

**Title IV, Safe and Drug-Free Schools Entitlement Project**

**2007-08**

**The School District of Lee County**

**Lee County, Florida**

**Final Evaluation Report**

Prepared by:

Ellen K. Williamson, MS PT, Grant Evaluator

Florida Gulf Coast University

10501 FGCU Blvd. South, BHG 226

Fort Myers, FL 33965-6565

(239) 590-7531 ekwill@fgcu.edu

August 2008

**Table of Contents**

I. Executive Summary..... 3

II. Introduction..... 4

III. Evaluation Questions..... 4

IV. Individual Components

    A. Second Step..... 5

    B. Too Good for Drugs and Violence..... 8

    C. Bully-Safe USA..... 10

    D. SDFS/SADD clubs..... 11

    E. Social Norming Activities..... 13

V. Conclusions and Recommendations..... 20

## **I. Executive Summary**

The School District of Lee County is responsible for the education of over 75 thousand students attending 13 high schools, 17 middle schools, 43 elementary schools, and 4 K-8 schools. Within the county there are also 20 Charter schools and 3 Private schools. SDFS grant services are available to all schools within the district. To serve the diverse needs of this large school district, grant-supported staff members focus their activities on providing support to individual schools in their efforts to decrease student's use of alcohol, tobacco and other drugs. Additionally the grant-related activities support the prevention of violence and bullying.

The monitoring of the implementation rates of three proven/promising prevention programs continued to serve as a method to hold schools accountable for putting the training provided by grant personnel and the materials purchased by SDFS grant funds to use. Support for implementation was provided and data were collected.

This evaluation year served as a phasing-out year for the monitoring of the activities of the SADD clubs. Club supervision became a purely voluntary activity during this year, resulting in a significant drop in active clubs in the district. A third and final year of knowledge testing was completed at the elementary level, but no other club monitoring was done.

A major shift to a Social Norming approach to ATOD use prevention was initiated during this evaluation year. New data collection procedures/instruments, as well as a new set of activities were implemented. This year served as a baseline year for the evaluation of the social norming activities.

This evaluation report describes each of these activities/programs, grant-related goals specific to each activity, and evaluative findings. Comparisons to previous year evaluative findings are included as appropriate. Baseline data were generated in specific areas. Conclusions and recommendations based on the evaluation process are provided.

## **I. Introduction:**

The School District of Lee County continues to be committed to effecting a change on the knowledge, behaviors and attitudes of the District's students and parents related to alcohol, tobacco, other drugs, and violence. The Safe and Drug-Free Schools Advisory council continues to provide guidance to the grant administrator and staff in developing a comprehensive prevention plan. This plan is based on prior years' evaluation results, needs assessment, and new developments in the field of Safe and Drug Free Schools. The following District Long-Term Goals were developed to guide the activities from Fall 2006 through June 30, 2012:

1. Students in grades K-12 will decrease the number of incidents of drug possession and use per 1,000 students by 6% (Baseline: 05-06 SESIR data = 2.87 per 1,000 students)
2. Students in grades 6-12 will increase their School Rewards for prosocial involvement by 20%. (Baseline 2006 FYSAS data = 43% of respondents)
3. Students in grades K-12 will decrease their tobacco related incidents per 1,000 students by 6%. (Baseline 05-06 SESIR data = 2.0 per 1,000)
4. Students in grades K-12 will decrease their threat/intimidation related incidents per 1,000 students by 10%. (Baseline 05-06 SESIR data = 7.65 per 1,000)
5. Students in grades K-12 will decrease incidents of fighting per 1,000 students by 20%. (Baseline 05-06 SESIR data = 20.05 per 1,000)
6. Students in grades 6-12 will decrease their 30-day prevalence of alcohol consumption by 20%. (Baseline 2006 FYSAS data = 36.5% of the respondents)
7. Student in grades K-12 will decrease incidents of alcohol related incidents per 1,000 students by 5%. (Baseline 05-06 SESIR data = .58 per 1,000)
8. Students in grades 6-12 will decrease their Past 30-day marijuana use by 5%. (Baseline 2006 FYSAS data = 13.9%)

The primary focus of the grant evaluation for this year was to measure the degree to which prevention programs are implemented in the schools of the district, to monitor student behaviors in ATOD-V, and to establish a baseline for Social Norming activities in specific schools.

## **II. Evaluation Questions:**

The evaluation questions for the 2007-08 evaluation year were:

1. To what degree do schools implement ATOD-V prevention programs since training was provided to the staff/faculty of a school?

2. Are there any ATOD-V knowledge differences in elementary students in schools which host SADD clubs as compared to students who are from non-SADD schools?
3. What are the ATOD-V usage patterns of middle and high school students? What are their perceptions of their peers as it relates to ATOD-V use?
4. What are students' perceptions of Social norming materials?

### **III. Individual Program Descriptions and Goals:**

#### **A. Second Step:**

##### **Program Description:**

The Second Step (SS) program is a proven program focused on student violence prevention, school-wide climate, and student discipline. The program includes parent involvement opportunities and is designed for grades Pre-K-8. Classroom use of the Second Step program includes life skills training and can be integrated in lessons in science, math, health, social studies, and language arts. The plan for 07-08 was to train and support the implementation of the program at four elementary schools (Lehigh Elementary, River Hall Elementary, Orange River Elementary, and Manatee Elementary) and one middle school (Varsity Lakes Middle). River Hall Elementary withdrew its commitment to the program at the beginning of the school year. Therefore, the prevention specialist focused her time on training new teachers/counselors in the Second Step program and supporting the program's implementation in the remaining three elementary schools and one middle school. The expectation was for those trained in the program to implement it in part/whole. Data were collected on the amount of training and frequency and degree of implementation within the target schools.

##### **Program Specific Objectives (by 6/30/08):**

1. Pre K-5<sup>th</sup> grade classes in Lehigh Elementary will decrease the number of incidents of peer conflict by 5% (Baseline data: 2006-07 County Annual Student Discipline Incident Report = 1.8% of total student population).
2. Grades 6-8 at Varsity Lakes Middle School will decrease the number of incidents of peer conflict by 5% (Baseline data: 2006-07 County Annual Student Discipline Incident Report = 13.7% of total student population).
3. Manatee Elementary School teachers will increase in the number of teachers trained by 50%. (2007-2008 training sign-in sheets).
4. Pre K-5<sup>th</sup> grade classes in Lehigh Elementary School will decrease the number of incidents of fighting by 5% (Baseline data: 2006-07 County Annual Student Discipline Incident Report = 5.7% of total student population).
5. Grades 6-8 at Varsity Lakes Middle School will decrease the number of incidents of fighting by 5% (Baseline data: 2006-07 County Annual Student Discipline Incident Report = 7.3% of total student population).

**Implementation and Evaluation Procedures:**

The prevention specialist distributed recording forms for program implementation and training attendance to each of the participating schools. Training was provided by the prevention specialist for new teachers at Orange River Elementary early in the school year. A school counselor who relocated from one school to another provided the classroom sessions for Manatee Elementary. Lehigh Elementary and Varsity Lakes Middle School did not require new teacher training. A 15-minute review was provided for all teachers at the middle school. These schools were selected as they serve as feeder schools to the high school with the highest incidence of fighting in the district. One target school did not participate in SS training/implementation. Collection of data is compared to the baseline data collected during 2006-2007.

**Evaluative Findings:**

Each of the four participating schools identified as ‘target’ schools completed and submitted implementation checklists (3 elementary, 1 middle school). Across the three elementary schools and one middle school participating, the following pattern of implementation was observed:

**Table I: Implementation rates of Second Step**

Grade level	# of participating classrooms	% completing all units	% completing more than half of all units
Pre-K	10 (2006-07)	60% (2006-07)	40% (2006-07)
	26 (2007-08)	71% (2007-08)	9.7% (2007-08)
Grade 1	20 (2006-07)	85% (2006-07)	15% (2006-07)
	23 (2007-08)	74% (2007-08)	1.5% (2007-08)
Grade 2	15 (2006-07)	100% (2006-07)	0% (2006-07)
	22 (2007-08)	62% (2007-08)	12% (2007-08)
Grade 3	17 (2006-07)	47% (2006-07)	5% (2006-07)
	23 (2007-08)	68% (2007-08)	20% (2007-08)
Grade 4	14 (2006-07)	64% (2006-07)	36% (2006-07)
	18 (2007-08)	65% (2007-08)	15% (2007-08)
Grade 5	12 (2006-07)	58% (2006-07)	42% (2006-07)
	17 (2007-08)	82% (2007-08)	0% (2007-08)
Grade 6	8 (2006-07)	25% (2006-07)	38% (2006-07)

	15 (2007-08)	93% (2007-08)	7% (2007-08)
Grade 7	8 (2006-07)	25% (2006-07)	38% (2006-07)
	15 (2007-08)	80% (2007-08)	20% (2007-08)
Grade 8	8 (2006-07)	38% (2006-07)	25% (2006-07)
	15(2007-08)	47% (2007-08)	7% (2007-08)
Total	112 (2006-07)		
	154 (2007-08)		

- % of units completed is a measure of total possible units in the curriculum for the grade level

A significant increase in number of classrooms/students who participated in the curriculum was observed at both the elementary and middle school level. In total, 154 classrooms/class sections participated in the Second Step curriculum, a 37.5% increase from the previous year. Not only were many more children involved in the Second Step curriculum, but the degree to which the program was implemented was far more complete in grades Pre-K, 3, 6 and 7 than during the 2006-07 school year. It is important to note that the middle school SS curriculum contains an additional 2 units, for a total of 5 units. Grade 6-8 data reflect the percentage of the 5 units completed. Therefore the full implementation of the program in the target middle school demonstrates a high level of commitment on the part of the school staff/administration.

Training of teachers at Manatee Elementary (Program specific goal #3) was not completed due to the school counselor taking on the responsibility for implementation. The prevention specialist activities were focused on providing support to implementation and a limited amount of training for new teachers or teachers needing a brief review. The implementation levels were mostly based on the commitment level of the teachers/administration within these particular schools.

It was predicted in the 2006-07 evaluation report that having only one prevention specialist would likely affect the level of implementation at additional schools during the 2007-08 year. This was observed in the limited number of schools who stayed committed to implementing the program. Complete training of the faculty, consistent follow-up, and the implementation of accountability measures appear to have had a strongly positive influence on the implementation of this proven violence prevention program in the past. Tracking of implementation rates will be important to observe if the lack of prevention specialist has an effect on continued implementation of Second Step.

Although SESIR data has been used in previous evaluations as a benchmark measure, the timing and delay of data availability does not provide timely information. Therefore, County Student Discipline Incident Reports are used to provide more accurate and timely data. The target middle school (Varsity Lakes Middle) experienced a 2.1% decrease in incidents of peer conflict (baseline 2006-07 – 13.7%; 2007-08 – 11.6% and 7.3 decrease in incidents of fighting (baseline 2006-07 – 7.3%; 2007-08 -- .004%)

as of April 2008. One of the targeted elementary schools, Lehigh Elementary, experienced an increase in incidents of peer conflict (baseline 2006-07 – 1.8%; 2007-08 – 3%). However, training of principles in reporting may have shifted incidents from fighting to peer conflict, thus increasing the number of peer conflicts reported. Incidents of fighting decreased during this past year (baseline 06-07 -- 5.7%; 2007-08 -- .003%) as of April 2008. Based on these reported changes, the district was able to meet Goal #4 and #5 related to incidents of fighting. However, program specific goals #1 and #2 were only met in part. Continued monitoring of discipline reports will allow the grant administrator to identify if these changes are stable and show a continuance of decreased incidents of peer conflict and fighting.

## **B. Too Good for Drugs & Violence program:**

### **Program Description:**

The Too Good for Drugs and Violence (TG) program is a proven program designed for grades Pre-K through 12. The program focuses on ATOD prevention, school-wide climate, and student discipline. Although TG programming may have been implemented in other schools in the district, due to the limited number of grant funded personnel, implementation and training was only focused on one school (Gateway Elementary).

### **Program Specific Objectives (by 6/30/08):**

1. Students at Gateway Elementary (K-5) will maintain the percent of students using or possessing alcohol or drugs in school (baseline data: Annual County Student Incident Report 2006-07: 0%)
2. Gateway Elementary will increase the number of teachers who implement the program by 50% (Baseline data: Implementation checklists 2006-07: 85% of teachers implement).
3. Middle schools (grades 6-8) that receive students from Gateway Elementary will maintain the percentage of students using alcohol or drugs in school (Baseline data: Annual County Student Incident Report 2006-07: .5%)

### **Implementation and Evaluation Procedures:**

Although other schools in the district may implement the Too Good curriculum, the prevention specialist focused her effort on the training of teachers at Gateway Elementary. Implementation checklists were distributed to monitor levels of implementation of the program. The prevention specialist kept regular contact with the school for support and accountability.

### **Evaluative Findings:**

Fifteen faculty, previously trained in the Too Good program, participated in a training review session with the prevention specialist. New teachers were trained by the school counselor. All teachers

participated in the program’s implementation, meeting Program Specific Goal #2. The following data represent self-reported implementation rates from Gateway elementary.

**Table II: Implementation rates for Too Good programming**

Grade level	# of participating classrooms	% completing all units	% completing more than half of all units
Pre-K	3 (2006-07)	100% (2006-07)	
	5 (2007-08)	100% (2007-08)	
Grade 1	6 (2006-07)	83% (2006-07)	17% (2006-07)
	7 (2007-08)	100% (2007-08)	
Grade 2	6 (2006-07)	100% (2006-07)	
	8 (2007-08)	100% (2007-08)	
Grade 3	6 (2006-07)	83% (2006-07)	17% (2006-07)
	6 (2007-08)	100% (2007-08)	
Grade 4	6 (2006-07)	83% (2006-07)	17% (2006-07)
	6 (2007-08)	100% (2007-08)	
Grade 5	7(2006-07)	86% (2006-07)	14% (2006-07)
	6 (2007-08)	100% (2007-08)	
Total classrooms	34 (2006-07)		
	38 (2007-08)		

Gateway elementary demonstrated a high level of participation during 2006-07. The table above demonstrates an even higher level of implementation in 2007-08, reaching 100% of all classes within the school. Gateway elementary has participated in the Too Good curriculum for several years. The majority of students from this elementary school have moved up to four middle schools in the county: Lee Middle, Varsity Lakes Middle, Veterans Park, and Michigan International Academy. Reported ATOD usage data were used to monitor student behaviors at these middle schools. Although small decreases are observed in reported use in three of the four target middle schools from 2006-07 to 2007-08 (< 1%), there is no significant difference in this change in these four schools from the change observed in all other remaining middle schools in the district (decrease of 1% on average). It is estimated that the need for ATOD prevention programs is high at these target schools. Program specific goal #3 is met.

The monitoring of Too Good implementation was reduced this year due to the time limitations of the one funded grant specialist. Although it had been planned that teachers of a middle school would also be trained and monitored, the target middle school elected to not participate.

The relationship between ATOD intervention using the Too Good program at the elementary level and sustained behavior change is not clear. Continued support of the Too Good program at Gateway Elementary and monitoring of reported ATOD usage should be continued to further investigate this relationship.

### **C. Bully Safe USA:**

#### **Program Description:**

Bully Safe is a commercially-developed bully prevention program that addresses physical, verbal, emotional, cyber and sexual bullying for students in grades K-9. This empowerment program meets components of character education for the state and targets school-wide climate, student violence prevention, and student discipline. Nationally, students participating in the BS USA program reported a 19% decrease in bullying behaviors. Peer-age students not participating reported an 11% increase in bullying behaviors.

#### **Program Specific Objectives (by 6/30/08):**

1. There will be a 5% decrease in threat and intimidation incidents with students in grades K-8 (Baseline data: County Student Incident Report 2005-06: 1.2%).
2. There will be a 20% increase in the number of schools submitting Bully Safe Implementation Checklists (Baseline data: 2006-07 implementation checklists: 27 schools)

#### **Implementation and Evaluation Procedures:**

The focus of grant-funded personnel (prevention specialist) was to provide training to school personnel in the Bully Safe USA (BS) program, distribute and collect implementation checklists, and monitor implementation and provide support to elementary and middle schools. Schools were responsible for reporting the grades that participated, the number of students in the grade, the number of student empowerment sessions that were held, and whether follow-up activities were held. Since all but three elementary schools had at least 1 trained staff member at the beginning of 2007-08 school year, the prevention specialist focused her attention on supporting the implementation of the program in 22 elementary schools, 3 K-8 schools, and 4 middle schools.

#### **Evaluative Findings:**

In 2006-07, nineteen elementary schools, empowerment sessions were held at all but three, representing an 84% participation rate of the elementary schools. However, at the three that did not

hold empowerment sessions, other follow-up activities related to the BS program were held. During the 2007-08 school year, 22 elementary schools participated, offering empowerment sessions in 102 classrooms. On average, across the 22 schools, 86 empowerment sessions were offered at each grade level (range 71-102). Numeric data on the number of empowerment sessions have not been collected prior to this reporting year, so no comparison can be made on the degree to which the schools increased or decreased their implementation within each school. Participating elementary schools also offered follow-up sessions for a total of 2,404 sessions district-wide (range per school 0-190). This demonstrates a 216% increase from 2006-07 in the number of follow-up sessions offered to elementary students within the district. Follow-up sessions varied in nature and included the reading of books, watching videos, participating in role-play activities, classroom discussion, writing projects, and designing posters.

Only four middle schools submitted Implementation checklists at the conclusion of 2007-08 school year. In 2006-07, 10 schools reported on their implementation of the Bully-Safe program. Implementation rates were relatively low, with only one of the four schools offering empowerment sessions in all three grades. Only two schools offered follow-up sessions, and only at the 6<sup>th</sup> grade level. This also demonstrates a decrease from 2006-07 where seven of the reporting schools offered a total of 194 follow-up sessions. This demonstrates a significant decrease in the district related to reporting (submission of Implementation checklists) as well as activity within participating schools.

A total of 29 schools submitted Implementation checklists which is only a small increase from the previous year (27 schools in 2006-07). Although goal #2 was not fully met, both reporting and implementation in the elementary schools demonstrated a measurable increase.

The use of "Ambassador Awards" was inconsistent across and within schools. Adoption of this individual student recognition appears to be a decision of each teacher.

The 2005-06 County Student Incident Report for Lee County reported a 1.2% incident rate for threat and intimidation incidents. One year later, the district reports a .3% incident rate for these incidents. This is a measurable shift in the numbers of incidents in the district. Based on 07-08 enrollment, this represents a decrease of over 700 incidents of threat/intimidation in the district's schools. Goal #1 was met in part for the 2007-08 year.

### **C. SDFS/SADD Clubs:**

#### **Program Description:**

The SDFS/SADD clubs exist to meet the informational needs of students, staff and parents in Lee County. School Resource Officers, teachers, or other staff members supervise SDFS/SADD clubs. Clubs meet 1-4 times per month for regular club meetings. In addition, clubs sponsor school wide activities to provide alcohol, tobacco, and other drug use prevention information to K-12 students, staff, and parents. As of this year, club advisors are uncompensated.

**Program Specific Objectives (by 6/30/08):**

1. Student reported 'Past 30-day marijuana use' will decrease by 5% for students in grades 6-12 (Baseline: 2006 FYSAS 13.9%).
2. The number of schools in the district with active SADD clubs will be maintained at 67 schools (Baseline: 06-07 End of year report).
3. Student reported 'Past 30-day drug use' will decrease by 5% for students in grades K-12 (Baseline: SESIR 2005-06 2.87 per 1000 students).

**Implementation and Evaluation Procedures:**

Evaluation procedures were significantly reduced for 2007-08 since club advisors were providing supervision to the clubs on an uncompensated basis. Only the pre-post tests for the 3<sup>rd</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> grades students were continued as measures of intervention effectiveness at the elementary level. Pre-tests were implemented at the beginning of the school year and post-tests were issued at the end of the school year. The brief test included an item on each of the following areas: alcohol, drugs, fighting, and bullying. District suspension rates from year to year were to be the measure of intervention effectiveness over time. No specific requests for programming were made for the clubs, and year-end reporting was not required.

**Evaluative Findings:**

At the beginning of 2007-08, 17 elementary schools reported having an active SADD club. Twenty-eight elementary schools reported no active SADD club or did not report their club's status. Three elementary schools did not submit a report. By the conclusion of the 2007-08 school year, six schools that had reported having a SADD club in August no longer were supporting clubs. Two schools started SADD clubs during the year.

For a third and final year, elementary school and grant personnel administered pre- and post-test evaluating knowledge and beliefs related to drugs, alcohol, fighting and bullying of the 3<sup>rd</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> grade students. Both schools that have SADD clubs and those who are 'non-SADD' schools were issued the tests. Within 45 schools, 11,256 students participated in pre testing and 10,855 participated in post testing. Participation in pre-post testing provided an opportunity for students and staff to think about ATOD-V issues. Table III demonstrates the differences in 'SADD' and 'non-SADD' schools, and changes from pre-test scores (September/October 2007) to post-test scores (April 2008).

**Table III: Pre- and post-test scores from SADD and non-SADD schools**

Item	Pre-test mean Non-SADD (n = 6944)	Pre-test mean SADD (n = 4312)	Post-test mean Non-SADD (n = 7182)	Post-test mean SADD (n = 3673)
A person can get hooked on <i>alcohol</i> if they drink it.	3.55	3.55	3.51	3.59
Kids will use <i>drugs</i> if they hang out with kids who use drugs.	3.29	3.38	3.49	3.43
I have the skills to avoid a <i>fight</i> .	3.79	3.80	3.94	3.93
I know who to go to when I see a kid being <i>bullied</i> .	4.62	4.51	4.54	4.71

Pre-test scores have remained stable each year for the 3 years the data have been collected. This provides a level of construct validity for the instrument which has been used without modification.

Significant differences in group means ( $p < .05$ ) were observed in a few areas of the pre-post test. Both SADD and non-SADD schools demonstrated a significant increase in scores on the post test for Item #2 (drugs) and Item #3 (fighting). Non-SADD schools demonstrated better knowledge on item #4 (bullying) at the time of pre-testing, however demonstrated a significant negative change in that knowledge over the school year. This same trend was observed for this item in 2006-07. There were no significant differences in SADD and non-SADD group means on either the pre- or post-test, nor were any significant increases observed from pre- to post-testing.

High school and middle school data related to the number of active SADD clubs were not collected. It is unclear as to whether Goal #2 was met.

To measure the effects that SDFS/SADD clubs have on the behaviors of the students in the district, grant personnel will track the ‘past 30-day marijuana use’ as reported on the FYSAS (baseline 2006 FYSAS data are 13.9%). This is an area of decline in reported use (since 2000 FYSAS where 15.6% of student reported 30-day use). At the time of this report, updated county level FYSAS data is not available. County-level data is only reported on even years, therefore, Goal #1 will need to be re-evaluated once the data are available.

**D. Social Norming:**

**Description:**

Social norming is an approach to promoting health and reducing harm through collecting and distributing credible data collected from a target population. Through various marketing approaches, the students are exposed to a variety of positive, data-based messages and misperceptions of peer drug

and alcohol use can be reduced. During this initial year, two middle schools and two high schools were targeted for pilot implementation.

**Program Specific Objectives (by 6/30/08):**

1. Nine-five percent (95%) of student at four target schools will be exposed to social norming materials (Baseline: 2007-08 Social Norming Survey).
2. The number of students at the target schools who report using alcohol in the last 30 days will decrease by 10% (Baseline: 2007-2008 Social Norming Survey).
3. The number of students, staff, and parents who report accurate perceptions about the percentage of students who are not using alcohol will increase by 10% (Baseline: 2007-08 Social Norming Survey).

**Implementation and Evaluation Procedures:**

Evaluation activities for 2007-08 are descriptive in nature and designed to develop baseline data for future analysis. Grant-funded activities, products, and data from these activities were used for this year's evaluation.

**Evaluative Findings:**

The following activities were initiated during the 2007-08 school year. The following list provides the approximate chronological order of events:

1. Grant staff consulted with Drug-Free Charlotte County to gain insight on implementing Social Norming activities in the district.
2. Grant staff collected data using the Middle School Teen Norms Survey and the High School Teen Norms Survey. Surveys were distributed to approximately 1600 students from the following schools: Mariner Middle, Dunbar Middle, East Lee County High, Cypress Lake High.
3. Results of the survey were analyzed by the Social Norms Institute.
4. The results of the survey were shared with teachers at the target schools during a face-to-face meeting.
5. Grant staff met with school administrators from the target schools to establish a plan for distributing the results of the survey to the student body and parents.
6. Postcards were distributed to teachers to provide key results of survey.
7. Focus groups were facilitated by prevention specialist to discuss the results of the survey with small groups of students and to identify ways in which the students believe that the message should be distributed.
8. While focus group activities were being conducted, poster evaluations were conducted with students to solicit feedback prior to final decisions were made on poster design and distribution.
9. Postcards with select survey results were sent to parents at home in district envelopes.

10. Grant staff met with key people in each target school who were identified by students as being those who which kids listen.
11. Posters were distributed through each target school.
12. Intercept surveys were conducted with students at each target school to identify the amount of saturation of the message, as well as what was liked and disliked about the poster campaign.
13. At various times during the year, the School Health Advisory Committee, The School Board, and a parent group at one school was briefed on the Social Norming activities.

Social Norming Survey:

The Social Norming survey was distributed to approximately 1600 students in the four target middle and high schools. At the middle school level, 58% were female and 42% were male. The distribution of participants was relatively even across grade levels: 39% 6<sup>th</sup> grade, 27% 7<sup>th</sup> grade, 34% 8<sup>th</sup> grade. The ethnicity of the participants were: 48% white, 24% Hispanic/Latino, 11% Black, with the remainder being comprised of American Indian, Asian American/Pacific Islander or “other”. The data consistently indicates that the middle school students surveyed believe that their peers approve of and participate in cigarette, marijuana, and alcohol use on a much greater level than is reported by the students themselves. For example, study participants believed that 56% of their peers smoked cigarettes in the past 30 days when only 7% have on self-report. Similarly, students believed that 42% of their peers used marijuana when only 7% report its use. When asked how many of their peers had at least one drink of alcohol in the past 30 days, students reported that they believed that 63% had used alcohol. Based on self-report, only 15% had used alcohol in the past 30 days. This last statistic serves as the baseline data for Goal #2.

Middle school students’ most frequent sources of information on alcohol and the believability of that information are found in Table IV. Although participating-students report getting information from both people and media, it is important to note that they rate the information provided by certain adults in the lives as being the most believable.

**Table IV: Sources and Believability of Alcohol Information**

Source	Frequency of Information	Believability of Information
Police/Dare officer	70%*	68%*
His/her parents	55%*	56%*
Nurse/Doctor	48%*	58%*
Poster at School	46%*	40%

Internet	43%*	25%
Teachers	41%	56%*
School counselor	37%	47%*

\* Top 5 responses

Lastly, of the students who were surveyed, 76% reported never trying alcohol, 91% never trying marijuana and 88% never trying cigarettes. Of those who report trying these drugs, the average age of first use was 11.12 years for alcohol, 11.04 years for marijuana, and 10.68 for cigarettes. These data grouped those who reported using any age 9 or younger into one category, potentially skewing the mean age higher than actual age.

The group of participating students at the high school level was 64% female and 36% male. The distribution of participants was relatively even across grade levels: 20% 9<sup>th</sup> grade, 29% 10<sup>th</sup> grade, 31% 11<sup>th</sup> grade, and 20% 12<sup>th</sup> grade. The ethnicity of the participant group was: 52% white, 26% Hispanic/Latino, 10% Black, with the remainder being comprised of American Indian, Asian American/Pacific Islander or “other”. As with the middle school survey data, the high school data consistently indicates that the high school students surveyed believe that their peers approve of and participate in cigarette, marijuana and alcohol use on a much greater level than is reported by the students themselves. Not only is the trend the same with middle and high school students, but the degree of misconception for their peers’ use of each of these substances was to a greater degree. For example, study participants believed that 82% of their peers smoked cigarettes in the past 30 days when only 17% have on self-report. Similarly, students believed that 82% of their peers used marijuana when only 23% report its use. When asked how many of their peers had at least one drink of alcohol in the past 30 days, students reported that they believed that 88% had used alcohol. Based on self-report, only 38% had used alcohol in the past 30 days. These baseline statistics serve as the baseline data for Goal #2 & 3.

High school students’ most frequent sources of information on alcohol and the believability of that information are found in Table V. This table demonstrates a different trend in where high school students get their information and believe the information they receive. High school students, differently from the middle school students surveyed, get information on alcohol from peers, followed then by the same sources as middle school students. However, high school students still rate the police, parents and other key adults in their life as the best source for believable information.

**Table V: Sources and Believability of Alcohol Information**

Source	Frequency of Information	Believability of Information
Friends	72%*	45%*
His/her parents	60%*	64%*
Police/Dare officer	59%*	57%*
Internet	59%*	33%
Teachers	48%*	50%*
Nurse/Doctor	47%	54%*
Poster at School	40%	37%

\* Top 5 responses

Lastly, of the students who were surveyed, 33% reported never trying alcohol, 58% never trying marijuana and 63% never trying cigarettes. Of those who report trying these drugs, the average age of first use was 13.26 years for alcohol, 13.56 years for marijuana, and 12.62 for cigarettes. These data grouped those who reported using any age 9 or younger into one category, potentially skewing the mean age higher than actual age.

Focus Groups and Poster Evaluations:

Focus groups were conducted at each of the target schools. Information was gathered on how students believe the results of the survey should be communicated, what design elements catch their eye, how parents should receive the information, and what type of ‘giveaways’ would be kept or put to use. To gain a better understanding of the participant group, questions were also asked who the students respect at their school, who they are most likely to believe, and what were their favorite TV shows, movies and commercials. This allowed grant administrators to gain valuable insight into what distribution methods may be most effective, and to what forms/designs of media catch the attention of the target audience.

Once posters were designed, additional groups of students in each of the target schools provided feedback on the nine samples. It is clear in the data that there are widely varying opinions on issues of color, layout, included elements, and slogans/phrases. From this data, and the evaluation of other key stakeholders, decisions were made on the posters with which to lead this year’s campaign.

### Intercept Surveys:

Intercept surveys were collected from a total of 147 middle school and 200 high school students representing each of the four target schools. At the middle school level, 53% were male and 47% were female, and represented each of the three grades. At the high school level, 47% were male and 53% were female. Student in grade twelve were represented the least at only 12.5%, with representation at the other three grades being fairly even. Themes in the data across each of the areas collected were consistent across both middle and high school. Therefore, they will be discussed as a whole. More than two-thirds of the students reported seeing the message “We don’t need to drink to have a good time” greater than eight times. The message was predominant seen on posters (85% of respondents), with students reporting that the message was also seen on TV ads, School news, and parent postcards. When asked the source of these messages, 53% reported not knowing the source of the information. The remainder of students selected options including: the principal’s office, PTO, School health, Police, SDFS, and mental health agency.

Common themes came out in the data when the students at both levels were asked the reason why they believe the posters were in the school. Although open ended responses were given, the responses fell into one of five themes:

- To tell you/make you not drink
- To educate/teach/inform/show about alcohol
- To help/encourage/send you a good message about having fun without alcohol
- To convince/warn about the danger of alcohol
- To prevent/stop/make sure/keep you from drinking

Lastly, students were asked what they liked and what they liked least about the posters. At the middle school level there were three consistent areas that they commented on liking the most: the design, that they were factual/truthful, and that they taught them something. High school students responded similarly to what they liked about the posters. Dislikes between groups varied. The middle school students consistently did not like the number of posters hung (“they are everywhere”), the poster design, and, to a lesser degree, were skeptical about the truth of the posters message. High school students were much less critical of the posters. There were far fewer complaints about the number of posters in their school, and only occasionally stated their distrust of the message. Poster design was an area of dislike for some of the survey participants.

The first year of implementation of the social norming approach to alcohol, drug and tobacco use prevention was focused on involving key stakeholders and collecting baseline data. Students, administration, community members, faculty/staff, and parents were all included in this developmental phase. Through participation in the social norming survey, focus groups, poster evaluations and distributing posters in the school, it is estimated that 90% of the students at the four target schools

were exposed to social norming materials. Although this is slightly short of reaching Goal #1, it demonstrates a high level of success with first year implementation.

### **Summary and Recommendations:**

District level FYSAS data (2008) will be available at the time of the next evaluation cycle. At that time monitoring of progress toward the 5-year grant goals will be conducted. Additionally, in 2009, the most current SESIR data will be used to demonstrate mid-cycle progress toward the 5-year goals.

The following observations and recommendations are made for the activities supported by the SDFS grant for 2008-09:

#### **Second Step:**

- Since progress toward grant related goals for peer conflict/fighting is evident, yet goals were not fully met, it is critical to continue the accountability measures for Second Step.
- Despite the absence of a prevention specialist position in 2008-09, it is recommended that ongoing monitoring of school implementation of the Second Step program is continued. This will allow for the continued monitoring of trends in implementation and its relationship to peer conflict/fighting incidents in each school.
- The responsibility for training new teachers should be shifted to the school level, allowing for teachers who are trained in the Second Step curriculum to train others in their school.

#### **Too Good:**

- As with Second Step programming, it is recommended that ongoing monitoring of the implementation of the Too Good curriculum continue at the target elementary school (Gateway E.) and expand to the target middle schools if possible.
- Continued monitoring of the Annual County Student Incident Report data for the target schools will allow for further analysis of the relationship, if any, between Too Good programming and student behaviors.

#### **Bully Safe:**

- Implement new pre-post tests (developed at the end of 2007-08) to collect student knowledge data related to the Bully Safe concepts.
- Compare bullying-related suspension rates in schools who participate in Bully Safe USA programming versus those who elect to not adopt this program. This may provide some insight into the effects that this bully-prevention program may have on student behaviors.
- Continue the goal of maintaining the percentage of schools with at least one trained person.
- Sustain accountability measures through reporting implementation rates.
- Support and follow-up activities by grant-funded personnel should focus on increasing the implementation rates at middle schools.

- Continue the goal to increase the implementation rates for empowerment sessions and follow-up sessions throughout all schools. Identify reasons why empowerment sessions are not held in schools where there are trained personnel.

#### **SDFS/SADD clubs:**

- It is recommended that SADD clubs no longer be a focus of the grant-related activities. These clubs are encouraged to continue their activities, but no further monitoring of student knowledge (pre-post tests) or club activities should be conducted.

#### **Social Norming Activities:**

- With the establishment of the initial framework for implementing this approach to ATOD use prevention, the second year of implementation will allow for the collection of meaningful data on the impact that this program has had on student's behaviors and the perception of peer behaviors.
- The Social Norming Survey results provide good evidence of student behaviors and misconceptions of their peers' behaviors. This survey should be repeated in Fall 2008 with the goal of capturing all of the student within the four target schools.
- It is recommended that the questions used during the focus group and poster evaluation session be re-evaluated. More meaningful data may be generated through a careful look at what questions are asked of the participating students.
- Repeating the Intercept Surveys will provide the opportunity to compare 2007-08 results, when the poster campaign was just initiated, to 2008-09 results, when a full year of the SN activities were implemented. This survey may want to be modified to gather information on which of the many posters/activities had led to the greatest impact (greatest recall) of information.

One continued challenge for grant staff is the ever changing population of school staff and students for which they are trying to provide services. This constant evolving population also serves as a limitation to evaluation procedures. The evaluation process is also limited by the nature of the measures possible. The constant demands on school staff limits their willingness to participate in comprehensive assessment. Self-report measures provide one form of evaluative data, however is limited by the nature of self-reporting. FYSAS and SESIR data also provide a limited source of information for evaluating grant-related activities. These limitations are not unique to Lee County and are an expected part of the evaluation process.

The contents of this evaluation and the recommendations herein are provided to the grant administrator and prevention specialist for consideration for future planning and programming.