

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Thursday, May 7, 2020

Pam Iorio Biography	2
Pam Iorio Testimony	3-5
Steve Salem Biography	6
Steve Salem Testimony	7-12
Steve Salem Supporting Document: Prevention Research University of Michigan. Evaluation Research Summary: Three-Year Longitudinal Study Outcomes for Cal Ripken, Sr. Foundation's Signature Badges for Baseball Program	13-14
Steve Salem Supporting Document: Badges for Baseball and Positive Youth Development Final Report	15-47
Wintley Augustus Phipps Biography	48
Wintley Augustus Phipps Testimony	49-53
Jim Clark Biography	54-55
Jim Clark Testimony	56-59

Pam Iorio

President and Chief Executive Officer



Pam Iorio is the President/CEO of Big Brothers Big Sisters of America, the country's oldest and most effective mentoring organization. Iorio has led the organization since March 31, 2014.

BBBSA is reinvigorated as it continues to be the nation's gold standard in mentoring. In 2017, the National Board of Directors adopted a five-year strategic plan focused on building needed infrastructure for the 240 BBBS agencies across the country. In 2018, BBBS unveiled a rebranding, modernizing their look and message. In 2019 BBBSA transformed their technology to a national state-of-the-art system that tracks each mentoring match and outcomes.

Iorio, the former two-term Mayor of Tampa, Florida, (2003 – 2011) successfully led the 54th largest city in the United States, leaving office in 2011 with an 87 percent approval rating. Elected in 2003, Iorio's tenure was noted for: a revitalized downtown, including the construction of the Curtis Hixon Waterfront Park and major segments of the Riverwalk; an unprecedented reduction in crime; a massive investment in infrastructure; redevelopment throughout the city; a commitment to the arts; and fiscal soundness, with financial reserves tripling even during a recession. In 2011 she received The University of Tampa's Center for Ethics, Tampa Bay Ethics Award.

First elected to public office at age 26, Iorio was the youngest person ever to win a seat on the Board of County Commissioners for Hillsborough County, Florida. In 1992 she was elected for the first of three terms as the county's Supervisor of Elections. In 1999 she served as the president of the State Association of Supervisors of Elections, where she served as spokesperson for the organization during the highly publicized 2000 presidential election in Florida. In 2002 she was awarded Leadership Florida's Distinguished Alumnus Award for her statewide efforts on election reform.

In 2012, after three decades in public life, Iorio authored a leadership book, "*Straightforward, Ways to Live and Lead*," and helped organizations build strong and effective leaders. She also served as the Leader-in-Residence at the John H. Sykes College of Business at the University of Tampa. In 2012, Iorio was asked to serve as the interim CEO of The Children's Board of Hillsborough County after the agency went through significant leadership challenges. She served in that capacity until July 2013, setting the agency on a positive course.

Iorio graduated from The American University in Washington, D.C. with a B.S. degree in Political Science and holds a master's degree in History from the University of South Florida.



**Testimony of Pam Iorio, president and CEO of Big Brothers Big Sisters of America
to the Presidential Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of
Justice
May 7, 2020**

Chairman Keith and Commissioners, I am Pam Iorio, the president and CEO of Big Brothers Big Sisters of America. I appreciate this opportunity to testify before this Commission about our one-to-one mentoring model and innovative law enforcement mentoring that speaks to the Commission's goals of reducing crime, reducing the number of youths involved in the juvenile justice system, and growing understanding and respect for law enforcement.

Since 1904, Big Brothers Big Sisters has been using the power of one-to-one mentoring relationships to help children reach their full potential. Our mission is to create and support one-to-one mentoring relationships that ignite the power and promise of youth. We have been devoted to changing the life trajectories of vulnerable youth since the program was first founded as a court diversion program in New York City. We call our volunteer mentors "Bigs" and the young people they mentor, "Littles."

In 2019, BBBSA agencies served more than 135,000 Littles across the country. Of these, 73% were eligible for free lunch; 15% had one or more parents incarcerated, and 57% were being raised in a single-parent home; 35% live with a family member experiencing mental health concerns; 26% have a family member struggling with substance abuse. Our programs are evidence-based, and our data shows that mentoring builds key social and emotional skills youth need to succeed in academics, career, and life.

The one-to-one mentoring model works and should be endorsed to prevent young people from entering the juvenile justice system.

Our one-to-one mentoring model is designed to promote emotional support, positive social skills and behaviors, feelings of safety and security, academic skills, and positive relationships with family and peers. Research on our Community-Based Mentoring Program has shown that overall, youth enrolled in Big Brothers Big Sisters programs are 46% less likely to begin using illegal drugs, 27% less likely to begin using alcohol, and 52% less likely to skip school. Over the past 10 years BBBSA has served a total of 2,689,388 youth with caring adult mentors, changing the trajectory of young people's lives for the better. When you consider the annual cost of juvenile incarceration of \$35,000-\$64,000 compared to Big Brothers Big Sisters annual cost of \$1800 to serve each youth, the potential savings from successful mentoring is billions of dollars.

Funding for OJJDP mentoring programs should be expanded.

We receive yearly funding from OJJDP which is allocated to our agencies to make matches, carefully vetted and professionally supported, between adult mentors and their mentees. With this grant funding received from OJJDP, we were able to offer impactful mentoring to over 7,900 youth in the last year. And here is the statistic that the Commission might find most interesting: Of the young people mentored through OJJDP grant funding who had previously been in the criminal justice system, 99.9% did not re-enter after being matched with their mentor. Why? Because of the nature of the strength of the relationship built with a trusted adult in their lives - their mentor.

Bigs in Blue/Bigs in Badges should be a robust, national program and encouraged on the state and local level.

A few years ago, concerned about the increasing tensions in many communities between police and the communities they serve, we took a local BBBS program that connected law enforcement with young people in a one-to-one mentoring model, and scaled it nationwide. Bigs in Blue/Bigs with Badges has grown from fewer than 20 agencies to 103 agencies in 35 states across the country. Mentors come from the ranks of the local police and sheriff departments to the FBI, Highway Patrol, and other law enforcement entities and court officials.

If the only time a child sees a law enforcement officer in their community is to make an arrest of a neighbor or family member, there begins a lifetime of distrust. But when a police officer becomes a Big Brother or Sister to a young person, taking an interest in his or her life and future, the attitude can change. We have seen so many instances of real friendships forming, not just with the young person, but with entire families.

In my former life as Mayor of the City of Tampa, our Police Chief at the time, Chief Hogue, was a Big Brother. His Little Brother was nine years old and lived in one of the most economically challenged communities in the city. One day, when talking about career choices, the Chief gave his Little his Chief's cap to keep. The Little's mother called the Chief to tell him that every night her son slept next to the Chief's cap and now wanted to be a police officer.

In Florida, Attorney General Ashley Moody is a strong supporter of Bigs in Blue and has formally asked all statewide law enforcement officials to become mentors. That kind of leadership, if multiplied across the country, could make a significant difference in our police/community relations.

Virtual mentoring initiatives should be encouraged and supported during this pandemic.

The coronavirus pandemic is changing so many aspects of our lives. Our organization is all about the strength of each relationship, and the many activities our matches enjoy. Social distancing is making it difficult for our Bigs and Littles to be together. But it has not stopped the creativity and innovative spirit of the BBBS Federation.

The National Office is currently building an e-mentoring platform to be integrated into our national database that tracks the progress of each match. This will be done in mid-June and will open many more possibilities for Bigs and Littles to engage virtually. Making new matches, and keeping current matches together, and doing so in a safe, virtual environment, takes expertise and skill. BBBSA has been a leader in the industry in providing safe, effective mentoring programming through our affiliate

network, partnering closely with organizations like the National Center for Missing & Exploited Children to address evolving technology-based safety risks to children and youth.

Commissioners, I thank you for the time and the interest you are demonstrating by serving on this important Commission and listening to this and other testimony.

Our recommendations from Big Brothers Big Sisters of America include the following:

- 1. The one-to-one mentoring model works and should be endorsed to prevent young people from entering the juvenile justice system.**
- 2. Funding for OJJDP mentoring programs should be expanded.**
- 3. Bigs in Blue/Bigs in Badges should be a robust, national program and encouraged on the state and local level.**
- 4. Virtual mentoring initiatives should be encouraged and supported during this pandemic.**

All of us have the capacity to ignite and defend the potential of young people. It is a privilege for me to represent an organization that reflects this can-do spirit of America, and to see the positive results. We can do more. Each year we have tens of thousands of young people on our waiting lists at agencies throughout the county, hoping to be matched with a Big Brother or a Big Sister. As you continue your worthwhile work, which will undoubtedly result in positive changes, I hope you will include the mission of Big Brothers Big Sisters as part of the solution.

Thank you.

Steve Salem

President & Chief Executive Officer, Cal Ripken Sr. Foundation



Steve Salem joined the Cal Ripken, Sr. Foundation (CRSF) as its President and CEO in March of 2006. In this capacity, Steve has helped to build the CRSF into a truly impactful national organization. He has overseen the development of a significant national Board of Directors; the growth of the organization staff infrastructure; the creation of a broad program direction, including the development of the CRSF National Youth Development Park Initiative; and the creation of a sustainable, comprehensive resource development plan.

Prior to joining the Foundation, Steve served as Vice President of Government Relations for Boys & Girls Clubs of America, where he helped to raise more than \$500 Million for local Clubs serving our country's most at-risk communities. In addition, he has worked closely with leading youth advocates to help pass critical child safety legislation including, the Adam Walsh Child Safety and Protection Act of 2006, and the National Amber Alert program in 2003.

In his volunteer capacity, Steve serves on the Board of Trustees at the Mystic Aquarium and Institute for Research in Mystic, CT, and on the Board of Directors at the National Center for Missing & Exploited Children, based in Alexandria, VA.

Steve and his wife Gregg have twin sons, Alex and Jake, and reside in Gaithersburg, MD.

Written Testimony
Steve Salem, CEO & President
Cal Ripken, Sr. Foundation
Mentorship of Juveniles & the *Badges for Baseball* Program

Organizational Background and Mission: Incorporated in 2001, the Cal Ripken, Sr. Foundation (“CRSF”) is a national 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization based in Baltimore, Maryland that implements youth development mentoring programs in 48 states, and Washington, D.C., impacting over 1.5 million at-risk youth each year. In 2008, CRSF created our evidence-based juvenile crime prevention and youth mentoring program, *Badges for Baseball* (“*Badges*”), in collaboration with the U.S. Department of Justice. We use sports-themed afterschool activities to bring police officers, youth mentors, and underserved kids primarily ages 9 to 14 together to teach critical life skills and build trust within the community by introducing law enforcement and public safety officers as mentors and role models. Through our year-round mentoring program, we are able to nurture and develop socio-emotional outcomes in our mentees which enable at-risk youth to change their trajectories in life and make good choices that help them to avoid negative behaviors and the juvenile justice system.

The Need for Youth Mentoring & the *Badges for Baseball* Program: The need for programming that pairs youth with caring adults has never been greater. Child poverty has reached record levels with one in five children (16.1 million) living in poverty.ⁱ Each day, nearly six million youth return home to an empty house, and nearly 15 million children are in need of mentors.ⁱⁱ To break this cycle of vulnerability, programs must encourage and empower youth to make positive choices, by allowing them to grow in a safe and nurturing environment. In fact, youth participating in team sports and effective mentoring programs statistically have better academic performance and improved classroom behavior, in addition to lower rates of cigarette smoking, teen pregnancy, and illegal drug use.ⁱⁱⁱ

CRSF provides the resources, on-going training, and curriculum materials to run an instructive program, so that our law enforcement mentors and youth partners can focus on mentoring youth and harnessing their energy in positive directions. Studies have shown that children participating in well-implemented, quality, out-of-school programs reap a range of positive benefits, including higher reading and math scores, increased self-esteem, higher school attendance, and decreased dropout rates.^{iv}

Badges program mentees struggle with multiple risk factors which include living in disadvantaged communities. The percentage of adolescent children living in low-income families has been on the rise – increasing from 36 percent in 2006 to nearly 41 percent in 2011.^v Successful strategies for lifting families out of poverty include creating relationships between youth and supportive role models/mentors that can increase academic achievement, reduce truancy and substance abuse, improve relationships with others, and reduce high school dropout rates (a contributing factor to the cycle of poverty).^{vi}

There is also a strong correlation between youth from single parent homes, specifically fatherless homes, and juvenile difficulties or delinquent behavior. Some alarming statistics about at-risk youth that come from a fatherless home include: 63% of youth suicides; 85% of all youths in

prison; and 75% of all adolescent patients in chemical abuse centers. “A study of 109 juvenile offenders indicated that family structure significantly predicts delinquency. Adolescents, particularly boys, in single-parent families were at higher risk of status, property, and person delinquencies.”^{vii}

Badges participants are challenged by the following high-risk factors:

- 79% are eligible for free or reduced-price school lunch.
- 66% are economically disadvantaged.
- 54% are from single-parent homes.

Overall, the *Badges* program has been implemented in 536 communities across the country, primarily in economically distressed communities. Many youth today do not come into contact with law enforcement outside of the constructs of the juvenile justice system, particularly those youth identified as at-risk. Not surprisingly, studies have found that such youth tend to have significantly less favorable attitudes toward police than those who have experienced no contact, positive or neutral.^{viii} These negative interactions contribute to the cynical perception of law enforcement that has become all too common in communities today.

Even youth who are exposed secondarily to negative interaction with law enforcement, through that of family or friends, consequently, have difficulty trusting in procedures and decisions put into place by police officers. This often results in a rejection of law enforcement completely. These negative concepts create a major gap in trust and, subsequently, increase juvenile delinquency, in that adolescents who do not show any trust in the police are 4.3 times more likely to believe that laws and orders can be disobeyed.^{ix}

Clearly, the concept of establishing trust is essential to building positive, constructive relationships because without it, there is little reason to respect and follow the requests or expectations of authority figures. Waiting until youth have had a negative experience with law enforcement, creates a stigma that is difficult to debunk. It is prior to this experience that law enforcement can bridge the gap with youth in their community to begin building a foundation for positive relationships. When officers are proactively engaged with community youth (and the community in general), it can help eliminate the perception that all police officers are untrustworthy or “bad.” The earlier youth experience positive interactions with police officers through programs like *Badges*, the more likely they will build lasting relationships and be encouraged to be active contributors to society. When law enforcement, citizens, businesses, and social services work together, it helps to bridge the gap in trust between law enforcement and the community.^x

Badges is designed to mitigate risk-factors by providing weekly, year-round mentoring programs that address the challenges these kids face each day. *Badges*, in conjunction with many of the Ripken Foundation’s enrichment programs, provides opportunities for youth to interact with positive adult mentors, law enforcement, public safety officers, and youth development professionals who educate children on the tools to become successful adults.

Bessy Banegas, the 2020 national CRSF scholarship recipient, from our Houston *Badges* program, is just one example of how our program improves the lives of at-risk youth. Both of her

parents emigrated as teenagers from Honduras and faced many obstacles and setbacks due to language barriers. The day-to-day struggles forced her parents to work long hours and leave their children in the care of neighbors. As Bessy grew up, so did the temptations around her. She initially surrounded herself with people who participated in illegal activities. Under those negative influences, she made some poor choices during her middle school years and ended up experimenting with drugs and being arrested in her freshman year of high school. After this major setback, through social media, she learned about the *Badges* program and in a short time found a true sense of family and community. She started volunteering in the program and found herself becoming a mentor and coach to the other kids. From setting up the fields to leading instructional drills, Bessy was able to connect with other kids in a positive way, and it inspired her to want to be a leader in her community. In addition to her participation as a peer mentor in the *Badges* program, Bessy became the captain of the high school varsity volleyball team, co-captain of the basketball team, and president of the Craft Club. Bessy now attends Howard Payne University in Brownwood, Texas, pursuing a degree in Business Administration, with a minor in Communications, while also being a part of the school's volleyball team. Bessy credits participation in the program with helping to turn her life around.

As shown through Bessy's experience, participation in afterschool programs can have a reparative effect on a range of prevention outcomes including: avoidance of drug and alcohol use, a decrease in delinquency and violent behavior, avoidance of sexual activity, and reduction in juvenile crime and obesity rates.^{xi} The Ripken Foundation helps our mentors teach children how to make positive behavioral decisions that lead them away from negative outcomes and toward a productive life where they can visualize their success.

Description of the program – *Badges for Baseball* – Juvenile Crime Prevention Initiative:

As our recent Michigan University research study confirms, the *Badges* program model is a proven effective, evidenced-based program that has the ability to positively connect youth with law enforcement officers on a regular basis, while repairing strained relationships within the community.^{xii} This simple, but effective, well-structured group mentoring program deters juvenile crime by providing youth the tools to transcend their difficult circumstances and gives law enforcement and youth-serving professionals an easy access point to build trusting relationships with kids and their families. The positive, healthy relationship between police and at-risk young people is the beginning of real change in distressed neighborhoods across the country.

Each week underserved young people are mentored by our program partners and law enforcement officers. Kids participate in sports activities while mentors integrate the Ripken Foundation's discussion-based, character education curricula, which focuses on building life skills, and developing personal accountability and respect for their communities. Before, during, and after sports activities, trained *Badges* mentors use the specially designed lesson plans to engage mentees in discussing a variety of topics including personal accountability, leadership, teamwork, and peer influences/choices. In addition to the *Badges for Baseball Coaches Manual*, CRSF also provides program partners with the *Healthy Choices, Healthy Children* curriculum flipbook series to help mentors expand these discussions and relate them to topics such as nutrition, fitness, resilience, anti-bullying, anti-cyber bullying, financial literacy, being an

engaged U.S. citizen, physical fitness, and nutrition. This series also includes a guide on adaptive sports for mentors working with youth who have disabilities.

The success of the *Badges* program helped CRSF to create other youth development programs under the *Badges* umbrella to enhance opportunities for kids, such as: the Ripken Summer Camp; *College Day Experience*; Instructional Leagues; Ripken Foundation STEM Centers; one-day multisport and mentoring training clinics; and *I'm GREAT* (Girls Respecting Each other And Themselves), a gender-based initiative. These programs allow us to expand our programmatic reach and expose kids to unique experiences like an overnight camp; college life; structured league play; STEM learning; one-day sports clinics that garner excitement for local programs; and a girls' curriculum that targets issues and challenges that girls face in adolescence.

We have found two significant outcomes arise from *Badges*: (1) young people are deterred from the activities associated with juvenile delinquency, and (2) community members and law enforcement officers are provided with direct opportunities to build affirming relationships and find common ground through structured, yet fun activities. This is consistent with studies that show providing youth with opportunities to connect with their community in positive ways can further enhance their favorable opinions of both the community and the police.^{xiii} This meaningful connection develops trust between law enforcement and community members, promoting a healthy relationship that solicits positive future outcomes.

Badges for Baseball – Law Enforcement Partners: Since 2008, CRSF has relied on partnerships with local and national law enforcement agencies to help us deliver *Badges* programs across the country. These community partnerships between law enforcement agencies and local youth-serving organizations provide a space and youth audience for the program to run, as well as a means to build relationships between the local organization's staff, board, and parents with participating officers. The local youth partners are acutely aware of the needs in their community and therefore, become an essential partner in the bridge between law enforcement mentors, youth, and the community. Law enforcement mentors are critical to the success of the *Badges* program because their mentorship is the stimulus that creates real systemic change in the lives and communities of the kids we impact.

We currently have 1,137 law enforcement mentors partnering in existing *Badges* programs across the country. Examples of important partnerships include those with the U.S. Marshals Service, Washington/Baltimore High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area (HIDTA), Maryland State Police, as well as local police agencies in communities such as: Milpitas, CA; Baltimore, MD; Pinellas, FL; Tampa, FL; Minneapolis, MN; Fayetteville, NC; Raleigh, NC; Knoxville, TN; Dallas, TX; Newport News, VA; and Green Bay, WI.

Badges for Baseball – Program Evaluation: In 2018, the University of Michigan Prevention Research Center concluded a three-year research study of *Badges* that officially categorized our program as **evidence-based** and helped us to better understand the effects of our program on youth developmental outcomes. The key results of the study revealed that *Badges* participants showed significant improvement in the following measured outcomes: perceptions of substance use risk, aggressive behavior, school disciplinary actions, empathy skills, social competence, conflict resolution skills, peer support, academic competence, self-worth, personal values,

community engagement, and leadership ability. The participants in the *Badges* program also improved at a significantly faster rate than the other youth program participants on the following outcome measures: reports of personal values including personal commitments to be ethical, honest, hard-working, and responsible. *Badges* participants also reported higher relationship skills, psychological well-being, personal values and behaviors, as well as a decrease in risky behaviors. Ultimately, “this three-year study by the University of Michigan research team strongly suggests the value of participating in *Badges for Baseball*. The participants improved on a variety of developmental outcomes that are critical for at-risk youth learning essential life skills that help them achieve success on and off the playing field. In addition, engaging local law enforcement as program mentors has the potential to build stronger police-community relationships for these youth and their families,” reported Dr. Thomas M. Reischl, Principal Investigator, University of Michigan School of Public Health Prevention Research Center.

Badges for Baseball – Growth, Reach, and Impact: CRSF has seen significant growth over the last 19 years in reach and impact. Since the launch of our *Badges* program in 2008, we have grown from impacting a little over 70,000 at-risk youth to 1.5 million per year and increased our geographic reach from 20 states in 2008 to 48 states, and Washington, D.C. today. As our reach grew so did the number of youth partners and law enforcement mentors. In 2008, we implemented our first *Badges* programs with the help of 370 coaches and mentors, and today, we have 6,622 coaches, law enforcement officers, teachers, volunteers, and other mentors working with kids in CRSF programs.

Over the last two months, in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Foundation has temporarily shifted our focus to help our program participants and their families with essential needs. Together with our corporate partners, we have launched the *Strike Out Hunger* campaign to help Feeding America distribute meals to families around the country struggling with food insecurity. We have also, in a time of social distancing and lockdown restrictions, adapted our *Badges* curriculum so that it is available virtually at no cost to our program partners.

Recommendations for the Commission: There are three primary recommendations that we would like to make to the Commission which will help at-risk youth make healthy behavioral decisions, build trust with law enforcement, and avoid criminal activity and involvement in the juvenile justice system:

1. Police executives should encourage their officers, especially in urban areas struggling with high crime rates, to engage as role models and mentors in youth development programs.
2. Congress should appropriate additional funding to the Office of Juvenile Justice & Delinquency Prevention for national mentoring organizations with proven, evidence-based outcomes.
3. Congress should appropriate additional funding to C.O.P.S. Office to support further enhancement of their Community Development Program.

Links to additional information: For more information on the *Badges* program, the CRSF annual report, and to find all of our character education curriculum, go <http://ripkenfoundation.org/resource-portal>.

-
- ⁱ Children's Defense Fund. "Overview of The State of America's Children 2014." 2014. <http://www.childrensdefense.org/child-research-data-publications/data/2014-soac.pdf>
- ⁱⁱ Overturf Johnson, Julia (November 5, 2005) (PDF). *Who's Minding the Kids? Child Care Arrangements: Winter 2002*. U.S. Census Bureau. <http://www.census.gov/prod/2005pubs/p70-101.pdf>.
- ⁱⁱⁱ Hanson, TL and Austin, GA. Are Student Health Risks and Low Resilience Assets an Impediment to the Academic Progress of Schools? (California Healthy Kids Survey Factsheet 3)
- ^{iv} "After School Programs in the 21st Century: Their Potential and Its Lasting Consequence," Harvard Family Research Project, 2008, <http://www.hfrp.org/publications-resources/browse-our-publications/after-school-programs-in-the-21st-century-their-potential-and-what-it-takes-to-achieve-it>
- ^v Sophia, Addy, Will Engelhardt, and Curtis Skinner. "Basic Facts About Low-Income Children." 2013. National Center for Children in Poverty.
- ^{vi} Child Poverty: Poverty is a Persistent Threat to the Well-being of Children." The Children's Aid Society. Accessed 10 June 2008. www.childrensaidsociety.org/files/ChildPoverty.pdf
- ^{vii} Eldredge, J. (2012, April 4). The Fatherless Generation.
- ^{viii} Brick, B. T., Taylor, T. J., & Esbensen, F. A. (2009). Juvenile attitudes towards the police: The importance of subcultural involvement and community ties. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 37(5), 488-495; Jackson, A. (2002). Police-school resource officers' and students' perception of the police and offending. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 25(3), 631-650; Leiber, M. J., Nalla, M. K., & Farnworth, M. (1998). Explaining juveniles' attitudes toward the police. *Justice quarterly*, 15(1), 151-174.
- ^{ix} Stamatakis, N. "Obedience and Trust in the Brazilian Police from a Youth's Perspective: The Preliminary Results." *Iberoamericana: Nordic Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Studies*, 45, 51-71 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.16993/iberoamericana.6>
- ^x Robinson, O., 2016
- ^x Orlando Robinson, MAPD, MSJAL, "Bridging the gap between law enforcement and the community," Article, LinkedIn Pulse (2016), (<https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/bridging-gap-between-law-enforcement-community-orlando-robinson>)
- ^{xi} <https://issuu.com/vsuw/docs/afterschoolreport>
- ^{xii} "Badges for Baseball and Positive Youth Development." August 2018. Dr. Thomas M. Reischl, Principal Investigator, University of Michigan School of Public Health Prevention Research Center.
- ^{xiii} Goodrich, S.A. Anderson, S., & LaMotte, V. (2014). Evaluation of a Program Designed to Promote Positive Police and Youth Interactions. *Journal of Juvenile Justice*, 3, 55.

Evaluation Research Summary: Three-Year Longitudinal Study Outcomes for Cal Ripken, Sr. Foundation's Signature *Badges for Baseball* Program

***Badges for Baseball* and Positive Youth Development**

The Cal Ripken, Sr. Foundation developed the *Badges for Baseball* program to promote positive youth development and to enhance relationships between law enforcement and youth in underserved communities. Participants in the *Badges for Baseball* program are highly likely to develop in positive ways according to the results of a three-year study by a team of University of Michigan researchers. Using a longitudinal evaluation design, the research team assessed 24 developmental outcomes among *Badges for Baseball* participants at 14 sites across the United States. The research team completed the study in two phases. In phase one, the researchers measured 24 developmental outcomes among participants in the *Badges for Baseball* program and other notable afterschool programs (that did not involve law enforcement). In phase two, they measured 14 of the 24 developmental outcomes among youth who had not recently participated in afterschool or summer enrichment programs.

Phase One: *Badges for Baseball* Participants Improved on Multiple Developmental Outcomes

In the first phase of the study (2016-2017), the research team compared 274 participants in 14 *Badges for Baseball* programs across the U.S. with 211 participants in other exemplary afterschool and summer enrichment programs in the same communities. The participants from both types of programs completed surveys assessing developmental outcomes three times: at the start of the program, at the end of program, and three months after the program. The results revealed that *Badges for Baseball* participants had essentially the same pattern of positive developmental improvements as the participants in the other exemplary afterschool/summer programs. *Badges for Baseball* participants showed significant improvement in 12 outcomes, including: improvements in empathy skills; social competence; conflict resolution skills; peer support; academic competence; self-worth; personal values; community engagement; leadership ability; perceptions of substance use risk; aggressive behavior; and school disciplinary actions. In addition, the *Badges for Baseball* participants reported beliefs that are more positive about police than participants in the other programs on all three surveys.

Phase Two: *Badges for Baseball* Participants Had Significantly Stronger Developmental Outcomes than Youth Who Do Not Participate in Afterschool Programs

In the study's second phase (2018), the University of Michigan research team compared developmental outcomes of *Badges for Baseball* participants with middle school youth who had not participated in structured afterschool or summer enrichment programs. The research team collected surveys from 847 middle school students in four of the original 14 study sites to help ensure these students were exposed to the same community risk factors as the *Badges for Baseball* program participants. The middle school students who reported recent participation in afterschool or summer enrichment programs were dropped from the comparative analyses. The middle school students completed surveys assessing 14 of the developmental outcomes used in the study's first phase. The analyses compared the survey responses of the middle-school students (program non-participants) with the end-of-program and follow-up survey responses from the *Badges for Baseball* participants. The results of the study suggest that participants who completed the *Badges for Baseball* program had significantly better developmental outcomes than the youth who had not participated in afterschool or summer enrichment programs.

Summary of Results

The analyses from both phase one and phase two of this study indicate that *Badges for Baseball* participants significantly stronger on a variety of developmental outcomes. The results from both phases are summarized in the table below. The *Badges for Baseball* participants reported higher relationship skills, psychological well-being, personal values and behaviors as well as a decrease in risky behaviors.

They also reported significantly better outcomes than non-participants at the end and three months after the completion of the program.

Summary of Evaluation Study Results from Phase One and Phase Two.

	<i>Badges for Baseball Participants Improved Over Time (Phase One)</i>	<i>Badges for Baseball Participants End-of-Program Outcome was Better than Non- Participants (Phase Two)</i>	<i>Badges for Baseball Participants 3-Month Follow-Up Outcome was Better than Non- Participants (Phase Two)</i>
Developmental Outcomes			
<i>Relationship Outcomes</i>			
Empathy Skills	✓		✓
Social Competence	✓	✓	✓
Conflict Resolution Skills	✓	✓	✓
Peer Support	✓	*	*
Positive Beliefs about Police		✓	✓
<i>Academic Outcomes</i>			
Academic Competence	✓	*	*
Reported Grades			
Future Expectations			✓
<i>Psychological Well-Being</i>			
Self-Worth	✓		✓
Life Satisfaction			✓
<i>Positive Values & Behaviors</i>			
Personal Values	✓		✓
Community Engagement	✓	✓	✓
Leadership Ability	✓		✓
<i>Risky Behaviors</i>			
Perceptions of Substance Use Risk	✓	*	*
Expected Substance Use			
Aggressive Behavior	✓		✓
School Disciplinary Actions	✓		

**This outcome was not included in phase two.*

Conclusion

This three-year study by the University of Michigan research team strongly suggests the value of participating in *Badges for Baseball*. The participants improved on a variety of developmental outcomes that are critical for at-risk youth learning essential life skills that help them achieve success on and off the playing field. In addition, engaging local law enforcement as program mentors has the potential to build stronger police-community relationships for these youth and their families.

Report submitted by Dr. Thomas M. Reischl, Principal Investigator, University of Michigan School of Public Health, October 2018.

Badges for Baseball and Positive Youth Development

Final Report

August, 2018

Thomas M. Reischl, PhD

Mary C. Cunningham, MHS

Justin E. Heinze, PhD

Andria B. Eisman, PhD

Marc A. Zimmerman, PhD

Riya Kumar



**SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH
PREVENTION RESEARCH CENTER**

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Executive Summary

The goal of this evaluation study was to understand the effects of Badges for Baseball on positive youth developmental outcomes. The Cal Ripken, Sr. Foundation (CRSF) developed and disseminated the Badges for Baseball program to promote positive youth development and to enhance the relationship between law enforcement and youth in underserved communities across the United States. Law enforcement officials served as coaches and mentors, using team sports and the CRSF's *Healthy Choices, Healthy Children* curriculum to teach lessons about teamwork, communication, respect, and leadership.

We conducted this evaluation study in two phases. The first phase began in the summer/fall of 2015 when 14 youth-serving organizations implemented the Badges for Baseball program. Program participants completed surveys that measured 24 developmental outcomes on three occasions:

1. Before the program began (baseline assessment)
2. During the last week of the program (post-test assessment)
3. Three months after the end of the program (follow-up assessment)

We also assessed the same set of developmental outcomes among a comparison group of youth who participated in a different program at the same 14 organizations.

The second phase of this study began in the fall of 2017 and was completed in the spring of 2018. This report summarizes the results from the second phase of this study.

To ensure that the sample for the second phase was similar to the sample for the first phase, we collected surveys from large samples of students who attended the same public middle schools (grades 6-8) that the phase one participants attended. We assumed that students who attended the same public schools would be comparable in terms of their family backgrounds and their neighborhood contexts. We collected surveys from five middle schools in four of the phase one sites: Milwaukee (WI), Holmes County (MS), Neenah (WI), and Waterville (ME). After collecting surveys from the middle school students, we excluded middle school students who reported participating in afterschool or summer enrichment programs in the past year. This exclusion ensured a no-program control group of students who had not recently participated in afterschool or summer programs. Our analyses then compared the no-program student group to the two program groups (Badges for Baseball and other comparison programs) we surveyed in phase one.

The data analyses compared the developmental outcomes of the no-program control group to the outcomes of the two program groups (Badges for Baseball and other comparison program) at two time points: (A) at the end of the program (post-test) and (B) three months after the program ended (follow-up). Both sets of comparisons revealed that program participants who completed their programs had better self-reported developmental outcomes than the youth who did not participate in ongoing afterschool or summer enrichment programs. The consistent pattern of positive developmental outcomes among Badges for Baseball and other comparison program (compared to the no-program control group) strongly suggests the value of participation in these programs.

Badges for Baseball and Positive Youth Development – Final Report

The Cal Ripken, Sr. Foundation (CRSF) developed and disseminated the Badges for Baseball program to promote positive youth development and to enhance the relationship between law enforcement and youth in underserved communities across the United States. Law enforcement officials serve as coaches and mentors, using team sports and the CRSF's *Healthy Choices, Healthy Children* curriculum to teach lessons about teamwork, communication, respect, and leadership. The goal of this evaluation study is to understand the effects of Badges for Baseball on positive youth developmental outcomes.

We conducted this evaluation study in two phases. The first phase began in the summer/fall of 2015 when 14 youth-serving organizations implemented the Badges for Baseball program. Program participants completed surveys that measured 24 developmental outcomes on three occasions: before the program began (baseline assessment) and during the last week of the program (post-test assessment) and three months later (follow-up assessment). We also assessed the same set of developmental outcomes among a comparison group of youth who participated in a different program at the same 14 youth-serving organizations.

The results of the first phase of this study were documented in an earlier report. The results noted that the Badges for Baseball participants had essentially the same pattern of positive developmental improvements as the participants in the other exemplary afterschool/summer programs. Across both groups of participants, there was significant improvement for 12 of the 24 measured outcomes, including improvements in:

- **Relationship Outcomes**
 1. Empathy skills
 2. Social competence
 3. Conflict resolution skills
 4. Peer support
- **Academic Outcomes**
 5. Academic competence
- **Psychological Well-Being**
 6. Self-worth
- **Positive Values & Behaviors**
 7. Personal values
 8. Community engagement
 9. Leadership ability
- **Risky Behaviors**
 10. Perceptions of substance use risk
 11. Aggressive behaviors
 12. School disciplinary actions

The participants in the Badges for Baseball program improved at a significantly faster rate than the other youth program participants on one of the outcome measures: reports of

personal values including personal commitments to be ethical, honest, hard-working, and responsible.

The results from the first phase of this evaluation study raised an important question: How are the participants in Badges for Baseball and similar afterschool and summer enrichment programs different from youth who do not participate in afterschool or summer programs? This was the question guiding the second phase of the evaluation study.

The goal of the second phase was to assess important developmental outcomes for youth who had not recently participated in afterschool or summer enrichment programs and to compare these assessments with the youth from the first phase of the study who had participated in Badges for Baseball and other similar programs. The second phase of this study began in the fall of 2017 and was completed in the spring of 2018. This report summarizes the results from the second phase of this study.

Phase Two Study Methods

Study Samples

One of the critical issues for the second phase of this study was the need to recruit a new sample of study participants who were comparable to the participants in the first phase of the study. We needed the second sample to be similar enough in their life circumstances to the first sample so that any outcome differences we noted could be reasonably attributed to whether or not they participated in an afterschool or summer enrichment program (e.g., Badges for Baseball). If the two samples of participants lived in different communities, attended different schools, or came from families with different economic backgrounds, any differences we found in developmental outcomes could be attributed to different life circumstances and not to differences in the participation in enrichment programs. Recruiting a similar sample during phase two was critical to improve the validity of the evaluation study.

To ensure that the sample for the second phase was similar to the sample for the first phase, we decided to collect surveys from large samples of students who attended the same public middle schools (grades 6-8) that the phase one participants attended. We assumed that students who attended the same public schools would be comparable in terms of their family backgrounds and their neighborhood contexts. We spoke to key staff at the youth-serving organizations where we had recruited participants for the first phase. We asked the key staff which middle schools their program participants attended. Then we contacted the principal at those middle schools to arrange for collecting surveys from students who attended those schools. The school principals (or their designees) instructed our study team on whether or not the survey collection was possible and how to secure the approvals from their school district.

We were successful in securing approvals from school administrators in four of the 14 communities that participated the first phase of the study: Milwaukee Public Schools (WI), Holmes County School District (MS), Waterville Public Schools (ME), and Neenah Joint School District (WI). Each of the four school districts agreed to allow a study team from the University of Michigan to recruit large samples of students at the identified middle schools. The Cal Ripken Sr. Foundation provided an incentive to each of the participating schools: \$2500 in cash and \$2000 of athletic equipment.

To further ensure that the comparative analyses of the participants from the first and second study phases were reasonably valid, we only used study participants from the four communities that participated in both phases of the study. In other words, we only compared the second phase sample to first phase participants from the same communities.

Finally, we were interested in comparing Badges for Baseball and other program participants (from phase one) with phase two participants with no recent afterschool or summer enrichment program experience. After collecting surveys from all middle school students during phase two, we used screening survey questions to select the participants with no recent afterschool or summer enrichment program experience. The numbers of students who participated in both study phases in the four communities are listed in Table 1.

Table 1. Number of Participants Recruited for First and Second Phases of the Evaluation Study.

Project Site	Phase One (Youth Serving Organizations)		Phase Two (Middle Schools)
	Badges for Baseball Group	Comparison Program Group	No Program Control Group
Milwaukee, WI	17	16	38
Holmes County, MS	15	17	71
Waterville, ME	23	24	64
Neenah, WI	13	5	38
TOTALS	68	62	211

Survey Measures

A second important methodological issue for the second phase of the evaluation study was the choice of developmental outcomes to measure in the study. In the first phase, we assessed 24 developmental outcomes using a survey measure. The time required to complete a survey assessing 24 outcomes, however, was nearly 60 minutes for some of the participants. For the second phase, we needed to reduce the time required to complete the survey to 30 minutes—the amount of time allocated for collecting the surveys in a school setting. The measures included in the surveys used in first and second phases of this study are listed in Table 2. In addition to including three demographic measures, we included all but one of the developmental outcome variables that improved for the study participants in phase one of the study. We did not include the Peer Support measure because we believed that measure was less important for evaluation the Badges for Baseball program. We also included three additional measures (Positive Beliefs about Police, Future Expectations, and Life Satisfaction) because we believed these measures were important outcomes of participating in the Badges for Baseball program. A copy of the survey is included in Appendix A.

Empathy Skills. Participants rated their level of agreement on a 5-point Likert scale (1-5) with five self-description statements indicating their level of empathy skills (adapted from Davis, 1980). An example statement was “I sometimes try to understand my friends better by

imagining how things look from their perspective.” We used the computed average rating in data analyses.

Social Competence. Participants rated their level of agreement on a 4-point Likert scale (1-4) with four self-description statements indicating their social skills needed to make new friends and maintaining friendships (adapted from Harter, 1982). An example statement was “Some kids find it hard to make friends BUT for other kids it's pretty easy.” We used the computed average rating in data analyses.

Conflict Resolution Skills. Participants used a 4-point scale (1-4) to rate how often they used five conflict resolution strategies when they were really angry at another person (Reischl et al., 2011). An example strategy was “When you get really angry at another person try to talk it out with the person.” We used the computed average rating in data analyses.

Positive Beliefs about Police. Participants rated their level of agreement on a 5-point Likert scale (1-5) with five self-description statements indicating their positive beliefs about the police (adapted from Hurst & Frank, 2000 and Brandt & Markus, 2000). An example statement was “In general, I trust the police.” We used the computed average rating in data analyses.

Grades. Participants reported their grades in school on a 7-item scale from “Mostly A’s” (1) to “Mostly D’s” (7).

Future Expectations. Participants rated their level of agreement on a 5-point Likert scale (1-5) with four self-description statements indicating their expectations for their future including being able to handle schoolwork, having good friends, staying out of trouble, and having a happy life (adapted from Wills, Sandy, & Yaeger, 2001). An example statement was “I will always have friends and people that care about me.” We used the computed average rating in data analyses.

Self-Worth. Participants rated their level of agreement on a 4-point scale (1-4) with six self-description statements indicating their self-worth (adapted from Harter, 1982). An example statement was “Some kids are happy with themselves most of the time BUT other kids are often not happy with themselves.” We used the computed average rating in data analyses.

Life Satisfaction. Participants reported how satisfied they usually feel about their life using a 7-point smiley-face scale (Holder et al., 2010).

Personal Values. Participants used a 4-point scale (0-3) to rate the importance of five personal values in their lives (adapted from Search Institute, 1996). An example statement was “Doing what I believe is right, even if my friends make fun of me.” We used the computed average rating in data analyses.

Community Engagement. Participants rated their level of agreement on a 5-point Likert scale (1-5) with three self-description statements indicating their engagement in neighborhood improvement activities, encouraging others to help improve neighborhoods, and helping others in the neighborhood (U.S Department of Education, 2004). An example statement was “I actively participate in my neighborhood’s activities.” We used the computed average rating in data analyses.

Table 2. Outcomes and Variables in the Phase One and Phase Two Surveys.

Variable	Phase One Survey	Phase Two Survey
Demographics		
Grade	✓	✓
Age	✓	✓
Race & Ethnicity	✓	✓
Relationship Outcomes		
Empathy Skills	✓	✓
Social Competence	✓	✓
Conflict Resolution Skills	✓	✓
Peer Support	✓	
Peer Prosocial Involvement	✓	
Peer Substance Use	✓	
Positive Beliefs about Police	✓	✓
Academic Outcomes		
Academic Competence	✓	
School Engagement	✓	
Grades	✓	✓
Future Expectations	✓	✓
School Work Motivation	✓	
Psychological Well-Being		
Self-Worth	✓	✓
Life Satisfaction	✓	✓
Positive Values & Behaviors		
Diversity Values	✓	
Personal Values	✓	✓
Community Engagement	✓	✓
Contribution Values	✓	
Physical Activity	✓	
Leadership Ability	✓	✓
Risky Behaviors		
Substance Use Risk	✓	
Expected Substance Use	✓	✓
Aggressive Behavior	✓	✓
School Disciplinary Actions	✓	✓

Leadership Ability. Participants used a 5-point scale (0-4) to rate the truth of three self-description statements about their leadership behaviors, including their ability to organize

people to get things done and whether they often serve as leaders in groups (adapted from Zimmerman & Zahniser, 1991). An example statement was “I am often a leader in groups.” We used the computed average rating in data analyses.

Expected Substance Use. Participants used a 4-point scale (0-3) to rate the likelihood that they will (a) drink alcohol, (b) smoke cigarettes, (c) smoke marijuana, and (d) illegally use prescription drugs during the upcoming year (Center for Behavioral Health Statistics, 1971). We used the computed average rating in data analyses.

Aggressive Behavior. Participants used a 5-point scale (0-4) to rate how often they engaged in nine aggressive behaviors in the last month (adapted from California Department of Education, 2004 and Orpinas & Frankowski, 2001). An example behavior was “I pushed or shoved someone.” We used the computed average rating in data analyses.

School Disciplinary Actions. Participants used a 5-point scale (0-4) to the frequency of being disciplined in five ways at school in the past month. An example statement was “In the past month I had in-school suspension or detention.” We used the computed average rating in data analyses.

Participants

Participants were 340 program participants and middle school students from Waterville, ME, Neenah, WI, Holmes County, MS, and Milwaukee, WI who met the criteria of having participated in the Badges for Baseball after-school program, the comparison after-school program, or no after school program. We collected Phase 1 data for the Badges for Baseball program and comparison program at local youth centers. We recruited middle schools to participate in Phase 2 based on their students’ participation in Phase 1. We collected Phase 2 survey data for the no-program control group participants at those middle schools.

All participants answered four demographic questions to report their gender, grade in school, their race, and their ethnicity (i.e., Hispanic or Non-Hispanic). The tabulations of these survey responses are listed in Table 3. The chi-squared (X^2) statistic indicated if there was a statistically significant difference between the three samples in the response distributions on a demographic variable. There was no significant difference in the distribution of males and females across the three groups. There was a significant difference in the distribution of grade in school—the two program groups (Badges for Baseball and comparison programs) included students who were in elementary school grades. There was also a significant difference in ethnicity—there was a higher percentage of Hispanic participants in the phase two (middle school students) sample than the two program groups. Finally, there was a significant difference in the distribution of race responses—there was a higher percent of African American participants and a lower percent of White participants in the comparison program group. There was also a higher percent of participants in the Badges for Baseball group and the no-program control group who replied “some other race.”

Table 3. Counts and Percents for Demographic Variables for Each Sample.

Demographic Variable	Badges for Baseball (n = 68)	Comparison Program (n = 62)	Control Group (n = 210)	X ² statistic
Gender				2.15
Female	29 (42.6%)	24 (38.7%)	100 (48.5%)	
Male	39 (57.4%)	38 (61.3%)	106 (51.5%)	
Grade in School				209.40***
3	1 (1.5%)	9 (14.5%)	0 (0.0%)	
4	25 (37.3%)	18 (29.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
5	12 (17.9%)	9 (14.5%)	0 (0.0%)	
6	9 (13.4%)	16 (25.8%)	77 (36.7%)	
7	13 (19.4%)	7 (11.3%)	53 (25.2%)	
8	3 (4.5%)	2 (3.2%)	80 (38.1%)	
9	4 (6.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
Ethnicity				27.28***
Hispanic	7 (10.9%)	1 (1.7%)	51 (24.4%)	
Non-Hispanic	57 (89.1%)	59 (98.3%)	158 (75.6%)	
Race				22.61*
White	31 (46.3%)	19 (32.2%)	75 (36.2%)	
Black or African American	19 (28.4%)	30 (50.8%)	82 (39.6%)	
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0 (0.0%)	2 (3.4%)	3 (1.4%)	
Asian	0 (0.0%)	2 (3.4%)	1 (0.5%)	
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.5%)	
Some other race	13 (19.4%)	1 (1.7%)	32 (15.5%)	
Multiracial	4 (6.0%)	5 (8.5%)	13 (6.3%)	

Note: The sample sizes varied for each analysis because of occasional missing values.

***p < 0.001; *p < 0.05

Data Analyses

The goal of this study was to understand the positive developmental outcomes of participating in Badges for Baseball and other high quality afterschool and summer enrichment programs. The analyses we conducted in the first phase of this study found that youth who participated in these programs improved on several developmental outcomes, including relationship outcomes, self-rated academic outcomes, psychological outcomes, personal values, and fewer risky behaviors. The analyses we conducted for the second phase of the

study focused on comparing the developmental outcomes of youth who have not participated in afterschool or summer enrichment programs (no program control group) with the outcomes of youth who have participated in such programs (e.g., Badges for Baseball and other comparable programs).

We ran two sets of comparative analyses. The first set of comparative analyses compared the outcomes of the no-program control group with the outcomes Badges for Baseball program group and the other program comparison group at the end of the program period. For the two program groups (Badges for Baseball, other comparable programs), we referred to the end of the program assessment as the “post-test” assessment.

The second set of comparative analyses compared the outcomes of the no-program control group with the outcomes of the two program groups three months after the program had ended. For the two program groups, we referred to this assessment as the “follow-up” assessment.

Results

Comparing Badges for Baseball and Other Program Participants’ Post-Test Outcomes with the No-Program Control Group Participants

The first set of analyses compared the end-of-program post-test outcomes for the Badges for Baseball and the comparison program participants with the outcomes for the no-program control group of participants. We organized the results by the type of outcomes: relationship outcomes, academic outcomes, psychological well-being outcomes, positive values and behaviors, and risky behaviors.

Relationship Outcomes. The analyses comparing group differences in the relationship outcome measures are listed in Table 4. The F-test statistic indicates whether or not the observed differences were statistically significant—the differences were unlikely to be due to chance alone. The p values associated with each significant F-test are noted below the table and indicate the probability of wrongly concluding a significant difference. For example, “ $p < .01$ ” indicates the probability of wrongly concluding a significant difference was less than .01 (i.e., 1% error rate). The LSD Post-Hoc tests indicated which groups were different from each other when there was a significant F-test.

We note in Table 4 that there were significant differences in mean scores for social competence, positive beliefs about police, and conflict resolution skills. The analysis of positive beliefs about police revealed that youth in the two program groups (Badges for Baseball and Comparison Programs) had significantly more positive police beliefs than youth in the no-program control group. The analyses of conflict resolution skills and social competence also indicated that participants in the two program groups had significantly higher scores than the no-program control group participants. There were no significant differences in the mean scores for empathy skills outcomes.

Table 4. Comparing No-Program Control Group and Two Program Group Post-Test Means and Standard Deviations for Relationship Outcomes.

Outcome Variable	Badges for Baseball (n = 65)		Comparison Program (n = 56)		Control Group (n = 203)		F-test	LSD Post-Hoc
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
Social Competence	2.91	0.81	2.93	0.74	2.67	0.93	3.02*	BB, CP > CG
Empathy Skills	3.46	0.89	3.66	0.81	3.41	0.81	2.01	
Positive Beliefs about Police	3.90	1.06	4.09	0.98	3.31	0.97	17.90***	BB, CP > CG
Conflict Resolution	1.74	0.76	1.97	0.76	1.41	0.67	16.24***	BB, CP > CG

Note: The sample sizes varied for each analysis because of occasional missing values.

***p < .001; *p < 0.05

Academic Outcomes. The analyses comparing group differences in the academic outcome measures are listed in Table 5. There were no significant differences in self-reported grades or in future expectations for academic and career success between the three participant groups.

Table 5. Comparing No-Program Control Group and Two Program Group Post-Test Means and Standard Deviations for Academic Outcomes.

Outcome Variable	Badges for Baseball (n = 65)		Comparison Program (n = 56)		Control Group (n = 203)		F-test	LSD Post-Hoc
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
Grades	2.38	1.38	2.47	1.35	2.80	1.54	1.85	
Future Expectations	3.94	0.99	4.25	0.86	4.01	0.87	2.04	

Note: The sample sizes varied for each analysis because of occasional missing values.

Psychological Well-Being Outcomes. The analyses comparing group differences in the relationship outcome measures are listed in Table 6. There was a significant difference in mean scores for life satisfaction. The analysis of life satisfaction ratings showed that the comparison group participants had significantly higher scores than youth in the no-program control group. There were no significant differences between the Badges for Baseball group and the no-program control group for these two outcomes.

Table 6. Comparing No-Program Control Group and Two Program Group Post-Test Means and Standard Deviations for Psychological Well-Being Outcomes.

Outcome Variable	Badges for Baseball (n = 64)		Comparison Program (n = 54)		Control Group (n = 203)		F-test	LSD Post-Hoc
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
Self-Worth	3.03	0.73	3.07	0.67	3.00	0.77	0.19	
Life Satisfaction	5.80	1.34	6.24	1.08	5.37	1.70	7.36***	CP > CG

Note: The sample sizes varied for each analysis because of occasional missing values.

*** p < .001

Positive Values and Behaviors. The analyses comparing group differences in the positive values and behaviors outcome measures are listed in Table 7. There was a significant difference in mean scores for community engagement—the Badges for Baseball and the comparison program participants’ reported significantly greater community engagement than the no-program control group. We also noted no significant differences in personal values or in leadership behaviors.

Table 7. Comparing No-Program Control Group and Two Program Group Post-Test Means and Standard Deviations for Psychological Positive Values and Behaviors.

Outcome Variable	Badges for Baseball (n = 64)		Comparison Program (n = 56)		Control Group (n = 203)		F-test	LSD Post-Hoc
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
Personal Values	2.22	0.74	2.41	0.62	2.18	0.68	2.24	
Leadership	2.05	1.11	2.13	1.15	1.95	1.15	0.61	
Community Engagement	3.20	1.04	3.24	1.09	2.74	1.05	7.58**	BB, CP > CG

Note: The sample sizes varied for each analysis because of occasional missing values.

** p < .01

Risky Behaviors. The analyses comparing group differences in risky behavior outcomes are listed in Table 8. There were no significant differences in the expected substance use, aggressive behaviors, and self-reported disciplinary actions.

Table 8. Comparing No-Program Control Group and Two Program Group Post-Test Means and Standard Deviations for Risky Behaviors.

Outcome Variable	Badges for Baseball (n = 64)		Comparison Program (n=56)		Control Group (n = 203)		F-test	LSD Post-Hoc
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
Expected Substance Use	0.30	0.65	0.11	0.44	0.19	0.54	1.82	
Aggression	0.98	1.03	0.75	0.84	1.00	1.00	1.49	
Disciplinary Actions	0.78	1.11	0.48	0.82	0.54	0.90	1.92	

Note: The sample sizes varied for each analysis because of occasional missing values.

Comparing Badges for Baseball and Other Program Participants' Follow-Up Outcomes with the No-Program Control Group Participants

The second set of analyses compared the 3-month follow-up assessment of outcomes for the Badges for Baseball and the comparison program participants with the outcomes for the no-program control group of participants. We again organized the results by the type of outcomes: relationship outcomes, academic outcomes, psychological well-being outcomes, positive values and behaviors, and risky behaviors.

Relationship Outcomes

The analyses comparing group differences among the relationship outcome measures are listed in Table 9. For all four of the relationship outcomes, both program groups (Badges for Baseball and comparison programs) had significantly higher outcome scores than the no-program control group.

Table 9. Comparing No-Program Control Group and Two Program Groups' 3-Month Follow-Up Means and Standard Deviations for Relationship Outcomes.

Outcome Variable	Badges for Baseball (n = 56)		Comparison Program (n = 56)		Control Group (n = 203)		F-test	LSD Post-Hoc
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
Social Competence	2.97	0.84	3.14	0.86	2.67	0.93	7.24**	BB, CP > CG
Empathy Skills	3.74	0.75	3.78	0.90	3.41	0.81	6.66**	BB, CP > CG
Positive Beliefs about Police	4.09	0.98	3.90	1.07	3.31	0.97	17.89***	BB, CP > CG
Conflict Resolution	2.08	0.70	2.11	0.73	1.41	0.67	35.53***	BB, CP > CG

Note: The sample sizes varied for each analysis because of occasional missing values.

*** $p < .001$; ** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$

Academic Outcomes

The analyses comparing group differences among the academic outcomes are listed in Table 10. The Badges for Baseball and comparison program participants had significantly higher future expectations for their lives than the no-program control group. There was no significant differences in the self-rated grades between the three groups.

Table 10. Comparing No-Program Control Group and Two Program Groups' 3-Month Follow-Up Means and Standard Deviations for Academic Outcomes.

Outcome Variable	Badges for Baseball (n = 56)		Comparison Program (n = 56)		Control Group (n = 203)		F-test	LSD Post-Hoc
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
Grades	3.29	2.48	2.64	1.98	2.80	1.54	1.90	
Future Expectations	4.28	0.80	4.33	0.65	4.01	0.87	4.67*	BB, CP > CG

Note: The sample sizes varied for each analysis because of occasional missing values.

** p < .01

Psychological Well-Being Outcomes

The analyses comparing group differences in psychological well-being outcomes are listed in Table 11. The Badges for Baseball and comparison program participants had significantly life satisfaction and self-worth ratings than the no-program control group.

Table 11. Comparing No-Program Control Group and Two Program Groups' 3-Month Follow-Up Means and Standard Deviations for Psychological Well-Being Outcomes.

Outcome Variable	Badges for Baseball (n = 56)		Comparison Program (n = 56)		Control Group (n = 203)		F-test	LSD Post-Hoc
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
Self-Worth	3.23	0.65	3.26	0.64	3.00	0.77	3.93*	BB, CP > CG
Life Satisfaction	6.04	1.12	6.34	1.18	5.37	1.70	10.74***	BB, CP > CG

Note: The sample sizes varied for each analysis because of occasional missing values.

*** p < .001

Positive Values and Behaviors

Table 12 lists the analyses comparing group differences in positive values and behaviors. We found that the Badges for Baseball and the comparison program groups reported significantly more positive personal values as well as more leadership behaviors and community engagement than the no-program control group.

Table 12. Comparing No-Program Control Group and Two Program Groups' 3-Month Follow-Up Means and Standard Deviations for Positive Values and Behaviors.

Outcome Variable	Badges for Baseball (n = 56)		Comparison Program (n = 56)		Control Group (n = 203)		F-test	LSD Post-Hoc
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
Personal Values	2.81	1.15	2.89	1.11	2.18	0.68	20.19***	BB, CP > CG
Leadership	2.39	1.06	2.38	1.10	1.95	1.15	5.36**	BB, CP > CG
Community Engagement	3.32	1.03	3.62	1.14	2.74	1.05	17.55***	BB, CP > CG

Note: The sample sizes varied for each analysis because of occasional missing values.

*** p < .001; ** p < .01

Risky Behaviors

The analyses comparing group differences in risky behaviors are listed in Table 13. The Badges for Baseball and comparison program participants reported significantly fewer aggressive behaviors than the no-program control group. There was no significant differences in the groups' expected substance use or in school disciplinary actions between the three groups.

Table 13. Comparing No-Program Control Group and Two Program Groups' 3-Month Follow-Up Means and Standard Deviations for Risky Behaviors.

Outcome Variable	Badges for Baseball (n = 55)		Comparison Program (n = 53)		Control Group (n = 203)		F-test	LSD Post-Hoc
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
Expected Substance Use	0.10	0.33	0.11	0.38	0.19	0.54	1.11	
Aggression	0.66	0.91	0.67	0.90	1.00	1.00	4.31*	BB, CP < CG
Disciplinary Actions	0.44	0.79	0.30	0.68	0.54	0.90	1.81	

Note: The sample sizes varied for each analysis because of occasional missing values.

* $p < .05$

Discussion

The data analyses compared the developmental outcomes of the no-program control group to the outcomes of the two program groups (Badges for Baseball and other comparison program) at two time points: (A) at the end of the program (posttest) and (B) three months after the program ended (follow-up). Both sets of comparisons revealed that program participants who completed their programs had better self-reported developmental outcomes than the youth who did not participate in ongoing afterschool or summer enrichment programs.

At the end of the Badges for Baseball program (post-test assessment), the Badges for Baseball participants had better outcomes than the no-program control group for four of the 14 outcomes we measured: social competence, positive beliefs about police, conflict resolution, and community engagement. Participants in the comparison programs also had better outcomes than the no-program control group at the end of their programs (posttest assessment) for five of the 14 outcomes: social competence, positive beliefs about police, conflict resolution, life satisfaction, and community engagement.

Using the outcome assessments three months after the programs ended, we found even better outcomes for the Badges for Baseball and the comparison program groups. The Badges for Baseball program participants had better outcomes than the no-program control group on eleven of the 14 outcomes we assessed:

- **Relationship Outcomes**
 1. Social competence
 2. Empathy skills
 3. Conflict resolution skills
 4. Peer support

- **Academic Outcomes**
 - 5. Future expectations
- **Psychological Well-Being**
 - 6. Life Satisfaction
 - 7. Self-worth
- **Positive Values & Behaviors**
 - 8. Personal Values
 - 9. Community engagement
 - 10. Leadership ability
- **Risky Behaviors**
 - 11. Aggressive behaviors

We also found that the comparison program participants had better outcomes than the no-program control group this same set of developmental outcomes and they also had higher scores on an additional relationship outcome: social competence. These results suggest that participating in an organized summer or afterschool program, including Badges for Baseball, increases positive youth development and that these effects are sustained over time.

In interpreting study results, we speculated on a few methodological limitations. The first limitation is that the participants in this study were not randomly assigned to the two programs or the control group. Instead, the participants (and their parents) chose their program groups. The reasons for their choices may have influenced the outcomes measured in this study. The study's reliance on self-report measures of program outcomes presents another limitation. Although we used established survey measures, the youth likely varied in how they understood the survey questions and how carefully they considered their answers to the survey questions. When interpreting results, it is important to consider that the time gap between the two phases of data collection was over two years. There may have been changes in during this time period at the individual, community, or national level that negatively influenced control group participants' responses. For example, the growing concern about negative police practices may have influenced some of the survey responses.

While these limitations suggest the study's results should be considered with appropriate cautions, the consistent pattern of positive developmental outcomes among Badges for Baseball and other comparison program (compared to the no-program control group) strongly suggests the value of participation in these programs. In phase one of this study, we noted improvements for program participants on 12 developmental outcomes across five developmental domains. In phase two of this study, we found that program participants had better developmental outcomes than youth who live in the same communities but had not participated in afterschool or summer enrichment programs.

References

- Brandt, D. E., & Markus, K. A. (2000). Adolescent attitudes towards the police: A new generation. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*, 15(1), 10–16. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02802653>
- Center for Behavioral Health Statistics, S. (1971). National Survey on Drug Use and Health (NSDUH): Summary of Methodological Studies, 1971-2014. Retrieved from <https://www.samhsa.gov/data/sites/default/files/NSDUHmethodsSummary2013/NSDUHmethodsSummary2013.pdf>
- Davis, M. H. (1980). A Multidimensional Approach to Individual Differences in Empathy. Retrieved from https://www.uv.es/friasnav/Davis_1980.pdf
- California Department of Education. (2004). placeholder.
- US Department of Education. (2004). placeholder.
- Harter, S. (1982). The Perceived Competence Scale for Children. *Child Development*, 53(1), 87. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1129640>
- Holder, M. D., Ben, A. E., Ae, C., Wallace, J. M., Holder, M. D., Wallace, J. M., & Coleman, B. (2010). Spirituality, Religiousness, and Happiness in Children Aged 8-12 Years. *J Happiness Stud*, 11, 131–150. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-008-9126-1>
- Hurst, Y. G., & Frank, J. (2000). How kids view cops The nature of juvenile attitudes toward the police. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 28(3), 189–202. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2352\(00\)00035-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2352(00)00035-0)
- Institute, S. (1996). Search Institute Profiles of Student Life--Attitudes and Behaviors. Retrieved from www.searchinstitute.org
- Orpinas, P., & Frankowski, R. (2001). The Aggression Scale: A Self-Report Measure of Aggressive Behavior for Young Adolescents. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 21(1), 50–67. Retrieved from <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0272431601021001003>
- Reischl, T. M., Zimmerman, M., Morrel-Samuels, S., Franze, S., Faulk, M., Eisman, A. B., & Roberts, E. (2011). Youth Empowerment Solutions for violence prevention | Request PDF. *Adolescent Medicine: State of the Art Reviews*, 22(3). Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/221711931_Youth_Empowerment_Solutions_for_violence_prevention
- Wills, T. A., Sandy, J. M., & Yaeger, A. M. (2001). Time perspective and early-onset substance use: A model based on stress–coping theory. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 15(2), 118–125. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0893-164X.15.2.118>
- Zimmerman, M. A., & Zahniser, J. H. (1991). Refinements of sphere-specific measures of perceived control: Development of a sociopolitical control scale. *Journal of Community*

Psychology, 19(2), 189–204. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1520-6629\(199104\)19:2<189::AID-JCOP2290190210>3.0.CO;2-6](https://doi.org/10.1002/1520-6629(199104)19:2<189::AID-JCOP2290190210>3.0.CO;2-6)

Youth Development Survey

Fill in the oval for the correct answer.

1. In what month were you born? (Choose one answer.)

- | | | |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> January | <input type="radio"/> May | <input type="radio"/> September |
| <input type="radio"/> February | <input type="radio"/> June | <input type="radio"/> October |
| <input type="radio"/> March | <input type="radio"/> July | <input type="radio"/> November |
| <input type="radio"/> April | <input type="radio"/> August | <input type="radio"/> December |

2. In what year were you born? (Choose one answer.)

- | | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> 2002 | <input type="radio"/> 2005 | <input type="radio"/> 2007 |
| <input type="radio"/> 2003 | <input type="radio"/> 2006 | <input type="radio"/> 2008 |
| <input type="radio"/> 2004 | | |

3. Are you a boy or a girl? (Choose one answer.)

- ☐ BOY ☐ GIRL

4. What grade are you in now? (Choose one answer.)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="radio"/> 5 th grade | <input type="radio"/> 8 th grade |
| <input type="radio"/> 6 th grade | <input type="radio"/> 9 th grade |
| <input type="radio"/> 7 th grade | |

5. Are you of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin? (Choose one answer.)

- ☐ No, not of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin
- ☐ Yes

6. What is your race or ethnicity? (You can choose more than one answer.)

- ☐ White
- ☐ Black or African American
- ☐ American Indian/Alaskan Native
- ☐ Asian
- ☐ Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
- ☐ Some other race

↳ Print other race: _____

7. Does your family qualify for the free or reduced lunch program at your school?

(Choose one answer.)

- ☐ No
- ☐ Yes

8. How far did your mother (or guardian) go in school?

(Choose one answer.)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="radio"/> I don't know. | <input type="radio"/> Attended college |
| <input type="radio"/> Attended high school | <input type="radio"/> Graduated from 2-year college |
| <input type="radio"/> Graduated from high school | <input type="radio"/> Graduated from 4-year college |

9. Do you go to any after-school and weekend activities (with adult leaders)
RIGHT NOW?

☐ Yes ☐ No → *Skip to question 11.*



10. What are all your after-school and weekend activities (with adult leaders)
RIGHT NOW?

Check (✓) all the activities you do RIGHT NOW:	How Often?				
	1 Day a Week	2 Days a Week	3 Days a Week	4 Days a Week	5 or More Days a Week
___ Sports →	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
___ School Clubs → examples: debate, robotics	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
___ Arts Programs →	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
___ Music Programs →	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
___ Church or Religious Groups →	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
___ Other After School Programs →	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

11. Do you go to any Boys and Girls Club programs after school or on the weekends **RIGHT NOW?**

☐ Yes ☐ No → *Skip to question 12.*



How many days a week do you usually go to the Boys and Girls Club programs?

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="radio"/> 1 day a week | <input type="radio"/> 4 days a week |
| <input type="radio"/> 2 days a week | <input type="radio"/> 5 or more days a week |
| <input type="radio"/> 3 days a week | |

12. Did you go to any after-school and weekend activities (with adult leaders)

LAST YEAR?

☐ Yes ☐ No → *Skip to question 14.*



13. What were your after-school and weekend activities (with adult leaders)

LAST YEAR?

Check (✓) all the activities you did LAST YEAR:	How Often?				
	1 Day a Week	2 Days a Week	3 Days a Week	4 Days a Week	5 or More Days a Week
___ Sports →	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
___ School Clubs →	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
___ Arts Programs →	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
___ Music Programs →	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
___ Church or Religious Groups →	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
___ After School Programs →	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

14. Did you go to any Boys and Girls Club programs after school or on the weekends **LAST YEAR?**

☐ Yes ☐ No → *Skip to question 15.*



How many days a week did you usually go to the Boys and Girls Club programs?

☐ 1 day a week

☐ 2 days a week

☐ 3 days a week

☐ 4 days a week

☐ 5 or more days a week

15. Did you **EVER participate in a program called “Badges for Baseball” at the Boys and Girls Club?**

☐ Yes

☐ No

How important is each of the following to you in your life?

	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Not Sure	Quite Important	Extremely Important
16. Doing what I believe is right, even if my friends make fun of me.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
17. Standing up for what I believe, even when it's unpopular to do.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
18. Telling the truth, even when it's not easy.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
19. Accepting responsibility for my actions when I make a mistake or get in trouble.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
20. Doing my best, even when I have a job I don't like.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Which Type of Kid are You?

FIRST, choose which type of kid is more like you.

SECOND, choose if this type is “sort of true” for you or “really true” for you.

<p>21. Which type of kid is more like you?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Some kids find it <i>hard</i> to make friends.</p> <p><input type="radio"/> For other kids it's pretty <i>easy</i> to make friends.</p>	<p>How true is that for you?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Sort of True for Me</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Really True for Me</p>
<p>22. Which type of kid is more like you?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Some kids have a <i>lot</i> of friends.</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Other kids <i>don't</i> have very many friends.</p>	<p>How true is that for you?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Sort of True for Me</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Really True for Me</p>
<p>23. Which type of kid is more like you?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Some kids are <i>popular</i> with others their age.</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Other kids are <i>not</i> very popular.</p>	<p>How true is that for you?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Sort of True for Me</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Really True for Me</p>
<p>24. Which type of kid is more like you?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Some kids wish that more kids liked them.</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Others feel that most kids <i>do</i> like them.</p>	<p>How true is that for you?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Sort of True for Me</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Really True for Me</p>

25. Which type of kid is more like you?		
<input type="radio"/> Some kids often get <i>mad</i> at themselves.	}	How true is that for you? <input type="radio"/> Sort of True for Me <input type="radio"/> Really True for Me
<input type="radio"/> Other kids are pretty <i>pleased</i> with themselves.		
26. Which type of kid is more like you?		
<input type="radio"/> Some kids <i>don't</i> like the way they are leading their life.	}	How true is that for you? <input type="radio"/> Sort of True for Me <input type="radio"/> Really True for Me
<input type="radio"/> Other kids <i>do</i> like the way they are leading their life.		
27. Which type of kid is more like you?		
<input type="radio"/> Some kids are <i>happy</i> with themselves most of the time.	}	How true is that for you? <input type="radio"/> Sort of True for Me <input type="radio"/> Really True for Me
<input type="radio"/> Other kids are often <i>not</i> happy with themselves.		
28. Which type of kid is more like you?		
<input type="radio"/> Some kids <i>like</i> the kind of <i>person</i> they are.	}	How true is that for you? <input type="radio"/> Sort of True for Me <input type="radio"/> Really True for Me
<input type="radio"/> Other kids often wish they were someone else.		
29. Which type of kid is more like you?		
<input type="radio"/> Some kids are very <i>happy</i> being the way they are.	}	How true is that for you? <input type="radio"/> Sort of True for Me <input type="radio"/> Really True for Me
<input type="radio"/> Other kids wish they were <i>different</i> .		

30. Which type of kid is more like you?

- ☐ Some kids *aren't* very happy with the way they do a lot of things.
- ☐ Other kids think the way they do things is *fine*.

How true is that for you?

- ☐ Sort of True for Me
- ☐ Really True for Me

How much do you agree or disagree with these statements?

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
31. I believe that there are two sides to every conflict and try to look at them both.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
32. When I'm upset at someone, I usually try to "put myself in their shoes" for a while.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
33. I try to look at everybody's side of a disagreement before I make a decision.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
34. Before I say something bad about a person, I try to imagine how I would feel if I were in their place.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
35. I sometimes try to understand my friends better by imagining how things look from their perspective.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

How much do you agree or disagree with the following?

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
36. In general, I trust the police.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
37. In general, I like the police.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
38. In general, I am satisfied with the police in my neighborhood.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
39. The police do a good job of stopping crime.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
40. The police in my neighborhood like most of the kids in the area.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

How much do you agree or disagree with the following?

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
41. I will be able to handle my schoolwork.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
42. I will always have friends and people that care about me.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
43. I will have a happy life.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
44. I will have interesting things to do in my life.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

In the upcoming year, how likely is it that you will do the following:

	Not at All Likely	Somewhat Likely	Very Likely	Extremely Likely
45. Drink beer or alcohol.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
46. Smoke cigarettes.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
47. Smoke marijuana.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
48. Use prescription drugs that are not yours.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

How true is each of these statements for you?

	Not True	A Little True	Somewhat True	Pretty True	Very True
49. Other people usually follow my ideas.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
50. I am often a leader in groups.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
51. I can usually organize people to get things done.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please describe how often you do following things when you get really angry at another person:

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often
52. Try to talk it out with the person.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
53. Try talking to a friend about it.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
54. Ask for advice from my parent.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
55. Ask for advice from a teacher or other adult.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
56. Try to see the other person's point of view.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

How much do you agree or disagree with the following?

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
57. I actively participate in my neighborhood's activities.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
58. I do volunteer activities to help my neighborhood.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
59. I encourage others to do things to help improve my neighborhood.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

60. What grades do you earn in school?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="radio"/> Mostly As | <input type="radio"/> Mostly Cs |
| <input type="radio"/> About half As and half Bs | <input type="radio"/> About half Cs and half Ds |
| <input type="radio"/> Mostly Bs | <input type="radio"/> Mostly Ds |
| <input type="radio"/> About half Bs and half Cs | <input type="radio"/> Don't know |

In the past month, how often did the following things happen?








	0 Times	1 Time	2 Times	3 Times	4 or More Times
61. I yelled at other kids.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
62. I broke someone else's stuff on purpose.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
63. I hit or punched someone.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
64. I left someone out of things on purpose.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
65. I completely ignored someone.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
66. I spread mean rumors or lies about another kid.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
67. I teased another kid.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
68. I pushed or shoved someone.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
69. I got into a physical fight with someone.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

In the past month, how often did the following things happen at school?

	0 Times	1 Time	2 Times	3 Times	4 or More Times
70. Someone from school called my parent or guardian because I got in trouble.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
71. I was sent to see the Principal's Office because I got in trouble.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
72. I had in-school suspension or detention.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
73. I had out-of-school suspension.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
74. I was expelled from school.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

75. Overall, how do you usually feel about your life?

(Please choose one of the faces that shows how you usually feel about your life.)

						
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Thank you for filling out this survey!

Please put the finished survey in the large envelope.

Seal the envelope with the finished survey inside before you return the survey to the program leader.

Wintley Augustus Phipps

Founder, U.S. Dream Academy



Wintley Augustus Phipps is Founder, CEO, and President of the U.S. Dream Academy, an innovative national after-school program that provides mentoring and tutoring to children of incarcerated parents and children falling behind in school. www.usdreamacademy.org Founded in 1998, this organization has grown from one center in Washington, DC to seven (7) cities (San Bernardino, Houston, Salt Lake City, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Orlando, and DC) across this nation and has served nearly 10,000 young people living in high-risk neighborhoods. The mission is to inspire and transform the lives of children of incarcerated parents and vulnerable young people through high-performance relationships with caring adults. The weekday program offers skill-building, character-building and dream-building activities in a safe after-school environment utilizing both one-to-one mentoring as well as state of the art technology to deliver on-line academic enrichment.

Wintley Phipps is a world-renowned vocal artist—Grammy Award nominee in 1988 and 1989, pastor, motivational speaker, and education activist. For more than thirty-five years, he has traveled the world delivering messages of hope, advocacy, and equality. On behalf of the U.S. Dream Academy and young people, he has spoken to varied audiences in the thousands throughout Europe, Australia, Asia, Africa, North and South America. He has performed on *Saturday Night Live* and been the special guest on the Emmy award-winning series *Super Soul Sunday* on the Oprah Winfrey Network. He is the author of **The Power of a Dream** (1996) and **Your Best Destiny** (2015). Phipps has attracted an entire new generation of fans as his performance of *Amazing Grace* has received over twenty million cumulative viewers on YouTube.

Born in the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago, Phipps moved to Montreal at an early age and then studied at Oakwood University in Huntsville, Alabama, where he received his Bachelor of Arts degree in theology. He went on to earn a Master of Divinity degree from Andrews University in Berrien Springs, Michigan. Phipps has three sons with his wife Linda Diane Galloway Phipps and currently serves as the senior pastor of the Palm Bay Seventh-Day Adventist Church in Palm Bay, Florida.

TESTIMONY FOR
THE JUVENILE JUSTICE AND YOUTH CRIME HEARING:
MENTORSHIP OF JUVENILES

MAY 7, 2020

Mentoring Youth to Prevent Delinquency and Reduce Violent Crime

WINTLEY A. PHIPPS
U.S. Dream Academy, Founder/CEO/President
wphipps@usdreamacademy.org



Introduction: It is my honor to join this august group of youth development charities, serving some of the most vulnerable youth populations in America. Because of the influence of my friend Chuck Colson, I was inspired to make my life's work helping Children of Incarcerated Parents and Children with Multiple Risk Factors, find paths to brighter futures. I feel privileged, to say, that decades since our meeting, I continue carrying on Chuck's legacy and the work he began in 1976, one year after his release from prison. His words continue to motivate and guide me in my work. Chuck once said: After three decades of prison ministry, I can tell you that resentment and bitterness are the rule, not the exception among prisoners and a resentful population can easily be radicalized. He also said the best way to keep a man from acting on his resentment, is to free him of it. Our work has shown that Mentoring, Tutoring, Character building and visions of success, free children of bitterness and resentment and place them on paths to achievement and success. Two important principles have inspired me and guided me. The first; every 10,000 children we keep out of the Juvenile Justice system, saves our nation 1.5 billion dollars annually and adds even more to this nation's economy, community, and productivity. The second, as Frederick Douglas once said, "It is easier to build strong children than to repair broken men."

Overview of Key Message

For the past 21 years, the Dream Academy has been mentoring, equipping, and tutoring youth to prevent delinquency and reduce violent crime. The results have been remarkable. In 2009, the Dream Academy led a violence-reduction strategy initiative backed by DOJ. In Ward 6 in DC, DOJ used the Dream Academy to sub-grant \$900,000 to 14 other grantees who led violence reduction strategies in a defined community. The final report showed, according to the local police precinct, a 33% reduction in violent crime during the time of our active engagement. I have included the final comprehensive report that illustrates the impact the strategy led by the Dream Academy had in one year. It was clear that our work eased the burden on law enforcement and with support and funding, I believe we can build on the efficacy and success shown in the work we have done.

Over the years we have learned that children and youth exposed to violence (as victims, witnesses, or offenders) are impacted in several negative ways which may have a lasting impact on both the individuals involved and the communities in which they reside and for Law Enforcement in these communities. Research has found that a complex combination of individual, relationship, community, and societal factors contribute to the risk of youth violence (CDC, 2016). As both the impact and the source of youth violence is broad, the solutions to address them must be equally multifaceted to reduce violence, the burgeoning burden on law enforcement and re-establish a relationship of trust between law enforcement in communities hardest hit by violent crime and drug addiction.

In communities with a high sense of safety, residents and law enforcement often work collaboratively to reduce crime as they share an ultimate end goal - to preserve their thriving community. A thriving community's foundation is built on safety. I founded the US Dream Academy over 21 years ago, and I am humbled to say we helped lead the way in shining a light; on innocent young people - hardest hit by the impact of violence, crime and incarceration in our country, the children of men and women who were incarcerated.

Statistics have shown that this population of young people may be more predisposed to distrust law enforcement because of the very up close and personal ways they have encountered the police in their communities – perhaps by witnessing the arrest of a parent in their home, or seeing their parent brought into a courtroom handcuffed with guns nearby. These images conjure up fear and distrust and must be combatted with character building, caring mentors, and new opportunities for growth and support. We discovered that our young people exposed to multiple risk factors were seeking the same kind of relationships with law enforcement that many others seek – one of trust and support. When we, as a community, provide the right preventative tools, supports and structure in the life of a young person, this improves their physical and emotional well-being and reduces contact with Law Enforcement.

Statement of the Problem

It is estimated that nine million young people are growing up in under-resourced environments without the support of mentors (Bruce & Bridgeland, 2014). Risk factors for these youth vary, but are often defined by economic adversity, peer difficulties, family stress, academic challenges, problem behavior and mental health concerns (Herrera, Dubois & Grossman, 2013). It is estimated that more than five million youth under 18 have had at least one parent in prison at one time or another, leading to an “adverse childhood experience . . . distinguished by the unique combination of trauma, shame and stigma (Hairston, 2007). Developmental disruptions in children have also been linked to trauma associated with a parent’s arrest (Johnson & Easterling, 2012), while having an incarcerated parent was associated with a 10% increase in risk of antisocial behavior (Jarjoura, 2016). One meta-analysis of 40 studies on COIP found that antisocial behaviors were present more consistently than any other factors, including mental health issues and drug use (Martin, 2017). While more studies are needed to determine the exact cause, data also shows that COIP are significantly more likely to be suspended or expelled from school, and to drop out of school at higher rates than children of non-incarcerated parents (Aaron & Dallaire, 2010). Additionally, children can be negatively impacted by the incarceration of any adult member of the household, not just a parent (Nicholas & Loper, 2012), and the impact of family disruption may last beyond the period of parental incarceration (Murray, Farrington & Sekol, 2012). These factors combined can increase a child’s risk factors for future incarceration. (Dallaire, 2007; Martin, 2017).

Recommendation: Mentoring In-person, Cloud (Virtual) and Blended

The Dream Academy proposes an innovative virtual mentoring strategy to increase mentor participation and extend our evidence-based mentoring model to serve thousands more vulnerable youth in highly-disadvantaged neighborhoods to reduce incidences of juvenile crime, substance abuse and bullying, increase academic success, protective factors and career development opportunities, thus reducing the burden of law enforcement in high risk communities. Supporting an *AIM for Your Dreams initiative: Access, Inspiration and Mentoring for Youth* through a multi-year project can save lives, reclaim bright futures and lighten the load of Law Enforcement.

The scope of challenges that COIP face, as well as their peers in the same under-resourced schools and neighborhoods, is formidable. Formal mentoring has been an effective strategy to mitigate challenges facing these youth and contributes to observable improvements in behavior, relationships, and emotional well-being (Rhodes, 2008; Jarjoura, 2016). Mentored youth appear to gain improvements in peer and parent relationships and school performance, while also engaging in substance and alcohol use at lower levels (Raposa et al, 2019). Studies have found mentoring effective for preventing psychosocial problems like delinquent behavior (DuBois & Karcher, 2013). Youth with elevated individual or environmental risk appeared to benefit more from mentoring than those without such risks (Tolan et al, 2014). Even small to moderate improvements in youth function can have an important influence on positive youth development, especially during key periods of development (Tanner-Smith et al, 2018).

Dream addresses the problems of vulnerable youth through trauma-informed programming and mentoring specifically tailored to disrupt the negative impact of multiple risk factors and increase resilience and perseverance. Dream's approach is rooted in the evidence based Developmental Relationship Framework (DRF) developed by the Search Institute built on the principles of the evidence-based 40 Developmental Assets. The DRF focuses on identifying and strengthening the internal and external Developmental Assets youth need to thrive and reach their fullest potential. Dream trains all staff and mentors to ensure each interaction with a child is characterized by the five developmental elements that make relationships transformative in young people's lives: Express Care, Challenge Growth, Provide Support, Share Power, and Expand Possibilities. Our findings, through a study with American Institute of Research (AIR), was that young people greatly benefitted from experiencing a Developmental Relationship with their mentors. AIR noted improvement in perseverance and decrease in behaviors such as violence, substance abuse or property offense.

The COVID-19 crisis and the sudden closure of schools in March 2020 forced Dream to accelerate a virtual mentoring and afterschool program delivery strategy to maintain vital relationships with our DreamKids, DreamTeens and Parents/Caregivers. During school closures, we utilized free platforms such as Zoom and Google Hangouts to support video conferencing mentor sessions.

In today's world, fighting a global pandemic and social distancing will require youth organizations to radically shift their delivery models to ensure those most vulnerable will still have access to mentoring and other wrap around services to support positive youth development. Constantly evolving technology along with visionary ways to use it, will rapidly position virtual mentoring as a viable, scalable option. However, there is limited research on virtual mentoring in high risk populations. What studies are available are promising and we seek to quickly add valuable research to the field of virtual mentoring to accelerate its most effective use and answer critical research questions. We seek to use technology to remove barriers to high-quality mentoring that existed pre-pandemic and face the new, yet unknown challenges that may exist post-pandemic.

One review of the virtual mentoring model found that it can reduce barriers associated with in-person meetings, address the issues of limited mentor availability, and allow greater flexibility in choosing a mentor that meet the needs of a mentee (e.g., choosing a mentor from a certain

profession) (Ibid.). Virtual mentoring can be particularly helpful to youth who lack resources to meet their mentor in person. Furthermore, today's youth are familiar with web-based communication, and the high penetration of cell phones and popularity of social media suggest that virtual mentoring is not only feasible but may be preferred for many youths. Just like in-person mentoring, how virtual mentoring is implemented matters. Clear guidelines to govern mentor-mentee communication and set realistic expectations, and structure to facilitate activities and support mentoring relationships are needed for successful implementation of virtual mentoring (Kaufman, 2017). MENTOR recently updated its *Elements of Effective Practice for Mentoring* (EPPM) to provide additional recommendations for virtual mentoring (Garringer et al, 2019), and Dream has ensured that our practices remain in alignment with EPPM, as our Recruitment, Screening, Training, Matching, Initiating and Support Standards in particular are directly influenced by many new Recommendations.

Twins—Deborah/Zion (mentee) and Tanesha (mentor)

In Philadelphia, two young people had a father incarcerated. After waiting for a year, Deborah and her twin brother Zion entered the Dream Academy at eight (8) years old. One of the twins—Deborah, underperformed academically and had to repeat 2nd grade. The following year, Deborah was matched with Tanesha, an Engineer who signed up to mentor at the Dream Academy. Once the connection was made, mom, mentor and the Dream Academy worked together to expose Deborah and Zion to new opportunities that opened up a world of possibilities for their future. Deborah is today an honor roll student on the road to college already paved with several college acceptance letters. Zion received a full scholarship to attend the University of Pittsburgh for Baseball and competed in an international tournament observed by Major League Baseball scouts. This is one of many stories of the powerful impact of mentoring! It made every difference for twins—Deborah and Zion.

Organizational Profile

The U. S Dream Academy (Dream), founded in 1998, aims to connect young people living with multiple risk factors, especially children of incarcerated parents, to high quality, structured mentoring relationships and a daily afterschool program to build skills, character and dreams to help increase positive life outcomes. Currently, Dream operates seven Learning Centers in partnership with Title I public schools in Baltimore, MD, Houston, TX, Orlando, FL, Philadelphia, PA (with proposed expansion to neighboring Chester Community Charter Schools), Salt Lake City, UT, San Bernardino, CA, and Washington D.C., in neighborhoods with documented patterns of high poverty, high arrest rates, and low academic achievement among residents. We have served nearly 10,000 young people and their families, the large majority African American (75%) and Latinos (22%). For the past three years, our Orlando DreamTeens have boasted a 92% on-time high school graduation rate.

Jim Clark

President and Chief Executive Officer of Boys & Girls Clubs of America



Jim Clark is President and Chief Executive Officer of Boys & Girls Clubs of America (BGCA), the nation's largest facility-based youth development organization with a primary focus on creating great futures for young people who need Clubs most. In this role, Mr. Clark leads a 111-year old network of 4,300 Boys & Girls Clubs that serve 4 million young people annually in all 50 states and on U.S. military installations across the globe.

Since joining BGCA in 2012, Mr. Clark has spearheaded a major restructuring of the national organization and guided BGCA through the launch of an exciting new strategic direction, the Great Futures Impact Plan. Through this plan, Clubs are increasing their impact on the young people they serve by focusing on three priority outcome areas – Academic Success, Good Character and Citizenship, and Healthy Lifestyles. The next evolution of this plan, the Great Futures 2025 strategic plan, will be launched in 2018, providing an even greater focus on building organizational capacity, further improving program quality and consistency, positioning BGCA as the leading advocate for youth in the United States, and growing the Boys & Girls Club Movement.

By introducing innovative programming that supports these outcome areas, such as state-of-the-art STEM initiatives and programs to combat summer learning loss, BGCA is increasing its impact on youth across the country. As a result of this work, Boys & Girls Clubs served 438,000 youth each day in 2015 – an increase of nearly 16% since he joined the organization – while the Boys & Girls Club Movement reached an all-time record with cumulative revenues of more than \$1.805 billion. Additionally, BGCA emphasizes its service to Clubs and the youth they serve in the critical areas of child protection and safety, executive and board development, increasing high school graduation rates, and combatting childhood obesity. For these and other efforts, BGCA has been ranked the #1 youth serving organization by *The Chronicle of Philanthropy* for 22 consecutive years.

Mr. Clark began his career at the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel in 1979, where he served in several senior leadership roles in distribution, sales, marketing, and customer service operations. He led new business development, mergers and acquisitions, and process improvement initiatives, and ultimately served as Senior Vice President of the news outlet until 2004.

During his career in the publishing industry, Mr. Clark was an active board member of the Boys & Girls Clubs of Greater Milwaukee, one of the largest and most successful local BGCA affiliates. In 2004, he became President and CEO of the organization, where he led eight consecutive years of revenue growth and added 17 new service locations during his tenure. Through the development of a dynamic growth and impact agenda focused on literacy, high school graduation, and college preparation, the Boys & Girls Clubs of Greater Milwaukee significantly increased average daily attendance and more than doubled its staff under his leadership. Additionally, as a result of the organization's work and proven outcomes in literacy, Mr. Clark secured a \$4.1 million "Investing in Innovation" (i3) grant from the U.S. Department of Education to take the program to scale.

Mr. Clark holds a Business Administration degree from the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, and currently resides in Atlanta with his wife and their two sons.

WRITTEN TESTIMONY

**Jim Clark, President & CEO
Boys & Girls Clubs of America**

The Role of Youth Mentoring in Youth Crime Prevention and Early Intervention

Honorable Commission Members,

Thank you for inviting me here today to speak to you about America's youth, and the ways Boys & Girls Clubs use mentorship and early intervention, to combat juvenile crime. I applaud the Commission and Attorney General Barr for taking on this important work, which will impact our nation's future for years to come.

For 160 years, Boys & Girls Clubs has served some of our nation's most vulnerable populations. Over three centuries, we've faced and worked through demanding periods, including wars and the Great Depression. Today, amid this unprecedented time, Boys & Girls Clubs are more committed than ever to serving America's children and teens. Each year, Boys & Girls Clubs serve more than 4.7 million youth at 4,700 sites across the country, including on Native lands, in affordable housing communities, in schools and on U.S. military installations worldwide. In nearly every Congressional district around the country, you'll find Boys & Girls Clubs serving all children and teens, and especially youth who need us most.

Boys & Girls Clubs change lives and are a sound investment. A study conducted by the Institute for Social Research and the School of Public Health at the University of Michigan, found that every dollar invested in Boys & Girls Clubs returns \$9.60 in current and future earnings, as well as cost-savings, to American communities. Much of the proof is in our outcomes. Teen Club youth consistently report lower levels of alcohol, cigarette and drug use when compared to their peers nationally, and 88 percent believe they can stand up for what they believe is right (even if their friends disagree). Eighty-one percent of Club youth also say they believe they can make a difference in their communities.

Today in America, so many youth face risk factors in their peer groups, their homes, their schools and their communities which present challenges that threaten to overcome their ability to cope and thrive. These problems, often out of their control, make them particularly vulnerable to environments and behaviors that can make it seem impossible to succeed. Issues such as poverty, family instability, failing schools, and neighborhood violence persist, all exacerbated by an ongoing opioid crisis that has exposed and accelerated substance abuse in families and across entire communities.

Youth exposed to even one persistent risk factor are more likely to initiate or escalate unsafe behaviors or become a victim of crime or abuse. Regrettably, many youth are exposed every day to multiple risk factors in their homes or communities, greatly increasing the likelihood that they could fall off course and interact with the juvenile justice system.

Relations between youth – particularly adolescent males – and law enforcement in many American communities are too often marked by mutual fear and distrust, fueling a vicious cycle that erodes the safety and well-being of our young people. In communities affected by violence, for instance, most citizens are law abiding. Yet the crime and violence committed by a few creates stress and elevates dangers that children must navigate every day and affects their prospects for a successful future.

Because when kids are exposed to violence, long-term harm is insidious, increasing risks for alcoholism, drug use, school dropout, depression, and delinquent or risky behaviors.

Youth impacted by risk factors at all levels need highly targeted support, to redirect them from problem behaviors and forge a path forward to be productive and valuable contributors to their communities.

Boys & Girls Clubs are optimally positioned to build positive, collaborative partnerships between local law enforcement and the communities they serve. Through the years, we've worked with White House Administrations, as well as our Congressional supporters, to create solutions for young people. For more than two decades, Boys & Girls Clubs of America and the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) worked closely together to meet the specialized needs of youth involved in the juvenile justice system and gangs.

Today we are here to continue that progress. We see three key opportunities where we can enhance our work and impact even more of America's youth:

1. By increasing investment in youth mentoring programs
2. Prioritizing early intervention and prevention
3. Making emergency investment in youth serving programs during critical times

Since 2008, with grant funding from the Department of Justice (DOJ) and OJJDP, Boys & Girls Clubs have supported at-risk kids and teens through the Youth Mentoring program. Our mentoring approach unites powerful mentoring elements already present in Clubs with formal mentoring practices and evidence-based prevention programs. The program provides a combination of individual mentoring, group, and peer mentoring services. Mentoring is site-based and provided by Club staff, volunteers, and peers, with ongoing efforts to recruit minority male mentors.

Boys & Girls Club mentoring services target communities where youth are more likely to face risk factors. We provide mentoring on Native lands and in public housing developments, in urban centers and in rural areas. Nearly all of these target communities have been impacted by opioids.

Clubs have greatly increased their mentoring impact and reach by implementing research-based enhancements to mentoring practices. Most recently, we integrated trauma-informed practices into our mentoring approach, to better support youth who may have gone through different forms of trauma that impact their well-being.

The eastern panhandle of the state of West Virginia has child poverty rates from 19 percent to 22 percent, and overdose death rates that are among the highest in the state. The Boys & Girls Club of the Eastern Panhandle has worked with key community partners, focusing on increasing the availability of social-emotional development and wellness programming in the community, which includes a dedicated prevention specialist who trains and coaches mentors on effective delivery of prevention programs and mental health first aid. Other activities implemented by the prevention specialist include a "kinetic approach to talking" – mentors check in with mentees while playing active games and creative writing activities intentionally designed to help mentees process emotions, a critical part of helping young people to cope and build resiliency. Mentees in the program ages 12-17 started a chapter of Students Against Destructive Decisions, organizing activities and going into local middle schools to lead discussions.

For the last 13 years, Boys & Girls Clubs have mentored an average of 30,000 youth ages 6-17 each year through the National Mentoring Program. Youth targeted for the program include those involved with the juvenile justice system at every level, from contact with and/or referral by police to re-entry. There is also a focus on populations under the age of twelve, given that exposure to risk factors at an early age increases the likelihood of delinquent behaviors and/or substance abuse.

One key way we can continue helping our kids is to prioritize prevention and early intervention, each of which reduce the potential for community violence, gang participation and engagement in high-risk activities. Boys & Girls Clubs have the scale, scope, and most importantly, the trust of communities and community leaders to help lead this critical work.

Boys & Girls Clubs and law enforcement agencies share a strong bond. Over 90 percent of Clubs have an ongoing association with local law enforcement, and 56 percent have a member of law enforcement on their board. Fifty-five percent of Clubs have members of law enforcement as mentors for Club youth. These relationships build deep ties and trust between youth and law enforcement, to the point that the Club is seen as a resource to help law enforcement connect and form relationships with often hard-to-reach youth. One out of 3 Clubs work with law enforcement to recruit high-need or at-risk youth to the Club, to benefit from mentoring services.

Still boundaries continue to exist among young people and law enforcement. In a survey of Club teens, 87 percent said they believe law enforcement officials are hardworking and do a good job. However, 52 percent stated they are afraid to interact with law enforcement. Clubs continue to elevate young people's opportunities to interact with law enforcement and educate them on how communities can work together. The police chief of Kenosha, in Wisconsin, shared that over a six-year span, juvenile crime decreased 47 percent, thanks in large part to their partnership with local Clubs.

A great example is Boys & Girls Clubs of Monterey County in California. They have held "Gang Prevention Summits" where law enforcement officers shared real world stories to show teens alternatives to violence.

Similarly, the Boys & Girls Clubs of Greater Kansas City in Missouri works with police to strengthen youth support systems. Police officers are introduced to youth as leaders and role models making a positive impact in the community. This also allows officers to become youth advocates and better understand challenges and issues of the community they serve.

There is an enduring need for strong, collaborative partnerships between local law enforcement and the communities they serve. Boys & Girls Clubs are optimally positioned to continue building these relationships. As a leading advocate for 4.7 million youth in rural, urban, Native and military communities, Boys & Girls Clubs are on a mission to keep kids safe and on track for long-term success.

Today in our society, we are also facing new challenges to this work due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The risk factors that kids face at home and in their communities are magnified – putting them at even higher risk than ever before. Any extended periods like this can increase risk factors and create trauma for kids and teens – everything from the lack of a positive influence or mentor, to much worse, such as mental or physical abuse.

It will be even more critical that we support programs that provide positive mentors and early intervention, like those at Boys & Girls Clubs, as these youth will need focused outcome driven development programs to help them succeed.

As we begin to recover from this crisis, children will be some of the most vulnerable to changes in our economy and society. This moment in time will undoubtedly shape their development as young adults. Its impact will have long-term implications on their ability to succeed. We must all support them to find pathways to future success.

In closing, my thanks once again to this Commission for inviting us to these critical hearings so that we can share the impact this work has and will continue to have on the young people of America. We ask that as you look forward, the following investments can be made to support our nation's youth.

Increased investments in youth mentoring programs such as the National Youth Mentoring Initiative through the DOJ and the OJJDP, can make a significant difference in communities. Mentors offer steady positive influences, guidance, and support, that lead to increased confidence and self-esteem, improved academic performance, positive decision making and relationships to help a child realize their true potential and avoid engaging in risky behaviors. We are very grateful and proud of the support we receive each year through the Youth Mentoring program. Unfortunately, the need is so great for so many vulnerable youth, that even with this significant support, only half of Clubs that apply for Youth Mentoring grants can receive funding.

Prioritizing prevention and early intervention with youth will reduce the potential impacts of community violence, gang activity and engagement in high-risk activity.

And emergency investments for youth-serving out of school time organizations that provide mentoring, due to the COVID-19 crisis will continue to be a critical need. The impact to communities and additional trauma at-risk youth are facing will be significant, especially now that out-of-school time is all the time. We urge you to advocate for funding to support critical youth serving organizations in the out-of-school time in the economic recovery funding, so we can continue critical services such as mentoring. This support will also help offset increased costs and demand for services to mitigate impact incurred due to shutdowns including, lost program revenue and the significant impact on private sector philanthropic support.

For every dollar invested in Boys & Girls Clubs, \$9.60 is returned in current and future earnings, as well as cost-savings, to American communities. We continue this positive investment by maintaining and increasing these programs that have become so critical to communities.

We believe that by strengthening these programs with youth development organizations, like our more than 4,700 local Boys & Girls Clubs, we can catalyze this transformative work in communities around our country at a time when it's needed more than ever before.

Thank you again for your time.