and dosage
Performance Measures Address Multiple Layers

ACYF

GRANTEE

Provider 1
- Program Model A
- Program Model B
- Program Model C
- Participants

Provider 2
- Program Model D
- Participants

Provider 3
- Program Model A
- Program Model D
- Participants

Participants

Model C

Participants
Measures of Structure and Support for Implementation
Measures of Structure and Support for Implementation

- Extent to which grantee or its partners conducted trainings, provided technical assistance, and observed program to monitor quality and fidelity
  - Yes/No Responses
  - Follow-up interviews with select PREP grantees on another study component explores this more in-depth
Measures of Structure and Support for Implementation

- Whether provider served youth in the reporting period
- Number of facilitators working for the provider to deliver programs
  - Number trained to deliver PREP program
  - Number observed
- Implementation challenges and needs for technical assistance
Measures of Structure and Support for Implementation

• Program name
  – Intended dosage
  – Target populations
  – Adult preparation topics
Measures of Attendance, Reach, and Dosage
Program Attendance, Reach, and Dosage

- Number of youth who attended at least one program session
  - Overall and by setting

- Number of youth completing at least 75% of intended program hours

- Whether more than 50 percent of the youth served were from one or more vulnerable subpopulations
  - Including adjudicated youth, youth in foster care or other institutions of care, living with HIV/AIDS, homeless or runaway, identified as LGBTQ, and pregnant and parenting
Measures from Participant Entry and Exit Surveys
Measures from Program Entry and Exit Surveys

- **Demographics**
  - Age, grade, ethnicity, race, gender

- **Sexual behaviors and orientation** (entry survey only)

- **Perceptions of program’s effects on sexual behaviors**

- **Perceptions of program’s effects on preparation for adulthood**

- **Perceptions of program quality**
Data Collection
Exemptions:
Addressing Grantee Concerns and Burden
Data Collection and Reporting Exemptions

• Entry Survey
  – Younger participants do not complete sensitive questions on entry survey
    • All youth in middle school programs exempt from the entry survey

• Attendance, Reach, and Dosage
  – No attendance collected on students in school-based, during school programs
Performance Measures Data Reporting
Performance Measures Reporting

• Each measure reported in the aggregate
  – No individual level data submitted

• Optional Excel-based tools allow grantees to prepare data for reporting
  – All required calculations and tabulations made in Excel-based tools
  – Use of Excel-based tools provide grantees with a “snapshot” of their reported measures

• Annual performance measures reporting
  – All measures reported once per year, and based on one full year of program provision
  – Appropriate timeline given that most programming happens in schools and TOP (9-month program) is one of the most popular models
Tribal PREP Performance Measures Findings: 2014-2015 Grant Year
As Tribal PREP Structure Grows, Needs Change

- Increasing number of providers and facilitators
  - 41 program providers (+5)
  - 92 program facilitators (+23)
    - 99 percent of all facilitators trained to deliver the program

- Technical assistance requests reflect maturing programs
  - Large reduction in the percentage of program providers that requested TA recruiting youth, getting them to attend regularly, and keeping them engaged
  - Providers request more assistance training facilitators (+16 percentage points) and minimizing negative peer interactions (+9 percentage points)
Tribal PREP Grantees’ Support for Implementation

• All grantees (or their designees) observed program delivery
  – Not all providers were observed – 81 percent of all providers had any facilitators observed
  – 70 percent of all facilitators were ever observed

• Most grantees (14 of 16) made training available to program providers

• Decrease in the number of grantees (or their designees) providing technical assistance
  – 13 grantees (- 2)
Improving Reach and Dosage for Vulnerable Youth

Number of Youth Served

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bars</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage Completing at Least 75 Percent of Intended Dosage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bars</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tribal PREP Serving Younger Youth and During School

**Percentage of Youth by Age Group**

- **14 and younger**: 80%
- **15 and older**: 20%

**Percentage of Youth by Program Type**

- **During School**: 80%
- **Out of Schol Time**: 20%
### Tribal PREP Youth Report Changing Behaviors Due to Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Youth intentions towards sexual behavior at program exit</th>
<th>Percentage of Youth (2014-2015)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much less or somewhat less likely to have sexual intercourse in next 6 months</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much more or somewhat more likely to use birth control if having sex in the next 6 months</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much more or somewhat more likely to use a condom if having sex in next 6 months</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much more or somewhat more likely to abstain from sexual intercourse in next 6 months</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth perception of the program at program exit</td>
<td>Percentage of Youth (2014-2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth were interested in program sessions and classes all or most of the time</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions or activities helped youth learn program lessons all or most of the time</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth felt respected all or most of the time</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth had a chance to ask questions about topics or issues that came up in the program all or most of the time</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth felt picked on, teased or bullied in the program all little or none of the time</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tribal PREP Youth Feel Prepared for Adulthood

• On average, 82 percent of youth respond “much more likely” or “somewhat more likely” to a series of items designed to measure constructs aligned with the PREP adulthood preparation subjects
  – In particular, being able to “resist or say no to peer pressure”, “be respectful towards others”, “make plans to reach goals”, “make healthy decisions about drugs or alcohol”, and “be the best they can be”
Tribal PREP:
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Grantee Challenges
Planning Efforts

• Tribal PREP was not included in original TA contract

• Planning occurred for State PREP
Performance Measures

• Tribal PREP grantees’ feedback was elicited but not used because the performance measures were already cleared and in use by State PREP grantees.

• Additional questions were not added that may have informed outcomes or issues important to the Tribal PREP grantees.
Data Reporting System

- Cost information: reporting cost information was problematic, but for all grantees.

- Program structure: the system was initially set up for State PREP; Tribal PREP grantees do not have subawardees.

- Missing data: the system couldn’t distinguish legitimately missing data (e.g., sexual behavior questions are not asked of middle school students) from data that had yet to be entered.
Changes Moving Forward
FYSB has plans to change how PREP performance measurement data are reported and used

- All PREP grantees will be receiving grantee-level reports starting the beginning of 2016
- In advance of the next contract, we’ll revise the performance measures
  - Elicit feedback from current grantees
  - Tailor/add a few questions of importance to Tribal grantees
- Provide “real-time” reporting and data dashboards
- Modify reporting from annual to biannual
- Use biannual data for program monitoring and improvement
Data Dashboard Example:
Child & Family Services Review (CFSR)
Children’s Bureau/ACYF
Of children entering foster care for the first time, what percent were reunified in less than 12 months?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>% Reunified</th>
<th>Number Reunified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of children entering foster care for the first time, what percent were reunified in less than 12 months?

State Overall: 27%

Counties with 0 cases are not shown.
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