Dedicated to the Health of the Whole Community



Administration 3003 Moorpark Avenue San Jose, California 95128 Tel. (408) 423-0701 Fax. (408) 423-0702

To: Geoff Paulsen, Program Manager, Violence Prevention Program

From: Alice Kawaguchi, Health Education Specialist, Violence Prevention Program

Subject: 2002/2003 PeaceBuilders® School Evaluation Data

Date: October 29, 2003

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to provide information about the PeaceBuilders® evaluation conducted at 26 schools during the 2002-2003 school year.

BACKGROUND

PeaceBuilders® is a research based violence prevention program developed for school age youth, from kindergarten to middle school. In 1997, PeaceBuilders® was initiated in Santa Clara County with funding from the David and Lucile Packard Foundation. Based on positive results, Santa Clara County funded an additional eight schools in 1998, and an additional ten schools in 2000. In May 2000, the City of San Jose/County of Santa Clara Joint Power Authority (JPA) also funded five schools in the City of San Jose. In July 2001, the JPA awarded additional funds to continue implementation of PeaceBuilders® at those five schools. In 2001 and 2002, county and JPA funds supported the PeaceBuilders® implementation at 7 additional schools.

EVALUATION PROCESS

The Violence Prevention Program (VPP) staff collected the 2002-2003 school year evaluation data from 26 of the 28 schools actively participating in the PeaceBuilders® Program. One school (Del Buono Elementary) declined to participate in the evaluation process. One school with a mid-year implementation date in 2003 (Olinder Elementary) was not evaluated due to the belief that the school had not had adequate time to initiate program components. The Violence Prevention Program staff requested 15-30 minutes of an existing staff meeting at each school and administered the teacher survey (Attachment A) and the principal survey (Attachment B.) The surveys were administered from March 2003-June 2003. Data was tabulated and the results are grouped by years of participation in the Santa Clara County PeaceBuilders® Program. A list of schools with their initial funding source and years of participating in the PeaceBuilders® Program is included in Attachment C.

EVALUATION RESULTS

Teachers were surveyed for increases in student pro-social behavior since the implementation of PeaceBuilders®, decreases in anti-social behavior since the implementation of PeaceBuilders®, and implementation of specific PeaceBuilders® Program components. In the principal survey, fights on the playground before and after implementation of PeaceBuilders® was selected as an objective measure of outcomes. Principals were also asked to rate implementation of the PeaceBuilders® Program. Results for sixth year, fifth year, third year, second year and first year schools are included in Attachments D-H. No new schools were started in 1999, therefore there is no 4th year school data.

Increases in Pro-Behavior

	6 th Year	5 th Year	3 rd Year	2 nd	1 st Year
	N=4	N=5	N=11	Year	N=5
	8			N=1	
% Teachers who say more or many more students display pro-social behaviors since implementation of PB – Avg. of 4 specific behaviors - Avg. of all schools in the group	61.4%	63.4%	59.8%	57.6%	56.2%

Roughly two-thirds of the teachers surveyed perceived more or many more students display positive behaviors following PeaceBuilders® implementation, with a trend to a slight increases over time involved with the program, except for sixth year schools.

Decreases in Anti-Social Behavior

	6 th Year	5 th Year	3 rd Year	2 nd	1 st Year
	N=4	N=5	N=11	Year	N=5
		. ,		N=1	
% Teachers who say few or very	53.0%	57.9%	64.4%	34.6%	55.8%
few students display anti-social					
behaviors since implementation of					
PB – Avg. of 4 specific behaviors -					
Avg. of all schools in the group		<u> </u>	<u> </u>		<u> </u>

Roughly half (53.1%) of teachers perceive that few or very few students display antisocial behaviors following implementation of PeaceBuilders®.

Fights on Playground

	6 th Year N=2	5 th Year N=4	3 rd Year N=9	2 nd Year N=1	1 st Year N=5
% Improvement – Number of Fights/month Before PB Implementation Compared Number of Fights on Playground/month during Current Year - Avg for all schools in group	90.9%	84.6%	88.0%	-50%	85.8%

The sample numbers vary because either the before implementation data or the after implementation data was incomplete for some schools. All school groups showed improvement in the number of fights on the playground except for Lincoln Elementary in year two, which went from 1 fight per month to two fights per month.

Use of Program

	6 th Year	5 th Year N=5	3 rd Year	2 nd Year N=1	1 st Year N=5
Principal Rated Implementation on a scale of 1-5 with 5 being the	4	3.6	3.8	4	3
highest	N=3		N=10		-
% of teachers that used specific program components or rated use	51.8%	61.6%	57.3%	70.5%	57.5%
by other in a positive manner – Avg of 7 parameters for all schools in the group	N=4		N=11		

Use of the program varies from year to year due to changing circumstance within the schools. The challenge for the Violence Prevention Program staff has been to sustain the use of the program over time. The program appears sustainable over time but may require ongoing input from the VPP staff, or the program distributor, Peace Partners, to maintain school interest and support.

Subjective comments from school principals are included in Attachment I. The principal comments reflect a number of successes for the PeaceBuilders® Program, but also indicate the need for ongoing support in order to "keep it going." Some of the needs have already been addressed such as refresher training for teachers, yard duty, parents and peace coaches, county-wide events such as the poster contest and newsletter, workshops on effective practices, stipends for onsite support, and student and school incentives. Some of the needs will require support from the new distributor of PeaceBuilders® Issues that have been previously discussed with Heartsprings, Inc., and Peace Partners include:

- The need for Spanish language materials
- Continued program development beyond the initial foundation/implementation of PeaceBuilders®

The schools also mentioned some ideas for possible ongoing support, which could be explored. These ideas include:

- Suggestion for dealing with students who have behavior problems
- Parent training in various languages
- Assemblies or speakers/role models for students
- PeaceBuilders® tables at school community health events

Overall, principals requested support to get the program going AND to keep it going.

PLANS FOR THE FUTURE

All 28 schools were notified at the end of the 2002-2003 school year that their funded status would be ending, but were offered continuing training and technical support upon request. One school (Bachrodt Elementary) notified the Violence Prevention Program that they would be discontinuing use of the program during the upcoming 2003-2004 school year. Despite inquires from the VPP staff; no specific reason was given. All other schools planned to continue use of the program. The VPP staff also initiated the implementation of PeaceBuilders® at 7 new schools for the 2003-2004 school year.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE

- Continue program components which are already developed, refresher training for teachers, yard duty, parents, and peace coaches
- Continue county-wide events such as poster contest, and Peace Connection Newsletter
- Continue "Peace Talks" Workshop
- Evaluate the use of stipends for onsite support
- Continue to provide materials and incentives to new PeaceBuilders® schools, as well as ongoing technical support for existing schools
- Continue to ask the new distributor, Peace Partners, for materials in other languages and continued development of new PeaceBuilders materials and train the trainer workshops
- Explore new ways that the VPP can support "keeping it (PeaceBuilders®) going."

Please contact Alice Kawaguchi or Susan Lowery, Health Education Specialists, if there are questions. They can be reached at (408) 494-7843 or (408) 494-7844.

PeaceBuilders® Teacher Survey

Name of School:	Date (day/mont	h/year)	:		
District:	Grade Level:				
On the scale from 1 to 5 (below), how would you r	ate your school in t	erms of	fstudents		
being at risk of physical violence (i.e., physical figh	nt, carrying weapon	s to sch	ool, etc.)?		
1 = No risk 2=Minimal risk 3 = Moderate risk	4= High risk 5	= Very	high risk	•	
On the scale from 1 to 5 (below), how would you rabeing at risk of verbal abuse (i.e. bullying, teasing,	ate your school in to intimidation, etc)?.	rms of	students		
1 = No risk 2=Minimal risk 3=Moderate risk	4=High risk 5=V	ery hig	h risk		
On a scale of 1 to 5, describe your school's use of the	ne PeaceBuilders®	Progran	n using the	e scale	e below
		Ü	Q		
1= Not used 2 = A few components used/periodical 4=Many components used regularly 5=Actively	ic use 3 = Some c and extensively use	ompon ed	ents used	regula	ırly
Please read the following instruc	ctions for completi	ng the	survev.		
Section A		_	•		
Read each item in this section carefully and rate how many of	the students in your cla	assroom	have shown	behavi	or change
since implementing PeaceBuilders®. Please circle response:					Ü
A = (Very Few) Very few students exhibit the behav	ior since implementing	PeaceBu	ulders®.		
B = (Few) A few students exhibit the behavior since C = (No Change) Have not observed any change in s PeaceBuilders®.	implementing PeaceBu tudents' behavior since	ilders®. implem	enting		
D = (More) More students exhibit the behavior since	implementing PeaceBr				
E = (Many More) Many more students exhibit the be	mbromente r oncors	illders®,			
	ehavior since implemen	illders®. iting Pea	ceBuilders®) .	
	ehavior since implemer Very	ting Pea	ceBuilders® No change		Many More
Since implementing PeaceBuilders®, roughly ho	ehavior since implemer Very Few	ting Pea	ceBuilders®		Many More
Since implementing PeaceBuilders®, roughly ho students in your classroom exhibit the behavior	ehavior since implemer Very Few w many	ting Pea	ceBuilders®		
students in your classroom exhibit the behavior l 1. Compromise with peers when necessary.	ehavior since implement Very Few w many listed. A	Few B	ceBuilders® No change C	More D	More E
 Compromise with peers when necessary. Respond to teasing or name calling constructive 	ehavior since implement Very Few w many listed. A	ting Pea	ceBuilders® No change	More	More
 Compromise with peers when necessary. Respond to teasing or name calling constructive (e.g., by ignoring it, changing the subject). Accept constructive criticism from peers without 	very Few many listed. A	Few B	ceBuilders® No change C	More D	More E
 Compromise with peers when necessary. Respond to teasing or name calling constructive (e.g., by ignoring it, changing the subject). Accept constructive criticism from peers without becoming angry. 	very Few many listed. A cly A	Few B B	C C	More D D	More E E
 Compromise with peers when necessary. Respond to teasing or name calling constructive (e.g., by ignoring it, changing the subject). Accept constructive criticism from peers without 	very Few many listed. A cly A	Few B B	ceBuilders® No change C C	More D D	More E E
 Compromise with peers when necessary. Respond to teasing or name calling constructive (e.g., by ignoring it, changing the subject). Accept constructive criticism from peers without becoming angry. Listen carefully to my instructions and direction 	very Few many listed. A cly A	Few B B	C C	More D D	More E E
 Compromise with peers when necessary. Respond to teasing or name calling constructive (e.g., by ignoring it, changing the subject). Accept constructive criticism from peers without becoming angry. Listen carefully to my instructions and direction for assignments. Cope appropriately with aggression from other children (e.g., trying to avoid a fight, walking and the compression of the contraction of the	very Few many listed. A A A A A A A	Few B B	C C	More D D	More E E
 Compromise with peers when necessary. Respond to teasing or name calling constructive (e.g., by ignoring it, changing the subject). Accept constructive criticism from peers without becoming angry. Listen carefully to my instructions and direction for assignments. Cope appropriately with aggression from other children (e.g., trying to avoid a fight, walking as seeking assistance, defending self). 	very Few many listed. A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A	Few B B B	C C C	D D D D	E E E E
 Compromise with peers when necessary. Respond to teasing or name calling constructive (e.g., by ignoring it, changing the subject). Accept constructive criticism from peers without becoming angry. Listen carefully to my instructions and direction for assignments. Cope appropriately with aggression from other children (e.g., trying to avoid a fight, walking as seeking assistance, defending self). Interact with a number of different peers. 	w many listed. A A A A A A A	Few B B B B	C C C C	More D D D D	E E E E
 Compromise with peers when necessary. Respond to teasing or name calling constructive (e.g., by ignoring it, changing the subject). Accept constructive criticism from peers without becoming angry. Listen carefully to my instructions and direction for assignments. Cope appropriately with aggression from other children (e.g., trying to avoid a fight, walking as seeking assistance, defending self). 	very Few many listed. A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A	Few B B B	C C C	D D D D	E E E E

Section B

Each item describes a behavior that often results in disciplinary action. Please circle response:

- A = (Less Often) If the behavior occurs less frequently than before PeaceBuilders®.
- B = (No Change) If you have not observed any change in the frequency of a particular behavior.
- C = (More Often) If the behavior occurs at a higher rate now than before PeaceBuilders® was implemented.
- D = (Never a Problem) If the behavior was never a problem in your classroom before PeaceBuilders® was implemented.

Often	to Change	Often	Problem
A	В	C	D
A	В	C	D
A	В	C	D
A	В	C	D
\mathbf{A}	${f B}$	C	D
\mathbf{A}	В	C	D
\mathbf{A}	В	\mathbf{C}	D
A	В	C	D
A	В	C	D
A	В	C	D
\mathbf{A}	В	C	D
A	В	C	D
	A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A	A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B	Often Often A B C A B C A B C A B C A B C A B C A B C A B C A B C A B C A B C A B C A B C A B C A B C A B C A B C

Less No Change More

Never a

Section C

The following questions relate to the use of PeaceBullders® in the school and classroom. Please circle response:

- A = (True) If statement is true of your classroom or school
- B = (Not True) If the statement is not true of your classroom or school
- C = (Unsure) If you are unsure
- D = (NA) If the statement does not apply

• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	True	Not True	Unsure	NA	
22. I taught most lesson plans (e.g., "What is Peace?,"	A	В	C	D	
"Helping and Hurting Behaviors") from the Action Guide.					
23. My students regularly recited the PeaceBuilders® Pledge.	A	В	C	D	
24. In my class, we associated stories, current events	A	В	C	D	
and school events to PeaceBuilders® frequently					
during the week.					
25. My students wrote Praise Notes to one another frequently.	A	В	C	D	
26. I sent home notes praising students each day.	A	В	C	D	
27. My students frequently wrote about PeaceBuilding themes.	A	В	C	D	
28. Other teachers are using PeaceBuilders® often.	A	В	C	D	
29. Many PeaceBuilders® assignments are displayed	A	В	C	D	
in the building and are changed often.					
30. Monitors and other staff are supporting PeaceBuilders®.	\mathbf{A}	В	\mathbf{C}	D	
31. The principal shows leadership in implementing PeaceBuilders®.	A	В	C	D	

Section D

Have you encountered any barriers/challenges to implementing PeaceBuilders®? If yes, please indicate the challenges/barriers on the backside of this sheet.

PeaceBuilding Survey for Principals Name of School: School District: City: Number of students in school: _____ Date: _____ Number of students participating in PeaceBuilders: Number of teachers participating: Number of staff participating: Number of volunteers participating: _____Number of parents participating: API Score for last school year: Attendance for last school year: **Program Impact After implementing PeaceBuilders®:** Estimated number physical fights on school grounds: Monthly Estimated number of students sent to the office for disciplinary action by principal. Monthly Estimated number of suspensions. Yearly Estimated number of terminations. Yearly Total number of weapons violations (e.g. gun, knife or club): Yearly On the scale from 1 to 5, how would you rate your school in terms of students being at risk of physical violence (i.e., physical fight, carrying weapons to school, etc.)?......! 1 = No risk 2=Minimal risk 3 = Moderate risk 4= High Risk 5 = Very High risk On the scale from 1 to 5, how would you rate your school in terms of students being at risk of verbal abuse (i.e. bullying, teasing, intimidation, etc.)?..... 1 = No risk 2=Minimal risk 3=Moderate risk 4=High risk 5=Very High risk On a scale of 1 to 5, describe your school's use of the PeaceBuilders® Program using the scale below:

 $1=Not\ Used\ 2=A\ few\ components\ used/periodic\ use\ 3=Some\ components\ used\ regularly\ 4=Many\ components\ used\ regularly\ 5=Actively\ and\ Extensively\ used$

Additional PeaceBuilders® Evaluation Questions Please use an additional sheet of paper if necessary

1.	Roughly what percentage of children show more positive behavior since you have implemented PeaceBuilders® in your school?%
2.	How have you adapted PeaceBuilders® materials into everyday practice in your school?
3.	What successes have you seen because of PeaceBuilders®?
4.	Have you encountered any barriers/challenges to implementing PeaceBuilders®? If yes, please indicate what the challenges/barriers are.
5.	What would you add or change to make PeaceBuilders® more effective?
6.	What activities/services can the Santa Clara County Public Health Department provide to better support your school's efforts to create a climate that prevents violence in school and in the community?
7.	Additional comments.

Attachment C

Santa Clara County PeaceBuilders® Schools Initial Funding Source and Years of Implementation

Packard Foundation Funded Schools -1997 - 1998 - 1999 - (delayed implementation into 2002) 6 year Schools

Brownell Middle

Chavez Elementary

Cureton Elementary

Horace Mann Elementary

McKinley Elementary

Russell Elementary

County Funded (C1) – 1998 – 1999 - 2000 – 5th year schools

Carlton Elementary

Hazelwood Elementary

Randall Elementary

Rose Elementary

Ryan Elementary

Slater Elementary

Vargas Elementary

Willow Glen Elementary

County Funded (C2) -2000-2001-2002-3rd year schools

Bachrodt Elementary

DeVargas Elementary

DelBuono Elementary

Hughes Elementary

Monta Loma Elementary

Painter Elementary

San Antonio Elementary

Simonds Elementary

Spangler Elementary

Theuerkauf Elementary

JPA Funded Schools (JPA) 2000-2001 – 3rd year schools

Baker Elementary

Christopher Elementary

Gardner Academy

Miller Elementary

Pala Middle School

County Funded (C3) – mid-year 2001 – 2nd year school Lincoln Elementary

Italics indicate schools which started the program but discontinued use of PeaceBuilders®

Attachment C

Santa Clara County PeaceBuilders® Schools Initial Funding Source and Years of Implementation

County Funded (C4) – 2002 – 1st year schools

Arbuckle Elementary

Burnett Academy (Middle School)

Darling Elementary

Miner Elementary (partial funding from JPA)

Olinder Elementary

Stipe Elementary

County Funded (C5) 2003 - new school have not year which have not yet been evaluated

Anderson Elementary

Del Roble Elementary

Graystone Elementary

Las Animas Elementary

Lone Hill Elementary

Muir Elementary

Washington Elementary

Note:

P- 6th Year Schools Discontinuation Rate 1/5=20% C1 -5th Year Schools Discontinuation Rate 3/8=37.5% C2/JPA-3 Schools –Discontinuation Rate 3/15=20%

Italics indicate schools which started the program but discontinued use of PeaceBuilders®

Attachment D

2002-2003 School Year PeaceBuilders® Evaluation Data

For Packard Foundation Funded Schools

6th Year of PeaceBuilders® Use

	Chavez	Cureton	Horace Mann	Russell	All P Schools Yr 6 Schools
		7410	70 70	55.00	(0.40/
Compromise with Peers	75.0%	74.1%	72.7%	55.6%	69.4%
Respond Appropriately to Name Calling	41.7%	57.7%	54.6%	53.6%	51.9%
Can Cope with Aggression from Others	54.2%	70.4%	90.9%	53.6%	67.3%
Can Accept Not Getting Their Own Way	66.7%	66.7%	54.5%	39.3%	56.8%
Are Cruel, Bullies, or Mean	62.5%	56.0%	63.6%	50.0%	58.0%
Are Disobedient in School	50.0%	50.0%	70.0%	35.7%	51.4%
Disturb Other Students	50.0%	44.0%	63.6%	35.7%	48.3%
Get Into Fights	58.3%	48.0%	81.8%	50.0%	59.5%
Disrupt Classroom Discipline	58.3%	38.5%	54.5%	39.3%	47.6%

Attachment D

2002-2003 School Year PeaceBuilders® Evaluation Data

For Packard Foundation Funded Schools

6th Year of PeaceBuilders® Use

	Chavez	Cureton	Horace Mann	Russell	All P Schools Yr 6 Schools
Principal Rated Implementation Scale 1-5 5 is highest	4	4	4	NA	4
Fights on Playground /mo Before PB	NA	5	30	8	17.5 2 schools only
Fights on Playground/mo After PB	ights on 1 large layeround/mo	3	0.22	NA	1.6 2 schools only
Taught the Lessons	21.7%	40.7%	60.0%	0.0%	30.6%
Recited the PB Pledge	39.1%	85.7%	20.0%	57.1%	50.5%
Associated events, stories with PB	62.5%	70.4%	45.5%	29.6%	52.0%
Wrote Praise Notes	50.0%	21.4%	45.5%	42.9%	40.0%
Teachers Use PB	52.2%	66.7%	30.0%	32.1%	45.2%
Monitors Use PB	62.5%	60.7%	100.0%		72.8%
Principals Shows Leadership for PB	91.7%		63.6%	75.0%	71.8%
Avg. Implementation Score	54.2%	57.5%	52.1%	43.5%	51.8%

Attachment E

2002-2003 School Year PeaceBuilders® Evaluation Data For County Funded (C1) Schools 5th Year of PeaceBuilders® Use

	Carlton	Hazelwood	Rose	Vargas	Willow Glen	All C1 Schools Yr 5 Schools
Compromise with Peers	92.8%	53.0%	56.5%	75.0%	66.7%	68.8%
Respond Appropriately to Name Calling	78.6%	57.1%	39.1%	60.9%	66.7%	60.5%
Can Cope with Aggression from Others	78.5%	58.8%	73.9%	54.1%	66.7%	66.4%
Can Accept Not Getting Their Own Way	64.2%	47.1%	65.2%	58.4%	55.5%	58.1%
Are Cruel, Bullies, or Mean	78.6%	43.8%	59.1%	73.9%	72.2%	65.5%
Are Disobedient in School	57.1%	25.0%	59.1%	56.5%	76.5%	54.8%
Disturb Other Students	50.0%	37.5%	60.9%	52.2%	72.2%	54.6%
Get Into Fights	78.6%	25.0%	78.3%	52.2%	77.8%	62.4%
Disrupt Classroom Discipline	71.4%	18.8%	47.8%	45.5%	77.8%	52.3%

Attachment E

2002-2003 School Year PeaceBuilders® Evaluation Data For County Funded (C1) Schools 5th Year of PeaceBuilders® Use

	Carlton	Hazelwood	Rose Rose	Vargas	Willow Glen	All C1 Schools Yr 5 Schools
Principal Rated Implementation Scale 1-5 5 is highest	4	3	3	5	3	3.6
Fights on Playground /mo Before PB	1	9	3.5	12.5	NA	6.5
Fights on Playground/mo After PB	1	2	0.1	1	10	2.8
Taught the Lessons	21.4%	25.0%	18.2%	37.5%	50.0%	30.4%
Recited the PB Pledge	100.0%	62.5%	82.6%	100.0%	77.8%	84.6%
Associated events, stories with PB	84.6%	37.5%	39.1%	83.3%	72.2%	63.3%
Wrote Praise Notes	71.4%	17.6%	47.8%	33.3%	16.7%	37.4%
Teachers Use PB	92.9%	35.3%	21.7%	87.5%		59.2%
Monitors Use PB	85.7%	76.5%	69.6%			78.6%
Principals Shows Leadership for PB	100.0%	88.2%	65.2%			77.6%
Avg. Implementation Score	79.4%	48.9%	49.2%	72.0%	58.4%	61.6%

Attachment F

	Bachrodt	DeVargas	Hughes	Painter	San Antonio	Simonds	Spangler
Compromise	52.4%	95.5%	83.3%	94.1%	77.8%	73.0%	73.9%
with Peers Respond Appropriately to Name	52.4%	71.4%	77.8%	82.4%	72.2%	57.6%	43.5%
Calling Can Cope with Aggression from Others	71.4%	85.7%	83.3%	88.2%	66.7%	73.0%	56.5%
Can Accept Not Getting Their Own Way	66.7%	72.7%	55.5%	82.3%	66.7%	73.1%	65.2%
Are Cruel,	52.4%	54.5%	77.8%	76.5%	58.8%	76.9%	69.6%
Bullies, or Mean		77.20/	61.10/	88.2%	70.6%	73.1%	73.9%
Are Disobedient in School	57.1%	77.3%					
Disturb Other Students	47.6%	63.6%	33.3%	76.5%			
Get Into Fights	61.9%	50.0%	66.7%	76.5%			
Disrupt Classrrom Discipline	57.1%				41.7%	57.7%	47.8%

Attachment F

	Christopher	Baker	Pala	Gardner		All C2/JPA Schools Yr 3 Schools
Compromise with Peers	84.2%	100.0%	27.3%	39.1%		72.8%
Respond Appropriately to Name Calling	88.9%	90.9%	27.2%	45.8%	-	64.6%
Can Cope with Aggression from Others	84.2%	81.8%	36.4%	50.0%		70.7%
Can Accept Not Getting Their Own Way	68.4%	72.7%	31.8%	41.7%		63.4%
Are Cruel, Bullies, or Mean	73.7%	72.7%	38.1%	44.0%		63.2%
Are Disobedient in School	63.2%	90.9%	33.3%	40.0%		66.2%
Disturb Other Students	52.6%	63.3%	19.0%	36.0%		49.2%
Get Into Fights	78.9%	81.8%	31.8%	48.0%		63.4%
Disrupt Classrrom Discipline	68.4%	81.8%	31.8%	34.8%		56.8%

Attachment F

	Bachrodt	DeVargas	Hughes	Painter	San Antonio	Simonds	Spangler
Principal Rated Implementation Scale 1-5 5 is highest	2	4	5	NA	4	3	4
Fights on Playground /mo Before PB	20	3	2-3	18	1	1	4
Fights on Playground/mo After PB	1	1	3	NA	0.25	0	0
Taught the Lessons	47.6%	18.2%	64.7%	62.5%	22.2%	30.8%	22.7%
Recited the PB Pledge	71.4%	95.5%	100.0%	87.5%	83.3%	34.6%	91.7%
Associated events, stories with PB	47.6%	68.2%	83.3%	87.5%	38.9%	34.6%	69.6%
Wrote Praise Notes	42.9%	28.6%	72.2%	56.2%	61.1%	34.6%	30.4%
Teachers Use PB	45.0%	59.1%	94.1%	87.5%	52.9%	40.0%	78.3%
Monitors Use PB	47.6%	77.3%	100.0%	75.0%	83.3%	76.9%	82.6%
Principals Shows Leadership for PB	60.0%	86.4%	100.0%	87.5%	76.5%	69.2%	82.6%
Avg. Implementation Score	51.7%	61.9%	87.8%	77.7%	59.7%	45.8%	65.4%

Attachment F

	Christopher	Baker	Pala	Gardner	All C2/JPA Schools Yr 3 schools
Principal Rated Implementation Scale 1-5 5 is highest	4	3	5	4	3.8
Fights on Playground /mo Before PB	1	12.5	NA	10-15	7.6
Fights on Playground/mo After PB	0.11	0.5	0.1	1	0.7
	172				
Taught the Lessons	22.2%	30.0%	9.5%	16.0%	31.5%
Recited the PB Pledge	94.7%	36.4%	4.8%	16.0%	65.1%
Associated events, stories with PB	78.9%	72.7%	14.3%	48.0%	58.5%
Wrote Praise Notes	72.2%	63.6%	4.8%	28.0%	45.0%
Teachers Use PB	89.5%	63.6%	4.8%	29.2%	58.5%
Monitors Use PB	84.2%	90.9%	28.6%	40.0%	71.5%
Principals Shows Leadership for PB	94.7%	81.8%	19.0%	26.1%	71.3%
Avg. Implementation Score	76.6%	62.7%	12.3%	29.0%	57.3%

Attachment G

2002-2003 School Year PeaceBuilders® Evaluation Data

For County Funded (C3) Schools 2nd Year of PeaceBuilders® Use

	Lincoln	All C3 Schools Yr 2 Schools
Compromise with Peers	65.3%	65.3%
Respond Appropriately to Name Calling	53.8%	53.8%
Can Cope with Aggression from Others	61.5%	61.5%
Can Accept Not Getting Their Own Way	50.0%	50.0%
Are Cruel, Bullies, or Mean	38.5%	38.5%
Are Disobedient in School	34.6%	34.6%
Disturb Other Students	26.9%	26.9%
Get Into Fights	38.5%	38.5%
Disrupt Classrrom Discipline	34.6%	34.6%

Attachment G

2002-2003 School Year PeaceBuilders® Evaluation Data

For County Funded (C3) Schools 2nd Year of PeaceBuilders® Use

		 2 Year of	PeaceBuilderse	y Ose	
	Lincoln				All C3 Schools Yr 2 Schools
Principal Rated Implementation Scale 1-5	4				4
5 is highest Fights on Playground /mo Before PB	1				1
Fights on Playground/mo After PB	2				2
Taught the Lessons	37.5%				37.5%
Recited the PB Pledge	100.0%				100.0%
Associated events, stories with PB	64.0%				64.0%
Wrote Praise Notes	46.2%				46.2%
Teachers Use PB	53.8%				53.8%
Monitors Use PB	92.3%				92.3%
Principals Shows Leadership for PB	100.0%				100.0%
Avg. Implementation Score	70.5%				70.5%

Attachment H

2002-2003 School Year PeaceBuilders® Evaluation Data

For County Funded (C4) Schools

1st Year of PeaceBuilders® Use

	Arbuckle	Burnett	Darling	Miner	Stipe	All C4 Schools Yr 1 Schools
Compromise with Peers	76.2%	48.6%	68.7%	60.0%	60.9%	62.9%
Respond Appropriately to Name Calling	70.0%	40.0%	46.2%	45.0%	43.5%	48.9%
Can Cope with Aggression from Others	81.0%	45.7%	65.6%	60.0%	65.2%	63.5%
Can Accept Not Getting Their Own Way	52.4%	48.6%	50.0%	45.0%	52.2%	49.6%
Are Cruel, Bullies, or Mean	90.0%	50.0%	48.4%	80.0%	52.2%	64.1%
Are Disobedient in School	71.4%	44.1%	40.6%	55.0%	60.9%	54.4%
Disturb Other Students	55.0%	47.1%	40.6%	30.0%	47.8%	44.1%
Get Into Fights	66.7%	55.9%	46.9%	75.0%	65.2%	61.9%
Disrupt Classrrom Discipline	61.9%	50.0%	40.6%	57.9%	60.9%	54.3%

Attachment H

2002-2003 School Year PeaceBuilders® Evaluation Data

For County Funded (C4) Schools 1st Year of PeaceBuilders® Use

	Arbuckle	Burnett	Darling	Miner	Stipe	All C4 Schools Yr 1 Schools
Principal Rated Implementation Scale 1-5 5 is highest	3	3	3	3	3	3
Fights on Playground /mo Before PB	2	9	15	112	10	29.6
Fights on Playground/mo After PB	1.5	0.5	10	4	5	4.2
Taught the Lessons	14.3%	48.6%	67.7%	40.0%	27.3%	39.6%
Recited the PB Pledge	35.5%	14.3%	93.5%	100.0%	13.0%	51.3%
Associated events, stories with PB	66.7%	26.5%	56.7%	63.2%	60.9%	54.8%
Wrote Praise Notes	50.0%	31.4%	46.7%	95.0%	26.1%	49.8%
Teachers Use PB	57.1%	40.0%	36.7%	60.0%	47.8%	48.3%
Monitors Use PB	76.2%	82.9%	90.3%	90.0%	39.1%	75.7%
Principals Shows Leadership for PB	76.2%	82.9%	87.1%	94.7%	73.9%	83.0%
Avg. Implementation Score	53.7%	46.7%	68.4%	77.6%	41.2%	57.5%