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CTC is installed in a community through a five-phase process implemented over a 1-2 year period:

1) Get Started—assessing community readiness to undertake collaborative prevention efforts;

2) Get Organized—getting a commitment to the CTC process from community leaders and forming a diverse and representative Community Youth Violence Prevention Board or coalition;

3) Develop a Profile—using epidemiologic data to assess prevention needs;

4) Create a Plan—choosing effective prevention practices, and programs based on assessment data;

5) Implement and Evaluate—implementing the new strategies with fidelity, in a manner congruent with the programs’ theory, content, and methods of delivery, and evaluating progress over time.
Mission: To decrease youth violence in Robeson County, NC

- $6.5 million, five year grant from CDC
- Community Based Participatory Research
- Implement multi-component youth violence prevention initiative

Robeson County, NC

One of the poorest counties in U.S. (poverty rate 34.7% vs. 13% for U.S.).
Lost 8,500 jobs over last decade (40% of private sector labor force).
The most ethnically diverse rural county in U.S. (43% Native American, 9% Latino, 30% African American, 17% non-Latino White).
Largest non-reservation concentration of Native Americans (Lumbee Nation)
Homicide rate 23.9/100,000 4x national rate 5.2/100K
Ranks first in NC for juvenile arrests (16,064 per 100,000)

Youth Violence Prevention Programs

Universal Prevention: Positive Action (PA) and Students Against Violence Everywhere (SAVE)
- Community Partner: Public Schools of Robeson County
  - 13 Intervention Schools; 55 teachers
  - > 4,700 participating 6th - 8th graders
  - Compare to 9 schools in Columbus County without PA and SAVE

Targeted Prevention: Teen Court (TC) for First Offenders
- Community Partners: Juvenile Services, Office of Courts, Law Enforcement Agencies & SROs
  - Serve 120 adolescents each year
  - Assess recidivism
  - Compare to TC and non-TC juveniles

Targeted Prevention: Parenting Wisely (PW) for Parents
  - Serve 100-150 parents each year
  - Compare no-TX to PW delivered in different formats
  - Pretest, Posttest, 6 mo follow-ups

Rural Adaptation Project: Longitudinal Panel Study of more than 5,000 Adolescents

Robeson County (RC) Health Dept, Public Schools of RC, Lumberton Police Dept, RC District Court, Southeastern Family Violence Center, Healing Lodge, RC Partnership for Children, RC NAACP, RC Juvenile Crime Prevention Council, UNC-Pembroke, Lumbee Tribe, Southeastern Mental Health, Guardian Ad Litem program, DSS.
From October 1 through December 10, 2012 we have had **58 parents complete PW**. Consequently, we are at 58% of our goal for participants served (58/100).

**Waitlist Control Group**: 55 parents recruited, completed pretests and posttests (3 months later)

**New Groups**: 1 group beginning in March with 11 parents.

**Plan**: From April through September, we need to run 2 more groups with 20 parents and have 10 parents complete PW online.

**Form and status of any booster sessions?** No booster sessions.

**How diffuse is the program** (does it have reach across the entire county)? Yes, we recruit all over the county.
Parenting Wisely Wait List Control Group

Purpose:
In order to evaluate the effectiveness of PW, it is helpful to compare the assessments of those parents who have participated in PW with those who have not. Therefore, we will implement a “wait-list control group” where parents will fill out the assessments twice (time 1- upon recruitment, time 2-three months later) before participating in PW. This will allow us to show how parents who have not participated in PW differ from those who have participated in PW.

Plan:
Recruit 35 parents this fall to serve as a “waitlist control group. We recruited 55. Have parent fill out first assessment after recruitment. Three months later, have parent fill out second assessment. Have parent participate in group/online delivery as usual. Have parents fill out post-test assessment. Have parents fill out 6-month follow-up assessment.

Compensation:
The parent will receive $10 for each assessment completed.
Parenting Wisely Standardized Effect Sizes by Delivery Style

- Parenting Sense of Coherence
- Parenting Self Efficacy
- Parent-Adolescent Conflict
- CBCL Externalizing

Delivery Styles:
- Workshop
- Group with Parents and Adolescents
- Group - Parents Only
- Online - Parents and Adolescents
Program Updates – Teen Court

• Received 147 referrals this fiscal year as of 3/15/2013
• Held 22 TC Sessions resulting in 94 Teen Court Trials (see tracking sheet)
  • 78% of goal of 120 defendants for this year
• Conducting Research on Jury Members/Attorneys/Volunteers
  • Good idea, but we have not had the personnel to do this. Two TC staff members have decreased their time and this piece of research is not a priority.
• Expansion to Pembroke: The expansion to Pembroke was to follow through with our promise to do some TC nights in outlying courts within the County.
  • Plan: One night per month (the third Thursday of each month) 2-3 cases. Start in April.
  • Progress: Secured the courtroom, secured Judges, arranged security from the Pembroke Police department, and logistically moved some staff around to cover the night.
• Needs: Securing attorney advocates to cover the cases that night. We have three going through training right now who are from UNCP.
Program Updates — Teen Court

Year 2
Totals: 100
Referrals – 69 Trials

Year 3
Totals: 147
Referrals – 94 Trials
Discuss PA implementation in 6th grade. Based on the July 17, 2012 conversation with Dr. Brian Flay and Dr. Carol Allred, 6th grade teachers should implement a minimum 100 lessons (by the end of the year). The benchmarks that you provided at the reverse site visit in December and the updated tracking sheet that you provided in February all have 70 lessons (by the end of the school year) as the goal for 6th grade.

Troubleshoot ways to bolster implementation in 6th grade classrooms

Suggestions from NC-ACE on how to enhance implementation – one suggestion is to have further discussions with Dr. Carol Allred)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hawaii</th>
<th>Chicago</th>
<th>Southern State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of schools</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Intervention Schools</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated # of teachers</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>“two classrooms per grade”</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated # of tx students</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>1,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training provided to schools</td>
<td>From Developer: 3-4 hrs in year 1; 1-2hrs each subsequent year. Other: Annual boosters and mini-conferences.</td>
<td>From Developer: 4 hrs in year 1; 2 hrs each subsequent year. Other: Annual boosters, workshops, TA/support.</td>
<td>Developer trained teachers at beginning of project. No follow-up trainings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported # of lessons taught?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Reported “% teachers teaching at least 4 lessons per week” Range: 61%-68%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation data collected</td>
<td>Year-end process survey: how often concept taught in typical day, how often classroom-specific and school-wide materials used (1=never; 5=always). Survey of control schools’ use of other interventions.</td>
<td>Weekly implementation reports; unit implementation reports; year-end process survey; student report of program exposure (note: manuscripts only reported data for some of these measures, not all.)</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dosage Time</td>
<td>“Approximately 1 hour during typical week” “15min each day”</td>
<td>“15 min each day”</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Positive Action Progress in Fairgrove Middle

- **Radford (6)**
  - Completed Lessons: 60
  - Goal: 70

- **Waddell (7)**
  - Completed Lessons: 43
  - Goal: 48

- **Kirkwood (8)**
  - Completed Lessons: 41
  - Goal: 48
Positive Action Progress in Fairmont Middle

Completed Lessons

Goal

Positive Action Progress in Littlefield Middle

- Hayes Locklear (6): 58 Completed Lessons, 70 Goal
- Cromartie (7): 42 Completed Lessons, 48 Goal
- Wyvis Oxendine (8): 21 Completed Lessons, 48 Goal
Positive Action Progress in Lumberton Junior High

Completed Lessons vs. Goal

Taylor (7): 47, 48
Lindsey (7): 30, 48
Chavis (8): 45, 48
Brumfield (8): 38, 48
Positive Action Progress in Magnolia Middle School

Completed Lessons

Goal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Tubbs (6)</th>
<th>Patton (7)</th>
<th>Jacobs (7)</th>
<th>Faulk (8)</th>
<th>Chavis (8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed Lessons</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Positive Action Progress in Orrum Middle School

- Mac/Nance/Burgess (6): 63/70
- Ellison Jacobs/Burgess (7): 44/48
- Bogan Wright/Burgess (8): 37/48

Completed Lessons
Goal
Positive Action Progress in Parkton Middle School

- Locklear (6): 70
- Locklear (7): 48
- Locklear (8): 48

![Bar Chart]

- Completed Lessons
- Goal
Positive Action Progress in Pembroke Middle School

![Graph showing completed lessons and goals for different classes.]

- Nutting (6): Completed 59 lessons, Goal 70
- Blount (7): Completed 40 lessons, Goal 48
- Dew/Godwin (7): Completed 26 lessons, Goal 48
- Munson (7): Completed 39 lessons, Goal 48
- Jacobs (8): Completed 37 lessons, Goal 48
- Boyd (8): Completed 38 lessons, Goal 48
- Elk (8): Completed 35 lessons, Goal 48
Positive Action Progress in Prospect Middle School

- **Dial (6)**: 60 Completed Lessons, 70 Goal
- **Hunt (7)**: 36 Completed Lessons, 48 Goal
- **Locklear (8)**: 30 Completed Lessons, 48 Goal
Positive Action Progress
in Rowland Middle School

Completed Lessons | Goal
--- | ---
Baker (6) 65 | 70
Dial (6) 61 | 70
Brown (6) 75 | 70
Gilliland (7) 43 | 48
Nunnery (7) 47 | 48
McBride (7) 43 | 48
Williams (8) 40 | 48
Bullard (8) 40 | 48
Nyguard (8) 40 | 48
Positive Action Progress in St. Paul’s Middle

- Kerns (6): 65 completed, 70 goal
- Holt (7): 32 completed, 48 goal
- Johnson (8): 27 completed, 48 goal

Completed Lessons vs. Goal
Positive Action Progress in Townsend Middle

Completed Lessons | Goal
--- | ---
Adema (6) | 64 | 70
Brown (7) | 58 | 48
Positive Action Teacher Observation

Date_________ School ___________ Teacher_________

Grade _______ Length of Lesson_______ Observer ______

Teacher states purpose of lesson.
Teacher presents core lesson content.
Teacher demonstrates positive actions in classroom.
Teacher uses PA vocabulary.
Teacher engages students in the lesson.
Teacher uses supporting materials.
Teacher concludes lesson.
Teacher maintains length of lesson to 10-20 min.

Modifications Made:
Omissions in the lesson:
Demonstrated teaching strengths:
Areas to bring more attention to:
Evaluation Overview

- Longitudinal trajectory 2000 – 2015
- Quasi-experimental RPD design
- Juvenile arrests; delinquent acts

- Quasi–experimental
- Longitudinal HLM
- School–level indicators
  - violent acts
  - suspensions
  - academic performance

- Training
- Manualized programs
- Technical support
- Supervision
- Process evaluation

- Quasi–experimental
- Longitudinal HLM
- Aggressive behavior
- Risk & protective factors
County-Level

- Does the youth violence prevention initiative reduce county-level indicators of violence?
  - Juvenile Arrests, Delinquent/Undisciplined rates

School-Level

- Does initiative reduce school-level indicators?
  - Do county-level statistics help explain changes in indicators?
  - School violence, suspensions, EOG/EOC scores

Individual-Level

- Is initiative associated with individual level outcomes; changes in youth social experiences
  - What are the relationships among changes in social environmental risk & protective factors, academics, & conduct
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>• Juvenile arrests • Delinquent acts • Complaints against juveniles</td>
<td>NC-DPS</td>
<td>Annually + 3-year baseline for all North Carolina counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>• Acts of violence at school • Suspensions • Math &amp; Language Arts EOG/EOC</td>
<td>NC-DPI Action for Children NC</td>
<td>Annually + 3-year baseline for target and comparison schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Individual | • School Success Profile PLUS  
  • Aggressive behaviors 
  • Neighborhood, school, peer, and family systems 
  • Physical & psychological health | Self-report                                | Annually from students in target and comparison county |
|         |                                                                          |                                             |                                                      |
|         | Program Assessments                                                     | Self-report                                 | Teen Court defendants and parents Parenting Wisely parents |
County Level Evaluation Data

Figure 2: NC Complaints Against Juveniles 2008

Note: Wake, Durham, Guilford, Forsyth, Cumberland, and Mecklenburg Counties are urban areas with large populations. The remaining counties are rural with high levels of youth violence.

Complaints Against Juveniles (Number) – 2008

Action for Children North Carolina
KIDS COUNT Data Center, www.kidscount.org/datacenter
A Project of the Annie E. Casey Foundation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Detailed Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TotalComp11</td>
<td>Total complaints filed against juveniles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class1_311</td>
<td>Total class 1-3 offenses filed against juveniles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ClassA_E11</td>
<td>Total class A-E offenses filed against juveniles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ClassF1_A11</td>
<td>Total class F1 and A1 offenses filed against juveniles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infractions11</td>
<td>Total infraction offenses filed against juveniles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status11</td>
<td>Total status offenses filed against juveniles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TotalDelComp11</td>
<td>Total delinquent complaints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBO11</td>
<td>Total number of school-based offenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSBO11</td>
<td>Total number of non-school-based offenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A_EFelApp11</td>
<td>Distinct juvenile A-E felony complaints approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A_EFelDis11</td>
<td>Distinct juvenile A-E felony complaints disposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CompApp11</td>
<td>Total complaints approved for court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DelCompApp11</td>
<td>Total delinquent complaints approved for court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UnCompApp11</td>
<td>Total undisciplined complaints approved for court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NotApp11</td>
<td>Total complaints not approved for court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DelNotApp11</td>
<td>Total delinquent complaints not approved for court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UnNotApp11</td>
<td>Total undisciplined complaints not approved for court</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Offenses Include:
- Arson
- Aggravated Assault
- Burglary, Breaking, and Entering
- Drunk and Disorderly Conduct
- Driving Under the Influence
- Embezzlement
- Forcible Rape
- Forgery and Counterfeiting
- Fraud
- Gambling – Bookmaking
- Gambling – Other
- Larceny Theft
- Liquor Law Violations
- Manslaughter by Negligence
- Murder & nonnegligent manslaughter
- Offenses Against Family and Children
- Other Assault, not aggravated
- Possession or Sale of Variety of Illegal Drugs
- Prostitution
- Robbery
- Runaways
- Sex Offenses
- Stolen Property
- Vandalism
- Weapons Offenses

County Level Variables from Juvenile Justice Data 2000 - 2011

Offenses Include:
- Arson
- Aggravated Assault
- Burglary, Breaking, and Entering
- Drunk and Disorderly Conduct
- Driving Under the Influence
- Embezzlement
- Forcible Rape
- Forgery and Counterfeiting
- Fraud
- Gambling – Bookmaking
- Gambling – Other
- Larceny Theft
- Liquor Law Violations
- Manslaughter by Negligence
- Murder & nonnegligent manslaughter
- Offenses Against Family and Children
- Other Assault, not aggravated
- Possession or Sale of Variety of Illegal Drugs
- Prostitution
- Robbery
- Runaways
- Sex Offenses
- Stolen Property
- Vandalism
- Weapons Offenses
Source: Special data request from State Bureau of Investigation.
Note: data includes youth up until their 18th birthday
Aggravated Assault Arrests 2000-2011

Source: Special data request from State Bureau of Investigation.
Note: data includes youth up until their 18th birthday
Other Assaults (Not Aggravated) Arrests 2000 - 2011

Source: Special data request from State Bureau of Investigation.
Note: data includes youth up until their 18th birthday
Weapon Possession Arrests 2000 - 2011

Source: Special data request from State Bureau of Investigation.
Note: data includes youth up until their 18th birthday
Number of Vandalism Arrests 2000 - 2011

Source: Special data request from State Bureau of Investigation.
Note: data includes youth up until their 18th birthday
Number of Larceny Arrests 2000 - 2011

Source: Special data request from State Bureau of Investigation.
Note: data includes youth up until their 18th birthday
Burglary: Breaking & Entering Arrests 2000-2011

Source: Special data request from State Bureau of Investigation.
Note: data includes youth up until their 18th birthday
Number of Runaways Arrests 2000 - 2011

Source: Special data request from State Bureau of Investigation.

Note: data includes youth up until their 18th birthday.

Note: 18 Counties do not report this data. State average only includes data from 79 counties.
Child and Family Level Research


Two rural counties: Census in County 1, randomly selected 40% of students in County 2.

Baseline data for the Rural Adaptation Project collected in Spring 2011, then annually in Spring thereafter.

Panel study: Follow core cohort for 5 years, add 500 more 6th graders each year for comparison.

Students gave assent and completed an online assessment (SSP+) in a school computer lab
- Each student was given a $10 gift card
- Students were free to skip any question or stop the assessment at any time
School Success Profile (SSP)
- 220 items, self report measure
- Attitudes and perceptions about school, friends, family, neighborhood, self, health and well-being

SSP+: Additional Scales
- Youth Self-Report: Internalizing and Externalizing behaviors
- Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale
- Phinney’s Ethnic Identity Measure
- Conflict Behavior Questionnaire: Parent-Child conflict
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Peers</th>
<th>Family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Neighborhood Support (5 items; $\alpha = .795$)</td>
<td>• Friend Support (5 items; $\alpha = .873$)</td>
<td>• Parent Support (5 items; $\alpha = .907$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Neighborhood Crime (3 items; $\alpha = .752$)</td>
<td>• Delinquent Friend Behavior (9 items; $\alpha = .906$)</td>
<td>• Parent Child Future Orientation (3 items; $\alpha = .887$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Peer Pressure (5 items; $\alpha = .750$)</td>
<td>• Parent Education Support (6 items; $\alpha = .829$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Peer Rejection (3 items; $\alpha = .718$)</td>
<td>• Parent-Child Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Personal Beliefs and Experiences</td>
<td>Mental Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teacher Support (8 items; $\alpha=.888$)</td>
<td>• Perceived Discrimination (3 items; $\alpha=.732$)</td>
<td>• Aggressive Behaviors (YSR: 12 items; $\alpha=.864$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School Danger (11 items; $\alpha=.864$)</td>
<td>• Ethnic Identity (6 items; $\alpha=.927$)</td>
<td>• Internalizing Problems (YSR: 8 items; $\alpha=.900$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School Satisfaction (7 items; $\alpha=.843$)</td>
<td>• Religious Orientation (3 items; $\alpha=.896$)</td>
<td>• Depression (4 items; $\alpha=.872$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Rigor (3 items; $\alpha=.797$)</td>
<td>• Future Optimism (12 items; $\alpha=.939$)</td>
<td>• Anxiety (3 items; $\alpha=.776$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Relevance (6 items; $\alpha=.884$)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Self-esteem (5 items; $\alpha=.893$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School Hassles (13 items; $\alpha=.910$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sample: 6th-8th Grade Students
2,873 in target county
and 1,448 in comparison county

Gender: 48.6% Male
Free/Reduced Lunch: 67.9%
Mean Age: 12.81 years

Native American 26%
African American 24%
Anglo/White 26%
Latino 9%
Mixed/Other 14%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Robeson County</th>
<th>Columbus County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Surveys</td>
<td>2,458</td>
<td>2,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Age</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th: 17%</td>
<td></td>
<td>6th: 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th: 33%</td>
<td></td>
<td>7th: 26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th: 31%</td>
<td></td>
<td>8th: 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th: 19%</td>
<td></td>
<td>9th: 23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female: 51%</td>
<td>Female: 51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>African American: 22%</td>
<td>African American: 29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino: 9%</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino: 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native American: 39%</td>
<td>Native American: 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White: 13%</td>
<td>White: 49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiracial: 14%</td>
<td>Multiracial: 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other: 2%</td>
<td>Other: 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunch</td>
<td>Yes: 73%</td>
<td>Yes: 64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Environment</td>
<td>Robeson County</td>
<td>Columbus County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asset</td>
<td>Caution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbor Support</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Crime</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination Experiences</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Support</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Relevance</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Rigor</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Satisfaction</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Danger</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Hassles</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend Support</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Group Relationships</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend Behavior</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Support</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Academic Environment</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Education Support</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Child Conflict</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Well-being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success Orientation</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Esteem</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalizing Behaviors</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalizing – Depression</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalizing – Anxiety</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externalizing Behaviors</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Environment</td>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asset %</td>
<td>Caution %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbor Support</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Crime</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination Experiences</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Support</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Relevance</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Rigor</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Satisfaction</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Danger</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Hassles</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend Support</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Group Relationships</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend Behavior</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Support</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Academic Environment</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Education Support</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Child Conflict</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Well-being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUCCESS ORIENTATION</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF ESTEEM</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERNALIZING BEHAVIORS</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERNALIZING – DEPRESSION</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERNALIZING – ANXIETY</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTERNALIZING BEHAVIORS</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 1: How Common are Negative School Experiences?
Prevalence of Negative School Experiences

- Bullied (12 months): 23
- Electronically Bullied (12 months): 23
- Afraid of Being Hurt at School*: 11
- Afraid of Being Hurt on Way to School: 30
- Insulted (30 Days): 22
- Disrespected (30 Days): 51
- Excluded from Activity (30 Days): 44
- Treated Unfairly (30 Days): 45

Prevalence:
- Males
- Females
Prevalence of Negative School Experiences

- Picked On (30 Days)
  - Males: 20
  - Females: 25
- Threatened (30 Days)
  - Males: 21
  - Females: 43
- Pushed-Shoved-Hit (30 Days)
  - Males: 17
  - Females: 24
- Made Fun of By Friends
  - Males: 32
  - Females: 34
- Racial Insult (30 Days)
  - Males: 10
  - Females: 15
- Difficulty Making Friends
  - Males: 5
  - Females: 10
Negative School Environment

- **Students Make Fun of Other Students**
  - Prevalence: 95%
  - Males: 95%
  - Females: 95%

- **Disagreements Between Different Races**
  - Prevalence: 66%
  - Males: 47%
  - Females: 26%

- **Destruction of School Property by Students**
  - Prevalence: 66%
  - Males: 47%
  - Females: 26%

- **Students Carry Weapons**
  - Prevalence: 26%
  - Males: 47%
  - Females: 19%

- **Students in Gangs**
  - Prevalence: 19%
  - Males: 47%
  - Females: 19%

- **Students Verbally Abuse Teachers**
  - Prevalence: 19%
  - Males: 47%
  - Females: 19%

- **Students Physically Abuse Teachers**
  - Prevalence: 19%
  - Males: 47%
  - Females: 19%

* Happens sometimes or often
Research Question 2: What Demographic, Psychological, Social, and Environmental Risk and Protective Factors Predict Bullying Victimization?
Dependent Measures

- Traditional bullying victimization
  - “During the past 12 months, have you ever been bullied on school property?” – Yes or No

- Cyber bullying victimization
  - “During the past 12 months, have you ever been electronically bullied? (Including being bullied through e-mail, chat rooms, instant messaging, Web sites, or texting.)” – Yes or No

School Hassles Scale (Bowen & Richman, 2008) – 13 items, frequency with which students have endured peer harassment over the past 30 days, Chronbach’s Alpha was .90.
“When someone is trying to put you down and run over the top of ya. Like calling you names or try to, uh, embarrass you in front of your friends and all that. [The bully] try to take control of you.” 6th grade male.

“I believe it means a person and another person, but the one person getting like, jumped or hit on or getting’ taken stuff from them.” 8th grade female.

“Somebody getting’ picked on and somebody getting’ in a fight.” 8th grade male.

“Somebody hurts some other person. They say something that makes you sad and tries to make you mad.” 6th grade female.

“Like, somebody say somethin’ mean and then push me and I push ‘em back.” 9th grade male.
Independent Measures

Demographics
- Age, race, gender, SES

Psychological factors
- Internalizing symptoms, self-esteem, externalizing Behaviors

Social support
- Teacher, friend, parent, neighborhood support

School Characteristics - Cross Sectional Only
- Size, student achievement, teacher turnover rate, teacher quality, school poverty level, teacher experience

School Experiences - Longitudinal Only
- School satisfaction, perceived discrimination, school danger, school hassles
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Logistic Regression Model Odds Ratios, N=3,610</th>
<th>Traditional Bullying</th>
<th>Electronic Bullying</th>
<th>School Hassles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.74***</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.82***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (Female)</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>1.90***</td>
<td>.73***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (White)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>.72*</td>
<td>.47***</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>.59***</td>
<td>.72*</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>1.46***</td>
<td>1.38**</td>
<td>1.92***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>1.77***</td>
<td>1.47**</td>
<td>2.10***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externalizing Problems</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.96***</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Satisfaction</td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td>.77*</td>
<td>.45***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend Support</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square (df); Nagelkerke R²</td>
<td>336 (28)**</td>
<td>213 (28)**</td>
<td>846 (29)*****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models also control for SES, teacher, parent, and neighborhood support; school and teacher characteristics. School Hassles model uses Ordinal Logistic Regression.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 3: Do chronically victimized students have more negative school experiences, lower perceived social support, and poorer mental health as compared to episodically victimized or non-victimized students?

Research Question 4: How is cumulative victimization related to adolescent adaptation?
Victimization Groups

- **Chronic Victims**: reported experiencing traditional or cyber bullying victimization at Year 1 and Year 2
- **Episodic Year 2 Victims**: reported experiencing traditional or cyber bullying victimization in Year 2, but not Year 1
- **Episodic Year 1 Victims**: reported experiencing traditional or cyber bullying victimization at Year 1, but not Year 2
- **Non-Involved Youth**: no reported traditional or cyber bullying victimization in Year 1 or Year 2
Traditional Bullying Victimization and Mental Health

- Self-Esteem: Never a Victim, Episodic Victim - Year 1, Episodic Victim - Year 2, Chronic Victim Years 1 & 2
- Aggression: Never a Victim, Episodic Victim - Year 1, Episodic Victim - Year 2, Chronic Victim Years 1 & 2
- Anxiety: Never a Victim, Episodic Victim - Year 1, Episodic Victim - Year 2, Chronic Victim Years 1 & 2
- Depression: Never a Victim, Episodic Victim - Year 1, Episodic Victim - Year 2, Chronic Victim Years 1 & 2
Cyber Bullying Victimization and Mental Health

- Self-Esteem
  - Never a Victim: 2.71
  - Episodic Victim - Last Year: 2.64
  - Episodic Victim - Current Year: 2.39
  - Chronic Victim: 2.43

- Externalizing
  - Never a Victim: 1.13
  - Episodic Victim - Last Year: 1.39
  - Episodic Victim - Current Year: 1.54
  - Chronic Victim: 1.64

- Anxiety
  - Never a Victim: 1.52
  - Episodic Victim - Last Year: 1.79
  - Episodic Victim - Current Year: 1.9
  - Chronic Victim: 1.9

- Depression
  - Never a Victim: 1.38
  - Episodic Victim - Last Year: 1.38
  - Episodic Victim - Current Year: 1.53
  - Chronic Victim: 1.97
Cyber Bullying Victimization and School Experiences

- **School Satisfaction**
  - Never a Victim
  - Episodic Victim - Year 1
  - Episodic Victim - Year 2
  - Chronic Victim - Years 1 & 2

- **Preceived discrimination**
  - Never a Victim
  - Episodic Victim - Year 1
  - Episodic Victim - Year 2
  - Chronic Victim - Years 1 & 2

- **School Danger**
  - Never a Victim
  - Episodic Victim - Year 1
  - Episodic Victim - Year 2
  - Chronic Victim - Years 1 & 2

- **School Hassles**
  - Never a Victim
  - Episodic Victim - Year 1
  - Episodic Victim - Year 2
  - Chronic Victim - Years 1 & 2
Traditional Bullying Victimization and Social Support

- Never a Victim
- Episodic Victim - Year 1
- Episodic Victim - Year 2
- Chronic Victim - Years 1 & 2

Support categories:
- Friend Support
- Parent Support
- Teacher Support
- Neighbor Support
Standardized Coefficients for Models Predicting Year 2 Social Support and Mental Health with Cumulative Victimization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parent Support</th>
<th>Teacher Support</th>
<th>Friend Support</th>
<th>Peer Rejection</th>
<th>Future Optimism</th>
<th>Self Esteem</th>
<th>Depression</th>
<th>Anxiety</th>
<th>Aggress</th>
<th>School Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender (Female)</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>0.063 ***</td>
<td>-0.040 *</td>
<td>0.118 ***</td>
<td>0.125 ***</td>
<td>0.058 ***</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunch (Yes)</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td>-0.040 *</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language at Home (Not English)</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.069 ***</td>
<td>-0.077 ***</td>
<td>-0.051 ***</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>-0.091 ***</td>
<td>-0.073 ***</td>
<td>0.037 *</td>
<td>0.077 ***</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>-0.058 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Parent (Yes)</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.038 *</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>-0.063 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV – Year 1</td>
<td>0.414 ***</td>
<td>0.329 ***</td>
<td>0.403 ***</td>
<td>0.219 ***</td>
<td>0.316 ***</td>
<td>0.336 ***</td>
<td>0.424 ***</td>
<td>0.346 ***</td>
<td>0.408 ***</td>
<td>0.410 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Victimization</td>
<td>-0.094 ***</td>
<td>-0.091 ***</td>
<td>-0.057 **</td>
<td>0.229 ***</td>
<td>-0.059 ***</td>
<td>-0.154 ***</td>
<td>0.147 ***</td>
<td>0.126 ***</td>
<td>0.077 ***</td>
<td>-0.130 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R-Square</td>
<td>0.20***</td>
<td>0.13***</td>
<td>0.19***</td>
<td>0.13***</td>
<td>0.13***</td>
<td>0.16***</td>
<td>0.27***</td>
<td>0.19***</td>
<td>0.27***</td>
<td>0.13**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- \( p < .05; \) ** \( p < .01; \) *** \( p < .001 \)
- \( N \) is greater than 2,700 for all models
- OLS Regression
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSRC Schools Over Two Years</th>
<th>Spring 2011</th>
<th>Spring 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent who are often or always afraid of being hurt or bothered in their neighborhood (N4)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent who are often or always afraid of being hurt or bothered at school (S14)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent who report being bullied at school in past 12 months (S15a)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent who report being bullied electronically in past 12 months (S15b)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent who report having bullied someone in the past 12 months (S15c)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent who report having electronically bullied someone in the past 12 month (S15d)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent who report having a lot of difficulty making new friends (FR6)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent who have had a close friend die in the last year (H11)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent who have had a close family member die in the last year (H12)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent who spent one or more hours in the past month doing volunteer work in the community (H16)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n/a=Data not available for Spring 2011. Question was added to assessment in Spring 2012.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rural Adaptation Project: Odds Ratios, N=3405</th>
<th>Depression</th>
<th>Self Esteem</th>
<th>Anxiety</th>
<th>Aggression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender (Female)</td>
<td>2.13***</td>
<td>.67***</td>
<td>.53***</td>
<td>.61**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunch</td>
<td>1.49***</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.27**</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (White)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>2.22***</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>1.79***</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Identity</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.14**</td>
<td>1.22**</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Orientation</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>1.56***</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Discrimination</td>
<td>1.46***</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent-Child Conflict</td>
<td>18.55***</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>8.56***</td>
<td>11.96***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Peer Relationships</td>
<td>3.95***</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td>4.08***</td>
<td>2.43***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Friend Behaviors</td>
<td>1.51***</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.40**</td>
<td>3.95***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Satisfaction</td>
<td>.64***</td>
<td>2.83***</td>
<td>0.77*</td>
<td>0.42***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend Support</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.65***</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Support</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>2.07***</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Turnover (School Level)</td>
<td>.98*</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.97*</td>
<td>0.96*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Lunch (School Level)</td>
<td>.99*</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.27**</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Depression, Self-Esteem, and Parent Support
Discussion: Interaction Effects for Ethnic Identity by School Racial Composition

Model-predicted Probabilities of High Anxiety

Model-predicted Probabilities of High Aggression

% American Indian Students

% Hispanic Students

Ethnic Identity = 1
Ethnic Identity = 2
Ethnic Identity = 3
Ethnic Identity = 4
Overall Themes on Risk and Protective Factors

Risk Factors Across Outcomes

Gender: Females were at risk for electronic bullying victimization, depression, low self esteem, anxiety, and aggression.

Parent child conflict and negative peer relationships were serious risk factors related to higher depression, anxiety, aggression, and lower self esteem.

Protective Factors Across Outcomes

Ethnic minority adolescents had lower victimization and higher self esteem. Ethnic identity was related to higher self esteem and anxiety.

School satisfaction was associated with less victimization, lower depression, anxiety, aggression, and higher self esteem.

Parent and friend support were related to lower victimization, less depression, and higher self esteem.
Qualitative Data: Case Studies from Interviews, Essays, Drawings, and Photos
That's awesome

Kick him
Kick him!

That's what you get

Hey guys ya'll are funny.

Slap him so he'll cry more.

Hey guys you're funny.

Give me your hand. I'll help you get up.

Stop crying little girl.
Shut Up Wimp!

Don’t bully him

Stop that — NOW!
you are the ugliest chick I have ever seen in my whole life, you midget.

Please leave me alone.
Please draw a picture of what happened when you were bullied.

She would usually walk up to me and start talking mean to me and I might say something back to make her feel bad but she still won't stop.
Stop Racism

Words can hurt more than you think.

Don't use them carelessly.

Life always offers you a second chance. It's called tomorrow.

Don't go as slow as a low bun does!!

Name calling

Your words have power. Use them wisely.
Help Stop Bullying Around the World
Community Engagement

- Community Violence Prevention Advisory Council
- Violence Prevention Community Coalition
- ROBESON COUNTY
  - Resource Guide
  - Newsletters
  - Brochures
  - Social Media
  - Faith-Based Resource Initiative

SERVICE-LEARNING ACTIVITIES
NCACE Community Violence Prevention Advisory Council

- Robeson County Health Dept.
- Public Schools of Robeson County
- Juvenile Crime Prevention Council
- NC Department of Juvenile Justice
- United Way of Robeson County
- EastPointe MH Services (SOC)
- Communities In Schools
- Lumbee Tribe of NC
- UNC–Pembroke
- Lumberton Police Dept.
- Robeson County Sheriff’s Office
- District Juvenile Court Services
- Faith Based Community
- Chamber of Commerce
- Department of Social Services
Implementation & Fidelity

- Initial staff training and periodic refresher sessions
- Weekly session notes and implementation tracking
  - Attendance, hours, content delivered
- Weekly clinical supervision sessions
- Selection of programs with strong resources for dissemination, implementation, and fidelity measurement
- Specialized measures of implementation and fidelity specific to selected intervention programs
- Ongoing process evaluation
  - Quantitative and qualitative feedback from participants and facilitators
  - Understand any implementation and fidelity issues and identify salient themes for content and process improvement
  - Iterative cycle of integrating feedback into ongoing program planning
Specific Aim: Enable the development of scholars and scholarly practitioners through cross-disciplinary training of new and established investigators in youth violence prevention.
Training Core Activities

- Create training opportunities
  - Exposure to local and visiting scholars
  - Series of seminars on topics related to youth violence prevention
    - Risk and protective factors
    - Surveillance of youth violence
    - Prevention strategies
    - Research methods

- Create mentoring opportunities
  - Graduate/Undergraduate students, Doctoral students, and junior youth violence prevention researchers receive supervision and guidance from senior researchers and advisory board
Training Core Activities (cont’d)

- Establish new collaborations
  - Multi-disciplinary team of researchers and practitioners collaborate on Advisory Committee and Community Violence Prevention Board
  - Representatives from social work, public health, education, sociology, and psychology
  - Framework for connections between community practitioners and practitioners and researchers

- Raise awareness in the professional and lay communities
  - Training and continuing education to social service providers, educators, public health practitioners, and clinicians
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Personal Well Being</th>
<th>Attitudes and Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• School Safety (11 items; α=.88)</td>
<td>• Physical Health (5 items; α=.75)</td>
<td>• School Engagement (4 items; α=.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Learning Climate (7 items; α=.81)</td>
<td>• Self-Confidence (5 items; α=.91)</td>
<td>• Extracurricular Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School Satisfaction (4 items; α=.86)</td>
<td>• Adjustment (6 items; α=.87)</td>
<td>• Success Orientation (12 items; α=.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Rigor (10 items; α=.91)</td>
<td>• Aggressive Behaviors (YSR: 16 items; α=.81)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Relevancy (11 items; α=.91)</td>
<td>• Internalizing Problems (YSR: 16 items; α=.85)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teacher Support (8 items; α=.89)</td>
<td>• Ethnic Identity (6 items; α=.80)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School Hassles (13 items; α=.90)</td>
<td>• Religious Orientation (4 items; α=.91)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>