

Evaluation Report  
**Prevent Alcohol and Risk-related Trauma in Youth (PARTY)**  
Student Evaluations: October 2003-May 2004  
McKee Medical Center  
November 2004



Prepared by  
The Colorado Injury Control Research Center  
Colorado State University

This publication was supported by Grant Number R49/CCR811509 from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Its contents are solely the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official views of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

## Prevent Alcohol and Risk-related Trauma in Youth (PARTY) Overview

McKee Medical Center in cooperation with the Thompson R2J School District, Thompson Valley Emergency Medical Services, Loveland Police Department, and the Larimer County Coroners office initiated an injury prevention program targeted for adolescents. This multidisciplinary program is a reality based program designed to educate youth on the consequences of drinking and driving and taking unnecessary risks. The specific elements of the program include hospital, agencies, videos, tours, survivors and stations. The hospital portion includes talks by emergency department nursing staff on their experiences in dealing with injuries to teens and the consequences of those injuries. The agencies portion includes talks by emergency medical personnel from the Thompson Valley Emergency Medical Services who are first responders to automobile crashes. They explain what they do and what happens at the scene of a car crash. Videos shown are interviews with individuals and their families who have survived major injuries explaining the impact a major trauma has had on their lives. The videos portion also includes a talk by the county coroner explaining what it is like to tell a family when a loved one has died due to injury and trauma. In addition, survivors are also present in person to talk about their experiences and answer questions from the students. Tours refers to tours of the morgue which includes presentation by an investigator from the Larimer County Coroner's office who relates the sometimes horrendous results for teens that choose to drink and drive. In addition, through use of special equipment at 3 different stations, students are given the chance to experience how different kinds of injury to the brain interfere with activities of daily living. Special equipment includes special glasses which simulate injury interfering with sight processing, the difficulty in buttoning a garment when motor skills are limited, and using mirror images to understand how brain injury can interfere with processing information.

The PARTY Program is integrated as a field trip for students taking the health education class at their high school. In addition to being part of the class, students must have signed parental consent to participate. This report presents the findings of the students' evaluation of the program from October, 2003 through May, 2004. Prior to beginning the program students are asked to complete a pre-test asking for demographic information as well as injury prevention attitudes. At the end of the program, students are then asked to complete an evaluation of the program. In addition, the same questions on injury related attitudes were asked in order to measure the impact the program may have played in changing such attitudes. During the 2003-2004 school year, 21 sessions were held with students from 5 different schools; 1,015 students completed the pretest; 979, the posttest.

## Pretest Evaluation Results

### Background information on the participants

Table 1 shows the number of participants who completed the pre-test survey by grade and sex.

Table 1: Number of participants by grade and sex in the program who completed the pre-program survey: 2003-2004

Grade	Female	Male
9	292	284
10	162	180
11	34	43
12	7	5
Total	495	512

Eight students did not give their grade or sex

Due to the small number of seniors participating, seniors and juniors are combined into one group in all analyses.

### Alcohol experience questions

Students were asked two different questions about their injury and alcohol related experiences:

1. Do you know someone who has been injured or killed in an alcohol-related accident; and
2. Do you have a friend or family member who has a drinking problem?

A majority of students answered “yes” to these questions with over 60 percent indicating that they have a friend or family member who has a drinking or drug problem. Girls were more likely to say “yes” to both of these than boys. Fifty-six percent of the girls had known someone who had been injured or killed in an alcohol-related accident; 48 percent of the boys. Girls were also more likely to report having a friend or family member who has a substance problem: 66 percent of girls vs. 55 percent of boys. There were no differences in the percentage who answered “yes” to either question by grade.

In the pre-test survey, students were also asked what types of information on alcohol and drugs were available through their schools. The response differed by grade. Table 2 shows the percentage of participants who completed the pre-program survey who said they had such information available through their schools.

Table 2: Percentage of students reporting that their schools used the following to provide information on alcohol and drugs by grade.

Method	9th Grade	10 <sup>th</sup> Grade	11 <sup>th</sup> & 12 <sup>th</sup> Grade
Written Materials	71%	58%	45%
Classroom Lecture	86%	79%	52%
Audio/Visual	59%	45%	39%
Outside Speakers	62%	42%	46%

Similar to last years' surveys, juniors and seniors were less likely to report having different types of information on alcohol and drugs at their schools. Approximately 22 percent of juniors and seniors said that they had no information on alcohol and drugs available to them through the schools compared to 3 percent of freshman and 8 percent of sophomores.

While the percentages were small, boys were more likely to say that "nothing" on "alcohol/drugs" was available to them at their schools; 8 percent of boys vs. 5 percent of girls. Specifically, boys were more likely to say that written material was not available (42% of boys vs. 28% of girls) and that speakers were not available at their schools (50% vs. 42%).

### Posttest Results: Ratings of the PARTY Program

As mentioned earlier, 36 fewer students filled out the program evaluation than took the pretest; 8 girls and 28 boys.

Students rated the elements of the program on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being the least helpful and 5 being the most helpful. Students rated the program very highly; 60 percent of students gave the overall program a 5 (Table 3).

Table 3: Helpfulness of the PARTY Program: Percentage of students who gave ratings of 1 through 5\*.

Program Elements	1	2	3	4	5
Overall Program	0.6%	0.7%	7.5%	31.2%	60.0%
Hospital	1.0%	5.3%	19.8%	35.9%	38.0%
Agencies	1.2%	2.7%	12.4%	31.2%	52.5%
Videos	1.2%	3.1%	14.8%	28.2%	52.7%
Tours	3.0%	6.2%	17.5%	30.5%	42.8%
Glasses	4.9%	7.2%	17.6%	24.8%	45.5%
Button Hooks	4.8%	7.2%	18.2%	27.4%	42.4%
Mirror Images	4.9%	7.9%	16.9%	26.9%	43.4%
Survivors	2.6%	3.5%	10.1%	26.5%	57.3%

\*ratings 1=least helpful rating, 5=most helpful rating

Since students tended to rate all aspects of the program very highly the most constructive way to evaluate the program may be to look at those program elements that had the highest percentage of very low ratings. Mirror images, glasses, and button hooks had the highest percentage of very low ratings; over 12 percent of these students gave these 3 program elements ratings of 1 or 2. This was similar to ratings from the past two school years.

In general, there were no differences in the ratings by grade level this year. The program elements that had the highest ratings among all students in all grades were agencies, videos, and survivors. Mirror images, glasses, and button hooks were the lowest rated program elements among all classes. However, sophomores, juniors, and seniors rated these program elements lower than their freshman counterparts. While only 10 percent of

freshman rated glasses very low (1 or 2), 14 percent of the other classes did; 15 percent of freshman rated that program element a “3” compared to 22 percent of sophomores and 19 percent of juniors and seniors. Similarly, the program element “button hooks” was rated lower by the older students compared to the freshman. Approximately 10 percent of freshman rated this program as least helpful compared to approximately 14 percent of sophomores and the junior-senior group.

Boys rated the program overall lower than girls; close to 10 percent of the boys gave the overall program a rating of 3 or less compared to 6 percent of girls. Additionally, over 65 percent of girls gave the program the highest rating of 5 compared to 54 percent of boys. Still a clear majority of boys thought the program was very useful. There were 2 program elements that boys consistently rated lower than girls: videos and survivors. Close to one-fourth of all boys rated videos at 3 or below compared to 15 percent of all girls. While over 51 percent of boys gave the highest rating of 5 to survivors, close to 63 percent of girls gave that rating to that program element.

#### **Comparison of Pretest and Posttest Attitudes and Knowledge.**

Participants were given a series of questions regarding their beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors around substance use and injury risk. Students were asked to rate how frequently they followed the statement from 1 (almost never) to 5 (almost always). These questions were asked on the pre-program survey and the post-program evaluation. While the pre-program scores were high, the post-evaluation scores were consistently in the direction of more positive beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors after participating in the program. Table 4 lists the questions and the percent of participants who answered “almost always” to the questions on the pre-program survey and the post-program evaluation.

Table 4: Percentage of students answering “almost always” to injury prevention beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors before and after the program.

Question	% of Students Answering “Almost Always” on Pre-Program Survey	% of Students Answering “Almost Always” on Post-Program Evaluation
A. I know it is important to wear my seatbelt.	69%	86%
B. I understand the consequences of not wearing my seat belt.	77%	87%
C. I think it is important to encourage my friends to wear their seat belts.	49%	79%
D. I will not ride in a car with someone who has been drinking or doing drugs.	64%	78%
E. I understand the consequences of using alcohol and other drugs.	73%	85%
F. I will not drink and drive.	78%	85%
G. I feel comfortable calling my parents or a friend if I feel I am in a dangerous situation.	58%	71%
H. I will not allow my friends to pressure me into taking risks I would not, normally take	59%	77%

Both boys and girls significantly increased their ratings on these questions from the pretest to the posttest. As in the 2001-2002 and 2002-2003 school year evaluations, boys less frequently answered “almost always” on these questions both on the pre- and post-tests than did girls. Yet, boys showed higher gains in the posttest compared to the pretest so that scores on the posttest were much similar between boys and girls than on the pretest. Grades 11 and 12 showed the least amount of change from the pretest to the posttest. While the ratings were higher for each of the above behaviors for grades 11 and 12, only statement A (I know it is important to wear my seatbelt) showed a statistically significant gain from the pretest to the posttest.

Students who knew someone who had been injured or killed in an alcohol-related accident scored lower on several injury attitudes and behaviors in the pretest. These included:

1. Knowing the importance of wearing a seatbelt.
2. Not riding in a car with someone who has been drinking and using drugs;
3. Understanding the consequences of using alcohol and other drugs;
4. Not drinking and driving; and

5. Not allowing friends to pressure them into taking risks that he or she would not normally take.

Thus it seems that even knowing someone who has been injured puts a student at higher risk of reporting attitudes and behaviors that would heighten the risk of injury. There is no way to know what impact the program had on changing these ratings; only how the students presented before the program.

### **Conclusions**

- Evaluation findings for the school year 2003-2004 were similar to those for the 2001-2002 and 2002-2003 school year.
- Participants rated the program very highly with a majority giving the program either a 4 or 5 with 5 being the highest rating.
- Girls tended to rate the program slightly higher than boys.
- This year no differences by grade were noted among the ratings for the program elements. Button hooks, glasses, and mirror images continued to have the lowest ratings of all the program elements.
- The participants had a high level of awareness of good injury prevention practices prior to the program.
- When given a pre-program survey and post-program evaluation, participants were more apt to answer that they would “almost always” agree to good injury prevention practices after finishing the program than before the program. While boys had lower ratings on the pretest, the difference in ratings between boys and girls was smaller on the posttest.

PARTY Program Qualitative Evaluation  
2003-2004 School Year

McKee Medical Center in cooperation with the Thompson R2J School District, Thompson Valley Emergency Medical Services, Loveland Police Department, and the Larimer County Coroners office has initiated an injury prevention program targeted for adolescents. This multidisciplinary program is a reality based program designed to educate youth on the consequences of drinking and driving and taking unnecessary risks. The PARTY Program is integrated as a field trip for students taking the health education class at their high school. In addition to being part of the class, students must have signed parental consent to participate. As part of the evaluation process, students who participated in the program are asked "How did this program affect you?" This report summarizes the students' answers to this question from October, 2003 through May, 2004. During that time, 21 sessions were held with students from 5 different schools and 979 evaluations were received.

**A. Positive responses**

Over 75 percent of students responded in a way that either met the goals of the program or was positive in tone without mentioning what specifically they got out of the program. Of the 21 different sessions held during the 2003-2004 school year, the proportion of positive responses ranged from 92 percent to 57 percent. Two sessions had less than 70 percent positive responses to this question: 63 percent and 57 percent.

For some, the program reinforced ideas about alcohol and drinking and driving that they already had. For others, it made them think more critically about these topics than they had thought about them before. Close to 14 percent of students reported that the program made them think about drinking or reinforced decisions that they had already made about drinking. Another 16 percent wrote responses about how they would think more carefully about the consequences of drinking and driving. Thus, close to 30 percent of the students mentioned drinking and/or alcohol in their positive responses to the program. The proportion of males and females responding in this way was similar.

The responses which included alcohol use ran the gamut from deciding never to drink, e.g.,

"It enforced my decision never to drink."

"I will never drink again because I am afraid of something bad happening."

"It made me not want to drink."

to learning more about alcohol use, e.g.,

"It helped me realize what the effects of alcohol are."

"It makes me want to think first before making my drinking choices."

"It showed me the consequences of being careless with drugs and alcohol."

Typical responses which mentioned drinking and driving included

"It showed me the affects of driving drunk and reinforced my promise to be a safe driver."

"It made me think about getting into a car with someone who has been drinking."

Another common type of response was a general statement that the program made the students “think” or made them “think” about the choices they made and “opened” their eyes to “the consequences” of their decisions. Approximately 19 percent of the students gave responses like this; however, this was more prevalent among female than male students (23% vs. 15%) These included responses like the following:

“I am more aware of the consequences and will think about my choices.”

“It showed me a little more reality than I thought.”

“This program makes you think more.”

“It opened my eyes to certain things.”

“It made me think about taking life seriously.”

“Wake-up call”

“It made me think carefully about what decision making means.”

“It opened my eyes to the consequences of my actions. That it doesn't take much your life can be changed in an instant.”

Drug use was another specific topic that was mentioned in response to how the program affected them. About 9 percent of students specifically mentioned either learning more about drug use, having their decision to not use drugs reinforced, or deciding not to use drugs.

“It really helped me understand how much of an effect alcohol and drugs can have on you.”

“Well I sure am not going to do any drugs ---- like that is dumb.”

“Some of the information and pictures that I saw made me think twice about drinking and never doing drugs.”

“A lot, although I never intended to drink or use drugs this program has encouraged me to stick to my decision and also to help others who are in (sic).”

Other specific areas that students mentioned included:

- 9 students (1%) mentioned that they had learned the importance of wearing seat belts;
- 20 students (2%) acknowledged how important being safe is when they drive or ride with someone who is a safe driver;
- 25 students (3%) specifically mentioned that they learned that injuries could happen to them; that these are not problems that just happen to others; and
- 45 students (5%) wrote responses that showed that they became more aware of how their actions and putting themselves at risk for injury would hurt people who cared about them, i.e., their family and friends.

Other responses that were included in the positive responses included just general responses, e.g., “Good,” “It was nasty but it was helpful,” “A lot.”

In most all of these responses there seemed to be a continuum of students with some on one end making overarching, more adamant statements and those on the other who were

more circumspect. For instance, many students said they would never drink, do drugs, never drink and drive, never, never, never. To them there were no gray areas. Others did not deny they may drink but said they had learned to make better, safer choices. It would be interesting to know which side of this continuum shows continued safety practices after leaving the program.

### **B. No response or neutral responses**

Approximately 10 percent of students either did not answer the question or gave an answer which could not be discerned as either positive or negative, e.g., “Okay,” “I don’t know.” However, 87 percent of the neutral responses were ones which were left blank. While no difference in neutral responses was seen by gender, over 17 percent of those in 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> grades did not respond to this question compared to 7 percent in 9<sup>th</sup> grade.

### **C. Emotional responses**

Five percent of students reported only on their emotional reaction to the program. For the most part it wasn’t clear what effect these emotional reactions will have on their behavior.

“Made me angry/sad.”

“I felt sad and scared.”

“It disturbed the hell out of me.”

“After seeing what could happen, I freaked out.”

“Shocking, disturbing.”

“It grossed me out. Stories were sad.”

“Kind of put fear into me about making future decisions.”

### **D. Negative responses**

Five percent of the responses to the question “How did this program affect you” gave seemingly negative responses. Males were more likely to give a negative response than females (7% vs. 3%); yet the type of response did not vary by gender. The answers ranged from saying that the program had no affect to explaining that the program had little effect on them because they already knew the information that was presented.

“Not that much”

“None”

“Didn't really effect me because I already now of the consiquences (sic) of drinking and driving and of doing drugs.”

“It didn't really affect me at all because I have already seen this stuff and I know about it.”

In this category, there were a few responses that were more emotionally charged.

“Sickening.”

“It really grossed me out. Some of the images, though effectively proving a very valid point, were gruesome and entirely unnecessary.”

Except for the last statement, there were no statements that negatively pinpointed specific aspects of the program.

### **E. Other responses**

Twelve students reported that the program made them think about some one or some incident in their life.

“This has a personal level for me because my family drinks a lot, same here. Also my friend killed herself three years ago.”

“It showed me how bad life can be and how my sister could end up.”

Thirty students mentioned specific aspects of the program but there seemed to be no consensus of which aspects had the most impact.

## **F. Conclusion**

Over 75 percent of the students wrote something positive about the program; ten percent gave no response or a neutral response; and 5 percent said something negative about the program. Over 30 percent of students mentioned alcohol use or drinking and driving as specific aspects of the program that had an impact on them.

The question on how the program affected the students was very vague and overarching. In many cases, students did not write enough to be able to clearly understand what they were thinking. More specific open-ended questions may gather more specific, targeted responses from students.