

The author(s) shown below used Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice and prepared the following final report:

Document Title: Evaluation of the Teens, Crime and the Community and Community Works Program

Author(s): Finn-Aage Esbensen

Document No.: 228277

Date Received: September 2009

Award Number: 2003-JN-FX-0003

This report has not been published by the U.S. Department of Justice. To provide better customer service, NCJRS has made this Federally-funded grant final report available electronically in addition to traditional paper copies.

Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

FINAL REPORT:

**Evaluation of the Teens, Crime and the Community and
Community Works Program**

Finn-Aage Esbensen,
Principal Investigator

Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice
University of Missouri - St. Louis
St. Louis, MO 63121

June, 2009

This research is funded by the National Institute of Justice, Office Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice, Award # 2003-JN-FX-0003 (October 2003 – June 2009). Points of view in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position of the U.S. Department of Justice.

ABSTRACT

In 2003, the University of Missouri-St. Louis received a grant to evaluate a Congressional Earmark funded through the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. This five year (10/1/03 – 6/30/09) grant to evaluate the Teens, Crime, and the Community and Community Works (TCC/CW) program was funded by the National Institute of Justice. TCC/CW was developed through a collaborative effort by the National Crime Prevention Council (NCPC) and Street Law, Inc. and received congressionally mandated funding from 1985 through 2008.

A process and outcome evaluation design was proposed to assess program fidelity and outcome. The process evaluation, consisting of interviews, questionnaires, and observations of training and program delivery, was initiated immediately upon funding notification. Following an extensive effort to identify potential sites for inclusion in the outcome evaluation, a quasi-experimental five-wave panel study of public school students was initiated in the fall of 2004. Approximately 1,700 students representing 98 classrooms in 15 schools located in nine cities in four different states were surveyed three times (pre- and post-tests, plus a one-year follow-up survey). Classrooms were matched by teacher or subject and one-half of the classrooms received TCC/CW while the other half was not exposed to the curriculum.

The process evaluation of the Community Works Program (Part I of this Final Report) concluded that the program was not implemented with fidelity in the majority of participating schools even though the 15 schools were recruited specifically because of their reported intent to implement the full program. The fact that only four of the participating schools met the minimum standards of program fidelity is telling, as the standards were quite liberal (see Chapter 4 of the Process Evaluation). In addition to program implementation failure, outcome analyses based on the three data waves of student surveys confirmed the absence of a program effect (Part II of this Final Report). Analyses of short-term impact (i.e., pre-post test comparisons) produced contradictory outcome results: there were more findings contrary to than supportive of program expectations.

Given the results of the process evaluation in conjunction with the preliminary outcome measures and in light of the GAO audit of NIJ funded programs (2003), a change in evaluation design was proposed. The redesign included the following two objectives: 1) one strategy focused on identifying reasons underlying program implementation failure and 2) a second strategy maximized the student data already collected (additional substantive reports have been produced).

SUMMARY

In 2003, the University of Missouri-St. Louis received a grant to evaluate a Congressional Earmark funded through the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. This five year (10/1/03 – 6/30/09) grant to evaluate the Teens, Crime, and the Community and Community Works (TCC/CW) program was funded by the National Institute of Justice. TCC/CW was developed through a collaborative effort by the National Crime Prevention Council (NCPC) and Street Law, Inc. and received congressionally mandated funding from 1985 through 2008. This law-related education curriculum has undergone several revisions during the past twenty years and a variety of program goals have been advanced by the program providers. Based upon careful review of materials and in-person interviews with program staff members, the most consistently identified goal is to reduce adolescent victimization. For more discussion of program goals, consult Section 3 – Curriculum Review - of this Final Report.

A process and outcome evaluation design was proposed to assess program fidelity and outcome. The process evaluation, consisting of interviews, questionnaires, and observations of training and program delivery, was initiated immediately upon funding notification. Following an extensive effort to identify potential sites for inclusion in the outcome evaluation, a quasi-experimental five-wave panel study of public school students was initiated in the fall of 2004. Approximately 1,700 students representing 98 classrooms in 15 schools located in nine cities in four different states were surveyed three times (pre- and post-tests, plus a one-year follow-up survey). Classrooms were matched by teacher or subject and one-half of the classrooms received TCC/CW while the other half was not exposed to the curriculum.

Key questions guiding the process evaluation component of this report focus on the quality and extent of program implementation. To what extent is the program implemented across the country? How widespread is program delivery? In what climates (locations) is the program delivered? To what extent is the program implemented by program adopters? What is the nature of relationships between the national office and regional Expansion Centers? Do program providers receive quality technical assistance when it is requested? Do potential providers receive adequate training? Is the program implemented with fidelity – that is, are required lessons taught; are Community Resource People utilized as expected; is the service learning project properly planned and implemented?

In this report we address these questions, relying upon multiple sources and methods. Training sessions were observed by six evaluation team members; interviews were conducted with program staff from the national (i.e., the National Crime Prevention Council) and regional offices, more than 250 program sites were contacted for information about program implementation, more than 100 class sessions were observed, and questionnaires were solicited from program providers participating in the outcome evaluation. Based upon these sources, we concluded that: (1) there were strained relationships between the national and regional staffs; (2) the training provided a sound introduction to techniques useful in teaching the Community Works (CW) program; (3) more training time should be devoted to the actual CW program content; (4) the NCPC data base of program providers was incomplete, misleading, and in dire need of repair;

(5) the program appeared to be used more as a resource than adopted as a program; (6) few of the sites contacted implemented the program; and (7) a minority of the 15 schools that participated in the outcome evaluation (selected due to their stated intent to implement the program with fidelity) were judged to implement the program with sufficient rigor to reasonably expect programmatic effect (see Section 1 of this report).

The process evaluation determined that the TCC/CW training failed to provide trainees with the necessary skills to adequately teach the program and more than 100 observations of classroom program delivery determined that the program was implemented with insufficient fidelity in terms of dosage, program adherence, and quality to reasonably expect programmatic effects. After discussions with NIJ program managers, the outcome evaluation was abbreviated at three waves of outcome data rather than the planned five waves. This report examines short (post-test following program completion) and interim (one-year follow-up) program effects. This **outcome evaluation** addresses the following three questions:

- 1) is program participation associated with a reduction in known risk factors (i.e., association with delinquent peers, risk-seeking, lack of commitment to school, etc.)?
- 2) are offending and victimization rates lower among the program participants than among the comparison students?
- 3) given differential program fidelity, are program effects detectable in those schools meeting minimal standards of program fidelity?

Curriculum Review of *Teens, Crime and Community and Community Works*

The process evaluation of the Community Works Program (Part I of this Final Report) concluded that the program was not implemented with fidelity in the majority of schools participating in the evaluation. It is important to note that the 15 participating schools were recruited specifically because of their reported intent to implement the full program in their schools. The fact that only four of the participating schools met the minimum standards of program fidelity is telling, as the standards were quite liberal (see Chapter 4 of the Process Evaluation). In addition to program implementation failure, outcome analyses based on the three data waves of student surveys confirmed the absence of a program effect (Part II of this Final Report). Analyses of short-term impact (i.e., pre-post test comparisons) produced contradictory results: findings supportive of program expectations were found for self-esteem, involvement in conventional activities, and “hitting neutralization”. Findings contrary to program goals were found for fear of school crime, fear of violent crime, use of aggressive conflict resolution strategies, perceived risk of school victimization, and serious victimization. In essence, there were more findings contrary to than supportive of program expectations. Of the 46 outcome measures assessed at Wave 3, we observed a program effect on only one measure - violent offending. Individuals in the treatment group experience a greater decrease in violent offending than do those in the control group.

As a result of this implementation failure and absence of program effect, the National Institute of Justice approved a change of scope for the Community Works evaluation. In November, 2006, an initial request for a redesign was submitted to the project manager. Following a series of conversations and email exchanges, a formal proposal for a change of scope was submitted January 30, 2007 and ultimately approved

in mid March, 2007. This report briefly reviews the proposed changes to the evaluation design and then provides an overview of the curriculum review spawned by the evaluation results.

CHANGES TO EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

Given the results of the process evaluation in conjunction with the preliminary outcome measures and in light of the GAO audit of NIJ funded programs (2003), the proposed change in evaluation design was two-pronged: 1) one strategy would focus on identifying reasons underlying program implementation failure and 2) another would maximize the student data already collected.

Studying the failure of implementation. The process evaluation documented the lack of program implementation. An important question remained: why did this program failure occur? To address this question, two separate strategies were proposed to produce information that would be useful to program staff at NCPC, to OJJDP, and evaluation insight that might prove informative for NIJ and subsequent solicitations.

The 15 schools participating in the evaluation were selected due to their stated commitment to implement the program fully, not just use it as a resource as some teachers reported doing. The first step was to organize a meeting with program providers (school teachers, SROs and/or JPOs). A two-day workshop was subsequently convened in Scottsdale, Arizona in April, 2007. During this meeting, the evaluation team presented the process evaluation results (without identifying which sites were classified as non-implementers). Of importance was the feedback from the implementers regarding their impressions about why the program was not implemented with fidelity. Results from these discussions were expected to provide substantial insight into programmatic issues that might lead to a better program. This initial meeting was restricted to program providers and did not include NCPC or Expansion Center staff. A second meeting with NCPC staff members and NIJ program managers occurred in June, 2007 (the OJJDP project manager and supervisors were invited to attend but declined). That meeting was intended to share the results of the meeting with program providers. Ground-level implementation issues identified by the program providers were discussed as were organizational issues associated with the NCPC national office and the Expansion Centers.

During the course of this second meeting NCPC staff indicated that they would be supportive of a curriculum review organized by the evaluation team [the PI had previously conducted a curriculum review as part of the NIJ funded National Evaluation of the G.R.E.A.T. program (1999-2001)]. The evaluation team agreed to oversee a curriculum review. This curriculum review work group would be comprised of prevention experts, members of the evaluation team, representatives from NCPC and TCC/CW implementers, and NIJ program staff. The goal of this strategy was to substantively review the CW materials, the theoretical framework of the program, and training and organizational issues. The CW curriculum had not been subjected to rigorous **outside** review since its development.

Data Analyses. In addition to the process evaluation component of the change of scope plan, the evaluation team proposed to maximize the student data already collected by preparing several additional manuscripts of substantive interest. Three waves of data

from a sample of students in 15 schools, in nine cities, in four states had been collected. The student questionnaire, while developed specifically to test the effectiveness of the CW program, contained a number of questions that allow for exploration of important issues of criminological and policy interest. Two aspects of the sample increase the attractiveness of this particular data set: 1) the students were initially in grades six through nine (the majority in grades 6 and 7) and as such provide a sample with considerable age variation; and 2) importantly, 10 of the schools are located in the Southwest with a sizable representation of Hispanic youths thereby allowing for investigation of the role of ethnicity in a number of the proposed analyses. Manuscripts developed as part of this change of scope are included as Part IV of this Final Report.

Curriculum Review

The curriculum review was an outgrowth of two meetings described in the previous section (convened in March and June, 2007). During that second meeting between the evaluation team, NCPC staff, and NIJ program staff, it was decided that we would proceed with a curriculum review of Community Works. To that end, three of the program providers who had attended the April meeting were invited to participate; all graciously agreed. These CW implementers were: Rudy Acosta, JPO from Yuma, Arizona; Melissa Larson, JPO from Tucson, Arizona; and John Mercer, a 6th grade social studies teacher from Las Cruces, New Mexico. Individuals knowledgeable of prevention programs were contacted and all four agreed to participate in the process. They were Denise Gottfredson, University of Maryland; David Huizinga, University of Colorado; Cheryl Maxson, University of California-Irvine; and Dana Peterson, University at Albany. NCPC staff members were also invited to participate. The following individuals from NCPC attended one or more of the curriculum review meetings: Lori Britain, Jim Wright, Joselle Shay, and Debra Whitcomb. Cathy Girouard and Winnie Reed represented NIJ at one or more of the meetings. Members of the evaluation team involved in this process included: Brad Brick, Finn Esbensen, Sara Hoover, Chris Melde, and Terrance J. Taylor.

The curriculum review consisted of a series of three additional meetings. The first meeting involved the prevention specialists and the evaluation team in St. Louis, Missouri, with the explicit goal of informing the consultants about the CW program, the results of the process and outcome evaluation, and the progress to date on the curriculum review. The second meeting involved all parties and was held January 17 – 18, 2008, in Mesa, Arizona. The third and last meeting was held March 27 – 28, 2008, in Crystal City, Virginia (agendas for these meetings are included in Appendix C). This report provides a summary of these three meetings as well as the two that preceded the actual initiation of the curriculum review.

This report provides an overview of these meetings by organizing discussions around common topical areas. Specifically, the following topics will be addressed: program goals and objectives, CW training, core curriculum, role of community resource people, and relevance of the action projects. Appendix A includes the detailed outline for the revised curriculum.

Table of Contents:

Abstract	Pg. 2
Summary	Pg. 3
PART 1: Process Evaluation	Pg. 10
Process Evaluation Overview	Pg. 11
Chapter 1: Introduction and Program Fidelity	Pg. 12
By Finn-Aage Esbensen	
Chapter 2: Site Selection and Surveys of CW Providers	Pg. 21
By Finn-Aage Esbensen and Kelli Burmeister	
Chapter 3: CW and Expansion Centers and CW Training	Pg. 30
By Finn-Aage Esbensen and Rodney Brunson	
Chapter 4: CW Implementation - Classroom observations	Pg. 47
By Chris Melde	
Chapter 5: CW Implementation - Implementer's survey	Pg. 67
By Karin E. Tusinski and Finn-Aage Esbensen	
Part I References	Pg. 80
Part I Appendices	
A. Protective and Risk Factor Linkage	Pg. 82
B. Observation Checklist	Pg. 93
C. CW Implementer Questionnaire	Pg.143
PART 2: Outcome Evaluation	Pg. 151
By Finn-Aage Esbensen and Bradley T. Brick	
Outcome Evaluation Overview	Pg. 152
Background	Pg. 154
Site selection and Subject Recruitment	Pg. 164
Design of the Longitudinal Analysis of Program Impact	Pg. 169
Results	Pg. 172

Conclusion	Pg. 177
References	Pg. 177
Tables	Pg. 184
PART 3: Curriculum Review	Pg. 198
By: Finn-Aage Esbensen	
Curriculum Review Overview	Pg. 199
Program Goals and Objectives	Pg. 204
Core Curriculum	Pg. 210
Community Works Training	Pg. 212
Planning, Skills Building, and Flexibility	Pg. 215
Role of Community Resource People	Pg. 218
Relevance of Action Project	Pg. 220
Conclusion	Pg. 225
Part 3 Appendix A: CW Lessons Content Meeting Four Primary Objectives	Pg. 226
Part 3 Appendix B: Proposed Detailed Outline for Revised CW Program	Pg. 228
Part 3 Appendix C: Meeting Agendas	Pg. 241

REPORTS AND PUBLICATIONS (available from PI)

Chris Melde, Finn-Aage Esbensen, and Karin Tusinski. 2006. "Addressing Program Fidelity Using Onsite Observations and Program Provider Descriptions of Program Delivery." *Evaluation Review* 30:714-730.

Finn-Aage Esbensen, Bradley Brick, Chris Melde, Karin Tusinski, and Terrance J. Taylor. 2008. "The Role of Race and Ethnicity in Gang Membership." In Frank van Gemert, Dana Peterson, and Inger-Lise Lien (eds.) *Youth Gangs, Migration, and Ethnicity*. Uffculme, Devon, UK: Willan Publishing Company.

Chris Melde, Terrance J. Taylor, and Finn-Aage Esbensen. Forthcoming 2009. "I Got Your Back': An examination of the protective function of gang membership in adolescence." *Criminology* 47:565-594.

Chris Melde, Finn-Aage Esbensen, Terrance J. Taylor. Forthcoming 2009. "May Piece Be With You: A typological examination of the fear and victimization hypothesis' of adolescent weapon carrying." *Justice Quarterly* 27:348-376.

Chris Melde. Forthcoming 2009. "Lifestyle, Rational Choice, and Adolescent Fear: A Test of a Risk Assessment Framework." *Criminology*

Bradley T. Brick and Terrance J. Taylor. "Don't Mess with Me: The Effect of Police Contact on Attitudes to the Police." Forthcoming. *Journal of Criminal Justice*.

Chris Melde & Finn-Aage Esbensen. Forthcoming 2009. "The Victim-Offender Overlap and Fear of In-school Victimization: A Longitudinal Examination of Risk Assessment Models." *Crime & Delinquency* 55:

Finn-Aage Esbensen and Dena Carson. "Consequences of Being Bullied: Results from a longitudinal assessment of bullying victimization in a multi-site sample of American students." Submitted to *Youth & Society* February 2009.

Kristin Carbone-Lopez, Finn-Aage Esbensen, and Bradley T. Brick. "The Correlates and Consequences of Peer Victimization: The role of gender in direct and indirect forms of bullying." Submitted to *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, June 2009.

Lee Ann Slocum, Terrance J. Taylor, Bradley T. Brick, and Finn-Aage Esbensen. "Don't Tell: The effect of neighborhood structural characteristics and individual-level attitudes and experiences on youths' reporting attitudes." Submitted to *Criminology*. June 2009.

Chris Melde and Finn-Aage Esbensen. "The Effect of Gang Membership on Emotions, Attitudes, and Behavior: A prospective study." Submitted to *American Journal of Sociology*, June 2009.

PART 1: Process Evaluation

Process Evaluation Overview

In September 2003, the University of Missouri - St. Louis was awarded a grant to conduct an evaluation of the Teens, Crime, and the Community and Community Works (TCC/CW) Program. The proposal called for both process and outcome evaluations to be conducted during the five-year funding period. The outcome component is ongoing but at this juncture we have completed the process evaluation. Key questions guiding this report focus on the quality and extent of program implementation. To what extent is the program implemented across the country? How widespread is program delivery? In what climates (locations) is the program delivered? To what extent is the program implemented by program adopters? What is the nature of relationships between the national office and regional Expansion Centers? Do program providers receive quality technical assistance when it is requested? Do potential providers receive adequate training? Is the program implemented with fidelity – that is, are required lessons taught; are Community Resource People utilized as expected; is the service learning project properly planned and implemented?

In this report we address these questions, relying upon multiple sources and methods. Training sessions were observed by six evaluation team members; interviews were conducted with program staff from the national (i.e., the National Crime Prevention Council) and regional offices, more than 250 program sites were contacted for information about program implementation, more than 100 class sessions were observed, and questionnaires were solicited from program providers participating in the outcome evaluation. Based upon these sources, we conclude that: (1) there are strained relationships between the national and regional staffs; (2) the training provides a sound introduction to techniques useful in teaching the Community Works (CW) program; (3) more training time should be devoted to the actual CW program content; (4) the NCPC data base of program providers is incomplete, misleading, and in dire need of repair; (5) the program appears to be used more as a resource than adopted as a program; (6) few of the sites contacted implemented the program; and (7) a minority of the 15 schools participating in the outcome evaluation (selected due to their stated intent to implement the program with fidelity) were judged to implement the program with sufficient rigor to reasonably expect programmatic effect.

CHAPTER 1: Introduction and Program Fidelity

The Teens, Crime, and the Community and Community Works (TCC/CW) program was developed in 1985 and represents a partnership between the National Crime Prevention Council and Street Law, Inc. The current program is largely based on a “risk-factor” approach that emphasizes various domains that have been shown to increase the probability that a youth will engage in anti-social and illegal behavior. As such, the TCC/CW program consists of three components:

- (1) a 31-lesson interactive curriculum that deals with such topics as guns, violence, hate crimes, substance abuse, conflict management, and preventing victimization;
- (2) the use of Community Resource People (e.g., teachers, law enforcement officers, doctors, lawyers) as role models to help deliver the curriculum; and
- (3) the implementation of “Action Projects” that allow teens to apply what they have learned to school and community settings.

Given the plethora of school-based prevention programs that have been designed to achieve a variety of desirable goals including delinquency, bullying, and victimization reduction, school administrators are challenged to select a program that is optimal in light of the time and resource constraints of their institutions. Thus, it is imperative this choice be guided by a well-informed sense of program effectiveness. And, in fact, there have been several attempts in the past decade to provide administrators with such knowledge. For example, the Blueprint Series (Elliott, 1997) identified model programs that have withstood rigorous scientific evaluations and the Maryland Report (Sherman et al., 1997) assessed the effectiveness of a broad range of projects. The Center for Substance Abuse provides a consumer’s guide of science-based prevention programs (CSAP, 2002) and the Report on Youth Violence to the Surgeon General (2001) categorizes programs as model or promising. One notable aspect of these reviews is the paucity of “model” or “effective” programs. This is not to say that most of the extant programs are ineffective, rather, the majority have not been evaluated in a manner that allows for assessment of

their effectiveness. Another concern is that some programs have experienced **implementation failure** that is then interpreted as **program failure**. Programs not implemented in accordance with program plans may compromise program outcomes. As such, one important component of every evaluation is assessment of the extent to which a program is implemented.

Among the questions answered in this process evaluation are the following:

- to what extent do the NCPC and Street Law, Inc. staffs provide support to the Expansion Center staff (e.g., adequacy and timeliness of technical assistance)?
- does the training provided by NCPC and Street Law, Inc. adequately prepare new subscribers in the use of the CW curriculum?
- to what extent is the TCC/CW program implemented at each site?
- what components of the program are most likely to be implemented?
- what factors contribute to the selection and implementation of program components?
- how are Community Resource People identified, recruited, and utilized?
- how are Action Projects selected and what contributes to their successful implementation?
- what school and community context factors are necessary for program implementation?
- is the program transferable to other communities or settings?

Process Evaluation Design

Upon grant receipt, we scheduled site visits with national and Expansion Center staff to obtain the latest information about program delivery and operating sites. These visits included trips to Washington to meet with NCPC, Street Law, Inc., and NIJ staff members, as well as trips to Expansion Centers in Arizona, Missouri, South Carolina, and Rhode Island. Training sessions were observed, program staff interviewed, and telephone surveys with program providers were conducted.

Another important task associated with the process evaluation entails gathering information about the role of the national and regional headquarters in terms of providing

guidance and technical assistance to the local program sites. This information will allow us to address the transferability of the program. Results from this process evaluation will also inform the outcome evaluation and the interpretation of results. The process evaluation design included a five-pronged strategy:

- (1) surveying sites implementing CW;
- (2) interviewing NCPC and Expansion Center staff members;
- (3) observing training;
- (4) observing classroom delivery; and
- (5) surveying program providers.

Program Fidelity

An important and vital aspect of every evaluation is the assessment of program effectiveness. However, an equally vital component of an evaluation is assessment of program fidelity. Much attention was given to the “nothing works” phase of justice system evaluations in the 1970s. It would not be inaccurate to state that to some extent, the nothing works adage was a reflection of **program implementation failure** more so than an assessment of program effectiveness. For example, in their National Study of Delinquency Prevention in Schools, Gottfredson et al. (2000:7-3) concluded that “about half of school-based prevention activities are of such poor quality that they cannot reasonably be expected to make a difference in levels of problem behavior.” For example, in one evaluation of the Life Skills Training program, it was reported that “coverage of the curriculum ranged from 27% to 97%, with 75% of students exposed to 60% or more of the material” (Gottfredson et al., 2000:1-11). With concerns about the degree and quality of program implementation, it becomes necessary to question the extent to which program failure is an artifact of poor programs as opposed to poorly implemented programs.

While the primary objective of evaluations is to determine what effect, if any, an intervention or treatment has on the targeted population, less attention had been accorded the assessment of the extent to which a program is actually implemented – in other words program fidelity. But, what do we mean by program fidelity? In this report, we will discuss three categories of fidelity: (1) **dosage** - is enough of the program actually

implemented to expect the anticipated effect; **(2) program adherence** – to what extent are program components actually taught or delivered; and **(3) quality of delivery** –if delivered, what is the quality of that delivery? While a number of process evaluations have been funded and conducted, they are generally thought of as inferior and of little inherent value relative to outcome evaluations. Early in the current evaluation, when it appeared as if the planned outcome evaluation of the TCC/CW program might not be feasible, NIJ staff made it imminently clear that funding for **only** a process evaluation would not be approved. But, without knowing to what extent a program is implemented, how can we as evaluators speak to the issue of program effectiveness?

The faithful implementation of programs has been the subject of increasing concern in discussions of "best practices", "model programs", or similarly intentioned terms to identify programs that have been empirically demonstrated to have measurable effect on the selected outcome variables. The blueprints program at the University of Colorado received specific funding to oversee and assess the problems associated with the implementation and replication of the Blueprint programs (Elliott & Mihalic, 2004; Fagan & Mihalic, 2003; Mihalic et al., 2002; and Mihalic & Irwin, 2003). Less attention, however, has been given to assessing program fidelity in evaluation research. In this section of our report, we will briefly review some general themes that emerge in assessing program fidelity.

General challenges to program fidelity:

1. Type of program (structure and complexity of program): One comment that may appear to be unwarranted or unnecessary is the importance of having a clearly defined program. Considerable diversity exists with regard to the structure and organization of prevention programs. Some programs, such as Drug Abuse Resistance Education (DARE) and Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T.), have a high degree of structure. Examination of the G.R.E.A.T. "Instructor's Manual", for example, would lead one to classify it as a "canned" program. That is, following training, the delivery is straightforward in that terms, concepts, class activities, and homework are clearly detailed and little deviation is allowed. The Community Works (CW) program provides a Curriculum Manual that includes lesson plans, but not "canned" delivery tasks. This is

a much more interactive, skills building program that encourages instructors to tailor the lesson to the group. Indeed, program flexibility is stressed during the CW training sessions. Similar materials are presented but not necessarily in the same sequence or format. Such differences in programs, while potentially important for a number of reasons, still present the evaluator with the task of assessing program fidelity. In the first case, does paraphrasing a direct quote constitute a lack of fidelity? In the second case, does presentation of material out-of sequence within the lesson constitute a lack of fidelity? While the degree of program specificity poses different challenges for the evaluator, assessing program fidelity is nonetheless essential.

2. Intended location of program: While a number of programs are developed for specific populations and settings, other programs are less well defined and are marketed as general prevention programs that can be adapted to school settings (both in-school and after-school), community settings, summer camps, juvenile justice settings, etc. The Community Works program has been marketed as a program that can be implemented in virtually any setting. From the evaluator's perspective, this raises potential concern about program fidelity. The CW program requires approximately 90 hours to complete if all 31 lessons are fully implemented. A subset of the lessons is considered to be the "core" of the program and it is recommended that these eight lessons plus the Action Project (about 30 hours) be taught in sequence and in their entirety. While there are other issues that will be considered later in this report, for the time being we focus on the question of the extent to which a 30-hour program can be systematically delivered in some settings. For example, is it possible to teach the program as intended in a juvenile justice detention center with the constant transition of youths in and out of the facility? What about a community center (e.g., Boys and Girls Club of America) where attendance is voluntary? Or, what is the feasibility of program fidelity in an in-school suspension program? Is the CW program suitable for such settings? These are important questions that were addressed in our site selection process that is described in detail in Chapter 2 of this report.

3. Dosage and adherence: The preceding comments about program location are directly relevant to the issue of fidelity, especially dosage and adherence. The G.R.E.A.T. program consisted of nine lessons (or ten if you counted the recommended culmination or graduation exercise/ceremony) ideally taught over the course of nine weeks (one lesson per week). In reality, some schools taught the program every day for two weeks while others used quite different models. Some officers combined lessons (in one instance three lessons into one period), thus reducing the dosage. The CW program consists of 31 lessons, although the "core 8" and the Action Project (three lessons) now referred to as the "core 11" constitute the essential elements of the program. These "core 11" lessons, however, require approximately 30 class periods to deliver. So, what kind of delivery dosage constitutes program implementation? Does someone who teaches all "core 11" lessons in 15 hours "implement" the program? Does someone who teaches the old "core 8" but no Action Project "implement" the program? What about someone who teaches 30 hours of CW but does so in a non-systematic fashion, teaching the "additional" lessons but not the "core 8"? Another component of the CW program that is considered essential is the integration of Community Resource People (CRP) into the lesson plans. If the core lessons are implemented in their entirety and with rigor, but without CRP, does this constitute implementation? To address questions about minimal levels of program implementation required to achieve desired effects, it is beneficial to have program staff identify what their minimum criteria are for program implementation. This task, however, generally tends to be left to the discretion of the evaluator. In the current evaluation of CW, we suggest utilizing the following: (1) at least 70% of the "core 8" lessons need to be taught; (2) at least 20 hours (approximately 70%) of program delivery time is required; (3) an Action Project must at the minimum have been initiated and planned; and (4) Community Resource People have to participate to some extent in the program delivery. Chapters 4 and 5 of this report provide discussion of the extent to which the selected sites complied with these implementation standards.

4. Training and certification of program providers: For evaluators, one place to begin is with observation and assessment of program training and certification. This serves two important functions – to increase familiarity with the program and to assess the extent to

which program providers are trained, certified, and/or monitored once they implement the program. When possible, multiple observers should attend multiple training sessions to reduce the possibility of observer bias on the one hand and trainer idiosyncrasies on the other. Different observers may bring different experiences to the observation and allow for a more comprehensive assessment of the training sessions. And, the CW program has at least ten different individuals who conduct training at one or more sites. Their knowledge and skill levels may contribute to variable training quality. One challenge then is to observe an adequate number of sessions to allow assessment of training consistency. Observations of training are time consuming, relatively costly (i.e., travel, lodging, and per diem), and also tend to get quite tedious, if not downright boring. Chapter 3 of this report provides an assessment of the CW training.

5. Targeted audience - unit of analysis: This is something to which most program providers pay relatively little attention. While they may pay attention to program type, location, dosage, and training, it is probably the rare practitioner who thinks about the unit of analysis. For the evaluator, however, this is a key issue that affects, among other things, sampling strategies, sample size, budget, staffing, and logistics. While most programs ultimately target individuals, we need to be more precise and need to assess how the program is delivered. Both the G.R.E.A.T. and CW programs are school-based prevention programs that could be described as individual-change strategies – that is, it is the individual, not the school climate that is targeted. But, the program is delivered to a classroom, not individuals. Thus, the unit of analysis is the classroom. As evaluators we must assess the extent to which classrooms participating in the program differ from classrooms that do not participate. Students comprise the classroom so while we obtain measures from the individuals, we pool these responses to obtain a classroom measure. To examine individual scores negates the fact that the individuals are nested within their classroom. Thus, to conduct an outcome analysis, we need to sample and analyze at the classroom level. In the CW evaluation, we have a sample of 98 classrooms (an equal number of comparison and treatment) with approximately 1,700 students. One logistical issue for an evaluator is the unit of analysis: as a general rule, the larger the unit of analysis, the more difficult it is to implement the evaluation. For instance, if students

were the unit, we could achieve adequate statistical power with approximately 400 students in each group. If schools were the sampling unit, in order to have a comparable level of statistical power, 400 schools would also be required in each group; the same applies to the classroom as the level of analysis. Such sample sizes clearly increase the cost and workload of an evaluation significantly and generally exceeds the budgets of most evaluations. Compounding this issue in school-based evaluations, regardless of the unit of analysis, has been the introduction of recent state and federal mandates (such as No Child Left Behind) which have led administrators to be less receptive to any activities that detract from instructional time.

6. Active Parental Consent: For all research involving minors, parental consent is required so this is nothing unique to program evaluation. What is unique, however, is the issue of differential participation rates in the treatment and comparison groups associated with active consent procedures. There are different strategies for enhancing response rates, most notably the use of incentives for return of permission slips (whether approving or declining permission to participate). Students (and their teachers) participating in a program have a greater investment in participating in an evaluation and, as such, tend to be more likely to return consent forms and to have more of the consent forms providing parental consent. Conversely, there is little incentive for the comparison students to participate in the evaluation. As a consequence, return rates tend to be lower and, of those returned, it is more likely that parents do not provide permission for their children to participate. Thus, evaluators must strive to reduce this possible differential rate of study participation.

7. Management Information System: Program evaluators expect that program providers maintain some level of information about program adoption and implementation. At a bare minimum, for instance, such a database should include names and addresses of people undergoing training, locations of program delivery, status of program implementation, and number of impacted people. Without such information, an evaluator is placed in the difficult situation of looking for a needle in a haystack. In this current “earmark” evaluation, we have spent considerable time and effort simply locating

potential evaluation sites. The database maintained by NCPC was neither current nor accurate. In Chapter 2 of this report, we document the evaluation team's efforts to identify program locations and degree of program implementation.

Summary

In the preceding discussion we have attempted to set the stage for the process evaluation conducted as part of our evaluation of the Community Works program. The following sections provide detailed accounts of our efforts, conclusions, and recommendations regarding the program fidelity of the CW program. We trust that the readers of this document will appreciate our attempts to assess CW program training, implementation, and management information system maintenance.

CHAPTER 2: Site Selection and Surveys of Community Works Providers

Two initial tasks guiding the process evaluation were: (1) delineating the parameters of the Community Works program and (2) identifying program implementation sites. While the first task would appear to be straightforward, it was anything but. To gain an appreciation for this task, a brief history of the program is required. Community Works is a second-generation Law Related Education (LRE) program. That is, Teens, Crime, and the Community (TCC), a law-related education curriculum, was created in 1985 by the National Crime Prevention Council (NCPC) and Street Law, Inc. In 1996, this textbook curriculum was revised to allow for wider dissemination of the program; NCPC and Street Law, Inc. created an interactive learning guide (Community Works) that eliminated the need for the purchase of textbooks. The CW program remains a law-related education program that has both a cognitive and a skills-building focus that has been linked to state teaching standards. Community Works is offered in a variety of settings, including elementary, middle and high schools, juvenile detention facilities, and community centers. The program utilizes a “risk- and protective-factor” approach (see Appendix A for a detailed assessment of each lesson with linkages of lesson components to risk and protective factors) and consists of three components:

- (1) a 31-lesson interactive curriculum dealing with such topics as conflict management, police and the community, handgun violence, hate crimes, substance abuse, and victimization;
- (2) Community Resource People (CRP), experts such as police officers, lawyers, counselors, and community volunteers who can share information and experiences with the students and also serve as potential role models, who assist in the delivery of the program; and
- (3) “action” or service learning projects that allow teens to apply what they have learned.

The Community Works program was intended to be adaptable to a variety of settings, age groups, and audiences. While this *curriculum versatility* was perceived as a strength and marketable feature, it made the *program* difficult to define and locate. In

order for the program to exist, what features were necessary? Did all 31 lessons need to be taught? If not, how many lessons and which ones were essential for the program to have its desired effect? Was it essential that Community Resource People (CRP) be utilized and/or that the Action Project be completed? Prior to determining program locations, these definitional parameters needed to be addressed. Following a series of conversations with NCPC staff and Street Law, Inc. and review of their program documents, it was determined that for the CW program to have its desired effect, program implementers should teach the "core 8" lessons, implement the Action Project, and utilize CRP in the program delivery. If implemented properly, this would amount to approximately 30 program hours.

Armed with these program parameters, we began the task of identifying program sites. It is important to realize that our objective in surveying sites was **not** to conduct a survey of all CW sites but to survey potential sites to be included in the outcome evaluation. We anticipated that this would be a relatively straightforward process: obtain a list of providers from NCPC, contact a sample of sites, and determine the extent of program implementation and sustainability. The following summarizes our efforts in identifying schools that would ultimately serve as sites for the outcome component of the current grant.

Surveys of Program Providers

Our initial efforts to identify sites focused on school-based programs as we were led to believe these sites offered the highest degree of program fidelity as well as impacted the greatest number of participants. Early in the grant period (December 2003) the evaluation team requested that NCPC provide information on the sites implementing the Community Works program. Specifically, we requested the following information: (1) a listing of program providers but especially schools (including addresses and contact persons if possible) teaching the Community Works curriculum, and (2) information about the grade level in which CW is offered at each site. This request produced delivery of copies of 143 "site registration" forms that identified four groupings of CW programs: those "currently" implementing in 2001-2002 and in 2002-2003, and those "planning to implement" in 2002-2003 and in 2003-2004. We reviewed these forms (i.e., identifying

grade levels, degree of program implementation, and geographical location) and began to forge a sampling strategy based on the information contained in the registration forms. A key issue that we considered in our review of materials was the grade level that would be most appropriate for the evaluation. As mentioned above, CW was offered in a variety of settings and to a wide age range of youth. The diversity of program offerings was used as a marketing tool to elicit program adoption. From an evaluation perspective, however, this program diversity posed additional concerns. To study the program in all its applications would not be feasible and our efforts would need to be focused on a restricted type of program delivery and a limited age range of program recipients.

In our proposal, we had identified middle schools as the targeted group and had received some degree of support for this strategy from the NCPC and Street Law, Inc. staff. In addition to restricting our search to middle schools, we were also concerned about geographic concentration. That is, we wanted to include schools from multiple states in order to better address program transferability. At the same time, we also needed to consider travel costs associated with multiple data collection trips to geographically dispersed schools. With these criteria in mind, our initial review of the site registration forms suggested that we would be able to include middle schools from the following states in the outcome evaluation: Arizona, Kentucky, Missouri, Texas, North Carolina, and South Carolina. We began contacting the middle schools in these states and quickly realized that these registration forms did not provide an accurate picture of program delivery and could not serve as the basis for outcome evaluation site selection. For instance, CW had been discontinued in some sites, never implemented in others, partially implemented in still others, and offered as after-school voluntary programs rather than in-school required programs in others.

Of the 143 site registration forms, 12 were elementary school based, 40 in middle schools, 32 in high schools, 14 in alternative schools, three in detention centers, and 42 were in other settings, including community-based programs. We tried to contact 66 of the sites that were identified as “currently implementing” in 2002 – 2003. A minimum of two telephone calls were made to all of the designated contact people (and messages left), with actual contact made with representatives at 36 sites. Of these individuals, 24 indicated that they were teaching either TCC or CW while 12 stated that they were not

implementing the program. Of the 24 sites, 15 were in non-traditional school settings (i.e., detention centers and alternative schools) and did not implement the program in a systematic manner to a consistent group of youth. Only nine of the identified sites were in-school programs, one in elementary and four each in middle and high school settings.

Since the evaluation design called for assessment of “in-school” programs, this list of current sites was inadequate. During a meeting with NCPC staff on February 15, 2004, we requested once again that NCPC provide the research team with information about site locations of the program. We offered to have a research assistant travel to Washington, DC to assist the NCPC staff organize their database so that we could obtain the requisite data on program delivery locations. The NCPC project director indicated that they would copy all their files onto a disk and forward their entire database to the research office. When the disk eventually arrived a research assistant began examining the multitude of files contained on the disk. A file identified as "active sites" and consisting of 761 program locations was deemed the most appropriate file for further scrutiny. In a follow-up phone conversation with NCPC staff, it was verified that the programs included in that file reflected those sites that, as far as NCPC knew, (based on recent submission of site registration forms or other knowledge) were currently offering TCC or CW. Of these 761 sites, 167 were in middle schools. We contacted 103 of these schools, leaving a minimum of two messages and successfully interviewed a respondent at 59 of these schools. Only two of these individuals were able to confirm that CW was indeed offered in their schools. (Most of the sites had not offered CW or TCC at anytime in the preceding three years.)

It became quite clear that this data file was inappropriate for purposes of identifying potential outcome sites. We contacted NCPC and informed them of the problems encountered. At this point we were told that they had begun a process of organizing their database and should have an accurate file to the evaluation team by April 12, 2004. On Thursday April 15, NCPC made the determination that their records would not allow them to provide a list of sites currently implementing the CW program. As a result they initiated a survey of all of the programs (approximately 3,000 individuals who had received training and/or received a CW binder) in their database. NCPC emailed

individuals for whom they had email addresses while others were contacted via fax or U.S. postal services.

On May 24, NCPC emailed to our offices an Excel file containing responses from their survey. The file contained responses from 270 sites. Of these, 15 were double-counted (e.g., SRO and teacher from same school responding), one was triple-counted, and two were reported by four different respondents; 58 indicated they did not have a CW binder and did not offer the program; 11 sites indicated they were not currently offering the program and 60 (newly trained in Arizona, South Carolina, and California) indicated that they were planning to implement the program in the future. Thus, of the 270 sites, there were 118 active sites (subtracting those identified in the preceding description) and 60 soon-to-be active sites for a total of 178 program locations. Of these, 110 were in schools, 50 in community agencies, 21 in juvenile justice locations, and nine in unspecified settings. Upon receipt of this information, we began contacting the middle schools (45) to confirm the validity of the information provided and to obtain additional information that would assist in determining whether the site could be considered for inclusion in the outcome evaluation. Telephone calls and/or email messages to the 45 middle schools (multiple attempts were made to reach the contact person) resulted in fourteen completed telephone interviews and three email responses; the remaining 28 individuals did not respond to messages or emails.

At this point, however, we were asked by NCPC to reconsider the evaluation design targeting not just middle schools, but schools in general. Responding to this request, we began calling high schools and elementary schools (from the survey-generated list) to inquire about program usage and delivery. A total of 34 elementary and high schools were called and contact made with 18.

Given concerns about the ongoing difficulty of identifying active CW sites and the wide range of program delivery models, evaluation team members flew to Washington, DC for a meeting with NCPC and Street Law, Inc. staff on June 8, 2004. In that meeting, we reviewed the alternatives of conducting an evaluation of in-school, after-school, community-based programs, as well as other delivery models. After considerable discussion, NCPC decided that they did want the evaluation team to proceed with the middle-school design and to evaluate programs that had the highest degree of program

fidelity. At that point, we returned to the task of contacting school personnel identified in the newest (i.e., third) database of “active” program sites. This process took longer given the unfortunate timing of receiving the “go ahead” after many schools had already closed for the summer. By June 30, 2004 we had been successful in contacting only six potential site representatives, leaving the bulk of the site selection process to be completed in August as schools re-opened for the new school year.

During 2004, NCPC and Street Law, Inc. had made substantial progress in redesigning and updating the CW curriculum. As a result, they asked us to restrict the evaluation to sites willing to implement the new curriculum. While the new curriculum did not include major changes, NCPC and Street Law, Inc. staff members felt it necessary to conduct one-day refresher training sessions. A willingness to use the new curriculum thus became another condition in the recruitment of schools to the outcome evaluation.

We began contacting schools again during the last week of July and began making additional progress in classifying schools as CW implementers and non-implementers. Many of the schools, as was determined in earlier telephone calls, were not implementing the program in a consistent manner. Many could be classified as program users but only a few implemented the core lessons as part of a structured in-school program. Concerned that we would not identify an adequate number of schools, we initiated two other strategies for identifying potential evaluation sites: (1) we worked closely with the Arizona Expansion Center and (2) we reviewed our notes and other documentation from training sessions that evaluation team members had observed during the preceding year.

Arizona was identified in the NIJ solicitation as a state with a high degree of program oversight and implementation. As such, evaluation team members had considerable contact with staff members at the Arizona Expansion Center during the first year of the grant period. This degree of contact proved beneficial as the Arizona Expansion Center maintained a comprehensive database on individuals participating in CW training and on schools implementing the program. The Arizona database proved to be more current than data provided by NCPC. Schools identified by Arizona Expansion Center staff had undergone training and had implemented CW or had plans to implement in 2004-2005. Older sites in Arizona (i.e., those trained prior to 2004) were listed in the

NCPC data set so between these two sources we identified 25 potential schools in Arizona. Of these, we excluded schools from consideration if, upon further exploration, they had stopped offering CW, did not deliver CW as intended (usually as an after-school club program), utilized the program as part of in-school detention, or offered the program to all students and were unwilling to withhold CW from a subset of classrooms. This process reduced the eligible pool of Arizona sites to 11 schools. Of these 11 schools, three districts declined the opportunity to participate (one principal indicated the program was not ready for evaluation; one research office thought that the questionnaire administration time was too great; and the third district did not want their students to answer the kinds of questions included in the survey). The remaining eight schools agreed to participate.

The Arizona Expansion Center conducted one-day re-certification training for sites interested in adopting the revised CW curriculum. An evaluation team member attended this training to assess the curriculum changes and associated training. He was also given the opportunity to make a formal presentation in which he detailed the evaluation design to the participants. This proved to be a beneficial strategy as the teachers and officers understood the school's responsibilities and were able to facilitate subsequent discussions with the principals.

Based upon review of materials from the process evaluation component of the current grant (training observations and interviews with South Carolina Expansion Center staff), we believed that South Carolina might prove a likely site. The evaluation team requested the opportunity to address the South Carolina School Resource Officer's group during one of its monthly meetings. (Several of these officers had attended the CW training session the evaluation team observed on April 22, 2004.) While the Expansion Center staff had indicated that none of the officers would be able or willing to implement CW in regular classrooms, we discovered that several officers would be more than happy to implement CW in this manner. Following a number of telephone conversations with the officers, teachers, principals, and district administrators, we successfully negotiated the implementation of the CW program in three middle schools in Florence, SC. Importantly, these schools also agreed to participate in the evaluation.

A situation similar to that reported in South Carolina materialized in New England. We were told that the CW program was not implemented as an in-school delivery model – that all of the programs in New England were after-school or club-based models. In reviewing the training attendee lists, we noticed that 12 officers and one sergeant from the New Bedford, Massachusetts Police Department had completed the CW training in February of 2004. This struck the research team as a considerable time commitment and we contacted the sergeant to ascertain their plans for implementing CW. No decision had been made regarding the CW delivery model, but once again, following numerous telephone and email exchanges, and two in-person meetings (8/31/04 and 10/26/04), we successfully negotiated the implementation of CW and participation in the evaluation in two middle schools in that city.

By the beginning of October, we had received approval to conduct the evaluation from six schools in Arizona and were still negotiating with additional schools in Arizona, South Carolina, Massachusetts, and New Mexico. Concerned that we would not meet our sample size goals, we requested that NCPC send an email to all CW sites for which they had email addresses. That email provided a brief description of the evaluation and requirements for participation. Eight individuals responded to the email but only one of the schools fit the evaluation requirements. By the end of October, agreements had been reached with a total of 15 schools (nine in Arizona, one in New Mexico, three in South Carolina, and two in Massachusetts).

To summarize, we reviewed a number of data sources in order to identify program sites, including the following: (1) site registration forms provided by NCPC (143); (2) a CD-Rom data base of active sites (761); (3) a list of “active sites” generated by a survey conducted by NCPC in summer of 2004 (270); (4) training participant lists provided by NCPC and Expansion Centers (more than 100); (5) a list of trained participants from the Arizona Expansion Center (25); and (6) responses to an email inquiry sent to NCPC’s email list of sites during Fall 2004 (eight). We restricted our contacts to school-based programs, focusing on middle schools. We made telephone contact with more than 250 schools and from this process we were able to recruit 15 schools into the outcome evaluation. The vast majority of the contacted schools did **not implement** the Community Works program. Many of those contacted did **use** elements of the CW

curriculum as resource material but did not teach the program as a coherent, stand-alone program. Reasons for excluding schools from participation in the evaluation included the following: schools that “used” the program but did not “implement” it (this, among others, applied to all alternative schools that were contacted); and schools that were geographically isolated (i.e., their inclusion would have placed undue financial costs on the evaluation).

CHAPTER 3: Training and technical assistance

In this chapter our goal is to address two aspects of the process evaluation related to training and technical assistance. Specifically, we examine the extent to which NCPC and Street Law, Inc. staff members provide (1) adequate training to potential program providers and (2) support to Expansion Center staff and program providers. To address these issues, we rely upon two primary data sources: observation of trainings and interviews with national office and Expansion Center staff.

With respect to training, our interest is in assessing the extent to which potential program providers are informed about various aspects of the program during the training sessions, including teaching styles, curriculum content, and other programmatic components. In other words, are training participants prepared to implement the CW curriculum after the two-day training sessions? Technical assistance, both the quality and amount provided, has been suggested (e.g., Mihalic & Irwin, 2003) to be a key factor associated with successful program implementation. In this chapter, we focus our attention on the role technical assistance (TA) plays in the provision of services to Expansion Centers and ultimately to the program providers of Community Works.

Community Works Training

As part of our proposal, we indicated that evaluation team members would observe a number of Community Works training sessions. The purpose of these observations is twofold: first, these observations serve a useful instructional and informational role for the evaluators by exposing them to program components and enhancing their familiarity with the program and second, the observations provide an opportunity to critically assess the quality of the training as it relates to the successful implementation of the program. A focus on the training sessions is also warranted, as it is the most common type of direct contact between program providers and the national office. While the NCPC staff does provide other forms of assistance to program providers (i.e., e-mails, newsletters, websites, telephone contact, and site visits), the training sessions are often the first in-person contact the trainees have with NCPC and therefore has a significant influence on their overall perception and assessment of the

quality of the program and the professionalism of the staff. As such, it is important to examine the quality of these training sessions.

During the first two years of the current grant (between November 2003 and April 2005), six members of the evaluation team observed seven different training sessions. In the majority of cases, two or more members of the evaluation staff observed the training sessions and compared notes upon training completion. The following training sessions were observed:

- Phoenix, AZ – October 2003
- Washington, DC – November 2003
- Phoenix, AZ – March 2004
- Springfield, MO – March 2004
- Columbia, SC – April 2004
- Phoenix, AZ – September 2004
- Las Vegas, NV – April 2005

With one exception (the refresher training in Phoenix in September 2004), all of the trainings were two-day sessions. Each observer took detailed notes that were typed and filed upon return to the office. These observations serve as the basis for the following assessment of the CW training.

Community Works training consists of a two-day schedule that attempts to introduce potential program providers to the CW curriculum as well as to expose trainees to a number of instructional techniques that are part of the CW program. The training team generally consists of three individuals with one serving as the primary trainer, a second as an assistant who helps to model various program components, and a third who serves as training facilitator, assisting with logistics as well as assisting with some of the actual training. The training classes varied in size but usually consisted of 25 – 30 trainees. In some situations, two or more representatives from a single program or school participated while in other situations a single person served as a program representative. Training participants also varied in terms of professional background. In the observed training sessions, the most common job descriptions were school resource officer, juvenile probation officer, teacher, school counselor, community agency representative, and school or agency administrator. Clearly, a wide range of experience in teaching and

program delivery characterized these training groups. One important aspect of this diversity of trainees is the lack of common knowledge and experience with regard to program delivery. Thus, one goal for the trainers is to provide teaching tools and strategies that non-educators could learn to utilize in eventual program delivery.

In the current outcome evaluation of CW, our focus is on the school-based program delivery. The fact that law enforcement and juvenile justice personnel are involved in the program delivery in many schools highlights the importance of introducing teaching strategies to training attendees. As others have noted (e.g., Sellers et al., 1998), the reliance on non-educators to deliver school-based prevention programs can prove challenging for a variety of reasons (see Chapter 4 of this report for a discussion). Ensuring that non-educators receive proper instruction regarding program content and purpose may alleviate some but not all of the potential barriers to proper program delivery.

In the following sections we organize our observations and comments into the following categories: trainers, teaching strategies, program content, time management, and intended audience. We conclude with a summary and recommendations for NCPC to consider.

Trainers

Trainers appeared to be at ease when speaking from their prepared scripts but seemed less comfortable when attempting to answer substantive questions regarding program implementation. In these instances, trainers sometimes provided attendees with vague or inaccurate information, such as specifying the difference between a misdemeanor and a felony. Also, trainers repeatedly characterized the CW curriculum as “adaptable and flexible”. For instance, trainers encouraged participants to have students write journals rather than state this was part of the program. Furthermore, trainers often encouraged trainees to modify the material. This may have had particular implications regarding the extent to which training sessions adequately prepared attendees to implement the program. Specifically, this appeared to influence whether potential program providers viewed CW as a resource rather than a program (see Chapter 5 of this report for a discussion). For example, an observer commented, “the training

offered no practical advice for the technical considerations of implementing the program. The trainer asked the group to think about how the program could be implemented but offered no advice toward convincing administrators of the value and importance of the program or how it could fit into an actual school program.”

Teaching Strategies

Training staff made ample use of group activities and teaching strategies that are included in the instructional materials (i.e., Brainstorming, Case Study, Compile a Hot List, Concentric Circles, Concept Map, Conduct a Survey, Continuum, Debriefing, Each One Teach One, Jeopardy, Journal Writing, Questioning, Role-play, Scavenger Hunt, Small-group Discussion, and Whole-group Discussion). For instance, “icebreakers” were modeled at several points during the training. These group activities are intended to create a safe and comfortable learning environment and to help familiarize program participants with one another. Some of the icebreakers are geared towards creating subgroups of students that may not otherwise mingle. One fun example of this is the balloon approach. In this exercise, the teacher slips a piece of paper with a number or letter on it into a balloon and then blows up the balloons. Students then break their balloons to find out their group assignment. When student interest wanes, instructors are encouraged to utilize “energizers” – strategies that can re-enforce lesson materials or simply serve to re-energize the groups. A number of teaching strategies are included in the training materials and a subset of these strategies are introduced through a modeling approach during training; that is, the trainers teach the designated materials by presenting the lesson as it should be taught. These teaching strategies are described in the training materials distributed to the trainees. Given the amount and sheer variety of information to be shared during a training session, the two-day schedule is quite busy. Table 3-1 provides a typical training schedule.

Table 3-1. Typical two-day training agenda

<i>DAY ONE</i>	<i>DAY TWO</i>
Welcome and Introduction	Icebreaker
What is Community Works	Victims of Crime (Session #3)
Overview of CW Curriculum	Break
Lunch	Action Projects
Energizer	Youth Safety Corps
What is a Crime (Session #2)	Handling Difficult Situations
Break	Lunch
Using Community Resource People (CRP)	What Makes a Great Session?
Teaching Strategies	Energizer
	Modeling a Session
	Debrief
	Program Planning

Trainers relied heavily upon icebreakers to help facilitate teaching the program, which most attendees seemed to enjoy. They also encouraged participants to utilize icebreakers in their delivery of the CW curriculum. For instance, in one particular exercise, trainees were required to negotiate a maze by stepping on the squares that contained the correct answers to questions related to CW. Each subsequent person was required to repeat the correct answers and retrace the squares across the maze. This strategy appeared to be an important teaching opportunity. However, several trainers continually failed to make explicit the link between icebreakers and key components of the program; they simply offered that icebreakers were appropriate given the interactive nature of CW.

Program Content

Training sessions provided attendees with an overview of the curriculum and highlighted key components necessary for proper implementation (i.e., the core or required lessons, Action Projects, and the role and use of Community Resource People). Sessions also offered attendees opportunities to observe lessons being modeled and to model a session in smaller groups. As noted above, trainers demonstrated several of the sixteen identified teaching strategies involved in delivering the CW curriculum.

However, this strategy should be expanded to allow participants more opportunity to model the core sessions of the curriculum. In addition to providing attendees with information, this approach might also prove beneficial for successful program implementation. All of the observers noted that, while teaching strategies were effectively utilized and several of the CW lessons were modeled, they were left with a lack of knowledge about the program as a whole. The training sessions did not allow for coverage of each of the eight core lessons and little time was allotted to the substantive information contained in the lessons. The attendees were instructed to review the other lessons on their own and that the information contained in those lessons was something with which they were somewhat familiar. This may be the case for SRO and JPO attendees but is less likely the case for counselors, administrators, and some teachers (e.g., English teachers may not be versed in criminal and juvenile justice subject matters).

Training participant lists are available to the trainers well before the scheduled training. Given the diversity of people attending the training, some attention should be given to specific needs. For instance, in a training session containing mostly SROs, less attention to substantive issues such as legal terms would be required while perhaps greater emphasis on teaching strategies, developmental stages, and classroom management might be needed. Conversely, in sessions containing mostly teachers, the opposite would be the case. Based upon our observations, trainers seemingly did not adapt training sessions to their audiences. This might have proved beneficial given the diversity of training participants. In addition to program delivery and content, it is also reasonable to expect that program providers in different settings would have unique issues and concerns regarding program implementation. Discussion of such issues, as we

will see in Chapter 4 of this report, may contribute to a greater degree of program implementation.

One component of the training introduced confusion about the actual program content. During the second day of training, the Youth Safety Corps (YSC) program was introduced. This proved confusing for some attendees. Specifically, participants were sometimes unable to distinguish between the two programs and had difficulty determining which was most appropriate for their respective sites. For instance, one observer noted, “Promoting YSC and CW simultaneously seems against the objectives of the training sessions and possibly harmful.” Observers and participants were left wondering if YSC was part of CW or if it was a distinct program.

Time Management

Observers noted, that in spite of the amount of material and teaching strategies that need to be covered during the training sessions, ineffective time management hindered many of the observed sessions. While the agendas were detailed and fairly consistent, they allowed for moderate variation. However, the posted timelines for particular components of the agendas were seldom followed. Several training sessions also did not begin at the designated time(s) (breaks and lunch often ran over so that the next session did not begin on time). Additionally, some trainers exceeded the time allotted for scheduled topics, reducing the time allotted for the next session. For example, one observer noted, “In the 90 minute demonstration of a CW lesson, the trainer went well over the established time period. This raises the concern that if the trainer can’t manage to complete the material in the allotted time, it seems unlikely that teachers and counselors who are less versed in the material would be able to do so.” This observation was a portent of the extent to which time management would be an issue in actual program delivery (in Chapter 4 we provide an in-depth discussion of this issue). Interestingly, while the training sessions were scheduled for two full days, rarely was this the case. The second day was often completed two hours before the scheduled time. In several of the observations, the trainers made a point of telling participants that they would wrap up early so that they could “beat the traffic”. Given the consensus of all the observers (i.e., that more time should be devoted to the actual CW curriculum content),

these time management issues become important for the trainers. It may not be that the training requires more time, just better time management.

There appeared to be a schism between marketing CW and providing attendees with a realistic view of time and resource allocations necessary for successful implementation. For instance, trainers repeatedly made concessions to participants who expressed concerns about not having the requisite classroom time to devote to CW. Rather than emphasizing that a minimum number of contact hours were necessary for implementation, trainers offered that there were differences between those who “used” and those who “implemented” the program. They further stressed that CW could effectively serve the needs of both populations. The distinction between the two terms is particularly important, as the “use” of CW is less likely to result in the consistent delivery of the core components of the program. Trainers appeared to be very interested in attendees adopting CW in *any* form and therefore appeared reluctant to raise or address concerns about program fidelity. As will be discussed in Chapters 4 and 5, our evaluation suggests that greater attention should be paid to this topic of program implementation.

Intended Audience

An additional concern regarding training sessions was a failure to target the appropriate audience. In some instances, school administrators and guidance counselors, none of whom intended on delivering CW, attended trainings without being accompanied by a teacher or school resource officers/juvenile probation officers (SRO/JPO). This is of particular importance because the trainings were not intended to promote the program but to train individuals to deliver the program. During the Program Planning phase of the training sessions, attendees were asked whether they felt comfortable showing other persons from their respective sites how to implement CW. This suggests that perhaps trainers were aware that those in attendance were not always the best suited for program implementation.

Summary and Recommendations

In the preceding sections we have provided an overview of the CW training and comments derived from observations of seven training sessions attended by evaluation staff members. Based upon these observations, we offer the following recommendations to NCPC:

- continue to model teaching strategies during trainings;
- emphasize that CW is a program, not simply a resource;
- expand the coverage of substantive components of the CW program;
- incorporate more modeling of the lessons (or sessions) into the training;
- improve time management during the training;
- encourage actual potential program providers to attend the training sessions.

These recommendations are offered with the intent to increase the probability that the program will be implemented with greater fidelity than is currently the case. As long as the program is perceived as a resource rather than as a coherent program, it will be unreasonable to expect that program outcomes can be achieved. As will be detailed in Chapter 4 of this report, program implementation was not achieved at many of the evaluation sites. Improved training might be one approach to remedying this situation.

Technical Assistance and NCPC Relationships with Expansion Centers

We now turn our attention to technical assistance and the relationship between NCPC and the Expansion Centers. Given the importance of technical assistance to successful program implementation (Mihalic & Irwin, 2003), we focus on the extent to which the Expansion Centers are able to provide this service. As described in the previous section of this chapter, the Community Works training introduces potential providers to the curriculum as well as to a number of teaching strategies. For the program to be successfully implemented, however, many providers require follow-up assistance for questions and situations that did not arise in training but confront the novice CW provider. To meet this need, NCPC disseminates a newsletter, maintains a website with program information, and has a Washington staff of three people who are available to respond to email inquiries. Additionally, NCPC staff members are also

available, on a limited basis, to provide on-site technical assistance. To further enhance the ability to provide efficient and cost-effective assistance, NCPC contracts with a number of local agencies to serve as Expansion Centers. These centers assist with training (i.e., scheduling, hosting, and providing the actual training) and with subsequent assistance to providers in their geographical areas. During the first two years of this evaluation, the number of Expansion Centers was in a continual state of flux, ranging from as many as 14 designated centers to as few as five. According to the TCC Program Director, National Crime Prevention Council, these changes in Expansion Center locations reflected the emerging role of these centers vis-à-vis the national office.

The Expansion Centers with the most apparent stability in 2004 were the following: Arizona Foundation for Legal Service and Education in Phoenix, Arizona; the Kentucky Administrative Office of the Court, Juvenile Services Section, Lexington, Kentucky; the Community Partnership of the Ozarks in Springfield, Missouri; the Rhode Island Children's Crusade in Providence, Rhode Island; and the South Carolina Bar Association in Columbia, South Carolina. To assess the extent and quality of technical assistance, evaluation team members met with representatives of these five Expansion Centers as well as with staff members at NCPC and Street Law, Inc. The director of the Expansion Center and, where appropriate, a second staff member (Arizona, Missouri, and South Carolina) were interviewed. The majority (all but one) of these interviews were face-to-face and lasted between one and two hours. Following the primary interviews, clarification and/or additional information was obtained via telephone or email communication. Multiple meetings and interviews with NCPC and Street Law, Inc. representatives occurred between November 2003 and September 2005, while the Expansion Center data were collected between February and April 2004.

The evaluation team developed an interview guide that was administered to Expansion Center staff. However, respondents were encouraged to elaborate on any subjects and to discuss topics not covered in the guide. The following questions were asked:

- (1) How many different programs does your Expansion Center support or assist?
- (2) How many staff members are placed at the Expansion Center?
- (3) How many staff members are involved in the CW program?

- (4) How many hours per week do staff members allocate to CW?
- (5) How many separate CW programs does your Expansion Center support or assist?
- (6) Does Expansion Center staff make on-site visits, phone calls, e-mails, or hold regular meetings with CW sites?
- (7) What is the geographical location of the Expansion Center?
- (8) Where are the CW sites located in relation to the Expansion Center?
 - (8a) Do you have a list of currently operating programs/sites?
- (9) Does the Expansion Center have knowledge of future plans for new CW sites or sites discontinuing the program?
- (10) Does the Expansion Center have any records regarding the number of classes or students involved in CW?

The Expansion Centers

Questions 1 through 5 of the interview guide sought information regarding the organizational structure of the Expansion Center with regard to its scope (diversity of programs and services offered), size (number of staff at the center in general and the number working with CW), and effort (number of hours per week allocated to CW and number of CW programs). Responses to these questions provided quite diverse descriptions of the Expansion Centers.

All of the Expansion Centers operated within a larger umbrella agency and the Community Works program represented but one of a multitude of programs. (All of the Expansion Centers operate in conjunction with a number of different agencies and programs, and CW is representative of just one of these programs.) In Missouri, for example, CW is one of more than 30 different programs supported by 27 different funding sources, all coordinated by the Community Partnership of the Ozarks. The diversity of programs offered by this southwestern Missouri agency is represented by the following list: Americorps, Caring Communities, Violence Free Families, Latinos Against Drugs, and TeenNet. In Arizona, the Arizona Foundation for Legal Service and Education has a much more targeted mandate and coordinates law-related education throughout the state, including organizing an annual conference attended by educators

and criminal justice professionals. As evidenced by these two examples, local oversight of the Community Works program within these Expansion Centers (EC) varies greatly.

The multitude of programs that are offered within these umbrella agencies is also reflected in the staffing effort allocated to CW. In the Kentucky EC, which provides support for numerous juvenile justice initiatives, one staff person commits approximately 15 hours per week to CW. The South Carolina EC has three staff members associated with CW; however, all three are at relatively low levels of involvement (the Director reported dedicating about 7% of her time to CW – less than three hours per week, an assistant committed approximately eight hours per week while an administrative assistant worked less than one hour per week on CW). At the Missouri site, the director and an assistant committed a combined 12 hours to CW (the director four and her assistant eight). In Arizona, the CW effort was enhanced by a grant from the Arizona Department of Education and by support from the Arizona Bar Foundation. The director of this EC was supported at 25% FTE by the CW grant while the DOE grant funded one whole position and the Arizona Bar Association covered all administrative costs.

Among the obligations associated with being designated a TCC/CW Expansion Center are the following: recruiting CW sites; training CW program providers; providing technical and follow-up assistance to those trained; and filing quarterly reports to the NCPC national office. These five Expansion Centers received grants ranging from \$30,000 to \$42,000 for fiscal year 2003-2004 (TCC Director, February 14, 2004). One of the objectives specified in their contracts was the recruitment of 25 new sites each year. As we will see in the subsequent section, this requirement was the source of considerable confusion.

Relationships between Expansion Centers and NCPC

While questions about the quality of the relationship between the Expansion Centers and the NCPC national office were not part of our guided interview questions, this issue was raised during each interview. Expansion Center staff reported being very satisfied with the assistance they received from the national office in the form of program materials (e.g., binders, brochures, training literature, etc.). This level of satisfaction, however, was in sharp contrast to underlying friction between the Expansion Centers and

NCPC. The EC directors were not satisfied with the direction they received regarding their grants and site recruitment issues. In fact, interviewees repeatedly characterized the relationship between NCPC and their Expansion Centers as “strained” and “tenuous”.

Many of the problems appeared to stem from ineffective communication between the parties and seemingly ever-changing NCPC policies. For example, personnel from Expansion Centers reported that NCPC has been vague as to the definition of a CW site. At three of the ECs, disagreement arose between the EC and national office on this topic of site definition. Was a classroom (where CW is offered) or the physical structure (i.e., school, community center) defined as the site? The Expansion Centers had understood that a site was defined as a teacher/officer unit and believed that this was consistent with NCPC’s criterion. However, conflict arose when such sites were identified in quarterly reports. When multiple classrooms from the same school were listed as program sites, NCPC refused to recognize them as such. As a result, Expansion Center staff reported that they shied away from attempting to increase the number of classrooms in any particular school for fear that regardless of their efforts NCPC would recognize the entire school as merely one site.

This definition of what constitutes a site arose at three of the ECs and had a subsequent negative effect on the outcome evaluation. In one site, for example, the EC staff worked on the assumption that a teacher/officer unit was one site. When they submitted three such sites from one school, NCPC challenged the counting and insisted that the school constituted the site. This disagreement is important for financial reasons; each site receives a stipend of \$250 to assist with the Action Projects and other costs associated with CW implementation. If a school is treated as one site, then \$250 is shared among all classroom teachers. If the teacher/officer unit is considered a site, then each teacher receives the stipend. This definitional debate that was won by NCPC created a disincentive to train more than one team from each school and had an apparent deleterious effect for the outcome evaluation. According to interviews with EC staff, NCPC had instructed them that the national evaluation people only wanted one CW classroom taught in each school. (At one of the observed training sessions, the trainer stated that the trainees should teach only one class of CW at their schools.) The outcome evaluation design had in fact stipulated that multiple classrooms would be recruited at

each school (the hope was to recruit five CW and five comparison classrooms from each school). As reported in Chapter 2 of this report, significant problems were encountered in the site selection process; one of the problems was finding schools planning to offer multiple classes of Community Works during the same semester.

Conversations with four of the Expansion Center staff members resulted in comments expressing frustration with NCPC. In addition to changing definitions of what constitutes a site, Expansion Center staff identified budget reductions, a lack of appreciation of the local situation, and poor communication in general as sources of discontent. Expansion Center personnel believed that NCPC expectations of them were unreasonable given the level of financial support being provided. In fact, many identified CW as their smallest contracts, yet it required considerably more effort and resources than were covered by the grant.

Another criticism was of NCPC staff members' apparent lack of interest in the EC's larger overall operation and functions. One site claimed that NCPC staff failed to appreciate the local situation and the specific mandate of the umbrella agency. For this agency, this meant that in order to meet NCPC's expectations, they would have to broaden the CW catchment area beyond that of their larger funding mandate. The CW coordinator interpreted this situation as a lack of sensitivity and understanding on the part of the NCPC staff. Perhaps most telling of the level of satisfaction with the national office and with the quality of that organization was the comment by one EC coordinator: "they don't have their shit together." This comment was in direct response to the definitional issues already discussed and to the changing budgetary conditions associated with the grants from NCPC.

The perception of Expansion Center staff was that the national office was more interested in program proliferation (i.e., offering trainings) than in maintaining existing sites. This orientation appeared to negatively impact the ability of Expansion Center personnel to provide technical assistance. For example, a staff member from one Expansion Center remarked that NCPC seemed more concerned with simply having CW manuals in every school than having quality programs in fewer schools. Other Expansion Center staff members shared this sentiment and offered as evidence language in their contracts that required them to recruit a specific number of sites each funding cycle.

Expansion Center staff were concerned that failing to recruit a specified number of “new sites” would result in a reduction of their funding for the following year. They viewed NCPC’s preference for introducing CW in additional physical locations over maintaining sites as counter-productive to the mission that was previously articulated by NCPC. In fact, they report that, as with other matters, NCPC has wavered on this issue before finally agreeing to decide on a case-by-case basis.

Expansion Center Records

The Expansion Centers, with but one exception, were not too dissimilar to the national office with regard to record keeping. The EC staff could not provide records of active or inactive sites and offered that NCPC had not asked them to collect or maintain such data even though they are required to submit quarterly reports to the national office. They noted that there is a general lack of accountability regarding CW sites, as the sites are not required to communicate with the Expansion Centers or the national office. As a result, it was very difficult for Expansion Center personnel to determine the total number of sites offering CW in their regions. Clearly, if they (the EC) are not aware of how many programs are actually being delivered, they are also not in a position to provide information about the location of the programs, the number of participants, or the degree of program fidelity. This lack of knowledge also calls into question the extent to which Technical Assistance (TA) or follow-up assistance is provided on anything but an irregular basis.

The majority of the technical assistance provided by Expansion Center staff was via telephone or through electronic communications. In fact, many of the Expansion Centers learned of defunct programs when they failed to return telephone calls or respond to e-mails. When asked specifically about CW programs in their region, staff members from two Expansion Centers were able to produce some unsystematic records but expressed a lack of confidence in their overall accuracy. Another Expansion Center staff member offered an explanation for the lack of reliable data on existing CW sites, stating that “program people are often too busy and do not appreciate the usefulness of data collection.”

At this juncture it is important to introduce one encouraging story - the unique situation found in one of the Expansion Center sites. In Arizona, school resource officers and/or juvenile probation officers are assigned to all schools. One aspect of their assignments is a requirement that they teach 90 hours of law-related education during each semester. Programs such as Community Works therefore help the officers to fulfill this requirement. The Arizona Foundation for Legal Services and Education (a part of the Arizona Bar Foundation) provides oversight of the CW program and has marketed CW as a team-taught program, requiring commitment of the SRO/JPO and a classroom teacher. As such, this team is expected to attend training, combining the substantive knowledge of the officer with the teaching knowledge and skills of the teacher. One consequence of this structural component in Arizona was that in the three trainings observed in Arizona, the norm was that two representatives (a teacher and an officer) from each school participated in the training. As detailed above, the Arizona EC has obtained outside funding to assist with its delivery of CW. Additionally, the director and staff appear to appreciate the need for accurate records (see Chapter 2 for an example of how this facilitated the outcome evaluation) and the importance of technical assistance in successful program implementation. This site was able to provide detailed information about the number of current and discontinued sites, as well as specific information about virtually every program site. The person responsible for TA delivery made personal visits to the sites, observed program delivery, and offered advice and assistance.

Summary and Recommendations

During the initial year of the current evaluation, a number of meetings and interviews were conducted with NCPC, Street Law, Inc., and Expansion Center staff members. Based upon notes from these conversations, we have provided the preceding assessment of technical assistance provided by these agencies and the nature of the relationships between the national office and the Expansion Centers. It would not be unreasonable to conclude that technical assistance is unsystematically provided, generally consists of email or telephone correspondence, and is not recorded. While ECs receive a sizable amount of money (grants between \$30,000 to \$42,000), the EC coordinators do not believe that the grants provide enough money to do what NCPC expects from the

centers. When the relatively low level of funding is combined with the perception of unreasonable expectations, as well as perceived changes in expectations that make contract compliance more difficult, the reported stress between NCPC and the Expansion Centers is not unexpected. To address the concerns expressed by the Expansion Center staff, we provide the following recommendations:

- develop reasonable goals and objectives for the EC;
- provide funding commensurate with expected performance measures;
- provide clearly defined terms for contract compliance;
- require accurate records of training, technical assistance, and program sites; and
- examine more closely the extent to which the Arizona Expansion Center may provide a model for other agencies.

CHAPTER 4: CW Implementation – Classroom Observations

In order to combat violence, drugs, alcohol, sexual abuse, and other problems, schools have turned to specialized programs and curricula that aim to provide students with skills necessary to prevent their own involvement in such problem behavior. While the goals of school-based prevention programs are generally similar (i.e. to reduce involvement in negatively defined behavior), the methods used by programs to accomplish these goals vary considerably. Programs may be quite different in content, duration, frequency, and general instructional style. For instance, some school-based prevention programs target specific behaviors like bullying (i.e. the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program), gang involvement (i.e. G.R.E.A.T.), or drug and alcohol abuse (i.e. DARE), while others target more general cognitive and behavioral issues (i.e. Life-Skills Training). Another common difference between prevention programs is the choice of program providers. While some school-based programs use classroom teachers or professional educators to provide instruction, others use outside professionals that have some expertise in the topic(s) covered by the curriculum. Ultimately, however, regardless of the strategy used to promote a desired outcome in youthful behavior, a fundamental issue each program must address is the degree of program implementation.

To date, a number of outcome evaluations have been conducted on school-based prevention programs to determine their overall success in changing behavior (for a review, see Gottfredson, 2001). More recently, however, the use of process evaluations in conjunction with outcome evaluations has become more common. The reason for using both of these complimentary techniques is quite simple: the process evaluation allows one to verify what is actually being delivered to the program audience, as well as the degree to which it resembles the intended delivery of the program. As Rossi, Freeman, and Lipsey state, “A precondition for impact on the social conditions a program addresses (*outcome*) is that the program actually be implemented in a manner that could plausibly affect those conditions (*process*)” (1999:199). In other words, a process evaluation helps confirm the results of the outcome evaluation by documenting the treatment delivered, so a link can be drawn between the treatment and the outcome.

As part of the process evaluation of the Community Works Program (CW), this chapter details the results of our on-site observations of program delivery. Specifically, this chapter addresses two questions: (1) how is the program being delivered? (2) is the program being delivered in the manner intended by CW developers?

Overview of the Program

As one may recall from Chapter 1, Community Works is based on the “risk factor” approach, and is comprised of three major components-- 31 interactive sessions taught by program instructors, Community Resource People (CRP), and service-learning projects (referred to as Action Projects). The program goal is to “educate students about the costs and consequences of crime, their rights and responsibilities as citizens, and their ability to bring about meaningful change through advocacy and service” (Carlson, Zimmer, & Green, 2004; iii).

The first of the three main CW components is the 31-session curriculum. Each session within the CW program is based on a unique topical area, consisting of issues such as: conflict management, substance abuse, hate crimes, handguns and violence, and victimization. Each session of the CW curriculum is further organized into several “parts” (usually two or three), which are the actual lessons to be delivered to the target audience (i.e. one part = one lesson). Usually these parts, or lessons, are intended to be implemented over a 45 to 55 minute time period. Finally, each part of the session is broken down even further into what CW calls “steps.” Steps are the basic building blocks of the individual parts, as each step consists of new activities or information that builds upon previously learned material.

Because some users of the CW program are unable to provide all 31 sessions due to time and/or resource constraints, CW developers created guidelines for the proper implementation of the program in these instances. These guidelines stipulate that in order for the program to have its desired effect, the first eight sessions in the curriculum, known as the "core 8", must be completely implemented. Included in the core-eight are lessons providing the fundamental skills and information necessary to fully realize the goals of the curriculum. For example, as stated above, a major goal of the curriculum is to provide students with the necessary skills to enact “meaningful change” in their local

community. Consequently, Session #4 of the "core 8" is titled "Safe and Secure Communities," and is described in the curriculum as providing students with information on "what it takes to create safe and secure communities"(Carlson et al., 2004:104).

The second major component of the CW program is the use of Community Resource People (CRP) in delivering the program. The basic purpose of CRP is to act as role models for the youth participating in the program. Because CW is a program focused on the costs and consequences of crime, CRP generally consist of people with some expertise in the field (e.g. police officers, probation/parole officers, victim services workers). CW stresses, however, that these people are not to be used simply as guest speakers or lecturers. Instead, the role of the CRP is to facilitate in the delivery of the curriculum, as well as to add site-specific information to complement curriculum topics. Essentially, CRP are not to be used as a break from the curriculum, but rather as a supplement to its customary implementation.

Action projects, the third and final part of the CW program, allow students to use the skills and knowledge they learned in the curriculum to better their community. Action projects fall under the general rubric of service learning, which is a form of community service. The skills learned through service learning projects enable youth to overcome adverse life circumstances and become socially competent and active citizens. According to CW developers, the following guidelines must be met for action projects to be considered true service learning:

- "be 'real,' genuine service;
- allow young people to make decisions that affect the outcome;
- include tasks that challenge the young people's thinking;
- provide opportunities for adults and young people to work together on common tasks;
- allow for reflection on the service experience;
- be tied to the curriculum; and
- serve as a final product of the young people's efforts" (Greene, Zimmer, and Bray, 1999: 35).

Sessions #9 through #11 in the new curriculum, which are organized in the same manner as the rest of the CW sessions, are devoted entirely to the Action Projects. Specifically, Session #9, "Planning a Project," introduces participants to the idea of service learning, and gets them thinking about possible projects in their communities. Session #10, "Designing a Project," provides guidance on how their team of participants can work together in solving their agreed upon problem. Finally, Session #11, "Doing a Project," provides the fundamentals of actually carrying out the chosen project. Each of these sessions, like the "core 8", are to be provided in their entirety by the program instructor in order to fully implement the program¹.

Overview of the Process Evaluation

As with any school-based prevention program, developers of the CW curriculum faced the challenge of meeting two essential, yet often conflicting, program necessities. First, in order for a program to be a success it must ultimately provide users with the intended results. At the same time, however, it must not overstep its bounds in terms of the time needed to adequately implement the program. After all, the priority of all schools is to provide youth with instruction in basic educational skills. This means that time devoted to instruction outside these basic skills is secondary, and thus limited. Accordingly, the amount of time instructors can devote to programs such as CW must be reasonable. Therefore, time needed for preparation for program delivery and classroom instruction must be minimal for the program to fit the aforementioned necessities of school-based prevention programs.

Another challenge faced by school-based prevention programs (like CW) concerns the use of law enforcement officials (i.e. school resource officers and juvenile probation officers) as program instructors. Not only must these personnel be trained in the content of the program, but often these individuals are not formally educated classroom instructors, which means that basic instructional skills essential for proper program delivery may be lacking (Sellers et al.11, 1998). For instance, without skills such as creating and implementing a lesson plan, classroom management, and public

¹ In some of the CW literature (e.g. web-pages, flyers,) the core-eight is actually referred to as the "core-11", which includes these three sessions.

speaking, implementing a program in its intended fashion may be asking too much without proper training. Further, their duties outside of the classroom (e.g. dealing with school-related crime, calls for service, and speaking with parents) may impede their ability to provide the program regularly.

With these basic challenges to program delivery, as well as the myriad of day-to-day interruptions common in every school setting, monitoring program delivery is an essential part of the evaluation process. Not only does it inform program developers and staff as to what is actually going on inside the classroom, it also complements the outcome evaluation results. For instance, if the program is found to have little or no effect on student participants, one could use the process evaluation as a guide in determining why these results were found. A null finding for program impact could be due to a number of factors, which can be determined through a process evaluation. For example, a process evaluation could indicate that any of the following reasons led to no overall impact:

- the program, as designed and implemented, has no effect;
- the program, as designed, is not well suited for implementation in the given setting; or
- the program is not being delivered as intended (implementation failure).

As research has articulated in the past, low levels of program effect found in several school-based prevention programs are more likely attributable to improper implementation practices than inept program content (DuBois et al., 2002; Nunnery et al., 1997). Similarly, if the program is found to have the intended impact, one can use the process evaluation to confirm that the delivery of the program was, in fact, a possible cause of the positive outcome observed.

Data and Methods

In order to gain an understanding of the manner in which the CW program is delivered in the classroom, ten observers witnessed the delivery of over 100 lessons across 14 of the 15 schools involved in the evaluation². While every session of the

² No lessons were observed at one school because the program was never delivered.

program curriculum (31 total) was not observed, all sessions included in the "core 8", as well as the three sessions devoted to the Action Project, were observed between four and 12 times. When possible, two observers witnessed the delivery of the same part(s) in order to reduce the possibility of observer bias; importantly, there were no instances in which two observers, witnessing the same lesson, submitted significantly different reports.

Because the CW program involves three distinct program components-- interactive sessions, Community Resource People (CRP), and Action Projects-- each of the three components will be included in the assessment of overall program fidelity. Specifically, the interactive sessions are examined based upon content, time management, classroom management, and other issues that may have altered program delivery. The role of the CRP in the classroom is also discussed, as the CW program has specific expectations for how they should be used. Finally, Sessions #9 through #11, which are devoted to the proper implementation of Action Projects, will be discussed separately.

In order to create uniformity between observation reports, a standardized form was created for each of the first eight sessions in the curriculum (see Appendix B). Based on the CW instructor's binder we developed a detailed outline of all activities included in the sessions. These outlines were organized according to the actual lesson plans provided for each session, including the recommended length of individual steps within parts, and a checklist so observers could easily indicate whether or not individual steps within parts were delivered. Further, the outlines included space for observers to indicate the actual time spent on each step of the session part, as well as whether or not a CRP was used. Also included in the observation forms was an area devoted to qualitative descriptions of the sessions delivered. Specifically, observers were prompted to provide general comments on the session/part observed, as well as specific comments on classroom discussion and the activities used in the session/part.

After receiving all of the observation reports, the data were first arranged by school in order to analyze information for each school independently. The procedure for analyzing the data by school was consistent throughout the data examination process,

and consisted of the following five steps:

(1) A member of the research team started by examining the checklist for each individual lesson observed, as well as the qualitative comments made by the observers. The checklists and qualitative comments were used to determine how closely the instructor followed the intended mode of delivery, otherwise known as program fidelity³.

(2) The qualitative assessments made by the observers were examined to determine if anything notable, or out of the ordinary, occurred during the delivery of the program (e.g. school-wide announcements, high class participation, student disruptions, conversations the observer had with the implementer, or use of a CRP during the lesson). This was done to determine if the lesson observed was somewhat typical, or if interruptions had interfered with the standard delivery of the program. From an evaluation standpoint, various interruptions can be expected in a school environment; however, regular disruptions can severely impact the proper implementation of a program. Therefore, the documentation of systematic interruptions can aid in highlighting problems that may be correctable. On the other hand, exceptional or innovative lessons, where implementation of the program was done in a manner worthy of praise, can be highlighted as models of successful program implementation

(3) Each observed class period was summarized, including both the strengths and weaknesses of the lesson, as well as pertinent qualitative notes written by the observers.

(4) After completing the summaries for each class period observed at an individual school, an overall summary of the school's implementation practices was documented. This summary specifically noted any trends found throughout the lessons observed, or in some cases the lack thereof.

(5) Schools were then placed on a three-point continuum of program fidelity ranging from high to low, with a fourth category consisting of schools that could not be placed on this continuum with a high degree of confidence. This procedure was followed for each school in which observations were made. These summaries were then used to determine if there were any systematic differences between schools in the manner in which the program was being delivered.

³ As might be expected with any qualitative assessment, there was wide variation across observers in the amount of detail provided about classroom activities. When specific qualitative comments were lacking, program fidelity was strictly based upon the checklists submitted by the observers.

To be classified as a program with a **high degree** of fidelity, CW providers needed to consistently deliver the lessons in the manner intended, including covering nearly all of the information in the lesson, adherence to the recommended time for delivery, and effectively managing the classroom environment. For instance, if CW providers at a given school consistently covered all of the material for each individual part, yet did so in only half the time recommended by the curriculum, their school would not be considered to have delivered the program with a high degree of fidelity. Those schools classified in the **middle category** on the continuum, medium or reasonable program fidelity, had to deliver nearly all of the recommended material, but time management and classroom management issues consistently interfered with the proper implementation of the program. The **low fidelity** category was reserved for schools that did not implement the program as intended. These schools did not follow the lesson plans provided, and merely used the curriculum as a resource or topical guide. Finally, those schools in which there was a lack of information, or in cases where information obtained from various lessons was inconsistent, were placed in a separate category of “indeterminable.”

After analyzing the data by school, the observation reports were rearranged by session. This was done in order to determine whether or not there were specific trends in lesson implementation across schools. For instance, are there lessons or sessions that are consistently taught with a high degree of fidelity? On the other hand, are there lessons that are consistently not implemented in the intended manner? By analyzing the data in this way, the evaluation team is capable of highlighting lessons continuously well implemented as well as those posing implementation problems across instructors.

Interactive Lessons

Lesson Content

In general, there is wide variation in the manner in which the CW curriculum is used in the schools participating in the evaluation. For instance, some schools implemented the program with a high degree of program fidelity, while others merely used the program as a topical guide. Further, after witnessing the delivery of the same sessions across sites, it became clear that some sessions are not consistently delivered in

the intended manner. Because these two forms of variability were found while observing session implementation, each will be covered separately.

Overall, out of the 110 class periods observed, only 18 of these lessons were found to be delivered in the manner intended by program developers (See Table 1 for a summary of all observations). Even though many observations indicated that instructors delivered steps within a part with a high degree of fidelity, an entire part was delivered in only 16% of all the lessons observed. Common deviations from the program included the following: no use of the introduction or conclusion, skipping steps in the lesson, or getting engrossed on steps and having the class time expire. For example, a problem noted several times at two schools in particular was running well over the recommended time devoted to particular steps. On one occasion, a step that was recommended to last only 30 minutes actually took the instructors 63 minutes to cover. The observer noted that while the class discussion and instructor enthusiasm was good, the class was unable to move beyond this step before the end of the period. Consequently, the content of that particular part was not delivered in its entirety.

Specific lessons that were consistently delivered in a poor fashion were Sessions #4, #5, and #7. In Session #4: Safe and Secure Communities, the “Bridge Story” was not used as intended in any of the six lessons observed across three schools. Whether it was glossed over in a matter of minutes, or skipped altogether, this part of the session, according to our observations, was not well implemented.

Next, Session #5: Where Are We Safe and Unsafe? involves the use of a field trip in part one, yet none of the 11 classes observed used the field trip as part of the lesson. Undoubtedly, time and logistical issues played a major role in this fact. However, if CW is going to target a school-based audience, the session may need to be altered to provide more guidance for schools unwilling to allow the time for a field trip.

Finally, Session #7: Your Conflict Choices presented problems for nearly all classes observed. Specifically, time management was an issue for all nine of the lessons observed. While four observations noted the class was able to provide all the information included in part two of the session, the lessons were not provided in a timely manner. Topics were quickly covered by the instructors, with little or no discussion of the material. Basically, the instructors rushed the delivery of part two in Session #7 in order

to provide all of the information. The instructors in the other observed lessons presented some information from the curriculum without actually covering the lesson in class. For instance, two schools presented material related to conflict choices, but did not follow the lessons provided.

In order to alleviate this problem with future CW instructors, sessions such as #4, #5, and #7 may need to be modified for use in the classroom setting. Specifically, Session #7: part two would be an ideal lesson to model during training. Perhaps if instructors see how this lesson is supposed to flow they may be able to provide this lesson in a more effective manner.

One session that was consistently implemented as CW program developers intended was Session #1. Observers witnessed the delivery of parts of this session on five occasions, and all five were delivered with a high degree of program fidelity. In fact, one observer noted that, “The students were actively involved and very imaginative, sharing and building ideas with the group at large.” Another noted, “The class was excited and involved and responded very optimistically to future projects.” Overall, it appears that Session #1 establishes a positive first impression on the students. The session seems to excite the students, as indicated by the amount of discussion and overall participation levels observed during implementation.

Time Management

Individual sites varied greatly in the length of time they devoted to the curriculum. While some sites taught the program over an entire school year⁴, others completed the program in a matter of weeks. Further, time devoted to individual sessions also varied. For instance, the average amount of time devoted to each part observed was 41 minutes. The average time for each part per session ranged from a high of 58 minutes for Session #1, to a low of 29 minutes for Session #3.

A consistent problem, when it came to time management, was instructors rushing through the curriculum and/or covering multiple parts of a session per class period. Specifically, 19% of the observations found that the instructors covered multiple parts of

⁴ No school in the evaluation delivered the program over the full nine months of the school year, but the delivery of the program at some schools spanned two semesters.

a session in one class period, when the recommended time would only allow for the completion of one part. While, in fact, it may be possible to cover the material in any given lesson in 20 to 30 minutes, it does not allow for the lesson to be truly interactive. Because of this, instructors who chose to rush the delivery of the program and/or cover more than one part of a session per class period all but eliminated any semblance of interactive learning, and therefore did not follow the spirit of the program.

One thing CW program developers should consider is whether or not the curriculum is structured in a manner that allows for proper implementation in a typical classroom setting. For instance, many session parts are estimated to take between 45 and 55 minutes to implement. The average class period for the schools involved in the curriculum is roughly 50 minutes. If one subtracts the everyday “housekeeping” tasks involved in running a classroom (e.g. attendance, announcements, and questions), the actual time available for instruction is considerably less than the original 50 minutes allotted. As stated previously, the average amount of time spent on a CW lesson was 41 minutes. Creating lessons that can be taught in this amount of time may make the implementation of CW more applicable for the school setting.

While not typical for schools observed in this evaluation (n=2), class periods in some schools are much longer than 50 minutes. In these instances instructors have the time to properly implement two parts of a session. However, nine observations made at one of these schools noted that the quality of program implementation waned over the course of these long periods. Therefore, CW program developers should consider whether or not schools in this situation should use the entire class period for program instruction. In general, how is the program best delivered: in small doses or over longer periods of time?

Classroom Management

Just as time management skills vary between instructors, so too does their ability to control the behavior of students in the classroom. While this was generally not a problem in most CW classrooms, 11 classroom observations in two schools noted that student behavior seriously detracted from the implementation of the program. For example, one observer noted, “Only two or three students were paying attention and

working on the handouts. The rest of the students were talking amongst themselves, playing with each other's hair, and the (instructor) ignored this behavior and continued to lecture." Other problems arose when small groups were used during class activities. Students had a tendency to drift away from the subject matter and into conversations of their own. Finally, the presence of substitute teachers presented a problem in two schools. While behavior problems were not noted in one of those schools (the problem in this school was the improper implementation of the CW lessons during these absences), the other school had significant problems of getting students settled for the CW lesson. One observer noted, "The class is usually taught by (instructor), but (he/she) was (absent) so (another instructor) substituted...Classroom was loud and the students were disruptive. The students were moving around and getting up to sharpen pencils. (The substitute) ignored this behavior. Two students left the classroom and (the substitute) said nothing."

Even though this may not be something training in the CW curriculum can solve, the control of student behavior should be emphasized as vitally important for proper program delivery. For instance, students participating in the CW program may not be able to learn what the program has to offer if they are constantly distracted by a disruptive classroom or classmate.

As for the problem with substitute teachers in the classroom, problems with disruptive students on these days are to be expected. However, CW trainers should consider addressing the best way to deal with these occurrences when they arise. For instance, it may not be wise to continue with the program when the usual classroom teacher is absent, even if the regular CW instructor (when not the classroom teacher) is still available to deliver the program. The presence of a substitute teacher may not offer the same deterrent effect as the regular teacher. Ultimately, however, the CW instructor must make this decision, as some classrooms may have no difficulty with student behavior on days with substitute teachers.

Other Distractions

Beyond the everyday distractions inherent in school-based programs, the use of law enforcement officials as program instructors adds to the number of potential disruptions. Besides their involvement in classroom instruction, these officials have

other responsibilities that often take precedent over the delivery of prevention programming. For instance, school resource officers are often the first ones called when fights or other events occur on school grounds. If this occurs during the delivery of CW, the instructor is often obligated to leave at once, and the session is either delayed or canceled altogether. On three occasions classroom observers noted that the duties of the law-enforcement official implementing the program interfered with the delivery of the program⁵. Therefore, an abbreviated lesson was provided on these occasions.

The regular delivery of the program at another school was interrupted because of a scheduling change at the end of the first semester. Essentially, the period reserved for CW was no longer available at the beginning of the second semester, so students were forced to decide whether they wanted to participate in CW or in physical education. Consequently, after this point roughly six to eight students were observed at any one lesson. Because of the number of contact hours involved in delivering just the core requirements of the program, delivering the curriculum over a two-semester period is not uncommon. While the CW developers already recommend the formation of a planning group before the implementation of CW, occurrences like these validate the need for long-term planning.

One final area that affected the delivery of the program was when one class in a school fell behind the other classes. In two schools, one of the classes receiving the curriculum fell behind the others. Instructors in both schools taught multiple parts of a session, or even an entire session, in one class period in order to have all classes on the same schedule. Obviously these students did not receive the same dosage as the other students, but situations like these may be unavoidable. While one can understand why an instructor would use this strategy, perhaps CW officials can create a uniform way to deal with such a situation, and could offer new trainees strategies to handle this problem.

Overall, variability in program delivery across schools was quite apparent after reviewing observation reports from each of the individual schools. In fact, in summarizing the degree of program fidelity across schools, only *one school* was found to

⁵ On these three occasions the reason for the interruption could be confirmed. Four other class periods were interrupted because the instructor never showed up; leaving the teacher to provide the lesson even though he/she had not prepared to do so. The reason for the instructor's absence, however, was not confirmed.

consistently provide the program with a *high degree of fidelity*. Further, *three schools* were considered to deliver the program with a *reasonable (medium) degree of fidelity*. These three schools, while providing the program to students, had a number of problems with time and classroom management. For instance, a common problem across these three sites was rushing through the program, and trying to present two 45 to 55 minute parts in one 40 to 50 minute class period. Even though all of the information in the lesson was provided, the instructors did not allow the sessions to be interactive, and class discussion was limited or nonexistent. Next, *six schools* delivered the program with a *low degree of program fidelity*. These schools used the program very sparingly. Generally, these schools used bits and pieces of the program to supplement the general discussion of topical areas. For instance, handouts included in the CW program binder were used, while the rest of the lesson did not follow the CW curriculum. Finally, four schools could not be adequately placed in any category due to a lack of generalizable information. For instance, one school was unable to deliver an entire part of a session in one class period, but the following class period devoted to the CW program was never observed, so we are unable to conclude whether the part was subsequently completed. In another instance, one lesson was delivered with a high degree of program fidelity, while the next lesson observed noted a multitude of deviations from the curriculum. For these reasons, we were not able to confidently place them on the three-point continuum.

Community Resource People (CRP)

The use of CRP is a major component of the CW curriculum. In fact, CW officials have mandated that full implementation of the program “must” include the use of CRP. According to our observations, instructors are using CRP in their respective schools. However, CW program developers provided guidelines of how these people are to be used as part of the program (Carlson et al., 2004). One of the main points regarding the proper use of CRP is that they are not to simply lecture to the students. In keeping with the notion of an interactive learning environment, CRP are supposed to aid the instructor in the delivery of the program by relating the program material to “what happens in the real world, especially situations that relate to young people” (Carlson et al., 2004: 22). Contrary to these expectations, all ten (100%) of the CRP observed

lectured to the students about their job and how it relates to young people. The instructor and CRP never worked in tandem to provide the lesson, and the lessons were not delivered as intended.

Perhaps CW officials should consider modeling the use of CRP during training. It is obvious that the instructors coordinating the use of CRP at these schools either did not understand how to properly use them or chose not to use them in their intended fashion. If the proper use of CRP is truly an important part of the curriculum, this program component should receive more attention.

Action Projects: Session #9, #10, and #11

Along with the interactive lessons and CRP, CW incorporates Action Projects into the curriculum to “enrich learning, teach civic responsibility, and strengthen communities” (Carlson et al., 2004:22). While every activity or class period pertaining to the Action Project was not observed, 23 class periods devoted to Action Projects were observed. Included in these 23 observations, made at seven different schools, were: 12 observations of activities associated with Session #9: Planning a Project, seven observations of activities related to Session #10: Designing a Project, and four observations of activities associated with Session #11: Doing a Project. If these 23 observations are any indication of the manner in which these three sessions are implemented, there seems to be a low degree of adherence to the Action Project lessons. In fact, only four of the 23 observations (17%) witnessed the full implementation of parts of these sessions, and three of those observations were at one school. From these figures, it seems as though instructors are not using the curriculum appropriately when preparing for or completing Action Projects.

Instructors at all but one school (where observations of Action Project activities were made) did an excellent job allowing the students to work through the process of brainstorming and planning the projects themselves⁶. For instance, observers at one school, which had problems with disruptive behavior during other lessons, noted how a large group brainstorming session, in which students were providing ideas for Action

⁶ An instructor at one school was observed telling the students what to do, and when they needed to have it done. There was no class discussion, and no student participation in this process. The instructor simply delegated the activities for the children.

Projects, led to a great discussion about some of the difficulties involved with some of their project ideas. Overall, classroom discussion and student involvement seemed to improve dramatically during the sessions devoted to the Action Projects. Therefore, CW trainers may only need to emphasize channeling this energy into the sessions devoted to the Action Project, as student enthusiasm for community involvement does not seem to be a problem.

Arizona and Other Sites

According to an evaluability assessment conducted prior to the start of our evaluation, Arizona was identified as a state with excellent oversight of the CW program providers, and as such provided a fertile ground for finding programs that were delivered as intended. In order to assess this claim, and determine whether or not Arizona sites systematically implement the CW curriculum with a higher degree of program fidelity than do sites in other states, classroom observations were split into two categories, Arizona and non-Arizona. As stated earlier, schools were placed into three categories (High, Medium, and Low) based on program fidelity, minus the four schools that could not be placed on this scale confidently. Of the nine Arizona schools (represented by letters A-I in Table 1), one was classified as high, three were classified as medium, and three were classified as low on the scale of program fidelity. Of the five non-Arizona schools, one was classified as medium, and four were classified as low on the scale of program fidelity. It does appear that Arizona sites provide the CW curriculum in a manner superior to the other states involved.

Summary and Recommendations

Based on the 110 observations made at 14 of the 15 schools participating in the evaluation, it is apparent that there is a high degree of variability in the manner CW is delivered across schools. For instance, while some instructors rarely deviated from the information provided in the CW binder, others used the provided material sparingly, if at all, during their class periods. The most common problems observed by the research team included deviations from the intended lesson content, time management, and behavior problems on behalf of other students. Further, Sessions #4, #5, and #7 seemed to

provide problems for implementers across schools, which may be a function of program content.

On the other hand, portions of the CW program seemed to be implemented quite well across the schools observed as part of the process evaluation. Session #1 was delivered with a high degree of fidelity across sites, and prompted a great deal of discussion among the students observed. Further, just as the developers of CW envisioned, instructors consistently allowed the students to make the Action Project a student-led effort to improve their communities. This included all phases of the project, including the formation and completion of the agreed upon task.

In accord with some of the findings already discussed in this chapter, the following is a list of recommendations for improving the delivery of CW.

Lesson Content

- Adherence to the program must be stressed to all those trained in teaching CW. From the observations, it is clear that CW is not being taught as intended by program developers. One example is the “Bridge Story” in Session #4. This was not used as intended in any of the observations made across three schools.

Time Management

- Considering CW is used in many schools, the length of individual parts/lessons should be approximately 40 minutes. The average class period in the schools involved in the evaluation was roughly 50 minutes. As a general rule from our observations, ten minutes of each period was used for general housekeeping issues (e.g. attendance, announcements), leaving 40 minutes for instruction. In fact, the average lesson witnessed during observations was 41 minutes.
- Some schools have class periods much longer than others (e.g. block scheduling). CW developers may need to provide some guidance on the appropriateness of delivering two lessons in one day. Observations made at schools such as these noted that the students’ attention waned towards the end of the second lesson. Therefore, teaching only one lesson per day may be the best way to provide the program.

- Time management within lessons was a major problem observed at nearly all sites observed. While the majority of instructors were far under the recommended time for delivering the curriculum, others went over on occasion. Additional modeling of lesson implementation at CW training may help to alleviate this problem. Session #7: part two may be an ideal lesson to model, as it presented problems for a number of instructors.

Classroom Management

- Control of student behavior presented a problem in a number of classrooms, especially during small group activities. Maintaining control of students during CW activities needs to be stressed as vitally important for proper program delivery.
- There were occasions when substitute teachers were present on the day of CW. CW trainers should emphasize this as a situation that needs to be addressed during the long-term planning process.

Other Distractions

- The duties of the SRO/JPO have the potential for interfering with proper CW implementation. Many sites in Arizona use a team teaching approach to alleviate this problem. CW developers and trainers should encourage each site to have multiple persons trained to deliver the program.
- Long-term planning groups need to be developed at each site. As was witnessed at one school, changes in scheduling all but stopped the program from continuing.
- CW trainers should develop, and provide instructors with, a standardized way to deal with classes falling behind in the curriculum.

Community Resource People (CRP)

- The use of CRP should be modeled during training. While it is stressed in the CW literature that these officials are not to be used as guest lecturers, our observations conclude that this is exactly the manner in which they are being used.

Action Projects

- Our observations also suggest that the sessions devoted to the Action Projects are not being followed by instructors. CW trainers should emphasize why these sessions are important for planning and completing student projects.

Table 1: Sessions Observed by School

School	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	Othe	Total
A #				1				1	2				4
B #								4					4
C ^							1						1
D \$	3									3			6
E *							2				1		3
F ^				4				3				4	11
G *				3	3					6			12
H *							3		6			2	11
I ^	1						1						2
J *				4	1	1			1				7
K *	1		2				2	1					6
L													0
M *		10										15	25
N #			4		3	4	2						13
O ^			2	1	1	1							5
Total	5	10	8	6	12	9	11	9	12	7	4	17	110
# Comp. Impl.^	5	0	2	0	1	1	4	1	4	0	0	0	18
Average Time**	58	NA	29	35	36	42	33	46	46	35	45	NA	41
CRPs used	0	2	2	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0		10
Team Taught	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	0		5

^ = Number of Sessions Observed with Complete Implementation

** = Time is in minutes per part

High Fidelity = \$ (D)

Medium Fidelity = # (A, B, N)

Low Fidelity = * (E, G, H, J, K, M)

Cannot Determine = ^ (C, F, I, O)

CHAPTER 5: CW Implementation – Implementer’s Survey

The preceding chapters focused on site selection and Community Works training and technical assistance. In this chapter, as in Chapter 4, we turn our attention to program implementation. One strategy for assessing program fidelity is to ask program providers to identify the lessons or program elements taught and resources utilized. To accomplish this, we developed a questionnaire (see Appendix C) for teachers, school resource officers, and/or juvenile probation officers, depending upon the school’s delivery model.

Upon completion of program delivery, program providers at 14 schools were asked to complete questionnaires. The requested information included the following: demographic and general background information; identification of the particular CW lessons taught; information about the use of Community Resource People (CRP); and implementation of Action Projects. Respondents were also asked to provide information about their training experiences with CW, the planning phase associated with implementation of CW in their schools, and the quantity and quality of technical assistance received.

In addition to providing descriptive information about program providers and program delivery, the primary objective of these questionnaires was to provide a measure of program fidelity. The standards introduced in Chapter 1 of this report were used to classify program providers as *implementers* and *non-implementers*: to be considered as implementing the program, all four of these minimal standards had to be met: (1) at least 70 percent of the "core 8" lessons had to be taught; (2) at least 20 hours (approximately 70 %) of program delivery time was required; (3) Community Resource People (CRP) had to participate to some extent in the program delivery; and (4) at the minimum, an action project had to have been planned and initiated.

Data and Methods

The outcome component of this evaluation includes a sample of 98 classrooms (49 treatment and 49 comparison) in 15 schools. One of the schools, however, failed to implement the program and as such was excluded from the process evaluation. Program providers in the remaining schools were asked to complete a seven page self-administered questionnaire. Completed questionnaires were obtained from 23 respondents representing 14 schools. Of the 14

schools represented, seven had two implementers submit completed questionnaires, one had three respondents, and the remaining six schools had one completed questionnaire. This response pattern reflects the extent to which CW is taught by both individuals and teams. Of the ten schools that utilize team-teaching approaches, seven sites provided two or more implementer questionnaires. In addition to the team-teaching sites, three sites were taught only by a SRO/JPO, although at one of these sites both a teacher and the SRO/JPO completed a questionnaire. At the final site, only the teacher implementing the program completed a questionnaire.

Implementer Demographics

Overall, the implementers surveyed were a relatively homogeneous group demographically except with regard to sex, with 12 males and 11 females in the sample. The majority was White/Anglo, not Hispanic (76 %) and all of them had earned a bachelor's degree: in fact 14 of the respondents had attained a Master's degree. There was considerable diversity, however, with respect to teaching experience, both in terms of years working in the education field and years at their designated school. On average, implementers had worked in education for nine years, with responses ranging from two to 30 years. There was considerable stability in this sample; implementers had been at their current school for six years, with responses ranging from one to 22 years.

As described earlier in this report, Community Works is flexible in terms of who facilitates the program, allowing each school the option of choosing an implementer. The curriculum developers recommend choosing implementers who have the right skills for the job including creativity and a good rapport with students. With regard to the primary job assignment of respondents, 12 were law-related personnel (i.e., School Resource Officers or Juvenile Probation Officers) and eleven were teachers.

Community Works Training and Program Implementation

The National Office of the Community Works Program and the Expansion Centers sponsor training sessions across the country. Potential users of Community Works are encouraged to attend such sessions prior to implementing CW. While it is recommended that the

person who will be teaching the curriculum attend the training, in some instances a supervisor or agency representative attends the training with the intention of instructing others in the use of the curriculum. Training sessions focus on a number of different aspects. One aspect of the CW program that receives considerable attention during training is the emphasis on interactive teaching. To facilitate the interactive nature of the program, the curriculum developers recommend one adult instructor (or assistant) for every ten students. Participants also are introduced to a variety of teaching techniques and to strategies for successfully implementing CW in their communities. Among these strategies is the use of a planning group to determine the best way to implement the program at individual schools. This group is expected to discuss program goals and objectives, identify Community Resource People, and establish a time frame for implementation. It is also recommended that the planning group meet after the first few sessions to review implementation plans, and then again halfway through the program.

In our sample of 23 program providers, 19 reported that they had attended training; importantly, at least one person from each of the participating schools had attended training. Of these individuals, 15 reported that the training was very helpful in implementing the program. Seven SRO/JPOs and two teachers from nine sites indicated they attended supplemental CW training, and seven of these individuals identified the additional training as very helpful in implementing the program. While not all respondents had attended CW training, all indicated that they had received an overview of the program and detailed outlines on how to implement the program in their schools. Respondents also indicated that they had been instructed to utilize interactive teaching strategies, to incorporate Community Resource People into program delivery, and to implement Action Projects in which students apply CW lessons to address a community problem. Ten of the 14 schools in this sample reported using a team-teaching approach (a teacher and an SRO/JPO), and eight sites also indicated that they had formed a planning group consisting of teachers and officers (although we were unable to determine if planning groups met again halfway through the program).

Implementing interactive teaching strategies was reportedly difficult for some of the program providers, due primarily to large classes (the average class size was 25 students). In situations where a teacher or officer is solely responsible for teaching CW, the prospects for interactive teaching are further compromised. If interactive strategies are considered an important component of the CW program, perhaps greater attention should be paid to the

strategy of team teaching during training sessions. Recall from Chapter 3 that observers noted training sessions often were not taught in the allotted time. If CW trainers are not able to model sessions in the appropriate time frame, it may not be practical for implementers to do so in a school setting. Team teaching may ease some of this problem. While it may not be reasonable to have one instructor for every ten students, stating explicitly the roles and responsibilities of each implementer in the classroom might be beneficial. Some issues to consider include: should the implementers co-facilitate, take turns teaching sessions, or should one act as the instructor of the CW session as the other assists (i.e. paperwork/answering questions/classroom management)? Should they both be in the classroom at all times? In CW training, one person serves as the instructor and the other as an assistant. If this is the recommended method of instruction, this should be emphasized in the training.

A final topic of some interest addressed here is who decides to offer CW in the schools. Based on responses to a series of questions it appears that teachers and SROs or JPOs are the moving force behind these programs; in the majority of cases (10 sites) a SRO or JPO introduced the program to the school. In only two instances did a respondent indicate that a school administrator (actually school board members) was responsible for the introduction of CW. When asked about decisions to implement CW in specific classrooms and about which lessons to teach, four sites reported the decision to implement CW in their classroom was that of a teacher, three sites specified the decision was by the SRO/JPO, five sites indicated a joint decision, and one site stated the decision was that of the school board and police department. It is important to highlight the extent to which non-school personnel (i.e., school resource officers and juvenile probation officers) were integrated into decisions regarding the adoption and implementation of Community Works in these 14 schools

Technical Assistance and Support

Technical assistance from the National Office and Expansion Centers is available to all registered CW program sites through phone, mail, and email. Of the 14 sites, 13 confirmed visits from staff of their regional Expansion Center and eight reported a visit from staff the National Office staff. Of these, over half indicated these visits were very helpful or helpful. Only eight of the 14 sites reported receiving bi-monthly contact from the regional Expansion Center. Of these sites, over half rated the contact as very helpful or helpful. Regarding email information about

the CW program, 13 sites received email correspondence with nine sites indicating the email was very helpful or helpful. *Youth in Service* is a monthly newsletter distributed to CW programs that highlights service-learning projects, teaching tips, and new opportunities available through the program. All sites indicated they received a TCC newsletter with eight reporting that the newsletters were very helpful or helpful. Ten sites received information about the national network and/or peer resources but only five sites indicated receiving referrals to resource people.

Community Works Materials

During the summer of 2004, NCPC and Street Law, Inc. produced a revised CW curriculum, which was intended to be used by all the sites included in the outcome evaluation. In fact, special training sessions were held and program providers were instructed to implement the new curriculum as a condition of participating in the evaluation. Some exceptions to this latter condition were made in order to increase the sample size. In light of this supposed criterion for study inclusion, it is surprising that only five sites reported using the new binder while five sites used the old binder (1994) and four sites used a combination of the two.

The CW program is designed as a stand-alone curriculum but can also be integrated into another class. Certain sessions in the CW program meet the national standards for civics and government, English, and health classes, allowing implementers an easy way to connect the subject matter to their established courses. Nine schools indicated that the program was used as a stand-alone curriculum: of the remaining 5 schools, the curriculum was primarily incorporated into social studies classes. Again, this is likely because the CW program incorporates the curriculum into the national standards for government and civics classes.

Impressions of the Curriculum

Respondents were also asked questions regarding their perceptions of the curriculum. Overall, implementers rated the CW materials positively. Eighty-two percent of the implementers agreed or strongly agreed that the CW program increased students' awareness of programs and services in their communities that assist crime victims. It was also the general impression of respondents that the CW program addresses problems confronting students at school. Only 59 percent of the implementers, however, agreed or strongly agreed that the educational materials available in the CW curriculum are appealing to students. These findings

suggest that CW developers may want to revisit the curriculum, paying special attention to topics relevant to middle school students. Additional modification of the CW materials for different ages and groups also may be worthy of consideration.

Program Fidelity

The remainder of this chapter will focus on the extent to which each site implemented the four program components (i.e., dosage, lessons, CRP, and action projects). To be considered as fully implementing the program, all four of the standards introduced at the beginning of this chapter had to be met. Based upon these criteria, six of the 14 schools would be classified as implementing the program while the remaining eight would be classified as failing to implement the program with sufficient rigor to reasonable expect program impact.

Program and Lesson Length

Because Community Works allows each school to determine program scheduling, implementers varied in terms of when, how long, and how often they taught the CW curriculum. As stated previously, a minimum of 20 contact hours was required for classification as implementing the CW program. Of the 14 sites, only nine sites reported meeting this dosage level. Among the sites that completed the minimum of 20 contact hours, the dosage ranged from 21 to 34 hours with an average of 24. Of the sites that delivered less than 20 hours, one site taught 14 hours of the CW session, another taught 18 hours, and the other three sites taught 17 hours.

Most implementers reported completing one or two sessions per week over a semester long period; however, one teacher reported offering a daily session over a three-week period at one school. At six schools, respondents indicated that the program was taught over a year while at the remaining sites respondents reported the program was taught over a semester (five sites) or less than a quarter (three sites). Based upon our records of pre- and post-test dates, however, we found many of the implementer responses to be inconsistent with our data. Of the schools that indicated the program was taught over the school year, in actuality the program lasted between five and seven months; of the semester long programs, the actual length of time taught was between three and seven months. One school indicated the program lasted less than a quarter, but from the evaluator's records, the program lasted 7 1/2 months. We calculated program length based upon dates on which pre- and post-tests were administered. All pre-tests were administered prior to program initiation while post-tests were collected after program completion. To account for delays in starting and ending the program and for holiday/school breaks, we subtracted two to four weeks from the time between pre- and post-tests. For example, if the program started in October and lasted until June, the evaluation team subtracted a total of four weeks from the program length; one week to start the CW program after pre-tests, one week prior to post-test administration, and two weeks for a break in December and January.

The CW program developers had sought to create a “user-friendly” program, one that required little preparation time and could be implemented with relative ease. With respect to the latter objective, it appears they were successful; seventy-three percent of the implementers agreed or strongly agreed that the individual session plans were convenient and easy to use. However, the CW trainers’ inability to model the lessons within the desired time frames

(described above) appears to reflect a real problem rather than simply a training issue; only 52 percent of the implementers either agreed or strongly agreed that the length of time allotted for each CW sessions was enough to cover the topics.

The Core Sessions

As previously stated, the foundation of the program is in teaching the "core 8" Sessions (Sessions #1 Creating a Community Vision, #2 What is Crime?, #3 Victims of Crime, #4 Safe and Secure Communities, #5 Where are we safe and unsafe?, #6 Our Community Resources, #7 Your Conflict Choices, and #8 Conflict, Communicating, and Working Together). It is recommended that these eight sessions be taught in sequence and in their entirety. Each session contains teaching strategies, detailed plans, handouts and posters, and suggestions for time management in an attempt to reduce the amount of preparation time for the implementers. According to the CW developers and the evaluation team, for full/successful implementation each school needed to complete at least the "core 8" sessions. Respondents at all but one of the schools reported teaching the "core 8" sessions. This particular individual taught only two of the "core 8" sessions, and instead taught topics he/she felt were relevant to this school, such as gangs, drugs, and shoplifting.

The sessions following the "core 8" and those devoted to the Action Project (AP) are optional and implementers can be flexible in which they choose to teach. The most common sessions taught after the core curriculum were #13 Intimidation (taught by 4 sites), #20 Drug Abuse (3 sites), and #24 Shoplifting (3sites).

Community Resource People (CRP)

Community Resource People are intended to play a key role in the CW program. Service agencies, educators, and juvenile justice officials can have a major impact on the development of students. CW uses CRP to enhance the curriculum and bring skills and knowledge from first-hand experience to the program by discussing community efforts to prevent crime. It is also a way to address stereotypes and myths, build upon weak relationships between the students and community agencies, and provide services to victimized youth. Of the 14 sites, 11 indicated they used CRP as part of their program. Implementers were asked how many CRP visited the classroom the last time the curriculum was taught and nine sites indicated between two and three

times. This is important to note because of the implementers using CRP, the majority incorporated them into more than one session as indicated by the program guidelines. According to the guidelines, some sessions are only to be taught with the assistance of a CRP. For instance, in session #2 What is Crime? the curriculum suggests inviting a police officer to help with this session because discussing specific crime information from a law enforcement official would be valuable. In this case, the use of a CRP was already achieved since many of the current sites used team teaching with an SRO/JPO. The most commonly used CRP were police officers, victim advocates, and lawyers. While the program guidelines specify that the role of the CRP is as a mentor and a resource to supplement the interactive curriculum, the two most common uses reported were as guest speakers and information providers. Based on these responses, it is apparent that CRP are being utilized, but not in a manner or degree consistent with CW guidelines and objectives. CW trainers may need to re-think how CRP utilization is introduced in the training sessions.

Action Projects: Session #9, #10, and #11

The culminating feature of the CW program is the Action Project (AP). The AP provides an opportunity to extend the educational portion of the program into the community and to address local problems. While the curriculum focuses on the causes of crime and victimization, the AP reinforces individual responsibility and resolutions. Students are encouraged to assume a leadership role, develop team-building skills, and to be involved in the planning, design, and implementation of the project. The program developers believe the more involved the students are, the more likely they will have better attitudes toward crime prevention and a better sense of community.

There are many ways that students can express their knowledge about crime prevention and victimization, for example, designing posters or coordinating a Neighborhood Watch program. There is no standard project that serves as an example; rather, it is important that students focus on the unique needs of their community.

The CW guidelines make a clear distinction between APs and community service. While both provide service to the community, APs follow service-learning standards: education, action, and reflection. Importantly, students are to take the time to reflect on the project in order to understand what they learned, what they got out of the service project, and the overall impact of

the service. Ordinary community service is usually relegated to a specific amount of time for service and students are usually told what service to perform, whereas APs are on-going and the students develop their own ideas for the project. Service learning projects enhance the CW program by encouraging teens to initiate and execute a project. The CW implementers are encouraged to facilitate student discussions that reflect on the group process and dynamics associated with the Action Project. All 14 sites reported initiating a student-led project.

According to the program guidelines, Action Projects should be related to a session topic. Twelve of the sites indicated that the CW in-class work was very or somewhat integrated into the AP through connections with some class topics or the projects were discussed frequently as part of the class. Nine sites indicated Session #4 (Safe and Secure Communities) pertained to their project. This session identifies specific ways to increase the safety of communities, generate effective strategies in prevention, and how young people can make a positive difference in the community. Session #1 (Creating a Community Vision) and #6 (Our Community Resources) were the next two most common sessions relating to the projects. Session #1 identifies characteristics of a safe community and effective communication skills and Session #6 teaches students about resources that are available in their community that help victims of crime.

With regard to the role community resource people played in the Action Projects, only five sites indicated that CRP assisted in the design and execution of the project. Three sites specified CRP contributed to the planning and selection of charities in the community while two sites indicated that CRP spoke with the students about their projects and provided suggestions for enhancing the projects.

Only two sites reported any unexpected outcomes of the AP. On a positive note, one site revealed that their AP won the Community Works' state competition and a second site indicated that students were much more active than anticipated. Conversely, this second site also stated that many students did not support the request for donations for their Action Project.

Implementers were also asked to describe any aspects of the AP that either turned out better than expected or worse than expected, and ten sites provided information. Nine sites responded that students' involvement and cooperation was better than expected. Replies by implementers included: "The students bonded as a group"; "Students united and made a great presentation"; and "All students were more involved than expected and learned what cooperative

involvement entails." Other implementers noted students creating a "dynamite project" and receiving community recognition.

Of the six sites that described aspects that turned out worse than expected, five indicated timing as an issue, specifically: "very time consuming"; "planning was hard and it took sometime to get it going"; and " The planning of the project took a lot of class time from several classes when time management is very important."

Summary and Recommendations

To be classified as implementing the CW program, schools had to meet the minimum standards on all four program components specified at the outset of this chapter: deliver a minimum of 20 hours of instruction, complete the "core 8" sessions, use CRP, and initiate an Action Project. Schools not meeting each of these minimal standards were classified as failing to implement the program as intended. Applying these standards resulted in the following classification: six schools fully implemented the program while eight schools did not (seven schools met three of the conditions while one met only two). It is important to view this classification of schools with some degree of caution. Recall that the minimum standards for program implementation are rather lenient, that is schools need: to provide 70 percent (i.e., 20 hours) of the recommended instructional time, to initiate the Action Project (i.e., it is not necessary to actually complete the AP), and use CRP at least once (i.e., one guest lecturer qualifies). From this perspective, we conclude that the majority of schools (eight of the 14) included in the outcome evaluation did not meet the minimum standards for full program implementation. Among the schools failing to meet the minimal standards five schools failed to deliver a minimum of 20 hours of CW sessions and four failed to utilize Community Resource People (one school failed to deliver both the minimum of 20 hours and to use Community Resource People).

The authors of the Evaluability Assessment included in the solicitation for this evaluation identified Arizona as an ideal state in which to implement the CW curriculum. Of the nine Arizona schools, five sites implemented the minimum standards to be classified as fully implementing the CW program. The remaining four Arizona schools failed to meet one of the minimal standards. In contrast, only one of the five schools located in other states met the standards of full implementation, three schools met three of the standards, and one met only two.

Data from the implementer survey suggest that the majority of schools participating in the evaluation of Community Works did not implement CW according to the minimum standards necessary for program effectiveness. There appears to be considerable variation in program delivery models with regard to program scheduling and implementation of program components (e.g., program length, contact hours, and the use of Community Resource People).

The data collected reveal that: (1) more than half of the CW implementers attended a training session; (2) the majority of program implementers liked the CW materials as they were easy to use and required little preparation; (3) over half of the implementers formed a planning group prior to implementing the CW program into their schools; (4) CRP were incorporated into the CW program; and, (5) Action Projects were initiated and linked to course material in all sites.

Based on the material presented in this Chapter, we offer the following recommendations:

- There is a need for more standardized guidelines for program implementation. While flexibility for implementers is appealing, the CW program should emphasize the importance of program fidelity, including dosage, program adherence, and quality of program delivery.
- With regard to materials, it was reported that less than half of the implementers used the new curriculum. It is recommended that the new binder be available to all sites to ensure the most effective use of the CW program.
- Only 59 percent of the implementers agreed that the educational materials are appealing to students. The CW developers should consider revising or modifying the CW materials for different ages.
- CW program developers should re-visit the time allotted to lesson. Almost half of the implementers did not think there was adequate time allotted to the lessons. We also noted in Chapter 3 that trainers had difficulty modeling the lessons in the specified time.
- Better communication and support from Expansion Centers to sites through establishing and maintaining contacts, increased assistance and more involvement, and periodic follow-ups can provide assistance in implementing CW according to the minimum standards.

- The questionnaire revealed that half of the implementers were from law-related professions. Devoting a part of the training session or providing a chapter in the binder specifically on the topic of classroom management may be beneficial.
- From the questionnaires, it was apparent that CRP were primarily used as speakers or to provide information rather than as mentors or more active participants in the courses. Greater attention in the CW guidelines on the use of CRP as interactive teachers (not lecturers) may be warranted.

REFERENCES

- Carlson, Andrea., Judith A. Zimmer, and Eleanor Green. (2004). *Community Works: Smart Youth Make Safer Communities*. National Crime Prevention Council and Street Law, Inc.
- Center for Substance Abuse Prevention. (2002) *Comparison Matrix of Science-Based Prevention Programs: A Consumer's Guide for Prevention Professionals*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services: Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. 2002 Conference Edition.
- DuBois, David L., Bruce E. Holloway, Jeffrey C. Valentine, and Harris Cooper. (2002). Effects of Mentoring Programs for Youth: A Meta-analytic Review. *American Journal of Community Psychology* 30:157.
- Elliott, Delbert S. and Sharon Mihalic. (2004). "Issues in Disseminating and Replicating Effective Prevention Programs." *Prevention Science* 5:47-54.
- Fagan, Abigail A. and Sharon Mihalic. (2003). "Strategies for Enhancing the Adoption of School-Based Prevention Programs: Lessons Learned from the Blueprints for Violence Prevention Replications of the Life Skills Training Program." *Journal of Community Psychology* 31:23-23.
- Gottfredson, Denise. (2001). *Schools and Delinquency*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Gottfredson, Gary D., Denise C. Gottfredson, and Ellen R. Czeh. (2000). *National Study of Delinquency Prevention in Schools, Final Report*. Ellicott City, Maryland: Gottfredson Associates, Inc.
- Mihalic, Sharon., Abigail Fagan, Katherine Irwin, Diane Ballard, and Delbert Elliott. (2002). *Blueprints for violence Prevention Replications: factors for Implementation Success*. Colorado: University of Colorado, Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence.
- Mihalic, Sharon F. and Katherine Irwin. (2003). "Blueprints for Violence Prevention: From Research to Real-World Settings - Factors Influencing the Successful Replication of Model Programs." *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice* 1:307-329.
- Nunnery, David., Robert E. Slavin, Nancy A. Madden, Steven Ross, Lana Smith, Phyllis Hunter, and Joseph Stubbs. (1997). *Effects of Full and Partial Implementation of Success for All on Student Reading in English and Spanish*. Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, March.
- Rossi, Peter H., Howard E. Freeman, and Mark W. Lipsey. (1999). *Evaluation: A Systematic Approach*. 6th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Sellers, Christine S., Terrance J. Taylor, and Finn-Aage Esbensen. (1998). Reality Check: Evaluating a School-Based Gang Prevention Model. *Evaluation Review* 22:5: 590-608.

Sherman, Lawrence W., Denise Gottfredson, Doris MacKenzie, John Eck, Peter Reuter, and Shawn Bushway. (1997). *Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising*. Washington D.C.: Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2001). *Youth Violence: A Report of the Surgeon General*. Rockville, MD: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

APPENDIX A: Protective and Risk Factor Linkage

Community Works Curriculum Protective Factors

PART 1: YOU AND YOUR COMMUNITY

Session 1: Setting the Stage

- community problem awareness
 - skills for avoiding victimization, and helping others who have been victimized
-

Session 2: Teens and Crime

No Protective Factors mentioned.

Session 3: Victims of Crime

- old age
 - female
 - mid-high SES
 - non-minority
 - un-vulnerable appearance
-

Session 4: Safe and Secure Communities

- possession and use of conflict management skills
-

Session 5: Where Are We Safe and Unsafe?

- knowledge of safe verses unsafe locations, times of day, etc.

Session 6: Our Community's Resources

- knowledge of victim resources and other emergency contact information

PART 2: CONFLICT MANAGEMENT

Session 7: Your Conflict Choices

- calming strategies
- ability to identify anger inducing words/actions
- ability to read body language

Session 8: Conflict, Communicating, and Working Together

- control of one's anger
- communication skills

PART 3: VIOLENT CRIME

Session 9: Robbery and Assault: What You Can Do

- awareness of surroundings

Session 10: Intimidation: How To Protect Yourself

- friends and family (being part of a group)
- communication skills
- being assertive [Step D:3]

Session 11: Rape and Acquaintance Rape: Define and Prevent

- communication skills
- reading others' body language
- acting responsibly (arranging transportation, sticking to personal, pre-set boundaries, avoiding drugs/alcohol, being skeptical of strangers)

Session 12: Dating Violence: Recognize and Prevent

- conflict management skills
 - clear communication
 - pre-determined limits and values
 - respecting others
 - knowledge of protective/helpful resources
-

Session 13: Handguns and Violence: Myths, Facts, and Prevention

- anger/conflict management skills
 - ability to examine situations and access them
-

Session 14: Gangs: Define the Problem

- knowledge of gang operation
-

Session 15: Gangs: Consider Alternatives

- communication skills (assertion and refusal skills)
 - conflict management
 - employment
 - participation in recreational activities
 - having a mentor
-

PART 4: SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND DRUG DEALING

Session 16: Alcohol Use: Recognize and Prevent

- community action
 - support groups
-

Session 17: Drug Abuse: Recognize and Prevent

No Protective Factors mentioned.

Session 18: Drug Dealing: Consider the Impact

No Protective Factors mentioned.

PART 5: PROPERTY CRIMES

Session 19: Property Crimes: What You Can Do

No Protective Factors mentioned.

Session 20: Vandalism: What You Can Do

No Protective Factors mentioned.

Session 21: Shoplifting: Why and How Is It a Problem?

No Protective Factors mentioned.

Session 21A: Suspicions, Stereotypes, and Solutions: A Negotiation Between Teens and Store Owners

- communication/negotiation skills [Step D, Do-It-Yourself Poster]

PART 6: HATE CRIMES

Session 22: Diversity and Bias Awareness: A Look at Stereotypes

No Protective Factors mentioned.

Session 23: Hate Crimes: What They Are and What You Can Do

No Protective Factors mentioned.

PART 7: POLICE AND COMMUNITY

Session 24: Police and Community: How Do They Need Each Other?

No Protective Factors mentioned.

Session 24A: Reporting a Crime

No Protective Factors mentioned.

Session 25: Cops on Call

No Protective Factors mentioned.

Session 25A: Police and Community: Working Together

No Protective Factors mentioned.

PART 8: ACTIONS PROJECTS

Session 26: Planning a Project

- self esteem (which is listed in the objectives of Part 8; gaining self-esteem through contributions to the community)
-

Session 27: Designing a Project

- self-esteem
 - contribution of own talents/skills to project that will benefit the community
[Handout 2]
-

Session 28: Doing a Project

No Protective Factors mentioned.

Community Works Curriculum Risk Factors

PART 1: YOU AND YOUR COMMUNITY

Session 1: Setting the Stage

- unsafe neighborhoods/ communities
-

Session 2: Teens and Crime

- drug use
 - lack of parental involvement
 - peer pressure
 - lack of values
 - media
 - poverty
 - low self control (all from Handout 2)
-

Session 3: Victims of Crime

- young age
 - racial/ethnic minority
 - low SES
 - male
 - vulnerable appearance (all from Handout 1)
-

Session 4: Safe and Secure Communities

No Risk Factors mentioned.

Session 5: Where Are We Safe and Unsafe?

Implied that risk factors will be discussed, but never explicitly given.

Session 6: Our Community's Resources

(reiterated from previous sessions)

- lack of parental involvement
- negative peer pressure
- lack of values

PART 2: CONFLICT MANAGEMENT

Session 7: Your Conflict Choices

- difficult temperament
- poverty
- powerlessness

Session 8: Conflict, Communicating, and Working Together

- selfishness
- low self-control
- temper
- uncooperative

PART 3: VIOLENT CRIME

Session 9: Robbery and Assault: What You Can Do

- nighttime activity
- lack of supervision
- drug and alcohol use
- being unaware of surroundings

Session 10: Intimidation: How To Protect Yourself

- not being assertive/ lack of confidence [Step D:3, Handout 1]
- being a loner [Step D:3]
- being different than other children [Handout 1]
- being younger, smaller, weaker than the bully [Handout 1]

Session 11: Rape and Acquaintance Rape: Define and Prevent

- drug and alcohol use
- being alone with unknown people

Session 12: Dating Violence: Recognize and Prevent

- alcohol/drug use
- reinforcing/supporting gender-based stereotypes (patriarchal views) [Handout 2: 3]
- having a partner with anger problems [Handout 2]

Session 13: Handguns and Violence: Myths, Facts, and Prevention

- negative peer pressure
- gang involvement

Session 14: Gangs: Define the Problem

- poverty
- living in at-risk communities [Step B: 4]
- being a minority
- drug/alcohol use
- lack of parental monitoring/nurturing
- poor education
- low self-esteem
- violent tendencies
- broken families (Mostly from Handout 3)

Session 15: Gangs: Consider Alternatives

- truancy
- dropping out of school
- unemployment

PART 4: SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND DRUG DEALING

Session 16: Alcohol Use: Recognize and Prevent

- negative peer pressure
 - family history of alcohol abuse
 - depression
-

Session 17: Drug Abuse: Recognize and Prevent

- negative peer pressure [Step D]
 - problems in school [Step C]
 - family history of drug abuse
 - poor family life [Step C]
 - emotional problems [Step C]
 - drug use as a risk factor for violence and other problems [Step C, Handout 1]
-

Session 18: Drug Dealing: Consider the Impact

- lack of money/poverty [Step C]
- living in a poor neighborhood [Step C]

PART 5: PROPERTY CRIMES

Session 19: Property Crimes: What You Can Do

No Risk Factors mentioned.

Session 20: Vandalism: What You Can Do

- gang membership [Sign 3]
-

Shoplifting: Why and How Is It a Problem?

- drug abuse
- poverty
- kleptomania (All in Handout 1)

Session 21A: Suspicions, Stereotypes, and Solutions: A Negotiation Between Teens and Store Owners

- being a teenager [Handout #1]

PART 6: HATE CRIMES

Session 22: Diversity and Bias Awareness: A Look at Stereotypes

- being part of a minority group

Session 23: Hate Crimes: What They Are and What You Can Do

No Risk Factors Mentioned.

PART 7: POLICE AND COMMUNITY

Session 24: Police and Community: How Do They Need Each Other?

No Risk Factors mentioned.

Session 24A: Reporting a Crime

No Risk Factors mentioned.

Session 25: Cops on Call

No Risk Factors mentioned.

Session 25A: Police and Community: Working Together

No Risk Factors mentioned.

PART 8: ACTIONS PROJECTS

Session 26: Planning a Project

No Risk Factors mentioned.

Session 27: Designing a Project

No Risk Factors mentioned.

Session 28: Doing a Project

No Risk Factors mentioned.

APPENDIX B: Observation Checklist

SESSION 1 CHECKLIST Creating a Community Vision

Part 1 (55 minute estimate)

Instructions: Please place a check mark after each area that is covered in the session. Leave the line blank when certain areas are not covered. Also, please note the approximate time spent on each part and steps within each part. After the checklist is completed, please complete the subsequent qualitative session evaluation.

Step A: Warm up (15 minute estimate)

1. Introduction and welcome _____
 - a. teens *introduce* themselves and *state* their favorite activity _____
 - b. name tags *distributed* and *used* _____
2. Icebreaker: Shapes (kids with same shapes *get together* and *form* shape) _____
3. *Overview* of program and today's session _____
 - a. teens *put together* puzzle messages (small group activity) _____

Actual time spent on Step A: _____

Step B: Creating a Community Vision (30 minute estimate)

1. *Brainstorm* what does it mean to be safe? _____
2. *Defining* community _____
 - a. help teens to come up with a definition similar to this: "a group of people that have something important in common" _____
 - b. teens *consider* what makes a school a community _____
 - c. *ask* teens what things we have in common to make school a community _____
3. *Think about* what makes a community safe and secure _____
4. *Create* vision of a perfect community _____
 - a. *break into* small groups _____
 - b. *develop* a list of what is essential to a "perfect community" _____
 - c. *read* list to larger group _____
 - d. *draw* the perfect community _____
5. Teens *report back* to larger group _____
 - a. *hang* perfect community posters up in classroom _____
6. (optional) *Brainstorm* safe and secure community characteristics _____

Pitch for creating a Youth Safety Corps (club) _____

Actual time spent on Step B: _____

Wrap-up: Sneak preview of Community Works Sessions (10 minute estimate)

1. Give each student a copy of Handout 2. _____
 - a. Each student reads one of the session titles. _____
 - b. Discuss the topics. _____
 - c. Ask teens:
 1. Which topics do you think will be most interesting? _____
 2. Which topics do they feel they already know some information about? _____
 3. Are there any resources that they know about that could be useful for any of the sessions? _____

Actual time spent on Wrap-up: _____

Actual time spent on Part 1: _____

QUALITATIVE SESSION EVALUATION

IN GENERAL...

General comments: _____

DISCUSSIONS...

Rate the discussions: 1. Excellent 2. Good 3. Fair 4. Poor

Comments on discussions: _____

ACTIVITIES...

How engaged were the teens in the activities?

1. Very Engaged 2. Somewhat Engaged 3. Not Engaged

Comments on activities: _____

CRP'S...

Were any Community Resource People brought in? 1. No 2. Yes

What was his/her title? _____

Did he or she....

- a. lecture
- b. co-facilitate

TEACHING TECHNIQUES

The following teaching strategies were suggested for this session: (check those used)

_____ Drawing Vision _____ Small-group discussion _____ Storytelling
_____ Poster _____ National Survey _____ Journal Writing
_____ Webbing/Concept Mapping

Part 2 (50 minute estimate)

Instructions: Please place a check mark after each area that is covered in the session. Leave the line blank when certain areas are not covered. Also, please note the approximate time spent on each part and steps within each part. After the checklist is completed, please complete the subsequent qualitative session evaluation.

Review and Preview

Review the previous part of session and give teens a preview of the objectives and what will be accomplished during the next part of the session _____

Step C: Setting group guidelines (15 minute estimate)

1. How will we work together? _____
 - a. *remind* teens of visions/drawings _____
 - b. teens *decide* how they will work together _____
 - c. ask teens how they want to be treated by others _____
 - d. teens *make list* of desirable group atmosphere _____
 - e. teens *make list* of rules/guidelines to be followed _____
 - f. *read* guidelines aloud to whole group _____
 - g. (optional) have teens *sign* the guidelines as a way of showing commitment to them _____

Actual time spent on Step C: _____

Step D: Good Communication (25 minute estimate)

1. *Explain* that good communication helps to solve conflicts appropriately _____
2. *Discuss* what might happen if group guidelines are not present to follow _____
3. *Demonstrate* how **not** to react in a conflict _____
4. Freeze demonstration and *ask* students for input on handling the situation _____
5. *Demonstrate* the proper way to give criticism: Handout 3 _____
 - a. Stay CALM and ask the person to talk _____
 - b. Say something POSITIVE _____
 - c. TELL the person what's on your mind _____
 - d. ASK if the person understands, ASK for change, ASK how the person feels _____
 - e. THANK the person for listening _____
6. *Role play* giving criticism in front of whole class _____

7. *Demonstrate* the proper way to receive criticism: Handout 3 _____
 - a. LISTEN to what the person has to say _____
 - b. ASK the person to explain if you don't understand _____
 - c. ASK what the person wants you to do _____
 - d. Tell the person you UNDERSTAND _____
 - e. AGREE & APOLOGIZE or ASK to tell your side _____
 8. *Role play* receiving criticism in front of whole class _____
 9. Break into small groups and *role-play* giving and receiving criticism _____
 10. Bring teens back into large group and *debrief* _____
- Actual time spent on Step D: _____

Step E: Reflection (10 minute estimate)

1. Relate session to teens' lives _____
 - a. *ask* what they learned _____
 - b. *remind* them to work together to create a safe community _____
 - c. *discuss* how teens felt about the communication (giving/receiving criticism) activity _____
2. Turning learning into action _____
 - a. *remind* teens that the Action Project is a main component of CW _____
 - b. *set up* an area to post ideas for Action Projects _____
3. Journaling _____
 - a. Did instructor *prompt* teens on how the journals would be handled? _____
 - b. Did instructor *ask* teens to share their entries with others? _____
 - c. Were journal entries *turned in* to instructor? _____

Actual time spent on Step E: _____

Actual time spent on Part 2: _____

QUALITATIVE SESSION EVALUATION

IN GENERAL...

General comments: _____

DISCUSSIONS...

Rate the discussions: 1. Excellent 2. Good 3. Fair 4. Poor

Comments on discussions: _____

ACTIVITIES...

How engaged were the teens in the activities?

1. Very Engaged 2. Somewhat Engaged 3. Not Engaged

Comments on activities: _____

CRP'S...

Were any Community Resource People brought in? 1. No 2. Yes

What was his/her title? _____

Did he or she....

- a. lecture
- b. co-facilitate

TEACHING TECHNIQUES...

The following teaching strategies were suggested for this session: (check those used)

- _____ Icebreaker _____ Small-group puzzle _____ Whole-group ordering
_____ Drawing _____ Brainstorming _____ Journal Writing

SESSION 2 CHECKLIST What Is Crime?

Part 1 (45 minute estimate)

Instructions: Please place a check mark after each area that is covered in the session. Leave the line blank when certain areas are not covered. Also, please note the approximate time spent on each part and steps within each part. After the checklist is completed, please complete the subsequent qualitative session evaluation.

Step A: Warm up/Icebreaker (10 minute estimate)

1. Introduction _____
 - a. *remind* teens that they will be doing service learning projects _____
 - b. *tell* teens the purpose of CW sessions is to help them develop skills to keep them from becoming victims of crime and to help them make their communities safer _____
 - c. *tell* teens "lives have been saved by the information learned in CW" _____
 - d. *return* journals from last session _____
2. Purpose of Session 2: "to understand the impact of crime on the community and be aware of the types of crime that pose the greatest threat to the public and to teens" _____
 - a. *ask* teens:
 1. What is meant by the word crime? _____
 2. What crimes are most common in the community? _____
 3. What crimes are most commonly committed against teens in the community? _____
3. *Remind* teens of guidelines they produced last session _____
 - a. is guideline list *posted* on wall? _____
 - b. have teens *volunteer* to go over the guidelines _____
 - c. *recap* activities from last session _____

Actual time spent on Step A: _____

Step B: What Do You Think (25 minute estimate)

1. What is Crime? _____
 - a. teens *defining* crime in small groups _____
 - b. *bring* large group back together to decide on a definition of crime _____
 - c. *compare* teens working definition with following:
"A crime is any unlawful behavior for which society has set a penalty.
The definition can change over time." _____
 - d. *explain* that in the U.S., the government (local, state, federal) defines those acts that are crimes _____
2. *Relate* Crime to Personal Experience _____
 - a. *brainstorm* list of crimes that occur in the community _____
 - b. visually *list* these crimes (chalkboard, newsprint) _____

- c. *ask* teens: 1. Have you or your family made changes in your lives because of crime? _____
- 2. Have you experienced, witnessed, or heard of crimes that make you feel unsafe? (give examples if needed) _____
- d. *list* teens' responses to these questions _____
- 3. *Explain* the findings from the "Are We Safe?" National survey _____
- 4. *Compare* findings from survey with responses from teens _____
 - a. *list* findings from survey (crime-related concerns) _____
 - b. have teens *check off* those they agree/share with surveyed teens _____
 - c. *discuss* areas that teens agree with survey and disagree with survey _____

Pitch for Service Learning (Action) Projects _____

Tell teens that surveys are a useful tool for discovering how people feel about certain issues. Suggest to the teens that they may want to create a survey to help pinpoint the concerns that others have. This may lead to a helpful idea for an Action Project.

Actual time spent on Step B: _____

Wrap-up Part 1: Sneak preview of CW (10 minute estimate)

- 1. *Ask* teens to make list of 5 questions related to crime issues in the school or community _____
- 2. *Explain* that teens can then use these questions to survey peers and come up with an Action Project related to the survey results _____

Actual time spent on Wrap-up: _____

Actual time spent on Part 1: _____

QUALITATIVE SESSION EVALUATION

IN GENERAL...

General comments: _____

DISCUSSIONS...

Rate the discussions: 1. Excellent 2. Good 3. Fair 4. Poor

Comments on discussions: _____

ACTIVITIES...

How engaged were the teens in the activities?

1. Very Engaged 2. Somewhat Engaged 3. Not Engaged

Comments on activities: _____

CRP'S...

Were any Community Resource People brought in? 1. No 2. Yes

What was his/her title? _____

Did he or she....

- a. lecture
- b. co-facilitate

TEACHING TECHNIQUES

The following teaching strategies were suggested for this session: (check those used)

- _____ Drawing Vision _____ Small-group discussion _____ Storytelling
_____ Poster _____ National Survey _____ Journal Writing
_____ Webbing/Concept Mapping

Part 2 (50 minute estimate)

Instructions: Please place a check mark after each area that is covered in the session. Leave the line blank when certain areas are not covered. Also, please note the approximate time spent on each part and steps within each part. After the checklist is completed, please complete the subsequent qualitative session evaluation.

Review and Preview

Review the previous part of session and give teens a preview of the objectives and what will be accomplished during the next part of the session _____

Step C: What are the Most Serious Crimes in Our Community (40 minute estimate)

1. *Tell* teens they will be looking at crimes in their community _____
 - a. *explain* they will look at both violent and property crime _____
 - b. *give* two teens violent/property crime definitions to *read aloud* to class _____
 - c. *write* definitions somewhere visible to all teens _____
 - violent crime: acts such as assault, rape, and robbery that involve the use or threat of force against a person _____
 - property crime: acts that involve taking property illegally but that do not involve the use or threat of force against an individual _____
 - d. *explain* a new category of crime called status offenses _____
 - status offense: illegal acts that can only be committed by juveniles _____

2. Small group ranking activity
 - a. in small groups, teens *review* list of crimes they created during part 1 _____
 - b. teens *determine* which crimes are violent or property or status offenses _____
 - c. give each group supplies to *record* their decisions _____
 - d. have a recorder in each group *write down* their decisions _____

3. *Bring* groups back together to form one large group _____
 - a. *complete* "Crime in Our Community: We Want To Know" do-it-yourself poster _____
 - b. *record* list of crimes generated in groups under "Most Serious Crimes" column _____
 - c. *put* check marks next to crimes as other groups repeat the same crimes _____
 - d. after all groups have *shared* their results, it should be obvious which crimes are seen by teens as being the most serious/biggest problems _____

Actual time spent on Step C: _____

Wrap-up for part 2 (10 minute estimate)

1. *Ask* teens:
 - a. are they learning new facts, or if most teens already know these things _____
 - b. how would they make other young people aware of the issues they have been discussing _____
 - c. do any actions projects come to mind? _____
 1. If yes, *record* these _____

Actual time spent on Wrap-Up: _____

Actual time spent on Part 2: _____

QUALITATIVE SESSION EVALUATION

IN GENERAL...

General comments: _____

DISCUSSIONS...

Rate the discussions: 1. Excellent 2. Good 3. Fair 4. Poor

Comments on discussions: _____

ACTIVITIES...

How engaged were the teens in the activities?

1. Very Engaged 2. Somewhat Engaged 3. Not Engaged

Comments on activities: _____

CRP'S...

Were any Community Resource People brought in? 1. No 2. Yes

What was his/her title? _____

Did he or she....

- a. lecture
- b. co-facilitate

TEACHING TECHNIQUES

The following teaching strategies were suggested for this session: (check those used)

- _____ Drawing Vision _____ Small-group discussion _____ Storytelling
_____ Poster _____ National Survey _____ Journal Writing
_____ Webbing/Concept Mapping

Part 3 (50 minute estimate)

Instructions: Please place a check mark after each area that is covered in the session. Leave the line blank when certain areas are not covered. Also, please note the approximate time spent on each part and steps within each part. After the checklist is completed, please complete the subsequent qualitative session evaluation.

Review and Preview

Review the previous part of session and give teens a preview of the objectives and what will be accomplished during the next part of the session _____

Step D: Crime Ranking Strategy (40 minute estimate)

1. *Explain* the difference between a felony and a misdemeanor _____

felony: a crime more serious than a misdemeanor, punishable by a prison sentence of more than one year as well as possible fines _____

misdemeanor: a criminal offense that is less serious than a felony and is punishable by a prison sentence of one year or less as well as by fines _____

- a. *tell* teens they will be ranking a list of crimes according to seriousness _____
- b. *distribute* Handout 2 "Rank These Crimes" and have teens **individually rank** the ten crimes (top portion of handout only), noting whether they are felonies or misdemeanors _____

2. Small group *activity* _____
 - a. *divide* teens into small groups _____
 - b. teens *discuss* how they each have labeled each crime listed _____
 - c. *tell* teens to reach an agreement on the category for each crime _____
 - d. one teen will *write down* group decision _____
3. Whole Group *Discussion* _____
 - a. back in large group, teens *discuss and compare* their rankings _____
 - b. teens *read and complete* bottom portion of Handout 2 _____
 - c. *ask* teens if these situations occur in their own communities _____
 - d. similarities/differences in the community situations _____

Actual time spent on Step D: _____

Wrap-up part 3 (10 minute estimate)

1. *Brainstorm* list of crime prevention community resources that teens feel every young person should know about _____
2. *Record* group's ideas _____
3. *Remind* group that these ideas can lead to future Action Projects _____

Actual time spent on Wrap-up: _____

Actual time spent on Part 3: _____

QUALITATIVE SESSION EVALUATION

IN GENERAL...

General comments: _____

DISCUSSIONS...

Rate the discussions: 1. Excellent 2. Good 3. Fair 4. Poor

Comments on discussions: _____

ACTIVITIES...

How engaged were the teens in the activities?

1. Very Engaged 2. Somewhat Engaged 3. Not Engaged

Comments on activities: _____

CRP'S...

Were any Community Resource People brought in? 1. No 2. Yes

What was his/her title? _____

Did he or she....

- a. lecture
- b. co-facilitate

TEACHING TECHNIQUES

The following teaching strategies were suggested for this session: (check those used)

_____ Drawing Vision _____ Small-group discussion _____ Storytelling
_____ Poster _____ National Survey _____ Journal Writing
_____ Webbing/Concept Mapping

Part 4 (50 minute estimate)

Instructions: Please place a check mark after each area that is covered in the session. Leave the line blank when certain areas are not covered. Also, please note the approximate time spent on each part and steps within each part. After the checklist is completed, please complete the subsequent qualitative session evaluation.

Review and Preview

Review the previous part of session and give teens a preview of the objectives and what will be accomplished during the next part of the session _____

Step E: Defining Crime (30 minute estimate)

1. Individual *activity* _____
 - a. Handout 3 "Types of Crime" *distributed* _____
 - b. have teens *read* list of crimes and *match* the crime to it's right label (from the box) _____
2. Small group *activity* on defining crime _____
 - a. teens *divided* into small groups _____
 - b. teens will use their individual answers to *compare and decide* on the best category for each crime listed _____
 - c. one teen from each group will *record* their decisions _____
3. Whole group *discussion* _____
 - a. teens *brought back* into large group _____
 - b. *utilize* Handout 4 (definitions of crime type) as teens *discuss* their labels _____
 - c. *ask* teens:
 1. Which crimes were hardest/easiest to label? _____
 2. Do the crimes listed happen in their communities? _____
 3. Which crimes are the biggest threats to public safety? _____

Actual time spent on Step E: _____

Step F: Reflection (20 minute estimate)

1. *Relate* session to teens' lives _____
 - a. *use* do-it-yourself poster to get a *discussion* going _____
 - b. *ask/write down* what subjects the teens want to cover in CW _____
 - c. *ask* teens to *suggest* CRP's to bring in _____
 - d. *ask* teens to help with next session _____
2. Turn learning into action _____
 - a. *ask* teens what information they think is most important to share with others _____
 - b. *remind* teens to keep thinking about an Action Project _____
 - c. *record* any project ideas that are mentioned _____
3. Journaling _____
 - a. Did instructor *prompt* teens on how the journals would be handled? _____
 - b. Did instructor *ask* teens to share their entries with others? _____
 - c. Were journal entries *turned in* to instructor? _____

Actual time spent on Step F: _____

Actual time spent on Part 4: _____

QUALITATIVE SESSION EVALUATION

IN GENERAL...

General comments: _____

DISCUSSIONS...

Rate the discussions: 1. Excellent 2. Good 3. Fair 4. Poor

Comments on discussions: _____

ACTIVITIES...

How engaged were the teens in the activities?

1. Very Engaged 2. Somewhat Engaged 3. Not Engaged

Comments on activities: _____

CRP'S...

Were any Community Resource People brought in? 1. No 2. Yes

What was his/her title? _____

Did he or she....

- a. lecture
- b. co-facilitate

TEACHING TECHNIQUES...

The following teaching strategies were suggested for this session: (check those used)

_____ Icebreaker _____ Small-group discussion _____ Whole-group discussion _____

Brainstorm _____ Poster _____ Journal Writing

_____ Ranking

SESSION 3 Checklist Victims of Crime

Part 1 (45 minute estimate)

Instructions: Please place a check mark after each area that is covered in the session. Leave the line blank when certain areas are not covered. Also, please note the approximate time spent on each part and steps within each part. After the checklist is completed, please complete the subsequent qualitative session evaluation.

Step A: Warm up (10 minute estimate)

1. Review _____
 - a. *ask* teens to remember purpose of community works _____
 - b. *tell* teens purpose of CW sessions is to help them develop skills to keep them from becoming victims of crime and to help them make their communities safer _____
 - c. *ask* teens to *update* newcomers _____
 - d. *return* journals from last session _____
2. *Tell* teens the purpose of Session 3: To put a human face on crime statistics by focusing on crime victims" _____
3. *Remind* teens of guidelines they produced last session _____
 - a. is guideline list *posted* on wall? _____
 - b. have teens *volunteer* to go over the guidelines _____
4. Icebreaker of choice _____

Actual time spent on Step A: _____

Step B: What Do You Think (35 minute estimate)

1. *Ask* teens:
 1. Have you or someone you know been the victim of a crime? _____
 2. How did it affect the victim? _____
2. *Explore* with teens how crimes can affect victims (physically, emotionally and financially) _____
 - a. *distribute* Handout 1 "My Friend Angela" and *read* to group _____
 - b. *discuss* teen victimization (small group or large group) _____
3. *Ask* teens about the impact of crime on a victim _____
 - a. make chart with 3 columns for physical, emotional, and financial impact _____
4. (optional) *Ask* teens to consider what might help Angela recover _____
 - a. teens *list* resources they can think of that help victims _____
5. *Ask* teens, "what impact did this crime have on the school community?" _____
 - a. discuss the crime's impact on parents, city, school, businesses, etc. _____
6. Write teens responses under the heading "Effects on Community" _____

Actual time spent on Step B: _____

Wrap-up for part 1 (No time estimate)

1. Ask teens what they learned about how crime hurts both individuals and communities

Actual time spent on Part 1: _____

QUALITATIVE SESSION EVALUATION

IN GENERAL...

General comments: _____

DISCUSSIONS...

Rate the discussions: 1. Excellent 2. Good 3. Fair 4. Poor

Comments on discussions: _____

ACTIVITIES...

How engaged were the teens in the activities?

1. Very Engaged 2. Somewhat Engaged 3. Not Engaged

Comments on activities: _____

CRP'S...

Were any Community Resource People brought in? 1. No 2. Yes

What was his/her title? _____

Did he or she....

- a. lecture
- b. co-facilitate

TEACHING TECHNIQUES

The following teaching strategies were suggested for this session: (check those used)

- _____ Drawing Vision _____ Small-group discussion _____ Storytelling
- _____ Poster _____ National Survey _____ Journal Writing
- _____ Webbing/Concept Mapping

Part 2 (45 minute estimate)

Instructions: Please place a check mark after each area that is covered in the session. Leave the line blank when certain areas are not covered. Also, please note the approximate time spent on each part and steps within each part. After the checklist is completed, please complete the subsequent qualitative session evaluation.

Review and Preview

Review the previous part of session and give teens a preview of the objectives and what will be accomplished during the next part of the session _____

Step C: Who Are the Victims? (25 minute estimate)

1. *Distribute* Handout 2 "Who Are Victims?" _____
 - a. *ask* teens to get into small groups and answer the questions _____
 - b. as a whole group, *provide answers* to the questions in a game-show atmosphere _____
 - c. *define violent crime:* "acts such as assault, rape, and robbery that involve the use or threat of force against a person" _____
 - d. *explain* to teens the importance of dispelling myths about crime and victims _____
2. *Distribute* Handout 3 (answers to Handout 2) _____
 - a. *go over* the correct answers with teens _____
3. (optional) Have teen work in small groups to come up with answers to the questions and then report their decisions to the larger group _____

Actual time spent on Step C: _____

Wrap-up for Part 2

Step D: School/Community Crime Prevention (20 minute estimate)

1. *Remind* teens they will be doing an Action Project for their school or community _____
2. *Get into* small groups and have each group develop a 60-second public service announcement to prevent teen victimization. _____
3. After groups have created the announcement, have them *practice* it. _____

Actual time spent on Step D: _____

Actual time spent on Part 2: _____

QUALITATIVE SESSION EVALUATION

IN GENERAL...

General comments: _____

DISCUSSIONS...

Rate the discussions: 1. Excellent 2. Good 3. Fair 4. Poor

Comments on discussions: _____

ACTIVITIES...

How engaged were the teens in the activities?

1. Very Engaged 2. Somewhat Engaged 3. Not Engaged

Comments on activities: _____

CRP'S...

Were any Community Resource People brought in? 1. No 2. Yes

What was his/her title? _____

Did he or she....

- a. lecture
- b. co-facilitate

TEACHING TECHNIQUES

The following teaching strategies were suggested for this session: (check those used)

_____ Drawing Vision _____ Small-group discussion _____ Storytelling
_____ Poster _____ National Survey _____ Journal Writing
_____ Webbing/Concept Mapping

Part 3 (55 minute estimate)

Instructions: Please place a check mark after each area that is covered in the session. Leave the line blank when certain areas are not covered. Also, please note the approximate time spent on each part and steps within each part. After the checklist is completed, please complete the subsequent qualitative session evaluation.

Review and Preview

Review the previous part of session and give teens a preview of the objectives and what will be accomplished during the next part of the session _____

Step D continued (from part 2) (20 minute estimate)

1. Let teens *practice* their public service announcement, then ask them to get into whole group _____
2. *Ask* teens to *remember* each message as it is presented _____

Actual time spent on Step D: _____

Step E: If a Friend is Hurt by Crime (25 minute estimate)

1. What can you do? _____
 - a. *tell* teens they are not helpless against crime _____
 - b. *tell* teens they can play an important role when a friend is victimized _____
2. *Tell* teens victims experience emotional trauma and need emotional help _____
 - a. *introduce* the term "secondary injuries" _____
 - b. *ask* teens what they think the term means _____
 - c. *define* term: secondary injuries are those that happen to the victim as a result of the crime and the victim's involvement with the justice system, family, friends and the community (what these things might do to the victim) _____
3. What to do when someone has been victimized _____
 - a. be non-judgmental and tell victim: _____
 1. I'm sorry it happened _____
 2. It wasn't your fault _____
 3. How can I help? _____
 - b. encourage person to report crime to the police _____
4. *Role-play* a victimization scenario _____
 - a. *ask* teen to read situation aloud _____
 - b. have teens *split into pairs* and *rehearse* the scenario _____
 - c. *give* teens questions to think about while role-playing _____
 1. What are Angela's feelings? _____
 2. What kind of problems could she have in the future? _____
 3. What could you do to help her practical and emotional problems? _____
 4. Who else might be hurt or troubled because of the crime against Angela? _____
 - d. have in mind possible answers to these questions to *aid teens* in their role-play and to spark discussion after they are finished _____
5. *Reconvene* and *ask* teens to share the answers to the questions _____

Actual time spent on Step E: _____

Step F: Reflection (10 minute estimate)

1. Relate session to teens' lives _____
 - a. *ask* teens to think about how they respond to friends who have problems _____
 - b. *ask* teens to consider why it is hard to discuss our own victimization _____
 - c. *ask* teens what services are available in the community that help victims _____
2. Turn learning into action _____
 - a. *suggest* a learning project that involves developing a "Hot Tips" list for other teens to read about crime and victimization prevention _____
 - b. also *suggest* that teens could take their announcements to a local radio station and ask them to air it _____
 - b. *remind* teens to keep thinking about an Action Project _____
 - c. *record* any project ideas that are mentioned _____
 - d. *ask* for volunteer to help with next session _____
3. Journaling _____
 - a. Did instructor *prompt* teens on how the journals would be handled? _____
 - b. Did instructor *ask* teens to share their entries with others? _____
 - c. Were journal entries *turned in* to instructor? _____

Actual time spent on Step F: _____

Actual time spent on Part 3: _____

QUALITATIVE SESSION EVALUATION

IN GENERAL...

General comments: _____

DISCUSSIONS...

Rate the discussions: 1. Excellent 2. Good 3. Fair 4. Poor

Comments on discussions: _____

ACTIVITIES...

How engaged were the teens in the activities?

1. Very Engaged 2. Somewhat Engaged 3. Not Engaged

Comments on activities: _____

CRP'S...

Were any Community Resource People brought in? 1. No 2. Yes

What was his/her title? _____

Did he or she....

- a. lecture
- b. co-facilitate

TEACHING TECHNIQUES

The following teaching strategies were suggested for this session: (check those used)

_____ Brainstorm _____ Whole-group discussion
_____ True/False Statements _____ Concentric Circles _____
Journal Writing _____ Role Playing

SESSION 4 Checklist
Safe and Secure Communities

Part 1 (50 minute estimate)

Instructions: Please place a check mark after each area that is covered in the session. Leave the line blank when certain areas are not covered. Also, please note the approximate time spent on each part and steps within each part. After the checklist is completed, please complete the subsequent qualitative session evaluation.

Step A: Warm up (10 minute estimate)

1. Review purpose of CW _____
 - a. *ask* teens to remember purpose of community works _____
 - b. *ask* teens to *update* newcomers _____
 - c. *tell* teens the purpose of these sessions is to help them develop skills to keep them from becoming victims of crime and to help them make their communities safer. _____
 - d. *return* journals from last session _____
2. *Tell* teens the purpose of Session 4 is: "to find out what works in preventing crime"

3. *Remind* teens of guidelines they produced last session _____
 - a. is guideline list *posted* on wall? _____
 - b. have a teen(s) *volunteer* to go over the guidelines _____

Actual time spent on Step A: _____

Step B: What Do You Think (10 minute estimate)

1. *Ask* teens to look at drawing they made in session 1 _____
 - a. *ask* teens: 1. what do their drawings mean? _____
2. how you we achieve this crime-free community? _____
 - b. *write* their answers down _____
 - c. *tell* teens they just generated crime prevention ideas _____
 - d. *hang* drawings on wall for next sessions _____
2. *Explain* to teens that working together is essential to crime prevention _____
 - a. *ask* for examples of how teamwork solves a problem or achieves a goal _____
 - b. *discuss* teens' answers to the question, "how do we achieve this crime-free community?" _____
 - c. *ask* teens which solutions involve working together _____
 - d. *put a check* next to those that involve working together _____
 - e. *tell* teens that crime prevention is one of many jobs for the police, but that everyone can help out to prevent crime _____

Actual time spent on Step B: _____

Step C: What Is Crime Prevention? (20 minute estimate)

1. *Tell* the "Bridge Story" _____
 - a. *explain* that the techniques of crime prevention are like the railing of the bridge, and can make the community safe _____
 - b. *ask* teens how young people can be part of the solution and help prevent crime _____
2. *Use* "What we Know About Crime Prevention" poster to provide teens with some basic information _____
 - a. *read aloud* or *ask* teen(s) to read poster aloud to class _____
 - b. make sure teens understand information and *ask* for questions _____
3. *Compare* information on poster to the solutions teens gave for achieving a crime-free community, and mark where ideas are similar _____
4. *Ask* teens to describe any crime prevention efforts they know of in their community _____
 - a. *list* some efforts happening in other communities to get ideas flowing _____
 1. midnight basketball, school watch, graffiti removal, neighborhood watch _____
 - b. *tell* teens that these efforts have been done by teens who stepped forward and made a difference _____

Actual time spent on Step C: _____

Wrap-up for part 1: Action Project Ideas (10 minute estimate)

1. *Ask* teens:
 - a. what types of activities they enjoy _____
 - b. if they know or have participated in any crime-prevention activities _____
2. *Make list* of these activities (and *post it* next session) _____
3. *Ask* teens to consider the community for which they would like to do the action project _____

Actual time spent on Wrap-up for part 1: _____

Actual time spent on Part 1: _____

QUALITATIVE SESSION EVALUATION

IN GENERAL...

General comments: _____

DISCUSSIONS...

Rate the discussions: 1. Excellent 2. Good 3. Fair 4. Poor

Comments on discussions: _____

ACTIVITIES...

How engaged were the teens in the activities?

1. Very Engaged 2. Somewhat Engaged 3. Not Engaged

Comments on activities: _____

CRP'S...

Were any Community Resource People brought in? 1. No 2. Yes

What was his/her title? _____

Did he or she....

- a. lecture
- b. co-facilitate

TEACHING TECHNIQUES

The following teaching strategies were suggested for this session: (check those used)

- _____ Drawing Vision _____ Small-group discussion _____ Storytelling
- _____ Poster _____ National Survey _____ Journal Writing
- _____ Webbing/Concept Mapping

Part 2 (45 minute estimate)

Instructions: Please place a check mark after each area that is covered in the session. Leave the line blank when certain areas are not covered. Also, please note the approximate time spent on each part and steps within each part. After the checklist is completed, please complete the subsequent qualitative session evaluation.

Review and Preview

Review the previous part of session and give teens a preview of the objectives and what will be accomplished during the next part of the session _____

Step D: Teens and Crime Prevention (30 minute estimate)

- 1. *Go over* list of crime-prevention activities made by teens in previous part _____
 - a. *select* a few examples and have teens describe the activity and their role in the activity _____

2. *Explain* to teens that a recent national survey found both bad and good news about teens and crime prevention _____
 - a. *distribute* Handout 1 _____
 - b. *read* first sentence aloud and ask if they agree with the statement: "Teenagers have very specific ideas about what people their age can do to stop violence in their neighborhoods _____
 - c. *read* next sentence aloud and ask for confirmation: "Today's teens tend to think they are making a positive difference in the community _____
3. Have teens work in small groups, using Handout 1 to come up with ideas to help prevent crime _____
 - a. *tell* teens the key idea in crime prevention is "watch out and help out" _____
 - b. *ask* them to fill out chart on Handout 1 _____
 - c. *point out* that crime prevention includes the following: self protective actions, anger and conflict management, and working with others _____
 - d. *ask* each small group to select a recorder and a reporter _____
 - e. *distribute* necessary supplies _____
4. *Re-group* into larger group _____
 - a. have teens *share* their ideas _____
 - b. *record* their ideas on a visual chart identical to the chart in Handout 1 _____
 - c. *tell* teens they will have an opportunity to revise suggestions/ideas later _____
5. School Safety Audit (optional idea): teens could help access current safety conditions of the school and this could help identify Action Project ideas _____

Actual time spent on Step D: _____

Step E: Reflection (15 minute estimate)

1. Relate session to teens' lives _____
 - a. *ask* teens to write down one project he/she would like to do to stop crime _____
 - b. *collect* ideas and post them on a flip chart _____
 - c. *choose* one idea to focus on and do a concept web later _____
 - c. *ask* for volunteers to help with next session _____
2. Turn learning into action _____
 - a. *create* a concept web out of the idea chosen above _____
3. Journaling _____
 - a. Did instructor *prompt* teens on how the journals would be handled? _____
 - b. Did instructor *ask* teens to share their entries with others? _____
 - c. Were journal entries *turned in* to instructor? _____

Actual time spent on Step E: _____

Actual time spent on Part 2: _____

QUALITATIVE SESSION EVALUATION

IN GENERAL...

General comments: _____

DISCUSSIONS...

Rate the discussions: 1. Excellent 2. Good 3. Fair 4. Poor

Comments on discussions: _____

ACTIVITIES...

How engaged were the teens in the activities?

1. Very Engaged 2. Somewhat Engaged 3. Not Engaged

Comments on activities: _____

CRP'S...

Were any Community Resource People brought in? 1. No 2. Yes

What was his/her title? _____

Did he or she....

- a. lecture
- b. co-facilitate

TEACHING TECHNIQUES

The following teaching strategies were suggested for this session: (check those used)

_____ Drawing Vision _____ Small-group discussion _____ Storytelling
_____ Poster _____ National Survey _____ Journal Writing
_____ Webbing/Concept Mapping

SESSION 5 Checklist
Where Are We Safe and Unsafe?

Part 1 (No time estimate)

Instructions: Please place a check mark after each area that is covered in the session. Leave the line blank when certain areas are not covered. Also, please note the approximate time spent on each part and steps within each part. After the checklist is completed, please complete the subsequent qualitative session evaluation.

(Field Trip to Gather Information)

1. Obtain a census tract map of your community. _____
(If the group did not use a census tract map,
what type of map did they use? _____)
 - a. With the group, locate and outline the teens' neighborhoods. _____
 - b. Locate important areas of town, such as schools, parks, public transportation routes, and locate and outline on the map. _____
 - c. Obtain crime statistics for the area. _____
including stats on:
homicide _____
rapes _____
assaults _____
robberies _____
burglaries _____
auto thefts _____
 - d. Statistics broken down by adult and juvenile crimes. _____
 - e. Ask teens: Are crime rates in the teens' neighborhoods going up or down? _____
Do some areas have more crime than others? _____
Which crimes are higher in some areas? _____
Why are these crimes higher? _____

3. Fill out Handout 1: Crime Statistics Chart. _____
Was it filled out as a Group _____ or Individually _____.

4. Have students find out if there is any Neighborhood Watch or similar programs in their communities. _____

5. Ask teens: "what information they were most surprised by during the field trip." _____

6. Tell teens how the information they gathered during this session fits into the next session:

QUALITATIVE SESSION EVALUATION

IN GENERAL...

General comments: _____

DISCUSSIONS...

Rate the discussions: 1. Excellent 2. Good 3. Fair 4. Poor

Comments on discussions: _____

ACTIVITIES...

How engaged were the teens in the activities?

1. Very Engaged 2. Somewhat Engaged 3. Not Engaged

Comments on activities: _____

CRP'S...

Were any Community Resource People brought in? 1. No 2. Yes

What was his/her title? _____

Did he or she....

- a. lecture
- b. co-facilitate

TEACHING TECHNIQUES

The following teaching strategies were suggested for this session: (check those used)

_____ Drawing Vision _____ Small-group discussion _____ Storytelling
_____ Poster _____ National Survey _____ Journal Writing
_____ Webbing/Concept Mapping

Part 2 (55 minute estimate)

Instructions: Please place a check mark after each area that is covered in the session. Leave the line blank when certain areas are not covered. Also, please note the approximate time spent on each part and steps within each part. After the checklist is completed, please complete the subsequent qualitative session evaluation.

Review and Preview

Review the previous part of session and give teens a preview of the objectives and what will be accomplished during the next part of the session _____

Step A: Warm-up (10 minute estimate)

1. Review previous session. _____
 - a. *ask* teens to *update* newcomers _____
 - b. *tell* teens the purpose of these sessions is to help them develop skills to keep them from becoming victims of crime and to help them make their communities safer. _____
 - c. *return* journals from last session _____
2. *Tell* teens the purpose of Session 5 is: "to find out where people are safe and unsafe in their communities" _____
3. *Remind* teens of guidelines they produced last session _____
 - a. is guideline list *posted* on wall? _____
 - b. have a teen(s) *volunteer* to go over the guidelines _____

Actual time spent on the Step A: _____

Step B: What Do You Think? (25 minute estimate)

1. Use of the *Where We're Most and Least Likely to Feel Safe* poster. _____
 - a. Record and discuss teens' views about where they feel safe and unsafe. _____
2. Tell teens that you'll be asking them "How safe do you personally feel in the following places or activities. _____"
 - a. Read aloud the name of locations in the community and asked teens to stand on the continuum between "Safe" and "Unsafe" signs. _____
 - b. Students record how they feel for each of the locations listed. _____
 - c. For each location, ask teens:
 1. Why they chose their particular spot on the continuum? _____
 2. Name one thing that would make them feel safer in that location. _____
 - d. Write their answers on the poster under the location it describes. _____
3. Debrief with teens. _____
 - a. Ask teens:
 1. Why did you choose a particular position? _____
 2. What are specific reasons why certain areas make you feel unsafe? _____
 - b. Brainstorm some ways that specific areas could be made safer. _____
 - c. Ask teens if there are community resources that could help make areas safer. _____

Actual time spent on Step B: _____

Step C: Mapping Our Community's Safe and Unsafe Places. (20 minute estimate)

1. Have students look at a large community map. _____
 - a. Have students locate where they are at.
 - b. Identification of important locations marked during the field trip. _____
 - c. Identification of safe and unsafe areas in their community. _____
 - d. Students use the results from Step B to rank the 3 safest and 3 least safe areas. _____

Actual time spent on Step C: _____

Wrap up for Part 2: (No time estimate)

- a. Ask the group about what questions arise about particular areas. _____
- b. Ask teens to predict crime statistics by crime and location in the community. _____
- c. Preview of Session 5, part 3. _____

Actual time spent on Wrap-up for part 2: _____

Actual time spent on Part 2: _____

QUALITATIVE SESSION EVALUATION

IN GENERAL...

General comments: _____

DISCUSSIONS...

Rate the discussions: 1. Excellent 2. Good 3. Fair 4. Poor

Comments on discussions: _____

ACTIVITIES...

How engaged were the teens in the activities?

1. Very Engaged 2. Somewhat Engaged 3. Not Engaged

Comments on activities: _____

CRP'S...

Were any Community Resource People brought in? 1. No 2. Yes

What was his/her title? _____

Did he or she....

- a. lecture
- b. co-facilitate

TEACHING TECHNIQUES

The following teaching strategies were suggested for this session: (check those used)

_____ Drawing Vision _____ Small-group discussion _____ Storytelling
_____ Poster _____ National Survey _____ Journal Writing
_____ Webbing/Concept Mapping

Part 3 (50 minute estimate)

Instructions: Please place a check mark after each area that is covered in the session. Leave the line blank when certain areas are not covered. Also, please note the approximate time spent on each part and steps within each part. After the checklist is completed, please complete the subsequent qualitative session evaluation.

Review and Preview

Review the previous part of session and give teens a preview of the objectives and what will be accomplished during the next part of the session _____

Step D. Adding Local Crime Statistics (40 minute estimate)

1. Ask teens:

- a. How many homicides occurred in the community in the past year? _____
- b. Where did they occur? _____
- c. How many rapes, assaults, robberies, burglaries, and auto thefts occurred in the teens' community in the past year (or six months)? _____
- d. Where did they occur? _____
- e. Is the crime rate in their communities going up or down? _____
- f. Do some neighborhoods have more crime than others?
- g. Which ones have more crime?
- h. Why do these communities have more crime? _____

2. Students form small groups, and are distributed pieces of Handout #1. _____

- a. Each group reads aloud their crime statistic. _____
- b. Each group identifies where their particular crime statistic(s) occurred on the map and marks it. _____

3. Groups are brought back together to discuss the map. _____

- a. Students locate the safest and least safe areas on the map according to the police statistics. _____

b. Students compare the map to the answers they gave for Step B, *Where We're Most and Least Likely to Feel Safe*. _____

c. Ask teens:

1. Do the police statistics indicate that the areas they thought of as unsafe were or were not the most dangerous? _____

2. Are you surprised by anything you learned in this session? _____

3. If you are surprised, what made you surprised? _____

Actual time spent on Step D: _____

Step E. Reflection (10 minute estimate)

1. Have students think of what they learned in this session. _____

a. Students share what they learned with the group. _____

b. Students pair up to discuss how they might use this session in changing their own behavior. _____

c. As a large group, students are asked what advice they would give others about safe and unsafe areas in their community. _____

d. Ask for volunteers to help with the next session. _____

2. Turn learning into action. _____

a. Students are asked how they could communicate what they learned with others. _____

b. Students are told about unsafe neighborhoods where students made a difference by making it safer. _____

3. Journaling. _____

a. Did instructor *prompt* teens on how the journals would be handled? _____

b. Did instructor *ask* teens to share their entries with others? _____

c. Were journal entries *turned in* to instructor? _____

Actual time spent on Step E: _____

Actual time spent on Part 3: _____

QUALITATIVE SESSION EVALUATION

IN GENERAL...

General comments: _____

DISCUSSIONS...

Rate the discussions: 1. Excellent 2. Good 3. Fair 4. Poor

Comments on discussions: _____

ACTIVITIES...

How engaged were the teens in the activities?

1. Very Engaged 2. Somewhat Engaged 3. Not Engaged

Comments on activities: _____

CRP'S...

Were any Community Resource People brought in? 1. No 2. Yes

What was his/her title? _____

Did he or she....

- a. lecture
- b. co-facilitate

TEACHING TECHNIQUES

The following teaching strategies were suggested for this session: (check those used)

- _____ Drawing Vision _____ Small-group discussion _____ Storytelling
- _____ Poster _____ National Survey _____ Journal Writing
- _____ Webbing/Concept Mapping

SESSION 6 Checklist Our Community's Resources

Part 1 (60 minute estimate)

Instructions: Please place a check mark after each area that is covered in the session. Leave the line blank when certain areas are not covered. Also, please note the approximate time spent on each part and steps within each part. After the checklist is completed, please complete the subsequent qualitative session evaluation.

Step A: Warm up (10 minute estimate)

1. Review purpose of CW _____
 - a. *ask* teens to remember purpose of community works _____
 - b. *ask* teens to *update* newcomers _____
 - c. *tell* teens the purpose of these sessions is to help them develop skills to keep them from becoming victims of crime and to help them make their communities safer. _____
 - d. *return* journals from last session _____
2. *Tell* teens the purpose of Session 6 is: "to identify and locate programs and services in their community that can help prevent crime and aid crime victims." _____
3. *Remind* teens of guidelines they produced last session _____
 - a. is guideline list *posted* on wall? _____
 - b. have a teen(s) *volunteer* to go over the guidelines _____
4. (Optional) Used an icebreaker to warm-up the group. _____

Actual time spent on Step A: _____

Step B: What Do You Think? (20 minute estimate)

1. Ask teens:
 - a. Do you know of any programs or services in their community that help prevent crime or aid victims? _____
 - b. Who helps keep conflicts from getting violent? _____
 - c. Who helps protect people and places from violence? _____
 - d. Do you know any place a person could go if he or she is victimized? _____
 - e. Do you know anyone who works with a group that prevents crime or helps victims. _____
 - f. Who could be a resource to prevent crime? _____
 - g. How could churches and schools be more involved in community efforts to prevent crime? _____
2. Tell teens that this session will build on what they already know. _____
 - a. Have teens brainstorm about types of resources that are important for prevention crime and helping victims. _____

b. Remind teens of Session 3, and ask what resources would help these people. _____

Actual time Spent on Step B: _____

Step C: Gathering Information on Resources. (25 minute estimate)

1. Tell teens that they will find and identify resources in their community that prevent crime and help victims. _____
 - a. Explain that each group will find one or two resources in the telephone book. _____
 - b. An example was shown on the chalkboard. _____
 - c. A volunteer reads aloud the name, address, and phone numbers of a hospital they looked up in the phonebook. _____
2. Ask each small group to find one or two resources in the phonebook. _____
 - a. Students are provided with materials, including Handout 1. _____
 - b. Search tips are read aloud as the students search for resources. _____
 - c. Each group has a reporter that writes down their information, places the information on the community map, and tells the class about the resource. _____
 - d. The instructor provides time for questions. _____

Actual time Spent on Step C: _____

Wrap-Up for Part 1: (no time estimate)

1. As a large group, ask the teens:
 - a. Were there any unusual resources listed? _____
 - b. Were there any resources that specialized in working with teens? _____
2. Preview of Part 2. _____

Actual time spent on Part 1: _____

QUALITATIVE SESSION EVALUATION

IN GENERAL...

General comments: _____

DISCUSSIONS...

Rate the discussions: 1. Excellent 2. Good 3. Fair 4. Poor

Comments on discussions: _____

ACTIVITIES...

How engaged were the teens in the activities?

1. Very Engaged 2. Somewhat Engaged 3. Not Engaged

Comments on activities: _____

CRP'S...

Were any Community Resource People brought in? 1. No 2. Yes

What was his/her title? _____

Did he or she....

- a. lecture
- b. co-facilitate

TEACHING TECHNIQUES

The following teaching strategies were suggested for this session: (check those used)

- _____ Drawing Vision _____ Small-group discussion _____ Storytelling
_____ Poster _____ National Survey _____ Journal Writing
_____ Webbing/Concept Mapping

Part 2 (60 minute estimate)

Instructions: Please place a check mark after each area that is covered in the session. Leave the line blank when certain areas are not covered. Also, please note the approximate time spent on each part and steps within each part. After the checklist is completed, please complete the subsequent qualitative session evaluation.

Review and Preview

Review the previous part of session and give teens a preview of the objectives and what will be accomplished during the next part of the session _____

Step D: Using Information Resources (35 minute estimate)

1. Students locate and mark the resources gathered in Step C on the community map. _____
 - a. Student representatives present the information gathered in Step C to the entire group.

 - b. Resources available to the entire community are listed in the bottom right corner of the map. _____
2. Tell teens to consider the map as a whole to get the big picture. _____
 - a. Ask teens:
 1. Are you surprised to discover the great number of different types of resources available to prevent crime and assist victims? Or, are they concerned about the limited number of resources? _____
 2. What information is new, and what information did they already know. _____

3. Students identify one or two of the available resources in their community to learn more about. _____
 - a. Student questions about the resource are listed for later use. _____

Actual time spent on Step D: _____

Step E: Reflection (15 minute estimate)

1. Relate session to teens' lives _____
 - a. *ask* volunteers to compile a list of all their findings. _____
 - b. ask volunteers to make copies of the list to pass out to the group. _____
 - c. ask volunteers to gather additional information on available resources. _____
2. Turn learning into action _____
 - a. ask students if they could imagine a time when they would use one of the available resources. _____
 - b. ask students how they could inform the community about what they learned in this session.
3. Journaling _____
 - a. Did instructor *prompt* teens on how the journals would be handled? _____
 - b. Did instructor *ask* teens to share their entries with others? _____
 - c. Were journal entries *turned in* to instructor? _____

Actual time spent on Step E: _____

Actual time spent on Part 2: _____

QUALITATIVE SESSION EVALUATION

IN GENERAL...

General comments: _____

DISCUSSIONS...

Rate the discussions: 1. Excellent 2. Good 3. Fair 4. Poor

Comments on discussions: _____

ACTIVITIES...

How engaged were the teens in the activities?

1. Very Engaged 2. Somewhat Engaged 3. Not Engaged

Comments on activities: _____

CRP'S...

Were any Community Resource People brought in? 1. No 2. Yes

What was his/her title? _____

Did he or she....

- a. lecture
- b. co-facilitate

TEACHING TECHNIQUES

The following teaching strategies were suggested for this session: (check those used)

_____ Drawing Vision _____ Small-group discussion _____ Storytelling
_____ Poster _____ National Survey _____ Journal Writing
_____ Webbing/Concept Mapping

SESSION 7 Checklist Your Conflict Choices

Part 1 (50 minute estimate)

Instructions: Please place a check mark after each area that is covered in the session. Leave the line blank when certain areas are not covered. Also, please note the approximate time spent on each part and steps within each part. After the checklist is completed, please complete the subsequent qualitative session evaluation.

Step A: Warm up (10 minute estimate)

1. Review purpose of CW _____
 - a. *ask* teens to remember purpose of community works _____
 - b. *ask* teens to *update* newcomers _____
 - c. *tell* teens the purpose of these sessions is to help them develop skills to keep them from becoming victims of crime and to help them make their communities safer. _____
 - d. *return* journals from last session _____
2. *Tell* teens the purpose of Session 7 is: "to help them examine the choices they make in conflicts." _____
3. *Remind* teens of guidelines they produced last session _____
 - a. is guideline list *posted* on wall? _____
 - b. have a teen(s) *volunteer* to go over the guidelines _____
4. Used the Balloon Burst icebreaker, or Each One Teach One to warm-up the group. _____

Actual time spent on Step A: _____

Actual time spent on Step A: _____

Step B: What Do You Think? (10 minute estimate)

1. Write the word "conflict" in the center of the newsprint. _____
 - a. Ask teens what comes to mind when we see the word conflict, and write down their answers. _____
2. Ask teens:
 - a. What words indicate that conflict is negative? _____
 - b. What about conflict can be positive? _____
3. Tell teens:
 - a. Conflict is normal/natural. _____
 - b. Not all conflict has to lead to violence. _____
 - c. Conflict can actually improve relationships. _____
 - d. If one can manage conflict effectively, they can make a positive difference. _____

4. Ask teens:

- a. How would you define conflict? _____
(answers are written down for everyone to see. _____)

Tell teens:

- b. Conflicts often start over limited resources, or different value beliefs. _____

Actual time spent on Step B: _____

Step C: Triggers (25 minute estimate)

1. Tell teens:

- a. Anger is often connected to conflict. _____
- b. Anger is a normal feeling. _____
- c. How we handle anger will determine whether we end a conflict effectively or with violence. _____

2. The definition of “triggers” is written where everyone can see. _____

- a. Explanations of triggers are also provided. _____

3. Teens are asked to write down their triggers. _____

4. Teens are asked to talk about their triggers in small groups, and write down their answers.

a. Ask teens:

1. What words trigger my anger? _____
2. What kind of body language is a trigger for me? _____
3. How do I react? _____

5. A member of each small group reports their ideas to the larger group. _____

- a. The most frequent answers are pointed out by the teacher. _____

Wrap-up for part 1: Action Project Ideas (no time estimate)

1. Ask teens:

- a. How do you know when you are angry? _____
- b. Pay attention to their triggers for the next several days to detect if they can see a pattern. _____

Tell teens that this will help them identify their own triggers, as well as the impact they have on conflict. _____

Actual time spent on Part 1: _____

QUALITATIVE SESSION EVALUATION

IN GENERAL...

General comments: _____

DISCUSSIONS...

Rate the discussions: 1. Excellent 2. Good 3. Fair 4. Poor

Comments on discussions: _____

ACTIVITIES...

How engaged were the teens in the activities?

1. Very Engaged 2. Somewhat Engaged 3. Not Engaged

Comments on activities: _____

CRP'S...

Were any Community Resource People brought in? 1. No 2. Yes

What was his/her title? _____

Did he or she....

- a. lecture
- b. co-facilitate

TEACHING TECHNIQUES

The following teaching strategies were suggested for this session: (check those used)

_____ Drawing Vision _____ Small-group discussion _____ Storytelling
_____ Poster _____ National Survey _____ Journal Writing
_____ Webbing/Concept Mapping

Part 2 (50 minute estimate)

Instructions: Please place a check mark after each area that is covered in the session. Leave the line blank when certain areas are not covered. Also, please note the approximate time spent on each part and steps within each part. After the checklist is completed, please complete the subsequent qualitative session evaluation.

Review and Preview

Review the previous part of session and give teens a preview of the objectives and what will be accomplished during the next part of the session _____

Step C: Conflict Styles (45 minute estimate)

1. Students are given the *Conflict Styles Questionnaire* (Handout #2). _____
 - a. The questionnaire, and how it works was explained to the students before they filled it out. _____
 - b. The instructor demonstrated the answering system for the entire group. _____
2. Students use the *Conflict Styles Scoring Key* (Handout #3). _____
 - a. The scoring key, and how it works was explained to the students before they filled it out. _____
 - b. The instructor circulated the room to assist the teens. _____
3. The Conflict Styles do-it-yourself poster is presented to the students. _____
 - a. The instructor points out that each Roman numeral represents a different conflict style. _____
 - b. Students are asked to add up the numbers under each Roman numeral. _____
 - c. Students are told that the column with the most points represents their conflict style. _____
 - d. Teens are told that while this exercise points out one conflict style, it does not give the entire story. _____
4. The Conflict Styles do-it-yourself poster is used to discuss the uses and limits of every conflict style. _____
 - a. Students with the highest totals under the various styles are asked to raise their hands when asked to do so. _____

Avoidance

- a. Students having the highest totals under I are identified. _____
- b. Avoidance as a conflict style is explained to the Youth. _____
- c. The uses of avoidance are discussed. _____
- d. The limitations and disadvantages of avoidance are discussed. _____

Competing

- a. Students having the highest totals under II are identified. _____
- b. Competing as a conflict style is explained to the Youth. _____
- c. The uses of competing are discussed. _____
- d. The limitations and disadvantages of competing are discussed. _____

Accommodating

- a. Students having the highest totals under III are identified. _____
- b. Accommodating as a conflict style is explained to the Youth. _____
- c. The uses of accommodating are discussed. _____
- d. The limitations and disadvantages of accommodating are discussed. _____

Compromising

- a. Students having the highest totals under IV are identified. _____
- b. Compromising as a conflict style is explained to the Youth. _____
- c. The uses of compromising are discussed. _____
- d. The limitations and disadvantages of compromising are discussed. _____

Collaborating

- a. Students having the highest totals under V are identified. _____
- b. Collaborating as a conflict style is explained to the Youth. _____
- c. The uses of collaborating are discussed. _____
- d. The limitations and disadvantages of collaborating are discussed. _____

5. Students are told that there are no right or wrong conflict styles. _____

- a. Students are told that the use of specific conflict styles is situation specific. _____
- b. Tell teens:
 - 1. The more you learn about conflict and yourselves, the better able you will be to choose conflict styles that work for you. _____

Actual time spent on Step C: _____

Wrap-up for Part 2: (no time estimate)

- a. Ask teens:
 - 1. Have you ever thought of conflict this way? _____
 - 2. Does anyone remember giving and receiving negative feedback strategies from Session 1? _____
 - 3. How does understanding triggers impact the way you give feedback to another person? _____

Actual time spent on Part 2: _____

QUALITATIVE SESSION EVALUATION

IN GENERAL...

General comments: _____

DISCUSSIONS...

Rate the discussions: 1. Excellent 2. Good 3. Fair 4. Poor

Comments on discussions: _____

ACTIVITIES...

How engaged were the teens in the activities?

- 1. Very Engaged
- 2. Somewhat Engaged
- 3. Not Engaged

Comments on activities: _____

CRP'S...

Were any Community Resource People brought in? 1. No 2. Yes

What was his/her title? _____

Did he or she....

- a. lecture
- b. co-facilitate

TEACHING TECHNIQUES

The following teaching strategies were suggested for this session: (check those used)

- _____ Drawing Vision
- _____ Small-group discussion
- _____ Storytelling
- _____ Poster
- _____ National Survey
- _____ Journal Writing
- _____ Webbing/Concept Mapping

Part 3 (45 minute estimate)

Instructions: Please place a check mark after each area that is covered in the session. Leave the line blank when certain areas are not covered. Also, please note the approximate time spent on each part and steps within each part. After the checklist is completed, please complete the subsequent qualitative session evaluation.

Review and Preview

Review the previous part of session and give teens a preview of the objectives and what will be accomplished during the next part of the session _____

Step E: Managing Anger (30 minute estimate)

1. Ask teens:

- a. What do you do to get your anger under control?
(Examples of such strategies are provided. _____)
- b. to list “healthy ways” to calm themselves, and write them on the newsprint. _____

Tell teens that we choose when we blow up. In other words, we are able to control our anger when we want to. _____

(Examples of such times are provided. _____)

Each teen is provided supplies to make a person with a thought bubble. _____
a. Teens are asked to write how they get their anger under control in the thought bubble. _____

2. Tell teens:

- a. Calming down or cooling off is a key step in managing conflict. _____
- b. The less “hot” the anger is, the more we can control it. _____
- c. Calming down does not mean you won’t be angry, or that anger is bad, it just means that to effectively deal with anger you must be under control. _____
- d. Even though you may be angry, it rarely helps to show this anger to the other person. It is sometimes helpful to show our anger in a calm and courteous way. _____

3. Present several strategies to control anger and calm down. _____

- a. Physically relaxing. _____
- b. Calming the mind. _____
- c. Talking to yourself. _____
- d. The “Chill Drill” is presented. _____

4. Ask teens:

- a. Add to the list of anger management strategies. _____
- b. Write the list on the chalkboard or newsprint. _____
- c. Write your own list on a piece of paper to keep in your room or on them. _____

Actual time spent on Step E: _____

Step F: Reflection (15 minute estimate)

1. Relate session to teens' lives _____

- a. *ask* teens to think of someone they know who handles conflict well. _____
- b. ask teens why this person is successful at handling conflict. _____
- c. ask teens to think of someone who does not handle conflict well. _____
- d. ask teens “what is the impact on that person’s life, and on the lives of those around him or her?” _____

2. Turn learning into action _____

- a. ask teens to think of possible Action Projects related to this session. _____
- b. ask teens to think of the best ways to share this information. _____
- c. ask teens for volunteers to help with the next sessions tasks. _____

3. Journaling _____

- a. Did instructor *prompt* teens on how the journals would be handled? _____
- b. Did instructor *ask* teens to share their entries with others? _____
- c. Were journal entries *turned in* to instructor? _____

Actual time spent on Step F: _____

Actual time spent on Part 3: _____

QUALITATIVE SESSION EVALUATION

IN GENERAL...

General comments: _____

DISCUSSIONS...

Rate the discussions: 1. Excellent 2. Good 3. Fair 4. Poor

Comments on discussions: _____

ACTIVITIES...

How engaged were the teens in the activities?

1. Very Engaged 2. Somewhat Engaged 3. Not Engaged

Comments on activities: _____

CRP'S...

Were any Community Resource People brought in? 1. No 2. Yes

What was his/her title? _____

Did he or she....

- a. lecture
- b. co-facilitate

TEACHING TECHNIQUES

The following teaching strategies were suggested for this session: (check those used)

_____ Drawing Vision _____ Small-group discussion _____ Storytelling
_____ Poster _____ National Survey _____ Journal Writing
_____ Webbing/Concept Mapping

SESSION 8 Checklist
Conflict, Communicating, and Working Together

Part 1 (50 minute estimate)

Instructions: Please place a check mark after each area that is covered in the session. Leave the line blank when certain areas are not covered. Also, please note the approximate time spent on each part and steps within each part. After the checklist is completed, please complete the subsequent qualitative session evaluation.

Step A: Warm up (10 minute estimate)

1. Review purpose of CW _____
 - a. *ask* teens to remember purpose of community works _____
 - b. *ask* teens to *update* newcomers _____
 - c. *tell* teens the purpose of these sessions is to help them develop skills to keep them from becoming victims of crime and to help them make their communities safer. _____
 - d. *return* journals from last session _____

2. *Tell* teens the purpose of Session 8 is: "to help learn to use communication and negotiation skills to manage conflict." _____

3. *Remind* teens of guidelines they produced last session _____
 - a. is guideline list *posted* on wall? _____
 - b. have a teen(s) *volunteer* to go over the guidelines _____

Actual time spent on Step A: _____

Step B: Negotiating Win-Win Solutions (35 minute estimate)

1. Icebreaker
 - a. M&M Challenge. _____
 - b. Other. _____
 - c. Ask teens:
 1. How many pairs fought against each other? _____
 2. How many decided to work together to solve the problem? _____
 3. If any worked together, how did you do it? _____

2. Ask teens to recap the five conflict styles discussed during the last session. _____
 - a. Tell teens that many of us are used to competing but that it is sometimes better to work together to solve problems. _____

3. Ask teens:
 - a. What does the word "negotiation" mean?
(A final definition is agreed upon. _____)

b. What are some examples of situations involving negotiation? _____

Tell teens that negotiation can be formal or informal, and can sometimes include a third person (mediator). _____

4. Distribute Handout #1: *Negotiating Win-Win Solutions*

a. The definition of a *Win-Win Solution* was discussed. _____

b. The definition of a *Position* was discussed. _____

c. The definition of an *Interest* was discussed. _____

d. Teens are told that two scenarios will be read, and they are to determine each person's positions and interests. _____

Conflict #1

a. The position of each actor was discussed. _____

b. The interests of each actor were discussed. _____

c. The needs of each actor were discussed. _____

Conflict #2

a. Students were broken into small groups. _____

b. The position of each actor was discussed. _____

c. The interests of each actor were discussed. _____

d. The needs of each actor were discussed. _____

4. The whole group gets together to report their findings using the *Put It Together* do-it-yourself poster. _____

5. Students are told they are now going to negotiate a win-win solution. _____

a. Tell teens the first step is framing a problem-solving question. _____

b. Ask teens which interests they identified as most important to Jill and Ron. _____

c. Teens form a problem solving question that will ask how these key interests can be met. _____

d. The problem-solving question is written on the *Put It Together* poster.

6. Student are told the next step is brainstorming. _____

a. The purpose of brainstorming is described. _____

b. Students are asked what they know about brainstorming. _____

c. Students are asked to brainstorm answers to their framing question. _____

d. Answers are placed on the poster. _____

7. Ask teens how they would narrow down these options. _____

a. Tell students to:

1. Consider the consequences of each idea. _____

2. Discard ideas that are impractical. _____

3. Rank the ideas and decide on one solution. _____

4. Be sure that solution meets the needs of both people. _____

- b. Students are told to use these guidelines to select the best solution for Jill and Ron.

- c. The acronym PROUD is explained to the students, to help them remember the negotiation process. _____

Actual time spent on Step B: _____

Step C: Reflection (15 minute estimate)

1. Ask students:
 - a. What kinds of people need to learn about communicating and negotiating? _____
 - b. In what situations and with what people might you see the skills you learned in this session? _____
 - c. Which skills would you find easy and which ones hard to use? _____
 - d. Who could benefit from these strategies for resolving conflict? _____
 - e. What would be the best way to share this information? _____
2. Ask for volunteers for the next session's tasks. _____
3. Journaling _____
 - a. Did instructor *prompt* teens on how the journals would be handled? _____
 - b. Did instructor *ask* teens to share their entries with others? _____
 - c. Were journal entries *turned in* to instructor? _____

Actual time spent on Step C: _____

Actual time spent on Part 1: _____

QUALITATIVE SESSION EVALUATION

IN GENERAL...

General comments: _____

DISCUSSIONS...

Rate the discussions: 1. Excellent 2. Good 3. Fair 4. Poor

Comments on discussions: _____

ACTIVITIES...

How engaged were the teens in the activities?

1. Very Engaged 2. Somewhat Engaged 3. Not Engaged

Comments on activities: _____

CRP'S...

Were any Community Resource People brought in? 1. No 2. Yes

What was his/her title? _____

Did he or she....

- a. lecture
- b. co-facilitate

TEACHING TECHNIQUES

The following teaching strategies were suggested for this session: (check those used)

- _____ Drawing Vision _____ Small-group discussion _____ Storytelling
_____ Poster _____ National Survey _____ Journal Writing
_____ Webbing/Concept Mapping

APPENDIX C: CW Implementer Questionnaire

NATIONAL EVALUATION OF TEENS, CRIME, AND THE COMMUNITY AND COMMUNITY WORKS

Community Works Implementer Questionnaire 2005

**University of Missouri-St. Louis
Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice
8001 Natural Bridge Road
St. Louis, MO 63121**

This questionnaire is part of the National Evaluation of Teens, Crime, and the Community and Community Works program. Funding is provided by the U.S. Department of Justice. As part of the evaluation, we are asking all Community Works implementers to complete this questionnaire. We are interested in your opinions and attitudes about the program, including the various components (sessions, Action Projects, Community Resource People) and the way in which the program is delivered. Please take a few minutes to answer these questions. Thank you.

Instructions

1. Your participation is voluntary.
2. Circle the number or write in the response that represents your best answer to each question.
3. Do NOT write your name on the questionnaire.
4. Your answers are ANONYMOUS.
5. You have the right to skip any question that you do not want to answer.

TEACHER/OFFICER QUESTIONNAIRE

The following questions are about you and your job. Please circle or write in your best answer to each question.

1. Your school's name: _____
2. What is your primary job assignment?
 1. Administrator
 2. Teacher
 3. SRO/JPO
 4. Other _____
3. What grade-level do you primarily teach?
 1. 6th
 2. 7th
 3. 8th
 4. 9th
4. What subject do you primarily teach?
 1. Health/Physical Education
 2. Language Arts
 3. Math/Computer Science
 4. Natural Sciences
 5. Social Sciences
 6. Other (Please Specify _____)
5. Your average class size: _____ students
6. Your total years working at this school: _____ years
7. Your total years in the field of education: _____ years
8. What is the highest degree you have attained?
 1. High School/ GED
 2. Associates
 3. Bachelors
 4. Masters
 5. Ph.D.
 6. Other (Please Specify _____)
9. Your sex:
 1. Male
 2. Female
10. Your race/ethnicity:
 1. White/Anglo, not Hispanic
 2. Black/African American
 3. Hispanic/Latino
 4. American Indian/Native American
 5. Asian/Pacific Islander/Oriental
 6. Other (Please Specify _____)

The following questions and statements are about the Community Works program. Please circle the response that best represents your opinion about each question or statement.

1. Whose decision was it to implement CW in your school?
 1. My own
 2. Principal
 3. School Board
 4. Other Teacher
 5. Other SRO/JPO
 6. Other (Please Specify _____)
- 1a. Whose decision was it to implement CW in your classroom?
 1. My own
 2. Principal
 3. School Board
 4. Other Teacher
 5. Other SRO/JPO
 6. Other (Please Specify _____)

2. Who decides which CW lessons are taught?
 1. I do
 2. Principal
 3. School Board
 4. Other Teacher
 5. Other SRO/JPO
 6. Other (Please Specify_____)

3. Prior to introducing the curriculum, did you form a planning group with other teachers, faculty members, or officers who were involved in the program?
 1. No
 2. Yes

4. Indicate which of the following CW materials you typically use. (Circle all that apply.)
 1. The new (2004) binder
 2. The old (1999) binder
 3. The TCC textbook
 4. Other (Please Specify_____)

5. Are you using CW... (Circle only one.)
 1. As a stand-alone curriculum
 2. In addition to another type of curriculum (**What other curriculum?** _____)
 3. To replace an existing curriculum (**What other curriculum?** _____)

6. Over what period of time did you teach the CW curriculum? (Circle only one.)
 1. < 1 quarter
 2. 1 quarter
 3. 1 semester
 4. 1 school-year
 5. Other (Please Specify _____)

7. How often did you teach the program? (Circle only one.)
 1. Daily
 2. Several times a week
 3. Once a week
 4. Every other week
 5. Monthly
 6. Other (Please Specify_____)

8. On average, how long is each session? (Circle only one.)

1. < 1	class period	2. 1 class period	3. 1 Block (2 class periods)	4. Other (Specify _____)	
--------	--------------	-------------------	------------------------------	--------------------------	--

9. The length allotted for each CW session provides enough time to cover the important, relevant topics.
 1. Strongly disagree
 2. Disagree
 3. Neither agree nor disagree
 4. Agree
 5. Strongly agree

10. Besides Community Resource People, typically, how many facilitators, including yourself, do you have for each of your CW sessions?
 1. One
 2. Two
 3. Three or more

- 10a. In addition to you, who facilitates the CW sessions? (Circle only one.)
 1. Teacher
 2. SRO/JPO
 3. Other (Please Specify_____)

11. Have you attended CW training? If yes, please specify the date of the most recent training.
 1. No
 2. No, but I am currently scheduled to attend one
 3. Yes (Please Specify) ____/____ (Month/Year)

- 11a. How helpful was the training in implementing the program?
- | | |
|----------------|---|
| 1. Not helpful | 3. <u>Very</u> helpful |
| 2. Helpful | 4. Not applicable/No trainings attended |

12. Have you attended any other type of CW training? (Circle all that apply.)
1. No, no other training sessions attended
 2. Yes, a training by our regional Expansion Center (EC)
 3. Yes, a training by the developers of CW (i.e. Street Law, Inc. or NCPC)

- 12a. How helpful was the training in implementing the program?
- | | |
|----------------|---|
| 1. Not helpful | 3. <u>Very</u> helpful |
| 2. Helpful | 4. Not applicable/No trainings attended |

14. Since starting to use CW, have you received any of the following? If yes, please rate how helpful they were in implementing the CW curriculum.

	<u>No/Yes</u>		<u>(1=Not helpful 5=Very Helpful)</u>				
	1	2	1	2	3	4	5
1. Site visits from staff of your regional EC							
2. At least bi-monthly contact from your regional EC	1	2	1	2	3	4	5
3. Site visits from staff of Street Law, Inc or NCPC?	1	2	1	2	3	4	5
4. E-mail information about CW	1	2	1	2	3	4	5
5. Referrals to resource people	1	2	1	2	3	4	5
6. Information about the national network and/or peer resources	1	2	1	2	3	4	5
7. A TCC newsletter	1	2	1	2	3	4	5

If you taught sessions from the **NEW (2004) Community Works binder**, please complete the chart below. If you taught sessions from the **OLD (1999) Community Works binder**, please complete the chart on the following page. If you did not teach a session, please leave the question blank.

Session Name	How many class periods were spent on the following sessions?	How effective were the following sessions in meeting the goals of CW? (1=Not effective, 5=Very effective)**	Were the following sessions age appropriate?
1. Creating a community vision	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
2. What is Crime?	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
3. Victims of Crime	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
4. Safe and Secure communities	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
5. Where are we safe and unsafe?	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
6. Our community resources	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
7. Your Conflict Choices	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
8. Conflict, communicating, & working together	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
9. Planning a project	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
10. Designing a project	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
11. Doing a project	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
12. Robbery and assault	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
13. Intimidation	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
14. Rape	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
15. Dating violence	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
16. Handguns	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
17. Gangs: Define the problem	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
18. Gangs: Consider alternatives	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
19. Alcohol use	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
20. Drug abuse	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
21. Drug dealing	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
22. Property crimes	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
23. Vandalism	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
24. Shoplifting	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
24a. Teens & Store owners	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
25. Diversity & bias awareness	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
26. Hate Crimes	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
27. Police and community	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
27a. Reporting a crime	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
28. Cops on call	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
28a. Police & community negotiation	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes

**The program has five primary goals: (1) to reduce victimization and the fear of victimization; (2) to involve youth in positive service in schools and communities; 3) to reduce delinquent behavior; 4) to improve school performance; and 5) to improve the learning environment for both students and teachers.

If you taught sessions from **the OLD (1999) Community Works binder**, please complete the chart below. If you did not teach a session, please leave the question blank.

Session Name	How many class periods were spent on the following sessions?	How effective were the following sessions in meeting the goals of CW? (1=Not effective, 5=Very effective)**	Were the following sessions age appropriate?
1. Setting the Stage	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
2. Teens and Crime	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
3. Victims of Crime	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
4. Safe and Secure communities	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
5. Where are we unsafe?	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
6. Our community resources	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
7. Conflict Choices	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
8. Conflict and communicating	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
9. Robbery and assault	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
10. Intimidation	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
11. Rape	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
12. Dating violence	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
13. Handguns	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
14. Gangs: Define the problem	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
15. Gangs: Consider alternatives	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
16. Alcohol use	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
17. Drug abuse	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
18. Drug dealing	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
19. Property crimes	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
20. Vandalism	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
21. Shoplifting	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
21a. Teens & Store owners	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
22. Diversity & bias awareness	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
23. Hate Crimes	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
24. Police and community	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
24a. Reporting a crime	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
25. Cops on call	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
25a. Police & community negotiation	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
26. Planning a project	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
27. Designing a project	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes
28. Doing a project	0 1 2 3+	1 2 3 4 5	No Yes

**The program has five primary goals: (1) to reduce victimization and the fear of victimization; (2) to involve youth in positive service in schools and communities; 3) to reduce delinquent behavior; 4) to improve school performance; and 5) to improve the learning environment for both students and teachers.

COMMUNITY WORKS ACTION PROJECT EVALUATION

1. Since initiating CW how many Action Projects have you completed? _____

2. How was your most recent project selected?
 1. Students
 2. Teacher
 3. SRO
 4. CRP
 5. Other (Please Specify _____)

3. To what CW sessions or topics did the Action Project relate? (Please provide the session number(s) as indicated on page 5 or 6).

4. How integrated into the CW in-class work was the Action Project?
 1. Not integrated/seen as a stand alone component of the C W course
 2. Somewhat integrated/connections were made with some class topics
 3. Very integrated/it was discussed frequently as part of the class

5. What role(s), if any, did Community Resource People play with regard to the Action Project?

6. Were there any unexpected outcomes of the Action Project?

7. Please describe any aspects of the Action Project that either turned out better than expected or worse than expected. (Please attach an additional sheet if further space is needed.)

Better:

Worse:

8. Do you plan to conduct an Action Project the next time you teach CW?
 1. No
 2. Yes
 3. Unsure
 4. Not Applicable, I will not be teaching CW again

**Thank you very much for answering these questions.
We really appreciate your help.**

PART II:
**Evaluation of Teens, Crime, and the Community and Community
Works Program: Program Effectiveness**

Executive Summary

In 2003, the University of Missouri-St. Louis received a grant to evaluate a Congressional Earmark funded through the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. This five year (10/1/03 – 6/30/09) grant to evaluate the Teens, Crime, and the Community and Community Works (TCC/CW) program was funded by the National Institute of Justice. TCC/CW was developed through a collaborative effort by the National Crime Prevention Council (NCPC) and Street Law, Inc. and received congressionally mandated funding from 1985 through 2008. This law-related education curriculum has undergone several revisions during the past twenty years and a variety of program goals have been advanced by the program providers. Based upon careful review of materials and in-person interviews with program staff members, the most consistently identified goal is to reduce adolescent victimization. For more discussion of program goals, consult Section 3 – Curriculum Review - of this Final Report.

A process and outcome evaluation design was proposed to assess program fidelity and outcome. The process evaluation, consisting of interviews, questionnaires, and observations of training and program delivery, was initiated immediately upon funding notification. Following an extensive effort to identify potential sites for inclusion in the outcome evaluation, a quasi-experimental five-wave panel study of public school students was initiated in the fall of 2004. Approximately 1,700 students representing 98 classrooms in 15 schools located in nine cities in four different states were surveyed three times (pre- and post-tests, plus a one-year follow-up survey). Classrooms were matched by teacher or subject and one-half of the classrooms received TCC/CW while the other half was not exposed to the curriculum.

The process evaluation (described in detail in Section 1 of this report) determined that the TCC/CW training failed to provide trainees with the necessary skills to adequately teach the

program and more than 100 observations of classroom program delivery determined that the program was implemented with insufficient fidelity in terms of dosage, program adherence, and quality to reasonably expect programmatic effects. After discussions with NIJ program managers, the outcome evaluation was abbreviated at three waves of outcome data rather than the planned five waves. This report examines short (post-test following program completion) and interim (one-year follow-up) program effects. This **outcome evaluation** addresses the following three questions:

- 1) is program participation associated with a reduction in known risk factors (i.e., association with delinquent peers, risk-seeking, lack of commitment to school, etc.)?
- 2) are offending and victimization rates lower among the program participants than among the comparison students?
- 3) given differential program fidelity, are program effects detectable in those schools meeting minimal standards of program fidelity?

Background

The Teens, Crime, and the Community and Community Works program (hereinafter referred to as Community Works or CW) was created in 1985 through a partnership between the National Crime Prevention Council (NCPC) and Street Law, Inc. While the CW program was not specifically developed according to a risk-factor approach, our review of the curriculum indicated that many of the lessons did address specific risk factors associated with youth violence or victimization (see Section I, Appendix A for listing of risk factors addressed in each CW lesson). We therefore developed our survey instruments to capture the various domains that have been shown to be associated with different types of adolescent problem behaviors. The CW program consists of three components:

- 1) a 31-lesson interactive curriculum that deals with such topics as guns, violence, hate crimes, substance abuse, conflict management, and preventing victimization;
- 2) the use of community resource people (e.g., teachers, law enforcement officers, doctors, lawyers) as role models to help deliver the curriculum; and
- 3) the implementation of “action projects” that allow teens to apply what they have learned to school and community settings.

While CW is primarily an “individual-change” strategy (i.e., a focus on changing individual students’ attitudes, knowledge, and behavior, including the use of role models), the program also includes a school-level component which seeks to affect the educational environment. Because the CW action project entails a wider target of interest than typically is the case, we will also assess school-level measures of disorder and student perceptions of safety at school.

The overarching mission of NCPC is: “To enable people to create safer more caring communities by addressing causes of crime and reducing possibilities of crime to occur.” The multitude of goals associated with the CW program is consistent with this overall mission (see the Section III - Curriculum Review for a detailed discussion of the program goals). Based on numerous conversations with NCPC and CW staff, we determined that the following three goals encompass the CW program: 1) reduce teen victimization; 2) reduce delinquency; and 3) engage teens in service in the community. In addition to these primary goals, a number of other goals and objectives were found in the CW literature. Some examples include: 1) provide a practical understanding of crime and crime prevention that will be useful in the everyday lives of young people; 2) teach young people to be resources for each other and to interact positively with community members; 3) develop each young person’s communication and problem-solving skills to promote personal and project success in the community; and 4) encourage young people to focus on their own leadership role in the community. In the outcome component of this evaluation, we developed measures for inclusion in the student questionnaires that would allow us to address most of the multitude of goals and objectives identified by program staff.

Scope of the Problem: Juvenile Offending and Victimization

Since 1980, considerable media attention has been given to the issue of youth crime. The term “superpredator” was introduced in the mid 1990s (DiIulio 1995) along with warnings about a new breed of violent offenders that would wreak havoc in the 21st century (Fox 1996).

Contrary to these predictions, the youth violent arrest rate peaked at over 500 arrests per 100,000 youths in 1994. It has declined in each subsequent year. And, when controlling for population increases, the juvenile crime rate accounts for a smaller percentage of crime today than it did in the 1970s.

The youth violence epidemic of the late 1980s and early 1990s was reflected in rising rates of youth violence during this period in both the UCR and NCVS. For example, Cook and Laub (1998; 2002) reported that violent crime arrest rates doubled between 1966 and 1975 for 13 - 17 year old youths, were static between 1975 and 1984, and then doubled again from 1984 to 1994. Since 1994, the violent crime rate for youth has been on the decline, reaching its 1984 rate by 2000. By way of comparison, property crime arrest rates were relatively stable between 1975 and 1994 before declining steadily, reaching 1966 levels in 2000.

The relatively recent declines in youth arrest rates for both violent and property crime are encouraging. Confounding this positive picture, however, is the 2001 report on youth violence submitted to the U.S. Surgeon General (U. S. Department of Health and Human Services 2001). In that report, the authors highlight trend data from the Monitoring the Future study (self-reports from high school seniors) that suggests there has been a slow but steady increase in reported rates of robbery and assaults resulting in injuries from 1980 through 1998. Thus, while homicide, robbery, and aggravated assault arrest rates may have peaked in 1993, other indicators suggest that the prevalence and incidence of youth violence in general remain at undesirably high levels.

School Crime

It is difficult to accurately assess the scope of school-related victimization, as estimates vary widely across different sources. Data from the 2003 – 2004 *School Survey on Crime and Safety* found 1,553,291 violent incidents (defined as rape, sexual battery other than rape, physical attack or fight with or without a weapon, threat of physical attack with or without a weapon, and robbery with or without a weapon), 55,193 serious violent incidents (defined as rape, sexual

battery other than rape, physical attack or fight with a weapon, threat of physical attack with a weapon, and robbery with or without a weapon), and 199,845 theft incidents occurring at public schools (Guerino, Hurwitz, Noonan, & Kaffenberger, 2006). In all, approximately 81 percent of public schools reported one or more violent incidents and 18 percent reported one or more serious violent incidents (Guerino et al., 2006). Annual rates per 1,000 students were 33.3 violent incidents and 1.2 serious violent incidents (Guerino et al., 2006).

One highly visible form of juvenile crime during the past decade has been school violence, especially well publicized school shootings (e.g., in Kentucky, Arkansas, Oregon, Colorado, Georgia, and Pennsylvania). In light of this media attention, it is important to note that schools remain one of the safest places for children and adolescents. While thefts appear to be somewhat more common experiences at school than elsewhere, during the nine-year period, 1992-2000, students aged 12-18 experienced lower rates of serious violent victimization at school than away from school (Devoe et al. 2002). In 1997, for instance, 48 students died from firearms on school property (National Center for Education Statistics 1998) while more than 3,000 youth were killed outside of school: for every child that died on school property that year, 66 were killed away from school.

Factors associated with the level of violence within schools include community characteristics such as the availability of drugs and weapons, and the consistency of rule enforcement within the school. Individual factors such as attitudes to school, academic performance, impulsiveness, peer rejection, and social competency also contribute to the level of violence in schools. Needless to say, some of these individual-level factors are affected by school-level characteristics such as school and classroom size, as well as school management practices.

The measurement of school crime, however, is problematic. The various sources of information about school crime rely upon different samples (principals, teachers, and/or students) and different methods (police reports of crime in the schools, self-reports about offending and victimization, and perceptions of the nature and extent of school crime). These different sources, by design, produce quite disparate descriptions of the volume and distribution of school-based crime. Some studies, for example, request principals and/or teachers to report on their perceptions of crime in their schools. At face value this may seem reasonable. Many principals, however, have a vested interest in the reported levels of crime in their schools because their own performance evaluations are in part based on the reported school crime rate. Another issue deals with the fact that perceptions of crime severity vary by location and other contextual factors. In low crime schools, for instance, a simple assault may be perceived as seriously as an aggravated assault would be in schools with a high rate of offending. Within different settings, these two quite different behaviors from a legal or behavioral perspective may result in the same level of perceived seriousness. Thus, perception of crime surveys may not be valid measures of **actual** criminal activity.

Another issue is raised by student perception surveys. Asking students if they have seen another student with a gun at school or if they know someone who has brought a gun to school is quite misleading. If 20 students in a school indicate that they know someone who has brought a gun to school, does this mean 20 different students have brought a gun? Another possibility is that one student is known by the other 20. To illustrate, according to the National Center for Education Statistics (1998) 71% of students knew of bullying, physical attack, or robbery occurring in their school, 56% had witnessed it, 25% worried about it, yet only 12% had been a victim.

Several sources of information track student reports and perceptions of school safety, most notably: the Monitoring the Future (MTF) study; the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) School Crime Supplement; and the Center for Disease Control's (CDC) Youth Risk Behavior Survey. These three sources provide a mixed picture of school violence. The NCVS School Supplement reveals a pattern of reduced victimization from 1995 to 2001; the CDC study reports an increase in the percentage of students reported being threatened or injured on school property between 1993 and 2001; and the MTF data indicate a slight increase from 1980 through 1998 in reported rates of robbery and assaults resulting in injuries. One author summarizes the disparate findings in the following manner:

The most recent available measures of school crime and violence in the United States indicate that the problems have *not* increased significantly in the past several years. In fact, some serious incidents such as school shootings, assaults involving injuries, physical fights, and weapon possession have actually decreased slightly. An increased sensitivity to and concern about school crime and safety has resulted in more extensive and frequent measures to assess students' reported victimization by behaviors such as threats, bullying, gang presence, alcohol and drug availability, and hate-related graffiti (Lawrence 2007:24).

Risk Factors Associated with Adolescent Problem Behaviors

Researchers have consistently reported the co-occurrence of adolescent problem behaviors. That is, drug use, victimization, school failure and dropout, and delinquency often co-occur. Similar risk factors (e.g., Hawkins et al. 1998; Howell 2009) are associated with the onset of these various behaviors and prevention efforts targeting one form of problem behavior

may well have unintended positive effects on other problem behaviors (Esbensen, Peterson, Taylor, and Freng 2009). This risk factor approach generally utilizes the following categories or domains to classify risk factors: community, family, school, peer, and individual. For school-level prevention efforts, the latter three domains are the most relevant. Family-related risk factors (e.g., prior family history of problem behavior; family conflict, and family management problems), while important, are generally beyond the control of the school and are difficult to address through school-based primary prevention efforts. We also do not dismiss the importance of community-level risk factors (e.g., the availability of drugs and firearms, economic deprivation and poverty, and high rates of mobility), however, a considerable body of research has found that most youth who reside in areas where youth crime and violence are prominent choose not to engage in these activities (e.g., Fagan 1990; Peterson et al. 2007; Short 1997). This suggests that additional factors are required to explain the prevalence and incidence of youth crime.

Several school-related risk factors (e.g., school management styles, school culture, teaching styles) consistently have been found to be associated with adolescent problem behavior, including delinquency and gang activity (see reviews by Gottfredson 2001; Hawkins et al. 1998; Howell 2009; and Klein and Maxson 2006). Individual-level measures of school risk factors (e.g., lower levels of commitment to school and early academic failure) have been found to be associated with a multitude of problem behaviors, including substance abuse, delinquency, and school drop-out.

A number of individual and peer factors are related to adolescent problem behaviors. By way of example, we offer several examples from recent studies contrasting gang and non-gang youth. Those studies report that gang youth: held more antisocial beliefs than did non-gang

youths (Esbensen et al. 2009; Hill et al, 1999); had more delinquent self-concepts, greater tendencies to resolve conflicts by threats, and had experienced more critical stressful events (Maxson et al. 1998); and had higher levels of commitment to delinquent peers, experienced more social isolation, and expressed greater tolerance for involvement in deviant behavior (Esbensen et al. 1993, 2001, 2009; Klein and Maxson 2006).

The most consistent finding associated with adolescent problem behavior, however, is the overarching influence of peers (e.g., Battin et al., 1998; Elliott and Menard, 1996; Warrd 2002; Warr and Stafford, 1991). In their comparison of stable and transient gang youth, for instance, Battin and colleagues reported that the strongest predictors of sustained gang affiliation were a high level of interaction with antisocial peers and a low level of interaction with pro-social peers. Researchers have examined the influence of peers through a variety of measures, including exposure to delinquent peers, attachment to delinquent peers, and commitment to delinquent peers. Regardless of how this peer affiliation is measured, the results are the same; association with delinquent peers is one of the strongest predictors (that is, risk factors) of adolescent offending.

Prevention Efforts

Schools provide one avenue through which youth-related problems can be targeted. While schools and their administrators cannot alter the level of poverty, unemployment, racial conflict, and other social conditions in the surrounding community, they can experiment with classroom size, student-teacher ratios, disciplinary practices (fairness, consistency, firmness), and more generally, introduce prevention programs to address problems confronting today's youth. Based upon reviews of research, some school-based programs have been identified as

“model programs”, while others have been labeled as “promising” strategies to delinquency prevention (see Mihalic et al. 2002 for a comprehensive review). Most school-based programs (including CW), however, have not been evaluated so little is known about their effectiveness.

Schools remain one of the common experiences for American youth and, as such, have become a focal point for general prevention programming. Gottfredson and Gottfredson (1999) reported the average middle school in the late 1990s provided 14 different and unique prevention programs. Here we briefly review two categories of school programs: 1) school- and classroom-level programs; and 2) individual-level based approaches.

Some prevention programs seek to alter the school environment in attempts to reduce adolescent problem behaviors. There is some evidence to suggest that schools in which there exists a participatory management style in which administrators and teachers communicate and work together not only have higher teacher morale, but also less disorder. Schools with clear school rules and reward structures also experience less disorder. Similarly, cooperative learning strategies have been found to be associated with higher academic achievement, more positive attitudes to school, better race relations, and acceptance of special education students who have been mainstreamed. Consensus is that these improvements in educational performance are also associated with reductions in violence.

In addition to school and classroom level strategies, a number of programs target the individual, seeking to change attitudes in order to change behavior. These programs tend to focus on increasing knowledge and skills while changing beliefs. These programs include: Life Skills Training (LST); D.A.R.E.; Law Related Education (LRE); Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T.); and a number of other programs focusing on peer mediation and conflict resolution.

Most of the programs that have a direct focus on crime and violence prevention can be classified as individual-change strategies. These programs focus on increasing knowledge and skills while also changing beliefs and subsequently behavior. In one study, Lockwood (1997) examined the causes of violent episodes in schools. He found that most of these episodes originated from a small, minor incident that led to an over-reaction by the initial victim. Lockwood accounted for this, in part, by what he described as a value system in which violence is accepted. Individual-level strategies attempt to change such belief systems. As a general rule, these types of programs have not been found to be effective. To date, the Life Skills Training (LST) program and Olweus' anti-bullying program are the only two middle school programs designated as model primary prevention programs (Mihalic et al. 2002).

Questionnaire Development

In light of the risk factors discussed above, what can we conclude about school-based prevention strategies? Two "facts" appear to be particularly salient. First, we know that adolescent problem behavior is not restricted to urban, underclass areas. Second, we know that offenders and victims come from a variety of backgrounds; they are not exclusively male, urban, poor, minority, or from single-parent households. Prevention efforts should therefore target the entire adolescent population, much like the public health sector approach to infectious diseases. It also appears that programs containing a school-level component are more likely to influence the larger environment and thereby influence individual behavior.

To assess program effectiveness, we reviewed the CW curriculum and identified risk factors addressed in each lesson. We also identified theoretical perspectives that were implied in the lesson content. Based upon this review and in conjunction with the varied statements of

program goals and objectives, we finalized a student questionnaire that would allow measurement of the program goals and objectives as well as the implied risk and protective factors. The resultant student questionnaire consists of measures identifying demographic characteristics of the students, attitudinal and behavioral measures. The following measures identify risk factors from four domains (family, school, peers and individual) addressed in the CW lessons: 1) family (parental monitoring and supervision); 2) school (perceptions of school environment, school safety, school commitment; 3) peer (commitment to negative peers, association with delinquent peers, peer group characteristics, and involvement in unsupervised activities); and 4) individual (impulsivity, risk-seeking, self-centeredness, temper, guilt associated with norm violations, neutralization, self-esteem, perceptions of strain, alcohol use, drug use, and conflict management skills). The scales measuring these risk factors, as well as program goals (i.e., victimization and delinquency) are described in greater detail in Appendix A at the end of this Section.

Site selection and Subject Recruitment:

Chapter 2 of Section I of this Final Report provides a detailed description of the selection of schools for inclusion in this evaluation. Here we provide a brief overview of the selection process. Community Works (CW) is offered in a variety of settings and to a wide age range of youth, making site selection a more difficult endeavor than anticipated. The NCPC staff and trainers promoted the diversity of program offerings as an advantage and utilized this feature in their marketing of the program. However, that very diversity led to numerous discussions about program fidelity and dosage. What constituted the program? How many lessons had to be implemented to achieve the desired outcomes? Could programs implemented in juvenile justice

detention facilities or in voluntary after-school clubs be implemented with adequate rigor? Even if all the required lessons were taught in these settings, there is little likelihood that there would be continuity in the program participants. These and other issues led to determination that the best strategy would be to include only those programs that implemented the program to a group of youths with some degree of consistency and duration. As such, in-school programs were selected as the targeted program delivery model. This clearly eliminated a large number of programs that were identified as after-school club models, community center activities, and other non-school programs. While many programs were eliminated, most program recipients were still included. Based on the site registration forms, the average number of participants in “club” models was quite low, especially in relation to the number of students participating in in-school programs. Furthermore, the CW program is most appropriate for middle school students; we therefore restricted our selection to programs offered in the middle-school grades (6 – 9).

A purposive sample of schools was selected for inclusion in the evaluation; only schools offering the Teens, Crime, and the Community and Community Works program were eligible for inclusion. The following summarizes our efforts to select sites to participate in the evaluation:

- 1) more than 250 schools identified as offering the Community Works program were contacted;
- 2) 18 schools met the evaluation criteria (i.e., confirmation that the program was actually being taught in its entirety, a sufficient number of classes to allow for matching of treatment and comparison groups while also being cost-effective in terms of travel to the school for data collection, a willingness to withhold the program from some classes, and agreement to adhere to the evaluation design);

- 3) the contact person was re-contacted at each eligible site and if the program delivery met the evaluation design criteria and the program providers agreed to adhere to the design (classroom matching, pre-and post-tests with three annual follow-up surveys) then the principal was contacted;
- 4) with agreement and support from the principal, the school district research and evaluation office (or comparable official) was contacted and proposals were submitted;
- 5) 3 schools declined the opportunity to participate;
- 6) 15 schools in 9 cities in 4 states agreed to the evaluation design and are participating in the outcome evaluation. (For a more detailed description of the site selection process, consult the Section 1, Chapter 2 of this Report.)

The 15 schools participating in the outcome evaluation are concentrated in the Southwest with 10 schools in Arizona and New Mexico. The remaining five schools were in South Carolina (3 schools) and Massachusetts (2 schools). With respect to grade level, CW was taught in 6th grade in six of the schools, 7th grade in four schools, 8th grade in three schools, 9th grade in one school and in both 7th and 8th grade at one school.

The evaluation design included matching of classrooms and agreement to a four-year study design that included a pre- and post-tests during the first year and then three annual follow-up surveys with students. The selection of schools was obviously purposive and the final sample of 15 schools (9 in Arizona, 1 in New Mexico, 2 in Massachusetts, and 3 in South Carolina) reflects the fact that program adoption was more pronounced in Arizona. Classrooms were selected based upon the grade in which the program was taught (ranging from 6th to 9th grade). Grade-level classrooms (six schools, 40 classes were 6th grade; five schools, 32 classes had 7th grade;

four schools, 25 classes had 8th grade; and one school with 2 classes were 9th graders – one school had both 7th and 8th graders) were matched by teacher.

All students in the selected classrooms were asked to participate in the evaluation and active consent letters were distributed to all students. Due to the nature of the study, active parental consent was required before students could participate in the evaluation, resulting in an initial loss rate of 28 percent. Twelve percent of this initial loss was due to active parental refusals, while another 16 percent was due to the failure of eligible students to return consent forms. To achieve this 72 percent active consent participation we recruited teachers to assist in the process. Teachers were paid \$2.00 for every consent form collected (whether affirmative or refusal) plus a bonus of \$10 if their classroom exceeded 70 percent, \$20 if it exceeded 80 percent, and \$30 if it exceeded 90 percent. In addition, students were provided an incentive for returning the consent forms (e.g., different types of key chains and different colored lanyards). This active consent rate is well above other recent school-based studies (e.g., Wilcox et al., 2006), and is in line with general recommendations for consent rates needed to ensure low sample bias (Babbie, 1973; Lueptow, 1977; Sewell and Hauser, 1975).

INSERT TABLE 1

Retention rates for the first three waves of data collection were well within acceptable standards (96%, 89%, and 72% respectively), although the Wave 3 data collection was negatively impacted by the fact that all students at one school (n=222) were lost when they transferred to a different school district and that district did not allow access to the students. As

reported in Section I of this report, the process evaluation concluded that the program was not taught with sufficient fidelity in most schools to allow for assessment of program impact. That is, even if differences between treatment and comparison group students were observed, these differences could not be attributed to the program. As a result, the planned waves four and five data collection efforts were dropped and the evaluation was altered to focus on examination of reasons for the lack of implementation (see Section III of this Final Report). The subsequent outcome analyses are therefore based on three waves of data, rather than the initial design of five waves.

Student Characteristics

The students participating in the evaluation resemble all students in their schools; that is, the sample demographics are similar to the school-level demographics. In fact, in several instances, the students represent all or most of the students at grade-level. The sample, however, is not representative of students across the nation, as schools were purposively selected to meet the needs of the program evaluation. With the majority of participating schools in the southwest (Arizona and New Mexico), the sample contains a large percentage (42%) of students identifying themselves as Hispanic. White (31%) and African-American (11%) youths comprise the next two largest race/ethnicities in the sample. Slightly more than half of the sample is female (53%) and the modal age at the pre-test was 12 years, reflecting the fact that most of the students were in 6th or 7th grade when completing the pre-test questionnaires during the fall semester. The majority of students live with both parents (56%) or with a parent and step-parent (16%). Nineteen percent live in a single-parent household, the majority being single-mother households. Two other demographic characteristics are reported in Table 2: parent education and mobility. It

is interesting to note that a sizable portion of students do not know their parents' educational attainment; 46 percent of students did not know the highest grade completed by their fathers and 34 percent did not know this about their mothers. Of those students reporting the highest grade level achieved (i.e., excluding the "don't know" responses), 51 percent indicated that their fathers had completed high school or less while 43 percent of the mothers had a high school diploma or less. At the other end of the educational spectrum, 36 percent of both mothers and fathers were reported to have completed college or more. With respect to mobility, more than 2/3 of the students indicated that they had not moved in the past year, but 11 percent reported having moved two or more times.

INSERT TABLE 2

Design of the Longitudinal Analysis of Program Impact

The techniques outlined in Osgood and Smith (1995) and Esbensen and colleagues (2001) are used to assess the Community Works program outcomes. Our original research design was premised on four nested levels of analysis: 1) waves of data collection are 2) nested within individuals who were followed over time, 3) students are nested within classrooms, and 4) classrooms are nested within schools. Due to low participation rates in some classrooms, we are unable to analyze the third level data (i.e. classroom) and with only 15 schools included in the sample we could not estimate school effects (this small sample size would produce unstable estimates). As a result of these design issues, the analyses are limited to a two level hierarchical design in which we examine within individual change over time while controlling for treatment classification.

As a result of the nested structure of the evaluation, it is necessary to correct for the dependence of observations underlying the assumption of independence of many statistical tests. When the assumption of independence is violated, estimates of standard errors will be smaller and relationships that are due to chance will be elevated to statistical significance (Hox 1995). Dependence of observations is attributable to patterns of similarity that cannot be fully controlled by the variables in the model (Esbensen, et al. 2001). When using nested data, it is often unlikely that all sources of similarity can be controlled; thus, the possibility of dependence must be taken into account. Multilevel regression techniques allow for dependence of observations by partitioning the residual variance components across higher levels of analysis. Numerous statistical programs exist that can conduct the analyses outlined above, for the purposes of this report we rely on HLM 6.0 (see Raudenbush, Bryk, Cheong, and Congdon 2004).

The presence of pre-existing differences between individuals or treatment and control groups may also influence the obtained results. We take certain precautions within the analyses to minimize the effects of such differences. One such correction is achieved by including in the models the mean value of each outcome measure across all waves for each individual. This strategy assures that contrasts between waves of data are within-individual comparisons and are not unduly influenced by stable individual differences.

In order to capture changes attributable to an individual's participation in the program, we include a measure of time coded as zero for the pretest and one for the post-test and one year follow-up. The resultant coefficient pertains to the mean change between the pretest and later waves of data combined. We also include a linear measure of time coded to be orthogonal to the pre-post measure (i.e. 0, -.5, and .5). In light of such coding a large positive value of the pre-post measure and a moderate positive value of linear time would suggest a continuing increase over

time, whereas a negative value of linear time would reflect an initial increase and a subsequent decline. While Osgood and Smith (1995) suggest the inclusion of a polynomial function of time to capture discontinuous and non-linear change over time, we are unable to include such a measure with three waves of data.

The Community Works program is a school based program that is delivered to entire classrooms of students. We therefore measure participation in the CW program through a dichotomous variable operationalized at the classroom level; all students enrolled in CW classes were assigned a value of one while those in the comparison classrooms were assigned a value of zero. Program involvement was measured at the individual level (level-2) and entered into the equations for the level-1 (within individual) intercept. Ultimately, successful program effects would be suggested by a more favorable change over time by the treatment group compared to the control group. To examine these effects, the estimate of program effect is based on an interaction between individual involvement in the program and within-individual change over time. Interactions of program involvement were examined with both the pre-post measure and the linear measure of time. These interactions were the product of entering the program involvement measures into the model predicting the pre-post difference. The differences generated by the pre-post interaction with program involvement will directly reflect the overall impact of the program. We also include a variance component for the pre-post difference. As a result of having three waves of data, it was not possible to include any further variance components; we judged the pre-post difference to be most important in examining program effects. Differences between treatment and control from the interaction with our linear coding of time pertain to the trend of the differences over the three waves of data. Likewise, we include our measure of treatment or control in the equation for the linear trend. We do not include a

variance component for the linear trend, as our focus is primarily on changes after the program intervention.

In addition to our measures of time and program involvement, we include controls for demographic characteristics of the individuals, which are measured at the person level (level-2). These include measures (sex, race, and age) which were entered as part of the model explaining the level-1 intercept. As discussed above, we also include in this model a measure of the person mean of the outcome across all three waves. Once again this is entered into the equation for the level-1 intercept at the person level.

Results

Comparability of Treatment and Control Groups

We begin by examining whether the group that received the Community Works program was comparable to the control group at the beginning of the study in regards to the outcome measures. Although we control for the existence of such differences through our analysis design by focusing on within-individual change, the evaluation was designed to produce groups that would be comparable. To assess differences between treatment and control groups at the outset of the evaluation, we rely on the full multilevel model, where the coefficient of the dichotomous measure representing Community Works involvement represents differences at the pretest. The results are presented in Table 3.

While our goal was to create comparable groups, eight of the 46 outcome measures show differences between the treatment and comparison groups. This number is above what would be expected by chance (2.3 at the .05 level and 4.6 at the .10 level). However, a majority of probabilities are not outside of the realm of chance with the present number of outcomes.

Esbensen et al. (2001) suggest that if the p -values are greater than the reciprocal of the number of outcomes, pre-test differences are less problematic if an analysis has enough statistical power. The fact that we found eight statistically significant differences suggests that our treatment and comparison groups do differ significantly. However, these differences are not systematic; for example, the analyses indicate that the treatment group is more pro-social with regard to conflict resolution and disorder while the effects of offending and neutralizations suggest that the comparison group is more pro-social. With a sample of 1,400 students we are detecting differences between the treatment and control group that are statistically significant, but are substantively minor.

INSERT TABLE 3

Of the eight observed significant differences, students who were enrolled in CW were less pro-social on five of the outcome measures. At the outset of the evaluation, students in the treatment group were more likely to rely on neutralizations of deviance in general and hitting specifically. They also reported greater levels of involvement in general delinquency and violent offending and less involvement in pro-social activities. The treatment group did exhibit greater conflict resolution skills and lower levels of perceived disorder in both the community and the school than did the control group.

Overall Program Impact

Tables 4 and 5 present our results for the analyses of program impact. Table 4 reveals mixed results with regard to overall program effect from pre-program to post-program. Overall

we find significant differences between seven of the 46 program outcomes in Table 4. Four of these relationships-- general delinquency, violent offending, neutralization for hitting, and pro-social involvement-- are in the direction consistent with a beneficial program effect. In the time following the completion of the CW program, students in the treatment group were involved in general delinquency and violent offending to a lesser degree than were individuals in the control group. Furthermore, students who received the Community Works program were involved in more pro-social activities than were control students. Finally, program enrollment appears to affect the use of neutralizations for hitting, where students who received the program were less likely to rely on such neutralizations than were their control counterparts. The four beneficial differences observed (out of 46 total outcomes) are more than would be expected by chance at the .05 level.

INSERT TABLE 4

However, students participating in CW, appear to experience a deleterious program effect with regard to conflict resolution skills. That is, individuals enrolled in the program used conflict resolution strategies to a lesser extent after the program than did the control group. For two other outcome measures (perceived school and community disorder), we also noted differences between the treatment and comparison groups. While the differences suggest that individuals who were exposed to Community Works perceive more disorder in their communities and school than do students in the control group, it is not clear whether this could be considered a beneficial program effect. The Community Works program implicitly seeks to improve individuals' attitudes about their community through lessons designed to raise youth

awareness of things that may be problematic in the community and what can be done to remedy those situations. Therefore, the observed difference for perceived community and school disorder may be due to program facilitators gearing their lessons towards addressing problems in the community and identifying solutions.

Table 5 presents the differences in the post-program linear trend between the treatment and control groups. While the post program differences suggested that there was at least a minimal program effect, the results of the linear trend do not have as much promise. Of the 46 outcome measures, we observe a program effect on only one linear trend: that of violent offending. Individuals in the treatment group experience a greater decrease in violent offending than do those in the control group, which suggests a beneficial effect of the program. By chance alone, however, we would expect to find two to four significant effects in this many comparisons.

INSERT TABLE 5

Analysis of High Fidelity Schools

In Section I we reported that only four schools were determined to have at least a moderate level of program fidelity. Because the program was not properly implemented at a majority of the schools in the sample, we replicated these analyses for only those students attending those four schools. The remainder of our discussion of results is based on these analyses. The results from the analyses of pretest differences are presented in Table 6.

INSERT TABLE 6

When we restrict the analysis to only those individuals attending high fidelity schools, we find fewer differences at the pre-test than in the full sample. Similar to the analyses conducted on the full sample, we find that CW students in high fidelity schools perceive more problems in both their communities and schools. We do not find any other pre-test differences that are consistent with those found in the full sample. On the other hand, we find that students in the treatment group are seriously victimized less than are students in the control group at the time of the pre-test. These results would suggest that the treatment and control groups in the high fidelity schools are more closely matched than were those in the full sample, providing more confidence in the findings. Additionally, although the fewer cases examined in the “high fidelity” analyses reduce statistical power to detect differences, we still find a slightly more significant differences than what would be expected by chance at the .05 level.

In our analysis of post-program impacts, we find significant differences in four of the outcomes examined. These results are presented in Table 7. As was the case with the full sample, CW students reported significantly greater perceptions of disorder in both the community and school. We also find significant post-program differences in the levels of serious in-school victimization, where students in the treatment group experience more victimizations than those in the control group. We also find that, on average, the treatment group was more altruistic following completion of the program than was the control group. Once again, the relatively few significant differences between the treatment and control groups, coupled with the direction of these differences, lend mixed support at best regarding program effect.

INSERT TABLE 7

Table 8 presents the differences in the post program linear trends of outcome measures, where we find three significant differences. Students who received the Community Works program experience a greater decrease in the level of strain and greater increases in involvement in pro-social activities and altruistic behavior than students in the control group. The three significant differences we observe are slightly greater than what would be expected by chance and are consistent with positive program effects.

INSERT TABLE 8

Conclusion

The Teens, Crime and the Community and Community Works program seeks to: 1) reduce teen victimization; 2) reduce delinquency; and 3) engage teens in service in the community. In addition to these program goals, our review of the curriculum identified a number of risk factors the program sought to address. Three waves of student data (self-administered group questionnaires) collected from students enrolled in both treatment and comparison classrooms revealed no systematic program effect. While the program did appear to impact some outcome measures in a positive direction, negative program effects were also identified. Given the low degree of program fidelity reported in Section I of this report, it is not surprising that these outcome analyses did not identify any positive systematic program effect.

Due to the program implementation failure detailed in Section I of this report and in conjunction with preliminary outcome results reported to the NIJ prior to the full initiation of

Wave 4 data collection, it was decided to modify the grant parameters. This modification consisted of a shift in focus that resulted in the cessation of student surveys. In place of more data collection, the evaluation team was encouraged to examine factors associated with the program implementation failure and to engage the program provider, NCPC, in a curriculum review. In the next section of this report, we provide a description of this changed mandate.

References

- Babbie, Earl R. 1973. *Survey research methods*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Battin, Sara R., Karl G. Hill, Richard D. Abbott, Richard F. Catalano, and J. David Hawkins. 1998. The contribution of gang membership to delinquency beyond delinquent friends. *Criminology* 36(1):93-115.
- Cook, Philip and John Laub. 1998. The unprecedented epidemic in youth violence. In *Youth violence, crime and justice: A review of research, Vol. 24*, ed. Michael Tonry and Mark Moore, 27-64. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cook, Philip and John Laub. 2002. After the epidemic: Recent trends in youth violence in the United States. In *Crime and justice: A review of research, Vol. 29*, ed. Michael Tonry, 1-37. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Devoe, Jill F., Sally A Ruddy, Amanda K. Miller, Mike Planty, Thomas D. Snyder, Katharin Peer, Philip Kaufman, Detis T. Duhart, and Michael R. Rand. 2002. *Indicators of School Crime and Safety: 2002*. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Education & U. S. Department of Justice.
- DeVoe, Jill F., Katharin Peter, Philip Kaufman, Amanda Miller, Margaret Noonan, Thomas D. Snyder, and Katrina Baum. 2004. *Indicators of School Crime and Safety: 2004* (NCES 2005-002/NCJ 205290). Washington, DC: US Department of Education.
- DiIulio, John. 1995. The coming of the superpredators. *Weekly Standard* (November 27):23.
- Elliott, Delbert S., David Huizinga, and Suzanne S. Ageton. 1985. *Explaining delinquency and drug use*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

- Elliott, Delbert S. and Scott Menard. 1996. Delinquent friends and delinquent behavior: Temporal and developmental patterns. In *Delinquency and crime: Current theories*, ed. J. David Hawkins, 28-67. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Esbensen, Finn-Aage and David Huizinga. 1993. Gangs, drugs, and delinquency in a survey of urban youth. *Criminology* 31:565-89.
- Esbensen, Finn-Aage, David Huizinga, and Anne Weiher. 1993. Gang and non-gang youth: Differences in explanatory factors. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* 9:94-116.
- Esbensen, Finn-Aage, D. Wayne Osgood, Terrance J. Taylor, Dana Peterson, and Adrienne Freng. 2001. How great is G.R.E.A.T.?: Results from a longitudinal quasi-experimental design. *Criminology and Public Policy* 1:87-118.
- Esbensen, Finn-Aage, Dana Peterson, Terrance J. Taylor, and Adrienne Freng. 2009. Youth Violence: The role of sex and race in understanding offending, victimization, and gang membership. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Fagan, Jeffrey. 1990. Social processes of delinquency and drug use among urban gangs. In *Gangs in America, 1st edition*, ed. C. Ronald Huff, 183-222. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Fox, James A. 1996. *Trends in juvenile violence: A report to the United States Attorney General on current and future rates of juvenile offending*. Washington, DC: United States Department of Justice (March).
- Gottfredson, Denise C. 2001. *Schools and delinquency*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gottfredson, Denise and Gary Gottfredson. 1999. "What Do Schools Do To Prevent Problem Behavior and Promote School Safety and How Well Do They Do It?" Paper presented at the Annual Conference on Criminal Justice Research and Evaluation, Washington, DC.

- Gottfredson, Michael and Travis Hirschi. 1990. *The General Theory of Crime*. New York, NY: University of Cambridge Press.
- Grasmick, Harold G., Charles R. Tittle, Robert J. Bursik, Jr., and Bruce J. Arneklev. 1993. Testing the core empirical implications of Gottfredson and Hirschi's General Theory of Crime. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 30(1):5-29.
- Guerino, Paul, Michael D. Hurwitz, Margaret E. Noonan, and Sarah M. Kaffenberger. 2006. *Crime, Violence, Discipline, and Safety in U.S. Public Schools: Findings from the School Survey of Crime and Safety: 2003 – 2004*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Hawkins, J. David, David P. Farrington, and Richard F. Catalano. 1998. "Reducing Violence through the Schools." In Delbert S. Elliott, Beatrix A. Hamburg, and Kirk R. Williams (eds.) *Violence in American Schools*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hill, Karl G., James C. Howell, J. David Hawkins, and Sara Battin-Pearson. 1999. Childhood risk factors for adolescent gang membership: Results from the Seattle Social Development Project. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 36(3):300-22.
- Howell, James C. 2009. *Preventing and reducing juvenile delinquency: A comprehensive framework, 2nd edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hox, J.J. 1995. *Applied Multilevel Analysis*. Amsterdam: TT – Publikaities.
- Huizinga, David, Rolf Loeber, and Terence Thornberry. 1995. *Urban Delinquency and Substance Abuse: Initial Findings Report*. Washington, D.C.: Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Lawrence, Richard. 2007. *School Crime and Juvenile Justice, second edition*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

- Lueptow, Lloyd, Samuel A. Mueller, Richard R. Hammes, and Lawrence R. Master. 1977. The impact of informed consent regulations on response rate and response bias. *Social Methods and Research* 6: 183-204.
- Maxson, Cheryl L., Monica L. Whitlock, and Malcolm W. Klein. 1998. Vulnerability to street gang membership: Implications for practice. *Social Service Review* March:70-91.
- Mihalic, Sharon, Abigail Fagan, Katherine Irwin, Diane Ballard, and Delbert Elliott. 2002. Blueprints for Violence Prevention Replications: Factors for Implementation Success. Boulder, CO: Institute of Behavioral Science.
- National Center for Education Statistics. 1998. Violence and Discipline Problems in U.S. Public Schools: 1996-97. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Osgood, D. Wayne and Gail L. Smith. 1995. "Applying Hierarchical Linear Modeling to Extended Longitudinal Evaluations. *Evaluation Review* 19:3-38.
- Raudenbush, Stephen W., Anthony S. Bryk, Yuk Fai Cheong, and Richard Congdon. 2004. *HLM 6: Hierarchical Linear and Nonlinear Modeling*. Lincolnwood, IL: Scientific Software International, Inc.
- Reiss, Jr., Albert J. 1988. "Co-offending and Criminal Careers." In M. Tonry and N. Morris (eds.) *Crime and Justice: An Annual Review of Research*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Sewell, William H., & Robert M. Hauser. 1975. *Education, occupation and earnings: Achievement in the early career*. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Short, James F., Jr. 1997. *Poverty, Ethnicity, and Violent Crime*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Thornberry, Terence P., Marvin D. Krohn, Alan J. Lizotte, Carolyn A. Smith, and Kimberly Tobin. 2003. *Gangs and delinquency in developmental perspective*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

U.S. Dept of Health and Human Services 2001 – Surgeon General Report

Warr, Mark. 2002. *Companions in crime: The social aspects of criminal conduct*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wilcox, Pamela, David C. May, and Staci D. Roberts. 2006. Student Weapon Possession and the "Fear and Victimization Hypothesis": Unraveling the Temporal Order. *Justice Quarterly*, 23(4), 502-529.

Table 1. Sample Sizes for Consent and Survey Process

Sample	N	% of Target Sample	% of Active Consent Sample
Target Sample	2,353	100%	n./a.
Parental Refusal	291	12%	n./a.
No Return	374	16%	n./a.
Active Consent	1,686	72%	100%
Pretest	1,624	69%	96%
Posttest	1,499	64%	89%
One Year Follow-up	1,209	51%	72%

Table 2. Sample Descriptive Statistics

Variable	%
<i>Sex</i>	
Male	47%
Female	54%
<i>Race</i>	
White	31%
Black	11%
Hispanic	42%
Other Races	15%
<i>Age (Mean)</i>	
	12.2
Under 12	26%
12	35%
13	30%
Over 13	10%
<i>Living Situation</i>	
Both Parents	56%
Parent and Step	16%
Single Parent	24%
Other	4%
<i>Paternal Education^a</i>	
<i>Don't Know</i>	46%
Less than HS	17%
HS Graduate	34%
Some College	13%
College Graduate	26%
More than College	10%
<i>Maternal Education^a</i>	
<i>Don't Know</i>	34%
Less than HS	14%
HS Graduate	30%
Some College	21%
College Graduate	25%
More than College	11%
<i>Mobility</i>	
0	74%
1	18%
2 or more	8%

^a Category percents exclude "don't know."

Table 3. Pretest Comparison of TCC/CW Treatment Group and Control Group From Full Multilevel Models

Outcome	Difference	S.E.	<i>p</i>
Community Disorder	-.037 *	.014	.009
School Disorder	-.049 *	.012	.000
Bond to the Community	-.008	.012	.487
School Commitment	-.030	.019	.113
Overall Delinquency(Freq.)	.285 *	.127	.025
Status Offending(Freq.)	.048	.039	.218
Minor Offending(Freq.)	.047	.043	.278
Property Offending(Freq.)	.023	.035	.507
Violent Offending(Freq.)	.105 *	.047	.026
Fear of Crime	-.044	.028	.119
Likelihood of Reporting	-.014	.040	.727
School Commitment	-.029	.017	.100
Perceived School Safety	-.020	.023	.395
Awareness of Services	-.035	.025	.156
Risk of Victimization	-.027	.029	.347
Overall Victization(Freq.)	-.014	.134	.915
In-School Victimization(Freq.)	-.010	.103	.921
Serious In-School Vic(Freq.)	-.038	.051	.456
Bullying Victimization(Freq.)	.038	.072	.598
Serious Victimization(Freq.)	-.023	.053	.662
Low Self-Control	-.001	.017	.940
Impulsivity	.001	.025	.982
Risk-Seeking	-.019	.026	.473
Anger	.006	.027	.826
Self-Centeredness	-.003	.023	.886
Negative Peer Commitment	.046	.029	.116
Positive Peer Commitment	.001	.035	.986
Neutralization	.042 *	.020	.038
Hitting Neutralization	.064 *	.030	.034
Lying Neutralization	.041	.029	.158
Stealing Neutralization	.024	.027	.327

Table 3. Pretest Comparison of TCC/CW Treatment Group and Control Group From Full Multilevel Models, Continued

Outcome	Difference	S.E.	<i>p</i>
Conflict Resolution	.027 *	.012	.021
Guilt	-.015	.013	.246
Guilt-Minor Offending	-.020	.016	.213
Guilt-Property Offending	-.005	.016	.740
Guilt-Violent Offending	-.020	.015	.185
Guilt-Substance Use/Sale	-.018	.017	.281
Strain (Cultural Rejection)	-.011	.016	.497
Self-Esteem	-.016	.018	.388
Self-Efficacy	.007	.019	.724
Collective Efficacy	-.021	.019	.275
Pro-Social Involvement	-.078 *	.039	.046
Peer Pro-Social Behavior	-.014	.023	.545
Empathy	-.003	.008	.673
Parental Monitoring	.005	.024	.833
Altruistic Behavior	-.026	.017	.135
Drug Use-Frequency	.063	.043	.136

* $p < .05$.

Table 4. Analysis of Program Impact: Preprogram Versus Post-Program Contrast

Outcome	Difference	S.E.	<i>p</i>
Community Disorder	.056 *	.022	.012
School Disorder	.076 *	.024	.002
Bond to the Community	.015	.019	.445
School Commitment	.050	.030	.090
Overall Delinquency(Freq.)	-.450 *	.203	.027
Status Offending(Freq.)	-.072	.062	.246
Minor Offending(Freq.)	-.072	.070	.302
Property Offending(Freq.)	-.037	.056	.509
Violent Offending(Freq.)	-.175 *	.075	.019
Fear of Crime	.068	.045	.128
Likelihood of Reporting	.020	.063	.747
School Commitment	.050	.028	.077
Perceived School Safety	.025	.036	.484
Awareness of Services	.056	.039	.154
Risk of Victimization	.037	.045	.410
Overall Victization(Freq.)	.009	.211	.966
In-School Victimization(Freq.)	.012	.163	.943
Serious In-School Vic(Freq.)	.057	.079	.473
Bullying Victimization(Freq.)	-.064	.113	.573
Serious Victimization(Freq.)	.031	.084	.709
Self-Control	.002	.027	.954
Impulsivity	.002	.040	.960
Risk-Seeking	.026	.041	.526
Anger	-.010	.043	.820
Self-Centeredness	.005	.037	.889
Negative Peer Commitment	-.071	.046	.125
Positive Peer Commitment	.001	.056	.987
Neutralization	-.061	.032	.054
Hitting Neutralization	-.097 *	.048	.043
Lying Neutralization	-.064	.045	.157
Stealing Neutralization	-.030	.039	.456

Table 4. Analysis of Program Impact: Preprogram Versus Post-Program Contrast, Continued

Outcome	Difference	S.E.	<i>p</i>
Conflict Resolution	-.042 *	.019	.027
Guilt	.025	.021	.245
Guilt-Minor Offending	.031	.025	.221
Guilt-Property Offending	.008	.031	.758
Guilt-Violent Offending	.032	.025	.196
Guilt-Substance Use/Sale	.031	.027	.258
Strain (Cultural Rejection)	.015	.026	.568
Self-Esteem	.024	.029	.413
Self-Efficacy	-.007	.031	.814
Collective Efficacy	.033	.030	.268
Pro-Social Involvement	.122 *	.062	.049
Peer Pro-Social Behavior	.026	.037	.480
Empathy	.006	.013	.658
Parental Monitoring	-.011	.038	.782
Altruistic Behavior	.044	.027	.107
Drug Use-Frequency	-.096	.069	.161

* $p < .05$.

Table 5. Analysis of Program Impact: Post-Program Linear Trend

Outcome	Coeff.	S.E.	<i>p</i>
Community Disorder	-.008	.023	.741
School Disorder	.008	.024	.723
Bond to the Community	.017	.026	.498
School Commitment	.016	.032	.623
Delinquency-Frequency	-.330	.274	.229
Status Offending(Freq.)	.012	.075	.877
Minor Offending(Freq.)	-.114	.085	.182
Property Offending(Freq.)	-.058	.072	.422
Violent Offending(Freq.)	-.191 *	.097	.049
Fear of Crime	-.024	.048	.615
Likelihood of Reporting	.017	.071	.814
Perceived School Safety	-.053	.039	.173
Awareness of Services	-.019	.043	.657
Risk of Victimization	-.085	.048	.079
Victimization-Frequency	.117	.244	.632
In-School Victimization(Freq.)	.130	.186	.486
Serious In-School Vic(Freq.)	.064	.093	.492
Bullying Victimization(Freq.)	.059	.130	.653
Serious Victimization(Freq.)	-.028	.098	.778
Self-Control	-.025	.030	.413
Impulsivity	.019	.043	.656
Risk-Seeking	-.007	.044	.867
Anger	-.040	.048	.398
Self-Centeredness	-.052	.042	.210
Negative Peer Commitment	.044	.045	.327
Positive Peer Commitment	.065	.060	.277
Neutralization	-.003	.034	.921
Hitting Neutralization	.017	.052	.749
Lying Neutralization	-.048	.048	.317
Stealing Neutralization	.013	.042	.766

Table 5. Analysis of Program Impact: Post-Program Linear Trend, Continued

Outcome	Coeff.	S.E.	<i>p</i>
Conflict Resolution	.012	.023	.613
Guilt	.021	.025	.402
Guilt-Minor Offending	-.013	.029	.654
Guilt-Property Offending	.015	.031	.628
Guilt-Violent Offending	.038	.031	.214
Guilt-Substance Use/Sale	.037	.032	.253
Strain (Cultural Rejection)	-.001	.028	.967
Self-Esteem	.020	.00	.360
Self-Efficacy	.031	.035	.382
Collective Efficacy	-.016	.033	.629
Pro-Social Involvement	-.048	.067	.471
Peer Pro-Social Behavior	.032	.041	.443
Empathy	.021	.014	.149
Parental Monitoring	-.003	.037	.933
Altruistic Behavior	.033	.031	.282
Drug Use-Frequency	.023	.084	.787

* $p < .05$.

Table 6. Pretest Comparison of TCC/CW Treatment Group and Control Group From Full Multilevel Models; High Fidelity Schools

Outcome	Difference	S.E.	<i>p</i>
Community Disorder	-.078 *	.033	.018
School Disorder	-.101 *	.036	.006
Bond to the Community	.013	.044	.766
School Commitment	-.059	.045	.189
Overall Delinquency(Freq.)	.133	.372	.721
Status Offending(Freq.)	.011	.102	.912
Minor Offending(Freq.)	.013	.128	.922
Property Offending(Freq.)	.021	.092	.818
Violent Offending(Freq.)	.080	.129	.538
Fear of Crime	-.048	.066	.471
Likelihood of Reporting	.084	.090	.351
School Commitment	-.059	.045	.189
Perceived School Safety	-.033	.055	.544
Awareness of Services	-.065	.054	.228
Risk of Victimization	.002	.063	.975
Overall Victimization(Freq.)	-.426	.337	.208
In-School Victimization(Freq.)	-.401	.256	.118
Serious In-School Vic(Freq.)	-.319 *	.122	.010
Bullying Victimization(Freq.)	-.090	.189	.634
Serious Victimization(Freq.)	-.041	.141	.773
Self-Control	.000	.048	.998
Impulsivity	.055	.065	.402
Risk-Seeking	-.025	.062	.689
Anger	-.024	.065	.709
Self-Centeredness	-.013	.052	.796
Negative Peer Commitment	.051	.079	.518
Positive Peer Commitment	-.002	.083	.983
Neutralization	.081	.052	.117
Hitting Neutralization	.075	.074	.313
Lying Neutralization	.092	.071	.199
Stealing Neutralization	.081	.071	.258

Table 6. Pretest Comparison of TCC/CW Treatment Group and Control Group From Full Multilevel Models; High Fidelity Schools, Continued

Outcome	Difference	S.E.	<i>p</i>
Conflict Resolution	.045	.027	.094
Guilt	-.029	.033	.391
Guilt-Minor Offending	-.015	.038	.686
Guilt-Property Offending	-.030	.039	.438
Guilt-Violent Offending	-.035	.039	.383
Guilt-Substance Use/Sale	-.035	.045	.440
Strain (Cultural Rejection)	.046	.047	.320
Self-Esteem	-.003	.040	.950
Self-Efficacy	.044	.045	.335
Pro-Social Involvement	.010	.095	.915
Peer Pro-Social Behavior	.029	.053	.587
Empathy	.009	.020	.671
Parental Monitoring	-.066	.057	.247
Altruistic Behavior	-.077	.040	.058
Drug Use-Frequency	-.037	.120	.758

* $p < .05$.

Table 7. Analysis of Program Impact: Preprogram Versus Post-Program Contrast; High Fidelity Schools

Outcome	Difference	S.E.	<i>p</i>
Community Disorder	.127 *	.051	.015
School Disorder	.161 *	.057	.006
Bond to the Community	-.018	.070	.799
School Commitment	.097	.071	.173
Overall Delinquency(Freq.)	-.204	.583	.726
Status Offending(Freq.)	-.014	.159	.929
Minor Offending(Freq.)	.010	.207	.961
Property Offending(Freq.)	-.036	.145	.801
Violent Offending(Freq.)	-.143.	.202	.481
Fear of Crime	.060	.105	.565
Likelihood of Reporting	-.144	.141	.310
School Commitment	.097	.071	.173
Perceived School Safety	.055	.086	.523
Awareness of Services	.099	.086	.255
Risk of Victimization	-.006	.100	.953
Overall Victization(Freq.)	.630	.520	.227
In-School Victimization(Freq.)	.602	.394	.128
Serious In-School Vic(Freq.)	.468 *	.187	.013
Bullying Victimization(Freq.)	.147	.294	.617
Serious Victimization(Freq.)	.048	.221	.827
Self-Control	.004	.068	.956
Impulsivity	-.084	.103	.411
Risk-Seeking	.040	.099	.687
Anger	.038	.103	.714
Self-Centeredness	.031	.082	.709
Negative Peer Commitment	-.054	.123	.662
Positive Peer Commitment	-.002	.131	.3985
Neutralization	-.118	.082	.152
Hitting Nuetralization	-.102	.117	.381
Lying Neutralization	-.143	.112	.202
Stealing Neutralization	-.112	.113	.322

Table 7. Analysis of Program Impact: Preprogram Versus Post-Program Contrast; High Fidelity Schools, Continued

Outcome	Difference	S.E.	<i>p</i>
Conflict Resolution	-.070	.042	.101
Guilt	.040	.052	.443
Guilt-Minor Offending	.019	.059	.752
Guilt-Property Offending	.045	.061	.464
Guilt-Violent Offending	.047	.063	.453
Guilt-Substance Use/Sale	.049	.071	.491
Strain (Cultural Rejection)	-.081	.065	.218
Self-Esteem	-.000	.064	1.000
Self-Efficacy	-.066	.072	.360
Pro-Social Involvement	.013	.151	.930
Peer Pro-Social Behavior	-.042	.084	.620
Empathy	-.013	.032	.680
Parental Monitoring	.102	.089	.249
Altruistic Behavior	.125 *	.063	.049
Drug Use-Frequency	.077	.193	.692

* $p < .05$.

**Table 8. Analysis of Program Impact: Post-Program Linear Trend;
High Fidelity Schools**

Outcome	Coeff.	S.E.	<i>p</i>
Community Disorder	.004	.054	.941
School Disorder	-.037	.057	.519
Bond to the Community	.051	.076	.501
School Commitment	.139	.081	.089
Delinquency-Frequency	-1.318	.907	.146
Status Offending(Freq.)	-.355	.189	.061
Minor Offending(Freq.)	-.108	.247	.660
Property Offending(Freq.)	-.310	.224	.166
Violent Offending(Freq.)	-.502	.306	.101
Fear of Crime	-.159	.111	.155
Likelihood of Reporting	.108	.153	.482
Perceived School Safety	-.036	.098	.713
Awareness of Services	.012	.103	.905
Risk of Victimization	-.016	.121	.894
Victimization-Frequency	-.150	.677	.825
In-School Victimization(Freq.)	-.236	.459	.607
Serious In-School Vic(Freq.)	-.310	.225	.167
Bullying Victimization(Freq.)	.044	.328	.894
Serious Victimization(Freq.)	.009	.301	.977
Self-Control	-.024	.052	.644
Impulsivity	.006	.099	.952
Risk-Seeking	-.010	.105	.924
Anger	-.117	.116	.314
Self-Centeredness	.025	.104	.810
Negative Peer Commitment	.257	.129	.046
Positive Peer Commitment	.232	.137	.090
Neutralization	-.125	.090	.165
Hitting Neutralization	-.034	.118	.774
Lying Neutralization	-.168	.116	.147
Stealing Neutralization	-.184	.119	.121

**Table 8. Analysis of Program Impact: Post-Program Linear Trend;
High Fidelity Schools**

Outcome	Coeff.	S.E.	<i>p</i>
Conflict Resolution	.003	.053	.962
Guilt	.104	.059	.076
Guilt-Minor Offending	.109	.061	.075
Guilt-Property Offending	.111	.072	.124
Guilt-Violent Offending	.096	.073	.186
Guilt-Substance Use/Sale	.093	.083	.263
Strain (Cultural Rejection)	-.165 *	.052	.002
Self-Esteem	.026	.078	.734
Self-Efficacy	.069	.077	.370
Pro-Social Involvement	.476 *	.145	.001
Peer Pro-Social Behavior	.062	.095	.514
Empathy	.048	.036	.175
Parental Monitoring	-.035	.092	.706
Altruistic Behavior	.145 *	.064	.024
Drug Use-Frequency	-.158	.292	.588

* $p < .05$.

PART 3: CURRICULUM REVIEW

Overview:

Curriculum Review of *Teens, Crime and Community* and *Community Works*

The process evaluation of the Community Works Program (Part I of this Final Report) concluded that the program was not implemented with fidelity in the majority of schools participating in the evaluation. It is important to note that the 15 participating schools were recruited specifically because of their reported intent to implement the full program in their schools. The fact that only four of the participating schools met the minimum standards of program fidelity is telling, as the standards were quite liberal (see Chapter 4 of the Process Evaluation). In addition to program implementation failure, outcome analyses based on the three data waves of student surveys confirmed the absence of a program effect (Part II of this Final Report). Analyses of short-term impact (i.e., pre-post test comparisons) produced contradictory results: findings supportive of program expectations were found for self-esteem, involvement in conventional activities, and “hitting neutralization”. Findings contrary to program goals were found for fear of school crime, fear of violent crime, use of aggressive conflict resolution strategies, perceived risk of school victimization, and serious victimization. In essence, there were more findings contrary to than supportive of program expectations. Of the 46 outcome measures assessed at Wave 3, we observed a program effect on only one measure - violent offending. Individuals in the treatment group experience a greater decrease in violent offending than do those in the control group.

As a result of this implementation failure and absence of program effect, the National Institute of Justice approved a change of scope for the Community Works evaluation. In November, 2006, an initial request for a redesign was submitted to the project manager. Following a series of conversations and email exchanges, a formal proposal for a change of

scope was submitted January 30, 2007 and ultimately approved in mid March, 2007. This report briefly reviews the proposed changes to the evaluation design and then provides an overview of the curriculum review spawned by the evaluation results.

PROPOSED CHANGES TO EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

Given the results of the process evaluation in conjunction with the preliminary outcome measures and in light of the GAO audit of NIJ funded programs (2003), the proposed change in evaluation design was two-pronged: 1) one strategy would focus on identifying reasons underlying program implementation failure and 2) another would maximize the student data already collected.

Studying the failure of implementation. The process evaluation documented the lack of program implementation. An important question remained: why did this program failure occur? To address this question, two separate strategies were proposed to produce information that would be useful to program staff at NCPC, to OJJDP, and evaluation insight that might prove informative for NIJ and subsequent solicitations.

The 15 schools participating in the evaluation were selected due to their stated commitment to implement the program fully, not just use it as a resource as some teachers reported doing. The first step was to organize a meeting with program providers (school teachers, SROs and/or JPOs). A two-day workshop was subsequently convened in Scottsdale, Arizona in April, 2007. During this meeting, the evaluation team presented the process evaluation results (without identifying which sites were classified as non-implementers). Of importance was the feedback from the implementers regarding their impressions about why the program was not implemented with fidelity. Results from these discussions were expected to

provide substantial insight into programmatic issues that might lead to a better program. This initial meeting was restricted to program providers and did not include NCPC or Expansion Center staff. A second meeting with NCPC staff members and NIJ program managers occurred in June, 2007 (the OJJDP project manager and supervisors were invited to attend but declined). That meeting was intended to share the results of the meeting with program providers. Ground-level implementation issues identified by the program providers were discussed as were organizational issues associated with the NCPC national office and the Expansion Centers.

During the course of this second meeting NCPC staff indicated that they would be supportive of a curriculum review organized by the evaluation team [the PI had previously conducted a curriculum review as part of the NIJ funded National Evaluation of the G.R.E.A.T. program (1999-2001)]. The evaluation team agreed to oversee a curriculum review. This curriculum review work group would be comprised of prevention experts, members of the evaluation team, representatives from NCPC and TCC/CW implementers, and NIJ program staff. The goal of this strategy was to substantively review the CW materials, the theoretical framework of the program, and training and organizational issues. The CW curriculum had not been subjected to rigorous **outside** review since its development.

Data Analyses. In addition to the process evaluation component of the change of scope plan, the evaluation team proposed to maximize the student data already collected by preparing several additional manuscripts of substantive interest. Three waves of data from a sample of students in 15 schools, in nine cities, in four states had been collected. The student questionnaire, while developed specifically to test the effectiveness of the CW program, contained a number of questions that allow for exploration of important issues of criminological

and policy interest. Two aspects of the sample increase the attractiveness of this particular data set: 1) the students were initially in grades six through nine (the majority in grades 6 and 7) and as such provide a sample with considerable age variation; and 2) importantly, 10 of the schools are located in the Southwest with a sizable representation of Hispanic youths thereby allowing for investigation of the role of ethnicity in a number of the proposed analyses. Manuscripts developed as part of this change of scope are included as Part IV of this Final Report.

Curriculum Review

The curriculum review was an outgrowth of two meetings described in the previous section (convened in March and June, 2007). During that second meeting between the evaluation team, NCPC staff, and NIJ program staff, it was decided that we would proceed with a curriculum review of Community Works. To that end, three of the program providers who had attended the April meeting were invited to participate; all graciously agreed. These CW implementers were: Rudy Acosta, JPO from Yuma, Arizona; Melissa Larson, JPO from Tucson, Arizona; and John Mercer, a 6th grade social studies teacher from Las Cruces, New Mexico. Individuals knowledgeable of prevention programs were contacted and all four agreed to participate in the process. They were Denise Gottfredson, University of Maryland; David Huizinga, University of Colorado; Cheryl Maxson, University of California-Irvine; and Dana Peterson, University at Albany. NCPC staff members were also invited to participate. The following individuals from NCPC attended one or more of the curriculum review meetings: Lori Britain, Jim Wright, Joselle Shay, and Debra Whitcomb. Cathy Girouard and Winnie Reed represented NIJ at one or more of the meetings. Members of the evaluation team involved in this process included: Brad Brick, Finn Esbensen, Sara Hoover, Chris Melde, and Terrance J. Taylor.

The curriculum review consisted of a series of three additional meetings. The first meeting involved the prevention specialists and the evaluation team in St. Louis, Missouri, with the explicit goal of informing the consultants about the CW program, the results of the process and outcome evaluation, and the progress to date on the curriculum review. The second meeting involved all parties and was held January 17 – 18, 2008, in Mesa, Arizona. The third and last meeting was held March 27 – 28, 2008, in Crystal City, Virginia (agendas for these meetings are included in Appendix C). This report provides a summary of these three meetings as well as the two that preceded the actual initiation of the curriculum review.

This report provides an overview of these meetings by organizing discussions around common topical areas. Specifically, the following topics will be addressed: program goals and objectives, CW training, core curriculum, role of community resource people, and relevance of the action projects. Appendix A includes the detailed outline for the revised curriculum.

PROGRAM GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

One recurring theme throughout the curriculum review was the importance of specifying program goals and objectives. In preparation for the initial meeting with the CW program providers, we reviewed a number of NCPC documents to identify the program goals. This review, not surprisingly, confirmed our earlier efforts to list program goals, namely that there was a considerable array of programmatic goals identified with only some consistency. This apparent lack of clarity in program goals was further evidenced when CW providers were asked to list the program goals. In subsequent curriculum review meetings, this issue was re-visited and ultimately resolved.

By way of review of this material, we provide a brief, yet representative sampling of CW goals identified in the CW materials. While the goals are clearly stated in some of the publications, in others they are embedded in statements included in the text.

From the *TCC/CW Program Overview* booklet (p. v), we find the following four goals: 1) prevent teen victimization and delinquency; 2) engage youth in education and action; 3) increase knowledge about crime, victimization, and crime prevention; and 4) increase bonds between youth and community and school. According to the *TCC/CW Volume One* manual, the program has seven goals, including the following: 1) increase teen awareness of their vulnerability to crime; 2) educate teens on how to protect themselves and their communities; 3) motivate teens to take action in their communities; 4) help teens understand the costs of crime and what can be done to prevent it; 5) foster community relations by bringing community resource people into the sessions; 6) bond youth to the community through increased self-esteem; and 7) increase teen empathy toward victims of crime.

In preparing the initial grant proposal and in subsequent reviews of CW materials, the evaluation team derived the following list of program goals: 1) reducing victimization and the fear of victimization (at both the individual and school level); 2) involving youth in positive service in schools and communities; 3) reducing delinquent behavior (at both the individual and school level); 4) improving school performance; and 5) improving the learning environment (including increased job satisfaction among teachers).

In addition to these various statements regarding program goals, we also identified a number of program objectives. According to the TCC/CW Program Overview booklet (p. 10), the principal objectives of the program are to: 1) make teens aware of the effects of crime and teens' risk of victimization; 2) educate teens on how to recognize crime and prevent crime through individual and community strategies; 3) help teens learn how to report crime, to be good witnesses, and to assist victims; 4) equip teens with skills to take crime prevention action; and 5) motivate teens to want to take action. Elsewhere in this same source (p. 3), it is stated that the Community Works Program will: 1) provide a practical understanding of crime and crime prevention that will be useful in the everyday lives of young people; 2) teach young people to be resources for each other and to interact positively with community members; 3) develop each young person's communication and problem-solving skills to promote personal and project success in the community; and 4) encourage young people to focus on their own leadership role in the community.

Other examples of goals and objectives that are embedded in the text and provide additional insight to the program are provided below. "Community Works combines education and action to *reduce teen victimization and involve young people in service to their communities*. The

program develops *self-esteem, leadership, and citizenship skills* by engaging young people in action to positively affect the circumstances of their lives. This manual provides everything you need to establish a program that will *motivate young people to take safety seriously and to make their communities better and safer.* “...[A] complete program approach, such as Community Works, can play an integral role in *strengthening resiliency skills* that propel young people to succeed in spite of those risk factors” (TCC/CW Program Overview booklet, p. 4, emphasis added). “Action Projects allow them to be leaders in the community, increasing their sense of *self esteem*...Additionally, service learning strengthens young people’s *belief in the future*. They more thoroughly *understand that they can positively impact their own lives and the lives of those around them*” (TCC/CW Program Overview booklet, p. 35, emphasis added). Summarizing what appears to be the primary program goals is the following quote from the TCC/CW Program Overview booklet (p.3): TCC/CW is an “effective strategy to help *prevent victimization, reduce delinquency, and involve young people in the life of their communities*” (emphasis added).

During the Curriculum Review meetings, the subject of program goals was discussed on a regular basis. At the fourth meeting (January, 2008), it became imperative for NCPC to articulate the program goals such that the review process could move forward. Without knowledge of the explicit goals, it would not be possible to make curricular recommendations. The overarching mission of NCPC is: “To enable people to create safer more caring communities by addressing causes of crime and reducing possibilities of crime to occur.” The multitude of goals associated with the CW program is consistent with this overall mission. Nonetheless, NCPC was encouraged to specify the primary goal(s) of the program. Following considerable discussion, it was determined that the following three goals encompass the CW program: 1)

reduce teen victimization; 2) reduce delinquency; and 3) engage teens in service in the community.

This list of goals, however, led to more discussion and the desire for more specificity on the part of the curriculum review committee. Considerable discussion surrounded the identification of both delinquency and victimization reduction as program goals. One of the consultants stated that these are two very different goals. What you would do in a program to reduce victimization is different from what you would do to reduce delinquency. Another consultant echoed this sentiment, stating “between victimization prevention and delinquency prevention there is a difference. If we were looking at target hardening, this is usually thought of with a notion of previous victimization. We could also reduce victimization if we could reduce delinquency that leads to that victimization. The kinds of things you would do to reduce delinquency is quite different than what you would do to reduce victimization. So when you get down to what to do in the program, those things become very important as to what should be in each lesson. Each goal means different things.”

The NCPC Director emphasized that “to engage teens in the community is for sure one of our goals. I can explain why there is variation in whether our goal is victimization prevention or delinquency prevention. Street Law and NCPC had different focus. At NCPC, the goal was specifically to reduce teen victimization. Street Law included delinquency prevention. I didn’t know there was difference for a long time. For NCPC, I believe reducing teen victimization was the goal, and as years have gone by, preventing delinquency has also become part of that goal. I don’t see that as a problem anymore because of design of CW.”

While there was consensus that both delinquency and victimization reduction were program goals, this produced some concern that a number of the social skills identified as program components were likely to reduce delinquency, not victimization. Some program components addressed delinquency prevention specifically with the subsequent effect of reducing victimization through a reduction in delinquency. Other program components were targeted specifically for victimization reduction. This issue was left largely unresolved and the committee moved forward with the understanding that both delinquency and victimization reduction were program goals. In the course of the discussions, further clarification was achieved in terms of specifying the type of victimization targeted by the program. The program, for instance, was not intended to, nor does it attempt to address childhood victimization or domestic assault. The program specifically addresses peer victimization, that is, teen victimization by other teens.

Considerable discussion surrounded the third goal listed above, engaging teens in service in the community. What outcomes were expected to be achieved through this component? Is the action project intended to make the community safer? Are the youth, through the action project intended to serve as social change agents? In response to these queries, program providers indicated that the objective was to have the youth take ownership and do something that involves developing a positive attitude. Does the action project lead to a reduction in victimization? Many of the action projects identified during discussion would have no effect on victimization in general or specifically. In clarifying the emergence of the action project and the associated goal of engaging youth in service in the community, the NCPC Director stated that “ that’s where the delinquency prevention portion came in, in part in talking about the service component and engaging youth in the community. That was a way to reduce delinquency among youth. The

service project was an add-on and it made the program unique and stand out but also supported our goal to reduce victimization and engage youth in the community.”

Concern lingered with respect to the extent to which the current program actually addressed the goal of engaging teens in service in the community. The discussion pointed to the possibility that engaging teens in service in the community was, in actuality, more of a means to an end: a program objective that helped meet the program goal of victimization reduction. Further discussion confirmed this interpretation, resulting in the final statement that the program goal was to “**reduce teen peer victimization and delinquency among program youth.**”

A number of specific program objectives were identified that were linked to achievement of this goal. Part of this process entailed a brainstorming of identification of factors associated with delinquency and victimization. These efforts resulted in the listing of four objectives that should be included in any revised curriculum:

Objective 1 – Create a sense of connection to the community;

Objective 2 – Develop social competency skills: problem solving, decision making, conflict resolution, reasoning, empathy, and impulse control;

Objective 3 – Increase awareness of the costs and consequences of crime;

Objective 4 – Educate about how to avoid risky situations and lifestyle choices.

By meeting these objectives, the curriculum can hope to achieve the primary goal.

CORE CURRICULUM

Considerable time was devoted to a close scrutiny of the current curriculum. During the fourth (March, 2008) meeting, the review led to the list of the four main objectives:

1. Sense of connection to the community
2. Social competency skills
3. Awareness of costs/consequences of crime
4. Avoidance of risky situations and lifestyles

Additionally, each of the lessons was reviewed by the entire review team to identify which of the objectives were met in each of the CW lessons as currently structured. One CW provider was tasked with providing an overview of each lesson to the entire group, and the lesson components which met one or more of the main objectives was recorded. An overview of these findings for lessons 1 – 8 is presented in Appendix A.

This chart provided a framework on which to build an outline of a model program aimed at meeting the goals of Community Works. During the fifth (March, 2008) meeting, teams consisting of one CW provider, one member of NCPC, one consultant, and one member of the research team were assigned three lessons which they would critically assess, and lead a discussion of the larger Committee. Teams assessed which, if any, of the program goals were addressed by each component of the CW program lessons. The entire Committee then met to systematically review the individual CW lessons, led by the team responsible for the first review. This process ultimately resulted in an outline for a revised 16 period CW curriculum, presented in Appendix B.

The discussions leading up to the outline for a revised CW curriculum focused on several key issues, including the appropriate dosage necessary for successful programs (minimum of 10

hours), the amount of time in a “standard” classroom setting (approximately 35 minutes), an emphasis on ensuring that each element of the program address one of the four main objectives, and an emphasis on developing, reinforcing, and practicing social skills.

The outline presented in Appendix B provides a baseline for revising the CW program to meet the goals of reducing teen peer victimization and delinquency among program youth by developing a sense of community, enhancing social competency skills, informing youth about the costs and consequences of crime, and avoiding risky situations and lifestyles. Anticipated time-frames and lesson content are provided.

COMMUNITY WORKS TRAINING

In the Process Evaluation Report, we detailed our findings that the CW training did not adequately prepare trainees to teach the curriculum (see Chapter 3 of that report). While the training left trainees “feeling warm and fuzzy,” they did not feel knowledgeable about the program.

In the meeting with program providers (April, 2007), considerable time was spent discussing the quality and quantity of training received at the CW training sessions. It became clear that the trainees did not feel well informed about the program in general. For instance, one CW provider stated “no trainer told me about the three main components.... They never told us about the objectives.” Another echoed this, indicating that “we did a lot of ice breakers and we felt good” but we needed knowledge about the objectives. Based upon these remarks, it would be prudent for NCPC to reconsider the current training format and training agenda.

Another theme that emerged throughout the meetings was the modeling of lessons. The trainees indicated that they would have liked more coverage of actual lessons and to have the lessons modeled according to the actual timeframes recommended in the Manual. We heard comments such as: “should go through so we can have a feel for it as a time frame.” One trainer commented that when he conducts a training session “I have to tell NCPC what I’m doing. I have to submit an agenda. Each agenda should include 2 lessons to be modeled. We get to pick those lessons; but they should be modeled.” Several of the CW providers did not feel that they had seen an entire lesson modeled so there appears to be some disconnect between what the trainers believe they are doing and what the trainees remember experiencing. One of the providers suggested that “I think we need to be able to teach the lessons in training. Let us teach the program at training. I think we would need like 40 hours to get proper training.” Another

suggested that perhaps more time than that was needed. These comments provide further stimulus for NCPC to re-assess their training models.

On a more positive note, the trainees liked the ice breakers that the trainers incorporated into the training modules but, upon further deliberation, did suggest that there were currently too many icebreakers included in the training session. One CW provider suggested that “Possibly only one is good. If you look at the blue book, I always felt really good and I was excited about leaving training, and I would get back to school and then 48 hours later, and pull out the book and I would be confused, have no idea what to do.” Another commented: “I don’t like all of the ice breakers. The ice breakers take too much time. They can’t be implemented with the program in the same class.” This last comment opened discussion about the appropriateness of the icebreakers for a classroom setting in which the students already know one another. The exercises seem better suited for people who have not previously met. One provider commented that the exercises were useful in energizing students after lunch but that for the most part, they were ineffective since the all know each other.

The interactive aspect of the training was also identified as a positive component of the training schedule. One provider commented: “Training was good, it forced you to speak in front of people. It made me do it, and it was important to do so.”

One integral part of the CW program, the Action Project, receives little time and attention during the training. One of the trainers commented that “We as trainers don’t get the point across that each part is important. Action projects are not modeled. People don’t implement. We don’t have the time or resources to teach a 40 hour training. We need to train the trainers better. But it is hard to get the time to give the training over a longer period of time.” There was general agreement that the CW training was too short for the amount of material that needed

to be covered. One of the reasons given for the lack of support for longer training sessions is the lack of administrator commitment to the program. One provider stated: “But administrators don’t buy in. We have other important things to do. Test scores. If this is going to be a program, you can’t have a bottoms up philosophy. We need to have a top down thing. Administrators need to buy in; it can’t be the other way.” The following comments summarize the discontent expressed at one of the curriculum review meetings: “at trainings they tell us about best practices, the objectives, goals, and it’s a joke” while another summarized her feelings more succinctly: “we weren’t well trained.”

PLANNING, SKILLS BUILDING, AND FLEXIBILITY

It should be noted that, while structured around key components of Community Works, the discussions in these meetings did not always flow in a linear manner. This was particularly true of the first two meetings (April with program providers and June with NCPC) preceding the formal decision to proceed with a formal curriculum review. In the course of these meetings, several other topical areas arose – for instance, the planning group, skills-building, and program flexibility. The outgrowth of these discussions further highlighted a discrepancy between what CW staff had intended to convey to program implementers and what program providers actually understood and enacted. Given that most information was conveyed through CW Training, we highlight a number of key issues here.

It was particularly noteworthy that throughout the review meetings, the CW providers indicated very little knowledge and coordination of the desired planning phase that was to precede program implementation. The first section of the Community Works Binder (which all trainees are provided) consists of a 20 page description of the planning process recommended to potential program providers. Typically, informal meetings were held with a school administrator to gain approval and, if not implemented by a teacher, with a teacher in whose classroom the CW program was going to be offered. For example, one implementer stated prior experiences with the school principal indicated that he/she was supportive of prevention programs generally. Thus, “the only planning was sitting with the principal, assistant principal, and a Social Studies teacher [in whose class the program was delivered].” Another implementer stated that in the program’s first year there was no planning group, but the implementer met with the principal and a teacher to discuss implementing the program in the classroom. This same implementer indicated that during the next year, however, there was even less planning with implementer

approaching teachers that (s)he thought would appreciate the extra prep time. Several of the providers were totally unfamiliar with this aspect of the program and were surprised to learn that they should have engaged in this activity.

Considerable discussion ensued about why planning groups were not used. Most commonly, implementers indicated that it was unnecessary to meet with school administrators, as it was stated that administrators were unaware of what went on in the classrooms on a day-to-day basis. Additionally, implementers noted the difficulties in finding mutually agreeable times in which all relevant stakeholders could meet. In short, implementers indicated that school administrators were generally too “overwhelmed” with other duties to take an active role in setting up the program. Thus, the planning of the program implementation typically occurred between implementers and teachers, with very little assistance or buy-in from school administrators.

With respect to the skills-building design of the program, it was quite surprising to learn that most, if not all, of the providers with whom we spoke, did not realize that the lessons were intended to be taught sequentially in order to build upon skills taught in prior lessons.

The following exchange highlights this lack of awareness among the providers:

Evaluator: As a program, it is structured this way, in sequence, with exercises and so forth to actually have an outcome.

Evaluator 2: CW is a skills-based approach, not a scripted approach.

Provider 1: Why so much emphasis on being taught sequentially?

Evaluator 3: It’s a skills building program; the lessons build on each other.

Evaluator 2: May I add, the skills building approach is proven to be better.

Provider 2: I didn’t know until I got here that it was a skills building approach. That would make a difference in how I teach the program. If they don’t get lesson 3, they can’t move on to lesson 4.

Provider 3: I've never thought of it as a skill building program. I've never taught it like that. I've just been disseminating the knowledge. Just get through the program.

Based on these discussions, it is important for NCPC to emphasize in future literature as well as in training that this program is a skills-based program that needs to be taught sequentially and in its entirety to achieve the desired goals.

Program flexibility and adaptability are topics that began appearing from the very beginning of the overall evaluation. Trainers told training participants that CW was a program that could be adapted to multiple settings and that they should feel comfortable adapting it to fit their situation and needs. This promotional position runs directly counter to the skills building approach just discussed and led to considerable confusion on the part of the providers. One very seasoned provider commented that "In reality, you can trim it, they give suggested time frames, and you can make this fit but some things" This comment resulted in several rejoinders from other providers, including "But then are you implementing the program?" and "I feel like you have to teach the whole suggestion, I feel like for the kids to grasp the lessons you can't copy and paste, I know I sound choppy up there, I skip whole sections." Still promoting the flexibility argument, the initial commentator reiterated his earlier comment: "I make it fit what I do.... everyone should feel free to make this work for you, you throw CW out the window anyway." By this point in the conversation, some of the providers were beginning to appreciate the need for consistency as evidenced by the rejoinder to the preceding comment: "The thing is, that's part of program failure because we do all do that, we drop things, or we condense it."

ROLE OF COMMUNITY RESOURCE PEOPLE

One required component of the CW program is the utilization of community resource people (CRP) to enhance specific lessons and serve as role models for the students. For example, a victim's advocate might be recruited to co-facilitate the lesson covering resources available to victims, while an attorney might help facilitate a lesson on law. Note that the ideal role for the CRP is as a co-facilitator, not as a guest speaker. As described in the Process Evaluation and confirmed in Curriculum Review meetings, however, many CW providers do not utilize CRP and when they do, they serve as guest speakers. The CW providers recognize the preferred role of the CRP but indicate that it takes too much planning time on not only their part but also that of the CRP to integrate the CRP into the curriculum (other than as a guest speaker who can talk about their specific area or expertise). For example, one implementer stated: "The CRP was just an addition to the curriculum and hearing it from others, a real life source to enforce lessons. If these CRP don't understand the curriculum, it turns into a lecture and doesn't integrate curriculum." Given this consistent message, it is recommended that NCPC reconsider the role and importance of this particular program component.

Throughout the curriculum review meetings, discussions were had about the role and potential benefit of having CRP as a program component. One provider commented: "it is important because just having a law enforcement officer in the classroom changes the relationship with the officer. The CRPs aren't just there to educate, but so students see them as positive role models." In the abstract and in an ideal setting, the CRP can play an important role in helping to meet at least one of the program objectives – creating a sense of connection to the community. The following exchange at one of the review meetings highlights this aspect of the CRP and the confusion about the role of these outside experts:

NCPC staff member: “Their historical purpose was to bond the kids with community members that they normally wouldn’t interact with. To be role models, provided resources in community.”

Provider 1: “When I use CRP, I want some expertise. If it’s about date rape, I use an organization that specializes in sexual assault.”

Consultant: “That could be included in causes and consequence of crime objective, because it is intended to educate kids.”

Provider 1: “Yes, but they are an entity in the community. Just for that so kids know it exists.”

Consultant: “This idea is about awareness of community resources. But that goes more with how to reduce consequences of victimization.”

Evaluator: “It sounds like the value of the CRP is a mechanism of teaching the sense of community, avoidance, costs and consequences - it’s a vehicle of getting those messages across.”

Provider 1: “It also provides this connection with someone outside of the classroom.”

Provider 2: “For us implementing CW, I don’t think they should be a part of it. But if I were to bring it in, it is for their expertise on a subject matter I don’t know about to answer kids questions ... nothing to do with bonding or sense of community.”

Given this level of disagreement about the role of the CRP and the difficulty of scheduling CRP, the consensus was that this should not be a core aspect of the program. Rather, the use of CRP could be an optional element used by providers to augment their own level of expertise, as evidenced in the preceding dialogue.

RELVANCE OF ACTION PROJECTS

The Action Project, alternately referred to as the service learning project (SLP), was initially considered to be one of the three key components of the Community Works program. One provider stated that the role of the action project was to meet one of the original goals of the CW program, stating that “it was explained to me that one of the goals was to engage youth in the community, and the service project helped enforce that, engage in meaningful contribution to the community.” However, in the process evaluation and in subsequent meetings with CW providers, we learned that the action project was not always incorporated into program delivery. One provider stated the following with regard to the action project: “That is something that I have never done, it is just too hard at the end of the year.” Indeed, according to observations and discussion with program implementers, the lead evaluator concluded that “the CW instructor who does not complete project is the norm.”

These realities led to several discussions about the purpose, structure, and impediments to successful action projects in the Community Works program. For example: How did the action programs develop? What is the true purpose of the action projects? What are typical action projects? How do these action projects meet the CW goals? What are barriers to successful action projects? More specifically, why is the lack of action projects the norm? Finally, what can be done in the CW program to make successful action projects more likely?

To answer the first question, discussions led to the realization that the action projects were a residual of the original TCC. It should be noted that the TCC program was a semester or year long course, often operating as an elective in the schools. Thus, the format of the TCC program may have been more conducive to the action project than the current CW program. NCPC was very clear, however, that the action project was a key component of the CW program

and that it was possible to do. In the words of one staff member, “Instructors have done the project, but have to go above and beyond to get that done.”

According to NCPC, the primary purpose of the action project is to engage youth in meaningful contribution to the community. In the words of one NCPC staff member, “our belief is that youth who participate in the community and have that connection to the community are less likely to engage in delinquent behavior. For reducing victimization, the types of projects can educate peers about risks in the communities and, therefore, addresses the goal of reducing victimization.”

So what kinds of action projects are actually done? Discussions about the types of projects highlighted a number of different illustrations of action projects. For example, one implementer used a current example: “One group is doing a project on kids walking to school and how this is risky because of traffic, so they got crosswalks put in to make things safer.” Another stated that, “kids in my class wanted to make a butterfly garden out of a bad area on school grounds. 40 volunteers showed up and we planted trees and plants.”

Returning to the purpose or intent of the action project, one of the consultants commented that NCPC should focus on how the action project is intended to reduce victimization. Projects such as cleaning the city park are not likely to lead to changes in individual victimization. A NCPC staff member responded by stating that “that’s where the delinquency prevention portion came in, in part in talking about the service component and engaging youth in the community. That was a way to reduce delinquency among youth. The service project was an add-on and it made the program unique and stand out but also supported our goal to reduce victimization and engage youth in the community.” A provider commented that, “I don’t see how the action project has anything to do with the goal. An action project at my school could be completely

different than at ____'s school. I don't see how the action project can lead to a goal, it's so broad what each project is. The kids are supposed to come up with the idea, so you can't be sure it will lead to one of the goals." An additional difficulty in fitting the project to the goals in the CW program arises from the reliance upon students to develop the ideas and actually see them through. According to one implementer, "Any time kids do the SLP, in no way shape or form do the teachers impose it on them, it is the kids' own idea." This provides additional rationale for making the CW program objectives explicit and reinforcing them throughout the curriculum.

One of the NCPC staff members expressed mild frustration with the changing nature of program accountability, especially in relation to program goals and program components. We provide a relatively lengthy quote to capture this consternation with having to justify the use of CRP and implementation of the action project. "Beyond educating youth, the additional service component encouraged youth to look at their communities. Now that they have these new skills, they can share them with others and implement these things in their communities. I don't know if there was scientific reasoning behind it, I don't know if it is necessary to have CRP and a service project. No one knows why those were added on. We didn't have to explain if it worked or not then, but now things are different and I want to know if what we are doing is working."

What about the fact that most implementers do not do the action projects? Is there something about the structure of the CW program that makes it difficult to carry out such projects? Conversely, what can be done to make action projects more doable?

In the current CW program, the action project is addressed at the end of the program, the last three sessions. Discussion focused on the rationale for having the action project almost isolated as the culminating part of the program. Could it not be incorporated throughout the

curriculum to enhance the probability that it would be integrated into the overall program and also be completed?

A NCPC staff member suggested that while it's introduced early in the program, "it is tacked on to the end because it wasn't as important to us as the curriculum and the skills." As discussion ensued, additional rationales for including the action project at the end of curriculum was offered. For example, a NCPC staff member stated that, "the most important step is the reflection part where you evaluate what you have done and the impact you had on the community. Trying to incorporate that into earlier lessons doesn't give kids enough time to get the learning part down to be able to think about the project in that way." It was acknowledged, however, that "the curriculum as it is now is flawed in its design, which makes it difficult to get to the project done."

Ultimately, a number of insights were provided about the desirability and utility of incorporating the action projects throughout the curriculum. One implementer stated that, "I'd like to see it woven into each lesson. Don't save it for big finale at end," while another said, "I'd like to see it tying in to each lesson so they work on the project all throughout." According to a member of the NCPC staff, NCPC had made efforts to incorporate the action projects into the main curriculum: "We've heard this about the SLP before. We moved the SLP to the end of Volume 1 [the "core curriculum"] instead of Volume 2. We also incorporated the SLP into the lessons a bit."

A number of comments were made about the time consuming nature of the action project and the difficulty of actually implementing the project. NCPC staff mentioned that the "most consistent feedback from implementers is they didn't have enough time to do a project or instructors just didn't want to do it." One of the providers seconded this observation, stating that

“the project is very time consuming. The last project I did, each class did their own. [One did a] fundraiser, a bake sale, for the humane society that took approximately six weeks with a CRP, and the head of the high school in _____, in conjunction with Petsmart. The CRP did talks, kids baked and raised \$500 for the humane society. It was fun, kids had fun, did it in shifts so each kid had a short time to be involved. We’ve done trash pick-up in parks, tree plantings, and father’s/mother’s day cards to elderly in retirement communities next to school.”

Based upon these discussions, a number of recommendations were made by the Review Committee. As indicated in Appendix A, lessons 13 – 15 of the revised curriculum were devoted entirely to planning the action project. Given the difficulties associated with implementing a project and the fact that most providers do not typically carry out the project, it was decided that implementing the project was optional. Thus, the revised lessons 13 – 15 focus on planning a project using skills learned throughout the CW course. For example, the roadmap introduced in lesson 1 is revisited in lessons 13 – 15, thus tying things together. It is important that the action projects developed in these three lessons are realistic in scope and tied to the main CW goals. CW should provide some examples of reasonable action projects which fit these criteria.

CONCLUSION

This report provides information about the Curriculum Review Group for the National Evaluation of the Teens, Crime, and the Community/Community Works program. Based upon the lack of program fidelity uncovered in the process evaluation of the program, coupled with the lack of salient outcome results differentiating students who had received the CW program from those who had not, the National Institute of Justice approved a redesign to the original National Evaluation in March, 2007. The evaluation redesign was intended to provide critical feedback about the CW program.

The Curriculum Review was a key component of the evaluation redesign. Through meetings with CW providers, NCPC staff, NIJ personnel, and prevention specialists, the CW program was subjected to intense scrutiny. Topics examined included the CW curriculum, training, and implementation. Regarding the CW curriculum, program goals and objectives were clearly delineated and an outline forming a baseline for a revised CW program was developed. CW trainings were observed and suggestions were made to make the trainings more effective. Finally, barriers to successful program implementation were examined from multiple perspectives, and suggestions were provided to assist in successful program implementation in the future.

APPENDIX A: CW Lessons Content Meeting Four Primary Objectives

Community Works			Objectives			
Time Alloted			Connection to the Community (1)	Social Competency Skills (2)	Crime and cost/consequences (3)	Risky situations/better lifestyle choices (4)
30 minutes	Lesson 1	B	X			
15 minutes		C	X	X		
25 minutes		D		X		
35 minutes	Lesson 2	B			X?	
50 minutes		C			X?	
50 minutes		D			X?	
30 minutes		E			X?	
35 minutes	Lesson 3	B		X?	X	
45 minutes		C			X	
20 minutes		D				
25 minutes		E		X		
10 minutes	Lesson 4	B	X	X?		
30 minutes		C	X?			X?
25 minutes		D				X
85 minutes	Lesson 6					
10 minutes	Lesson 7	B		X		
25 minutes		C		X		
50 minutes		D		X	X?	X?
30 minutes		E		X		
35 minutes	Lesson 8	B		X		

Program Goals:	1.) Reduce teen peer victimization and delinquency (among program youth)
	2.) Engage teens in service to the community

APPENDIX B: Proposed Detailed Outline for Revised Community Works Program

Class Period One – Introduction to Community Works

This lesson is designed to set the stage for the program and discuss what the program is.

Step A (5-10 minutes):

Combine elements of the original step A, numbers one and two. This consists of introducing instructor, asking students to introduce themselves, and the icebreaker that allows students to get to know each other. This step would also emphasize the objectives and goals of the program, possibly in a pre-made poster defining the goals in their language.

Eliminate parts C (Setting Group Guidelines) and D (Good Communication), incorporate this information into the introduction and offer optional speaking points for instructors who feel they may need to cover this information in more detail.

Step B (25-30 minutes):

This part would remain intact from original curriculum. Allow approximately 15 minutes for students to draw their vision of a safe community and allow 15 minutes for discussion and reporting of each group's ideas. Point out that any instructors who have more than 35 minutes per class may expand the drawing session time. Incorporating a method for effective problem solving is something that was seen as needed in this curriculum. In order to teach the skill of problem solving, it was suggested that the instructor outline the S.A.R.A. model here for future use.

Class Period Two – Introducing the Roadmap

Step A (35 minutes):

Review picture from last time and introduce the road map and planning process. Bring up action project for the first time. Use the pictures from the first class period to fill in the road map focusing on what things prevent individuals from having this ideal community. Discuss what can be done by the students to solve these problems and work towards the goals in the drawings, thinking of a possible action project. Begin very broadly at this point so students are able to narrow down ideas and work towards an action project or solution that is doable.

Class Period Three – Crime in the Community

This class period was originally designed as beginning with a brief discussion where students come up with a list of different crimes that create harm in their community (posted on flip chart or board), narrow that down to five crimes and have the class vote on the two that are most important. Teacher would then continue through the activity laying out how these particular crimes are harmful to the community. Then the class would discuss any costs/benefits of committing this crime. There was lengthy conversation regarding the time it would take to come up with a list of crimes, vote on the two most important and then go through the discussion. Several ideas were considered such as including a pre-made list of crimes in the curriculum; however these crimes may not resonate with the students as problems in their individual community. It was decided that students would go back to the vision of a safe community picture from the previous class period and focus on what behaviors made their community not safe and use these things for the exercise.

Another concern was that this exercise eliminated the discussion regarding crime definitions, something that was seen as important to this lesson. As a result, a brief discussion of official definitions of the crimes the class could discuss was incorporated. There was also a concern about discussing the possible benefits of these crimes with students of this age. As a result of these concerns, the class period was structured as follows:

Step A (15 minutes):

Briefly discuss some of the things students came up with in the drawing a safe community exercise from class one, focusing on what behaviors would make a community not safe. Tie in a brief discussion on the official definitions of these crimes.

Step B: (20 minutes):

Pick two of the crimes discussed above that students feel are most important or serious. Teacher takes one of the crimes and guides a discussion on how this crime is harmful to the community. Make sure to cover the following aspects if applicable:

- harm to individual victims
- family of victims
- to bystanders or observers
- to environment either physical, neighborhood, or school etc.
- to the employment sector
- to community resources like public health, criminal justice system, community well-being, taxpayers

Discuss with the class (maybe write on flip chart) the costs of each of these crimes, focusing on costs to the individual committing the crime and the costs to their family, victims, community etc.

Class Period Four – Crime in the Community Continued

This class period is a continuation of the previous class period.

Step A (5 minutes):

Begin with a brief recap of previous lesson, reminding students of the things discussed (bring out flip charts from previous class).

Step B (30 minutes):

Break into small groups and work through same exercise as above using the second crime. Answering the same questions about in what ways this crime is harmful and why do people do this. Assign one member of each group to record answers.

Report back to larger group and share what was recorded in individual groups.

Reflection: Make sure to emphasize that the benefits are to the individual and the costs are to the community. Begin a general discussion about what can be done to reduce the harm and destructiveness of these crimes. Think of this in terms of a potential action project.

Class Period Five – Peer Resistance Skills

Step A (35 minutes):

Peer resistance skills, discuss prevalence of crime, risk factors such as age, gender, peer influence, and self-control. This class period was added later after it was discussed that introducing peer avoidance skills would be a very beneficial topic to cover in this curriculum. This topic would directly link to the discussion about impulse control that is taught later in the program.

Class Period Six – Victimization

This class period was originally seen as an opportunity to focus on risky situations, avoidance skills, and decision making skills given that these things had not been addressed in much detail thus far. It was pointed out that there are many ideas and activities in volume two that could be incorporated here such as stay safe crime prevention tips. The directory of resources available to students was brought up as something that is considered valuable to have, but could be done ahead of time and just used as a handout to save time. Introducing the concept of the S.A.R.A. model is discussed here, but ultimately included in the first lesson. See dialogue above. NCPC has incorporated the S.A.R.A. model in their Youth Safety Corps program.

Step A (10 minutes):

What is victimization? Discuss types of victimization, how teens are at high risk of being victimized, etc.

Step B (25 minutes):

Strategies to reduce victimization, how to stay safe, avoiding risky situations. This part is not currently in the curriculum.

Class Period Seven – Victim Services and Empathy

Step A (10 minutes):

Services available to victims of crime, especially in the student's community. Possibly hand out the directory of services card that is part of the original lesson six, pre-made.

Step B (10-15 minutes):

Empathy for victims of crime, providing help to victims, Angela's story. Possibly incorporate this into action project.

Step C (15 minutes):

How to educate others on strategies to reduce victimization. The skills this program seeks to address were outlined as decision making, empathy, problem solving, conflict resolution, reasoning skills, and impulse control. There was concern raised about how these skills were specifically going to be taught. Some of the later lessons incorporate these skill building approaches and were moved forward in the curriculum to assist with this.

Class Period Eight – Conflict Resolution

Step A (5 minutes):

Use original lesson seven, step A number two. Explains the purpose of the lesson.

Step B (30 minutes):

From original lesson 7, Step B "What Do You Think?" and Step C "Triggers". This lesson's content will be continued in the next class period.

Class Period Nine – Managing Anger

Step A (35 minutes):

From original lesson 7, Step E “Managing Anger” except replace CHILL drill with something else or bring in a CRP or school counselor.

The elimination of the warm up exercises at the beginning of each lesson was discussed, and while most of the exercises in the warm-ups were determined to take up too much time and deemed not necessary, it was suggested that each class period begin with a very brief re-cap of the previous class period work to bring the students up to speed.

These revised lessons draw heavily on the original content of lesson seven. In original discussions, these four periods (class periods eight, nine, ten and eleven) were designed as two periods, however after consideration these periods were separated into four classes. One reason for this was that through classroom observations it was found that many classes did not get through some steps in an entire class period, let alone having time to cover an entire lesson. These skills were deemed as valuable skills to reinforce (conflict resolution, managing anger) by incorporating role plays and allowing for additional time.

Class Period Ten – Conflict Styles #1

Step A (35 minutes):

From original lesson 7, Step D “Conflict Styles” should be kept as is, except change the verbiage of uses and limits on handout to pros and cons or advantages or

disadvantages. Make sure to discuss legal ramifications of conflict. Also change roman numerals in handout 3 to actual style names. Possibly end with M&M challenge.

It was noted that a lot of time is spent on the uses and limits section of this exercise, mainly because of some confusion surrounding the terms “uses” and “limits”. It was recommended to change those terms to “pros” and “cons” to help this exercise flow better.

Adding legal ramifications to this lesson was suggested and agreed upon by many group members. It was noted that the curriculum should make sure that instructors discuss the legal ramifications of conflict when discussing the other “cons”.

The M&M challenge was recommended as an end to this class period because it seems most students enjoy it and it helps to reinforce the curriculum.

Class Period Eleven – Conflict Styles #2

Step A (35 minutes):

Practical application of conflict styles and problem solving. Generate role play scenarios that are applicable to student real life situations, including common experiences to which everyone can relate. Then move in next class to acting out and how this applies to victimization.

Class Period Twelve – Conflict Resolution Role Plays

Step A (35 minutes):

Finish and act out the different role play scenarios generated in previous class. Practice different conflict situations, getting to a win/win. Maybe incorporate bullying scenarios from volume two.

The role plays were added in place of discussing the different conflict styles in detail. It was agreed that discussing the different conflict styles was not very beneficial for how much time it took to complete in the original section. The role play scenarios were determined to be more valuable in reinforcing the skills taught in these lessons.

It was stressed that the role plays that are intended to provide practice of the different conflict situations must revolve around victimization. In the old curriculum, the role plays did not incorporate victimization. It was suggested that the bullying vignettes from volume two be incorporated here so that the students can act out real life situations to develop the skills taught in this lesson. Because of the importance placed on practicing these real life conflict situations, an entire class was dedicated to the conflict resolution role plays. It was also mentioned that the curriculum should give enough latitude for the instructor to respond to the structural layout of the class and class dynamics.

Class Period Thirteen – Action Planning #1

Step A (35 minutes):

Use original Step B from lesson 4. Students list their ideas on what it takes to make their vision a reality. Go back to roadmap and the list/chart of problems in their school or community. Create a chart that lists ideas, obstacles, and resources and through a process of elimination, pick an action project based on resources needed and obstacles. The instructor would demonstrate this process and then break into small groups and continue the process. Each group would take one idea to go through.

Class Period Fourteen – Action Planning #2

Step A (35 minutes):

Decide on final class action project. Begin to get into detail of what project would entail. Identify what resources would be needed, assign responsibilities, and create a timeline.

Class Period Fifteen – Action Planning #3

Step A (35 minutes):

This class period is dedicated to project planning and development. Give the students an opportunity to create the project if possible or allow instructor to make additional arrangements to complete project if they want to.

There was much discussion on what types of action projects could be completed in three class periods. A list of small, medium and large scale action projects is provided in the trainings giving instructors ideas to use when planning the project. Ultimately it was decided that the students should play an integral part in coming up with what the action project is and how it should be carried out.

The idea arose that those classes that have an extra semester or extra time could potentially develop a large scale project. This was the idea of the Youth Safety Corps, an add-on for those who went through the CW program; however it was discovered that most individuals either taught CW or Youth Safety Corps, but not both. This in addition to discussions with evaluators led to NCPC dropping Youth Safety Corps as a booster to the CW program.

It was suggested that the roadmap development over the course of the program will replace the journaling process. In addition to the big main roadmap, each student will have their own individual roadmap they are filling in along with the class.

Class Period Sixteen – Reflection and Wrap-Up

Final component would be coming back together and evaluating the project, what they did, how successful they were, what they could have done differently.

*After the lessons were detailed and written on a flip chart, discussion centered on the skills that were being taught in this curriculum. It was noted that there were not many lessons that addressed objective 4, risky situations/lifestyles choices. It was suggested that the activity in the peer refusal skills lesson could help to reinforce that objective.

It was also noted that there are many lessons that address conflict resolution (5 class periods) and not very many that address peer resistance (1 class period). The content may not be adequately reflected in the lesson titles, as some of the “conflict resolution” lessons do incorporate impulse control and empathy.

The idea of adding the bullying lesson from volume two into the main curriculum was addressed since that lesson was a favorite for instructors. It was pointed out that this lesson develops empathy and discusses the role of the bystander in victimization and what can be done. Ultimately it was agreed upon that instead of incorporating a stand alone lesson for the bullying topic, it would be better to incorporate elements of it throughout the other lessons in the form of scenarios etc.

Another lesson from volume two that was discussed as a favorite was the diversity lesson. Many instructors used this lesson as a supplement to the original curriculum and agreed that it was a beneficial lesson for the students. Many felt that this lesson helped to facilitate discussion about some common misconceptions about prejudice. It was stated that hate and bias crimes are not common in this age group and these things are not major risk factors for delinquency and victimization, however it may be useful to incorporate some of this into the various vignettes.

Some suggestions were made as to the critical things that could be done to help this new curriculum succeed. The current trainings style was discussed. It was explained that the current trainings spend the entire second day on modeling and teach-backs, however some suggested that if the new lessons are to be done in 35 minutes then the trainings must model the lessons in 35 minutes. The skills development portion was also discussed, and it was reiterated that the skill development portion of the program is the aspect that is most likely to ensure that the program makes a difference.

In closing, the topic of implementation and training arose. It was suggested that NCPC market this program as these 16 lessons detailed over the past few days. Be sure to express that these 16 lessons are the CW program and if a site cannot commit to implementing a program of this scale, perhaps a different program would suit them better. It was recommended that the trainings spend more time up-front discussing what the program is designed to achieve and how implementation is crucial to seeing results. Trainings should introduce the goals and objectives up-front, discuss the research behind them and explain how important it is to follow the curriculum so that these goals and objectives are being accomplished.

Following this conversation the idea of providing a fully scripted curriculum was introduced. This could help teachers who feel intimidated by the curriculum follow at least a baseline version of the program. A scripted version of the curriculum was retained as a likely possibility for NCPC.

Another suggestion was made to address the issue of implementation by instructors. Developing an implementation instrument or having a team of individuals visit classrooms in the same manner as the evaluation team did would help NCPC have an idea of how the program is being implemented in different schools.

APPENDIX C: MEETING AGENDAS

Community Works Meeting Agenda – Phoenix, Thursday April 26, 2007

- 1) Introductions:
 - a. Meet and Greet-Introductions
 - b. Intro to why we are here
 - c. Process Evaluation, Outcome Evaluation, Evaluation Redesign.
 - d. Outline of things we hope to accomplish with this meeting.
 - i. Understanding of each site in terms of history of program, extent of program implementation, and any unique issues
 - ii. Reasons for selecting CW for their schools, their goals for program
 - iii. Issues (both positive and negative) associated with the program delivery
 - iv. Recommendations for the evaluation team and NCPC
- 2) History of CW at each site
 - a. When and why was CW selected?
 - b. Who was responsible for selecting CW?
 - c. Was there a planning group?
 - d. Support from school administration? District?
 - e. Relationship with NCPC &/or Expansion Center?
- 3) What were/are your goals for the program?
 - a. What did you want out of the program?
 - b. Do you think the program achieved its goals?
 - c. Do you think the program can achieve your goals?
 - d. How do you measure your program goals?
 - e. What was your experience with the program?
 - f. Have things changed since our evaluation in AY 2004-05?
 - g. Evaluation is static – that is, restricted to the way things were at time of sampling.
- 4) What were the goals of the CW developers?
 - a. TJ – review NCPC stated goals in various publications
 - b. What is the overlap between NCPC and implementers' goals?
- 5) Community Works Curriculum
 - a. Review the idea of a skills building approach.
 - b. The curriculum is designed with this in mind
 - c. Core 8 – extent to which taught in order & comprehensively? Is this necessary?
 - d. Action Project – how often implemented? Student initiated? CRP involvement? Examples of APs?

- e. Community Resource People – what role & frequency of use?
- 6) Outcome Results-
- a. Brad & TJ - What goals/objectives did we measure? How did we measure it? State hypotheses, explain what results would be expected if program had desired effect. Mention design if not covered earlier – i.e., treatment and control groups.
 - b. Show three graphs. Ask what they mean and then state what they mean.
- 7) Program Fidelity
- a. What is it? Dosage, Adherence, Quality
 - b. Why is it important? Program failure or implementation failure?
 - c. What have other school-based researchers found?
 - d. Barriers to implementation - Chris
- 8) How did we measure program fidelity?
- a. Observations - Chris
 - b. Implementer Surveys - Karin
 - c. Results - Chris
 - d. How does the information we learned at this meeting jive with what our conclusions were?

Friday April 27, 2007

- 9) Review
- a. What we reviewed yesterday
 - b. CW provided a roadmap to achieve their goals
 - c. Program did not reach its' desired goals
 - d. What are some possible explanations? - CW was developed as a skills building program – inclusion of many activities and interactive learning. Not a focus on information dissemination
 - e. Disconnect between CW curriculum writers' and NCPC trainers' understanding of flexibility
- 10) Community Works Training
- a. Review the content of training
 - b. What was your experience with training?
 - c. Likes/dislikes
- 11) Recommendations - what should CW developers know about their program?
- a. CW curriculum
 - b. Implementation issues
 - c. CW training/TA
 - d. Anything else?

Agenda for June 29, 2007 Community Works Meeting
Fox Valley Technical College DC Office (FVTC DCO),
410 9th Street, NW, Suite 630, Washington, DC 20004
(202) 347-5610.

Meeting Agenda:

- 9:00 – Introductions and meeting overview
- 9:20 – History of Congressional Earmark evaluations
- 9:45 – Break
- 10:00 – Overview of evaluation results
 - site selection
 - training and technical assistance
 - program implementation
 - outcome results
- 11:00 – Break
- 11:10 – Discussion of evaluation results
- 12:00 – Lunch
- 1:00 – Redesign of the evaluation
 - implementation failure
 - curriculum review
 - proposed reports
 - meeting with program implementers
- 2:15 – Break
- 2:30 – Where do we go from here
- 4:00 – Adjourn

Agenda for January 17 – 18, 2008 Community Works Meeting
Holiday Inn Hotel & Suites,
Mesa, AZ
480-610-4322

Thursday Meeting Agenda:

8:30 – Introductions and meeting overview

9:00 – NCPC presentation by Jim Wright and Lori Brittain

- history of the earmark and annual and total budget; budget information in terms of where the money goes (how much spent on staff, training, etc.);
- organizational structure, especially in terms of where CW fits into NCPC organization (who does what and who reports to whom?)
- role of the expansion centers and their budgets and accountability; and,
- last but by no means least, a delineation of the goals of CW (what is it that NCPC hopes to achieve through the offering of this program?)

10:30 – Break

10:45 – Some more interesting results from the evaluation and moving forward with the curriculum review

12:00 – Lunch

1:00 – 5:00 – Review and critique of Lessons 1 - 4

Group dinner for those interested.

Friday Meeting Agenda:

8:30 – 3:30 – Continue with review of lessons (Lesson 5 – 8 and AP, if time permits)

Lunch Break at convenient time

Agenda for March 27 – 28, 2008
Marriott Crystal City at the Airport

Thursday March 27, 2008

7:30 am - Continental Breakfast

8:00 – Review of progress to date, meeting overview, and discussion of action project

9:15 – Break

9:30 – Work groups and report back to larger group (Lessons 1 – 3)

11:45 – Break for Lunch

1:00 – Work groups and report back to larger group (Lessons 4, 6, 7)

3:30 – Wrap-up

Friday March 28, 2008

7:30 am - Continental Breakfast

8:00 – Review of progress from Thursday

8:30 – Work groups and report back to larger group (Lesson 8 and Action Project)

11:45 – Break for Lunch

1:00 – Work groups (Training Issues)

3:30 – Wrap-up

Work Groups

Group A:

Brad, Cathy, Denise, Lori, Rudy

Group B:

Cheryl, Jim, Melissa, Sara, TJ

Group C:

Chris, Dana, David, John, Winnie