

An Evaluation of Public Awareness of the Georgia Alliance for Drug Endangered Children

Wes Clarke, Rich Clark
Rachel Hagues, and Melinda Moore



Carl Vinson **Institute of Government**

The University of Georgia

An Evaluation of Public Awareness of the Georgia Alliance for Drug Endangered Children

Wes Clarke
Rich Clark
Rachel Hagues
Melinda Moore

Carl Vinson Institute of Government
University of Georgia
Athens

Contents

Introduction	1
GADEC County Exploratory Meetings	3
DEC Team Meetings	6
GADEC’s Eight Steps to Developing a DEC Program	6
Georgia Alliance for Drug Endangered Children Public Awareness Survey	8
Recreational Activities Reported by Respondents	16
DEC Team Member Survey	22
Appendix A	29
Appendix B	39

Introduction

The Georgia Alliance for Drug Endangered Children (GADEC) considers both children who are exposed to potential harm and children who suffer actual harm from the manufacture, distribution, sale, or use of alcohol and drugs to be drug endangered children, including children who are endangered not only by the actions of others but also through their own actions. Children living in proximity to these activities are at risk of experiencing

- neglect or abandonment,
- exposure and accidental poisoning,
- physical abuse,
- sexual abuse, and
- mental/emotional abuse.

Although the alliance for drug endangered children movement, as it is referred to by the National Alliance for Drug Endangered Children (NADEC), emerged largely in response to the increased prevalence of methamphetamine manufacturing, children are in danger where any illegal substance is used, produced, stored, or sold.

Typically, law enforcement agencies are the primary—if not the only—respondents to situations involving the manufacture and distribution of illegal drugs. These agencies may lack the resources or expertise to meet some of the special needs of children living amidst those activities. The Georgia Alliance for Drug Endangered Children (GADEC) seeks to meet the challenge of “coordinating the social and political systems charged with preventing, intervening, and treating these cases.”¹

In 2006, Applied Research Services (ARS) issued a report titled *Georgia Alliance for Drug Endangered Children: A Needs Assessment*.² Using data from the Georgia Bureau of Investigations, Georgia Department of Corrections, Georgia Board of Pardons and Paroles, Georgia Department of Education, Georgia Department of Human Resources, Georgia Child Fatality Review, Georgia Department of Juvenile Justice, and the Georgia Department of Education, the ARS report presented evidence to suggest that as many as 300,000 of Georgia’s 2.4 million children may be in some

way affected by illegal drug production or use. The report also suggested that 600,000 children may be exposed to alcohol abuse in their environments.

The authors of the ARS report found a sharp increase in the number of methamphetamine-related arrests from 1990 to 2005 as well as a high incidence of reported methamphetamine activity and high prisoner commitment rates for methamphetamine-related offenses in the northern third of the state, particularly in the northwest counties, and in metropolitan areas across the state. The report highlights the need for better data on the dangers faced by drug endangered children, especially information on the dependent children of persons entering drug treatment programs or facing incarceration on drug-related charges.

Working with community leaders and organizations, GADEC planned to initially establish programs in 25 of Georgia's 159 counties. A preliminary meeting in each of these counties brought together leaders in law enforcement, courts, probation, social services, substance abuse treatment, mental health clinics, the Department of Family and Children Services (DFCS), schools, nonprofits, and other organizations to begin a dialogue about the community's specific needs. GADEC then helped create a Drug Endangered Children (DEC) Team in each county made up of persons from these agencies and organizations to establish procedures for coordinating their response in the community.

The DEC Team members in each county participated in training sessions that included education about drug endangered children and their needs, methods of sharing information, an inventory of community resources, and emerging best practices for responding to situations involving children and illegal drugs. The challenges addressed by the DEC Team included limited community awareness of the problem, inefficient use of resources, and insufficient collaboration between groups with different roles, responsibilities, and perspectives. For example, in some communities, law enforcement officers, treatment professionals, and school officials have expressed very different ideas about what constitutes an appropriate procedural response to dangerous situations such as methamphetamine manufacture, drug trafficking, or alcohol abuse.

GADEC contracted with the Carl Vinson Institute of Government (CVIOG) to determine the level of public awareness of the programs in the counties where DEC

Teams are in place and to survey DEC Team members' satisfaction with the training sessions they have attended.

GADEC County Exploratory Meetings

The purpose of the initial exploratory meeting is to begin a dialogue about the county's drug problems and the resources that are needed to address them. During the course of the meeting, which typically lasts between two and three hours, participants engage in an open and frank discussion of drug-related issues in their community.

A key component of these meetings is a short presentation made by a GADEC staff member on the mission, vision, and outcomes of GADEC as well as the purpose of the local DEC Team. The mission of GADEC is to prevent child abuse stemming from the manufacture, distribution, sale, or use of drugs and to rescue, defend, shelter, and support children who suffer physical or psychological harm caused by methamphetamine, alcohol, and other drugs. The GADEC vision states that through the protection, advocacy, and support provided by caring professionals and communities, drug endangered children will be empowered to live lives free of drug and alcohol abuse and filled with happiness and hope.

In all meetings, the GADEC facilitators told participants that they would be the first to establish programs in Georgia and that their contribution to development of model programs and best practices would be critical to future efforts.

In June 2008, faculty and staff from CVIOG attended the initial meetings in White County, Dade County, and Hall County. In each county, it was apparent that many of the participants were well acquainted with one another but that some of them had particular knowledge that others lacked concerning the nature of drug abuse issues in the county or the resources available to provide treatment, education, or social services. Typically 15 to 20 people were present at these meetings, representing such diverse agencies as the police department, sheriff's department, Juvenile Court, Juvenile Probation, Family Connection Partnership, District Attorney's Office, DFCS, Head Start, KidsNET, Meth Task Forces, Public Health, local schools, domestic violence

shelters, and Victim Witness programs as well as counselors and members of the community.

In White County, participants expressed concern that many people, including the professionals, lacked knowledge about available resources and how to use them. Participants decided to bring together key agencies to learn more about the resources each can provide to DEC.

In Dade County, participants at the initial meeting expressed concern that many people lacked knowledge about available resources and how to use them. They also noted that there might be difficulties utilizing resources across different parts of the county. In this discussion, more than one participant referred to “the mountain” to the south and the state line to the north that act as psychological barriers.

Participants at the meeting in Hall County agreed that many of their current procedures and protocols were useful in meeting the needs of drug endangered children. However, they also agreed that many community resources were not used effectively either because of underutilization or lack of awareness among agencies.

The Hall County collaborative has been meeting for a longer period of time than Dade County, so there were differences in the content of their meetings. The Hall County DEC Team is designing local protocols, plans, resources, and programs while ensuring that the agencies involved are communicating and collaborating to the best of their ability to prevent gaps in service.

Box 1 GADEC Guidelines

DEC Guidelines

The purpose of *The Guidelines for Managing Children Found at Methamphetamine Clandestine Laboratory Sites and Other Drug Endangered Children* (DEC guidelines) is to provide multidisciplinary professionals with a foundation for the development of "better practice" procedures for situations where there are drug endangered children. An understanding among the key partners should also be considered to formalize roles and relationships beyond the guidelines.

Implementation of the DEC guidelines should be adapted by local community professionals, to ensure that children who may be at risk for exposure receive protection, advocacy, and support through a multidisciplinary approach, and that investigations provide the best opportunity for prosecution of individuals involved in manufacturing, selling, and abusing drugs or alcohol.

Why Use a Multidisciplinary Response Team Approach to DEC

Most professionals working with abused, neglected children generally agree that a multidisciplinary team (MDT) approach to child maltreatment is an effective way of improving systems and ensuring the best outcomes for children, families, and society. In Georgia, two examples of the way the multidisciplinary team concept has been used are child death review teams and child abuse protocol committees. The purpose of child death review teams is to review cases of child death in a community in order to determine whether they were abuse-related and to identify what could have been done to prevent the death. The purpose of the child abuse protocol committee is to ensure coordination and cooperation of various agencies, organizations and individuals, as they work with cases of child abuse.

It is suggested that DEC response teams work closely with their Child Abuse Protocol committees to review cases of DEC in their communities. This data will assist with the identification of available resources as well as gaps and overlaps in service. The members of the response teams will utilize this information to respond quickly when children are found in drug environments in order to remove them from the dangerous living conditions and ensure they receive medical care and other services needed to improve their long term outcomes. The basic premise of the multidisciplinary team is that because multiple professions are involved in responding to the complexity of child abuse, neglect, and endangerment cases - working together saves resources through better communications and the elimination of overlap in services.

A large body of research supports how the MDT approach is a more effective and efficient way to render services. MDTs can improve* the:

- Accuracy of overall assessment
- Prediction of risk, and
- Quality of Intervention strategies

*(Chadwick, 1996; Pardess, Finzi, & Sever, 1993; Pence & Wilson, 1994)

Other advantages of MDTs include reduced role confusion and duplication of services** and improved quality of evidence***

** (Rogan, 1990)

*** (American Prosecutors Research Institute, 1993; Hochstadt & Harwicke, 1985).

DEC Team Meetings

Once participants in the initial exploratory groups make the decision to put a DEC Team in place, GADEC provides the group with a number of suggested activities or tasks that it should undertake, including making an inventory of community resources, identifying agency personnel who will be involved, and developing protocols for communication. GADEC has summarized the process as eight distinct steps. Members of the GADEC staff facilitate most of the activities, especially the early steps. In addition, GADEC conducts training sessions on specific needs identified by the DEC Team.

GADEC's Eight Steps to Developing a DEC Program³

The eight steps for program development are as presented on the GADEC Web site.

1. Consider possible team members from each CORE agency in your locality: Child Protective Services, Special Assistant Attorney General, Prosecutor's Office, Law Enforcement, and Healthcare Professionals. Find the individuals who are interested in child endangerment and illicit drug manufacturing and/or trafficking, like multidisciplinary work, and are involved in agency policy development.
2. Decide how you will all communicate (i.e. email, phone, faxes, interoffice mail, etc.). Consistently structured meetings (face-to-face or conference call) are initially needed to develop a team cohesion and establish working relationships. Clear communication and participation with agency supervisors are recommended.
3. Cross-train among team members so each member has a clear sense of what other team members from different disciplines do. Familiarize yourselves with the philosophies, departmental policies, and hierarchies of your own and other team member agencies. Each team member needs answers to the following: What are Team goals? What is each member required to do when arriving at a drug scene? When encountering a child, what are team priorities in handling a case?
4. Utilize the cross-training to develop guidelines as a team for what should happen during an intervention at a drug-producing/trafficking home with children. First, all

existing core agencies' guidelines must be gathered, reviewed, and analyzed to see: What is already in place? What needs to be changed to facilitate the Team's work? What might impede Team goals? Where are the gaps? Where are the overlaps? With buy-in/approval of each agency, the Team should utilize the state model to develop a unified DEC TEAM guidelines.

5. Distribute draft guidelines among agency colleagues for input/feedback. Revise guidelines with reviews and comments. Re-review FINAL DRAFT guidelines with all relevant agencies. Be sure to include front line professionals as well as policy development staff in this process. Finalize guidelines with approval by Core Team member agencies. Publish the guidelines with a date and caveat that it will be modified as experience and circumstances demonstrate the need to do so.
6. Identify Team member needs for additional formal and informal training (i.e. shadowing/ridealongs, etc.). Seek additional assistance and training from the professional members of the GADEC Training Network and other relevant agencies.
7. Identify key "auxiliary" agencies that your Team wants involved in DEC cases that need DEC training. These may include medical/health care providers, mental health providers, fire personnel, Emergency Medical Services, Hazardous Materials team staff, foster parents, probation/parole officers, school personnel, drug treatment providers, domestic violence service providers, criminal and juvenile court personnel. Contact a professional member of the GADEC Training Network to schedule and provide trainings for the groups.
8. Develop a way to monitor the progress of your program, the effectiveness of your guidelines, and intermittently discuss how the DEC process can be improved. Discuss what is working well and provide praise. Look at what isn't working and make necessary adjustments. GOOD LUCK!

Georgia Alliance for Drug Endangered Children Public Awareness Survey

State programs like GADEC seek to foster better collaboration and coordination of agency resources, but a second important goal is to create a greater willingness on the part of community members to alert local law enforcement or social service agencies of situations in which children are exposed to drug abuse. The willingness to report these situations may bring about a response weeks or even months before one would otherwise occur. In addition to promoting willingness to call, GADEC plans to provide people with information so that they can identify situations dangerous to children and know whom to call. A public awareness campaign to accomplish these goals is planned for counties that have created DEC Teams. The elements of the awareness campaign include

- radio and television spots,
- billboards,
- notices about GADEC and county DEC Teams on bulletin boards in government agency offices,
- flyers distributed in schools and at school functions,
- promotional videos in local movie theaters, and
- other appropriate venues in each community.

In June 2008, in addition to attending GADEC meetings, faculty and staff at CVIIOG conducted a survey of Georgians to collect data on their use or awareness of the informational media to be used in the campaign. The survey also collected information on the respondents' perceptions of drug problems in their communities. These data will help GADEC utilize appropriate media in each community and will serve as a baseline that can be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the public awareness campaign. The evaluation will require a second survey to be administered several weeks after the campaign is in place.

Table 1 shows the distribution by county of the 1,022 responses to the survey. Seven of the DEC Team counties—Bibb, Carroll, Chatham, Douglas, Hall, Lumpkin, and Paulding—produced a large number of responses, with smaller numbers coming

from 10 others. Three counties (Bartow, Clayton, and Spalding) produced sufficiently large samples to serve as controls to determine if the DEC Team counties differ from other Georgia counties in a statistically significant way. The remainder of the data analysis will focus on these 10 counties, although some tables will consider all responses.

Table 1. Survey Responses by County

County	Number of Responses	Percent of Total	County	Number of Responses	Percent of Total
Unidentified	30	2.9	Jackson	1	0.1
Bartow	67	6.6	Johnson	1	0.1
Bibb	75	7.3	Jones	7	0.7
Carroll	99	9.7	Lamar	1	0.1
Chatham	107	10.5	Lumpkin	28	2.7
Clayton	132	12.9	Newton	1	0.1
Cobb	2	0.2	Paulding	94	9.2
Dade	9	0.9	Peach	17	1.7
Dekalb	5	0.5	Pickens	21	2.1
Douglas	92	9.0	Pike	11	1.1
Fannin	12	1.2	Polk	1	0.1
Fayette	1	0.1	Putnam	1	0.1
Fulton	1	0.1	Rabun	1	0.1
Gilmer	14	1.4	Spalding	28	2.7
Glynn	1	0.1	Towns	6	0.6
Gordon	2	0.2	Twiggs	8	0.8
Gwinnett	2	0.2	Union	14	1.4
Hall	83	8.1	Upson	20	2.0
Henry	3	0.3	White	24	2.3
			Total all counties	1022	100.0

Note: Bold county names indicate DEC Team counties.

Awareness of GADEC

About four out of every five respondents to the public awareness survey (78.3 percent) indicated that they have not heard of GADEC (see Table 2). Another 12.2 percent were not sure if they had heard of GADEC. Only 9.4 percent of all respondents reported having heard of GADEC, with the highest individual county proportion being 12.0 percent in Hall County (see Table 3). None of the 28 respondents in Lumpkin County

was aware of GADEC. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test across the counties in the sample shows that the proportion of the public with an awareness of GADEC does not differ in a statistically significant way. The ANOVA results are presented in Table 4.

**Table 2. All Responses to the Question
“Have you heard of the Georgia Alliance for Drug
Endangered Children?”**

	Number of Responses	Percent of Total*	Cumulative Percent
Yes	76	9.4	9.5
No	630	78.3	87.8
Not sure	98	12.2	100.0
TOTAL	804	100.0	

*Total may not add to 100.0 percent due to rounding.

**Table 3. Responses by County to the Question
“Have you heard of the Georgia Alliance for Drug
Endangered Children?”**

	Number of “Yes” Responses	Percent
Bartow	4	6.0
Bibb	7	9.3
Carroll	9	9.1
Chatham	10	9.3
Clayton	15	11.4
Douglas	7	7.6
Hall	10	12.0
Lumpkin	0	0.0
Paulding	11	11.7
Spalding	3	10.7

Table 4. ANOVA * Difference in Proportion of Respondents Reporting Awareness of GADEC

	Bartow	Bibb	Carroll	Chatham	Clayton	Douglas	Hall	Lumpkin	Paulding	Spalding
Bartow	-----									
Bibb	-0.03363	-----								
Carroll	-0.03121	0.00242	-----							
Chatham	-0.03376	-0.00012	-0.00255	-----						
Clayton	-0.05393	-0.02030	-0.02273	-0.02018	-----					
Douglas	-0.01639	0.01725	0.01482	0.01737	0.03755	-----				
Hall	-0.06078	-0.02715	-0.02957	-0.02702	-0.00685	-0.04439	-----			
Lumpkin	0.05970	0.09333	0.09091	0.09346	0.11364	0.07609	0.12048	-----		
Paulding	-0.05732	-0.02369	-0.02611	-0.02356	-0.00338	-0.04093	0.00346	-0.11702	-----	
Spalding	-0.04744	-0.01381	-0.01623	-0.01368	0.00649	-0.03106	0.01334	-0.10714	0.00988	-----

*None of the observed differences reached statistical significance at the $p = 0.10$ level.

Willingness to Report a Situation Involving a Drug Endangered Child

Nearly 70 percent of respondents reported their willingness to assist a child that they believe to be in an environment involving drug abuse by calling local law enforcement, the Department of Family and Children Services, or another social service agency (see Table 5). About 9 percent were not sure how they would respond, while another 3.4 percent reported that they would do nothing. More than 17 percent indicated that they would personally intervene to assist the child. While Table 6 suggests some variation across counties (the proportion indicating a willingness to help ranging from 61.5 percent in Lumpkin County to 78.6 percent in Spalding County), none of the reported differences reach statistical significance.

**Table 5. All Responses to the Question
“Suppose you encounter a child who is in an environment where drug use has put that child at risk. What would you do?”**

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Call local law enforcement	163	20.2	20.6
Call the Department of Family and Children Services	161	20.0	41.0
Call a social service agency	30	3.7	44.8
Alert authorities	197	24.5	69.7
Not sure	75	9.3	79.1
Do nothing	27	3.4	82.6
Try to help the child myself	138	17.1	100.0
TOTAL RESPONSES	791	98.3	
Did not answer	14	1.7	
TOTAL	805	100.0	

Table 6. Proportion of Respondents Who Would Contact Local Officials, by County

County	Proportion of Respondents
Bartow	72.7
Bibb	61.6
Carroll	78.4
Chatham	67.3
Clayton	66.2
Douglas	68.9
Hall	73.5
Lumpkin	61.5
Paulding	69.2
Spalding	78.6

Respondents' Use of Media

Public education is one of the critical steps in publicizing GADEC and encouraging residents to report a situation involving a drug endangered child. The campaign elements listed on page eight could be used in many combinations. To assist GADEC in making decisions about how to implement the public awareness campaign in individual counties, respondents were asked about their use of various media. Table 7 reports the average number of hours that all respondents reported using radio, television, and the Internet (other than for e-mail). Respondents report listening to 2.6 hours of radio on average, and most listen to popular music, country and western music, or classic rock on FM stations. Fewer than 10 percent of respondents listen to AM stations. This is consistently true across all counties represented in the survey responses. Respondents watch about 18 hours of television programming per week, with variation across counties ranging from fewer than 15 to about 20 hours per week.

Table 7. Respondents' Reported Use of Media

Question	Number of Responses	Mean	Std. Deviation
On a typical day, how many hours do you listen to the radio?	696	2.6	2.69
Excluding e-mail, how many hours do you spend on the Internet in a typical week?	782	17.7	15.61
About how many hours a week on average would you say that you watch television?	803	18.1	14.52

Type of Radio	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Which programming format do you listen to most often?				
Popular music	139	17.3	17.5	17.5
Oldies	75	9.3	9.5	27.0
Country western	124	15.4	15.6	42.6
Classic rock	98	12.2	12.4	55.0
Christian music	90	11.2	11.3	66.3
Talk or news programs	89	11.1	11.2	77.6
Classical music	12	1.5	1.5	79.1
Rap / Hip hop	71	8.8	9.0	88.0
Other (please specify):	91	11.3	11.5	99.5
Other (please specify):	4	.5	.5	100.0
Total	793	98.5	100.0	
Which do you listen to most often?				
AM stations	74	9.2	9.2	9.2
FM stations	667	82.9	82.9	92.0
Satellite radio	39	4.8	4.8	96.9
None of the above	25	3.1	3.1	100.0
Total	805	100.0	100.0	

About half of respondents (48.9 percent) report recalling a billboard they have seen in their community during the prior week (see Table 8). Almost as many (42.4 percent) report that they cannot recall a billboard message during the same time frame. This pattern is consistent across the surveyed counties with the exception of Lumpkin County, where only 3 in 28 respondents (10.7 percent) recalled seeing a billboard

during the past week. This result may be due to the smaller number of responses from Lumpkin County; a larger sample could produce a more evenly divided response.

Table 8. Responses to Questions about Daily Commute and Government Internet Sites

Please consider the driving, walking, or other commuting you've done in the last week. Can you recall the message on any billboard you have seen?	Number	Percent
Yes	394	48.9
No	341	42.4
Haven't seen a billboard	69	8.6
Total	804	99.9
No response	1	0.1
Total	805	100.0

How often do you use public transportation?	Number	Percent
Daily	31	3.9
Weekly	13	1.6
Monthly	12	1.5
A few times a year	133	16.5
Never	595	73.9
Other (please explain):	19	2.4
Total	803	99.8
No response	2	0.2
Total	805	100.0

How often do you use the Internet for getting information about state or local government services?	Number	Percent
Very often	164	20.4
Somewhat often	305	37.9
Rarely	304	37.8
Never	29	3.6
Total	802	99.6
No response	3	0.4
Total	805	100.0

A large majority of all respondents reported never using public transportation (73.9 percent), and although there are larger numbers that report some public transportation use in Douglas and Clayton counties, the proportion that report daily or weekly use is 8 percent or less in all counties except Clayton (12.8 percent).

Nearly 60 percent of respondents reported that they use the Internet often or somewhat often to obtain information from local government agencies. The lowest proportion of reported use for this purpose is 46.4 percent in Lumpkin County. The highest reported use is in Clayton and Douglas Counties, at 63.6 and 62.0 percent, respectively. Individual county results for these questions are contained in Appendix A. (Appendix B presents comments from respondents.)

Recreational Activities Reported by Respondents

Respondents were asked to report their use of certain kinds of recreational or entertainment facilities. The list of items in Table 9 was presented, and respondents were asked to check all that applied. The items most frequently checked were shopping mall, movie theater, and state or local park, closely followed by public library and church event.

Tables 10 through 13 present the results by county for the DEC counties as well as three non-DEC counties. In each instance, the top three results (bold type in the tables) are from the five listed above, although it is apparent that respondents with children are more likely to visit places and attend activities involving their children. Still, shopping mall, park, and movie theater are included frequently in the responses even when not in the top three.

Table 9. Proportion of Respondents Who Have Visited Specific Types of Social, Religious, Recreation, or Entertainment Facilities in the Past Twelve Months

Facility Type	Percent that have visited in the past twelve months	Facility Type	Percent that have visited in the past twelve months
Shopping mall	82.3	Live theater (e.g., concert or play)	23.1
Movie theater	64.4	Local community center (e.g., YMCA, recreation department facility)	22.5
Library	54.3	Theme park	20.5
State or local park	59.8	Professional sporting event	19.6
Church event	53.4	Museum	18.7
School function	43.5	Skating rink	11.6
Sporting event at a school or for kids	29.7	Other (please explain):	3.8
Bowling alley	25.5		

Table 10. Places Visited by Respondents in the Past Twelve Months, DEC Counties

	Bibb (n = 75)		Carroll (n = 99)		Chatham (n = 107)		Douglas (n = 92)		Hall (n = 83)		Lumpkin (n = 28)		Paulding (n = 94)	
Movie Theater	47	62.7%	66	66.7%	73	68.2%	70	76.1%	49	59.0%	14	50.0%	65	69.1%
Public Library	34	45.3%	53	53.5%	62	57.9%	56	60.9%	42	50.6%	17	60.7%	50	53.2%
Professional Sporting Event	13	17.3%	21	21.2%	17	15.9%	20	21.7%	22	26.5%	2	7.1%	27	28.7%
YMCA or Recreation Department	12	16.0%	27	27.3%	27	25.2%	21	22.8%	23	27.7%	7	25.0%	19	20.2%
Child's Sporting Event	21	28.0%	34	34.3%	24	22.4%	34	37.0%	26	31.3%	9	32.1%	34	36.2%
Shopping Mall	66	88.0%	85	85.9%	99	92.5%	85	92.4%	73	88.0%	24	85.7%	76	80.9%
Bowling Alley	24	32.0%	17	17.2%	19	17.8%	30	32.6%	26	31.3%	8	28.6%	24	25.5%
Skating Rink	6	8.0%	5	5.1%	8	7.5%	18	19.6%	5	6.0%	4	14.3%	20	21.3%
State or Local Park	39	52.0%	55	55.6%	70	65.4%	66	71.7%	53	63.9%	20	71.4%	51	54.3%
Church	47	62.7%	48	48.5%	50	46.7%	54	58.7%	49	49.0%	17	60.7%	51	54.3%
Theme Park	14	18.7%	24	24.2%	14	13.1%	32	34.8%	13	15.7%	6	21.4%	29	30.9%
Museum	21	28.0%	15	15.2%	25	23.4%	20	21.7%	11	13.3%	5	17.9%	18	19.1%
Live Theater or Concert	16	21.3%	21	21.2%	25	23.4%	25	27.2%	22	26.5%	9	32.1%	22	23.4%
School Function	25	33.3%	45	45.5%	40	37.4%	46	50.0%	42	50.6%	15	53.6%	50	53.2%
Other	2	2.7%	3	3.0%	4	3.7%	1	1.1%	3	3.6%	1	3.6%	0	0.0%

Note: Top results in bold type for each county.

Table 11. Places Visited by Respondents in the Past Twelve Months, Non-DEC Counties

	Bartow (n = 67)		Clayton (n = 142)		Spalding (n = 28)	
Movie Theater	46	68.7%	95	72.0%	16	57.1%
Public Library	39	58.2%	67	50.8%	14	50.0%
Professional Sporting Event	19	28.4%	29	22.0%	1	3.6%
YMCA or Recreation Department	15	22.4%	31	23.5%	2	7.1%
Child's Sporting Event	24	35.8%	36	27.3%	6	21.4%
Shopping Mall	53	79.1%	114	86.4%	16	57.1%
Bowling Alley	12	17.9%	53	40.2%	5	17.9%
Skating Rink	5	7.5%	22	16.7%	5	17.9%
State or Local Park	50	74.6%	74	56.1%	18	64.3%
Church	35	52.2%	70	53.0%	12	42.9%
Theme Park	8	11.9%	35	26.5%	3	10.7%
Museum	18	26.9%	25	18.9%	3	10.7%
Live Theater or Concert	13	19.4%	34	25.8%	4	14.3%
School Function	39	58.2%	55	41.7%	10	35.7%
Other	3	3.0%	4	3.0%	3	10.7%

Note: Top results in bold type for each county.

Table 12. Places Visited by Respondents in the Past Twelve Months, DEC Counties, Families with Children

	Bibb (n = 29)		Carroll (n = 57)		Chatham (n = 37)		Douglas (n = 49)		Hall (n = 37)		Lumpkin (n = 12)		Paulding (n = 53)	
Movie Theater	16	55.2%	30	52.6%	27	73.0%	35	71.4%	29	78.4%	5	41.7%	41	77.4%
Public Library	11	37.9%	32	56.1%	26	70.3%	29	59.2%	20	54.1%	4	33.3%	32	60.4%
Professional Sporting Event	3	10.3%	5	8.8%	4	10.8%	11	22.4%	7	8.4%	0	0.0%	11	20.8%
YMCA or Recreation Department	3	10.8%	15	26.3%	14	37.8%	9	18.4%	15	40.5%	3	25.0%	10	18.9%
Child's Sporting Event	10	34.5%	22	38.6%	10	27.0%	25	51.0%	22	59.5%	2	16.7%	27	50.9%
Shopping Mall	21	72.4%	52	91.2%	34	91.9%	42	85.7%	36	97.3%	9	75.0%	39	73.6%
Bowling Alley	8	27.6%	5	8.8%	12	32.4%	17	34.7%	19	51.4%	4	33.3%	14	26.4%
Skating Rink	6	20.7%	4	7.0%	6	16.2%	13	26.5%	9	24.3%	4	33.3%	20	37.7%
State or Local Park	11	37.9%	31	54.4%	22	59.5%	33	67.3%	29	78.4%	9	75.0%	36	67.9%
Church	14	48.3%	33	57.9%	18	48.6%	30	61.2%	27	73.0%	6	50.0%	33	62.3%
Theme Park	4	13.8%	17	29.8%	6	16.2%	21	42.9%	9	24.3%	1	8.3%	25	47.2%
Museum	4	13.8%	11	19.3%	10	27.0%	11	22.4%	3	8.1%	1	8.3%	7	13.2%
Live Theater or Concert	0	0.0%	5	8.8%	7	18.9%	10	20.4%	8	21.6%	3	25.0%	8	15.1%
School Function	14	48.3%	29	50.9%	25	67.6%	29	59.2%	30	81.1%	5	41.7%	35	66.0%
Other	1	1.3%	2	3.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Note: Top results in bold type for each county.

Table 13. Places Visited by Respondents in the Past Twelve Months, Non-DEC Counties, Families with Children

	Bartow (n = 36)		Clayton (n = 60)		Spalding (n = 13)	
Movie Theater	18	50.0%	43	71.7%	7	53.8%
Public Library	20	55.6%	37	61.7%	6	46.2%
Professional Sporting Event	7	19.4%	10	16.7%	0	0.0%
YMCA or Recreation Department	10	27.8%	15	25.0%	0	0.0%
Child's Sporting Event	17	47.2%	24	40.0%	3	23.1%
Shopping Mall	25	69.4%	46	76.7%	7	53.8%
Bowling Alley	9	25.0%	26	43.3%	3	23.1%
Skating Rink	3	8.3%	16	26.7%	5	38.5%
State or Local Park	32	88.9%	30	50.0%	10	76.9%
Church	20	55.6%	31	51.7%	7	53.8%
Theme Park	8	22.2%	21	35.0%	0	0.0%
Museum	8	22.2%	8	13.3%	1	7.7%
Live Theater or Concert	2	5.6%	6	10.0%	0	0.0%
School Function	26	72.2%	29	48.3%	7	53.8%
Other	0	0.0%	5	8.3%	2	15.4%

Note: Top results in bold type for each county.

DEC Team Member Survey

DEC Team members were asked to complete an online survey following their participation in a training session designed to assist them with various aspects of the program, including development of protocols, creating an inventory of community resources, and learning to recognize signs that indicate a situation in which a child is drug endangered.

As of the end of July 2008, 242 persons had taken part in one or more meetings conducted by GADEC to assist local DEC Teams. Sixty-two of those logged on to the Web site and began the post-meeting survey; fifty-four completed the survey, and the results are reported here. About three-fourths of the respondents are female, and 80 percent are Caucasian (see Tables 14 and 15).

Table 14. DEC Team Survey Respondents' Gender

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Male	13	21.0	24.1	24.1
Female	41	66.1	75.9	100.0
Total	54	87.1	100.0	
No response	8	12.9		
Total	62	100.0		

Table 15. DEC Team Survey Respondents' Ethnicity

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
White	49	79.0	94.2	94.2
Black or African-American	3	4.8	5.8	100.0
Total	52	83.9	100.0	
No response	10	16.1		
Total	62	100.0		

Half of the respondents had been with their present agency for more than six years (see Table 16). More than one-third (37.1 percent) are treatment or prevention specialists, while only about 5 percent work in law enforcement (see Table 17). Fifty-two percent of respondents reported that they encounter drug endangered children weekly in their work (see Table 18).

Table 16. Respondents' Years of Employment with Current Agency

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
0	2	3.2	4.0	4.0
1	5	8.1	10.0	14.0
2	7	11.3	14.0	28.0
3	2	3.2	4.0	32.0
4	1	1.6	2.0	34.0
5	7	11.3	14.0	48.0
6	1	1.6	2.0	50.0
7	3	4.8	6.0	56.0
8	2	3.2	4.0	60.0
9	3	4.8	6.0	66.0
10	1	1.6	2.0	68.0
11	2	3.2	4.0	72.0
12	1	1.6	2.0	74.0
14	2	3.2	4.0	78.0
17	2	3.2	4.0	82.0
18	1	1.6	2.0	84.0
19	1	1.6	2.0	86.0
20	2	3.2	4.0	90.0
23	1	1.6	2.0	92.0
24	1	1.6	2.0	94.0
27	1	1.6	2.0	96.0
32	1	1.6	2.0	98.0
35	1	1.6	2.0	100.0
Total	50	80.6	100.0	
No response	12	19.4		
Total	62	100.0		

Table 17. Respondents' Agency by Type

What best describes the agency for which you work?	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
District attorney	3	4.8	7.9	7.9
Police chief	1	1.6	2.6	10.5
Sheriff	2	3.2	5.3	15.8
DFCS director	2	3.2	5.3	21.1
SAAG	1	1.6	2.6	23.7
Emergency medical service provider	1	1.6	2.6	26.3
School superintendent	5	8.1	13.2	39.5
Prevention specialist	10	16.1	26.3	65.8
Treatment professional	13	21.0	34.2	100.0
Total	38	61.3	100.0	
No response	24	38.7		
Total	62	100.0		

**Table 18. All Responses to the Question
“How often do you encounter drug endangered children?”**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Daily	12	19.4	22.2	22.2
Weekly	16	25.8	29.6	51.9
Monthly	11	17.7	20.4	72.2
Less often	15	24.2	27.8	100.0
Total	54	87.1	100.0	
No response	8	12.9		
Total	62	100.0		

Ninety-one percent of respondents rated the training session they attended as good or excellent at defining the roles of agencies represented on the DEC Team. A similar percentage felt that they understood their agency’s role and were either somewhat or very prepared to help their agency fulfill that role. (See Tables 19–21.)

**Table 19. All Responses to the Question
“Rate the meeting’s effectiveness in defining the agencies’ roles on the GADEC team.”**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Excellent	13	21.0	23.6	23.6
Good	37	59.7	67.3	90.9
Fair	5	8.1	9.1	100.0
Total	55	88.7	100.0	
No response	7	11.3		
Total	62	100.0		

**Table 20. All Responses to the Question
“After this meeting, how prepared do you feel to meet your agency’s role?”**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very prepared	12	19.4	21.4	21.4
Somewhat prepared	39	62.9	69.6	91.1
Not too prepared	5	8.1	8.9	100.0
Total	56	90.3	100.0	
No response	6	9.7		
Total	62	100.0		

**Table 21. All Responses to the Question
“How comfortable are you with your understanding of your agency’s role on the GADEC team?”**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very comfortable	22	35.5	39.3	39.3
Somewhat comfortable	29	46.8	51.8	91.1
Not too comfortable	5	8.1	8.9	100.0
Total	56	90.3	100.0	
No response	6	9.7		
Total	62	100.0		

A smaller percentage of respondents (81.8 percent) felt that the meeting helped prepare them to respond to a situation involving a drug endangered child, and nearly 93 percent felt that the meeting was at least somewhat effective in addressing methods of communication with other DEC Team members or agencies. Overall, a large majority of respondents (90 percent or more) felt that the meeting helped prepare them to work with other agencies in the community, share information, and raise public awareness of drug problems in their communities. Only 79.6 percent felt that the meeting helped prepare them to take action that would reduce drug problems in their communities. (See Tables 22–27.)

**Table 22. All Responses to the Question
“How well did the meeting prepare you to respond to a situation involving a drug endangered child?”**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very well	11	17.7	20.0	20.0
Somewhat well	34	54.8	61.8	81.8
Not too well	8	12.9	14.5	96.4
Not at all well	2	3.2	3.6	100.0
Total	55	88.7	100.0	
No response	7	11.3		
Total	62	100.0		

Table 23. All Responses to the Question
“How effectively did the meeting address methods of communication with other DEC team members or agencies?”

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very effectively	29	46.8	51.8	51.8
Somewhat effectively	23	37.1	41.1	92.9
Not too effectively	4	6.5	7.1	100.0
Total	56	90.3	100.0	
No response	6	9.7		
Total	62	100.0		

Table 24. All Responses to the Question
“After leaving this meeting, how confident are you that your DEC team can . . . effectively share information regarding drug endangered children in the community?”

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very confident	23	37.1	42.6	42.6
Somewhat confident	27	43.5	50.0	92.6
Not too confident	4	6.5	7.4	100.0
Total	54	87.1	100.0	
No response	8	12.9		
Total	62	100.0		

Table 25. All Responses to the Question
“After leaving this meeting, how confident are you that your DEC team can . . . work well together to address situations involving drug endangered children?”

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very confident	25	40.3	46.3	46.3
Somewhat confident	23	37.1	42.6	88.9
Not too confident	4	6.5	7.4	96.3
Not at all confident	2	3.2	3.7	100.0
Total	54	87.1	100.0	
No Response	8	12.9		
Total	62	100.0		

Table 26. All Responses to the Question
“After leaving this meeting, how confident are you that your DEC team can . . . raise awareness of drug problems in the community?”

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very confident	34	54.8	63.0	63.0
Somewhat confident	17	27.4	31.5	94.4
Not too confident	3	4.8	5.6	100.0
Total	54	87.1	100.0	
No Response	8	12.9		
Total	62	100.0		

Table 27. All Responses to the Question
“After leaving this meeting, how confident are you that your DEC team can . . . prevent drug problems involving children in the community?”

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very confident	13	21.0	24.1	24.1
Somewhat confident	30	48.4	55.6	79.6
Not too confident	10	16.1	18.5	98.1
Not at all confident	1	1.6	1.9	100.0
Total	54	87.1	100.0	
No Response	8	12.9		
Total	62	100.0		

Notes

¹ NADEC Web site: <http://www.nationaldec.org/theproblem.html>

² Meredith, Tammy, John Speir, Sharon Johnson, Heather Hull, Jake Bucher, and Aishia Rogers. 2006. *Georgia Alliance for Drug Endangered Children: A Needs Assessment*. Atlanta: Applied Research Services, Inc.

³ GADEC Web site: <http://www.georgiadec.org/>

Appendix A: Reported Use of Media by County

Descriptive Statistics

County		N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Bartow	On a typical day, how many hours do you listen to the radio?	60	.00000	12.00	3.05	2.88
	Excluding email, how many hours do you spend on the Internet in a typical week?	67	1.00	80.00	19.03	16.62
	About how many hours a week on average would you say that you watch television?	67	2.00	67.00	19.22	12.74
	Total	60				
Bibb	On a typical day, how many hours do you listen to the radio?	64	0.00	20.00	2.95	3.56
	Excluding email, how many hours do you spend on the Internet in a typical week?	71	1.00	80.00	18.36	14.70
	About how many hours a week on average would you say that you watch television?	75	1.00	85.00	20.03	17.008
	Total	63				
Carroll	On a typical day, how many hours do you listen to the radio?	89	0.00	15.00	2.38	2.15
	Excluding email, how many hours do you spend on the Internet in a typical week?	97	1.00	150.00	18.44	22.42
	About how many hours a week on average would you say that you watch television?	99	2.00	100.00	17.15	14.91
	Total	88				
Chatham	On a typical day, how many hours do you listen to the radio?	92	0.00	18.00	3.01	2.93
	Excluding email, how many hours do you spend on the Internet in a typical week?	99	1.50	90.00	19.56	15.86
	About how many hours a week on average would you say that you watch television?	106	0.00	65.00	16.95	12.20
	Total	88				

County		N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Clayton	On a typical day, how many hours do you listen to the radio?	114	0.00	20.00	2.51	2.60
	Excluding email, how many hours do you spend on the Internet in a typical week?	130	1.00	72.00	17.63	12.52
	About how many hours a week on average would you say that you watch television?	132	0.00	100.00	19.10	14.97
	Total	113				
Douglas	On a typical day, how many hours do you listen to the radio?	82	0.00	13.00	2.68	2.65
	Excluding email, how many hours do you spend on the Internet in a typical week?	91	1.00	75.00	14.79	12.78
	About how many hours a week on average would you say that you watch television?	92	0.00	80.00	16.48	13.16
	Total	82				
Hall	On a typical day, how many hours do you listen to the radio?	73	0.00	12.00	2.35	2.29
	Excluding email, how many hours do you spend on the Internet in a typical week?	80	0.00	75.00	17.02	14.18
	About how many hours a week on average would you say that you watch television?	82	0.00	80.00	18.65	16.19
	Total	72				
Lumpkin	On a typical day, how many hours do you listen to the radio?	21	0.00	10.00	1.73	2.13
	Excluding email, how many hours do you spend on the Internet in a typical week?	27	2.00	80.00	18.66	16.98
	About how many hours a week on average would you say that you watch television?	28	0.00	40.00	14.75	10.57
	Total	21				

County		N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Paulding	On a typical day, how many hours do you listen to the radio?	76	0.00	9.00	2.14	1.79
	Excluding email, how many hours do you spend on the Internet in a typical week?	92	1.00	100.00	17.61	14.97
	About how many hours a week on average would you say that you watch television?	94	1.00	90.00	18.48	14.899
	Total	75				
Spalding	On a typical day, how many hours do you listen to the radio?	25	0.00	20.00	2.84	4.17
	Excluding email, how many hours do you spend on the Internet in a typical week?	28	3.00	55.00	15.82	11.86
	About how many hours a week on average would you say that you watch television?	28	1.00	70.00	18.93	17.41
	Total	25				

County	Which do you listen to most often?	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Bartow	A.M. stations	6	9.0	9.0	9.0
	F.M. stations	58	86.6	86.6	95.5
	Satellite radio	1	1.5	1.5	97.0
	None of the above	2	3.0	3.0	100.0
	Total	67	100.0	100.0	
Bibb	A.M. stations	6	8.0	8.0	8.0
	F.M. stations	57	76.0	76.0	84.0
	Satellite radio	6	8.0	8.0	92.0
	None of the above	6	8.0	8.0	100.0
	Total	75	100.0	100.0	
Carroll	A.M. stations	9	9.1	9.1	9.1
	F.M. stations	83	83.8	83.8	92.9
	Satellite radio	4	4.0	4.0	97.0
	None of the above	3	3.0	3.0	100.0
	Total	99	100.0	100.0	
Chatham	A.M. stations	16	15.0	15.0	15.0
	F.M. stations	84	78.5	78.5	93.5
	Satellite radio	3	2.8	2.8	96.3
	None of the above	4	3.7	3.7	100.0
	Total	107	100.0	100.0	
Clayton	A.M. stations	8	6.1	6.1	6.1
	F.M. stations	115	87.1	87.1	93.2
	Satellite radio	6	4.5	4.5	97.7
	None of the above	3	2.3	2.3	100.0
	Total	132	100.0	100.0	
Douglas	A.M. stations	8	8.7	8.7	8.7
	F.M. stations	80	87.0	87.0	95.7
	Satellite radio	2	2.2	2.2	97.8
	None of the above	2	2.2	2.2	100.0
	Total	92	100.0	100.0	
Hall	A.M. stations	9	10.8	10.8	10.8
	F.M. stations	68	81.9	81.9	92.8
	Satellite radio	6	7.2	7.2	100.0
	Total	83	100.0	100.0	
Lumpkin	F.M. stations	22	78.6	78.6	78.6
	Satellite radio	4	14.3	14.3	92.9
	None of the above	2	7.1	7.1	100.0
	Total	28	100.0	100.0	
Paulding	A.M. stations	11	11.7	11.7	11.7
	F.M. stations	77	81.9	81.9	93.6
	Satellite radio	5	5.3	5.3	98.9
	None of the above	1	1.1	1.1	100.0
	Total	94	100.0	100.0	

County	Which do you listen to most often?	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Spalding	A.M. stations	1	3.6	3.6	3.6
	F.M. stations	23	82.1	82.1	85.7
	Satellite radio	2	7.1	7.1	92.9
	None of the above	2	7.1	7.1	100.0
	Total	28	100.0	100.0	

County	Please consider the driving, walking, or other commuting you've done in the last week. Can you recall the message on any billboard you have seen?	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Bartow	Yes	37	55.2	55.2	55.2
	No	28	41.8	41.8	97.0
	Haven't seen a billboard	2	3.0	3.0	100.0
	Total	67	100.0	100.0	
Bibb	Yes	34	45.3	45.3	45.3
	No	31	41.3	41.3	86.7
	Haven't seen a billboard	10	13.3	13.3	100.0
	Total	75	100.0	100.0	
Carroll	Yes	49	49.5	49.5	49.5
	No	44	44.4	44.4	93.9
	Haven't seen a billboard	6	6.1	6.1	100.0
	Total	99	100.0	100.0	
Chatham	Yes	57	53.3	53.3	53.3
	No	39	36.4	36.4	89.7
	Haven't seen a billboard	11	10.3	10.3	100.0
	Total	107	100.0	100.0	
Clayton	Yes	65	49.2	49.6	49.6
	No	56	42.4	42.7	92.4
	Haven't seen a billboard	10	7.6	7.6	100.0
	Total	131	99.2	100.0	
Douglas	Yes	41	44.6	44.6	44.6
	No	45	48.9	48.9	93.5
	Haven't seen a billboard	6	6.5	6.5	100.0
	Total	92	100.0	100.0	
Hall	Yes	44	53.0	53.0	53.0
	No	32	38.6	38.6	91.6
	Haven't seen a billboard	7	8.4	8.4	100.0
	Total	83	100.0	100.0	
Lumpkin	Yes	3	10.7	10.7	10.7
	No	20	71.4	71.4	82.1
	Haven't seen a billboard	5	17.9	17.9	100.0
	Total	28	100.0	100.0	
Paulding	Yes	49	52.1	52.1	52.1
	No	38	40.4	40.4	92.6
	Haven't seen a billboard	7	7.4	7.4	100.0
	Total	94	100.0	100.0	
Spalding	Yes	15	53.6	53.6	53.6
	No	8	28.6	28.6	82.1
	Haven't seen a billboard	5	17.9	17.9	100.0
	Total	28	100.0	100.0	

County	How often do you use public transportation?	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Bartow	Daily	1	1.5	1.5	1.5
	A few times a year	4	6.0	6.1	7.6
	Never	59	88.1	89.4	97.0
	Other (please explain):	2	3.0	3.0	100.0
	Total	66	98.5	100.0	
Bibb	Daily	4	5.3	5.3	5.3
	Weekly	2	2.7	2.7	8.0
	Monthly	4	5.3	5.3	13.3
	A few times a year	4	5.3	5.3	18.7
	Never	60	80.0	80.0	98.7
	Other (please explain):	1	1.3	1.3	100.0
	Total	75	100.0	100.0	
Carroll	Daily	2	2.0	2.0	2.0
	Monthly	1	1.0	1.0	3.0
	A few times a year	10	10.1	10.1	13.1
	Never	86	86.9	86.9	100.0
	Total	99	100.0	100.0	
Chatham	Daily	5	4.7	4.7	4.7
	Weekly	5	4.7	4.7	9.3
	Monthly	2	1.9	1.9	11.2
	A few times a year	17	15.9	15.9	27.1
	Never	77	72.0	72.0	99.1
	Other (please explain):	1	0.9	0.9	100.0
	Total	107	100.0	100.0	
Clayton	Daily	13	9.8	9.9	9.9
	Weekly	4	3.0	3.1	13.0
	Monthly	2	1.5	1.5	14.5
	A few times a year	31	23.5	23.7	38.2
	Never	77	58.3	58.8	96.9
	Other (please explain):	4	3.0	3.1	100.0
	Total	131	99.2	100.0	
Douglas	Daily	4	4.3	4.3	4.3
	Weekly	1	1.1	1.1	5.4
	Monthly	2	2.2	2.2	7.6
	A few times a year	25	27.2	27.2	34.8
	Never	57	62.0	62.0	96.7
	Other (please explain):	3	3.3	3.3	100.0
	Total	92	100.0	100.0	
Hall	A few times a year	17	20.5	20.5	20.5
	Never	63	75.9	75.9	96.4
	Other (please explain):	3	3.6	3.6	100.0
	Total	83	100.0	100.0	
Lumpkin	A few times a year	7	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Never	19	67.9	67.9	92.9
	Other (please explain):	2	7.1	7.1	100.0
	Total	28	100.0	100.0	

County	How often do you use public transportation?	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Paulding	Daily	1	1.1	1.1	1.1
	Weekly	1	1.1	1.1	2.1
	Monthly	1	1.1	1.1	3.2
	A few times a year	13	13.8	13.8	17.0
	Never	76	80.9	80.9	97.9
	Other (please explain):	2	2.1	2.1	100.0
	Total	94	100.0	100.0	
Spalding	Daily	1	3.6	3.6	3.6
	A few times a year	5	17.9	17.9	21.4
	Never	21	75.0	75.0	96.4
	Other (please explain):	1	3.6	3.6	100.0
	Total	28	100.0	100.0	

County	How often do you use the Internet for getting information about state or local government services?	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Bartow	Very often	14	20.9	20.9	20.9
	Somewhat often	26	38.8	38.8	59.7
	Rarely	27	40.3	40.3	100.0
	Total	67	100.0	100.0	
Bibb	Very often	19	25.3	25.3	25.3
	Somewhat often	23	30.7	30.7	56.0
	Rarely	25	33.3	33.3	89.3
	Never	8	10.7	10.7	100.0
	Total	75	100.0	100.0	
Carroll	Very often	25	25.3	25.3	25.3
	Somewhat often	29	29.3	29.3	54.5
	Rarely	39	39.4	39.4	93.9
	Never	6	6.1	6.1	100.0
	Total	99	100.0	100.0	
Chatham	Very often	24	22.4	22.6	22.6
	Somewhat often	38	35.5	35.8	58.5
	Rarely	42	39.3	39.6	98.1
	Never	2	1.9	1.9	100.0
	Total	106	99.1	100.0	
Clayton	Very often	30	22.7	22.7	22.7
	Somewhat often	54	40.9	40.9	63.6
	Rarely	43	32.6	32.6	96.2
	Never	5	3.8	3.8	100.0
	Total	132	100.0	100.0	
Douglas	Very often	15	16.3	16.3	16.3
	Somewhat often	42	45.7	45.7	62.0
	Rarely	33	35.9	35.9	97.8
	Never	2	2.2	2.2	100.0
	Total	92	100.0	100.0	
Hall	Very often	13	15.7	16.0	16.0
	Somewhat often	29	34.9	35.8	51.9
	Rarely	36	43.4	44.4	96.3
	Never	3	3.6	3.7	100.0
	Total	81	97.6	100.0	
Lumpkin	Very often	3	10.7	10.7	10.7
	Somewhat often	10	35.7	35.7	46.4
	Rarely	15	53.6	53.6	100.0
	Total	28	100.0	100.0	
Paulding	Very often	14	14.9	14.9	14.9
	Somewhat often	44	46.8	46.8	61.7
	Rarely	34	36.2	36.2	97.9
	Never	2	2.1	2.1	100.0
	Total	94	100.0	100.0	

County	How often do you use the Internet for getting information about state or local government services?	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Spalding	Very often	7	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Somewhat often	10	35.7	35.7	60.7
	Rarely	10	35.7	35.7	96.4
	Never	1	3.6	3.6	100.0
	Total	28	100.0	100.0	

Appendix B: Comments from Respondents

The following are the unedited comments from respondents to the survey:

- Action is already in place in the community, I feel this is duplicate of other programs which is place.
- As all is in the initial stages of development there will be growth in all skill levels between agencies in the areas of communication and continual strategy development.
- At this time, lack of experience would mean a lack of confidence.
- Diversity of all the members brings a wide approach to addressing the drug problems in our community. Many levels of expertise!
- Effective communication amongst all parties involvement is crucial. White county has to be urgent in it's response to the untimely deaths of 4 youths this year alone. Time is of essence. Summertime may be upon us, but the youth is wanting something to be done now to address this most pressing issue.
- I am confident in the desire to help and the ability to communicate and work together but even system wide involvement will have a limited impact on drug use until we find a more innovative solution to preventing the problem.
- I am new to this type of work, while at the meeting I notice all agencies involved were very good to interact and support one another while discussing the counties needs.
- I believe this organization will work together to help our community. As we meet more often we will learn more.
- I believe we have a great Family Connections collaborative that already work well together and our Law enforcement is behind our efforts. And also our community at large is very hungry for this type of information. Most of our community leaders have been hearing about problems and have been made aware of DEC and our team arriving and striving to make a difference.
- I don't believe we can prevent drug problems altogether. We can make a positive impact. We can prevent some problems.

- I don't feel like our DEC team is far enough along to feel confident in dealing with drug endangered children and communicating agency to agency...but I know that will definitely come with time...once we start our action plan!
- i feel i learned alot but to build my confort level i will have to practice more in doing the things mention for public awareness adn making sure i understand what the community response is after further traing as well
- I feel we have very professional and dedicated members who work to educate the community about the risks of drug endangered children and what can be done to prevent our children from being exposed.
- I think Paulding County DEC will be very effective in sharing information with agencies and the community. I think the challenge will be in consistently getting agency directors to the table, for critical decision making.
- I work with teachers at the university level. There is no comprehensive plan...rather no plan to address this issue to increase the awareness or ability of teachers to deal with this problem.
- It going to take alot of communication between agencies that prefer to guard their turf!
- It was the first meeting and I feel that with time, the team will be able to address the concerns.
- It was the first of such meetings that I've attended. I'm not sure how well the various agencies represented have and will align and communicate.
- It will be a great challenge to keep people interested and focused.
- Many agencies and individuals were present with strong feelings of need for proactive, cohesive and comprehnsive services for the protection of children in drug endangered environments. All involved had something to add, and if directed effectively, the at risk children in our community would benefit greatly.
- Not sure it will get combined with protocol & fatal review.
- Our community lready has great collaboration among involved agencies, and the DEC program will fine tune that collaboration to protect children from the effects of substance abuse.

- Our community seems to be working well together & doing a good job of keeping necessary agencies informed.
- Our DEC team basically is made up of our county collaborative members who also serve on the Child Fatality Review Team, Tuancy Treatment Team, and Child Abuse Protocol. We interact frequently & have a good working relationship
- Our DEC Team has worked together in the past and share a common goal of protecting our children and their families.
- Process is new to me.
- Teachers need to be a part of any solution to serve children more effectively.
- The DEC team is able to communicate effectively in order to deal with current situations.
- The group that met have a history of working well together. We are already doing some of the work discussed at the meeting.
- The initial meeting is all that I know has occurred to this point. Although I left feeling that we could work within the concept, I felt we as a community are a long way from being ready to respond in a coherent planned manner to an event.
- The members of the DEC team also are members of other committees and collaboratives. Therefore, each agency is considered a team player and will collaborate to address the children's needs.
- The members of the DEC team collaborate on a variety of issues involving children and families; therefore, I am confident that this will continue into the DEC.
- The team was very effective at stating the problems in our community and the solutions that we will explore to resolve the problems. Each discipline was represented and all questions were addressed. We are in the process of scheduling future meeting to deal with the most challenging issues identified in our community which I think will really benefit the community.
- There is good communication already existing between the involved agencies and the meeting stressed the importance that this should continue. Everyone takes their job of protecting these children as a high priority.

- There needs to be unity, and avoid leaving key people out of the team.
- Too new.
- Unsure how well everybody will actually work together to get the goals completed.
- We are already doing the work without the structure of a DEC
- We are in the beginning process of our team. The next meeting is going to be a meeting where we learn who and what our resources are as well as putting together a resource book.
- We are really just getting started and it has not come together yet. Still in the planning stages and we need to put our thoughts and plans into action. I am confident that it will come together eventually.
- We are still building the team and defining our roles, goals, and purpose so I am not sure about my level of confidence until we are further along.
- We are still very new and have a lot to learn....we are still only in the planning stages and not so much into implementing or finding solutions. WE have identified the problem...now we just have to network to start looking at agency protocols to better understand what is already happening with DEC kids and what needs to happen.
- We do not have a follow-up meeting planned.
- We have a very dedicated group of professionals in our group. I do not feel that I am as confident in my knowledge as I am in their's.
- We will get it together with our local DEC, however, as much as we will try, there will always be drugs & alcohol and the sorrows that come from it until Jesus Christ returns. Now I've given you the TRUTH of the matter, even though it is politically incorrect. But the TRUTH is what it is.
- Willingness to colaborate was very strong. Without a local person spearheaded this effort it could be placed on the backburner for someone as an additional duty to their already existing job.



The University of Georgia

The Carl Vinson Institute of Government has served as an integral part of the University of Georgia for more than 80 years. A public service and outreach unit of the university, the Institute has as its chief objective assisting public officials in achieving better government and communities, particularly in Georgia. To this end, it draws upon the resources and expertise of the university to offer an extensive program of governmental instruction, research and policy analysis, technical assistance, and publications.

Collectively, Vinson Institute faculty and staff design and conduct more than 600 training and development programs per year, in which more than 18,000 public officials participate. Technical assistance takes many forms, including evaluation of existing facilities and methods, provision of information for decision makers, and assistance in establishing new programs. Research helps inform policy decisions at local and state levels.

Research with wide general application is made available through the publications program. Publications include handbooks for specific governmental offices, research studies on significant issues, classroom teaching materials, and reports on practical methods for improving governmental operations.