**“THE AGENCY”**

**Tobacco Prevention and Cessation South Project, Year 2 (FY 2018-2019)**

**OBJECTIVE OUTCOME EVALUATION ANNUAL REPORTING TABLE**

**Objective 1**

|  |
| --- |
| **TPC SOUTH YEAR 2 (FY18/19) OBJECTIVE OUTCOME EVALUATION ANNUAL REPORTING TABLE – PART 1** |
| **PROJECT:** Lowering Youth Prevalence and Youth access to Tobacco – South Orange County; Year 2 2018-2019  **OBJECTIVE**: (1) By June 30, 2020, report a stabilization and/or reduction in the prevalence of smoking among the youth population, depending on Orange County youth smoking trends. (2) By June 30, 2020, report a stabilization and/or reduction in the prevalence of e-cigarette use among the youth population, depending on Orange County e-cigarette use trends.   * Objective Number: 1 * Objective Description: By June 30, 2019, conduct classroom tobacco educational presentations to a minimum of three hundred (300) 9th graders and three hundred (300) 10th graders in one (1) high school in the catchment area and to two hundred (200) 6th, (200) 7th, and (200) 8th grade students in one feeder middle school for a total of six hundred (600) high school students and six hundred (600) middle school students. * Outcome Objective: To evaluate increases in knowledge, attitudes, and skills resulting from the tobacco education presentations. |
| **EVALUATION METHODS:** [Describe each item below in 3 sentences or less.]   * Evaluation Design: [Include design type, temporal characteristics, groups compared (if any)] The evaluation of the project incorporated a non-experimental research design method. Only those students who had received the intervention were evaluated. A quantitative pre- and post-survey data collection process was utilized. * Sampling: [Who was sampled, how were they sampled, what was the sample size and response rate (if applicable), and any sample limitations] “THE AGENCY” staff implemented the presentation and surveyed students in grades six through twelve from Aliso Viejo Middle School and Aliso Niguel High School. One hundred fifty-six (156) middle school surveys were collected and analyzed (6th grade n= 57, 7th grade n= 54, and 8th grade n= 45). Six hundred ten (610) high school surveys were collected and analyzed (9th grade n= 512, 10th grade n= 97, 11th grade n= 1, and 12th grade n= 0). Additionally, “THE AGENCY” staff presented to and surveyed at-risk students enrolled at Bridges Community Day School and CUSD Adult Transition Program at Saddleback College. Sixteen (16) 2018-19 surveys were collected and analyzed. An additional 56 at-risk students were administered the 2017-18 “Educational Presentation” and instrument in July and September 2018. * Data collection instruments and procedures: [Type and source of data collection instruments, how data were collected, and data collection limitations] The project evaluation team collaborated with “THE AGENCY” staff in developing the Youth Educational Presentation instruments (middle school and high school). The middle school quantitative instrument included nine agreement Likert-scale questions assessing self-perception of knowledge, attitude, and skills of e-cigarettes to meet the requirements of the objective. The high school quantitative instrument included four knowledge-based, true/false questions and eleven agreement Likert-scale questions assessing self-perception of knowledge, attitude, and skills of cigarettes and e-cigarettes to meet the requirements of the objective. The students were instructed to complete the self-administered paper pre-survey prior to the delivery of the educational presentation. After the presentation “THE AGENCY” staff instructed the students to complete the post-survey. A limitation to the assessment was students knowing they would be completing a pre- and post-survey of which staff observed students rushing through the pre-survey but spent more time completing the posttest. Lack of thoroughly reading the pretest questions could have potentially affected students’ responding accurately. * Data analysis: [How data were analyzed, software used, statistical methods] The evaluator analyzed the data using the IBM Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25. The evaluator omitted surveys based on completion of the survey. Descriptive statistics including frequencies, cross-tabulations, and t-tests to assess increases in knowledge, attitudes, and skills. Sub-group comparisons of site, setting, or grade level variation were analyzed as needed. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **MAJOR RESULTS – PART 1**  **TPC SOUTH YEAR 2 (FY18/19) OBJECTIVE OUTCOME EVALUATION ANNUAL REPORTING TABLE** | | | |
| **Measure**  [Write each measure being assessed for this objective.] | **Target**  [Desired change in measure or benchmark value.] | **Outcome**  **Measure**  **Result by Site/City (N)\*** | **Evaluator Interpretation of Result**  [In 3 sentences or less, describe the findings and what they say about whether or not the measure target was met. Present any other sub-group variation in the measure where appropriate.] |
| 1. To increase knowledge among middle school participants who attended the tobacco education presentations. | 10% | TOTAL (N): 156  Aliso Viejo MS (n): 156 | Evaluator Interpretation: An increase was observed among the MS students’ knowledge of e-cigarettes (e-cig) and media literacy (Table 3.1.2). A significant improvement was observed from pretest to posttest in students knowing e-cigs are just as harmful as regular cigarettes (57.6% of change) and are flavored to appeal to youth (25.9% of change). Additionally, a significant improvement was observed from pretest to posttest in students knowing e-cig companies promote their products to attract youth (44.0% of change) and are targeted to youth and young adults (74.6% of change). |
| 1. To increase attitude among middle school participants who attended the tobacco education presentations. | 10% | TOTAL (N): 156  Aliso Viejo MS (n): 156 | Evaluator Interpretation: An increase was observed among the MS students’ attitude of e-cigs (Table 3.1.2). A significant improvement was observed from pretest to posttest in students feeling people at their school who smoke e-cigs have more friends (15.8% of change) and being bothered if a close friend smoked e-cigs (30.0% of change). No change was observed in students’ attitude that smoking e-cigs helps people at their school fit in. |
| 1. To increase skill among middle school participants who attended the tobacco education presentations. | 10% | TOTAL (N): 156  Aliso Viejo MS (n): 156 | Evaluator Interpretation: An increase was observed among the MS students’ skills to using and/or refusing e-cigs (Table 3.1.2). A significant improvement was observed from pretest to posttest in students’ likelihood of using an e-cig in the next 6 months (57.7% of change) and ability to refuse an offer to use e-cigs (27.5% of change). |
| 1. To increase knowledge among high school participants who attended the tobacco education presentations. | 10% | TOTAL (N): 610  Aliso Niguel HS (n): 610 | Evaluator Interpretation: An increase was observed among the HS students’ knowledge of cigarettes and e-cig (Table 3.1.3). A significant improvement was observed from pretest to posttest in students knowing: 1) less than half of teens in OC smoke cigarettes (28.4% of change), 2) the amount of nicotine in a JUUL pod is the same as a pack of cigarettes (44.2% of change), 3) The smoke from an e-cig is not harmless water vapor (12.8% of change), 4) knowing the phone number people can call to quit smoking (512.5% of change), and 5) being aware of the harmful effects of e-cigs (20.9% of change). |
| 1. To increase attitude among high school participants who attended the tobacco education presentations. | 10% | TOTAL (N): 610  Aliso Niguel HS (n): 610 | Evaluator Interpretation: An increase was observed among the HS students’ attitudes of cigarettes and e-cigs (Table 3.1.4). A significant improvement was observed from pretest to posttest in students feeling people at their school who smoke cigarettes have more friends (10.1% of change) and being bothered if a close friend smoked cigarettes (4.6% of change). Additionally, a significant improvement was observed from pretest to posttest in students feeling people at their school who smoke e-cigs have more friends (10.7% of change) and being bothered if a close friend smoked e-cigs (9.1% of change). No changes were observed in students’ attitude that smoking cigarettes or e-cigs helps people at their school fit in. |
| 1. To increase skill among high school participants who attended the tobacco education presentations. | 10% | TOTAL (N): 610  Aliso Niguel HS (n): 610 | Evaluator Interpretation: An increase was observed among the HS students’ skills to using and/or refusing cigarettes and e-cigs (Table 3.1.5). A significant improvement was observed from pretest to posttest in students’ ability to refuse an offer to use cigarettes (9.3% of change). Additionally, a significant improvement was observed from pretest to posttest in students’ likelihood of using an e-cig in the next 6 months (13.1% of change) and ability to refuse an offer to use e-cigs (9.6% of change). Consequently, a significant negative change was observed of students stating their likelihood of using a cigarette in the next 6 months (-7.7% of change). |
| 1. To increase knowledge among at-risk participants who attended the tobacco education presentations. | 10% | TOTAL (N): 16  Adult Transition Prog @ Saddleback College (n): 10  Bridges Community Day School (n): 6 | Evaluator Interpretation: Little knowledge change of cigarettes and e-cigs was observed from pretest to posttest among the at risk students (Table 3.1.6). The only significant improvement was observed from pretest to posttest in students knowing the phone number people can call to quit smoking (85.6% of change). While some changes were observed, as reported in table 3.1.6, the sample size was too small to yield any significant improvements.  However, 56 at-risk students were administered the 2017-2018 Educational Presentation and Assessment. Based on the at-risk students’ responses to the test questions 96.4% received a passing score of 70.0% or higher. Responses to specific test items are illustrated in tables 3.1.9-3.1.17. When asked to self-report their knowledge of the negative effects of e-cigarettes, 81.8% *strongly agreed* or *agreed* that it had improved. Additionally, 85.4% of the students *strongly agreed* or *agreed* they knew the phone number people can call to quit smoking. |
| 1. To increase attitude among at-risk participants who attended the tobacco education presentations. | 10% | TOTAL (N): 16  Adult Transition Prog @ Saddleback College (n): 10  Bridges Community Day School (n): 6 | Evaluator Interpretation: No significant changes were observed among the at-risk students’ attitudes of cigarettes and e-cigs (Table 3.1.7). However, negative changes were observed in students’ attitudes of people who smoke cigarettes (pretest= 6.3%, posttest= 18.8%; 198.4% of change) and e-cigarettes (pretest= 6.3%, posttest= 12.5%; 98.4% of change) have more friends. No changes were observed in students’ attitude that smoking cigarettes or e-cigs helps people at their school fit in. |
| 1. To increase skill among at-risk participants who attended the tobacco education presentations. | 10% | TOTAL (N): 16  Adult Transition Prog @ Saddleback College (n): 10  Bridges Community Day School (n): 6 | Evaluator Interpretation: No significant changes were observed among the at-risk students’ skills to using and/or refusing cigarettes and e-cigs (Table 3.1.8). Although not significant, slight improvements were observed in students’ likelihood to smoke a cigarette in the next 6 months (pretest= 12.5%, posttest= 6.3%; 49.6% of change) and ability to refuse an offer to use cigarettes (pretest= 75.0%, posttest= 81.3%; 8.4% of change). A negative change was observed in students’ ability to refuse an offer to use e-cigs (pretest= 81.3%, posttest= 75.0%; 7.7% of change).  Based on the 56 at-risk students’ responses on the 2017-2018 Educational Presentation and Assessment, 92.7% *strongly agreed* or *agreed* that they are more confident in their ability to refuse an offer to use cigarettes. |
| \*Please note all statistically significant (p<.05) site differences with an asterisk. | | | |

|  |
| --- |
| **OVERALL EVALUATOR IMPRESSION – PART 1**  **TPC SOUTH YEAR 2 (FY18/19) OBJECTIVE OUTCOME EVALUATION ANNUAL REPORTING TABLE**  [Please provide no more than 3 sentences per section.] |
| **Was the objective met?** [What does the analysis suggest about whether the overall objective was met?]  The analyses suggest that the “outcome” objective for the high school and middle school students was met.. Significant improvements in knowledge, attitudes, and skills were achieved among the middle and high school students. However, the number (process) of middle school participants to be reached was not met, due to inability to receive approval from the school principal to implement presentations in Year 2. Staff, however, persisted and reached 156 students by educating small on-campus groups on numerous occasions. |
| **What went well?** [What does the data suggest is going well? How might these successes inform improvements elsewhere?]  The education provided to youth has proven to be beneficial in increasing their knowledge of e-cigarettes. Staff engaged in discussion with youth at the alternative school sites in which the students shared that most of their friends are not aware that e-liquids contain the nicotine chemical even though product packaging says nicotine is not present. Higher rates of change were observed among middle school students regarding e-cig attitudes and skills in comparison to the high school students. It suggested that saturating middle school aged youth with information regarding e-cigarettes can provide them with the tools to make better decisions when exposure increases at the high school level. |
| **What were some opportunities for improvement?** [What does the data suggest could be improved? How might site/city disparities be equalized?]  Continued dissemination of information is highly recommended due to increased use of this trend among youth and young adults and the overall lack of information available. The data suggests staff could incorporate more refusal and resistance skills into the presentation to build students’ confidence in refusing vape products. Additionally, it is suggested that only knowledge and skill change are assessed. Improvements in knowledge can indirectly affect youths’ perceptions and attitudes about cigarettes and e-cigarettes. Reaching a larger sample of at-risk students can provide a better assessment of the benefits of the educational presentation to the specific population. |
| **How did the evaluation work?** [What were some challenges in evaluation? How could the evaluation approach be improved?]  Evaluation faced no significant limitations; however, it is recommended to replace the attitudinal question of using cigarettes or e-cigarettes helps teens to fit in. This question yielded no change with middle school, high school, or at-risk students. This may be due in part that the content provided has no influence on their perspective to this specific issue. It is recommended that staff continue to reach out to additional alternative school sites to increase the sample size for this population. Additionally, it is recommended to utilize one instrument for consistent reporting purposes especially with the at-risk population since there are barriers in reaching this population and the small sample size of the current year. |

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| **DETAILED RESULTS APPENDIX – PART 2**  **TPC SOUTH YEAR 2 (FY18/19) OBJECTIVE OUTCOME EVALUATION ANNUAL REPORTING TABLE [Place at end of provider report]**  [Please provide ALL basic frequency and percentage or descriptive statistics tables for each item used in the assessment of this objective, including breakdowns by site or city. Please also provide the results of any tests of significance used. Label *all* tables numerically so they are clearly associated with the objective they are designed to assess. Also include a brief descriptive title, which should include the group assessed, time period, sample size, and, where appropriate, the measure to which an item contributes.] |
| See results below (Tables 3.1.1 -3.1.17). Notation: Tables 3.1.1 to 3.1.8 represent data using the 2018-2019 Educational Presentations Pre-Post instrument. Tables 3.1.9 to 3.1.17 represent at-risk population data using the 2017-2018 Educational Presentation Assessment, which was a post-only instrument and had different questions than the current instrument. |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 3.1.1. Number of Surveys Collected and Analyzed by Location and Grade Level | | | | | | |
|  | **Aliso Viejo MS** | | **Aliso Niguel HS** | | **At-Risk Population** | |
|  | Submitted | Analyzed | Submitted | Analyzed | Submitted | Analyzed |
| 6th grade | 57 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7th grade | 54 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8th grade | 45 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9th grade | 0 | 0 | 512 | 512 | 0 | 0 |
| 10th grade | 0 | 0 | 97 | 97 | 2 | 2 |
| 11th grade | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| 12th grade | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Not applicable | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 10 |
| Total | *156* | *156* | *610* | *610* | *16* | *16* |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3.1.2. Aliso Viejo Middle School Students’ (N=156) Pre- and Posttest**  **Responses of E-Cigarette Use by School Site (*strongly agree* and *agree* responses)** | | |
| **Attitudes of E-cigarettes** | **Pretest** | **Posttest** |
| People at my school who smoke e-cigarettes have more friends. \* | 12.2% | 10.3% |
| It would bother me if one of my close friends smoked e-cigarettes. \* | 57.7% | 75.0% |
| Smoking e-cigarettes helps people at my school fit in. | 9.6% | 9.6% |
| **Knowledge of E-cigarettes** | **Pretest** | **Posttest** |
| E-cigarettes are just as harmful as regular cigarettes. \* | 54.5% | 85.9% |
| E-cigarettes are flavored to appeal to youth. \* | 66.7% | 84.0% |
| E-cigarette companies promote their products to attract youth. \* | 60.9% | 87.7% |
| E-cigarette ads are targeted to persons over the age of 30. \* | 25.6% | 6.5% |
| **Behaviors of E-cigarette Use (skill change)** | **Pretest** | **Posttest** |
| I will likely use an e-cigarette in the next 6 months. \* | 4.5% | 1.9% |
| If someone were to offer me an e-cigarette, I am sure I could say no. \* | 62.8% | 80.1% |
| *\* Paired samples t-test indicates a significant mean difference from pre- to post-test when p < 0.05.* | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3.1.3. Aliso Niguel High School Students’ (N= 610) Pre- and Posttest Knowledge of**  **Cigarette and E-Cigarette Use by School Site (correct response)** | | |
| **True/False Knowledge Statements** | **Pretest** | **Posttest** |
| More than half of teens in Orange County smoke cigarettes. \* | 68.9% | 88.5% |
| The amount of nicotine in a JUUL pod is the same as a pack of cigarettes. \* | 62.6% | 90.3% |
| The smoke from an e-cigarette is harmless water vapor. \* | 86.4% | 97.5% |
| I know the phone number people can call to quit smoking. \* | 15.2% | 93.1% |
| I am aware of the harmful effects of e-cigarettes. (agreement Likert scale) \* | 75.9% | 91.8% |
| *\* Paired samples t-test indicates a significant mean difference from pre- to post-test when p < 0.05.* | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3.1.4. Aliso Niguel High School Students’ (N= 610) Pre- and Posttest Attitudes of**  **Cigarette and E-Cigarette Use by School Site (*strongly agree* and *agree* responses)** | | |
| **Attitudes of Cigarette Use** | **Pretest** | **Posttest** |
| People at my school who smoke cigarettes have more friends. \* | 8.9% | 8.0% |
| It would bother me if one of my close friends smoked cigarettes. \* | 67.3% | 70.3% |
| Smoking cigarettes helps people at my school fit in. | 5.9% | 8.9% |
| **Attitudes of E-Cigarettes Use** | **Pretest** | **Posttest** |
| People at my school who smoke e-cigarettes have more friends. \* | 21.5% | 19.2% |
| It would bother me if one of my close friends smoked e-cigarettes. \* | 56.1% | 61.2% |
| Smoking e-cigarettes helps people at my school fit in. | 16.1% | 17.7% |
| *\* Paired samples t-test indicates a significant mean difference from pre- to post-test when p < 0.05.* | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3.1.5. Aliso Niguel High School Students’ (N= 610) Pre- and Posttest Behaviors of**  **Cigarette and E-Cigarette Use by School Site (*strongly agree* and *agree* responses)** | | |
| **Behaviors of Cigarette Use (skill change)** | **Pretest** | **Posttest** |
| I will likely smoke a cigarette in the next 6 months. \* | 2.6% | 2.8% |
| I am confident in my ability to refuse an offer to use cigarettes. \* | 82.8% | 90.5% |
| **Behaviors of E-Cigarettes Use (skill change)** | **Pretest** | **Posttest** |
| I will likely use an e-cigarette in the next 6 months. \* | 6.1% | 5.3% |
| I am confident in my ability to refuse an offer to use e-cigarettes. \* | 79.8% | 87.5% |
| *\* Paired samples t-test indicates a significant mean difference from pre- to post-test when p < 0.05.* | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3.1.6. At-Risk Youth (N= 16) Pre- and Posttest Knowledge of**  **Cigarette and E-Cigarette Use by School Site (correct response)** | | |
| **True/False Knowledge Statements** | **Pretest** | **Posttest** |
| More than half of teens in Orange County smoke cigarettes. | 37.5% | 37.5% |
| The amount of nicotine in a JUUL pod is the same as a pack of cigarettes. | 68.8% | 81.3% |
| The smoke from an e-cigarette is harmless water vapor. | 87.5% | 81.3% |
| I know the phone number people can call to quit smoking. \* | 43.8% | 81.3% |
| I am aware of the harmful effects of e-cigarettes. (agreement Likert scale) | 81.3% | 68.8% |
| *\* Paired samples t-test indicates a significant mean difference from pre- to post-test when p < 0.05.* | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3.1.7. At-Risk Youth (N= 16) Pre- and Posttest Attitudes of**  **Cigarette and E-Cigarette Use by School Site (*strongly agree* and *agree* responses)** | | |
| **Attitudes of Cigarette Use** | **Pretest** | **Posttest** |
| People at my school who smoke cigarettes have more friends. | 6.3% | 18.8% |
| It would bother me if one of my close friends smoked cigarettes. | 68.8% | 68.8% |
| Smoking cigarettes helps people at my school fit in. | 6.3% | 6.3% |
| **Attitudes of E-Cigarettes Use** | **Pretest** | **Posttest** |
| People at my school who smoke e-cigarettes have more friends. | 6.3% | 12.5% |
| It would bother me if one of my close friends smoked e-cigarettes. | 56.3% | 62.5% |
| Smoking e-cigarettes helps people at my school fit in. | 6.3% | 6.3% |
| *\* Paired samples t-test indicates a significant mean difference from pre- to post-test when p < 0.05.* | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3.1.8. At-Risk Youth (N= 16) Pre- and Posttest Behaviors of**  **Cigarette and E-Cigarette Use by School Site (*strongly agree* and *agree* responses)** | | |
| **Behaviors of Cigarette Use** | **Pretest** | **Posttest** |
| I will likely smoke a cigarette in the next 6 months. | 12.5% | 6.3% |
| I am confident in my ability to refuse an offer to use cigarettes. | 75.0% | 81.3% |
| **Behaviors of E-Cigarettes Use** | **Pretest** | **Posttest** |
| I will likely use an e-cigarette in the next 6 months. | 12.5% | 12.5% |
| I am confident in my ability to refuse an offer to use e-cigarettes. | 81.3% | 75.0% |
| *\* Paired samples t-test indicates a significant mean difference from pre- to post-test when p < 0.05.* | | |

**The next set of tables (Tables 3.1.9 to 3.1.17) represent at-risk population data using the 2017-2018 Educational Presentation Assessment. Data was collected in July 2018, prior to instrument changes reelected for the 2018-19 FY.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3.1.9. At-risk youths’ (N=55) knowledge of what e-cigarettes**  **and/or vape pens are made of (Q2)** | | |
|  | Frequency | Percent |
| **A battery (correct response)** | **51** | **92.7** |
| Propylene glycol | 1 | 1.8 |
| Flavors | 0 | 0.0 |
| Nicotine | 3 | 5.5 |
| Multiple options selected | 0 | 0.0 |
| Total | *55* | *100%* |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3.1.10. At-risk youths’ (N=55) knowledge of why the**  **“vaping” term is inaccurate (Q3)** | | |
|  | Frequency | Percent |
| Small vape shops are not Big Tobacco | 0 | 0.0 |
| E-cigarettes/vape pens produce a water vapor | 1 | 1.8 |
| **E-cigarettes/vape pens produce aerosol, not water vapor (correct response)** | **54** | **98.2** |
| Vaping is only a “hipster” term | 0 | 0.0 |
| Multiple options selected | 0 | 0.0 |
| Total | *55* | *100%* |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3.1.11. At-risk youths’ (N=55) knowledge of what aerosol**  **can be produced from (Q4)** | | |
|  | Frequency | Percent |
| Deodorants | 1 | 1.8 |
| E-cigarettes/vape pens | 2 | 3.6 |
| Hair spray | 4 | 7.2 |
| **All options are correct (correct response)** | **46** | **83.6** |
| Other variation of multiple options selected | 0 | 0.0 |
| No response | 2 | 3.6 |
| Total | *55* | *100%* |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3.1.12. At-risk youths’ (N=55) knowledge of what is**  **safe for your lungs (Q5)** | | |
|  | Frequency | Percent |
| Aerosol | 0 | 0.0 |
| Water vapor | 2 | 3.6 |
| Smoke | 1 | 1.8 |
| **Oxygen (correct response)** | **52** | **94.5** |
| Multiple options selected | 0 | 0.0 |
| Total | *55* | *100%* |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3.1.13. At-risk youths’ (N=55) knowledge that cigarettes have 47 chemicals and e-cigarettes/vape pens have only 15 (Q6)** | | |
|  | Frequency | Percent |
| True | 1 | 1.8 |
| **False (correct response)** | **54** | **98.2** |
| Total | *55* | *100%* |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3.1.14. At-risk youths’ (N=55) knowledge that the chemical rubidium is found in e-cigarettes/vape pens as well as… (Q7)** | | |
|  | Frequency | Percent |
| Health foods | 1 | 1.8 |
| Organic lamb | 0 | 0.0 |
| Car oil | 0 | 0.0 |
| **Fireworks (correct response)** | **53** | **96.4** |
| Multiple options selected | 0 | 0.0 |
| No response | 1 | 1.8 |
| Total | *55* | *100%* |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3.1.15. At-risk youths’ (N=55) knowledge that**  **third hand smoke… (Q8)** | | |
|  | Frequency | Percent |
| Are chemicals left in the environment after smoking **(correct response)** | 54 | 98.1 |
| Is smoke that comes from hookah | 0 | 0.0 |
| Is a mythical term invented by the cancer society | 0 | 0.0 |
| Occurs when smokers share cigarettes | 0 | 0.0 |
| Multiple options selected | 0 | 0.0 |
| No response | 1 | 1.8 |
| Total | *55* | *100%* |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3.1.16. At-risk youths’ (N=55) test score (in percentage range)**  **of questions 2-8** | | |
|  | Frequency | Percent |
| 0 % | 0 | 0.0 |
| 1.0-59.9% | 2 | 3.6 |
| 60.0-69.9% | 0 | 0.0 |
| 70.0-79.9% | 2 | 3.6 |
| 80.0-89.9% | 9 | 16.4 |
| 90.0-99.9% | 0 | 0.0 |
| 100.0% | 42 | 76.4 |
| Total | *55* | *100%* |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3.1.17. At-risk youths’ (N=55) level of agreement (strongly agree and agree) of increased knowledge and refusal skills (Qs9-11)** | | |
|  | Frequency | Percent |
| My knowledge of the negative effects of e-cigarettes has improved. | 45 | 81.8 |
| I know the phone number people can call to quit smoking. | 47 | 85.4 |
| I am more confident in my ability to refuse an offer to use cigarettes. | 51 | 92.7 |

**Objective 2**

|  |
| --- |
| **TPC SOUTH YEAR 2 (FY18/19) OBJECTIVE OUTCOME EVALUATION ANNUAL REPORTING TABLE – PART 1** |
| **PROJECT:** Lowering Youth Prevalence and Youth access to Tobacco – South Orange County; Year 2 2018-2019  **OBJECTIVE:** (1) By June 30, 2020, report a stabilization and/or reduction in the prevalence of smoking among the youth population, depending on Orange County youth smoking trends. (2) By June 30, 2020, report a stabilization and/or reduction in the prevalence of e-cigarette use among the youth population, depending on Orange County e-cigarette use trends.   * Objective Number: 2 * Objective Description: By June 30, 2019, maintain a student task force, consisting of at least 1 teacher/advisor and at least 12 students per campus who will serve as peer educators on *each* middle school and high school campus, and facilitate a minimum of five (5) middle school and four (4) high school campus-wide and/or community-based events, for a total of nine (9) events. * Outcome Objective: To assess the overall experience of student participation, determine Task Force functioning across key areas, and assess student engagement to identify any needed changes to the Task Force and inform collaboratively created improvements as appropriate. |
| **EVALUATION METHODS:**   * Evaluation Design: The evaluation of the project incorporated a non-experimental research design method. Only those students who were part of the student task force were evaluated. A post-only survey was administered to the participants. * Sampling: The survey was administered to the middle and high school Tobacco Prevention Task Force groups. Of the 22 middle school and 27 high school task force members, 13 (59.1% response rate) and 14 (51.9% response rate) surveys were collected, respectively. * Data collection instruments and procedures: The students completed a self-administered post-survey following their participation in the task force. Staff developed a survey site-specific to identify the campus-wide events implemented at each school; however, the core-content questions were the same for all sites. The high school task force members were recruited from the Associated Student Body (ASB) and Key Club. The middle school task force members were recruited from Peer Assisted Leadership (PAL) and mental health counselor’s peer wellness group. * Data analysis: The evaluator analyzed the data using the IBM Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25. Descriptive statistics were calculated to assess effectiveness and meaningfulness of the task force group. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **MAJOR RESULTS – PART 1**  **TPC SOUTH YEAR 2 (FY18/19) OBJECTIVE OUTCOME EVALUATION ANNUAL REPORTING TABLE** | | | |
| **Measure**  [Write each measure being assessed for this objective.] | **Target**  [Desired change in measure or benchmark value.] | **Outcome**  **Measure**  **Result by Site/City (N)\*** | **Evaluator Interpretation of Result**  [In 3 sentences or less, describe the findings and what they say about whether or not the measure target was met. Present any other sub-group variation in the measure where appropriate.] |
| 1. Assess overall experience of middle school student participation, determine Task Force functioning across key areas, and possible areas for improvement | N/A | TOTAL (N): 13  Aliso Viejo MS (n): 13 | Evaluator Interpretation: All (100.0%, *m*= 4.90, *sd*= .216) of the task force survey respondents at Aliso Viejo MS *strongly agreed* or *agreed* their participation in the Tobacco Prevention Task Force to be effective and meaningful. Additionally, all (92.3%, *m*= 3.92, *sd*= .277) of the students were *very satisfied* with being involved in the task force. |
| 1. Assess overall experience of high school student participation, determine Task Force functioning across key areas, and possible areas for improvement | N/A | TOTAL (N): 14  Aliso Niguel HS (n): 14 | Evaluator Interpretation: All (97.8%, *m*= 4.72, *sd*= .516) of the task force students at Aliso Niguel HS *strongly agreed* or *agreed* their participation in the Tobacco Prevention Task Force to be effective and meaningful. Additionally, the majority (85.7%, *m*= 3.79, *sd*= .579) of respondents were very satisfied with being involved in the task force. |

|  |
| --- |
| **OVERALL EVALUATOR IMPRESSION – PART 1**  **TPC SOUTH YEAR 2 (FY18/19) OBJECTIVE OUTCOME EVALUATION ANNUAL REPORTING TABLE**  [Please provide no more than 3 sentences per section.] |
| **Was the objective met?** [What does the analysis suggest about whether the overall objective was met?]  This objective was met. Twenty-seven (27) Aliso Niguel High school students and 22 Aliso Viejo Middle school students served on the tobacco prevention task force. The HS students helped plan and conduct four campus-wide events and the MS planned and implemented five campus events, for a total of nine campus events at the school sites. |
| **What went well?** [What does the data suggest is going well? How might these successes inform improvements elsewhere?]  Students were very motivated and eager to conduct campus-wide events, especially since the task force and tobacco prevention activities became more recognizable on campus after Year 1. Involvement in the task force allowed the members to work cohesively as a group and develop materials that were specifically geared toward their school’s student body. Project staff ensured that task force member ideas and opinions were valued and highlighted through the activities implemented on campus. |
| **What were some opportunities for improvement?** [What does the data suggest could be improved? How might site/city disparities be equalized?]  Overall, task force members felt “THE AGENCY” staff provided strong leadership. Suggestions of incentives from last year were taken into consideration of which the phone chargers were a big hit among both grade levels. Suggestions from middle school members are to have more mental health activities (e.g., stress relief), afterschool events, and better pens, in which staff will brainstorm with the task force in the next year to bring these ideas to fruition. |
| **How did the evaluation work?** [What were some challenges in evaluation? How could the evaluation approach be improved?]  The questions/statements on the middle school instrument assessed the outcome of the data and worked well for the data collection process. It would have been ideal to collect post surveys from all task force members to capture all ideas and suggestions for improvement. The small sample size for each school allowed individual opinions to weigh more heavily on the data analysis. |
|  |
| **DETAILED RESULTS APPENDIX – PART 2**  **TPC SOUTH YEAR 2 (FY18/19) OBJECTIVE OUTCOME EVALUATION ANNUAL REPORTING TABLE [Place at end of provider report]**  [Please provide ALL basic frequency and percentage or descriptive statistics tables for each item used in the assessment of this objective, including breakdowns by site or city. Please also provide the results of any tests of significance used. Label *all* tables numerically so they are clearly associated with the objective they are designed to assess. Also include a brief descriptive title, which should include the group assessed, time period, sample size, and, where appropriate, the measure to which an item contributes.] |
| See results below (Tables 3.2.1 – 3.2.3) |
|  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3.2.1. Participation in Planning of Tobacco Prevention Activity** | | |
|  | **Aliso Viejo MS**  **(N= 13)** | **Aliso Niguel HS**  **(N= 14)** |
| Activity #1: Trivia Wheel | 69.2% | 78.6% |
| Activity #2: I Pledge | 84.6% | 85.7% |
| Activity #3: What’s it going to cost you? | 69.2% | 57.1% |
| Activity #4: Tobacco cost activity | 69.2% | 50.0% |
| Activity #5: Mindful Jars | 69.2% | N/A |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3.2.2. Middle and high school task force members’ level of agreement to their participation in the Tobacco Prevention Task Force being effective and meaningful (s*trongly agree* and *agree* responses)** | | | | | | |
| Statement | **Aliso Viejo MS (n=13)** | | | **Aliso Niguel HS (n=14)** | | |
|  | Agreed responses | Mean | SD | Agreed responses | Mean | SD |
| The task force members worked well together in different tobacco prevention projects. | 100.0% | 4.85 | .376 | 100.0% | 4.79 | .426 |
| I liked the tobacco prevention campus-wide activities our task force organized. | 100.0% | 4.69 | .480 | 92.9% | 4.71 | .611 |
| My opinion was valued during the tobacco prevention task force meetings. | 100.0% | 5.00 | .000 | 100.0% | 4.71 | .469 |
| “THE AGENCY” staff provided strong leadership during the Tobacco Prevention Task Force meetings. | 100.0% | 5.00 | .000 | 100.0% | 4.86 | .363 |
| My skills were effectively used by the Tobacco Prevention Task Force. | 100.0% | 4.92 | .277 | 92.9% | 4.64 | .633 |
| Materials that were produced reflected the ideas of Tobacco Prevention Task Force members. | 100.0% | 5.00 | .000 | 100.0% | 4.71 | .469 |
| As a result of my involvement with the Tobacco Prevention Task Force, I know how to conduct a campus-wide tobacco prevention event. | 100.0% | 4.85 | .376 | 100.0% | 4.62 | .650 |
| **Performance Outcome Measure**  **Respondents’ level of agreement of the Tobacco Prevention Task Force to be effective and meaningful (mean of percentages, mean of means, and standard deviations)** | 100.0% | ***4.90*** | ***0.216*** | ***97.8%*** | ***4.72*** | ***0.517*** |
| *Note: A five-point scale was used to calculate the mean scores where 1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= neither agree nor disagree, 4= agree, and 5= strongly agree.* | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3.2.3. Students’ Level of Satisfaction with the Tobacco Prevention Task Force** | | |
| Level of satisfaction | **% of students who strongly agreed or agreed with means and standard deviations** | |
|  | Aliso Viejo MS  (N=13) | Aliso Niguel HS  (N= 14) |
| Very satisfied | 92.3% | 85.7% |
| Satisfied | 7.7% | 7.1% |
| A little satisfied | 0.0% | 7.1% |
| Not satisfied | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Mean | 3.92 | 3.79 |
| Standard deviation | .277 | .579 |
| *Note: A four-point scale was used to calculate the mean scores where 1= not satisfied, 2= a little satisfied, 3= satisfied, and 4= very satisfied.* | | |

**Objective 3**

|  |
| --- |
| **TPC SOUTH YEAR 2 (FY18/19) OBJECTIVE OUTCOME EVALUATION ANNUAL REPORTING TABLE – PART 1** |
| **PROJECT:** Lowering Youth Prevalence and Youth access to Tobacco – South Orange County; Year 2 2018-2019  **OBJECTIVE:** (1) By June 30, 2020, report a stabilization and/or reduction in the prevalence of smoking among the youth population, depending on Orange County youth smoking trends. (2) By June 30, 2020, report a stabilization and/or reduction in the prevalence of e-cigarette use among the youth population, depending on Orange County e-cigarette use trends.   * Objective Number: 3 * Objective Description: By June 30, 2019, collaborate with local law enforcement, including School Resource Officers (SRO) and Drug Liaison Officers (DLO), to assess illegal tobacco and e-cigarette sales to youth by conducting “Attempted Buys” with 17 stores in the catchment area to assess illegal tobacco and e-cigarette sales to persons under 21 years of age. * Outcome Objective: To assess changes in sales rate and other project metrics. |
| **EVALUATION METHODS:**   * Evaluation Design: The evaluation of the project incorporated a non-experimental research design method. The sites received a pre-, post-, and final-attempted buy assessment. “THE AGENCY” staff and youth conducted at least one follow-up assessment over the course of the grant utilizing the same instrument. There were no post-attempted buy assessments conducted because 100% of the sites were in compliance at the pre-attempted buy assessment. * Sampling: “THE AGENCY” staff, recruited youth and young adults (persons between the ages of 17 and 20) to conduct the “attempted buys” with 17 tobacco retailer vendors in Aliso Viejo and Laguna Niguel. A list of all tobacco retailers in the catchment area were collected from the California Department of Tax and Fees (CDTFA) during the 2018 fiscal year and narrowed down to find only the retailers within a 2-mile radius of the target middle schools and high school. “THE AGENCY” selected tobacco merchants by means of a convenience sample of the narrowed list. Therefore, the selected merchants may not be representative of all tobacco retailers in the area. * Data collection instruments and procedures: A 5-question observational survey was developed to assess tobacco compliance of sales from tobacco retail establishments. Two “THE AGENCY” staff or trained volunteers were paired with two community youth or young adult volunteers and chaperoned them to each store/location. One youth/young adult was responsible for the attempted purchase of cigarettes (youth did not complete any cigarette purchases), while the other two were responsible for identifying the type of store, noting if proof of identification was asked for, and ensuring the youth attempted to purchase the correct type of tobacco product. The youth/young adult completed the survey upon his/her return to the car with assistance from staff as necessary. * Data analysis: The evaluator analyzed the data using the IBM Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25. Only descriptive statistics were calculated to analyze the nominal data. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **MAJOR RESULTS – PART 1**  **TPC SOUTH YEAR 2 (FY18/19) OBJECTIVE OUTCOME EVALUATION ANNUAL REPORTING TABLE** | | | |
| **Measure**  [Write each measure being assessed for this objective.] | **Target**  [Desired change in measure or benchmark value.] | **Outcome**  **Measure**  **Result by Site/City (N)\*** | **Evaluator Interpretation of Result**  [In 3 sentences or less, describe the findings and what they say about whether or not the measure target was met. Present any other sub-group variation in the measure where appropriate.] |
| 1. Assess compliance of laws governing tobacco sales | N/A | TOTAL (N): 17  Aliso Viejo (n): 13  Laguna Niguel (n): 4 | Evaluator Interpretation: The tobacco retailers observed were complying with tobacco sales’ laws. “THE AGENCY” staff conducted attempted buys and compliance checks with 17 establishments of which no sales were made at the pre-attempted buy period nor at the final attempted buy period. The mid-attempted buy was not conducted, due to the outcome during the pre-attempted buy period. At the end of the grant year, all 17 (100.0%) tobacco retailer sites qualified to be a 5-Star Merchant. |

|  |
| --- |
| **OVERALL EVALUATOR IMPRESSION – PART 1**  **TPC SOUTH YEAR 2 (FY18/19) OBJECTIVE OUTCOME EVALUATION ANNUAL REPORTING TABLE**  [Please provide no more than 3 sentences per section.] |
| **Was the objective met?** [What does the analysis suggest about whether the overall objective was met?]  Yes, the objective was met. “THE AGENCY” staff conducted a total of four compliance checks and two attempted buys at the 17 tobacco retailers within a 2-mile radius of the catchment area. |
| **What went well?** [What does the data suggest is going well? How might these successes inform improvements elsewhere?]  Tobacco retailers are taking precautions to reduce the sales of tobacco products to underage persons by asking for proof of age (i.e. valid ID). Extensive education and the conducting of attempted buys in the previous year may have also supported tobacco retailers in continuing to comply with tobacco laws. Staff will continue to provide technical assistance in the coming years to facilitate continued merchant compliance. |
| **What were some opportunities for improvement?** [What does the data suggest could be improved? How might site/city disparities be equalized?]  Due to the new cigarette age policy and e-cigarettes are a relatively new trend, continued education needs to be provided to tobacco retailers regarding the policy on the sales of these products and the required signage to be displayed. Additionally, “THE AGENCY” staff could consider incorporating male volunteers as attempted buyers to be more representative of underage buyers that may be purchasing tobacco products. |
| **How did the evaluation work?** [What were some challenges in evaluation? How could the evaluation approach be improved?]  Revisions to the instrument from the previous year were implemented. Use of the instrument indicates no changes needed. |

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| **DETAILED RESULTS APPENDIX – PART 2**  **TPC SOUTH YEAR 2 (FY18/19) OBJECTIVE OUTCOME EVALUATION ANNUAL REPORTING TABLE [Place at end of provider report]**  [Please provide ALL basic frequency and percentage or descriptive statistics tables for each item used in the assessment of this objective, including breakdowns by site or city. Please also provide the results of any tests of significance used. Label *all* tables numerically so they are clearly associated with the objective they are designed to assess. Also include a brief descriptive title, which should include the group assessed, time period, sample size, and, where appropriate, the measure to which an item contributes.] |
| See results below (Tables 3.3.1-3.3.3) |
|  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Table 3.3.1 Type of Store (N=17) | |
| Convenience (with gas) | 41.2% |
| Convenience (without gas) | 5.9% |
| Liquor Store | 11.8% |
| Drug Store/Pharmacy | 11.8% |
| Supermarket/Large Grocery | 23.5% |
| Vape Shop/Lounges | 5.9% |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 3.3.2 Attempted Buy Merchant Assessments (% of “yes” responses) | | | |
| Variable | Pre-Attempted Buy  (N= 17) | 2nd Attempted Buy  (N= 0) | Final Attempted Buy  (N= 17) |
| Sale was made | 0.0% | N/A | 0.0% |
| Tobacco type of attempted buy |  |  |  |
| Cigarettes | 70.6% | N/A | 58.8% |
| E-Cigarettes | 29.4% | N/A | 41.2% |
| Product underage person attempted to buy |  |  |  |
| Camel Crush | 52.9% | N/A | 41.2% |
| American Spirit | 17.6% | N/A | 17.6% |
| JUUL | 29.4% | N/A | 35.3% |
| Suorin | 0.0% | N/A | 5.9% |
| Clerk’s response to attempted buy from underage person |  |  |  |
| Buyer was asked his/her age | 5.9% | N/A | 5.9% |
| Buyer was asked for ID | 94.1% | N/A | 94.1% |
| Clerk made a comment/question to the buyer | 0.0% | N/A | 0.0% |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 3.3.3 Tobacco Retailer Compliance Check Assessment (% of “yes” responses) | | | | |
| Variable | **1st Quarter**  **(N= 17)** | **2nd Quarter**  **(N= 17)** | **3rd Quarter**  **(N= 17)** | **4th Quarter**  **(N= 17)** |
| Merchant has not sold tobacco to anyone under the age of 21. | 76.5% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Merchant displays current Board of Equalization Tobacco Seller’s Permit within public view and STAKE Act stickers at every register. | 94.1% | 100.0% | 88.2% | 100.0% |
| Merchant keeps all tobacco products locked or behind the counter so that sales must be clerk assisted. | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Merchant does not sell single cigarettes or cigarettes in packages fewer than 20 cigarettes. | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Merchant does not sell alcohol to anyone under the age of 21. | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Retailer meets 5-Star Merchant requirements. | **70.6%**  **(n= 12)** | **100.0%**  **(n= 17)** | **88.2%**  **(n= 15)** | **100.0%**  **(n=17)** |

**Objective 4**

|  |
| --- |
| **TPC SOUTH YEAR 2 (FY18/19) OBJECTIVE OUTCOME EVALUATION ANNUAL REPORTING TABLE – PART 1** |
| **PROJECT:** Lowering Youth Prevalence and Youth access to Tobacco – South Orange County; Year 2 2018-2019  **OBJECTIVE:** (1) By June 30, 2020, report a stabilization and/or reduction in the prevalence of smoking among the youth population, depending on Orange County youth smoking trends. (2) By June 30, 2020, report a stabilization and/or reduction in the prevalence of e-cigarette use among the youth population, depending on Orange County e-cigarette use trends.   * Objective Number: 4 * Objective Description: By June 30, 2019, in collaboration with local law enforcement and youth volunteers, merchant education will be conducted with the 17 previously surveyed (“Attempted Buys”) retailers in catchment area to provide information on the laws governing the sale and advertising of traditional and non-traditional tobacco products, and the new requirements from the five tobacco control bills signed into California law in 2016. At least 25% of the stores will sign a merchant education commitment form. * Outcome Objective: To analyze data collected from the Tobacco Retailer Site Assessments to determine tobacco retailer’s compliance to tobacco laws and policies and if further action is warranted. |
| **EVALUATION METHODS:**   * Evaluation Design: The evaluation of the project incorporated a non-experimental research design method. “THE AGENCY” staff assessed the tobacco retailers’ compliance to tobacco policies (see results in objective 3). Further assessment was conducted during the merchant education phase, which occurred immediately following the site visit assessment. * Sampling: See “Sampling” method in objective 3 * Data collection instruments and procedures: “THE AGENCY” staff and the evaluator modified TUPP’s existing Tobacco Retailer Site Assessment Survey for providers to gather information regarding the sites’ compliance with tobacco laws and regulations. “THE AGENCY” staff contacted the retail stores to schedule the site visit with the manager or owner. Staff made observations of the store and completed the site inspection components on the survey. Following inspection, staff provided feedback and resources and completed the merchant education components of the instrument. * Data analysis: The evaluator analyzed the data using the IBM Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25. Descriptive statistics (frequency measures) were calculated to analyze the data. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **MAJOR RESULTS – PART 1**  **TPC SOUTH YEAR 2 (FY18/19) OBJECTIVE OUTCOME EVALUATION ANNUAL REPORTING TABLE** | | | |
| **Measure**  [Write each measure being assessed for this objective.] | **Target**  [Desired change in measure or benchmark value.] | **Outcome**  **Measure**  **Result by Site/City (N)\*** | **Evaluator Interpretation of Result**  [In 3 sentences or less, describe the findings and what they say about whether or not the measure target was met. Present any other sub-group variation in the measure where appropriate.] |
| 1. Determine tobacco retailer’s compliance to tobacco laws and policies | NA | TOTAL (N): 17  Aliso Viejo (n): 13  Laguna Niguel (n): 4 | Evaluator Interpretation: The tobacco retailers observed were complying with tobacco laws and policies. Merchant education was conducted to merchants (owners, managers, and employees) at 17 stores that sell tobacco. During the Merchant Education all 17 tobacco retail locations were compliant of proper signage being appropriately posted and tobacco products were out of the public’s reach. No tobacco retail locations required a re-check. |

|  |
| --- |
| **OVERALL EVALUATOR IMPRESSION – PART 1**  **TPC SOUTH YEAR 2 (FY18/19) OBJECTIVE OUTCOME EVALUATION ANNUAL REPORTING TABLE**  [Please provide no more than 3 sentences per section.] |
| **Was the objective met?** [What does the analysis suggest about whether the overall objective was met?]  Yes, the objective was met. “THE AGENCY” staff conducted merchant education at the 17 tobacco retailers within a 2-mile radius of the catchment area. Re-checks were not needed, as all tobacco retail locations were found to be compliant during Merchant Education. Six of 17 (35.3%) stores signed the merchant commitment form. |
| **What went well?** [What does the data suggest is going well? How might these successes inform improvements elsewhere?]  Significant improvements in the retail environment were seen during this past funding year. All tobacco retailers were compliant with having required signage displayed properly and abiding by state laws to keep all tobacco products out of the public’s reach prior to “THE AGENCY” conducting Merchant Education, which shows their efforts from last year helped create lasting changes within the retail environments. This shows that education “THE AGENCY” is providing within Aliso Viejo and Laguna Niguel has been successful and should decrease the number of underage tobacco sales. Well-established relationships with retailer managerial staff also allowed for the smooth implementation of merchant education. |
| **What were some opportunities for improvement?** [What does the data suggest could be improved? How might site/city disparities be equalized?]  Although none of the tobacco retailers required re-checks, it is still important to continue with routine compliance checks, as “THE AGENCY” has been conducting in order to maintain compliance with the new state laws and regulations. The merchants were receptive to “THE AGENCY” and available resources. Although “THE AGENCY” does not have any enforcement control, staff recommendations have helped to keep retailers in compliance. With continued visibility of partnerships and support from city leaders, retailers have successfully adopted changes within the retail environment. Staff will also continue to provide resources and education to these merchants as staff noticed employee turnover between Year 1 and Year 2. |
| **How did the evaluation work?** [What were some challenges in evaluation? How could the evaluation approach be improved?]  The questions/statements on the instrument assessed the outcome of the data and worked well for the data collection process. No changes are deemed necessary. |
|  |
| **DETAILED RESULTS APPENDIX – PART 2**  **TPC SOUTH YEAR 2 (FY17/18) OBJECTIVE OUTCOME EVALUATION ANNUAL REPORTING TABLE [Place at end of provider report]**  [Please provide ALL basic frequency and percentage or descriptive statistics tables for each item used in the assessment of this objective, including breakdowns by site or city. Please also provide the results of any tests of significance used. Label *all* tables numerically so they are clearly associated with the objective they are designed to assess. Also include a brief descriptive title, which should include the group assessed, time period, sample size, and, where appropriate, the measure to which an item contributes.] |
| See results below (Tables 4-6) |
|  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Table 3.4.1 Merchant Education Tobacco Retailer Site Assessment (N=17) | | |
|  | Yes | No |
| The establishment sold to a person under 21 prior to Merchant Education | 0.0% | 100.0% |
| The STAKE Act Signs were visible at each register where tobacco is sold | 100.0% | 0.0% |
| The current State of CA tobacco license was posted in locations visible to the public | 100.0% | 0.0% |
| The store sells single cigarettes | 0.0% | 100.0% |
| The store sells cigarettes in packages of less than 20 cigarettes | 0.0% | 100.0% |
| The tobacco retail location needs to be re-checked | 0.0%  (n=0) | 100.0%  (n=17) |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 3.4.2 Merchant Education Tobacco Retailer Site Assessment (N=17): Tobacco Compliance | | | | |
| Are the following tobacco products within public reach? | **Yes** | **No** | **Unable to determine** | **Product not sold at location** |
| Cigarettes | 0.0% | 94.1% | 0.0% | 5.9% |
| Smokeless tobacco | 0.0% | 70.6% | 0.0% | 29.4% |
| Cigars | 0.0% | 70.6% | 0.0% | 29.4% |
| Little cigars | 0.0% | 88.2% | 0.0% | 11.8% |
| Hookah/hookah items | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% |
| E-cigarettes | 0.0% | 70.6% | 0.0% | 29.4% |
| Other | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Table 3.4.3 Tobacco Retailer Site Assessment (N=17): Merchant Action | |
| After speaking with the clerk or manager, the following action was taken before the observer left: | **Frequency (%)** |
| STAKE Act sign(s) were posted | 0 (0.0%) |
| CA state tobacco license was posted in public view | 0 (0.0%) |
| Relocated tobacco products out of public reach | 0 (0.0%) |
| No action was taken before the observer left | 17 (100.0%) |