2014 Louisiana Caring Communities Youth Survey

Results for

Acadiana Area Human Service District (AAHSD), DHH Region 4

2014 Louisiana

Caring Communities Youth Survey

Sponsored by

Dr. Rochelle Head-Dunham, *Assistant Secretary/Medical Director, OBH, DHH*

John White, *State Superintendent of Education*

The LCCYS was conducted by

Cecil J. Picard Center for Child Development and Lifelong Learning, University of Louisiana at Lafayette

This report was created by

Bach Harrison, L.L.C.

Table of Contents

Introduction 4

The Risk and Protective Factor Model of Prevention 5

Data-Driven Strategic Planning: Risk and Protective Factor Model 6

Prevention Planning: Risk and Protective Factor Model 7

Prevention Planning: Strategic Prevention Framework (SPF) Model 7

Using CCYS Data for Prevention Planning 9

Understanding the Charts in this Report 10

Charts and Tables in this Report:

Drug Use Profiles 13

Gateway Drug Use, Other Illicit Drug Use, Severe Substance Use Indicators

Antisocial Behavior and Gambling Profiles 22

Risk and Protective Factor Profiles 30

Alcohol Environmental Risk Factors 40

Mental Health and Suicide Indicators 49

Additional Data for Prevention Planning 56

Violence and Bullying Indicators,
Perceived Perception of Risk, Parent/Peer Disapproval, and 30-Day Use

Risk and Protective Scale Definitions 58

Contacts for Prevention 60

Introduction

2014 Acadiana Area Human Service District (AAHSD), DHH Region 4 CCYS Summary

This report summarizes the findings from the 2014 Louisiana Caring Communities Youth Survey (CCYS), a survey of 6th, 8th, 10th, and 12th grade students conducted in the fall of 2014, completed January, 2015. The results for your DHH region are presented along with comparisons to the results for the state of Louisiana. In addition, the report contains important information about the content of the survey, and suggestions and guidelines on how to interpret and use the data for prevention planning.

The Louisiana CCYS was originally designed to assess students' involvement in a specific set of problem behaviors, as well as their exposure to a set of scientifically validated risk and protective factors identified in the Risk and Protective Factor Model of adolescent problem behaviors. These risk and protective factors have been shown to predict the likelihood of academic success, school dropout, substance abuse, violence, and delinquency among youth. As the substance abuse prevention field has evolved, the CCYS has been modified to measure additional substance abuse and other problem behavior variables to provide prevention professionals in Louisiana with important information for understanding their communities. Some examples of these additional variables include the percentage of youth who are in need for alcohol or drug treatment, measures of community norms around alcohol use, and bullying.

Tables 1 and 2 describe the characteristics of the students who completed the survey from your region and the state of Louisiana. A total of 577 schools across Louisiana participated in the survey. Since students are able to select more than one race or ethnicity, the sum of students of individual categories may exceed the total number of students surveyed. Because not all students answer all of the questions, the total count of students by gender (and less frequently, students by ethnicity) may be less than the reported total students.

Comparisons between the number of students completing the survey and the student enrollment in your community and the state are shown on Table 2. The total percentage of students completing the survey and the percentage from each grade are shown in the "Percent" column.

When using the information in this report, please pay attention to the number of students who participated from your community. If **60% or more** of the students participated, the report is a good indicator of the levels of substance use, risk, protection, and antisocial behavior. If fewer than 60% participated, consult with your local prevention coordinator or a survey professional before generalizing the results to the entire community.

Coordination and administration of the Louisiana CCYS was a collaborative effort of Department of Health and Hospitals, Office of Behavioral Health (OBH), Addictive Disorders Services; Regional Prevention Coordinators; Department of Education; Cecil J. Picard Center for Child Development and Lifelong Learning, University of Louisiana at Lafayette; and Bach Harrison, L.L.C. For more information about the CCYS or prevention services in Louisiana, please refer to the Contacts for Prevention section at the end of this report.

Table 1. Characteristics of Participants

	Region 2010		Region 2012		Region 2014		State 2014	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Grade								
6	5,411	32.6	5,086	32.3	3,760	28.9	27,132	29.3
8	4,908	29.6	4,495	28.5	3,594	27.6	26,389	28.5
10	3,530	21.3	3,621	23.0	3,211	24.7	22,363	24.1
12	2,729	16.5	2,548	16.2	2,442	18.8	16,721	18.1
Gender								
Male	7,606	46.9	7,292	47.6	6,018	47.2	43,481	48.1
Female	8,621	53.1	8,034	52.4	6,735	52.8	46,956	51.9
Ethnicity*								
African American	5,995	34.7	5,582	33.9	5,072	35.0	37,766	36.5
American Indian	414	2.4	468	2.8	489	3.4	4,017	3.9
Asian	372	2.2	468	2.8	362	2.5	2,483	2.4
Hispanic or Latino	609	3.5	676	4.1	582	4.0	5,865	5.7
Pacific Islander	131	0.8	239	1.5	138	1.0	918	0.9
White	9,146	53.0	8,503	51.6	7,338	50.7	48,196	46.6
Other	588	3.4	533	3.2	506	3.5	4,280	4.1

* Students were instructed to select one or more Ethnicity categories.

Table 2. Survey Completion Rate

	Region 2014			State 2014		
	Number Surveyed	Number Enrolled*	Percent	Number Surveyed	Number Enrolled*	Percent
Grade						
6	3,760	6,768	56.0	27,132	52,311	51.9
8	3,594	6,630	54.0	26,389	52,835	49.9
10	3,211	6,300	51.0	22,363	49,469	45.2
12	2,442	4,950	49.0	16,721	40,610	41.2
Total	13,007	24,648	53.0	92,605	195,225	47.4

* Rounded to within 10 students of actual enrollment to protect student privacy.

Table 1 provides demographic information for the survey participants in your community. Table 2 provides estimated enrollment and survey completion rate information for your community.

Please note that in order to be included in the charts and tables in this report, grades must meet a minimum cutoff of 20 participating students. However, data are presented in Tables 1 & 2 for all participating grades, even those grades surveyed that did not meet minimum cutoff criteria.

The Risk and Protective Factor Model of Prevention

Prevention is a science. The Risk and Protective Factor Model of Prevention is a proven way of reducing substance abuse and its related consequences. This model is based on the simple premise that to prevent a problem from happening, we need to identify the factors that increase the risk of that problem developing and then find ways to reduce the risks. Just as medical researchers have found risk factors for heart disease such as diets high in fat, lack of exercise, and smoking; a team of researchers at the University of Washington have defined a set of risk factors for youth problem behaviors.

Risk factors are characteristics of school, community and family environments, and of students and their peer groups known to predict increased likelihood of drug use, delinquency, school dropout, and violent behaviors among youth. For example, children who live in disorganized, crime-ridden neighborhoods are more likely to become involved in crime and drug use than children who live in safe neighborhoods.

The chart below shows the links between the 19 risk factors and six problem behaviors. The check marks indicate where at least two well designed, published research studies have shown a link between the risk factor and the problem behavior.

Protective factors exert a positive influence and buffer against the negative influence of risk, thus reducing the likelihood that adolescents will engage in problem behaviors. Protective factors identified through research include strong bonding to family, school, community, and peers; and healthy beliefs and clear standards for behavior. Protective bonding depends on three conditions:

1. **Opportunities** for young people to actively contribute
2. **Skills** to be able to successfully contribute
3. **Consistent recognition** or reinforcement for their efforts and accomplishments

Bonding confers a protective influence only when there is a positive climate in the bonded community. Peers and adults in these schools, families, and neighborhoods must communicate healthy values and set clear standards for behavior in order to ensure a protective effect. For example, strong bonds to antisocial peers would not be likely to reinforce positive behavior.

Research on risk and protective factors has important implications for children's academic success, positive youth development, and prevention of health and behavior problems. In order to promote academic success and positive youth development and to prevent problem behaviors, **it is necessary to address the factors that predict these outcomes**. By measuring risk and protective factors in a population, specific risk factors that are elevated and widespread can be identified and targeted by policies, programs, and actions shown to reduce those risk factors and to promote protective factors.

Each risk and protective factor can be linked to specific types of interventions that have been shown to be effective in either reducing risk(s) or enhancing protection(s). The steps outlined here will help planners make key decisions regarding allocation of resources, how and when to address specific needs, and which strategies are most effective and known to produce results.

In addition to helping assess current conditions and prioritize areas of greatest need, data from the Louisiana CCYS can be a powerful tool in applying for and complying with federal programs such as the Strategic Prevention Framework process.

Risk Factors

	Community						Family				School		Peer / Individual						
	Community Laws & Norms Favorable Toward Drug Use, Firearms & Crime	Availability of Drugs & Firearms	Transitions & Mobility	Low Neighborhood Attachment	Community Disorganization	Extreme Economic & Social Deprivation	Family History of the Problem Behavior	Family Conflict	Family Management Problems	Favorable Parent Attitudes & Involvement in the Problem Behavior	Academic Failure	Lack of Commitment to School	Early Initiation of Drug Use & Other Problem Behaviors	Early & Persistent Antisocial Behavior	Alienation & Rebelliousness	Friends Who Use Drugs & Engage in Problem Behaviors	Favorable Attitudes Toward Drug Use & Other Problem Behaviors	Gang Involvement	Constitutional Factors
Substance Abuse	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Depression & Anxiety			✓				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Delinquency	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Teen Pregnancy						✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓		
School Drop-Out			✓			✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
Violence	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓

Data-Driven Strategic Planning: Risk and Protective Factor Model

Why conduct the Louisiana Caring Communities Youth Survey? Data from the CCYS are important for building an understanding of the substance use priorities in your community, and can help your community develop a data driven strategic prevention plan to address the areas of greatest need. The Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (CSAP) has emphasized data driven strategic planning guidelines using the Risk and Protective Factor Model, and more recently, the Strategic Prevention Framework (SPF) Model through incentive grants provided to states. These two planning models share much in common and utilize many of the same planning steps and tasks. Specifically, both planning models advocate the collection and use of data to identify needs, resources and community capacity. Based on these data, communities can establish substance abuse prevention priorities to be addressed. Next, both models encourage the implementation of strategically chosen evidence-based programs and interventions to address the identified priorities. Finally, the two models promote the collection of evaluation data to ensure the desired outcomes are achieved. An overview of the basic planning steps and tasks for both the Risk and Protective Factor Model and SPF Model is provided below[1]

Step 1: Profile Population Needs, Resources, and Readiness to Address the Problems and Gaps in Service Delivery

- **Community Needs Assessment:** While planning prevention services, communities need to understand the factors that cause substance use and abuse in their community. Communities are urged to collect and use multiple data sources, including archival and social indicators, assessment of existing resources, key informant interviews, as well as survey data in order to establish prevention priorities for their community. CSAP encourages states to consider administering a survey to assess adolescent substance use, anti-social behavior, and many of the risk and protective factors that predict adolescent problem behaviors. The results of the CCYS (presented in this Profile Report and in results reported at the State level) are particularly useful in helping to identify the prevention needs in your community.
- **Community Resource Assessment:** It is likely that existing agencies and programs are already addressing some of the prioritized risk and protective factors. It is important to identify the assets and resources already available in the community and any gaps in services and capacity.
- **Community Readiness Assessment:** It is very important for states and communities to have the commitment and support of their members and ample resources to implement effective prevention efforts. Therefore, the readiness and capacity of communities and resources to act should also be assessed.

Step 2: Mobilize and/or Build Capacity to Address Needs: Engagement of key stakeholders at the State and community levels is critical to plan and implement successful prevention activities that will be sustained over time. Some of the key tasks to mobilize the state and communities are to work with leaders and stakeholders to build coalitions, provide training, leverage resources, and help sustain prevention activities.

Step 3: Develop a Comprehensive Strategic Plan: States and communities should develop a strategic plan that articulates not only a vision for the prevention activities, but also strategies for organizing and implementing prevention efforts. The strategic plan should be based on documented needs, build on identified resources/strengths, set measurable objectives, and identify how progress will be monitored. Plans should be adjusted with ongoing needs assessment and monitoring activities. The issue of sustainability should be kept in mind throughout each step of planning and implementation.

Step 4: Implement Evidence-based Prevention Programs and Infrastructure Development Activities: By understanding risk and protective factors in a population, as well as other causal factors at work in the community, prevention programs can be implemented that will reduce the most influential causes of substance abuse in your community. For example, if academic failure is identified as a prioritized risk factor in a community, then mentoring, tutoring, and increased opportunities and rewards for classroom participation can be provided to improve academic performance. After completing Steps 1, 2, and 3, communities will be able to choose prevention programs that fit the Strategic Framework of the community, match the population served, and are scientifically proven to work.

Step 5: Monitor Process, Evaluate Effectiveness, Sustain Effective Programs/Activities, and Improve or Replace Those That Fail: Finally, ongoing monitoring and evaluation are essential to determine if the outcomes desired are achieved and to assess program effectiveness, assess service delivery quality, identify successes, encourage needed improvement, and promote sustainability of effective policies, programs, and practices.

1 ADAPTED FROM CSAP'S STRATEGIC PREVENTION FRAMEWORK STATE INCENTIVE GRANTS REQUEST FOR APPLICATION (2010)

Prevention Planning: Risk and Protective Factor Model

For communities using the Risk and Protective Factor Model of prevention as their guide, the CCYS is an ideal source of information for planning purposes. Because the CCYS was specifically developed as a means for assessing the levels of risk and protective factors within the community, the data are particularly relevant to planning using this model.

When using the Risk and Protective Factor Framework for prevention planning, the focus is primarily on identifying the risk and protective factors that are the most problematic within your community and choosing evidence-based programs to address these priority risk and protective factors. In theory, by reducing areas of high risk and bolstering areas of low protection, substance abuse and other problem behaviors in youth can be reduced. An examination of the Risk Factor Profile and Protective Factor Profile charts provided in this report, will allow you to compare the relative levels of each risk (or protective) factor measured by the survey. In so doing, the data will reveal what risk and protective factors your community should pay most attention to, and which factors are relatively low priorities for prevention resources. Once problematic risk and protective factors have been identified, this information can be used in conjunction with information about the existing prevention resources, and community readiness, to identify the priority risk and priority factors that should be addressed with the prevention resources available to your community.

For more information about prevention planning using the Risk and Protective Factor Framework, contact the State Office of Behavioral Health (OBH), Addictive Disorders Services (see contacts section).

Prevention Planning: Strategic Prevention Framework (SPF) Model

The SPF Model of prevention planning is the most current planning model endorsed by CSAP. The SPF planning model, while differing in focus from the Risk and Protective Factor Model, is actually quite similar in regards to process. While the Risk and Protective Factor Model of prevention planning focuses on identifying prevention priorities based on areas of higher risk and lower protection as a means for ultimately reducing substance use and problem behaviors, the SPF Model has a broader focus. Within the SPF, it is important for prevention professionals to understand what substance use related consequences are problematic in the community (e.g., alcohol related motor vehicle crashes), what substance use patterns are associated with those consequences (e.g., binge drinking and drinking and driving), and what factors within the community cause these problematic substance use (consumption) patterns (e.g., community norms that accept binge drinking and/or drinking as driving as acceptable behavior). The CCYS is an important source of data for prevention professionals using the SPF Model, as it contains many pieces of information



Prevention Planning: SPF Model (cont'd)

regarding substance use and the causal factors that predict substance use. However, as a result of the broad focus of the SPF, it is highly recommended that prevention professionals using the SPF Model for prevention planning obtain other sources of data in addition to the CCYS in developing a strategic plan for their community. In particular, the CCYS has limited data regarding substance use consequences within the community, therefore prevention staff are encouraged to seek consequence related data from both local (e.g., local law enforcement) and state sources (e.g., the State Epidemiological Workgroup).

Among the CCYS data that prevention professionals are likely to find useful in their SPF needs assessment process are substance use trends among youth, and risk and protective factor data relevant to the substance use consequences and consumption patterns identified as problematic in the community. While not all of the risk and protective factors within the Risk and Protective Factor Model are likely to be relevant to your community's substance use consumption and consequence priorities, many likely will be useful for planning purposes. Prevention professionals should closely examine the risk and protective factor data available through CCYS to determine which are relevant to understanding the causal influences that lead to the specific substance use consequence priorities in their community.

Additionally, several items have been added to the CCYS to better identify causal factors related to problematic alcohol consumption because the Louisiana State SPF SIG Strategic Plan identified alcohol consumption and consequences as the highest priorities for the state overall. These additional items were added to the CCYS in order to aid those communities identified as alcohol problem hot spots through the state needs assessment process. However, given that alcohol is by far the most widely consumed substance across the entire state, these data should be helpful for other communities that experience high levels of alcohol use and consequences. Data for these items can be found in Table 10 of this report.

Using CCYS Data for Prevention Planning

What are the numbers telling you?

Review the charts and data tables presented in this report. Note your findings as you discuss the following questions.

- **Which 3-5 risk factors appear** to be higher than you would want when compared to the Bach Harrison Norm?
- **Which 3-5 protective factors** appear to be lower than you would want when compared to the Bach Harrison Norm?
- **Which levels of 30-day drug use** are increasing and/or unacceptably high? Which substances are your students using the most? At which grades do you see unacceptable usage levels?
- **Which antisocial behaviors** are increasing and/or unacceptably high? Which behaviors are your students exhibiting the most? At which grades do you see unacceptable behavior levels?

How to identify high priority problem areas

Once you have familiarized yourself with the data, you can begin to identify priorities.

- **Look across the charts** for items that stand out as either much higher or much lower than the others.
- **Compare your data** with statewide, and/or national data. Differences of 5% between local and other data are probably significant.
- **Prioritize problems for your area** according to the issues you've identified. Which can be realistically addressed with the funding available to your community? Which problems fit best with the prevention resources at hand?
- **Determine the standards and values** held within your community. For example: Is it acceptable in your community for a percentage of high school students to drink alcohol regularly as long as that percentage is lower than the overall state rate?

Use these data for planning.

Once priorities are established, use data to guide your prevention efforts.

- **Substance use and antisocial behavior data** are excellent tools to raise awareness about the problems and promote dialogue.
- **Risk and protective factor data** can be used to identify exactly where the community needs to take action.
- **Promising approaches** for any prevention goal are available for through resources listed on the last pages of this report. These contacts are a great resource for information about programs that have been proven effective in addressing the risk factors that are high in your community, and improving the protective factors that are low.

	Sample notes	Priority rate 1	Priority rate 2	Priority rate 3
Risk factors	8th grade Favorable Attitude to Drugs (Peer/Indiv. Scale) @14% (8% > BH Norm.)			
Protective factors	10th grade School rewards for prosocial involvement down 7% from 2 yrs ago			
Substance abuse	8th grade 30-day Marijuana @7% (3% above state av.)			
Antisocial behavior	12th grade - Drunk/high at school @ 5% (same as state, but still too high)			

Understanding the Charts in this Report

There are three major categories of data presented in this report, representing nine types of charts:

Drug use profiles:

1. Gateway drug use charts
2. Other illicit drug use charts
3. Severe substance use indicator charts

Antisocial behavior and gambling profiles:

4. Antisocial behavior (ASB) charts
5. Gambling charts

Risk and protective factors, alcohol environmental risk factors and mental health and suicide indicators:

6. Risk factor charts
7. Protective factor charts.
8. Alcohol environmental risk factor charts
9. Mental health and suicide charts

Drug Use Profiles

There are three types of use measured on the drug use charts.

- **Gateway drug use** measures lifetime and 30-day use rates for alcohol, tobacco, marijuana, and inhalants.
- **Other illicit drug use** measures lifetime and 30-day use rates for a variety of illicit drugs, including cocaine, heroin, and methamphetamine.
- **Severe substance use** indicators offer estimates of youth in need of alcohol and drug treatment, the percentage of youth indicating having been drunk or high at school, and youth indicating drinking alcohol and driving or reporting riding with a driver who had been drinking alcohol.

Antisocial Behavior and Gambling Profiles

- **Antisocial behavior (ASB)** profiles show the percentage of youth who reported antisocial behaviors, including suspension from school, selling illegal drugs, and attacking another person with the intention of doing them serious harm.
- **Gambling profiles** show the percentage of youth who gambled in the past year, and the specific types of gambling they engaged in.

Risk and Protective, Alcohol Environmental Risk and Mental Health Factors

- **Risk factor charts** show the percentage of youth who are considered "higher risk" across a variety of risk factor scales.
- **Protective factor charts** show the percentage of youth who are considered high in protection across a variety of protective factor scales.
- **Alcohol environmental risk factor charts** show alcohol availability in the community, and insights into community norms on alcohol related issues.
- **Mental health and suicide charts** show the percentage of youth with mental health treatment needs, currently using medication to manage mental health, and at risk for suicide.

Data corresponding to each of these categories are also presented in tabular format following each set of charts (tables 3 through 11).

Additional Tables in this Report

Additional data useful for prevention planning are found in Tables 12 and 13.

Table 12 contains prevention indicators from the CCYS relevant to the issues of violence, bullying and mental health.

Table 13 contains information required by communities with Drug Free Communities Grants, such as the perception of the risks of ATOD use, perception of parent and peer disapproval of ATOD use, and rates of past 30-day use for alcohol, tobacco, marijuana, and prescription drugs.

Understanding the Format of the Charts

There are several graphical elements common to all the charts. Understanding the format of the charts and what these elements represent is essential in interpreting the results of the 2014 CCYS survey.

- **The Bars** on substance use and antisocial behavior charts represent the percentage of students in that grade who reported a given behavior. The bars on the risk and protective factor charts represent the percentage of students whose answers reflect significant risk or protection in that category.

  Each set of differently colored bars represents one of the last three administrations of the CCYS: 2010, 2012, and 2014. By looking at the percentages over time, it is possible to identify trends in substance use and antisocial behavior. By studying the percentage of youth at risk and with protection over time, it is possible to determine whether the percentage of students at risk or with protection is increasing, decreasing, or staying the same. This information is important when deciding which risk and protective factors warrant attention.

Understanding the Charts in this Report (cont'd)

- **Dots and Diamonds** provide points of comparison to larger samples. The dots on the charts represent the percentage of all of the youth surveyed across Louisiana who reported substance use, problem behavior, elevated risk, or elevated protection.

  For the 2014 CCYS Survey, there were 92,605 participants in grades 6, 8, 10, and 12, out of 195,225 enrolled, a participation rate of 47.4%. The fact that over 90,000 students across the state participated in the CCYS make the state dot a good estimate of the rates of ATOD use and levels of risk and protective factors of youth in Louisiana. The survey results provide considerable information for communities to use in planning prevention services.

  The diamonds represent national data from either the Monitoring the Future (MTF) Survey or the Bach Harrison Norm. The Bach Harrison Norm was developed by Bach Harrison L.L.C. to provide states and communities with the ability to compare their results on risk, protection, and antisocial measures with more national measures. Survey participants from eight statewide surveys and five large regional surveys across the nation were combined into a database of approximately 460,000 students. The results were weighted to make the contribution of each state and region proportional to its share of the national population. Bach Harrison analysts then calculated rates for antisocial behavior and for students at risk and with protection. The results appear on the charts as BH Norm. In order to keep the Bach Harrison Norm relevant, it is updated approximately every two years as new data become available.

  A comparison to state-wide and national results provides additional information for your community in determining the relative importance of levels of alcohol, tobacco and other drug (ATOD) use, antisocial behavior, risk, and protection. Information about other students in the state and the nation can be helpful in determining the seriousness of a given level of problem behavior. Scanning across the charts, it is important to observe the factors that differ the most from the Bach Harrison Norm. This is the first step in identifying the levels of risk and protection that are higher or lower than those in other communities. The risk factors that are higher than the Bach Harrison Norm and the protective factors that are lower than the Bach Harrison Norm are probably the factors your community should consider addressing when planning prevention programs.

Drug Use Profiles

The charts and tables that follow present the substance use rates for your community for 6th, 8th, 10th and 12th grade students who completed the survey. The first set of substance use charts cover the **"Gateway Drugs"** most commonly used by youth (alcohol, tobacco, marijuana and inhalants). The second set of substance use charts include a variety of important, but less commonly used **illicit drugs** such as cocaine, heroin, methamphetamine, and prescription narcotics. Finally, the last set of substance use charts present indicators of **severe (or extremely dangerous) substance use,** including the youth in need of substance abuse treatment, the percentage indicating they used substances in school, and students involved in drinking and driving.

Each chart represents students from a single grade. The bars on each chart represent the percentage of students in the indicated sample (*e.g.* school, parish, or region) reporting substance use, and related behaviors or perceptions. The **dots** on the charts represent the same data for all students of that grade surveyed in the state of Louisiana. The **diamonds** represent national data included to allow a comparison of your data to a national sample of students, either the Monitoring the Future (MTF) Survey (*lifetime use and 30-day use*), or the Bach Harrison Norm (*heavy use and severe substance use*). The Bach Harrison Norm is available for grades 6 through 12 while MTF only surveys grades 8, 10, and 12.

A comparison to state and national results provides additional information for your community in determining the relative importance of levels of ATOD use. Information about other students in the region and the nation can be helpful in determining the seriousness of a given level of problem behavior. Scanning across the charts will help you gain a better understanding of the substance use (consumption) issues affecting your community.

The following definitions and descriptions provide information for the substance use and severe substance use charts that follow.

- **Lifetime use** is a measure of the percentage of students who tried the particular substance at least once in their lifetime and is used to show the percentage of students who have had experience with a particular substance.
- **30-day use** is a measure of the percentage of students who used the substance at least once in the 30 days prior to taking the survey and is a more sensitive indicator of the level of current use of the substance.
- **Heavy use** includes binge drinking (having five or more drinks in a row during the two weeks prior to the survey) and smoking one-half a pack or more of cigarettes per day.
- **Severe Substance Use** indicators include student responses regarding drinking alcohol and driving, riding with a drinking driver, being drunk or high at school, and the need for substance abuse treatment (alcohol, drug, and the total in need of any treatment -alcohol or drug).

The need for treatment is defined as students who have used alcohol or drugs on 10 or more occasions in their lifetime and marked at least three of the following items specific to their drug or alcohol use in the past year:

- *Spent more time using than intended;*
- *Neglected some of your usual responsibilities because of use*
- *Wanted to cut down on use*
- *Others objected to your use*
- *Frequently thought about using*
- *Used alcohol or drugs to relieve feelings such as sadness, anger, or boredom*

Students could mark whether these items related to their drug use and/or their alcohol use.

GATEWAY DRUG USE PROFILE
2014 Acadiana Area Human Service District (AAHSD), DHH Region 4, Grade 6



OTHER ILLICIT DRUG USE PROFILE
2014 Acadiana Area Human Service District (AAHSD), DHH Region 4, Grade 6



* Monitoring the Future does not survey 6th graders and has no equivalent for 'Other Stimulants,' 'Sedatives,' or 'Prescription Narcotics.'

GATEWAY DRUG USE PROFILE
2014 Acadiana Area Human Service District (AAHSD), DHH Region 4, Grade 8



OTHER ILLICIT DRUG USE PROFILE
2014 Acadiana Area Human Service District (AAHSD), DHH Region 4, Grade 8



* Monitoring the Future does not survey 6th graders and has no equivalent for 'Other Stimulants,' 'Sedatives,' or 'Prescription Narcotics.'

GATEWAY DRUG USE PROFILE
2014 Acadiana Area Human Service District (AAHSD), DHH Region 4, Grade 10



OTHER ILLICIT DRUG USE PROFILE
2014 Acadiana Area Human Service District (AAHSD), DHH Region 4, Grade 10



* Monitoring the Future does not survey 6th graders and has no equivalent for 'Other Stimulants,' 'Sedatives,' or 'Prescription Narcotics.'

GATEWAY DRUG USE PROFILE
2014 Acadiana Area Human Service District (AAHSD), DHH Region 4, Grade 12



OTHER ILLICIT DRUG USE PROFILE
2014 Acadiana Area Human Service District (AAHSD), DHH Region 4, Grade 12



* Monitoring the Future does not survey 6th graders and has no equivalent for 'Other Stimulants,' 'Sedatives,' or 'Prescription Narcotics.'

Table 3. Percentage of Students Who Used Gateway Drugs

On how many occasions (if any) have you... (One or more occasions)		Grade 6					Grade 8					Grade 10					Grade 12				
		Region 2010	Region 2012	Region 2014	State 2014	MTF 2014	Region 2010	Region 2012	Region 2014	State 2014	MTF 2014	Region 2010	Region 2012	Region 2014	State 2014	MTF 2014	Region 2010	Region 2012	Region 2014	State 2014	MTF 2014
Lifetime Alcohol	had alcoholic beverages (beer, wine or hard liquor) to drink in your lifetime -- more than just a few sips?	26.9	21.9	19.5	16.5	n/a	51.8	46.8	42.6	36.4	26.8	71.8	67.8	63.8	56.0	49.3	80.3	77.9	73.3	66.1	66.0
Past 30 Day Alcohol	had beer, wine, or liquor to drink during the past 30 days?	10.3	8.6	7.3	5.7	n/a	26.7	22.7	21.6	16.4	9.0	41.0	40.8	36.7	30.7	23.5	54.5	55.7	49.7	42.4	37.4
Binge Drinking	How many times have you had 5 or more alcoholic drinks in a row in the past 2 weeks? (One or more times)	6.1	4.9	4.6	3.2	n/a	13.8	10.8	11.5	8.8	4.1	22.5	21.4	20.3	16.8	12.6	32.3	31.0	28.1	24.0	19.4
Lifetime Cigarettes	Have you ever smoked cigarettes?	11.8	10.4	8.5	7.1	n/a	27.6	23.4	23.0	19.2	13.5	39.3	35.4	33.2	27.7	22.6	49.4	44.5	40.9	34.8	34.4
Past 30 Day Cigarettes	How frequently have you smoked cigarettes during the past 30 days?	2.9	2.5	2.0	1.5	n/a	8.6	6.9	7.6	5.5	4.0	14.8	14.3	13.5	9.7	7.2	25.3	21.9	20.1	15.8	13.6
1/2 Pack of Cigarettes/Day	During the past 30 days, how many cigarettes did you smoke per day? (About one-half pack a day or more)	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.3	n/a	1.2	1.0	0.8	0.9	0.5	3.4	2.3	2.3	1.8	1.2	7.2	6.0	4.8	4.2	2.6
Lifetime Chew ing Tobacco	used smokeless tobacco (chew, snuff, plug, dipping tobacco, chewing tobacco) in your lifetime?	4.8	4.4	4.3	4.0	n/a	11.3	9.4	10.9	9.8	8.0	13.7	15.2	15.2	13.7	13.6	19.0	16.4	17.9	16.1	15.1
Past 30 Day Chew ing Tobacco	used smokeless tobacco (chew, snuff, plug, dipping tobacco, chewing tobacco) during the past 30 days?	1.8	1.5	1.5	1.4	n/a	5.5	4.7	5.5	5.1	3.0	6.8	8.3	8.2	7.2	5.3	10.3	8.9	10.2	8.5	8.4
Lifetime Marijuana	have you used marijuana in your lifetime?	1.9	1.9	1.8	1.5	n/a	10.9	9.8	10.3	8.9	15.6	22.9	24.5	23.4	21.4	33.7	32.9	34.2	35.0	31.5	44.4
Past 30 Day Marijuana	have you used marijuana during the past 30 days?	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.7	n/a	5.4	4.7	5.3	4.1	6.5	11.5	12.3	11.6	10.5	16.6	15.8	16.9	18.0	16.4	21.2
Lifetime Inhalants	sniffed glue, breathed the contents of an aerosol spray can, or inhaled other gases or sprays, in order to get high in your lifetime?	7.2	7.1	5.0	4.9	n/a	10.5	9.1	9.6	9.1	10.8	8.7	5.7	5.9	7.1	8.7	5.6	4.6	3.9	4.8	6.5
Past 30 Day Inhalants	sniffed glue, breathed the contents of an aerosol spray can, or inhaled other gases or sprays, in order to get high during the past 30 days?	2.5	3.0	2.3	2.1	n/a	4.0	3.2	3.4	3.3	2.2	2.0	1.5	1.5	1.8	1.1	1.1	0.6	0.7	0.9	0.7

* Monitoring the Future does not survey 6th graders.

Table 4. Percentage of Students Who Used Other Illicit Drugs

On how many occasions (if any) have you... (One or more occasions)		Grade 6					Grade 8					Grade 10					Grade 12				
		Region 2010	Region 2012	Region 2014	State 2014	MTF 2014	Region 2010	Region 2012	Region 2014	State 2014	MTF 2014	Region 2010	Region 2012	Region 2014	State 2014	MTF 2014	Region 2010	Region 2012	Region 2014	State 2014	MTF 2014
Lifetime Hallucinogens	used LSD or other hallucinogens in your lifetime?	0.5	0.3	0.5	0.4	n/a	1.0	1.0	1.3	0.9	2.0	2.6	2.3	2.4	2.3	5.0	3.5	3.7	4.4	3.7	6.3
Past 30 Day Hallucinogens	used LSD or other hallucinogens during the past 30 days?	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	n/a	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.5	0.9	0.6	0.7	0.8	1.2	0.9	1.1	1.3	1.2	1.5
Lifetime Cocaine	used cocaine or crack in your lifetime?	0.6	0.4	0.4	0.4	n/a	1.1	0.9	1.1	1.0	1.8	1.6	1.5	1.3	1.3	2.6	2.9	2.0	2.4	2.2	4.6
Past 30 Day Cocaine	used cocaine or crack during the past 30 days?	0.3	0.2	0.0	0.2	n/a	0.5	0.4	0.7	0.5	0.5	0.7	0.7	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.6	0.7	1.0
Lifetime Methamphetamines	used methamphetamines (meth, crystal, crank) in your lifetime?	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.2	n/a	1.0	0.8	0.7	0.6	1.0	1.6	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.4	2.2	1.5	1.2	1.3	1.9
Past 30 Day Methamphetamines	used methamphetamines (meth, crystal, crank) during the past 30 days?	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.1	n/a	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.7	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.7	0.7	0.4	0.5	0.5
Lifetime Other Stimulants*	used stimulants other than methamphetamines (such as Ritalin, Adderall, or Dexedrine) without a doctor telling you to take them in your lifetime?	1.1	0.5	0.5	0.5	n/a	1.9	1.4	1.1	0.9	6.7	3.6	2.4	2.4	2.1	10.6	5.5	4.0	3.9	3.2	12.1
Past 30 Day Other Stimulants*	used stimulants other than methamphetamines (such as Ritalin, Adderall, or Dexedrine) without a doctor telling you to take them during the past 30 days?	0.4	0.2	0.1	0.2	n/a	1.0	0.6	0.5	0.5	2.1	1.5	1.0	1.1	0.9	3.7	2.0	1.3	1.8	1.3	3.8
Lifetime Sedatives*	used sedatives (tranquilizers, such as Valium or Xanax, barbiturates, or sleeping pills) without a doctor telling you to take them in your lifetime?	3.6	3.0	2.3	3.0	n/a	6.7	5.3	5.2	5.0	n/a	9.0	8.2	7.0	7.0	n/a	10.4	8.8	8.0	8.0	6.8
Past 30 Day Sedatives*	used sedatives (tranquilizers, such as Valium or Xanax, barbiturates, or sleeping pills) without a doctor telling you to take them during the past 30 days?	1.8	1.1	0.9	1.3	n/a	3.0	2.4	2.1	2.3	n/a	4.0	3.9	3.3	3.3	n/a	4.3	3.6	2.7	3.4	2.0
Lifetime Heroin	used heroin or other opiates in your lifetime?	0.4	0.2	0.3	0.2	n/a	0.7	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.9	0.7	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.9	0.9	0.8	1.1	1.0	1.0
Past 30 Day Heroin	used heroin or other opiates during the past 30 days?	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.1	n/a	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4
Lifetime Prescription Narcotics*	used narcotic drugs (such as OxyContin, methadone, morphine, codine, Demerol, Vicodin, Percocet) without a doctor telling you to take them in your lifetime?	1.1	0.5	0.3	0.6	n/a	3.0	2.0	1.7	1.8	n/a	6.5	4.1	4.3	4.2	n/a	8.2	5.5	6.2	6.4	n/a
Past 30 Day Prescription Narcotics*	used narcotic drugs (such as OxyContin, methadone, morphine, codine, Demerol, Vicodin, Percocet) without a doctor telling you to take them during the past 30 days?	0.5	0.2	0.1	0.2	n/a	1.4	0.9	0.8	0.8	n/a	2.6	1.5	1.8	1.8	n/a	3.0	2.5	2.0	2.4	n/a
Lifetime Ecstasy	used Ecstasy ('X', 'E', or MDMA) in your lifetime?	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	n/a	1.4	1.0	0.7	0.7	1.4	3.0	2.0	1.4	1.7	3.7	5.3	3.2	2.7	2.8	5.6
Past 30 Day Ecstasy	used Ecstasy ('X', 'E', or MDMA) during the past 30 days?	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	n/a	0.6	0.4	0.2	0.3	0.4	1.0	0.7	0.4	0.6	0.8	1.2	0.8	1.1	1.0	1.4

* Monitoring the Future does not survey 6th graders and has no equivalent for 'Other Stimulants,' 'Sedatives,' or 'Prescription Narcotics.'

SEVERE SUBSTANCE USE INDICATORS
2014 Acadiana Area Human Service District (AAHSD), DHH Region 4, Grade 6



SEVERE SUBSTANCE USE INDICATORS
2014 Acadiana Area Human Service District (AAHSD), DHH Region 4, Grade 8



SEVERE SUBSTANCE USE INDICATORS
2014 Acadiana Area Human Service District (AAHSD), DHH Region 4, Grade 10



SEVERE SUBSTANCE USE INDICATORS
2014 Acadiana Area Human Service District (AAHSD), DHH Region 4, Grade 12



Drug Use Profiles

Table 5. Severe Substance Use Indicators

		Grade 6					Grade 8					Grade 10					Grade 12				
		Region 2010	Region 2012	Region 2014	State 2014	BH Norm	Region 2010	Region 2012	Region 2014	State 2014	BH Norm	Region 2010	Region 2012	Region 2014	State 2014	BH Norm	Region 2010	Region 2012	Region 2014	State 2014	BH Norm
Needs Alcohol Treatment	Answered 'Yes' to at least 3 alcohol treatment questions and has used alcohol on 10 or more occasions	0.9	0.5	0.3	0.3	n/a	3.3	2.8	2.4	1.8	n/a	7.2	6.6	5.6	4.9	n/a	10.9	9.3	6.8	6.7	n/a
Needs Drug Treatment	Answered 'Yes' to at least 3 drug treatment questions and has used alcohol on 10 or more occasions	0.4	0.2	0.3	0.2	n/a	1.9	1.7	2.1	1.5	n/a	5.1	4.7	4.4	4.0	n/a	6.2	5.4	6.0	6.0	n/a
Needs Alcohol or Drug Treatment	Needs alcohol and/or drug treatment	1.2	0.7	0.5	0.4	n/a	4.8	4.1	3.4	2.6	n/a	10.9	10.2	8.0	7.2	n/a	15.1	13.2	10.6	10.1	n/a
Been Drunk or High at School	How many times in the past year have you been drunk or high at school?	3.1	2.9	2.2	2.1	2.3	8.6	7.8	7.8	7.0	7.8	13.5	12.8	13.5	12.4	14.7	15.6	15.8	18.0	15.3	17.3
Drinking and Driving	During the past 30 days, how many times did you DRIVE a car or other vehicle when you had been drinking alcohol?	3.2	2.5	2.4	2.6	3.6	4.9	4.1	4.2	4.2	5.6	7.4	5.9	5.2	4.9	5.3	19.2	14.9	13.8	11.1	11.8
Riding w ith a Drinking Driver	During the past 30 days, how many times did you RIDE in a car or other vehicle driven by someone who had been drinking alcohol?	30.1	26.2	24.4	19.2	17.1	36.2	33.6	31.0	24.5	22.3	40.8	34.8	35.4	26.9	24.0	38.5	35.8	32.1	25.5	24.1

Antisocial Behavior and Gambling Profiles

The charts and tables that follow present the rates of a variety of antisocial behaviors, as well as gambling behavior among youth in your community who completed the survey. The first set of charts in this section present the percentage of youth who reported engaging in several forms of **antisocial behavior** (e.g., attacked someone with the idea of seriously hurting them, stolen a vehicle) or related consequences (e.g., been suspended from school, been arrested). The second set of charts in this section highlight the percentage of youth who indicated engaging in a variety of **gambling behaviors**. Rates of both antisocial behavior and gambling reflect reported behavior in the past year.

As with the substance use profile charts presented earlier, the **bars** on the following charts represent the percentage of students in that grade who reported the behavior, while the **dots** on the charts represent the percentage of all of the youth surveyed in Louisiana who reported the problem behavior. The **diamonds** represent national data from the Bach Harrison Norm and allow a comparison of your antisocial and gambling behavior data to a national sample of students.

A comparison to state and national results provides additional information for your community in determining the relative importance of levels of antisocial and gambling behavior. Information about other students in the region and the nation can be helpful in determining the seriousness of a given level of problem behavior. Scanning across the charts will help you gain a better understanding of the issues affecting your community.

The following definitions and descriptions provide information for the substance use and severe substance use charts that follow.

- **Antisocial behavior (ASB)** is a measure of the percentage of students who report any involvement with the eight antisocial behaviors listed in the charts during the past year. In the charts, antisocial behavior is referred to as ASB.
- **Gambling behavior** charts show the percentage of students who engaged in each of the 10 types of gambling along with the percentage for any gambling behavior during the past year.

Antisocial Behavior and Gambling Profiles

ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIOR PROFILE
2014 Acadiana Area Human Service District (AAHSD), DHH Region 4, Grade 6



GAMBLING PROFILE
2014 Acadiana Area Human Service District (AAHSD), DHH Region 4, Grade 6



Antisocial Behavior and Gambling Profiles

ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIOR PROFILE
2014 Acadiana Area Human Service District (AAHSD), DHH Region 4, Grade 8



GAMBLING PROFILE
2014 Acadiana Area Human Service District (AAHSD), DHH Region 4, Grade 8



ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIOR PROFILE
2014 Acadiana Area Human Service District (AAHSD), DHH Region 4, Grade 10



GAMBLING PROFILE
2014 Acadiana Area Human Service District (AAHSD), DHH Region 4, Grade 10



ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIOR PROFILE
2014 Acadiana Area Human Service District (AAHSD), DHH Region 4, Grade 12



GAMBLING PROFILE
2014 Acadiana Area Human Service District (AAHSD), DHH Region 4, Grade 12



Antisocial Behavior and Gambling Profiles

Table 6. Percentage of Students With Antisocial Behavior

How many times in the past year (12 months) have you: (One or more times)	Grade 6					Grade 8					Grade 10					Grade 12				
	Region 2010	Region 2012	Region 2014	State 2014	BH Norm	Region 2010	Region 2012	Region 2014	State 2014	BH Norm	Region 2010	Region 2012	Region 2014	State 2014	BH Norm	Region 2010	Region 2012	Region 2014	State 2014	BH Norm
Been Suspended from School	18.0	19.5	19.9	16.2	9.2	21.9	20.9	22.1	20.9	13.4	16.7	15.0	14.9	16.0	11.2	12.5	11.4	12.5	12.0	8.5
Been Drunk or High at School	3.1	2.9	2.2	2.1	2.3	8.6	7.8	7.8	7.0	7.8	13.5	12.8	13.5	12.4	14.7	15.6	15.8	18.0	15.3	17.3
Sold Illegal Drugs	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	2.8	2.7	2.8	2.5	3.1	5.4	5.1	4.8	4.9	7.2	7.0	5.0	7.5	6.3	8.6
Stolen or Tried to Steal a Motor Vehicle	1.9	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.2	2.8	2.2	1.9	2.3	2.2	3.1	2.6	2.8	2.7	2.7	2.3	1.6	2.3	2.4	2.0
Been Arrested	4.0	4.0	3.5	2.9	2.1	6.9	6.7	5.6	5.7	4.8	7.4	6.9	5.6	5.8	6.0	7.0	4.9	5.8	5.4	5.8
Attacked Someone with the Idea of Seriously Hurting Them	16.7	14.0	14.0	12.8	10.2	19.0	16.8	16.2	16.6	12.9	17.5	13.5	14.5	14.4	11.8	13.9	11.0	12.0	11.2	9.6
Carried a Handgun	5.2	5.8	7.6	6.0	4.4	6.2	6.4	7.1	7.5	5.4	5.4	5.2	6.1	7.0	5.5	5.5	5.2	6.5	7.0	5.5
Carried a Handgun to School	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.6	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.1	0.9	0.8	1.1	1.0	1.4	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.6	1.7	1.2

Table 7. Gambling Behavior

How often have you done the following for money, posessions or anything of value:	Grade 6					Grade 8					Grade 10					Grade 12				
	Region 2010	Region 2012	Region 2014	State 2014	BH Norm	Region 2010	Region 2012	Region 2014	State 2014	BH Norm	Region 2010	Region 2012	Region 2014	State 2014	BH Norm	Region 2010	Region 2012	Region 2014	State 2014	BH Norm
gambled at a casino?	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.7	5.1	1.2	1.2	1.0	1.1	6.8	1.1	1.3	1.6	1.5	7.7	1.3	1.4	1.5	2.0	9.3
played the lottery or lottery scratch-off tickets?	19.0	20.5	18.3	14.9	15.6	18.8	20.1	20.9	16.4	19.1	16.7	17.6	17.7	14.1	18.3	13.1	15.8	13.3	11.6	20.8
bet on sporting events?	21.0	21.7	18.7	17.1	16.4	24.8	21.9	21.5	19.7	23.4	21.0	21.7	17.7	18.3	23.0	19.7	16.6	16.5	15.5	21.6
played cards for money?	17.4	14.4	12.2	8.1	13.3	25.6	19.4	17.4	12.8	25.0	25.0	20.0	16.7	13.7	24.7	24.0	20.7	16.3	12.8	24.7
bet money on horse races?	7.4	6.0	5.8	3.2	5.4	7.0	6.0	5.8	3.2	5.8	5.8	5.9	5.7	3.2	5.5	5.9	5.5	4.3	3.0	5.2
played bingo for money or prizes?	32.9	28.0	25.2	20.2	22.4	29.9	27.8	24.5	19.4	20.8	22.8	19.5	19.3	15.5	15.9	17.7	15.6	14.7	11.7	11.8
gambled on the internet?	3.7	2.9	2.3	2.0	3.0	3.8	3.4	3.2	2.6	4.1	2.9	2.4	2.8	2.8	4.1	3.0	2.1	2.5	2.6	4.1
bet on dice games such as craps?	4.6	3.8	3.3	2.4	5.0	8.0	5.8	5.5	4.5	14.3	7.9	5.8	4.8	5.1	12.5	7.5	5.1	6.1	5.4	11.1
bet on games of personal skill such as pool, darts or bowling?	16.2	15.3	13.8	12.4	14.2	16.6	15.5	14.6	13.3	19.6	14.1	13.4	12.3	12.6	18.4	14.4	11.0	11.0	10.7	16.9
bet on video poker or other gambling machines?	2.3	2.2	2.1	1.8	2.6	2.6	2.7	1.9	2.0	4.2	1.9	1.6	2.0	2.1	4.0	1.6	1.8	1.9	2.2	4.5
Total Gambling																				
Any gambing in the past year	53.6	51.1	46.3	40.6	34.2	57.1	54.1	50.5	44.1	45.5	51.2	48.3	45.1	40.8	43.8	47.0	43.9	38.9	34.4	43.8

Risk and Protective Factor & Alcohol Environmental Risk Factor Profiles

The charts and tables that follow are intended to provide prevention professionals with data that are helpful in understanding the predictors and causes of substance use in your community. Data in the risk and protective factor profiles will provide you with an overview of the levels of risk and protection in your community. The Alcohol Environmental Risk Factors charts present data relevant to several community domain variables associated with increased alcohol consumption.

Risk and Protective Factor Profiles

The risk and protective factor charts show the percentage of students at risk and with protection for each of the risk and protective factor scales. The risk and protective factor scales measure specific aspects of a youth's life experience that are predictive of whether he/she will engage in problem behaviors. Higher risk and lower protection predict a greater likelihood that a youth with engage in problem behaviors, while lower risk and higher protection predict a greater likelihood that youth will not engage in problem behaviors.

The factors are grouped into four domains: community, *family, school,* and *peer/individual*. Brief definitions of the risk and protective factors scales are provided in Table 13 at the end of this report. For more information about risk and protective factors, please refer to the resources listed on the last page of this report under *Contacts for Prevention*.

Consistent with the other charts in this report the **bars** represent your community's levels of risk and protection, the **dots** represent the Louisiana state average, and the **diamonds** represent a national comparison through the Bach Harrison norm, where available. Scanning across the charts, it is important to observe the factors that differ the most from the Bach Harrison Norm. This is the first step in identifying the levels of risk and protection that are higher or lower than those in other communities. The risk factors that are higher than the Bach Harrison Norm and the protective factors are lower than the Bach Harrison Norm are probably the factors that your community should consider addressing when planning prevention programs. By looking at the percentage of youth at risk and with protection over time, it is possible to determine whether the percentage of students at risk or with protection is increasing, decreasing, or staying the same. This information is important when deciding which risk and protective factors warrant attention.

Alcohol Environmental Risk Factor Profiles

The Alcohol Environmental Risk Factors profiles include the percentage of students who obtained alcohol from specific sources and survey data gathered to shed light on the community norms about alcohol use. Percentages for the sources of alcohol are based upon only those students who reported having used alcohol in the past year. (Sample sizes are noted in the chart legend.)

Student perceptions of community norms are drawn from all students surveyed, regardless of whether they reported any alcohol use.

RISK PROFILE
2014 Acadiana Area Human Service District (AAHSD), DHH Region 4, Grade 6



PROTECTIVE PROFILE
2014 Acadiana Area Human Service District (AAHSD), DHH Region 4, Grade 6



RISK PROFILE
2014 Acadiana Area Human Service District (AAHSD), DHH Region 4, Grade 8



PROTECTIVE PROFILE
2014 Acadiana Area Human Service District (AAHSD), DHH Region 4, Grade 8



RISK PROFILE
2014 Acadiana Area Human Service District (AAHSD), DHH Region 4, Grade 10



PROTECTIVE PROFILE
2014 Acadiana Area Human Service District (AAHSD), DHH Region 4, Grade 10



RISK PROFILE
2014 Acadiana Area Human Service District (AAHSD), DHH Region 4, Grade 12



PROTECTIVE PROFILE
2014 Acadiana Area Human Service District (AAHSD), DHH Region 4, Grade 12



Risk and Protective Factor Profiles

Table 8. Percentage of Students Reporting Risk

Risk Factor	Grade 6					Grade 8					Grade 10					Grade 12				
	Region 2010	Region 2012	Region 2014	State 2014	BH Norm	Region 2010	Region 2012	Region 2014	State 2014	BH Norm	Region 2010	Region 2012	Region 2014	State 2014	BH Norm	Region 2010	Region 2012	Region 2014	State 2014	BH Norm
Community Domain																				
Laws & Norms Favor Drug Use	41.5	41.3	38.9	38.7	38.8	45.6	42.4	42.3	39.4	40.0	44.7	43.1	42.3	39.4	42.3	52.7	52.7	53.3	48.6	48.1
Perceived Availability of Drugs	41.1	40.8	34.7	35.9	45.3	34.8	33.3	32.4	28.3	36.9	34.4	33.7	33.1	28.5	38.6	39.5	36.3	33.9	32.2	41.0
Perceived Availability of Handguns	26.5	27.6	26.0	25.9	26.3	37.3	38.7	39.4	38.0	36.7	26.0	24.4	24.7	25.8	23.7	29.8	26.3	27.3	28.7	27.6
Family Domain																				
Poor Family Management	50.6	51.1	49.3	48.4	48.1	42.4	40.5	38.5	38.2	40.4	38.4	37.1	36.8	35.4	40.0	40.1	38.2	39.1	36.5	41.2
Family Conflict	44.8	42.9	40.8	39.2	38.9	40.4	35.1	34.9	33.9	35.3	46.1	42.0	41.4	40.5	39.9	41.1	40.8	39.4	38.5	38.0
Family History of Antisocial Behavior	52.3	45.8	43.4	38.2	37.8	47.0	42.5	43.0	36.2	35.4	51.6	46.7	45.5	40.1	40.2	50.8	48.7	45.8	40.7	42.7
Parent Attitudes Favorable to ASB	39.1	34.8	32.1	31.5	37.7	48.1	42.0	40.8	40.0	49.1	50.7	44.7	43.1	41.7	53.5	47.6	42.9	41.3	39.4	52.9
Parent Attitudes Favor Drug Use	16.2	13.5	12.9	11.7	11.4	33.5	27.3	25.7	22.8	23.7	49.7	45.1	41.5	36.1	39.6	49.5	44.3	42.4	37.0	40.3
School Domain																				
Academic Failure	44.9	46.0	50.6	43.9	32.1	49.9	50.2	51.4	46.7	37.2	47.1	45.1	44.3	43.3	39.8	40.9	41.6	40.9	40.1	37.9
Low Commitment to School	45.1	47.7	48.1	46.6	42.8	43.9	46.2	50.1	48.5	45.1	39.2	44.4	47.6	46.1	41.1	42.6	46.8	50.4	49.4	42.1
Peer And Individual Domain																				
Early Initiation of ASB	35.9	35.5	37.1	31.8	23.8	47.3	43.0	44.4	43.2	32.2	48.5	44.6	44.0	44.0	34.2	47.9	43.5	43.3	42.9	34.2
Early Initiation of Drug Use	33.7	29.5	25.7	23.2	23.4	42.8	38.4	35.5	31.9	31.9	42.1	38.4	36.5	31.6	32.8	45.7	40.3	39.2	35.3	38.0
Attitudes Favorable to ASB	42.8	42.8	39.0	38.8	40.0	33.2	29.1	28.3	29.3	34.7	36.6	33.7	32.9	33.8	40.8	32.8	29.6	30.8	31.3	39.0
Attitudes Favorable to Drug Use	23.5	22.6	19.7	18.1	18.9	36.9	33.8	34.0	31.1	33.0	45.5	46.5	44.7	42.0	45.2	43.8	46.2	45.8	42.1	46.9
Perceived Risk of Drug Use	56.4	55.3	52.9	52.6	44.5	45.6	47.4	48.0	48.8	37.9	52.0	59.8	59.8	60.3	51.9	42.7	52.1	55.9	55.8	47.4
Interaction with Antisocial Peers	51.5	51.2	55.2	49.3	33.6	41.9	38.6	40.5	39.5	30.0	39.5	37.5	37.4	36.3	31.3	32.4	31.3	34.8	33.3	29.6
Friend's Use of Drugs	24.8	21.7	20.7	19.1	19.7	43.2	37.6	35.7	33.6	39.2	41.1	41.8	39.4	32.9	40.4	38.1	35.7	35.9	31.2	38.5
Rewards for ASB	29.7	27.6	25.4	23.9	24.5	33.7	32.2	32.4	29.7	31.9	42.2	45.7	43.9	39.5	42.1	47.0	46.0	46.3	43.8	46.6
Depressive Symptoms	34.8	30.7	29.4	28.0	30.3	41.0	35.2	38.7	35.0	34.8	44.2	36.6	41.5	37.4	37.8	36.4	32.6	33.7	32.4	33.4
Gang Involvement	12.2	11.0	10.0	9.5	5.6	11.8	9.1	10.1	9.9	6.9	8.0	6.8	6.1	7.5	5.9	6.3	4.9	5.7	6.5	5.2

Table 9. Percentage of Students Reporting Protection

Protective Factor	Grade 6					Grade 8					Grade 10					Grade 12				
	Region 2010	Region 2012	Region 2014	State 2014	BH Norm	Region 2010	Region 2012	Region 2014	State 2014	BH Norm	Region 2010	Region 2012	Region 2014	State 2014	BH Norm	Region 2010	Region 2012	Region 2014	State 2014	BH Norm
School Domain																				
Opportunities for Prosocial Involvement	53.9	51.8	53.4	55.7	59.5	63.6	64.5	63.9	64.2	65.6	64.7	62.6	62.9	62.4	66.0	61.5	60.5	60.8	61.3	67.7
Rewards for Prosocial Involvement	52.1	53.5	55.7	52.4	56.9	54.2	52.7	52.7	53.3	56.9	61.6	55.7	57.1	58.9	63.4	44.3	41.2	41.9	43.9	52.4
Peer And Individual Domain																				
Belief in the Moral Order	58.3	59.8	61.2	61.3	62.9	63.7	67.3	67.8	68.5	65.8	54.6	56.8	57.0	57.0	54.6	55.4	58.2	57.6	56.3	55.6
Religiosity	41.1	41.6	40.8	45.2	40.9	56.7	56.4	57.1	60.1	53.7	55.1	56.2	55.8	57.9	48.4	51.3	49.4	49.5	53.4	42.9
Interaction with Prosocial Peers	54.3	54.0	54.6	56.5	57.0	59.7	60.5	59.5	60.9	59.6	60.3	56.0	56.4	57.0	59.9	57.7	53.1	51.4	53.0	57.2
Prosocial Involvement	55.8	57.6	57.8	58.6	57.7	50.5	53.4	54.8	56.6	58.1	49.2	51.4	51.4	53.2	58.2	50.7	47.3	46.8	49.9	58.9
Rewards for Prosocial Involvement	51.7	53.7	58.0	56.4	48.4	56.7	59.7	61.4	60.4	50.9	63.9	61.1	63.5	62.7	59.9	63.3	60.9	59.6	62.0	63.0

ALCOHOL ENVIRONMENTAL RISK FACTORS*
2014 Acadiana Area Human Service District (AAHSD), DHH Region 4, Grade 6



* Students were initially asked if they drank alcohol in the past year. Students marking "no" were instructed to skip the question regarding sources of obtaining alcohol.
Sample size represents the number of youth who chose at least one source of obtaining alcohol. Students who indicated they had not drunk alcohol in the past year are not included in the sample.
In the case of smaller sample sizes, caution should be exercised before generalizing results to the entire community.

ALCOHOL ENVIRONMENTAL RISK FACTORS*
2014 Acadiana Area Human Service District (AAHSD), DHH Region 4, Grade 8



* Students were initially asked if they drank alcohol in the past year. Students marking "no" were instructed to skip the question regarding sources of obtaining alcohol.
Sample size represents the number of youth who chose at least one source of obtaining alcohol. Students who indicated they had not drunk alcohol in the past year are not included in the sample.
In the case of smaller sample sizes, caution should be exercised before generalizing results to the entire community.

ALCOHOL ENVIRONMENTAL RISK FACTORS*
2014 Acadiana Area Human Service District (AAHSD), DHH Region 4, Grade 10



* Students were initially asked if they drank alcohol in the past year. Students marking "no" were instructed to skip the question regarding sources of obtaining alcohol.
Sample size represents the number of youth who chose at least one source of obtaining alcohol. Students who indicated they had not drunk alcohol in the past year are not included in the sample.
In the case of smaller sample sizes, caution should be exercised before generalizing results to the entire community.

ALCOHOL ENVIRONMENTAL RISK FACTORS*
2014 Acadiana Area Human Service District (AAHSD), DHH Region 4, Grade 12



* Students were initially asked if they drank alcohol in the past year. Students marking "no" were instructed to skip the question regarding sources of obtaining alcohol.
Sample size represents the number of youth who chose at least one source of obtaining alcohol. Students who indicated they had not drunk alcohol in the past year are not included in the sample.
In the case of smaller sample sizes, caution should be exercised before generalizing results to the entire community.

COMMUNITY NORMS REGARDING ALCOHOL USE*
2014 Acadiana Area Human Service District (AAHSD), DHH Region 4, Grade 6



* Community norms data represents the perceptions of respondents for each question, regardless of whether they indicated any alcohol use in the past year.

Alcohol Environmental Risk Factors

COMMUNITY NORMS REGARDING ALCOHOL USE*
2014 Acadiana Area Human Service District (AAHSD), DHH Region 4, Grade 8



* Community norms data represents the perceptions of respondents for each question, regardless of whether they indicated any alcohol use in the past year.

COMMUNITY NORMS REGARDING ALCOHOL USE*
2014 Acadiana Area Human Service District (AAHSD), DHH Region 4, Grade 10



* Community norms data represents the perceptions of respondents for each question, regardless of whether they indicated any alcohol use in the past year.

COMMUNITY NORMS REGARDING ALCOHOL USE*
2014 Acadiana Area Human Service District (AAHSD), DHH Region 4, Grade 12



* Community norms data represents the perceptions of respondents for each question, regardless of whether they indicated any alcohol use in the past year.

Alcohol Environmental Risk Factors

Table 10. Alcohol Environmental Risk Factors

Sources of Obtaining Alcohol: If you drank alcohol (not just a sip or taste) in the past year, how did you get it?	Grade 6				Grade 8				Grade 10				Grade 12			
	Region 2010	Region 2012	Region 2014	State 2014	Region 2010	Region 2012	Region 2014	State 2014	Region 2010	Region 2012	Region 2014	State 2014	Region 2010	Region 2012	Region 2014	State 2014
*Sample size**	*382*	*315*	*202*	*1,233*	*1,235*	*951*	*704*	*3,996*	*1,561*	*1,575*	*1,202*	*6,873*	*1,575*	*1,423*	*1,236*	*7,026*
I bought it myself with a fake ID	7.1	6.0	5.9	10.4	5.6	5.4	5.4	7.4	4.9	6.3	5.7	6.1	9.4	7.4	8.7	8.9
I bought it myself without a fake ID	11.5	9.8	12.9	13.1	8.3	7.2	7.1	10.1	10.0	10.0	10.5	9.1	20.2	18.7	20.1	16.2
I got it from someone I know age 21 or older	59.4	54.3	55.0	48.6	67.8	69.9	68.5	63.9	77.6	77.0	75.2	73.1	85.5	84.0	81.1	80.1
I got it from someone I know under age 21	29.3	21.9	23.8	23.3	33.6	33.4	38.5	34.8	45.2	43.9	41.3	43.9	43.4	45.3	39.6	43.6
I got it from home with my parents' permission	44.5	44.4	52.0	47.0	44.8	45.8	49.9	44.4	48.0	51.9	54.3	46.2	51.4	57.5	60.2	52.2
I got it from home without my parents' permission	31.2	28.6	25.2	28.5	39.4	41.3	39.6	40.8	37.0	38.5	36.7	39.4	29.2	29.4	29.6	30.8
I got it from a family member or relative other than my parents	55.2	49.2	50.0	49.6	59.8	58.4	65.8	56.6	61.8	60.4	58.2	55.8	59.9	60.6	58.3	54.9
A stranger bought it for me	14.9	14.9	14.4	15.2	14.0	12.8	13.8	14.8	20.1	19.4	19.6	19.3	23.5	20.4	23.1	23.3
I got it another way	30.6	23.8	29.2	26.7	32.1	29.8	30.8	32.3	34.1	31.4	29.0	31.4	33.3	28.2	28.9	29.7
Community Norms Regarding Alcohol Use: Student Perceptions**																
It is not wrong at all for adults over 21 to drink alcohol in public.	12.7	14.1	12.4	10.6	26.0	26.1	28.2	23.9	38.0	39.4	38.6	35.7	47.1	50.1	47.2	43.7
It is not wrong at all for adults over 21 to get drunk or be drunk in public.	4.6	4.1	4.2	3.5	9.7	8.8	9.8	7.5	12.9	13.2	11.2	10.8	16.5	16.8	15.1	13.9
In my community, it would be very easy or sort of easy for someone under 21 to buy alcohol from a store.	19.7	23.4	22.7	20.1	19.8	20.7	22.1	20.3	29.6	28.8	27.2	26.4	35.2	34.7	33.7	33.4
Students answering 'NO!' or 'no' to the following question: If someone was drinking and driving in your neighborhood, would they get caught by the police?	28.0	25.1	25.0	23.5	44.6	38.0	38.3	35.7	54.9	48.9	46.8	43.8	59.8	50.8	51.6	47.2
Students answering 'NO!' or 'no' to the following question: If the police caught a kid drinking alcohol in your neighborhood, would he or she be in serious trouble?	12.8	12.5	13.3	13.1	24.5	21.3	22.9	22.1	35.8	32.0	33.4	31.1	39.7	38.8	40.7	36.5

* Students were initially asked if they drank alcohol in the past year. Students marking "no" were instructed to skip the question regarding sources of obtaining alcohol. Sample size represents the number of youth who chose at least one source of obtaining alcohol. Students who indicated they had not drunk alcohol in the past year are not included in the sample. In the case of smaller sample sizes, caution should be exercised before generalizing results to the entire community.

** Community norms data represents the perceptions of all students surveyed, regardless of whether they indicated any alcohol use in the past year.

Mental Health and Suicide Indicators

In addition to substance abuse and antisocial behaviors, mental health and suicide are important public health and prevention issues affecting youth. The CCYS collects several indicators related to mental health and suicide. These indicators are presented in the tables and charts that follow.

Mental Health Treatment Needs were estimated using the K6 Scale that was developed with support from the National Center for Health Statistics for use in the National Health Interview Survey. The tool screens for psychological distress by asking students "During the **past 30 days**, how often did you: 1) feel nervous? 2) feel hopeless? 3) feel restless or fidgety? 4) feel so depressed that nothing could cheer you up? 5) feel that everything was an effort? and 6) feel worthless?"

Answers were scored based on responses: *None of the time (0 points), A little of the time (1 point), Some of the time (2 points), Most of the time (3 points), All of the time (4 points).* Students with a score of 13 or more points were determined to be in need of mental health treatment.

In addition to need for mental health treatment, the percentage of participants who indicated currently taking medication that was prescribed because of problems with "your behavior or emotions" is provided.

Depressive Symptoms were calculated from by asking students about the following statements: 1) Sometimes I think that life is not worth it, 2) At times I think I am no good at all, 3) All in all, I am inclined to think that I am a failure, and 4) In the past year, have you felt depressed or sad MOST days, even if you felt OK sometimes?

These four depressive symptoms questions were scored on a scale of 1 to 4 (NO!, no, yes, YES!). The survey respondents were divided into three groups. The first group was the High Depressive Symptoms group who scored at least a mean of 3.75 on the depressive symptoms. This meant that those individuals marked "YES!" to all four items or marked "yes" to one item and "YES!" to three. The second group was the No Depressive Symptoms group who marked "NO!" to all four of the items, and the third group was a middle group who comprised the remaining respondents..

The survey also includes a series of questions about suicide. These questions provide information about suicidal ideation and attempts of suicide (e.g., "Have you ever considered attempting suicide?" and "Have you ever attempted suicide?"), as well as the impact of suicide on participants (e.g., Have you ever been impacted by someone's suicide?" and "Has there ever been a time in your life when you experienced a loss by suicide?").

MENTAL HEALTH AND SUICIDE INDICATORS
2014 Acadiana Area Human Service District (AAHSD), DHH Region 4, Grade 6



* Mental health treatment needs are calculated from student responses to several questions. See text for a complete explanation, and the mental health table for additional calculated variables.

MENTAL HEALTH AND SUICIDE INDICATORS
2014 Acadiana Area Human Service District (AAHSD), DHH Region 4, Grade 8



* Mental health treatment needs are calculated from student responses to several questions. See text for a complete explanation, and the mental health table for additional calculated variables.

MENTAL HEALTH AND SUICIDE INDICATORS
2014 Acadiana Area Human Service District (AAHSD), DHH Region 4, Grade 10



* Mental health treatment needs are calculated from student responses to several questions. See text for a complete explanation, and the mental health table for additional calculated variables.

MENTAL HEALTH AND SUICIDE INDICATORS
2014 Acadiana Area Human Service District (AAHSD), DHH Region 4, Grade 12



* Mental health treatment needs are calculated from student responses to several questions. See text for a complete explanation, and the mental health table for additional calculated variables.

Mental Health and Suicide Indicators

Table 11. Percent of Students Responding to Mental Health and Suicide Indicators

		Grade 6				Grade 8				Grade 10				Grade 12			
		Region 2010	Region 2012	Region 2014	State 2014	Region 2010	Region 2012	Region 2014	State 2014	Region 2010	Region 2012	Region 2014	State 2014	Region 2010	Region 2012	Region 2014	State 2014
Needs Mental Health Treatment (Scored 13 or more points on the K6 screening scale for psychological distress. See text for further explanation.)		n/a	17.7	18.5	18.3	n/a	20.6	23.4	21.9	n/a	21.3	25.9	24.2	n/a	20.8	23.0	21.7
Are you currently taking any medication that was prescribed for you because you had problems with your behavior or emotions? (Answered 'Yes')		n/a	19.4	22.4	17.0	n/a	16.7	19.6	15.4	n/a	13.3	14.3	12.7	n/a	12.2	12.9	10.8
Depressive Symptoms Calculation*	High Depressive Symptoms	2.6	2.4	2.1	2.4	4.7	4.1	5.2	4.3	4.8	3.8	4.8	4.1	2.7	2.2	2.8	2.8
	Moderate Depressive Symptoms	78.3	72.2	69.4	67.7	75.3	68.8	67.0	66.6	76.6	70.7	71.5	68.6	73.9	69.1	67.9	66.3
	No Depressive Symptoms	19.1	25.4	28.5	29.9	20.0	27.1	27.8	29.1	18.6	25.6	23.7	27.3	23.4	28.8	29.3	30.9

* Calculated from student responses to four depressive symptoms questions. See text for further explanation.

Mental Health and Suicide Indicators

Table 11. Percent of Students Responding to Mental Health and Suicide Indicators (Cont'd)

		Grade 6			Grade 8			Grade 10			Grade 12		
		Region 2012	Region 2014	State 2014	Region 2012	Region 2014	State 2014	Region 2012	Region 2014	State 2014	Region 2012	Region 2014	State 2014
Have you ever been impacted by someone's suicide? (Percentage of students who answered 'Yes.')		17.3	14.9	16.0	22.3	24.0	23.6	28.4	26.8	27.7	27.6	28.0	25.9
If you marked 'Yes' on the question above, please rate on a scale of 1-5 how it impacted you.	1 (It had no effect on me.)	6.4	5.6	6.1	4.5	4.9	4.0	3.6	4.8	3.2	2.0	2.1	2.4
	2 (It had little effect on me.)	17.6	15.3	13.8	13.2	12.8	12.0	10.3	11.8	11.1	11.5	12.5	12.0
	3 (It had some effect on me.)	19.7	22.0	23.6	28.3	25.8	25.8	27.6	26.8	29.2	34.3	31.1	32.2
	4 (It had considerable effect on me.)	17.4	18.5	18.9	19.9	20.6	23.6	24.3	24.5	25.9	25.2	24.1	25.6
	5 (It had great effect on me.)	38.9	38.6	37.6	34.0	35.8	34.7	34.2	32.1	30.7	27.0	30.2	27.9
Has there ever been a time in your life when you experienced a loss by suicide? (Answered 'Yes')		16.5	16.4	14.1	19.8	21.8	18.5	23.4	23.0	21.5	22.4	24.9	20.7
If you marked 'yes' on the question above, how long ago did the suicide happen?*	Within the last year.	62.4	70.5	71.6	77.4	76.7	78.6	72.3	83.8	83.4	72.8	84.3	86.0
	Within the past two or three months (60-90 days)	23.2	18.7	19.6	15.7	16.3	14.4	16.6	9.4	11.2	18.0	9.4	10.4
	In the past month (30 days).	14.4	10.8	8.7	6.9	7.0	7.0	11.1	6.8	5.4	9.1	6.3	3.7
If you marked 'yes' on the question above, was the loss a blood relative or friend? (Mark all that apply)*	Friend/peer	4.0	3.2	3.3	6.3	5.8	6.2	10.5	9.7	9.6	11.4	10.9	9.7
	Blood relative	5.7	6.2	5.0	6.3	7.7	5.3	6.1	6.5	5.0	5.0	7.0	5.0
	Friend/family	6.1	5.2	4.6	5.8	6.9	5.5	5.9	6.6	5.5	5.7	5.9	5.1
	Best friend	0.9	1.5	1.4	1.8	1.9	2.2	2.1	2.2	2.0	1.2	2.0	1.5
If you marked 'yes' to the question above, have you spoken to anyone about your loss?*	No	50.3	45.3	48.0	54.4	53.0	52.5	54.6	52.6	51.4	46.1	52.9	50.2
	Yes	49.7	54.7	52.0	45.6	47.0	47.5	45.4	47.4	48.6	53.9	47.1	49.8
Have you ever considered attempting suicide? (Answered 'Yes')		13.2	10.6	11.7	23.1	24.7	23.1	27.0	30.2	27.8	27.1	26.5	25.3
Have you ever attempted suicide? (Answered 'Yes')		3.8	3.6	3.7	7.2	8.8	8.0	9.8	11.5	10.5	8.9	8.6	8.6

* Not all students that answered "Yes" to the question "Has there ever been a time in your life when you experienced a loss by suicide?" answered this question. Responses to this question are based upon the students that answered "Yes" to the question above AND this question.

Additional Data for Prevention Planning

Table 12. Percent of Students Responding to Violence and Bullying Indicators

		Grade 6				Grade 8				Grade 10				Grade 12			
		Region 2010	Region 2012	Region 2014	State 2014	Region 2010	Region 2012	Region 2014	State 2014	Region 2010	Region 2012	Region 2014	State 2014	Region 2010	Region 2012	Region 2014	State 2014
Violence on School Grounds (Answered 'no' or 'NO!' to statement...)	I feel safe at my school.	22.5	26.2	22.0	21.1	26.4	28.1	27.5	26.8	26.8	30.1	30.2	27.9	23.9	28.0	29.5	25.2
Prevalence of Violence (Answered one or more times in the past year)	How many times in the past year have you attacked someone with the idea of seriously hurting them?	16.7	14.0	14.0	12.8	19.0	16.8	16.2	16.6	17.5	13.5	14.5	14.4	13.9	11.0	12.0	11.2
Perception of Peer Disapproval (Answered 'Wrong' or 'Very Wrong' to question...)	How wrong do you think it is for someone your age to attack someone with the idea of seriously hurting them?	91.8	92.3	93.1	93.3	85.9	87.9	88.5	87.4	84.8	86.5	85.8	85.6	87.7	89.9	88.3	88.0
Avoidance of School in the Past Month Due to Bullying (Answered 1 or more days to question...)	During the past 30 days, on how many days did you NOT got to school because you felt you would be unsafe at school or on the way to or from school?	10.7	9.3	10.8	9.9	10.1	8.9	10.0	9.4	7.4	8.2	9.0	7.5	6.0	5.1	7.9	6.3
Bullying in the Past Year (Answered 1 or more days to question...)	During the past 12 months, how often have you been picked on or bullied by a student ON SCHOOL PROPERTY?	30.1	29.1	28.4	25.5	24.5	25.2	25.3	23.8	16.8	16.8	18.8	16.3	10.2	10.8	10.0	10.0

Additional Data for Prevention Planning

Table 13. Perceived Perception of Risk, Parent/Peer Disapproval, and 30-Day Use

Outcome	Definition	Substance	Grade 6		Grade 8		Grade 10		Grade 12		Male**		Female**	
			Percent	Sample	Percent	Sample	Percent	Sample	Percent	Sample	Percent	Sample	Percent	Sample
Perception of Risk* (People are at Moderate or Great Risk of harming themselves if they...)	take five or more drinks of an alcoholic beverage (beer, wine, liquor) once or twice a week?	Binge drinking	69.7	3,336	72.3	3,344	74.6	2,987	72.2	2,272	69.4	5,390	74.8	6,336
	smoke one or more packs of cigarettes per day?	Tobacco	72.7	3,378	78.7	3,371	83.2	3,015	81.9	2,296	79.6	5,448	78.3	6,396
	smoke marijuana once or twice a week?	Marijuana	76.0	3,276	77.1	3,275	65.2	2,963	52.9	2,262	66.8	5,305	71.3	6,257
	use prescription drugs that are not prescribed to them?	Prescription drugs	77.4	3,318	83.5	3,300	83.8	2,982	81.2	2,257	81.2	5,345	81.8	6,301
Perception of Parental Disapproval* (Parents feel it would be Wrong or Very Wrong to...)	have one or two drinks of an alcoholic beverage nearly every day?	Alcohol	96.0	2,942	90.8	3,158	81.7	2,859	74.5	2,195	87.1	4,938	86.3	6,017
	smoke cigarettes?	Tobacco	97.5	2,944	95.7	3,159	93.2	2,858	88.4	2,194	94.2	4,934	94.1	6,021
	smoke marijuana?	Marijuana	98.9	2,907	96.1	3,129	92.7	2,836	88.9	2,182	94.5	4,880	94.6	5,976
	use prescription drugs not prescribed to you?	Prescription drugs	98.5	2,929	97.3	3,141	95.6	2,846	95.4	2,186	97.3	4,906	96.5	5,995
Perception of Peer Disapproval* (Friends feel it would be Wrong or Very Wrong to...)	have one or two drinks of an alcoholic beverage nearly every day?	Alcohol	91.9	2,999	77.4	3,177	60.4	2,863	55.2	2,204	71.6	4,990	73.6	6,054
	smoke tobacco?	Tobacco	95.4	2,996	84.3	3,173	69.2	2,864	58.9	2,203	76.9	4,985	79.9	6,054
	smoke marijuana?	Marijuana	95.9	2,985	82.5	3,172	63.2	2,864	55.5	2,205	75.9	4,982	76.0	6,046
	use prescription drugs not prescribed to you?	Prescription drugs	96.0	2,986	90.5	3,176	83.3	2,865	80.5	2,205	87.7	4,986	88.7	6,048
Past 30-Day Use* (at least one use in the past 30 days)	had beer, wine, or hard liquor	Alcohol	7.3	3,347	21.6	3,382	36.7	3,005	49.7	2,278	23.7	5,419	29.3	6,375
	smoked cigarettes	Tobacco	2.0	3,180	7.6	3,325	13.5	2,949	20.1	2,259	10.0	5,245	9.9	6,262
	used marijuana	Marijuana	0.8	3,333	5.3	3,377	11.6	2,980	18.0	2,272	8.3	5,388	7.8	6,361
	combined results of prescription stimulant, prescription sedative and prescription narcotics questions	Prescription drugs	1.1	3,289	2.8	3,367	4.9	2,984	5.1	2,273	3.2	5,368	3.3	6,332

* For Past 30-Day Use, Perception of Risk, and Perception of Parental/Peer Disapproval, the "Sample" column represents the sample size - the number of people who answered the question and whose responses were used to determine the percentage. The "Percent" column represents the percentage of youth in the sample answering the question as specified in the definition.

** The male and female values allow a gender comparison for youth who completed the survey. However, unless the percentage of students who participated from each grade is similar, the gender results are not necessarily representative of males and females in the community. In order to preserve confidentiality, male or female values may be omitted if the total number surveyed for that gender is under 20.

Risk and Protective Scale Definitions

Table 14. Scales that Measure the Risk and Protective Factors Shown in the Profiles	
Community Domain Risk Factors	
Laws and Norms Favorable Toward Drug Use	Research has shown that legal restrictions on alcohol and tobacco use, such as raising the legal drinking age, restricting smoking in public places, and increased taxation have been followed by decreases in consumption. Moreover, national surveys of high school seniors have shown that shifts in normative attitudes toward drug use have preceded changes in prevalence of use.
Perceived Availability of Drugs and Handguns	The availability of cigarettes, alcohol, marijuana, and other illegal drugs has been related to the use of these substances by adolescents. The availability of handguns is also related to a higher risk of crime and substance use by adolescents.
Family Domain Risk Factors	
Poor Family Management	Parents' use of inconsistent and/or unusually harsh or severe punishment with their children places them at higher risk for substance use and other problem behaviors. Also, parents' failure to provide clear expectations and to monitor their children's behavior makes it more likely that they will engage in drug abuse whether or not there are family drug problems.
Family Conflict	Children raised in families high in conflict, whether or not the child is directly involved in the conflict, appear at risk for both delinquency and drug use.
Family History of Antisocial Behavior	When children are raised in a family with a history of problem behaviors (e.g., violence or ATOD use), the children are more likely to engage in these behaviors.
Parental Attitudes Favorable Toward Antisocial Behavior & Drugs	In families where parents use illegal drugs, are heavy users of alcohol, or are tolerant of children's use, children are more likely to become drug abusers during adolescence. The risk is further increased if parents involve children in their own drug (or alcohol) using behavior, for example, asking the child to light the parent's cigarette or get the parent a beer from the refrigerator.
School Domain Risk Factors	
Academic Failure	Beginning in the late elementary grades (grades 4-6) academic failure increases the risk of both drug abuse and delinquency. It appears that the experience of failure itself, for whatever reasons, increases the risk of problem behaviors.
Low Commitment to School	Surveys of high school seniors have shown that the use of drugs is significantly lower among students who expect to attend college than among those who do not. Factors such as liking school, spending time on homework, and perceiving the coursework as relevant are also negatively related to drug use.
School Domain Protective Factors	
Opportunities for Prosocial Involvement	When young people are given more opportunities to participate meaningfully in important activities at school, they are less likely to engage in drug use and other problem behaviors.
Rewards for Prosocial Involvement	When young people are recognized and rewarded for their contributions at school, they are less likely to be involved in substance use and other problem behaviors.

Table 14. Scales that Measure the Risk and Protective Factors Shown in the Profiles (cont'd)	
Peer-Individual Risk Factors	
Early Initiation of Antisocial Behavior and Drug Use	Early onset of drug use predicts misuse of drugs. The earlier the onset of any drug use, the greater the involvement in other drug use and the greater frequency of use. Onset of drug use prior to the age of 15 is a consistent predictor of drug abuse, and a later age of onset of drug use has been shown to predict lower drug involvement and a greater probability of discontinuation of use.
Attitudes Favorable Toward Antisocial Behavior and Drug Use	During the elementary school years, most children express anti-drug, anti-crime, and pro-social attitudes and have difficulty imagining why people use drugs or engage in antisocial behaviors. However, in middle school, as more youth are exposed to others who use drugs and engage in antisocial behavior, their attitudes often shift toward greater acceptance of these behaviors. Youth who express positive attitudes toward drug use and antisocial behavior are more likely to engage in a variety of problem behaviors, including drug use.
Perceived Risk of Drug Use	Young people who do not perceive drug use to be risky are far more likely to engage in drug use.
Interaction with Antisocial Peers	Young people who associate with peers who engage in problem behaviors are at higher risk for engaging in antisocial behavior themselves.
Friends' Use of Drugs	Young people who associate with peers who engage in alcohol or substance abuse are much more likely to engage in the same behavior. Peer drug use has consistently been found to be among the strongest predictors of substance use among youth. Even when young people come from well-managed families and do not experience other risk factors, spending time with friends who use drugs greatly increases the risk of that problem developing.
Rewards for Antisocial Behavior	Young people who receive rewards for their antisocial behavior are at higher risk for engaging further in antisocial behavior and substance use.
Depressive Symptoms	Young people who are depressed are overrepresented in the criminal justice system and are more likely to use drugs. Survey research and other studies have shown a link between depression and youth problem behaviors.
Gang Involvement	Youth who belong to gangs are more at risk for antisocial behavior and drug use.
Peer-Individual Protective Factors	
Belief in the Moral Order	Young people who have a belief in what is "right" or "wrong" are less likely to use drugs.
Religiosity	Young people who regularly attend religious services are less likely to engage in problem behaviors.
Interaction with Prosocial Peers	Young people who associate with peers who engage in prosocial behavior are more protected from engaging in antisocial behavior and substance use.
Prosocial Involvement	Participation in positive school and community activities helps provide protection for youth.
Rewards for Prosocial Involvement	Young people who are rewarded for working hard in school and the community are less likely to engage in problem behavior.

Contacts for Prevention

Region I
Metropolitan Human Services District
1010 Common St., Ste 600
New Orleans, LA70112
504-568-3130
504-568-3137 (Fax)

Region II
Capital Area Human Services
4615 Government Street, Bldg. 2
Baton Rouge, LA 70806
225-925-3827
225-925-1987 (Fax)

Region III
South Central Louisiana Human Services Authority
521 Legion Avenue
Houma, LA 70364
985-857-3615 x 143

Region IV
Acadiana Area Human Services District
302 Dulles Drive
Lafayette, LA 70506
337-262-1105
337-262-1103 (Fax)

Region V
Imperial Calcasieu Human Services Authority
3505 5th Ave., Suite B
Lake Charles, LA 70605
337-475-4861
337-475-3105 (Fax)

Region VI
Central Louisiana Human Services District
401 Rainbow Drive, #35
Pineville, LA 71360
318-484-2169
318-487-5453 (Fax)

Region VII
Northwest Louisiana Human Services District
2924 Knight Street, Suite 350
Building III, 2nd Floor
Shreveport, LA 71105
318-862-3072
318-862-3080 (Fax)

Region VIII
Northeast Delta Human Services Authority
2513 Ferrand Street
Monroe, LA 71201
318-362-5483
318-362-3268 (Fax)

Region IX
Florida Parishes Human Services Authority
835 Pride Drive Suite B
Hammond, LA 70401
985-543-4730
985-543-4752 (Fax)

Region X
Jefferson Parish Human Services Authority
3616 South 1-10 Service Road West
Metairie, LA 70001
504-838-5702
504-838-5706 (Fax)

Contacts for Prevention

State Contacts

Department of Health & Hospitals
Office of Behavioral Health
Dr. Rochelle Head-Dunham,
Assistant Secretary/Medical Director
628 North 4th Street, Fourth Floor
P. O. Box 4049
Baton Rouge, LA 70802-4049
(225) 342-1085
(225) 342-3931 (Fax)
www.oad.dhh.louisiana.gov

Governor's Office
Office of Community Programs
State Office Building
1201 North 3rd Street, G219
Baton Rouge, LA 70802
(225) 342-3423 / (800) 827-5885
(225) 342-7081 (Fax)
www.gov.louisiana.gov/

Louisiana Office for Behavioral Health Reports
dhh.louisiana.gov/index.cfm/subhome/10/n/328

Louisiana Department of Education
Division of School and Community Support
1201 North Third Street
Baton Rouge, LA 70802
(225) 342-3338 phone
(225) 219-1691 (Fax)
www.louisianabelieves.com

National Contacts & Resources

SAMHSA/Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (CSAP)
www.samhsa.gov/prevention/

DOJ/Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP)
www.ojjdp.gov

ED/Office of Safe and Healthy Students (OSHS)
www2.ed.gov/oese/oshs

SAMHSA/Strategic Prevention Framework (SPF)
www.samhsa.gov/spf

Social Development Research Group, University of Washington
www.sdrg.org

National Council on Alcoholism and Drug Dependence, Inc.
www.ncadd.org

NIH/National Institute of Mental Health
www.nimh.nih.gov

National Suicide Prevention Lifeline
www.suicidepreventionlifeline.org

The LCCYS was conducted for the State of Louisiana by :

Cecil J. Picard Center for Child Development and Lifelong Learning,
University of Louisiana at Lafayatte
(337) 482-1567
www.picardcenter.org

This Report was Prepared for the State of Louisiana by Bach Harrison, L.L.C.
116 South 500 East
Salt Lake City, Utah 84102
(801) 359-2064
www.bach-harrison.com

For more information about this report or the information it contains, please contact the Louisiana Department of Health and Hospitals Office of Behavioral Health (OBH), Addictive Disorders Services at (225) 342-1085.