

Title : Monitoring the adherence to drug preventive curricula in schools. Examples from the EU-DAP trial.

Authors: M. Rosaria Galanti¹, and the EU-DAP study group:

Karl Bohm², Gregor Burkhart³, Leila Fabiani⁴, Fabrizio Faggiano⁵, Ann-Marie Lindahl¹, Juan Carlos Melero⁶, Massimiliano Panella⁵, Tatiana Perez⁶, Marina Scatigna⁴, Roberta Siliquini⁷, Peer Van de Kreeft⁸, Maro Vassara⁹, Gudrun Wiborg¹⁰, Vicki Yotsidi¹¹

¹ Stockholm Centre of Public Health and Dept. of Public Health Sciences, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden, ² Institute fur Sozial und Gesundheitspsychologie, Vienna, Austria, ³ EMCDDA, European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction, Lisbon, Portugal, ⁴ University of L'Aquila, Dept. of Internal Medicine and Public Health, L'Aquila, Italy, ⁵ Avogadro University, Dept. of Medical Sciences, Novara, Italy, ⁶ Edex, Bilbao, Spain, ⁷ University of Turin, Dept. of Public Health and Microbiology, Turin, Italy, ⁸ De Sleutel, Gent, Belgium, ⁹ PYXIDA Center for drug abuse prevention and health promotion, Thessaloniki, Greece, ¹⁰ IFT Nord, Kiel, Germany, ¹¹ University of Mental Health Research Institute, Athens, Greece

Introduction: The EU-DAP study is a randomized controlled trial of efficacy of an innovative drug preventive curriculum, conducted in nine centres of seven European countries. The curriculum, based on a social skills approach, was administered during the school year 2004-2005 in 77 schools, while 64 schools served as reference group (usual curricula).

Methods: A monitoring system consisting of short structured reports was set up in order to study the adherence to the protocol. One report for each program unit (n=12) was required from classes in the intervention arm, encompassing information on degree of the unit implementation, its duration, students' reactions and critical events. Schools running parents' meetings or peer-led modules were also to report on these activities. All classes, including controls, were requested to send reports on other health education.

Results: The interim compliance with the core program report system was good (87% averaged on 8 centres), and reflected closely the degree of implementation, which varied between countries. Four of the core units were most difficult implemented in all centres, because of duration and content, while many other units required a longer time to completion than foreseen. The peer-led module had a delayed or incomplete implementation while the attendance to the parents meetings was low in all reporting centres but two.

Conclusions: Process monitoring is a feasible and informative activity in the context of school drug prevention. Main purposes are: to weigh the program impact by its intensity, program modification and quality assurance in the dissemination phase.