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Executive Summary

Evaluation Purpose and Evaluation Questions

This report provides findings from an evaluation of the MBF Child Safety Matters Program in Florida. This independent evaluation was conducted by Florida State University’s School of Teacher Education. The purpose of the evaluation was to determine the overall effectiveness of the MBF Child Safety Matters™ Program in Florida. The study also sought to identify factors that contributed to helping or hindering change, and draw lessons for future programing. The objectives of the evaluation were to:

1. Evaluate the effectiveness of the MBF Child Safety Matters Program against its overall goal.
2. Determine the extent to which the intervention adheres to the protocol and program model as originally developed.
3. Assess the extent to which students participating in the MBF program achieved the desired objectives at a satisfactory level.
4. Draw lessons for future programming.

Project Background

The MBF Child Safety Matters™ program is a prevention education program, provided at no cost to Florida public elementary schools, designed to “*educate and empower elementary students, school personnel, and adults with information and strategies to prevent bullying, cyberbullying, digital abuse, and all types of child abuse*” (CSM, 2014).

The MBF Child Safety program includes the following components:

* Curriculum aligned with Florida Education Standards;
* Incudes active learning strategies and reinforcement materials;
* Teaches universal rules and strategies;
* Certified facilitators trained prior to program implementation in classrooms;
* Standardized curriculum with facilitator script and classroom PowerPoint presentation;
* Two lessons for each grade level (K-5th grade);
* Reinforcement lessons and materials;
* Provided at no cost to Florida public elementary schools.

evaluation questions, design, methods and limitations

In order to respond to the evaluation objectives the study was guided by the following four questions:

1. Is the program being delivered as designed?

2. Is the quality of program delivery adequate?

3. What are the facilitators’ opinions about the MBF Child Safety Matters™ program?

4. What is the effect of the MBF Child Safety Matters™ Program on students’ knowledge, recognition, and understanding of issues and situations related to safety?

A range of methods have been used in undertaking this evaluation.

1. A desk-based review of MBF Child Safety Matters documentation, including lessons and teaching resources.
2. A survey developed by the researchers and administered to the trained facilitators.
3. Semi-structured qualitative interviews conducted with a sample of trained facilitators.
4. Observations of MBF CSM lessons in several different schools and across several grade levels.
5. Pre- and post-test assessment instruments developed by the researchers.
6. Pre- and post-tests administered to a sample of students in several schools in Florida.

Findings And conclusions

In order to respond to the above assessment questions, four separate yet interlinked areas of review were identified and key findings under each are summarized below:

1. Program delivery
2. Program quality
3. Impact
4. Lessons for future programing

The findings suggest that the program is being delivered as designed but it is difficult for the facilitators to complete all of the activities. There seems to be high procedural fidelity to the prescribed curriculum.

The evaluation findings suggest that the quality of program delivery is adequate and that there are many positive elements of the program. The lessons are clear and easy to implement, and they cover a broad range of child safety issues. For the most part, the lessons are age appropriate. There are some concerns over the appropriateness of the kindergarten and first grade lessons.

The facilitators feel that the various topics are covered appropriately in the CSM curriculum including the lesson scripts and the lesson resources. However, most expressed concern about time constraints and felt that the lessons were too long.

Evidence from the child assessments suggest that the program is successful in educating elementary students with strategies to prevent bullying, cyberbullying, digital abuse, and all types of child abuse. Most of the participants achieved pre- to post-test gains on the measures of interest.

programmatic Recommendations

1. In consultation with program facilitators, reduce the length of each of the CSM lessons.
2. Provide an alternative four lesson format for the lessons. This could be accomplished by providing facilitators with a summary format for re-organizing the content into four lessons. In other words, it would not be necessary to create four new lessons, but simply provide suggestions for appropriate ways to split the lessons.
3. Review the ways that some of the more sensitive topics, such as sexual abuse and pornography, are addressed in the lessons.
4. Consider including more developmentally appropriate, or interactive, activities for the kindergarten and first-grade lessons so that the lessons are less “teacher centered”. Examples could be the use of resources such as puppets, picture books, big books, or flash cards that include key vocabulary.
5. Provide recommendations concerning the timing of implementation of the CSM program during the school year.

Evaluation Purpose & Evaluation QuestionS

Introduction

This report provides findings from a research study designed to evaluate the effectiveness of MBF Child Safety MattersTM in Florida. MBF Child Safety MattersTM is a program developed and administered by the Monique Burr Foundation for Children Inc. (MBF). This independent evaluation was conducted by Florida State University’s School of Teacher Education (STE) and administered by the College of Education Office of Research. The FSU research team developed the terms of reference for the evaluation and the MBF administrators assisted with access and logistics. They also provided comments on draft versions of the report. Full responsibility for the qualitative and quantitative analyses and the implementation of those results reside with the FSU research team.

Evaluation Purpose

This study was designed to conduct an evaluation of the effectiveness of the MBF Child Safety Matters™ Program developed and administered by the Monique Burr Foundation for Children, Inc. MBF Child Safety Matters™ is a prevention education program designed to:

“*educate and empower elementary students, school personnel, and adults with information and strategies to prevent bullying, cyberbullying, digital abuse, and all types of child abuse*” (CSM, 2014).

The overall purpose of the evaluation of MBF Child Safety Matters™ Program (CSM) was to determine the effects of the program by providing evidence concerning the program’s contributions to its overarching goal. To this end we evaluated both process and outcomes as follows.

First, the evaluation examined the extent to which the program is being implemented as intended. To this end we considered the fidelity of the program delivery, or the extent to which the intervention adheres to the protocol or program model as originally developed.

Second, we examined the extent to which students participating in the MBF Child Safety Matters program achieved the desired objectives at a satisfactory level. To this end the evaluation was designed to be student oriented by focusing on learning outcomes. These outcomes are the short-, and medium-term changes in program participants' knowledge and skills that result directly from the program. We examined the extent to which the lessons actually produce the desired results by measuring pre- / post-tests of knowledge gain on the part of the participants. The main purpose here was to determine the extent to which the CSM program is achieving its primary goal of educating and empowering children "*with increased knowledge and skills to recognize and respond to unsafe situations*" (CSM, 2014).

Evaluation Questions

1. Is the program being delivered as designed? (To what extent does what is being implemented match the program as originally planned).
2. Is the quality of program delivery adequate? (What aspects of the implementation process are facilitating success or creating challenges?)
3. What are the facilitators’ opinions about the MBF Child Safety Matters program?
4. What is the effect of the MBF Child Safety Matters Program on students’ knowledge, recognition, and understanding of issues and situations related to safety?

Program Background

keeping children safe

Child safety is a concern for everyone, and all children have the right to protection. Yet many children are vulnerable to violations in many places, including their school and home. Many children deal with violence, abuse, neglect, exploitation, exclusion and/or discrimination every day. The actual numbers of children experiencing some form of abuse or violation is not easy determine. However it is estimated, for example, that:

* Each hour in the U.S., 377 children are abused.
* The U.S. receives over 3 million reports of abused or neglected children each year.
* The estimated annual cost of child abuse and neglect in the U.S. is $124 billion.
* 1 out of 7 children ages 10-17 will be sexually solicited online.
* 1 in 4 students will be bullied, 1 in 5 cyber-bullied.

Unfortunately, children who have been violated or traumatized comprise a significant proportion of our school population. According to the National Center for Child Traumatic Stress (NCCTS), childhood trauma may develop from exposure to natural disasters, domestic violence, automobile accidents, war trauma, terrorism, community and school violence, abuse, and bullying. Current estimates of the numbers of children who experience some type of trauma, are staggering, to say the least. The National Child Traumatic Stress Network (NCTSN) reports that one out of every four children attending school has been, or will be, exposed to a traumatic event that can affect learning or school behavior. According to Ziegler (2011), it is estimated that each year, nearly 5,000,000 new children are traumatized and will develop potentially debilitating effects, including problems at school. It is further claimed (Ziegler, 2011) that trauma could constitute the greatest cause of students’ underachievement in schools. For example, according to the NCTSN, childhood trauma is associated with:

* Lower grade point averages
* Higher school absence rates
* Increased drop-out rates
* Increased suspensions and expulsions
* Reading difficulties

Clearly, childhood trauma is a cause for concern for everyone. Researchers, educators, and parents are aware of the fact that children who are, or have been, bullied, cyberbullied, and abused have a difficult time learning and achieving in school. Yet, understanding precisely how such violations lead to underachievement is difficult. One theory according to a report by the Kauffman Foundation, Set for Success, is that trauma impacts neural development in the brain and therefore, emotional and behavioral consequences are usually evident, and school readiness and behavior affected. While there could be many indicators and consequences of child abuse, they are thought to include:

* Hypervigilence or always being on alert.
* Abused and bullied children may constantly be in fight or flight mode making it is difficult for them to relax and concentrate on schoolwork;
* Displaying aggression and social anxiety;
* Lacking behavioral self-regulation; expressing emotions and behaviors in ways that lack control;
* Displaying an inability to relate with others such as lacking trust and misreading others’ intentions;
* Expecting the worst from all situations; and
* Suffering from learning difficulties.

Recently, educators and policymakers have sought to find ways to address the troubling increases in the numbers of children who are being bullied at school. According to the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) 1 in 3 U.S. students say they have been bullied at school. Indeed

according to the Indicators of School Crime and Safety report, by the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) and National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Institute of Education Sciences (IES), the majority of bullying still takes place at school. In 2013 the CDC reported that on average across 39 states, 7.2% (range: 3.6% – 13.1%) of students admit to not going to school due to personal safety concerns. Many of these children fear the physical and verbal aggression of their peers. Others attend school in a chronic state of anxiety and depression. It is further estimated that 70.6% of young people say they have witnessed bullying in their schools. Bullying can lead to many problems including reluctance to go to school, truancy, headaches and stomach pains, reduced appetite, shame, anxiety, irritability, aggression and depression.

In recent years, various programs and activities have been implemented in an attempt to address this troubling problem. Recent research findings suggest that despite being victims of abuse, children who have been maltreated can in fact be successful in school and attain high academic achievement. Coohey, Renner, Hua, Zhang & Whitney (2011) determined that schools can increase academic achievement among maltreated children by incorporating prevention education and helping children increase their competency with daily living skills. According to one of the researchers, Stephen Whitney, “*Teachers are the gatekeepers to reporting abuse, getting kids the help they need, and then providing crucial support in helping those kids overcome their past.”*

While fully addressing the problem of childhood abuse, violations, and trauma is everyone’s responsibility, schools have a significant and important role to play. It is well established that the family is considered the first line of protection for children. Yet, teachers and other caregivers also have a responsibility to help protect children. Schools and communities are responsible for building a safe and child-friendly environment outside the child's home. In the family, school, and community, children should be fully protected so they can survive, grow, learn and develop to their fullest potential.

Primary Prevention

The purpose of primary prevention is to stop maltreatment before it occurs. That is, prevention involves investing in future outcomes by influencing current behavior or conditions (Stagner & Lansing, 2009). Primary prevention can be directed toward the general population as well as individual groups such as school children or parents. Although protecting children who have experienced abuse is essential, primary prevention programs have the potential to reduce the number of children who need protection.

Most children attend school, and therefore schools are considered the ideal places to engage children from diverse backgrounds in primary prevention programs. Furthermore, much of children's social learning takes place in schools, and research has shown that social learning can play a role in the development of behaviors and attitudes that support bullying and other forms of abuse. Also, teachers typically represent the second most important influence in the lives of children. As such, they are ideally placed to motivate students to consider new ways of thinking and behaving.

MBF Child Safety Matters™

MBF Child Safety Matters™ a prevention education program provided at no cost to Florida public elementary schools, is designed to “***educate and empower elementary students, school personnel, and adults with information and strategies to prevent bullying, cyberbullying, digital abuse, and all types of child abuse*”** (CSM, 2014).

The primary prevention program, MBF Child Safety Matters™, targets elementary children in Kindergarten through Grades 5 in an effort to educate and empower students at highest risk of maltreatment with strategies to help adults keep them safe. The program is a research–based, comprehensive, developmentally appropriate, kindergarten through 5th grade curriculum supported by the Florida Department of Education (DOE), Department of Children and Families (DCF), and other subject matter experts and partner organizations. It is aligned with Florida Education Standards and Florida School Counseling Framework, meets Statute 39 and the Jeffrey Johnston Stand Up For All Students Act as amended July 2013 by Florida law, Chapter 2013-87, requiring schools to provide cyberbullying prevention education to students, parents, and staff. The program is also aligned with many Health Education Standards, helping schools meet required instruction statute.

The MBF Child Safety Matters program was developed based on findings from the research literature and by using best practices for educating students to help the adults in their lives keep them safe. The program is considered a critical and necessary component of any school’s safety and prevention plan. There are lessons developed for K through 5th grade students, and materials and additional program components that educate and empower school staff, parents/guardians, and other concerned community members as well.

The curriculum includes 2 in–class lessons on topics including: safety and responsibility, Safe Adults, Safety Rules, types of abuse, why & how abuse happens, abuse red flags and reporting, Social–Emotional learning, character development, bullying & cyberbullying, technology / digital dangers (gaming, virtual reality, and social media), digital safety and digital citizenship. Lessons are taught to students by trained Certified Facilitators (usually school counselors). Certified Facilitator training is available via on-demand e-learning, and live training options. The curriculum, Facilitator training, and all program materials are provided at no cost to public elementary schools in Florida.

MBF Child Safety Matters also educates and empowers school faculty, school personnel, parents and community members. This collaborative process is considered the best practice method for preventing bullying, cyberbullying, digital abuse, and maltreatment. It creates a safety net for children, a safer school environment, and opens the lines of communication between the home and school. Specific curriculum strategies include:

* Raising awareness about safety concerns and issues facing students today;
* Educating school staff, parents and students about the dangers and risks of bullying, cyberbullying/digital abuse, and all types of child abuse and exploitation;
* Teaching school personnel the signs of abuse and reporting requirements;
* Teaching the signs of unsafe behaviors and situations;
* Creating a safe and supportive environment for students to seek help from safe adults;
* Teaching techniques and strategies for students to avoid and report unsafe situations;
* Providing resources to school personnel, parents, and students about where to find additional information and support.

While there are some exceptions, many, if not most, MBF Child Safety Matters™ Certified Facilitators are School Counselors. This is by design, not default. The overarching philosophical foundation of MBF Child Safety Matters is aligned with the Florida’s School Counseling Framework’s goals for school counselors. Thus, MBF Child Safety Matters is an important and strategically aligned component of a comprehensive school counseling program. Many of the nation’s problems can be addressed through prevention and early intervention. School counseling programs provide students with the opportunity to learn more about themselves and others before they have problems resulting from self-concept issues. They learn interpersonal skills before they have an interpersonal crisis. In crisis situations, they can draw on their skills to address their problem.

Following is a list of most of the components of the MBF Child Safety Matters™ program:

* Written, best-practice guidelines for facilitators
* 2 lesson plans for each grade (K-5th grade), including:
	+ Facilitator scripts for K to Grade 5 lessons
	+ PowerPoint slides for each of the lessons
* Alignment to academic standards
* Theoretical alignment
* Short videos that are included as part of each lesson
* Reinforcement lesson plans and materials for the classroom and school
	+ Safety Rules poster
	+ Safety Rules banner
* Suggestions and tips for administrators
* Suggestions and tips for teachers
* Parent opt out forms
* Reinforcement materials for parents/Safe Adults
	+ Parent information sheets and activities to do with children
	+ Safety Rules magnet
	+ Safe Adult bookmarks
* Grade appropriate reinforcement materials for students
	+ Personal safety cards
	+ Stickers
	+ Backpack tags
	+ Pencil pouches
	+ Pencils
	+ Ink pen with stylus
	+ Wristbands

Evaluation methods

This evaluation was conducted between January and June 2015 and included desk based document review of the MBF Child Safety Matters curriculum material, development of four assessment instruments, administration of pre-, and post-test assessments to a sample of Kindergarten through 5th grade students, administration of a survey instrument to trained facilitators, key informant interviews, and classroom observations of the MBF CSM lessons. Prior to conducting the evaluation, approval for all phases of the study was obtained from the Florida State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) for research involving human subjects. Further detail on how these methodologies were implemented follows below:

**Facilitator Survey**

Evidence was drawn from the trained facilitators through a detailed survey and semi-structured interviews. The survey instrument was developed by the researchers in consultation with MBF administrators. The survey instrument (Appendix A) consisted of a series of 23 questions designed to seek the opinions of the facilitators concerning the MBF CSM program. We also sought information concerning the extent to which the program was implemented in the classrooms as planned. A wide range of answer options (including an 'other' free text option) were included in the detailed survey. The intent of the use of very open questions was to allow for new and unexpected themes and gaps to surface.

Facilitators who had been trained and who had taught, or were planning to teach, the MBF CSM lessons during the 2014-2015 school year were contacted by email and invited to complete the survey. The survey was administered using the Qualtrics online survey and insight platform. Qualtrics is web based software that allows the user to create surveys and generate reports. The qualtrics survey tool provided a secure data collections system that protected the confidentiality of the participants’ responses.

The survey concluded at the end of May 2015. A total of 186 facilitators completed the on-line survey instrument for a response rate of 20%.

**Semi-structured Interviews**

Trained facilitators from different participating schools were contacted by email and invited to participate in a semi-structured interview. The interviews were conducted at scheduled times that were most convenient to the interviewee. A total of 12 interviews were conducted by the project staff. Several of the interviews were face-to face meetings. The majority, however, were conducted by phone, and with the interviewee’s permission recorded for subsequent analysis. Most interviews lasted 15 to 20 minutes, though some interviews lasted up to 45 minutes.

The interviews were conducted by one of the project’s research assistants. Each interview was guided by the interview protocol instrument (see Appendix B). The interview questions were to be used as more of an interview “guide” rather than asked verbatim or in a particular order. Interviewers were encouraged to probe responses as appropriate. This more flexible approach was designed to help gather information that reflects each facilitator’s unique experiences with MBF. The interviews covered a range of topics pertaining to various aspects of the MBF CSM program, including:

* Perceived strengths of the MBF CSM program
* Parents’ responses to the program
* Program resources
* The MBF CSM lessons
* The PowerPoint slides

Analyses of the interviews were conducted by researchers who were not involved in the interview process in an effort to reduce bias. The researchers had access to all interview notes and the recordings, as needed. Interview notes were reviewed to identify patterns and themes that emerged.

**Classroom Observations**

Direct observations of MBF CSM lessons were conducted during May 2015. Observation requests were sent to a sample of facilitators in three Florida school districts. Observations were subsequently scheduled by the researchers. A total of 12 lessons were observed across all grade levels. Direct observations of MBF CSM lessons were conducted by the research staff and recorded using the observation protocol instrument (Appendix C). This instrument was used to record the different MBF CSM program components that were observed, as well as the extent to which the facilitator adhered to the scripted lesson.

The observation protocol was developed specifically for this study to capture the degree to which teachers adhered to step-by-step procedures for implementing the MBF CSM program. The checklist was completed during the classroom observations by the trained coders. The checklist comprised 13 items, each scored as 1 (present) or 0 (not present), and was similar to other procedural fidelity tools designed to identify the absence or presence of explicitly defined observable features of implementation for instructional approaches (e.g., Justice & Ezell, 2002; Wasik et al., 2006) and curricula (e.g., Dodge, Colker, & Heroman, 2002).

**Child Assessments**

Having obtained approval to conduct the assessment from the Institutional Review Board, the research team developed and pilot tested four assessment instruments including one test for kindergarten, one for first and second grades, one for third grade, and a final test for 4th and 5th grades. Development of the assessment instruments occurred in stages. First, the MBF curriculum for each grade level was reviewed by the researchers. Then, critical content for each grade level was identified. This was followed by the creation of a bank of objective test items (multiple choice questions). At this stage each of the researchers worked independently to write test items. Then, final selection and editing of test items occurred during a meeting of the research team. The draft questions were then sent to a panel of experts, including public school teachers, content experts, college professors, and graduate students for review. Each test item was edited and revised based on feedback from the panel of experts. Then, the final test items were submitted for approval and review to the MBF administrators. The MBF administrators did not recommend any major changes to the test items. The final test items are included in Appendix D.

The evaluation utilized a one group pre-test / post-test design to assess the impact of the MBF CSM lessons on children’s understanding of bullying, cyberbullying, digital abuse, and all types of child abuse. The pre-test / post-test design involves two measurements of the dependent variable surrounding, in time, the administration or occurrence of a single treatment or level of the independent variable. Participants were selected from within those elementary schools that had agreed to participate in the evaluation. The intervention consisted of a series two lessons taught by trained MBF CSM facilitators. The pre-tests were administered prior to delivery of the first of the two lessons. Then, to measure changes in children’s knowledge of the MBF CSM content, the post-tests were administered at the conclusion of the second lesson. It was predicted that children’s participation in the MBF Child Safety Matters program would lead to positive changes in their knowledge of the content. Satisfactory achievement was determined to be at a satisfactory level if at least 70% of the test items were correct. Program effectiveness was determined based on 90% of the participants achieving pre- to post-test gains.

**Data Analyses**

The following table (Table 1) shows the alignment of the evaluation methods and the questions being asked.

**Table 1: Alignment of research questions, data source, analytical procedures**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Research Question** | **Data source** | **Data Analysis** |
|  | Facilitator survey | 1. Frequency and descriptive statistics of the survey items
2. Qualitative analysis of the free responses
 |
| Is the program being delivered as designed? | Interviews | 1. Qualitative analyses of interview responses
 |
|  | Classroom observations | 1. Frequency of the lesson components observed
2. Qualitative analysis of observation records
 |
|  | Facilitator survey | 1. Frequency and descriptive statistics of the survey items
2. Qualitative analysis of the free responses
 |
| Is the quality of program delivery adequate? | Classroom observations and  | 1. Qualitative analysis of the interview responses
 |
|  | Interviews | 1. Frequency of the lesson components observed
 |
| What are facilitators’ opinions about the Child Safety Matters program? | Facilitator survey | 1. Frequency and descriptive statistics of the survey items
2. Qualitative analysis of the free responses
 |
|  | Interviews | 1. Qualitative analyses of interview responses
 |
| What is the effect of the MBF Child Safety Matters Program on students’ knowledge, recognition, and understanding of issues and situations related to safety? | Pre- and post-test assessments | 1. t-test and repeated measures ANOVA
 |

The data were analyzed using the SPSS 20.0 software. Descriptive statistics were calculated for all study variables (means, medians, ranges, standard deviations, percent data missing, and frequencies for categorical variables). We assessed each outcome in a bivariate model, comparing the scores on the pre- and post-tests. Each analysis was performed for the overall project as well as stratified by test and grade level. Chi squared p-values were used when the sample size was large enough. The survey data was analyzed by computing descriptive statistics including frequencies, means, and standard deviations.

The interview data were analyzed qualitatively in order to identify emerging patterns, codes, categories, and themes regarding their use of the MBF CSM program. The purpose of interviewing is to collect information from people with regard to aspects or phenomena that are not directly observable (Merriam, 2009; Patton, 2002). In this case, the unobservable concepts were facilitators' opinions concerning the MBF CSM program.

Data collected from classroom observations were used to understand the delivery of the CSM lessons and the extent to which facilitators adhere to the program as intended. For example, with regards to lesson delivery, data were analyzed to understand: How did facilitators use the CSM materials? Did the facilitators engage children in the classroom activities? Did facilitators use the PowerPoint slides? Consideration was also given to affective aspects of the data: What did the body language of the students indicate? Did they appear interested? Were the students distracted? Were facilitators confident in using CSM to teach children about the various child safety issues? Did the interactions between facilitators and children appear joyful (i.e., smiling, laughing)?

The interviews, survey free responses, and observations were analyzed qualitatively. Keeping the research questions in mind, immersion in the data collected took place in order to identify patterns, emerging codes, categories, and themes (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Patton, 2002). Memos were written to maintain focus on emerging patterns and connect different data elements (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Participants’ responses were read and reread multiple times (Patton, 2002). In addition, various matrices and data displays (i.e., checklist matrices, time ordered displays) were used to portray the data from different angles and perspectives (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Data from the survey responses, semi-structured interviews, and observations were analyzed to identify recurring themes.

Findings, conclusions & Recommendations

# findings

# Facilitator Survey Results

**Characteristics of Survey Respondents**

A total of 186 facilitators completed the on-line survey instrument. This represents a response rate of approximately 20%. Most of the respondents were female (n= 175; 95%) and only 9 (5%) were males. A total of 171 reported that they had completed the MBF CSM Certified Facilitator training (93%). The age distribution of the respondents are illustrated in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Respondents’ age distribution

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Age Range |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

 | Frequency | % |
| 18-24 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

 | 2 | 1% |
| 25-30 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

 | 17 | 9% |
| 31-40 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

 | 59 | 32% |
| 41-50 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

 | 49 | 27% |
| 51-60 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

 | 40 | 22% |
| 61-up |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

 | 17 | 9% |
| Total |  | 184 | 100% |

The majority of the facilitators who completed the survey reported their race/ethnicity as white (n=130; 71%) with 15% (n=28) reporting that they are African American, and the remainder (11%) Hispanic. One respondent reported being mixed race and three (2%) did not disclose their racial background. Most of the respondents reported that they worked as a school counselor (87%) while the others (13%) indicated that they worked in some other capacity at their school. The educational level of the survey respondents was judged to be high since the majority had earned at least a masters’ degree (n=179; 98%). Three of the respondents reported their highest educational level as the bachelors’ degree and one the high school diploma.

The survey respondents were asked about their experiences in teaching the MBF Child Safety Matters program. Most reported that they had taught at least some of the MBF lessons in the past year. These findings are reported in Table 3 below. The data also indicates that most of the respondents had taught the MBF Child Safety program for several years.

Table 3: Frequency distribution of MBF lessons taught in the current academic year.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| MBF Lessons Taught this year |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

 | Frequency | % |
| Yes, in all classes. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

 | 71 | 38% |
| Yes, in some classes. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

 | 99 | 53% |
| No |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

 | 16 | 9% |
| Total |  | 186 | 100% |

Those individuals who reported that they had not taught the lesson were asked to indicate the reason for this. Most (n=9) indicated that they had not had enough time to teach the lessons this year. The lessons that had been taught by the respondents seemed to be relatively evenly distributed, as shown in Table 4, below.

Table 4: Frequency distribution of grades that have been taught the MBF Child Safety Matters lessons.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grades  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

 | Frequency | % |
| Kindergarten |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

 | 94 | 51% |
| 1st grade |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

 | 129 | 70% |
| 2nd grade |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

 | 128 | 70% |
| 3rd grade |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

 | 122 | 66% |
| 4th grade |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

 | 141 | 77% |
| 5th grade |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

 | 143 | 78% |

Respondents’ opinions about the MBF Child Safety Matters Program

A section of the survey asked the facilitators their opinions about various topics that are addressed in the MBF CSM curriculum. First, they were asked to indicate how well certain topics are addressed in the overall program. These findings are reported in Table 5 below. Next, they were asked their opinions about the adequacy of coverage of the same topics in the classroom presentation or lessons. These findings are reported in Table 6. In the next section they were asked to indicate the extent to which they consider the MBF CSM lesson materials for various topics (e.g., lessons, PowerPoint slides, etc.) to be age and developmentally appropriate. These findings are reported in Table 7 below.

Table 5: How well are topics covered in the overall MBF CSM program?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Topic | Not covered at all | Not covered enough | Somewhat covered | Covered very well | Total Responses | Mean |
| Bullying | 1 | 5 | 51 | 118 | 175 | 4.63 |
| Cyberbullying | 2 | 10 | 43 | 118 | 173 | 4.60 |
| Sexual abuse | 1 | 3 | 25 | 147 | 176 | 4.81 |
| Neglect | 2 | 4 | 42 | 128 | 176 | 4.68 |
| Emotional abuse | 1 | 2 | 38 | 136 | 177 | 4.75 |
| Physical abuse | 1 | 2 | 26 | 148 | 177 | 4.81 |
| Digital abuse/Digital safety | 1 | 11 | 43 | 118 | 173 | 4.61 |
| Parent education (parent information and materials) | 3 | 7 | 24 | 141 | 175 | 4.73 |
| Reinforcement (student/school materials, reinforcement lessons) | 3 | 2 | 40 | 128 | 173 | 4.69 |

Table 6: How well are topics covered in the MBF CSM classroom presentations?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Question | Don't know | Not covered at all | Not covered enough | Somewhat covered | Covered very well | Total Responses | Mean |
| Bystander vs Upstander actions | 13 | 0 | 19 | 64 | 87 | 183 | 4.16 |
| Red Flags | 7 | 0 | 3 | 17 | 156 | 183 | 4.72 |
| Cyberbullying | 8 | 2 | 11 | 52 | 110 | 183 | 4.39 |
| Safe Adults | 7 | 0 | 2 | 17 | 157 | 183 | 4.73 |
| Child sexual exploitation | 10 | 6 | 13 | 52 | 102 | 183 | 4.26 |
| Neglect | 7 | 3 | 6 | 54 | 113 | 183 | 4.44 |
| Sexual abuse | 8 | 2 | 6 | 35 | 132 | 183 | 4.54 |
| Emotional abuse | 7 | 1 | 3 | 49 | 123 | 183 | 4.53 |
| Physical abuse | 7 | 2 | 2 | 27 | 145 | 183 | 4.64 |
| Bullying | 7 | 0 | 8 | 48 | 120 | 183 | 4.50 |

Table 7: The extent to which lesson material for various topics is age and developmentally appropriate.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Question | Inappropriate | Somewhat inappropriate | Appropriate | Very appropriate | Total Responses | Mean |
| Bystander vs Upstander actions | 0 | 4 | 67 | 102 | 173 | 4.57 |
| Red Flags | 1 | 10 | 61 | 104 | 176 | 4.52 |
| Cyberbullying | 1 | 10 | 72 | 90 | 173 | 4.45 |
| Safe Adults | 0 | 2 | 57 | 117 | 176 | 4.65 |
| Child sexual exploitation | 8 | 22 | 68 | 74 | 172 | 4.21 |
| Neglect | 0 | 6 | 75 | 93 | 174 | 4.50 |
| Sexual abuse | 4 | 14 | 73 | 83 | 174 | 4.35 |
| Emotional abuse | 1 | 5 | 74 | 95 | 175 | 4.50 |
| Physical abuse | 1 | 4 | 68 | 102 | 175 | 4.55 |
| Bullying | 0 | 3 | 65 | 107 | 175 | 4.59 |

Program Implementation

A section of the survey asked the facilitators to record their opinions about the two lessons provided to students by the trained facilitators. We received more than 100 comments. Two main themes were evident in these responses. First, a significant number of respondents (approximately 50%) had positive opinions about the classroom lessons such as:

 *“Lessons are clear, concise- they appeal to a wide variety of students”*

*“I like the way the 5 rules are each broken down and explained”.*

*“The lesson plans are thorough”.*

Another recurring theme that emerged from these comments centered on time constraints. These facilitators seemed to like the program and lessons, but were of the opinion that either the lessons were too long, or that they were not provided enough time to teach the lessons. Some respondents indicated that this was because of on-going emphasis on the academic curriculum and testing,

 *“Lesson Plans are long. Allocating time is difficult within the school day.”*

*“For time purposes, there is a lot of material to cover in one lesson.”*

 *“The lessons were packed tight so they were hard to complete in the time frame allowed by teachers”.*

*“The lessons are too long. The lessons are very informative and cover a lot, however, they repeat a lot of material that was already said.”*

Similarly, several of the facilitators noted that it was difficult for teachers to find time to teach the monthly reinforcement lessons:

*“They're fantastic but the teachers did not have the ability to implement them with the testing schedule”.*

*“Our teachers indicated that they did not have time to implement the lessons into their already structured and time deprived days:(“*

A small number of respondents reported a level of discomfort in discussing the content with their students.

*“Some teachers are uncomfortable with the lesson content at times”*

Another section of the survey asked respondent to comment on the ways that they modify or change the lessons. The majority of the respondents included a comment in this section. Most of the responses indicated that the lessons were condensed or shortened in some way.

*“At times, I have had to make them slightly shorter due to time constraints”*

*“Yes. I have had to cut some parts of lessons out to fit them in my allotted time frame.”*

*“Yes, due to time constraints I have to shorten some of the lessons. I teach all of the concepts but don't do all of the repetition.”*

A significant number of respondents, however, reported that they did not make any changes to lessons. Others reported making minor changes in response to the needs of the students or other special circumstances. For example:

*“Yes, in a class where I knew kids were being abused and they had just disclosed to the grandparent and DCF was involved. I emphasized "no blame, no shame" and that it never too late to tell.”*

Several individuals changed lessons in response to students’ behavior or in an attempt to make the lessons more appropriate to the developmental level of the students.

*“If I felt I was losing the attention of the students I would shift the activities around.”*

*“yes. I used puppets for our youngest children and children's literature for bullying”*

Finally, some facilitators changed the program because they were uncomfortable with some of the content.

*“Yes, I especially don't like the picture of the "Loser” in the 2nd gr curriculum (possibly others). There is also not enough time for many of the "interactive” activities”*

*“I did change 3rd, 4th and 5th grade lessons. I would not use the word pornography in the classrooms since parents were not aware that that term would be used.”*

The facilitators were asked to discuss what they like about the MBF Child Safety Matters program. The majority of respondents offered a positive comment. Topics were varied, addressing aspects such as the value of the 5 Safety Rules, the simplicity of the program, the videos, the resources, the PowerPoint slides, the motions that accompany the Safety Rules. The following are some of the comments on positive aspects of the program:

*“The videos in the power point AND the power point. And the give-away materials.”*

*“That the lessons are age appropriate and it is presented in a very tasteful manner”*

*“The safety rules with motions”*

*“The catchy steps that the kids can follow to be safe.”*

Some of the respondents discussed the appropriateness of the manner in which the program addresses potentially sensitive content.

*“it provided an opportunity to share important information in a safe environment and made it ok for students to talk about things that can be uncomfortable.”*

*“for such a difficult topic to broach- it makes it simple and fun for students”*

*“It presents some issues that are not typically covered like neglect and abuse.”*

*“It helps students realize their vulnerability and the importance that they need help maintaining personal safety.”*

A related section asked the respondents for their opinions on the ways in which the program could be improved. Again, the majority of the facilitators offered their opinion. Most, focused on time constraints and the need to shorten the materials. A few of the comments suggested that the lessons should be more interactive.

*“As much as time is a factor, I think there is so much information that using three shorter lessons would be more helpful to help students learn and review all the information that they are being exposed to in this program.”*

*“Lessons are very long but not sure what can be done about this with the amount of information that needs to be covered”*

Approximately 50% of the respondents offered some additional comments. These comments either focused on issues related to time constraints or were remarks about the quality of the program. For example one respondent noted that:

“*I really liked it overall and thought it was especially important for my kids where the family might not be having these discussions. The pencils and home pages and other goodies were very exciting. I like the homepage a lot.”*

# Interview results

Interviews with MBF Child Safety Matters facilitators provided valuable insight as to the implementation of the program today and into the future. Facilitators were able to respond with positives, negatives, and suggestions in regards to the MBF CSM Program. The following is a recapitulation of their overall ideas as well as some direct quotes. There were certainly a number of program factors that had a positive effect on the facilitators, students, and parents. Such aspects (as dictated by facilitators) include: the curriculum’s information and content, its’ ease of implementation, great reinforcement giveaway items, appropriate letters to parents and homework for students, videos provided within the PowerPoints, and the Safety Rule movements for the younger students.

We report the interview findings under five broad themes:

1. Quality of content and information in the lessons
2. Reinforcement giveaway items
3. Parent information and activities
4. Lesson resources (PowerPoints, videos, etc.)
5. Suggestions for improvement

## Content

Facilitators were quick to comment on how the program provided great content that was “*essential for children*”. It was “*easy to implement, specific, well detailed*”, and (for most facilitators) broken down appropriately for each grade level. One facilitator especially liked how Kindergarten was incorporated, and mentioned how the children just “*eat up the information*”. Classroom management was also not a problem for facilitators, and as one put it,

“*I just felt very comfortable with the program*, *it requires very little preparation*”.

In sum, they find the content includes important information for children, and that it is interesting and relevant.

## Reinforcement giveaway items

The facilitators reported that the students loved the free giveaways. They find that the giveaways succeed in getting students excited about the lessons, and help reinforce the information. They also serve as a reminder of the safety rules that children can take home with them. As one facilitator commented:

 “*Anything that goes home with students is a positive, in order to have the ‘conversation’ continue at home*”.

## Parent information

The facilitators all commented on how much they liked the parent letters. They noted, in particular, that they were very satisfied with the “*parent friendly*” wording.

## Lesson presentation resources

All of the facilitators interviewed had positive comments concerning the teaching resources such as the PowerPoint slides and the videos. The reported that their students responded positively to the videos. The consensus of opinion was that the videos were fun and engaging. One teacher noted how her 3rd graders responded positively to the rap video. They were also very enthusiastic about the safety rules as well as the ‘motions’ for teaching the rules. One teacher commented that her students were ‘*hyped for the rules*’ and that the students ‘*loved*’ doing the motions.

## Suggestions for improvement

Some aspects of the program that facilitators agreed could be improved include: too long of a script for facilitators/ too much information to cover, not enough time to complete all activities, students could use even more movement, and a lot of teacher talk. There was definitely a common consensus that the program was too long to cover given the time the facilitators had with each grade level. They all mentioned how they didn’t want to miss information or cut it out of their teaching, but in most cases time would not permit their feeling as if they were able to cover it all in its entirety. Some facilitators said that even more movement would be good to keep students engaged. Also, as the program utilized a lot of teacher talk, the students did not have as much time to provide input. As one facilitator put it, “*kids want to talk, but there is not a whole lot of time [for them to do so*]”.

Facilitators were quick to provide suggestions for the program and were eager to share their ideas for improvement. The suggestions included:

* incorporating the use of a picture book for younger grades,
* the use of alternative terminology,
* introducing the program/materials to teachers (and parents) in advance,
* timing the implementation of the program so that it is completed earlier in the school year.

One kind of alternative terminology that some facilitators recommended was the use of “reporting” as opposed to “telling”. The term “bullying” is good for the younger grades, but terms such as “*bystander”* and “*upstander*” are “*too advanced [for these grades*]”. One facilitator suggested the use of “*choosing kindness*”, or a “*Be Kind initiative*” instead of a focus on bullying.

On the whole, the interview data confirms that facilitators are excited and enthusiastic about the program, but want to have the information earlier in the year (beginning/middle) so that they could avoid testing at the end of the school year, and get the pre-and post-test material completed as soon as possible. Some wanted to introduce the material to school counselors even earlier and give them a script that they could use at a “PTA meeting to present [the material] to parents to educate them as well”. They wanted to know more about when they can get materials for next year, and if there was a way to send packets by the number of classes who will use the program, especially for bigger schools.

In sum, facilitators felt positively about the program in regards to student acceptance and interaction.

One facilitator could not contain her excitement for the program, saying that

“*After 32 years, I am getting that giddy feeling- like, I want to teach this!*”

Overall, facilitators were “*eager to do the program*”, as it provides “*such powerful information*” for students, teachers, and parents alike.

# Classroom observations

A total of 12 lessons taught to Kindergarten to 5th grade classes were observed by the project staff. Most of the observations occurred in May 2015. The observed lessons were conducted in elementary schools located in three Florida school districts. In all cases the lessons were taught by the school counselor who had participated in the MBF facilitator training.

Although the lessons were all taught by school counselors there were some differences in terms of other adults present in the classroom. For example, in some instances the school counselor was the only teacher present in the classroom. In other cases, the classroom teacher was also present in the classroom. However, the classroom teachers did not participate in the lessons but merely observed from the back of the classroom. In other cases paraprofessionals and parent volunteers were also present in the classroom.

With few exceptions, the school counselors did not have their own classrooms. Therefore, when it was time to teach the lesson they visited each relevant classroom. This seemed to create some challenges because the teacher would have to take the material with her to the class, and also plan ahead so that they technology and PowerPoint presentation was set up in the classroom. In one or two cases, arranging the technology delayed the start of the lesson. Also, on two occasions the teacher had difficulty displaying the videos, and had to pause the lesson in order to solve the technological problem.

There were differences in the amount of time allocated for the lessons. For example, in one case the facilitator was only given 15 minutes for the lesson. However, instead of delivering two CSM lessons she divided each lesson and delivered four shorter lessons. In contrast, other teachers delivered lessons that lasted approximately 45 minutes.

We observed differences in the length of time between the two CSM lessons. In all cases, the lessons observed were the second in a series of two stand-alone lessons. Some of the facilitators reported that the first lesson had been taught the previous week. In other cases several weeks had passed since the delivery of the first lesson.

Our analyses focused on two aspects of procedural fidelity: routine activities and lesson activities. Routine activities include the following:

* All students can see the facilitator
* The facilitator calls children’s attention to and/or makes an explicit transition to the activity
* The facilitator has all listed materials available and easily accessible
* All listed materials are listed in accordance with the activity plan
* There are no major distractions during the lesson

The lessons activities considered were as follows:

* Teacher language is in general accordance to the script in the activity plan
* Facilitator makes explicit attempts to engage the children’s participation in the activity
* Facilitator summarizes the children’s performance and task engagement
* Facilitator provides formal ending to task
* All components of the lesson are completed

Routine Activities

In all of the lessons observed, the students were able to see the facilitator, and they all had an unobstructed view of the interactive white board or screen displaying the PowerPoint slides and videos. Typically, students in kindergarten and first grade sat on a carpeted area of the classroom for most of the lesson. The older students in grades 2-5 sat at their desks in groups of three to five students. All lessons started promptly, and it was evident that all materials, including technology, was in place prior to the start of the lesson. The facilitators seemed to be aware that they only had a specific amount of time with the class, and were eager to commence the lesson. Thus, all lessons started promptly.

All of the facilitators ensured a smooth transition to the lesson by reminding students of the expectations and reviewing some of the previous lesson’s content, that is, the classroom teachers’ established expectations for learning and achievement. The facilitators kept the focus on the lesson, and they did not attend to any extraneous activities. In most cases there were no major distractions during the lessons. On occasion a facilitator would have to pause to redirect students who were off task. This occurred more often in kindergarten and first-grade. Lessons seemed to flow at a smooth, yet rapid, pace. In several cases the facilitators seemed to have to rush through the activities, particularly in classes where lessons were 30 minutes or less. For example, in one classroom the students were engaged in a group tasks. Although some of the groups had not completed the activity, the facilitator moved on to the next part of the lesson.

Lesson Activities

All of the facilitators used language that was in accordance with the lesson script. Some facilitators made more of an effort to strictly adhere to the language of the activities. For example, one facilitator placed the lesson manual on a stand in front of the class and read from the script. Typically, however, the facilitators had the lesson and script located nearby and referred to it during the lesson. It seems that the more experienced facilitators, though adhering to the language in the lesson, did directly refer to the lesson plan during the lesson. One facilitator explained that since she had taught the lesson so many times she was very familiar with the content.

The facilitators all followed the sequence of lesson activities as presented in the MBF CSM lesson. Furthermore, all of the facilitators made explicit attempts to engage their students’ participation in the activities. However, some of the lessons included extensive periods of time when facilitators would be displaying PowerPoint slides and talking to students. During the facilitator directed parts of the lessons some students seemed to be disengaged or distracted. Also, students in the younger grades seemed to struggle more with paying attention to the facilitator’s oral presentation. The videos and group activities were effective in engaging students. The students seemed to be more engaged when the lesson was more interactive.

At the conclusion of specific lesson activities several of the teachers would summarize the children’s performance and task engagement. For most, commenting on students’ performance occurred at the conclusion of the lesson; although this seemed to depend on whether the teacher had completed the lesson as planned. Some of the lessons involved the presentation of difficult concepts to young children. In some cases it was evident that students were struggling to understand a concept; yet, because the teacher wanted to complete all of the lesson activity she was not able to devote any time to re-teaching a concept or checking for understanding. Approximately 50% of the lessons observed ended abruptly with the teacher not having enough time to complete all of the activities. Some of the teachers distributed the materials, e.g., magnets, bookmarks, directly to the students at the end of the lesson. Others would leave the material with the classroom teacher so that she could share the material at the end of the day.

We did not observe facilitators formally ending tasks with any regularity. Often, group tasks would end abruptly so that the facilitator could move to the next activity. However, facilitators made an effort to emphasize important lesson elements, such as reviewing the rules. In many instances, children would take much longer than anticipated on a task and as a result the facilitator did not have enough time to formally end the activity and transition smoothly to the next.

Few facilitators succeeded in completing all of the lesson components. However, they were all successful in addressing the main parts of the lesson. When asked about elements that were omitted the most consistent reason given was a lack of time.

In summary, the major finding emerging from our observation of the MBF CSM lessons is that facilitators exhibited high levels of procedural fidelity to the prescribed language and curriculum. Adherence to the lesson plans and general guidelines exceeded 90% for most aspects of fidelity measured. Despite the fact that in many cases all of the activities were not completed, all facilitators completed what could be considered the main lesson activities, such as the classroom presentation, videos, or repeating the safety rules. Also, there was considerable variation in the extent of time devoted to specific activities. On the whole however, facilitators were able to modify the lessons without significantly altering either the overall tone of the lesson, or the lesson’s goals and objectives. Lesson observers were of the opinion that the facilitators made a concerted effort to deliver the lessons as intended. Also, the facilitators were able to modify the lessons in response to time constraints, or the specific needs of students, without any detrimental effects on the curriculum or lesson quality.

1. Child assessments

The pre- and post-test instruments were administered to a total of 620 kindergarten through 5th grade students. The numbers and percentages of participants at each grade level are reported in table 8 below.

Table 8: Numbers of participants at each grade level.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade level** | **Number of participants (n)** | **Percent** **(%)** |
|  | Kindergarten | 23 | 3.7 |
|  | First grade | 28 | 4.5 |
| Second grade | 79 | 12.7 |
| Third grade | 176 | 28.4 |
| Fourth grade | 135 | 21.8 |
| Fifth grade | 179 | 28.9 |
|  |  |  |
| Total | 620 | 100.0 |

The sample included approximately equal numbers of males and females (307 females and 313 males).

Means and standard deviations for each of the four tests are reported in table 9 below. A series of paired samples t-tests were conducted in order determine whether the differences in the means of the pre- and post-test scores were statistically significant. The findings of these analyses are reported in table 10 below.

We also examined the mean pre to posttest differences by grade level and each case the difference between the pre-, and posttest scores were statistically significant.

Table 9:

|  |
| --- |
| **Means and Standard Deviations by Test** |
| **TEST** | **Pretest** | **Posttest** | **GAIN** |
| Kindergarten | Mean | 1.3043 | 4.3478 | 3.0435 |
| Std. Deviation | .47047 | .64728 | .70571 |
|  |  |  |  |
| 1st & 2nd grade | Mean | 1.6835 | 3.6329 | 1.9494 |
| Std. Deviation | .98116 | .92233 | 1.29989 |
|  |  |  |  |
| 3rd grade | Mean | 3.0568 | 4.8807 | 1.8239 |
| Std. Deviation | 1.51078 | 1.41521 | 1.56304 |
|  |  |  |  |
| 4th and 5th grade | Mean | 4.6975 | 6.1306 | 1.4331 |
| Std. Deviation | 1.42351 | 1.08966 | 1.36020 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Table 10: Results of t-test analyses

|  |
| --- |
| **Paired Samples Test** |
| Test | Paired Differences | t | Sig. (2-tailed) |
| Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |
| Lower | Upper |
| Kindergarten | posttest – pretest | 3.04348 | .70571 | .14715 | 2.73831 | 3.34865 | 20.683 | .000 |
| 1st and 2nd grade | posttest – pretest | 1.61905 | 1,45695 | .14218 | 1.33709 | 1.90100 | 11.387 | .000 |
| 3rd grade | posttest – pretest | 1.82386 | 1.56304 | .11782 | 1.59134 | 2.05639 | 15.480 | .000 |
| 4th and 5th grade | posttest – pretest | 1.43312 | 1.36020 | .07676 | 1.28209 | 1.58415 | 18.670 | .000 |

Finally, we examined the pre- and post-test differences for the whole sample of Kindergarten through 5th grade students. Since four different tests were administered we converted the raw scores to standard scores (z scores). Z scores are expressed in terms of standard deviations from their means. The z scores have a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1.

The differences between the pre- and post-test scores were analyzed using a paired samples t test. There was a statistically significant difference between the pre and post test scores (t=28.455, p<.05). The confidence interval is 1.56 to 1.78; that is, the mean difference between pre-test and post-test scores is between 1.56 and 1.79. A total of 82% of the sample evidenced had pre- to post-test gains. However, since a significant number of participants had high scores on both the pre- and post-test there was some evidence of a “ceiling” effect. Thus, when controlling for this ceiling effect by judging high pre- and post-test scores to be gain scores, the percentage of students demonstrating post-test gains is approximately 96%. Conclusions

The evaluation of the MBF program was guided by the following broad questions:

1. Is the program being delivered as designed?

2. Is the quality of program delivery adequate?

3. What are the facilitators’ opinions about the MBF Child Safety Matters program?

4. What is the effect of the MBF Child Safety Matters Program on students’ knowledge, recognition, and understanding of issues and situations related to safety?

In order to respond to the above assessment questions, four separate yet interlinked areas of review were identified.

1. Program delivery
2. Program quality
3. Impact
4. Lessons for future programing

Our summary conclusions are organized around each of the four core evaluation questions.

**Program Delivery**

Evidence obtained from the document review, facilitator survey, classroom observations, and interviews suggest that the program is, for the most part, being delivered as designed. Although many of the facilitators strive to adhere to the program protocol, they appear to be struggling to complete all of the activities. Yet, despite modifying the MBF CSM lessons, the facilitators are successful in including all of the core components of the program such as review of the safety rules, PowerPoint presentations etc. Most of the facilitators indicated that the lessons were too long or that they were not provided enough time to teach the lessons.

In sum, there is evidence of high procedural fidelity to the prescribed program, including the MBF CSM language and curriculum.

**Program Quality**

The evaluation findings suggest that the quality of program delivery is adequate. Our findings suggest that there are many positive elements of the program. These include: the safety rules, the short videos, and the PowerPoint slides. The lessons are clear and easy to implement, and they cover a broad range of child safety issues. For the most part, the lessons are age appropriate. However, there was some concern over the appropriateness of the kindergarten and first grade lessons.

For the most part, the children seem to respond well to the lessons and the facilitators were enthusiastic about the program.

**Facilitators’ Opinions**

The facilitators feel that the various topics are covered appropriately in the MBF CSM curriculum including the lesson scripts and the lesson resources. However, most expressed concern about time constraints and felt that the lessons were too long. They expressed some reservations about the appropriateness of the topic of child sexual exploitation and sexual abuse within the CSM curriculum.

Impact

Evidence from the child assessments suggest that the program is successful in educating elementary students with strategies to prevent bullying, cyberbullying, digital abuse, and all types of child abuse. Most of the participants achieved pre- to post-test gains on the measures of interest.

Recommendations

Based on the results of all components of the evaluation, we make the following five programmatic recommendations:

1. In consultation with program facilitators, reduce the length of each of the MBF CSM lessons.
2. Provide an alternative four lesson format for the lessons. This could be accomplished by providing facilitators with a summary format for re-organizing the content into four lessons. In other words, it would not be necessary to create four new lessons, but simply provide suggestions for appropriate ways to split the lessons.
3. Review the ways that some of the more sensitive topics, such as sexual abuse and pornography are addressed in the lessons.
4. Consider including more developmentally appropriate, or interactive, activities for the kindergarten and first-grade lessons so that the lessons are less “teacher centered”. Examples could be the use of resources such as puppets, picture books, big books, or flash cards that include key vocabulary.
5. Provide recommendations concerning the timing of implementation of the MBF CSM program during the school year.
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Appendicies

Appendix A: Facilitator survey

 **Consent Form**

**Evaluation of the MBF Child Safety Matters Program:**

You are invited to be in a research study of the MBF Child Safety Matters™ program.  The purpose of the study is to evaluate the overall effectiveness of the program.  To this end we are seeking input from individuals who have participated in the MBF Child Safety Matters training.  You were selected as a possible participant because you are a trained MBF Child Safety Matters facilitator. We ask that you read this form and email any questions you may have before agreeing to be in the study.

This study is being conducted by Dr. Ithel Jones, School of Teacher Education, Florida State University.

**Background Information:**

The purpose of this study is to determine the extent to which the program is being implemented as intended. To this end we are considering the fidelity of the program delivery, or the extent to which the intervention adheres to the protocol or program model as originally developed.  We are also interested in learning about the program’s strengths and weaknesses.

**Procedures:**

If you agree to be in this study, we would ask you to complete the on-line survey.  The survey should take no more than about 15 minutes to complete. Your participation is voluntary. If you decided to participate, your information will be kept strictly confidential. By completing this survey, you indicate your consent to participate in the research study.

**Risks and Benefits of being in the Study:**

There are no risks of harm associated with your participation in this study.  Also, there are no direct benefits to you for participating in the study.

**Confidentiality:**

The records of this study will be kept private and confidential to the extent permitted by law.  In any sort of report we might publish, we will not include any information that will make it possible to identify a subject.  Research records will be stored securely and only researchers will have access to the records.

**Voluntary Nature of the Study:**

Participation in this study is voluntary.  Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with the Monique Burr Foundation.  If you decide to participate, you are free to not answer any question or withdraw at any time without affecting those relationships.

**Contacts and Questions:**

The researchers conducting this study are Dr. Ithel Jones and Ms. Young Ah Jung.  You may ask any question you have now be emailing Dr. Jones (ijones@fsu.edu).  If you have a question later, you are encouraged to contact them at Florida State University, School of Teacher Education, Tallahassee, FL 32306, 850-644-8468.

 If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study and would like to talk to someone other than the researcher(s), you are encouraged to contact the FSU IRB at 2010 Levy Street, Research Building B, Suite 276, Tallahassee, FL  32306-2742, or 850-644-8633, or by email at humansubjects@fsu.edu

I would like to continue to this survey.

1. Did you implement the MBF Child Safety Matters Program this school year?

Yes, in all classes.

Yes, in some classes.

No ▶*Go to 1-1*

1-1. If you didn't implement the program in all classes or at your school, why?

Not enough time

Not approved at my school

Used another program (\*explain further additional comments)

Didn't like the program (\*explain further additional comments)

Other reason (\*explain further additional comments)

2. How well is each of the following addressed in the program?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Don’t know  | Not covered at all | Not covered enough | Somewhat covered | Covered very well  |
| Bullying |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cyberbullying |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sexual abuse |  |  |  |  |  |
| Neglect |  |  |  |  |  |
| Emotional abuse |  |  |  |  |  |
| Physical abuse |  |  |  |  |  |
| Digital abuse/Digital safety |  |  |  |  |  |
| Parent education (opt out form, parent information sheets, parent materials) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reinforcement (student/school materials, reinforcement lessons) |  |  |  |  |  |

3. Do you have any comments about the following addressed in the program?

* Bullying
* Cyberbullying
* Sexual abuse
* Neglect
* Emotional abuse
* Physical abuse
* Digital abuse/Digital safety
* Parent education (opt out form, parent information sheets, parent materials)
* Reinforcement (student/school materials, reinforcement lessons)

Yes, I do (\*please explain further comments)

No, I don't.

4. Did you receive the monthly MBF Child Safety Matters lesson plans sent to your school by the Monique Burr Foundation for Children?

Yes, I received them by email. ▶*Go to 4-1*

Yes, I received a copy in the mail. ▶*Go to 4-1*

Yes, I received them both by email and in the mail. ▶*Go to 4-1*

No, I did not receive them.

4-1. If you received them, did you forward them to teachers?

Yes ▶*Go to 4-2*

No

4-2. Did you receive any feedback from teachers who used the lesson plans in their classrooms?

Yes, I received feedback.

No, I did not receive feedback.

5. Please provide your comments regarding the lesson plan.

6. Did you receive any disclosures of abuse, bullying or cyberbullying within 4 weeks of implementation of the program?

Yes, I received reports.

No, I did not receive reports.

6-1. How many reports of abuse/bullying/cyberbullying did you receive?(Check all that apply)

Reports of abuse

Reports of bullying

Reports of cyberbullying

7. Are you a trained MBF Child Safety Matters Facilitator?

Yes

No

8. What is your current job title?

Teacher: Kindergarten

Teacher: 1st grade

Teacher: 5th grade

Teacher: 3rd grade

Teacher: 4th grade

Teacher: 5th grade

Counselor

Other

9. How many years have you been working in this position?

10. What is your age group?

18-24

25-30

31-40

41-50

51-60

61-up

11. Your gender?

Male

Female

12. Race/Ethnicity?

White

Black or African American

American Indian or Alaskan Native

Asian

Hawaiian or Pacific Islander

Hispanic or Latino

Other/Mixed Race

Not available

13. Which of the following settings best describes the location where you work?

Rural

Suburban

Urban

14. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

High school diploma or GED

Associate's degree

Bachelor's degree

At least one year of course work beyond a Bachelor's degree but not a graduate degree

Master's degree

Education specialist or professional diploma based on at least one year of course work past a Master's degree level

Doctorate

15. How many times have you taught the MBF Child Safety Matters Curriculum?

16. To what grades have you taught the MBF Child Safety Matters Lessons? (Check all that apply)

Kindergarten

1st grade

2nd grade

3rd grade

4th grade

5th grade

17. Using the scale, please indicate the extent to which you think each of the following topics are covered by the student classroom presentation.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Don’t know  | Not covered at all | Not covered enough  | Somewhat covered | Covered very well  |
| Bystander vs Upstander actions |  |  |  |  |  |
| Red Flags |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cyberbullying |  |  |  |  |  |
| Safe Adults |  |  |  |  |  |
| Child sexual exploitation |  |  |  |  |  |
| Neglect |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sexual abuse |  |  |  |  |  |
| Emotional abuse |  |  |  |  |  |
| Physical abuse |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bullying  |  |  |  |  |  |

18. Please indicate whether you consider the lesson material for each of the following topics to be age and developmentally appropriate.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Don’t know  | Inappropriate | Somewhat inappropriate | Appropriate | Very appropriate  |
| Bystander vs Upstander actions |  |  |  |  |  |
| Red Flags |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cyberbullying |  |  |  |  |  |
| Safe Adults |  |  |  |  |  |
| Child sexual exploitation |  |  |  |  |  |
| Neglect |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sexual abuse |  |  |  |  |  |
| Emotional abuse |  |  |  |  |  |
| Physical abuse |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bullying  |  |  |  |  |  |

19. What do you like most about the program?

20. What part of the program could be improved?

21. How could the program be improved?

22. Did you ever change or modify any of the lessons? Please explain.

23. Do you have any other comments?

Thank you so much for your participation in our survey

Appendix B: Semi-structured interview

**FSU Child Safety Matters Evaluation**

Questions for semi-structured interview.

1. Briefly describe your role (office, committee, classroom, etc.) as it relates to the MBF Child Safety Matters program.

Probes: How are you involved in this program?

How did you get involved?

2. What do you like about the MBF Child Safety Matters program?

3. Is the program working – why or why not?

4. How do you think the MBF CSM program could be improved?

5. Did you participate in any of the MBF CSM training? What was most helpful?

6. What is being accomplished through the MBF CSM program?

7. What do parents think of the program?

8. Have you or your colleagues encountered resistance to the program (e.g. from parents or colleagues)?

9. How do you go about assessing whether students grasp the material you present in class?

Probe: Do you use evidence of student learning in your assessment of classroom strategies?

10. What kinds of assessment techniques tell you the most about what students are learning?

APPENDIX c: classroom observations

Name of Facilitator \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Grade \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Name of Observer \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Lesson Number\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Date Taught \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Check off all that you observe being done during the lesson:

* Pre-test
* Post-test
* Use of PowerPoint
* Watched videos
* Used motions for Safety Rules
* Followed the script closely
* Completed all class activities
* Distributed materials at the end
* Reviewed class expectations
* Reviewed safety rules from lesson 1 during Lesson 2
* Defined unfamiliar (bold) words to children as noted in script
* Delivered the Safety Rules and motions with enthusiasm
* Students participated

Comments / Observations

Appendix d: Pre- and Post-tests

**MBF Child Safety Matters**

 **Kindergarten Pre/Post Test**

Student Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Instructions**: Read each question carefully. Circle the BEST answer for each item.

1. **What is the first safety rule you can use to help adults keep you safe?**
2. Know What’s Up
3. Make a Move
4. Spot Red Flags
5. Talk It Up
6. **Whose job is it to keep children safe?**
7. Older Children
8. Safe Friends
9. Parents
10. Adults
11. **The safety rule “No Blame | No Shame” reminds you that if you are hurt by someone else:**
12. It’s never your fault
13. It’s probably your fault
14. You need to be more careful
15. You need to be calm and quiet
16. **When are adults supposed to keep children safe?**
17. Always
18. Sometimes
19. Only at school
20. Only at home
21. **Which Safety Rule should you follow after “Spot a Red Flag”?**
22. Know What’s Up
23. Make a Move
24. No Blame | No Shame
25. Talk It Up

 **MBF Child Safety Matters**

**1st and 2nd Grade Pre/Post Test**

Student Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Instructions**: Read each question carefully. Circle the BEST answer for each item.

1. **The Safety Rule “Know What’s Up” means knowing:**
	1. What a trick is
	2. How to keep a secret
	3. Whether a situation is safe or unsafe
	4. Your personal information and safety procedures
2. **A stranger walked up to Jane and asked her to help find a lost dog. She notices this may be unsafe. Which Safety Rule lets Jane know this is unsafe?**
3. Make a Move
4. Talk It Up
5. Spot Red Flags
6. No Blame | No Shame
7. **People who watch someone get bullied but do nothing about it are called**
8. Bullies
9. Bystanders
10. Cyberbullies
11. Upstanders
12. **Cyberbullying means hurting someone by saying mean things**
13. To their face
14. In the classroom
15. On the playground
16. On a cell phone or computer
17. **If I spot a red flag the next safety rule I should use is**
	1. Know what’s up
	2. Stay quiet
	3. Make a move
	4. Distract myself



**MBF Child Safety Matters**

**3rd Grade Pre/Post Test**

Student Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Instructions**: Read each question carefully. Circle the BEST answer for each item.

1. **One of the safety rules is “Spot Red Flags”. Which of the following is most likely to be a Red Flag?**
2. An adult asks you to keep secrets.
3. An adult tells you to follow the rules.
4. An adult tells you her name.
5. An adult asks you what time it is.
6. **What are the four types of child abuse?**
7. Emotional, Physical, Sexual, and Neglect
8. Internal, Home, School, and External
9. Central, Passive, Impassive, and Aggressive
10. Immediate, Direct, Emotional, and Physical
11. **If you or a friend are being cyberbullied, which of the Safety Rules reminds you to let a safe adult know what is happening?**
	1. Make a Move
	2. Talk It Up
	3. Spot Red Flags
	4. No Blame No Shame

 **-- Turn to Page 2 --**

1. ***Roberto’s neighbor, Frank, tries to get Roberto to come over to Frank’s house to play video games. Roberto does not know Frank very well, but Frank says he has a lot of friends they can play with and chat with online. Frank also told Roberto not to tell his parents about it.***

**What order of Safety Rules should Roberto follow after hearing Frank’s offer?**

1. Know What’s Up and Make a Move
2. Spot Red Flags and Make a Move
3. Talk it up and tell
4. Talk It Up and No Blame No Shame
5. **What kind of person tells someone to stop bullying?**
6. Teacher
7. Bystander
8. Upstander
9. Bully
10. **Which of the following is a type of physical abuse?**
	1. A mom spanking her child for misbehaving.
	2. An older child calling a younger child names.
	3. A boy hitting his brother to get his attention.
	4. An older child hitting a younger child repeatedly.
11. **If you’ve been hurt by someone else the safety rule “No Blame | No Shame” reminds you that:**
	* 1. It’s your fault
		2. It’s never your fault
		3. You need to follow the rules
		4. You need to find a safe place

**MBF Child Safety Matters**

**4th and 5th Grade Pre/Post Test**

Student Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Instructions**: Read each question carefully. Circle the BEST answer for each item.

1. **What type of abuse is it when a child is not getting what he or she needs to be healthy and safe, like not having food or proper clothes?**
	1. Neglect
	2. Empathy
	3. Emotional
	4. Physical
2. **What are your choices when unsafe things happen?**
	1. Wait for someone to come and help me
	2. Go along with what is happening
	3. Get away, stay away, and tell a safe adult.
	4. Pretend that the things didn’t happen.
3. **Which of the following digital safety tips can help keep you safe online?**
	1. Give out your personal information only to people you meet online who are your age
	2. Chat with people you don’t know online only if you are with a group of friends
	3. Only visit certain websites if they have been approved by your parent/guardian
	4. Never post things online for your family and friends to read or see
4. **Which of the following examples would be considered a “Red Flag”?**
	1. A neighbor tells Jimmy about a surprise party for his parents
	2. A coach gives Jimmy a nicer gift than Jimmy’s teammates received
	3. A teacher sends Jimmy to the office for misbehaving in class
	4. A parent spanks Jimmy for talking back when he was told to go to his room

 **--Turn to Page 2--**

1. **Which of the following is an example of the safety rule “Talk it Up”?**
	1. Letting the teacher know about a child who was bullied on the bus
	2. Getting away and staying away from bullies on the playground
	3. Noticing a classmate coming to school with bruises on their arm
	4. If you are ever hurt, it is never your fault and never too late to tell
2. **Which of the following safety rules can you use if you are unsure if a situation is safe?**
	1. Talk it up
	2. No Blame | No Shame
	3. Make a move
	4. Spot red flags
3. **What is Safety Rule #5?**
	1. Make a move
	2. Spot Red Flags
	3. No Blame | No shame
	4. Talk it Up
4. ***Rebecca was a shy 5th grade girl. She only had a few friends that she talked to and ate lunch with. One day, Rebecca came to school and seemed really down most of the day. At one point, she mentioned that her mom and dad were fighting a lot at home and her dad had been really mean to her.***

**Which of the following is the best way to help Rebecca?**

* 1. No Blame | No Shame
	2. Talk It Up
	3. Know What’s Up
	4. Spot Red Flags
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