

**AN EVALUATION OF THE NEW JERSEY  
CHILD ASSAULT PREVENTION (CAP)  
PROGRAM**

Prepared by

Gayle Riesser, Ph.D.  
Suzanne Borys, Ed.D.

NJ DHS Evaluation



**April 2005**

**NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES**

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report benefited greatly from the guidance provided by Aldina Hovde, Program Support Specialist for the Division of Prevention and Community Partnerships' Policy and Planning Unit, who requested this evaluation and provided technical support throughout, ensuring partnership between the researchers at the Department of Human Services and the management and staff for the Child Assault Prevention (CAP) Program. She collated and provided her own comments adding immeasurably to the quality of this report. We would also like to thank Kay Reiss, Director of Operations for the Office of Children's Services, for her comments on an earlier draft of this report.

A good understanding of the CAP Program was essential to the analysis. We would like to express our appreciation to Pat Stanislaski, Executive Director for NJ CAP Regional Training Center and the National Center of Assault Prevention, Cheryl Mojta, Assistant Director, NJ CAP, and Jeannette Collins, Regional Supervisor for NJ CAP for sharing their data, providing insights into both the data and the CAP Program, and commenting on earlier drafts of this report. Antoinette Gurden, currently a Research Scientist with the Division of Child Behavioral Health, assisted with the data analysis.

# An Evaluation of the New Jersey Child Assault Prevention (CAP) Program

## Executive Summary

The New Jersey Child Assault Prevention (NJ CAP) program is a community-based primary prevention program that has been operating in New Jersey schools since 1985 under the auspices of the International Center for Assault Prevention (ICAP) and the Educational Information and Resource Center (EIRC). The program, which is funded in part by the Division of Youth and Family Services (DYFS), provides an array of workshops for teachers, parents and children. A unique feature of the children's workshops is the additional one-on-one review time which reinforces the program's educational message and offers children a safe setting for disclosing issues that concern them.

This evaluation examined five years of administrative data from 1998 to 2003. Over that five year period the program was presented in 1,565 schools to over 60,000 teachers and parents and more than a half million children, almost half of whom talked with program facilitators during a 30-minute review time.

Results indicated that review time is a key engagement outcome that resulted in the identification of 705 cases requiring outside intervention by DYFS, the police or the Institutional Abuse Unit. During this time, instances of bullying, domestic violence, substance abuse, sexual/physical abuse, neglect and suicidal ideation may be revealed, and schools and CAP facilitators can take the necessary steps to help and empower children. Use of review time was most apt to occur in the elementary age group. The focus for the majority of facilitator or school interventions during review time was bullying.

In addition, teachers and school administrators have consistently rated the NJ CAP program very positively. As an example, more than 90% of the administrators gave not even one negative rating to any aspect of the CAP program. The fact that less than 7% of the administrators had anything negative to say about the program over a five year period is a strong endorsement and demonstration of support. These findings remain stable regardless of the year or program, showing a very high level of consistency for the CAP model.

In summary, the evaluation findings suggest that CAP is an effective primary prevention public education program that exceeds its contracted levels of service (LOS) for each program year.

Recommendations include:

- Encouraging the Division of Prevention and Community Partnerships (DPCP) within the Office of Children's Services to review this and Rutgers University's pilot study of CAP in light of the program's effectiveness for prevention and develop strategies to make communities and schools aware of the CAP program as an efficacious community-based primary prevention program.
- Suggesting that schools fund the CAP program to provide continued support for the basic elementary program, as well, as specialized programs and recognize the importance of review time, developing strategies to optimize opportunities for review time among teens
- Exploring funding strategies that would support expansion of specialized programs, such as the special needs, preschool, teen and bully programs
- Suggesting collaboration between CAP and the School Based Youth Services Program (SBYSP) which operates in low-income middle and secondary schools; these programs might be able to provide accessible space for teen review time in schools where the programs are based as well as additional resources for follow-up.

## INTRODUCTION

The New Jersey Child Assault Prevention (NJ CAP) program has been a project endorsed and supported by the New Jersey Task Force on Child Abuse and Neglect for almost twenty years. It is a community-based primary prevention program first developed in 1978 by Women Against Rape in Columbus, Ohio. Currently, facilitators in 32 states and 18 countries have been trained to present CAP workshops. The program has been operating in New Jersey since 1985 under the auspices of the International Center for Assault Prevention (ICAP) and the Educational Information and Resource Center (EIRC).

New Jersey's CAP program provides comprehensive prevention workshops for teachers, parents and students in order to reduce the vulnerability of children to verbal, physical and sexual assault. Its mission is to improve the quality of life for children by reducing the level of interpersonal violence through assault prevention education. When CAP begins implementing its programs in a district, teachers and school staff are trained to: recognize signs of child abuse and neglect, handle children's disclosure of abuse in a sensitive way, know their rights and responsibilities in reporting abuse and empower their students to be free from abuse.

CAP also includes a unique intervention component, requiring a team effort on the part of the school community, local law enforcement and social service providers. One of CAP's program goals is to make the prevention of interpersonal violence a community effort. This combination of prevention and intervention has made the New Jersey program a national and international model identified in a federally-funded project designed to disseminate information to the professional community on emerging practices to prevent child abuse and neglect.'

The CAP program provides the following services in public and private schools throughout the state:

- Awareness programs for school staff as well as educational workshops for parents;
- Interactive workshops for children in preschool, elementary and secondary schools;
- Programs for special needs populations, with special emphasis on children with developmental disabilities and cognitive impairments and children of migrant workers;
- Curricula which address abduction, bullying, and sexual assault as well as safe school environments, sexual harassment and conflict resolution.

<sup>1</sup> Thomas, David, Christine Leicht, Candy Hughes, Amy Madigan, and Kathy Dowell. *Emerging Practices in the Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect*. Office on Child Abuse and Neglect (OCAN), Administration for Children and Families (ACF), U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2003.

Each year, the CAP program staff presents workshops that meet or exceed the program's funded level of service (LOS), averaging 619 schools and more than 200 school districts throughout the state. CAP programs are also conducted in private, parochial and charter schools.

One of the initial goals articulated by the Governor's Task Force on Child Abuse and Neglect was to implement CAP in every elementary school in the state. Therefore, priority for funding has always been given to districts that have never had CAP. Since its inception, 90% of the public school districts in the state have participated in CAP workshops. However, because student turnover is continuous, CAP staff periodically returns to schools to provide the program to an entirely new group of students.

## **METHODOLOGY**

The New Jersey Department of Human Services Evaluation Unit was asked by staff from the Division of Prevention and Community Partnerships to conduct an evaluation of the NJ CAP program utilizing existing program data. This analysis examined data the CAP program had been collecting and maintaining from 1998 to 2003. Data included:

- County CAP project reports with annual information on schools with CAP programs;
- Number of teachers, parents and children participating in workshops and interventions provided;
- Teacher evaluations of CAP; and
- Administrative exit surveys completed by school principals.

This analysis did not examine other program components such as training and community outreach. An independent consultant is conducting a meta-analysis of a Rutgers pilot study of the CAP program and the CAP program's administrative data. She is also collecting information from school teachers and administrators regarding program delivery and reviewing the forms used to evaluate the program. Her analysis should shed some light on these other aspects of the program.

### **Program Description**

The NJ CAP receives funding from the Division of Youth and Family Services, the Children's Justice Act and Children's Trust Fund to deliver its program. Funding allocations for workshops are based on school population, substantiated cases of child abuse and neglect in a school district and the number of TANF cases in district schools. When a district requests CAP, it will usually receive the model designed for K-6 (elementary school age), but may also contract for other curricula. In addition to the kindergarten and primary grades curricula, CAP also has specially-tailored programming for preschool-age

children and adolescents, as well as children with developmental disabilities or migrant populations. CAP also offers a bullying program, *No More Bullies, No More Victims*, for 3<sup>rd</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup> grades, and a curriculum focused on *Violence Prevention through Conflict Resolution* (VPCR). Adult workshops can also be tailored to suit specific needs, including a focus on sexual harassment or bullying.

Since the funding for CAP programs was originally aimed at the elementary level (K-6), that curriculum still receives the largest portion of the state allocation. The kindergarten curriculum consists of 45 minute programs on two consecutive days focusing on rights to personal safety and self protection techniques along with experience role playing different situations. In the first through sixth grades, the program is a one-day program with three trained facilitators who use role playing and guided group discussion to train children to recognize potentially dangerous situations and effective response strategies, while also emphasizing their entitlement to a safe personal environment. Staff is available after the program for individual review time. Other CAP curricula address additional child populations or topics and are described in greater detail in Appendix 1.

### **Participants**

Information about the programs provided, attendance and resulting interventions are recorded on the CAP School District Reporting Form (Appendix 2). These forms show that, over the five year period under study, the CAP program provided workshops in over 1,500 schools<sup>2</sup> to 76,878 adults, 40,482 teachers and staff and 36,396 parents. A total of 33,948 workshops for children were also provided.

Over the five-year period under study, CAP programs reached 531,977 children, an average of over 100,000 children each year. Results are presented in Table 1.

<sup>2</sup> The CAP database was not originally designed to capture schools; the numbers identified here may underestimate the number (since some schools may have the same name or not be separately identified) or overestimate the number (reporting the same school under different names).

**Table 1**  
**Characteristics of NJ CAP: 1998 – 2003**

<b>Category</b>	<b>1998-1999</b>	<b>1999-2000</b>	<b>2000-2001</b>	<b>2001-2002</b>	<b>2002-2003</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Average</b>
<b>Schools</b>	572	656	603	591	673	1,565 <sup>3</sup>	619
<b>Parent/Teacher Workshops</b>	580	623	669	644	639	3,155	631
<b>Total Adults</b>	11,553	12,980	14,307	11,560	13,665	64,065	12,813
<b># Teachers/Staff</b>	6,019	6,088	7,947	6,146	7,535	33,735	6,747
<b># Parents</b>	5,534	6,892	6,360	5,414	6,130	30,330	6,066
<b>Children's Workshops</b>	9,170	5,890	5,565	6,255	7,068	33,948	6,790
<b>Total Children</b>	<b>108,933</b>	<b>108,890</b>	<b>105,345</b>	<b>99,935</b>	<b>108,874</b>	<b>531,977</b>	<b>_104,595</b>

### **Funding**

Table 2 outlines the breakdown of funding for each curriculum from 1998-2003. The data show that funding for the basic K-6 CAP program has varied only slightly from year to year. There has, however, been a decline in VPCR funding and a corresponding growth in funding for TeenCAP and the bullying prevention programs. Since the funding for CAP programs was originally aimed at the elementary level, that curriculum still receives the largest portion of the state allocation. CAP staff has also found this to be the optimal time for prevention education. Preschool and TeenCAP are frequently requested but only a small portion of each year's allocation can be designated for those two programs. Even fewer dollars are available to provide workshops for migrant programs, special needs classes, the new bullying curriculum or the maintenance component. While special needs programs have had a consistent level of funding, these programs saw an increase in 2001-2002.

<sup>3</sup> The same school might be visited several times with different programs, or the same program could be offered to different grades.

**Table 2****Program Type by Year**

<b>Program</b>	<b>1998-1999</b>	<b>1999-2000</b>	<b>2000-2001</b>	<b>2001-2002</b>	<b>2002-2003</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Preschool	19.6%	14.8%	17.7%	15.3%	15.9%	16.6%
K-6	58.7	61.5	57.7	59.7	59.3	59.4
Teen	9.0	10.0	9.5	9.2	12.2	10.1
Bully	0.1	3.5	7.5	10.2	9.2	6.2
Migrant	1.7	1.5	1.1	1.5	1.2	1.4
Special Needs	1.4	1.1	1.8	2.8	1.3	1.7
VPCR	4.4	3.5	2.2	0.8	0.0	2.1
Maintenance*	5.0	3.9	2.4	0.4	0.8	2.5
<b>Total Programs</b>	<b>703</b>	<b>789</b>	<b>717</b>	<b>718</b>	<b>841</b>	<b>3,768</b>

\*"Maintenance" is a follow-up adjunct to the K-6 CAP program.

Note: program percents reflect available funding for the given year.

**Review Time**

One of the unique characteristics of the CAP program and the one which prompted the Governor's Task Force on Child Abuse & Neglect<sup>4</sup> to support CAP in 1985 is the intervention component woven into the curriculum. No other program provides children with the opportunity to speak privately, one-on-one, with a trained prevention specialist during a designated review time. Most children who choose to speak with facilitators after a workshop use the time to review strategies they have just learned or to talk about whom they could go to if they had a problem. However, a small percentage discloses problems or situations which require some form of intervention.

Table 3 indicates that the number of children who participated in this voluntary review time was 240,847 over five years, representing 45.3% of the children attending.

**Table 3****Children Attending Review Time by Year**

<b>Children Attending</b>	<b>1998-1999</b>	<b>1999-2000</b>	<b>2000-2001</b>	<b>2001-2002</b>	<b>2002-2003</b>	<b>Total</b>
Workshops	108,933	108,890	105,345	99,935	108,874	531,977
ReviewTime	54,077	48,111	45,494	45,407	47,758	240,847
% in Review Time	49.6	44.2	43.2	45.4	43.9	45.3

<sup>4</sup> Currently known as the New Jersey Task Force on Child Abuse and Neglect

The availability of review time varies with each curriculum. In the elementary model, children go outside the classroom to meet with a CAP facilitator. In the Preschool and Special Needs curriculum, review time takes place in the classroom. In TeenCAP, review time may be scheduled in the library or some other quiet place during the school day. These different formats for review time have an impact on the number of children who choose to participate in this post-workshop activity. In particular, Table 4 indicates that the higher percentages participating in preschool (79.8%) and special needs (70.1 %) review time reflect the fact that classroom time is provided for that purpose. Teens are generally under a "bell" system for changing classes and require a pass to go to review time, which is often provided in the guidance office. The additional visibility and anticipated peer pressure, as well as other demands on their time, may lead to lower teen utilization of review time.

**Table 4**

**Children Attending Review Time by Program**

<b>Programs</b>	<b>Number Attending</b>	<b>Review Time</b>	<b>% for Review Time</b>
Preschool	29,858	23,826	79.8
K - 6	407,662	200,873	49.3
Teens	46,939	3,089	6.6
Bully	29,582	5,321	18.0
Migrant	3,026	1,509	49.9
Special Needs	1,642	1,151	70.1
Maintenance *	13,268	5,078	38.3
Total	531, 977	240, 847	45.3

Note: VPCR is incorporated with the other K-6 programs.

\* "Maintenance" is a follow-up adjunct to the K-6 CAP program.

Table 5 shows that the most common interventions occurring in 77.9% of the cases were on-the-spot problem solving related either to bullying or other problems. School interventions related either to bullying or another situation occurred in an additional 19.8% of the cases. Both these categories highlight the prominence of bullying as an issue of concern for school-age children (13,082 instances under problem solving and 2,433 instances requiring school intervention).

**Table 5**  
**Review Time Interventions**

<b>Intervention</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Problem Solving</b>		
Bully	13,082	41.1
Other	11,721	36.8
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>24,803</i>	<i>77.9</i>
<b>School Interventions</b>		
Bully	2,433	7.6
Alcohol/Drugs	283	0.9
Domestic Violence	504	1.6
Sexual Harassment	254	0.8
Suicide	34	0.1
Other	2,809	8.8
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>6,317</i>	<i>19.8</i>
<b>Other Interventions</b>		
DYFS	630	2.0
Institutional Abuse	6	0.0
Police	69	0.2
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>705</i>	<i>2.2</i>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>31,825</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Note 1: Percentages may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Note 2: Children attending review time may receive more than one intervention, e.g., both alcohol/drug and domestic violence interventions

Interventions by organizations charged with investigating child abuse and neglect occurred for 705 cases or 2.2% of all interventions. DYFS was involved in 630 interventions, the police were involved in 69 interventions and the institutional abuse unit was involved in six instances. It may be that without the CAP program, these cases would not have come to light, and the school or other appropriate authorities could not have acted. Review time is an important engagement outcome for CAP, and schools should be encouraged to provide adequate cooperation and accommodations for this component for all students.

## Teacher Satisfaction

Teachers at schools participating in CAP workshops were given a Teacher Evaluation Form to complete (Appendix 3). These surveys are required as part of the contract between the school and the CAP program, and teachers must return these surveys to their principals. This requirement may contribute to a high survey response rate. From 1998 to 2003, a total of 24,616 surveys were distributed, and 23,919 were returned, resulting in a response **rate of 97%**.

The survey contained eight questions rating different aspects of teachers' experiences with the CAP workshop:

- General impressions
- Age-appropriateness of the material
- Clarity of presentation
- Children's perceived comfort with suggested strategies
- Usefulness of materials
- Staff professionalism
- Desire to have CAP return to the school
- Plans for follow-up on strategies

Each of the eight items was rated on a five-point scale with "1" representing the most favorable response ("very much") and "5" representing the least positive ("no"). A rating of "6" indicated the item was "not applicable" and was therefore not included in the calculation of the average score. Results are presented in Table 6.

Satisfaction among teachers with the New Jersey Child Assault Prevention program was extremely high. The average rating for the eight items was 1.28, indicating strong consensus that CAP was a valuable and useful educational tool for teachers and had perceived benefits for children. More than 90% expressed either very much or general satisfaction with each of the eight items rated.

Seven of the eight items had ratings that averaged between 1.16 and 1.28, with the highest average rating given to staff professionalism (1.16). Plans for follow-up strategies averaged 1.55. These ratings indicate very strong support for the program by teachers in the classroom.

**Table 6****Teacher Satisfaction**

	<b>Items</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Very Much (1)</b>	<b>Yes (2)</b>	<b>Somewhat (3)</b>	<b>Not Particularly (4)</b>	<b>No (5)</b>	<b>Average Score</b>
1.	Were your general impressions of the workshop favorable?	23,966	78%	20%	1 %	0.1 %	0.1 %	1.24
2.	Did you feel the material presented was age appropriate?	23,792	79%	19%	2%	0.3%	0.1 %	1.24
3.	Was the material presented in a clear matter?	23, 890	80%	18%	1 %	0.1 %	0.1 %	1.21
4.	Did the children appear to be comfortable with the strategies they received?	22,310	69%	28%	2%	0.1 %	0.1 %	1.33
5.	Do you think the information the children learned in CAP will be useful?	23,299	74%	23%	2%	0.1 %	0.1 %	1.28
6.	Was the CAP staff professional in conduct and delivery of services during the program implementation in your <u>school</u> ?	23,654	85%	14%	0.4%	0.04%	0.1 %	1.16
7.	Would you like to see CAP return to your school?	23,268	77%	21 %	1 %	0.4%	0.1 %	1.25
8.	Do you have plans to follow-up the strategies we covered in class?	20,136	56%	35%	6%	1 %	1 %	1.55

In summary, the results indicate that the CAP workshop was well-received by teachers, who thought the presentations were professionally delivered and well articulated, and that the material was age-appropriate and useful to the students who participated. Teachers were likely to follow up with the strategies covered in the workshop. These teacher ratings provide a strong endorsement of the NJ CAP program as a supportive adjunct to the educational program.

## **School Administration Satisfaction**

A similar impression is gleaned from the administrative exit surveys. These surveys were given to the principal or other administrator in all schools receiving CAP. The administrator was asked to rate the CAP program at his or her school on several dimensions, including teacher and staff reactions, parent feedback, CAP staff professionalism and preparation, clarity of information provided, and children's understanding. Principals were informed that their feedback would be used to evaluate the CAP curriculum and administration of the CAP program. There was a total of ten items that were rated on a five-point scale with "1" representing the most positive response and "5" representing the least positive. A rating of "6" indicated the item was "not applicable;" this rating was not included in the calculation of the average scores. Results are presented in Table 7.

Based on their responses to the exit survey, principals, like teachers, view the CAP program very positively. More than 80% of responding administrators either very much agreed with the statements about the program or said "yes". As a result, average scores for the items ranged from 1.15 for staff professionalism to 1.83 for staff plans to follow up on CAP strategies covered during the workshop. Responses of administrators resembled those of their teaching staff. Both gave their most favorable ratings to the professionalism of the CAP staff. Ratings of administrators averaged from 1.16 to 1.83, again indicating strong support for the CAP program. If CAP wishes to make modifications, it may look to providing additional guidance to schools in terms of follow up activities that support the prevention education that CAP has provided. The averages for teacher plans for follow-up activities, while still high, were somewhat lower than for other aspects of the CAP program.

These data provide strong evidence of school support - both among teachers in the classroom and school administrators - for the CAP curriculum within their schools. Additional information is needed to obtain information about the perspectives of parents and more details about the outcomes among children and the duration of the program's impact.

**Table 7**  
**Satisfaction of School Administration**

<b>Items</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Very Much (1)</b>	<b>Yes (2)</b>	<b>Somewhat (3)</b>	<b>Not Particularly (4)</b>	<b>No (5)</b>	<b>Average Score</b>
1. After having the CAP program, did the school staff feel the program met their expectations	3,405	69.1 %	28.3%	'2.1%	0.2%	0.2%	1.34
2. Has the CAP program met your expectations?	3,419	72.3%	25.7%	1.6%	0.3%	0.1 %	1.30
3. Was feedback that you received from parents supportive?	2,431	50.3%	40.0%	6.4%	2.1 %	1.2%	1.64
4. Was the CAP staff professional in conduct and delivery of services?	3,407	86.3%	12.6%	0.9%	0.1 %	0.0%	1.15
5. Based on staff feedback, did children seem to comprehend and respond to the prevention strategies presented?	3,375	63.6%	33.9%	1.9%	0.3%	0.2%	1.40
6. Does your staff have plans to follow up on the strategies that were covered during CAP workshop?	3,266	37.6%	45.4%	14.1%	1.8%	1.1%	1.83
7. Would you like to have CAP return to your school?	3,304	68.8%	27.4%	1.8%	0.7%	1.4%	1.38
8. Was the CAP administrator organized and prepared to answer your questions or concerns?	3,352	84.1%	15.3%	0.3%	0.1 %	0.2%	1.17
9. Was the information provided to assist you in scheduling and implementation of the program clear, accurate and complete?	3,245	79.5	19.2	1.1	0.0	0.2	1.22
10. Was the program administrator able to handle anticipated and/or unanticipated problems?	3,027	78.5	20.3	0.8	0.1	0.4	1.24

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This analysis examined administrative data maintained by the NJ Child Assault Prevention program. Findings show that the program annually reaches an average of close to 620 schools, and provides information to more than 6,500 teachers and more than 6,000 parents on a yearly basis. The program seeks to dispel myths that parents and educators may have about child assault and helps adults inform and empower children to respond effectively. When CAP leaves a school, the administrators and teachers report that children have gained valuable knowledge. Overwhelmingly, teachers and administrators rate the program very highly.

The program reached more than a half million children over five years, an average of over 100,000 children each year, almost half of whom talked one-on-one with CAP staff following the program. This discussion reinforced the educational message of the program, incorporated opportunities to develop problem-solving skills, and provided a safe context for disclosure and intervention. This is an important engagement outcome.

Over a five year period, 31,285 interventions occurred, an average of 6,365 annually. Review time disclosures resulted in 630 DYFS interventions and 69 police interventions. **These interventions might not have occurred without the CAP program.**

Use of review time was greater when time was provided in the classroom, as was the case in preschools and special needs programs. Utilization was least in TeenCAP where less time and privacy are provided by schools. Strategies to provide more time and greater privacy may help to increase teen use of review time. In that regard, CAP may want to partner with School-Based Youth Service Programs (SBYSP) which currently operate in over 60 middle and high schools and will expand to over 80 programs next year. These programs may be able to provide easily accessible space for teen review time and can provide additional resources for bullying and other programs. It should be noted however that young children are developmentally more apt to be open, while teens may have more reserve.

While virtually all districts have had NJ CAP, funding limits the availability of CAP's more specialized programs for preschools, middle and high schools and those targeting special need populations. Given the prominence of bullying among the issues discussed by children during review time and the value of early intervention, additional funding that would support expansion of CAP's specialized programs may be merited.

The NJ CAP program has been identified as noteworthy in a review of emerging practices in the prevention of child abuse and neglect. This evaluation supports the conclusions of the national review.

Two independent evaluations are currently underway. One is being conducted, by a consultant with expertise in evaluating non-profits and will focus on outcomes and process, including the perspectives of parents and school officials. The child component incorporates a comparison group providing methodological rigor. Another study being conducted by Rutgers University will expand a pilot outcomes study that utilized a randomized design with a comparison group and focused on child outcomes, including self-esteem, mastery, and greater knowledge and skills that help children avoid abuse.

Information about CAP's effectiveness gained from this and other ongoing studies may assist the Department of Human Services, which is currently in the midst of a major reform of its child welfare system. This report may be useful to the Division of Prevention and Community Partnerships (DPCP) within the newly-formed Office of Children's Services, which may wish to share the results with local communities and schools.

## Appendix 1

## **NJ CAP CURRICULA**

### **Preschool**

Preschool CAP is designed for 3 1/2 to 5 year olds; the program is provided 25 minutes daily over 3 consecutive days by two specially trained facilitators who use pictures, dolls, songs and role-playing to discuss children's rights and personal safety. Each day has individual review time in the classroom

### **Kindergarten**

The elementary grades CAP for kindergarten classes is a 45 minute program provided by three facilitators over two consecutive days; the program is designed to empower children in their rights to personal safety and give them effective techniques for protecting themselves. Through role playing different situations, children are given opportunities to interactively master the material. They have opportunities after the program for individual review time. Maintenance is a follow-up activity available as part of the kindergarten program.

### **First through Sixth Grades**

The elementary grades CAP provided for children in first through sixth grades is a one day program of one hour with three trained facilitators who use role playing and guided group discussion to train elementary school age children to recognize potentially dangerous situations and develop effective response strategies, empowering them to assert their rights to personal safety. Review is available following the program. Maintenance is a follow-up activity available as part of the elementary grades program.

### **TeenCAP**

TeenCAP is provided in three 40-45 minute classroom periods in which two facilitators, one male and one female, discuss personal rights, types of assaults and effective strategies for handling potentially dangerous situations. On the second and third days of the program, male and female students are separated to provide a more comfortable setting for group discussion. Review time is available in a separate setting such as the guidance office or library during the school day.

### **Bully**

The CAP Bully program consists of three consecutive days with 40 to 60 minute presentations each day by two facilitators. The program was developed for students in 3<sup>rd</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup> grades to heighten awareness of the impact of bullying on the victim, the bully and the school community and to empower students and others in the school to address bullying in the school environment. These workshops use role playing and discussion to highlight the roles of not only the victim and bully but also the witnesses, who make up 85% of all children involved when bullying occurs, to take a stand by not participating in bullying behaviors and in reporting acts of aggression. Review time is available in a separate setting such as the library during lunch time.

**Migrant**

The migrant program is a summer curriculum designed for the children of migratory workers who cannot participate at other times of the year. Children come from a variety of non-English speaking countries and are offered the same array of CAP programs available to other children during the school year. CAP facilitators provide a linguistically and culturally-accessible learning experience and are available for review time (which varies depending on the program).

**Special Needs**

The Special Needs CAP curriculum consists of a five day program, one hour daily. The classroom teacher facilitates the first and last days of the program with three CAP facilitators presenting for the three intervening days. The program was designed for developmentally and cognitively disabled students in 6<sup>th</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup> grades to reduce the risk of potential assault for the special needs child by using role playing and appropriate materials for the population. In-class review time is provided.

**VPCR (Violence Prevention through Conflict Resolution)**

VPCR consists of one-hour in-class presentations by two facilitators on five consecutive days. The VPCR program was designed for 4<sup>th</sup> through 6<sup>th</sup> grade students and focuses on communication, cooperation and problem-solving as alternatives to violence in resolving individual and group conflict.

## Appendix 2

# CAP SCHOOL DISTRICT REPORTING FORM

COORDINATOR NAME/AGENCY \_\_\_\_\_ I \_\_\_\_\_ COUNTY \_\_\_\_\_ COMPLETION DATE \_\_\_\_\_

SCHOOL DISTRICT \_\_\_\_\_ **Please check:** GRANT \_\_\_\_\_ NON GRANT ONLY \_\_\_\_\_ (Use Separate form)

**Please Check:** PROGRAM: K-6\_\_\_ PRESCHOOL\_\_\_ TEEN\_\_\_ SPECIAL NEEDS\_\_\_ VPCR\_\_\_ MAINTENANCE\_\_\_ Bully\_\_\_\_\_

SPEC PROJECT = MIGRANT\_\_\_ Other\_\_\_\_\_

QUARTER (circle one) 1 2 3 4

List Each School	# Adult Wksp	# Teacher Staff attend	# Parent attend	# Kg. Wksp	# Other class Wksp.	# Child attend Wksp	# Child review time	# Problem solving		# School intervention**						# DYFS Intv	# Inst Abuse	# Police
								B	O	A/D	B	D/V	S/H	S	Other			

Children not granted permission to see workshop # \_\_\_\_\_ # \_\_\_\_\_ Assembly # \_\_\_\_\_ Children in Assemblies

\*\* A/D-Alcohol & Drugs    B-Bully  
 D/V-Domestic Violence    S-Suicide  
 S/H-Sexual Harassment    O-Other

Non-grant NJ CAP Administrative Fee 25%: \$ \_\_\_\_\_

**Use back of page for additional Statistic info.** Revised 6/01Adm Manual/NJ RTC Forms/Dist Reporting Form Statistics

## Appendix 3

# NJ CAP Teacher Evaluation of Classroom Workshop

Name of District \_\_\_\_\_

School \_\_\_\_\_ Grade Level: \_\_\_\_\_ Type of CAP Curriculum:

K-6 \_\_\_\_\_ Teen \_\_\_\_\_ Preschool \_\_\_\_\_  
Special Needs \_\_\_\_\_ Migrant \_\_\_\_\_ VPCR \_\_\_\_\_

Please answer the questions below using the following criteria: **1=very much**      **2=yes**  
**3=somewhat**                      **4=not particularly**                      **5=no**      **6=NA**

1. Were your general impressions of the workshop favorable?

1                      2                      3                      4                      5                      6

Strengths of workshop

Weaknesses of workshop

2. Did you feel the material presented was age appropriate?

1                      2                      3                      4                      5                      6

Comments:

3. Was the material presented in a clear manner?

1                      2                      3                      4                      5                      6

Comments:

4. Did the children appear to be comfortable with the strategies they received?

1                      2                      3                      4                      5                      6

Comments:

5. Do you think the information the children learned in CAP will be useful?

1            2            3            4            5            6

Comments:

6. Was the CAP staff professional in conduct and delivery of services during the program implementation in your school?

1            2            3            4            5            6

Comments:

7. Would you like to see CAP return to your school?

1            2            3            4            5            6

Comments:

8. Do you have plans to follow-up the strategies we covered in class?

1            2            3            4            5            6

Comments:

## Appendix 4

# NJ CAP

## Administrative Exit Interview Questionnaire

District \_\_\_\_\_ School(s) \_\_\_\_\_ County \_\_\_\_\_

(Please list all that apply to this exit interview)

Principal/Other \_\_\_\_\_ Date of Program \_\_\_\_\_ (mo/yr)

Type of CAP Curriculum: (PLEASE CHECK CURRICULUM):

Preschool \_\_\_\_\_ K-6 \_\_\_\_\_ Teen \_\_\_\_\_ Spec Needs \_\_\_\_\_ Migrant \_\_\_\_\_

Other \_\_\_\_\_ (Please specify)

CAP Interviewer \_\_\_\_\_

(Circle) Grant Non-grant (Circle) Qtr. 1 2 3 4

This questionnaire will be used to evaluate the CAP curriculum and the administration of the CAP program. It may also be used in program marketing and promotion. Please use the following criteria to rate the programmatic use and administrative areas of the program.

1= Very Much 2 = Yes 3 = Somewhat 4 = Not Particularly 5 = No 6 = NA

### I. EVALUATION OF CAP WORKSHOPS

1 After having the CAP program, did the school staff feel the program met their expectations?

1 2 3 4 5 6

Comments that you have received from staff regarding CAP.

2. Has the CAP program met your expectations?

1 2 3 4 5 6

Comments:

3. Was feedback that you received from parents supportive?

1 2 3 4 5 6

Comments that you may have received from parents.

4. Was the CAP staff professional in conduct and delivery of services?

1 2 3 4 5 6

Comments:

5. Based on feedback from staff did children seem to comprehend and respond to the prevention strategies presented?

1 2 3 4 5 6

Comments:

6. Does your staff have plans to follow up on the strategies that were covered during CAP workshops?

1                      2                      3                      4                      5                      6

Comments:

7. Would you like to have CAP return to your school?

1                      2                      3                      4                      5                      6

Comments:

## II. EVALUATION OF PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

8. Administrator Preparation

Was the CAP administrator organized and prepared to answer your questions or concerns?

1                      2                      3                      4                      5                      6

Comments:

9. Administrator Performance

Was the information provided to assist you in the scheduling and implementation of the program clear, accurate and complete?

1                      2                      3                      4                      5                      6

Comments:

10. Administrative Problem Solving Skills

Was the program administrator able to handle anticipated an/or unanticipated problems?

1                      2                      3                      4                      5                      6

Comments:

Administrator's Signature \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_ Date

WDMRJ\STRATIVE MANUAL\School District Form\NJ RTC Form-s-Administrative Ebt b/98