



# **The Louisiana Strategic Prevention Framework State Incentive Grant: Implementation and Outcome Data Final Report for Lafayette Parish**

**September 2011**

Report prepared for the Office of the Governor of Louisiana and the Department of Health and Hospitals, Office of Behavioral Health by:

**Bach Harrison, L.L.C.**  
116 South 500 East  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84102  
(801) 359-2064

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
Environmental Interventions.....	1
Components of Environmental Interventions.....	2
Lafayette Parish Intervention Descriptions and Data Summary.....	4
Environmental Interventions Process and Outcome Data.....	4
Alcohol Retail Compliance Checks.....	4
Operating While Impaired (OWI) Saturation Patrols.....	5
Public Support and Public Awareness Efforts.....	7
Newspaper.....	8
Television.....	9
Radio.....	10
Billboards/Outdoor.....	11
Causal Factor Outcomes and SPF SIG Priority Indicators.....	12
Alcohol Related Motor Vehicle Crashes.....	13
Causal and Contributing Factor Data.....	14
Causal/Contributing Factor Data Sources.....	15
Alcohol Use Data.....	20
Additional Program Evaluation.....	21
Social Norming for Alcohol Prevention.....	21
Stay on Track.....	22
Summary.....	22
Appendices.....	24
Appendix A: Media Campaign Description and Glossary of Media Evaluation Terminology.....	24
Appendix B: List of Contributing Factors by Causal Variables for the Louisiana SPF SIG.....	28
Appendix C: Social Norms for Alcohol Prevention Evaluation Report.....	30
Appendix D: Stay on Track Evaluation Report.....	31

# The Louisiana Strategic Prevention Framework State Incentive Grant: Implementation and Outcome Data Final Report for Lafayette Parish

## INTRODUCTION

The Louisiana Strategic Prevention Framework State Incentive Grant (SPF SIG) Project, also known as the Governor's Initiative to Build a Healthy Louisiana, was a seven year prevention initiative (five year initial project with two 1-year extensions) that began in October 2004 and concluded in September 2011. The project was funded through the federal Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (CSAP) at \$2.35 million per year. The explicit goals of CSAP for the SPF SIG Program were to: a) prevent the onset and reduce the progression of substance abuse, b) reduce substance abuse-related problems in communities, and c) build prevention capacity and infrastructure at the state and community levels.

This report provides a summary of the implementation and evaluation data for interventions implemented in Lafayette Parish as part of the Louisiana SPF SIG. The SPF SIG was an incentive grant intended to encourage the state and sub-recipient communities within the states to engage in a data driven prevention planning structured around the five step SPF planning process. This planning process involves: a) **assessment** of needs, resources, readiness and capacity of the community, b) **building of capacity** to carry out a coalition based, data driven planning and implementation process, c) **strategic planning** to identify community level priorities based on assessment data and the selection of interventions and strategies to address these priorities, d) **implementation** of the selected interventions, and e) **evaluation** and monitoring of intervention implementation. Ten parishes in Louisiana were chosen to be funded through the SPF SIG Project: Calcasieu, Cameron, Jefferson Davis, Lafayette, Orleans, St. James, St. Landry, St. Mary, Tangipahoa and West Baton Rouge. These parishes were chosen based on a state level assessment that identified alcohol abuse and alcohol related consequences as the substance abuse priorities to be addressed by the SPF SIG.

Each of the interventions discussed below represents a choice made by a coalition of the major substance abuse prevention stakeholders in Lafayette Parish to address the priorities that contribute to problem alcohol use and the negative consequences associated with alcohol use/misuse (e.g., alcohol related motor vehicle crashes). Data contained within this report describes both the implementation details for each intervention (i.e., what was implemented, when, by who and how much), as well as the outcomes of those interventions.

This report builds upon data presented in progress reports that were written during the SPF SIG implementation time frame, and which summarized the data of the interventions of all ten of the SPF SIG funded parishes. This report, however, focuses solely on the intervention data for Lafayette Parish, and presents additional outcome data not contained in the progress reports.

## Environmental Interventions

As a result of guidance provided by the federal Center for Substance Abuse Prevention, the Louisiana SPF SIG Project encouraged the use of environmental interventions to address problem alcohol use patterns and alcohol related consequences at the community level. The focus on environmental strategies was a departure from the types of interventions typically funded within the substance abuse prevention field. Traditionally, substance abuse prevention interventions have been "program-based" and have focused on individual level change (usually

targeting youth, parents of youth or families). Typically, the goal of these programs has been on improving knowledge or skills (e.g., social or life skills) using an educational approach. The goal of these individual based programs has been to reduce the likelihood of substance abuse by improving the ability of individuals to engage in healthy behaviors rather than potentially harmful ones involving the use of substances. In contrast to the program-based prevention efforts of the past, environmental interventions are focused more on creating a community level impact by changing the environmental context that contributes to the use and misuse of alcohol. The assumption behind the use of environmental strategies is that alcohol use is shaped not only by what an individual knows and the skills they possess, but also by contextual factors such as cultural attitudes about alcohol use, the availability and price of alcohol, laws and norms regarding appropriate alcohol use, etc.

For the Louisiana SPF SIG Project, a strong emphasis was placed on funded communities using environmental interventions to address the identified priorities within their community. Because the SPF SIG represented a supplemental funding source for substance abuse prevention activities, it provided a unique opportunity for these communities to add environmental substance abuse prevention interventions to the existing prevention activities that were being implemented prior to the SPF Project.

### **Components of Environmental Interventions**

Environmental interventions have been utilized effectively in the public health field over the past two decades. The broad based campaign carried out by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) to reduce tobacco usage nationwide is perhaps the most recognizable environmental intervention implemented in the U.S., and exemplifies a successful environmental intervention. Through the public health field, three components of effective environmental interventions have been identified: a) identification or passing of laws, ordinances, or regulations that promote healthy behavioral choices, b) enforcement efforts, and c) public support and public awareness efforts. The last of the three components are implemented through media campaigns that result in two goals. Public awareness messages focus on increasing community awareness regarding (new or existing) regulations on substance use as well as increases in enforcement for these regulations and the penalties associated with violations. Public support messages, on the other hand, focus on trying to change societal/cultural attitudes about the behavior so that unhealthy behaviors are viewed more negatively and healthy behaviors are viewed more positively. The CDC's tobacco initiative illustrates each of these three components. Laws governing cigarette use in public places (i.e., clean indoor air acts) were initiated first in a select number of states, and now are nearly ubiquitous throughout the country. The enforcement of these laws serves an essential role in ensuring that the laws are followed. Finally, the tobacco initiative included a strong media campaign that served two functions: a) to raise public awareness of the new laws regulating cigarette use in public places (as well as the associated penalties), and b) to make prevailing societal attitudes about cigarette use and the harmfulness of second hand smoke more negative (increase public support for anti-tobacco use behaviors).

Each of the SPF funded parishes implementing environmental strategies as part of their strategic plan incorporated the three components of environmental interventions as part of their implementation. Most of the initial media campaign (both public awareness and public support messaging) for the SPF parishes was developed by Sides and Associates, a professional media development and advertising agency based in Lafayette, Louisiana. A single vendor was chosen to coordinate the media campaign component for all of the SPF funded parishes in order to enhance the use of resources as well as create a unified and cohesive "brand" across the state. As the implementation period continued, additional media materials were purchased with SPF SIG funds from national media campaigns and other states, specifically from FACE

([www.faceproject.org](http://www.faceproject.org)) and Parents Empowered ([www.parentsempowered.org](http://www.parentsempowered.org)). Descriptions of the media campaign themes being used statewide as well as a glossary of terminology used in the evaluation summaries of the media campaigns are provided in Appendix A. Some parishes elected to supplement the statewide media campaign activities by working with local media and advertising agencies. For example, Calcasieu Parish has worked with the O'Carroll Group in Lake Charles to develop additional public awareness and support messaging for their environmental strategies.

## LAFAYETTE PARISH INTERVENTION DESCRIPTIONS AND DATA SUMMARY

As part of the development of the Lafayette Parish SPF SIG Strategic Plan, the coalition in Lafayette identified four priority causal factors and contributing factors to target through SPF funded interventions, and implemented two environmental interventions as well as two programs to address the alcohol problems in the parish.

Priority Causal/Contributing Factors	SPF SIG Funded Interventions
Retail Availability	Alcohol Retail Compliance Checks
Lack of Alcohol Retail Compliance Checks	DUI Saturation Patrols
Low Perceived Risk of Alcohol Use and/or Drinking and Driving	Stay on Track
Lack of Enforcement of Drinking and Driving	Social Norms Campaign

### Environmental Interventions Process and Outcome Data

#### Alcohol Retail Compliance Checks

The Lafayette Parish coalition chose to implement alcohol retail compliance checks to address the retail availability priority and an identified lack of alcohol retail outlet compliance checks. The goal of the intervention was to identify alcohol retail outlets that do not engage in proper identification check procedures and sell products containing alcohol to individuals under the age of 21. The intervention consisted of law enforcement officers working with an underage individual who attempted to purchase alcohol from a retail establishment. If alcohol was sold to the underage buyer, the outlet was non-compliant with laws regarding underage purchase of alcoholic beverages, and both the employee and owner of the retail outlet received a warning or citation as a result. In Lafayette, SPF funded alcohol retail compliance checks were first implemented in January 2009 (data were not available prior to March 2009).

As a result of the SPF Project, law enforcement has implemented compliance checks nearly each month throughout the parish. Over 475 retail outlets were checked during SPF SIG. The average rate of non-compliance over the course of this span was 26.9%, indicating that a relatively large proportion of retailers in the parish did not use proper identification procedures. While non-compliance rates were relatively low in several months, the fluctuating non-compliance rate observed in the parish suggests that continued compliance checks may be necessary to curb sales to underage buyers.

**Table 1. Alcohol Retail Compliance Check Implementation and Outcome Data**

Underage Alcohol Purchase Compliance Checks		Start Date: January 2009		
Process and Outcome Data				
		Number of Retail Outlets Checked	Number of Outlets in Non-Compliance	Percent (Non-Compliance)
2009	March	25	12	48.0%
	May	5	5	100%
	September	34	11	32.4%
	October	62	13	21.0%
2010	March	34	13	38.2%

<b>Underage Alcohol Purchase Compliance Checks (continued)</b>			
	<b>Number of Retail Outlets Checked</b>	<b>Number of Outlets in Non-Compliance</b>	<b>Percent (Non-Compliance)</b>
	June	26	6 23.1%
	July	5	5 100%
	August	34	11 32.4%
	September	33	0 0.0%
	October	54	0 0.0%
	November	6	3 50.0%
	December	31	11 35.5%
2011	January	11	5 45.5%
	February	27	4 14.8%
	March	9	3 33.3%
	April	34	5 14.7%
	May	13	6 46.2%
	June	17	5 29.4%
	July	16	10 62.5%
<b>Total</b>		<b>476</b>	<b>128</b> <b>26.9%</b>

### **Operating While Impaired (OWI) Saturation Patrols**

The Lafayette Parish coalition chose to implement an OWI saturation patrol intervention to address low perceived risk of alcohol use/drinking and driving as well as lack of enforcement of drinking and driving in the community. The goal of this intervention was to deter individuals from driving under the influence of alcohol throughout the parish and to reinforce anti-drinking and driving expectations and norms within the community. The intervention consisted of increasing enforcement of drinking and driving through roving OWI patrols at times of the day where drunk driving was more frequent. Drivers suspected to be driving under the influence of alcohol were pulled over and given a field sobriety test, and a chemical breath analysis test if deemed to be under the influence of alcohol. Drivers found to have a blood alcohol concentration level over the legal limit were cited and/or arrested. Through the SPF Project, five officers in Lafayette (and 14 additional officers from other jurisdictions) were trained in the OWI patrol protocol. Three officers were specifically designated to the Alcohol Traffic Action Campaign (ATAC) unit which was responsible for the OWI patrols.

Table 2 presents implementation and outcome data for the OWI patrols implemented in Lafayette. In Lafayette Parish, SPF funded OWI saturation patrols were first implemented in January 2009. Since that time, officers with the ATAC unit have implemented the patrols seven days a week for a minimum of 160 officer hours per week. These patrols have resulted in over 5,000 vehicle stops & field sobriety tests being administered, and 2,127 OWI arrests since January 2009, including over 350 underage OWI arrests. The Lafayette SPF SIG Project Director was able to obtain OWI arrest data from 2008 and 2009 which allowed a comparison of the number of OWI arrests made in the parish before SPF and during the first year of implementation. In 2008, a total of 257 OWI arrests were made throughout the parish. In 2009, 532 OWI arrests were made throughout the parish, representing an increase of over 200%. For 2010, data was available only from January through August, but in eight months, there were already 459 OWI arrests, suggesting the SPF SIG funded enforcement was continuing to make a very visible impact in the community in 2010.

**Table 2. Operating While Intoxicated Patrols Implementation and Outcome Data**

OWI Saturation Patrols		Start Date: January 2009			
Process Data					
		Number of Patrols (Days)	Number of Officer Hours (Estimated)	Number of Vehicles Stopped	Number of Field Sobriety Tests Administered
2009	January	31	480	29	25
	February	28	480	68	62
	March	31	480	53	49
	April	30	640	41	36
	May	31	640	67	59
	June	30	640	56	48
	July	31	640	62	54
	August	31	640	59	51
	September	30	640	54	47
	October	31	640	71	51
	November	30	640	53	41
	December	31	640	56	49
2010	January	31	640	82	66
	February	28	640	88	57
	March	31	640	64	47
	April	30	640	72	58
	May	31	640	83	58
	June	30	640	71	42
	July	31	640	96	74
	August	31	640	91	66
	September	30	640	473	494
	October	31	640	487	512
	November	30	640	475	504
	December	31	640	437	463
2011	January	31	640	451	472
	February	28	640	305	321
	March	31	640	359	382
	April	30	640	328	351
	May	31	640	267	308
	June	30	640	248	289
	July	31	640	n/a	n/a
<b>Total</b>		<b>942</b>	<b>19,360</b>	<b>5,146+</b>	<b>5,136+</b>

<b>OWI Saturation Patrols (continued)</b>					
<b>Outcome Data</b>					
		<b>Number of Alcohol Related Citations</b>	<b>Total Number of Citations (All Offenses)</b>	<b>Number of Underage OWI Arrests</b>	<b>Total Number of OWI Arrests</b>
2009	January	56	82	1	25
	February	143	213	8	62
	March	97	155	9	49
	April	79	120	5	36
	May	153	226	4	59
	June	112	168	8	48
	July	114	179	11	54
	August	113	168	4	51
	September	64	117	6	47
	October	59	117	7	51
	November	29	77	7	41
	December	49	106	8	49
2010	January	68	148	14	66
	February	71	138	10	57
	March	53	104	4	47
	April	73	139	8	58
	May	69	144	17	58
	June	47	99	10	42
	July	74	170	22	74
	August	69	146	11	66
	September	85	177	15	77
	October	124	255	20	111
	November	126	123	14	83
	December	147	266	10	109
2011	January	117	249	18	114
	February	93	205	21	91
	March	96	202	17	89
	April	101	211	17	113
	May	104	179	16	104
	June	97	201	19	99
	July	101	191	14	97
<b>Total</b>		<b>2,783</b>	<b>5,075</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>2,127</b>

### **Public Support and Public Awareness Efforts**

The Lafayette coalition initiated their media campaign in May 2010. The coalition utilized a wide variety of media materials from Sides and Associates, as well as themes from FACE and Parent's Empowered (see Appendix A for descriptions of the media campaign themes and evaluation terminology glossary). In addition to traditional media mediums, the coalition also disseminated novelty items promoting public support and awareness for alcohol misuse prevention at local fairs, festivals and other public events. These items

include stress balls, t-shirts and cooler clings with the message “21 is 21.” Overall, the Lafayette media campaign was extensive in gaining exposure for both the public awareness and public support messaging. This is especially true of advertising that occurred from July through September 2010 and from March through July 2011 through the television and local radio mediums.

Based on survey data collected from a sample of 400 adults (between the ages of 18 and 65) in Lafayette Parish, saturation of the drinking and driving media campaign was very good, while recognition for messaging discouraging youth alcohol use and adult provision of alcohol to youth was significantly less (see Table 3). Approximately 78% of respondents in Lafayette indicated seeing advertisements discouraging drinking and driving via television in the past 90 days, over 70% indicated seeing the ads via billboards, and nearly 60% indicating hearing the ads on the radio. Exposure to advertising messages discouraging youth alcohol use and adult provision of alcohol to youth was quite a bit lower, with only about half reporting seeing or hearing the ads via television and less than 40% seeing or hearing the ads via other mediums. The specific media themes that were most recognized in Lafayette were: DWI Enforcement (67%), Kids and Alcohol Don’t Mix (65%), Alcohol Kills More Kids than All Other Drugs Combined (50%), and The Easiest Place for Kids to Get Alcohol is at Home (59%). Please note that recognition data for specific media themes were only available for media campaign themes that were commonly run throughout the state. Unfortunately, recognition data were not available for all of the specific media themes that were run in Lafayette.

Survey participants were also asked about their reactions to the prevention messages for both drinking and driving themed messaging and for youth alcohol use/adult provision of alcohol to youth messaging. Respondents were asked, “Overall, which of the following best describes your reaction to the advertising messages discouraging drinking and driving (youth alcohol use or adults providing alcohol to youth)?”, on a 5-point scale from 1 (very unfavorable) to 5 (very favorable). Favorability ratings for both media campaigns were overwhelmingly positive among respondents in Lafayette. For the drinking and driving media campaign, the average favorability rating was (M = 4.58), with 73% indicating “very favorable,” and 21% indicating “somewhat favorable.” For messaging discouraging youth alcohol use and adult provision of alcohol to youth, the average response was (M = 4.44), with 68% indicating “very favorable,” and 22% indicating “somewhat favorable.”

**Table 3. Percentage of Adult Respondents Who Indicated Reading, Hearing or Seeing SPF SIG Related Advertising Messages in the Past 90 Days by Advertising Medium.**

In the past 90 days have you read, seen or heard any messages discouraging people from (drinking and driving/youth alcohol use)... through the following means?	Drinking and Driving	Youth Alcohol Use or Providing Alcohol to Youth
...on a radio station	59.5%	33.8%
...in a newspaper	35.8%	23.0%
...on an outdoor billboard	72.8%	39.8%
...on television	78.8%	52.5%

**Newspaper.** The newspaper ad campaign ran from May through September of 2010, and featured two public support themes (“Graduation” and “Kids and Alcohol Don’t Mix”), as well as the “DWI” theme to promote public awareness of increased enforcement of operating a vehicle while intoxicated. Newspaper advertising re-commenced in March of 2011 and ran through July featuring continued use of the media themes mentioned above, plus the “Locked Can” media theme to encourage parents to curb youth

alcohol use. Overall, newspaper advertisements were the smallest component of the Lafayette media campaign. Advertisements were placed in six newspaper outlets including: the Times of Acadiana, The Independent, Surge Spotlight, Parlez Vous (Lafayette High School), the Daily Advertiser, and the Vermillion (University of Louisiana, Lafayette). The campaign included approximately 70 newspaper advertisements during its run, with an average of 7 ads per month (during months the campaign was active).

**Table 4. Newspaper Media Campaign Data Summary**

Month		Number of Ads	Number of Outlets	Average # Ads/Outlet	Number of Awareness Msgs	Number of Support Msgs	Circulation per Outlet	Readership per Outlet
2010	May	3	3	1	0	3	20,000-41,391	40,000-82,782
	June	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a
	July	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a
	August-September*	36	3	12	18	18	20,000-41,391	40,000-82,782
Average per Month: May-Sept 2010		7.8	n/a	n/a	3.6	3.6	n/a	n/a
2011	March	2	2	1	1	1	5,000	10,000
	April	11	6	1.83	3	8	2,500-30,586	5,000-61,172
	May	8	5	1.6	0	8	2,500-42,692	5,000-85,384
	June	6	4	1.5	0	6	5,000-42,692	10,000-85,384
	July	4	3	1.25	0	4	5,000-42,692	10,000-85,384
Average per Month: March-July 2011		6.2	4	1.55	.8	5.4	n/a	n/a

\*Data for these months were received in a combined format.

**Television.** The television component of the Lafayette media campaign took place in two waves. The first wave of television advertising ran from July through September 2010, and featured, the “Kids and Alcohol Don’t Mix” and “DWI” themes. The second wave of advertising ran from February 2011 through July, and featured a variety of public support messages including, “Don’t Drink and Drive/Think B4 You Drink,” “Genie,” “Hang Glider,” “Interference,” and “Keep in Contact.” In all, over 4,500 television ads were broadcast through cable and network television stations. Between July and September, the average number of ads per month broadcast via television was nearly 600. During the second wave (February through July of 2011), the average number of ads per month was nearly 500.

The range of estimated percent of viewers reached by the ads is presented for the 12-17 and 18-34 demographics (the primary target age groups for the media campaign). These ranges represent the percentage of individuals in each age group estimated to have seen the ad on a given channel, based on the viewership for that channel and the number of ads ran. More popular channels or channels with a larger number of airings therefore, have a higher estimated reach. For those who were likely to see an advertisement on a particular channel, an estimate is also available for how times they were likely to have seen the ad on that channel. Please note that because estimates of reach and the number of times viewed in the table apply only to a single channel, the actual total reach is likely to be higher than the highest reach estimate in the table given the fact that most individuals watch several stations on a regular basis (likewise, for the number of times viewed across multiple channels).

**Table 5. Television Media Campaign Data Summary**

Month		# of Spots	# of Stations	Average # Ads/Station	# of Awareness	# of Support	Estimated Reach per Station		Estimated Times Viewed per Station	
							12-17	18-34	12-17	18-34
Cable Television										
2010	July-Sept*	1577	19	83	562	1015	1%-84.6%	1.3%-4.3%	1.3-4.3	1.3-4.3
Avg/Month July-Sept		525.67	n/a	n/a	187.33	338.33	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2011	Feb	173	8	21.6	0	173	.5%-21.9%	.4%-15.4%	1.3-2.6	1.2-2.2
	March	373	12	31.1	0	373	.3%-13.7%	.2%-9.0%	1.4-2.9	1.4-2.4
	April	481	12	40.1	0	481	0%-56.7%	0%-25.9%	0-3.9	0-5.1
	May	317	10	31.7	0	317	0%-56.1%	.4%-25.1%	0-3.8	1.2-4.8
	June	408	11	37.1	0	408	0%-57.6%	.8%-18.8%	0-4.7	1.2-3.4
	July	325	11	29.5	0	325	0%-88.7%	.5%-38.3%	0-7.0	1.0-4.0
Avg/Month Feb-July		346.17	10.67	32.44	0	346.17	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Network Television										
	July-Sept*	188	5	37.6	44	144	.3%-13.3%	1.4%-26.5%	1.0-3.8	1.5-4.5
Avg/Month July-Sept		62.67	n/a	n/a	14.67	48	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2011	Feb	41	2	20.5	0	41	14.6%-24.7%	24.7%-30.0%	1.7-1.8	1.7
	March	90	3	30	0	90	13.0%-22.4%	35.5%-40.9%	1.7-2.2	1.8-2.3
	April	166	3	55.3	0	166	8.4%-15.2%	10.3%-33.5%	2.1-4.1	2.0-3.1
	May	161	3	53.7	0	161	9.0%-20.7%	21.2%-35.5%	1.9-3.9	2.0-2.8
	June	209	3	69.7	0	209	9.2%-17.4%	24.2%-50.4%	2.3-4.4	2.5-2.7
	July	141	3	47	0	141	11.9%-23.1%	16.7%-48.2%	2.2-3.3	2.2-3.3
Avg/Month Feb-July		134.67	2.83	47.59	0	134.67	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

\*Data for these months were received in a combined format.

**Radio.** The radio component of the media campaign also began in July 2010 and ran in waves that parallel the television campaign waves. The first wave of ads (from July through September 2010) featured both the “Kids and Alcohol Don’t Mix” and “DWI” themes. The second wave of advertising began in February 2011 and ran through July. This wave featured a variety of public support “Family themes including, “Family Celebrations,” “Alcohol Kills More Kids,” “Lincoln,” and “The Talk.” Radio ads were played both through traditional “over the air” broadcasts and through internet stream broadcasts. Overall, more than 3,500 ads were broadcast via radio stations. Nearly 400 ads were broadcast via radio each month during the first wave of the radio campaign, and over 200 ads were broadcast per month during the second wave.

Where available, the range of estimated reach per station (percentage of the target population) as well as an estimate of the number of times each listener was likely to hear an ad are provided in the table. For streaming broadcast listings, only the total number of

estimated listeners was available. Based on the large number of ads, regular listeners of most of the stations where airtime was purchased were likely to have been exposed to the messaging on multiple occasions when the media campaign was active.

**Table 6. Radio Media Campaign Data Summary**

Month		Total # Spots	Total # Stations	Average # Ads/Station	Total # Awareness	Total # Support	Estimated Reach per Station		Estimated Times Heard per Station	
							12-17	18-34	12-17	18-34
Over the Air Radio										
2010	July-Sept*	649	7	92.71	302	301	n/a <sup>2</sup> (22.8%)	n/a	.7-3.6	2.5-4.4
Avg/Month July-Sept		216.33	n/a	n/a	100.67	100.33	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2011	Feb	77	8	9.6	0	77	n/a	n/a	.7-2.6	1.2-3.8
March		178	8	22.3	0	178	1.5%-23.2%	6.5%-19.8%	1.4-2.8	1.9-3.4
April		211	9	23.4	0	211	0%-28.9%	1.4%-21.9%	0-3.2	2.1-2.8
May		212	8	26.5	0	212	0%-29.9%	1.4%-20.5%	0-3.4	2.3-3.2
June		306	8	38.3	0	306	0%-32.2%	1.1%-22.5%	0-4.6	2.6-3.9
July		266	7	38	0	266	2.9%-32.4%	7.2%-25.6%	1.5-3.8	1.8-3.8
Avg/Month July-Sept		208.33	8	26.0	0	208.33	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Streaming Broadcasts										
2010	July-Sept*	514	4	128.5	218	296	n/a	n/a	n/a	36-19,457 <sup>1</sup>
Avg/Month July-Sept		171.33	n/a	n/a	72.67	98.67	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2011	April	300	5	60	0	300	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
May		273	4	68.3	0	273	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
June		382	5	76.4	0	382	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
July		140	4	35	0	140	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Avg/Month July-Sept		273.75	4.5	60.83	0	273.75	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

\*Data for these months were received in a combined format

<sup>1</sup>Range of estimated average number of listeners (all ages combined) per spot. Demographic breakouts were not available from this source.

<sup>2</sup>Reach estimates were only available for two of the seven stations. The highest reach estimate was 22.8%.

**Billboards/Outdoor.** The outdoor media campaign in Lafayette Parish began in June 2010 and ran continuously through July 2011. The billboard campaign featured the “Kids and Alcohol Don’t Mix,” “Organ Donor,” “DWI,” “Refuse to be Roadkill,” and “It’s Only Beer” themes. During the billboard media campaign advertisements were placed on as many as eight billboards at a time throughout the parish, with a total of over 1,700 billboard days accumulated.

**Table 7. Billboard Media Campaign Data Summary**

Month		Number of Billboards	Total Number of Billboard Days	Avg. Number of Days on Billboard (per Ad)	Number of Awareness Msgs	Number of Support Msgs	Daily Effective Circulation per Billboard
2010	June	1	7	7	0	1	27,802
	July	6	108	18	2	4	871-46,374
	August	6	186	31	2	4	871-46,374
	September	6	180	30	2	4	871-46,374
	October	4	124	31	2	2	871-46,374
	November	4	120	30	2	2	871-46,374
	December	4	124	31	2	2	871-46,374
2011	January	4	124	31	2	2	871-46,374
	February	4	112	28	1	3	871-46,374
	March	4	124	31	1	3	534-26,921
	April	4	119	29.8	1	3	534-26,921
	May	8	105	13.1	2	6	534-39,164
	June	8	151	18.9	2	6	534-33,932
	July	5	155	31	2	3	534-28,664
Average per Month: June-Feb		4.86	124.21	25.77	1.64	3.21	n/a

**CAUSAL FACTOR OUTCOMES AND SPF SIG PRIORITY INDICATORS**

The data presented above highlight the extensive nature of the enforcement and media campaign components of the interventions implemented in Lafayette through the SPF SIG. In this section, data that provide insight regarding the impact of the interventions on the target goals of the SPF SIG are presented. In Lafayette, the priority consequence targeted was alcohol related motor vehicle crashes, and the priority consumption indicators targeted were 30-day alcohol use, binge drinking, and drinking and driving. The priority causal factors identified for the parish were: a) retail availability, b) lack of alcohol compliance checks, c) low perceived risk of alcohol use and/or drinking and driving, and d) lack of enforcement of drinking and driving.

Before these data are examined, a couple of important caveats regarding the data should be noted. First, the indicators presented in this section of the report provide a more global perspective of changes regarding alcohol behaviors in the community. While the intervention data presented earlier were specific to the interventions implemented, these outcome measures are not solely determined by the implementation of SPF SIG funded interventions. Instead, alcohol use rates, alcohol related crashes and the various causal and contributing factor indicators are determined by many factors operating within the parish and the state (with the SPF SIG being one of those factors). A second caveat regarding these data is that most of the indicators presented are not optimal in terms of the chronology of when they were collected/obtained. Most of the SPF funded parishes began implementing their interventions between January and May of 2010, and concluded their implementation in July 2011. However, most of the outcome data related to causal factors, alcohol use and alcohol related crashes were not available to reflect conditions in the communities

through the entire implementation period (through July 2011). In fact, many of the indicators were available only through or during the year 2010, due to time lags that exist in the availability or release of the data (also some data sources such as the Caring Communities Youth Survey are only collected every other year). Therefore, much of the data presented here only reflect on part of the SPF SIG implementation period, rather than the full implementation time frame. With these caveats in mind, readers should consider these data preliminary regarding the insight they provide about the impact of the SPF SIG. Additional analyses using data that capture the complete SPF SIG implementation period would provide more reliable results about the project.

### **Alcohol Related Motor Vehicle Crashes**

Alcohol related motor vehicle crashes were the top priority substance use related consequence identified for the State of Louisiana through a state level needs assessment that was conducted as part of the state's SPF SIG strategic plan, and Lafayette Parish was chosen to be a SPF SIG funded community partially because of the rate and number of alcohol related crashes that existed in the parish prior to SPF SIG. The Highway Safety Research Group (HSRG) at Louisiana State University is an indispensable resource for data related to motor vehicle crashes in Louisiana. The HSRG collects and reports crash data through their website (<http://lhsc.lsu.edu/Reports/default.asp>) for public consumption. Using these data, the evaluation team provides a preliminary look at data relevant to alcohol related crashes in Lafayette Parish.

Table 8 presents the number and rate of alcohol related crashes that resulted in fatalities or injuries for each year between 2005 and 2010 (as well as the percentage of fatal crashes involving alcohol). Lafayette Parish began the SPF SIG planning process in 2007, and implementation of SPF SIG funded interventions began in January 2009 (enforcement only; full implementation of media and enforcement began in May 2010). As such, the 2009 and 2010 crash data provide potential insight regarding the impact of up to 24 months of implementation. The data in Table 8 provide optimism that SPF SIG may have had an impact on alcohol related crashes during both 2009 and 2010. From 2008 to 2009, the number of fatal alcohol crashes dropped from 24 to 16 (a decrease of 33%), and from 2009 to 2010, dropped even further to eleven (a decrease of 31%). In fact, 2010 was associated with the lowest number and rate of fatal alcohol crashes, as well as the lowest rate (and second lowest number) of injury alcohol related crashes of any year in Lafayette since 2005. Between 2005 and 2008 (pre-implementation), the number of fatal alcohol related crashes in Lafayette ranged from 16 to 24, increasing each year through 2007 and then holding steady in 2008. Alcohol related crashes resulting in injury ranged from 211 and 246 during this same timeframe, also increasing from 2005-2007, with a small drop in 2008.

**Table 8. Number and Rate of Alcohol Related Motor Vehicle Crashes Resulting in Injury and Percentage of Fatal Crashes that Involved Alcohol in Lafayette Parish, 2006-2010**

Year	Number of Fatal Alcohol Crashes	Rate of Fatal Alcohol Crashes*	Number of Injury Alcohol Crashes	Rate of Injury Alcohol Crashes*	% of Fatal Crashes Involving Alcohol
2005	16	12	211	154	50%
2006	22	16	226	162	61.1%
2007	24	17	251	175	63.2%
2008	24	17	246	170	66.7%
2009	16	11	240	164	61.5%
2010	11	7	214	144	42.3%

\*Rates are calculated per 100,000 licensed drivers.

While the data in Table 8 provide initial encouragement regarding the impact of the SPF Project on alcohol related crashes, unfortunately, the data are limited in this respect. Statistical analyses conducted on the data in Table 8 revealed that none of the reductions observed in 2009 and 2010 were statistically significant. The lack of statistical significance can be accounted for mainly as a result of the fact that data are only available for two years of the implementation period presented significant challenges regarding an accurate interpretation of the trends observed and the ability to conclusively determine whether SPF SIG was associated with a meaningful level of change on these indicators. Ideally, data would be available for not only the entire implementation period (e.g., through 2011), but also for several years after the intervention. Having several years of data both prior to implementation and after implementation allows the statistical analysis of the data to account for naturally occurring fluctuations in the data and a more reliable test. In fact, if additional years continue the current trend seen in 2009 and 2010, the likelihood of demonstrating a statistically significant reduction is very high.

### **Causal and Contributing Factor Data**

The interventions chosen by each SPF SIG funded parish were intended to address specific causal and contributing factors that were prioritized and considered to be the most problematic contributors to problem alcohol use and drinking and driving in the community. The purpose of identifying causal and contributing factors in the strategic planning process was to focus planning efforts on the factors in the community that were most influential in contributing to problem alcohol use and the consequences associated with alcohol. By coming to a detailed understanding of the specific causes of the problem in each community, interventions that address the specific needs of each community could be chosen, thus maximizing the impact on each community. For the Louisiana SPF SIG planning process, coalitions were encouraged to examine data to understand their communities from the perspective of six general causal factors that predict problem alcohol use:

- a) Retail availability (The ability for underage individuals to obtain alcohol through retail means, and/or the ability of individuals to continue the purchase of alcohol despite being intoxicated),
- b) Social availability (The ability for underage individuals to obtain alcohol through non-retail means, via friends, family, unmonitored alcohol in the home, etc.),

- c) Community norms (The presence of community norms that encourage alcohol use and misuse),
- d) Criminal justice/enforcement (The presence, or lack of, enforcement of alcohol sales to or possession to minors, public intoxication, drinking and driving, etc.)
- e) Promotion (The presence of advertisements or other promotional messages in the community that encourage alcohol use and misuse.)
- f) Individual factors (Personal, family or friendship characteristics such as beliefs, attitudes or rules about alcohol use and misuse that may contribute to use).

While understanding the general causal factors was an important step in identifying interventions to implement in the community, the causal factors in and of themselves are quite broad. In order to facilitate the intervention selection process, coalitions were asked to “drill down” to more specific contributing factors within each of the causal factors prioritized for their community. A list of contributing factors was generated for each causal factor that provided a detailed list of topics that fell within each causal factor. These contributing factors provided greater insight regarding the specific interventions that would most likely be effective in the community. Example contributing factors for each causal factor are provided below. For a more complete list of contributing factors please see Appendix B. Once contributing factors for each causal factor were prioritized, interventions were chosen to address the contributing factors. For example, if ease of underage buying (retail availability) was identified as a priority in the community, a retailer intervention that targets alcohol outlets who sell to minors might be chosen to address the contributing factor.

Causal Factor	Example Contributing Factors
Retail availability	Alcohol outlet density Ease of underage buying
Social availability	Alcohol available and unmonitored within the home Alcohol provided to minors by parents or other family members
Community norms	Community acceptance of alcohol use and misuse Community acceptance of drinking and driving
Criminal Justice/Enforcement	Lack of or inconsistent enforcement of alcohol laws Alcohol law penalties not enforced
Promotion	Widespread alcohol sponsorship at public events Widespread alcohol advertisements on billboards that glamorize use or are attractive to youth
Individual factors	Lack of perceived risks of alcohol use Favorable attitudes toward alcohol use

**Causal/Contributing Factor Data Sources.** In order to examine the impact of the SPF intervention period on the causal and contributing factors identified by each SPF parish, two data sources were utilized by the evaluation team. The first source of causal/contributing factor data was the Caring Communities Youth Survey (CCYS), a statewide youth survey administered by the Office of Behavioral Health on a biennial basis (on even years). The CCYS contained several items that the evaluation team felt could serve as proxy measures of the causal/contributing factors for SPF SIG. Additionally, items were added to the 2008 and 2010 CCYS surveys to measure additional alcohol causal factors that were relevant for data collection through a youth population. The

second source of causal factor data was an adult survey that was developed specifically for the SPF SIG and administered to adults in each of the ten SPF SIG funded parishes via telephone. The adult survey was administered both prior to the implementation of most of the SPF funded interventions (September 2009) and near the conclusion of the grant (July 2011) to allow a comparison of responses before and after implementation. A summary of data from both the CCYS and SPF SIG adult survey are presented below.

While data from the CCYS and SPF SIG Adult Survey were considered to be the best available data regarding causal and contributing factors, there are several important limitations to the data that should be noted. For the CCYS, the follow-up data does not represent true post-implementation data collection. While the 2008 CCYS data represents a true pre-implementation data collection period, the 2010 data (collected in October and November of 2010) was collected in the middle of the implementation period. Depending on when a particular parish began implementation, the data may reflect nearly a year of implementation or only a few months (most parishes began implementing between January and May of 2010). Regardless, the timeframe may not have been sufficient for SPF SIG interventions to have had an impact on CCYS data. Another limitation of the CCYS is that many of the items used as measures of causal/contributing factors were not specifically developed to measure these constructs. While these items were considered to be closely related enough to be useful as proxies (substitutes) for the causal/contributing factors their use as such had not been tested or documented prior to the analyses. Finally, the sample size and quality of the samples varies both across parishes and from year to year which may influence the reliability and interpretation of the results. Several limitations also apply to the adult survey data presented. While the adult survey items were developed specifically to measure causal and contributing factors, these measures had never been used before. Much thought was put into the wording of the items, but given the timeline for completion and resources available, a systematic pilot test data collection was not able to be conducted. As a result, the reliability, validity and sensitivity of the adult survey items were all unknowns prior to data collection. In other words, prior to data collection it was uncertain how well these items measured what they were intended to measure or if they provided a good opportunity to demonstrate changes in the causal/contributing factors over time. Typically, these survey issues are worked out over several iterations of data collection. Lastly, the adult survey data was not available during the assessment process that led to prioritization of the identified causal/contributing factors. As a result, there is some disconnect between the information and data used to determine the priorities, and the data that are now being used to measure changes in those same priorities. Ideally, the assessment process and the outcome evaluation would have been able to capitalize on many of the same measures (allowing a more precise measurement of change), but unfortunately, because the SPF SIG planning process was a “design-build” like process (being designed and implemented at the same time), some disconnect between the planning process and the evaluation process was unavoidable. Despite these limitations, causal/contributing factor data collected through the CCYS and SPF SIG Adult Survey are presented below, and represent the best data available for assessing levels and changes in the causal/contributing factors for each parish. Taken together with other data presented throughout this report, these data are useful for understanding the impact of the SPF SIG. However, these data should be considered preliminary, and judgments about the effectiveness or lack of effectiveness of the SPF SIG based on these data alone should be tempered.

Table 9 presents the mean (average) scores for each of the CCYS items that serve as proxy measures for the various causal/contributing factors. The data in Table 9 represent the combined data of all CCYS participants in grades 6, 8, 10 and 12 for 2008 and 2010. The total sample for Lafayette Parish was 4,752 in 2008 and 6,055 in 2010. The distribution of participants across each of the four grades was similar for both samples. A comparison of the average response for each item from 2008 to 2010

revealed mixed results. Slightly more than half of the items had changed in the expected direction (towards lower risk), while the remaining items changed in the unexpected direction. Through statistical analyses, three items showed significant change from 2008 to 2010. Two of these items changed in the expected direction (“If a kid drank alcohol in your neighborhood would he or she be caught by the police,” and “If a person was drinking and driving in my neighborhood would they get caught by the police?”). The third item (“How wrong do you think it is for adults over 21 to drink alcohol in public”) changed in the unexpected direction with participants indicating it is less wrong at follow-up. In all, the CCYS data for Lafayette Parish provides a somewhat confusing picture regarding whether the SPF SIG implementation period was associated with a positive impact on youth beliefs and attitudes related to alcohol use and alcohol enforcement.

**Table 9. Caring Communities Youth Survey Causal/Contributing Factor Item Means at Baseline and Follow-up**

Item	Causal-Contributing Factor	Pre-test Mean	Posttest Mean
1. How wrong do you think it is for someone your age to drink beer, wine, or hard liquor regularly? (1 = Very wrong to 4 = Not wrong at all)	-Favorable attitudes toward alcohol use -Youth expectations and norms regarding alcohol use	1.69	1.68
2. How much do you think people risk harming themselves if they take one or two drinks of an alcoholic beverage nearly every day? (1 = No risk to 4 = Great Risk)	-Perceived risk of alcohol use	2.79	2.80
3. How wrong would most adults in your neighborhood think it is for kids your age to drink alcohol? (1 = Very wrong to 4 = Not wrong at all)	-Adult acceptance of youth alcohol use	1.73	1.71
4. If a kid drank some beer, wine or hard liquor in your neighborhood, would he or she be caught by the police? (1 = Definitely Not True to 4 = Definitely True)	-Perceived risk of alcohol use -Lack of or inconsistent enforcement of alcohol laws	2.28	2.34*
5. If a person was drinking and driving in my neighborhood would they get caught by the police? (1 = Definitely Not True to 4 = Definitely True)	-Perceived risk of drinking and driving -Lack of or inconsistent enforcement of alcohol laws	2.69	2.76*
6. If the police caught a kid drinking alcohol in your neighborhood, would he or she be in serious trouble? (1 = Definitely Not True to 4 = Definitely True)	-Perceived risk of alcohol use -Lack of or inconsistent enforcement of alcohol laws	3.08	3.09
7. If you wanted to get some beer, wine or hard liquor, how easy would it be for you to get some? (1 = Very hard to 4 = Very easy)	-General availability (retail or social)	2.31	2.33
8. In your community, how easy would it be for someone under 21 to buy alcohol from a store? (1 = Very hard to 4 = Very easy)	-Ease of underage buying of alcohol via retail outlets	1.82	1.79
9. How wrong do your parents feel it would be for you to drink beer, wine or hard liquor regularly? (1 = Very wrong to 4 = Not wrong at all)	-Adult acceptance of youth alcohol use -Parent attitudes favorable toward alcohol use	1.46	1.48
10. How wrong do you think it is for adults over 21 to drink alcohol in public? (1 = Very wrong to 4 = Not wrong at all)	-Community acceptance of alcohol use	2.63	2.74*
11. How wrong do you think it is for adults over 21 to get drunk or be drunk in public? (1 = Very wrong to 4 = Not wrong at all)	-Community acceptance of alcohol use	1.98	2.02

\*Indicates a statistically significant difference from 2008 to 2010 (Independent samples T-Test at  $p < .05$ ).

Table 10 presents the mean (average) scores for each of the SPF SIG Adult Survey items that serve as measures for the various causal/contributing factors. The data in Table 10 represent a sample of adults from age 18 to 65. The baseline sample for Lafayette included 309 participants, while the follow-up sample included 400 participants. A comparison of the average response for each item from baseline to follow-up revealed a statistically significant difference for one item (question 12), and a marginally significant difference for one item (question 6). Both items changed in the expected direction (attitude that regular alcohol use by adults 21 and over is less “expected,” and belief that there was a greater likelihood of facing serious consequences, respectively). It is somewhat disappointing that more items did not show significant change from baseline to follow-up, especially for those items where improvement appeared to be obtainable. However, many items that did not reach statistical significance did trend in the right direction at follow-up (e.g., items 3, 5, 9, 10, 11, and 13), which is encouraging. It should also be noted that the average response for many items at baseline did not provide substantial room for improvement, meaning that pre-SPF implementation attitudes in some areas were already quite favorable. For example, the average response for items 7, 8, 9, 11, 15, 16, 18, 19 and 20 were all between the two highest points on the scale at baseline (between 3.0 and 4.0), with many of the items scoring above 3.5.

**Table 10. SPF SIG Adult Survey Causal/Contributing Factor Item Means at Baseline and Follow-up**

Item	Causal-Contributing Factor	Pre-test Mean	Posttest Mean
1. In your community, if someone drives while under the influence of alcohol, how likely is it that they would be caught by the police? (1 = Very unlikely to 4 = Very likely)	-Perceived risk of drinking and driving -Lack of or inconsistent enforcement of alcohol laws	2.73	2.85
2. When someone is cited or arrested for drunk driving in your community, how likely is it that they will face serious consequences as a result? (1 = Very unlikely to 4 = Very likely)	-Perceived risk of drinking and driving -Lack of or inconsistent enforcement of alcohol laws	3.02	2.99
3. In your community, if a parent or other adult provides alcohol at parties for people under 21, how likely are they to get caught by law enforcement? (1 = Very unlikely to 4 = Very likely)	-Perceived risk of providing alcohol to youth -Lack of or inconsistent enforcement of alcohol laws	2.10	2.20
4. When a parent or other adult is caught by law enforcement for providing alcohol to people under 21, how likely is it that they will face serious consequences as a result? (1 = Very unlikely to 4 = Very likely)	-Lack of or inconsistent enforcement of alcohol laws	2.78	2.81
5. In your community, if people under 21 drink alcohol on a regular basis, how likely are they to get caught by law enforcement officers? (1 = Very unlikely to 4 = Very likely)	-Lack of or inconsistent enforcement of alcohol laws	2.49	2.60
6. When people under 21 are caught by law enforcement for possessing alcohol or being drunk in public, how likely is it that they will face serious consequences as a result? (1 = Very unlikely to 4 = Very likely)	-Lack of or inconsistent enforcement of alcohol laws	2.76	2.91**
7. How much do you think adults over 21 risk harming themselves if they drink alcohol regularly (at least a few times a week)? (1 = No risk to 4 = Great risk)	-Perceived risk of adult alcohol use	3.12	3.11
8. How much do you think adults over 21 risk harming themselves if they drink alcohol heavily (3 or more drinks nearly every day)? (1 = No risk to 4 = Great risk)	-Perceived risk of adult alcohol use	3.55	3.56

Item	Causal-Contributing Factor	Pre-test Mean	Posttest Mean
9. How much do you think people under 21 risk harming themselves if they drink alcohol on the weekends? (1 = No risk to 4 = Great risk)	-Perceived risk of youth alcohol use	3.23	3.32
10. How wrong do you feel it is for an adult over 21 to use alcohol nearly every day? (1 = Not at all wrong to 4 = Very wrong)	-Favorable attitudes toward alcohol use -Community acceptance of alcohol use	2.83	2.95
11. How wrong do you feel it is for an adult over 21 to be drunk in public? (1 = Not at all wrong to 4 = Very wrong)	-Favorable attitudes toward alcohol use -Community acceptance of alcohol use	3.39	3.49
12. In your community, to what extent is regular alcohol use (at least a few times a week) by adults over 21 considered "normal" or "expected" behavior? (1 = Not at all "normal" to 4 = Very much "normal")	-Community acceptance of alcohol use	3.21	3.00*
13. How wrong do you feel it is for people under 21 to drink alcohol? (1 = Not at all wrong to 4 = Very wrong)	-Adult acceptance of youth alcohol use	3.08	3.17
14. To what extent do people in your community consider alcohol use on weekends by people under 21 to be "normal" or "expected" behavior? (1 = Not at all "normal" to 4 = Very much "normal")	-Adult acceptance of youth alcohol use -Adult provision of alcohol to youth	2.75	2.68
15. How wrong do you feel it is for parents or other adults to provide alcohol to people under 21 at parties when adult supervision is present? (1 = Not at all wrong to 4 = Very wrong)	-Adult acceptance of youth alcohol use -Adult provision of alcohol to youth	3.35	3.38
16. How wrong do you feel it is for parents or other adults to provide alcohol to people under 21 at parties when adult supervision is NOT present? (1 = Not at all wrong to 4 = Very wrong)	-Adult acceptance of youth alcohol use -Adult provision of alcohol to youth	3.73	3.76
17. In your community, to what extent is it considered "acceptable" for parents to provide alcohol to people under 21 at private parties or community events such as festivals? (1 = Not at all "acceptable" to 4 = Very "acceptable")	-Adult acceptance of youth alcohol use -Adult provision of alcohol to youth	2.07	2.14
18. When police officers break up a party and find that parents who own the home supplied alcohol to people under 21, to what extent do you feel the parents should be cited and prosecuted? (1 = Not at all to 4 = Very much)	-Adult acceptance of youth alcohol use	3.39	3.42
19. How wrong do you feel it is for someone to drive a few miles to get home while under the influence of alcohol? (1 = Not at all wrong to 4 = Very wrong)	-Community acceptance toward drinking and driving	3.71	3.70
20. Based on your observations, to what extent do restaurants and bars in your community tend to serve customers alcohol even when they outwardly appear to be intoxicated? (1 = Never to 4 = Almost always)	-Sales to intoxicated patrons	3.42	3.38
*Indicates a statistically significant difference from 2008 to 2010 (Independent samples T-Test at p < .05).			
**Indicates a marginally significant difference from 2008 to 2010 (Independent samples T-Test at p < .10).			

## Alcohol Use Data

In the SPF model, reductions in causal/contributing factors theoretically lead to decreases in substance related consequences by reducing problematic substance use behaviors. While data presented above examined the alcohol consequence indicators targeted by the Louisiana SPF SIG Project, and the alcohol causal/contributing factors prioritized as the most concerning in the parish, data regarding alcohol use behaviors has yet to be presented. In this section, alcohol use data is examined in order to understand whether alcohol use decreased during the SPF implementation period. As with the causal/contributing factor data, the data regarding alcohol use comes from the CCYS and SPF SIG Adult Survey. Table 11 presents data from the CCYS Survey regarding alcohol use and drinking and driving from both 2008 and 2010 (all data represent grades 6, 8 10 and 12 combined). An examination of the 2008 and 2010 data reveal that youth alcohol use rates and rates of driving after drinking were virtually the same in Lafayette based on CCYS data.

**Table 11. Caring Communities Youth Survey Alcohol Use and Driving After Drinking Rates at Baseline and Follow-up**

Item	2008		2010	
	Sample Size	% Used	Sample Size	% Used
Youth Any Alcohol Use in the Past 30 Days	4,498	24.7%	5,711	24.2%
Youth Binge Drinking in the Past Two Weeks	4,275	12.8%	5,603	13.0%
Youth Driving After Drinking Alcohol in the Past 30 Days	4,622	5.8%	5,834	5.6%

Table 12 presents data from the SPF SIG Adult Survey regarding alcohol use and drinking and driving among a sample of adults between 18 and 65 years old. Examination of the adult survey data reveals that adult 30-day use rates and rates of driving after drinking were virtually the same at baseline and follow-up. However, rates of binge drinking dropped from baseline to follow-up (from 22.6% to 15.3%) to a statistically significant degree.

**Table 12. SPF SIG Adult Survey Alcohol Use and Driving After Drinking Rates at Baseline and Follow-up**

Item	Pre-SPF		Post-SPF	
	Sample Size	% Used	Sample Size	% Used
Adult Any Alcohol Use in the Past 30 Days	307	52.8%	391	50.1%
Adult Binge Drinking in the Past 30 Days	305	22.6%	385	15.3%*
Adult Driving After Drinking Perhaps Too Much Alcohol in the Past 30 Days	305	3.0%	385	2.9%

\*Indicates a statistically significant change from 2008 to 2010 (Test of proportions at  $p < .05$ )

## **ADDITIONAL PROGRAM EVALUATION**

In addition to the environmental interventions described above, the Lafayette coalition chose to implement two programs targeted at youth in the parish. The first program was Social Norming for Alcohol Prevention (SNAP), a social norms program which was implemented in four high schools within the parish. The second program, Stay on Track, was a curriculum-based program for middle school students, and was implemented in nine schools within the parish.

### **Social Norming for Alcohol Prevention**

The SNAP program was a social norms program aimed at changing youth's beliefs and attitudes about alcohol use and risky alcohol behaviors including: a) alcohol use, b) binge drinking, and drinking and driving. The program is based on social norms theory, which posits that youth often have misperceptions about how many of their peers are engaging in risky behaviors, such as alcohol use. Specifically, youth tend to believe that far more of their peers use alcohol than actually do use. Moreover, the theory suggests that because of youth's desires to fit in with their peers, these misperceptions are an important influence on an individual youth's decision to drink alcohol, and make it more likely that youth will choose to drink alcohol. Based on this theory, schools participating in the SNAP program implemented localized "media campaigns" to dispel misconceptions about alcohol use within the student body. At each school, a pre-test (or baseline) survey was conducted within the student body which asked about alcohol use (e.g., past 30-day, binge drinking, etc.), drinking and driving behaviors, as well as assessing attitudes and beliefs about alcohol use (e.g., "how do you feel about someone your age having one or two drinks of alcohol nearly every day," "how do you feel about someone your age drinking and driving," "how much do people risk harming themselves when they have 5 or more drinks of alcohol once or twice a week"). Additionally, the survey asked students about their perceptions regarding peer alcohol use. The baseline survey data provided the program developers and facilitators with the information that would feed the media campaign. As expected, when comparing the actual alcohol use rates to perceptions of peer use, youth across all four participating schools overestimated the proportion of their peers who drank alcohol. Thus, media campaign materials developed and placed throughout each school emphasized these misperceptions and attempted to provide youth with more accurate beliefs about peer alcohol use within each school community and the parish. The media campaigns featured a variety of creative messages and themes and each school was provided the opportunity to develop "custom" messages that would resonate within the context of that particular school. In addition to the media campaign, SNAP sponsored activities were implemented at school events such as pre-Spring break school gatherings.

At the conclusion of the implementation period, a follow-up survey was conducted at each school to assess whether changes were evident in youth alcohol use rates, drinking and driving behaviors or beliefs and attitudes about alcohol use. Unfortunately, based on the data collected at follow-up, the results did not support the conclusion that the SNAP program had a positive impact overall across the four schools that participated. In general, the post-program data revealed no reductions in undesired behaviors such as alcohol use (30-day and binge drinking), drinking and driving, riding with a drinking driver, nor did attitudes and beliefs (overall) change to a more "anti-alcohol use/misuse" stance. While the outcome measures for the program were generally disappointing, the program did experience many successes during its implementation period. For example, the participating schools, including their administrations and student leaders were bought into the program, and media themes and messaging developed were creative and well-presented.

To view the complete evaluation results as prepared by the program developers for the SNAP program implemented in Lafayette Parish, please see Appendix C.

The program faced several challenges in demonstrating a positive impact. First, the time frame of implementation was short, much shorter than is typically planned for this type of intervention. The baseline survey and the initiation of the media campaigns at each school were implemented in February 2011, and program implementation (and the follow-up survey) was completed at the end of April 2011. This allowed for a total of approximately 2.5 months of program implementation (with full media campaign activities in effect for approximately 6 weeks at most schools). Typically, social norms campaigns are implemented over several months, beginning shortly after the beginning of the school year and concluding toward the end of the school year. Additionally, data collection issues, such as the timing of the baseline and follow-up surveys, sampling methods used, etc. may have contributed to the lack of results (see evaluation report for further explanation).

### **Stay on Track**

Stay on Track is a curriculum based substance abuse prevention program typically implemented in the school setting. The program consists of a knowledge based curriculum intended to educate middle school youth about the harmful effects of drugs, as well as teach important life skills such as goal setting, decision making and communication skills, which predict healthier life choices. The program consists of twelve classroom sessions (45-50 minutes in length) with emphasis placed on information about tobacco, alcohol, club drugs, hallucinogens, prescription drugs, marijuana and inhalants.

In Lafayette Parish, Stay on Track was implemented in nine middle schools as part of the SPF SIG. The program developer, National Center for Prevention and Research Solutions (NCPRS), conducted an evaluation of the program in Lafayette that examined the following outcomes: a) knowledge about illicit substance use, b) normative beliefs about peer substance use, c) goal setting and decision making skills, d) self-esteem, and e) refusal, communication and advocacy skills. Overall, the results of the evaluation provided evidence of a positive impact in several of the areas measured. In particular, participants showed increases in knowledge about tobacco, depressants, and inhalants. Additionally, a larger percentage of youth correctly estimated peer use rates of marijuana, cigarettes and alcohol (students typically tended to overestimate use). To view the complete report of Stay on Track evaluation data prepared by NCPRS, please see Appendix D.

### **SUMMARY**

Through the SPF SIG, the Lafayette Coalition developed a strategic plan that identified the alcohol priorities for the community and implemented four interventions to address those priorities. Two of the interventions (retail compliance checks and OWI saturation patrols) were environmental intervention that encompassed both enforcement and a public support/public awareness media campaign. The other two interventions were youth based programs aimed at preventing and reducing youth alcohol behaviors. The evaluation data presented in this report suggests that the interventions implemented through the SPF SIG reached a broad base of the community and these efforts were highly visible. Enforcement efforts through the OWI saturation patrols were incredibly productive, with a more than 200% increase in arrests made during the first year of implementation as a result. The media campaign

was implemented through all four major media campaign milieus, and data suggest the campaign was quite comprehensive in coverage. Both media saturation data and community survey data suggest a large proportion of the population was exposed to SPF funded prevention advertising. In regards to causal/contributing factors and alcohol use, the CCYS data were not conclusive in providing evidence of positive change resulting during the SPF period. The SPF SIG Adult Survey data was also not very conclusive, other than a statistically significant reduction in adult binge drinking that was observed. However, there was a clear drop in the number of alcohol related motor vehicle crashes resulting in both fatality and injury. While statistical analyses of the alcohol related crash data lacked sufficient power to demonstrate that the reductions were statistically significant, the trend was quite encouraging. Taken together, it is clear that SPF SIG implementation in the parish was active, visible, and robust and the initial outcomes data provide reason for optimism. Readers are reminded that much of evaluation data available at the time of reporting should be considered preliminary given the fact that they do not reflect the entire implementation period. As a result, it is possible that the impact of SPF SIG was not adequately captured by these data. An additional caveat is that the analyses presented should not imply that the SPF SIG was the sole causal factor responsible for changes in the data. Because SPF SIG implementation did not occur in a vacuum, the outcomes examined in relation to SPF SIG are likely to reflect other influences in the parish, state and perhaps even the nation, as well as the SPF SIG.

## Appendix A

### Media Campaign Description and Glossary of Media Evaluation Terminology

## SPF SIG Media Campaign Theme Descriptions

Sides and Associates created five media campaign themes as part of the statewide media library for use by the SPF SIG funded parishes. Below, a brief description of each theme is provided (themes with a high level of similarity are combined into a single description):

- 1) **“Kids and alcohol don’t mix”** – This primarily public support media campaign theme is targeted toward both youth and adults, especially parents. Media materials associated with this theme were focused on persuading the audience of the dangers of underage alcohol use, as well as the importance of adults, and parents in particular, of not providing alcohol to underage individuals.
- 2) **“DWI”** – This primarily public awareness media campaign theme is targeted toward the community at large and was focused on raising awareness about increased enforcement of drinking and driving violations. Sides and Associates worked with many of the parishes to customize the DWI themed messages to include local law enforcement in the messaging.
- 3) **“Organ donor”** – This primarily public support media campaign theme is targeted toward both youth and adults, especially parents. The main thrust of the messaging is to persuade the audience of the dangers of alcohol misuse (both underage drinking and drinking and driving). The strong message associated with this campaign is that if you give a youth a drink or support underage drinking, you should make sure that youth (or yourself) are registered as an organ donor because the consequences could be lethal.
- 4) **“Graduation” and “Prom”** – These primarily public support media campaign themes are targeted toward both youth and adults, especially parents. The graduation and prom themes urge youth and parents to forego the use of alcohol in celebrating these important events. Images of youth who lost their lives prematurely as a result of alcohol misuse are prominently used throughout the campaign.
- 5) **“7 out of 10”**\*\* – This media campaign features imagery of beer bottles with the message that “7 out of 10 local teens say it is easy to get alcohol. Don’t let them get it from you.”
- 6) **“Don’t waste time”**\*\* – This media campaign features the image of a man working out with the message, “Don’t waste your time, 1 night drunk equals 14 days lost training time.”
- 7) **“Men who drink”**\*\* – This media campaign features the image of a young man passed out on the floor around the toilet with the message, “Men who drink are not sexy.”

\*These themes were adopted from the Mason City Youth Task Force.

The O’Carroll Group of Lake Charles has worked with three of the SPF Parishes in either developing media materials or media placement. Media campaign themes they have developed specifically for these parishes include the following.

- 1) **“(DWI) Enforcement”** – These public awareness ads focused on informing the community about increased enforcement of alcohol violations, in particular drinking and driving. The ads featured pictures, images or video of local law enforcement officers from the parish.
- 2) **“Mugshot”** - This primarily public awareness ad campaign featured mug shot images of youth and adults with messages about the enforcement and penalties of underage drinking and providing alcohol to youth.

In 2011, the state purchased several media campaign themes from FACE, a non-profit organization focused on raising public awareness about the impact of alcohol misuse and abuse. Many of the themes purchased from FACE can be previewed at their website ([www.facecatalog.org](http://www.facecatalog.org)). All of the FACE media campaign themes are focused on public support.

- 1) **“It’s only beer”** – This media campaign theme features imagery of a beer bottle that looks like a syringe with a caption stating that alcohol is the number one drug problem in our country. The message is intended to debunk the myth that alcohol is a harmless substance.
- 2) **“Refuse to be roadkill”** – This theme features imagery of a skull and crossbones and encourages people to avoid riding with drivers who have been drinking and find alternative ways to get home.
- 3) **“Family celebrations”** – This media campaign theme features imagery of parties and celebrations involving individuals of all ages. It reminds people that celebrating with excessive alcohol use contributes to youth expectations and norms about alcohol use in celebratory events.

- 4) **“Shock therapy”** – This theme describes how too much alcohol consumed quickly can lead to a heat attack.
- 5) **“How big is it,” “Count” and “Size matters”** – These two media campaign themes focus on the importance of limiting alcohol consumption to a manageable and safe amount by paying attention to the size and number of drinks they consume.
- 6) **“Thin line”** – This media campaign encourages drinkers to not drink and drive by emphasizing the thin line they tread when their driving abilities are impaired by alcohol.
- 7) **“Basketball”** – This media campaign is targeted toward student athletes and reminds them of the consequences of getting caught for using alcohol (being suspended from the team, and letting down themselves and teammates).
- 8) **“Easiest place”** – This media campaign is targeted toward parents and reminds them that unsecured or unmonitored alcohol in the house may be an easy source of alcohol for youth.
- 9) **“Alcohol kills more kids”** – This media campaign is intended to debunk the myth that alcohol is harmless by discussing how alcohol is responsible for more youth fatalities than all other drugs combined.
- 10) **“Don’t provide”** - This media campaign is targeted toward changing the attitudes of parents and other adults who are willing to provide alcohol to youth by discussing the negative consequences of youth alcohol use.

In 2011, the state also purchased several television ads from the Parent’s Empowered media campaign designed by R & R Partners, a for-profit advertising company located four states and the District of Columbia. The Parent’s Empowered ad campaign was developed for the State of Utah and focused on the importance of parent involvement with youth as a strong prevention influence on youth substance use. All of the Parent’s Empowered media campaign themes are aimed towards parents and focused on public support.

- 11) **“Hang Glider”** – This television ad features a parent who swoops in on a hang glider and takes their child away as he attempts to drink alcohol with his friends. The message is that parent’s should drop by unannounced on their kids outings to monitor their activity.
- 12) **“Keep in Contact”** – This television ad features a mother who pulls their son in using a string when he attempts to drink alcohol with his friends. The message is to keep in constant contact with youth to monitor their activities.
- 13) **“Elephant in the Room”** – This television ad features parents who make excuses for their son’s suspicious behavior while an elephant eats from the popcorn bowl they are holding. The message is that ignoring the issue of underage drinking will lead to larger problems.
- 14) **“Keep on Them”** – This television ad feature a dad who stands so close to his son that it makes it physically impossible for him to drink a can or bottle of beer. The message is that kids who are close to their parents are less likely to drink.
- 15) **“Interference”** – This television ad features youth sitting in a classroom setting who are impaired by alcohol products that hang in front of their faces. The message is that alcohol use by teens can impair their school performance even when they are not drunk at the time.
- 16) **“Genie”** – This television ad features a genie that appears when a male youth who opens a bottle of beer. The genie tells the boy that drinking alcohol means the loss of privileges and the youth reveals that the genie is his dad. The message is that parent’s should set clear rules and expectations about alcohol use to reduce the likelihood of their children using.

### **Media Evaluation Terminology**

An explanation of key terminology used in the media evaluation summary tables is provided below.

- 1) **“Number of Ads or Spots”** – The number of newspaper ads, television spots or radio spots purchased during a given month.
- 2) **“Number of Outlets or Stations”** – For newspapers, the number of unique newspapers or circulars that ads were placed in during a given month. For radio or television, the number of unique stations that ads were placed in during a given month.

- 3) **“Number of Awareness Messages”** – The number of messages intended to raise awareness of new or existing laws and increased enforcement of those laws that is or will be occurring. By increasing awareness of laws and enforcement efforts, the hope is that individuals will change their behavior either as a result of increased knowledge or to avoid legal sanctions.
- 4) **“Number of Support Messages”** – The number of messages intended to change attitudes about behavior. The goal of public support is to appeal to the audience in order to make their attitudes about healthy behaviors more positive and unhealthy behaviors less positive.
- 5) **“Circulation per Outlet”** – For newspapers, the number of subscribers to the newspaper.
- 6) **“Readership per Outlet”** – For newspapers, the number of estimated readers for the newspaper.
- 7) **“Estimated Reach per Station”** – For radio or television, the estimated number or percentage of the population in the parish that were reached by the advertisements on that channel. In the data tables, the range (lowest and highest) of estimated reach across all channels for a given month is provided. Because the estimate applies to a single channel, the actual reach is likely to be higher than the highest reach estimate, given that most television viewers watch multiple channels and therefore would likely see ads on more than one channel during the month.
- 8) **“Estimated Times Viewed per Station”** – For radio or television, the estimated number of times each person who saw the ad on a particular channel was likely to have seen the ad on that channel. In the data tables, the range (lowest and highest) of estimated times viewed across all channels for a given month is provided.
- 9) **“Number of Billboards”** – The number of billboards which displayed campaign messaging during a given month.
- 10) **“Total Number of Billboard Days”** – The number of days any ad was displayed on any billboard in the community (the number of billboards multiplied by the number of days any ad associated with the campaign was displayed).
- 11) **“Average Number of Days on Billboard”** – The average number of days each billboard contained an ad during a given month.
- 12) **“Daily Effective Circulation”** – For billboards, the estimated number of individuals who may view the billboard. In the data tables, the range (lowest and highest) of estimated DEC is provided for all billboards which were utilized in that month.

## Appendix B

### List of Contributing Factors by Causal Variables for the Louisiana SPF SIG

## **List of Contributing Factors by Causal Variable for the Louisiana SPF SIG**

### **Retail Availability:**

- 1) Number of outlets in the community (including Density)
- 2) Hours of sales
- 3) Ease of underage buying (includes use of fake IDs, failure for proper ID checks by clerks, lack of retailer education, etc.)
- 4) Sales to intoxicated patrons
- 5) Low priced alcohol (low (or lack of) alcohol tax, happy hours, discount drinks, specials that promote large quantity consumption)

### **Enforcement:**

- 1) Limited number of sobriety checkpoints (due to shortage of police resources to conduct checks, etc.)
- 2) Lack of or inconsistent enforcement (actual or perceived) of alcohol laws, policies or ordinances for adults or youth (may be due to shortage of police resources, lack of training on alcohol issues, lack of community support for alcohol enforcement)
- 3) Low prosecution (actual or perceived) of alcohol violations
- 4) Lack of or limited number of retailer compliance checks
- 5) Penalties not enforced for retailers selling to youth

### **Individual Factors**

- 1) Perceived risk of alcohol use (and/or drinking and driving)
  - a. Perceived risk of being caught for drinking (and driving)
  - b. Perceived risk of injury or death from drinking (and driving)
- 2) Favorable attitudes toward alcohol use (including intentions to use alcohol)
- 3) Parent attitudes favorable toward alcohol use

### **Social Availability:**

- 1) Alcohol provided by parents/siblings/other adults (influenced by lack of knowledge of penalties for providing alcohol to minors, belief that alcohol use is safer than other substances, or that adult supervision creates a safe context for underage drinking)
- 2) Alcohol available and unmonitored within the home (but not explicitly provided by parents/relatives/other adults)\*
- 3) Alcohol available at community celebratory events (due to lack of monitoring or perceived acceptability of use)\*
- 4) Alcohol available through peers (e.g., at parties, friends with fake IDs)

\*These factors specific to underage drinking.

### **Community Norms:**

- 1) Community acceptance of alcohol use (general); expectation that drinking is part of everyday behavior (e.g., adult alcohol use common in public places)
- 2) Community acceptance toward drinking and driving
- 3) Adult acceptance of youth alcohol use (e.g., expectation as “normal” behavior, or belief that it is safer to use alcohol than other substances)
- 4) Youth expectations and norms regarding alcohol use (e.g., youth perceive drinking (perhaps even excessive drinking) as acceptable or cool; drinking is a normal and expected behavior among youth)

### **Promotion:**

- 1) Alcohol sponsorship of public events
- 2) Presence and density of alcohol advertisements in stores or store front windows
- 3) General advertising that makes alcohol consumption attractive to youth (e.g., portrayals of alcohol use as sexy or fun in TV and movies; advertisements in local or national publications, billboards, etc.)

## Appendix C

### Social Norms for Alcohol Prevention Evaluation Report

## Appendix D

### Stay on Track Evaluation Report