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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Urban Networks to Increase Thriving Youth (UNITY) is a comprehensive strategy designed to address youth violence in large urban areas across the United States. Since its inception in 2005, UNITY has built support for effective, sustainable efforts to prevent violence before it occurs, so that urban youth can thrive in safe environments with supportive relationships and opportunities for success. It does this primarily by working intensively to promote collaboration and build capacity through the provision of training, technical assistance, and tools centered on youth violence prevention.

The project grew out of the recognition that youth violence, while decreasing across the United States in general, is still at unacceptably high levels. Phase I of the UNITY initiative was therefore primarily focused on shifting the paradigm regarding public health’s role in violence prevention by establishing a network for cities, in which they could develop plans, strategies, and a road map as a guide to reduce youth violence in the urban areas. The network has matured and evolved, and this second assessment was performed to provide feedback for program improvement and to measure UNITY’s impact on its stated goals and its responsiveness to city needs. Specifically, the evaluation aimed to determine whether UNITY has met/is meeting its goals of maintaining and enhancing a national consortium to prevent youth violence; increasing awareness of critical issues faced by cities in addressing youth violence; and enhancing the capacity of cities to collaborate, plan, and implement youth violence prevention strategies by providing technical assistance networking opportunities and other resources.

Findings indicate that UNITY has/is meeting or exceeding its goals. For example, UNITY has helped increase the role of public health in youth violence prevention efforts. UNITY’s initial assessment found there was a lack of involvement of the public health community, and public health departments did not see themselves as part of the solution to address youth violence. Over the past seven years, UNITY has helped local public health departments become more involved in violence prevention efforts. Many are now taking a leading role.

UNITY has also built a robust consortium of U.S. cities, national partner organizations, and community groups/members dedicated to reducing youth violence. UNITY has helped to shift the paradigm regarding the issue of youth violence by increasing awareness about the youth violence problem among this consortium, and throughout the Country by hosting meetings and networking opportunities. UNITY has increased awareness through the consortium by educating stakeholders and the public about youth violence issues and strategies.

Moreover, UNITY has enhanced and built capacity by promoting collaboration between cities, national partners, community members, and intra-city agencies/departments, which has directly affected youth violence prevention efforts. The initiative has improved collaboration and capacity by providing a variety of resources and tools as well as a forum for cities to work together on critical issues. Through these collaborative
efforts, cities have been able to build capacity they did not previously have before joining UNITY. This includes greater engagement with city youth, community groups, and city leadership. It is of particular note that none of the cities received any funding from UNITY yet continued to participate in the UNITY City Network.

Based on this assessment, the following major findings and recommendations are made to assist urban areas in addressing youth violence:

**Key Findings**

**Increased Public Health Involvement**
- Public health departments are much more involved in citywide youth violence prevention strategies and activities since UNITY’s inception, and in some cities, are leading efforts.
  - Nearly 90% of strategic plans to address youth violence reflected the input of the local health department.
  - 91% of city representatives said the health department was the lead sponsor of the local coalition to address violence.
  - Besides the governance sector, health departments are the most likely to sponsor a youth advisory body.

**Improved Collaboration and Engagement**
- Engagement of leadership and community members has generally increased for cities since becoming involved with UNITY. For example:
  - 93% of cities have formed a coalition/network that addresses violence.
  - Cities report increased collaboration among the mayor’s office, police department, schools and health department since joining UNITY.
  - 60% of cities reported that collaboration with community members and youth increased since joining UNITY. Community members and youth are involved in determining priorities and activities for preventing youth violence, and implementing activities.

**Enhanced Strategic Planning**
- All UNITY cities either have a city-wide plan to address youth violence or have discussed developing such a plan.
- All cities developed their strategic plans in partnership with other sectors.
- Every city worked with governance, education, community services, youth-serving organizations, and justice sectors to develop their plan.

**Strengthened Attention to Prevention**
- Cities are shifting actions towards prevention of youth violence and not relying solely on intervention, suppression or enforcement methods.
- Two-thirds of cities either created plans or significantly modified existing plans since they joined UNITY, by incorporating and adopting primary prevention strategies
Decreased Suicide Rate
All UNITY cities experienced a reduction in suicide rate for 15-24 years olds\(^1\)

Increased Use of UNITY Resources
- All cities reported using UNITY resources and tools, with technical assistance and networking opportunities noted as particularly useful.
  - 75% of cities reported that their efforts to prevent violence are more effective because of UNITY’s trainings, technical assistance, and tools.
  - All cities said that access to violence prevention experts through UNITY helped improve their strategic plans, as did UNITY events, networking with other cities, technical assistance on preventing violence affecting youth, and UNITY webinars and publications.
  - 85% of cities report using the UNITY RoadMap.
- Joining the UNITY initiative has directly resulted in increased collaboration among cities.
  - City representatives value networking opportunities with other cities, and more than 85% of UNITY cities communicate with other cities.
  - City representatives know a point of contact, share information, and communicate with an average of eight other cities.

Recommendations

1. UNITY should continue to provide technical assistance to cities and focus on ways to improve available resources and tools.

2. UNITY could work to advance better access to online resources for cities and partners.

3. UNITY could help cities increase focus on evaluation and provide more tools to perform evaluation.

4. UNITY could help cities assess staffing needs and assist with the development of staff training in youth violence prevention strategies and efforts.

5. UNITY should continue its efforts to promote prevention strategies and efforts.

6. UNITY should continue to help cities without strategic plans to develop them, and help those that have plans to fully implement them.

7. UNITY meetings and convenings should be continued, as cities said that they provide a good opportunity to encourage networking.

8. UNITY could develop tools or connect cities with existing resources to reduce service gaps.

---

\(^1\) Decreasing suicide was not an explicit objective of the UNITY initiative, this finding is noteworthy however because, in a report of August 2013 by CDC, firearm-related suicides increased in a majority of the 50 most populated metropolitan statistical areas in the country [Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report (MMWR); Firearm Homicides and Suicides in Major Metropolitan Areas - United States, 2006-2007 and 2009-2010; August 2, 2013 / 62(30);597-602]
9. UNITY can help cities maintain and improve partnerships that have been developed thus far.

10. Strategies and efforts with public health departments should be preserved and built upon.
OVERVIEW

Urban Networks to Increase Thriving Youth (UNITY) is a comprehensive strategy designed to address youth violence in large urban areas across the United States. Since its inception in 2005, it has built support for effective, sustainable efforts to prevent violence before it occurs, so urban youth can thrive in safe environments with supportive relationships and opportunities for success. UNITY works intensively with a select group of the nation's largest cities through the UNITY City Network and with a broad consortium of practitioners and decision-makers to promote collaboration and build capacity for youth violence prevention. It does this by providing a variety of resources and tools, such as trainings, materials, and technical assistance.

UNITY is a partnership between Prevention Institute, Harvard School of Public Health, UCLA Fielding School of Public Health, and UCSF Department of Social and Behavioral Sciences. In addition, more than 20 agencies and associations nationwide have worked with UNITY in a variety of ways to provide resources and shift strategies for preventing violence in the America. The initiative is supported by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and is part of CDC's national youth violence prevention initiative, Striving to Reduce Youth Violence Everywhere (STRYVE). UNITY is also funded in part by grants from The Kresge Foundation and The California Wellness Foundation.

At the start of the UNITY initiative, an assessment was conducted in an effort to better understand the youth violence problem and city efforts to address youth violence using a primary prevention approach. The assessment involved a mixed method approach including a review of secondary data sources and in-depth interviews with key city leaders. Findings showed that public health departments, in general, were minimally involved in city efforts to reduce youth violence, and few utilized a public health prevention approach. In addition, law enforcement was the most prevalent strategy, which primarily focused on suppression and enforcement methods, which resulted in considerably less prevention strategies. Furthermore, city leaders did not include public health in their youth violence prevention plans, and public health departments themselves had difficulty identifying their potential role in such plans. Phase I of the UNITY project, therefore, was primarily devoted to shifting the paradigm regarding public health’s role in youth violence, and engaging cities in a network to develop plans, strategies, and a road map in order to reduce youth violence in the urban areas.

Now that the network has matured and evolved, a second assessment was performed to provide feedback for program improvement. This assessment was primarily conducted to measure UNITY’s impact on its stated goals and its responsiveness to city needs. Specifically, the evaluation is aimed at determining whether UNITY has met/is meeting its goals of: 1) maintaining and enhancing a national consortium to prevent youth violence; 2) increasing awareness of critical issues faced by cities in addressing youth violence; 3) developing and refining tools, strategies, and messages to promote and facilitate building infrastructure and a broad base of support for youth violence prevention in US cities; and 4) enhancing capacity through technical assistance with U.S. cities to collaborate, plan, implement, and evaluate youth violence prevention strategies, principles, practices, and concepts.
METHODS

Data for this assessment were collected from multiple sources including the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS), Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS), and surveys with three UNITY stakeholder groups: UNITY cities, UNITY staff, and national partner organizations.

NCHS and YRBSS Data

Secondary data on youth violence and youth violence risk factors were obtained from the National Center for Health Statistics and Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System.

National Center for Health Statistics Data

NCHS is the principle U.S. agency responsible for providing statistical information on public health issues, and its mission is to provide information that can guide actions and policies to improve the health of the American people. Data on homicide (0-24 year olds), suicide (15-24 year olds), and firearm deaths (0-24 year olds) were assessed from 1999-2003 and 2005-2009 to better understand potential changes in trends before and after UNITY’s implementation. Both annual and 5-year average annual rates were calculated for each of the 21 UNITY cities and are available in Appendix A, Appendix B, and Appendix C, respectively.

Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System Data

YRBSS is an epidemiologic survey system established by CDC to monitor health-risk behaviors that contribute to the leading causes of death and disability among youth and young adults, including behaviors that contribute to unintentional injuries and violence. YRBSS data were accessed for available cities (N=9), and in cases where city level data were unavailable, county and state data that included a UNITY city were examined. Data indicators included violence, school violence, and suicide measures such as: the proportion of students that carried a weapon, did not go to school because they felt unsafe, were threatened or injured with a weapon, were in a physical fight, were bullied, felt sad or hopeless, seriously considered suicide, made a plan about suicide, attempted suicide, were forced to have sexual intercourse, and were intentionally hurt by a boyfriend or girlfriend (Appendix D, Appendix E, and Appendix F).

UNITY Cities, UNITY Staff, and National Partners Surveys

Three surveys were conducted with stakeholders in the UNITY initiative: UNITY city representatives, national partners, and internal UNITY staff. Data were collected in separate online questionnaires and follow-up was performed as needed through emails and/or phone conversations. For all three surveys, survey respondents were selected
from a census of UNITY cities, national partner organizations/associations, and UNITY staff, respectively.

**UNITY City Survey**

Twenty-eight respondents from 21 cities across the United States were invited to participate in the UNITY cities assessment. Respondents were sent an email invitation via Survey Monkey and personnel email accounts. Data were collected between January and April 2013 using an online questionnaire with several reminder communications sent. Approximately 81% of UNITY cities responded to the survey, and 71.4% of invited participants responded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Invited</th>
<th>Responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City J</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City K</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City L</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City M</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City O</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City P</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Q</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City U</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey instrument was developed in partnership with the UCLA Fielding School of Public Health, CDC, and Prevention Institute (Appendix H). It was reviewed and pilot tested with experts in the field of violence prevention before being administered. The questionnaire consisted of multiple measures of youth violence, citywide strategic planning, citywide violence prevention efforts, intra-city and inter-city collaborative efforts, public health approach to violence prevention, city resources, access to data, role of leaders, and use of UNITY resources.
UNITY Staff Survey

Prevention Institute staff were surveyed to understand the types of youth violence prevention resources and tools that have been developed and are available for UNITY cities and others. A list of products is available in Appendix G. Resources include but are not limited to white papers, press releases, webinars, trainings/speaking engagements, technical assistance, E-alerts, and UNITY convenings.

National Partners Survey

Representatives from national partner organizations and agencies were invited to participate in an online survey in April 2013. A little more than half (52.6%) of those surveyed responded to measures of their organization’s involvement with UNITY, interaction with UNITY cities, an evaluation of UNITY efforts and effectiveness, and changes to the national conversation on youth violence prevention.

Analytic Strategy

Qualitative and quantitative data were collected for this assessment. Responses to open-ended questions were content analyzed and coded into quantitative data for subsequent analysis. Data were imported into and analyzed with SPSS v19.0 (IBM Inc., 2010), except UCINET (Analytic Technologies, 2011)\(^2\) social network analysis software was used to analyze and visualize the level of collaboration between the UNITY cities. Weighting was used to account for selection probability due to multiple respondents from some cities. With each frequency distribution, measures of central tendency and dispersion were obtained as appropriate to the Steven’s classification of the variable.\(^3\) Denominators included only valid responses where “don’t know,” “refused,” and “other” were excluded from the analysis where appropriate.
RESULTS

NATIONAL CENTER FOR HEALTH STATISTICS
AND YOUTH RISK BEHAVIOR SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM DATA

Homicide Rates for 0-24 Year Olds in UNITY Cities

The overall 5-year average homicide frequency for all UNITY cities decreased from 62.5 to 58.4 between 1999-2003 and 2005-2009, however, the 5-year average homicide rate per 100,000 people increased slightly from 19.7 to 22.2 (Appendix A). In total, eight UNITY cities experienced a decrease in the average number of homicides, 11 saw an increase, and one stayed the same. Homicide data for 2010 through 2013 were not available at the time of the report, which is a gap in information during a critical period of UNITY activity. It should be noted that while Detroit saw a reduction in the number of homicides between 2005 and 2009, the population decreased driving the rate per 100,000 people up. Similarly, the average homicide frequency between 1999-2003 and 2005-2009 was almost unchanged in New Orleans; yet, a population contraction resulted in a higher 5-year average homicide rate per 100,000 people. Additionally, at least three cities with an increase in homicides between 2005 and 2009 were not actually members of the UNITY initiative until after 2010.

Firearm Death Rate for 0-24 Year Olds in UNITY Cities

Similar to patterns seen with homicide rates, the 5-year average fatal firearm frequency decreased from 57.8 to 56.1 between 1999-2003 and 2005-2009. However, the 5-year average firearm rate per 100,000 increased slightly from 18.9 to 21.6 per 100,000 people (Appendix B). In total, nine UNITY cities experienced a decrease in average homicides while 11 saw an increase in the average number of homicides. Again, it should be noted that Detroit and New Orleans experienced a population contraction, which contributed to an increased average rate of firearm deaths, and several cities in the calculation were not officially members of the UNITY initiative during the data collection period.

Suicide Rate for 15-24 Year Olds in UNITY Cities

For all UNITY cities, the 5-year average suicide frequency and the 5-year average annual suicide rate per 100,000 for 15-24 year olds decreased between 1999-2003 and 2005-2009. Specifically, the 5-year average suicide frequency decreased from 11.3 to 10.0 between 1999-2003 and 2005-2009. The 5-year average annual suicide rate per
100,000 decreased more dramatically during the same periods from 8.4 to 3.6 (Appendix C). \(^2\)

**Measures of Violence, School Violence, and Suicide**

YRBSS monitors health-risk behavior in youth and young adults including measures related to violence in general, school violence, and suicide. For violence measures, the majority of UNITY cities were below the national average in the number of youth electronically bullied during the last 12 months (100%), and those that reportedly carried a weapon on at least 1 day during the last 30 days (67%) (Appendix D). Similar results were seen with school violence. All UNITY cities (100%) were below the national average for youth reporting that they were bullied on school property, and over half (56%) of cities were below the national average for youth that reportedly carried a weapon on school property (Appendix E). All the UNITY cities were below the national average for youth that seriously considered attempting suicide during the previous 12 months (100%). Most cities were also below the national average for youth reporting that they felt sad or hopeless (78%) and made a plan about how they would attempt suicide during the previous 12 months (56%) (Appendix F). Specific city information is in the Appendix.

**Table 2. Proportion of UNITY Cities Below National Average for Select Violence Risk Factors, 2011* (N=9)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violence Variables</th>
<th>Proportion Below National Average (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ever been electronically bullied during the last 12 months</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carried a weapon on at least 1 day during the last 30 days</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carried a gun on at least 1 day during the last 30 days</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever physically forced to have sexual intercourse</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a physical fight one or more times during the last 12 months</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatened or injured with a weapon on school property one or more times during the past 12 months (%)</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High, slapped, or physically hurt on purpose by their boyfriend or girlfriend during the last 12 months</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullied on school property during the past 12 months</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carried a weapon on school property on at least 1 day during the past 30 days</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^2\) Decreasing suicide was not an explicit objective of the UNITY initiative, this finding is noteworthy however because, in a report of August 2013 by CDC, firearm-related suicides increased in a majority of the 50 most populated metropolitan statistical areas in the country [Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report (MMWR); Firearm Homicides and Suicides in Major Metropolitan Areas - United States, 2006-2007 and 2009-2010; August 2, 2013]
Did not go to school because they felt unsafe at school at least 1 day during the past 30 days | 11.1

Suicide

| Seriously considered attempting suicide during the 12 months | 100 |
| Felt sad or hopeless (almost every day for 2 or more weeks in a row so that they stopped doing some usual activities during the 12 months) | 77.8 |
| Made a plan about how they would attempt suicide during the 12 months | 55.6 |
| Attempted suicide one or more times during the 12 months | 11.1 |
| Suicide attempt resulted in an injury, poisoning, or overdose that had to be treated by a doctor or nurse during the 12 months | 0 |

*Data were from 2011 for all cities, except New Orleans (2005), Baltimore (2007), and Seattle (2009). **For a few questions, data were not available for all cities.

NATIONAL PARTNERS SURVEY

Results on the following pages were derived from a survey of UNITY’s national partners.

Involvement with UNITY Initiative

Survey participants were asked several questions regarding their involvement with UNITY. First, they were asked how long their organization had been involved with the UNITY initiative. Responses varied from three years to ‘since UNITY’s founding’ with an average of more than 6 years of involvement (N=6). Partners were then asked how many UNITY network meetings they have attended. Half of respondents (50%) had attended one meeting, and a third (33%) of the sample had attended two meetings (N=6). Only one person said they had not attended any of the meetings. Lastly, respondents were asked in what ways their organization was involved with the UNITY initiative. The majority (57%) provided some type of guidance as subject matter experts or consultants on specific types of issues, such as media framing or child-adolescent health (N=7). Additionally, about a quarter (28%) of partners primarily used UNITY as a source of information and resources for their organizations. One partner helped with meeting and network relations (14%).

Interaction with UNITY Cities

Two out of seven national partners (29%) said they interact directly with UNITY cities. These two partner organizations reported that they work with a total of 17 different cities; both partner organizations reportedly worked with Denver, Nashville, and San Diego. One of the respondents reported that they provide technical assistance and policy support, while the other provides program support. These organizations interact, on average, between once a week to at least once a month with the various cities.
Table 3. List of Cities Select National Partners Interact with Regularly (N=2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cities</th>
<th>Cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver (2)</td>
<td>Detroit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville (2)</td>
<td>Newark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>Oxnard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>St. Louis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Effectiveness of UNITY Initiative at Preventing Youth Violence

Respondents were asked, “On a scale of one-to-ten, where 1 means “not at all effective” and 10 means “very effective,” how would you rate the overall effectiveness of the UNITY initiative at preventing youth violence?” Answers ranged from 5 to 10 with an average score of 7.9 (SD=2.2) and median of 9 (N=7). Partners were also asked if they thought UNITY is a viable model for preventing youth violence. The majority (71%) said it is a viable model for preventing youth violence while 29% were unsure (N=7).

Most Successful Aspects of UNITY Initiative

Survey participants were asked, “What aspects of the UNITY initiative do you think have been most successful at preventing youth violence?” Two themes emerged: 1) UNITY has been successful at engaging multiple partners at different levels to obtain buy-in and create change (57%); and 2) UNITY has served as a leader with a commitment to educating policy makers about prevention, which has inspired cities (29%)(N=7). One respondent also mentioned UNITY’s openness to collaboration as one of its most successful aspects. As an example, one respondent said,

“UNITY has done a remarkable job of engaging local partners and stakeholders to try to effect change at the local level. The breadth of partners is impressive and a critical foundation.”

Least Successful Aspects of UNITY Initiative

Similarly, national partners were asked to comment on the least successful aspects of the UNITY initiative at preventing youth violence. One respondent said there were no unsuccessful aspects of the initiative, and another was unsure. Three national partners provided specific comments:
“Few people outside of UNITY know what it is, what it does, or what the objectives are. It can be hard to access.”

“Perhaps it is because we are more peripherally involved, but the focus seems diffuse. This is necessary because of the locally driven work, but makes it difficult to identify the overarching goals and how our constituents can contribute.”

Changing the National Conversation about Youth Violence

When asked if the national conversation about youth violence prevention has decreased, increased, or stayed the same since the UNITY initiative began, almost all national partners (86%) said it has increased, and one (14%) respondent was unsure (N=7).

National partners were also given the opportunity to provide comments at the end of the survey. Four respondents provided feedback:

“I think greater awareness of UNITY and what work it has done and is doing would have a significant impact.”

“I think this is a fabulous initiative! And has done great work to spread the news of its successes and promise.”
UNITY CITIES SURVEY

The following portion of this assessment concentrates on findings from the UNITY cities survey.

UNITY Cities Sample Characteristics

Cities that responded to the survey, on average, have been participants in the initiative for 3.2 years (SD=3.0) with a range of less than one year to seven years. Two-thirds (63%) publically identify as UNITY cities, but less than half (42%) have signed a memorandum of understanding (MOU) to become an official UNITY city.

When asked about the number of city agencies/departments in their city that actively participate in UNITY efforts, respondents mentioned between one and five agencies/departments with an average of 2.9 (SD=1.5). Respondents were also asked about the number of private organizations and individuals in their city that actively participate in UNITY efforts. Answers ranged from 0 to 50 private organizations and individuals with an average of 11.9 (SD=15.7).

Collaboration with other UNITY cities

Respondents were asked whether their city communicates with other UNITY cities; the majority (85.2%) of the sample said they did. In addition, respondents were asked to rate their level of collaboration with each of the other cities in the UNITY city network on a scale of one to five where one means “no collaboration” and five means “very strong collaboration.” Descriptions of these varying levels of collaboration were included in the survey to help respondents determine the most accurate level of collaboration between their city and the other UNITY cities (see table 4).

| Table 4. Response Options and Descriptions for Unity City Network Question |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Level of Collaboration       | Description                      |
| No Collaboration             |                                  |
| Little Collaboration         | Know UNITY point of contact in city, infrequent communication |
| Some Collaboration           | Know UNITY point of contact in city, share information, relatively infrequent communication |
| Strong Collaboration         | Know UNITY point of contact in city and others involved in youth violence prevention in city, share information & ideas, frequent communication |
| Very Strong Collaboration    | Know UNITY point of contact and others involved in youth violence prevention in city, share information & ideas, develop shared strategies, frequent and prioritized communication |
Network Analysis of UNITY City Collaboration

Social network analysis was performed to analyze and visualize the level of collaboration between the UNITY cities (figure 1). All respondents (N= 15) indicated that they collaborated with at least one other UNITY city, and on average, respondents reported collaborating with eight other UNITY cities. The overall average score across cities for quality of collaboration was 2.5, in between “little collaboration” and “some collaboration.”
Figure 1. UNITY City Network
Note: Lines represent reported collaboration between cities, with darker lines representing stronger reported collaboration.
Youth Violence Problem

Respondents were asked a series of questions about youth violence in their cities including the types of violence that occur, the seriousness of the problem, and UNITY’s role in changing the youth violence problem.

Major Types of Youth Violence

Survey participants were asked the open-ended question, “What are the major types of youth violence in your city?” In total, 17 cities provided feedback about 13 specific types of youth violence. Almost all of the cities (88%) reported firearm violence as a major type of youth violence followed by gang violence (77%), teen relationship/intimate partner violence (59%), bullying (53%), and homicide (53%). Less common types of violence mentioned were sex trafficking of minors (12%), suicide (12%), robberies/crime (17%), and child maltreatment (24%). Cities also mentioned other issues related to youth violence (6%) including racial tension, graffiti, drugs, and homelessness.

Seriousness of Youth Violence

Respondents were asked on a one-to-ten scale where 1 is “not at all serious” and 10 is “very serious,” how serious youth violence was in their city (N=17). Answers ranged from 3 to 10 with an average score of 8.7 (SD=1.7), median of 9, and mode of 10.
UNITY’s Role in Changing the Youth Violence Problem

To better understand the role of the UNITY initiative in changing youth violence, participants were asked, “In what ways has the UNITY initiative helped/not helped change the rate of youth violence in your city?” As a whole, respondents mentioned resources and tools that UNITY provided, which in turn helped them address their respective youth violence issues. Over half of cities (59%) said UNITY has been helpful at providing technical assistance/advice and at providing connections/networking opportunities with other UNITY cities (53%). About a third of respondents thought the tools/resources (35%), meetings (29%), and best practices/strategies (30%) available through UNITY were helpful at changing the rate of youth violence. To a lesser extent, advocacy (24%), coalition building (18%), information on funding (18%), resources on evaluation (12%), and intangibles such as inspiration, encouragement, and confidence (12%) have provided positive impacts on cities’ ability to address youth violence.

Figure 3. UNITY Project’s Role in Changing Youth Violence (N=17).
Citywide Planning

Respondents were asked questions about citywide plans to prevent youth violence including their presence/absence, development, evaluation and monitoring, implementation, UNITY resources used, and funding as well as barriers to development.

Citywide Plans

Slightly more than half (54.4%) of the cities surveyed have a written citywide strategic plan to prevent youth violence. Of the cities that have written strategic plans to prevent youth violence, a little over half (57%) had plans before becoming a UNITY city while close to a third (32%) wrote their plans after joining the UNITY initiative. A few cities (11%) were unsure when their citywide plan was written.

Since becoming UNITY cities, 67% have made significant changes to their citywide strategic plan while a third have not made any changes (N=9). The most common modifications were refocusing and updating plans (33%). In particular, respondents mentioned adding specific goals and objectives, incorporating prevention strategies/best practices, and responding to fluctuations in policy as well as resources. Two cities also said they joined the National Forum (22%). To a lesser extent, individual cities mentioned using the UNITY Roadmap, incorporating a wider variety of youth violence organizations, and building better coalitions/allies.
Collaborative Development of Citywide Plans

Respondents with a citywide plan were asked if their plan to address youth violence was developed collaboratively with multiple agencies or community partners. All participants (N=9) said their plans were developed collaboratively with numerous partners. Every city (100%) reported working with community services (e.g. parks and rec., libraries), education (e.g. schools, colleges), governance (e.g. mayor’s office, city council/board), justice (i.e. courts, probation, DA’s office), and youth servicing organizations. The majority (90%) of cities also mentioned partnering with emergency services (e.g. police, fire), faith-based groups, and health entities (e.g. public health departments, hospitals). Cities were less inclined to collaborate with public works (22%), survivors (22%), transportation services (0%), or sports leagues (0%). Other partners mentioned were former gang members and national experts.

Figure 5. Collaborative Development of Citywide Strategic Plans to Prevent Youth Violence (N=9).
Evaluation of Citywide Plans

When asked whether implementation of the citywide plan was being evaluated or monitored, most respondents (78.4%) said their citywide plans were being evaluated or monitored. Respondents were then asked to specify what measures were being used. About two-thirds (67%) mentioned how their plans were being evaluated or monitored, and over 40% said who was performing the evaluation. Of those that mentioned how monitoring was occurring, nonspecific performance or outcome measures were the most common response (33%), followed by review of data and statistics on homicide and gang activity (11%), “public accountability elements” (11%), and specific measures (which were not directly identified (11%). Crime prevention, education/school-based, homicide, migration, and youth engagement measures were all specific measures reported by survey respondents. Over 40% also stated certain entities were responsible for evaluation including an executive committee, commission, unspecified formal reviews, and unspecified informal reviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who Evaluates or Monitors</th>
<th>Proportion (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified, formal review</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified, informal review</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How Evaluated or Monitored</th>
<th>Proportion (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data and statistics</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public accountability</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specified measures</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime prevention</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational/school-based</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homicide rates</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant monitoring</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth engagement</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified performance measures</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation of Citywide Plans

Of UNITY cities with strategic plans (N=9), 76% have been partially implemented while a quarter (24%) have been fully implemented. Implementation dates range from 2001 to 2012 with an average implementation date between 2008 and 2009.
Funding of Citywide Plans

Respondents were asked, “What sources of funding were used/are being used to implement the citywide plan” and to select as many types of funding as were applicable (N=9). Local government funds (78%) were the most common type of funding followed by federal government funds (67%), re-allocation of existing funds (44%), other sources (44%), and state government funds (33%). UNITY cities were least likely to report bond measures (11%) and private foundation funds as sources of money for implementing their citywide plans. Other sources of funding mentioned were parcel taxes, ‘complex but unknown system of funding,’’ and work done by volunteers because of a lack of funding.

![Figure 6. Funding Sources for Citywide Strategic Plans to Prevent Youth Violence (N=9).](image-url)
Respondents were also asked approximately how much funding was allocated to the implementation of the citywide plan to prevent youth violence last fiscal year. Only five cities provided approximations that ranged from $0 to $8 million with a median of $375,000 of funding allocated last year.

To better understand the funding situation respondents were asked about any changes in funding. Specifically, UNITY cities were asked, “On average, has the amount of funding for youth violence prevention increased, decreased, or stayed about the same in your city in the last five years?” Most respondents (41%) stated funding stayed the same in last five years, but about 30% mentioned that it had actually decreased. A portion of cities (22%) experienced an increase in funding over the past five years.

![Figure 7. Changes in Funding Sources for Citywide Strategic Plans to Prevent Youth Violence (N=9).](image-url)
UNITY Resources Used to Develop or Improve Citywide Plan

Survey participants were asked, “What types of UNITY tools/resources, if any, has your city used to help develop or improve its citywide plan?” Respondents could select as many tools/resources as were applicable. Every city used at least one UNITY resource or tool. Specifically, all respondents (100%) stated that the access to expertise provided by the UNITY initiative was utilized to develop or improve their strategic plans. The majority of respondents also used in-person meetings (89%), technical assistance (89%), webinars (67%), fact sheets/publications (67%), the UNITY Roadmap (56%), and contact with other UNITY cities (56%) for their citywide plans to prevent youth violence. Only about a quarter of respondents reported using workshops (22%) and specific publications (22%).

Figure 8. UNITY Resources Used to Develop Citywide Strategic Plans to Prevent Youth Violence (N=9).
Discussion of and Barriers to Developing Citywide Plans

Of the eight cities that do not have a citywide plan, all reported being interested in having a plan, or that their cities have discussed developing one. Two cities mentioned they were in the process of developing a plan or had pieces of a plan. Respondents were then asked what some of the challenges or barriers were to developing a youth violence prevention plan (N=7). Three major themes emerged from the comments: 1) city dynamics and diversity, 2) partnership and relationship issues, and 3) buy-in and bureaucracy. Specifically, some cities mentioned it was difficult to bring to scale individual efforts to the citywide level, especially with sprawl and diverse neighborhoods. Additionally, several cities stated there were issues with partners that either did not want to work together, or if they did, developing and maintaining relationships were tenuous due to organizational and personnel changes. Lastly, getting buy-in for primary prevention and dealing with bureaucracy were noted as barriers. Examples include:

“The silo effect of agencies being unwilling to discuss gaps in services...”

“It is hard to have one plan with so many partners...”

“Getting buy-in for a public health approach that focuses on primary prevention instead of relying on enforcement and containment strategies only...”

UNITY Assistance Needed to Develop Citywide Plans

Cities without plans were asked what types of assistance would be most helpful in developing a citywide plan on youth violence prevention (N=7). The majority (86%) said technical assistance would be most helpful followed by online tools/fact sheets (21%) and information on evaluation (21%). Cities also noted help with coalition building, networking with other cities, taking current work up to full scale, and increasing the frequency of regional convening and collaboration (14.3%).

Figure 9. Assistance Needed to Develop Citywide Plans (N=7).
Citywide Violence Prevention Efforts

Multiple questions were asked about specific and non-specific approaches to preventing youth violence.

Most Successful Youth Violence Prevention Approaches

Respondents were asked, “What approaches have been or seem most successful at preventing youth violence in your city?” There was no consensus on a specific type of approach that worked best, but about 40% of respondents noted school-based programs, such as increasing safety personnel, changing school climates, and alternatives to suspension. About a quarter (24%) of the sample said efforts focused at the community/neighborhood level and workforce development were also successful at preventing youth violence. To a lesser extent, having multiple types of approaches, mentoring, afterschool activities, projects with multiple partners, and key leadership (i.e. mayors, police chiefs, and peers) were reported to be successful approaches in UNITY cities (18%).

![Figure 10. Most Successful Approaches to Preventing Youth Violence (N=17).](image-url)
Measuring Successful Approaches to Youth Violence Prevention

Respondents were asked how successful approaches were measured (N=17). Approximately a third (35%) of cities said success was being measured, but they gave non-specific answers about how it was measured. Crime statistics (29%), especially homicide rates, were mentioned as indicators as well as school achievement scores (6%), anecdotal feedback (6%), juvenile court referrals (6%), and school disciplinary action rates (6%). No measurements were being collected for 18% of cities surveyed.

Least Successful Youth Violence Prevention Approaches

Participants were asked, “What approaches have been or seem least successful at preventing youth violence in your city?” The most common response (24%) was that cities were unsure of which approaches were least successful (N=17). Of specific approaches that were mentioned, police/public safety only efforts were not successful (18%) nor were current street outreach efforts (12%). All other mentions came from individual cities including school suspensions, tip/advice lines, media framing, using non-evidence based-programs, having too many professionals and not enough community leaders, partners not working together, cuts in programming, and interventions misrepresented as prevention efforts.

Gaps in Youth Violence Prevention Services

Cities reported several gaps in youth violence prevention services (N=17). Family education/support (35%) was the most common gap reported followed by trauma-sensitive therapy and protocols (24%), adequate mental health services (18%), and focus on prevention instead of intervention or suppression (18%). Two of 17 cities also noted a need for afterschool activities, better school partnerships, increasing community engagement, and services to reduce unsafe environments that lead to violence exposure. Furthermore, individual cities mentioned the need for transportation to youth activities and programs, strong leadership, street savvy workers, and workforce development.

Some respondents noted the type of programs that were lacking in their cities. In particular, there is a need for programs that are:

- Culturally competent
- Empowering
- Evidence-based
- Holistic
- Innovative
Obstacles to Developing or Implementing Effective Violence Prevention Programs

Cities were asked about obstacles to developing or implementing effective youth violence prevention programs (N=17). Six of the 17 cities noted lack of funding and lack of collaborative cohesion between partners as major obstacles to developing or implementing effective violence programs. Respondents also mentioned a lack of non-monetary resources (18%), such as staff, training and capacity; political will (18%); competing demands (18%); and poor educational systems (12%). In addition, cities cited a lack of vision to expand programs, changes in leadership, inability to troubleshoot gaps, and a focus on suppression and intervention instead of prevention as obstacles to effective youth violence prevention programs.

Figure 11. Obstacles to Developing Effective Youth Violence Prevention Programs (N=17).
Effectiveness of Youth Violence Prevention Efforts

Respondents were asked to rate, on a one-to-ten scale, the overall effectiveness of their city’s efforts to prevent youth violence, with ten being most effective (N=15). Answers ranged from 3 to 8 with an average score of 5.8 (SD=2.0), median of 6, and mode of 8. When asked whether the overall effectiveness of the city’s efforts to prevent youth violence have changed since joining the UNITY initiative, 75% of cities said the effectiveness of their efforts have increased. A small portion thought the overall effectiveness of their youth violence prevention efforts stayed the same or were unsure if they changed. Effectiveness of violence prevention efforts did not decrease for any of the participants since joining UNITY.

![Figure 12. Change in Overall Effectiveness of Youth Violence Prevention Programs (N=15).]

UNITY’s Role in Changing the Overall Effectiveness of City Strategies

Cities were asked, “How has the UNITY initiative helped change/not change the overall effectiveness of youth violence strategies in your city?” Of the responses provided (N=17), most noted how the UNITY initiative has increased the overall effectiveness of their cities’ youth violence prevention strategies. In particular, about a quarter (24%) of respondents said the resources, such as technical assistance, materials and webinars, helped improve their overall effectiveness. Also, respondents mentioned that UNITY encouraged collaboration at multiple levels (18%), helped them learn what other cities were doing (18%), educated policy makers, (12%) and helped with planning (12%).
Other assistance was mentioned, such as building capacity, providing evaluation assistance, and helping define prevention. Examples are listed below:

“UNITY has helped us organize and plan, brought together interested volunteers to support a public health approach to youth violence, and gain the support of leadership...”

“It has been a catalyst for bringing multiple agencies to the table to begin work on a comprehensive plan.”

“The UNITY initiative has been integral in our efforts to enhance our youth violence strategies.”

![Figure 13. UNITY’s role in Changing the Overall Effectiveness of Youth Violence Prevention Strategies (N=17).](image)

Cities also mentioned where UNITY could help increase the overall effectiveness of their youth violence prevention efforts. Three requests were made:
“Not always clear when my requests are appropriate so I hold back...could use more clarity to better utilize what is available.”

“Conversations about how to complement existing intervention-suppression efforts while building capacity to do trauma-aware/informed system alignment would be helpful.”

“As a participant, I am able to share information I gain from UNITY with other local planners. I would like to have more materials that are prepared to be passed on and guidance on how to best gain from them.”

Consistency of Youth Violence Prevention Efforts with Citywide Plans

Respondents were asked to rate, on a one-to-ten scale with ten being most consistent, how consistent overall their city’s youth violence prevention efforts are with the citywide strategic plan (N=15). Answers ranged from 1 to 10 with an average score of 5.3 (SD=3.2), median of 4, and mode of 4. They were then asked to think about why there is or is not consistency between planned youth violence efforts and actual programs/activities. Three cities noted consistency was achieved through:

- Activities supported and endorsed by leadership
- Constant thinking, evaluation, and resources around goals of plan
- Funding has allowed for evaluation and accountability to the public

The majority of cities, however, listed reasons why there was a lack of consistency between planned efforts and actual programs/activities. The top three reasons were a lack of funding (20%), coordinated work (20%), and planning (20%). Other reasons included a change in political leadership, redirected priorities, lack of resources, vague plans, little buy-in from partners, disjointed approaches, and trouble bringing small projects to scale.

Top Reasons for Inconsistency:

- Lack of funding
- Lack of coordinated work
- Lack of planning

Specific Programs and Strategies to Prevent Youth Violence

A series of questions was asked about specific types of programs and strategies cities used to prevent youth violence. First, cities were asked if these specific types of
programs existed. All respondents said they had quality afterschool programs (100%), and most had programs for youth leadership (95%), positive early childcare and education (90%), positive social and emotional development (90%), and mental health services when violence occurs (89%). Even programs and strategies that were not as likely to be used were in place in more than half of all cities. Less frequently used approaches to prevent youth violence include street outreach/interruption (56%), social reentry support (68%), and universal school-based strategies (70%).

Second, respondents were asked to provide the target populations of the programs and strategies they utilize to prevent youth violence. Results are presented on the following two pages with programs ranked by the percentage that is universally available. Figure 15 shows school-based strategies (89%) have the highest universal availability followed...
by youth leadership programs (81%), built environment interventions (77%), economic development (76%), and quality afterschool programs (72%).

Street outreach/violence interruption (12%), social reentry support (13%), mental health services before violence occurs (23%), mentoring (29%), and conflict resolution (38%) were more likely to be offered to specific groups. For example, 65% of street outreach/violence interruption programs are targeted to gang members whereas high-
risk, non-gang youth are more likely to be targeted for mental health services before violence occurs (77%) and social reentry support (52%) programs.

![Figure 16. Target Population of Specific Programs and Strategies to Prevent Youth Violence (N=15).](chart_image)

Lastly, respondents were asked to report on the extent to which programs and strategies were offered across the entire city or only in specific, targeted geographic areas/locations. Some programs were offered only in highly specific geographic areas of cities, such as street outreach/violence interruption (91%), social re-entry support
(91%), mental health services when violence occurs (90%), and mental health services after violence occurs (78%). On the other hand, several types of programs/strategies were more likely to be available throughout the city. For example, positive early childcare and education (93%), positive social and emotional development (84%), youth leadership (74%), family support or counseling (73%), and economic development (71%) had higher rates of citywide availability.

**Figure 17. Target Areas of Specific Programs and Strategies to Prevent Youth Violence (N=15).**
City Collaboration with Individuals and Organizations in the Community

As can be seen from Figure 18, adult community members, as a whole, have played a larger role in determining priorities (93%), determining activities (82%), implementing activities (82%), and evaluating activities than youth community members (59%). The largest gaps between adult and youth community member involvement in violence prevention efforts is in determining priorities (35%) while the smallest gap is with determining activities (10%).

Figure 18. Adult and Youth Community Member Involvement in Youth Violence Prevention Efforts (N=15).
Types of Community Members Involved in Youth Violence Prevention Efforts

When asked about the types of community groups or individuals that have participated in youth violence prevention efforts, respondents mentioned faith-based groups most frequently (88%)(N=15). Approximately two-thirds of respondents also mentioned education (77%), youth groups (75%), and community service groups (74%). Less than half of survey participants said family members of victims/survivors (44%) or sports leagues (35%) were involved in youth violence prevention efforts in their city.

Figure 19. Types of Community Members Involved in Youth Violence Prevention Efforts (N=15).

Community Engagement

Respondents were asked, “As a whole, has community engagement decreased, increased, or stayed the same since becoming a UNITY city?” The majority of cities (60%) said community engagement has increased since becoming a UNITY city. A
small portion stated that community engagement either stayed the same (10%) or decreased (17%) (N=15).

Change in Community Engagement since Joining UNITY

As a follow up, respondents were asked why they thought community engagement in youth violence prevention efforts has/has not changed. A wide variety of answers were provided including having excitement about the new initiative and planning, better messaging, a collective sense of urgency, developing momentum, more groups asking to participate with a wide range of interests, having longevity with the UNITY initiative, and direct support or resources from UNITY. Two cities mentioned their involvement was too recent to have affected their community engagement. One city cited a decline in initial excitement and a decrease in violence for declining community engagement.

UNITY’s Role in Changing Community Engagement

UNITY’s role in changing community engagement was measured with, “In what ways has the UNITY Project helped/not helped change community engagement in youth violence prevention efforts in your city?” One city said it needed more staff and support to sustain effort, but the most common answers were UNITY helped increase community engagement by providing:

- Access to information and ideas (27%)
- Opportunities to share information and network between cities (20%)
- Information to share with stakeholders/community partners (13%)
- Better strategies and approaches (13%)
- Information on providing better assistance to community partners (13%)
- Assistance in developing a plan to increase community engagement (13%)

Quotes:

“[UNITY] has helped us focus our investment of time and effort to provide better outcomes.”

“I have learned better strategies of engagement; been able to share webinars with stakeholders; partners like being in alignment with a national movement.”

“The UNITY Project has been tremendous in helping us to promote community engagement in youth violence prevention efforts … via informational resources and networking opportunities”
Youth Advisory Council, Board, or Commission

Most cities surveyed (78%) had a youth advisory council, board, or commission (N=15). Of those with a youth advisory council, board, or commission, almost half (49%) said they included high-risk youth (N=12). Respondents were then asked who were the sponsoring agencies or organizations of their youth advisory council, board, or commission (N=12). Over two-thirds (68%) of cities said governance (e.g. mayor’s office, city council/board) was the sponsoring agency or organization, followed by health (e.g. public health departments, hospitals) (62%), education (e.g. schools, colleges) (53%), and job training/workforce development (53%). Transportation services (4%); community development (15%), and sports leagues (17%) were less inclined to sponsor youth advisory councils, boards, or commissions.

Figure 20. Sponsoring Agencies and Organizations of Youth Advisory Council, Board, or Commission (N=12).
Evaluation of Youth Advisory Council, Board, or Commission Activities

When asked whether activities of the youth advisory council, board, or commission were being monitored or evaluated, 40% of respondents were unsure if this was happening. Less than half (38%) reported that activities were being monitored or evaluated and 21% said activities were not being evaluated (N=12).

Cities were asked what type of evaluation is being used to assess the advisory council, board, or commission. The majority (57%) said outcome evaluation only followed by process evaluation only (21%), and both process and outcome evaluation (21%).
Collaboration between City and Youth Advisory Council, Boards, or Commission

In separate questions, respondents were asked whether collaboration and communication have increased, decreased, or stayed the same between their city and youth advisory council, board, or commission since joining UNITY (N=12). No city reported decreased collaboration or communication since becoming a UNITY city. With regard to collaboration, almost half (49%) of respondents said it stayed the same and about 20% said it increased since joining UNITY. A similar pattern was seen with communication where about one-third (36%) of cities reported it stayed the same and about 30% said it increased. About a third of survey participants were unsure whether collaboration or communication changed since becoming a UNITY city.

Figure 23. Collaboration and Communication between the City and Youth Advisory Council, Board, or Commission (N=12).
Coalitions

Almost all cities (93%) have coalitions or networks that address youth violence (N=15). Coalitions or networks that work with UNITY cities are sponsored primarily by outside organizations/entities (46%), but some are also sponsored by the city itself (23%) or an equal mix of public and private organizations/entities (31%). Respondents were then asked which types of agencies or organizations sponsored their youth violence coalition (N=14). Over 90% of cities said health (e.g. public health departments, hospitals) agencies or organizations sponsored coalitions or networks that address youth violence followed by governance (90%), education (75%), justice (70%), and faith-based groups (68%). Transportation services (7%), sports leagues (7%), and other (7%) were less inclined to sponsor coalitions or networks on youth violence.

Figure 24. Types of Sponsoring Agencies for Coalitions and Networks for Youth Violence Prevention (N=14).
Collaboration and Communication between City and Coalition/Network Members

Since joining UNITY, over half (57%) of cities have seen an increase in the number of coalition members/agencies (N=14). In a quarter of the cities, the number has stayed the same; 18% of respondents were unsure if there was a change in the number of coalition members/agencies concerned with youth violence.

Respondents were also asked whether collaboration and communication have increased, decreased, or stayed the same between their city and coalitions/networks since joining UNITY (N=14). No city reported a decline in collaboration or communication since becoming a UNITY city. Both collaboration and communication has increased in about two-third of cities since joining UNITY while it stayed the same in 21% of cities. A small portion of survey participants (14%) were unsure whether collaboration or communicated changed since becoming a UNITY city.

Figure 25. Collaboration and Communication between Cities and Coalitions/Networks (N=14).
Evidence-based Programs

Respondents were asked, “Is your city using any evidence-based programs, such as Cure Violence or the David Kennedy Model?” Eighty percent (80%) of cities said they were using an evidence-based program. Then, cities were asked to specify which programs they were utilizing. Two-thirds of cities (67%) are using Cure Violence/Cease Fire. In addition, 42% have employed the David Kennedy Model and 17% Big Brothers Big Sisters. Other evidence-based programs being applied include Aggression Replacement Training, BUILD, Good Behavior Game, STANCE (Standing Together Against Neighborhood Crime Everyday), Restorative Justice, Open Circle, and various individual efforts.

Figure 26. Top Evidence-based Programs UNITY Cities Use to Prevent Youth Violence (N=12).
Primary Focus of Evidence-based Youth Violence Prevention Programs

Respondents were then asked if the evidence-based programs they use are primarily focused on prevention (i.e. before something happens), intervention (i.e. once the kids are already in trouble), suppression (i.e. law enforcement), re-entry, or something else. Almost half (44%) said the primary focus of evidence-based programs was intervention and a third (38%) mentioned prevention. To a lesser extent, suppression (8%), something else (6%), and re-entry (3%) were the primarily focus of evidence-based programs in UNITY cities (N=12).

Figure 27. Focus of Evidence-based Programs Used in UNITY Cities to Prevent Youth Violence (N=12).
Public Health Approach to Youth Violence Prevention

Figure 28 shows cities use multiple types of approaches to deal with youth violence, particularly intervention (83%), suppression (60%), and primary prevention (58%).

**Figure 28. General Approaches toward Youth Violence Prevention in UNITY Cities (N=15).**

However, intervention (53%) is the most often used approach, followed by an equal mix of approaches (22%), and suppression (20%) (Figure 29). Only 5% of cities said primary prevention was the most often used method of dealing with youth violence (N=15).

**Figure 29. Most Often Used Approaches toward Youth Violence Prevention in UNITY Cities (N=15).**
Citywide Resources to Prevent Youth Violence

Funding

Cities were asked to think about the funding they have for youth violence prevention. Almost 90% said it was not adequate for their needs or that it was not stable (N=15). The majority of respondents also thought that funding is not flexible for their priorities (63%) nor is it sustainable for the future (63%).

Limitations of Youth Violence Prevention Funding

UNITY cities felt limited or constrained by funding for youth violence prevention efforts in several ways. In particular, dependence on grant funding (27%) that is unstable or limiting, not enough funding to support programs or implement them fully (20%), and inflexible funding (20%) and constrained by directives were the top reasons cities feel limited by funding (N=15). Other reasons include funding is not coordinated between entities well in some cities, competition with law enforcement, and money is focused on suppression not prevention.
UNITY’s Role in Obtaining Stable Funding for Youth Violence Prevention

About a third of cities said UNITY has helped them obtain stable funding for youth violence prevention, but almost 30% have not received help from UNITY with funding. About a third of survey participants did not know if UNITY had provided their city any assistance with funding (N=15).

![Figure 31. UNITY’s Role in Youth Violence Prevention Funding (N=15).](image)

When asked in what ways has the UNITY Project helped/not helped your city with obtaining stable funding for youth violence prevention efforts, cities provided a variety of reasons (N=15). The most common reason was that UNITY has not provided any direct funding assistance (27%). Two cities said the initiative has helped identify sources of funding. Other specific reasons include:

“Help us to maintain strong connections to networks, expand/strengthen relationships to funders, build on best practices -- all of which has helped us to be very successful in raising $$.”

“Using UNITY tools helped us secure a STRYVE grant”

“By helping us develop a strategic plan for youth violence prevention, UNITY has given us a framework we can leverage for funding opportunities.”
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Staff and Training

City representatives were asked a series of questions about the adequacy of their staff and training. Respondents were asked, on a one-to-ten scale where 1 means “not at all adequate” to 10 “completely adequate,” how adequate is the number of staff in their city dedicated to youth violence prevention programs/efforts (N=15). Answers ranged from 1 to 8 with an average score of 3.8 (SD=2.2), median of 3, and mode of 3. Survey participants were then asked, on a one-to-ten scale where 1 means “not at all stable” to 10 “completely stable,” how stable is the staffing in their city dedicated to youth violence prevention programs/efforts (N=15). Answers ranged from 1 to 8 with an average score of 4.3 (SD=2.4), median of 4, and mode of 3. Thus, on average, cities rated the adequacy and stability of staffing as less than favorable.

Next, questions were asked about training in youth violence programs/efforts. On a one-to-ten scale where 1 means “not at all adequate” to 10 “completely adequate,” respondents rated how adequate their training is for programs/efforts dedicated to youth violence prevention (N=15). Answers ranged from 1 to 7 with an average score of 4.2 (SD=2.2), median of 3.9, and mode of 6. The frequency with which training occurs was measured with, “About how frequently does staff receive training on youth violence prevention strategies?” Responses ranged from at least every few months to never with the average frequency between every few months and at least once a year.

![Figure 32. Frequency Staff Receives Training on Youth Violence Prevention Strategies (N=15).](image-url)
Intra-City Coordination and Collaboration

Survey participants were asked several questions about intra-city coordination and collaboration.

Intra-City Communication

Survey participants were asked, “On a scale of one-to-ten, where 1 means “no communication” and 10 means “very good communication,” how well do your city’s agencies and departments communicate about their youth violence prevention strategies and efforts with each other?” Scores ranged from 1 to 8 with an average of score was 4.8 (SD=2.2), median of 5, and mode of 5.

When asked about how agencies and departments communicate, the most frequent responses were email (70%), followed by face-to-face (68%), telephone (50%), websites (46%), and written communication (43%) (n=15). About 6% of cities noted no communication between agencies and departments.

Figure 33. Intra-City Community about Youth Violence Prevention Strategies and Efforts (N=15).
The frequency with which intra-city communication occurs between agencies and departments ranging from at least once a week to never (N=15) (Figure 34). The most frequent response was at least once a week (28%) followed by at least once a month (26%), at least every few months (21%), at least once a year (19%), and never (7%).

Figure 34. Frequency of Intra-City Community about Youth Violence Prevention Strategies and Efforts (N=15).
Intra-City Collaboration - Mayor’s Office

Respondents were asked about changes in collaboration between their department and the mayor’s office (N=15). For most UNITY cities, collaboration has either increased (45%) or stayed the same (41%). A small portion saw a decrease (7%) in collaboration between their department and the mayor’s office; few have no existing collaborative efforts.

Cities were asked why they thought collaboration has changed or not changed with the mayor’s office since being a UNITY city. A third (33%) of respondents reported that they already had working relationships with the mayor’s office for collaborative efforts. Cities also noted increasing awareness of the public health approach to violence prevention, having focused discussions, and increasing the conversation on plan development and maintenance has influenced collaborative efforts. One city said a change in leadership has actually decreased collaboration since the new mayor was unaware they were a UNITY city.
Intra-City Collaboration – Police Department

When asked about intra-city collaboration with the police department, all cities had some type of collaborative efforts. Over half of cities saw an increase (56%), or reported efforts had stayed the same (40%). A small portion saw a decrease (3%) in collaboration between their department and the police department.

![Figure 36. Change in Intra-City Collaboration with the Police Department (N=15).](image)

Cities were asked why collaboration has changed with the police department since being a UNITY city (N=15). The most common response was active participation in coalitions and on committees focused on youth violence prevention (27%) has helped increase collaboration. All other responses were individual to each city’s experience, such as increasing meetings and discussion and having police department members participate in UNITY trainings for education and to foster teamwork. One city noted staff changes at the police department led to restructuring and decreased involvement on their end.
Intra-City Collaboration – Health Department

Respondents were asked about changes in collaboration between their department and the health department (N=10). About 75% of cities experienced an increase in collaboration with the health department. The amount of collaboration stayed the same for some cities (13%) or has never existed (13%).

Figure 37. Change in Intra-City Collaboration with the Health Department (N=10).

Few responses were provided about why collaboration has changed with the health department (N=6). The most common (20%) was increased partnerships between departments/agencies. One city noted that collaboration has not increased because of the health department’s mindset toward violence prevention. Example responses include:

“UNITY has helped connect me to partners in the health department.”

“UNITY (again through Prevention Institute) has been a vital player with our County’s violence prevention work and thus helped to connect the dots for us. Very helpful role.”

“The health department is slowly moving ""upstream"" and understanding that violence prevention is another form of intentional injury prevention that deserves strategies to prevent rather than treat the illness (violence).”
Intra-City Collaboration – Public School District

Lastly, change in intra-city collaboration with public school district(s) was measured. Over half of survey participants experienced an increase (58%) in collaboration while a portion saw no change (42%) since joining UNITY. None of the cities reported a decrease in collaboration or that no collaboration with public school district(s) existed (N=13).

Figure 38. Change in Intra-City Collaboration with the Public School District(s) (N=13).

A small number of responses were provided regarding why collaboration has changed with public school district(s) (N=10). Two cities mentioned an increase in collaboration with the participation of school/school district staff and students in forums, committee, and/or working groups focused on youth violence prevention. Increasing discussion on shared data and strategic plans that require these relationships were also cited as reasons. One city noted that it has to re-build relationships because of a change in superintendent and a new cabinet.
Intra-City Collaboration – Other Departments and Agencies

Respondents were asked about collaborative efforts with other agencies and departments besides the mayor’s office, police department, health department and public school(s) (N=15). All of the cities have collaboration with at least one other department or agency. Over half of cities have collaborations with health (e.g. hospitals) (63%), education (e.g. university/colleges) (63%), community service (62%), justice (59%), governance (54%), and social services departments or agencies (53%).

Figure 39. Change in Intra-City Collaboration with the Public School District(s) (N=15).
Challenges and Barriers to Intra-City Collaboration

UNITY cities discussed a wide range of challenges and barriers to intra-city collaboration. The most common responses were a lack of, or competition for funding (27%), competing demands for time (20%), lack of appropriate staffing/resources (20%), and territorialism between entities (13%). Other examples of challenges and barriers were finding people willing to collaborate, inconsistent directives, having people see the benefits of collaboration when no funding is available, funding that does not support prevention initiatives, changes in leadership, and overcoming a history of dysfunctional relationships.

Primary Challenges and Barriers:

- Lack of or competition for funding (27%)
- Competing demands for time (20%)
- Lack of appropriate staffing/resources (20%)
- Territorialism (13%)

Quotes:

“Competing demands for time; competing plans/inconsistent directives about priorities.”

“Due to fiscal shortages, often times there are silos to overcome.”

“Changes in leadership, budget reductions, historical turf issues.”

Factors that Promote Intra-City Collaboration

Respondents mentioned numerous factors that support collaboration between city agencies and departments. Having shared goals, agenda and/or vision was mentioned most frequently (27%) followed by finding common ground (27%) and support of leadership (27%). Cities also cited mutual understanding, willingness to be inclusive, respecting values of partners, appropriate resources and staff, a culture of collaboration, and flexible funding. Interestingly, one city said that an increase in violence and a lack of funding prompted collaboration between city departments and agencies.

Key Factors that Promote Collaboration

- Share goals, agenda, and/or vision (27%)
- Finding common ground (27%)
- Support of leadership (27%)
Access to Data about or Relevant to Youth Violence

Several questions were asked about access to data on youth violence. The first question asked whether cities have no access, partial access, complete access, or if they were unsure about their access (N=15). Most cities had only partial access to data on or relevant to youth violence. Specifically, survey participants were most likely to report having only partial access to school (80%), juvenile justice (74%), adult law enforcement and justice (61%), child protective services (60%), and health (50%) data. Of those with complete access, health data (43%) was the most common response followed by adult law enforcement and justice data (32%), Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance Survey (YRBSS) data (26%), and Child Fatality Review data (26%). For all data types, at least some respondents were unsure if their city had access.

Figure 40. Access to Data on or Relevant to Youth Violence (N=15).
Next, UNITY cities were asked if they had access to raw data, summary reports, or both types of information (N=15). Half the cities reported access to both raw data and summary reports on health information while only 4% had access to both for raw data and summary report data from the Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance Survey (YRBSS). As a whole, cities were more likely to cite having access to summary reports compared to raw data. Over a third of survey participants were unsure if they have access to YRBSS data or Child Fatality Review data.

![Bar chart showing access to raw and summary data on or relevant to youth violence](chart.png)

**Figure 41.** Access to Raw and Summary Data on or Relevant to Youth Violence (N=15).
For all information types, no cities reported decreased access (N=15). The greatest gain in access was reported in health data about or relevant to youth violence (33%) followed by adult law enforcement and justice data (30%) and school data (22%). Data access for the majority of cities stayed the same for child protective services data (67%), juvenile justice data (64%), and Child Fatality Review data (55%). Between 17% and 38% of the sample were unsure about their access to each type of data on or relevant to youth violence.

Figure 42. Change in Access to Data on or Relevant to Youth Violence (N=15).
Access to a Mapping System and Geographic Data

Most of cities (93%) have access to geographic information systems to map data. A third of respondents had some change in their mapping system access. Examples include:

**Increases in Access**

“We have started to develop a youth violence risk index to determine what neighborhoods are highest priority for programs and services.”

“[I] am able to receive shapefiles from our partners to more completely prepare our assessment and build topic specific data profiles. We also utilize the resources of our central GIS team who is able to provide prepared queries of census and ACS data for our geographic and age specific targets.”

**Decreases in Access**

“The City has made a broad push toward publicly available and mapable data. Many data (including police calls for service) are not publicly available online.”

“Reduction in staff has limited access.”
Role of High Level Leaders

In separate questions, respondents were asked if high level leaders have declared violence is *preventable* and/or declared violence is *unacceptable* (N=15). In two-thirds of cities, directors of public health (68%) and mayors (67%) have declared that youth violence is preventable; police chiefs have stated youth violence is preventable in 50% of UNITY cities. School boards (6%) and school superintendents (16%) were less likely to have declared violence as preventable. Mayors (80%), police chiefs (68%), city councils/boards (57%), and directors of public health (52%) were most likely to assert youth violence is unacceptable. The business sector was mentioned as the other type of leader that has declared youth violence is unacceptable.

![Figure 43. Declaration that Youth Violence is Preventable and Unacceptable by High-Level Leaders (N=15).](image-url)
Engagement of Leaders in Planning to Prevent Youth Violence

Respondents were asked, “On a scale of one-to-ten, where 1 means ‘not at all engaged’ and 10 means ‘very engaged,’ how engaged is your city’s leadership in planning youth violence prevention efforts?” Scores ranged from 2 to 9 with an average score of 6.2 (SD=2.7), median of 7, and mode of 8. Participants were then asked if leadership engagement in planning of youth violence efforts has changed since becoming a UNITY city. The majority of respondents (62%) said leadership engagement has increased since becoming a UNITY city, or it has stayed the same (21%). One city has seen a decrease in leadership engagement while a few cities (14%) were unsure if it has changed (N=14).

Figure 44. Changes in of Leadership Engagement in Planning of Youth Violence Prevention Efforts (N=14).

Role of Leaders in the Implementation of Youth Violence Prevention Efforts

Respondents were asked, “On a scale of one-to-ten, where 1 means ‘not at all engaged’ and 10 means ‘very engaged,’ how engaged is your city’s leadership in implementing youth violence prevention efforts?” Answers ranged from 2 to 9 with an average score of 6.1 (SD=2.4), median of 6, and mode of 9 (N=14). Since joining the UNITY initiative, about half (49%) of cities have seen an increase in the role of leadership in
implementing youth violence prevention efforts. No respondents reported a decrease in leadership involvement, but a third (33%) of cities were unsure if change has occurred.

Figure 45. Changes in the Role of Leadership in Implementation of Youth Violence Prevention Efforts (N=15).

Change in Leadership

Since joining the UNITY Project, over half (57%) of cities have experienced a change in the political leadership (N=15). Respondents were asked to comment on how this has impacted the city’s programs/efforts to prevent youth violence. Eight cities gave a variety of answers that included both positive and negative changes. Examples include:

“Funding is being re-allocated, decisions are not yet final but proposed changes now threaten a great deal of the youth development structure we’ve contributed to creating.”

“The Mayor made addressing violence his top priority. In doing so, he pulled our department into the work of violence prevention, which was the first time we had taken on that work. The result has been the implementation of a very public strategy by the City.”
UNITY RoadMap

The majority (85%) of cities have used the UNITY RoadMap (N=14). None of the respondents suggested any changes to the UNITY RoadMap. Besides the RoadMap, cities were asked what resources or assistance could UNITY provide to help improve youth violence prevention efforts in your city. Two cities provided responses:

“Maybe some specific time with consultation to do a close review and develop a plan for incorporation.”

“Strategic planning assistance.”

Limitations of Study

A note of caution is tendered to the reader when interpreting the findings of our study. The sample of 17 cities is not a probability sample and therefore results may not be generalizable, in the statistical sense, to all UNITY cities or all United States cities. Nonetheless, ours is a representative sample in the qualitative sense, and therefore serves as an appropriate basis for a qualitative analysis. Another issue to consider is that the information presented is based on self-reported data, which may not reflect a complete picture of efforts in each city.
DISCUSSION

Violence is a significant public health problem. Nationwide, homicide is the second leading cause of death for 15–24 year olds, claiming more than 8,500 lives each year, and suicide is the third leading cause of death among this group claiming another 4,100 lives annually. To help address this problem, the Urban Networks to Increase Thriving Youth (UNITY) initiative was developed in 2005 as a comprehensive strategy to build support for effective, sustainable efforts to prevent violence before it occurs so youth can thrive in safe environments with supportive relationships and opportunities for success. As of April 2013, 21 cities participate in the initiative, which provides training, technical assistance, and tools centered on youth violence prevention. No UNITY City received direct monetary resources through UNITY to support their efforts to prevent youth violence.

This assessment was conducted to measure UNITY’s impact on youth violence prevention efforts and to determine its responsiveness to city needs. Findings indicate, as a whole, that UNITY has/is meeting its goals in the following ways:

**Increased Public Health Involvement**

UNITY has helped increase the role of public health in youth violence prevention efforts. UNITY’s initial assessment found there was a lack of involvement of the public health community, and public health departments did not see themselves as part of the solution to address youth violence. Given their capacity for data collection, surveillance and analysis, program development, evaluation, and promotion of healthy behavior, public health departments are critically important for successful violence reduction efforts. UNITY has helped city and county public health departments become more involved in violence prevention efforts. Many are now taking a leading role. Furthermore, there is a greater emphasis on prevention of youth violence instead of just intervention and/or suppression strategies. This has and will continue to enhance city capacity to collaborate, plan, and implement youth violence prevention strategies.

**Key Findings**

- Public health departments are much more involved in citywide youth violence prevention strategies and activities since UNITY’s inception, and in some cities, are leading efforts.
  - Nearly 90% of strategic plans to address youth violence reflected input of the local health department.
  - 91% of city representatives said the health department was the lead sponsor of the local coalition to address violence.
  - Besides the governance sector, health departments are the most likely to sponsor a youth advisory body.

**Improved Collaboration and Engagement**
UNITY has built a robust consortium of U.S. cities, national partner organizations, and community groups/members dedicated to reducing youth violence. UNITY has promoted awareness about the youth violence problem among this consortium by hosting meetings and networking opportunities, and it has increased awareness through the consortium by educating policymakers and the public about youth violence issues. UNITY has also enhanced and built capacity by promoting collaboration between cities, national partners, community members, and intra-city agencies/departments, which has directly affected youth violence prevention efforts. Furthermore, the initiative has improved collaboration by providing a variety of resources and tools as well as a forum for cities to work together on critical issues. Through these collaborative efforts, cities have been able to build capacity and gain buy-in they did not previously have before joining UNITY. This includes greater engagement with city youth, community groups, and city leadership.

**Key Findings**

- Cities collaborate with a variety of entities including each other, national partners, community partners, and internally between various agencies and departments.
- Engagement of leadership and community members has generally increased for cities since becoming involved with UNITY. For example:
  - 93% of cities have formed a local coalition or other network that addresses violence.
  - Cities report increased collaboration among the mayor’s office, police department, schools and health department since joining UNITY.
  - Nearly 3 in 4 cities said that collaboration with the local health department increased.
  - 60% of cities reported that collaboration with community members and youth increased since joining UNITY. Community members and youth are involved in determining priorities and activities for preventing youth violence, and implementing activities.

**Enhanced Strategic Planning**

All UNITY cities either have developed strategic plans or have discussed developing them. Strategic planning is important because it can lead to better outcomes by promoting approaches that are well coordinated, responsive to local needs and concerns, and build on best practices and existing strengths. Further, the process of strategy development builds a shared understanding and commitment and enables participants to establish working relationships. Cities used a variety of UNITY tools and resources to develop or improve their plans, such as access to expertise provided by the UNITY, technical assistance, webinars, fact sheets/publications, the UNITY RoadMap, and contact with other UNITY cites. Cities report strategic plan development was a collaborative process involving a range of sectors, notably governance, education, community services, and justice. Of those cities without a plan, all expressed interest in developing one. Cities without a plan expressed the need for
technical assistance and information, which UNITY can directly provide to help with plan development.

**Key Findings**

- All UNITY cities either have a city-wide plan to address youth violence or have discussed developing them.
- All cities reported developing their strategic plans in partnership with other sectors.
- Every city representative said that governance, education, community services, and justice sectors worked together with youth-serving organizations to develop the plan.

**Strengthened Attention to Prevention**

A key focus of UNITY is preventing violence before it occurs. UNITY has helped cities recognize that law enforcement alone cannot solve the problem of violence, and that more comprehensive approaches are necessary. While intervention and suppression are still the most widely used techniques, cities are beginning to use preventative approaches to reduce youth violence. Cities are also incorporating primary prevention into their strategic plans, and they are using evidence-based programs that focus on prevention.

**Key Findings**

- Cities are starting to shift actions towards prevention of youth violence and not solely relying on intervention or suppression methods.
- Partner organizations and agencies report increased attention on and conversation about the youth violence problem nationwide.
- Two-thirds of cities either created plans or significantly modified existing plans since they joined UNITY. Modifications include incorporating primary prevention strategies and elements of the UNITY RoadMap.

**Increased Use of UNITY Resources**

UNITY provides a variety of tools and resources to assist cities with their youth violence prevention efforts. All cities reported using at least one of UNITY’s resources with technical assistance and networking opportunities noted as particularly useful. Respondents also mentioned using the UNITY RoadMap, a resource for cities to prevent violence before it occurs by mapping out solutions to effectively and sustainably prevent violence. The UNITY RoadMap 1) helps cities understand the current status of their efforts (starting point), 2) describes the core elements necessary to prevent violence before it occurs (milestones), and 3) provides information, resources, and examples to support cities in planning, implementation, and evaluation. As UNITY grows, it will continue to develop and refine the tools and resources it provides to best meet the needs of the cities in the network.
Key Findings

- All cities reported using various UNITY resources and tools, with technical assistance and networking opportunities noted as particularly useful.
  - 75% of cities reported that their efforts to prevent violence are more effective because of UNITY’s trainings, technical assistance, and tools.
  - All cities said that access to violence prevention experts through UNITY helped improve their strategic plans, as did UNITY events, networking with other cities, technical assistance on preventing violence affecting youth, and UNITY webinars and publications.
  - 85% of cities report using the UNITY RoadMap.

- Joining the UNITY initiative has directly resulted in increased collaboration among cities.
  - City representatives value networking opportunities with other cities, and more than 85% of cities in the UNITY City Network communicate with other cities.
  - Representatives know a point of contact, share information and communicate with an average of eight other cities.

Recommendations

UNITY has made an impact on the national landscape of youth violence prevention by increasing the role of public health, improving collaboration and engagement, strengthening attention on prevention, enhancing strategic planning, and providing tools and resources, among other impacts. UNITY cities report a direct benefit with 75% stating the effectiveness of their youth violence prevention efforts have increased since joining UNITY. Still, there is much work to be done to prevent youth violence. Based on our findings the following recommendations should be considered:

1. UNITY should continue to provide technical assistance to cities and focus on ways to improve available resources and tools.
2. UNITY could work to advance better access to online resources for cities and partners.
3. UNITY could help cities increase focus on evaluation and provide more tools to perform evaluation.
4. UNITY could help cities assess staffing needs and assist with the development of staff training in youth violence prevention strategies and efforts.
5. UNITY should continue its efforts to promote prevention strategies and efforts. While there is an increased focus on prevention, intervention and suppression are still the primary means of addressing youth violence.

6. UNITY should continue to help cities without strategic plans to develop them, and help those that have plans to fully implement them.

7. UNITY meetings and convenings should be continued, as cities said that they provide a good opportunity to encourage networking. Cities found networking amongst themselves very useful, and they would like continued opportunities to share and learn from one another.

8. UNITY could develop tools or connect cities with existing resources to reduce service gaps. Cities need help with gaps in youth violence services, such as working with families, providing mental health services, and trauma planning.

9. UNITY can help cities maintain and improve partnerships that have been developed thus far.

10. Strategies and efforts with public health departments should be preserved and built upon.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>115.6</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>102.8</td>
<td>48.6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>1428</td>
<td>285.6</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>1049</td>
<td>209.8</td>
<td>22.7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>130.2</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>117.2</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>120.8</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville**</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>10.1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>67.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>4.7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>12.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>1208</td>
<td>241.6</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>1027</td>
<td>205.4</td>
<td>15.7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (Total)</td>
<td>(6,248)</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5,826)</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data from National Center for Health Statistics

* Fewer than 10 deaths have been suppressed for confidentially purposes; **Louisville represents the Louisville metro area; ----- Data not available
## Appendix B. 5-Year Average Annual Suicide Rate for 15-24 Years Old in UNITY Cities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2.7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>2.4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>4.8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>3.4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>3.8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville**</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>3.4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>4.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>3.0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>4.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>7.9*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>2.4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>2.7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (Total)</td>
<td>(1,182)</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>(996)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^Data from National Center for Health Statistics

* Fewer than 10 deaths have been suppressed for confidentiality purposes; **Louisville represents the Louisville metro area; ----- Data not available
### Appendix C. 5-Year Average Annual Firearm Death Rate for 0-24 Years Old in UNITY Cities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>105.6</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>44.0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>1328</td>
<td>265.6</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>189.8</td>
<td>20.6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>120.6</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>110.4</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>123.6</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville**</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>9.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>69.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>4.7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>25.9*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>4.2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6.0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>15.4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>1207</td>
<td>241.4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>199.2</td>
<td>15.2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (Total)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(6070)</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5609)</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^Data from National Center for Health Statistics _ * on the preceding tables indicates a decrease in rate during the 2nd five year period.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City, State, or Nation</th>
<th>Carried a weapon on school property on at least 1 day during the past 30 days (%)</th>
<th>Did not go to school because they felt unsafe at school at least 1 day during the past 30 days (%)</th>
<th>Threatened or injured with a weapon on school property one or more times during the past 12 months (%)</th>
<th>In a physical fight on school property one or more times during the past 12 months (%)</th>
<th>Bullied on school property during the past 12 months (%)</th>
<th>Survey Year*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore, MD</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans, LA</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City, State, or Nation</td>
<td>Felt sad or hopeless (almost every day for 2 or more weeks in a row so that they stopped doing some usual activities during the 12 months) (%)</td>
<td>Seriously considered attempting suicide during the 12 months (%)</td>
<td>Made a plan about how they would attempt suicide during the 12 months (%)</td>
<td>Attempted suicide one or more times during the 12 months (%)</td>
<td>Suicide attempt resulted in an injury, poisoning, or overdose that had to be treated by a doctor or nurse during the 12 months (%)</td>
<td>Survey Year*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore, MD</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans, LA</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix F. Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System Data for Select Locations, Violence Variables, 2011*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City, State, or Nation</th>
<th>Carried a weapon on at least 1 day during the last 30 days (%)</th>
<th>Carried a gun on at least 1 day during the last 30 days (%)</th>
<th>In a physical fight one or more times during the last 12 months (%)</th>
<th>Injured in a physical fight one or more times during the last 12 months (%)</th>
<th>Hit, slapped, or physically hurt on purpose by their boyfriend or girlfriend during the last 12 months (%)</th>
<th>Ever physically forced to have sexual intercourse</th>
<th>Ever been electronically bullied during the last 12 months (%)</th>
<th>Survey Year*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore, MD</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans, LA</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>States</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Data includes only those states and cities that met the minimum sample size requirement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>17.6</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>34.1</th>
<th>3.9</th>
<th>11.8</th>
<th>8.8</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix G. Resources Developed by and Available from UNITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Website Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**City Voices and Perspectives briefs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>URL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>URL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence, Social Disadvantage and Health</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://preventioninstitute.org/component/jlibrary/article/id-320/127.html">jlibrary/article/id-320/127.html</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Press Releases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>URL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>URL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDC Project Tackles Youth Violence from a Public Health Perspective</td>
<td>Apr. 27, 2012</td>
<td><a href="http://www.thelundreport.org/resource/cdc_project_tackles_youth_violence_from_a_public_health_perspective">http://www.thelundreport.org/resource/cdc_project_tackles_youth_violence_from_a_public_health_perspective</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids Living in Combat Zones...in U.S. Cities</td>
<td>May 4, 2012</td>
<td><a href="http://citiesspeak.org/2012/05/04/kids-living-in-combat-zonesin-u-s-cities/">http://citiesspeak.org/2012/05/04/kids-living-in-combat-zonesin-u-s-cities/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Webinars**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNITY Webinar: Parallel Worlds—Key</td>
<td>Oct. 13, 2011</td>
<td><a href="http://preventioninstitute.org/unity-">http://preventioninstitute.org/unity-</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Title</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>URL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>URL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trainings/Speaking Engagements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plenary Panel &amp; Q &amp; A: Update on Statewide Violence Prevention Programs The California Wellness Foundation</td>
<td>Nov. 15, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Youth Violence Prevention Partner Meeting</td>
<td>Jan. 9, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITY: Offering a Solution to the Pipeline UNITY / Congressional Black Caucus</td>
<td>Sep. 27, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The California Wellness Foundation (TCWF) 16th Annual Conference on Violence Prevention</td>
<td>Nov. 20, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting Health Equity: Fostering a National Strategy and Movement Office of Minority Health</td>
<td>Feb. 27, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing Injuries and Violence through Community Action to Address Determinants of Health World Federation of Public Health Associations</td>
<td>May 1, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White House meeting, Gang Violence Prevention and Crime Control – Learning from Successful Partnerships Around the</td>
<td>Aug. 24, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Campaign for Violence Prevention and Upcoming Violence Prevention Programs; UNITY World Health Organization</td>
<td>Sep. 17, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and Territorial Injury Prevention Directors Association (STIPDA) CDC Injury Center Stakeholder Strategy Development Meeting</td>
<td>Mar. 5, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of community violence on health; UNITY Safety 2010 World Conference</td>
<td>Sep. 22, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITY Co-Chair on Criminal Justice Reform</td>
<td>Oct. 11, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PolicyLink Equity Summit Workshop: Community Safety and Youth</td>
<td>Nov. 9, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community violence impact on natural and built environment</td>
<td>Mar. 7, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Workshop on Safety, Sustainability and Future Urban Transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General’s National Task Force on Children Exposed to Violence Hearing</td>
<td>Apr. 23, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond Turf Wars: How Effective</td>
<td>May 21-88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventing the Epidemic: Understanding the UNITY Approach to Youth Violence</td>
<td>Oct. 29, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E-Alerts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>URL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDC awards Prevention Institute major grant to lead national efforts to prevent violence</td>
<td>Sep. 9, 2010</td>
<td><a href="http://org2.democracyinaction.org/o/5902/t/0/blastContent.jsp?email_blast_KEY=1136230">http://org2.democracyinaction.org/o/5902/t/0/blastContent.jsp?email_blast_KEY=1136230</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITY Priorities &amp; Other Updates</td>
<td>Oct. 28, 2010</td>
<td><a href="http://org2.democracyinaction.org/o/5902/t/0/blastContent.jsp?email_blast_KEY=1142003">http://org2.democracyinaction.org/o/5902/t/0/blastContent.jsp?email_blast_KEY=1142003</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>URL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congressional Briefing on Preventing Violence and Chronic Disease, Feb. 2</td>
<td>Jan. 24, 2011</td>
<td><a href="http://org2.democracyinaction.org/o/5902/t/0/blastContent.jsp?email_blast_KEY=1151117">http://org2.democracyinaction.org/o/5902/t/0/blastContent.jsp?email_blast_KEY=1151117</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Resources for Preventing Violence</td>
<td>Mar. 23, 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDC Webinar: Preventing Violence--Public Health's Role</td>
<td>Apr. 7, 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITY Fact Sheets--Linking Violence to Chronic Illness, Mental Health, and Learning</td>
<td>May 17, 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Join Us: Webinar on Bullying Prevention, Sept. 8</td>
<td>Sep 1, 2011</td>
<td><a href="http://org2.democracyinaction.org/o/5902/t/0/blastContent.jsp?email_blast_KEY=1176039">http://org2.democracyinaction.org/o/5902/t/0/blastContent.jsp?email_blast_KEY=1176039</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>URL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis Mayor Rybak, Prevention Champion</td>
<td>Feb. 29, 2012</td>
<td><a href="http://org2.democracyinaction.org/o/5902/t/0/blastContent.jsp?email_blast_KEY=1196370">http://org2.democracyinaction.org/o/5902/t/0/blastContent.jsp?email_blast_KEY=1196370</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITY Partners with The Martin Luther King III Institute</td>
<td>Mar. 29, 2012</td>
<td><a href="http://org2.democracyinaction.org/o/5902/t/0/blastContent.jsp?email_blast_KEY=1199971">http://org2.democracyinaction.org/o/5902/t/0/blastContent.jsp?email_blast_KEY=1199971</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congressional Briefing: Preventing Violence that Affects Youth</td>
<td>Apr. 17, 2012</td>
<td><a href="http://org2.democracyinaction.org/o/5902/t/0/blastContent.jsp?email_blast_KEY=1202253">http://org2.democracyinaction.org/o/5902/t/0/blastContent.jsp?email_blast_KEY=1202253</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congressional Tri-Caucus Sponsors Briefing with UNITY</td>
<td>Apr. 26, 2012</td>
<td><a href="http://org2.democracyinaction.org/o/5902/t/0/blastContent.jsp?email_blast_KEY=1201769">http://org2.democracyinaction.org/o/5902/t/0/blastContent.jsp?email_blast_KEY=1201769</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to Pay for Prevention: Innovative City Funding Strategies</td>
<td>Jul. 11, 2012</td>
<td><a href="http://org2.democracyinaction.org/o/5902/t/0/blastContent.jsp?email_blast_KEY=1210628">http://org2.democracyinaction.org/o/5902/t/0/blastContent.jsp?email_blast_KEY=1210628</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>URL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITY to Highlight Solutions at CBCF’s Annual Legislative Conference</td>
<td>Sep. 18, 2012</td>
<td><a href="http://org2.democracyinaction.org/o/5902/t/0/blastContent.jsp?email_blast_KEY=1218755">http://org2.democracyinaction.org/o/5902/t/0/blastContent.jsp?email_blast_KEY=1218755</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Register Now for 11/30 Webinar: The Relationship Between Community Conditions and Violence/Trauma</td>
<td>Nov. 29, 2012</td>
<td><a href="http://org2.democracyinaction.org/o/5902/t/0/blastContent.jsp?email_blast_KEY=1227833">http://org2.democracyinaction.org/o/5902/t/0/blastContent.jsp?email_blast_KEY=1227833</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UNITY Convening’s**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Convening Name</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>URL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
PART A – INTRODUCTION

As you may be aware, UNITY is an initiative funded by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention’s National Center for Injury Prevention and Control. UNITY’s goal is to strengthen youth violence prevention efforts in the largest US cities. We are surveying representatives in selected cities to assess the impact of the UNITY Project. The data collected in our interviews will help improve UNITY’s national strategy for youth violence prevention and to assure that the UNITY Project is able to continue, grow, and help meet your needs.

Throughout this questionnaire, we will be asking about youth violence prevention activities in your city. The information that you provide is confidential and will not be shared with your office/department or city. All answers from this survey will become part of a national sample and will be reported only in summary form. All data will be encoded and entered into a database without identifiers.

1. Before you start the questionnaire, we want to assure you that this survey is completely confidential and voluntary. By continuing with the following questions, you consent to participate in our survey. Are you willing to participate?

   YES .................................................................1
   NO .................................................................2
PART B – YOUTH VIOLENCE PROBLEM

In our assessment, we are interested in violence in which youth are the perpetrator or the victim. Therefore, when responding to the questions, please keep in mind that we are using a broad definition of youth violence that includes, for example, homicide, suicide, firearm violence, gang violence, teen relationship violence, and bullying, among other things.

First, we would like your assessment of youth violence in your city.

2. What are the major types of youth violence in your city?

__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________

3. On a scale of one-to-ten, where 1 means “not at all serious” and 10 means “very serious,” how seriousness is the rate of youth violence in your city?


Not At All
Serious

Very Serious

REFUSED…………………………….97
DON’T KNOW……………………….98

4. In your opinion, has the rate of youth violence increased, decreased, or stayed about the same since becoming a UNITY city?

DECREASED………………………….1
SAME……………………………………..2
INCREASED……………………………3
REFUSED………………………………97
DON’T KNOW……………………….98
5. Why do you feel the rate of youth violence has/has not changed?

_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________

6. In what ways have the UNITY Project helped/not helped change the rate of youth violence in your city? For example, has UNITY provided technical assistance, access to funding, coalition building, or other things that have influenced the rate of youth violence?

_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________

PART C – INTERNAL CAPACITY: CITYWIDE PLAN/PLANNING

As part of the effort to reduce youth violence, many cities have adopted strategic plans. For the next set of questions, we want you only to think about your city’s strategic planning to prevent youth violence.

7. Does your city have a written citywide strategic plan to address youth violence?

   YES..........................................................1
   NO...............................SKIP TO PART D Q26.............................2
   REFUSED............. SKIP TO PART D Q26.................................97
   DON’T KNOW……. SKIP TO PART D Q26...............................98

8. Was the citywide strategic plan written before or after your city became a UNITY City?

   BEFORE..........................1
   AFTER............................2
   REFUSED........................................97
   DON’T KNOW.....................98
9. Has your city made significant changes to its citywide strategic plan since becoming a UNITY City?

YES.................................................................1
NO.................................. SKIP TO Q11......................2
REFUSED.................. SKIP TO Q11.............................97
DON’T KNOW....... SKIP TO Q11.................................98

10. Please explain what types of changes have been made to the citywide plan since becoming a UNITY city.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

11. Was the citywide strategic plan to address youth violence developed collaboratively with multiple agencies or community partners?

YES.................................................................1
NO...........................................SKIP TO Q13..................2
REFUSED...............SKIP TO Q13....................................97
DON’T KNOW....... SKIP TO Q13.................................98
12. Who was involved in the collaborative development of the citywide strategic plan? SELECT ALL THAT APPLY.

COMMUNITY SERVICES (E.G. PARKS & REC., LIBRARY) ..............1
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT (E.G. HOUSING) .........................1
EDUCATION (E.G. SCHOOLS, COLLEGES) ..............................1
EMERGENCY SERVICES (E.G. POLICE, FIRE) ..........................1
GOVERNANCE (E.G. MAYOR’S OFFICE, CITY COUNCIL) ............1
HEALTH (E.G. PUBLIC HEALTH DEPT, HOSPITALS) ..................1
JUSTICE (E.G. COURTS, PROBATION, DA’S OFFICE) .................1
SOCIAL SERVICES (E.G. CHILD FAMILY SERVICES) ..................1
TRANSPORTATION (E.G. PUBLIC TRANSIT) .............................1
FAITH-BASED GROUPS ......................................................1
COMMUNITY SERVICE/BASED GROUPS (E.G. ROTARY, LIONS) ....1
BUSINESS SECTOR ..................................................................1
YOUTH GROUPS ....................................................................1
YOUTH SERVICE GROUPS ....................................................1
SURVIVORS ........................................................................1
FAMILY MEMBERS OF SURVIVORS/VICTIMS .........................1
SPORTS LEAGUES .............................................................1
JOB TRAINING/WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS .......1
REENTRY PROGRAMS ..........................................................1
OTHER1 ..............................................................................1
  SPECIFY1 ________________________________________________
OTHER2 .............................................................................1
  SPECIFY2 ________________________________________________
OTHER3 .............................................................................1
  SPECIFY3 ________________________________________________
13. Does your city's citywide strategic plan contain measurable objectives, or specific means to determine if goals were achieved?

YES..............................................1
NO.................................................2
REFUSED...........................................97
DON'T KNOW.......................................98

14. Does the citywide plan contain an evaluation plan?

YES.............................................1
NO.................................................2
REFUSED..........................................97
DON'T KNOW....................................98

15. Is the implementation of the citywide plan being evaluated or monitored?

YES......................................................1
NO..........................SKIP TO Q17..........2
REFUSED..................SKIP TO Q17...........97
DON'T KNOW..................SKIP TO Q17.........98

16. What measures are being used to evaluate or monitor the citywide plan?

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

17. Has the citywide plan to prevent youth violence been implemented fully, partially, or not at all?

FULLY..............................SKIP TO Q20......................1
PARTIALLY......................SKIP TO Q20......................2
NOT AT ALL..........................1
REFUSED..........................SKIP TO 26......................97
DON'T KNOW..........................SKIP TO 26......................98
18. Why has the citywide plan not been implemented?
____________________________________________________________________________________

19. What have been the barriers or challenges in implementing the citywide plan?
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________

(SKIP TO QUESTION 26)

20. When was the citywide plan first implemented? (PROBE FOR MONTH AND YEAR)

(MONTH 01-12) ________ YEAR ________

21. What sources of funding were used/are being used to implement the citywide plan? SELECT ALL THAT APPLY.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT FUNDS ........ 1
STATE GOVERNMENT FUNDS........ 1
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FUNDS..... 1
BOND MEASURE ....................... 1
PRIVATE FOUNDATION FUNDS...... 1
RE-ALLOCATED EXISTING FUNDS... 1
OTHER SOURCE ....................... 1
SPECIFY________________________

REFUSED .................................. 97
DON'T KNOW ............................... 98

22. Approximately how much funding was allocated to the implementation of the citywide plan to prevent youth violence last fiscal year?

$_________________________
23. On average, has the amount of funding for youth violence prevention increased, decreased, or stayed about the same in your city in the last five years?

DECREASED ........................................... 1
SAME .................................................. 2
INCREASED ......................................... 3
REFUSED ............................................ 97
DON’T KNOW .................................... 98

24. Has your city used any UNITY resources to help develop or improve its citywide plan?

YES.......................................................... 1
NO.......................... SKIP TO PART D Q26 ...... 2
REFUSED........... SKIP TO PART D Q26 ..... 97
DON’T KNOW.... SKIP TO PART D Q26 ...... 98

25. What types of UNITY resources did your city use? Please select all that apply:

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE .............................................. 1
ACCESS TO EXPERTISE PROVIDED BY UNITY ............... 1
WEBINARS ........................................................................ 1
IN-PERSON MEETINGS .................................................. 1
WORKSHOPS ...................................................................... 1
ONLINE TOOLS ................................................................ 1
UNITY ROADMAP ............................................................. 1
FACT SHEETS/PUBLICATIONS ......................................... 1
INFORMATION ON OR ACCESS TO FUNDING .................. 1
CONTACT WITH OTHER UNITY CITIES ............................ 1
COALITION BUILDING ..................................................... 1
OTHER1............................................................................... 1
   SPECIFY1_______________________________________
OTHER2............................................................................... 1
   SPECIFY2_______________________________________

(SKIP TO PART E GO TO QUESTION 29)
PART D – INTEREST IN CITYWIDE PLAN DEVELOPMENT

26. Has there been interest in or discussion about developing a citywide plan focused on youth violence in your city?

YES...............................................1
NO.................................................2
REFUSED........................................97
DON’T KNOW.............................98

27. What are some challenges or barriers to developing a youth violence prevention citywide plan in your city?

_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________

28. What types of assistance would be most helpful to your city in developing a citywide plan on youth violence prevention? (For example, technical assistance, contacts with other cities, information on evaluation, online tools/fact sheets, webinars, coalition building, help from unity or Prevention Institute staff, etc.)

_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
PART E – INTERNAL CAPACITY: CITYWIDE VIOLENCE PREVENTION EFFORTS

Now, we would like you to think generally about all of your city’s youth violence prevention efforts. These efforts may include, but are not limited to, policies, programs/initiatives or activities geared toward preventing youth violence.

29. What approaches have been or seem most successful at preventing youth violence in your city?

__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________

30. How have you measured this success? If success has not been measured, please write N/A.

__________________________________________________________________________________

31. What approaches have been or seem least successful in preventing youth violence in your city?

__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________

32. What issues in your city take attention away from addressing youth violence?

__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
33. On a scale of one-to-ten, where 1 means “not at all effective” and 10 means “very effective,” how would you rate the **overall** effectiveness of your city’s efforts to prevent youth violence?

1 -- 2 -- 3 -- 4 -- 5 -- 6 -- 7 -- 8 -- 9 -- 10

Not At All                      Very Effective
Effective

REFUSED............................................97
DON’T KNOW........................................98

34. Has the **overall** effectiveness of your city’s efforts to prevent youth violence increased, decreased, or stayed the same since becoming a UNITY city?

DECREASED................................. 1
SAME ............................................. 2
INCREASED .................................... 3
REFUSED ....................................... 97
DON’T KNOW ................................. 98

35. How has the UNITY Project helped change the **overall** effectiveness of youth violence strategies in your city?

_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________

36. On a scale of one-to-ten, where 1 means “not at all consistent” and 10 means “very consistent,” how consistent **overall** are your city’s youth violence prevention efforts with the citywide strategic plan to prevent youth violence?

1 -- 2 -- 3 -- 4 -- 5 -- 6 -- 7 -- 8 -- 9 -- 10

Not At All                      Very Consistent
Consistent

REFUSED............................................97
DON’T KNOW......................................98
37. Why do you think there is/is not consistency between planned youth violence prevention efforts and the actual programs/activities that exist?

_______________________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________
38. In this series of questions, think about the following programs and strategies to prevent youth violence in your city.

38A. Does this type of program/effort exist? RECORD IN COLUMN A. 97=Refused 98=Don't Know

38B. What percent of your city’s prevention resources (i.e. staff, funding, etc.) are dedicated to this type of program/effort? RECORD IN COLUMN B. 97=Refused 98=Don't Know

38C. Who is the target population for this program/effort? Would you say “universal coverage,” “gang-specific,” “high risk youth other than gang members,” “gender-specific,” or “some other group.” RECORD IN COLUMN C. 97=Refused 98=Don’t Know

38D. What is the target area for this program/effort? Would you say a specific neighborhood/community or the entire city? RECORD IN COLUMN D. 97=Refused 98=Don't Know
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPES OF PREVENTION PROGRAMS</th>
<th>44A. EXISTES</th>
<th>44B. RESOURCES DEDICATED</th>
<th>44C. TARGET POPULATION</th>
<th>44D. TARGET LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Positive early childcare and education?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Positive social and emotional development?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Parenting skill development?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mentoring?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Quality afterschool programs?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Youth leadership?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Social connection in neighborhoods?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Universal school-based strategies?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Economic development?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Mental health services when violence occurs?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Mental health services in the aftermath of violence?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Family support or counseling?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Conflict resolution?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Social reentry support?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now, think about organizations and individuals in the community that collaborate with your city on youth violence prevention.

39. Have community members actively helped with…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>RF</th>
<th>DK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determining priorities?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining activities?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing activities?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating activities?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40. Thinking about youth violence prevention efforts in your city, has your city’s youth actively helped with…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>RF</th>
<th>DK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determining priorities?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining activities?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing activities?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating activities?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41. What types of community groups or individuals have participated in youth violence prevention efforts? Please select all that apply:

- Faith-based groups
- Community service groups (e.g. Rotary, Lions)
- Business sector
- Youth groups
- Survivors
- Family members of survivors/victims
- Education (public/private schools or colleges)
- Sports leagues
- Other
  - specify1
  - specify2
  - specify3
42. As a whole, has community engagement decreased, increased, or stayed the same since becoming a UNITY city?

- Decreased ........................................ 1
- Same ....................................................... 2
- Increased .............................................. 3
- Refused .............. SKIP TO 45 ........97
- Don’t know ....... SKIP TO 45..........98

43. Why do you feel the community engagement in youth violence prevention efforts has/has not changed?

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________

44. In what ways have the UNITY Project helped/not helped change community engagement in youth violence prevention efforts in your city?

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
PART F – YOUTH DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Now, we would like to discuss a few specific types of youth violence prevention strategies and efforts that may exist in your city.

45. Does your city offer youth development programs?

YES..............................................................1
NO...................SKIP TO Q50.................2
REFUSED..........SKIP TO Q50..................97
DON’T KNOW......SKIP TO Q50.................98

46. What are the areas of focus in these youth development programs or activities? Please select all that apply:

Physical health .................................................................1
Mental/behavioral health .....................................................1
Intellectual/academic development ........................................1
Tutoring ...............................................................1
Employment .................................................................1
Social or civic involvement ..................................................1
Mentoring ................................................................1
Leadership ..................................................................1
Arts programs .................................................................1
Athletics/sports leagues .......................................................1
Specific to gang activity reduction .........................................1
Other1 ..........................................................................1
    specify1___________________________________________
Other2 ..........................................................................1
    specify2___________________________________________
Other3 ..........................................................................1
    specify3___________________________________________
47. Would you say most of the youth development programs in your city are sponsored by the city itself, outside organizations/entities, or an equal mix of public and private organizations/entities?

City ................................................................. 1
Outside organizations ........................................... 2
Equal mix of public and private ................................ 3
Refused .............................................. SKIP TO 49 .............. 97
Don’t know ................................................. SKIP TO 49 .............. 98

48. Specially, what types of organizations or agencies sponsor youth development programs in your city? Please select all that apply:

Community services (e.g. parks & rec., library) ......................... 1
Community development (e.g. housing) .................................. 1
Education (e.g. schools, colleges) ........................................ 1
Emergency services (e.g. police, fire) .................................... 1
Governance (e.g. mayor’s office, city council) .......................... 1
Health (e.g. public health dept., hospitals) ............................. 1
Justice (e.g. courts, probation, DA’s office) ............................ 1
Social services (e.g. child family services) ............................. 1
Transportation (e.g. public transit) ....................................... 1
Faith-based groups ................................................................ 1
Community service groups (e.g. Rotary, Lions) ....................... 1
Business sector .................................................................... 1
Youth groups ...................................................................... 1
Survivors of violence ................................................................ 1
Family members of survivors/victims .................................... 1
Sports leagues ...................................................................... 1
Job training/workforce development programs ....................... 1
Reentry programs .............................................................. 1
Other1 .......................................................................... 1
    specify1________________________________________
Other2 .......................................................................... 1
    specify2________________________________________
Other3 .......................................................................... 1
    specify3________________________________________
49. Since becoming a UNITY city, has the number of youth development programs generally increased, decreased, or stayed the same?

   DECREASED ........................................ 1
   SAME ............................................. 2
   INCREASED ...................................... 3
   REFUSED ......................................... 97
   DON’T KNOW ..................................... 98

50. Does your city have a youth advisory council, board, or commission?

   YES .................................................... 1
   NO ................................................. 2
   REFUSED ........................................... 97
   DON’T KNOW ..................................... 98

51. Does the youth advisory council, board, or commission include high-risk youth?

   YES .................................................... 1
   NO ..................................................... 2
   REFUSED ........................................... 97
   DON’T KNOW ..................................... 98
52. Who are the sponsoring agencies or organizations? Please select all that apply:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community services (e.g. parks &amp; rec., library)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community development (e.g. housing)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (e.g. schools, colleges)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency services (e.g. police, fire)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance (e.g. mayor's office, city council)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health (e.g. public health dept., hospitals)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice (e.g. courts, probation, DA's office)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social services (e.g. child protective services)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation (e.g. public transit)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith-based groups</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community service groups (e.g. Rotary, Lions)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business sector</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth groups</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survivors of violence</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family members of survivors/victims</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports leagues</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job training/workforce development programs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reentry programs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specify1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specify2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specify3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
53. Are the activities of the youth advisory council, board, or commission monitored or evaluated?

YES........................................... .............1
NO..........................SKIP TO Q55...........2
REFUSED.............SKIP TO Q55.............97
DON’T KNOW.......SKIP TO Q55.............98

54. What type of evaluation is being used to assess the youth advisory council, board, or commission? Would you say process evaluation, outcome evaluation, both process and outcome evaluation, or something else? Process evaluation is defined as an assessment of whether the goals and activities were implemented and completed, and outcome evaluation is defined as an assessment of the results, and whether activities produced change.

Process evaluation.........................................................................................1
Outcome evaluation .....................................................................................2
Process and outcome evaluation .................................................................3
Other ............................................................................................................4
specify________________________

55. Since becoming a UNITY city, has collaboration between youth advisory councils, boards, or commissions and your city generally increased, decreased, or stayed the same?

Decreased.............................................1
Same ..........................................................2
Increased .................................................3
Refused ....................................................97
Don’t know .............................................98

56. Since becoming a UNITY city, has communication between youth advisory councils, boards, or commissions and your city generally increased, decreased, or stayed the same?

Decreased.............................................1
Same ..........................................................2
Increased .................................................3
Refused ....................................................97
Don’t know .............................................98
PART G – COALITIONS

Now, we want you to think about coalitions or networks in your city. For the purpose of this assessment, we are defining a coalition or network as two or more organizations from different disciplines working together on an issue.

57. Does your city have any coalitions or networks addressing youth violence prevention?

YES...............................................................1
NO..........................SKIP TO Q63..................2
REFUSED............SKIP TO Q63.................97
DON’T KNOW......SKIP TO Q63...............98

58. Would you say most of the coalitions or networks in your city are sponsored by the city itself, outside organizations/entities, or an equal mix of public and private organizations/entities?

City .................................................................................1
Outside organizations.........................................................2
Equal mix of public and private..............................3
Refused ............................................................97
Don’t know.........................................................................98
59. Who are the sponsoring agencies or organizations of the coalition or network? Please select all that apply:

- Community services (e.g. parks & rec., library) .............................................. 1
- Community development (e.g. housing) ............................................................. 1
- Education (e.g. schools, colleges) ................................................................. 1
- Emergency services (e.g. police, fire) ............................................................. 1
- Governance (e.g. mayor’s office, city council) .................................................. 1
- Health (e.g. public health dept., hospitals) ......................................................... 1
- Justice (e.g. courts, probation, DA’s office) ..................................................... 1
- Social services (e.g. child family services) ....................................................... 1
- Transportation (e.g. public transit) ................................................................. 1
- Faith-based groups ....................................................................................... 1
- Community service groups (e.g. Rotary, Lions) ............................................. 1
- Business sector ............................................................................................ 1
- Youth groups ............................................................................................... 1
- Survivors of violence ..................................................................................... 1
- Family members of survivors/victims ........................................................... 1
- Sports leagues .............................................................................................. 1
- Job training/workforce development programs ........................................... 1
- Reentry programs ......................................................................................... 1
- Other1 ........................................................................................................... 1
  - specify1___________________________________________
- Other2 ........................................................................................................... 1
  - specify2___________________________________________

60. Since becoming a UNITY city, has the number of coalitions generally increased, decreased, or stayed the same?

- Decreased .............................................. 1
- Same ..................................................... 2
- Increased ............................................ 3
- Refused .................................................. 97
- Don’t know .......................................... 98
61. Since becoming a UNITY city, has **collaboration** between coalitions and your generally increased, decreased, or stayed the same?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decreased</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

62. Since becoming a UNITY city, has **communication** between coalitions and your city generally increased, decreased, or stayed the same?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decreased</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now, think about the specific programs in your city.

63. Is your city using in any evidence-based programs, such as Chicago Cease Fire or the David Kennedy Cease Fire Model?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO ... SKIP TO Q66</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFUSED ... SKIP TO Q66</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DON'T KNOW ... SKIP TO Q66</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

64. Which evidence-based program(s) is your city using?

65. Would you say the program is primarily focused on prevention, intervention, suppression, re-entry, other something else?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevention (i.e. before something happens)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention (i.e. once the kids are already in trouble)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppression (i.e. law enforcement)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-entry</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Something else</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>64. PROGRAM NAME</th>
<th>65. PROGRAM TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ___________________</td>
<td>1..2..3..4..5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ___________________</td>
<td>1..2..3..4..5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ___________________</td>
<td>1..2..3..4..5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ___________________</td>
<td>1..2..3..4..5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ___________________</td>
<td>1..2..3..4..5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART H – PUBLIC HEALTH APPROACH

Now we want to discuss whether any of your city’s youth violence prevention programs or efforts use public health approaches.

66. Are you familiar with the public health approach to youth violence prevention?

YES...........................................................1
NO.........................SKIP TO 70............2
REFUSED..............SKIP TO 70..........97
DON’T KNOW............SKIP TO 70..........98

67. Please describe your definition of the public health approach to youth violence prevention.

_______________________________________________________________________

68. Would you describe your city’s general approaches towards youth violence as primary prevention, intervention, and/or suppression? Primary prevention efforts aim to prevent violence before it happens, intervention efforts deal with violence once it has happened, and suppression involves law enforcement activity. Please select all that apply:

PRIMARY PREVENTION..........................................................1
INTERVENTION.........................................................................1
SUPPRESSION .........................................................................1
OTHER.....................................................................................1

SPECIFY________________________________________

IF INFORMANT PROVIDES MORE THAN ONE ANSWER TO 68, ASK Q69. OTHERWISE, SKIP TO Q70.

69. Of these approaches you mentioned, which approach is most often used? Or are the approaches equally utilized?

Primary prevention.................................................................1
Intervention..........................................................................2
Suppression ...........................................................................3
Something else.................................................................4
Equally used.................................................................5
Refused .................................................................................97
Don't know.........................................................................98
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PART I - CITYWIDE RESOURCES

Now, we would like you to think about the resources available to your city for youth violence prevention.

70. Thinking about the funding you have for youth violence prevention, would you consider the funding <….>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>RF</th>
<th>DK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Adequate for your needs?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Flexible enough for your priorities?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Stable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Sustainable for the future?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

71. In what ways does your city feel limited or constrained by funding for youth violence prevention efforts?

_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________

72. Has being a UNITY city helped with obtaining stable funding for youth violence prevention?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>RF</th>
<th>DK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

73. In what ways have the UNITY Project helped/not helped your city with obtaining stable funding for youth violence prevention efforts?

_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________
74. On a scale of one-to-ten, where 1 means “not at all adequate” and 10 means “very adequate,” how adequate is the number of staff in your city dedicates to youth violence prevention programs/efforts?

\[1 -- 2 -- 3 -- 4 -- 5 -- 6 -- 7 -- 8 -- 9 -- 10\]

Not At All Adequate  Very Adequate

REFUSED............................................97
DON’T KNOW........................................98

75. On a scale of one-to-ten, where 1 means “not at all stable” and 10 means “very stable,” how stable is your city’s staffing for youth violence prevention programs/effort?

\[1 -- 2 -- 3 -- 4 -- 5 -- 6 -- 7 -- 8 -- 9 -- 10\]

Not At All Stable  Very Stable

REFUSED............................................97
DON’T KNOW........................................98

76. On a scale of one-to-ten, where 1 means “not at all adequate” and 10 means “very adequate,” how adequate is the training for your city’s staff in youth violence prevention strategies?

\[1 -- 2 -- 3 -- 4 -- 5 -- 6 -- 7 -- 8 -- 9 -- 10\]

Not At All Adequate  Very Adequate

CITY HAS NO TRAINING.......................0
REFUSED............................................97
DON’T KNOW........................................98

77. About how frequently does staff receive training on youth violence prevention strategies? Would you say at least once a week, at least once a month, at least once every few months, at least once a year, every few years, or never?

At least once a week ....................... 1
At least once a month....................... 2
At least every few months .......... 3
At least once a year....................... 4
Every few years.......................... 5
Never........................................... 6
Refused....................................... 97
Don’t know................................. 98
78. On a scale of one-to-ten, where 1 means “no communication” and 10 means “very good communication,” how well do your city’s agencies and departments communicate about their youth violence prevention strategies and efforts with each other?

1 -- 2 -- 3 -- 4 -- 5 -- 6 -- 7 -- 8 -- 9 -- 10

No Communication  Very Good Communication

REFUSED.................................97
DON’T KNOW............................98

79. How do city agencies and departments communicate with each other about youth violence prevention strategies and efforts? Please select all that apply:

- Email .................................................. 1
- Websites .............................................. 1
- Shared Servers ................................. 1
- Telephone ........................................... 1
- Written communication (mail, memos) . 1
- Face-to-face ................................. 1
- Social Networking .......................... 1
- Fax .................................................... 1
- Other ................................................. 1

SPECIFY____________________

REFUSED ................................. 97
DON’T KNOW ......................... 98

80. About how often do city agencies and departments communicate with each other about youth violence prevention strategies and efforts? Would you say at least once a week, at least once a month, at least once every few months, at least once a year, every few years, or never?

- At least once a week .................... 1
- At least once a month ................. 2
- At least every few months .......... 3
- At least once a year ................. 4
- Every few years ....................... 5
- Never ............................................. 6
- Refused ......................................... 97
- Don’t know .................................. 98
Now, we want to discuss coordination and collaboration between various offices, agencies, and departments in your city.

81. Does your office/department currently work with the mayor’s office to address youth violence prevention?

YES ................................................................. 1
NO ................................................................. 2
NOT APPLICABLE – MY AGENCY ........... SKIP TO 84 ............ 3
REFUSED ........................................................... 97
DON’T KNOW ..................................................... 98

82. Since becoming a UNITY city, has collaboration between your office/department and the mayor’s office on youth violence prevention increased, decreased, stayed about the same, or never existed?

Never existed ......................... 1
Decreased ......................... 2
Same ................................. 3
Increased ................................. 4
Refused .............. SKIP TO 84 ............ 97
Don’t know ... SKIP TO 84 ....... 98

83. Why has collaboration changed between your office/department and the mayor’s office since being a UNITY city?

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

84. Does your office/department currently work with the police department to address youth violence?

YES ................................................................. 1
NO ................................................................. 2
NOT APPLICABLE – MY AGENCY ........... SKIP TO 87 ............ 3
REFUSED ........................................................... 97
DON’T KNOW ..................................................... 98
85. Since becoming a UNITY city, has collaboration between your office/department and the police department on youth violence prevention increased, decreased, stayed about the same, or never existed?

NEVER EXISTED................................. 1
DECREASED........................................ 2
SAME ................................................ 3
INCREASED ...................................... 4
REFUSED ............. SKIP TO 87.........97
DON'T KNOW ...... SKIP TO 87.........98

86. Why has collaboration changed between your office/department and the police department since being a UNITY city?
________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________

87. Does your office/department currently work with the health department to address youth violence?

YES ................................................................................................................................. 1
NO ................................................................................................................................. 2
NOT APPLICABLE – MY AGENCY ........ SKIP TO 90...............3
REFUSED .................................................................................................................. 97
DON'T KNOW .......................................................................................................... 98

88. Since becoming a UNITY city, has collaboration between your office/department and the health department on youth violence prevention increased, decreased, stayed about the same, or never existed?

NEVER EXISTED...................... 1
DECREASED................................. 2
SAME ............................................... 3
INCREASED .................................... 4
REFUSED ............... SKIP TO 90.....97
DON'T KNOW ........ SKIP TO 90.....98
89. Why has collaboration changed between your office/department and the health department since being a UNITY city?

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

90. Does your office/department currently work with the public school district to address youth violence?

YES ................................................................................................................. 1
NO .................................................................................................................. 2
NOT APPLICABLE – MY AGENCY .......... SKIP TO 93 ......................... 3
REFUSED ........................................................................................................... 97
DON’T KNOW .............................................................................................. 98

91. Since becoming a UNITY city, has collaboration between your office/department and the public school district(s) on youth violence prevention increased, decreased, stayed about the same, or never existed?

NEVER EXISTED ......................... 1
DECREASED ................................. 2
SAME .............................................. 3
INCREASED .................................... 4
REFUSED ............... SKIP TO 93 ...... 97
DON’T KNOW ....... SKIP TO 93 ...... 98

92. Why has collaboration changed between your office/department and the public school district(s) since being a UNITY city?

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________
93. Besides the mayor’s office, police department, health department and public schools, what other entities within your city do you collaborate with on youth violence prevention efforts?

No other collaborations.................................................................1
Community services (e.g. parks & rec., library).................................1
Community development (e.g. housing)..........................................1
Education (e.g. public/private schools or colleges).............................1
Emergency services (e.g. police, fire)..............................................1
Governance (e.g. mayor’s office, city council)....................................1
Health (e.g. public health dept., hospitals) .......................................1
Justice (e.g. courts, probation, DA’s office).....................................1
Social services (e.g. child family services) ......................................1
Transportation (e.g. public transit)..................................................1
Other1..............................................................................................1
   specify1_______________________________________________________
Other2..............................................................................................1
   specify2_______________________________________________________
Other3..............................................................................................1
   specify3_______________________________________________________

94. What are the challenges and barriers to collaborating with other agencies/departments in your city on youth violence prevention?
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________

95. What are some of the factors that promote collaboration with other agencies/departments in your city on youth violence prevention?
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________
PART J – ACCESS TO DATA

96. Now, we want to find out about city’s access to data on youth violence.

96A. Does your city have no access, partial access, or complete access? **IF NO, SKIP TO NEXT CATEGORY OF DATA SOURCE.** RECORD IN COLUMN A. 97=RF 98=DK

96B. Does your city have access to raw data, summary reports, or both? RECORD IN COLUMN B. RECORD IN COLUMN B. 97=RF 98=DK

96C. Does your city have better access, worse access, or about the same access to data since becoming a UNITY city? RECORD IN COLUMN C. 97=RF 98=DK

(READ GOING ACROSS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA SOURCE</th>
<th>96A. ACCESS</th>
<th>96B. DATA TYPE</th>
<th>96C. SINCE UNITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Access</td>
<td>Partial Access</td>
<td>Complete Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Juvenile justice data?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Adult law enforcement and justice data (such as crime reports, arrests, incarcerations, probation, parole, domestic violence, and sexual violence)?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Child protective services data (such as reported child abuse, reported child sexual abuse, and child fatality review team findings)?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Child Fatality Review data?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Health data?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. School data?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System or YRBSS data?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Other source?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
97. Does your city have a mapping system or GIS that they use to map data?

YES..........................................................1
NO........................SKIP TO Q100..........2
REFUSED............SKIP TO Q100............97
DON'T KNOW.....SKIP TO Q100.............98

98. Have there been changes to your access or use of GIS data and mapping ability since your city became a UNITY city?

YES..........................................................1
NO..........................SKIP TO Q100...............2
REFUSED............SKIP TO Q100.............97
DON'T KNOW.... SKIP TO Q100...............98

99. In what ways have your access or use of GIS data and mapping changed?

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
PART K – ROLE OF HIGH LEVEL LEADERS

For the next few questions, we would like you to think about city leadership.

100. Have any high-level leaders ever publically declared that violence is preventable?

   YES .................................................. 1
   NO..................SKIP TO 102..............2
   REFUSED...........SKIP TO 102.............97
   DON'T KNOW.....SKIP TO 102..............98

101. Who has declared violence is preventable? Please select all that apply:

   No declaration .................................. 1
   Mayor .............................................. 1
   City Council/Board................................. 1
   Police Chief ........................................ 1
   Director of Public Health......................... 1
   School Board...................................... 1
   Superintendent ................................... 1
   Other ............................................... 1

       specify______________________________
   Refused ......................................... 97
   Don't know ...................................... 98

102. Have any high-level leaders ever publically declared that violence is unacceptable?

   YES .................................................. 1
   NO..................SKIP TO 104...............2
   REFUSED...........SKIP TO 104.............97
   DON'T KNOW.....SKIP TO 104..............98
103. Who has declared violence is unacceptable? Please select all that apply.

- No declaration ................................ 1
- Mayor ........................................ 1
- City council/board ......................... 1
- Police chief .................................. 1
- Director of public health ................. 1
- School board .................................. 1
- Superintendent ............................. 1
- Other ........................................... 1
  specify__________________________
- Refused ........................................ 97
- Don’t know .................................... 98

104. On a scale of one-to-ten, where 1 means “not at all engaged” and 10 means “very engaged,” how engaged is your city’s leadership in planning youth violence prevention efforts?

1 -- 2 -- 3 -- 4 -- 5 -- 6 -- 7 -- 8 -- 9 -- 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not At All</th>
<th>Very Engaged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REFUSED........................................97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DON'T KNOW.......................................98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

105. As a whole, has leadership engagement in planning youth violence prevention efforts decreased, increased, or stayed the same since your city became a UNITY city?

- Decreased...................................... 1
- Same ............................................. 2
- Increased .................................... 3
- Refused .......................................... 97
- Don’t know ..................................... 98
106. On a scale of one-to-ten, where 1 means “not at all engaged” and 10 means “very engaged,” how engaged is your city’s leadership in implementing youth violence prevention efforts?

1 -- 2 -- 3 -- 4 -- 5 -- 6 -- 7 -- 8 -- 9 -- 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not At All Engaged</th>
<th>Very Engaged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REFUSED..................97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DON’T KNOW...............98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

107. As a whole, has leadership engagement in implementing youth violence prevention efforts decreased, increased, or stayed the same since your city became a UNITY city?

DECREASED..............................1
SAME....................................2
INCREASED..............................3
REFUSED..............................97
DON’T KNOW............................98

108. Has your city’s political leadership changed since becoming a UNITY city?

YES........................................1
NO..................SKIP TO Q110..........2
REFUSED...............SKIP TO Q110......97
DON’T KNOW......SKIP TO 110,.........98

109. How has this impacted the city’s programs/efforts to prevent youth violence?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
PART L - UNITY Project

One of the resources available to help improve youth violence prevention efforts is the UNITY RoadMap. The UNITY RoadMap is a resource aimed at preventing violence before it occurs by mapping out to effective and sustainable solutions.

110. Have you heard of the UNITY RoadMap?

YES.................................................................1
NO............................SKIP TO Q116...............2
REFUSED...........SKIP TO Q116............97
DON'T KNOW.....SKIP TO Q116............98

111. Have you used the UNITY RoadMap?

YES.................................................................1
NO............................SKIP TO Q116...............2
REFUSED...........SKIP TO Q116............97
DON'T KNOW.....SKIP TO Q116............98

112. In what ways have your city used the UNITY RoadMap?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

113. If you could suggest any changes to the UNITY RoadMap, what would they be?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

(SKIP TO Q122)
114. What were some of the reasons why your city did not use the UNITY RoadMap?
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

115. Besides the Roadmap, what resources or assistance could UNITY provide to help improve youth violence prevention efforts in your city?
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

PART M - DEMOGRAPHICS

Lastly, there are a few questions we need to ask about your city.

116. How long has your city been a UNITY city? (RECORD IN YEARS)

________________________________________

117. Does your city publically identify itself as a UNITY city?

   YES....................................................1
   NO...................................................2
   REFUSED...........................................97
   DON'T KNOW.................................98
118. To your knowledge, has the current or former mayor ever signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with UNITY to officially become a UNITY city?

   YES..............................................1
   NO...............................................2
   REFUSED......................................97
   DON’T KNOW...............................98

119. Approximately how many city agencies/departments in your city activity participate in UNITY efforts?

   ________________________________

120. Approximately how many private organizations and individuals in your activity participate in UNITY efforts?

   ________________________________

121. Does your city communicate with other UNITY cities about their youth violence prevention efforts?

   YES..............................................1
   NO...............................................2
   REFUSED......................................97
   DON’T KNOW...............................98
122. Please indicate your level of collaboration with each of the cities in the UNITY City Network.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
<th>No Collaboration</th>
<th>Little Collaboration</th>
<th>Some Collaboration</th>
<th>Strong Collaboration</th>
<th>Very Strong Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART N – WRAP UP

That concludes the main portion of our questionnaire.

123. If we need to ask you anything else, may we contact you again?

YES..............................................1
NO.............................................2

Name__________________________________________________
Title___________________________________________________
Agency / Organization __________________________________
Contact Information______________________________________
124. Do you have any questions or comments that you would like to add?

______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________

Thank you very much for your time. Once the interviews have been completed and analyzed, we will send you a copy of the findings.