Institute for Youth in Policy

5214F Diamond Heights Blvd #3055
San Francisco, CA 94109
+1 (715) 469-6884
fellowship@yipinstitute.org
www.yipinstitute.org/fellowship/

Fellowship Capstone | Policy Brief

Predictive Analytics for Early Intervention in Substance Use Disorders

Joseph Buechler

I. Executive summary

In 2023, nearly one in six Americans, about 48.5 million people, struggled with a substance use disorder, while drug overdoses tragically claimed roughly 105,000 lives nationwide. This brief proposes a tiered prevention model using predictive analytics to identify at-risk youth and connect them to consistent support within existing public education frameworks. By targeting resources earlier and more efficiently, this model aims to reduce addiction rates and the long-term costs associated with treatment, incarceration, and lost productivity.

II. Overview

Substance use disorder (SUD) imposes a massive economic burden in the U.S., with opioid-related costs alone reaching approximately $1.5 trillion annually. Current prevention approaches rely largely on broad education campaigns and reactive treatment; these strategies often fail to reach young people before addiction begins. This policy recommends a tiered prevention model within public schools:

1. Identify at-risk youth using predictive analytics applied to academic, behavioral, attendance, familial, wellness, and optional student self-assessment data.
2. Provide regular counseling and small-group support during the school year, and create a referral pathway so flagged students can also be connected to healthcare providers or social services.
3. Offer a summer leadership and prevention program to build resilience and purpose.
4. Pair each student with a trained mentor for year-round guidance and support.

A. Relevance

SAMHSA reports that substance abuse prevention offers a strong return on investment, especially in schools. Studies show that effective school-based programs can prevent millions of youth from initiating substance use, resulting in billions saved in lifetime healthcare and productivity costs. Interactive, evidence-based programs focused on students showing early risk factors produce significantly greater reductions in drug use than broad, universal efforts. Embedding this model within schools leverages trusted infrastructure—daily access to nearly all youth, trained staff, and existing support services—enabling early and consistent intervention when prevention matters most.

III. History

In the 1980s, the "Just Say No" campaign, championed by First Lady Nancy Reagan, epitomized the era's approach with its emphasis on moral messaging and personal responsibility.

At the same time, the Drug Abuse Resistance Education (D.A.R.E.) program was launched, aiming to educate youth about the dangers of drugs through school-based curricula delivered by uniformed police officers. Evaluations of D.A.R.E.'s effectiveness revealed limited success in reducing drug use among participants, leading to criticisms about its approach and content.

In the 1990s, there was a shift towards a more comprehensive understanding of addiction. The establishment of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) in 1992 consolidated federal efforts to address substance abuse and mental health issues, aiming to provide more coordinated and effective services. This period also saw the emergence of evidence-based prevention programs, such as Operation Snowball, which utilized peer-led initiatives to promote drug-free lifestyles among youth.

The 2000s brought further advancements, notably with the enactment of the Paul Wellstone and Pete Domenici Mental Health Parity and Addiction Equity Act of 2008. This legislation mandated that insurance coverage for substance use disorders be no more restrictive than that for other medical conditions, which was a significant step towards integrating addiction treatment into mainstream healthcare. The Affordable Care Act of 2010 also expanded access to prevention, screening, and treatment services for substance use disorders.

The more recent approach to SUD prevention is complex and fragmented, involving a combination of school-based programs, community initiatives, and healthcare integration. Programs like Botvin LifeSkills Training and Project Towards No Drug Abuse have been implemented in schools to educate students about the risks of substance use and to build skills to resist peer pressure. Other initiatives, like the Strengthening Families Program and Early Risers Skills for Success, focus on improving family dynamics and individual competencies to reduce risk factors associated with substance misuse.

Despite these efforts, challenges persist. The opioid crisis, fueled by prescription painkillers and synthetic opioids like fentanyl, has led to a surge in overdose deaths, with over 105,000 reported in 2023 alone. In response, legislation such as the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act (CARA) of 2016 authorized funding for prevention and treatment programs. Since then, the COVID-19 pandemic has exacerbated substance use issues, demonstrating the need for new prevention strategies.

IV. Policy Problem

A. Stakeholders

The primary stakeholders in this proposal are at-risk youth and their families, especially those in underserved communities. These young people face the greatest risk of early exposure and eventual addiction due to a combination of environmental and genetic factors. Their families often bear the emotional and financial burdens of substance use disorder, and strained or unstable family dynamics can increase the risk of addiction. Public schools are key stakeholders, serving as the central hub for intervention programs. Teachers, counselors, and school social workers would help identify students in need and

deliver support services. State and local governments—particularly departments of education, health, and human services—are critical because they set the policies, allocate budgets, and build the partnerships needed to make any prevention framework work. Taxpayers and the broader economy also have a stake, as untreated addiction creates significant social and economic costs.

B. Risks of Indifference

Failing to invest in prevention allows substance use disorders to entrench themselves in communities, costing both lives and money. Without early intervention, at-risk youth often move from experimentation to long-term addiction, which is significantly more expensive to treat later on. A reactive rather than proactive approach leads to higher public spending on criminal justice, emergency healthcare, and social welfare programs. It also means losing the long-term potential of individuals who could otherwise become healthy, productive adults. Indifference sends a message that only those already suffering from addiction deserve attention, missing the opportunity to prevent it in the first place. Left unaddressed, youth addiction not only worsens public health outcomes but also contributes to cycles of poverty and unemployment.

C. Nonpartisan Reasoning

Addiction prevention is a nonpartisan issue with broad public benefit. Investing in youth intervention strategies is cost-effective, with estimates showing that every dollar spent on prevention can save up to $18 in long-term costs related to treatment and incarceration. Equipping schools to identify and support at-risk youth strengthens the education system's ability to protect students and stabilize communities. Prevention programs ultimately align with conservative calls for fiscal responsibility and reduced public dependency, while meeting progressive goals of equity, health access, and social mobility.

V. Tried Policy

One of the most prominent recent federal efforts to reduce youth substance use was the Drug-Free Communities (DFC) Support Program, which began in 1997 and was reauthorized as recently as 2018. This program provides grants to community-based coalitions to reduce youth substance use. While the DFC model emphasizes early prevention, its focus remains broad and not data-driven. Most interventions are community-wide and not tailored to individuals most at risk.

Another policy example is the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration's (SAMHSA) School-Based Preventive Interventions, including evidence-based programs like LifeSkills Training (LST). These classroom curricula aim to reduce youth drug use by building social skills, self-esteem, and resistance strategies. While LST and similar programs have shown moderate success in lowering early-stage experimentation, they are not designed to identify or intervene with students at higher risk of long-term addiction. Additionally, their one-size-fits-all nature may overlook key personal, family, or mental health factors.

In recent years, predictive tools have been

introduced at the state and district level, but usually for academic tracking or behavioral interventions, not addiction prevention. For example, Florida's Early Warning System uses attendance, behavior, and course performance data to flag students at risk of struggling or dropping out. Similarly, some districts use social-emotional screeners or risk indices to recommend support services. However, these tools aren't currently connected directly to substance use prevention. Without a clear framework or mandate, schools are left without the tools or incentives to connect early indicators to consistent addiction prevention support.

VI. Policy Options

1. Predictive Risk Identification in Public Schools

Public school districts would implement pilot programs that use predictive analytics to identify students at elevated risk of developing substance use disorders (SUD). Models would be created in partnership with research institutions and grounded in longitudinal adolescent health data. Data inputs could include academic, behavioral, attendance, familial, wellness, and optional student self-assessments. Access to predictive tools would be restricted to trained staff, and each flagged case would be reviewed by an internal team with a clear plan for follow-up support.

2. School-Year Counseling and Targeted Group Support

Identified students would receive regular one-on-one counseling during the school year, small-group programs focused on emotional regulation, resilience, and healthy decision-making, and monthly wellness check-ins. The frequency of services could be increased based on student needs and clinical recommendations. When necessary, students would also be referred to healthcare providers or community services for additional support. This kind of ongoing engagement, similar to academic intervention programs, keeps students connected to trusted adults and helps destigmatize asking for help.

3. Summer Leadership and Prevention Programming

State education departments would fund summer programs for at-risk students that combine leadership development, service-learning, prevention education, and supervised recreational activities, offered at no cost to participants. Peer mentorship would be integrated, and stipends or incentives would be provided to reduce participation barriers for low-income students. Research consistently shows that meaningful summer engagement helps prevent risky behavior by giving students a sense of belonging and forward momentum.

4. Year-Round Mentorship

Each participant would be matched with a trained mentor—such as a school staff member, counselor, or vetted nonprofit volunteer—who would maintain weekly contact, escalate concerns to appropriate personnel, and be trained in trauma-informed care, motivational interviewing, and adolescent development.

5. Student Data Privacy and Oversight

All data use would comply with FERPA and relevant privacy laws. Programs would emphasize transparent communication with students and families about what data is collected, how it's

used, and how privacy is protected, including requiring informed consent or at least clear opt-out options. Predictive analytics could not be used for disciplinary or punitive purposes. An independent oversight board appointed by the state department of education would review annual program outcomes to ensure equity, transparency, and effectiveness.

VII. Conclusions

Substance use disorder continues to strain communities, families, and public systems across the U.S. Current prevention programs lack the tools to identify students most at risk before addiction takes hold. A school-based tiered prevention model that uses predictive analytics offers a practical way to intervene earlier. By connecting at-risk students to counseling, mentorship, and structured support year-round, this policy can prevent future addiction and reduce long-term public costs. Schools already collect the data and have the infrastructure. What's missing is the direction and investment to use it effectively.

Acknowledgment

The Institute for Youth in Policy wishes to acknowledge Mason Carlisle, Lilly Kurtz, Asher Cohen, Paul Kramer. and other contributors for developing and maintaining the Fellowship Program within the Institute.

References

[1] SAMHSA, Cost and Benefits of Substance Abuse Prevention, https://www.samhsa.gov/sites/default/files/cost-benefits-prevention.pdf

[2] National Institutes of Health (NIH), Preventing Youth Substance Use: Programs That Work, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8091480

[3] National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA), Investing in Prevention Makes Good Financial Sense, https://nida.nih.gov/about-nida/noras-blog/2022/04/investing-in-prevention-makes-good-financial-sense

[4] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), Understanding the Opioid Overdose Epidemic, https://www.cdc.gov/overdose-prevention/about/understanding-the-opioid-overdose-epidemic.html

[5] National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, Fostering Healthy Mental, Emotional, and Behavioral Development in Children and Youth, Chapter 6, https://nap.nationalacademies.org/read/25546/chapter/6

[6] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), Drug-Free Communities Program Success, https://www.cdc.gov/overdose-prevention/php/drug-free-communities/program-success

[7] Community Anti-Drug Coalitions of America (CADCA), Drug-Free Communities (DFC) Program, https://www.cadca.org/dfc-program

[8] University of Colorado Boulder, Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development, LifeSkills Training (LST), https://www.blueprintsprograms.org/programs/5999999/lifeskills-training-lst

[9] Substance Abuse: Research and Treatment, Substance Use Prevention in Adolescents, https://substanceabusepolicy.biomedcentral.c

om
[10] Time Magazine, Sarah Pruitt, 2017, The History of the Opioid Crisis and "Just Say No", https://time.com/4999376/history-opioid-just-say-no
[11] CrimeSolutions.gov, DARE Program (1983–2009), https://crimesolutions.ojp.gov/ratedprograms/drug-abuse-resistance-education-dare-1983-2009#2-0
[12] Congressional Research Service, R46426: The Opioid Crisis: Status of the 2016 CARA and 2018 SUPPORT Acts, https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/R46426
[13] National Center for Biotechnology Information (NCBI), Mental Health and Addiction Equity Act, https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK424860
[14] Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS), Mental Health Parity and Addiction Equity, https://www.cms.gov/marketplace/private-health-insurance/mental-health-parity-addiction-equity
[15] Office of National Drug Control Policy, Obama White House Archives, Healthcare and Drug Policy, https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/ondcp/healthcare
[16]
[17] Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Substance Use Prevention Resources for Schools, https://www.pa.gov/agencies/ddap/substance-use-prevention/prevention-resources-for-schools
[18] Riverside University Health System, Substance Use Prevention Toolkit for Schools, https://www.ruhealth.org/substance-use-prevention-toolkit-schools-education-educational-programs
[19] PubMed Central (PMC), Adolescent Substance Use Interventions, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8896880/
[20] PubMed Central (PMC), School-Based Interventions and Mental Health, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7936257/
[21] PubMed Central (PMC), The Case for Universal Screening in Schools, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5980729/
[22] National Institutes of Health (NIH), Adolescents and Drug Use: Evidence-Based Interventions, https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK552668/
[23] National Student Support Accelerator, Stanford University, Student Data Privacy Guidance, https://nssa.stanford.edu/tutoring/data-use/measures-data-collection/student-data-privacy-guidance
[24] National Education Association (NEA), Safeguarding Student Data in a Digital World, https://www.nea.org/nea-today/all-news-articles/safeguarding-student-data-digital-world
[25] New Hampshire MTSS-B, Universal Screening Overview Sheet, https://nhmtssb.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/12/Universal-Screening-Overview-Sheet.pdf
[26] U.S. Department of Education, Safe and

Supportive Schools Discipline Compendium (Florida Example), https://safesupportivelearning.ed.gov/discipline-compendium?state=Florida&sub

[27] PubMed Central (PMC), Risk Factors and Screening for Substance Use, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC2265741