



## 2015/16 Tobacco-Use Prevention Education (T.U.P.E.) Competitive Grant Annual Report

### 1. Contact Information

Name: Scott Gerbert

LEA Name: Alameda County Office of Education

Cohort: I                      Year:

County: Alameda              Phone: 510-670-4524

Email: sgerbert@acoe.org

### 2. Which of the research-validated or evidence-based programs listed below were implemented?

Botvin's Life Skills Training	0
Keepin' It Real	0
Minnesota Smoking Prevention Program	0
Project Alert	2192
Project Northland	0
Project SUCCESS	0
Project TND (Towards No Drug Abuse)	1353
Project TNT (Towards No Tobacco Use)	0
SPORT	0
State-Wide Indian Drug Prevention Program	0

### 3. Comments pertaining to question 2 are located in the appendix. (Optional)

The project coordinator for the consortium grant left in January and was not replaced until the end of April. Unfortunately, although instruction still occurred, data collection was spotty. In order to be honest and accurate, we are only counting "participants" as student that we have pre/post surveys from. Again, we know that more students received the instruction, in

## 2015/16 Tobacco-Use Prevention Education (T.U.P.E.) Competitive Grant Annual Report

4. Which other curriculum-based programs (e.g., LEA adopted health curricula, lessons addressing specific populations, etc.) listed below were offered to students in the general population during the 2015/16 school year?

Program/Strategy Name	Number of Participating Students
Anti-Tobacco Media Blitz	
Blowing Away Big Tobacco's Big Lies	
Classroom Animation Studio Kit	
Decisions for Health Series	
Effective Youth and Adult Partnerships	
Enough Snuff	
Guiding Good Choices – Families That Care	
Hands Off Tobacco! Series	
Health and Wellness Series	
Personal/Social Lessons: The Missing Link	
Project ABCD (Analyze, Beware, Create, Disseminate)	
Project ALIVE! (Arts Leading Into Vital Education)	
Project SCAT (Schools and Communities Against Tobacco)	
Something Stinks in Hollywood	
Stay On Track Series	
Teen Health Course Series	
Teens Tackle Tobacco	

5. If a non researched-validated curriculum-based program not listed in the table above was offered, please specify the name of the program/strategy along with the number of projected and participating students in the boxes below.

## 2015/16 Tobacco-Use Prevention Education (T.U.P.E.) Competitive Grant Annual Report

6. Comments pertaining to question 4 are located in the appendix. (Optional)

7. Which of the non-curricula activities listed below were offered to students in the general population during the 2015/16 school year?

Non-Curricula Activities	Number of Projected Students
Assembly Presentations	
Law enforcement sting operations to monitor tobacco sales to minors (i.e., Stop Tobacco Access to Kids Enforcement (STAKE) Act or others)	0
Media Literacy and Youth Media Production to Counter the Influence of the Tobacco Industry	137
Youth Involvement in Anti-Tobacco Advocacy	
Tobacco use prevention Peer Educator	2,196
Tobacco use prevention focused Service-Learning Projects	0

8. If a non-curricula activity not listed in the table above was offered, please specify the name of the activity along with the number of projected and participating students.

9. If you selected *Assembly Presentation* as an activity, please specify the names of the speaker(s) and a brief description of the presentation in the space below:

Assemblies were documented by the site coordinators in their monthly reports, but no numbers were given and the names and descriptions of the presentations were not included. The new program coordinator was not able to gather specifics from the site coordinators prior to the end of the school year.

## 2015/16 Tobacco-Use Prevention Education (T.U.P.E.) Competitive Grant Annual Report

10. Comments pertaining to question 7 are located in the appendix. (Optional)

11. Which of the intervention programs listed below were offered during the 2015/16 school year?

Intervention Programs	Number of students identified	Number of students served
Brief Intervention	321	321
Craving Identification and Management (CIM)	0	0
Intervention with Teen Tobacco Users (TEG)	283	283
Project Life	0	0
Smokeless Schooldays: Smokeless Saturday School	0	0
Tobacco-Free Generations	0	0

12. If an intervention program not listed in the table above was offered, please specify the name of the program and the number of projected and participating students.

13. Comments pertaining to question 11 are located in the appendix. (Optional)

## 2015/16 Tobacco-Use Prevention Education (T.U.P.E.) Competitive Grant Annual Report

14. Which of the cessation services listed below were offered during the 2015/16 school year? For each program offered provide the number of students identified and served

Cessation Programs	Number of students identified	Number of students served
Adolescent Smoking Cessation-Escaping Nicotine and Tobacco (ASCENT)	0	0
Enough Snuff: A Guide for Quitting Smokeless Tobacco	0	0
Helping Teens Stop Using Tobacco (TAP)	64	64
California Smoker's Helpline	0	0
Project EX: Teen Tobacco Use Cessation Program	0	0
Project N-O-T (Not on Tobacco)	0	0

15. If a cessation program not listed in the table above was offered, please specify the name of the program along with the number of students identified to be served and the number of students served in the space below. *(Please do not use acronyms)*

16. Comments pertaining to question 14 are located in the appendix. (Optional)

## 2015/16 Tobacco-Use Prevention Education (T.U.P.E.) Competitive Grant Annual Report

17. Indicate which programs were provided to students in the grades listed below

	Research-Validated or Evidence-based curricula-based programs	Other Curricula-based programs	Non-curricula activities	Intervention programs	Cessation programs
6th Grade	X		X	X	X
7th Grade	X		X	X	X
8th Grade	X		X	X	X
9th Grade	X		X	X	X
10th Grade			X	X	X
11th Grade			X	X	X
12th Grade			X	X	X
Non Traditional	X		X	X	X

18. Comments pertaining to question 17 are located in the appendix. (Optional)

## 2015/16 Tobacco-Use Prevention Education (T.U.P.E.) Competitive Grant Annual Report

19. Indicate which programs were specifically targeted to students in the priority populations listed below (i.e.; a conscientious decision was made to select or tailor programs to impact priority populations). ?

	Research-Validated or evidence-based curricula-based programs	Other Curricula- based programs	Non-curricula activities	Intervention programs	Cessation programs
African American	X		X	X	X
American Indian or Alaska Native	X		X	X	X
Asian	X		X	X	X
Pacific Islander	X		X	X	X
Hispanic/Latino	X		X	X	X

20. Comments pertaining to question 19 are located in the appendix. (Optional)

## 2015/16 Tobacco-Use Prevention Education (T.U.P.E.) Competitive Grant Annual Report

21. How many parenting and/or pregnant minors were identified and served during the 2015 /16 school year under this grant?

	Number of students
Number of parenting and/or pregnant minors identified	0
Number of parenting and/or pregnant minors served	0
Number of parenting and/or pregnant minors in school based programs	0
Number of parenting and/or pregnant minors referred to community programs	0

22. Comments pertaining to question 21 are located in the appendix. (Optional)

23. How many classified and/or certificated staff were trained in the areas listed below?

Training Type	Classified	Certificated
Trained to deliver program curriculum	0	32
Trained to deliver youth development strategies	0	32
Trained to deliver intervention strategies	2	0
Trained to deliver cessation strategies	2	0
General TUPE information	0	0

24. If staff were trained in areas not listed in the table above please specify the type of training and how many classified and/or certificated staff were trained in the box below.



## 2015/16 Tobacco-Use Prevention Education (T.U.P.E.) Competitive Grant Annual Report

25. Comments pertaining to question 23 are located in the appendix. (Optional)

26. How many parents received general TUPE information during the 2012/13 school year under this grant? 0

27. If parents received training other than general TUPE information, please specify in the space below the type of trainings or information they received and the number of parents participating in each activity.

28. Comments pertaining to questions 26 are located in the appendix. (Optional)

29. Were the activities listed in the table below offered in collaboration or coordination with LEAs, community agencies or other organizations?

Activity Type	Local Education Agency	Local public health agency	Local governmental agency	Local non-governmental organization
Curriculum Implementation	YES	NO	NO	YES
Youth Development activities	YES	YES	NO	YES
Cessation activities	YES	NO	NO	NO
Intervention activities	YES	NO	NO	NO
Local tobacco control coalition planning meetings	NO	YES	YES	YES

## **2015/16 Tobacco-Use Prevention Education (T.U.P.E.) Competitive Grant Annual Report**

30. If an activity other than those listed in the table above was offered, please specify the type of activity and if the activity was in collaboration with an LEA, community agency, local coalitions, or another agency.

31. Comments pertaining to question 29 are located in the appendix. (Optional)

## 2015/16 Tobacco-Use Prevention Education (T.U.P.E.) Competitive Grant Annual Report

Comments regarding question 4:

Comments regarding questions 5:

Comments regarding questions 7, 8 & 9:

The project coordinator for the consortium grant left in January and was not replaced until the end of April. Unfortunately, although non-curricula activities occurred, data collection was spotty. In order to be honest and accurate, we are only reporting numbers for items we know to be accurate based on site coordinator reports. We know that more students participated in these non-curricula activities, but in order to be transparent and accurate, we are only reporting numbers that we feel are accurate.

Comments regarding questions 11 & 12:

The new project coordinator started with the consortium at the end of April of 2016 and it was too late to create an evaluation tool/mechanism to determine the “identified” students vs. those who were served. As stated in a previous response, the new coordinator feels strongly that only concrete, documented, data should be submitted to CDE.

## 2015/16 Tobacco-Use Prevention Education (T.U.P.E.) Competitive Grant Annual Report

Comments regarding questions 14 & 15:

The new project coordinator started with the consortium at the end of April of 2016 and it was too late to create an evaluation tool/mechanism to determine the “identified” students vs. those who were served. As stated in a previous response, the new coordinator feels strongly that only concrete, documented, data should be submitted to CDE.

Comments regarding questions 17:

Comments regarding questions 19:

The new project coordinator started with the consortium at the end of April of 2016 and it was too late to create an evaluation tool/mechanism to determine if these items were targeted at these priority populations or if they were simply impacted as part of the broader efforts. Data collected shows that these priority populations were served, but it is not clear if the programs were “specifically targeted” to these students. As stated in a previous response, the new coordinator feels strongly that only concrete, documented, data should be submitted to CDE.

Comments regarding questions 21:

## 2015/16 Tobacco-Use Prevention Education (T.U.P.E.) Competitive Grant Annual Report

Comments regarding questions 23 & 24:

Comments regarding questions 26 & 27:

Comments regarding questions 29 & 30:

If you are the lead agency for a consortium, please list in the space provided below which districts in your consortium contributed to this report.

Alameda County Office of Education (LEA Lead for Consortium)

- Alameda USD
- Dublin USD
- Livermore Valley Joint USD
- Newark USD
- San Lorenzo USD