Youth Development Strategies, Concepts, and Research

a supplement to the Healthy Kids Survey Resilience & Youth Development Module report

Contents

6

Preface

This supplement to the Healthy Kids Survey (HKS) Resilience & Youth Development Module Report expands on the strategies, concepts, and research identified in the report, and provides specific resources and references for each. It is designed to assist practitioners in broadening their knowledge-base on resilience/youth development research and strategies. It provides a quick resource to the many approaches to providing youth with supports and opportunities at school and in the community. It serves as a guide for determining what course of action should be taken to meet the needs identified through the HKS.

The HKS was developed under contract from the California Department of Education (CDE) by WestEd in collaboration with Duerr Evaluation Resources. Assisting in its development was an Advisory Committee consisting of researchers; education practitioners from county offices of education, school districts, and schools across the state; and representatives from federal and state agencies involved in assessing youth health-related behaviors. Rod Skager served as a special consultant. For more information about the survey, call the toll-free helpline at 888.841.7536, or visit the HKS website at www.wested.org/hks.

Gregory Austin, Ph.D.   Meredith Rolfe
CHKS Director   Administrator
WestEd   Safe & Healthy Kids Program Office
Los Alamitos, CA   California Department of Education

Adventure Learning

Adventure learning is a form of experiential education that involves students in challenging outdoor experiences. Experiential learning is that which provides carefully guided experiences for students and allows them to reflect on what they have learned. While typically thought of as a 3-4 week wilderness experience such as Outward Bound, increasingly educators are incorporating these experiential techniques and methods into schooling. These are examples of the types of supports and opportunities that adults need to provide to youth to help foster resilience. Four critical attributes of adventure programs are:

- *Each student creates challenging and specific goals that direct his/her attention and effort.*
- *The experience is intense; the student is fully participating in the activity.*
- *Feedback is plentiful and immediate.*
- *Reflection, dialog, and action occur in the context of mutual group support, thus providing a learning experience that promotes successful learning and healthy development, one that is constructivist, brain-based, and youth development-centered.*

Examples of adventure learning are Project Adventure and Expeditionary Learning Outward Bound. Project Adventure, begun in 1971, is now in over a thousand schools worldwide. Expeditionary Learning Outward Bound was created as a whole school reform model that is part of the New American Schools initiative with sixty-five schools in 13 states currently using this approach in K-12 education.

A meta-analysis of over 96 studies of outdoor adventure programs (involving over 12,000 young people) found students made gains on 40 different outcomes, categorized into leadership, self-concept and self-control, academics, intrapersonal, interpersonal, and adventuresome (Hattie, 1997). In other words, they found positive holistic (cognitive, emotional, social, physical, and spiritual) developmental outcomes. A key finding of this study is that the student outcomes continued to increase over time, a sharp contrast to most educational interventions in which program effects fade after the program terminates. The researchers attribute these positive findings to the four critical elements listed above.

References

Hattie, J., Marsh, H., Neill, J., & Richards, G. (1997). Adventure education and Outward Bound: Out-of-class experiences that make a lasting difference. *Review of Educational Research 67*(1), 43-87.

Resources

Expeditionary Learning Outward Bound, www.elob.org
    Project Adventure, Inc., www.pa.org

Arts Learning

Several national, large-scale research studies have found that young people involved in the arts, either in their schools or through community-based organizations (CBOs), regardless of educational and economic backgrounds, do better academically, socially, and behaviorally (Heath, 1998; Catterall, 1997). For example, UCLA researcher James Catterall's analysis of data from the National Educational Longitudinal Survey (NELS) involving over 25,000 middle and high school students found that students involved in the arts —*including those from the lowest quartile of family education and income*--do better academically, on standardized test scores, on persistence in school, and on a sense of commitment to the community than students with little or no arts involvement. The findings support the resilience and youth development literature which emphasize the importance of caring relationships, opportunities for meaningful participation, and high expectations.

Heath (1998) looked at characteristics of CBOs engaging youth and found they had a youth development perspective and most offered arts in one form or another. These organizations:

- *Provided caring relationships in the form of an adult facilitator to youth and in positive peer support;*
- *Communicated high expectation messages that challenged and encouraged risk-taking and excellence in performance; and*
- *Elicited the ongoing active participation by the young people in both the artistic endeavor and in the governance of the organization itself.*

The management of these effective community-based arts organizations focused on the 3 Cs:

- *Forging links to the Community,*
- *Building Connection to each other and the community, and*
- *Commitment to their craft and to maintaining a nurturing and healthy organizational environment for learning.*

References

Catterall, J. (1997). Involvement in the arts and success in secondary school. *Americans for the Arts Monographs, 1*(9).

Heath, S., Soep, E., & Roach, A. (1998). Living the arts through language and learning: A report on community-based youth organizations. *Americans for the Arts Monographs, 2* (7).

Resources

Americans for the Arts, www.artsusa.org, (provides research, tool kits, manuals, and PSAs to promote arts in schools and communities).

Getty Education Institute for the Arts, www.artsednet.getty.edu (teaching resources and links to other web sites on arts).

Authentic Assessment

Also referred to as alternative or performance assessments, authentic assessment is grounded in the principles of meaningfulness and validity. Authentic assessments such as student portfolios, performance tasks, and student exhibitions acknowledge and try to measure students' unique strengths, interests, and accomplishments. Authentic assessment is based on seven key principles: (1) the primary purpose of assessment is to improve student learning; (2) assessment for other purposes supports student learning; (3) assessment systems are fair to all students; (4) professional collaboration and development support assessment; (5) the broad community participates in assessment development; (6) communication about assessment is regular and clear; and (7) assessment systems are regularly reviewed and improved.

Authentic assessment reflects the principals of positive youth development as follows:

- *It is student-centered and whole-child focused.*
- *It informs instructional planning through assessment activities linked directly to students' learning experiences and to the context of those experiences.*
- *It results in students who are more intensely connected and engaged in their own learning because assessments are shared with students.*
- *It communicates student growth and achievement in a more meaningful and valid way to family and community.*
- *It provides evidence of student achievement by assessing samples of students' actual schoolwork done over years as opposed to one-shot examinations.*
- *It actively motivates teachers to keep their instruction meaningful to students.*
- *It is integrally tied to authentic* instruction*, involving modes of teaching that foster understanding of rich content, are classroom-based and culturally sensitive, and that encourage students' positive engagement with the world.*

Advocates encourage those in the youth development movement to: (1) discuss the limitations of traditional tests; (2) encourage a shift in emphasis and resources toward classroom-based approaches; (3) promote professional development, aimed at creating schools as communities of learners; and (4) support implementation of high-quality classroom authentic assessments.

References

Darling-Hammond, L. (1995). Authentic assessment in action: Studies of schools and students at work. New York: Teachers College Press.

National Forum on Assessment (1995). Principles and Indicators for Student Assessment Systems. Cambridge, MA: FairTest.

Neill, D. M. (2000). Transforming student assessment [on-line] www.fairtest.org

Resources

Estrin, E. (1993). Alternative assessment: Issues in language, culture, and equity. Far West Laboratory Knowledge Brief 11.

FairTest: The National Center for Fair and Open Testing, 342 Broadway, Cambridge, MA 617-497-2224. Web site: www.fairtest.org

Hill, B.H., & Ruptic,C. (1994). *Practical aspects of authentic assessment: putting the pieces together.* Norwood, MA:Christopher-Gordon Publishers, Inc.

Beacon Centers

Beacon Centers are school-based community centers operated by community organizations that focus on the development of the whole child. Beacons are open extended hours during the school year and during summer months and incorporate a vast array of services, activities, opportunities, and supports to promote the healthy development of children, youth, families, and communities. Individual centers offer a mix of sports and recreation, arts and culture, educational supports, leadership and career development, health education and services, community service learning, family support groups and counseling, social services, and immigration support services.

While each Beacon is unique, reflecting local interests and diversity, they all are grounded in a youth development philosophy based on:

- *promoting caring relationships,*
- *high expectations and clear standards,*
- *high quality activities,*
- *shared ownership and contributions, and*
- *continuity of support.*

They also seek to improve school-home-community linkages by: 1) increasing *family* presence and involvement; 2) involving Beacon staff in school decisions; 3) increasing communication between school staff and community partners, and 4) encouraging shared resources.

In early 1999 there were 76 Beacons in operation in New York City (where the concept originated), 40 of them operating in schools. San Francisco public schools now boast 8 Beacons, and Beacons are now underway in ten other cities across the U.S. A 1997-98 process evaluation by Warren and Brown[1], found that the Beacons' activities and programs were consistent with the core tenets of youth development practice and influenced youth as follows:

- *85% said they considered Beacons a safe place*
- *80% said Beacons helped them avoid drug use*
- *74% said Beacons helped them avoid fighting*
- *75% said Beacons helped them do better in school*
- *72% said Beacons helped them become a leader*
- *73% said they helped organize and carry out activities*

References

Warren, C., Brown, P., & Freudenberg, N. (1999). *Evaluation of the New York City Beacons: Summary of Phase I Findings.* Washington, D.C.: Academy for Educational Development.

Resources

Community Network for Youth Development. 657 Mission Street, Suite 410, San Francisco, CA 94105. Phone (415) 495-0666; E-mail: cnyd@aol.com

Gambone, M. & Arbreton, A. (1997). *Safe Havens: The Contributions of Youth Organizations to Healthy Adolescent Development.* Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

---

[1] Included two rounds of site visits to the 39 beacons then in operation; focus groups with parents; interviews with over 1,000 youth, staff and administrators; and a participant survey of over 7,000 youth.

Class Size Reduction

Nation-wide states are increasingly moving to reduce class size and decrease the student to teacher ratio. Proponents argue that a learning community is easier to foster and develop in a small school with small classes than in a large school of thousands of students and hundreds of faculty. Small classes create such an environment through increased teacher-student contact, less attention paid to discipline, more hands on activities, fostering of student-to-student relationships, and a greater focus on learning. In essence, small classes should create a climate richer in the external assets of caring relationships, high expectation messages, and opportunities for active participation and contribution in the learning process. Such a system benefits students, teachers, and school staff.

Class size reduction has promising research on student academic performance effects. One of the few large, scientifically controlled, long-term studies of class size, the Student Teacher Achievement Ratio (STAR) program in Tennessee, found both immediate and long term effects of reduced class size. Kindergarten children were randomly assigned to classes ranging in size— small (12-17), medium (18-21), and large (22-26). By the fourth grade, test scores and behavior of students in the small classes were better than those of kids in the larger classes. Moreover, low income and Black students increased their scores twice that of White students. Students in smaller classes paid closer attention, asked more questions, and had fewer behavior problems. They even participated more in school clubs and engaged to a greater extent in school life (Mosteller; Toch & Streisand, 1995). A similar program in Wisconsin, the Student Achievement Guarantee in Education (SAGE), was evaluated using a quasi-experimental design and yielded results consistent with Tennessee's STAR experiment (U.S. Dept. of Ed., 1999).

California's CSR initiative has shown that smaller classrooms contribute to and facilitate the development of an environment that positively impacts learning and academic outcomes (California CSR, 2000). The evaluation found that small classes in and of themselves is not the lodestone. Rather, the small classes had to also have the external assets of caring relationships, high expectations, quality instruction, and opportunities to contribute. It also found that equity is a critical issue. The poorer, urban districts are less able to provide the space, number and quality of teachers, and monies required to reduce class size compared to their suburban counterparts.

References

California CSR Research Consortium. (2000). Class size reduction in California: The 1998-99 Evaluation Findings, Executive Summary. Web site: www.classize.org.

Mosteller, F. (1995). The Tennessee study of class size in the early school grades. *The future of children*, 5(2), 113-137.

U.S. Department of Education. (1999). Local success stories:reducing class size. Web site: www.ed.gov/offices/oese/classsize/localsuccess.

Resources

Finn, J. (1998). *Class size and students at risk: What is known? What is next?* National Institute on the Education of At-Risk Students, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.

Policy Analysis for California Education & WestEd, 1998. California's Class Size Reduction, Implications for Equity, Practice, & Implementation.

Community-Based Youth-Serving Organizations

A 1992 review found out-of-school community-based programs served as a powerful force in drug abuse prevention. These promising programs operate with the underlying belief that providing the external assets-- caring relationships, high expectations, and opportunities for meaningful participation-- is critical to positive youth development. (GAO, 1992).

The attributes of these programs included comprehensiveness, intensity, and flexibility. "The most promising programs did not focus on drug prevention alone; rather, they helped the young participants deal with multiple challenges at home, at school, and in the neighborhoods. In some cases, they provided for basic needs in the areas of health and nutrition"(GAO, 1992, p. 24).

McLaughlin et al, (1994) clearly established that for inner-city youth, involvement in a neighborhood organization "that engaged their time, attention, and commitment" was the turnaround factor in their leaving gangs and prisons and becoming contributing community members. These "Places of Hope" had several characteristics in common: (1) physical and psychological safety; (2) listening to youth and giving them opportunities to be heard, make decisions, and plan; (3) providing opportunities and activities grounded in real responsibility and real work; (4) establishing clear rules and discipline that the youth helped create; and (5) providing tools for young peoples' futures: skills, pride, and discipline.

"The Wizards"—the youth workers who succeed with adolescents— are the most critical component of youth organizations that nurture hopeful youth. While totally differing in style, temperament, race, gender, etc., they too, share certain fundamental characteristics essential to creating programs that work for youth. They see the potential—and not the pathology of disadvantaged youth; locate risk in the larger society—not in the youth, their families, their cultures, and their communities; and are youth-centered, placing youth needs before organization, program, or activity. The Wizards also believe in their own self-efficacy—they believe they can make a difference with youth, and that it's never too late. They have a sense of giving back—they want to give back to youth what others gave them as they grew up—and they model this behavior for youth. Lastly, they are authentic: "These kids can see through you if you are really not genuine and really don't care about them".

According to the researchers, "Most of all, the youth organizations that change inner-city youths' lives are families and communities. The skills of wizards and their assistants are skills of community building, constructing places that engage adults and youth together in hopeful, concrete, productive purposes." "The major message we want to get across is that …If adults were to stop viewing young people as something to be fixed and controlled and, instead, helped enable their development, there would be phenomenal change in their lives and society in general" (McLaughlin in Portner, 1994).

References

Government Accounting Office (1992). Adolescent Drug Use Prevention: Common Features of Promising Community Programs,Washington, D.C.

McLaughlin, M., Irby, M., & Langman, J. (1994). Urban Sanctuaries: Neighborhood Organizations in the Lives and Futures of Inner-City Youth. San Francisco: Jossey- Bass.

Portner, J. (1994). The search for elusive sanctuaries for urban youth. Education Week, 6, 30-31.

Community Schools

Community schools, also called full-service or extended-service schools, are a model of public school that combines academics with a complete range of child and family services. The school is open all the time and usually operates through partnerships with federal, state, or local agencies; universities; hospitals; and other organizations. According to researcher Joy Dryfoos, these schools "combine quality education with whatever support services are needed in that community for that community and its students to succeed" (Dryfoos, 1998, p. 72). They are not just places to teach children, but learning centers dedicated to meeting the community's needs and to improving community life. They provide supports and opportunities for students and their families within a caring environment.

This "settlement house-in-the-school" approach describes one of the most well-known community school models, the Children's Aid Society (CAS) Community Schools in New York City. Created in 1992 through a partnership between CAS and the New York City Board of Education, CAS schools offer medical, dental and mental health services, tutoring and other learning supports, recreation activities, teen programs, family resource centers, student-run businesses, Outward Bound adventure activities, museum programs, and career academies. Community schools differ from Beacon center schools in that they integrate families and communities into the curriculum of the school itself. "The goal is to help strengthen the educational process for teachers, parents, and students in a seamless way. Thus, at each school, the site director, employed by CAS, works as an equal partner with the principal on integrating their concerns and expertise to achieve this common goal." By bringing these services into the school, CAS hopes to free teachers to do the work for which they are trained: teaching.

A three-year evaluation comparing the Washington Heights CAS community school students from two middle schools and two elementary schools to students at other schools was begun in 1997 and is currently underway. The study is based on interviews with administrators and staff, teacher focus groups and surveys, evaluations of student perceptions of school climate, and parent interviews. According to one review (Walker, 1999), preliminary data show the following:

- *attendance rates for students* and *teachers have continually improved since the schools opened in 1993;*
- *a student attendance rate of 90% (currently among the highest in the city);*
- *every parent visited a Resource Center at least once;*
- *70% of parents used the Resource Center's services on an ongoing basis;*
- *each student has full health coverage and is seen at least once annually;*
- *no graffiti has been done at any of the schools;*
- *visitors report an overall "good community feeling" at the schools (pp. 15-16).*

References

Dryfoos, J. (1998). Safe Passage: Making It Through Adolescence in A Risky Society. New York: Oxford University Press.

Walker, J. D., (1999). Some Things That DO Make A Difference for Youth: A Compendium of Evaluations of Youth Programs and Practices, Vol. 2 . Washington, D.C.: American Youth Policy Forum.

Community Service Learning

Community service-learning (also called service-learning) is an educational process that integrates students' academic learning with service that meets actual community needs. It combines two effective approaches to education and youth development: experiential learning and community service. Several evaluations, including one on CalServe, California's statewide service-learning efforts, have documented the positive impacts on students both academically and developmentally—socially, emotionally, morally, and spiritually— on teachers, on school climate, and on communities. Both the national evaluation of Learn and Serve programs and the CalServe evaluation found positive student impacts in terms of engagement in school, grades, core subject GPA, educational aspirations, personal responsibility, social responsibility, acceptance of cultural diversity, and leadership.

CalServe found positive effects on both external and internal assets. Teachers involved in Cal Serve reported being more student-centered in their teaching, more collegial, more enthusiastic about teaching, and more resourceful in supporting students. School climate effects were positive with students reporting feeling more connected to school, increased levels of group cohesiveness, mutual respect, and positive peer interactions, and improved relationships between students and teachers. Moreover, service-learning often provided a strong catalyst for reform, for restructuring school activities from traditional methods to more student-centered approaches. Lastly, positive community impacts included improved perceptions of both students and their schools on the part of community agencies and of the general community, increases in the number of community agencies and community volunteers who wanted to participate, and increases in school enrollments and in the passage of school bonds. Perhaps the most important impact on the community was that students met real community needs and made their communities better places.

These and other studies have identified the components of effective service-learning programs: (1) school staff's belief that youth are resources—and not problems to be fixed; (2) students in leadership, planning, and decision-making roles; (3) service experiences grounded in real community needs; (4) a focus on caring relationships—with school staff, students, community agency staff, and agency clients; (5) time for planning, processing, and reflecting on the part of teachers, students, and community partners; (6) teacher control with active principal support, encouragement, and vision; and (7) high-quality professional development.

References

Melchior, A. (1996, 1998). National Evaluation of Learn and Serve America School and Community-Based Programs: Interim and Final Reports Washington, D.C.: Corporation for National Service.

RPP International (1998). An Evaluation of K-12 Service-Learning in California. Sacramento: California Department of Education, CalServe Office.

Resources

National Service-Learning Clearinghouse. Website: www.nicsl.coled.umn.edu

Superintendent's Service-Learning Task Force (1999). Service-Learning: Linking Classrooms and Communities. Sacramento: California Department of Education.

Conflict Resolution

Conflict resolution programs come in a variety of shapes and sizes based on local needs and resources; however,all are similar in their goal to prevent school violence. Conflict Resolution programs teach students flexibility, effective communication, problem-solving skills, and critical thinking. These skills are exactly those identified in resilience research as the internal assets associated with healthy development and life success. Educators typically see Conflict Resolution as providing three key benefits: keeping arguments from turning violent, teaching self-control, and providing fundamental social rules and structures that may not necessarily be found in the home and community environment. Such rules include, but are not limited to: (1) resort to verbal but not physical actions, (2) call people by their proper names, (3) respect others, (4) listen attentively to others (Klonsky, 1995). Conflict Resolution needs to be addressed along with other important school factors, such as positive relationships between and amongst teachers and students, high expectation messages, and opportunities to contribute (Johnson & Johnson, 1996a).

A common component of conflict resolution programs is peer mediation. Typically, a small team of "peer mediators" is chosen to receive training, although sometimes an entire school body is trained. In addition to training about the mediation process, peer mediators are trained in active listening, cultural diversity, power, and bias awareness. Ideally, a balanced, diverse group of mediators, representing the student body in gender, race, ethnicity, and ability levels are trained (Frederickson & Maruyama, 1996).

Research on the effectiveness of Conflict Resolution programs is promising. Findings from a study of the Peacemakers Program implemented across North, Central and South America, Asia, Europe, and Africa indicated that following training, students knew the negotiation and mediation procedures, retained their knowledge throughout the school year, were able to apply the procedures to conflicts in school as well as non-classroom settings, and, when given the option, engaged in problem-solving rather than win-lose negotiations. In addition, teachers dealt less with discipline problems, freeing them to teach (Johnson & Johnson, 1996b).

References

Crawford, D. & Bodine, R. (1996). *Conflict Resolution Education.* Washington D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice & Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Department of Justice, and Safe & Drug Free Schools Program, U.S. Department of Education.

Frederickson, J. & Maruyama, G. (1996). Peer mediator programs: Benefits and key program elements. *Research/Practice, 4*(3), 4-9

Johnson, D. & Johnson, R. (1996a). Teaching students to be peacemakers. *Research/Practice, 4*(3), 10-19.

Johnson, D. & Johnson, R. (1996b). Conflict resolution and peer mediation programs in elementary and secondary schools. *Review of Educational Research, 66*(4), 459-506.

Klonsky, S. (1995). To Learn in Peace. *City Schools, 1*(2), 18-25.

Resources

National Association for Mediation in Education. 205 Hampshire House, Box 33635, University of Massacheusettes, Amherst, MA 01003.
National Center for Conflict Resolution. Web site: www.nccre.org.

Cooperative Learning

Cooperative learning is a pedagogical approach in which a teacher structures learning so that heterogenous groups of students work together to achieve a shared learning goal (see Group Process). Each student is responsible not only for her or his learning, but for other group members' as well. The five basic elements considered essential to all cooperative learning groups include: positive interdependence (feeling of mutuality), face-to-face interaction, interpersonal and small-group social skills, individual accountability, and group processing (time for reflection on group effectiveness). From a youth development perspective, cooperative learning provides a context for learning rich in the critical protective factors of caring relationships, high expectation messages, and opportunities for participation and contribution, thus meeting students' needs for safety, belonging, respect, mastery, challenge, power, and meaning.

Over a thousand studies, according to the International Association for the Study of Cooperation in Education, now corroborate the power of this educational intervention to produce both academic and other broad developmental outcomes–emotional, social, moral, and spiritual. Researchers have found—in studies with matched control groups—increases in the following: academic scores, empathy, social skills, acceptance of diversity (ethnic, racial, physical), conflict resolution, self-esteem, self-control, positive attitudes toward school, and critical thinking (Johnson and Johnson, 1989; Slavin, 1990). According to Slavin, "What is remarkable is that each of several quite different methods has been shown to have positive effects on a wide variety of outcomes… In general, for any desired outcome of schooling, administer a cooperative learning treatment, about two-thirds of the time there will be a significant difference between the experimental and control groups in favor of the experimental group. Rarely, if ever, will differences favor a control group".

References

Johnson, D. & Johnson, R. (1989). *Cooperation and Competition: Theory and Research.* Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.

Slavin, R. (1990). *Cooperative Learning: Theory, Research, and Practice.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Resources

Gibbs, J. (1995). *Tribes: A New Way of Learning and Being Together.* Sausalito, CA: CenterSource Systems. Website: www.tribes.com

Emotional Intelligence

The concept of emotional intelligence, often referred to as EQ, was popularized by Daniel Goleman in his best-selling book by the same name. He summarized years of research by numerous scientists studying intelligence. Researchers had been puzzled for decades as to why IQ often turned out to be limited as a predictor of professional and personal success. What most studies have found is that people with *high EQ* tend to be more successful in life than those with *lower EQ* even if their IQ is average. Interestingly, the skills and attitudes of emotional intelligence match the skills and attitudes that resilience research has identified as promoting life success. These are the same internal assets surveyed in the HKS Resilience & Youth Development Module: cooperation and communication, empathy, problem solving, self-awareness, self-efficacy, and goals and aspirations.

In the current age of standards-driven educational reform, with its concomitant emphasis on inculcating market logic and increasing individualism, many advocates question whether the teaching of emotional intelligence can even be introduced into schooling. They suggest, rather, that community-based organizations provide the more fertile ground for addressing emotions. However, it is the view of the writers of this report that most—not all—of the advocates of emotional intelligence fall into the social skills trap. They fall into the behaviorist paradigm, which assumes that emotional intelligence is learned through the direct teaching of emotional skills. Resilience and other related research (including brain science) has clearly documented the power of positive role models and nurturing climates to tap these inborn survival skills, including the cognitive ability to learn. In other words, emotional intelligence, similarly to resilience, is heavily impacted by the environments that adults create for kids and less by what can be taught in a classroom.

References

Goleman, Daniel (1997). Emotional Intelligence: Why It Can Matter More than IQ. New York: Bantam Books.

Resources

Collaborative to Advance Social and Emotional Learning (CASEL), University of Illinois, 1007 West Harrison Street, Chicago, IL 60607; website: www.casel.org
Institute for Social and Emotional Learning, website: www.mediatorsfoundation.org
Six Seconds (a nonprofit organization serving schools, families, communities, and corporations with training and materials to support emotional intelligence; website: www.eqtoday.com

Family Center

Whether school-based or school-linked, the family resource/service center is a comprehensive family support approach which coordinates delivery of services to children and families (see Healthy Start). Schools establishing family centers are often referred to as full-service schools (Dryfoos, 1995). They are caring environments which provide supports and meaningful opportunities for parents and their children. Lisbeth Schorr (1997) found that highly effective family support programs in general were characterized by flexibility, comprehensiveness, responsiveness, front-line discretion, high standards of quality and good management, a family focus, community rootedness, a clear mission, and respectful, trusting relationships (1997). Similarly, an effective family center is grounded in family support philosophy which emphasizes the family as the unit, builds on family strengths, encourages voluntary participation in programs and activities, addresses family needs comprehensively, and respects individual and cultural differences.

Family resource centers are generally located in home-like settings and serve as informal meeting places for regularly scheduled classes, groups, and social activities. They usually offer activities such as support groups, parenting classes, childcare, short-term counseling, recreational activities, prenatal education, adult education, and career classes. Some centers have a home-visiting component and referral service to other community resources. They all involve community outreach and follow-up and are usually staffed by people from the local community.

References

Dryfoos, J.(1995). *Full-Service Schools.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Schorr, L. (1997). *Common Purpose: Strengthening Families and Neighborhoods to Rebuild America.* New York: Doubleday.

Resources

Center for Collaboration for Children, California State University, Fullerton, CA 92634
Family Resource Coalition, 200 S. Michigan Avenue, Suite 1520, Chicago, IL 60604
School-Linked Integrated Services, Institute for Educational Leadership, Washington, D.C.

Group Process

The seminal work of educational and social constructivist theorists John Dewey and Vigotsky has informed a movement within education that believes small-group processes contribute to the development of higher order thinking skills as well as positive social outcomes. The theory is that through a process of small group discussion and discovery experiences, students construct their own knowledge as well as learn citizenship skills.

The few studies that have actually looked deeper into the conditions that make cooperative learning an effective strategy (see Cooperative Learning) shed some light on the group processes that distinguish between successful and unsuccessful cooperative learning efforts. It is clear from the research that quality of interaction is the key. Cohen's (Cohen, 1994) review of effective group processes identified the following critical components:

- *meta-cognitive processing of the experience,*
- *explicit attention to skill-building,*
- *a group task that requires interaction in terms of interdependence and reciprocity,*
- *open-ended and discovery tasks without one right answer,*
- *belief that every student has gifts and abilities necessary to the group,*
- *acknowledgment of low-status students' competencies,*
- *training students for group process, and*
- *teacher's delegation of authority to the groups.*

Similarly, three meta-analyses, examining over two hundred school-based alcohol, tobacco, and other drug abuse (ATOD) prevention programs, found that interactive group process programs are far more effective in reducing actual ATOD use than non-interactive ones (Tobler 2000). Furthermore, the interactive programs were effective independent of gender, culture, and socioeconomic status. These programs provide opportunities for exchange of ideas between peers. They provide (1) safety and support, and often a substitute family, 2) a place to experiment with new roles and identities, (3) the chance to problem-solve alternative solutions and to acquire new skills and competencies, and (4) the opportunity to be included, to contribute, and to be validated. In essence, interactive programs promote positive youth development.

Tobler also identified program size as a predictor of positive outcomes, even with interactive programs. She found that small is indeed beautiful! In smaller groups, students connect. Tobler's advice to school communities is two-fold. First, "The paramount question for school boards and administrators is whether they will provide the necessary money, class time, extra personnel, and aggressive teacher training in the use of interactive group process skills. An interactive program must include participation by everyone, preferably in small groups. Without the extra leaders to form small groups, the adolescents can interact only a few times and the essential part of the interactive program is missing—that of active involvement, exchange and validation of ideas with their peers, and enough time to practice and truly acquire interpersonal skills" (1997). Secondly, Tobler found that when whole school communities work together to make system-wide changes—either creating school-based programs that actively involve and have the support of family and/or community or creating supportive school environments—that the program effect size can even double (2000).

References

Cohen, E. (1994). Restructuring the classroom: Conditions for productive small groups. *Review of Educational Research 64*(1), 1-35.

Tobler, N. (2000a). Lessons learned. *Journal of Primary Prevention, 20*(4), 261-274.

Tobler, N. (2000b). School-based adolescent drug prevention programs: 1998 meta-analysis. *Journal of Primary Prevention, 20*(4), 275-336.

Tobler, N. & Stratton, H. (1997). Effectiveness of school-based drug prevention programs: A meta-analysis of the research. *Journal of Primary Prevention, 18*(1), 71-128.

Resources

Tribes process, website: www.tribes.com
Council process, website: www.ojaifoundation.org

Health Realization

Health Realization is a psychological-educational approach to prevention, early intervention, and treatment that is focused on teaching individuals self-awareness. The health realization approach shows people of all ages, including students, how their thoughts create their reality, that is, affect their feelings and behavior. According to this approach, thought is the basic common denominator supporting all human experience. Like breathing, thinking is a natural life function that we are always doing. Even our perceptions, feelings, and behavior are the effects of thought; what we think determines how we feel, act, and believe. It is our thoughts that create what seems real to us and account for our separate realities—our differing perceptions of what seems real. As Roger Mills (1995), one of Health Realization's founders, explains, "This is why two people can be in the same situation and perceive it totally differently from each other. For example, someone can live in a subsidized housing development and be grateful for the opportunity to have low-cost shelter, be able to stop worrying about where they will live, and get on with meeting the other needs in their lives, such as education, job training, and daycare. Another person in the same situation might perceive that they are sinking downward, that they will never get out, or that they don't like the kinds of people they must live around.

Thought is the vehicle through which we can either (1) access our innate wisdom and resiliency, as in the former example, or (2) through which we access, in the latter example, our conditioned thinking—the messages or expectations of our past that we have internalized from others' low expectations, from our environments, that create our assumptions, beliefs, memories, judgments, biases, attitudes, and expectations for ourselves and for other people. When we accept this conditioned thinking about ourselves, when we see ourselves as victims, we also begin to see other people through this negative filter of blame and low expectations. This results in feelings of depression, anger, hostility, fear, and despair that often manifest themselves in further victimizing behaviors toward oneself and others, such as alcohol and other drug abuse and violence. The work of Health Realization is to help people learn to recognize and let go of this negative, self-defeating thinking and free their minds to access their innate well being and resilience. Thought recognition can be taught anytime, anywhere, as long as it's done in the context of a caring, respectful, reciprocal relationship, i.e., the three protective factors. It is not an add-on program but a process of deep, cultural belief-system change that requires teachers and youth workers to live this understanding in their own lives.

References

Mills, R. (1995). *Realizing Mental Health.* New York: Sulzburger and Graham Publishing.
Pransky, G. (1998). *The Renaissance of Psychology.* New York: Sulzburger and Graham Publishing.

Resources

Health Realization website: www.psychologyofmind.com

Healthy Start

A popular strategy for strengthening family-school-community connections and for supporting families is through an approach known as school-based integrated services or school-linked services. California's Healthy Start School-Linked Services initiative has been one of the largest efforts nationwide to families to provide more comprehensive integrated services linked to schools through community-generated, collaborative strategies. Several lessons have been learned from this initiative as well as others that can guide schools in their efforts to collaborate with community groups and local service providers in order to ensure their students' healthy growth and development--a necessary precursor to successful learning.

The California Healthy Start evaluation found that there is no single model for collaborative school-linked services. "Local communities can best design effective strategies for meeting the needs of their children and families" (Wagner and Golan, 1996). However, it also found that services delivered tended to be more accessible to students and families, more comprehensive, better integrated into the life of the school, and more likely to get parents involved in the planning and implementation when coordinators

- *were located on a school campus;*
- *served only that campus;*
- *stayed with the effort over time; and*
- *spent more of their time on school-linked services.*

Furthermore, as the California evaluation found, the more parents were actively involved, the more culturally sensitive the program was, the more likely other key stakeholders (teachers, principals, citizens, etc.) were to be invited in, and the more positive overall were the outcomes. (see also Community Schools; Family Center).

References

Wagner, M. & Golan, S. (1996). California's Healthy Start School-Linked Services Initiative: Summary of Evaluation Findings. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International.

Resources

Center for Collaboration for Children, California State University, Fullerton, CA 92634
Family Resource Coalition, 200 S. Michigan Avenue, Suite 1520, Chicago, IL 60604
School-Linked Integrated Services, Institute for Educational Leadership, Washington, D.C.
National Center for Service Integration, Child and Family Policy Center, 218 Sixth Avenue, Fleming Building, Suite 1021, Des Moines, IA 50309-4006

Learned Optimism

Psychologist Martin Seligman, a leading expert on motivation, developed the concept of learned optimism. Having spent most of his early professional life researching the causes and correlates of depression, Seligman was intrigued by the same question as resilience researchers: How is it that some people manage to rise about adversity that should have crushed them? Seligman was also intrigued by the phenomenon that people that should be happy, i.e., that have a loving family, sufficient money, a good job, etc, were not.

Seligman's years of research, involving more than 800,000 people and approximately 200 doctoral dissertations, has identified that what is crucial to a happy successful life is what we say to ourselves when we experience failures and disappointments that inevitably come to even the most fortunate men and women. How we explain our setbacks to ourselves can make the difference between overcoming defeat and succumbing to it. Our explanatory styles are basically either optimistic or pessimistic. Seligman claims that explanatory style develops in childhood, and without explicit intervention, is lifelong. There are three dimensions to explanatory style: permanence, pervasiveness, and personalization (the 3 P's). Pessimistic individuals see bad things as permanent ("I'll never make any friends at my new school"); pervasive ("I hate everything about my new home and school"); and personal ("If I had done better at my old school, we would never have moved."

The goal of parents, teachers, and youth workers is to help youth develop that critical resilience trait, optimism, by continually challenging pessimistic thinking. This means helping young people realize that bad events are not permanent, "It takes time to find a new friend when you move"; not pervasive ("I do like my new history teacher and the kid next door"); and not personal ("I know we had to move to a more affordable house"). Many curricula employ this reframing strategy. However, learning to listen for explanatory style and challenging the 3 P's is something caregivers can do in all their interactions with young people. It is part of that powerful protective factor, high expectation messages, that communicated in an ongoing way, help a youth internalize an optimistic explanatory style.

References

Seligman, M. (1995). The Optimistic Child: A Revolutionary Program that Safeguards Children Against Depression and Builds Lifelong Resilience. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Seligman, M. (1992). Learned Optimism: How to Change Your Mind and Your Life. New York: Pocket Books.

Mentoring

Mentoring, providing an adult-to-youth or older youth-to-younger youth relationship, is a powerful youth development strategy. While creating mentor-rich environments is a major goal of the youth development approach, mentoring is one programmatic approach that has recently proven its power to effect positive alcohol and drug abuse, violence, and academic outcomes. In a scientifically controlled evaluation by Public/Private Venture (P/PV) of over 1,000 adolescents involved in Big Brothers/Big Sisters, mentoring was found to not only produce positive prevention outcomes like delay of onset of alcohol and drug use and reduced levels of violence, cutting classes, and skipping school but also improved relationships with both parents and peers and beginning improvements in grades (Tierney et al, November 1995).

Moreover, the P/PV researchers validated the youth development principle that it is not the program per se that makes the difference but rather the quality of relationships and opportunities for youth participation. They found the relationships that met frequently and proved long-lasting were those in which the adults focused on meeting the developmental needs of the youth—not on their academic competence—and treated the youth as a resource. Ironically, these sought-after outcomes of most educational interventions and prevention programs resulted when they were not the focus of the intervention.

More recent research by P/PV (Herrera et al, 2000) has focused on mentoring relationships in school-based settings. The results suggest that "a school-based approach to providing disadvantaged youth with volunteer mentors provides a promising complement to the traditional community-based model. School-based mentors report relationships with youth that are similar in quality to those observed among mentors in community-based organizations". Program practices that facilitate relationship development in school programs include: (1) shared interests; (2) at least six hours of pre-match training for mentors; (3) monthly mentor contact with program staff; (4) time spent engaging in social as well as academic activities; and (5) ongoing training and support for mentors working with older youth. An impact study of school-based mentoring has not yet been done. (see also, Community Based Youth-Serving Organizations)

References

Herrera, C., Sipe, C., & McClanahan, W. (2000). Mentoring School-Age Children: Relationship Development in Community-Based and School-Based Programs. Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

Morrow, K. & Styles, M. (1995). Building Relationships with Youth in Program Settings: A Study of Big Brothers/Big Sisters. Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

Sipe, C., & Roder, A. (1999). Mentoring School-Age Children: A Classification of Programs. Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

Tierney, J., Grossman, J., & Resch, N. (1995). Making A Difference: An Impact Study of Big Brothers/Big Sisters. Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

Public/Private Ventures, 2005 Market Street, Suite 900, Philadelphia, PA 19103; 215/557-4400; website: www.ppv.org

Resources

California Mentoring Foundation. Web site: www.calmentor
   National Mentoring Partnership. Web site: www.mentoring.org

Multiple Intelligences (MI)

From the field of multiple intelligences (Gardner, 1983; 1999) comes the understanding that there are many different ways of knowing. According to MI theory, each person possesses at least eight intelligences in varying degrees and is capable of developing each intelligence to an adequate level of competency. MI theory can help students develop the resilience trait of self-awareness by helping them reflect upon their own learning processes. This metacognitive activity also helps them develop another resilience trait, active problem solving.

The eight intelligences are:
Verbal/Linguistic: the capacity to think and learn through written and spoken words; the ability to memorize facts, fill in workbooks, take written tests, and enjoy reading.
Musical/Rhythmic: the capacity to perceive, discriminate, transform and express musical forms,
Logical/Mathematical: the capacity to think deductively, deal with numbers, recognize abstract patterns and reason well.
Inter-personal: the capacity to perceive and make distinctions in the moods, intentions, motivations, temperaments and feelings of other people; relational skills.
Visual/Spatial: the capacity to think in and visualize images and pictures; the ability to create graphic designs and communicate with diagrams and graphics; sensitivity to color, line, shape, form, space, and relationships between these.
Intra-personal: the capacity to enjoy and learn through self-reflection, metacognition, working alone; an awareness of inner spiritual realities.
Body/Kinesthetic: the capacity to learn through physical movement and body wisdom; a sense of knowing through body memory; uses hands to produce or transform things.
Naturalistic: the capacity to observe, understand, differentiate, sort and organize patterns in the natural environment; may show expertise in the recognition and classification of plants, animals, or human objects.

While each child possesses all eight intelligences and can develop each to a fairly high level of competence, Gardner claims children begin showing proclivities in specific intelligences from a very early age. By the time they enter school, they have probably established ways of knowing and learning that favor some intelligences more than others. Traditionally, however, schools have focused most of their attention on teaching the 20 percent of the students who learn through only two of the eight intelligences: verbal/linguistic and logical/mathematical methods. National dropout statistics tell us what happens to the other 80 percent of the students who learn visually/spatially, musically/rhythmically, bodily/kinesthetically, inter-personally, intra-personally, and naturalistically.

Many schools, have found Multiple Intelligences theory to provide a research base for using diverse instructional styles, grouping practices, forms of assessment, and subject matter, and materials. "MI theory essentially encompasses what good teachers have always done in their teaching: reaching beyond the text and the blackboard to awaken students' minds…While many other learning-style theories contain terms and acronyms not easily understood by adults, let alone children, the [eight] intellligences are yoked to concrete antecedents that young and old alike have had experience with: words, numbers, pictures, the body, music, people, self, and [nature]." MI theory thus becomes a wonderful tool for looking for, identifying, and helping students discover their own strengths—and for using these strengths to build competencies in their other intelligences.

References

Armstrong, T. (1994). *Multiple Intelligences in the Classroom*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Gardner, H. (1993). *Multiple Intelligences: The Theory in Practice*. New York: Basic Books.

Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.

Resources

New Horizons for Learning. Web site: www.newhorizons.org

Project Zero, Harvard University. Web site: pzweb.harvard.edu

New Dimensions of Learning. Web site: www.multi-intell.com

National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health

Over 12,000 7th–12th grade students were surveyed in the National Longitudinal Study on Adolescent Health which was the first to examine protective factors as well as risk factors in the individual, family, and school. Four domains of adolescent health were assessed: emotional health, violence, substance use (cigarettes, alcohol, and marijuana), and sexuality. According to the University of Minnesota and the University of North Carolina researchers, " It is clear that when demographic characteristics are controlled, social contexts count. Specifically, we find consistent evidence that perceived caring and connectedness to others is important in understanding the health of young people today."

Major findings regarding risk factors included: guns in the home, presence of ATOD in the home, and perceived student prejudice. The exciting findings, however, lay in what the researchers found to protect adolescents against health-risk behaviors: Parent-family connectedness and perceived school connectedness were protective against every health risk behavior measure.

In terms of the family, the researchers commented that while much attention has been placed on the physical appearance of a parent in the home as reducing the risk for substance abuse, "It is consistently less significant than parental connectedness (e.g., feelings of warmth, love, and caring from parents)." A second major family protective factor was parental expectations regarding school achievement. This factor was associated with lower levels of all risk behaviors except suicidality, in which only parent-family connectedness was protective.

In terms of school, the researchers stated, " While much emphasis is placed on school policies governing adolescent behaviors, such policies appear… to have limited associations with the student behaviors under study." Rather, school connectedness, "influenced in good measure by perceived caring from teachers and high expectations for student performance" was found to make the critical difference.

Resources

Resnick, M., Bearman, P., Blum, R., Bauman, K., Harris, K., Jones, J., Tabor, J., Beuring, T., Sieving, R., Shew, M., Ireland, M., Bearinger, L., & Udry, J. (1997). Protecting adolescents from harm: Findings from the national longitudinal study on adolescent health. Journal of the American Medical Association, 278, 823-832.

Resources

Add Health Website: www.cpc.unc.edu/addhealth

Peer Helping/Support

A growing body of psychological and developmental literature is finding positive peer relationships as a critical and influential force in individual outcomes. Creating both positive adult-to-youth and youth-to-youth relationships is necessary for creating a positive school climate that develops a sense of connectedness in students, motivating them academically and protecting them from health-risk behaviors. Peer helping is defined as "a variety of interpersonal helping behaviors assumed by nonprofessionals [in this case, students] who undertake a helping role with others" (Tindall, 1995). It includes one-to-one helping relationships, support groups, tutoring, service learning, conflict mediation, peer education, cooperative learning, and all services of a helping nature. In peer helping and peer support groups all youth are actually helpers—not just the recipients of help, so that the helper experiences the real sense of contribution and empathy. In small group experiences youth are given the chance to meet their developmental needs for safety, belonging, contribution, competence, and self-awareness.

These programs have been successful in elementary and secondary schools in reconnecting disruptive and alienated students, as well as in building inclusion and a sense of belonging with new, immigrant, and ESL students and among racially, ethnically, and physically different students (Eggert, et al, 1998). They have been found to positively affect academic achievement in terms of test scores, grade point averages, and course pass rates, as well as reducing alcohol, tobacco, and other drug use, and violence in schools (Johnson and Johnson, 1996; Perry, 1989; Pringle et al, 1993; Tobler, 1986).

References

Eggert, L. et al. (1998). Preventing adolescent drug abuse and high school dropout through an intensive school-based social network development program. *American Journal of Health Promotion, 8*(3), 208-210.

Harris, J. (1998). *The Nurture Assumption: Why Children Turn Out the Way They Do*. New York: Touchstone.

Johnson, D. & Johnson, R. (1996). Conflict resolution and peer mediation programs in elementary and secondary schools: A review of the research. *Review of Educational Research, 66*(4), 459-506.

Perry, C. (1989). Prevention of alcohol use and abuse in adolescence: Teacher vs. peer-led intervention. *Crisis, 10*(10), 52-61.

Pringle, B. et al. (1993). *Peer Tutoring and Mentoring Services for Disadvantaged Secondary School Students*. Washington, D.C.: Policy Studies Associates.

Tindall, J. (1995). *Peer Programs*. Bristol, PA: Accelerated Development.

Tobler, N. (1986). Meta-analysis of 143 adolescent drug prevention programs: Quantitative outcome results of program participants compared to a control or comparison group. *Journal of Drug Issues, 16*(14), 537-567.

Resources

National Peer Helpers Association, website: www.peerhelping.org

California Association of Peer Programs, website: www.cappeer.org

Brown, B. et al. (1998). *Peer Potential: Making the Most of How Teens Influence Each Other*. Washington, D.C.: National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy (www.teenpregnancy.org).

Resilience Research: Kauai Longitudinal Study

A landmark longitudinal study now spanning over four decades has provided a wealth of data on the protective factors for healthy, successful development despite cumulative risk. Emmy Werner and Ruth Smith have followed the nearly 700 children born on the island of Kauai in 1955. In this study, the high risk group–about a third of these children–was defined by having four or more early risk factors, including poverty, perinatal stress, family conflict, and parental psychopathology–including alcoholism. Their seminal follow-up study at age 18, *Vulnerable But Invincible*, documented that about a third of these high risk children were doing well in terms of getting along with parents and peers, doing fine in school, avoiding serious trouble, and having good mental health. According to the researchers, these youth were "competent, confidant, and caring," despite their stressful childhoods.

A follow-up study, *Overcoming the Odds*, found again "this self-righting tendency". At age 32 about two-thirds of the adolescents identified as high-risk at age18 had become successful adults. They were competent in their work, able to maintain long-term relationships (including marriage), and, of special importance since many had been abused as children, successful at parenting. Three clusters of protective factors distinguished the resilient youth from youth who did develop problems during adolescence: (1) engaging social skills which they used to reach out to family and other supportive individuals; (2) the presence of a committed caregiver (especially during the first year of a child's life); and (3) a broad community support system (informal multigenerational kinship network and supportive role models in school, church, youth groups, etc.)

Werner asks all people who care about children to spread the two-fold message that (1) most delinquent youth and pregnant teens stage a turnaround–and do **not** become either criminals or welfare recipients as adults if they are provided opportunities for participation in adult society; and (2) it's never too late to intervene and change a life trajectory from risk to resilience (Werner 1992; 1996). Werner's specific recommendations to school personnel include:

- *Be a positive roIe model. It is the adult role model–not the building, the bricks, the curriculum, or performance standards–that makes the difference. "Among the most frequently encountered positive role models in the lives of [these] children, outside of the family circle, was a favorite teacher. For the resilient youngster a special teacher was not just an instructor for academic skills, but also a confidante and positive model for personal identification" (1989).*
- *Create opportunities for students to participate in "community'"activities that foster cooperation . "It was an activity where you were not just a passive recipient, but where you were called upon to help someone else and you grew up in the process" that provided a form of protection (1996).*
- *Provide mastery experiences. The self-confidance of resilient children comes from the development of competence: in reading and problem-solving/planning skills; or from a special hobby, talent, or "a gift that they can be proud of, that they can [use to] be accepted by their peers and that can also provide them [with] solace when things fall apart in their home" (1996).*
- *Share the gift of hope with all your students. "We've learned from resilient youngsters that competence and confidence and caring can flourish, even under adverse circumstances. If children encounter persons who provide them with a secure basis for the development of trust, autonomy, initiative, and competence they can*

successfully overcome the odds. That success brings hope. And that is a gift each of us can share. You can share that gift with a child at home, in a classroom on the playground, or in the neighborhood. The rediscovery of the healing powers of hope may be the most precious harvest you can glean in the work you do--for yourself and for the youngsters whose lives you touch" (1996).

References

Werner, E. (1996). Observations on resiliency. *Resiliency in Action, 1*(1), 18-29.

Werner, E., & Smith R. (1992). *Overcoming the odds: High-risk children from birth to adulthood.* New York: Cornell University Press.

Werner, E., & Smith R. (1989). *Vulnerable but Invincible: A Longitudinal Study of Resilient Children and Youth.* New York: Adams, Bannister, and Cox.

Resources

Resiliencenet web site (available in English and Spanish): http://resilnet.uiuc.edu

Restorative Justice

Restorative justice is a philosophy and an approach to discipline that moves away from punishment and towards "restoring" a sense of harmony and well being for all those affected by a hurtful act. It provides families, schools, and communities a way to ensure accountability while at the same time breaking the cycle of retribution and "unlearning" violence. It is based on the resilience view that children and youth are resources who can solve problems, rather than problems that adults must fix. It focuses not on retribution but on reconnecting severed relationships and re-empowering individuals by holding them responsible. In other words, it is grounded in the three protective factors of caring relationships, high expectation messages, and opportunities for participation. This approach acknowledges that when a person does harm, it effects the person(s) they hurt, the community, and themselves. When using restorative measures, an attempt is made to repair the harm caused by one person to another and to the community so that order and well being is restored for everyone.

Restorative justice measures in schools can take many forms:

- teen courts *in which youth become the judge, jury, prosecutor, and defense attorneys;*
- peer and staff mediation*; sentencing circles (also called peacemaking circles), which create a respectful group space, are replacing the "Behavioral Hearing Panels" in Vallejo for students who have been suspended for victimizing others;*
- classroom constitutions *in which students participate in establishing the rules for the class based on the democratic principles of rights and responsibilities;*
- conflict resolution programs *(see Conflict Resolution); and*
- family group conferencing *which brings students and their family members together in meeting with the person harmed.*

These are all variations on the theme of recreating the informal social and community control that contemporary life has fractured. It is a method of "rebuilding the village" to raise all our children. Restorative measures in schools are another tool to build the resilient traits and internal assets associated with life success: cooperation and communication, empathy, problem solving, self-awareness, self-efficacy, and goals and aspirations.

References

Bazemore, G., Pranis, K., & Umbreit, M. (1997). *Balanced and Restorative Justice for Juveniles.* St. Paul, MN: Center for Restorative Justice and Mediation, University of Minnesota.

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (1998). *Guide for Implementing the Balanced and Restorative Justice model.* Washington, D.C.: Department of Justice.

Resources

Center for Restorative Justice and Mediation (includes National Restorative Justice Training Institute), University of Minnesota, School of Social Work. Website: www.ssw.che.umn.edu/rjp

Community Justice Institute, Florida Atlantic University, Fort Lauderdale, FL ; e-mail: bazemor@acc.fau.edu

Restorative Justice Project, Fresno Pacific University, Center for Peacemaking and Conflict Studies, Fresno, CA. Website: www.fresno.edu/pacs/rjp

School-to-Work

School-to-Work programs are a pro-active, systematic, and comprehensive community-wide effort to help students prepare for high-skill careers, receive top quality academic instruction, and gain the foundation skills necessary to pursue post-secondary education and/or entry into the job market. School-to-Work Programs strive to positively impact school attendance, school bonding, and academic performance. Successful School-to-Work programs revolve around a youth development paradigm which integrates high expectations and high standards, supports positive student to teacher or mentor relationships, and opportunities to participate and contribute. These factors encourage the development of social competence, a sense of self, and a sense of purpose and future.

School-to-Work programs come in a variety of forms: learning in the context of a specific major or career; working with teachers in small schools-within-schools; receiving extra support from adult mentors; or participating in internships or being a part of classes at a university. Regardless of the shape or form, all School-to-Work programs recognize that every student benefits from academic learning taught in an applied context and that education not only occurs in schools, but also in neighborhoods, communities, and workplaces. Students graduate from such programs more prepared to enter the workforce or to engage in further training or higher education.

The five basic premises of School-to-Work Programs are:

- *youth need active, not passive, learning in a combination of environments;*
- *students must actively demonstrate mastery of academic skills;*
- *youth are provided with opportunities for positive relationships with caring adults;*
- *research is used to understand how students learn best and application of those methods;*
- *outcome and performance are oriented with high expectations and standards (Halperin, 1994).*

For example, in the Chicago High School for Agricultural Sciences curriculum integration is very important, and agricultural science is incorporated into all content areas and teachers work to complement the subjects being taught in each other's classes. Evaluations of the Chicago High School for Agricultural Sciences indicate that attendance is very high (92%), 93% of students graduate and 72% go onto four-year colleges and universities (McGraw Hill Companies, 1996).

Career Academies are small groups of students organized within a school who take classes together each year with the same teacher. Each Academy focuses on a career theme–electronics, business, finance, etc. Academic and occupation related classes comprise the curriculum, and relationships with local industry and businesses provide on-site education, mentors, and program guidance. Results to this point show that career academies provide students and teachers with a greater degree of institutional and interpersonal support than is available to their non-academy counterparts in the same comprehensive schools. Students in the early stages of their Academy experience report that they are more motivated to attend school, and that their schoolwork seems more relevant to their future education and career goals (Kemple, 1997).

References

Halperin, S. (1994, November). School-to-Work: A larger vision. Presented at the Statewide School-to-Work Conference, Newport, Rhode Island.

Kemple, J. (1997) Career Academies – Communities of Support for Students and Teachers: Further Findings from a 10-Site Evaluation.

McGraw Hill Companies (1996). *Seventh Annual Business Week Awards for Instructional Innovation.* New York: McGraw Hill Educational and Professional Publishing Group.

Resources

National Center for Career and Technical Education, website: Nccte.com
Jobs for the Future, website: www.jff.org

Student Assistance Programs

Student assistance programs (SAP) are a pro-active learning support approach to addressing issues that directly affect student learning and academic outcomes but are not part of the traditional educational system. Similar to employers who provide employee assistance programs to improve productivity, absenteeism, and retention, school districts have also found it necessary to support students in much the same way. Student assistance programs provide prevention, intervention, and support services and deal with issues such as alcohol and drug abuse, eating disorders, sexual abuse and rape, etc. This is inherently a collaborative approach with the school interfacing with student services professionals, social services providers, community-based organizations, law enforcement officials, and religious, business, and community leaders.

Student assistance programs come in a variety of shapes and sizes, from on-going support groups to day-long seminars to a comprehensive system of referrals. Award-winning Kenton County School District in Northern Kentucky has been offering SAPs for secondary school students since 1993 to reduce and prevent alcohol, tobacco, and other drug use, and develop healthy relationships with adults and older peers. It includes day-long seminars addressing anger, relationships, communication, working with others, growing up with alcohol or other drug problems in the home, coping, and peer pressure. Pre and post surveys of participants examined the relationships the participants experienced with the adults or returning youth volunteers of the seminar. Findings indicated that the program fostered positive relationships with teachers and other adults (Flaugher, et al, 1998, 1999). This supports research that support groups positively affect resilience traits through reducing risk factors, promoting protective factors, and increasing development of assets.

Ongoing support groups are also considered a form of student assistance programs. In response to the high prevalence of eating disorders among teens at his school, James Loretta (1996) arranged a support group and referral network for girls dealing with this issue. An addiction counselor specializing in eating disorders co-facilitated the group and provided training for James, who then trained staff and administrators. The evaluation both reduced symptomatic behaviors and revealed positive feedback regarding the emotional experience of the group, successfully providing a safe place for these young women to discuss important issues.

References

Flaugher, P. (1999). New lessons learned when a SAP program component is re-evaluated. *Student Assistance Journal, 11*, 14-15.

Flaugher, P., Laughlin, M.., Sims, D., & Verst, L. (1998). An evaluation of Kenton County: Kentucky's anti-substance abuse conferences. Student Assistance Journal, 10, *14-18.*

Loretta, J. (1996). A pound of cure. *Student Assistance Journal. 8*(5), 16.

Montilla, D.A. (1996). Out of the Ivory Tower. *Student Assistance Journal, 8*(5).

Resources

National Association of Student Assistance Professionals, website: www.nasap.org. Student Assistance Journal. Toll free subscription number: 800.453.7733.

21ˢᵗ Century Community Learning Centers

A major boost to the concept of family-school-community partnerships is the U.S. Department of Education's 21ˢᵗ Century Community Learning Centers (CCLCs) initiative, currently funding afterschool efforts across the county. This is one of the largest single sources of funding for afterschool programming to emerge. Many states, such as California, are also funding statewide afterschool initiatives. Most of these school-based and school-linked programs have a two-fold purpose—education and development. They enhance academic learning (for example, doing hands-on science projects, studying plants and animals in nature, playing math games, etc.) and also provide opportunities for healthy overall youth development (art, music, recreation, community service, team games, and interest-based and peer support groups).

Collaboration with community-based organizations (CBOs) is a requirement. A decade ago most before- and after-school programs were based in community nonprofits. According to the National Study of Before- and After-School Programs (Seppanon, Love, and Bernstein, 1993), two-thirds were operated by community nonprofits and public school-based programs only comprised one quarter of all afterschool programs. However, during the last few years we have witnessed an exponential growth in the collaboration of schools and community-based organizations in creating after-school programs. As more and more school district personnel, along with parents, policymakers, foundations, and other advocates have realized that young people spend as much as 40% of their time outside of school, the importance of these programs as supports to both learning and social development has grown. Research has clearly born out and influenced this understanding.

First, research has consistently found that youth unsupervised after school are at higher risk for drug, alcohol, and tobacco use; delinquent behavior; violent victimization; and injury, compared to their peers who are supervised. In fact, statistics show that most juvenile crime is committed in the hours immediately following school. Second, beginning with <u>Risks and Opportunities in the Nonschool Hours</u> (1992), which drew attention to the role of community-based organizations serving both afterschool and out-of-school youth in positive youth development, several studies have documented that this is indeed the case. In <u>Urban Sanctuaries: Neighborhood Organizations in the Lives and Futures of Inner-City Youth</u> (1994), the five-year results indicated that for many inner-city youth, involvement in a neighborhood organization "that engaged their time, attention, and commitment" was the turnaround factor in their leaving gangs and prisons and becoming contributing community members [see Community-Based Youth-Serving Organizations]. Similarly, a national study of Boys and Girls Clubs, Girls Incorporated, and the YMCA found that these organizations were providing the developmental supports and opportunities that have been associated with positive developmental outcomes—safety, social support from adults, leadership, belonging, challenging and interesting activities, input and decision-making, and community service (Gambone and Arbreton, 1997).

More recently, a joint report of the U.S. Departments of Education and Justice, <u>Safe and Smart: Making the After-School Hours Work for Kids</u> (1998), provides, in the words of the Attorney General and Secretary of Education, "evidence of the impact that safe, enriching, and high-quality after-school opportunities can have on our children and youth." <u>Safe and Smart</u> summarizes several research studies that have found the following positive developmental, learning, and health behavioral outcomes for young people involved in afterschool programs:

- decreases *in juvenile crime, violent victimization, school vandalism, alcohol, tobacco, and drug use, television watching, drop-out rate, grade retention, and special education placement.*
- •increases *in academic achievement and grades, school attendance, homework completed, high school graduation, educational motivation and aspirations, interest and ability in reading, development of new skills and interests, positive classroom behavior, conflict resolution, cooperation with peers and adults, caring relationships with adults and peers, self-confidence, and personal sense of community and belonging.*

However, this study also found that the positive effects of afterschool programs were not limited to the young people. As a result of collaborating to provide afterschool programs for youth, schools, families, and communities themselves benefited in the following ways:

- *Money savings for school districts in terms of reduced student retention and special education placements;*
- *Increased community capacity to meet the demand for affordable afterschool care;*
- *Increased business support and involvement;*
- *Greater family involvement in the schools and in students' learning (which research shows correlates with better student academic outcomes);*
- *Increases in the number of community schools.*

References

Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development (1992). *A Matter of Time: Risk and Opportunity in the Nonschool Hours.* New York: Carnegie Corporation, Task Force on Youth Development and Community Programs.

Gambone, M. & Arbreton, A. (1997). *Safe Havens: The Contributions of Youth Organizations to Healthy Adolescent Development.* Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

McLaughlin, M., Irby,M. & Langman, J. (1994). *Urban Sanctuaries: Neighborhood Organizations in the Lives and Futures of Inner-city Youth.* San Francisco:

Jossey-Bass. *Safe and Smart: Making the After-School Hours Work for Kids* (1998). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Departments of Education, Justice, and Health and Human Services.

Seppanen, P., Love, D. deVries, & Bernstein, L. (1993). *National Study of Before and After School Programs.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

Resources

California Center for Community-School Partnerships, University of California-Davis.
California's After School Learning and Safe Neighborhoods Program, www.cde.ca.gov
Federal 21st Century Learning Centers, www.ed.gov/offices/OERI/21stCCLC
David and Lucile Packard Foundation (1999). When school is out. *The Future of Children, 9*(2).