



## 2016/17 Tobacco-Use Prevention Education (T.U.P.E.) Competitive Grant Annual Report

### 1. Contact Information

Name: Bruce Baldwin

LEA Name: BCOE

Cohort: K

Year:

County: Butte

Phone: 530-532-5842

Email: [bbaldwin@bcoe.org](mailto:bbaldwin@bcoe.org)

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

Botvin's Life Skills Training	587
Keepin' It Real	0
Minnesota Smoking Prevention Program	764
Project Alert	0
Project Northland	0
Project SUCCESS	0
Project TND (Towards No Drug Abuse)	0
Project TNT (Towards No Tobacco Use)	0
SPORT	388
State-Wide Indian Drug Prevention Program	0

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

Unfortunately, we are still having difficulty getting schools to implement all 15 LifeSkills lessons, the number above reflects those sites which indicated they had implemented LS, either all or in part.

# 2016/17 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:

Comments regarding questions 11 & 12:

CIM lessons were delivered to all students at Concow school all students taking science classes at Ridgeview HS.

The majority of the schools in the consortium do not ever catch students using tobacco at school anymore and therefore there a no referrals for intervention at those sites.

# 2016/17 Tobacco-Use Prevention Education (T.U.P.E.) Competitive Grant Annual Report

Comments regarding questions 14 & 15:

Comments regarding questions 17:

The TUPE consortium consists of 9 different districts, not all districts participated in all activities. For any box selected above at least one district of the nine offered that activity at that grade level.

Comments regarding questions 19:

While you fail to list them here "rural residents" are a TEROC priority population.

ALL ACTIVITIES CONDUCTED BY THE BUTTE COUNTY TUPE CONSORTIUM WERE SPECIFICALLY TARGETED TO THE PRIORITY POPULATION "RURAL RESIDENTS" therefore, all activities include priority populations.

Comments regarding questions 21:

Oroville High school district runs a pregnant/parenting school, the district coordinator neglected to provide information on enrollment for the year, no other districts reported having pregnant or parenting minors.

# 2016/17 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.

The following districts are covered by this report as part of the Butte County TUPE Consortium:

Butte County Office of Education schools, Durham Unified School District, Biggs Unified School District, Golden Feather Elementary School District, Manzanita Elementary School District, Oroville City Elementary School District, Oroville Union High School District, Paradise Unified School District, Thermalito Union Elementary School District

# 2016/17 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 2016/17 school year under this grant?

	Number of students
Number of parenting and/or pregnant minors identified	14
Number of parenting and/or pregnant minors served	14
Number of parenting and/or pregnant minors in school based programs	14
Number of parenting and/or pregnant minors referred to community programs	14

22. Please use the space below to comment on your answers to question 21. *(Optional)*

23. Report the total number of classified and/or certificated staff trained in one or more of the areas listed in the table below. Then identify how many individuals received each type of training.

Training Type	Classified	Certificated
TOTAL persons receiving any kind of training related to the TUPE program	145	66
Trained to deliver program curriculum	2	16
Trained to deliver youth development strategies	30	15
Trained to deliver intervention strategies	23	12
Trained to deliver cessation strategies	90	12
General TUPE information		11

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.

14 certificated and 4 classified were trained to deliver MSPP or LifeSkills curriculum in the classroom. All other trainings included not only school staff but staff from agencies who work with the schools to provide services, such as Butte County Behavioral Health and Victor Counseling services, therefore not all were either certificated or classified, we don't have a breakdown by that criteria. 45 people were trained in risk to resilience, youth development. 35 were trained in Intervention Coaching. 82 people attended the Butte County Cessation Symposium, all in attendance received training in working with youth and young adults in tobacco cessation, not all were school staff as the symposium was a collaborative effort between the Butte County Office of Education, the California Health Collaborative, Butte County First Five and Enloe Medical Center.

# 2016/17 Tobacco-Use Prevention Education (T.U.P.E.) Competitive Grant Annual Report

25. Comments pertaining to question 23 & 24 are located in the appendix. (Optional)

26. How many parents received general TUPE information during the 2016/17 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 & 27 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	No	No	Yes	No
Youth Development activities	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cessation activities	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Intervention activities	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Local tobacco control coalition planning meetings	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

## 2016/17 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)

## 2016/17 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 2016/17 school year?

Program/Strategy Name	Number of Participating Students
Anti-Tobacco Media Blitz	0
Blowing Away Big Tobacco's Big Lies	0
Classroom Animation Studio Kit	0
Decisions for Health Series	0
Effective Youth and Adult Partnerships	0
Enough Snuff	0
Guiding Good Choices – Families That Care	0
Hands Off Tobacco! Series	0
Health and Wellness Series	0
Personal/Social Lessons: The Missing Link	0
Project ABCD (Analyze, Beware, Create, Disseminate)	0
Project ALIVE! (Arts Leading Into Vital Education)	0
Project SCAT (Schools and Communities Against Tobacco)	0
Something Stinks in Hollywood	0
Stay On Track Series	0
Teen Health Course Series	0
Teens Tackle Tobacco	0

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.

Several schools indicated teacher created tobacco curriculum was used or tobacco curricula in health class.

Total number = 412

American lung association presented to students at Honey Run Academy in Paradise = 40



# 2016/17 Tobacco-Use Prevention Education (T.U.P.E.) Competitive Grant Annual Report

6. Comments pertaining to question 4 & 5 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 2016/17 school year?

Non-Curricula Activities	Number of Projected Students
Assembly Presentations	0
Law enforcement sting operations to monitor tobacco sales to minors (i.e., Stop Tobacco Access to Kids Enforcement (STAKE) Act or others)	14
Media Literacy and Youth Media Production to Counter the Influence of the Tobacco Industry	116
Youth Involvement in Anti-Tobacco Advocacy	61
Tobacco use prevention Peer Educator	0
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.

Photovoice completion held at Las Plumas High school included under Media Literacy and Youth advocacy as results of media were used to influence the City Council

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:

# 2016/17 Tobacco-Use Prevention Education (T.U.P.E.) Competitive Grant Annual Report

10. Comments pertaining to question 7, 8 & 9 are located in the appendix. (Optional)

11. Which of the intervention programs listed below were offered during the 2016/17 school year?

Intervention Programs	Number of students identified	Number of students served
Brief Intervention	64	56
Craving Identification and Management (CIM)	98	98
Intervention with Teen Tobacco Users (TEG)	0	0
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& 12 are located in the appendix. (Optional)

# 2016/17 Tobacco-Use Prevention Education (T.U.P.E.) Competitive Grant Annual Report

14. Which of the cessation services listed below were offered during the 2016/17 school year? For each program offered provide the number of students identified and served under this grant.

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)	0	0
California Smoker's Helpline	4	4
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)*

CIM - while CIM is listed as an intervention, consortia schools use a modified version as our cessation curriculum. As mentioned previously, referrals in OUHSD were down due to staffing issues this year and almost no students were caught smoking on any other campuses. A total of 26 students attempted to quit.

16. Comments pertaining to question 14 & 15 are located in the appendix. (Optional)

# 2016/17 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	x
10th Grade	x	x	x	x	x
11th Grade	x	x	x	x	x
12th Grade	x	x	x	x	x
Non Traditional	x	x	x	x	x

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

# 2016/17 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). Enter an “x” in the appropriate boxes below for the school year.

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

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