**Tools to Assess Community Readiness to Prevent Substance Misuse**

“Readiness” describes the degree to which a community is willing and prepared to address prevention needs. This tool provides a list of tools that practitioners working to prevent substance misuse can use to assess their community’s readiness to address identified needs, and to prioritize these needs accordingly. Please note that the examples presented here are not representative of all assessment tools available to the field and do not imply endorsement by SAMHSA’s Center for the Application of Prevention Technologies.

| **TOOL** | **DIMENSIONS COVERED** | **FROM WHOM IS DATA COLLECTED?** | **KEY ELEMENTS** | **INSTRUMENT CONSIDERATIONS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Community Key Leader Survey*Goodman and Wandersman* <http://www.drugs.indiana.edu/spf/page.php?category=Assessment#Readiness-tab> | * Awareness
* Concern
* Action across community levels
 | * Key leaders
 | * 48 questions
* Questions focus on leaders’ organization
* Can be used with any number of respondents
* No implementation training available
* Cost: Free
 | * Since key leaders are the only source, tool may not provide accurate picture of overall community readiness
* Supplementary *Interpretation Guide* offers guidance for understanding findings and strategies for increasing readiness
 |
| Community Prevention Readiness Index*Community Partner Institute*<http://www.drugs.indiana.edu/spf/page.php?category=Assessment#Readiness-tab> | * Conceptual clarity
* Policy development
* Strategic planning
* Networking
* Evaluation
* State/local collaboration
* Technical assistance
* Funding commitment
* Program models
* Data
* Leadership
* Educational support
 | * Individuals in the community
* Coalitions
* Leadership
* Organizations
 | * 12 core questions (more can be added)
* Can be used with any number of respondents
* No implementation training available
* Cost: Free
 | * Additional questions can be added to enrich specific dimensions
* Provides guidance on scoring, interpretation, and how to increase readiness across dimensions
 |
| Community Prevention Readiness Self-Assessment Tool*Prevention Institute at the Center of Community Well-Being* <http://www.preventioninstitute.org/component/jlibrary/article/id-313/127.html>  | * Adherence to 6-level Spectrum of Prevention framework
* Collaboration
* Leadership
* Relationship of clinical and community activities
 | *Not specified*  | * 15 questions
* Cost: Free
 | * No guidance provided on scoring or interpretation
 |
| Community Readiness Model*Tri-Ethnic Center*<http://www.triethniccenter.colostate.edu/communityReadiness_home.htm> | * Community knowledge of prevention efforts
* Leadership
* Community climate
* Community knowledge of the issue
* Resources for prevention
 | * 4-6 individuals who represent different community segments and are connected to the priority issue or problem
 | * I35 core questions
* Implementation training available
* Cost: Free
* Time commitment: 20 minutes to 1 hour (to conduct the interview)
 | * Tool requires community to select a specific issue or substance (around which questions are based)
* Tool provides extensive guidance on survey preparation, conducting interviews, scoring, and using results to develop an action plan to increase readiness
 |
| Community Readiness Survey*Minnesota Institute of Public Health*Community Readiness Survey (cont.) | * Perception of substance misuse problem within the community
* Permissiveness of attitudes towards substance misuse
* Support for substance misuse policies and prevention efforts
* Adolescent access to alcohol and tobacco
* Perception of community’s commitment to prevention efforts
 | * Scientific random sample of 600 adults in the community
 | * 52 questions
 | * Meant to be implemented at community level; county-level implementation must meet certain prescribed criteria
* Survey no longer exists, but survey items are included in the following article: Beebe, T. J., Harrison, P. A., Sharma, A., & Hedger, S. (2001). The Community Readiness Survey: Development and initial validation. *Evaluation Review, 25,* 55-71.
 |