



Report on
Law Enforcement School-Based Programs Questionnaire

School Violence Resource Center
Criminal Justice Institute
University of Arkansas System

October 29, 2003

Submitted by: Mira Frosolono

SVRC Research Specialist

This project is supported by Grant Number 2000-DD-VX-0026, awarded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Introduction

The school shooting incidents during the decade of the 1990's prompted an increase of law enforcement presence in our schools. The School Violence Resource Center (SVRC) at the Criminal Justice Institute (CJI) University of Arkansas System undertook a project to determine what programs law enforcement agencies currently provide in their local schools. The purpose of the project was to survey law enforcement on their programs and compile the results into a directory to be located on the SVRC website.

The concept for this project was based upon the work by Colleen Ryan, M.A. and Frederick Matthews, PhD (1995) entitled *A National Directory of Exemplary School-Based Police Programs to Combat Youth Violence*. This directory was produced under a joint partnership between the Solicitor General Canada, the Canadian Association for Safe Schools, and Central Toronto Youth Services. The document is available on-line at http://www.sgc.gc.ca/policing/publications_e.asp in Adobe Acrobat format.

Project Development and Background Information

As mentioned above the purpose of this project was to survey law enforcement agencies to discover what, if any, programs they provide in schools. The SVRC was interested in discovering programs aimed to prevent or intervene in youth violence. Once completed the survey data would be compiled into a directory and posted on the SVRC website.

Traditional survey research can be a very costly endeavor since the questionnaire is usually sent to potential respondents via postal mail. This method requires a significant expenditure initially in terms of postage, paper, and envelopes. Often times

postage paid envelopes go unused, as recipients do not return the completed survey. For this project there was a potential population base of 17,784 law enforcement agencies (Hickman and Reaves, 2003), thus making the traditional method of surveying cost prohibitive.

In order to reduce the costs associated with this type of research, alternate methods for conducting the survey were explored. Additionally, it was necessary for the research staff to use resources currently available to the SVRC. With these two caveats in mind the decision (proposal) was made to utilize e-mail as the method to contact potential respondents and to disseminate the survey.

There are many advantages to using e-mail to conduct survey research. The most notable of these advantages is the cost savings incurred. It is considerably less costly to send out thousands of e-mails versus sending out thousands of postage paid envelopes for both delivery and return of a questionnaire.

Utilizing e-mail for survey research is not a new concept. In fact results from the first e-mail survey were published in 1986 (Sheehan 2001). It has been speculated that response rates to e-mail surveys have decreased significantly since that time. In an e-mail response rate study by Sheehan (2001) the findings indicate that while the use of e-mail has been increasing over the past fifteen years, the average response rate appears to be decreasing. This decrease may be attributed to the population type being surveyed (users of technology versus general population) or fear of viruses through unsolicited e-mails.

The initial plan for this project was to use an embedded survey in an e-mail message requiring respondents to reply to the e-mail. As development on the survey

began the decision was made to convert the survey into a web-based form located on the SVRC web page on the Internet (www.svrc.net). This method would, hopefully, provide easier entry on the part of the respondent and assist the researcher by directing responses to a database. This database could then be imported into a statistical program for analysis.

Lack of access to e-mail and the Internet can be considered a methodological weakness for on-line survey research. Most studies attempt to generalize findings to the population surveyed. If there are members of this population who do not have an opportunity to respond due to lack of access, an element of bias may be introduced into the findings. It is possible that those who cannot receive the survey may respond in significantly different ways from those who do. Based upon recent statistics the access to an Internet survey would not be as difficult or uncommon as five or six years ago.

Internet users in the United States increased from 6.7% to 59.1% between 1995 and April 2002 (NUA Internet Surveys 2002). Law enforcement Internet use has also shown an increase in recent years. The percentage of local police departments using computers for Internet access increased “ from 24% to 56% between 1997 and 2000. For those agencies serving smaller populations (<10,000) usage increased from 17% in 1997 to 48% in 2000” (Hickman and Reaves, 2003). “The percentage of sheriffs’ offices using computers for Internet access rose from 31% in 1997 to 67% in 2000. Those serving fewer than 25,000 residents, nearly 4 times as many were using computers for this purpose in 2000 (57%) as in 1997 (15%)” (Hickman and Reaves, 2003). Considering the overall growth of Internet usage in the general US population as well as law enforcement,

using a web-based survey appeared to be a viable alternative to postal mail or an embedded survey within an e-mail.

The targeted audience for this survey was potentially all law enforcement agencies in the United States – 17,784. As with postal mail one of the limitations of e-mail is having an accurate address. The feasibility for the SVRC to secure e-mail addresses for the appropriate person in these agencies would be costly in terms of dollars and time. Also the research specialist was tasked with using the resources at hand, therefore, a current project within the National Center for Rural Law Enforcement (NCRLE) met the parameters set for the survey project.

The NCRLE has an on-going project through the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) to provide no cost Internet service to rural law enforcement agencies on a nationwide basis. Currently the BJA Internet Project has approximately 1,300 e-mail accounts. Many of these accounts are different users at the same agency. It was believed, however, that by using these e-mail addresses a sufficient number of responses could be obtained with which to compile a directory. Also, the agencies participating in this project keep their email addresses fairly up to date so there would not be as many “undeliverable” messages due to address changes.

The SVRC realized the results would be skewed to small, rural departments serving populations of 50,000 or less for sheriffs departments and 25,000 or less for local police departments, however, given the enormity of searching for e-mail addresses, using this source seemed a viable solution and could also provide insight into programs offered by small, rural agencies.

Methodology

A questionnaire listing the desired information was developed in Microsoft FrontPage. This file was then given to a computer technical specialist to convert to an on-line form with the responses directed to a database. A representation of the on-line survey form can be found in Appendix I.

The request to participate in the survey was sent via e-mail along with a link to the survey residing on the SVRC website. It was hoped that this format would encourage response and decrease time needed to respond.

The survey was tested by several Arkansas agencies to ensure that it functioned properly. One test agency respondent remarked that it was fortunate a link was sent instead of an attachment. The server receiving e-mails for their agency deletes any and all attachments.

The first phase of the project was to send the e-mail and survey link to all Arkansas e-mail addresses available to SVRC through the BJA Internet Project. Additionally the e-mail was transmitted to members of the Arkansas Chiefs of Police Association through their listserv.

In the second phase of the project the e-mail and survey link were sent to the remainder of the national e-mail list supplied by the BJA Internet Project. Those agencies that had been sent e-mails previously were excluded. This phase disseminated the survey link to over 1,000 e-mail addresses.

To gain additional responses, law enforcement executives attending one of the Criminal Justice Institute's courses were asked to complete the survey in paper format. The SVRC research specialist entered these responses into the database.

For the final phase of the project and, unfortunately due to poor response, the Chiefs of Police Association in each state was contacted via telephone and/or e-mail to ask their assistance by sending out the e-mail with the survey link to their association members.

Results

The response rate prior to contacting the state associations of chiefs of police was very poor – less than 5%. Once the associations began sending the e-mail with the survey link to their members it was not possible to calculate an accurate response rate as there was no total count of recipients from these organizations. However, based upon the number of responses to the survey it is likely the response rate continued to be less than 5%. Unfortunately 15-20 responses were lost from the database for the period June 3 through September 2, 2003 due to technical error.

Total responses to the on-line survey were 153.* After eliminating incomplete responses or submission errors, there were 131 useable surveys. Upon reviewing the data after these eliminations, 14 were identified as other types of programs (non-school hours) and ten were duplicate agencies. The total number of individual agencies was 107.

For the purpose of quantifying the information collected, programs presented in schools are presented separately from those programs offered after school hours or during weekends and summers. All programs will be discussed in this report.

Agency demographics

Law enforcement agencies from 18 states responded to the on-line survey. There were additional states that responded but as stated above this information was lost due to

* Two additional responses were received after the writing of this report.

a technical problem. The state of Virginia submitted the most responses. Ohio was second in number of responses with Arkansas and Arizona tying for third.

Only four out of the 107 individual agencies represented sheriff's offices. This result is in part due to a lack of response by sheriffs' offices that participate in the BJA Internet Project. The sheriff's associations in each state were not contacted because there was no current listing of these organizations available. To obtain a listing it must be purchased from the National Sheriffs' Association. This purchase was not possible as it went outside the parameters of the project to utilize available resources.

The majority of responding agencies served populations of 15,000 or less. The next largest group of agencies served populations between 25,000 and 50,000. Over 50% of respondents did not indicate any seasonal (tourist) populations; those that did cited 50,000 or less. The final breakdown of agencies responding shows that 47 served populations >50,000 and 58 served under 50,000. Two agencies did not report population served.

Sixty-two percent of responding agencies had 50 or less full-time certified officers. Only one third of the agencies responded that they had part-time certified officers and of these the majority had 10 or less.

Agency programs

Since the purpose of this survey was to compile a directory of law enforcement programs offered in schools, efforts were not made on the on-line survey to provide space for each individual program or course an agency might provide. Therefore, quantifying the responses for the programs was never the intention of the project, however, every effort has been made to do so.

Agency responses indicate that law enforcement provides a variety of programs and services to their local schools and students. Of the agencies reporting programs primarily delivered during or in school 77% listed one program with the remaining 23% listing more than one.

Types of programs

A clarification is necessary before reporting the program most common among law enforcement. Upon reviewing the data it was apparent that the term “program” was ambiguous. For many agencies their “program” included the presentation of various educational courses or classes. For others the specific program, or course was listed by name. The responses were of two types: programs that encompass numerous goals with several courses and classes provided by the law enforcement officers, such as a School Resource Officer (SRO) program or, specific programs with specific goals, such as Drug Abuse Resistance Education (DARE).

The program most often cited was the School Resource Officer program. The second most frequently cited was the DARE program. Many agencies citing an SRO program included in their descriptions that these officers also provide instruction such as the DARE curriculum. For some agencies the SRO was in the school to prevent or intervene in any violent and/or criminal behavior.

Programs listed other than SRO or DARE included: C.H.O.I.C.E.S., Gang Resistance Education (GREAT), Police School Liaison, Bullying, and RadKids (see Appendix II for a complete list of programs).

Target populations

Law enforcement agencies were asked to identify which age groups their program or programs targeted: elementary school age, middle school age, or high school age. Thirty-two percent of the agencies targeted all 3 age groups. The largest percentage (73%) targeted middle school age students. The next group was elementary with 63.5% and high school with 58%. The majority of agencies (80%) considered their programs to provide both violence prevention and intervention. Twenty-one agencies noted their program as prevention only.

Program duration and personnel

Respondents were asked to indicate how long their program had been offered. The majority of programs had been offered for 5 years or less. Four agencies reported programs that had been offered for over 20 years. Only 5 reported programs that were offered less than one year. Agency respondents also indicated that their programs were most often requested from or through the school.

Most programs offered by law enforcement are during or throughout the school year. Some are offered only once per year and a few agencies noted their programs are provided year round. The same officer or officers were used to provide the programs by most agencies. Some agencies reported rotating officers after a specific time such as 2 to 5 years or, assigning them to a particular school.

Program funding sources

Agencies were asked to indicate how their programs were funded. The funding sources listed were: their agency, community groups, local businesses, school, fund-raisers, state grant, or federal grant. Respondents were encouraged to check all options

that applied to their particular situation. The majority of agencies had two funding sources. Of those reporting two sources, the law enforcement agency and the school funded most programs. Only one agency indicated it received assistance from all sources listed on the survey. Sources of funding noted other than those listed above included: traffic fine surcharge, local charities, community backed anti-drug tax, and donations in lieu of fines (through the court).

Partnerships and resources

When asked about partnerships in developing and implementing their programs, the most common response by agencies was the school (faculty, administrators, and/or district). Respondents were asked to list any resources they used to deliver the programs. If the agency officer was presenting a specific program, such as DARE, the national curriculum was used. Several SRO programs used lesson plans for law education classes available through the National Association of School Resource Officers (NASRO). Others used books, pamphlets, videos, and other materials depending upon the subject matter. Many officers worked together with school officials to determine resources to be used. Some agencies indicated their officers developed their own materials depending upon the subject matter and audience addressed.

Other Programs (non-school hours)

In order to more easily quantify the programs provided by law enforcement, the programs were separated into two categories: during school hours and non-school hours. The information that follows is a discussion of the programs offered outside regular school hours.

Agency demographics

There were 14 agencies reporting programs that were not delivered in school but were oriented toward school age children. One agency was a duplicate that had both in-school and non-school hour programs, therefore, there were 13 different agencies from the number noted in the previous section (107). This discussion will report on all 14 agencies' programs.

All agencies were local law enforcement except one that served the entire state. The majority served populations of 5,000 or less. Of those providing seasonal population information, none had populations greater than 5,000. The majority of agencies had either 10 or less officers or between 51 and 100. Those reporting part-time officers all reported less than ten officers.

Agency programs

These agency representatives reported a variety of programs or services for youth. Several agencies provide Junior Police Academies. Two agencies specifically targeted at-risk youth or those with behavioral problems. Often the law enforcement chief executive would simply visit the school to communicate with school officials and/or address any problems that may have arisen. One state level agency provides programs on school safety to adult audiences only.

Other programs noted by respondents included: safety education, stranger awareness, safety awareness, fingerprinting. One agency provides school supplies to children and other activities at Thanksgiving, Christmas, and Easter. A complete listing is provided in Appendix III.

Target population

Three agencies indicated their programs target all three age groups while others indicated elementary only or middle school only. The majority of agencies believe their efforts provide both violence prevention and intervention. Most of these programs have been offered for 5 years or less.

Program requests, personnel, and partnerships

The programs are requested in a variety of ways: through an application process, through the school (teachers and/or counselors,), and by word of mouth through other programs. The programs are offered upon request, during the summer, Saturday mornings, year round, and after school hours.

If the agencies used the same or different officer depended upon the program. For these 14 agencies they were almost evenly matched between the same and different officers. Of those responding, the most common way to fund programs was by the law enforcement agency itself.

Partnerships were usually between law enforcement, school, and community groups. Resources used depended upon the program. Materials included books, films, educational materials and supplies ordered from national organizations, such as the National Junior Police Academy.

Discussion

The results indicate that many law enforcement agencies participate in some way with the youth in their communities. This interaction can be through the schools by presenting educational sessions; by simply being a presence in the school for assistance,

mentoring, and role modeling; or they provide or participate in activities and programs outside the normal school hours.

The most often mentioned program provided by law enforcement was the school resource officer program. From the information provided it did not appear that the funding for these SRO's was through the federal grant program "Cops in Schools." The use of the terminology "SRO" may be the manner in which agencies designate the focus of the activities of these particular officers.

The day-to-day activities of the SRO's varied widely. Some agencies' program descriptions indicated their officers were in the school during all school hours as well as attending school events. Many SRO's divide their time between schools. For example, one agency noted that their four SRO's divide their time between 10 schools K-12. One agency provides an SRO to the alternative middle and high school in its community.

D.A.R.E. officers and the D.A.R.E. curriculum were the next most common response for law enforcement programs. Agencies reported that this curriculum is taught to a variety of age groups from kindergarten through high school. The D.A.R.E. curriculum was frequently cited as being taught by the school resource officers for many agencies.

Several agencies provide programs that were developed by their state attorney general. These programs focus on law education, procedures, and the courts. Other agencies did not indicate where their programs originated but provided descriptions of what they do.

A few agencies listed some specific programs they provide. One curriculum developed by a state police agency is used by local law enforcement. The subject matter

(topics) presented depends upon the grade level of the audience. For elementary age the focus was on safety issues; in middle school the topics included laws, gun safety, and violence prevention; the high school topics included those for middle school but added problem solving.

One agency also provides a four-part program that promotes a non-violent approach to problems faced by youth. The four topics included: bullying and teasing, conflict resolution, healthy relationships, and gang violence and prevention.

Efforts are made to assist youth in making the right decisions. One agency utilizes an interactive CD that plays out scenarios of a gun in school, drugs in school, bullying, and depression. The officer has the students watch a scene then stops the scenario to have a discussion on decisions that need to be made.

Many agencies indicated providing information on topics such as safety, driving under the influence (DUI), and date/acquaintance rape. Many officers participate in activities such as peer mediation groups, drug and violence free dances, seat belt safety, and drivers' education classes.

Even though the response rate was not what was hoped for or desired, the information received is useful. Since the primary purpose of the survey was to collect information for use in an on-line directory, there are sufficient responses to accomplish this goal.

Several factors influenced the outcome of the on-line survey. One important factor that directly affected the results was the technical errors and problems associated with the on-line form and Microsoft Access database. The on-line survey was set up to collect the information in the database. The form and database worked well if the

information typed into a particular field did not exceed the number of spaces allowed by the field in the database.

It was apparent by participants' responses to this survey that they had differing perspectives on the term "program". Many respondents noted a program that provided several programs, such as the School Resource Officer Program. Often times within their descriptions of the SRO program they listed educational programs that the SRO's were conducting in the schools. Others listed their specific programs such as DARE, GREAT, or law education courses and often times listed the officers teaching them as SRO's. In this regard the survey could have been more explicit in what information was sought by using the term program. This oversight may have been due to the research specialist's desire to make the survey concise and relatively easy to answer. Also, from several telephone calls received by the SVRC research specialist most agencies' program was the school resource officer. These agencies were encouraged to respond, as were those agencies with non-school hours programs. There would have been considerably less responses if these programs had been excluded.

Limitations

There were several methodological limitations recognized in this project. The primary methodological limitation can be found when comparing this project's methodology to "traditional" survey methodology. In a traditional survey several contacts are made with potential respondents. Initially the survey is sent with a personalized cover letter explaining the purpose of the survey. Several weeks later a reminder letter or card is sent asking the recipient to complete the survey and send it in.

Schaefer and Dillman (1998) quote studies comparing single contact e-mail surveys with multiple contacts. These studies reported an increase in response rate for the multiple contact e-mails versus the single. Another form of contact prior to sending the e-mail containing the survey is pre-notification. Sheehan (2001) reviewed several studies that provide varying results on the effects of pre-notification on mail survey response rates, however, pre-notification did appear to increase response speed.

For this project, in an effort to avoid “bombarding” users of the BJA Internet service with unsolicited e-mails, no follow-up or reminder e-mail was sent. It was not feasible to send a follow-up e-mail to those agencies receiving the information from their chiefs of police associations, as there was no access to these e-mail addresses.

Law enforcement agencies that have e-mail available to their personnel are often overwhelmed by nuisance e-mails (spam) as are members of the general population. In addition to the spam e-mails officers routinely receive informational or alert bulletins that are of importance to their day-to-day work. As do most e-mail recipients, law enforcement screens out e-mails by determining which are sent from known sources and those that are of interest to them. It is possible our e-mail was ranked a low priority or interest.

Connection speed to the Internet may have contributed to the low response rate. Our survey was 336k which might take several minutes to load if an agency had a slow transmission speed due to limited modem capacity. A lengthy loading time could discourage busy officers that did not want to wait.

Another aspect of the on-line survey that could have hindered response (participation) was its appearance on individual respondents’ computer screens. Due to

differences in browsers and screen resolution settings the survey questions could have appeared out of line and required scrolling to read, thus discouraging response.

Conclusions

Although the response rate was not what was hoped for or desired, this survey project provided a significant learning experience for the SVRC research specialist and the computer technical specialist. The glitches and technical problems encountered in this questionnaire will be avoided in the next on-line survey that is developed. Other possible limitations of potential respondents will be taken into account, such as modem speed, screen resolution, and browser availability. SVRC staff will assess the feasibility of using the standard survey methodological approach of pre-notification and follow-up e-mails.

The decision to contact individual state associations of chiefs of police to request their assistance in disseminating the e-mail to their membership was the saving grace of the survey project. The response rate would have been more disappointing had this effort not been made. This increased response considerably; thereby lending credence to research that indicates response rates are increased when they have an official or respected sponsorship (Digman 2001). Law enforcement executives (chiefs) receiving our e-mail from their state association usually forwarded it to the appropriate person within their agency to respond. Since the request was coming from the highest supervisory level, it was more likely a response would be made. In fact numerous responses were received after the deadline stated within the e-mail message.

The primary conclusion from the project results was that the topic being surveyed was not of high interest or importance to the recipient. This conclusion is based upon the

response rate received from the original “population” surveyed through the BJA Internet Project. Topic salience (interest) is one of the factors most likely to influence survey response (Dillman and Carley-Baxter 2000). If the recipient is not interested in the subject or it does not pertain to what is currently a priority, the survey goes unanswered.

The BJA Internet Project e-mail participants are quite often the recipients of surveys to be completed. At one point it was theorized that they were over surveyed, thus contributing to the poor responses by them for the school programs survey. However, this theory was discounted upon comparing its response rate to other surveys sent out to them during the time period the school programs survey was active. A survey sent in March 2003 using the same methodology received approximately 113 responses. Another survey sent five months later received approximately 100 responses from the same “population” as the school programs survey. Therefore this topic may not have held as much interest to this group of law enforcement as the survey on terrorism or records management systems.

The topic of school shootings has taken on less prominence in the national media since September 11, 2001. Recent incidents remind us that the occurrence of school violence does not reside in the distant past. In September 2003 two school shooting incidents occurred in a North Carolina middle school (“Eighth-grader,” 2003) and a Minnesota high school (“Hero,” 2003). Fortunately, no one was injured in the North Carolina incident but not so in Minnesota. One student was killed and another critically wounded. These incidents emphasize the importance of continued violence prevention efforts and law enforcement’s contribution in this endeavor.

Recommendations

The primary recommendation to be made from this research project is to place a directory of the law enforcement programs on the SVRC website. The e-mail text (see Appendix IV) sent requesting participation in the survey stated the results would be placed on the SVRC website in a directory format. Since those who responded did so in good faith, we should make a good faith effort to make the information provided available to any interested parties.

REFERENCES

Digman, Monica(2001, June). Survey Response Rates: Mail and Electronic Surveys Compared. *Marketing Fast Facts*. Retrieved from:
http://www.asaenet.org/sections/marketing/search/results/1,2144,6_2001,00.html

Dillman, Don A. and Lisa R. Carley-Baxter (2000). Structural Determinants of Mail Survey Response Rates Over a 12 Year Period, 1988-1999. Washington State University. Retrieved from: <http://survey.sesrc.wsu.edu/dillman/papers.htm>

Eighth-grader charged with firing gun inside North Carolina middle school. (2003, September 25). *Associated Press*. Retrieved from: <http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/news/archive/2003/09/25/national1359EDT0649.DTL>

'Hero' Coach Halts School Shooting. (2003, September 26). *Minneapolis-St. Paul Star Tribune*. Retrieved from: <http://www.nynewsday.com/news/nationworld/nation/ny-usminn263469756sep26,0,3447098.story?coll=ny-nationalnews-print>

Hickman, Matthew J. and Brian A. Reaves (2003). *Local Police Departments 2000*. Bureau of Justice Statistics, US Department of Justice, NCJ 196002.

Hickman, Matthew J. and Brian A. Reaves (2003). *Sheriffs' Offices 2000*. Bureau of Justice Statistics, US Department of Justice, NCJ 196534.

NUA Internet Surveys (2002). *How Many Online?* [online]. Retrieved from:
http://www.nua.ie/surveys/how_many_online/n_america.html

Sheehan, Kim (2001). E-mail Survey Response Rates: A Review. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communications*, Volume 6 (2), January 2001. Retrieved from:
<http://www.ascusc.org/jcmc/vol6/issue2/sheehan.html>

APPENDIX I: Law Enforcement School-Based Programs Questionnaire Form

Law Enforcement School-Based Programs Questionnaire

School Violence Resource Center

Criminal Justice Institute

The purpose of the following questionnaire is to collect information on law enforcement school-based programs aimed at preventing or reducing youth violence. This information will be used to compile a directory of law enforcement programs that will be posted on the School Violence Resource Center web site www.svrc.net.

Agency Information:

Agency:

Address:

City:

State:

Zip:

Telephone:

Fax:

E-mail:

Agency Website:

Population served:

Seasonal population:

Number of full-time certified officers:

Number of part-time certified

officers:

Program Information:

1. Program name:

2. Program contact person:

3. Program description:

4. What is (are) your target group(s)?

Elementary school age Middle school age High school age

5. Nature of the program?

Prevention Intervention Both

6. How long has your program been offered? months or years.

7. How is your program requested?

8. How/when is your program offered?

9. Do you use the same or a different officer to provide the program?

10. How is your program funded? (Check all that apply):

My Agency Community Groups Local Businesses School
 Fund Raisers/Donations

State Grant Federal Grant Other

11. Other partnerships: (others who assist with development and implementation of your program such as parents, community partners.)

12. Resources used to deliver program: (such as books, pamphlets, curriculum, etc.)

APPENDIX II: Complete Listing of Law Enforcement Programs

Complete Listing of Law Enforcement Programs*

School Resource, at risk and class action
EZ-Plus
SAVE-Students Against Violence Everywhere
Youth Services
School Resource Officer Program
G.R.E.A.T
Smart Choices
Conflict and the Law
Bullying
Middle School Awareness
C.H.O.I.C.E.S.
Safety Program
Law Education Program
Resist Aggression Defensively (RadKids)
TRUTH ABOUT DRINKING/Alcohol and Other Drug Program
Be a Winner
Smart Choices-Better Chances
Kids Teaching Kids
Safety Programs
School Liaison Officers
Super Kids
Think Straight / A violence prevention program for 6th grade
TEAM Classes
AFTERMATH classes
CounterAct Drug, Alcohol and Violence Prevention Program
Students Against a Violent Environment (SAVE)
Shannon County Safe Schools
SAFE (Safety Awareness For Everyone)
Aggressors, Victims, and Bystanders
Options, Choices, and Consequences
Safety Pup
CLASS action program
Peer Mediation Program
To Be A Winner
Wyoming Neighborhood Enforcement Team (W.Y.N.E.T)
Investigations/School Services Unit

*Duplicate programs removed – do not represent individual agencies. Program name taken from “program name” field on survey not “program description.”

APPENDIX III: Listing of Non-School Hour Programs

Listing of Non-School Hour Programs*

Junior Police Academy
Fingerprinting
Safety Awareness
Challenge Camp
Work with school to resolve any problems
Driver's Educational Law Enforcement Supplement
Citizen Police Academy for Youth
Summers Buddies Program
What to "Do Program",
Safety Town Program
Provide Safe School materials and personal interaction with school
Pocomoke Police Youth Initiative
Youth Academy
Personal contact
Virginia State Police School Safety Program

*Duplicate programs removed – do not represent individual agencies. Program name taken from “program name” field on survey not “program description.”

APPENDIX IV: E-mail Text Sent to Potential Respondents

E-MAIL TEXT SENT TO POTENTIAL RESPONDENTS

Dear Law Enforcement Official:

The School Violence Resource Center (SVRC) at the Criminal Justice Institute (CJI) is compiling a directory of law enforcement programs provided in schools to prevent or intervene in youth violence. We very much want to have your agency's information included. The link, <http://www.svrc.net/questionnaire.asp>, will take you to a questionnaire located on the SVRC website. The information can be filled in the spaces provided on the questionnaire form and submitted without having to print it out or mail the completed questionnaire back to us.

We would greatly appreciate receiving your information by _____. Once all agencies' information is received and compiled we will post the directory on the SVRC website.

If you have any questions or if you encounter problems with the questionnaire, please contact me. Thank you very much for your assistance with this project.