CGR

Research to drive informed decisions.
Expertise to create effective solutions.

A COMPREHENSIVE FRAMEWORK FOR YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION:
SOME PROMISING INITIATIVES

Prepared for:
City of Rochester

Donald E. Pryor
Project Director

37 South Washington Street
Rochester, NY 14608-2091
(716) 325-6360

826 Broadway 9th Floor
New York, NY 10003-4826
(212) 505-9648

www.cgr.org

June, 2000

A COMPREHENSIVE FRAMEWORK FOR YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION:

SOME PROMISING INITIATIVES

June, 2000

SUMMARY

The unfortunate exception to a general downturn in violent crime is an unprecedented upsurge in violence among youth. As in many cities across America, the City of Rochester has been engaged in efforts to understand juvenile violence and to identify policies that will help prevent or reduce it. The City hired CGR to conduct a nation-wide literature search on anti-violence programs that are in operation, identify those that have demonstrated a reduction in juvenile crime, and determine which of those have the potential to work locally.

In addition to describing nine most promising models that have been tested and found effective in other communities, CGR provides a generic best-practice framework for a comprehensive approach to violence prevention both within schools and in the community.

The demonstrated models found through our literature search are:

- Elementary School
  - 1) PATHS Model;
- Middle School
  - 2) Life Skills Training Model
- High School
  - 3) Quantum Opportunities Program Model
- School-wide
  - 4) Project ACHIEVE
  - 5) Resolving Conflicts Creatively Program Model

- Youth-Focused Initiatives
  - 6) Big Brothers Big Sisters of America Program
- Family-Focused Strategies
  - 7) Functional Family Therapy Model
  - 8) Multisystemic Therapy Model
- Community-Based Response
  - 9) Youth Violence: A Community-Based Response – Boston's Success Story

Our research indicated that there are many different ways to teach young people to avoid violence. While it appears logical that any violence prevention solution should be tailored to each school and its neighborhood in addition to families, the most important stakeholders – the youth – are often excluded from the process of developing policies and approaches that define any solution. *Therefore, as our community seeks to further expand and enhance its youth violence prevention efforts, it is imperative to solicit youth input in any discussion to prevent violence and seek their buy-in to any new programs that are being developed and implemented.*

Contributing Staff

Shalini Sarin, Principal Researcher and Report Author

Susan Sauers, Research Associate

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Gladys Santiago, Vice President, Rochester City Council
Brian F. Curran, Councilmember at Large, Rochester City Council
Richard Hannon, Budget Director, City of Rochester
Earl Issac, Ex-xavier Holiday and Ray Mayolitz from Pathways to Peace, along with Craig Waleed from Camp Good Days and Special Times, conducted outreach for youth to participate in the focus groups.

Staff Team

CGR's Senior Research Associate David Bond and Research Assistant Jaclyn Boushie helped facilitate the youth focus groups.

I. INTRODUCTION

The unfortunate exception to a general downturn in violent crime is the unprecedented upsurge in violence among youth. Violent crimes committed by juveniles aged 10 to 17 increased substantially during the 1980s and were still growing early in this decade according to a 1991 Federal Bureau of Investigation report. The U.S. Department of Justice Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention's 1996 report further confirmed that youth violence has continued to grow steadily since this earlier report (ACLU 1997). The growing use of firearms to settle disputes and high profile incidents such as school shootings serves to keep the problem of juvenile violence at the forefront of national attention.

As in most cities across America, the City of Rochester has been engaged in efforts to understand juvenile violence and to identify policies that will help prevent or reduce it. In 1998 the City collaborated with other governmental agencies to launch the City of Rochester's Youth Violence Initiative to reduce youth violence by tracking four key measures: homicide, robbery, serious assault, and criminal possession of a weapon. The Initiative includes programs such as Ceasefire, Pathways to Peace, Operation Nightwatch, Aftercare Services, Project Exile, Juvenile Prosecutorial Efforts, School Resource Officers, and Truancy Intervention. In the following year, City Council also passed an amendment to the FY 2000 City Budget for an Anti-Violence Education Initiative (Ordinance No. 99-203). The primary goal of this amendment was to develop a systematic approach for spreading the message about the consequences of and alternatives to violence.

The City of Rochester engaged CGR (Center for Governmental Research Inc.) to conduct a literature search on anti-violence programs that are in operation in other communities around the country, identify those that have demonstrated a reduction in or deterrence of juvenile crime, and determine which of these have the potential to work locally. CGR was to obtain feedback on feasibility, acceptance, and potential pitfalls concerning the most

promising program operations, including input obtained via focus groups with Rochester youth.

The report is organized as follows: in the next chapter we present research that details the characteristics and patterns of at-risk juveniles, followed by a discussion in Chapter III on the increasing importance of evaluation research in reducing youth violence. Chapters IV and V detail a comprehensive framework for a community-wide and school-based violence prevention approach. In Chapter VI, we present age and population specific demonstrated model programs that may be replicable in the City of Rochester. The Chapter VII details our findings from the youth focus groups we conducted, and the final chapter presents our overall conclusions and recommendations. Appendix A provides the names and contact points of the most promising youth violence prevention models that we came across in our research, and Appendix B presents the bibliographic references used in our literature search.

II. Characteristics and Patterns of At-Risk Juveniles

The risk that an adolescent will become involved in violent offending and/or be a victim of violence varies based on a variety of factors, including individual characteristics, family characteristics, peer and school influences, neighborhood environment, and daily activities. Some of the key areas of risk identified in a child's life include:

Perinatal Risk and Temperament

Prebirth and newborn prenatal difficulties are statistically related to increases in crime in later life. A retrospective study of over 4,000 children conducted by Raine, Brennan, and Mednick (1994) found a link between various birth complications (combined with ratings of maternal rejection at age one) and violent criminal acts at age 18. Kandel and Mednick (1991) have also found an association between low birth-weight, number of delivery complications, and birth trauma with violent behavior. Finally, Moffitt (1990) contends that birth complications can lead to certain neurological and neuropsychological deficits that enhance a person's propensity to engage in violent behavior.

Intelligence and School Achievement

Limited intelligence and low levels of achievement in school have been found to predict aggressive and violent behaviors. For instance, low verbal intelligence has been documented to have a correlation with risk for aggression and violence (Eron and Huesmann 1993). Similarly, low IQ has been found to be associated with youth delinquency, regardless of an individual's demographics like ethnicity, family size, or economic status (Rowe 1994). Further, children who perform poorly at school are more likely to be truant or stop attending school altogether (Carins, Carins, and Neckerman 1989). Conversely, delinquent behavior, even in early adolescence, can be traced to lack of attachment to school (Vazsonyi and Flannery, in press). When not attending school, truant youth tend to hang out with other school drop-outs who have been actively rejected by many of their peers, providing a fertile ground for engaging in delinquent and aggressive behavior (Patterson, Reid, and Dishion 1992).

Demographic Characteristics

Juvenile violence studies report that the perpetrators as well as the victims of violent offenses are overwhelmingly male. Increasingly, however, females are engaging in violent behavior as well. Report to Congress on Juvenile Violence Research (1999) documents that "at age 13, females reported slightly higher rates of violent behavior than males", and that "many juveniles who become involved in violent behavior begin doing so by age 15."

Juvenile violence is causing serious problems among minority communities, particularly among urban African-Americans and Hispanics. Hawkins, Herrenkohl, Farrington, Brewer, Catalano, and Harachi (1998) link the disproportionately high rates of urban violence with "a combination of macro-level risk factors, such as poverty and joblessness, and individual risk factors such as family disruption," (Report to Congress on Juvenile Violence Research 1999).

Domestic Violence

Adolescents who have repeatedly witnessed violence at home while growing up are more likely to engage in similar behaviors themselves. A study conducted by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention found that 70% of adolescents living in families with dysfunctional parental relationships self-reported violent delinquency, compared to 49% of adolescents from households without such problems. The same study also showed that the risk of self-reported youth violence doubles when a child is exposed to a family climate of hostility or multiple forms of violence including domestic violence and child abuse. In addition, such a child is at greater risk of attempting suicide, abusing drugs and alcohol, running away from home, and engaging in teenage prostitution, or other delinquent behaviors (Carter 1999).

Media Violence

Media violence has been implicated as a contributor to the impressions and opinions children carry with them throughout their lives. A 1994 report entitled "Protecting our Schools" published by the California School Boards Association, suggests that "Violence is woven into the cultural fabric of American society…Our folk heroes and media images…often glorify interpersonal violence on an individual and personal level." The same study also found that "Children view more than 8,000 murders and hundreds of thousands of acts of violence on television by the time they have reached eighth grade. Video

games, computer software and interactive video, song lyrics, comic books and movies appear to be more graphic and violent." Mediascope (1996), while analyzing the extent of violence on commercial and public television, concludes that more than two-thirds of all violence in children's programs is portrayed in a humorous context and that only 1 out of 20 acts of violence depict their long-term, negative consequences.

APA (1993) (see also Derksen and Strasburger 1996 and Gerbner and Singorielli 1990) has suggested a strong association between exposure to media violence and a child's risk of engaging in aggressive and sometimes violent behavior. Flannery (1997) cites three main effects of children being exposed to violence in the media. "First, children who are exposed to high levels of media violence are more accepting of aggressive attitudes and, after watching, behave more aggressively with peers…Second, more chronic and long-term exposure to violence can lead to desensitization to violence and its consequences…Third, children who watch a lot of violence on television seem to develop a 'mean world syndrome'," increasing their "fear of becoming a victim of violence because they come to view the world as a mean and dangerous place which increases their felt need to protect themselves and to be mistrustful of others," (Flannery 1997). What is fantasy in the media may sometimes become indistinguishable from reality for younger children who come to view violence as a quick and effective way to end confrontations without negotiation or compromise (Sege and Dietz 1994).

Accessibility of Firearms

An alarmingly high proportion of youth report that they can procure firearms in the community in a day or less. In addition, the relatively low cost of these weapons compounds the gravity of the situation. Guns can be purchased for less than $50 – called Saturday Night Specials - and even those that cost up to $200 are perceived to be affordable by youth in poor communities. Armed youth, by their own admission, explain the reasons for buying firearms either because it is a behavioral norm or to protect themselves from "perceived dangers in their communities – especially the threat of violence as they go to or from school and gang-related threats" (ACLU 1997).

Gangs

The increasing violence in their community propels youth to seek protection of gang membership. A report by the California Department of Education contends that, "Gangs provide protection and safety. A youth may believe that personal survival depends on joining the neighborhood gang." Other factors that compound gang activity are the absence of parental supervision and increased disciplinary actions by school authorities. Together, these factors lead to the release of unsupervised adolescents into the community during schools hours.

Schools not only provide children exposure to gang activity (Embry, Flannery, Vazsonyi, Powell and Atha 1996) but also, at times, settings for gang recruitment (Walker, Colvin and Ramsey 1995). Further, since gang affiliation is often associated with certain types or colors of clothing, children, regardless of grade level, race, or gender concur that wearing certain types of clothing can put them at risk of experiencing violence at or near school (ACLU 1997).

The general age range for gang membership is between 14 and 24, with 17 being the peak age. Some research has found evidence that, children as young as 8 could be involved in gangs or have a desire to hang out with them (Huff 1996).

The racial and ethnic composition of gangs has changed significantly over time. Till the 1950s, gangs in the US were mostly white, representing various European backgrounds. By the 1970s, African-Americans and Hispanics constituted an estimated 80 percent of all gang members, with an increasing emergence of Asian groups in the last few years. Howell (1994) has suggested that gang members have traditionally - and continue to be - comprised of recently migrated youth and those of lower socioeconomic status.

School Risk Factors

When high levels of violent behavior exist among youth in a community, some of that violence tends to be played out in and around schools (Sheley, McGee, & Wright 1992). Curcio & First (1993) concur that "They bring their weapons, drugs, grudges, problems, anger, and potential for danger to schools with them when they come. They mingle there with other children – some who skirt on the edge of danger themselves and some who have

been victims rather than perpetrators of violence, both inside and outside the school gates."

Schools have responded to increased violence on and around their premises in controversial ways. Noguera (1995) suggests that historical preoccupation with control has limited the ability of schools and administrators to respond creatively to crisis created by violence and disorder. Reacting to the upsurge in gang violence, racial conflict, and intentional (most notably drive-by) shootings, schools have beefed up security through the use of metal detectors, close-circuit monitoring, and spot-checks. These strategies are based on the premise that "the best way to reduce violence is to identify students with the potential for committing acts of violence, and to exclude them from the rest of the population," (Flannery 1997). Not surprisingly, this has led to a perception that schools are prison-like facilities or combat zones. Noguera (1995) exhorts schools to find ways to create more humane learning environments in order to make school personnel and students feel less alienated, threatened and repressed.

Several factors explain the decline in school safety. First, given that school funding is driven by daily average attendance rates, schools are focusing more on attendance and less on their expectations regarding student behavior. Second, school personnel are becoming increasingly isolated from the students and neighborhoods they serve. This condition is further exacerbated by fear. Quite naturally, order and discipline is compromised when teachers are afraid of their students or are uncomfortable in their workplace. Additional factors conducive to disorder, crime, and violence at school are summarized by Flannery (1997) as "…a) overcrowding; b) high student/teacher ratios; c) insufficient curricula/course relevance; combined with d) low student academic achievement and apathy; e) poor facilities design and portable buildings that both increase isolation and hamper internal communication; and, f) adult failure to act because they improperly identify potentially inflammatory situations, are reluctant to admit to problems, believe nothing will work, or simply do not know what to do."

According to the ACLU 1997 report, "The backdrop of violence in communities where young people live can have detrimental

effects not only on the safety of youth, but also on their psychological and emotional development and well-being." Hearings held by the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency in 1975 conclude that the fear of crime and violence is more crippling educationally and socially than the actual acts themselves. This fear may lower education quality through reducing time-on-task; teachers and staff refraining from staying after school to work with students; teachers and staff becoming less outgoing and demanding greater assurances of physical safety; unruly and deviant behaviors tending to become more tolerated; and any respect for authority being lost when youngsters discover that adults in schools are unable to control events (ACLU 1997). This perceived lack of control among school authorities can lead students to believe that this inability also exists in the community at large. "Thus, unchecked violence in schools permeates to the surrounding community, and the community becomes infected with youth-perpetrated crime," (ACLU 1997).

Finding solutions to the challenges presented in the above analysis is neither simple nor easy. Moreover, historical attempts at quick fixes and dependence on approaches that lack any empirical evidence on effectiveness have also not helped ameliorate the increasing concerns surrounding youth violence. The factors outlined above in combination with resource constraints necessitate a change in strategy. The next chapter of this report discusses the key role of evaluation research in effectively addressing youth violence.

III. The Role of Evaluation Research in Reducing Youth Violence

In an era of scarce resources, schools and other organizations will be less likely to receive "entitlement" money to spearhead provision of programs and services without clear evidence that these programs are effective, efficient, and cost-beneficial. Modzelski (1996) concludes that one of the main reasons why Congress has reduced funding for drug and violence prevention programs in schools is the lack of outcome effectiveness data. Therefore, it appears that prior to implementing any long-term violence prevention program, it is vital to have a framework for program evaluation in place. The intent of having such an evaluation tool is to determine which efforts merit further consideration.

Criteria for Evaluating a Program for Effectiveness

The University of Colorado in Boulder has established a juvenile violence program review division at its Center for Study and Prevention of Violence called Blueprints Program Review. Blueprints evaluates each program against a set of evaluation standards before designating a program as "Model" or "Promising." Admittedly, the selection criteria set a very high standard – one that has proven difficult to meet – but they allow communities to replicate these programs in the confidence that they will be effective in deterring violence. The criteria presented below are excerpted from the University of Colorado's Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence website: http://www.colorado.edu/cspv. CGR recommends that the City adopt these stringent Blueprints criteria in deciding whether to locally implement a program that has been effective in another community.

For a program to be designated ***"Model"*** by Blueprints it must meet the following criteria:

1. Strong Research Design. Experimental designs with random assignment provide the greatest level of confidence in evaluation findings. Two other design elements are also considered essential for a strong research design. They are low rates of participant attrition and adequate measurement. Attrition

may be indicative of problems in program implementation, and it can compromise the integrity of the randomization process and claim of experimental control-group equivalence. Measurement issues include the reliability and validity of the study measures, including the outcome measure, and the quality, consistency, and timing of their administration to program participants.

2. Evidence of Significant Prevention or Deterrent Effects. This is an obvious minimal criterion for claiming program effectiveness. Relatively few programs have demonstrated effectiveness in reducing the onset, prevalence or individual offending rates of violent behavior. Evidence of deterrent effects for delinquency, drug use, and/or violence can be accepted as evidence of program effectiveness. Both primary and secondary prevention effects - i.e., reductions in the onset of violence, delinquency or drug use compared to control groups and pre-post reductions in offending rates compared to control groups - meet this criterion.

3. Multiple Site Replication. Replication is an important element in establishing program effectiveness. It establishes the robustness of the program, its prevention effects and its exportability to new sites. Adequate procedures for monitoring the integrity of implementation must be in place and this can be established only through actual experiences with replications.

4. Sustained Effects. A number of programs have demonstrated initial successes in deterring delinquency, drug use, and violence during the course of treatment. This selection criterion requires that these short-term effects be sustained beyond treatment or participation in the designed intervention.

As stated earlier, these standards for program selection are very high, and not all programs will meet all four individual standards. Programs or interventions that come closest to meeting these standards are the ones that should be selected.

Programs that do not fit all the criteria for a "Model" program may be designated as ***"Promising."*** Promising programs have demonstrated quantitative effects on one or more of the following outcome variables: delinquency/crime, violence, drug use, and pre-delinquent aggression. Promising programs have a good

experimental or quasi-experimental (with control group) design. Programs that have not yet demonstrated their long-term effects remain in the Promising category. Promising programs can be single site, unreplicated projects or have a small effect on outcome measures.

Benchmarking Data for Evaluation

In order to conclusively determine that a program is effective, outcome data or evidence of sustained deterrent effects are needed. Reproduced below are three components that Flannery (1997) suggests must be considered in any evaluation in order to make the results more readily interpretable and valid.

1. **Collect outcome data before the intervention is implemented.** This information provides a baseline of youth behavior from which change can later be determined.

2. **Include in the assessments, whenever possible, a comparison group of youth who are not exposed to the intervention.** A comparison group (preferably very similar to the students in the intervention with respect to gender, age, risk status, etc.) will allow a determination of whether and how the intervention is effective for children in the program as opposed to those not in the program.

3. **Random assignment of children to treatment or control groups.** This is most difficult to achieve, both practically and ethically, and may not be possible in most "real world" situations. Random assignment of two equally deserving children with similar assessments provides the strongest evidence that it was the treatment that caused any observed differences in the child's outcome. One strategy that has been used successfully to address this issue is to randomly assign children to treatment and control groups at the beginning of the evaluation, with a provision to eventually provide the same treatment to the controls.

Data Collection

How can data be collected at low cost and effort? One potential source of information could be self-reports by students, parents, or teachers. With increasing attention being given to protecting human subjects, particularly minors, it will become more and more difficult to gather this data. Schools, law enforcement agencies, and the juvenile justice system may be other viable sources. Flannery (1997) cites that most schools collect archival data as part

of their daily operations including attendance, grades, conduct ratings on report cards, disciplinary contacts, suspensions, weapons violations, visits to the nurse's office for treatment of injury, and costs of vandalism and property destruction. The author suggests a) number of visits to the principal's office for disciplinary action, and b) observational ratings of aggressive behavior in the classroom, lunchroom, and playground as other data that can be very useful but are not currently recorded. In fact, Walker & Sylwester (1991) hold these measures as two of the most accurate predictors of which young children are at risk of subsequent delinquent behavior and arrest for criminal activity as adolescents.

Data on community crime and the nature of types of contact with youth can also be collected and tracked through the local police department and the juvenile justice system. Collectively all these data can be pooled to construct a comprehensive database that will assist in deciding the kind of intervention that will work best for particular types of youth.

IV. A COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH TO VIOLENCE PREVENTION

As stated in the previous section of our report, resources for juvenile prevention are often scarce and more so without an effective evaluation protocol in place. Knowing how to proceed efficiently is as important as knowing what to do. Whether it is a school-based program working with elementary school-aged children or a community-based program for teenagers outside the school setting, a basic framework should be in place to develop an effective plan. The key is for the plan to be comprehensive – one that is multifaceted, well integrated, addresses a broad range of causal factors and includes all the key stakeholders in the solution process, especially youth.

Violence prevention programs are of many different types. Most programs can be changed to satisfy the specific needs of participants and the communities they live in. A generic best-practice planning model was recently developed by the Hamilton Fish National Institute on School and Community Violence (1999). Their framework given below can be used as a guide to help ensure a planning process that is tailored, comprehensive, effective, dynamic, and draws strength from many different resources. This planning process is sequential as well as iterative in nature.

1. **Unite Schools with Their Communities.** In the effort to prevent juvenile violence, members of the community (families, faith communities, businesses, social service agencies, police, juvenile justice authorities, civic organizations, etc.) and school administrators may share specific information about youth crime, systems for measuring levels of violence, and interpersonal skills for working with youth, among other things. This process will widen the access to funding, volunteers and learning opportunities. School and community partnerships invite multiple perspectives, and this allows for the sharing of responsibility and accomplishments.

2. **Identify and Measure the Problem.** A needs assessment helps a community and its schools determine what its needs are

regarding violence reduction and prevention. Answering several questions first might help a community develop a more effective strategy in the long run. For example: What is the prevalence of violence or victimization at the school or in the neighborhood? What is the impact of violence on child adjustment and mental health and learning? What are the costs of vandalism and discipline problems related to violence in particular schools? What is the extent of gang activity in a school or the community at large? School administrators, teachers, students, parents, law enforcement agencies and community organizations all have different perceptions of juvenile crime. Perceptions tend to converge once objective data are available and shared widely. Collecting data on victimization, perpetration, substance abuse, etc. can help develop consensus, identify areas and points of intervention, assist in gaining resources to deal with problems, and establish benchmarks for subsequent evaluation.

3. Set Goals and Objectives. Goals describe broad purposes and common directions, while objectives are sequential, measurable steps necessary to achieve a goal. Objectives describe "who will do how much of what by when."

4. Identify Appropriate Strategies. This may come into play once a particular set of programs have been identified as suitable for the community. A strategy is considered appropriate when it provides the following: evidence that the strategy has been effective in the past, a match between strategy and objectives, the age-appropriate reading levels of educational materials, and culturally sensitive images, visuals and examples.

5. Implement a Comprehensive Plan. Successful implementation occurs in several stages. In the early stages, program administrators will obtain district approvals, seek community support through a public campaign, select youth for participation, request approval from parents, etc. The later stages address unforeseen barriers, unintended negative consequences of selected strategies, changes in the nature of the problem over time, and the need for adjustments.

6. Measure the Success of the Effort. This answers the question "what changed because of the intervention?" Being clear on what the program is meant to address is essential to measuring

its effectiveness. For example, a substance abuse prevention program may do little to reduce victimization by violence or the perpetration of violence, and teen pregnancy reduction is not violence prevention.

7. **Revise Strategies Based on the Evaluation.** After an evaluation has been completed, administrators may make revisions to correct for unintended negative consequences based on the findings.

The following two action steps are not part of the Hamilton Fish Institute's best-practice model. Flannery (1997) suggests that these two additional action steps will add value to a framework of violence prevention. CGR recommends that they be added on to the previously listed points.

8. **Do a Process Evaluation.** A process evaluation seeks to answer the question "What works best about our program and why does it work?" Is program effectiveness related to quality of teacher and staff training, the number of years an individual has been teaching, strong administration support of the program, scope of the program, or active parent involvement in implementation and support? Parent involvement has been found to consistently impact program success and is therefore often rated as more important that any of the above, even more than the teachers' "buy in" of the program's effectiveness and importance.

9. **Conduct a cost-benefit analysis.** Cost-benefit analysis attempts to address the question "is the program cost-effective?" This may include an assessment of how much the program costs to implement per student or how much the program saves in other related costs, e.g., vandalism.

V. A COMPREHENSIVE FRAMEWORK FOR SCHOOL-BASED VIOLENCE PREVENTION

"The ultimate goal of any school violence prevention program is to create safe and orderly schools," (Making Schools Safe 1999). Christopher Stone (1999) commented that while the level of school violence overall is both low and stable, fear of in-school violence has increased. This could be linked to the increase in percentage of students who have been threatened (Kaufaman, Chen, Choy, Chandler, Chapman, Rand and Ringel 1998) or victimized. For instance, a 1998 National Center for Education Statistics study found that 10 percent of all public schools reported one or more incidents of rape, sexual assault, robbery, or aggravated assault for the 1996-97 school year. Another statistic showed that students in school are more likely to be victims of theft, which accounts for approximately 62 percent of all crime against students (Annual Report on School Safety 1998). Additional research has found that nearly a million students carried a gun during the 1997-98 school year (PRIDE 1998) and that each year, teachers are victims of approximately 18,000 serious violent crimes while in school (Kaufaman et al., 1998).

In light of these facts, it is clear that no community can effectively address the issue of youth violence without targeting schools as part of its solutions. Schools are appropriate settings for an early identification of at-risk youth and house a captive youth audience for consistent periods of time. Therefore, as a subset to a community-wide plan, in this chapter CGR provides a specific framework for establishing school-based violence prevention programs. The Hamilton Fish National Institute on School and Community Violence (1999) article on school violence prevention and the Making Schools Safe brief from the National Governors Association (1999), consistently associate the following, sometimes overlapping, characteristics with promising school-based violence-prevention programs:

1. **An early start and long-term commitment:** based on the understanding that although a child or teenager is not beyond help at any developmental stage, prevention is most effective when it

begins early and is continuously reinforced. This approach focuses on (1) reaching young children to shape attitudes, knowledge and behavior while they are still open to positive influences, and (2) sustaining the intervention over multiple years (e.g., from kindergarten through 12th grade).

2. **A comprehensive approach:** recognizes that violence is a complex problem that requires a multi-faceted approach and aims at including every aspect of the school as well as the surrounding community. These may be broadly categorized as follows:

a) Administrative support in leading the violence prevention effort.

- Accurate monitoring and prompt reporting of serious violent behaviors to the police and parents of students. These data also provide essential information in planning appropriate remedies.

b) Securing the school facility.

- Monitoring all areas of school buildings and grounds;
- Areas students congregate are limited and supervised;
- Staggering class schedules and dismissal times to avoid hallway congestion;
- Facility and grounds have sufficient lighting;
- Low-level landscaping to limit blind spots;
- Limiting roof and window access, closing off areas under stairs, and eliminating drop tile ceilings where weapons can be hidden;
- Restricting access to buildings through enforcing a policy against loitering, requiring identification cards of all students and staff entering the building; limiting handles on exterior doors, and requiring visitor sign-in;

- Random use of metal detectors, alarm systems and surveillance cameras; and

- Providing communication devices to staff to alert administrators and students of security lapses, a crisis response team with clearly delineated duties, a rapid parent notification system, and a single point of contact with the media.

c) School-wide education on violence prevention and reinforcing learning as students progress.

- Curricula-based training in social skills, anger management, danger avoidance, conflict resolution, bullying reduction, drug education, and reporting;

- Age-appropriate learning materials;

- Instituting School Resource Officers to provide law enforcement and law-related counseling and education in addition to providing police visibility;

- Peer mediation; and

- Low teacher/counselor to student ratios.

d) Counseling students about their stresses, fears and experiences.

- Expand counseling services at schools;

- Home visitations;

- Addressing child abuse and neglect; and

- Providing family services to at-risk students.

e) Environmental modification with focus on improving the students' physical and social environment at particular times of the day: before school, at school lunch periods, and after school hours.

- Positive adult interaction/mentoring; and

- Before and after school recreational (especially sports) and academic activities.

f) Providing unique services to violent students, e.g., alternative schools.

- Ensuring that the basic needs of these students are met (housing, family supports, nutrition, health and financial) eliminates barriers to their successful participation in the intervention program.

3. Strong leadership and disciplinary policies: that create an environment conducive to learning, school attachment, and non-violent behavior.

a) Administrator, principal and teacher buy-in is reflected through effective and visible leadership, i.e., caring and knowledgeable adults;

b) Establishing, communicating and enforcing a disciplinary code of conduct – such as zero tolerance policies for weapons – in an effective, consistent and impartial manner; and

c) Encouraging student involvement in formulating violence prevention policies.

4. Staff development: involves providing training for key staff persons to equip them to handle disruptive students and understand and incorporate prevention strategies. It also allows for high quality professional development opportunities for teachers.

5. Parental involvement: Seeks to increase parental involvement in school efforts and use parents as volunteers. Becoming involved also gives parents the opportunity to get to know teachers, child-care providers and coaches to ensure that their children's needs are met when they are not present.

- Offering parents training in parenting and family management.

6. **Interagency partnerships and community linkages:** the hallmark of successful intervention programs. Some examples include:

a) Juvenile justice authorities can assign probation officers and social workers to schools where they can better monitor and serve adjudicated students, and provide stronger and broader sanctions for violent behavior;

b) Increased police visibility (presence or patrolling) in or near schools and in neighborhoods can deter violence and prevent situations from escalating;

c) The business community can be a valuable resource in addressing the issue of school-based violence. They can fund programs and services, facilities for school events, and training programs for job skills; provide internships and jobs for motivated students; and encourage their staff to volunteer at schools by offering them flexible schedules; and

d) Health, social-service, local government, and faith-based organizations can contribute significantly in preventing youth violence.

7. **A culturally sensitive and developmentally appropriate approach:** in designing programs this approach considers (1) racial/ethnic values and norms by using bilingual materials and culturally appropriate program activities, role models and leaders, and (2) participants' age and level of development.

As is clear from the above framework, achieving school safety requires meeting several challenges simultaneously. Uniting concerned adults and youth through a community partnership is an effective means of raising children and teenagers to be happy, responsible citizens. Although difficult, carefully designed comprehensive intervention plans are the best hope of enhancing school safety.

VI. MOST PROMISING MODELS

For many years violence prevention strategies have been based largely on theoretical and ideological assumptions about "what works," in the absence of objective, scientific evidence. The situation is quite different. In this chapter of our report, we present nine age-specific violence prevention models that have been tested and found effective with youth in other communities.

Information on Models 1 through 3 and 6 through 8 was obtained from the University of Colorado's Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence website: http://www.colardo.edu/cspv. Model 4's description has been drawn largely from the quarterly publication of Criminal Justice Policymakers and Practitioners, Policy and Practice, Volume 1, No. 4. Information on Model 5 was taken mainly from a 1995 Senate Subcommittee on Children and Families, School Safety Report. And, Model 9 is excerpted from a brief issued by the Mayor's Public Safety Cabinet in Boston.

Elementary School

1. The PATHS Model

The PATHS (Promoting Alternative THinking Strategies) is a demonstrated model for kindergarten through fifth grade children. The program is designed to promote emotional and social competencies through expression, understanding and regulation of emotions while simultaneously enhancing the educational process in the classroom. Cognitive problem solving skills are also taught. This innovative curriculum is designed for use by educators and counselors in a multi-year, universal prevention model. Although primarily focused on the school and classroom settings, information and activities are also included for use with parents.

In 1997, the PATHS program was identified as one of Blueprints for Violence Prevention 10 model programs that met a high scientific standard of program effectiveness. Listed as "promising" in the National Criminal Justice Association quarterly publication Policy and Practice, PATHS is called a demonstrated model by the Hamilton Fish National Institute on School and Community Violence.

Program Targets:

The PATHS Curriculum was developed for use in a classroom setting with all elementary school-aged children. PATHS has been field-tested and researched in classroom settings, as well as with a variety of special needs students (deaf, hearing-impaired, learning disabled, emotionally disturbed, mildly mentally delayed, and gifted). The main objectives are to improve critical thinking skills, enhance the classroom climate, and prevent violence, aggression and other behavior problems. Currently the PATHS program is used in selected schools in Illinois, Kansas, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Tennessee and Washington state, with new training beginning in New Mexico and New York.

Program Content:

The PATHS Curriculum is taught three times per week for a minimum of 20-30 minutes per day for four semesters and is organized into four separate units. It provides teachers with systematic, developmentally based lessons, materials, and instructions for teaching their students emotional literacy, self-control, social competence, positive peer relations, and interpersonal problem-solving skills. A key objective of promoting these developmental skills is to prevent or reduce behavioral or emotional problems. PATHS lessons include instruction in identifying and labeling feelings, expressing feelings, assessing the intensity of feelings, managing feelings, understanding the differences between feelings and behaviors, delaying gratification, controlling impulses, reducing stress, self-talk, reading and interpreting social cues, understanding the perspective of others, using steps for problem-solving and decision-making, having a positive attitude towards life, self-awareness, nonverbal communication skills, and verbal communication skills. Activities such as story telling, group discussions, role-playing and art are used in the lessons to assist children in recognizing their own feelings and those of others. Teachers receive training in a two- to three-day workshop and in bi-weekly meetings with the curriculum consultant.

Program Outcomes:

The PATHS Curriculum has been shown to improve protective factors and reduce behavioral risk factors. Evaluations have demonstrated significant improvements for program youth (regular education, special needs, and deaf) compared to control youth in the following areas:

- ✓ Improved self control and empathy,
- ✓ Improved understanding and recognition of emotions,
- ✓ Increased ability to tolerate frustration,
- ✓ Use of more effective conflict resolution strategies,
- ✓ Improved thinking and planning skills,
- ✓ Decreased anxiety/depressive symptoms (teacher report of special needs students),
- ✓ Decreased conduct problems (teacher report of special needs students),
- ✓ Decreased symptoms of sadness and depression (child report – special needs), and
- ✓ Decreased report of conduct problems, including aggression.

Program Costs:

Program costs over a three-year period would range from $15/student/year to $45/student/year. The higher cost would include hiring an on-site coordinator, the lower cost would include redeploying current staff.

Program Contact:

Prevention Research Center, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA; Tel: 814-863-0112; www.psu.edu/dept/ prevention related links - PATHS.

References:

The above information has been obtained from:

University of Colorado, Boulder – Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence website http://www.colorado.edu/cspv

Hamilton Fish Institute on School and Community Violence: Effective Programs and Strategies to Create Safe Schools. February 1999.

Policy and Practice: Winter 1999. A quarterly publication for Criminal Justice Policymakers and Practitioners. Published by the National Criminal Justice Association, Washington DC.

Middle School

2. The Life Skills Training Model

The Life Skills Training (LST) model delivers a broad approach to social competency and skills development to youth in middle schools.

LST is designated as one of University of Colorado's Blueprints for Violence Prevention model programs for use with students in middle and junior high schools. It has also been listed as a demonstrated program for mixed ethnic students by the Hamilton Fish National Institute.

Program Targets

LST is a primary intervention that targets all middle/junior high school students to prevent or reduce gateway drug use (i.e., tobacco, alcohol, and marijuana) that is strongly correlated with violence.

Program Content

LST is a three-year intervention designed to prevent or reduce substance abuse, primarily implemented in school classrooms by school teachers. The program is delivered in 15 sessions in year one (initial intervention in grades 6 or 7, depending on the school structure), 10 sessions in year two, and 5 sessions in year three. Sessions, which last an average of 45 minutes, can be delivered once a week or as an intensive mini-course. The program consists of three major components which teach students (1) general self-management skills, (2) social skills, and (3) information and skills specifically related to drug use. Skills are taught using training

techniques such as instruction, demonstration, feedback, reinforcement, and practice.

Program Outcomes

Results of over a dozen studies consistently show that the LST program dramatically reduces tobacco, alcohol, and marijuana use. These studies further show that the program works with a diverse range of adolescents, produces results that are long lasting, and is effective when taught by teachers, peer leaders, or health professionals. LST has been found to:

- ✓ Cut tobacco, alcohol, and marijuana use 50%-75%.

Long-term follow up results observed six years following the intervention show that LST:

- ✓ Cuts polydrug use up to 66%,
- ✓ Reduces pack-a-day smoking by 25%,
- ✓ Decreases use of inhalants, narcotics, and hallucinogens.

Program Costs

LST can be implemented at a cost of approximately $7 per student per year (curriculum materials averaged over the three-year period). This does not include the cost of training which is a minimum of $2,000 per day for one or two days.

Program Contact

Institute of Prevention Research, Cornell Medical College; Tel: 212-746-1270.

References

The information for this program outline was obtained from:

University of Colorado, Boulder – Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence website: http://www.colorado.edu/cspv

Cornell, D.G (1999) What Works in Youth Violence Prevention. Virginia Youth Violence Project, University of Virginia.

Hamilton Fish Institute on School and Community Violence: Effective Programs and Strategies to Create Safe Schools. February 1999.

High School

3. The Quantum Opportunities Program Model

The Quantum Opportunities Program Model (QOP) is an intense comprehensive intervention project that is funded by the federal government. The main goal is to lower the dropout rate among students using innovative techniques. This new government sponsored program to assist students in the pursuit of their education and livelihood is presently available in seven major U.S. cities.

QOP is designated as one of ten Blueprints for Violence Prevention model programs by the University of Colorado's Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence.

Program Targets

QOP is designed to serve adolescents from families receiving public assistance by providing education, service and development activities, as well as financial incentives, over a four-year period, from ninth grade through high school graduation. The QOP program, which targets 80 students (called associates) in various area high schools, focuses on preparing students for college, trade schools, military as well as apprenticeship type activities.

Program Content

Each QOP participant is eligible to annually receive: 1) 250 hours of education – participating in computer-assisted instruction, peer tutoring etc. to enhance basic skills; 2) 250 hours of development activities – participating in cultural enrichment and personal development, acquiring life/family skills, planning for college or advanced technical/vocational training, and job preparation; and 3) 250 hours of service activities – participating in community service projects, helping with public events, and working as a volunteer in various agencies. The program also works to help participants avoid behaviors that often become barriers.

QOP's success is attributed to the following factors:

- Small groups of 20-25 youth, bonding with each other and with caring adults;

- A community-based, case-management approach, tied closely to school, and individually tailored to the youth's own needs and circumstances;

- A program that starts early (average age of participants in pilot was 14) before many young people are in deep trouble, and invests in their future year-round over four years, providing opportunities for learning, development and service;

- An approach with multiple dimensions, building basic skills, imparting life and social skills, broadening horizons, and enabling young people to give back to their communities;

- Financial incentives that reward youngsters immediately for hours worked, providing periodic completion bonuses, and contributing matching funds to their accrual accounts over the longer-term;

- Program administrators who go the extra mile, by tracking the whereabouts and activities of each young person, making home visits, and motivating the youth to go the extra mile, too; and,

- Multi-year funding, provided in advance, so that excellent staff can be recruited and retained, so that young people can absolutely count on this program sticking with them.

Program Outcomes

An evaluation which compared QOP participants to a control group demonstrated that QOP members were:

- ✓ More likely to be high school graduates: 63% of QOP members graduated high school compared to 42% of the control group,

- ✓ More likely to go on to post-secondary schools: 42% of QOP members compared to 16% of the control group,

- ✓ Less likely to be high school dropouts: 23% of QOP members compared with 50% of the control group,
- ✓ More likely to have received an honor or award in the past year: 34% of QOP members compared to 12% of the control group, and
- ✓ Less likely to become teen parents: 24% of QOP members compared to 38% of the control group.

Program Costs

The cost for four years was $10,600 per participant, or $2,650 per year.

Program Contact

Opportunities Industrialization Centers of America, Philadelphia, PA; Tel: 215-236-4500 ext. 251; www.oslc.org/tfc/tfcoslc.html.

QOP Coordinator, Washington, D.C.: Tel: 202-289-9100 ext. 311

QOP Coordinator, Cleveland, OH: Tel: 216-592-7777

References

The information for this program outline was obtained from:

University of Colorado, Boulder – Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence website http://www.colorado.edu/cspv

School-Wide Model

4. Project ACHIEVE

Project ACHIEVE is a school-wide prevention and early intervention program targeting academically and socially at-risk and underachieving students in elementary through high schools.

First implemented in the Polk County, Florida school district, the program is now being implemented in schools in several states, including Alaska, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland and Texas. Most of these schools have large numbers of special education referrals each year and are "at-risk for multiple incidents of violence."

Project ACHIEVE is listed as a promising approach in Policy and Practice (1999, see References below), a quarterly publication published by the National Criminal Justice Association. It is also

described as a demonstrated model by the Hamilton Fish National Institute.

Program Targets

Project ACHIEVE places particular emphasis on improving the social behavior of students, increasing student performance in the areas of social skills and aggression control, and in reducing incidents of school-based violence. Its goal is to reduce disciplinary referrals by providing school-wide prevention services in every classroom. The program is designed to teach students social skills, problem-solving methods and anger-management techniques, as well as reduce acts of aggression and violence by students.

Program Content

The program involves a number of components that work together to create a comprehensive school-wide program that involves school teachers and staff, and parents and students. The components include:

- Intensive staff development and training in social skills, leading to school-wide discipline and behavioral management;
- Instructional consultation and curriculum based assessment;
- Behavioral consultation, behavioral interventions and aggression control training; and
- Parent training, tutoring and support.

Parent involvement is an important component of the program. Schools also provide them with transportation and scheduling accommodations to ensure they get to school when necessary. In addition, parents receive regular information from the school on program activities, as well as feedback regarding their children.

Program Outcomes

In one school, over the first three years of implementation:

- ✓ Student referrals to special education had a 75% decline;
- ✓ Student placement in special education had a 67% decline;
- ✓ The total disciplinary referrals to the principal's office had a 28% decline;
- ✓ Student suspensions decreased by 67% (Quinn 1998); and
- ✓ Large decreases were reported in disobedience and fighting, with smaller decreases in disruptiveness, abusive behavior, and disrespect.

According to a school psychologist attached to a Project ACHIEVE school, the program's greatest impact has been students reminding one another to "stop and think" before making a decision.

Program Cost

No data available.

Program Contact

School Psychology Program, College of Education, University of South Florida, Tampa, FL; Tel: 813-974-9498.

References

Information for this program outline was excerpted from:

Hamilton Fish Institute on School and Community Violence: Effective Programs and Strategies to Create Safe Schools. February 1999.

Quinn, M.M., Osher, R., Hoffman, C.C., and Hanley, T.V. (1998). Safe, drug-free, and effective schools for all students: What works! Washington, DC: Safe and Drug-Free Schools, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education and Office of Special Education Programs, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, U.S. Department of Educaiton.

Policy and Practice, Winter 1999. A quarterly publication for Criminal Justice Policymakers and Practitioners, published by the National Criminal Justice Association, Washington, DC.

5. The Resolving Conflicts Creatively Program (RCCP) Model

The RCCP, jointly sponsored by the New York City Board of Education and Educators for Social Responsibility, is a school-based program in conflict resolution and intercultural understanding. Its curricula contain strategies to promote multicultural acceptance and global peace. The program cultivates the emotional, social and ethical development of children through teaching concepts and skills in conflict resolution and inter-group relations.

An evaluation of the program conducted by Metis Associates, Inc. in 1989 concluded that the RCCP was exemplary and that participants' assessments were extremely positive (School Safety 1995, see References below). The program has also been described as a demonstrated model by the Hamilton Fish Institute.

RCCP is in place in 180 elementary, intermediate/junior high and high schools in New York City, with 3,000 teachers and 70,000 students participating. According to RCCP officials, most of the programs serve at-risk students located in lower-income neighborhoods in Brooklyn, South Bronx, Manhattan and Queens (School Safety 1995).

Program Targets

RCCP is a comprehensive school-based program that has a long-range plan to improve the learning climate at school and to teach students alternatives to violence. It is also intended to assist students, teachers, and parents in changing their attitude towards conflict: from seeing it as either a problem to be swept under the rug or an opening for confrontation to seeing it as a process that defines values and leads to growth. RCCP is somewhat unique among conflict resolution programs in that it has models for implementation for children in grades K-12. Using a hybrid approach, the RCCP trains educators to provide students with instruction in peer mediation and bias reduction, and parents to resolve conflicts non-violently at home (Gregg 1998, see References below). Participation at every level is voluntary.

RCCP officials state that the major barrier they encountered in operationalizing their program was working in a culture that glamorizes violent responses to conflict. Based on the premise that human aggression is a learned behavior, RCCP teaches its

students that violence is not an acceptable means of resolving conflict.

Program Content

The RCCP offers a ten-unit curriculum with lessons on inter-group relations, cooperative learning, and dispute resolution techniques. The model includes the following components: professional development for teachers, regular classroom instruction for K-12 students, peer mediation, and training in the concepts and skills of conflict resolution and bias awareness for administrators and parents.

In 12 of the schools, 20-40 students a year in fourth, fifth and sixth grades get 3 days of mediation training. They then serve as mediators, facilitating communication between disputants. Student mediators do not act as judges or police officers. RCCP introduces student mediation in schools that have been participating in the conflict resolution program for at least a year and have a group of teachers who regularly use the RCCP curriculum. Mediators work in pairs during lunch periods and recess to identify and resolve disputes.

RCCP provides a 20-hour training course for teachers; mediator training for interested students, parents, and staff; and "outreach" seminars to help all students become aware that a nonviolent technique is available at the school for resolving conflicts. Parents attend 10 four-hour workshops and then lead workshops for others.

Program Outcomes

Initial results from a rigorous evaluation by the Center for Disease Control and Prevention reveal significant positive impact for children who receive a substantial amount of instruction in the curriculum (Aber, Jones, Brown, Chaudry and Samples 1998, see References below). Other findings discussed in Conflict Resolution Education Program Report (1996, see References below) and by Inger (1991, see References below) include:

- ✓ Improved self-esteem and sense of empowerment,

- ✓ Increased awareness of articulation of feelings,
- ✓ Greater acceptance of differences,
- ✓ Students report they feel better about themselves and safer at school,
- ✓ They handle conflicts quickly, sometimes taking only minutes to deal with situations,
- ✓ Many schools report that student mediators help solve large numbers of disputes (in New York, they resolve an average of 100 disputes each year at each school in the program) and that disputes remain settled in the vast majority of cases,
- ✓ Often the best student mediators are those who had been considered troublemakers,
- ✓ Teachers report fewer fights and more caring student behavior, and
- ✓ Administrators, noticing improved attendance and a dramatic decline in suspensions, find that they spend less time on disciplinary matters.

Program Costs

No data found.

Program Contact

RCCP National Center, New York, NY; 212-509-0022.

References

The information for this program outline was obtained from:

Aber, J.L., Jones, S.M., Brown, J.L., Chaudry, N., and Samples, F. (1998). Resolving conflict: Evaluating the developmental effects of a school-based violence prevention program in neighborhood and classroom context. Development and Psychopathology, 10, 187-213.

Conflict Resolution Education: A Guide to Implementing Programs in Schools, Youth-Serving Organizations, and Community and Juvenile Justice Settings – Program Report (1996). Published by Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Department of Justice and Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program, U.S. Department of Education.

Flannery, D.J (1998) in Appendix B.

Greg, S. (1998). School-based programs to promote safety and civility. AEL Policy Briefs. Charleston, WV: Appalachia Educational Laboratory.

Hamilton Fish Institute on School and Community Violence: Effective Programs and Strategies to Create Safe Schools. February 1999.

Inger, Morton (1991). Conflict Resolution Programs in Schools. ERIC/CUE Digest Number 74. Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), Clearinghouse on Urban Education, New York, NY.

School Safety (1995) – Promising Initiatives for Addressing School Violence: Reporting to the Ranking Minority Member, Subcommittee on Children and Families, U.S. Senate, April 1995. GAO/HEHS-95-106.

Schwartz, Weny (1999). Developing Social Competence in Children. Choices Briefs, Number 3, 1999. Institute for Urban and Minority Education, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Youth-Focused Initiatives

6. The Big Brothers Big Sisters of America Program

Big Brothers Big Sisters of America (BBBSA) has been providing adult support and friendship to youth for nearly a century. A 1991 report stated that through BBBSA's network of nearly 500 agencies across the country, more than 70,000 youth and adults have been supervised in one-on-one relationships.

The Hamilton Fish Institute describes BBBSA as a demonstrated mentoring strategy for adolescents. BBBSA is also one of ten model programs identified by University of Colorado's Blueprints for Violence Prevention program.

Program Targets

BBBSA typically targets youth (ages 6 to 18) from single parent homes.

Program Content

BBBSA agencies use a case management approach, following through on each case from initial inquiry through closure. The case manager screens applicants, makes and supervises the matches, and closes the matches when eligibility requirements are no longer met or when either party decides they can no longer participate fully in the relationship. Service delivery is by volunteers who interact regularly with youth in a one-on-one relationship. BBBSA also refers high-risk youth to other, more appropriate community agencies. Nationally, BBBSA relationships last an average of 1½ years, and the adults and youth spend time together about three times per month. BBBSA distinguishes itself from other mentoring programs via rigorous published standards and required procedures:

- Orientation is required for all volunteers.
- Volunteer screening includes a written application, a background check, an extensive interview, and a home assessment; it is designed to screen out those who may inflict psychological or physical harm, lack the capacity to form a caring bond with the child, or are unlikely to honor their time commitments.
- Youth assessment involves a written application, interviews with the child and the parent, and a home assessment; it is designed to help the caseworker learn about the child in order to make the best possible match, and also to secure parental permission.
- Matches are carefully considered and based upon the needs of the youth, abilities of volunteers, preferences of the parent, and the capacity of program staff.
- Supervision is accomplished via an initial contact with the parent, youth, and volunteer within two weeks of the

match; monthly telephone contact with the volunteer, parent and/or youth during the first year; and quarterly contact with all parties during the duration of the match.

Program Outcomes

An evaluation of the BBBSA program has been conducted to assess children who participated in BBBSA compared to their non-participating peers. After an eighteen month period, BBBSA youth:

- ✓ Were 46% less likely than control youth to initiate drug use during the study period,
- ✓ Were 27% less likely to initiate alcohol use than control youth,
- ✓ Were almost one-third less likely than control youth to hit someone,
- ✓ Were better than control youth in academic behavior, attitudes, and performance,
- ✓ Were more likely to have higher quality relationships with their parents or guardians than control youth and,
- ✓ Were more likely to have higher quality relationships with their peers at the end of the study period than the control youth.

Program Costs

The national average cost of making and supporting a matching relationship is $1,000 per year.

Program Contact

Big Brothers Big Sisters of America, Philadelphia, PA; Tel: 215-567-7000; www.bbbsa.org.

References

Information for this program outline was obtained from:

University of Colorado, Boulder – Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence website http://www.colorado.edu/cspv

Hamilton Fish Institute on School and Community Violence: Effective Programs and Strategies to Create Safe Schools. February 1999.

Family-Focused Strategies

7. Functional Family Therapy

Functional Family Therapy (FFT) is an outcome-driven prevention/intervention program for youth who have demonstrated the entire range of maladaptive, acting out behaviors and related syndromes. Treatment makes use of cognitive and behavioral methods to improve family relationships and increase reciprocity and cooperation among family members.

The Hamilton Fish Institute describes FFT as a demonstrated short-term change program that motivates families to deal with processes, such as intense negative affect, which prevent change. FFT is also one of ten model programs identified by University of Colorado's Blueprints for Violence Prevention program.

Program Targets

Youth, ages 11-18, at risk for and/or presenting with delinquency, violence, substance use, Conduct Disorder, Oppositional Defiant Disorder, or Disruptive Behavior Disorder.

Program Content

FFT requires as few as 8-12 hours of direct service time for at risk or presenting youth and their families, and generally no more than 26 hours of direct service time for the most severe problem situations. FFT provides for flexible delivery of service by one or two person teams to clients in-home, at a clinic, at juvenile court, and at time of re-entry from institutional placement. Service providers include para-professionals under supervision, trained probation officers, mental health technicians and degreed mental health professionals.

FFT effectiveness derives from emphasizing factors that enhance protective factors and reduce risk, including risk of termination.

FFT is organized in steps that build upon each other. These phases consist of:

- Engagement, designed to protect youth and families from early program dropout,
- Motivation, designed to change maladaptive emotional reactions, and increase alliance, trust, hope, and motivation for lasting change,
- Assessment, designed to understand family and larger relationships,
- Behavior change, which consists of communication training and basic parenting skills, and
- Generalization, during which period family case management is guided by individualized family functional needs.

Program Outcomes

Outcome studies demonstrated that functional family therapy improved family relationships and reduced recidivism among adolescents referred by juvenile court for offenses such as truancy, theft, and unmanageable behavior (Klein, Alexander and Parsons 1977, see References below). In rigorous evaluations FFT has consistently produced sustained reductions in juvenile recidivism and sibling entry into high-risk activities when compared to a variety of other individual or group-based treatments (Elliot 1997, see References below).

Clinical trials have demonstrated that FFT is capable of:

- ✓ Effectively treating adolescents with Conduct Disorder, Oppositional Defiant Disorder, Disruptive Behavior Disorder, alcohol and drug abuse disorders, and who are delinquent and/or violent,
- ✓ Interrupting the matriculation of these youth into more restrictive, higher cost services,
- ✓ Preventing further incidence of the presenting problem,

- ✓ Preventing younger children in the family from penetrating the system of care, and
- ✓ Effectively transferring treatment effects across treatment systems.

Program Costs

These reductions in adolescent disruptive behavior disorder have been accomplished at lower expense than alternative approaches.

The 90-day costs in two ongoing programs range between $1,350 to $3,750 for an average of 12 home visits per family.

Program Contacts

Department of Psychology, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT; Tel: 801-581-6538/801-585-1807.

References

Information for this program outline was obtained from:

University of Colorado, Boulder – Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence website http://www.colorado.edu/cspv

Klein, N.C., Alexander, J.F., and Parsons, B.V. (1977). Impact of family systems intervention on recidivism and sibling delinquency: A model of primary prevention and program evaluation. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 45, 469-474.

Elliot, D.S. (Ed.) (1997). Blueprints for Violence Prevention. Boulder, CO: Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence, C & M Press.

Hamilton Fish Institute on School and Community Violence: Effective Programs and Strategies to Create Safe Schools. February 1999.

8. The Multisystemic Therapy Model

Multisystemic Therapy (MST) is an intensive family- and community-based treatment that addresses the multiple determinants of serious anti-social behavior in juvenile offenders. The MST approach views individuals as being nested within a complex network of interconnected systems that encompass individual, family and extrafamilial (peer, school, neighborhood)

factors. Intervention may be necessary in any one or a combination of these systems.

MST is one of ten model programs identified by University of Colorado's Blueprints for Violence Prevention program.

Program Targets

MST targets chronic, violent, or substance abusing male or female juvenile offenders, ages 12-17, at high-risk of out-of-home placement, and the offenders' families. The major goal of MST is to empower parents with the skills and resources needed to independently address the difficulties that arise in raising teenagers and to empower youth to cope with family, peer, school, and neighborhood problems.

Program Content

Multisystemic therapy (MST) is a relatively short-term (1-6 months) but intensive form of therapy that is aimed at strengthening family functioning. It is provided using a home-based model of services delivery. This model helps to overcome barriers to service access, increases family retention in treatment, allows for the provision of intensive services (therapists have low caseloads), and enhances the maintenance of treatment gains. A hallmark of the multisystemic approach is the therapist's role as a problem-solver who works closely with parents to identify and remedy problems in a wide variety of areas, ranging from a child's school attendance to marital discord.

Typically, therapists begin treatment by visiting the family several times a week for sessions ranging from 15-90 minutes, and later gradually taper contact prior to termination. Therapists make flexible use of family therapy, parent education, and cognitive-behavioral techniques to improve family relationships, strengthen parental authority and effectiveness, and modify children's behavior.

The multisystemic approach is carefully described in a treatment manual (Henggeler 1991, see References below). It is important that therapists faithfully adhere to MST principles and procedures for this treatment to be effective. A recent study (Henggeler,

Melton, Brondino, Scherer and Hanley 1997, see References below) found that MST effectiveness declined when therapists failed to follow the treatment model.

Program Outcomes

Multisystemic therapy is one of the most cost-effective and demonstrably effective treatments for high-risk or delinquent children and their families. In controlled outcome studies multisystemic therapy has proven to be superior to standard treatments for chronic juvenile offenders, inner-city at-risk youth, child-abusive families, and other traditionally difficult populations (Cornell 1999, see References below).

Evaluations of MST have demonstrated for serious juvenile offenders:

- ✓ Reductions of 25-70% in long-term rates of rearrest,
- ✓ Reductions of 47-64% in out-of-home placements,
- ✓ Extensive improvements in family functioning, and
- ✓ Decreased mental health problems for serious juvenile offenders.

Program Costs

MST has achieved favorable outcomes at cost savings in comparison with usual mental health and juvenile justice services, such as incarceration and residential treatment. At a cost of $4,500 per youth, a recent policy report concluded that MST was the most cost-effective of a wide range of intervention programs aimed at serious juvenile offenders.

Program Contact

Family Services Research Center, Medical University of South Carolina, Charleston, SC; Tel: 803-792-8003/843-876-1800 or MST Inc., Mount Pleasant, South Carolina; Tel: 803-856-8226 ext. 11; www.mstservices.org.

References

The information for this program outline is obtained from:

University of Colorado, Boulder – Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence website http://www.colorado.edu/cspv

Cornell D.G. (Working paper) (1999). What Works in Youth Violence Prevention. Virginia Youth Violence Project, University of Virginia.

Henggeler, S.W. (1991). Treating conduct problems in children and adolescents (treatment manual). Columbia, SC: South Carolina Department of Mental Health.

Henggeler, S.W., Melton, G.B., Brondino, M.J., Scherer, D.G., and Hanley, J.H. (1997). Multisystemic therapy with violent and chronic juvenile offenders and their families: The role of treatment fidelity in successful dissemination. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 65, 821-833.

A Community-Based Response

9. Youth Violence: A Community-Based Response – One City's Success Story

Boston's initiatives rely on community organizations, individuals, and the business community, as well as contributions from federal, state, and local government. The Departments of Justice, Treasury, Housing and Urban Development, Education, Health and Human Services are all supporting Boston's efforts.

Program Targets

The aim: youth by youth, person by person, block by block, neighborhood by neighborhood, solve the youth violence problem.

Program Content

Boston has implemented a three-pronged strategy to combat youth violence: enforcement, intervention and prevention.

A: Enforcement-Oriented Programs

1. The Youth Violence Strike Force (YVSF) is one of the primary enforcement strategies that Boston is pursuing to combat youth violence. The YVSF is a multi-agency coordinated task

force made up of 45 full-time Boston police officers and 15 officers from outside agencies (e.g., Massachusetts State Police, Department of Treasury's Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms, Massachusetts Corrections, Probation, Parole and Division of Youth Services officers, and police departments from neighboring jurisdictions.) YVSF investigates youth crimes, arrests those responsible, and breaks up environments of crime. One important accomplishment of the YVSF was the creation of a comprehensive computer database, which has allowed tough enforcement efforts against the gang leaders, and positive intervention for those at-risk of becoming hard-core members.

In addition, the YVSF in cooperation with the City of Boston and the Department of Justice, has used criminal and forfeiture laws to help secure the safety of the community by taking over drug dens and renovating them as new homes.

2. Police and Probation Working in the Community – Operation Night Light

Operation Night Light is a cooperative effort between the YVSF and the Massachusetts Department of Probation that sends police and probation officers on nightly visits to the homes of youth on probation to ensure that they are complying with the terms of their probation. The officer teams make regular home, school or work site visits to enforce curfews or court-designated area restrictions. These house calls serve simultaneously to provide for a more interactive relationship between the probation officer and the probationer, strengthen the relationships between police and probation officers, get the parents involved in the child's probation, and serve notice to other youths that police and probation officers are serious about their mission. One probation officer has commented that from 1990 to 1994, 68 of his youthful clients had been murdered. Since 1995, he reports that 3 of his clients have been murdered.

3. Tough Action Against Gangs – Operation Cease Fire

Under its anti-gang strategy, partially funded by the Department of Justice, Boston has implemented Operation Cease Fire, a two-part Zero Tolerance strategy in the Roxbury, Dorchester, Mattapan, and South End neighborhoods of Boston. Boston officials meet

with gang members to make clear that community leaders have "zero tolerance" for violence in their city and neighborhoods, and lay out in concrete terms the intensive police attention gangs will experience unless violence stops. Following these community briefings, the "zero tolerance" policy is enforced. It may be that grafitti, truancy, noise or public drinking statutes are vigorously enforced as a means to stop gang activity leading to more serious crimes. The Boston police attribute their success to the community's involvement in establishing and enforcing their quality of life priorities.

Operation Cease Fire is also a collaboration of interested law enforcement parties, including the U.S. Attorney, the Suffolk County District Attorney, the Boston Police Department, and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms. These partners meet weekly to review their progress and to target any flare-ups.

4. Targeting Gun Violence- The Boston Gun Project

This interagency (Boston Police Department, Suffolk County District Attorney, the U.S. Attorney's Office, ATF, and researchers at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University) project focuses on the supply side of gun crimes. The Boston Gun Project uses increased emphasis on ATF traces and post-arrest debriefing to identify sources of illegal firearms. The work of the Boston Gun Project is integrated into the overall Operation Ceasefire strategy. In cooperation with other local, state and federal law enforcement agencies, increased enforcement efforts are then directed against those that supply or traffic illegal firearms, both in-state and interstate. The Boston Gun Project has also cracked down on felons who are prohibited from owning firearms, and severely punishes those who put guns into the hands of juveniles and older gang members.

B: Intervention and Prevention Oriented Programs

1. Problem Solving Through Partnerships – Safe Neighborhood Initiative

A big part of Boston's success is attributable to a greater-level-than-ever-before communication between participants in the

criminal justice system and the community. Some of the initiatives launched through this collaboration include:

i) *Safe Neighborhood Initiative Tip Line*: a phone line, advertised in local newspapers, is designed to increase the community's ability to respond with a clear voice when crimes are occurring. The information received from these phone calls allows police to identify areas of known drug, gang, or prostitution activities.

ii) *The Child Witness to Violence Project:* a partnership between Boston police officers and Boston City Hospital pediatricians, emergency room staff and child psychiatrists. In this project, in order to study the impact of violence and to prevent the cycle of violence from occurring, police are trained to assess the impact of trauma on child and family, familiarized with services available in the community, and taught to make appropriate referrals.

iii) *Improving the Court's Response:* the Dorchester District Court has established a partnership with the police department to utilize the Child Witness to Violence Project when the court is confronted with cases of domestic violence or child abuse. Through this program, court judges may require a defendant to undergo intensive, supervised domestic violence training as part of their sentence. The court has taken an active role in training court personnel, police officers, prosecutors, and the public to sensitize them to the nature of domestic violence and its impact on the victim and children.

iv) *The Vietnamese-Police Collaborative to Reduce Crime Victimization*: Boston has established a partnership between the police and one of its growing minority populations, the Vietnamese community. The Vietnamese Residents Advisory Council works with the police to identify, prioritize and solve problems.

v) *Community Prosecutions:* by pooling intelligence and other information, the Safe Neighborhood Initiative team is able to target those individuals and situations that are generating the greatest fear and victimization, and choose the court of appropriate jurisdiction to address the problem. This includes civil law to address chronic problems - such as crack houses operating with the owners looking the other way - that cannot be handled adequately using criminal law alone.

vi) *The Boston Violence Prevention Program:* approaches violence as a public health problem as well as an issue for the criminal justice system. Health care workers participate in multi-disciplinary Victim Care Services teams to reach youth who have been injured in intentional violence while they are still receiving treatment at Boston City Hospital. The program educators also provide violence prevention training to community-based groups and organizations.

vii) *Summer of Opportunity:* a partnership between the Boston Police Department Youth Violence Strike Force, John Hancock Financial Services (business community), and Northeastern University designed to engage at-risk youth in a host of summer activities beneficial to their social, academic and professional aspirations. These are 15-17 year old youths who have been involved with the criminal justice system and referred to the program by police officers. Youth who successfully complete the training, which incorporates mentorships, job readiness, leadership and life skills training, are placed in part-time jobs in places such as John Hancock, YMCA and Franklin Park Zoo. The youth must be enrolled in either a school or an alternative education program, must maintain passing grades, maintain a relationship with their mentors, not be arrested or violate their probation.

viii) *Partnerships in the Boston Coalition:* represents over 350 civic, business, and community leaders working with law enforcement to reduce violence, fight substance abuse, and assist the criminal justice system. BC has successfully established a drug diversion court, is supporting a series of conferences and basic competency classes for youth street workers, and has trained clergy on issues of domestic violence.

ix) *The Boston Bar Association:* the local bar association is also active on issues of violence and its prevention, through mentoring and educational programs in Boston's public high schools; a summer jobs program for youth in legal settings; co-sponsoring a conference on gun violence with law enforcement agencies and local media.

x) *The Ten Point Coalition:* an ecumenical group of clergy and lay leaders working to mobilize the religious community around issues affecting urban youth. The Coalition's main activities are

facilitating collaboration between churches with programs in place and helping to train those willing to reach out. The TPC aims to: establish church-sponsored "Adopt-a-Gang" programs where inner-city churches would serve as drop-in centers providing sanctuary for troubled youth; initiate neighborhood crime-watch programs within local church neighborhoods; establish working relationships between local churches and community-based health centers to provide counseling to families in times of crisis; establish rape-crisis drop-in centers and services for battered women in churches, and counseling programs for abusive men.

xi) *Operation Safe Home:* as public housing areas are often areas of high crime, this project is an initiative developed by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development to reduce violent crime and improve the quality of life in public housing. It develops task forces with law enforcement agencies to investigate drug trafficking and violent crime within public housing developments. HUD brings unique resources to these investigations such as tenant lists and information, access to apartments and common areas for physical and electronic surveillance, and funding for strategic investigations. HUD also helps redesign housing development structures to eliminate havens for drug dealing, assists in drafting tenant leases which permit immediate eviction for criminal activity, increases access to available social services, and provides recreation and job opportunities.

2. The Comprehensive Communities Program

This program is Boston's citywide, pro-active approach to improving the quality of life and reducing crime and fear for the residents of Boston. Among the CCP public safety strategies are:

i) *CCP's Strategic Planning and Community Mobilization:* where police and area community members are working together to develop action plans to address community needs and then implement them.

ii) *The Youth Service Providers Network:* a vehicle to better serve at-risk youth and their families. The Network is made up of some of the most successful youth service organizations in the City of Boston in partnership with the Boston Police. The Network has

developed a Case Management Referral System that is used by front line police officers to refer youth in need of service to a Licensed Clinical Social Worker based at the stationhouse. Some of the programs supported by the YSPN are: Boston Against Drugs – community based drug education; Boston Community Centers – direct service through street corner outreach; Bridge Over Troubled Water Inc- a multiservice program for homeless, runaway and other at-risk youth; Greater Boston One to One – mentoring training and technical assistance; and Streetworkers Program – designed to reach at-risk youth on the streets, including former gang members.

iii) *CCP's Alternatives to Incarceration Network:* a collaboration (Department of Youth Services, Department of Probation, the Suffolk County District Attorney's Office, the Boston Police Department, and several community-based non-profit agencies) which diverts first time and non-violent offenders who would otherwise be incarcerated.

C: Prevention Oriented School Programs

Boston has used its schools not only for academic enrichment, but also as physical locales where counseling, mentoring and tutoring programs can enrich the lives of Boston youth.

i) *Boston Community Centers:* Boston has established a network of 41 comprehensive community centers, each run by an independent, non-profit Community Center Council, with primary funding coming from the City's budget. Many of these centers use school buildings after hours. BCC is Boston's largest single human services provider, offering youth and families services that include child care, adult and youth education, youth services, and youth recreation.

ii) *Community Schools:* Funded by the Department of Health and Human Services, this program funds a broad coalition (residents, schools, community-based organizations, health centers, tenant task forces, city agencies and law enforcement) for prevention and intervention services for 9-18 year-olds in order to prevent violence and foster a safer community. Some of the services offered by this program include safe havens, tutoring, and family strengthening services.

iii) *Safe Schools*: Funded by the Department of Education, this program is operating at the two public schools in Boston with the highest incidence of violence. It is an effort to provide full-service schools, complete with health, social services, and enrichment both during and after school.

iv) *School to Work Program:* Funded by the Department of Education and the Department of Labor, the Boston School-to-Career Program provides school to work services in every Boston public high school, including alternative schools. The program provides internships and job shadowing services, among others.

v) *The Louis D. Brown Peace Curriculum:* Louis Brown was a 15 year old honor student who was tragically shot down by gang gunfire on his way to an anti-gang-violence Christmas party in 1993. This Curriculum founded by his parents targets high school tenth graders. Students participate in community field projects and class discussions, read a selected novel, write essays about their understanding of peace and their own peace making efforts. During the 1995-96 school year, the Curriculum was implemented in 11 of the 17 Boston Public High Schools and over 1600 students enrolled in the program.

vi) *Children's Hospital Fenway Collaborative:* a cooperative effort between Fenway Middle College High School and Boston's Children's Hospital, the Collaborative is a school-to-work program focused on preventing school dropouts by enhancing employment skills and offering career development. The program offers 40 juniors and seniors in high school the opportunity to explore the health care profession in many different areas through part-time jobs, internships, and classroom activities.

vii) *Student Conflict Resolution Experts (SCORE):* A program sponsored by the Massachusetts Office of the Attorney General and receiving funding from the Department of Justice, this program trains students from 16 high schools and 9 middle schools in conflict resolution and peer mediation.

Program Outcomes

Boston's three-pronged strategy is paying dividends in the following ways:

- ✓ The number of juvenile homicides dropped approximately 80% citywide between 1990 and 1995;
- ✓ Between 1993 and 1995, the juvenile violent crime arrest rate for aggravated assault and battery with a firearm decreased 65%;
- ✓ The number of violent crime incidents in one of Boston's toughest neighborhoods, Dorchester, went down from 1,583 in 1991 to 1,224 in 1995;
- ✓ Year to date in 1996 (January 1 through mid-August) Boston has no firearm homicides of juveniles (defined by Massachusetts law); and
- ✓ Violent crime in the public schools fell more than 20 percent in school year 1995-1996 as compared with the previous year.

Program Costs

No data available.

Program Contact

Mayor's Public Safety Cabinet in Boston; Tel: 617-343-5096

References

Information for this fact sheet has been excerpted from:

Pamphlet issued by the Mayor's Public Safety Cabinet in Boston with a foreword by U.S. Attorney General Janet Reno (September 1996).

VII. FOCUS GROUP FINDINGS

As part of this study, CGR agreed to facilitate focus groups with Rochester youth in order to gain a first-hand perspective on their concerns with violence, their expectations from violence prevention services, and the potential limitations they see of any such efforts.

The City arranged for focus group participation by inviting youth enrolled in Pathways to Peace and Camp Good Days and Special Times programs. Five focus groups with a total of 23 youth, ranging from ages 8 to 24, were held at the Avenue D and Flint Street Recreation Centers. The questions asked during the focus groups included: How much do you worry about violence in your lives? Does the fear or threat of violence affect what you would like to do and where you would like to go? What do you think the community needs to do to stop or reduce violence that affects youth in the City? What kinds of services would make you feel confident and safe? Participants were also asked to voluntarily complete a short written survey. Given the short time available for each focus group and the wide age range of the participants, CGR decided against asking their opinions on specific models detailed earlier in our report.

Responses from the participants made it clear that violence is a prominent part of the lives of inner city youth. More than in school or at home, children reported feeling at increased risk of being a victim of violence on the streets. Most expressed no fear or concern because their families "had their back" though interestingly they indicated that much of the protection provided to them was through violent means such as an older sibling or parent threatening the perpetrator with a gun or resolving the issue through physical fights.

Violence seemed more controlled on school premises. Many mentioned "drilling" as the main source of harassment in school, where a bunch of kids center on one child and poke on him/her while picking on them verbally until the child breaks down and cries.

Only youth from Nathaniel Rochester School mentioned gangs. Some of the names listed were SRT, Crypts, Bloods, Orange, Hot Boys Union, Knotty Heads, Rough Riders, 2-5, Hot Girls and 24K. They described in detail about what gangs were "out there," which gangs to avoid, which colors not to wear, which streets to avoid, etc. They explained how most kids join gangs for safety and how some gangs were not organized, but rather just a group of friends.

Sixteen of the 23 youth completed the survey and the following information was gathered from them: 14 were male and 2 were female; 14 identified themselves as Black, 1 as Hispanic/Latino and 1 as Other; 14 reported being a victim of violence at least once, including 3 who answered "several times," "more than 10 times," and "every week"; almost everyone claimed being a victim of "threats" at least once, with 2 reporting "assault," 1 reporting sexual assault, and one reporting involvement in a gang fight; "street/neighborhood," "on way to and from school," "school" and "home" were identified as some of the places where these youth were exposed to violence.

Several solutions were offered to reduce or prevent violence:

- First, youth suggested in-school suspension for truant students because out-of-school suspension is like an unsupervised vacation for most kids.

- Second, have year-round free sports tournaments and leagues sponsoring teams. The Hudson Rough Riders for example, like to play basketball and regular tournaments would give youth a place to go and keep them out of trouble. In fact several participants suggested that the City youth centers should be expanded and have longer hours as they are fun and safe places for youth to hang out at.

- Third, install cameras on signal lights and stop signs on street cross-sections to deter street violence.

- Fourth, increase police and/or community (PACTAC) patrolling on "problem" streets.

- Fifth, have more and more peer mediation in schools. "We need someone to listen objectively rather than instigate and take sides."

Many youth in the focus groups felt that although all these solutions can make people aware of and decrease violence, in the final analysis people themselves have to make a conscious decision to change their ways.

VIII. CONCLUSION

The City of Rochester's Youth Violence Initiative was inspired by and modeled after the City of Boston's Youth Violence Community Based Response. The City's Initiative that has led to unprecedented levels of interagency cooperation to reduce the level of violence among youth in our community includes partner agencies such as: City of Rochester: Office of the Mayor, Police Department; Rochester City School District; County of Monroe: Office of the County Executive, Juvenile Prosecutor's Office, Office of Probation-Community Corrections, Office of the Sheriff, Office of the District Attorney; New York State: Division of Parole, Office of Children and Family Services; Federal Bureau of Investigation; United States Attorney; Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms, and Office of the Administrative Justice of the 7th Judicial District. Early evaluations of this program report significant declines in youth violence statistics.

As found through our research, there are many different ways to teach young people to avoid violence. While it appears logical that any violence prevention solution should be tailored to each school and its neighborhood in addition to families, the most important stakeholders -- the youth -- are often excluded from the process of developing policies and approaches that define any solution. More than anyone else, the youth are aware of the many conditions and problems that lead to violence and fear. It is quite probable that youth are privy to information unavailable to school teachers or parents -- information that does not eventually show up in the statistics. *Therefore, as our community seeks to further expand and enhance its youth violence prevention efforts, it is imperative to solicit youth input in any discussion to prevent violence and seek their buy-in to any new programs that are being developed and implemented.*

APPENDIX A: LIST OF SUCCESSFUL OR PROMISING VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAMS

SCHOOL-BASED

A: Elementary School Programs

1. ***PeaceBuilders,*** Arizona, California, Utah, and Ohio: demonstrated model. Contact: www.peacebuilders.com.

2. ***Second Step***, Seattle, Washington: demonstrated model. Contact: Committee for Children; Tel 800-634-4449; www.cfchildren.org.

3. ***Young Ladies/Young Gentlemen Clubs***, Cleveland, Ohio: promising model. Contact: Partnership for a Safer Cleveland.

4. ***Families And Schools Together (FAST),*** Madison, Wisconsin: promising model. Contact: FAST Project, University of Wisconsin; Tel 608-263-9476.

5. ***Perry Preschool Program,*** Ypsilanti, Michigan: promising model. Contact: High Scope Educational Research Foundation; Tel 734-485-2000; www.highscope.org.

6. ***Baltimore Mastery Learning (ML) and Good Behavior Game Interventions (GBG),*** Baltimore, Maryland: promising model. Contact: School of Hygiene and Public Health, Johns Hopkins University; www.bpp.jhu.edu.

7. ***I Can Problem Solve,*** Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: promising model. Contact: Clinical Health and Psychology Department, MCP Hahnemann University; Tel 215-762-7205.

8. ***Contingencies for Learning Academic and Social Skills (CLASS),*** California and Hawaii: demonstrated model. Contact: Educational Achievement Systems; Tel 1-877-ED-PROOF or 206-769-8155; www.edresearch.com.

9. ***Alternatives to Gang Membership,*** Paramount, California: promising program.

10. ***Bullying Prevention Program,*** Bergen, Norway: model program. Contact: Research Center for Health Promotion; Tel: 47-55-48-23-27.

B: Middle School Programs

1. ***Students of Peace Project:*** promising model.

2. ***Richmond Youth Against Violence Project:*** promising model.

3. ***Positive Adolescent Choices Training (PACT),*** Dayton, Ohio: demonstrated model. Contact: Center for Child and Adolescent Violence Prevention, Wright State University; Tel: 937-775-4300.

4. ***Peer Culture Development:*** promising model.

5. ***Project PATHE,*** Charleston, South Carolina: promising model. Contact: Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University; Tel: 410-516-8808; http://scov.csos.jhu.edu.

6. ***Preventive Intervention:*** promising model. Contact: Graduate School of Applied and Professional Psychology, Rutgers University; Tel: 732-445-2189.

7. ***Project STOP (Schools Teaching Options for Peace),*** New York, New York: promising model. Contact: National Criminal Justice Reference Service: 800-851-3420.

8. ***The Safe Harbor Program,*** New York, New York: promising model. Contact: National Criminal Justice Reference Service: 800-851-3420.

9. ***BASIS:*** demonstrated model. Contact: Department of Criminology, University of Maryland; Tel 301-405-4717.

10. ***A Constructive Discipline Model,*** Los Angeles County, California: demonstrated model. Contact: Safe Schools Coordinator, Los Angeles County Office of Education; Tel: 562-922-6391.

11. ***Aggressors, Victims, and Bystanders: Thinking and Acting to Prevent Violence:*** demonstrated model. Contact:

Education Development Center, Newton, MA; Tel: 800-225-4276 ext. 2364.

12. ***Project ALERT***, Los Angeles, California: demonstrated model. Contact: Tel 800-253-7810; www.projectalert.best.org.

13. ***Project Northland:*** promising model. Contact: School of Public Health, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis; Tel: 612-624-4188.

14. ***Responding in Peaceful and Positive Ways:*** demonstrated model. Contact: Life Skills Center, Virginia Commonwealth University; Tel: 888-572-1572.

15. ***Safe Dates:*** demonstrated model. Contact: Department of Health Behavior and Health Education, School of Public Health, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, North Carolina; Tel: 919-966-6616.

16. ***The Anger Coping Program:*** demonstrated model. Contact: Department of Psychology, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Alabama; Tel: 205-348-5083.

17. ***The Coping Power Program:*** demonstrated model. Contact: Department of Psychology, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Alabama; Tel: 205-348-5083.

18. ***The Coca-Cola Valued Youth Program:*** demonstrated model. Contact: Intercultural Development Research Association, San Antonio, Texas; Tel: 210-684-8180.

19. ***The Midwestern Prevention Project:*** demonstrated model. Contact: Center for Prevention Policy Research, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California; Tel: 323-865-0325.

20. ***Talent Development Middle Schools and High Schools,*** Washington DC and Pennsylvania: demonstrated model. Contact: CRESPAR (Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk), Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland; Tel: 410-516-8800; and Department of Psychology, Howard University, Washington DC; Tel:202-806-8484; http://scov.csos.jhu.edu/crespar/CreSPaR.html

21. ***Gang Risk Intervention Program (GRIP),*** California: promising model. Contact: Safe Schools and Violence Prevention Office, California Department of Education, Sacramento, California; Tel: 916-323-1026.

C: High School Programs

1. ***Omega Boys Club,*** San Francisco, California: promising model.

2. ***Self Enhancement Program,*** Portland, Oregon: demonstrated model. Contact: Self-Enhancement Inc. Portland, Oregon.

3. ***School Transitional Environment Program (STEP):*** promising model. Contact: Center for Prevention, Research & Development, University of Illinois, Champaign, Illinois; Tel: 217-333-3231; http://www.igpa.uiuc.edu/

4. ***Student Training Through Urban Strategies:*** Project STATUS: promising model. Contact: Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD; Tel 410-516-8808; http://scov.csos.jhu.edu.

5. ***Conflict Resolution: A Curriculum for Youth Providers:*** demonstrated model. Contact: National Resource Center for Youth Services, University of Oklahoma, Tulsa, Oklahoma; Tel: 918-585-2986; www.nrcys.ou.edu/default.htm.

6. ***Dating Violence Prevention Program:*** demonstrated model. Contact: Department of Psychology, SUNY, Stony Brook, New York; Tel: 516-632-7852; www.psy.sunysb.edu/marital.

7. ***The School Safety Program:*** demonstrated model. Contact: Policy Executive Research Forum, Washington, DC; Tel: 202-466-7820; www.policeforum.org.

8. ***Peer Culture Development:*** demonstrated model. Contact: School of Education, Loyola University, Wilmette, Illinois; Tel: 847-853-3320.

9. ***Reconnecting Youth,*** Texas: demonstrated model. Contact: National Education Service, Bloomington, Indiana; Tel: 800-733-6786; www.nes.org.

10. ***The Alternative Education Program,*** Alexandria, Virginia: promising model. Minnie Howard School, Alexandria, Virginia; Tel: 540-659-9899.

11. ***The Stafford County Alternative Education Program:*** promising model. Contact: Director of Alternative and Adult Education, Stafford County Public Schools, Falmouth, Virginia; Tel: 540-659-9899

12. ***Social Thinking Skills:*** demonstrated model. Contact: Graduate School of Education, University of California, Santa Barbara, California; Tel: 805-658-9332.

13. ***Project CARE,*** Baltimore, Maryland: promising model.

D: School Wide

1. ***Consistency Management and Cooperative Discipline:*** demonstrated model. Contact: College of Education, University of Houston, Texas; Tel: 713-743-8663; www.coe.uh.edu/~freiberg/cm/

2. ***The Comprehensive School Security:*** promising model. Contact: The Hamilton Fish National Institute on School and Community Violence, Rosslyn, Virginia; Tel: 703-527-4217.

3. ***Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design:*** promising model. Contact: National Crime Prevention Institute, Shelby Campus, University of Louisville, Kentucky.

4. ***Use of School Security Professionals:*** promising model. Contact: American Society for Industrial Security, Cleveland, Ohio; Tel: 216-251-3067.

5. ***W.A.R.N (Weapons Are Removed Now):*** promising model. Contact: Reseda High School, Reseda, California; Tel: 818-881-0280.

6. ***GRASP:*** promising model. Contact: Susan A. Hritz, 3550 S. Gilpin Street, Cherry Hills, Co 80110.

7. ***Project ACHIEVE***, Florida, Alaska, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland and Texas: demonstrated model. Contact: School Psychology Program, University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida; Tel: 813-974-9498.

8. ***SMART,*** Anaheim, California: promising model. Contact: Anaheim Union High School District, California.

Community Based

A: Gangs

1. ***Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T),*** Phoenix, Arizona: promising model. Contact: Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms.

2. ***The Boys & Girls Clubs of America's Gang Prevention Through Targeted Outreach:*** promising model.

3. ***Tri-Agency Resource Gang Enforcement Team (TARGET)***, California: promising model.

B: Guns

1. ***Operation Ceasefire – Boston Gun Project:*** promising model.

C: Children and Youth

1. ***Preventive Treatment Program:*** promising model. Contact: School of Psycho-Education, University of Montreal, Montreal, Quebec; Tel: 514-385-2525.

2. ***Intensive Protective Supervision Project (IPSP):*** promising model. Administrative Office of the Courts, Raleigh, North Carolina; Tel: 919-662-4738.

3. ***Garden of Hope:*** promising model. Contact: Coordinator of Volunteers: Mount Airy City Schools, Mount Airy, North Carolina; Tel: 336-786-9763.

4. ***Boys and Girls Club:*** promising model.

D: Parents

1. ***Parent Child Development Center Programs:*** promising model. Contact: Department of Psychology, University of Houston – University Park, Houston; Tel: 713-743-8508.

2. ***Syracuse Family Development Research Program (FDRP):*** promising model. Contact: Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York; Tel: 315-443-4296.

3. ***Yale Child Welfare Project:*** promising model. Contact: Department of Psychology, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut; Tel: 203-432-4588.

4. ***Seattle Social Development Project (SSDP):*** promising model. Contact: School of Social Work, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington; Tel: 206-286-1805; http://weber.u.washington.edu/~sdrg.

5. ***Preparing for the Drug-Free Years:*** promising model. Contact: School of Social Work, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington; Tel: 206-685-1997.

6. ***Iowa Strengthening Families Program (ISFP):*** promising model. Contact: Social and Behavioral Research Center for Rural Health, Iowa State University, Ames, IA; Tel: 515-294-4518.

7. ***The Strengthening Families Program:*** promising model. Contact: Department of Health Promotion and Education, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT; Tel: 801-585-9201.

8. ***Multi-dimensional Treatment Foster Care:*** model program. Contact: Oregon Social Learning Center, Eugene, OR; Tel: 541-485-2711; www.oslc.org/tfc/tfcoslc.html.

9. ***Prenatal and Infancy Home Visitation by Nurses:*** model program. Contact: Prevention Research Center for Family and Child Health and Home Visitation, Denver, Colorado; Tel: 303-864-5200. For replication contact: Replication and Program Strategies, Philadelphia, PA; Tel: 215- 557-4482; www.replication.org.

E: Neighborhoods

1. Very few neighborhood interventions have been implemented and even fewer have been evaluated.

APPENDIX B: REFERENCES

ACLU (1997, March). From Words to Weapons: The Violence Surrounding our Schools.A publication of the ACLU Foundation of Southern California. Los Angeles, CA.

APA (1993). American Psychological Association. Summary report of the American Psychological Association Commission on Violence and Youth (Vol1). Washington D.C. (ERIC Abstract).

Annual Report on School Safety (1998). U.S. Department of Education and U.S Department of Justice (Washington, D.C.: Authors).

Burton, S., Weaver, MT. (1994). On Alert! Gang Prevention: School In-Service Guidelines. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education

Cairns, R., Cairns, B., and Neckerman, H. (1989). Early school dropout: Configurations and determinants. Child Development 60 (6), 1437-1452.

Carter, J. (1999). Domestic Violence, Child Abuse, and Youth Violence: Strategies for Prevention and Early Childhood Intervention. Family Violence Prevention Fund.

Centerwall, B.S. (1992). Television and violence. Journal of the American Medical Association, 267. 3059-3063.

CSBA (1994). Protecting our Schools. California School Board Association. Los Angeles, CA.

Curcio, J.L., and First, P.F. (1993). Violence in the schools: How to proactively prevent and defuse it. CA: Corwin Press.

Derksen, D.J., and Strasburger, V.C. (1996). Media and television violence: Effects on violence, aggression, and antisocial behaviors in children. In A.M. Hoffman (Ed.), Schools, violence, and society. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Embry, D.D., Flannery, D.J., Vozsonyi, A.T., Powell, K.E., and Atha, H (1996). Peacebuilders: A theoretically driven, school-based model for early violence prevention. American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 12, 91-100.

Eron, L.D., and Huesmann, R. (1993). The stability of aggressive behavior—even onto the third generation. Handbook of Developmental Psychopathology (pp147-156). NY:Plenum.

Flannery D.J. (1997). School Violence: Risk, Preventive Intervention, and Policy. Cleveland OH: Cleveland State University, Urban Child Research Center.

Flannery, D. and Williams, L. (in press). Effective youth violence prevention. In T. Gullotta and S McEhlaney (Eds.), Preventing family and community violence: Voices on violence. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Gerber, G., and Signorielli, N. (1990). Violence Profile, 1967 through 1988-89: Enduring patterns. Unpublished manuscript, University of Pennsylvania, Annenberg School of Communications.

Hamilton Fish National Institute on School and Community Violence (1999). Comprehensive Framework for School Violence Prevention. Rosslyn, Virginia: Author, 2/8/99.

Hawkins, J.D., Herrenkohl, T., Farrington, D.P., Brewer, D., Catalano, R.F., and Harachi, T.W. (1998). A review of predictors of youth violence. In Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders: Risk Factors and Successful Interventions, edited by R. Loeber and D.P. Farrington. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Howell, J.C. (1994). Recent gang research: Program and Policy implications. Crime and Delinquency, 40, 495-515.

Huesmann, L.R. (1986). Psychological processes promoting the relation between exposure to media violence and aggressive behavior by the viewer. Journal of Social Issues, 42, 125-139.

Huff, C.R. (1996). The criminal behavior of gang members and nongang at-risk youth. In C.R. Huff (Ed.), Gangs in America (pp75-102). Newbury Park CA: Sage.

Kandel, E., and Mednick S.A. (1991). Perinatal complications predict violence offending. Criminolgy, 29, 519-529.

Kaufman, P., Chen, X., Choy, S.P., Chandler, K.A., Chapman, C.D., Rand, M.R. and Ringel, C. (1998). Indicators of School Crime and *Safety, 1998*. U.S. Departments of Education and Justice. NCES 98-251/NCJ-172215. Washington, D.C.:1998, 30.

Making Schools Safe (1999). National Governors Association, Center for Best Practices. http://www.ngo.org.

Mediascope (1996). National television violence study: Executive summary. 1994-1995 Los Angeles: Author.

Modzeleski, W. (1996). Creating safe schools: Roles and challenges, a federal perspective. Education and Urban Society, 28(4), 473-491.

Moffitt, T.E. (1990). The neuropsychology of juvenile delinquency: A critical review. Crime and Justice: A review of the literature. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Noguera, P.A. (1995). Preventing and producing violence: A critical analysis of responses to school violence. Harvard Educational Review, 65(2), 189-212.

Patterson, G., Reid, J.B., and Dishion, T. (1992). Antisocial boys. Eugene, OR: Castalia.

PRIDE (1998). 1997-1998 PRIDE Survey, Parent Resource Institute for Drug Education.

Raine, A., Brennan P., and Mednick S.A. (1994). Birth complications combined with early maternal rejection at age 1 predispose to violent crime at age 18. Archive of General Pyschiatry, 51, 984-988.

Report to Congress on Juvenile Violence Research. (1999). Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Rowe, D. (1994). The limits of family influence. NY: Guilford Press.

Sege, R., and Dietz, W. (1994). Television viewing and violence in children: The pediatrician as agent for change. Pediatrics, 94, 600-607.

Sheley, J.F., McGeee, Z.T., and Wright, J.D. (1992). Gun-related violence in and around inner-city schools. American Journal of the Disabled Child, 146, 667-682.

Stone, C. (1999). Comments made by Christopher Stone during the February 1999 Executive Forum on Combating School Violence.

Vazsonyi, A., and Flannery, D. (in press). Early adolescent delinquent behaviors: Associations with family and school dimensions. Journal of Early Adolescence.

Walker, H.M. and Sylwester, R. (1991). Where is school along the path to prison? Educational Leadership, 49(1), 14-16.