
Implementation of a Peer Mediation Program in Six Rural Elementary and Middle Schools: A Comprehensive Qualitative Evaluation

Kathleen Curry
Norm Constantine

School and Community Health Research Group
WestEd, Oakland, CA

Paper presented at the
American Educational Research Association Annual Conference
Montreal, Canada
April, 1999

Acknowledgements

Our special thanks to the evaluation workgroup for their collaboration on the development and implementation of this study:

David Barret, Oak Manor Elementary School

Armand Brint, Mendocino County Office of Alcohol and Other Drug Programs

David Delgado, Nokomis Elementary School

Melissa Dunken, Mendocino County Youth Project

Katie Koerper, Hopland Elementary School

Valerie Lawe, Mendocino County Office of Alcohol and Other Drug Programs

David Lilker, Potter Valley Middle School

Suzy Miller, Mendocino County Office of Alcohol and Other Drug Programs

Anne Oliver, Mendocino County Youth Project

Tina Tyson, Potter Valley Middle School

Marian Venaas, Nokomis Elementary School

Ned Walsh, Mendocino County Office of Alcohol and Other Drug Programs

Karin Wandrej, Mendocino County Youth Project

Additional thanks to WestEd's BethAnn Berliner, Danielle Briggs, and Marycruz Diaz for assisting with interviews and focus groups, and to the students, teachers, and principals who participated in the interviews and focus groups.

Abstract

While school-based peer mediation programs frequently generate high levels of short-term interest, these programs face numerous implementation challenges and are often short-lived. The average peer mediation program runs between five and seven years, and often confronts obstacles such as low administrative support, staff turnover, staff burnout, and insufficient resources. This paper describes key findings and cross-site trends and differences from the first year of a comprehensive two-year program implementation study of a multi-site peer mediation demonstration program in a rural Northern California county. A total of 91 key informants participated in data collection, which consisted of 73 semi-structured interviews and two focus groups. The study creates a framework for assessing a variety of implementation dimensions and issues, including administrative support, teacher participation and commitment, student motivation, and program integration into school policy and culture. Site-level analyses were conducted to provide site-specific recommendations for program improvement. Cross-site analyses were conducted to identify success factors, challenges and recommendations that are common to most or all sites as well as those that are unique to program and school settings. Cross-site analyses also assessed relative integration of the program into the schools as demonstrated by alignment with discipline policy, training opportunities, and staff support.

Introduction

School-based peer mediation programs for children and adolescents arise from a variety of disciplines and perspectives, including criminal justice and law, non-violence activism, anti-nuclear war activism, and conflict resolution. This diversity of paradigms presents a challenge to evaluators attempting to assess program implementation and effectiveness. The majority of conflict resolution and peer mediation programs in schools lack a substantial theoretical base, resulting in ambiguity concerning program implementation and effectiveness expectations (Johnson & Johnson, 1996).

Evaluations of school-based peer mediation programs traditionally have addressed a variety of outcome measures, with little focus on program implementation. Outcome-focused approaches employ measures of student behavior, student attitude toward conflict, school climate, academic achievement, and school discipline (OJJDP, 1996). It can be difficult, however, to interpret outcome data without the benefit of a full understanding of a program's implementation experiences.

While peer mediation programs frequently generate high levels of short-term interest, these programs face numerous implementation challenges and are often short-lived. The average peer mediation program does not last longer than six years, and often confronts obstacles such as low administrative support, staff turnover, staff burnout, and insufficient resources (Halligan, J., phone interview, July, 1998). A thorough understanding of specific program implementation issues and experiences is key to ongoing development and program improvement, and to strengthening the knowledge base about program effectiveness and impact on school culture and policy.

This article describes key findings and cross-site trends from the first year of a comprehensive two-year program implementation study across six schools in Mendocino County, a rural county in Northern California. This study is part of a five-year evaluation of a high-risk youth national demonstration program funded by the federal Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (Constantine & Curry, 1998a; 1998b). In the present study we examine a variety of implementation dimensions and issues, including administrative support, teacher participation and commitment, student motivation, program alignment with discipline policy, and cross-site trends. The implementation study addresses three primary evaluation questions: (1) what factors contribute to successful program implementation, (2) what factors inhibit or challenge program implementation, and (3) to what degree is the program integrated into a school's culture and policy?

Description of the Intervention

The primary goal of the multi-component program is to prevent and reduce alcohol and other drug (AOD) use and AOD-related violence among children and youth 9-14 years old. The six participating schools in this rural northern California were chosen based on their willingness to provide the necessary staff time to meet the criteria for participating in the program and the evaluation study. The program includes three types of services delivered in the schools: a violence prevention classroom curriculum, a peer mediation component, and anger management counseling services delivered by school-based paraprofessional counselors.

This implementation evaluation focuses on the peer mediation component, Conflict Managers, a model developed by The Community Board Program, Inc. (1992) of San Francisco. Conflict Managers is an example of the legal discipline's contribution to school-based conflict resolution (Johnson & Johnson, 1996), and has been used at all levels of elementary and high

school. Students volunteer their time or are nominated by their teachers and classmates, and then participate in a training program to learn the skills associated with third-party mediation techniques. Student mediators are trained in understanding different styles of conflict, identifying factors that contribute to effective communication, setting ground rules for mediation, practicing active listening skills, listening to both sides of the story, using “I-messages,” defining the problem, and finding or facilitating appropriate resolutions.

Materials developed for Conflict Managers offer extensive implementation guidelines, with a variety of models designed to be developmentally appropriate for different ages. Schools can choose between the elementary school model, in which students share responsibility for monitoring the playground and approaching situations that may require mediation, and the middle school model, in which disputes are referred to student conflict managers who set up a time and place to carry out a mediation. In both models student conflict managers may request assistance at any time from a program coordinator, teacher, or other school staff member.

While the Conflict Managers materials offer detailed instructions for implementing an effective program in schools, program coordinators also are encouraged to modify the program design to the needs and realities of their local school environment. In this regard, we were less interested in evaluating the sites’ fidelity to the original program model, and more interested in capturing cross-site trends as well as site-level uniqueness pertaining to implementation of the model.

Methods

Data collection

Interview and focus-group protocols were developed through a highly collaborative process. This involved multiple development and review sessions with local program staff from

the coordinating agencies as well as representatives from all participating schools. During the spring of 1998, researchers visited the six participating school sites and conducted interviews and focus groups with a variety of key informants. Due to the absence of the principal and several key teachers during one site visit, the data presented here reflect the experience of five of the six participating sites.

A total of 91 key informants participated in data collection. All informants participated once, with the exception of prevention specialists, who participated twice. Purposeful sampling (Patton, 1990) led to identification of the following informants at each of the six school sites: one school principal or assistant principal, four to six teachers, one prevention specialist, and four to six trained student conflict managers or prospective conflict managers.

Individual interviews of 30 to 45 minutes each were conducted with key program informants at each school. Focus groups were also conducted with fourth grade students and with key paraprofessional program staff (called prevention specialists), who work directly with school staff and assist with the daily coordination of the peer mediation programs. The latter focus group was intended to clarify issues and patterns that emerged during the interviews with principals, teachers and trained conflict managers.

Site-level analyses

To provide each site with timely formative feedback to guide program implementation and development, we first organized and summarized the site-specific data into site-level conceptually clustered matrices (Miles & Huberman, 1994). These matrices were structured according to the following content categories: (1) perceived need for program, (2) success factors for implementation, (3) challenges to implementation, (4) program integration into school, and (5) ideas for program development. Content-clustered responses were then further broken down

by respondent: (a) student, (b) principal and (c) teacher. For an example, see Table I in the Results section.

Cross-site analyses

To better understand the patterns and implications of site-specific issues and findings, we employed cross-site summary matrices (Miles and Huberman, 1994) by extracting and clustering relevant data from the site-level matrices. The cross-site summary matrices allow program coordinators to identify key cross-site examples of (1) success factors for implementation, (2) challenges to implementation, and (3) ideas for program development, and help clarify which of the factors or recommendations are common among all or most sites and which are unique to individual school and program settings. Data within these categories were organized into five domains. These domains provided a structure for coding responses and evaluating cross-site trends: (a) support from school-wide community, (b) personal qualities of staff and participants, (c) design of program, (d) school environment, and (e) implementation.

Site ordered meta-matrices were employed to evaluate the degree of integration of Conflict Managers into the existing school systems at each of the participating schools. These provided a structure for presenting both positive examples of integration, as well as challenges to integration, in the following categories: (1) alignment with discipline policy, (2) training opportunities, and (3) staff support. We classified each school's integration of their Conflict Managers program as "high", "moderate" or "low" across the three categories indicated above.

Results

Within-site analyses

Within-site analyses have been especially useful in developing site-specific recommendations for program improvement. For example, at one school where peer mediation

has a long history, both teachers and students pointed out the need to increase training opportunities for teachers and students as well as create new opportunities for student mediators, such as involving them as assistant trainers. At other schools, particularly those where the Conflict Managers program is in only its second or third year, we identified a need to promote awareness among both teachers and students about the mediation process, as well as to build incentives into the program to encourage more students to participate. Table I provides one sample of the 22 conceptually clustered site matrices generated.

—▶ **Table I: Conceptually clustered site-level matrix (program integration into school)**

Site-level analyses also allowed us to identify incongruencies among the perceptions of various program stakeholders. For example, in several schools we found a lack of congruence between principals' and teachers' understanding of the alignment between the peer mediation program and the school-wide discipline policy. In most schools we also observed principals' lack of familiarity with both key ingredients to program success and challenges to program implementation. These two discrepancies in perception are a key to understanding why most programs appear to be operating as "add-on" activities or clubs and have not been fully integrated into school culture. Until there is a common understanding about the essential elements of the peer mediation program implementation and the desired role of the program, it is likely to have negligible impact on improving school culture and climate.

Cross-site analyses

Success factors

As shown in Table II, reported success factors were distributed across all of the five domains mentioned above: (a) support from school-wide community, (b) personal qualities of

staff and participants, (c) design of program, (d) school environment, and (e) implementation.

The majority of success factors were mentioned by only one or two sites, indicating that Conflict Managers programs at each school site have developed along diverse paths and independently have identified unique and creative ways to implement program-related activities. Several factors, however, were mentioned by three or more of the sites, indicating their broader relevance to the overall program.

1. Commitment of site coordinators was mentioned universally as a critical success factor. This commitment extends not just to personal enthusiasm but to support structures allowing the coordinator to be fully available and responsive to the students.

2. A school-wide belief in process, also described as an “open and receptive environment” was also universally noted as critical to program success. While this notion lacks precise definition, it was described as including a culture of constructive communication as evidenced by relationships among teachers, between the teaching staff and the administration, and among students.

3. Support from teachers was mentioned by all but one of the sites as a critical success factor. Teacher support encompasses both active teacher involvement in coordinating conflict managers as well as teachers’ willingness to excuse students to participate in mediations as mediators and as disputants. The latter form of support is often not acknowledged as critical to program success, but is both necessary to student participation as well as to student perception of the legitimacy of the mediation process.

4. Incentives and recognition were mentioned by four of the five sites, and range from free hot chocolate for conflict managers “on duty” to special parties or trips to official

recognition of student contribution to the school at school-wide assemblies. Both students and teachers confirmed that recognition and reward are important to keeping students involved in the program as well as further integrating the program into school culture. “When kids reach a certain maturity level many of them naturally feel motivated to volunteer,” commented one teacher. “We should acknowledge and celebrate that development.”

5. The prevention specialist’s rapport with students was mentioned by three of the five sites. The prevention specialist is perceived as equally accessible to teachers and students. The prevention specialist also plays a crucial role in modeling the skills and attitudes associated with conflict resolution and providing students with an example of individual commitment to resolving conflict in peaceful and constructive ways. A teacher at one school commented that “Conflict Managers is seen as an extension of the prevention specialist’s positive, peaceable relationship with the kids.” Examples of important qualities mentioned by students and staff pertain to a prevention specialist being bi-lingual and bi-cultural, being available and immediately responsive to students, and treating students as unique individuals.

→ **Table II: Sample cross-site summary table (success factors in implementation)**

Challenges to implementation

Interview and focus group participants spoke at length about challenges to implementation, defined as any programmatic or environmental factor that provides an obstacle to the program’s ability to effectively address conflict at school. Challenges to implementation of

Conflict Managers spread across most of the same domains as success factors. The spread, however, is less even, and none of the challenges relates directly to personal factors. The most frequently mentioned challenges pertain to program design and support from the school-wide community. While the majority of challenges were unique to one or two sites, the following emerged as universal or highly prevalent to the implementation of the Conflict Managers program among the six schools:

1. Insufficient teacher support and buy-in was mentioned by every participating site as a challenge to program implementation. Although all sites described teacher support as a critical success factor, all sites also acknowledged that the lack of universal support hindered optimal development and implementation of the program. Teacher support encompasses both active teacher involvement in coordinating Conflict Managers as well as teachers' willingness to excuse students to participate in mediations as mediators and as disputants. A lack of teacher support is evidenced by lack of involvement in planning and coordinating, resistance to allowing students to miss class time to be involved in mediations, and expression of belief that school time should be devoted to academic learning.

2. Insufficient time for planning and coordination due to a staff that is already overworked was also mentioned at every site. Whether or not teachers are supportive of the goals of the program, the majority are so busy with their own teaching responsibilities that they have neither the time to actively participate nor to remain current on program activities. "Teachers are like islands," one principal reflected, "if you don't bother them they don't pay attention to what's going on in school. They are all too busy taking care of their own classes."

3. Teachers are not skilled in behaviors associated with conflict resolution and do

not model them for students. Concerns about teachers' lack of ability to model skills and philosophies associated with conflict resolution were mentioned by three of the participating sites. This challenge overlaps significantly with lack of teacher support, as it is indicative of both a lack of time to participate, as well as a lack of interest in or commitment to the conflict resolution process. A principal at one school noted that their program suffered from inconsistency. "If all staff were trained," she remarked, "we'd all use the same language and the same steps and would be more effective."

4. Too many students are trained to keep them all active. Although a sign of program

integration into school culture, an overabundance of conflict managers has proven problematic for three sites because it leads to underutilization of students who have been trained, and consequently to boredom and frustration. Several students interviewed during our site visits indicated that they would not participate in the program again because they didn't have enough opportunities to mediate.

5. Students don't want to give up their free or recess time. Three of the sites indicated

that the program has faced a lack of student interest and an unwillingness to commit their free time to the program. Surprisingly, this is true both in schools that indicate that they have "too many trained students" and those who do not. One student noted that being on regular duty during free time was damaging to her relationships with friends. "It takes away from my recess," she said, "I hardly ever see my friends any more."

Recommendations for Program Development

The majority of recommendations pertain to program implementation. Recommendations are diverse and vary greatly in feasibility; the majority were mentioned only by one site and

reflect the diversity of contexts for implementation as well as needs for improving or solidifying the program. While no recommendations were common to all sites, several recommendations were articulated by two or more; these are shown below with number of schools in parentheses.

Implementation Recommendations

- Provide optional in-service training opportunities for teachers (3)
- Provide mandatory in-service training for all teachers (3)
- Share coordination duties among several staff (2)
- Offer more incentives and recognition for participation (2)
- Promote school-wide awareness about the program (2)
- Invite outside trainers and/or consultants for additional training and planning (2)
- Don't require conflict managers to wear hats on duty (2)

Design Recommendations

- Lengthen training time (2)
- Schedule training and mediation to minimize students missing class time (2)

Most recommendations mentioned for program development pertain to training for both teachers and student participants, indicating a need to reconsider elements of the training design and to promote training opportunities that are meaningful as well as minimally intrusive.

The appearance of support from teachers as both a success factor and a challenge to implementation indicates its critical importance to the success of the Conflict Managers program. Most schools indicate that teachers provide a necessary bedrock of organizational support, but that incomplete support also hinders the program's full integration into school culture and policy.

To that end, teacher support should be addressed through a variety of means, including training and involvement in coordination responsibilities.

Degree of Integration

A cross-site analysis of degree of integration produced information for assessing the relative levels of implementation at the five sites, and as such provides useful contextual information for understanding outcome data collected during the spring of 1999 (see the site-ordered meta-matrices, Tables III, IV, and V.) For example, School B's implementation struggles are documented consistently and specific details listed across all three matrices, representing difficulties in 1) alignment with discipline, 2) training, and 3) staff support. As such, we should expect different outcome results than at School C, which has achieved a relatively high level of implementation success

—————▶ **Tables III, IV, and V: Site ordered meta-matrices: Degree of integration (alignment with discipline policy, training, staff support)**

In addition to context for understanding outcome data, the site-ordered meta-matrices yield useful concrete information about how to concentrate resources for program improvement. We learned, for example, about certain cross-site trends that can impact program development, such as the need for more training opportunities at all schools. These tables can also be useful in creating partnerships and shared learning among sites. Two schools have already suggested that sites with moderate or low integration in one area could be partnered with a site experiencing higher levels of integration in order to create "mentor" relationships.

Discussion

This study helps to fill a critical gap between peer-mediation program research and practice by documenting and evaluating implementation of a multi-site program. A thorough

review of the peer mediation research literature uncovered few studies focusing on the implementation of such programs, and no studies analyzing qualitative program data across sites. Our study offers both a conceptual and a practical programmatic contribution to the field of research and evaluation literature for peer mediation programs.

Conceptually, we have created a specific typology of issues and factors to better understand and evaluate program implementation in a multi-site peer mediation intervention. This typology represents the key factors in program implementation and provides a framework for within-site and cross-site analyses. We consider our framework an exploratory model which can serve as a template for assessing the implementation of other similar programs. In that regard, we hope that this study offers a useful conceptual tool for other researchers and program staff involved with school-based peer mediation programs.

Programmatically, this study brings important information to bear for purposes of expanding involvement, promoting success, and institutionalizing the Conflict Managers program. Analysis conducted during the summer and fall of 1998 elicited details of program implementation to better understand the internal dynamics of the program: strengths, weaknesses, and overall program integration into school culture and policy. This detailed, descriptive information about the program has been used to continue to improve services at each site. These initial findings and the additional qualitative data still being collected are also useful in assessing each sites' progress toward achieving a whole-school approach, a more comprehensive program model now being implemented that integrates peer mediation, classroom curricula, and training for teachers, staff and parents. The purpose of this shift is to move away from a reactive model of addressing conflict and to fully infuse the principles of conflict resolution into school culture (Moore & Thorpe, 1996).

This movement toward a whole-school approach is necessarily a unique process at each site. Each process is contextualized within unique school cultures of success factors, challenges, teacher support, training opportunities, and administrative procedures for addressing conflict between students. At the same time, coordinating program staff at the county level are interested in helping all participating schools move along a similar path toward full integration, and have been especially eager for findings and recommendations that can be applied to multiple sites.

The design for this comprehensive, qualitative evaluation was based largely on a need identified by our evaluation work group: to better understand “what implementation looks like” in order to help each school fully integrate the principles of conflict resolution into its everyday operations. Data from this evaluation also provide a rich contextual groundwork for better understanding the qualitative and quantitative outcome data currently being collected at each of the six school sites. During the spring of 1999, our evaluation team visited each of the participating sites and interviewed teachers and students to assess the following outcomes of the Conflict Managers program: (1) effectiveness of listening and communication skills used by students, (2) to what degree students use their skills in other settings, (3) student attitude toward conflict, (4) student understanding of and compassion for cultural differences, (5) to what degree teachers and trust the conflict resolution process, and (6) impact of the Conflict Managers program on school culture. Clearly, these qualitative and quantitative outcome data will be enriched and contextualized by a better understanding of the varying levels of implementation across the program sites.

Complete set of matrices and tables

- Within-Site Conceptually Clustered Matrices (22 pages)
- Cross-Site Summary Tables of Implementation Issues (4 pages)
- Site-ordered Meta- matrices (3 pages)

For more information and a copy of the complete set of matrices and tables, please contact:

Norm Constantine, Ph.D.
Director, Center for Research on Adolescent Health and Development
Public Health Institute
2001 Addison Street, 2nd Floor
Berkeley, CA 94704
Phone: 925.284.8118 Fax: 925.284.8107
nconstantine@phi.org
<http://crahd.PHI.org>

References

- Community Board Program. (1992) Starting a conflict managers program. San Francisco: Community Board Program.
- Constantine, N. A. & Curry, K. (1998a, August) Preliminary results from a theory-based collaborative violence prevention evaluation: integrating qualitative and quantitative findings. Paper presentation to the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention Violence Prevention Demonstration Projects Grantees National Meeting, San Francisco, CA.
- Constantine, N. A. & Curry, K. (1998b, November) Collaborative development of a theory-based assessment instrument for a school-linked violence prevention evaluation. Paper presented at the 1998 American Evaluation Association Annual Conference, Chicago
- Heckman, Paul E. (1993) School restructuring in practice: reckoning with the culture of school. International Journal of Educational Reform, **2**, 263-71.
- Johnson, D.W. & Johnson, R.T. (1996) Conflict resolution and peer mediation programs in elementary and secondary schools: a review of the research. Review of Educational Research, **66**, 459-506.
- Kegler, M.C., Steckler, A.S., Malek, S.H., & McLeroy, K., (1998) A multiple case study of implementation in 10 local Project ASSIST coalitions in North Carolina. Health Education Research, **13**, 225-238
- Metis Associates. (1990) The resolving conflict creatively program: 1988-1989 summary of significant findings. Evaluation report submitted to William Casey, Superintendent, Community School District 15, Brooklyn, NY.
- Miles, M.B., & Huberman, A.M. (1994) Qualitative data analysis. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Moore, M. & Thorp, V. (1996) Using conflict resolution for whole school change: an evaluation of year two of the whole school conflict resolution project. Urban Apprentices.
- Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. (1996) Conflict resolution education: a guide to implementing programs in schools, youth serving organizations and community and juvenile justice settings. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Opffer, E. (1997) Toward cultural transformation: comprehensive approaches to conflict resolution. Theory Into Practice, **36**, 46-52.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990) Qualitative evaluation and research methods. Newbury Park, CA: Sage
- Powell, K.E., Dahlberg, L.L., Friday, JI, Mercy, J., Thornton, T., & Crawford, S., (1996) Prevention and violence: rationale and characteristics of 15 evaluation projects. American Journal of Preventive Medicine, **12**, 3-12.

Tolan, P & Guerra, N. (1996) Progress and prospects in youth violence prevention. American Journal of Preventive Medicine, **12**, 129-131.

**Cross site display of implementation issues:
Ingredients for Success**

Success factor	Sites at which item is mentioned
<i>Support:</i> Teacher support	A, C, D, E
<i>Support:</i> Support from principal	C, E
<i>Support/Design:</i> Recognition of student service	C, D
<i>Support:</i> School board support	E
<i>Personal factors:</i> Prevention Specialist's rapport with students	A, B, C
<i>Personal factors:</i> Commitment of coordinating staff	A, B, C, D, E
<i>Personal factors:</i> Student desire to contribute to school	B
<i>Personal factors:</i> Bi-lingual prevention specialist	A
<i>Personal factors:</i> Prevention specialist's commitment and reliability	D
<i>Personal factors:</i> Male coordinator increases boys' participation	D
<i>Design:</i> Incentives to participate (snacks, parties, trips)	A, B, C, D
<i>Design/Implementation:</i> Consistency in coordinator's relationship with students	B, D
<i>Design/Logistics:</i> Training arranged so that kids don't miss class or other extra-curricular time	A
<i>Environment:</i> Receptive school climate; school-wide belief in mediation process	A, B, C, D, E
<i>Logistics:</i> Transportation for kids who live far from school	A
<i>Environment:</i> Other compatible curricula/programs at school	C
<i>Implementation:</i> Students are involved in promoting program	E
<i>Design/Implementation:</i> Program's timely response to conflict	E
<i>Design:</i> Strong training program	E
<i>Implementation/Personal factors:</i> Coordinator always available	E
<i>Implementation:</i> Mentorship opportunity created for coordinator, allows extra time to invest in program	B
<i>Implementation:</i> Involve all teachers in planning to better determine their needs and availability	D
<i>Implementation:</i> Diversity of participating students	D
<i>Environment:</i> School already committed due to previous training from outside organization	D
<i>Support/Implementation:</i> Staff can model skills	D

**Cross site display of implementation issues:
Challenges to implementation**

Challenges to implementation	Sites at which item is mentioned
<i>Support:</i> Insufficient teacher support and buy-in	A, B, C, D, E
<i>Support/Environment:</i> Teachers not skilled in behaviors, do not model	A, C, E
<i>Support:</i> Kids don't want to give up free time	A, B, D
<i>Support:</i> Conflict Managers perceived as punitive arm of administration	A
<i>Support:</i> Widespread perception that conflict managers is only a "club"	E
<i>Support:</i> Inconsistent administrative support	E
<i>Design:</i> Doesn't reach kids in all grades (younger)	A
<i>Design:</i> Training too short	A, C
<i>Design:</i> Referral model is limiting – too few opportunities to mediate	A
<i>Design:</i> Cultural barriers, may not be appropriate for Latino population	E
<i>Design:</i> Doesn't reach kids in all grades (younger)	A
<i>Design/Logistics:</i> Lack of systemic way to inform and involve staff	E
<i>Design/Logistics:</i> Lack of systemic way to pull kids out of class	E
<i>Environment:</i> High levels of racial tension at school	E
<i>Environment:</i> Kids receive contradictory messages about violence (from media, etc.)	A
<i>Environment:</i> Difficult for middle and elementary school to collaborate	D
<i>Environment:</i> Many parents don't trust schools, unwilling to give consent	D
<i>Implementation:</i> Too many students trained – hard to keep them all involved	C, D, E
<i>Implementation:</i> Lack of diversity among conflict managers	A, E
<i>Implementation/Environment:</i> Misuse of program – students use as attention getting technique	A, E
<i>Implementation:</i> Misuse of program – conflict managers intervene in physical fights	D
<i>Logistics/Environment:</i> Not enough time to plan; staff overworked	A, B, C, D, E
<i>Logistics:</i> Limited funds	C, E
<i>Logistics:</i> Bussing issues for students who live far from school	C
<i>Logistics:</i> Lack of regular meetings between coordinator and conflict managers	E

**Cross site display of implementation issues:
Ideas for program improvement and development**

Ideas for improvement and development	Sites at which item was mentioned
<i>Support:</i> Generate more administrative support and directives to school	E
<i>Environment:</i> Create more play space – limited space increases tension	B
<i>Design:</i> Lengthen training time	A, B
<i>Design:</i> Plan program to minimize students missing class time	A, B
<i>Design:</i> Have multiple pairs of conflict managers on duty every day	A
<i>Design:</i> Use middle school referral model for upper grades	C
<i>Implementation:</i> Train all staff in skills	A
<i>Implementation:</i> Promote school-wide awareness about program	A, E
<i>Implementation:</i> Offer more incentives and recognition to participating students	A, D
<i>Implementation:</i> Have conflict managers visit every class to promote awareness	A
<i>Implementation:</i> Mandatory in-service training for all teachers	C, D, E
<i>Implementation:</i> Optional in-service opportunities for teachers	B, C, D
<i>Implementation:</i> Provide booster trainings for students	C
<i>Implementation:</i> Train fewer students to ensure that all trained have a role	C, E
<i>Implementation:</i> Involve conflict managers as trainers	C
<i>Implementation:</i> Actively recruit new faculty	C
<i>Implementation:</i> Integrate with other programs/ curricula (TRIBES)	C
<i>Implementation:</i> Share coordination among several staff	B
<i>Implementation:</i> Hire full time coordinator	C
<i>Implementation:</i> Offer conflict managers training for students sent to office with discipline problems	C
<i>Implementation:</i> Develop strategies for recruiting more diverse group of conflict managers	E
<i>Implementation:</i> Build more incentives for participation into program	E
<i>Implementation:</i> Further integrate with discipline policy	E
<i>Implementation:</i> Training opportunities for all students	B
<i>Implementation:</i> Create opportunities to increase parent and family involvement	B

<i>Implementation:</i> Develop a mentor relationship with more experienced program	B
<i>Implementation:</i> Recruit kids already trained in elementary school	B
<i>Implementation:</i> Bring in outside trainer	B, D
Research additional funding sources	B
<i>Design:</i> Train all students	D
<i>Support:</i> Interview teachers to find out what would get them involved and keep them involved	D
<i>Implementation:</i> Allow CMs to choose own partners	D
<i>Implementation:</i> Don't require conflict managers to wear hats	D
<i>Design:</i> Expand scope of skills (and de-emphasize "I messages")	D
<i>Implementation:</i> More conflict managers on the playground	D

Degree of Integration: Alignment with discipline policy

HIGH

School	Positive examples	Challenges
C	<p>Consistent and Closely aligned</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part of continuum, CM handles low level disputes • Strongly influences discipline: principal uses CM skills when students come to her • Allows kids be proactive about solving conflicts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recess isn't long enough to solve problems effectively
A	<p>Consistent and closely aligned</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most utilized form of discipline • Principal supports program and shares philosophy • Helps promote responsible attitude among all students • CM Forms are available to principal to help make appropriate discipline decisions • Consistent with discipline policy, although CMs are not permitted to intervene in violent situations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perceived by some teachers as primarily symbolic

MODERATE

School	Positive examples	Challenges
E	<p>Separate but consistent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Problems often presented to conflict managers before being referred to principal • Part of continuum, CMs handle low level problems • Administration has plans to include on official discipline chart for the school • First step in discipline policy • Intended to reduce referrals to principal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CM program marginalized, not given opportunity to handle serious problems • Not designed for problems that typically get "referred"
D	<p>Separate but consistent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principal counts on students to help address problems • Reduces number of conflicts sent to principal • Integral to school climate and discipline: invests kids with responsibility for maintaining a peaceful environment 	<p>Related but not connected</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No relation to standard discipline procedures; a set of skills to help students deal with problems
B	<p>Separate but related</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First stage of referral process: if CMs can't handle a problem, it gets sent to yard duty and then to the office • General support from administration 	<p>Related but marginalized</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No overt support from administration • Minimal awareness among school staff • No direct relationship with discipline procedures

Site ordered meta matrix
Degree of Integration: Training

MODERATE

School	Positive examples	Challenges
A	<p>Logistically sound</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training sessions held after school to minimize disturbance to teachers • Transportation provided for students who live far from home 	<p>Not wide spread enough</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not enough teachers trained in skills • Teachers don't model CM behaviors
D	<p>Widespread opportunity and interest</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many staff trained • Many staff model behaviors • Classified staff have training opportunities • Periodic in-service opportunities for all staff 	<p>Interest and participation not universal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Middle school students not trained – creates an inconsistency • Teachers object to “being trained”, likely to resist • Time constraints make training staff impractical
C	<p>Reflects needs and culture of school</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training has developed over time to be responsive to needs and realities of the school 	<p>Limitations due to time and logistics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient in-service training opportunities • Teachers don't feel sufficiently trained • Logistical problems – many students can't participate in after school training because no transportation is provided
E	<p>Student training extensive and accessible</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive training (15 hours) for students held during summer 	<p>Staff training limited and problematic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient in-service training opportunities for staff • Mandatory in-service training would create resentment among staff

LOW

B		<p>Insufficient student and staff training opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training poorly planned – students must miss class time • Student training too short • Insufficient in-service training opportunities for teachers and other staff
----------	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Site ordered meta matrix
Degree of Integration: Staff support

HIGH

School	Positive examples	Challenges
C	<p>Widespread support and interest</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Principal is supportive Widespread school support High teacher/staff/community buy-in 	<p>Support not yet universal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some new teachers haven't been exposed to program Some teachers associate CM (negatively) with <i>Project Yes!</i>
D	<p>Involving teachers in planning led to widespread support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Moderate to high levels of teacher support Teachers have been consulted on program planning and development Most staff trained in skills and can model them Staff generally interested in and receptive to program 	<p>Logistical difficulties in generating additional support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teacher support not universal School day isn't set up in a way that allows teachers to devote time to extra projects

MODERATE

School	Positive examples	Challenges
A	<p>Moderate awareness and support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers somewhat aware of CM through experience with <i>Project Yes!</i> Moderate teacher buy-in 	<p>Support fractured and unlikely to change under present conditions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many staff not skilled in CM behaviors Teacher support not universal Staff already overworked
E	<p>School-wide commitment to keep staff involved and interested</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Big investment has been made to promote staff awareness Staff support generated and maintained through referral system Principal supports program Staff demonstrate support by allowing students to leave class to participate in mediations 	<p>Support inconsistent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inconsistent administrative support Referrals have tapered off recently Low staff skill and ability to model behaviors Inconsistent teacher support – many would prefer to focus on academics Lack of systematic way to involve teachers and other staff

LOW

School	Positive examples	Challenges
B	<p>Open school climate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> School climate open to conflict management 	<p>Some resistance to program and participation requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some teachers not interested Teachers resist allowing students to miss class to participate