



THE UNIVERSITY OF
NEW MEXICO.

Protecting You Protecting Me Program Review

Prepared by:

Evelyn Olmos, B.A.

Paul Guerin, Ph.D.

Prepared for:

Bernalillo County Department of

Behavioral Health Services

Institute for Social Research

University of New Mexico

July 2022

INTRODUCTION

The Bernalillo County Department of Behavioral Health Services' (DBHS) mission is to improve behavioral health outcomes in Bernalillo County through innovative, cohesive and measurable programs, treatment services and supports aimed at preventing the incidence of crisis and substance use disorder. The Department of Behavioral Health Services' three divisions are Behavioral Health (BH), Substance Abuse (SA), and Driving While Intoxicated (DWI).

The Center for Applied Research and Analysis (CARA), Institute for Social Research (ISR) at the University of New Mexico (UNM) has been contracted by DBHS to provide research and evaluation services for the Substance Abuse and Driving While Intoxicated divisions. The Substance Abuse division provides a variety of programs to reduce the impact of alcoholism, alcohol abuse, drug dependence and drug abuse in the County with the goal of making Bernalillo County a safe place to live and work.

The Driving While Intoxicated Division receives funding from the N.M. Department of Finance Administration (DFA) which administers the statewide Local Driving While Intoxicated (LDWI) Grant Fund that serves all 33 New Mexico counties funded entirely by Liquor Excise Tax Collections (LETC). All county programs are required to hire a local evaluator to assess the effectiveness of programs of locally chosen services. The services fall in the following six areas: screening, treatment and detoxification, enforcement, prevention, compliance monitoring tracking, and alternative sentencing.

This report reviews the DBHS funded Protecting You Protecting Me (PY/PM) prevention program for FY 2022 year. This review is designed as a process evaluation and not an outcome evaluation. The Protecting You Protecting Me program has not previously been evaluated by ISR. Process evaluations are designed to measure program implementation, the internal dynamics of how a program operates, and if the program operates according to its design and if the design is based on best practices.

This process evaluation comprises a review of program materials, program evaluations conducted as part of the program by Protecting You Protecting Me students, and observations of the Protecting You Protecting Me classes taught in Albuquerque Public School classrooms (due to the COVID-19 pandemic, observations were partially conducted online using Google Classrooms and this will be explained further later in this report). This report continues from this introduction to a brief review of best practice literature focused on child alcohol prevention programs, a short description of the Protecting You Protecting Me program, a review of the student post-test data, and a comparison of our classroom observations and findings with the National Institute of Drug Abuse (NIDA) prevention principles.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Beginning prevention education in elementary school-aged children is believed to be an effective deterrent of substance use later in adolescence. Elementary school-based prevention programs reach children before they have fully shaped attitudes and opinions about substance use, therefore these programs can help children make informed decisions when they get older. Although 21 is the legal drinking age across the United States, almost one half (48.6%) of high school seniors report drinking alcohol at least once in the past 30 days, and the average age that youth aged 12 to 17 report they first used alcohol was 13 (Bell et al., 2005). Rates of initiation of drinking rise rapidly starting at age 10 (grades 4 and 5) and peak between 13 and 14 (grades 8 and 9) (Stigler et al., 2011).

Many school-based programs aim to reduce alcohol use by preventing consumption before it begins. Although substance prevention programs are most often implemented during the middle school years, it is shown that children start being influenced by their peers during fourth and fifth grade. Studies indicate that young children begin to acquire an understanding about alcohol at a very early age and often long before they have direct involvement with it. The formation of attitudes about alcohol is influenced by several factors including siblings and parents, the media, and peers. Because risk factors are present several years before initiation, prevention activities should start in elementary school and be periodically reinforced as students mature and are presented with new social situations and pressures to use alcohol (Bell et al., 2005).

According to the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) long-term research studies on the origins of drug abuse behaviors and the common elements of effective prevention programs have provided a number of principles (NIDA, 2003). These research-based principles are useful in helping practitioners address drug use among children, adolescents and young adults and can help guide the "...thinking, planning, selection, and delivery of drug abuse prevention programs at the community level." Research has shown early intervention can prevent adolescent risk behaviors like drug use. These principles will be discussed again later in this report.

The Protecting You Protecting Me program is an evidence-based prevention program that has been found, in the short-term, to benefit students by influencing their attitudes toward advertisements, increasing their intentions not to ride with a driver who has been drinking, developing their skills to protect themselves when they have no other option but to ride with an alcohol impaired driver, and improving their knowledge about the developing brain (Bohman et al., 2004). Research suggests that alcohol prevention targeted toward children should begin early, before they enter middle or junior high school. Evidence is growing that prevention programs can postpone initial substance use and thus prevent the developmental progression into more serious forms of abuse. Interactive programs that include interpersonal skill development show greater effectiveness in reducing, delaying and/or preventing drug use as compared to non-interactive programs (Bohman et al., 2004; Botvin et al., 2002).

Prevention programs have primarily been school-based because schools are an effective way of capturing a large audience of young people at the same time. (Griffin & Botvin, 2010) To be most effective, school-based substance use interventions should be theory driven, address social norms on substance use, build personal and social skills designed to help resist substance use, use interactive teaching, use peer leaders, be delivered over multiple sessions and years, provide training and support to facilitators, and be culturally and developmentally appropriate. All school-based prevention programs (interactive and non-interactive) increase the knowledge of drugs (Cuijpers, 2003).

In conclusion, elementary school-based prevention programs reach children at an appropriate time to deter and prevent substance use later in life. Prevention programs targeted to young children should be

interactive, relevant to local needs, and aid in personal and social skills development. To be most effective, these programs should be research-based and developmentally appropriate.

PROGRAM DESIGN

The Protecting You Protecting Me (PY PM) is a classroom-based alcohol use prevention and vehicle safety program originally developed by Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD) in 1997. The program targets elementary school-aged children and is designed to reduce alcohol-related injuries and death among children due to underage alcohol use and/or to riding in vehicles with intoxicated drivers.

The PY PM curriculum is no longer supported by MADD and the curriculum is no longer for purchase or listed on the national MADD website. However, it is unclear when the curriculum became inactive. It is also unclear why the curriculum is not supported or available.

MADD's PY PM curriculum incorporates research on human brain development, focuses on the immediate risks of using alcohol before age 21, and improves elementary school students' vehicle safety skills, including their ability to protect themselves when they have no option but to ride with an adult who has been drinking alcohol. The PY PM program aims to increase students' social competency skills, problem-solving skills, autonomy and sense of purpose through the curriculum's discussions and activities.

The PY PM curriculum in total provides a series of 40 lessons. These 40 lessons are separated across grades 1 through 5 with one lesson per week for eight weeks. Each grade level has its own materials and activities. Curriculum topics include:

- Our Brain
- Growth and Development
- Health and Safety
- Rules and Laws
- Friends
- Choices and Decisions
- Media Awareness
- Communication and Vehicle Safety

As noted earlier lessons are taught weekly and, depending on grade level, can last between 20-25 minutes or 45-50 minutes. PY PM's interactive and affective teaching processes include role-playing, small group and classroom discussions, reading, writing, storytelling, art, and music.

PY PM lessons and activities focus on teaching children about:

1. The brain and how it continues to develop throughout childhood and adolescence, what alcohol does to the developing brain, and why it is important for children to protect their brains
2. Vehicle safety, particularly what children can do to protect themselves if they have to ride with someone who is not alcohol free, and
3. Life skills, including decision-making, stress management, media awareness, resistance strategies, and communication.

The PY PM program currently funded by Bernalillo County is managed and facilitated by one person. This PY PM staff member is in charge of creating and maintaining ties with schools and educators, creating and updating all presentation materials, and facilitating all classes. This staff person ensures materials are up to date. While the original curriculum is no longer supported the program staff person has

adapted the curriculum with new material including the latest statistics related to the 8 curriculum topics.

METHODOLOGY

Our evaluation of the Protecting You Protecting Me program focused on a review of program materials, a review of student post-tests conducted as part of the program, and observations of the Protecting You Protecting Me program in Albuquerque Public School classrooms. We also had several informed conversations with the single program staff on the curriculum and implementation of the program.

Our observations of the delivery of the Protecting You Protecting Me program are compared to the known best practices for school-based prevention programs, using the National Institute on Drug Abuse's (NIDA) research-based prevention principles for preventing drug use among children and adolescents. We will also be discussing the characteristics of effective school-based programs found when we reviewed the literature, and how these programs compare to what we observed from PY PM.

Table 1 summarizes the 16 NIDA principles. The principle number, a summarized description of the principle, the target of the principle, the relevance of the principle to our evaluation, and whether the principle was observable is provided. The *target* column provides the topic(s) covered by each principle. There are three targets including risk and protective factors, prevention planning, and prevention program delivery. First, research has tried to identify factors associated with increased "risk" of potential of drug use and those associated with the reduced potential of abuse which are called "protective" factors. A goal of prevention programs should be to change the balance of factors so that protective factors are greater than risk factors. Principles 1 through 4 involve risk and protective factors. Second, prevention planning provides a framework for programming. Principles 5 through 11 involve prevention planning by the location of the program. Programs that are consistent with these principles are not necessarily effective programs. Third, a subset of the principles focuses on research-based program delivery principles. Programs should incorporate Principles 12 through 16, which address how these principles can be applied to effectively create family, school, and community programs.

Prevention programs that incorporate research-based program delivery principles as well as incorporate risk and protective factors and incorporate the prevention principles that provide a framework for effective programming should result in the delivery of the best practice prevention programs.

Our evaluation is not designed to evaluate the impact of the program on alcohol and drug use but to evaluate how the program adheres to effective prevention program principles and the processes used by the PY PM program. Our primary mechanism to evaluate the process of this program is through our structured observations and how these programs adhere to the relevant principles, our review of materials, and review of student surveys that provide insight into adherence to relevant principles.

The *relevant* column is meant to note whether the principle is relevant to the review of the program. This means the program should incorporate this principle into their program. The *observable* column documents whether this principle could be observed during the delivery of the program. Importantly, for our evaluation some of these principles were not directly observable because they are not part of the program delivery. The last column, labeled *Design*, notes whether the principle should be incorporated into the design of the program. This is important because not all the principles that should comprise the programs are observable as part of the delivery of the program.

Six of the 16 NIDA principles were not relevant and are highlighted in gray in Table 1. Principle 5 was considered not relevant because it applies to family-based prevention programs. Principle 6 was not relevant because it refers to preschool programs and the PY PM program curriculum begins in the 1st grade. Principle 8 was not relevant because it applies to middle school programs. Principles 9 through 11 were not included because they deal with community-based prevention programs.

Table 1. NIDA Prevention Principles Summarized

#	Description	Target	Relevant	Obs.	Design
1	Prevention Programs should enhance protective factors and reverse or reduce risk factors	Risk and Protective Factors	Yes	No	Yes
2	Prevention program should address all forms of drug abuse	Risk and Protective Factors	Yes	Yes	Yes
3	Prevention programs should address local problems	Risk and Protective Factors	Yes	Yes	Yes
4	Prevention programs should be tailored to address risks specific to the population or audience	Risk and Protective Factors	Yes	Yes	Yes
5	Family-based prevention programs should enhance family bonding and relationships and include parenting skills;	Prevention Planning Family Programs	No	No	No
6	Prevention programs can be designed to intervene as early as preschool	Prevention Planning School Programs	No	No	No
7	Prevention programs for elementary school should target academic and socio-emotional learning	Prevention Planning School Programs	Yes*	Yes	Yes
8	Prevention programs for middle-school should increase academic and social competence	Prevention Planning School Programs	No**	Yes	Yes
9	Prevention programs aimed at general populations at key transition points, such as the transition to middle school, can produce beneficial effects even among high-risk families and children	Prevention Planning Community Programs	No	No	Yes
10	Community prevention programs that combine two or more effective programs, such as family-based and school-based programs, can be more effective than a single program alone	Prevention Planning Community Programs	No	No	No
11	Community prevention programs reaching populations in multiple settings—for example, schools, clubs, faith-based organizations, and the media—are most effective when they present consistent, community-wide messages in each setting	Prevention Planning Community Programs	No	No	No
12	Core elements of the original interventions should be retained when programs are adapted to meet local needs	Prevention Program Delivery	Yes	No	No
13	Prevention programs should be long-term with repeated interventions	Prevention Program Delivery	Yes	No	Yes
14	Prevention programs should include teacher training on good classroom management practices	Prevention Program Delivery	Yes	Yes	Yes
15	Prevention programs are most effective when they employ interactive techniques such as peer discussion groups and parent role playing	Prevention Program Delivery	Yes	Yes	Yes
16	Research based prevention programs can be cost effective	Prevention Program Delivery	Yes	No	No

*Relevant and observable for elementary school only.

**Relevant and observable for middle school only.

These principles serve as guidelines for the development, delivery, and study of research based-drug and alcohol abuse prevention programs. The NIDA prevention principles serve as a guide when comparing the PY PM curriculum delivery to known best practices of prevention programs.

ANALYSIS

Student Post Tests

Protecting You Protecting Me provided ISR with 329 post-tests completed during 2017-2019 by students who were part of the program. PY PM provided post-tests for the 2017-2019 years because the COVID-19 pandemic caused incomplete data like not enough student answers due to the classes being taught remotely in the more recent years of 2020 and 2021. These post-tests comprise of 8 questions (the 2017 version of the post-test includes an extra question). The first six (seven in the 2017 version) questions were quiz type questions and are designed to measure if students retained important class material, while the last two questions ask students to evaluate the program and speak on what they liked or what they would change about the program. These forms are filled out by students on the last day of instruction by PY PM. There is no pre-test and as designed the post-test is not designed or intended to be compared to a pre-test.

Of the six (seven in the 2017 version) quiz questions, the first two ask students to write in a short answer, for these questions there is only one right answer. The next four questions (five in the 2017 version of the post-test) are True False statements. The final two evaluation questions are open-ended questions.

For the two open-ended questions we created categories that represented the responses provided by students. After all student answers were entered into a MS Excel worksheet, we compared each answer and tracked commonalities. Since these were answers of elementary school-aged children, they were often short and straightforward. For example, if asked what they liked about the program, students would give answers like “I liked learning about neurons” or “Everything.” Categories were then derived from these answers. Often, student responses were repetitive and categories could easily be derived from their responses and grouped together. Any answer involving a certain topic would then be grouped with similar answers. The following tables report the most common responses to each question and are described below.

Question 1: “Who is the boss of our body?”

The correct answer for this question is “the brain”. A total of 328 students gave an answer for this question. Out of these 328 students, 308 wrote a version of the correct answer. The remaining 20 students incorrectly answered this question. Incorrect answers included “me”, “the heart”, or “my body.”

Table 2. Question 1

Q1	Count	Percent
Correct	308	93.9
Incorrect	20	6.1
Total Answers	328	100

Question 2: “What age is your brain fully developed?”

The correct answer for this question is the age range “25-26”. However, if students answered with either a 25 or a 26, it also counted as being a correct answer. A total of 327 students gave an answer to this question. Out of these 327 students, 309 wrote a version of the correct answer. Correct answers include “25”, “26”, or “25-26”. The remaining 18 students incorrectly answered this question with other ages or age ranges.

Table 3. Question 2

Q2	Count	Percent
Correct	309	94.5
Incorrect	18	5.5
Total Answers	327	100

Question 3: “Alcohol and other drugs can interfere with the messages that keep us living, growing and learning.”

Possible answers for this question were “True” or “False”. The correct answer for this question is “True.” A total of 325 students answered this question. Out of 325 students, 301 answered correctly and 24 answered incorrectly.

Table 4. Question 3

Q3	Count	Percent
Correct	301	92.6
Incorrect	24	7.4
Total Answers	325	100

Question 4: “Stress management skills can help us protect our brain and the rest of our body.”

Possible answers for this question were “True” or “False”. The correct answer for this question is “True.” A total of 320 students answered this question. Out of 320 students, 247 answered correctly while 73 students answered incorrectly.

Table 5. Question 4

Q4	Count	Percent
Correct	247	77.2
Incorrect	73	22.8
Total Answers	320	100

Question 5: “On average, how many alcohol related traffic deaths occur every 33 minutes in the United States?”

This question is only available on the 2017 version of the post-test. Possible answers are “1” or “5”. The correct answer for this question is “1”. A total of 73 students answered this question. Of 73 students, 55 answered correctly and the remaining 18 answered incorrectly.

Table 6. Question 5

Q5	Count	Percent
Correct	55	75.3
Incorrect	18	24.7
Total Answers	73	100

Question 6: “Is it important to be a good friend?”

Possible answers for this question were “Yes” or “No”. The correct answer for this question was “Yes.” A total of 328 students answered this question. Of 328 students, 327 answered correctly while only 1 student answered incorrectly.

Table 7. Question 6

Q6	Count	Percent
Correct	327	99.7
Incorrect	1	0.3
Total Answers	328	100

Question 7: “5 Rules of Safe Riding: 1. Sit in the back seat, 2. Put everything on the floor, 3. Buckle up tight, 4. Don’t bother the driver. Be Quiet, 5. Tell a trusted grown-up immediately about any unsafe ride.”

Possible answers for this question were “True” or “False”. The correct answer was “true.” A total of 328 students answered this question. Of 328 students, 326 answered correctly and 2 answered incorrectly.

Table 8. Question 7

Q7	Count	Percent
Correct	326	99.3
Incorrect	2	0.7
Total Answers	328	100

Question 8: “What did you like best about PY PM?”

As mentioned earlier, the last two questions were open-ended questions. For this question, nearly 30% of student listed activities as the best part of PY PM, 18% of students listed learning about drunk driving, another 17% listed knowing how to make good choices, 12% listed learning about the brain and/or body, 10% liked learning about drugs and/or alcohol, almost 5% of students listed that they liked everything about the program, almost 5% liked learning in general, and almost 3% listed the instructor of PY PM as the best part of the program. Lastly, only 2 students listed “nothing” as their favorite part of PY PM.

Table 9. Question 8

Q8	Count	Percent
Activities	91	29.5
Drunk Driving	56	18.2
Good Choices	53	17.2
Brain Body Info	37	12.0
Drug Alcohol Info	32	10.4
Everything	15	4.9
Learning	14	4.5
Instructor	8	2.6
Nothing	2	0.6
Total Answers	308	100

Question 9: “Is there anything you would change about the class?”

As mentioned earlier, the last two questions were open-ended evaluation questions. For Question 9, the majority of students, 69% wrote they would change nothing about the program with some students even saying that they liked the program as is. Then, 8% of students listed that they would have liked the program to include more activities, 7% listed they had problems paying attention due to their classmates, while 5% said the physical classroom setting (some students sitting on the floor) was uncomfortable.

About 4% of students mentioned they would like the instructor to make sure they will have a safe future, possibly meaning that some of the students receiving the post-test are too young to understand the questions or how to evaluate a program. The remaining students mentioned wanting to change the class material, 2%, the days and time of the class, almost 2%, wanted no homework, almost 2%, and lastly, wanted to change the instructor, under 1%.

Table 10. Question 9

Q9	Count	Percent
Nothing	208	69.1
More Activities	24	8.0
Distracting Peers	21	7.0
Classroom	15	5.0
Ensure Safe Future	13	4.3
Class Material	7	2.3
Days Time	5	1.7
No Homework	5	1.7
Instructor	3	0.9
Total Answers	301	100

Overall, the student post program evaluation indicates students retain the information provided to them throughout the lessons and their attitudes towards the Protecting You Protecting Me program are positive. Students were excited to learn new topics and participate in an interactive program.

Program Observations

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Protecting You Protecting Me program had to alter delivery methods. During the fall semester, all classes were taught online through Google Classrooms. In the spring semester Albuquerque Public Schools (APS) reinstated the allowance of visitors in the classroom. Although APS allowed out-of-school visitors, some schools still maintained online-only PY PM classes, while others allowed PY PM staff to do classes in-person. The PY PM program was implemented at a total of four elementary schools (in a total of 13 classrooms): Double Eagle, Mary Ann Binford, Kirtland, and Tomasita Elementary Schools.

Observations of the PY PM program began slowly December 2nd, 2021, and became more frequent beginning January 27th, 2022. The majority of our observations were of Mary Ann Binford Elementary 4th and 5th grade classes due to Mary Ann Binford Elementary allowing ISR staff to observe in-person. Other schools did not allow more than one visitor in the classroom at a time. We completed a total of 27 observations, with 5 observations being online and 22 observations in-person. On average, there were approximately 18 students per class. Each class lasted approximately 45 minutes. All PY PM classes were taught by the same facilitator who is the single staff member.

As mentioned earlier in this report, the original MADD PY PM curriculum consists of eight lessons meant to be taught over an eight-week period. However, PY PM staff mentions at the beginning of instruction that the program will take about “10 to 12 weeks” to ensure student retention of material. PY PM staff splits lessons up to multiple class periods depending on what is believed to be the most important information of the lessons. Of the total eight sessions, we were able to observe seven. The following table lists the sessions observed.

Table 11. Curriculum Topic Observed

Topic	Number of times observed
Our Brain	6
Growth and Development	4
Health and Safety	5
Rules and Laws	2
Friends	6
Choices and Decisions	1
Media Awareness	0
Communication and Vehicle Safety, Post-Test	3

It is not known to ISR staff how many times each session was taught at each school, or how each module was scheduled to be taught and how the schedule differed by school. ISR did not observe any Media Awareness sessions. Each class we observed is a session found on the curriculum. Therefore, for the 27 observed classes, the curriculum was implemented 100% of the time.

As noted earlier our observations of the PY PM program were compared to known best practices using the National Institute on Drug Abuse's (NIDA) research-based prevention principles for preventing drug use among children and adolescents. These prevention principles have emerged from research studies funded by NIDA as the common elements found in effective prevention programs. We will be discussing how and if the NIDA prevention principles were observed during the 27 observed classes. Ten of the 16 NIDA principles were applicable to this review of the Protecting You Protecting Me elementary school-based prevention program. The applicable principles are principles 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16 (below).

As per Table 12, principles 1, 12, 13, and 16 were not directly observable but we were able to observe principle 1, 12, and 13 being implemented in an implicit way. This means that we found PY PM addresses both risk and protective factors in the implementation of their curriculum by trying to incorporate information regarding peer pressure, the importance of healthy habits, and building strong ties to family, friends, and community. This also means that although the curriculum has been amended by PY PM to meet local needs and stay up to date with research, the core elements of the MADD curriculum have been retained. Lastly, although the PY PM program is currently not explicitly providing long-term repeated interventions, students who have been in the program during 3rd or 4th grades, end up in a classroom receiving the PY PM classes again in later grades. This occurs because the program has consistently been implemented at the same school and students who stay at the same school where the curriculum is delivered over multiple school years likely receive repeated interventions. It was also observed that children who had been in the PY PM program before had retained key points from the previous year(s). All observable principles were observed.

Table 12. Principles Observed

#	Description	Target	Observed	Times Observed
1	Prevention Programs should enhance protective factors and reverse or reduce risk factors	Risk and Protective Factors	Yes	15 of 27
2	Prevention program should address all forms of drug abuse	Risk and Protective Factors	Yes	18 of 27
3	Prevention programs should address local problems	Risk and Protective Factors	Yes	7 of 27
4	Prevention programs should be tailored to address risks specific to the population or audience	Risk and Protective Factors	Yes	27 of 27
7	Prevention programs for elementary school should target academic and socio-emotional learning	Prevention Planning School Programs	Yes	27 of 27
12	Core elements of the original interventions should be retained when programs are adapted to meet local needs	Prevention Program Delivery	Yes	27 of 27
13	Prevention programs should be long-term with repeated interventions	Prevention Program Delivery	Yes	2 of 27
14	Prevention programs should include teacher training on good classroom management practices	Prevention Program Delivery	Yes	27 of 27
15	Prevention programs are most effective when they employ interactive techniques such as peer discussion groups and parent role playing	Prevention Program Delivery	Yes	27 of 27
16	Research based prevention programs can be cost effective	Prevention Program Delivery	No	N/A

DISCUSSION

Our review of the Protecting You Protecting Me program is based on a review of program materials, a review of student post-test answers, and program observations. Although Albuquerque Public Schools was mostly back to in-person instruction this school year, there were still measures in place that presented challenges both in the delivery of the curriculum and in our observations of the program delivery. For the Fall semester, all Protecting You Protecting Me classes were offered remotely. During the Spring semester, once PY PM staff was allowed to visit classes in-person, the majority of classes were offered in-person with a few remaining remote. Primarily, one elementary school remained remote while the rest allowed for classes to be in-person as long as visitors complied with the mask mandates. ISR was able to observe remote sessions for Double Eagle Elementary School and sessions at Mary Ann Binford Elementary School, while the other schools did not allow for more than one visitor in the classroom at a time and so we were unable to observe those sessions.

The MADD Protecting You Protecting Me curriculum is no longer available, and it is unclear why the program is no longer supported or reproduced by MADD. MADD developed the curriculum in the late 90s, however the curriculum currently in use in Bernalillo County was published in 2006. It is unknown if this was the last publication of the materials and/or if this is when they were last updated. The observed Protecting You Protecting Me program retains the key points and outline of the original curriculum while updating the content in their presentations to keep information relevant and informative to Bernalillo County children. According to the PY PM single staff member, the presentations are constantly amended to fit the needs of students. Whenever PY PM staff member feels like the students are not engaged or retaining material, the presentation and activities are amended. ISR observed PY PM staff tailoring

presentations to meet the needs of the classroom, allowing students to get as much information as possible while ensuring key points were delivered in the presentation. This sometimes meant breaking up sessions over multiple class periods, skipping or staying longer on certain slides, or opting for shorter or longer activities, depending on the density of the material and/or the classroom ability to pay attention throughout the presentation. The vast majority of handouts used during class time came from the original curriculums. In line with the NIDA principles, the curriculum and the delivery of the curriculum are tailored not only to address the needs of Bernalillo County youth, but further tailored for each school/community.

As stated in the literature review, interventions should be theory driven, address social norms on substance use, build personal and social skills designed to help resist substance use, use interactive teaching, use peer leaders, be delivered over multiple sessions and years, provide training and support to facilitators, and be culturally and developmentally appropriate (Stigler et al., 2011). The PY PM program executes these concepts both implicitly and explicitly, except that the PY PM program does not currently incorporate peer leaders. According to PY PM staff there is currently not enough funding for the program to be implemented over multiple years. In some cases, this is able to happen unintentionally due to PY PM staff maintaining strong ties with schools and educators and being allowed to visit and implement the program in multiple classrooms over multiple grades over successive years. However, this means that not every student is able to receive this repeated intervention.

ISR was provided post-test surveys filled out by students that completed the PY PM program during the 2017-2019 years. These years were provided since more recent years had incomplete data due to COVID-19. The results from these surveys demonstrated that students are able to retain key information and that student attitudes towards the PY PM program are mainly positive. The students listed the PY PM activities as their favorite part of the program, and sometimes listed wanting the program to incorporate more activities. For students receiving instruction remotely, PY PM provided the teacher with necessary materials and students would work on activities in the classroom with their teacher therefore ensuring that although PY PM staff could not be physically present, students could still participate in the key activities of the program. According to the literature review, "Interactive programs that include interpersonal skill development show greater effectiveness in reducing, delaying and/or preventing drug use as compared to non-interactive programs (Bohman et al., 2004; Botvin et al., 2002)." The PY PM program provides an array of activities as a multimodal classroom setting that includes things like videos, role playing, making posters, group activities, games. These activities aid in the retention of class material, and can be effective in delaying and/or preventing substance use in the future.

A total of 27 classes were observed, with 22 of those being in person and 5 being online observations. Although we are unsure of the total number of classes taught during FY2022, we know that Protecting You Protecting Me was implemented in a total of 13 classrooms. Based off our observations, we know that PY PM staff tried to stay with one classroom as long as possible, meaning that most of the time PY PM was taught throughout a 12-week period. If we estimate there were about 12 sessions per classroom, then we believe there was a total of 156 classes taught. All applicable and observable NIDA principles were observed at this time. We believe the Protecting You Protecting Me program uses the applicable NIDA principles in both implicit and explicit ways. Although principles 1, 12, 13, and 16 were not directly observable, we believe we were able to observe principle 1, 12, and 13 being implemented in an implicit way throughout the classes. We found PY PM addresses principle 1 in the implementation of their curriculum by trying to incorporate information regarding peer pressure, the importance of healthy habits, and building strong ties to family, friends, and community. Principle 12 was observable because

although the curriculum has been amended by PY PM to meet local needs and stay up to date with research, the core elements of the MADD curriculum have been retained. Lastly, for principle 13, we found that although the PY PM program is currently not explicitly providing long-term repeated interventions, we observed that a couple of students who had been in the program during their 3rd or 4th grades, ended up in a classroom receiving the PY PM classes again in later grades. It was also observed that children who had been in the PY PM program before had retained key points from the previous year(s) and were enthusiastic about participating again in the program. During our observations, it was made known to ISR staff that funding had ran out with at least a month of instruction still left and a few new classes yet to begin. Meaning that the PY PM staff member covered costs out of pocket until all classes were completed.

CONCLUSION

The Institute for Social Research was contracted to evaluate the DBHS funded Protecting You Protecting Me prevention program for the FY 2022. The review was designed as a process evaluation which means we were measuring program implementation, if the program operates according to its design, and if the design is based on best practices. This evaluation included a review of program materials, a review of student post-tests, and observations of the Protecting You Protecting Me program.

In conclusion, the observed Protecting You Protecting Me program has been adapted to meet the needs of the local community. PY PM program presentations have been updated to reflect the newest findings and statistics (i.e. DWI related deaths per year). The MADD Protecting You Protecting Me was developed to focus on teaching children about the brain and how it continues to develop throughout childhood and adolescence, what alcohol does to the developing brain, and why it is important for children to protect their brains; vehicle safety, particularly what children can do to protect themselves if they have to ride with someone who is not alcohol free; and life skills, including decision-making, stress management, media awareness, resistance strategies, and communication. The observed PY PM program retains all of these goals and focuses on teaching Bernalillo County youth about the brain, vehicle safety, and life skills.

Because MADD no longer circulates the PY PM curriculum, there is the possibility to consider either choosing a more current research-based curriculum for this age group or renaming the current program to differentiate itself from the inactive PY PM program and more clearly identify itself and continue using the materials compiled by the program staff member. Student program post-tests demonstrate APS students not only retain key program information but also enjoy the program and its interactive curriculum. Bernalillo County youth mention enjoying the opportunity to learn more about substance use, the brain, and how to make better choices in their future.

We observed a total of 27 classes. We observed the curriculum being implemented in all of these classes. Only 10 of the 16 NIDA Prevention Principles were applicable to this review of the Protecting You Protecting Me program. All applicable principles were observed, with five of the principles being observed in each session. As mentioned earlier, the program currently has limited funding to complete a full school year and it may be useful for the County to consider an increase in funding. According to both the literature review and the NIDA principles, and based on our observations of the program, we believe Protecting You Protecting Me delivers a best practice elementary school-based prevention program for Bernalillo County youth.

REFERENCES

- Bell, M. L., Kelley-Baker, T., Rider, R., & Ringwalt, C. (2005). Protecting You Protecting Me: Effects of an Alcohol Prevention and Vehicle Safety Program on Elementary Students. *Journal of School Health*.
- Bohman, T. M., Barker, E. D., Bell, M. L., Lewis, C. M., Holleran, L., Pomeroy, E. (2004). Early Intervention for Alcohol Use Prevention and Vehicle Safety Skills: Evaluating the Protecting You/Protecting Me Curriculum. *Journal of Child & Adolescent Substance Abuse*.
- Botvin, G. J., Scheier, L. M., & Griffin, K.W. (2002). Preventing the onset and developmental progression of adolescent drug use: Implications for the gateway hypothesis. *Stages and Pathways of Involvement in Drug Use: Examining the Gateway Hypothesis*.
- Cuijpers, P. (2003). Three Decades of Drug Prevention Research. *Drugs: education, prevention and policy*.
- Griffin, K. W., & Botvin, G. J. (2010). Evidence-based interventions for preventing substance use disorders in adolescents. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Clinics of North America*, 19, 505526.
- National Institute on Drug Abuse (2003). Preventing Drug Use Among Children and Adolescents: A Research-Based Guide for Parents Educators, and Community Leaders. NIH Publication No. 04-412(A).
- Stigler, M. H., Neusel, E., & Perry, C. (2011). School-Based Programs to Prevent and Reduce Alcohol Use Among Youth. *Alcohol Research & Health*.