

**UMTRI-2004-28**

**MCRUD: Evaluation of Process  
and Visibility**

**Lidia P. Kostyniuk  
Linda L. Miller**

**Prepared for the Michigan  
Office of Highway Safety Planning**

**October 2004**

### Technical Report Documentation Page

1. Report No. <b>UMTRI-2004-28</b>		2. Government Accession No.		3. Recipient's Catalog No.	
4. Title and Subtitle <b>MCRUD: Evaluation of Process and Visibility</b>				5. Report Date <b>October 2004</b>	
				6. Performing Organization Code	
7. Author(s) <b>Kostyniuk, L.P., Miller, L.L.</b>				8. Performing Organization Report No.	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address <b>The University of Michigan Transportation Research Institute 2901 Baxter Road Ann Arbor, MI 48109</b>				10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS)	
				11. Contract or Grant No. <b>047075</b>	
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address <b>Michigan Office of Highway Safety Planning 4000 Collins Road Lansing, MI 48909</b>				13. Type of Report and Period Covered <b>Final</b>	
				14. Sponsoring Agency Code	
15. Supplementary Notes					
16. Abstract  This report presents findings of a process evaluation of the Michigan Coalition to Reduce Underage Drinking (MCRUD) program funded by a Michigan Office of Highway Safety Planning (OHSP) traffic safety grant, <i>Community Traffic Safety Countermeasures</i> , in fiscal years 2001, 2002, and 2003. The report also includes an assessment of the extent to which the MCRUD program is known among the youth alcohol-abuse prevention community and is recognized by the general public. A comparison of proposed and completed activities shows that, with a few exceptions, most proposed activities were carried out. A survey of organizations and agencies involved in youth and alcohol prevention programs indicates that the majority of respondents is familiar with the MCRUD program and is satisfied with its interactions with it. Response to questions on a statewide survey indicate that 35±4% of Michigan adults recognize the name MCRUD. Suggestions for improvement of the MCRUD program include greater compliance with OHSP reporting protocols, submission of an annual report to OHSP, more comprehensive reporting of the small grants awarded by the MCRUD program, website improvement, and the development and application of a program to evaluate MCRUD's effectiveness in reducing underage drinking.					
19. Security Classification. (of this report) <b>Unclassified</b>		20. Security Classification. (of this page) <b>Unclassified</b>		21. No. of Pages <b>76</b>	22. Price

This report is based on information that was provided to us by the Michigan Office of Highway Safety Planning or that we became aware of during the course of the review and acquired on our own. There may be other information about Michigan Coalition to Reduce Underage Drinking that we did not review. Our conclusions are based on the information that was available to us.

The opinions, findings, and conclusions expressed in this publication are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the Michigan office of Highway Safety Planning.

<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	1
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	8
INTRODUCTION.....	12
METHODS.....	14
PROCESS EVALUATION.....	
FY 2001.....	14
FY 2002.....	18
FY 2003.....	22
SURVEYS OF AGENCIES AND ORGANIZATIONS.....	27
SURVEY OF THE GENERAL PUBLIC.....	35
FINDINGS.....	40
DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	43
APPENDIX A	
Survey Material.....	46
APPENDIX B	
FY 2001 Activities Reported by Regional Coalitions Receiving Initial MCRUD Grants.....	54
APPENDIX C	
FY 2002 Activities Reported by Regional Coalitions Receiving Initial MCRUD Grants.....	58
APPENDIX D	
FY 2003 Activities Reported by Regional Coalitions Receiving Initial MCRUD Grants.....	63

**LIST OF TABLES**

1	MCRUD Coalitions .....	9
2	FY 2001 MCRUD Objectives.....	14
3	FY 2002 MCRUD Objectives.....	18
4	FY 2003 MCRUD Objectives.....	22
5	Agencies/Organizations of Respondents.....	27
6	Awareness of MCRUD.....	27
7	Extent of Familiarity with MCRUD.....	28
8	Distribution of Respondents by Whether They Applied for MCRUD Grant.....	28
9	Rating of Difficulty of Grant Application Process.....	29
10	Distribution of Help Sought.....	30
11	Rating of Help Received.....	30
12	Rating of MCRUD Website.....	31
13	Rating of Newsletter.....	32
14	Newsletter Delivery Preference.....	32
15	Change of Preference.....	32
16	Rating of Communications.....	33
17	Rating of Follow Through.....	33
18	Extent of Program Familiarity.....	34
19	Name Recognition of MCRUD by General Public by Region of State...	36
20	Name Recognition of MCRUD by General Public by Age.....	37
21	Name Recognition of MCRUD by General Public by Sex and Age.....	37
22	Name Recognition of MCRUD by General Public by Race.....	38
23	Name Recognition of MCRUD by General Public by Income.....	39

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

We express our thanks to the members of youth and alcohol-prevention programs in the state of Michigan, who took the time and effort to respond to our survey. We also thank Lisa Molnar and Jonathon Vivoda for their valuable comments on a previous version of this report, and Mary Chico and Judy Settles for their help in the administrative portions of this project. Special thanks are due to the Michigan Office of Highway Safety Planning for its support.

Lidia P. Kostyniuk, Ph.D.  
Linda L. Miller, B.A.

October, 2004

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Michigan Coalition to Reduce Underage Drinking (MCRUD), a statewide community outreach program dedicated to preventing or reducing alcohol use by children and youth, is now in its eighth year with 23 active regional coalitions. The overall MCRUD program is managed by Prevention Michigan, Inc. (Prevention Network), a statewide coalition of volunteer and professional groups with the mission of providing support, guidance, technical assistance, and advocacy for community-based efforts to reduce or prevent alcohol, tobacco, and other drug use. MCRUD policies and activities are overseen by a Steering Committee with members from the regional MCRUD coalitions, the Michigan Department of Community Health, County Health Departments, Michigan Liquor Commission, the Michigan Office of Highway Safety Planning (OHSP), AAA Michigan, state organizations concerned with health, youth, and alcohol abuse, and Prevention Network staff.

The MCRUD program receives funds from several sources including the Michigan Department of Community Health (MDCH) Division of Substance Abuse Quality and Planning, the MDCH Office of Drug Control Policy, federal block funds from the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, and OHSP. Funds from OHSP for MCRUD are passed through a large OHSP Traffic Safety Planning Grant to the MDCH Division of Substance Abuse Quality and Planning that is also used to provide funds for several other programs administered by Prevention Network.

The funds allocated to MCRUD provide start-up funding for up to three years to new regional MCRUD coalitions as well as technical assistance and training opportunities to all regional MCRUD coalitions. An annual MCRUD Conference is supported by these funds, as is the MCRUD website, and the printing and distribution of alcohol awareness and prevention materials. These funds are also the source of money for small grants awarded by the MCRUD program to regional coalitions and other groups for specific projects. In addition, the funds cover some of Prevention Network's administrative costs, including those for the MCRUD coordinator.

To evaluate its sponsorship of the MCRUD program, OHSP asked the University of Michigan Transportation Research Institute (UMTRI) to conduct a process evaluation of MCRUD activities funded under the OHSP Highway Safety Planning Grants for fiscal years (FY) 2001, 2002, and 2003, and also to evaluate MCRUD's "market penetration;" that is, its visibility among organizations involved in providing youth alcohol-prevention programs and the general public. In response, UMTRI conducted a three-part study, including a process evaluation as well as assessments of MCRUD's visibility among community organizations involved with youth alcohol-use-prevention and among the general public.

In the process evaluation, MCRUD-related objectives and activities proposed for each of the three years were enumerated and compared to the activities that were carried out. Objectives and proposed activities were obtained from three separate OHSP Traffic Safety Planning Grants, all titled *Community Traffic Safety Countermeasures*, awarded to the MDCH in FYs 2001, 2002, and 2003. Information about completed activities was obtained from the portions of the quarterly reports for these grants that were submitted by Prevention Network. Because there was no documented one-to one correspondence between objectives listed in the grant and the activities reported in the quarterly reports, the matching of MCRUD objectives and reported activities was done by examining each available quarterly report; finding the MCRUD activities; and matching the activities to objectives that appeared most related, based on the judgment of the project team.

The review of the objectives listed for each fiscal year from 2001-2003 shows that they are compatible with the purpose of supporting community outreach. However, there were no activities/objectives listed that would help assess the effects of the MCRUD program on reducing underage drinking at the local level or at the state level. The objectives/activities proposed for each of fiscal years 2001-2003 were process oriented, (for example, to hold a specific number of steering committee meetings, to bring the MCRUD display board to a specific number of conferences/events, or to hold a training session). These were carried out, with the exception of the annual survey of MCRUD regional coalitions to identify technical needs (FY 2002 and FY 2003). It was



not possible from the documentation to determine if these surveys were indeed conducted as part of the MCRUD program.

The visibility and recognition of the MCRUD program among organizations and agencies engaged or interested in underage-drinking prevention were assessed by a telephone/e-mail/fax survey of prevention professionals and organizations. A survey instrument was developed to help determine if these organizations knew about MCRUD programs and resources, the extent of their interactions with the MCRUD program, and their perceptions of the help that they received from the MCRUD program. Community organizations with missions/activities that included youth alcohol-use prevention were identified through an Internet search of organizations associated with alcohol-abuse prevention, from state and regional community public health agencies, and from a list provided by OHSP. Of the total of 108 agencies and organizations identified and contacted by an UMTRI researcher, 50 responded to the survey.

Analysis of survey results showed that the MCRUD program was well-known and well-received among most of the organizations that responded to the survey. Respondents who were familiar with MCRUD formed two distinct groups, respondents from regional coalitions, grass-roots groups, and youth groups who have applied for the small MCRUD grants for specific projects, and respondents from larger agencies such as county health departments, school districts, police agencies, state agencies that may be part of regional coalitions, or on the MCRUD steering committee and who have not applied for a MCRUD grant.

The respondents who applied for small grants from the MCRUD program rated the process as "not difficult", and most reported that the help they received from the MCRUD Coordinator, Prevention Staff, and from the *Prevention News* newsletter was very helpful. The MCRUD website was rarely used for help in applying for MCRUD grants, and was not rated as very helpful when it was used for that purpose. Among all respondents familiar with MCRUD, most rated the user friendliness of the MCRUD website as very good, but gave it a somewhat lower rating for information content and usefulness to youth alcohol prevention programs.

When asked about the usefulness of the newsletter, *Prevention News*, respondents familiar with MCRUD rated it as very good both, for information about MCRUD and for usefulness to their under-age drinking prevention programs. Most respondents familiar with MCRUD reported that the communication and follow through from the MCRUD coordinator and Prevention Network staff were good to very good

The small proportion of respondents who were not familiar with MCRUD were from MADD, SADD, Boys and Girls Club, two prevention organizations/consultants, and a medical/rural prevention network. Considering that MCRUD has interactions with MADD, SADD, medical/prevention networks, and prevention consultants, it may be simply that the particular individuals interviewed were not the ones who had worked with MCRUD. However, when respondents who were familiar with MCRUD were asked if they believed all groups who should be aware of MCRUD were aware of it, most indicated that there are groups with interests in prevention of underage drinking that are not aware of MCRUD. Among the groups mentioned most often were Boys and Girls Clubs, SADD Chapters, law enforcement officials, and Parent Teacher Organizations.

Although it is not a goal of MCRUD to be recognized by the general public, the program has been in existence for eight years, has received publicity, and therefore should have some name recognition among the public. The level of recognition is less important than that there be some recognition of the program. A complete absence of name recognition of MCRUD in the general public would indicate problems with visibility. To gauge MCRUD's recognition among the general public, two questions about MCRUD were included in a statewide telephone poll of Michigan adults conducted for OHSP by EPIC-MRA, a Lansing-based survey company.

The results of the telephone survey indicated that  $35 \pm 4\%$  of Michigan adults have heard of the program. Recognition was higher in mid-Michigan, within Detroit, and among persons more likely to be exposed to the program. The lowest recognition was in areas without regional MCRUD coalitions (southeast Michigan area, excluding Detroit, Hamtramck, and Highland Park). Adults under age 25 were more likely than

others to have heard about MCRUD, as were Black/African Americans and respondents with annual incomes ranging from \$30,000-\$100,000. Most respondents reported that they had heard about MCRUD from a newspaper story or from TV.

The overall findings of this study indicate that MCRUD program activities proposed by Prevention Network are mostly carried out and the MCRUD program is known in the prevention community and is visible to the general public. However, in examining the goals, objectives, and activities of the MCRUD program, several points should be made. The process evaluation in this report was based on the documentation of grants and quarterly reports for the MCRUD program as part of the OHSP traffic safety grant. The quality of the documentation varied considerably, but overall was quite poor. For example, documentation often contained extraneous information and lacked basic information necessary to understand what was done. Use of undefined acronyms was frequent. Use of coalition names was not consistent; two or three different names were sometimes used for the same coalition. The MCRUD program, funding, and reporting are so intertwined with other Prevention Network programs and activities, that it is difficult to separate out MCRUD activities. Furthermore, there was no one-to-one correspondence between objectives in the original OHSP traffic safety grant and the quarterly reports. If it is important that the activities from a specific funding program be identified, then it is important that the standard OHSP grant application and reporting protocols be followed.

It would also be extremely useful to have Prevention Network produce a succinct annual report about MCRUD. It should be limited strictly to MCRUD and not should include other programs administered by Prevention Network. The report could consist of the following:

- Mission statement of MCRUD
- Steering Committee Membership (name and organization represented)
- Membership of the other committees
- List of MCRUD Regional Coalitions (official name, geographic area, list of members)
- List of MCRUD grants awarded that year (title of project, name of grantee,

regional coalition)

- Conferences and Training (with name, location, number of attendees from MCRUD coalitions) organized by MCRUD
- List of youth activities
- Other accomplishments/noteworthy events
- Progress in reaching overall mission/program goals

This information could easily be included in, and would be a beneficial addition to the MCRUD website, and could be updated annually.

Another area in which the MCRUD program could improve is in the documentation of the small MCRUD grants. The grant program is one of the highlights of the MCRUD program, yet a comprehensive list of what was awarded to whom and for what, was not provided, nor could it be easily constructed. A more comprehensive system of reporting these grants would substantially improve the process of determining program effectiveness. Still another area for improvement is the MCRUD website. It was the least used resource for help in the grant application process, and was not rated as highly as the other sources of information. Although the website contains much useful information, it would benefit from some professional website design help to reformat it and to make it more attractive and easier to use.

At the more general level, a criticism of MCRUD is that the program is very much process and activity driven. Although the staff and members of the MCRUD program appear to be dedicated and enthusiastic, and successful in completing activities and generating member satisfaction, this does not necessarily mean that the mission is being accomplished. Most objectives for the MCRUD program as stated in the applications for OHSP funds for FYs 2001-2003 (e.g., the intent to hold a specific number of Steering Committee Meetings, to hold training sessions, or to distribute material) are for the most part, listings of activities rather than explicit objectives. While these activities were largely carried out, it is difficult to determine how they contributed to the success of the program, e.g., how productive were the meetings, was the training applied, and how useful were the distributed materials. It would be beneficial to the

MCRUD program to step back, examine its goals, and make sure that the objectives are carefully and thoughtfully developed and reflect what the program is intended to accomplish.

Because of the focus of MCRUD on processes rather than impacts or outcomes, it is difficult to examine the effect of the program on underage drinking, and ultimately on the number of alcohol-related crashes and injuries. It would be very useful if some effort was allocated to formalizing the evaluation process for assessing MCRUD program effectiveness toward these goals. An evaluation plan of the program that not only considers things being done, but also determines if behaviors and attitudes are being changed, and if there is a reduction in underage drinking, should be developed and implemented at the local and state levels.

## **INTRODUCTION**

In 1994, the Michigan State Safety Commission created the Michigan Alcohol Issues Forum (MAIF) to enhance traffic safety by reducing alcohol-impaired driving. One of MAIF's goals was to prevent or decrease alcohol use by young and future drivers. Helping community-based alcohol prevention programs was identified as an effective strategy to achieve this goal. In 1996, MAIF created the Michigan Coalition to Reduce Underage Drinking (MCRUD), a statewide community outreach program dedicated to preventing or reducing alcohol use by children and youth. In 1997, the coordination of MCRUD was transferred from MAIF to Prevention Michigan, Inc. (Prevention Network), a statewide coalition of volunteer and professional groups with the common mission of providing support, guidance, technical assistance, and advocacy for community-based efforts to reduce or prevent alcohol, tobacco, and other drug use.

The charge to Prevention Network was to bring together individuals, grassroots groups, and organizations concerned with underage drinking, and assist them in their efforts to reduce underage alcohol use in their communities by providing them with leadership, training, and technical assistance. The creation and nurturing of local MCRUD coalitions became the focus of the MCRUD program.

The MCRUD program is now in its eighth year. Currently, there are 23 active regional coalitions dedicated to the prevention of underage drinking. Table 1 lists the names and geographic areas of all the regional coalitions that are, or have been, in the MCRUD program.

**Table 1. MCRUD Coalitions**  
 (Source: Undated Prevention Network Report, *MCRUD and OJJDP Funded Regional Coalitions*)

Name	Geographic area
1. Teen Action Council*	Oscoda, Alcona Ogemaw, Iosco, Arenac Counties
2. Charlevoix, Emmet, Antrim Counties Coalition **	Charlevoix, Emmet, Antrim Counties
3. Wayne County Coalition	All of Wayne County except Detroit
4. Peers Resisting Our Underage Drinking (PROUD) Connexion, Inc.	Genesee County
5. Western UP Coalition***	Gogebic, Iron, Dickinson Counties
6. Eastern UP Coalition/ Teens Networking Together ****	Schoolcraft County
7. Sturgis Coalition	Sturgis County
8. Gaylord Coalition	Ostego County
9. Circle of Health Partnership	Midland and Isabella Counties
10. Alpena Coalition	Alpena County
11. Battle Creek Coalition	City of Battle Creek
12. Lapeer County Coalition	Lapper County
13. Tri-County Coalition	Berrien, Van Buren, Cass Counties
14. Brightmoor CRUD	Brightmoor Neighborhood, Detroit
15. One Life to Live	City of Highland Park
16. FACTS Coalition	Huron County
17. Mason, Lake, Oceana Coalition/ Westshore Safe Communities****	Mason, Ocean, Lake Counties
18. Bout-IT Coalition	City of Muskegon and Muskegon Heights
19. Copper Country Coalition	Houghton, Keweenaw, Baraga Counties
20. Gogebic and Ontonagon Coalition/ Snow Country Teens*****	Gogebic and Ontonagon Counties
21. Dickinson and Iron Coalition/ Dickinson Iron Healthy Youth Coalition*****	Dickinson and Iron Counties
22. Hamtramck Coalition/H-Town Commodores*****	City of Hamtramck
23. Leland Dodge Coalition	Leland Neighborhood of Detroit
24. Coalition of Resisting Youth in Shiawassee County (CRYS)	Shiawassee County
25. Jackson County Coalition	Jackson County

\* Original name, Rural Prevention Network

\*\* No longer functioning

\*\*\* Split into Copper Country, Gogebic and Ontonagon Coalition, and Dickinson and Iron Coalition

\*\*\*\* The Mason, Lake, Oceana Coalition became part of the Westshore Safe Communities in 2003

\*\*\*\*\* The youth group and county names were used interchangeably in documents available for review

The overall MCRUD program is managed by Prevention Network with a Prevention Network employee serving as MCRUD coordinator. MCRUD policies and activities are overseen by a Steering Committee with members from the regional MCRUD coalitions, the Michigan Department of Community Health, County Health Departments, Michigan Liquor Commission, the Michigan Office of Highway Safety Planning (OHSP), AAA Michigan, state organizations concerned with health, youth, and alcohol abuse, and Prevention Network staff. The MCRUD committee structure has evolved over time. Aside from the Steering Committee, other current committees include an Executive Committee, a Policy Committee, an Action Committee, a Conference Planning Committee, a Grant Review Committee, and a Teen Leadership Team (TLT).

The MCRUD program receives funds from several sources including the Michigan Department of Community Health (MDCH) Division of Substance Abuse Quality and Planning, the MDCH Office of Drug Control Policy, federal block funds from the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, and OHSP. Funds from OHSP for MCRUD are passed through a large OHSP Traffic Safety Planning Grant to the MDCH Division of Substance Abuse Quality and Planning that is also used to provide funds for several other programs administered by Prevention Network.

The funds allocated to MCRUD provide start-up funding for up to three years<sup>1</sup> to new regional MCRUD coalitions as well as technical assistance and training opportunities to all regional MCRUD coalitions. An annual MCRUD Conference is supported by these funds, as is the MCRUD website, and the printing and distribution of alcohol awareness and prevention materials. These funds are also the source of money for small grants awarded by the MCRUD program to regional coalitions or other groups for specific projects. In addition, the funds cover some of Prevention Network's administrative costs, including those for the MCRUD coordinator. Because the initial

---

<sup>1</sup> Most coalitions started with these funds, although eight coalitions were formed through a different program and received initial funding from an Office of Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) grant.



funding grants to regional MCRUD coalitions and the small grants for specific projects are both referred to as “MCRUD grants” by coalition members and Prevention Network, they will be differentiated in this report by referring to the new regional start-up grants as *initial MCRUD grants* and to the small grants awarded by the MCRUD program for specific projects as *MCRUD grants*.

To evaluate its sponsorship of the MCRUD program, OHSP asked the University of Michigan Transportation Research Institute (UMTRI) to conduct a process evaluation of MCRUD activities funded under the OHSP Highway Safety Planning Grants for fiscal year (FY) 2001, 2002, and 2003 and also to evaluate MCRUD’s “market penetration;” that is, its visibility among organizations involved in providing youth alcohol-prevention programs. Because the intent of the MCRUD program is to help at the community-level, the program should also be visible to community members; that is, the general public. Thus, the objectives of this study are to determine the extent to which the activities conducted in the MCRUD program match those proposed, and to determine the extent to which the MCRUD program is recognized by the alcohol-abuse prevention community and the general public.

## METHODS

The first portion of this study is concerned with the process evaluation of MCRUD activities funded by OHSP in FY 2001, 2002, and 2003. MCRUD-related objectives and activities proposed for each of the three years were enumerated and compared to the activities that were carried out. Objectives and proposed activities were obtained from three separate OHSP Traffic Safety Planning Grants, all titled *Community Traffic Safety Countermeasures*, awarded to the MDCH in FY 2001, 2002, and 2003. Information about completed activities was obtained from the portions of the quarterly reports for these grants that were submitted by Prevention Network<sup>2</sup>. It should be noted again that the portion of the OHSP grants that provided funds for the MCRUD program also provided funds for other programs administered by Prevention Network. The objectives listed in each year's grant application have separate headings for each of these programs in FY 2002 and FY 2003, but in FY 2001, the objectives were not clearly identified by program. In addition, even though the OHSP quarterly report format asks for progress toward the specific objectives listed in the grant, the quarterly reports across all years (FY 2001-2003) that included MCRUD activities were not organized in that manner. Consequently, there was no documented one-to-one correspondence between the objectives listed in the grant and the activities that were reported in the quarterly reports. For the purposes of this study, the matching of MCRUD objectives and reported activities was done by 1) examining each available quarterly report, 2) finding the MCRUD activities, and 3) matching the activities to objectives that appeared most related, based on the judgment of the project team.

In the second portion of this study, a survey of community organizations involved with youth alcohol-use-prevention programs was conducted. The objectives were to determine if these organizations knew about MCRUD programs and resources, the extent of their interactions with the MCRUD program, and their perceptions of the help that they received from the MCRUD program. A survey instrument with questions about MCRUD was developed. Community organizations with missions/activities that included youth alcohol-use prevention were identified through an Internet search of

---

<sup>2</sup> Reports for the 1<sup>st</sup> quarter of FY 2001 and 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter of FY 2002 were not available for this review.

organizations associated with alcohol-abuse prevention, from state and regional community public health agencies, and from a list provided by OHSP. A total of 108 agencies and organizations were identified and contacted by an UMTRI researcher. The researcher asked to speak to the director of the organization or a person familiar enough with the youth alcohol prevention program to represent his/her organization in the survey. They were offered the option of completing the survey via telephone or by having it e-mailed or faxed to them. Respondents choosing the e-mail or fax option were re-contacted if their surveys were not received by project staff within two weeks. The survey materials including the cover letter and the telephone and e-mail/fax interview instruments are in Appendix A.

In the third portion of this study, the visibility of MCRUD among the general public in Michigan was assessed. It should be noted that it is not one of MCRUD's goals to be known among the general public. However, because MCRUD has been sponsoring events and programs throughout Michigan for eight years, it is reasonable to expect that some portion of the general population of Michigan has heard of it. To gauge MCRUD's recognition among the general public, two questions about MCRUD were included in a Michigan statewide poll conducted for OHSP by EPIC-MRA, a Lansing-based survey company. Respondents were asked if they had heard of MCRUD, and if they answered in the affirmative, they were asked how they had heard about it. Responses to these questions were examined for the Michigan population, by region of the state and by socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents.

**PROCESS EVALUATION  
FY 2001**

The objectives for MCRUD for FY 2001 were embedded in a broader list of objectives for implementing statewide prevention initiatives targeting underage alcohol use. The list includes objectives not only for MCRUD but for the College Campus Liaison program, Innovative Initiatives to Prevent Underage Drinking, the Fatigued/Distracted Driver College Program, and coordination of Safe Communities activities. Table 2 lists only the objectives pertaining to the MCRUD program. These are shown exactly as they appear in the FY 2001 Grant.

<b>Table 2. FY 2001 MCRUD Objectives</b>	
1	Continue maintenance of existing MCRUD coalitions by provision of technical assistance, and conduct a minimum of one site visit to each coalition.
2	Develop three new MCRUD coalitions.
3	Review and make funding decisions with the MCRUD and Prevention Network Grant Review Committees on applications for grants totaling \$100,000.
4	Provide monthly mailings, and plan and conduct a minimum of 10 MCRUD Steering Committee meetings for approximately 30 attendees.
5	Continue MCRUD outreach through the use of the MCRUD display board (attending at least five conference or other events), materials distribution to youth, and dissemination of information via MCRUD website.

MCRUD-related activities reported in the quarterly reports for FY 2001 were identified and are grouped under the objective heading most closely related to the activity.

***1. Continue maintenance of existing MCRUD coalitions by provision of technical assistance and conduct a minimum of one site visit to each coalition.***

***Technical Assistance - Supporting new coalitions***

Seven coalitions received funds through initial MCRUD grants during this fiscal year. These included the Brightmoor Community Coalition, Tri-County Coalition, and the One Life to Live Coalition of Highland Park (third year of funding); the FACTS

Coalition from Huron County, Bout-It Coalition from Muskegon and Muskegon Heights, and Mason, Lake, Oceana Coalition (second year of funding), the Hamtramck Coalition/H-town Commodores, the Leland Dodge Coalition, the Copper Country Coalition of Houghton, Keweenaw, and Baraga counties, the Gogebic and Ontonagon Coalition/Snow Country Teens, and the Dickinson Iron Coalition/Dickinson Iron Healthy Youth Coalition (first year of funding). Activities reported by these coalitions for FY 2001 are listed in Appendix B.

#### Technical Assistance - Responding to inquiries

Prevention Network staff provided technical assistance to MCRUD coalitions by answering requests for information. The MCRUD coordinator responded on average to 31 telephone and e-mail requests per month for information regarding MCRUD, underage drinking, grant applications, and technical assistance.

#### Technical Assistance - Attending and speaking at MCRUD Coalition meetings

The MCRUD Coordinator and other Prevention Network staff attended coalition meetings at the Wayne County Coalition, Western UP Coalition, Huron County Coalition, BOUT-IT Coalition Mason, Lake, and Oceana Coalition combined meetings, the Highland Park Coalition, and the Cass and Van Buren Counties Prom and Graduation Rally.

#### Technical Assistance - Newsletter

During FY 2001, MCRUD information and articles appeared in five editions of the *Prevention News*.

#### Technical Assistance - Training and networking opportunities

On January 27, an all-day training session for regional coalitions was conducted in Lansing by FACE: Truth and Clarity on Alcohol and the Louisiana Coalition to Reduce Underage Drinking. The second annual MCRUD conference was held on March 17, 2001 in Lansing. It was attended by approximately 260 youth and adults, and included 18 workshops.

### Coalition site visits

The MCRUD Coordinator visited each MCRUD coalition at least once during the year. Each regional coalition with an Initial MCRUD Grant was visited at least twice.

#### **2. Develop three new MCRUD coalitions.**

During FY 2001, two new coalitions were activated and one existing coalition was divided into three separate coalitions. Newly formed coalitions included the Leland Dodge Coalition and the Hamtramck/H-Town Commodores. The Western Upper Peninsula Coalition was divided into Copper Country Coalition (Houghton, Keweenaw, and Baraga counties), Gogebic Ontonagon Coalition/Snow County Teens, and the Dickinson Iron Coalition Iron Healthy Youth Coalition.

#### **3. Review and make funding decisions with MCRUD and PN Grant Review Committees on applications for grants totaling \$100,000.**

During FY 2001, 32 MCRUD grants were awarded for a total of \$105,889. Additional monies came from unused funds from other programs administered by Prevention Network. Although the quarterly reports include reports from the grant committee about review of grant applications and decisions to award or not award grants, no comprehensive list of final awarded grants was provided, nor could a complete list be constructed from the materials provided.

#### **4. Provide monthly mailings and plan to conduct a minimum of 10 MCRUD Steering Committee meetings for approximately 30 attendees.**

Ten MCRUD Steering Committee meetings were held during the fiscal year. Steering Committee meeting packets were mailed to over 100 members prior to the meetings.

#### **5. Continue MCRUD outreach through the use of the MCRUD display board (by bringing it to at least five conferences or other events), materials distributed to youth, and dissemination via MCRUD website.**

### Display Board

The MCRUD display has been set up and staffed at nine events/conferences including coalition planning meetings, FACE training, the Second Annual MCRUD conference, and prom and graduation rallies.

### Distribution of materials

Information about the Second Annual MCRUD Conference and MCRUD grant programs, as well as materials related to Awareness Month and the graduation/prom season, were distributed to all Michigan High Schools.

### Website

The MCRUD website was updated to include new links and information about MCRUD coalitions, MCRUD Steering Committee meeting minutes, and the Second Annual MCRUD Conference. Regional coalition information and the MCRUD logo were updated on the home page. A link to the American Medical Association web page was added and "dead" inactive links to outside sites were fixed and/or removed.

## FY 2002

The objectives for the MCRUD program, exactly as they appear in the FY 2002 *Community Traffic Safety Countermeasures Grant* are shown in Table 3.

<b>Table 3. FY 2002 MCRUD Objectives</b>	
1.	Continue funding of second and third year MCRUD Coalitions and conduct a minimum of two site visits to each of these coalitions. Continue to support all MCRUD Coalitions by providing requested technical assistance.
2.	Provide monthly mailings and plan to conduct 6 to 9 MCRUD Steering Committee meetings for approximately 30 attendees.
3.	Continue MCRUD outreach through the use of the MCRUD display board by attending at least three conferences or other events. Distribute youth alcohol materials to youth and adults and disseminate information via the MCRUD web site.
4.	Review and make funding decisions with the MCRUD Grant Review Committee on a minimum of 30 grant applications.
5.	Coordinate training for local coalitions to include; Self-sufficiency and Data Collection training. Coordinate a minimum of two additional trainings from the following choices: Strategies for Improving Collaboration; Planning; Working with Law Enforcement; State Liquor Laws; Parental and Youth Involvement; and/or Youth Speaking to Policy makers. Contact PIRE to obtain trainers for already-developed trainings in the above stated areas.
6.	Conduct an annual survey of MCRUD Coalitions to determine training needs.
7.	Develop a Youth Advisory Panel with a minimum of 8 youth. Advisory Panel will make recommendations at the statewide level (to MCRUD Steering Committee) regarding underage drinking initiatives, develop a youth speaker's bureau, assist in bringing technology to MCRUD, and assist in planning MCRUD conference(s).
8.	Continue to fund an employee as the MCRUD Coordinator to oversee all MCRUD functions.

MCRUD-related activities reported in the quarterly reports for FY 2002 were identified and are grouped under the objective heading most closely related to the activity and are listed below.

***1. Continue funding of second and third year MCRUD Coalitions and conduct a minimum of two site visits to each of these coalitions. Continue to support all MCRUD Coalitions by providing requested technical assistance.***

***Technical assistance - Supporting new coalitions***

Eight regional MCRUD coalitions received initial MCRUD grants in FY 2002. Coalitions in the third year of funding included: the FACTS Coalition of Huron County, the Mason, Lake, Oceana Coalition which joined with the Westshore Safe Communities, and the Bout-It Coalition of Muskegon and Muskegon Heights. Coalitions in the second year of funding included: the Copper Country Coalition of Houghton, Keweenaw, Baraga counties, the Gogebic Ontonagon Coalition/Snow County Teens, the Dickinson



Iron Coalition/Dickinson Iron Healthy Youth Coalition, the Hamtramck Coalition/H-Town Commodores, and the Leland Dodge Coalition of the Leland neighborhood of Detroit. Activities reported by these coalitions for FY 2002 are in Appendix C.

#### Technical assistance Newsletter

Articles about MCRUD appeared in two issues of the *Prevention Network Newsletter*.

#### Technical Assistance-Site Visits

The MCRUD Coordinator visited each of the new coalitions at least twice in this fiscal year.

### **2. Provide monthly mailings and plan to conduct six to nine MCRUD Steering Committee meetings for approximately 30 attendees.**

The Steering Committee met nine times during FY 2002. Prior to the meetings, invitations and information packets were mailed to the Steering Committee members. A survey about the possible restructuring of this committee was included. As a result, the Executive Committee and the Action Committee were formed.

### **3. Continue MCRUD outreach through the use of the MCRUD display board by attending at least three conferences or other events. Distribute youth alcohol materials to youth and adults and disseminate information via the MCRUD web site.**

#### MCRUD Outreach - Display Board

The MCRUD display board was exhibited at 10 events. In April, the display board was exhibited at the MCRUD Conference and the Traffic Safety Summit; in May, at the Youth Tobacco Access Reduction (YTAR) Conference at Wayne County Community College, the Michigan Parent Teacher Student Association (MTSA) Conference, and the Saginaw County Traffic Safety breakfast; in October, at the Upper Peninsula Youth Conference; in November at the Parenting Awareness Michigan (PAM) Kickoff and the Michigan Prevention Association Conference in November; and in December, at the Michigan Students Against Drunk Driving (SADD) Conference and at

the Prevention Network Awards Banquet.

MCRUD Outreach - MCRUD Website, Brochure

The MCRUD website experienced technical problems, and no updates were made during the third and fourth quarters. A web designer was hired to update the site. The MCRUD brochure was revised with updated information.

**4. Review and make funding decisions with the MCRUD grant Review Committee on a minimum of 30 grant applications.**

Thirty MCRUD grants totaling \$98,240 were awarded to local coalitions and youth and other groups. Money left over from FY 2001 projects was added to the funds available for FY 2002 grants. The grant committee recommended a maximum of \$2,500 for each MCRUD grant awarded in FY 2003. As in the previous year, no comprehensive list of grants awarded was provided, nor could it be readily constructed from the available information.

**5. Coordinate training for local coalitions to include self-sufficiency and data collection training. Coordinate a minimum of two additional trainings from the following choices: strategies for improving collaboration; planning; working with law enforcement; state liquor laws; parental and youth involvement; and/or youth speaking to policy makers. Contact Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation (PIRE) to obtain trainers for already-developed trainings in the above stated areas**

The Third Annual MCRUD Conference was held in April. Training on data collection and coalition sustainability was conducted in September by PIRE. About 25 members of MCRUD regional coalitions attended.

**6. Conduct an annual survey of MCRUD Coalitions to determine training needs.**

There was no information about this activity in the quarterly reports.

**7. Develop a youth advisory panel with a minimum of eight youth. The advisory panel will make recommendations at the statewide level (to MCRUD Steering Committee) regarding underage drinking initiatives, develop a youth's speakers'**

***bureau, assist in bringing technology to MCRUD, and assist in planning MCRUD conference(s).***

The MCRUD coordinator worked with teens in youth leadership events to identify and recruit potential members of the youth advisory panel. The first MCRUD Teen Leadership Team retreat was held during the second quarter of FY 2002. Eight youth from MCRUD coalitions attended the International Collaborative Teen Conference in Detroit.

***8. Continue to fund an employee as the MCRUD coordinator to oversee all MCRUD functions.***

A MCRUD coordinator was supported from MCRUD funds. He oversaw all MCRUD activities and functions, and represented MCRUD at national functions including the Third Annual OJJDP Enforcing Underage Drinking Laws (EUDL) National Leadership Conference in September. He accompanied MCRUD youth to the International Collaborative Teen Conference held in Detroit. He attended many events sponsored by regional coalitions, made site visits to regional coalitions, and responded to inquiries about MCRUD programs and grants.

**FY 2003**

Table 4 shows the objectives for MCRUD exactly as they appeared in the *Community Traffic Safety Countermeasures Grant* for FY 2003.

<b>Table 4. FY 2003 MCRUD Objectives</b>	
1.	Continue funding of second and third year MCRUD Coalitions and begin funding of 2 new MCRUD coalitions. Conduct a minimum of two site visits to each of these coalitions. Continue to support all MCRUD Coalitions by providing requested technical assistance.
2.	Provide monthly mailings and plan to conduct 6 to 9 MCRUD Steering Committee meetings for approximately 30 attendees.
3.	Continue MCRUD outreach through the use of the MCRUD display board by attending at least three conferences or other events. Distribute youth alcohol materials to youth and adults and disseminate information via the MCRUD web site.
4.	Review and make funding decisions with the MCRUD Grant Review Committee on a minimum of 20 grant applications.
5.	Coordinate a teen leadership training to take place in the summer of 2003. The focus of the training will be to teach teens how to conduct community environmental assessments, identify available resources and determine resources needed to change the environment pertaining to underage drinking. Members from the MCRUD Steering Committee will work with teens from the Teen Leadership Team (TLT) to develop this training. MCRUD and the TLT will secure the location and have responsibility for oversight and coordinating all lodging, travel, and food reimbursement expenses.
6.*	Training will be provided to MCRUD, Safe Community, and local coalitions in the area of youth alcohol issues. The prevention coalition will choose or develop training with prior OHSP approval, contract with trainers, provide funding for training materials, make arrangements with facilities to host training, oversee selection of food and make arrangements for lodging. In some cases it may be necessary for the prevention coalition to reimburse trainers and attendees for travel, food, and/or lodging. The prevention coalition may also send coalition members to OHSP pre-approved in-state or out-of-state training courses.
7.	Conduct an annual survey of MCRUD Coalitions to determine training needs.
8.	Continue work with the Youth Advisory Panel, with a minimum of 8 youth, to make recommendations at the statewide level (to MCRUD Steering Committee) regarding underage drinking initiatives, develop a youth speaker's bureau, assist in bringing technology to MCRUD, and assist in planning MCRUD conference(s).
9.	MCRUD will work with the Michigan School Board Association and the Michigan High School Athletic Association to educate students and student athletes about the dangers of underage drinking. MCRUD and the Steering Committee may undertake other underage drinking issues or activities as deemed necessary by the Michigan Alcohol Forum youth committee and approved by OHSP prior to any activity being initiated.
10.	Continue to fund an employee as the MCRUD Coordinator to oversee all MCRUD functions.

\* Only the first (unshaded) part of this objective applies to MCRUD

MCRUD-related activities reported in the quarterly reports for FY 2003 were identified and are grouped under the objective heading most closely related to the activity.

**1. Continue funding of second and third year MCRUD Coalitions and begin funding of two new MCRUD coalitions. Conduct a minimum of two site visits to each of these coalitions. Continue to support all MCRUD Coalitions by providing requested technical assistance.**

Technical Assistance - Supporting new coalitions

During FY 2003, seven regional coalitions received initial MCRUD grants. Coalitions in the third year of funding included Copper Country Coalition of Houghton, Keweenaw, Baraga Counties, Gogebic Ontonagon Coalition/Snow County Teens, Dickinson Iron Coalition/Dickinson Iron Healthy Youth, Hamtramck Coalition/H-Town Commodores, and the Leland Dodge Coalition of the Leland neighborhood of Detroit. Coalitions in the first year of funding included the Coalition of Resisting Youth in Shiawassee County (CRYS) and the Jackson County Coalition. Activities reported by these coalitions in FY 2003 are in Appendix D.

Technical Assistance - Site visits

Each of the coalitions receiving initial MCRUD grants was visited at least twice by the MCRUD Coordinator.

Technical Assistance - Responding to inquiries

On average, 54 requests for information about MCRUD were received and responded to each quarter. The requests were for information about the MCRUD program, underage drinking, grant applications, and technical assistance.

Technical Assistance - Newsletter

Articles about MCRUD were submitted and included in five issues of the *Prevention Network News*.

**2. Provide monthly mailings and plan to conduct six to nine MCRUD Steering Committee meetings for approximately 30 attendees.**

Nine MCRUD Steering Committee Meetings were held. Information packets were mailed to the Steering Committee members prior to the meetings.

**3. Continue MCRUD outreach through the use of the MCRUD display board by attending at least three conferences or other events. Distribute youth alcohol materials to youth and adults and disseminate information via the MCRUD web site.**

The MCRUD display board was exhibited at the Substance Abuse Conference in September and was staffed by Prevention Network personnel.

**4. Review and make funding decisions with the MCRUD grant Review Committee on a minimum of 20 grant applications.**

Eighteen MCRUD grants totaling \$38,899 were awarded. As in the two previous years, a comprehensive list of awards was not included in the materials provided.

**5. Coordinate a teen leadership training to take place in the summer of 2003. The focus of the training will be to teach teens how to conduct community environmental assessments, identify available resources and determine resources needed to change the environment pertaining to underage drinking. Members from the MCRUD Steering Committee will work with teens from the Teen Leadership Team (TLT) to develop this training. MCRUD and the TLT will secure the location and have responsibility for oversight and coordinating all lodging, travel, and food reimbursement expenses.**

The TLT Teen Advocacy Training was held in July at Michigan State University. Participants included 35 teens and seven adults. About 30 of the teens were new to the MCRUD TLT.

**6. Training will be provided to MCRUD, Safe Community, and local coalitions in the area of youth alcohol issues.**

The Fourth annual MCRUD Conference and Training Day was held in April. The topics of the training sessions could not be identified from the materials provided.

**7. Conduct an annual survey of MCRUD Coalitions to determine training needs.**

No survey of MCRUD Coalitions was reported. However surveys to gather information about several dimensions of underage drinking were undertaken. The first

survey was on the topic of student athlete drinking. A questionnaire about student athlete alcohol policies was sent to administrators and principals of approximately 1,600 public, private, charter, and alternative high schools in Michigan. The response rate was 11%. Results are being analyzed by Prevention Network staff, and will be posted on the MCRUD website.

The second survey was concerned with enforcement of alcohol laws and the treatment of youth arrested for alcohol violations. A questionnaire about alcohol compliance checks was mailed to approximately 900 law enforcement agencies in Michigan. A second questionnaire about policies for housing and monitoring minors following a minor in possession arrest was also sent to law enforcement agencies. The response rates were 17% and 19%, respectively for the two surveys. The results are being analyzed by Prevention Network staff, and will be posted on the MCRUD website.

The third survey is intended to help the Action Committee to identify sports facilities with established policies regarding alcohol sales and service and to determine what help can be given to large facilities to address irresponsible alcohol use during sports events. An instrument about alcohol policy, sales, and service was developed and will be distributed to sports venues throughout the state.

***8. Continue work with the Youth Advisory Panel, with a minimum of eight youth, to make recommendations at the statewide level (to MCRUD Steering Committee) regarding underage drinking initiatives, develop a youth speaker's bureau, assist in bringing technology to MCRUD, and assist in planning MCRUD conference(s).***

During the TLT Advocate Training in July, youth workgroups met to brainstorm about recommendations for future MCRUD TLT activities. Three members of the MCRUD TLT attended the 2003 Alcohol Policy 13 Conference in Cambridge, MA.

***9. MCRUD will work with the Michigan School Board Association and the Michigan High School Athletic Association to educate students and student athletes about the dangers of underage drinking. MCRUD and the Steering Committee may undertake other underage drinking issues or activities as deemed***

***necessary by the Michigan Alcohol Forum youth committee and approved by OHSP prior to any activity being initiated.***

No activities were reported for this objective.

***10. Continue to fund an employee as the MCRUD coordinator to oversee all MCRUD functions.***

A Prevention Network employee acted as MCRUD Coordinator. He oversaw all MCRUD functions and represented MCRUD at state and national meetings including the Michigan SADD Conference, the Fourth Annual OJJDP Leadership Conference to Reduce Underage Drinking, and the 2003 Alcohol Policy 13 Conference. He accompanied the MCRUD display to the annual conference for the Michigan Prevention Association in Lansing, at the UP Youth Conference, and at the PAM Kickoff Conference in Lansing. He attended many events sponsored by regional coalitions, made site visits to regional coalitions, and responded to inquiries about MCRUD programs and grants. He also made presentations about MCRUD to parent group meetings and other organizations.



## SURVEY OF AGENCIES AND ORGANIZATIONS

There were 50 responses (response rate of 46%) to the telephone survey of organizations/agencies working with youth and/or alcohol-abuse. Table 5 shows the organizational affiliations of the respondents.

<b>Table 5: Agencies/Organizations of Respondents</b>		
	Number of respondents	Comments
Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD) chapters	9	8 county and 1 state chapter
Students Against Drunk Driving (SADD) chapters	1	
Alano Clubs	1	
Boys and Girls Clubs	4	
Medical/health programs	10	
Prevention-education training organizations/ consultants	3	
Police agencies	3	
School districts/regional education services	5	
Community coalitions/organizations	9	8 local coalitions, 1 regional
Youth-led prevention programs	2	
Youth career program	1	
State government agencies	2	Current and former MCRUD Steering Committee Members
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	

Most (88%) respondents were aware of MCRUD (Table 6). Of the six respondents not aware of or not sure about MCRUD, two were from MADD organizations, one was from an Alano group, and three were from Boys and Girls Clubs.

<b>Table 6. Awareness of MCRUD</b>		
<b>Are you aware of the Michigan Coalition to Reduce Underage Drinking, usually called MCRUD? (n=50)</b>		
Yes	No	Not sure
44 (88%)	5 (10%)	1 (2%)

Eighty percent of respondents aware of MCRUD indicated that they were familiar with the MCRUD program (Table 7). Of the nine respondents who were not familiar

with MCRUD, four were from MADD organizations, one was from a Boys and Girls Club, one was from a medical/rural prevention network, and two were from prevention education organizations.

<b>Table 7. Extent of Familiarity with MCRUD</b>	
<b>How familiar are you with the MCRUD program? (n= 44)</b>	
Not familiar	Familiar
9 (20%)	35 (80%)

Close to half (45%) of the respondents who were aware of MCRUD reported that their organization had applied for a MCRUD grant (Table 8), and two indicated that their organizations were current MCRUD grant recipients.

<b>Table 8. Distribution of Respondents by Whether They Applied for MCRUD grant</b>	
<b>Has your organization ever applied for a MCRUD grant? (n=42)</b>	
Yes	No
19 (45%)	23 (55%)

Agencies and organizations that had applied for grants included: community coalitions or organizations (37%), medical/health organizations (32%), school district/regional educational services (5%), MADD chapter (5%), SADD chapter (5%), youth-led prevention program (5%), youth-career program (5%), prevention education training consultant (5%).

Respondents who reported never submitting a grant application came from the following organizations: MADD chapters (26%), police agencies (13%), school district/regional educational services (17%), medical/health programs (17%), community organization (4%), prevention-education training organizations (9%), state or county government agencies (9%), and other (5%).

Respondents whose organizations had applied for MCRUD grants were asked

about the grant application process. As can be seen in Table 9, most respondents did not find the process difficult. Indeed, approximately one-quarter considered it to be very easy (5).

<b>Table 9. Rating of Difficulty of Grant Application Process</b>				
<b>On a scale of 1 - 5, how would you rate the application process? (n=19)</b>				
1 Very Difficult	2	3	4	5 Very Easy
0 (0%)	1 (5%)	6 (32%)	7 (37%)	5 (26%)

Two respondents offered comments about the grant application process. One commented on the length and complexity of the application, noting:

“It is very hard for adults, let alone students/youth, to understand what is to be written....The grant limit is only \$1000, and it is too difficult (to conduct) and to evaluate for that small amount..... I have not applied for a grant in a long time due to the time required to complete the application and the additional time and thought for the evaluation, even though I am desperately seeking funding for a project.”

The other respondent wrote:

“The grant committee doesn’t appear to be consistent in its awards. Several situations have occurred in which only one of two similar projects (in different geographic locations) received funding, with no apparent explanation.”

Respondents who had applied for a grant were asked about sources of help they turned to when applying for a grant. In all, 14 of the 19 respondents (74%) who applied for grants sought help from either one or more of the following: Prevention Network staff, the MCRUD coordinator, the MCRUD website, or the Prevention Network newsletter. Of those who sought help, most turned to more than one source. Table 10 shows that the most frequently sought sources of help were Prevention Network staff and the MCRUD coordinator.

<b>Table 10. Distribution of Help Sought</b>			
<b>When you applied for a MCRUD grant, did you seek help from? (n=19)</b>			
Prevention Network staff	MCRUD coordinator	MCRUD website	Prevention Network newsletter
13 (68%)	13 (68%)	2 (11%)	7 (37%)

Most respondents considered the help they received to be either very helpful or somewhat helpful (Table 11). The MCRUD website was the source least likely to be used, and respondents who turned to it reported that it was only somewhat helpful.

<b>Table 11. Rating of Help Received</b>			
<b>How helpful was each in helping you with your MCRUD grant application?</b>			
	Not helpful at all	Somewhat helpful	Very helpful
Prevention Network Staff (n=10)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	9 (90%)
MCRUD coordinator (n=12)	0 (0%)	2 (24%)	10 (76%)
MCRUD website (n=2)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)
Prevention Network newsletter (n=5)	0 (0%)	2 (40%)	3 (60%)

All respondents who were aware of MCRUD were asked if they had visited the MCRUD website, and if so how often. Of the 44 respondents who were aware of MCRUD, 18 (41%) reported that they had visited the MCRUD website at least once. Of grant-applicant respondents, only 7 (37%) had visited the website. Among respondents who did not apply for a MCRUD grant, 11 (48%) had visited the MCRUD website. Most respondents who visited the website reported visiting it a few times a year.

Table 12 shows the rating of the MCRUD website for user friendliness, information content, and usefulness to the respondent's prevention program. Overall, the majority of respondents found the website to be user friendly with good to very good information content. However, the majority of respondents found the website to be

neutral (score of 3) in the usefulness of the information to their youth alcohol prevention program.

<b>Table 12. Rating of MCRUD Website</b>					
<b>On a scale of 1 - 5, how would you rate the MCRUD website?</b>					
	1 Very Poor	2	3	4	5 Very Good
User friendliness (n=15)	0 (0%)	1 (7%)	5 (33%)	8 (53%)	1 (7%)
Information content (n=15)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	6 (40%)	4 (27%)	4 (27%)
Usefulness to your youth alcohol prevention program (n=15)	0 (0%)	1 (7%)	8 (53%)	4 (27%)	2 (13%)

Forty respondents reported that their organization receives the *Prevention News*, the newsletter of the Prevention Network. This included most of the respondents who said that they were not familiar with the MCRUD program. Of the forty respondents who have access to the newsletter, 68% said they read every issue, and 32%, every so often. These proportions did not differ much among respondents who had applied for grants and those who did not.

Table 13 shows the rating of the newsletter on information about MCRUD and usefulness to the respondent's youth alcohol prevention program by respondents who were aware of MCRUD. Most (85%) of the respondents reported that the information about MCRUD in the newsletter was either good or very good and almost three-quarters (74%) reported that the newsletter provided a high level of usefulness to their youth alcohol prevention program. The proportions did not vary by whether the respondents had applied for a MCRUD grant or not.

<b>Table 13. Rating of Newsletter</b>					
<b>On a scale of 1 - 5, how would you rate the newsletter on information about MCRUD and usefulness to your youth alcohol prevention program?</b>					
	1 Very poor	2	3	4	5 Very good
Information about MCRUD (n=40)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (15%)	16 (40%)	18 (45%)
Usefulness to your youth alcohol prevention program (n=38)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	10 (26%)	11 (29%)	17 (45%)

At the present time, *Prevention News* is delivered by the U.S. Postal Service. When asked if they would prefer to receive the newsletter by e-mail, over one-half of respondents indicated that they would not prefer e-mail delivery (Table 14). However, when told that the money saved by using e-mail delivery would go into prevention programs, 81% of those who preferred mail delivery or did not know if they would prefer e-mail delivery, changed their preference to e-mail (Table 15).

<b>Table 14. Newsletter Delivery Preference</b>		
<b>Would you prefer to receive the newsletter by e-mail? (n=40)</b>		
Yes	No	Don't know
13 (32%)	21 (53%)	6 (12%)

<b>Table 15. Change of Preference</b>		
<b>If you knew that the money by e-mailing the newsletters went into prevention programs, would you change your preference? (n=26)</b>		
Yes	No	Don't know
21 (81%)	4 (15%)	1 (4%)

The next set of questions on the survey was concerned with the quality of communications and follow through with the MCRUD Coordinator and Prevention

Network staff. Overall, almost 80% of respondents rated the quality of communications with the MCRUD coordinator and Prevention Network staff as very good or good. However, 8-10% rated communications as very poor to poor. There was little difference between the ratings of those who applied for MCRUD Grants and those who did not.

<b>Table 16. Rating of Communications</b>					
<b>On a scale of 1 - 5, how would you rate your communication concerning your youth alcohol prevention program?</b>					
	1 Very poor	2	3	4	5 Very good
With the MCRUD coordinator (n=38)	2 (5%)	2 (5%)	5 (13%)	9 (24%)	20 (53%)
With Prevention Network staff (n=38)	2 (5%)	1 (3%)	5 (13%)	11 (29%)	19 (50%)

Follow through by the MCRUD coordinator and Prevention Network staff was highly rated. Table 17 shows that approximately 90% of the respondents rated follow through as either good or very good. Again there was little difference between the ratings of the grant applicants and other respondents.

<b>Table 17. Rating of Follow Through</b>					
<b>On a scale of 1 - 5, how would you rate the help and follow through you received?</b>					
	1 Very poor	2	3	4	5 Very good
From the MCRUD coordinator (n=34)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (12%)	9 (29%)	21 (62%)
From Prevention Network staff (n=36)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	3 (8%)	9 (25%)	23 (64%)

Respondents who were aware of MCRUD were asked if they thought that all organizations that should know about MCRUD know about it. Only 2 respondents (5%) indicated that all groups who should be aware of MCRUD are indeed aware of the

MCRUD program. Those who suggested groups that should know about MCRUD overwhelmingly identified schools, Boys and Girls Clubs, SADD chapters, law enforcement officials, Parent Teacher Association (PTA) groups, and local coalitions. Other groups mentioned with less frequency were faith-based organizations, Youth in Action (a group affiliated with MADD), PALS, Family Independence Agencies, and courts.

<b>Table 18. Extent of Program Familiarity</b>		
<b>Do you think that all organizations and groups that should know about MCRUD are familiar with the program (n=44)</b>		
Yes	No	Don't Know
2 (5%)	25 (57%)	17 (38%)



## **SURVEY OF THE GENERAL PUBLIC**

For eight years, the MCRUD program has helped Michigan communities organize events and programs aimed at preventing alcohol consumption by children and youth. MCRUD sponsorship of events is often noted in news stories and community newsletters. School newsletters also carry information about MCRUD-sponsored events, and parents may hear about them from their children or other parents. Thus, even though Prevention Network does not directly seek publicity for MCRUD, there should be some name recognition of MCRUD among the general public. It is expected that the MCRUD name should be recognized most in areas of the state where MCRUD-sponsored activities have taken place, and among the parents of children and youth targeted by the programs.

Two questions about MCRUD were included on a telephone survey of a random sample of Michigan residents that is conducted periodically for OHSP by EPIC-MRA, a survey polling firm in Lansing, Michigan. The survey was conducted from June 2 to June 6, 2004, with a resulting sample of 597 adult Michigan residents. The sample was 56% female, 84% White/Caucasian and 13% Black/African American by race; the average age was 53.3 years; 28% of respondents had at least one child (age 18 or younger) living at home; and the median household annual income was between \$45,000 and \$60,000. The results of the survey are representative of the state and accurate within 4 percentage points for questions asked of the entire sample.

The first question was concerned with whether the respondent had ever heard of MCRUD. The second question, asked only of those respondents who stated that they had heard of MCRUD, was concerned with how they heard about it. The second question was open-ended allowing the respondent to answer in his/her own words.

Table 19 shows the overall result and the results by region of the state. Overall, 36% of adult Michigan residents have heard of MCRUD. Examining this proportion by regions of Michigan shows that the highest awareness of MCRUD is in the central area of the state (at 46%), and the lowest is in the Outer Metro Region (Southeast Michigan

excluding Wayne County; 25%).

<b>Table 19. Name Recognition of MCRUD by General Public by Region of State</b>							
	Detroit (n=113)	Outer Wayne (n=153)	Outer Metro (n=52)	Central (n=56)	West (n=101)	North (n=122)	Total (n=597)
Yes, have heard about MCRUD	38.9%	32.7%	25.0%	46.4%	36.6%	35.3%	35.7%
How did you hear about MCRUD?	Detroit (n=44)	Outer Wayne (n=50)	Outer Metro (n=13)	Central (n=26)	West (n=37)	North (n=43)	Total (n=213)
Newspaper	18.2%	24.0%	46.2%	23.1%	35.1%	25.6%	26.3%
TV	31.8%	34.0%	30.8%	46.2%	35.1%	25.6%	33.3%
Radio	13.6%	2.0%	7.7%	7.7%	5.4%	2.3%	6.1%
Newsletter	2.3%	8.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.3%	6.6%
From children	4.6%	12.0%	0.0%	7.7%	2.7%	7.0%	6.6%
Other (from friends, at work, word of mouth, etc)	20.4%	12.0%	15.3%	11.7%	10.9%	7.0%	12.6%
Don't know	9.1%	4.0%	0.0%	3.6%	10.8%	16.2%	8.5%

The most frequently reported way of hearing about MCRUD was through the media, newspapers, TV, and radio. Overall, 60% of those who were aware of MCRUD, reported that they heard about it from TV, or read about it in the newspaper. Although this proportion varied somewhat across the regions of the state, newspapers and TV were the dominant sources of information about MCRUD.

Table 20 shows the proportion of Michigan residents who had heard of MCRUD by age category. The results indicate that those below age 25 were more likely than others to have heard about MCRUD. The proportion of people who had heard of MCRUD decreased with age until age 70. Surprisingly, 37% of respondents over age 70 reported that they had heard of MCRUD.

<b>Table 20. Name Recognition of MCRUD by General Public by Age</b>					
Age	25 or less (n=34)	26-40 (n=117 )	41-55 (n=161)	56-70 (n=178)	71+ (n=107)
Yes, have heard about MCRUD.	47.1%	36.0%	34.2%	33.7%	37.4%
<b>How did you hear about MCRUD?</b>					
	25 and under (n=16)	26-40 (n=42 )	41-49 (n=55)	50-65 (n=60)	>65 (n=40)
Newspaper	20%	21%	27%	40%	40%
TV	19%	27%	41%	22%	22%
Radio	11%	8 %	7%	6%	6%
Newsletter	8%	8%	8%	7%	7%
From children	4%	6%	10%	8%	8%
Other (from friends, at work, word of mouth, etc)	22%	22%	4%	15%	16%
Don't know	16%	8%	3%	2%	1%

There was no difference between the proportions of men and women who had heard about MCRUD. However, examining MCRUD awareness by age and sex together (Table 21) shows that younger (i.e., below age 40) women were more likely than older women and men of any age to have heard about MCRUD. The table also shows that women were more likely than men to get the information about MCRUD from newsletters and from children.

<b>Table 21. Name Recognition of MCRUD by General Public by Sex and Age</b>				
Sex and Age	Men 40 and under (n=71)	Men >40 (n=195)	Women 40 and under (n=80)	Women >40 (n=251)
Yes, have heard about MCRUD.	32.4%	36.4%	43.8%	33.5%
<b>How did you hear about MCRUD?</b>				
	Men 40 and under (n=23)	Men >40 (n=71)	Women 40 and under (n=48)	Women >40 (n=121)
Newspaper	17.4%	32.4%	20.0%	26.2%
TV	17.4%	38.0%	37.1%	32.1%
Radio	13.0%	8.5%	0%	4.8%
Newsletter	0.0%	1.4%	8.6%	11.9%
From children	4.4%	2.8%	5.7%	10.7%
Other (from friends, at work, word of mouth, etc)	39.1%	8.5%	14.3%	8.3%
Don't know	8.7%	8.4%	14.3%	6.0%

Table 22 shows the proportion of the general public that is aware of MCRUD by race. The results indicate that Black/African Americans are more likely to have heard about MCRUD than White/Caucasian Americans and other races. Also, Black/African Americans were more likely than others to have heard about MCRUD from sources such as friends, word of mouth, and at work.

<b>Table 22. Name Recognition of MCRUD by General Public by Race</b>			
Race	White (n=509)	Black (n=53)	Other (n=21)
Yes, have heard about MCRUD.	35.0%	50.9%	28.6%
<b>How did you hear about MCRUD?</b>			
	White (n=178)	Black (n=27)	Other (n=6)
Newspaper	28.7%	14.8%	16.7%
TV	30.9%	37.0%	66.7%
Radio	6.7%	3.7%	0%
Newsletter	7.3%	3.7%	0%
From children	7.3%	3.7%	0%
Other (from friends, at work, word of mouth, etc)	9.5%	31.5%	0%
Don't know	9.6%	5.6%	16.6%

Examining MCRUD awareness by income (Table 23) shows that Michigan residents with household incomes over \$100,000 per year were the least likely to recognize the MCRUD name. However, among those with incomes below \$100,000, the lowest awareness of MCRUD was in the lowest income group (< \$30,000 per year).

<b>Table 23. Name Recognition of MCRUD by General Public by Income</b>				
Income	< \$30K (n=133)	\$30-60K (n=200)	\$60-\$100K (n=118)	>\$100K (n=63)
Yes, have heard about MCRUD.	33.8%	40.5%	40.7%	22.2%
<b>How did you hear about MCRUD?</b>				
	< \$30K (n=45)	\$30-45K (n=81)	\$45-60K (n=48)	\$60-75K (n=8)
Newspaper	20.0%	33.3%	22.9%	21.4%
TV	37.8%	34.6%	27.1%	35.7%
Radio	2.2%	9.9%	8.3%	0%
Newsletter	6.7%	3.7%	6.25%	21.4%
From children	6.7%	6.2%	10.4%	0%
Other (from friends, at work, word of mouth, etc)	19.7%	7.4%	16.7%	7.1%
Don't know	6.9%	4.9%	8.3%	14.3%

## **FINDINGS**

The overall purpose of MCRUD is to support community outreach to reduce underage drinking by helping interested persons, groups, and organizations form regional coalitions, and providing these coalitions with technical assistance, training, and opportunities to network. The objectives listed for each fiscal year from 2001-2003 are compatible with the purpose of supporting community outreach. However, there were no activities/objectives listed that would help assess the effects of the MCRUD program on reducing underage drinking at the local level or at the state level.

The objectives/activities proposed for each of fiscal years 2001-2003 were process oriented, (for example, hold a specific number of steering committee meetings, bring the MCRUD display board to a specific number of conferences/events, or hold a training session). These were carried out, with the exception of the annual survey of MCRUD regional coalitions to identify technical needs (FY 2002 and FY2003). It was not possible from the documentation to determine if these surveys were indeed conducted as part of the MCRUD program.

The survey of organizations and agencies engaged or interested in underage-drinking prevention showed that the MCRUD program was well-known and well-received among most of the organizations that responded to the survey. There were two groups of respondents: those who were familiar with MCRUD and those who were not. The respondents who were familiar with MCRUD formed two distinct groups, respondents from regional coalitions, grass-roots groups, and youth groups who have applied for the small MCRUD grants for specific projects, and respondents from larger agencies such as county health departments, school districts, police agencies, state agencies that may be part of regional coalitions, or on the MCRUD steering committee and who have not applied for a MCRUD grant.

The respondents who applied for small grants from the MCRUD program rated the process as "not difficult," and most reported that the help they received from the MCRUD Coordinator, Prevention Staff, and from the *Prevention News* newsletter was very helpful. The MCRUD website was rarely used for help in applying for MCRUD

grants, and was not rated as very helpful when it was used for that purpose. Among all respondents familiar with MCRUD, most rated the user friendliness of the MCRUD website as very good, but gave it a somewhat lower rating for information content and usefulness to youth alcohol prevention programs.

When asked about the usefulness of the newsletter, *Prevention News*, respondents familiar with MCRUD rated it as very good, both for information about MCRUD and for usefulness to their under-age drinking prevention programs. Although there was a marked preference for receiving the newsletter by mail, most respondents indicated that they would be willing to receive it electronically if the money saved went to prevention programs. Most respondents familiar with MCRUD reported that the communication and follow through from the MCRUD coordinator and Prevention Network staff were good to very good. It should be noted that the views on postal service and e-mail delivery of the newsletter are those of the survey respondents and are representative of organizations concerned with underage drinking. These opinions are not necessarily those of entire readership of the *Prevention News*, which exceeds 15,000.

Respondents who were not familiar with MCRUD were from MADD, SADD, Boys and Girls Club, two prevention organizations/consultants, and a medical/rural prevention network. Considering that MCRUD has interactions with MADD, SADD, medical/prevention networks, and prevention consultants, it may be simply that the particular individuals interviewed were not the ones who had worked with MCRUD. However, when respondents who were familiar with MCRUD were asked if they believed all groups who should be aware of MCRUD were aware of it, most indicated that there are groups with interests in prevention of underage drinking that are not aware of MCRUD. Among the groups mentioned most often were Boys and Girls Clubs, SADD Chapters, law enforcement officials, and Parent Teacher Organizations. Thus, it appears that although there are links between SADD chapters and some coalitions and even though the MCRUD Display Board has been exhibited at the Michigan Parent Teacher Student Organization (PTSO) meeting, some of the membership of these organizations is not familiar with MCRUD. This indicates that there

still is room for improvement in the name recognition of MCRUD among organizations concerned with youth and youth alcohol issues.

The level of public awareness about MCRUD was also examined in this study. Although it is not a goal of MCRUD to be recognized by the general public, the program has been in existence for eight years, has received publicity, and therefore should have some name recognition among the public. The level of recognition is less important than that there be some recognition of the program. A complete absence of name recognition of MCRUD in the general public would indicate problems with visibility. The results of a statewide telephone survey of Michigan adults that included a question on the name recognition of MCRUD, indicated that  $35 \pm 4\%$  of Michigan adults have heard of the program. Recognition was higher in mid-Michigan and within Detroit and among persons more likely to be exposed to the program. The lowest recognition was in areas without regional MCRUD coalitions (southeast Michigan area, excluding Detroit, Hamtramck, and Highland Park). Adults under age 25 were more likely than others to have heard about MCRUD, as were Black/African Americans and respondents with annual incomes ranging from \$30,000-\$100,000. Most respondents reported that they had heard about MCRUD from a newspaper story or from TV.



## DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The objective of this study was to determine the extent to which the activities conducted in the MCRUD program matched those proposed and to determine to what extent MCRUD was recognized by the alcohol-abuse prevention community. The overall findings indicate that proposed activities are mostly carried out and the MCRUD program is known in the prevention community and is visible to the general public. However, in examining the goals, objectives, and activities of the MCRUD program, several points should be made.

The process evaluation in this report was based on the documentation of grants and quarterly reports for the MCRUD program as part of the OHSP traffic safety grant. The quality of the documentation varied considerably, but overall was quite poor. For example, documentation often contained extraneous information and lacked basic information necessary to understand what was done. Use of undefined acronyms was frequent. Use of coalition names was not consistent; two or three different names were sometimes used for the same coalition. The MCRUD program, funding, and reporting are so intertwined with other Prevention Network programs and activities, that it is difficult to separate out MCRUD activities. As noted in the methods section, there is no one-to-one correspondence between objectives in the original OHSP traffic safety grants and the quarterly reports. If it is important that the activities from a specific funding program be identified, then it is important that the standard OHSP grant application and reporting protocols be followed.

It would also be extremely useful to have Prevention Network produce a succinct annual report about MCRUD. It should be limited strictly to MCRUD and should not include other programs administered by Prevention Network. The report could consist of the following:

- Mission statement of MCRUD
- Steering Committee Membership (name and organization represented)
- Membership of the other committees
- List of MCRUD Regional Coalitions (official name, geographic area, list of members)

- List of MCRUD grants awarded that year (title of project, name of grantee, regional coalition)
- Conferences and Training (with name, location, number of attendees from MCRUD coalitions) organized by MCRUD
- List of youth activities
- Other accomplishments/noteworthy events
- Progress in reaching overall mission/program goals

This information could easily be included in, and would be a beneficial addition to the MCRUD website, and could be updated annually.

Another area in which the MCRUD program could improve is in the documentation of the small MCRUD grants. The grant program is one of the highlights of the MCRUD program, yet a comprehensive list of what was awarded to whom and for what was not provided, nor could it be easily constructed. A more comprehensive system of reporting these grants would substantially improve the process of determining program effectiveness. Still another area for improvement is the MCRUD website. It was the least used resource for help in the grant application process, and was not rated as highly as the other sources of information. Although the website contains much useful information, it would benefit from some professional website design help to reformat it and to make it more attractive and easier to use.

At the more general level, a criticism of MCRUD is that the program is very much process and activity driven. Although the staff and members of the MCRUD program appear to be dedicated and enthusiastic, and successful in completing activities and generating member satisfaction, this does not necessarily mean that the mission is being accomplished. Most objectives for the MCRUD program as stated in the applications for OHSP funds for FYs 2001-2003 (e.g., the intent to hold a specific number of Steering Committee Meetings, to hold training sessions, or to distribute material) are for the most part, listings of activities rather than explicit objectives. While these activities were largely carried out, it is difficult to determine how they contributed to the success of the program, e.g., how productive were the meetings, was the training

applied, and how useful were the distributed materials. It would be beneficial to the MCRUD program to step back, examine its goals, and make sure that the objectives are carefully and thoughtfully developed and reflect what the program is intended to accomplish.

Because of the focus of MCRUD on processes rather than impacts or outcomes, it is difficult to examine the effect of the program on underage drinking, and ultimately on the number of alcohol-related crashes and injuries. It would be very useful if some effort was allocated to formalizing the evaluation process for assessing MCRUD program effectiveness toward these goals. An evaluation plan of the program that not only considers things being done, but also determines if behaviors and attitudes are being changed, and if there is a reduction in underage drinking, should be developed and implemented at the local and state levels.

**APPENDIX A**  
**Survey Materials**

## Survey Cover Letter

Dear \_\_\_\_\_:

UMTRI is conducting a study for the Michigan Office of Highway Safety Planning (OHSP) about the Michigan Coalition to Reduce Underage Drinking (MCRUD) program. Because your organization is involved in prevention of underage drinking we would like to ask you a few brief questions about your interactions with this program, including if you had any interactions with it.

The following questionnaire will take at most five minutes to complete. Your answers will be tabulated together with those from similar organizations, and reported to OHSP without individual names or organizations. By answering these few questions, you will be helping the OHSP and MCRUD program better serve the needs of Michigan's communities.

If you would prefer an electronic copy of the questionnaire, we would be happy to email it to you. Please email me at [lindamil@umich.edu](mailto:lindamil@umich.edu).

Once finished, please fax or mail the completed survey to the fax number or address listed above. If you have any questions about this study, please call Dr. Lidia Kostyniuk at UMTRI (734) 763-2466 or Diane Perukel at OHSP at (517) 333-5337

We greatly appreciate your help in this study.

Linda L. Miller  
University of Michigan Transportation Research Institute  
2901 Baxter Road  
Ann Arbor, MI 48109  
734.763.2466  
[lindamil@umich.edu](mailto:lindamil@umich.edu)

## MCRUD Questions for prevention coordinators and local prevention organizations

Please click on the box that best represents your answer. Be sure you only select one answer per question. If you would like to change an answer, click on the box again and the “x” will be removed. Once finished, save the document and email to [lindamil@umich.edu](mailto:lindamil@umich.edu).

### E-mail/Fax Questionnaire

#### Section 1

---

Are you aware of the Michigan Coalition to Reduce Underage Drinking, usually called MCRUD?

- Yes  
 No  
 Not sure

How familiar are you with the MCRUD program?

- Not very familiar, (I have heard about them, but know very little)  
 I am familiar (or very familiar) with the program

Has your organization ever applied for a MCRUD grant?

- Yes  
 No (**go to Section 2**)

Are you currently receiving funding from a MCRUD grant?

- Yes  
 No

On a scale of 1-5, with 5 being very easy and 1 being very difficult, how would you rate the application process?

- Very difficult                      Very easy  
 1                       2                       3                       4                       5

If you found the process difficult, tell us why it was difficult?

---

When you applied for your MCRUD grant did you seek help from any of the following?  
(Check all that apply)

- |                               |                              |                             |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Prevention Network Staff      | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| MCRUD coordinator             | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| MCRUD website                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Prevention Network Newsletter | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |

If you sought help from any of the above, how helpful were they in helping you complete the MCRUD grant application?

Prevention Network Staff  Not at all helpful  Somewhat helpful  Very helpful  NA  
MCRUD coordinator  Not at all helpful  Somewhat helpful  Very helpful  NA  
MCRUD website  Not at all helpful  Somewhat helpful  Very helpful  NA  
Prevention Network Newsletter  Not at all helpful  Somewhat helpful  Very helpful  NA

**Section 2 MCRUD Website**

---

Have you ever visited the MCRUD Website on the Internet?

- Yes
- No (**go to Section 3**)

How often do you visit the MCRUD Website?

- Just once
- A few times a year
- A few times a month
- A few times a week
- Don't know

On a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 is very poor and 5 is very good, how would you rate the MCRUD website on:

	Very poor				Very good
User friendliness	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
Information content	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
Usefulness to your youth alcohol prevention programs	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5

**Section 3 Newsletter**

---

Do you or your organization receive the Prevention Network Newsletter?

- Yes
- No (**go to Section 4**)

How often do you read the newsletter?

- I read every issue
- Every so often
- Never
- Don't know

On a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 is very poor and 5 is very good, how would you rate the newsletter on:

	Very poor				Very good
Information about MCRUD	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
Usefulness to your youth alcohol prevention programs	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5

Would you prefer to receive the newsletter by e-mail?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

If you knew that the money saved by sending the newsletter by e-mail rather than printing and mailing hard copies went to prevention programs, would you be more willing to receive the newsletter by e-mail?

- Yes
- No (I still would prefer the hard copy)
- Don't know

**Section 4 – Communications and Assistance**

---

In general, how would you rate your communication concerning your youth alcohol prevention programs?

	Very poor			Very good	
With the MCRUD coordinator	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
With Prevention Network Staff	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5

In general, how would you rate the help and follow through you received?

	Very poor			Very good	
From the MCRUD coordinator	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
From Prevention Network staff	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5

Do you think that all organizations and groups that should know about the MCRUD are familiar with the program?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

If you answered no, tell us which group(s) should know about MCRUD?

---

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this survey. Please save this file and email it as an attachment to Linda Miller at [lindamil@umich.edu](mailto:lindamil@umich.edu). If you have any questions, please call Dr. Lidia Kostyniuk, UMTRI, (734)763-2466 or Diane Perukel, OHSP, (517)333-5337.



## MCRUD Questions for prevention coordinators and local prevention organizations

### Telephone Questionnaire

Q1a. Are you aware of the Michigan Coalition to Reduce Underage Drinking, usually called MCRUD?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Not sure

*If Q1 = No or Not sure, check if someone else in organization might know about it and make arrangements to talk to him/her. If no one is familiar with MCRUD, **thank and terminate.***

*If Q1 = Yes, ask.*

Q1b. How familiar are you with the MCRUD program?

1. Not very familiar, (I have heard about them, but know very little)
2. I am familiar (or very familiar) with the program

Q2a. Has your organization ever applied for a MCRUD grant?

1. Yes
2. No (go to Q4a)

Q2b. Are you currently receiving funding from a MCRUD grant?

1. Yes
2. No

Q3a. On a scale of 1-5, with 5 being very easy and 1 being very difficult, how would you rate the application process?

1      2      3      4      5

*If Q3a = 1 or 2, ask. Otherwise go to Q3c.*

Q3b. Difficult in what way? \_\_\_\_\_

Q3c. When you applied for your MCRUD grant did you seek help from any of the following?  
(Check all that apply)

- |                                  |     |    |
|----------------------------------|-----|----|
| 1. Prevention Network Staff      | Yes | No |
| 2. MCRUD coordinator             | Yes | No |
| 3. MCRUD website                 | Yes | No |
| 4. Prevention Network Newsletter | Yes | No |

*If no to all, go to Q4a, otherwise ask about any that apply.*

Q3d. How helpful was each in helping you complete the MCRUD grant application? Would you say that they were (1) not at all helpful, (2) somewhat helpful, (3) very helpful?

- |                                  |   |   |   |    |
|----------------------------------|---|---|---|----|
| 1. Prevention Network Staff      | 1 | 2 | 3 | NA |
| 2. MCRUD coordinator             | 1 | 2 | 3 | NA |
| 3. MCRUD website                 | 1 | 2 | 3 | NA |
| 4. Prevention Network Newsletter | 1 | 2 | 3 | NA |

- Q4a. Have you ever visited the MCRUD Website on the Internet?
1. Yes
  2. No (go to Q5a)
- Q4b. How often do you visit the MCRUD Website? Would you say
1. Just once
  2. A few times a year
  3. A few times a month
  4. A few times a week
  5. Don't know
- Q4c. On a scale of 1-5, where 1 is very poor and 5 is very good, how would you rate the MCRUD website on:
- |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. User friendliness                                    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. Information content                                  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. Usefulness to your youth alcohol prevention programs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
- Q5a. Do you or your organization receive the Prevention Network Newsletter?
1. Yes
  2. No (go to Q6a)
- Q5b. How often do you read the newsletter?
1. I read every issue
  2. Every so often
  3. Never (go to Q5d)
  4. Don't know
- Q5c. On a scale of 1-5, where 1 is very poor and 5 is very good, how would you rate the newsletter on:
- |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Information about MCRUD                              | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. Usefulness to your youth alcohol prevention programs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
- Q5d. Would you prefer to receive the newsletter by e-mail?
1. Yes
  2. No
  3. Don't know
- If Q5d = Yes, go to Q6a. Else ask*
- Q5e. If you knew that the money saved by sending the newsletter by e-mail rather than printing and mailing hard copies went to prevention programs, would you change your preference (that is be more willing to receive the newsletter by e-mail).
1. Yes
  2. No (I still would prefer the hard copy)
  3. Don't know
- Q6a. In general on a scale of 1 - 5, where 1 is very poor and 5 is very good, how would you rate your communication concerning your youth alcohol prevention programs?
- |                                  |   |   |   |   |   |
|----------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. With the MCRUD coordinator    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. With Prevention Network Staff | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Q6b. On a scale of 1 - 5, where 1 is very poor and 5 is very good, how would you rate the help and follow through you received

- |                                  |   |   |   |   |   |
|----------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. From the MCRUD coordinator    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. From Prevention Network staff | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Q7a. Do you think that all organizations and groups that should know about the MCRUD are familiar with the program?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know

*If Q7a = no or don't know, ask. **Else thank and terminate***

Q7b. Which group(s) should know about it? \_\_\_\_\_

**Thank and terminate**

If interviewee has questions, they can call Dr. Lidia Kostyniuk, UMTRI, (734)763-2466.  
or Diane Perukel, OHSP, (517)333-5337

**APPENDIX B**  
**FY 2001 Activities reported by regional coalitions receiving initial MCRUD grants**

*Brightmoor Community Coalition (Brightmoor Neighborhood in Detroit)*

Members of the Brightmoor Coalition attended FACE training in January. The coalition held a Safe Night celebration in March, with about 50 teens participating. In April, this coalition helped to support the Leland Baptist Church Youth Department. In April, the coalition received funding for a grant which includes a four month prevention series called *Families Getting a Head Start Against Drugs*. In May, the coalition distributed anti-alcohol literature at a three-day Outdoor Tent Revival organized by the Outreach Ministry. Members of the coalition attended *Lion Quest*, three-day substance-abuse prevention training and received certifications in conflict resolution and substance abuse prevention. In June, the coalition co-sponsored a week long Life Skills class, an outdoor ice cream social, and a three mile walk. Activities in August and September included an annual Community Fair, a Community Appreciation Dinner, a candle light vigil, and an annual Safe Night. Consequences of alcohol abuse and conflict resolution were discussed at these events, educational materials were, distributed, and lives lost on September 11 were recognized.

*Tri-County Coalition (Berrien, Van Buren, Cass Counties)*

The Tri-County Coalition sponsored the Seventh Annual Tri-County Project Prom and Graduation Rally in March. Over 400 teens and adults attended. Participants attended small break out sessions including one with a Fatal-Vision Goggles demonstration.

*FACTS Coalition (Huron County)*

PRIDE presentations were organized at local high schools and SADD chapters. (PRIDE is a national youth drug prevention program). Eight presentations on alcohol awareness were made to students from 8-12 grades. A mock car crash presentation was staged at North Huron High School just before prom season. About 350 people attended the car-crash simulation and debriefing.

*BOUT-It Coalition (Cities of Muskegon and Muskegon Heights)*

Twenty-five area youth attended the MCRUD-sponsored Student Leadership Services training in February. Other activities included a Peace Jam at Mona Lake in August, the airing of the TV show *Focus*, and a seminar on alcohol-use prevention at

the Spring Street Church in September. Members of the coalition conducted a survey at the Muskegon Heights Festival to determine can be done in Muskegon to reduce underage drinking. The results of the survey were presented to local agencies such as the Optimist Club and the Community Youth Activities Program. Informational fliers about the coalition and its mission were handed out to local stores, schools, and agencies.

*Mason, Lake, Oceana Counties Coalition (Mason, Lake, and Oceana County)*

The coalition held focus groups on alcohol-use among teens and what can be done about the problem. The discussions brought about the realization that the coalition and community must organize alcohol free activities for teens.

The coalition staffed a booth at the Ludington Family Affair event, and organized a Hawaiian Luau in order to recruit teens into the coalition. Information about underage drinking prevention was distributed at the event. Parent Awareness Brochures were handed out at the Family Safety Day in Lake County. A demonstration of the *Fatal Vision Goggles* was staffed at Oceana County Fair, and underage drinking prevention literature was distributed. The coalition participated in the Scottville Harvest Festival Parade and also passed out underage drinking prevention literature. A Safe and Sober Prom was held in April of 2001. Coalition members distributed Don't Drink Cards to flower and tuxedo shops and "Thanks for ID'ing" cards to local retailers. In April, coalition members completed the ACTS Surveys, which helps to identify community problems. In June, the coalition distributed a brochure on parent awareness at the Asparagus Festival, and sponsored a teen dance at the Harbor Festival. During this year the coalition began coordinating its efforts with the West Shore Safe Communities to increase the effectiveness of both groups.

*Hamtramck Coalition/H-Town Commodores (City of Hamtramck)*

Members of the Hamtramck Coalition completed the "Basics of Prevention" training, which is intended to help community members and start up prevention efforts.

*Gogebic and Ontonagon Coalition/Snow Country Teens (Gogebic and Ontonagon Counties)*

The coalition together with the Ironwood SADD group sent students to the Upper Peninsula Youth Conference.

*Dickinson-Iron Healthy Youth Coalition (Dickinson and Iron County Counties)*

The coalition organized a MCRUD station at the 4<sup>th</sup> Annual Youth Asset Development Training which was attended by 330 people. The theme of the MCRUD station was “fitness of not drinking and not being a drunk driver.” Materials on underage drinking and drinking and driving were distributed.

The coalition distributed information on underage drinking and drinking and driving at the County Fair, and initiated the *Bring Your Own MCRUD Attitude* campaign at the Raceway and Fairgrounds in late August and early September. In August, the coalition staffed a booth and distributed underage drinking prevention material at the Family Day at a local cinema and at the Pine Mountain Music Festival. The coalition posted underage drinking posters in all of the portable bathrooms at the Music Festival and was asked to be on the planning committee for the following year’s event.

*Copper Country Coalition (Houghton, Keweenaw, Baraga Counties)*

The coalition surveyed people at the Baraga and Houghton County Fairs about their perceptions of underage drinking in their respective communities. In September, five youth from the coalition acted in a video production of a public service announcement. A Liquor License Town Meeting was held on September 17, 2001 for adults. Discussions included county liquor licenses, legislation and enforcement of liquor sale laws, server training programs, and results from the ACTS Survey.

**APPENDIX C**

**FY 2002 Activities reported by regional coalitions receiving initial MCRUD grants**



*Gogebic Ontonagon Coalition/Snow Country Teens (Gogebic and Ontonagon Counties)*

The coalition provided travel funds for a student to attend the state SADD board of directors meeting.

*FACTS Coalition (Huron County)*

Five youth and one adult attended the Third Annual MCRUD Conference. In April, the coalition worked with the Harbor Beach Community School and local police to stage a mock car accident event. During prom week at Lakers and North Huron High School, the coalition displayed a Grim Reaper, smashed car, and casket along with a billboard and posters about drinking and driving. In June, the coalition set up a display at the Senior Fair providing information about MCRUD. The youth chairperson of the coalition made several presentations about underage drinking to area teens at area high schools and to children age 9-13 at the Celebrate Life Day Camp. He also attended the National MCRUD Conference in Detroit. A display containing information about MCRUD was set up at the Huron County Fair in August. In September, a potluck was organized to encourage socializing among coalition members and to discuss future projects.

A Youth Summit was held in October at Bad Axe High School and the Red Ribbon Project was initiated in December. The placement of a red ribbon on a car indicates that there is a safe and sober driver in the vehicle. The SADD group also presented a Grim Reaper/Drinking and Driving program at the Red Ribbon project initiation.

*Mason, Lake, Oceana Coalition/Westshore Safe Communities (Mason, Lake, Oceana Counties)*

The coalition came under the “umbrella” of West Shores Safe Communities which incorporated and received a prevention (CAIT) license from the State of Michigan. In early October, coalition youth participated in a SADD-sponsored Fall Carnival. During November and December, the coalition sponsored a weekly prevention program for students at risk for alcohol use. The coalition sponsored *Toilet Talk*, a media campaign for bathrooms (with their captive audience) at Mason schools. The coalition also sponsored the presentation of *Deadly Decisions* which features a mock

car crash to high school students in Mason, Oceana, and Muskegon counties. The coalition received support from local businesses for the community-based campaign, Communities Mobilizing for Change on Alcohol, which focuses on responsible retailing. Youth members of the coalition participated in team building and leadership training sessions, and in a *Safe and Sober 2002* presentation.

#### *Hamtramck Coalition /H-Town Commodores (Hamtramck)*

The H-Town Commodores youth, participated in the production of a digital movie for the New Life Media Project. The Commodores taped interviews about alcohol abuse for this project. During the taping of the interviews, they handed out flyers on alcohol abuse. The coalition sponsored the *I Dream a World* Youth Prevention Program for eighth graders at Kosciusko Middle School. In October, the coalition together with other organizations sponsored a *Turn off the Violence Night* at Hamtramck High School. In mid-August, coalition youth attended the Youth Leadership Training. A H-Town Commodore's Family Dinner was held, where the Commodores made presentations.

#### *Leland Dodge Coalition (Leland Neighborhood of Detroit)*

The Leland Dodge Awakening Campaign to send a positive alcohol-free message to the community was developed with the help of area residents and local businesses. In October, the coalition held a prevention training session for coalition members and sponsored a Prevention Night on Halloween. The coalition-sponsored Summer Prevention camp for children age 7-12 was held four days per week during the months of July and August. At the camp, youth participated in various prevention, recreational, and educational activities. The coalition together with the Spiritual Warriors co-sponsored water activities at the YMCA pool to show youth how to have fun without alcohol. In July, the coalition sponsored a skating party and a swimming party for teens. A trip for go-cart racing and a trip to the movies were sponsored for teens during August. The coalition participated in a Safe Night Event with prevention activities and entertainment in September. In September, the coalition published a newsletter detailing their summer activities.

*Dickinson Iron Coalition/Dickinson Iron Healthy Youth Coalition (Dickinson and Iron Counties)*

Coalition youth participated in the 4<sup>th</sup> Annual Assets Celebration, attended a PRIDE presentation, and gave eight \$100 minigrants to each of their SADD chapters. The coalition demonstrated *Fatal Vision Goggles* and made presentations on underage drinking and driving to the cast and crew of the Community Performing Arts Theater. About 45 Parenting Awareness Packets were distributed. MCRUD literature was distributed at the Pine Mountain Music Festival, at Reading in the Park, and at the Iron and Dickinson County Fairs. A MCRUD booth was set up at the EAA Ford Airport Fly In. Information about the MCRUD initiative and the goals of both MCRUD and Prevention Network were distributed at the Kingsford Middle School's "Meet the Parents" event. The coalition contributed some funds to the local WAVES swim team. Area youth received The Michigan Cancer Consortium's *Spirit of Collaboration* award in recognition of their *Youth for Truth* counter-tobacco media project.

Students inserted messages about drinking and driving into programs for proms and into articles that they wrote for the local newspapers. Parent information packets were distributed to local businesses and included resources on responsible decision-making, communicating with teens about sex, drinking, and abstinence. Several youth from the area attended the MCRUD Conference. Students Taking on a New Direction (STAND) training was held at Iron Mountain Middle School. A *Rip-It-Out* counter-media campaign was conducted.

*Gogebic Ontonagon Coalition/Snow Country Teens (Gogebic Ontonagon Counties)*

The coalition reported that area youth have been working closely with the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention Team of Gogebic Community College.

*BOUT-IT Coalition (Muskegon and Muskegon Heights)*

In May, the coalition sponsored a Community Rally in Muskegon to which local law enforcement officials, prosecutors, the mayor, city officials, religious leaders, and youth were invited. The purpose of the rally was to increase community awareness and request zero tolerance in the community. Activities in December included a joint meeting between the coalition and law enforcement, schools, Westshore Safe

Communities, and the Juvenile Court System and a Christmas Party.

*Copper Country MCRUD Coalition (Houghton, Keweenaw, Baraga counties)*

The coalition created an e-mail list serve (e-mail list) to ease the sharing of ideas and monitoring progress on activities. Area SADD members created posters depicting celebrities who have died from drug or alcohol abuse. Local seventh, ninth, and eleventh grade students completed the Search Institute-America's Promise survey in April 2001. Stadium cups displaying the youth activities website (ccyouth.net) and the MCRUD logo were distributed to all schools during basketball and volleyball games. Bookmarks and posters were also distributed to nine area high schools and six local libraries. Two schools competed in a High School Seatbelt Challenge that included a week of education, an incentive week and pre- and post-surveys. The MCRUD Conference was attended by eleven youth and three adults. A breakout session on the Copper Country MCRUD coalition's Social Marketing Campaign was conducted by the members attending the MCRUD Conference.

**APPENDIX D**  
**FY 2003 Activities reported by regional coalitions receiving initial MCRUD Grants**

*Copper Country MCRUD (Houghton, Keweenaw, Baraga Counties)*

The PIRE training in September which focused on building and sustaining coalitions was attended by 5 youth and 24 adult members of the coalition. The coalition coordinator and one youth member participated in the MCRUD Teen Advocacy Training at MSU and the National Youth Leadership Council. The coalition coordinator attended the state Substance Abuse Conference and the July MCRUD Steering Committee meeting.

*Dickinson and Iron Coalition/Dickinson Iron Healthy Youth (Dickinson and Iron Counties)*

The MCRUD banner and literature were displayed at the Ethnic Jamboree and at a one-day Parenting Awareness Organizers' Kickoff Conference. Underage drinking and smoking prevention pamphlets were handed out to children at a Halloween party for handicapped children held at the Elks Lodge and at an activity night at IM Central Middle School. The Coalition sponsored a teen dance, and the proceeds from the dance were donated to the Salvation Army.

The coalition sponsored a PRIDE performance at the Fifth Annual Youth Asset Community Celebration, distributed underage drinking prevention literature, and awarded MCRUD mini-grants to six local school districts. MCRUD materials were also distributed at a middle school "Smoke Out" cookout at the WAVES swim team lock-in, and to spectators and participants of the annual Elks National Free Throw "Hoop Shoot" contest.

The coalition provided *Fatal Vision Goggles* to the *Walk the Line* program in Iron County. Several public service announcements on drinking and driving written by West Iron County High School students were aired on local radio stations during the holidays. Kingsford HS PRIDE performed at a local mall in Iron Mountain in an effort to make more people aware of PRIDE and its mission. The Coalitions B.Y.O. (Bring your own attitude) program was recognized as a model project at a luncheon in Lansing.

*Gogebic and Ontonagon/Snow County Teens (Gogebic and Ontonagon Counties)*

The coalition provided travel funds for 20 students from Luther Wright High School's SADD Chapter to attend the U.P. Youth Conference in Marquette. Coalition members regularly attend High-Risk Drinking Prevention Group Meetings so that they can establish community collaborations to prevent and reduce underage drinking.

*Leland Dodge Coalition (Leland Neighborhood of Detroit)*

The coalition sponsored a 4-week Summer Prevention Camp for children ages 7-13. The focus of the camp was underage drinking prevention and empowering youth in the areas of resistance skill building. In August, the coalition conducted an Awakening Campaign that focused on middle school-aged youth but also send a positive alcohol-free message to the entire community. This campaign incorporated posters, banners, yard signs, and newsletters. On August 6, 2003, the coalition held a youth forum, which was also attended by members of the state and local governments. At the end of September, the coalition held a Safe Night to provide one evening where youth are off the streets and given a safe haven. The coalition was assisted by The Soldiers For Christ who provided presentations and entertainment.

*Shiawassee CYRS (Shiawassee County)*

The coalition coordinator attended the July, August, and September MCRUD Steering Committee meeting. The coalition coordinator and two youth members attended the National Leadership Conference in Atlanta, Georgia. In July, the coalition coordinator participated in the July advocacy training at Michigan State University. In September, the Perry CYRS published a back-to-school newsletter.