

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY SAN MARCOS

THESIS SIGNATURE PAGE

THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE  
MASTER OF PUBLIC HEALTH

TITLE: Determining the Efficacy of Vista Community Clinic's Youth Prevention Program

AUTHOR(S): Salvador Roman

DATE OF SUCCESSFUL DEFENSE: 05/02/2018

THE THESIS HAS BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE THESIS COMMITTEE IN

PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF PUBLIC HEALTH

Dr. Deborah Morton  
COMMITTEE CHAIR

DocuSigned by:  
*Dr. Deborah Morton*  
10B28EEAA0FF484...  
SIGNATURE

7/9/2018  
DATE

Dr. Christina Holub  
COMMITTEE MEMBER

DocuSigned by:  
*Dr. Christina Holub*  
0BC44F0225E7462...  
SIGNATURE

7/12/2018  
DATE

COMMITTEE MEMBER

SIGNATURE

DATE

COMMITTEE MEMBER

SIGNATURE

DATE

**Determining The Efficacy of Vista Community Clinic's Youth Prevention Program**

Salvador Roman

California State University San Marcos

September 2018

### Abstract

**Objective:** The objective of this program is to analyze the dosage of the program and compare teens that completed the VCC program to those who did not complete the program.

**Methods.** Vista Community Clinic's Youth Development program project REACH is a youth prevention program working with youth who are at higher risk of engaging in negative behaviors that can lead to an unhealthy lifestyle. The survey was comprised using 3 assessment tools. The first section used components of the California Healthy Kids Survey (CHKS) to measure involvement in risky behavior such as alcohol and drug use, sexual activity, and violence. Development Asset Profile (DAP) survey that assesses internal and external assets is used to measure protective factors shown to reduce/prevent involvement in risky behavior measured by the CHKS. Stress Index measured 3 different environmental stress factors (life transitions, circumscribed events, and exposure to violence). Using SPSS software to generate descriptive statistic using cross-tabulations and paired sample t-test to compare means between males and females in regards to their participation in risky behavior. We also used a paired sample t-test to compare DAP scores and stress index scores.

**Results.** The overall result indicated an overall increase in protective factors measured by the internal and external captured by the DAP. There was an overall significant increase in Internal Asset Scores for males  $p < .05$ ,  $p = .031$ . The subscales within the internal asset having significance were Social Competencies  $p < .05$ ,  $p = .032$ .

**Conclusions.** The data indicated that the youth prevention program Project REACH is overall an effective program. It is increased protective factors proven to prevent youth from participating in unhealthy behaviors measured by the CHKS. Future work with a larger sample is needed to confirm results of the evaluation of the program.



### **Acknowledgments**

This study is dedicated to Vista Community Clinic, the Project REACH youth and their families. To my parents, Salvador Sr. and Maria Roman who sacrificed their dreams, so I can have a better future. To my siblings Sofi, Mari, and Jesus Roman who picked me up when I fell. To my high school mentor and coach, Manny Elizarraraz, that proved sometimes it takes one person to inspire a young student to accomplish great things (I see the light). To my professional mentors that helped me find my vocation, Maria Yanez, and Yesenia Diaz-Chavez, I am who I am because of you. To my academic mentors, Jason Coker and Dr. Fernando Soriano, who inspired my passion for the work I do. To the MPH faculty, thank you for the amazing experience, and especially to my data guru, Dr. Deborah Morton; this thesis was only possible with her guidance and knowledge. To my cohort, who I see as my second family, and Fatima and Kayla, you are the real ones. I wish you all the best in your next endeavors.

**List of Tables**

Table 1: Sample for Project REACH, Vista Community Clinic (VCC), 2015-2017.  
Stratified by Gender.

Table 2: Mean Difference and Standard Deviation for Stress and Stress Sub Scales for baseline and year 2, 2015-2017.

Table 3: Mean Difference and Standard Deviation for Stress and Stress Sub Scales for Baseline and Year 2, 2015-2017. (FEMALES ONLY)

Table 4: Mean Difference and Standard Deviation for Stress and Stress Sub Scales for baseline and year 2 2015-2017. (Males ONLY)

Table 5: Involvement in “Risky Behavior” California Healthy Kids Survey (n, %) in baseline vs. year 2 Total, 2015-17

Table 6: Involvement in “Risky Behaviors” California Healthy Kids Survey (n, %) baseline Male vs. Female, 2015-2016

Table 7: Involvement in “Risky Behaviors” California Healthy Kids Survey (n, %) year 2 Male vs. Female, 2016-2017

Table 8: Mean Difference and Standard Deviation for External and Internal Developmental Asset Profile for baseline and year 2, 2015-2017

Table 9: Mean Difference and Standard Deviation for External and Internal Developmental Asset Profile for baseline and year 2, 2015-2017 (MALES ONLY)

Table 10: Mean Difference and Standard Deviation for External and Internal Developmental Asset Profile for baseline and year 2, 2015-2017 (FEMALES ONLY)

**Table of Contents**

Acknowledgments.....	4
List of Tables.....	5
Table of Contents .....	6
Background/Literature .....	8
Youth.....	8
Risk Factors .....	8
Protective Factors.....	10
Community-Based Youth Programs.....	11
Methods.....	13
Program and Participants .....	13
Procedures and Measures.....	13
The California Healthy Kids Survey (CHKS) .....	14
Developmental Asset Profile.....	14
Stress Index.....	15
Descriptive Results .....	15
Stress Score.....	16
Risky Behaviors .....	16
Developmental Asset Profile.....	17
Discussion.....	18

Limitations ..... 18

Recommendations ..... 19

References ..... 21

Tables ..... 23

    Table 1 ..... 23

    Table 2 ..... 24

    Table 3 ..... 25

    Table 4 ..... 26

    Table 5 ..... 27

    Table 6 ..... 28

    Table 7 ..... 29

    Table 8 ..... 30

    Table 9 ..... 31

    Table 10 ..... 32

**Background/Literature**

For decades now, youth have been participating in afterschool programs. In a fast-paced society where it is almost impossible to have at least one non-working parent who can solely focus on raising their children. At least two-thirds of children in the United States have both parents employed, (Emily, P Smith, et al. 2013) and more than 75% of children who live with single parents are in the workforce (Snyder and Sickmund, 2006). The original purpose of afterschool programs was to provide supervision and a safe space for youth to develop while parents worked. Youth programs have since evolved to address the need for youth services that involve more than a “safe space.” Youth programs now provide services assisting youth to foster positive development.

**Youth**

Adolescent youth is considered a period from about age 10 to about age 24 and is the most complex stage of development that human beings experience, considering it is during this time adolescent bodies are biologically transitioning from children to adults (Ebert, 2015). Risky behaviors include involvement of any behavior that can lead to unhealthy lifestyles as they transition into adulthood. Students that are more likely to engage in these behaviors are considered to be “at-risk” youth. At-risk youth are less likely to transition successfully into adulthood (Smith, 2004). Success includes academic achievement, job readiness, financial independence, and overall positive membership in society by avoiding a life of crime (Smith, 2004).

**Risk Factors**

Risk factors associated with youth “risky behavior” range from the interpersonal level to the community level (CDC, 2017).

### Environmental

Risk factors associated with the youth's environment include poverty, gang activity, drug use, and bullying (David-Ferdon, Corinne, Simon, 2014). The setting can vary from school to the community, to peers. Other risk factors are poor academic performance and having a low commitment to learning (David-Ferdon, Corinne, Simon, 2014). Being in an environment that has access to alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs are also risk factors. Many environmental factors contribute to and overlap with risky behaviors (Attar, Guerra, and Tolan, 1994). Gangs and drugs in the community are strong indicators of high youth violence (Herrenkohl et al., 2000). Low levels of social cohesion within a community are linked to higher rates of youth violence. Neighborhood watch programs or neighborhood associations allow the opportunity for communities to solve local issues together increasing cohesiveness within communities (Herrenkohl et al., 2000). Factors such as income inequality, food insecurity, rapid demographic changes in the youth population, and urbanization have all been positively linked with youth deviance (Herrenkohl et al., 2000).

### Family

Domestic factors associated with negative behaviors include lack of family relationships, having increased levels of conflict in the family, and overall poor attachment between the youth and the parent (Attar, Guerra, and Tolan, 1994). How children are raised within their families is strongly related to a positive or negative development. Children who experience violent behavior at home are more likely to engage in violence themselves (David-Ferdon, Corinne, Simon, 2014). An environment with antisocial behaviors can negatively affect a child's behavior by allowing the behavior to be normalized (Finkelhor et al., 2006). Furthermore, family management can affect a child's development and promote undesired behaviors if the parents fail

to set clear standards or expectations (Finkelhor et al., 2006). The failure to appropriately monitor the way a child behaves and apply consequences also affects the development of behavior (Finkelhor et al., 2006).

### Individual

Risk factors related to the involvement of risky behavior is linked to the ability to self-regulate emotions (David-Ferdon, Corinne, Simon, 2014). Having low self-esteem or low self-control is another risk factor. The ability to think and solve problems, as well as having effective coping skills can promote positive development. (Attar, Guerra, and Tolan, 1994). Experiencing multiple life stressors can affect a child's ability to develop coping skills (Attar, Guerra, and Tolan, 1994). Numerous stressful events can cause emotional and behavioral problems (Forehand, Middleton, and Long, 1987). Within environments and situations, youth are exposed to a multitude of risk factors; however, there are protective factors that can mitigate the outcome of involvement in risky behaviors.

### **Protective Factors**

Protective factors also fall into three categories, individual, family, and community. In response, prevention programs need to be analyzed to see how they provide protective factors that help reduce those risks. A good blueprint for a prevention program focuses on teaching new skills in different settings such as the environment, family, and individually (Frieden et al., 2016). Research suggests students who feel connected to their families, communities, and schools are at lower risks for involvement in risky behavior (Frieden et al., 2016). Youth Programs working with parents to enhance family environments have demonstrated effectiveness in preventing negative behaviors. Community-based programs can work as a protective factor when addressing the risk factors with evidence-based techniques (Frieden et al., 2016).

### Environment

Research has revealed that mentorship and support can develop skills and interest linked to reducing deviant behaviors (Smith et al., 2013). Opportunities for engagement within school and community reduce the participation in risky behaviors. Engagement within environments such as the community and school can be done if physically and psychologically safe (Smith, R. 2014). Combination of mentors and community engagement produce a positive experience in the environment. The components to address the problem of undesired youth behavior depends on the collaboration and responses of the relevant community, businesses, faith-based, grassroots organizations, social agencies, health organizations, and law enforcement entities (Frieden et al., 2016). Depending on the situation, one component may have a more concentrated response but will ultimately rely on the overall collaborative net (Frieden et al., 2016).

### Family

The family provides the foundation of structure, limits, rules, and supervision (Frankford, E. R. 2007). Clear family standards and expectations are a crucial fundamental component of development for children. Their behavior and attitude have a direct correlation to their parents' behaviors and attitudes (Smith et al., 2013).

### Individual

There are also interpersonal characteristics that can be developed and provide a sense of resiliency towards negative behaviors. The present study will define resiliency by the protective factors that are analyzed in the Developmental Asset Profile (DAP) survey.

### **Community-Based Youth Programs**

Youth-prevention programs have been implemented to prevent risky behaviors, such as involvement in violence. These programs were implemented in areas where populations are at

risk for violence. Risk factors associated with violence are settings where there is poverty, gang activity, high crime rates, high dropout rates, and high unemployment rates (CDC, 2017). Using drugs is also a factor, as it increases undesired behaviors among youth. These programs are designed to mitigate the factors that can be controlled, such as, substance abuse, stress management, and communication skills (Smith et al, 2013). They also can increase individual protective factors that help students deter from unhealthy life decisions.

### **Current Study**

The current study will investigate the Project REACH prevention program, compare it to the literature of other programs and identify what components make it an effective prevention program. Vista Community Clinic (VCC) has operated a youth prevention program called Project REACH since 1996. Project REACH is a community-based program whose primary goal is to work with at-risk teens using a prevention and early intervention approach. This program collaborates with parents, community residents, the Oceanside Police Department's Neighborhood Police Team, and the Oceanside Unified School District. This collaboration of services is meant to support students in all youth's environments. VCC has allowed the use of its data which will be used to measure the effectiveness in preventing risky behaviors.

The goal of this study is to find an association between youth prevention programs and the reduction of risk behaviors. Among teens in the VCC prevention programs, what are the individual factors associated with reducing risky behaviors such as youth violence? This study will aim to answer the question of how to make the program an effective prevention program. The objective of this program is to analyze the dosage of the program and compare teens that completed the VCC program to those who did not complete the program.

## **Methods**

### **Program and Participants**

Vista Community Clinic's Project REACH is an acronym for Recreation, Employment readiness, Academic achievement, Communication skills, and Healthy Lifestyles. It is a comprehensive youth after-school development program for at-risk youth addressing healthy lifestyles for teens, with a focus on academic, social, and cultural education. The primary goals of the program include prevention of teenage pregnancy, school drop-out, drug use, and gang involvement. The program is offered at three sites: Rancho Buena Vista High School (RBVHS) in Vista, California, Libby Lake Community Center in Oceanside, California and Joe Balderrama Recreation Center in Oceanside, California.

Recruitment of students for the REACH program heavily relies on word of mouth. Primarily, students that attend the program are students that reside in the surrounding neighborhood. Over 200 students attend the REACH program every year. The intake process entails an application in which both parents and students must complete. There is no fee associated with enrollment and students can enroll as long as they attend middle school or high school. Participants are offered academic assistance and educational programming on an ongoing basis in the areas of life skills, reproductive health, and service learning.

### **Procedures and Measures**

Upon enrollment, participants are administered a baseline survey based on the California Healthy Kids Survey (CHKS), developmental Asset Profile (DAP) survey, and Stress Index (SI) survey. This was the VCC's first-time data was collected electronically. During the transition from paper to digital surveys, procedures were also in development to ensure a quality response. Although administration of survey procedures was in progress, they were not in place. This

resulted in many incomplete surveys and survey sections. For the evaluation of the program, only 47 surveys had enough complete data to compare baseline and year 2. This study is a quantitative secondary data analysis: Using survey data collected by VCC to measure involvement in “risky behavior,” internal and external factors, and stress. The baseline survey that was collected was from the school year 2015-2016. The year two of the survey data that was collected is from the school year 2016-2017. All data was collected by VCC before the beginning of the study. Unique ID number was assigned to each youth to protect their privacy. Data used for this study did not have any youth’s personal information that could identify any individual.

### **The California Healthy Kids Survey (CHKS)**

The CHKS provides a comprehensive, data-driven, decision informing process to guide efforts to improve youth program climate (CHKS, 2018). Subsections and specific questions were taken from the CHKS survey. The items that were used from the CHKS survey were six item questions from the demographic section; one item from the school section; one subscale from sexual behavior comprised of 6 items; two subscales that were pulled from CHKS with 22 items; seven questions were used from the CHKS to measure involvement in violent behaviors.

### **Developmental Asset Profile**

The DAP is a 58-question item survey assessing both internal and external assets, each has four subscales. The DAP is designed to evaluate how youth are growing personally, socially, and within the context of the environment. It is useful to study the effects of youth in intervention and prevention programs. The four subscales for external assets are support, empowerment, boundaries, and expectations, and construct use of time. The external assets subscales measure the supports, opportunities, and relationships young people need in their development stages. The subscales under internal assets are positive values, social competencies,

positive identity, and commitment to learning. The internal assets subscales are designed to measure personal skill, commitments, and own values they need to make positive choices. It also measures responsibility and self-reliance. In all, the DAP is used to measure the protective factors discussed in the literature.

### **Stress Index**

The stress index is a self-reporting survey comprised of 16 questions that measure three types of stress. Items from this survey were selected from two original scales of the social stress measure. The three subscales in the stress index are life transitions, circumscribed events, and exposure to violence. This information provided insight on the level of stress youth experience in negative environments.

### **Descriptive Results**

The descriptive results displayed demographic information regarding the students' gender. The final sample size was 47 students (Table 1.) There was an even distribution among males and females, 51.1% were male and 48.9% were female. The result indicated the majority of youth were in high school (76.6%) versus (23.4%) in middle school. The majority of youth were in 15-17 years old (63.9%), followed by 12-14 years old that were (25.5%) and last by 18 years and up (10.6%). Out of the three REACH site locations, RBV REACH had the most participants (48.9%), followed by Balderrama REACH with (28.9%), and lastly Libby Lake REACH (22.2%). Ethnicity majority reported having more than two races, and overall, 97% students reported being Latino/Hispanic. Overall there was an even distribution of gender the other variables. A chi-square was done to measure if there was any significance. The results indicated there was no significant difference that would signify any changes are due to gender.

### **Stress Score**

The stress score was measured by comparing the mean scores. Only 22 surveys had enough complete data to compare. A paired sample t-test was conducted to analyze any significant difference comparing baseline and year 2 (Table 2.) There was a decreasing pattern of life exposure and life transitions. There was an increase in circumscribed events sub-scale when comparing baseline with year 2. Although there was an increase in one of the sub-scales their overall total stress indicated a decrease.

Comparing females only (Table 3) using a paired sample t-test to test mean scores there was an increase in stress with Life Transitions and Exposer to Violence. There was a decrease in stress in circumscribed events, but the overall total stress score had increased comparing baseline to year 2. There was no significant decrease or increase for females and stress (Table 4). The means were compared using a paired sample t-test to compare baseline and year 2 for males only. The results showed all stress subscales and total stress decreased over the year the students were in the program. Although the results indicated the scores had reduced, none of the results were significant.

### **Risky Behaviors**

Involvement in risky behavior was measured from the CHKS survey (Table 5). Comparing baseline and year 2 percentages. chi-squared was used to find significance in the following risk factors; sexual intercourse, alcohol consumption, using marijuana, electronic smoking cigarette, school violence, and school attendance. Comparing total risk involvement, there was an overall increase in all risky behaviors except school violence that reduced from (19.1%) to (14.6 %.) There was significance in involvement in sexual intercourse with a  $p < .05$ ,  $p = .013$ .

When comparing risky behavior in only the baseline by gender (table 6), the result indicated females reported being involved in more risky behaviors, with the exception of school violence. School violence was the only variable that was significant, males being more involved in school violence, males (33.3%) vs. females (4.3%)  $p < .05$   $p = .012$ . The results for year 2 by gender showed slightly different results (Table 7). There was a near even result of the involvement of risk when comparing males and females, with the only exception of school violence. Involvement of school violence by males compared to females, males (20.89%) vs. females (4.3%) was not significant.  $p > .05$ ,  $p = .09$ .

### **Developmental Asset Profile**

The result for DAP scores measured the increase in protective factors before and after attending the program. The total of responses collected with the survey collected was 23. The number of responses was affected by collection methods used by the program. The overall results were produced using a paired sample student t-test (unadjusted). The results indicated an overall increase in internal asset and external asset. within internal and external assets, there was a higher increase in total internal assets score ( $p = .087$ ) vs. external assets score ( $p = .255$ ). The total internal asset subscales had significant findings with Social competencies  $p < .05$ ,  $p = .010$ . There was also a significant increase in positive identity another internal subscale  $p < .05$ ,  $p = .007$ . Commitment to learning is worth noting nearing significance with  $p = .056$ . When comparing means by gender, there was a huge difference in results. Male's results (table 9) demonstrated significance in internal and external asset scores. External asset subscale; empowerment  $p < .05$ ,  $P = .022$ . Internal scores had multiple subscales that had a significant increase. Commitment to learning had a near significant score  $p = .052$ . Social competencies had a significant increase

$p < .05$ ,  $p = .032$ . Social Identity subscale had the highest increase  $p < .05$ ,  $p = .007$ . The total internal score was also significantly higher  $p < .05$ ,  $p = .031$ .

When comparing means and standard deviations for females using a paired sample t-test (unadjusted) the results were much different from the males. There was a decrease in mean total external asset score but was not significant. Moreover, a slight increase in means of total internal assets score, which was also not significant.

## **Discussion**

### **Limitations**

The first limitation was difficulty in conducting a valid comparison of pre-test and post-test data with a limited matched sample of participants.

Second, examination of participants over time inherently means participants are growing older, which is associated with increased incidence of risky behaviors as a byproduct of age. Comparing the end of year data summarized across time points somewhat mitigates the issue of passage of time, and can be validly compared with national, state, and county data when available. Unfortunately, comparative data were not available for all the REACH target variables due to local and state entities not using the complete California Healthy Kids Survey modules. For example, the sexual behaviors module was not given by California schools, and therefore comparative data was not available

A third limitation is without dosage data, it is impossible to determine the amount of intervention exposure participants received. It is expected those who completed the program would show better results than those who did not. Dosage information is needed to compare dosage time with positive and negative youth development of youth.

### **Recommendations**

The first recommendation is to address lack of response data. The organization needs in place procedures to ensure surveys are complete in order to provide the program with accurate data. Lack of data from poor response rate made it difficult to measure with adequate sample size. Revise the curriculum for girls; Project REACH must use evidence-based strategies to improve female internal and external outcomes. Incorporating ethnic pride, and multicultural activities to engage youth who may not necessarily associate with the American culture is needed. Using the college mentors that come from different fields and cultural backgrounds can benefit the learning process for both the youth and mentors, as they make for a more impactful mentoring.

### **Implications**

Youth-prevention programs are still working to understand what makes a compelling youth-prevention program in communities. More research is still needed to clearly understand what prevents risky behaviors. The impact youth violence has on society cannot be ignored. Youth violence is a problem which not only affects the communities, it also costs American taxpayers a lot of money. Although it is difficult to assess actual costs in dollars along with the value of preventing deviant behaviors, the cost through public assistance programs, the judicial system, public works, and other local and federal systems could be more cost-effective. However, what is known is that substance abuse rates are significantly higher in children who have conduct disorders, one of the costliest and damaging societal issues. Connections also exist between adverse youth development and mental health disorders with substance use and abuse. Adult mental disorders have their origins in early conduct problems.

### **Conclusion**

In summary, this study finds that VCC's Project REACH is making an impact overall on the positive development of the youth. The program has a more significant effect in increasing protective factors for male youth. The results showed a definite positive trend in increasing protective factors observed in both genders. The present study provides a framework for future research to continue to investigate the impact of reducing unhealthy behaviors and how that would lead to healthy lifestyles as an adult. This study provides a possible foundation with preliminary findings and should not be regarded as direct relationships or conclusive findings. Further testing is still needed to include adjusted analysis to find and identify predictor variables providing more enriched results. This evaluation, however, provided the necessary information to improve Project REACH and make it a more impactful prevention program in the future.

### References

- Resnick, M. D. (2000). Protective factors, resiliency, and healthy youth development. *Adolescent medicine: State of the art reviews*, 11(1), 157-164.
- Adolescent and School Health. (2017, August 9). In Center for Disease Control and Prevention. Retrieved October 6, 2017.
- (2018). In *California Healthy Kids Survey*. Retrieved from <http://chks.wested.org/about/>
- Ferdon, C. D., & Simon, T. R. (2014). Preventing Youth Violence: Opportunities for Action. In Center for Disease Control and Prevention. Retrieved October 6, 2017.
- Frankford, E. R. (2007). Changing Service Systems for High-Risk Youth Using State-Level Strategies. *American Journal of Public Health*, 97(4), 594–599.  
<http://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2006.096347>
- Smith, R. (2014). What Is At-Risk Youth. Retrieved from <https://study.com/academy/lesson/what-is-at-risk-youth-definition-statistics.html>
- Robertson, E. B., David, S. L., & Rao, S. A. (2003). *Preventing Drug Use Among Children and Adolescents: A Research-based Guide*. (2nd ed.). Bethesda, MD: U.S Department of Health and Human Services. (Original work published 1997)
- Risk and Protective Factors (2017). In *Developmental Asset Profile*. Retrieved from <https://www.search-institute.org/our-research/development-assets/developmental-assets-framework/>
- Smith, E., Osgood, D., Caldwell, L., Hynes, K., & Perkins, D. (2013). Measuring Collective Efficacy Among Children in Community-based Afterschool Programs: Exploring Pathways

toward Prevention and Positive Youth Development. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 52(1-2), 27-40.

Moshman, D. (2016). Laurence Steinberg, *Age of Opportunity: Lessons from the new science of adolescence*. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 42, 98-99.

Sugimoto-Matsuda, J., Hishinuma, J., Momohara, E., Rehuher, S., Soli, C., Bautista, K., & Chang, D. (2012). Monitoring the Multi-Faceted Problem of Youth Violence: The Asian/Pacific Islander Youth Violence Prevention Center's Surveillance System. *Journal of Community Health*, 37(5), 1015-1025.

Visher, C. A., Winterfield, L., & Coggeshall, M. B. (2005). Ex-offender employment programs and recidivism: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 1, 295–315.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11292-005-8127-x>

## Tables

**Table 1**  
**Sample for Project REACH, Vista Community Clinic (VCC), 2015-2017. Stratified by Gender**

Variable	Total		Female		Male		p-value
	n	%	n	%	n	%	
<b>Total</b>	47	100	23	48.9	24	51.1	
<b>School</b>							.792
<b>Middle School</b>	11	23.4	5	21.7	6	25	
<b>High School</b>	36	76.6	18	78.3	18	75	
<b>Site</b>							.732
<b>Libby Lake</b>	10	22.2	4	19	6	29.2	
<b>Balderrama</b>	13	28.9	6	28.6	7	25	
<b>RBV</b>	24	48.9	11	52.4	11	45.8	
<b>Age Categories</b>							0.392
<b>12-14 Years</b>	12	25.5	4	17.4	8	33.3	
<b>15-17 Years</b>	30	63.9	14	60.9	16	66.7	
<b>18 Yrs. and up</b>	5	10.6	5	21.7	0	0	
<b>Ethnicity</b>							.217
<b>White</b>	12	20	8	47.7	4	21.1	
<b>Black</b>	2	3.3	0	0	2	10.5	
<b>Two+ races</b>	17	60	7	41.2	10	52.6	

	Total		Female		Male		p-value
<b>Amer Indian</b>	4	13.3	1	5.9	3	15.8	
<b>Nat HI or PI</b>	1	3.3	1	5.9	0	0	
<b>Latino</b>	46	97.6	23	48.8	23	51.2	

**Table 2**


---

**Mean Difference and Standard Deviation for Stress and Stress Sub Scales for Baseline and Year 2, 2015-17.**

---

	Baseline			Year 2			p-value *
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	
<b>Total Stress</b>	22	.2074	.15715	22	.1989	.20011	.845
<b>Life Transitions</b>	22	.2500	.20412	22	.2121	.21320	.479
<b>Exposure to Violence</b>	22	.3068	.32671	22	.1439	.23735	.378
<b>Circumscribed Events</b>	22	.0985	.12236	22	.2614	.30352	.529

\*Paired Student Sample t-test (Unadjusted)

---

**Table 3**


---

**Mean Difference and Standard Deviation for Stress and Stress Sub Scales for Baseline and Year 2, 2015-17. (FEMALES ONLY)**

---

	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>*P-value</b>
<b>Total Stress</b>	13	.2500	.16732	13	.25657	.22217	.895
<b>Life Transitions</b>	13	.3077	.21350	13	.2564	.21350	.538
<b>Exposer to Violence</b>	13	.0897	.12938	13	.1923	.27085	.180
<b>Circumscribed Events</b>	13	.4038	.37553	13	.3654	.34784	.753

**\*Paired Sample Student t-test (unadjusted)**

---

**Table 4**

<b>Mean Difference and Standard Deviation for Stress and Stress Sub Scales for Baseline and Year 2 2015-17. (Males ONLY)</b>							
<b>Males</b>	<b>Baseline</b>			<b>Year 2</b>			<b>*p-value</b>
	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	
<b>Total Stress</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>.1458</b>	<b>.12500</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>.1111</b>	<b>.11600</b>	<b>.276</b>
<b>Life Transitions</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>.1667</b>	<b>.16667</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>.1481</b>	<b>.15466</b>	<b>.760</b>
<b>Exposer to Violence</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>.1111</b>	<b>.11785</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>.0741</b>	<b>.16897</b>	<b>.559</b>
<b>Circumscribed Events</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>.1667</b>	<b>.17678</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>.1111</b>	<b>.13176</b>	<b>.169</b>

**\*Paired Sample Student t-test (unadjusted)**

**Table 5**

<b>Involvement in “Risky Behavior” California Healthy Kids Survey (n, %) in Baseline vs. Year 2 Total, 2015-17</b>						
	<b>Baseline</b>		<b>Year 2</b>		<b>P-Value</b>	
	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>		
<b>Intercourse</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>14.9</b>	<b>.013</b>	
<b>Alcohol use</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>12.8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>21.3</b>	<b>.160</b>	
<b>Marijuana</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>14.9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>.569</b>	
<b>E-Sig</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>14.6</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>19.1</b>	<b>.261</b>	
<b>School Violence</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>19.1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>14.6</b>	<b>.261</b>	
<b>Truancy</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>23.4</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>25.5</b>	<b>.767</b>	

**Table 6**

<b>Involvement in "Risky Behaviors" California Healthy Kids Survey (n, %) Baseline Male vs. Female, 2015-2016</b>					
	<b>Male</b>		<b>Female</b>		<b>Significance (2-sided)</b>
	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	
<b>Intercourse</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>.312</b>
<b>Alcohol use</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>21.7</b>	<b>.071</b>
<b>Marijuana</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>21.7</b>	<b>.197</b>
<b>E-Sig</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>21.7</b>	<b>.071</b>
<b>School Violence</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>33.3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>.012</b>
<b>Truancy</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>16.7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>30.4</b>	<b>.256</b>

**Table 7**

<b>Involvement in “Risky Behaviors” California Healthy Kids Survey (n, %) Year 2 Male vs. Female 2016-2017</b>						
	<b>Male</b>		<b>Female</b>		<b>Significance (2-sided)</b>	
	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>		
<b>Intercourse</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>17.4</b>	<b>.638</b>	
<b>Alcohol use</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>20.8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>21.7</b>	<b>.940</b>	
<b>Marijuana</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>16.7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>17.4</b>	<b>.947</b>	
<b>E-Sig</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>20.8</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>17.4</b>	<b>.764</b>	
<b>School Violence</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>20.8</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>.09</b>	
<b>Truancy</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>26.1</b>	<b>.932</b>	

**Table 8**

<b>Mean Difference and Standard Deviation for External and Internal Developmental Asset Profile for baseline and year 2, 2015-2017</b>							
	<b>Baseline</b>			<b>Year 2</b>			<b>p-value*</b>
	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	
<b>External Assets</b>							
<b>Support</b>	23	30.6832	8.86792	23	32.0497	32.0497	.517
<b>Empowerment</b>	23	31.0145	8.71460	23	33.0435	6.22905	.243
<b>Boundaries and Expectations</b>	23	31.1111	9.85871	23	32.0290	32.0290	.662
<b>Constructive Use of time</b>	23	28.4783	8.10931	23	28.0435	7.38382	.799
<b>Total External Score</b>	23	30.5686	8.71819	23	32.9348	5.77817	.255
<b>Internal Asset</b>							
<b>Commitment to Learning</b>	23	27.9503	9.03329	23	32.1118	6.82228	.056
<b>Positive Values</b>	23	29.4466	8.24466	23	29.7233	6.16231	.872
<b>Social Competencies</b>	23	29.3478	34.2935	23	34.2935	5.66371	.010
<b>Positive Identity</b>	23	27.0290	9.27902	23	32.5362	6.31396	.007
<b>Total Internal Score</b>	23	28.6413	8.07107	23	31.6555	6.87966	.087
<b>Total Asset Score</b>	23	29.5052	8.16281	23	32.9348	5.77817	.110
<b>*Paired sample Student T-test (unadjusted)</b>							

**Table 9**

**Mean Difference and Standard Deviation for External and Internal Developmental Asset Profile for baseline and year 2, 2015-2017 (MALES ONLY)**

	Baseline			Year 2			p-value*
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	
<b>External Assets</b>							
<b>Support</b>	10	26.4286	11.13207	10	31.8571	8.75595	.124
<b>Empowerment</b>	10	26.3333	9.96289	10	32.8333	6.85160	.020
<b>Boundaries and Expectations</b>	10	26.2222	11.99222	10	30.7778	8.81217	.182
<b>Constructive Use of time</b>	10	24.2500	7.91008	10	27.2500	8.61604	.161
<b>Total External Score</b>	10	26.0000	10.33337	10	32.4063	6.50195	.066
<b>Internal Asset</b>	10			10			
<b>Commitment to Learning</b>	10	24.5714	10.36303	10	31.2857	7.60266	.052
<b>Positive Values</b>	10	24.6364	8.73495	10	28.3636	7.38300	.203
<b>Social Competencies</b>	10	27.0000	10.36152	10	34.5000	5.59638	.032
<b>Positive Identity</b>	10	24.8333	10.25749	10	33.0000	6.32456	.007
<b>Total Internal Score</b>	10	25.2500	9.39904	10	31.0000	8.04981	.031
<b>Total Asset Score</b>	10	25.5862	9.72342	10	31.7759	7.03409	.038

\*Paired Sample Student T-test (Unadjusted)

**Table 10**

**Mean Difference and Standard Deviation for External and Internal Developmental Asset Profile for baseline and year 2, 2015-2017 (FEMALES ONLY)**

	Baseline			Year 2			p-value*
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	
<b>External Assets</b>							
<b>Support</b>	13	33.9560	4.95400	13	32.1978	6.96481	.382
<b>Empowerment</b>	13	34.1667	5.70752	13	33.0556	6.22934	.611
<b>Boundaries and Expectations</b>	13	34.6296	6.11952	13	32.4074	6.08273	.444
<b>Constructive Use of time</b>	13	31.4583	7.10780	13	28.1250	6.58209	.223
<b>Total External Score</b>	13	33.8462	5.50319	13	32.7865	5.23160	.647
<b>Internal Asset</b>							
<b>Commitment to Learning</b>	13	29.7619	6.94087	13	32.1429	6.28630	.451
<b>Positive Values</b>	13	32.5758	5.62854	13	30.3030	5.02934	.304
<b>Social Competencies</b>	13	30.4167	5.89523	13	33.6458	5.92228	.177
<b>Positive Identity</b>	13	27.7778	8.11326	13	31.5278	6.37460	.225
<b>Total Internal Score</b>	13	30.5208	5.65386	13	31.6667	6.12391	.658
<b>Total Asset Score</b>	13	32.0115	5.24780	13	32.0115	5.24780	.908

\*Students Paired Sample T-test (Unadjusted)