



One Story Many Voices:
The Impact of VPI
Leadership Programs

funded by

The California Wellness
Foundation

September 30,
2003



Credits

This evaluation was conducted by the following members of the Leadership Learning Community:

Jah'Shams Abdul-Mumin, Director, Non-Traditional Leadership Program, Los Angeles, CA
Kim Ammann Howard, Ph.D., Evaluation and Organizational Learning Consultant,
Berkeley, CA

Deborah Meehan, Executive Director, Leadership Learning Community, Oakland, CA
Claire Reinelt, Ph.D., Evaluation Consultant, Development Guild/DDI, Brookline, MA
Georgia Sorenson, Ph.D., Founding Director and Senior Scholar, Academy of Leadership,
University of Maryland

Robert L. Williams, Ph.D., Associate Director, Fanning Institute for Leadership, University
of Georgia

We received special help from the following individuals:

Keith Adams, Triangle Associates, Athens, GA

James M. Burns, Ph.D., Visiting Scholar, Jepson School for Leadership, University of
Richmond

Bella Celnik, Leadership Learning Community

Lori Hunter, Fanning Institute for Leadership

Lynn Rothstein, Ph.D., Consultant, New York

Special thanks to the fellows, Peace Prize awardees, principal investigators, fellowship coordinators and staff of The California Wellness Foundation who gave of their time to be interviewed and to complete surveys.

**One Story Many Voices:
The Impact of VPI Leadership Programs**

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	iv
Introduction	2
Personal Impact of the Leadership Program on Participants and Their Work.....	11
Leadership & Systemic Change.....	21
Lessons Learned About Developing Leadership Within the Violence Prevention Field.....	40
Conclusion	48
 Appendices:	
Appendix A: TCWF Leadership Program Evaluation Team Members.....	50
Appendix B: TCWF Leadership Program Survey Instruments.....	52
Appendix C: TCWF Leadership Program Interview Questions.....	90

Executive Summary

Overview

In 1993, The California Wellness Foundation (TCWF) launched a 10-year Violence Prevention Initiative (VPI) to reduce violence against youth in California. A significant component of the VPI were its three leadership programs—the Community Fellowship Program, the Academic Fellowship Program, and the Peace Prize Award. These three programs were intended to achieve the following:

- Recognize and promote individual leaders of violence prevention;
- Help communities empower themselves by recognizing leadership in violence prevention;
- Support the professional training of ethnic minorities and women in violence prevention and injury control;
- Support and link promising grassroots leaders of community efforts in violence prevention through leadership and professional development; and
- Build a critical mass of community leaders and professionals who are positioned and prepared to advocate for and institute programs and policies to prevent violence against youth and foster safer and healthy communities.

Methodology and Structure of the Report

Under the auspices of the Leadership Learning Community, the evaluation team used a variety of methods to learn about the programs and their impact: surveys, interviews, site visits, document review and participant-observation. In addition, the evaluation team brought decades of experience evaluating, running and studying leadership programs that provided a backdrop for assessing the strengths and weaknesses of the VPI leadership programs.

Information for this report was obtained from 61% of the leadership program participants who received the Peace Prize award or completed one of the fellowship programs from approximately one to nine years earlier. We also spoke to the academic fellowship site principal investigators, two TCWF foundation staff and seven of the leadership program coordinators. We do not know how these individuals' views compare to those who did not participate in the evaluation.

In what follows we describe the impact of the VPI on the participants and their work, contributions that VPI leadership programs have made to long-term systemic impact on reducing violence against youth, and lessons learned about specific leadership development approaches and emerging models of leadership for the field. Interspersed throughout are stories of fellows and awardees. We focus on the most common themes and discuss challenges most frequently mentioned and observed; challenges common to most programs (e.g., staff turnover) are excluded.

Impact of the VPI Leadership Programs on Participants and Their Work

In this section, we explore the most common changes that have occurred for individuals who participated in the three leadership programs.

Increased commitment to violence prevention

The highest reported personal impact of the program was an increase in participants' commitment to violence prevention work. Approximately three-quarters or more of all participants surveyed reported that the fellowship had a "moderate" to "large" effect on their commitment to violence prevention work.

Improved confidence and self-esteem

Participants reported improved confidence and self-esteem as a result of the knowledge and skills they acquired during their fellowship, the opportunities they had to share their expertise with others, new experiences in which they engaged, and positive encouragement and input received from colleagues.

Increased credibility and access

The award or fellowship increased participants' perceived credibility and access to people of influence such as elected officials, policy makers, foundation staff and national organizations. Participants believed this occurred as a result of their association with TCWF and the VPI, and the recognition they received.

A place for healing and spirituality

Fellows recognized the importance of healing themselves before they could help others heal. As one community fellow said, "Hurt people hurt people." Providing a place for healing and spirituality offered antidotes to the pain of loss, violence and disenfranchisement. This was important since violence had a significant personal presence in the lives of many of the leadership participants.

Mentoring and being mentored

While mentoring of youth was a stated goal of the VPI and was built into the Community Fellowship Program, the fellows were also personally impacted by the act of mentoring. Community fellows described how important and validated they felt because the young people whom they mentored respected their opinions and heeded their advice about decisions in their lives. The value of the experience is demonstrated by the fact that nearly 80% of these fellows reported that they continue to mentor their "mentee."

Academic fellows were more likely than community fellows to be mentored. Academic fellow principal investigators and colleagues at fellowship sites, and academic fellowship coordinators, were frequently mentioned as mentors or role models who inspired, and in some cases, transformed the fellows' sense of self and life direction. Fellows described how these individuals provided encouragement and guidance both professionally and personally, access to key individuals and resources, and examples/opportunities about how to pursue violence prevention as a career and integrate it into their existing work.

Learning

New learnings focused on a variety of topics and tools to prevent violence including the public health approach to violence, the root causes of violence, policies to reduce gun injuries, how to use the media to promote policy change, and greater awareness about different community perspectives on violence and its prevention. More than 50% of the community fellows and more than 74% of the academic fellows reported that the fellowship program had a “moderate” or “large” effect on their knowledge about these areas. Learning about the public health model of violence prevention, media advocacy, and policy was especially high. Academic fellows reported a significantly larger program effect on knowledge development than community fellows, most likely because this was a specific focus of their fellowship. The most frequent types of learning that were mentioned were informal learning from peers and more structured learning through such venues as workshops and conferences.

Peer learning

Fellows said that peer learning offered them the opportunity to learn new ideas and strategies that were transferable to their work. The richest peer learning took place within fellowship cohorts. Community fellows talked about the ways they brought their personal struggles to fellowship gatherings and learned that others were often having the same problems as they were. They used each other’s experiences and knowledge to help solve problems. Peer learning was also reported to occur across leadership programs and with others in the VPI, although a number of fellows and Peace Prize awardees reported that learning across programs could have been enhanced if there had been more intentional efforts to foster exchange and peer learning beyond gathering at annual conferences.

Structured and experiential learning

Some of the learning opportunities the fellows had were formal trainings, such as media advocacy and policy advocacy. Formal training, when combined with experiential learning (e.g., through their individual learning plans and research projects) was said to reinforce and extend the knowledge and skills that were acquired during formal sessions. The media advocacy training offered by the Berkeley Media Studies Group was the most frequently and positively mentioned learning activity. Seventy-five percent of community fellows and 82% of academic fellows said the media advocacy was “moderately” or “very” effective. Training in policy advocacy was also positively mentioned. Sixty-eight percent of academic fellows and 75% of community fellows said that this training was “moderately” or “very” effective. While reactions to the training were overwhelmingly positive, far fewer participants reported the application of what they learned to their violence prevention work.

Boundary crossing

The leadership programs often sought to mix participants who did not share common cultures, classes, disciplines, backgrounds and experiences. Leadership participants exercised leadership across these different types of boundaries. While not always comfortable for participants or staff, they said that the experience led to a greater appreciation and broader perspective of self, others and strategies for their work. On a personal level one community fellow commented that she overcame her fear of people who were different from her. On a

strategic level, another community fellow discussed building bridges between Latino and African-American communities in order to promote understanding and minimize opportunities for fear and resentment that occur when only one community is being served. Other fellows spoke about being a bridge between their own culture and the mainstream culture—bringing resources and knowledge from the mainstream culture that can benefit their community, while at the same time sharing cultural wisdom with and bringing balance to the mainstream culture. Some boundaries, such as the ones between community leaders and academic professionals, seemed particularly difficult to cross.

Leadership and Systemic Change

The leadership programs of the VPI have seeded enduring and systemic changes. The full impact of these changes will unfold over time, and may never be fully documented. This section of the report captures some of these changes that will make a significant difference to young people, their families and communities, and to the field of violence prevention. Six dimensions of enduring change are discussed.

Leadership for violence prevention

One of the goals of the initiative was to “build a critical mass of leaders and professionals who are positioned and prepared to advocate for and institute programs and policies to prevent violence against youth and foster safer and healthier communities.” The VPI has accomplished this in several ways.

Numbers of leaders

The VPI has recognized and provided support to 148 leaders in violence prevention. These leaders touch hundreds of people in communities and institutions in the state of California and around the nation.

Sustaining leadership in the field

The sustained engagement of these leaders in the field over time is another indicator that a critical mass of leaders is being built. Over 90% of community fellows and Peace Prize awardees report that they are still involved in violence prevention. Nearly 70% of academic fellows have an on-going involvement. Many of the community fellows and Peace Prize awardees work long hours to save lives even though it takes a toll on their personal well-being and that of their families. Receiving recognition and resources from The Wellness Foundation was reported to increase well-being, and support many to continue their violence prevention work. Some of the academic fellows stated that the demands of their professional jobs make it difficult to integrate violence prevention into their work, however, most academic fellows have found ways to bring their commitment to violence prevention with them, such as serving as a member of a child death review team or chairing a statewide psychology conference focused on violence prevention.

Inspiring and developing the next generation of leaders

Building a critical mass of leaders requires not only sustaining leaders who are currently in the field, but also inspiring and developing the next generation of leaders. Numerous stories were told about the ways that community fellows positively impacted the lives of the young

people who they mentored. Among those fellows who mentored a young person during their fellowship, 80% reported that their “mentees” are still involved in violence prevention work.

Social capital

In order for a critical mass of leaders to be an effective force for change, numbers are a necessary, but not sufficient condition of change. The influence and power of leadership is in the relationships and networks that nurture, connect and mobilize resources to get things done. In turn, relationships and networks are an important foundation for creating collaborations that will have a sustained impact for communities and for finding solutions to violence.

Relationships and networks

The VPI leadership programs, in particular the Academic Fellowship Program and Community Fellowship Program, provided a structure that nurtured bonds of trust among cohorts of fellows in the same program. Eighty-eight percent of the community fellows and 82% of the academic fellows reported that the “opportunity to develop relationships with other fellows in my cohort” was “moderately” to “very” effective. Since the Peace Prize Award did not involve participation in a program, awardees had very few opportunities to build relationships with one another, or others in the VPI, unless they personally took it upon themselves to come to VPI conferences.

There was a difference in how academic fellows and community fellows described the value of their relationships. Academic fellows emphasized being part of a network that had professional benefits. Community fellows characterized their relationships as providing an on-going resource for friendship, personal support, inspiration and learning.

Very little social capital was generated between academic and community fellows. Only 11% of community fellows indicated that they had continued communication with academic fellows, compared with 72% who maintained connections with community fellows. Likewise, only 8% of academic fellows had continued communication with community fellows, compared with 76% who maintained relationships with academic fellows. There are diverse reasons why long-lasting relationships between academic and community fellows did not develop. These include having few formal opportunities for interaction and significant class and cultural differences between the two groups that are unlikely to be bridged without intentional effort.

Collaborations

Collaborations occurred both among individuals and between organizations. Sometimes collaborations were intentionally formed to address a particular problem or issue; at other times the opportunity to collaborate emerged out of the relationship itself. Although collaboration was not actively supported by the programs (e.g., through mini-grants), some fellows did create collaborative opportunities. One academic fellow spoke about how the Academic Fellowship Program enabled her to collaborate with two other Latinas to address domestic violence issues in the Latino community. A community fellow described how the fellowship contributed to her efforts to form an organizational collaboration within her community.

New and shared knowledge

Knowledge is a powerful tool to influence social norms about violence, to increase support for interventions to decrease violence, and to inspire others to get involved in violence prevention. Knowledge was generated from exposure to new ideas and information; reflection about one's own experiences and the experiences of others; and implementation of research and community-focused projects.

Promoting a public health approach to violence

One of the goals of the VPI was to promote violence prevention as a public health issue. This viewpoint was new for many of the leadership participants. Three quarters of the academic fellows and 42% of the community fellows reported that the fellowship program had a "large effect" on their understanding of the public health approach to violence prevention.

Sharing and disseminating knowledge

The power of knowledge to catalyze change increases when it is shared. It is fundamental for personal, organizational and policy transformation. Fellows and awardees report sharing knowledge through publications, presentations, public testimony, the media and art.

Using research for policy impact

Research has raised awareness about the seriousness of problems, such as Post Traumatic Stress Syndrome among youth at the California Youth Authority and the challenges institutions face in addressing problems like this. Research has also been used to advocate successfully for changes in policy, such as gun safety legislation throughout California and domestic violence laws in Japan.

Discourse and policy impacts

Academic and community fellows received training in positioning their message through the media, and in influencing policymakers and the policymaking process. Peace Prize awardees were given a media platform to bring visibility and attention to their work. Some of the fellows have used these strategies to contribute to change in their communities including changing the discourse about violence; organizing and activism, particularly around gun violence; mobilizing and leveraging of media attention; and taking on leadership positions. Each of these strategies appears to have raised the visibility of violence prevention and, in some cases, led to policy change.

New resources for violence prevention

Many fellows and awardees used TCWF funds and/or the recognition that they received to leverage additional resources for their work. Fellows reported that the fellowship increased their credibility with other funders. More than half of leadership participants reported that their participation in the program resulted in a "moderate or large effect" in their ability to attract or leverage funds for their organization.

Institutionalizing changes

Long-term sustainable change requires innovations and new ideas to become embedded in organizations, institutions and the practices and policies of a field. Leadership program

participants accomplished this by creating their own nonprofit organizations; establishing new programs and approaches to violence prevention within existing institutions; and increasing the prevalence of violence prevention courses, presentations and publications.

Lessons Learned about Developing Leadership Within the Violence Prevention Field

Impact of the broader VPI on the leadership programs

- Situating the leadership programs within the broader VPI added value to the individual experiences of participants and enhanced their collective impact on violence prevention efforts.
- To have an enduring impact within a field, leadership programs need to develop a critical mass of committed leaders that have the breadth of perspective to develop multi-solution approaches and the ability to build cross-sectoral and multi-ethnic partnerships. The VPI increased these opportunities for leadership participants.
- A strength of the VPI leadership programs was its recognition that there was no “one size fits all” leadership model for the reduction of violence.

Program design and delivery strategies

- The use of diverse adult learning principles, e.g. peer learning, core curriculum and individual learning, self-reflection, and experiential learning, maximized the development of skills and capacities of participants.
- The inclusion of non-traditional leaders (e.g., ex-convicts and priests) and design elements (e.g., a focus on healing and spirituality) enriched the leadership programs.
- Community fellows identified personal qualities, such as listening, humility, empathy, and respect as more important for leadership than traditional field specific competencies.
- Utilization of participants’ experiences and skills strengthened individual and cohort learning.

Comparisons of the three different leadership programs

- The benefits of leadership recognition outweighed the concerns (e.g., resentment from colleagues) and should be integrated into leadership programs for maximum impact.
- Peace Prize awardees could have benefited from a cohort convening experience.
- Mentoring cultivated the next generation of leaders and benefited the mentors; the expansion of the mentoring component for academic fellows to mentor others and community fellows to have a mentor would have been beneficial.

The role of financial resources

- Personal financial stability increased community leadership capacity; unrestricted funds are a particularly effective strategy for achieving this outcome.
- Community innovations were effectively supported by identifying and distributing resources to social entrepreneurs.

Building boundary crossing capacity

- Bringing together people from different backgrounds, classes, gender, cultures and sectors created dynamic learning opportunities; however, there was a widespread feeling that more intentional efforts would have had increased these benefits.

Sustainability

- Efforts to sustain leadership networks and alumni connections can enhance leadership investments. There are currently no formal plans in place to sustain the VPI network.

**Key innovations of the VPI leadership programs that are instructive
for the field of leadership development**

- * Connecting leadership programs to a broader Initiative magnifies impact.
- * Providing unrestricted award funds supports innovation at the community level.
- * Mentoring young people develops the next generation of leaders and also strengthens the leadership capacity of the mentor.
- * Paying attention to healing past wounds empowers leaders to give back to their community.

Conclusion

The story of the leadership program is one story but many voices. These voices tell us about enduring changes that have taken place. Participants have been changed forever by their VPI experience both personally and professionally. They are more connected with another, and, by and large, feel part of a larger movement. Most individuals continue to work to prevent violence and mentor the next generation of leaders. Some have played important leadership roles that brought about systemic changes to mitigate violence in their organizations, professional specialties and communities.

The VPI leadership program goals were largely met: leaders were recognized and promoted, communities empowered through this recognition, and leaders supported through multiple types of learning, convening and training. Innovative practices were identified that will inform leadership development strategies. As a result of speaking with these leaders, we have a deeper understanding of some of the crucial components of transforming change and the leadership tasks required of that change.

Introduction

“I have buried 116 young people, killed on our streets for no reason. If you are close enough to this kind of work and you have the heartbreak of kids dying, in order to be resilient, you have to focus on being faithful rather than ‘successful’, faithful to an approach that you believe in. The second you start to fixate on saving lives, tally sheets, or how many kids have been extricated from the jaws of gun violence—once you start to quantify it, and say this is what success looks like, then you get perilously close to burnout. You have to know what you think you are doing and stay utterly faithful to it ...”

“Don’t relinquish your own common sense! Once I was in a debate with [Harvard sociologist] James Q. Wilson. Somebody thought this would be fun: the statistical meets the anecdotal. I was telling story after story, with people laughing, crying or thinking, and he was just saying numbers and getting more [annoyed]. And finally he pounded on the table and he said, ‘There is no statistical proof whatsoever that says that a job will help reduce gang violence.’ To which I said, ‘There is nobody in this room that needs that proof.’ ”

Father Greg Boyle, California Wellness Foundation Peace Prize Awardee, 2000

There are multiple ways of knowing, as Peace Prize Awardee Father Boyle reminds us. We can know with the mind, with the gut, and with the heart. This report brings the statistical into focus by means of a thick analysis of the experience of people touched by the Leadership and Professional Development Program of the Violence Prevention Initiative (VPI). It is a story of a bold vision, tempered by the forces of resistance and change and ultimately ennobled by leadership and the enduring human spirit. It relies on common and uncommon sense, numbers, moral imagination, and a kind of *conocimiento*, or deep knowing, by those interviewed. Above all, we offer the power and purity of the story of the VPI in the words of the people who brought the vision to life.

Bold Vision

Great leadership, whether collective or individual, finds its voice in the wants and needs of people. The story of the vision of the VPI begins with the desire to find a way to stop the senseless killing of young people, the number one cause of death for youth in California in the early 1990s. Violence is usually addressed after the fact, in trauma centers, courts, prisons, coroner’s offices, and research centers.¹ Could violence be prevented or reduced by focusing on communities, schools, policy, and the media before children became another statistic?

In 1993, The California Wellness Foundation (TCWF) launched the ten-year VPI to reduce violence against youth in California. The VPI took a systemic approach to addressing issues of youth violence in California. The architects of the initiative knew that in order to have a significant impact on youth violence, they needed to launch many efforts simultaneously. The hope was that if all these efforts were coordinated as part of an overall initiative, the resulting impact would be greater than if these efforts were funded and launched separately.

¹As noted in TCWF 1998 Annual Report.

The initiative included efforts to change laws and policies that affect levels of violence; transform the public discourse about violence from a criminal justice issue to a public health issue; build community, organizational, and institutional capacity to address violence; generate new knowledge and research about violence and violence prevention; diversify the medical and public health workforces responsible for treating victims of violence; and recognize and support outstanding leaders in violence prevention work. No foundation or government entity had ever taken such a comprehensive approach to violence prevention.

Transforming change

The ever-whirling wheel of Change; to which all mortal things doeth sway.

–Edmund Spenser

Change is ubiquitous, and as Spenser’s epic poem laments, it can whirl along without any help from us. What we are interested in is transforming change and the ways that leaders can be effectively involved in this change.

The public health model of change involves careful attention to the root causes of a problem and the consequences of intervention at a systemic level. Using a host/environment/agent approach, the public health model allows for learning and adjustments as information and data are generated. Unintended consequences are moderated through feedback loops, which in turn adjust the direction and outcomes of the model. Well-known examples of the use of the public health model include the government’s anti-smoking campaign, the designated driver campaign, and the fasten-your-seatbelt campaign.

There is no roadmap for systemic change. Positive change is made and lost. It is subject to fluctuations in economic and political realities, in particular, the level of focused attention directed at it and the resources that people, organizations, institutions, foundations and governments commit over time. No one organization or effort can lead to systemic change. Nevertheless, TCWF’s ten-year commitment to violence prevention stands out as a beacon for others desirous of change to follow.

“[The VPI’s public health approach to violence prevention] was a forerunner that helped shape the parameters and framework for a more comprehensive approach. If we hadn’t had [this initiative], we would be in that same mode we were six or seven years ago with categorical approaches. Wellness helped plant the [seeds] for other foundation initiatives. Even public policy is looking at violence prevention differently now.”

What Leadership Skills Are Most Important in Supporting Systemic Change?

Dr. James MacGregor Burns, a renowned leadership scholar who served as a consultant to this evaluation, was asked, “What would indicate that the VPI Leadership Program has built a critical mass of leaders who can effectively work to prevent violence?”

Burns replied that for over sixty years, from the introduction of the Model T to today, he has mused over the problem of auto injuries. He has witnessed a variety of strategies: improved road conditions, seat belts, seat belt legislation, air bags, driver education, and enforced speed laws. Did one of these approaches serve as the lynchpin for improved safety? Progress cannot be attributed to one key event or intervention, he believes, but to the accumulation of approaches. All these strategies were necessary, and their interaction was significant as well. It’s an apt analogy for violence prevention.

Burns supported the broad approach adopted by the VPI. “In an area like violence prevention that is enormously complex, one problem is partiality and taking bites around the edges. Systems change requires leaders who will take the broadest view and deepen their psychological and cultural perspectives. Experience can broaden or narrow a leader’s perspective. How much can we do without a broad knowledge of change and a deep understanding of the human condition? Leaders must go through learning processes that broaden [their] outlook,” he suggests, “and defend against one-tactic or one-remedy solutions.”

To a large extent, we found that the VPI expanded and broadened participants’ views of violence prevention and the process of change. Participants talked about the ways in which they broadened their perspectives about violence prevention, how they acquired new knowledge about a variety of problems and solutions related to violence, and how they learned better strategies for defending their views to opponents.

The VPI Leadership and Professional Development Program

This report focuses on the three programs within the VPI Leadership and Professional Development Program— the Community Fellowship Program, the Academic Fellowship Program, and the Peace Prize Award. The **Community Fellowship Program** selected ten community fellows each year to receive a \$50,000 grant over two years to support them in their leadership efforts to prevent violence in their communities. The **Academic Fellowship Program** funded academic fellowships at nine sites with the goal of increasing the number of women and underrepresented ethnic groups in the health professions with expertise in violence prevention. The fellowship sites received \$50,000 to \$65,000 a year, most of which was used for fellows’ stipends. TCWF provided funds to hire coordinators for each of the fellowship programs. The **Peace Prize Award** was given annually to three individuals to recognize their outstanding work to prevent violence in their communities. Each awardee received \$25,000.

The leadership programs of this initiative sought to achieve the following:

- Recognize and promote individual leaders of violence prevention.
- Help communities empower themselves by recognizing leadership in violence prevention.
- Support the professional training of ethnic minorities and women in violence prevention and injury control.
- Support and link promising grassroots leaders of community efforts in violence prevention through leadership and professional development.
- Build a critical mass of community leaders and professionals who are positioned and prepared to serve as advocates and institute programs and policies to prevent violence against youth and foster safer and healthier communities.

Structure of the Report

This report is divided into three sections. Section I describes the impact of the VPI on the participants and their work. We have organized the section around major themes and have drawn extensively from the interviews and site visits to illustrate and elaborate the learning and impact related to each theme. Section II examines the ways in which the leadership programs have contributed to outcomes that may have long-term systemic impact on reducing violence against youth. Section III explores lessons learned about the three distinct professional and leadership development strategies, the effectiveness of specific leadership development approaches, key innovations, and emerging models of leadership.

Interspersed throughout this report are three stories of participants in the leadership programs. We chose only three, one from each of the three programs. We could have chosen many more. The stories are the result of lengthy interviews with these individuals and people who know them. We think the stories are vital to understanding the evaluation of the leadership programs for three reasons. First, they provide a glimpse into the life history of the individual, thereby contributing to a better understanding of how their presence and the presence of others like them contributed to the leadership programs' outcomes. It is the story of what they shared with others in VPI. Second, the stories go deeper than results gleaned from standard evaluation questions. They seek the context that would influence what the person sought and took out of the program. The stories reflect the personal "learning lens" that shaped their VPI experiences. Third, the stories explore the way these three individuals have carried their experience forward, not in grants or programs, but as a life force or agent of change, for all time impacted by their involvement with the VPI. We chose the story format because, throughout history, it has been stories that weave the dramatic words and actions of people with reflections on meaning in a way that is memorable beyond the life of a report.

Evaluation Approach

Research for this report was coordinated by the Leadership Learning Community (LLC). LLC assembled a diverse team with expertise in leadership evaluation methodologies, violence prevention work, applied research, and leadership theory and scholarship to conduct this evaluation (Appendix A – Evaluation Team Members). The breadth of the team's knowledge and experiences contributed significantly to asking deeper questions, mining

themes from the data, and drawing from the findings broader lessons about how to effectively develop and support transformational leadership.

Methodology

The evaluation team used four different methods to learn about the leadership programs and collect evidence of, and stories about, its impact.

Surveys

We developed and distributed an in-depth survey tailored to each of the leadership programs. All fellows and Peace Prize awardees that we were able to locate were asked to complete the survey. We received an 86% response rate from academic fellows; an 82% response rate from Peace Prize awardees; and a 48% response rate from community fellows (Appendix B – Survey Instruments).

Interviews

We conducted, on average, one-hour interviews with twenty-seven academic fellows, twenty-five community fellows and ten Peace Prize awardees. Extensive notes were written on each interview and subsequently used for a thematic analysis. In addition to interviews with program participants, we also conducted interviews the nine academic fellowship principal investigators (PIs), the two academic fellowship coordinators, five of the community fellowship coordinators and two foundation staff members (Appendix C – Interview Protocols).

In-depth Interviews and Site Visits

We selected three community fellows, three academic fellows, and two Peace Prize awardees to conduct in-depth interviews and site visits. Selection was based on gender, ethnicity, the degree to which the team felt their story embodied the VPI experience, and the year they were in the program. These interviews and site visits enabled us to explore the leadership context in more depth, and in some cases, have an opportunity to talk with others in the fellows' community or organization that know or have been affected by their work. We also had an opportunity to talk to “mentees” of some of the community fellows.

Document Review

We reviewed documentation on the earliest vision and development of the initiative provided by the Trauma Foundation. We also reviewed evaluation reports and other documents provided by TCWF.

Participant Observation

Members of the evaluation team attended two VPI conferences in December 2002 and December 2003 and the Academic Fellowship Program Annual Evaluation Meeting in May 2002.

Analyses

The variety of methods we used enabled us to understand the impact of the programs both quantitatively and qualitatively. In addition, we were able to use each phase of data collection to inform our inquiry for subsequent phases. This gave us an opportunity to test our findings

with participants and each other and deepen our learning as we went along. A limitation in this learning results from those leadership participants who did not participate in the evaluation.

We approached the analysis of data from two different angles. First, we used a grounded theory approach to identify emergent themes, test their relevance, and look for connections among and between the three programs. Second, we asked what we could learn from the outcomes and impact of these three programs about how to effectively support the leadership of those engaged in the broad change work of transforming society. In the final analysis, we offer the stories of those who were there—stories of personal change, community change, research about violence, and dreams of reducing violence against young people.

Malcolm “Jerry” Williams: The Lollypop Cop

Six years after receiving the Peace Prize, Oakland Housing Authority police corporal Malcolm “Jerry” Williams couldn’t explain what was going on in East Oakland. “Words are just words. You just gotta come see for yourself.”

Across the sparkling San Francisco Bay on a jewel-like day, East Oakland emerges as if in another world and another time. East 14th Street (renamed International Boulevard), the bustling main artery through town, is a testament to the vitality of twenty-first century America: This is It Barbeque, Doo Rae Bak Restaurant, Allen Temple Church, Taqueria’s Mexican Restaurant, Hop Phat Meat Market, and Plucky’s Liquor Store are nestled comfortably between nail salons and “paycheck cashed” enterprises.

East Oakland is a diverse, multiethnic community of nearly five thousand people residing in the area bounded by Seminary Avenue, 81st Avenue, East 14th Street and the Southern Pacific Railroad tracks. By almost any measure, East Oakland has had a tough time: crime, joblessness, violence, sagging economy, institutionalized poverty, racism, and homeless Vietnam vets.

Jerry Williams’s beat in East Oakland included Lockwood/Coliseum Gardens, two of the most dangerous and dilapidated public housing projects in the country. They were barren, inhuman, violent, nefarious, and isolated. When people were murdered elsewhere in the Bay Area, it was not uncommon for their bodies to be dumped in Lockwood/Coliseum Gardens.

Nationally, public housing projects are home to some 1.3 million American households in fourteen thousand developments across the county. Three-quarters of these households are headed by single mothers, and nearly half of these are African American. Of the three million people in projects across the nation, about half are children and a third, elderly individuals.

In 1992, Jerry Williams was a tough undercover narcotics officer, working the Lockwood/Coliseum Garden complexes. “We used to make dozens of arrests a night in

this community; it was like fishing in a fish bowl,” he says of his early days. “We were kicking in doors and hauling off people’s kids and grandkids for drug-related crimes.”

He was, by his own admission, “a very aggressive police officer” where success was measured by number of arrests. He was personally averaging seven felony arrests a night. “I had been doing it so long and was so successful at it, it was second nature. I didn’t think about it,” he says matter-of-factly. The problem was, the more arrests he and his fellow officers made, the more the crime rate increased. And not just that: when he drove home after work, it would take him longer and longer to shed the streets—sometimes a couple hours. “I knew what the problem was—[my work] didn’t come from within.”

His personal crisis was cresting, when in 1992, his chief called him in and said he wanted Jerry to “do this thing called community policing.” Jerry remembers saying “I didn’t have a clue.” The chief handed Jerry ten guidelines, nine of which Jerry remembers he was already doing as a traditional police officer. But the tenth guideline instructed him to “establish rapport with the community,” a simple statement that would begin a change in Jerry the police officer and Jerry the person.

Still uncertain about how to do community policing, Jerry headed for training in Los Angeles. He left the training having learned “what to do” but still wondered “how to do” it. When he returned to Oakland, he participated in a health realization training that answered this question. At first Jerry thought “Oh, geez, this sounds like some cult stuff. How is this going help me make more arrests?” He explains how on the second day of class “we were down to twenty [participants]. On the third day, I was the only person left.”

Leaving the training, Jerry remembers a number of lessons that stuck. “They talked about how my mind constructed my reality and that ability, creativity, judgment, love, wisdom, and compassion were everyone’s birthright, not just a select few. ‘People want to do good,’ they assured me. ‘Just go out and give it a try. Oh, and stay in touch.’”

“I returned to Lockwood/Coliseum Gardens and got out of my car and started talking to people. I thought I would begin by asking people to call me ‘Jerry.’ After all, I called them by their first names, so why should I be ‘Corporal Williams’? I bought lollypops for the kids and stuck them in my trunk to hand out. That’s why the kids call me the Lollypop Cop. I tried to look for the goodness in everyone and myself, but it was still hard, real hard,” Jerry recounted.

Jerry recounts what he was learning from the community and from the empowerment training now taking place at Lockwood/Coliseum Gardens. “They taught me how to listen, really listen, not just to people’s words, but beyond those words to the feelings,” Jerry remembers. “I also had to let go of the ‘fix it’ attitude and find what sparkles in people. To learn to work with people instead of on them. I began to catch on. I felt like I was finally graduating from the real police academy and that I was beginning to become a “peace officer”—someone who keeps the peace—and not simply a “police officer.”

The change in Jerry did not come easily. “After a few months, I began to see changes in Lockwood/Coliseum Gardens. I knew there was something working out there. I knew the philosophy of this model, and I was working it hard, but it was a still a struggle for me. I thought if they can change, why can’t I change?” Jerry recalled. About six months later, with the help of the training and seeing the people in this community change, he finally got it. “I stopped thinking and trying to fix it. It was an interactive process between them and me. We fixed each other, you might say, although in truth, nothing was ever broken. It all just fit into place, and my life changed forever.”

Corporal Williams had discovered the true nature of community policing. He hadn’t made any drastic outward changes—it was about being a compassionate and authentic person and seeing the goodness in himself and others. No small task.

At first Jerry felt a bit soft and vulnerable. His fellow officers kidded him and called him “Officer Friendly” or “Officer Hug-a-Thug.” But over time, some tagged along, and pretty soon they were taking kids to the swimming pool and to camp. His relationship with the youth facilitated relationships with others in the community,” Jerry said. “They [community residents] know what the problems are, and they know what the solutions are. I can be the vehicle to take them towards that solution.”

It took about eighteen months for the adults to really trust him. The turning point came at a meeting in which the community members suggested they wanted to take on the troublemakers in the neighborhood. Instead of asking Jerry and the other officers to try to handle the problem, they came up with their own creative solution: printing up “Wanted: Out of the Community, By the Community” posters with photographs of four young men who were threatening kids and stealing from community members. No sooner had the posters been tacked up on Lockwood telephone poles, then the buzz went out and one of the young men showed up at Jerry’s office, saying he was leaving because he didn’t need that kind of exposure. The other three called him shortly after and left too.

Working together, the housing authority, the police and the community built a police substation at Lockwood, conducted a community audit, offered health realization training for residents, and started a volunteer program in Havens Court Middle School and Lockwood Elementary. Jerry convinced the local garden center to subsidize a daycare center and helped the community start a school lunch program for the kids. People hung their laundry outside, no longer afraid that the crack addicts would steal it. The housing project transformed into a community where children played outside again. With the help of politicians, businesses, the housing authority and others, millions of dollars of federal grants poured into Lockwood/Coliseum Gardens, bringing new housing, jobs, and skills training. “Operation Weed and Seed” and other support group agencies collaborated to “weed out” violent crime, gang activity, drug use, and drug trafficking and then “seed” the restoration of the area by social and economic revitalization.

About this time, Jerry was named the recipient of the 1997 California Peace Prize Award. National and local news profiled Jerry, community policing, and Lockwood/Coliseum Gardens, dubbing it the “Miracle on 65th Avenue.” The award and resulting media

coverage began to expand Jerry's influence on violence prevention. He found himself in demand at police departments and other troubled communities around the country. He provided technical assistance to cities that wanted to replicate his form of community policing and taught college courses on violence prevention and the role of police. Attorney General Janet Reno paid him two visits because she had heard what had been going on. For Jerry, the greatest benefit of all the attention was the media put the community in a positive light, when it had only gotten negative publicity before. "They were just as honored and excited as I was when I was nominated to receive the award. It was as if they too received the award. Remember, this community was hopeless with low self-esteem. The award made them feel that they accomplished the ultimate reward—true peace, in a place that once was the most violent community in the City of Oakland."

A lot has changed over the last decade. Coliseum Gardens is being plowed under and new homes constructed. Lockwood Gardens is a community in the fullest sense of the term. Catherine Smith, a longtime resident says quietly, "I've lived here seventeen years, and this place has really changed. When I first came here, there was a lot of drug trafficking. A lot of people got killed here. My own son got killed here. A lot has changed, and Jerry has brought about change." Of all the changes, Jerry and the community are especially proud of the fact that there was not one homicide in eight years.

Leadership recognition efforts like the TCWF Peace Prize represent a new approach by foundations to foster and support leadership in communities. Critics worry that when one leader is recognized, the community might get lazy or expect the person in the spotlight to solve all its problems. What happens when that person leaves, they ask? In 2003, Jerry was re-assigned to the West End. Before starting his assignment, he said that "everyone there had heard about me, and knew I could be trusted."

Because he was not the "fix" for what happened in Lockwood/Coliseum Gardens, he doesn't think his departure will undo the change since the invisible thread of love and connection has taken hold, both in Lockwood/Coliseum Gardens and in Jerry. Five years after winning the Peace Prize, Jerry stands with community folks on a Lockwood corner one sunny day. "There is nothing magic about Lockwood/Coliseum Gardens," he says. "If it can be done here, it can be done anywhere. The whole process is so natural. I didn't do anything great. It's not about me. This has always been a great community. It just never had been recognized."

When asked if TCWF could do anything else to improve the impact of the Peace Prize, the Lollypop Cop thinks a moment and then responds, "They did a beautiful job, [but] what I would like to have seen was for them to present the award in the community, that the attention be brought into the community."

Personal Impact of the Leadership Program on Participants and Their Work

From the beginning, the spirit and essence of the leadership programs focused on individuals. The program selected leaders carefully, offered them resources and new experiences, and encouraged individual differences. “Service to others” forged a common link among participants. Many participants, especially those working in communities, came into the program reflecting on both the accomplishments and frustrations of years spent focusing solely on others through youth initiatives, relationship building and organizing, community projects, and social change initiatives. For many, the fellowship provided a time for personal reflection, rejuvenation, and growth, in addition to the typical focus on professional pursuits, organizations, and communities. For most participants, this focus on self was unusual and appreciated.

In this section we explore the most significant ways in which the leadership programs impacted the lives of those who participated. We discuss seven specific themes that emerged from the information we collected from participants: commitment to violence prevention, confidence and self-esteem, credibility and access, healing and spirituality, mentoring, learning and boundary crossing. These themes closely relate to each other and sometimes overlap.

Increased commitment to violence prevention

When asked about what qualities are most important to violence prevention work, one answer united leadership participants: commitment! The exacting toll and sense of isolation that so often result from this type of work came through loud and clear in the comments of many participants. “When you are doing this kind of work, you feel alone, as if nobody is there for you or with you.”

The good news is that participants reported that the greatest personal impact of the program was an increase in their commitment to violence prevention work. Approximately three-quarters or more of participants from each of the three programs reported that the fellowship had a “moderate” to “large” effect on their commitment to violence prevention work. One community fellow described the impact of the fellowship on his commitment in this way:

“[I can’t believe] how much more solid I am in it [my work]. I’m unshakeable... People will say, ‘You can’t do that,’ and I’ll do it anyway. I’m just going to keep pecking at the rock, because you never know when it’s going to provide a little break or snap open. This experience made me feel like a brand new woman.”

Improved confidence and self-esteem

Participants reported improved confidence and self-esteem as a result of the knowledge and skills they acquired during their fellowship, the opportunities they had to share their expertise with others, the new experiences in which they engaged, and the positive encouragement and input they received from colleagues. The examples below provide a glimpse into the ways in which this occurred.

“It increased my confidence as a professional. I felt very acknowledged ... I was a teacher in meetings. I had a lot of experiences that others did not. I brought a decade of violence prevention experience to the fellowship. Just seeing that academics were interested in what I had to say was great.”

“Being recognized built my self-esteem. It was rewarding to be acknowledged for my tireless efforts and personal hardships in the pursuit of peace.”

“It was a really transformative experience for me personally and professionally. I hadn’t had a lot of exposure to academic mentors. It was really powerful to be around all of these intelligent and warm people and be treated as an equal ... treated as a full professional ... The opportunity to go to APHA [American Public Health Association] conferences and be able to present at meetings ... It was a big self-esteem boost.”

“The fellowship definitely supported my development as a leader. It gave me more confidence in myself and my ability to work with diverse groups.”

Increased credibility and access

Fellows also talked about the ways in which the award or fellowship increased their credibility with and access to key people, such as elected officials, policy makers, and foundation staff as well as influential national organizations.

“The main thing is that it [the award] opened some doors to get in certain places and be able to be heard and to have access to certain types of information and people... In some ways, it validates your work for some people inside and outside your community. Perhaps it gives them a new perspective on what you are doing, because you are recognized by someone [The Wellness Foundation] who is already well known for being involved in the issue... Outside recognition helps to validate work and makes people more open and [willing] to participate ... I think this happened in my case.”

This access to influential people and organizations came about in two ways: through VPI introductions and through the leadership programs’ recognition of their efforts. Seventy percent of the academic fellows, 67% of the community fellows and 53% of the Peace Prize awardees said that the fellowship had at least a moderate effect on their access to other leaders. The way in which these relationships led to stronger support networks for violence prevention work is discussed later in this section.

A place for healing and spirituality

The leadership programs offered a dimension of personal reflection—a focus on healing and spirituality—not always found in other leadership programs. The act of healing, as described by participants, goes beyond the simple concepts of “repair” and “grieving” to the power of spiritual beliefs. This focus occurred most often at community fellow meetings and the VPI annual conferences, both of which made use of prayers, rituals, and ceremonies from diverse religions and cultures. Most participants welcomed these practices, even when they were not always comfortable with them due to their unfamiliarity.

“The conference was always beneficial for regrouping and recharging with people who are of like minds, and it taps into the spiritual element of how we need to take care of one another. It was refreshing, and it was an initiative that was thinking out of the box.”

“The use of rituals was introduced from the beginning. I saw the traditional and the non-traditional approaches to healing—all these cultures coming together to prevent violence.”

Providing a place for healing and spirituality offered antidotes to the pain of loss, violence, and disenfranchisement. This was important since violence had a significant personal impact on the lives of many of the leadership participants. For example, when asked why they wanted to participate in the fellowship, about two-thirds of the community fellows cited their personal experience with violence; three-quarters cited the violence in their communities.

Fellows recognized the importance of healing themselves before they could help others heal. As one community fellow said, “Hurt people hurt people.” Another community fellow described the importance of the healing circle:

“It is also about healing within a circle of peers where you can let go of all of your responsibilities and just cry. The fellows defined the project and the form, and one of the key things they consistently talked about was the need for healing... We always began with the healing circle, telling fellows to throw it in the fire, whatever you have been carrying. Until the circle can really put out what you have been carrying for three months [between gatherings], it will affect everyone.”

One young African American academic fellow found the fellowship offered a painful, but healing, opportunity to be with others who had similar experiences:

“[It was important] to be able to see others struggle with their own issues and identity, [such as] being a minority male and all that brings up. The group provided a sounding board to work on ... issues being directed at minority males. [It is] a very painful issue to look at, and you feel helpless initially, and even when we have ideas as to how to [address] this problem, we still see so many people impacted. You hate to see your community so devastated.”

Mentoring and being mentored

The VPI cited the mentoring of youth as one of its goals and incorporated it into the Community Fellowship Program. Community fellows were required to mentor two young people throughout their fellowship. Fellows attested to the fact that they were personally impacted by the act of mentoring—that mentoring benefits the mentor as well as the mentee. The value of this experience is demonstrated by the fact that nearly 80% of these fellows reported that they continue to mentor their “mentee.” Two community fellows described their mentoring experience in this way:

“[The relationship with mentees] made me feel important again. They made me feel needed; they depended on me, and took my advice when it came to certain decisions that needed to be made ranging from relationships, school, employment, and so forth.”

“I benefited a lot from being a mentor because being responsible for them and seeing them develop helped me too. I gained a lot. There are not a lot of people that could be mentors to these kids. That they chose me, opened my mind and my heart. If it were not for the fellowship, I could not have done all of this ... I am in touch with all of the mentees still. In the real world, there is so much insanity. They see violence everyday, and they can lose sanity. They call me when they are feeling this way. They need to hear my voice and need me to encourage them. That’s one thing that I am thankful for.”

For academic fellows, the program focused more on being mentored than on mentoring others. Mentors played a key, sometimes even transformational, role in many fellows’ experiences. Mentors served as an inspiration and role model. They provided encouragement and guidance both professionally and personally, access to key individuals and resources, and examples/opportunities about how to pursue violence prevention as a career and integrate it into existing work.

Mentors most frequently mentioned included the PIs at fellowship sites, the academic fellowship coordinators, colleagues at fellowship sites and within fellowship cohorts, and less frequently, other individuals within the VPI. Two fellows described the impact of these individuals:

Billie is not just my mentor, she is my public health hero. She didn’t just help me— after I met her, I said, ‘Wow! I want to do what you do and want to be like you’... I went to learn from her.”

“The three people that I worked with at EPIC were most instrumental. They encouraged all of us to go out and do things. They would have us do speaking engagements that they would normally do. They forced us to get out there and take some leadership, to be prepared to help set the agenda. Now I won’t shut up. They were definitely like professional guardian angels.”

Learning

Leadership participants experienced significant learning that occurred in a variety of ways. Some benefited from formal and informal discussions with VPI colleagues, fellowship coordinators, and PIs at annual VPI conferences, training sessions, and fellowship meetings and retreats. Others learned from written materials supplied by the foundation and the Pacific Center for Violence Prevention, the policy center of the VPI.

Learning focused on a variety of topics related to violence, including the public health approach to violence, the root causes of violence, policies to reduce gun injuries, the use of the media to promote policy change, and greater awareness about different community perspectives on violence and its prevention. Fifty percent of the community fellows and 74% of the academic fellows reported that the fellowship program had a “moderate” or “large” effect on their knowledge about these areas. Learning about the public health model of

violence prevention, media advocacy, and policy were notably high. Academic fellows reported significantly greater knowledge development from programs than did community fellows, most likely because this was a specific focus of the academic fellowship. The most frequent types of learning that were mentioned were informal learning from peers and more structured and experiential learning.

Peer learning

Peer learning offered fellows the opportunity to learn new ideas and strategies that were transferable to their work. This occurred in both formal settings, such as the annual conference and fellows' meetings, as well as informal settings, such as over a meal or during a visit to a colleague's organization. The richest peer learning took place within fellowship cohorts. One community fellow provided an example of peer learning within his cohort:

“We were people bringing different perspectives from different communities that were all having the same problem. Each fellow brought leadership skills to the table and shared their perspective, their commitment, and their challenges. When I struggled with dedication, another fellow modeled how he delegates in his organization to take some of the load off.”

Peer learning also occurred across the leadership programs and with others in the VPI. Two academic fellows provided these examples:

“Coming from Hopkins, I had a good sense of epidemiology and policy, so the most important part of the fellowship for me was working with people who have different life perspectives and ideas about ways to work. It helped a lot to learn about priorities, sensitivities, perspectives ... how different people look at the same thing and come to completely different conclusions based on their experience.”

“I was passionate about violence prevention as an advocate, but a lot of times I would communicate with anger. I needed to make sure I communicated in a way where people would listen. At the annual meetings, I met activists who were so well versed. They had amazing skills. This is something that I learned more about in the fellowship: how to play the role between researcher and activist.”

Structured and experiential learning

Fellows participated in a variety of structured learning activities such as workshops, meetings, and conferences. The most frequently and positively mentioned activity among the leadership programs was the media advocacy training offered by the Berkeley Media Studies Group (BMSG). Seventy-five percent of community fellows and 82% of academic fellows said the media advocacy was “moderately” or “very” effective.

During the training, participants learned how to use the media to garner attention for violence prevention policies. This training was viewed as a unique opportunity (i.e., not offered in other educational settings) and an invaluable resource for most participants, regardless of whether or not they had applied the acquired knowledge.

Training in policy advocacy was another type of learning that participants discussed frequently and positively. Sixty-eight percent of academic fellows and 75% of community fellows said that this training was “moderately” or “very” effective. The strategic importance of policy training is evident in the successful efforts of VPI members to pass firearms legislation.

Experiential learning occurred when fellows engaged in a project or activity that deepened their knowledge and skills, and enabled them to learn lessons that could be transferred to other contexts and projects. Individual learning plans and research projects were vehicles for experiential learning. This learning was often reinforced and expanded through sharing and reflecting with peers.

As one community fellow put it, the best combination was coupling structured workshops or courses with experience.

“I attended those trainings, and I took the information and applied it to my life and then was able to apply it to the work I do and have an impact on youth. One of the most significant things that came [out of] it was that you take the pebble and throw it in the pond and then you see the rippling effect.”

Boundary crossing

The leadership programs and VPI often sought to mix participants who did not share common cultures, classes, disciplines, backgrounds, and experiences. Leadership participants exercised leadership across these different types of boundaries. While not always comfortable for participants or staff, the experiences did lead to a greater appreciation and broader perspective of self, others, and work strategies.

“Every couple of months, I’d get invited to a TCWF meeting. I would meet other women and other organizations. Before I was scared of other women of color, but these meetings had many cultures, and I lost the fear that I once had ... I learned that there are different cultures. Latino and indigenous cultures are different. When we’re not educated, we ignore the problem ... I was able to overcome my fear of people who were different than me. I used to be afraid of black people, and I am no longer afraid. I learned that there are a lot of different cultures and different belief systems around violence.”

A community fellow understood that to focus on the needs of his own community without paying attention to building relationships between Latinos and African Americans might exacerbate tensions and incite violence.

“We were just starting to address the issue of Latino infrastructure, because the priority was to build relationship between African Americans and Latinos instead of just trying to build Latino leadership. Without safety, understanding, and tolerance, nothing can be done. Building the organization was a big challenge, since the area had historically been a stronghold of the African American community. We had to deal with the relationships first. In 1989–1990, we faced a dilemma of what to do— build bridges or just serve Latinos and become a target of fear, misunderstanding, or resentment from African

Americans. It is crucial to pay attention to finding commonalities ... so that everyone sees the need to extend hands to one another."

While one fellow saw the need to reach out before working within his group, another fellow appreciated the need to reach out from within her group to build relationships with other groups.

"Early on I recognized that I was a bridge leader. I realized I had a gift to go back and forth. In mentoring you need to take the hand of someone else and expose him or her to the outside. The magic word is integration. You take the best of both worlds. Balance is the key."

Merris Obie: A Woman of Two Worlds

Cutting past the misty Shasta Mountains and deep through the Six Rivers National Forest of cedar and old-growth oak five hours north of Sacramento, the Trinity River winds through the Pacific Northwest to the sea and beyond. The Hoopa Valley Indian Reservation is one of the few reservations in the nation that remains on the ancestral homeland of the Hupa people and now home to other tribes that live there: the Yurok, Karuk and others. This is the land of the Natinook-wa, "People of the Place Where the Trails Return"—a place of rich tradition, spirit and natural beauty as well as poverty and despair.

Merris Obie was a community fellow in the VPI from 1995 to 1997. Of Karuk descent and a Yurok Tribal Member, she grew up in the Hoopa Valley most of her life. As the car winds along the river and through the reservation, she conducts a visual history lesson, pointing out sites that once housed the government boarding school and the abandoned old fort and barracks built in the 1850s to house the military. Nearby stands a tree where Indians were hanged by the soldiers in days gone by. The Indians themselves have made many changes, as evidenced by several of the modern buildings: the Hoopa Community Center (site of tribal governance, recreational and cultural events) and the buildings that house the AmeriCorps and the Tribal Civilian Community Corps programs funded by The Corporation for National and Community Service that Merris started.

Merris is a woman of two worlds. Like so many of the community fellows, Merris is a bridge leader who adeptly manages an inextricable web of self—a web woven of history, culture, tradition, family, gender, political status, age, and other variables. She is a person who has learned to bring the riches of both worlds to her work and everyday life.

Although she is a victim of gun violence [her police officer brother was murdered], she recognizes and supports the traditional use of guns: "In a sense we are still a hunter-gatherer people. Instead of the more traditional way of hunting with bows and arrows, guns are now used for hunting to provide deer meat for families to sustain themselves."

For many Native Americans, deer hunting is still a way for survival due to extreme poverty yet others relate to the cultural significance of providing deer for the social gatherings, ceremonies, family and elders. "I do recognize that gun violence is a problem in Indian Country and I do not support any form of gun violence ... I do support stronger gun laws and the need for people and corporations to have more gun accountability." Merris was a strong advocate in TCWF's successful statewide anti-gun campaign, securing the tribal council's support and participation in the petition drive.

She travels between the world of Native traditions and the world of cell phones, melding her ancient culture with the mainstream culture. "Early on I recognized that I was a bridge, the connector. I realized I had a gift to go back and forth from Indian Country to mainstream." Twenty years ago, she was compelled to leave college and return home to help her family heal after the murder of her older brother. Consequently, she became responsible for raising his four children. "I later learned from the elders that this was the traditional way; when someone passes on, you come home and take care of the 'burdens' for two years," said Merris.

Merris attributes her strength and courage to the strong and powerful female leaders of her family. In spite of their historical trauma of genocide, oppression, poverty, the boarding school era, alcoholism and sexual violence, they role-model wisdom, gentleness, forgiveness and grace. Other elders have played a key role in her life too. From elders she is learning of the traditional ways and sacred ceremonies. The Brush Dance has meaning for Merris. It is a dance conducted by a medicine woman and a dance for healing a sick child. "You can't heal the world unless you heal yourself," she asserts. This is one of the great lessons the community fellows have taught each other. Her own example is illustrative: When she was awarded the community fellowship, her personal world was falling apart. She had just left a destructive marriage, had little income, had no formal education, and had recently learned that her mother had been diagnosed with terminal cancer.

"At the time that The Wellness Foundation contacted me, I was working in the trenches with at-risk Native American youth. I was doing group work, community resourcing and anything to keep adolescents in school and off the streets. I worked with kids who were either abusing or trying to recover from drugs and alcohol. I worked with the homeless and runaways. At the time I was doing the work as a volunteer. I had just gotten myself out of an abusive relationship ... I [moved into] substandard housing, and that's exactly when the Wellness award came through. Having a stable income with the Wellness funds supporting my work enabled me to take out a bank loan to purchase my own house. That stabilized my life. Wellness kept telling us 'use the money to compensate your time and improve the quality of your life so that you can better serve your community.' Finally, hearing this for the sixth time, I realized that I needed to stabilize my personal life in order to move forward and to better serve my family and community. And that's exactly what I did. I bought a home, became a certified drug and alcohol counselor and received my Associate of Arts degree."

The second youngest of seven and the fourth generation product of Indian boarding schools intent on “mainstreaming” young Indians, Merris’s traditional ties had been severed. She received very little connection to Indian history and culture through her formal education. “I basically stopped learning in the sixth grade. Something happened. I think it was the lack of expectations, the lack of discipline and the chaos that happens in the classroom. I graduated from high school with a 2.0. I had never picked up a book and read it. I could barely write when I went to college,” she remembers.

But she did excel in some things. She was active in clubs and activities and took on leadership roles in groups. She was the senior class president. “That’s what kept me in school, even though I’d gotten in skirmishes. I see signs now of the organizer in me back then. I was good at it,” explains Merris.

Although not motivated to go to college at first, a recruiter showed her sources of funding for Native Americans and “did all the paperwork. My choices were either end up in jail or go to college,” she says. “So I went to college.” This was not an easy transition for Merris. “When I went, I was suffering from culture shock. I started drinking more. I really did not understand why I was so angry. Then I started learning in anthropology classes about genocide and oppression. They didn’t teach you about internalized oppression—I learned that from Native American scholars. When I started to learn the truth about why we are the way we are, it made me angry. But I had nowhere to go with my anger.”

Then Merris met Sister Patricia Carson, a Sister of Mercy from New Jersey who has been running a women’s resource center on the reservation for fifteen years. Paradoxically, it was Sister Pat, a Catholic nun, who helped Merris confront her anger about racism. “She has been a great mentor for me; she helped me recover from white hate. She was the very first white person I had contact with outside of my group. She helped me in the healing process to overcome my own anger.”

Sister Pat’s approach was subtle. “With Merris [and other Indian women] it was not a direct kind of approach, but rather as a listener. Listening and validating the right to have the anger, the right to express it, to work through it, the freedom of choice to get on, but never forgetting. No one should ever forget where they came from, but [they should] use it as a steppingstone to where they want to be. It’s more powerful that way,” says Sister Pat. As Merris deepened her commitment to her own healing with the support of Sister Pat and some elders, she made an unexpected discovery: “I found out I didn’t hate—I hurt.”

She experienced what seemed to be an insurmountable interlocking legacy of past and present hurt. “Because of our historical traumas, we are [wounded]. I knew that in order to grow, I had to heal the wounds of the past as well, wounds caused by internalized oppression and the oppression of the community,” she says looking back on those times.

When she learned about her tribal history from her elders, some of the mystery of genocide, oppression and internalized oppression was revealed. She discovered that on her paternal side, Spanish and American authorities forced her people into slave labor and exposed them to numerous diseases that decimated their tribe. In California when Spanish rule ended in 1821, grazing cattle had wiped out the native food supply, and starvation beset the dwindling population. In the 1850s, the gold rush brought white settlers who killed most indigenous people of California for greed, land, other natural resources and to ensure settlement claims. Merris recalls her grandmother passing on stories of white brutality and sexual abuse in boarding schools.

“It’s a sad history,” she recounts. “I was born inheriting the soul wounds of our people and I still carry those. If you get underneath the root causes of the [personal] violence and social problems in general you will find that the root causes of violence are direct links to historical violence and trauma. ”

Understanding her history helped Merris understand the cycle of violence and low self-esteem she encountered in her own life and in the lives of the families and children she served. But historical knowledge also provided new cultural resources to bring balance and conviction into her life and work.

The community fellowship unleashed Merris’s natural talents. She speaks of the fellowship with deep appreciation for the abundance and support she received. “They literally took us by the hand and helped us learn how to be our own nonprofit, how to write grants.” Through mentoring and access to resources and foundations, Merris honed her considerable talent to speak powerfully on behalf of the needs of Indian people. Shortly after the fellowship, she wrote grants that brought near five million dollars and sixty jobs to the Hoopa Valley community. The funding brought an AmeriCorps program and a residential Tribal Civilian Community Corps program for 18- to 25-year-old Indian youths around the country. “Social problems are symptoms of poverty and oppression, so I decided to improve the economic development of the tribal community with jobs specifically targeting young adults 18 to 25 in the hope to reduce social problems of violence, drug and alcohol abuse. I see it working!”

The fellowship also provided Merris with a multi-dimensional experience of diversity, one that both challenged her and comforted her. She remembers walking into the first fellows meeting in San Francisco and being struck by the different cultures represented. As the meeting progressed, she began to hear about the same issues and problems in very different communities. At that point, she says, “It became a family; a bonding started occurring and continues to this day.”

Some parts of the first fellowship meetings needed to be adjusted, she recounts. Merris was up to the task, but she was not sure how it would be received. “The way that they were sitting was offensive to me ... For me to talk and have my back to them was so foreign and disrespectful. I said we either sit in a circle or I need to go.” She describes how she shared her “spirituality and humor” which has contributed to the resiliency of Native Americans throughout their historical traumas. She taught them “talking

circles,” in which the fellows could clear their personal stress in order come together as a group. This was important, since many TCWF community fellows speak of the crucial task of healing themselves. Many have been deeply wounded by a historical legacy of racism and oppression and the psychological and economic impact that this has had for them, their families, and their communities. For her, the fellowship was tied to the “spiritual essence” of all the different cultures represented. Beginning and ending meetings with prayers drawn from different faiths and beliefs was an important way to model the healing and the celebration.

Merris’s life has come full circle. She is employed and is a consultant to federally funded tribal programs. She has also raised significant funds for the Hoopa Tribal Radio Station, KIDE. Her children are strong, her mother survived her bout with cancer, and Merris herself is a homeowner and a college graduate. She continues working on behalf of tribal communities, and Native Americans in urban settings as well. She is linked to the larger world of people working towards healing and transformation. Reflecting on the ceremonies of her people, she says quietly, “I’m the fourth generation product of boarding schools. I did not have the opportunity to dance in the ceremonies. But now my daughter is going to dance for her great-grandmother, grandmother and mother. She will be dancing; she will mend that broken hoop in my family.”

Leadership and Systemic Change

The leadership components of the VPI have seeded enduring and systemic changes. The full impact of these changes will unfold over time and may never be fully documented. It is our intent, in this section of the report, to capture some of these changes that will make a significant difference to young people, to their families and communities, and to the field of violence prevention.

We focus our attention on six dimensions of enduring change that are significant achievements of this initiative. They include violence prevention leadership; social capital; new and shared knowledge; discourse and policy impacts; new resources for violence prevention work; and institutionalized changes.

Violence Prevention Leadership

One of the goals of the initiative was to “build a critical mass of leaders and professionals who are positioned and prepared to advocate and institute programs and policies to prevent violence against youth and foster safer and healthier communities.” The VPI has accomplished this in several ways.

Numbers of leaders

The VPI has recognized and provided support to 148 leaders in violence prevention. These leaders touch hundreds of people in communities and institutions in the state of California and around the nation. The majority of these leaders come from communities of color that disproportionately bear the burden of violence. Their work is often invisible to the external

world and seldom receives recognition or reward. These leaders are among the least likely to hold positions that give them a platform for creating and contributing to new programs, policies, and knowledge.

Sustaining leadership in the field

The sustained engagement of these leaders in the field over time is another indicator that a critical mass of leaders is being built. Over 90% of community fellows and Peace Prize awardees report that they are still involved in violence prevention. Nearly 70% of academic fellows have an ongoing involvement. The differences in numbers likely reflect the different contexts in which leaders work and the opportunities available to them to do the work.

Many of the community fellows and Peace Prize awardees work long hours to save lives, even though it takes a toll on their personal well-being and that of their families. Receiving recognition and resources from the Wellness Foundation has increased well-being and effectiveness, as is evidenced by Merris Obie's story (see *Woman of Two Worlds* on page 16) and those of other community fellows and Peace Prize awardees. One community fellow commented:

"I was able to make a down payment for a house with the money that was received. At the time, my family was living in others' homes. They did not have a place of their own. To be able to provide for my family gave me the strength to continue, even when there were times I wanted to quit."

Academic fellows operate in a different context. The structure of academic institutions and the demands of professional jobs make it difficult for some fellows to find ways to integrate violence prevention into their work. One academic fellow, currently on a tenure track in academia, was hired to teach violence prevention courses, but she found she was needed and expected to teach the core requirement courses. She wanted to do the work, but at the time, there were no opportunities in her department.

Most academic fellows, however, are able to bring their commitment to violence prevention with them, even if their course work or jobs have only a tangential connection to violence prevention. In fact, because there are limited violence prevention career paths, fellows were forced by necessity to find ways to integrate the violence prevention perspective into more traditional careers. Examples of the ways fellows incorporate violence prevention into their work include:

- Serve as a co-chair of a statewide psychology conference focused on violence prevention.
- Apply experiences with violence prevention as a member of a child death review team.
- Direct a school-based substance abuse and violence reduction program for youth.
- Conduct research and teach courses on violence against women.
- Treat youth and their families who have been perpetrators of violence and/or exposed to violence.

Inspiring and developing the next generation of leaders

Building a critical mass of leaders requires not only sustaining leaders who are currently in the field but also inspiring and developing the next generation of leaders. As mentioned in the previous section, community fellows were required to mentor two youth during their fellowship. Common ways community fellows spent time with their “mentees” include involving them in their organizations, bringing them to the VPI conferences or other VPI activities, assisting them with their educational pursuits, discussing or demonstrating leadership and values, and providing support for personal issues.

One community fellow spoke eloquently about her own work and its impact.

“The first year I co-facilitated a leadership school for young girls. The second year it was a youth mobilization team that put together a summer violence program. All of these young people [are] still involved in violence prevention work to this day. As for me, [it brings] tears [to my eyes] to see the hope and the possibilities for transformation. It’s larger than their neighborhood and pursuing their goals.”

Other community fellows mark their success in developing the next generation of leaders by the number of underserved youth who have gone to college and continue to give back to their communities.

“I have, for the last twelve years, mentored hundreds of young men. We have literally hundreds of young men now all over this country at various colleges and universities who come back and talk about their experiences and what the program did for them, volunteer their time to tutor, transport kids, and talk at special events on behalf of the organization.”

The cycle of leadership is nurtured and continues from one generation to the next through role modeling and mentoring. Nearly 80% of these fellows report that their “mentees” are still involved in violence prevention work. Both fellows and “mentees” relate stories of personal transformation and the power they discovered to influence young people’s lives in a positive way.

“I had people that I mentored, and these guys developed a tremendous knack for leadership. One of them is now working at a legal firm and is in college, and the other is starting his college career. Both are tremendous leaders.”

Research shows that people who have mentors are more likely to mentor others. This “leadership ladder” can lift up leaders generation after generation.

Carole and Illyanna: On Being A Mentor and Mentee

Illyana (Illy) was part of the “Young Women’s Challenge Support Group”, a multifaceted project that Carole Ching initiated to work with high-risk young women attending an inner city alternative/continuation high school in Sacramento. Carole first met Illy when

she was 16. At that time in her life, Illy was angry and getting into a lot of trouble: “It seemed that many of her choices were being based on limited knowledge or concern for consequences.” Carole mentored Illy through the Community Fellowship Program. She listened to her, helped her find a job, provided basic work clothes, took her to conferences and introduced her to people she never would have met. When Carole was asked what is good mentoring, she mused, “availability, a conscious decision to be there for them even when you are very busy; an ability to frame things in a way that they will listen. It’s also important to introduce other positive role models, since I know I don’t have all the answers.”

The VPI became a very important part of Illy’s life. Reflecting on her experience, Illy said, “I grew up being part of the VPI. It really means a lot to me. They made me feel special, didn’t reject me for who I am and where I grew up.” She went on (with Carole’s help) to write a grant to teach art with kids in an after-school program. While the program has now ended, Illy continues to have close contact with 4 of the 10 kids who were in the after-school program. Asked whether she is a mentor, she says, “I try to teach them how to act, get on their case about cussing, support them to do the right thing.”

While the Academic Fellowship Program did not have a formal mentoring component, one academic fellow speaks passionately about his mentoring role with students of color who are training to be future leaders in the medical profession.

“I listen to what is important to them, [have them give me] a sense about how they feel about the individuals who are important to them, why they are important to them, and then try to help them use those individuals as a mirror to reflect back on themselves and help them realize that even though they hold these individuals in high esteem, they represent some of the qualities they have in themselves. I try to get them to look at that and nurture that, raise their self-esteem, and realize that they enjoy what they are doing... The ball starts and [there is a shift from] ‘can I be someone’ to ‘yes, I can, and this is who I want to be’... It is a beautiful process when it begins to unfold.”

As mentioned in the previous section on the personal impact of the leadership programs, many of the academic fellows had mentors who played a key role in their fellowship. These individuals contributed positively to the personal and professional development of the academic fellows, and as a result, a new generation of health professionals who will incorporate violence prevention into their careers.

Social Capital

In order for a critical mass of leaders to be an effective force for change, numbers are a necessary, but not sufficient, condition. The influence and power of leadership are in the relationships and networks that nurture, connect, and mobilize resources to get things done.

Social capital is often described as the bonds of trust and relationships that exist among individuals and communities² that support mutual understanding, collaboration, and joint

² Communities may include ethnic communities, geographic communities, or communities of practice/fields.

action. Building trust and relationships among people from diverse backgrounds, cultures, ethnicities, and professions is a prerequisite for creating and taking advantage of political, economic, and social opportunities that will have a positive impact on youth violence.

Relationships and networks

The leadership programs, in particular the Academic Fellowship Program and the Community Fellowship Program, provided a structure that nurtured bonds of trust among cohorts of fellows in the same program, and to some extent, among fellows from earlier cohorts. This was particularly evident among academic fellows. Since the Peace Prize Award did not involve participation in a program, awardees had very few opportunities to build relationships with one another or with others in the VPI, unless they personally took it upon themselves to come to VPI conferences.

Eighty-eight percent of the community fellows and 82% of the academic fellows reported that the “opportunity to develop relationships with other fellows in my cohort” was “moderately effective” to “very effective.” For some, these relationships were viewed as the most important aspect of the fellowship.

“The greatest gift was not about the money but the gathering process of people and communities and the exchange of knowledge, talents and healing. It was the relationships with each other that was most sustainable.”

The geographical proximity and presence of shared interests increased the impact of relationships and networks. For example, academic fellows in the Bay Area tended to have more contact through monthly fellows meetings, and, therefore, they experienced stronger relationships with each other than with fellows in southern California. Exceptions to the relational power of proximity generally arose when fellows shared a common interest, such as working on statewide public policy or working with sub-issues of violence prevention such as domestic violence.

There was a difference in how academic fellows and community fellows described social capital. Academic fellows emphasized being part of a network.

“It is invaluable to be able to have a directory of people that I know I can call up, and say I was affiliated with you through the VPI, and get collaboration almost immediately because we have been part of a common goal and vision. Those linkages and networks are really long-term, no matter where you end up.”

“I think the important thing is that when you have something like the VPI, it allows for an infrastructure in which people can be called on and mobilized when needed.”

Sometimes this networking became community-wide.

“A lot of networking [occurred] in the San Francisco area. We didn’t expect it to happen to the degree that it did. [There was a] camaraderie among the academic fellows, and even at one point, between the SF community and the academic fellows.”

Community fellows experienced social capital less as a professional network and more as an ongoing resource for friendship, personal support, inspiration, and learning.

“Those [three community fellows] have had such an impact on me, hearing about their background, the success they had. When I looked at [them] and saw that they could raise a million for their community, I thought, I can do that.”

“Being part of a group of wonderful people like the fellows who were involved was empowering, each of them are great people and great role models. And that only meant that I would also need to meet those standards.”

Still, many community fellows expressed disappointment that there were not more opportunities to collaborate and learn from one another.

In addition, very little social capital was generated between academic and community fellows.

- Only 11% of community fellows indicated that they have continued communication with academic fellows, compared with 72% who maintain connections with community fellows.
- Likewise, only 8% of academic fellows have continued communication with community fellows, compared with 76% who maintain relationships with academic fellows.

Academic fellows were much more likely to comment on the missed opportunities with community fellows than vice versa. Perhaps this is in part because academic fellows are more removed from community violence. One academic fellow who attended a community fellows’ retreat noted:

“[The retreat] was very grounding for me. I am not a front-line person, and these are the people from the front lines. It is very grounding for your work to remind you why you are doing this.”

There are diverse reasons why long-lasting relationships between academic and community fellows were rare. First, there were few formal opportunities for interaction. One academic fellow described it as follows:

“I had no connection with community fellows or Peace Prize awardees. It would have been nice to have more places for connection, to help make resources available for that. At conferences, academic fellows would meet separately from community fellows. There was not much interaction.”

There are significant class and cultural differences between the two groups that are unlikely to be bridged without intentional effort. One academic fellowship coordinator commented, “A large percentage of people in the [academic] fellowship were from upper classes, regardless of their color. They could go to medical school and get a PhD, and that made them

very different from the community fellows.” Geno Tellez, who did effectively bridge the gap with community fellows, notes that there is a different pace to academic work—it moves quickly, whereas community time moves much more slowly. Most of the academic fellows faced real time constraints due to the short period of their fellowship (typically one to two years) and other fellowship demands. Few had the time to get to know the community by being present and listening for nearly a year as Geno did (see *Listening and Leadership* on page 36). Lack of interest, a certain level of discomfort and “labeling” of both groups (e.g., as academic vs. community) were also mentioned as potential barriers to collaboration.

Collaborations

Developing relationships and networks is an important foundation for creating collaborations that can have a sustained impact for communities and for finding solutions to violence. Collaboration occurs both among individuals and between organizations. Sometimes collaborations are formed intentionally to address a particular problem or issue; at other times the opportunity to collaborate emerges out of the relationship itself.

One academic fellow spoke about how the academic fellowship enabled her to develop collaboration with two other Latinas to address domestic violence issues in the Latino community.

“Two Latina women who had fellowships before me at EPIC [Epidemiology and Prevention for Injury Control] recommended me to the fellowship. I worked with one on finishing up a project for a few months and then took it over. We formed a really good bond. The three of us have had a couple of get-togethers recently, looking at how we can continue to work together on Latina-focused work and offer our special perspective on evaluation or program development.”

A community fellow spoke about how the fellowship contributed to her efforts to form an organizational collaboration. This model has the potential to be replicated in other communities.

“I started this collaboration of multi-discipline organizations—not just organizations involved in violence prevention but many youth-serving organizations, the school, the arts as well. The collaboration flourished because of my fellowship, and we won a national award. We would like to replicate this successful collaboration in other school districts and, who knows, perhaps take it nationwide.”

Building collaborations is a critical component of political and policy work. An academic fellow reflects on the near failure of safety standards for handgun legislation because the coalition was not solidly in place.

“[You’ve] got to collaborate—I really mean it. If you are going to do policy work, by definition you have to do collaborative work. Elected officials are diverse people: gender, class, political party, rural/urban. You’ve got to have that representation in your work or you won’t be successful. The biggest problem we had in getting gun [legislation] passed

at the end was the rural problem. We almost lost on safety standards for handguns because of it.”

New and shared knowledge

Knowledge is a powerful tool which can be used to influence social norms about violence, to increase support for interventions to decrease violence, and to inspire others to get involved in violence prevention. Knowledge is generated from exposure to new ideas and information, reflection about one’s own experiences and the experiences of others, and implementation of research and community-focused projects.

Promoting a public health approach to violence

One of the goals of the VPI was to promote violence prevention as a public health issue. This viewpoint was new for many of the leadership participants. Three quarters of the academic fellows and 42% of the community fellows reported that the fellowship program had a “large effect” on their understanding of the public health approach to violence prevention. Beyond this personal impact, VPI participants report that awareness of the public health approach has extended beyond the VPI.

“From interpersonal to international settings, there is a group of people that know that violence can be prevented, even if it is a daunting [task]. All of that happened in the last ten years.”

“Before the VPI there was a growing awareness that violence prevention could be approached using public health methods and institutions. However, I think that the VPI accelerated that a great deal. At least in California, it accelerated the willingness of people outside of the public health sector to recognize that public health had a role in violence prevention.”

“In my ethnic Vietnamese community, there is more awareness of the root causes of violence and [greater] recognition that violence is a broader public health issue that needs to be addressed by every citizen who lives in the community.”

Generating new knowledge through research and inquiry

Academic fellows generated new knowledge to support violence prevention efforts through their fellowship projects, most of which had a research component. Research studies focused on issues such as:

- The practice of violence prevention among pediatricians specializing in adolescents;
- Analysis of the source of firearms used in suicides among California youth;
- Portrayal of youth violence on Spanish language television; and
- Physical, emotional, and sexual abuse of prison inmates.

Academic fellow and psychiatrist Zakee Matthews examined young people at the California Youth Authority (CYA) for Post Traumatic Stress Syndrome (PTSD) to identify the number

of youth affected and some of the consequences. This research provided a knowledge base for more effective assistance of these youth.

“Among the 83 wards we assessed, the majority had been exposed to horrific traumatic experiences. We developed new assessment tools to better diagnose PTSD and used the information to develop treatment plans. One-third of these kids would not have been diagnosed with PTSD based on typical questionnaires; others would have been under-diagnosed. This may help to reduce recidivism.”

A few of the community fellows pursued less traditional types of research about their history and communities. One fellow described the important type of information that he gathered and shared with the youth in his program.

“When we started, there was a lot of conflict between Mexican American and African American communities, and this stuff was happening in prison and then spilled out on the streets. As we did research, we found that the relationship between Native Americans, Mexican Americans, and African Americans hasn't been antagonistic until recently, and that [antagonism] is coming from the prison gangs. So when we start putting down the history to a lot of the young people, they start understanding that back in the 1700s and 1800s, most of the African Americans were slaves and some would run away from the slave plantations and be taken in by the Native Americans and Mexican Americans. This is a real serious part of history.”

Sharing and disseminating knowledge

The power of knowledge to catalyze change increases when it is shared. It is fundamental for personal, organizational, and policy transformation. Sharing knowledge occurs through publications, presentations, public testimony, the media, and art.

Academic fellows have well-established vehicles for sharing knowledge, such as professional publications and conference presentations. One of best examples of sustained academic dissemination of knowledge occurred at the Stanford fellowship site. Over the tenure of the Stanford fellowship, fellows published more than forty articles about TCWF-supported research; in addition, each fellow presented his or her research findings at two to three conferences annually. Sometimes study results were used to advocate for policy or organizational changes; many times study results allowed fellows who were relative newcomers to their careers to have a visible voice.

The recognition and visibility that Peace Prize awardees received gave them a platform for influencing others about violence prevention.

- Seventy-nine percent of Peace Prize awardees reported that they were invited to speak at a meeting or conference.
- Seventy-four percent responded to requests for information about their work.
- Twenty-one percent presented legislative testimony.

An innovative way of sharing knowledge is through art. One community fellow, whose son was murdered in a gang war, used a quilt to make people aware of the toll of violence in her community.

“The community got an eye-opener. They didn’t know how many innocent lives were taken by violence. They were shocked, because everyone on the quilt was an innocent victim. The community had no idea that this was going on. They hear it on the news but then don’t see it anymore...When you hang that quilt, it forces them to face it. I named the quilt ‘Face-to-Face’ for that reason—because it brings you face-to-face with what really is happening. This helped the community to want to get involved and work together when they see something like that.”

Another community fellow spoke eloquently about how sharing knowledge deepens understanding and builds capacity in young people, who then pass it on to others.

“[Because of the VPI], I was able to go to conferences regarding suicide and gangs and bring youth. I came back with training and materials to share with other people in my organization and community. Most importantly, youth got training that they were able to share with others as well as got the bigger picture of what was happening in the world.”

Using research for policy impact

Research raises awareness about the seriousness of a problem and the failure of institutions and policy to address that problem. Hans Steiner, an academic fellow principal investigator, spoke about how the VPI allowed his colleagues and him to conduct research on mental health within the juvenile justice system.

“The fellowship has allowed us to push a mental health agenda within juvenile justice. Last December, the fellows and I gave a big report to Governor Davis on the status of the mental health system within the CYA, and what needs to be done. That has never been done to my knowledge.”

The policy impact of the VPI has stretched beyond the boundaries of its target population in California. One academic fellow reflected on her use of research to change policy towards domestic violence in Japan.

“If it were just women organizing, we would not have gotten that far. The fellowship helped me to analyze data and present it in a scientific way to improve the government response to domestic violence in Japan. The Japanese Congress passed the first domestic violence act in April 2001.”

Arturo Ybarra: Increasing Organizational Capacity

“The support provided as part of the community fellowship enabled us to step up our organizing of the community to support a class action lawsuit against the Public Housing Authority in conjunction with the Watts Health Foundation. The case was

settled. Part of the settlement was the formation of a blue ribbon committee of which we were a part. One part of the settlement secured compensation settlement for those victimized, and another portion went to the organizations involved. The judge determined the settlements based on the nature of each individual's case. In addition, it provided \$50,000 to each prosecuting organization, one of which was [our agency] the Watts Century Latino Organization."

"As a result of this compensation, we were able to find a new site for our organization. The site occupies the building that was formerly a liquor store. The former owner had one prospective buyer who wanted to open a mini-market with a license to sell liquor. It was half a block from an elementary school. There were all kinds of crimes, drug exchanges, and prostitution when it existed, so we decided that we couldn't allow this. With the money from the settlement and a loan from the National Council of La Raza, we were able to secure the site for a community resource center where our organization is now housed."

"What I want to emphasize here is that thanks to The California Wellness Foundation we were able to continue our work in violence prevention."

Discourse and policy impacts

Academic and community fellows received training in positioning their message through the media and in influencing policymakers and the policymaking process. Peace Prize awardees had the opportunity to use a media platform to bring visibility and attention to their work. Some of the strategies that fellows employed to bring about change in their communities and in policies included changing the discourse about violence, organizing and activism, mobilizing and leveraging of media attention, and assuming leadership positions. Each of these strategies raised the visibility of violence prevention and led, in some cases, to policy change.

Changing the discourse about violence

Changing the discourse about youth violence and enacting policies that support prevention efforts were a major focus of the VPI. A community fellow commented about the progression that he witnessed in the discourse about violence and the role of The Wellness Foundation in changing that discourse.

"If it [had not been] for The Wellness Foundation and the position that they took after the riots, we would not have so much intervention and prevention activities going on in the state of California. And that is something highly important, because [before] the only thing legislators and public officials talked about was suppression, locking people up and throwing away the key. It's not one thing they have done, it's the greatest thing they have done."

Organizing and activism

The most significant policy organizing effort during the VPI occurred around firearms safety legislation. The successful passage of this legislation would not have happened without the

initiative. VPI leaders from communities to academic institutions were mobilized to take part in this focused policy effort. One academic fellow who had been trained in media and policy advocacy during his fellowship was able to apply his skills in his position as a key state legislative staff person. He worked with the state assembly committee on gun violence prevention and served as a conduit between advocates and legislators to promote the need for policy reform related to gun violence.

“As a [legislative] staffer, I facilitated a process where advocates would sit down with key legislators and [they would] talk with each other ... I would keep advocates in the loop, faxing and emailing them, making sure they were at the table. I was able to bring the VPI network into the capitol ... At the beginning of the year, we did a hearing on different approaches to reducing gun violence, and we focused on the three VPI approaches. [I arranged for a group] of VPI folks—community fellows, community organizations, researchers—to testify at the hearing. We made sure that [our media pieces and] brochures were getting to the governor’s office. I made sure that I was running research pieces by advocates.”

Mobilizing and leveraging media attention

Media advocacy is a critical leadership skill for impacting the policy-making process. The VPI provided media training to leaders so that they would feel more comfortable and capable when using the media to communicate their message and influence policy. One academic fellow reflected on the use of media advocacy for the successful publication of an Op-Ed piece in favor of a local gun control ordinance.

“We learned how to make the local media work for our cause—how to bring the issue home to local communities—how people can make their issue important to others and keep the fires burning. We did this with the gun ordinance in Sacramento. We found examples in our own communities and brought them to our local Latino and African American newspapers and to our own groups (e.g., churches) and reminded them how guns have impacted our families and communities.”

Another academic fellow described how she applied her media advocacy training in her work as a teacher.

“Because of gangs, drug dealing, prostitution, we are working with students to organize, so the school can move to another location. Kids are testifying at school board meetings and doing media work. They have been on the KPFA Morning Show [and] were the headline story on Channel 5. Hopefully this gives them a sense of power over their own lives. We got all of this press because we used BMSG tools. I couldn’t have done it without the training.”

Taking on leadership positions

The recognition and visibility that leaders received led some to take on new leadership positions, both within public and private institutions. For instance, 26% of the California Peace Prize awardees indicated that they had been appointed to a leadership position, such as

a board or commission, as a result of their award. One of the academic fellow principal investigators made this observation:

“Within two to four years of the VPI, I had a strong feeling that the single most valuable measurement may be how many VPI participants, broadly defined, end up playing a role in community leadership on school boards, city councils, etc. Whether we like it or not, it is one of the significant ways that lasting change is made.”

One community fellow reflected on the impact of his fellowship on his successful run for city council member and the way he now approaches his work.

“It [my fellowship experience] transfers very readily to the thinking that goes on [in] large institutions, whether it’s a city, a school district, or a law enforcement agency. So the rank and file and the due process were all very important for me to understand the politics of what made things move and happen. I learned a lot of that thinking because I saw the process. Whether it was a group gathering information or evaluating a program, the process was always helpful. When I entered the arena politically, I’m always looking at process and outcome.”

As a result of her fellowship, one academic fellow became a program officer at a national foundation. In this position, she provided institutional leadership to develop and oversee a grants program that provided approximately eight million dollars to support violence prevention efforts across the United States.

Sometimes fellows did not make proactive decisions to become a leader. One academic fellow described what happened to him in this way:

“By receiving the fellowship, I automatically became a leader, because people saw me as one. They were big shoes to fill, and I struggled to fill them. I was anointed an expert and then need to become one. I wanted to be able to go into any environment and give them information.”

New resources for violence prevention

Many fellows and awardees used the TCWF funds and/or the recognition that they received to leverage additional resources for their work. Most interviewed reported that receiving the fellowship increased their credibility with other funders (both foundations and local agencies). More than half of leadership participants reported that their participation in the program resulted in a “moderate or large effect” in their ability to attract or leverage funds for their organization.

“Resources” were described broadly in their responses. In addition to funds, which were mentioned most often, they mentioned office space, equipment, support from others, access to influential people, and new knowledge and skills. A few examples illustrate the variety of ways in which resources were leveraged.

“I received a \$32,000 grant to provide schools with presentations on violence prevention. My fellowship made it possible for them to consider me for the grant that will help continue some of the things that my fellowship helped to start.”

“I realized a couple of years ago that if you take the recognition and use it in the right way, you will be able to get money that you need from everywhere. I added it up and realized that I was able to bring together The California Endowment, Barry Gordy Foundation, and several other foundations [which] have given me money because I was a Peace Prize awardee.”

Two University of California San Diego academic fellows talked about receiving a Center for Diseases Control (CDC) grant award to establish a Center of Excellence in Youth Violence Prevention at their fellowship site. This resulted in hiring and training staff to work on the grant and closer working collaborations with the surrounding community.

“The great thing about the fellowship was that it gave Vivian and [me] the chance to develop our skills, gave us the institutional time to focus on violence prevention, which in turn allowed us to apply for CDC funding. The partnership between the university and community was strengthened and there was increasing interest and dedication to solving violence prevention problems.”

“It is the first time they gave money to medical schools to do a comprehensive three-pronged approach that involves education and curriculum development for medical and public health schools, for research on violence prevention at universities, and for universities to work with communities to develop response plans to violence prevention. We are one of ten schools funded in the country. The fellowship really helped.”

Institutionalizing changes

Long-term sustainable change requires innovations and new ideas to become embedded in organizations, institutions, and the practices and policies of a field. Participants in the leadership programs accomplished this in a number of ways. All of these changes have a visible presence that endures over time.

Creating non-profit organizations

The fellowship allowed several community fellows the time and resources to create non-profit organizations that directly serve members of their community. For instance,

- Merris Obie established the Tribal Civilian Conservation Corps, a residential community service program for Indian youth. The tribe donated land and a facility was built to house the organization.
- Carole Ching founded My Sister’s House, the first safe haven for battered Asian/Pacific Islander (API) women and children in Sacramento (see more in-depth story below).

Carole Ching: Invaluable Opportunities

In 1992, Carole Ching did a research paper on domestic violence in the API community. She was appalled to find that there were no domestic violence shelters that provided culturally sensitive and language accessible services to Sacramento's API women. When existing shelters would get a call from an API woman who didn't speak English, they would contact a local API organization and ask for one of their bilingual staff members to do interpretation (for free). Dismayed, Carole reflects that meeting the needs of women who are victims of domestic violence requires much more than straight interpretation: there has to be an advocacy piece. "It's not easy," she says, "to find someone who can perform that interpretation, who understands the issues, and isn't related to the victim in some way." Carole began talking with fellow API colleagues about starting a shelter. She knew that most mainstream shelters would tend to feel it was too much trouble to deal with immigrant issues, especially language advocacy, given the community's broad diversity. "Besides," she says, "you cannot just add on a multi-cultural/multi-lingual piece to a mainstream organization. It has to be a core element of that organization, otherwise when funding gets cut, it is the first thing to go."

A friend of Carole's had tried to establish an API-appropriate domestic violence shelter in a neighboring San Joaquin Valley community, but "she ran into a brick wall." There was huge resistance from both local mainstream and Asian communities. At the time Carole was working for Asian Resources, Inc., a non-profit community-based organization established in 1980 that is dedicated to providing multiple social services needed in the Asian community. She approached the board and asked them if they would be willing to host the project. They agreed, and a core planning group was formed in 1998. In 1999, The California Endowment provided a planning grant that included a start-up matching grant of \$200,000. That same year she received the Community Fellowship from The California Wellness Foundation. She says, "those two years I spent with the fellowship were totally invaluable. It really freed me up so that I could dedicate myself to starting a shelter for API women. If I hadn't gotten the fellowship I think I would still be struggling with my own personal doubts. Those two years off gave me precious time to concentrate on developing myself and reaffirming the path I was taking. It gave me a chance to breathe, take care of myself, and make it possible to get things that I would not have normally gotten, for example, a computer at home and a laptop, both of which I'm still using. I didn't have to get another job. I had the luxury of time to think, work on organizing My Sister's House, and be with my fellows in the program."

In December 2000, My Sister's House was incorporated. The six-bed shelter opened in late April 2003. Carole's vision became a reality.

Establishing new programs and approaches within existing institutions

About one-third of the community fellows and Peace Prize awardees stated that the leadership program had a "large effect" on the start of new violence prevention work within their institutions. Some of these changes involved innovative programs or approaches that met an existing need or problem. Examples include the following:

- As profiled on page 6, Peace Prize awardee Jerry Williams promoted community policing within the Oakland Police Department, thereby helping to reduce the homicide rate in some Oakland neighborhoods.
- The work of academic fellows at Highland Hospital, in collaboration with a community program, resulted in the institutionalization of a program to reduce reoccurring injuries among victims of violence.
- Three fellows at an academic fellowship site worked together to start a statewide advisory board that developed a curriculum on assisting Latinas with domestic violence issues.

Influencing academic professions and specialties

The leadership program contributed to noticeable changes in academic fields and professions. Academic fellows report an increase in the number of courses addressing violence prevention, a greater interest in violence prevention among their colleagues, more violence prevention presentations at conferences, and more publications that address violence prevention.

The reflections of academic fellowship PIs capture the impact and changes that have occurred within their fields.

“The Academic Fellowship Program had a stimulating effect on the field of child psychiatry. For example, this year at the American Academy of Adolescent and Child Psychiatry [conference], we will have a whole day-long institute just on mental health in the juvenile justice system. In 1990, there were eight presentations about delinquency and conduct disorder. In 2000, I counted 40.”

“We have had an impact on the professional societies, especially in the way violence prevention became a more common topic in the field of adolescent medicine. That’s new and an outgrowth of the fellowship program.”

“Prior to 1993, prevention was virtually unheard of, and now we [surgeons] are considering making it a much more concrete requirement for level I trauma surgeons. Did the initiative cause this? No, but we can say that it was an important contributor.”

Geno Tellez: Listening and Leadership

Nights are usually the busiest at the trauma center at JPS Hospital in Fort Worth, Texas. An emergency room nurse stands outside the bright lights that surround the ambulance bay on her break, delighting in the uncharacteristically cool night of a late Texas spring. She points to an old cemetery that the modern hospital buildings surrounds. “They say it’s the oldest Jewish cemetery in Texas. They built the original hospital because other hospitals would not treat Jews, or so they say.”

The hospital still serves the underserved of America’s ninth largest metropolitan area, now mostly Latino. The waiting area is filled with an after-midnight mixture of sick children and tired parents. A loud drunk, who was on the losing end of a fistfight, presses

his bloody t-shirt against his face. The sense of worry is palpable. On any given night, it's the victims of violence who bring out the best in a trauma center.

Geno Tellez, the trauma director at JPS Hospital and a Wellness Foundation Academic Fellow from 1993-1996, understands the dichotomy between the sophistication of trauma care in America's hospitals and the emerging field of violence prevention. "Outside of California and a few other major centers, we do a much better job of treating the effects of violence than addressing the root causes," said Geno. One of the goals of the academic fellowship was to improve the understanding of violence prevention among health professionals like trauma surgeons.

In the forty-nine years since he was born in an older Mexican-American community in East LA, Geno has lived with both the root causes and the effects of violence. His working class neighborhood was "not one of anything," a mixture of Chicano small business owners, new Latin American immigrants, African Americans, and low-income whites. Geno focused on sports during his early years. As a promising athlete, he moved easily through the racial and class divides of his neighborhood, even when his relatives criticized him for befriending people who were not Latino. But he enjoyed an ever-changing palette of diversity.

Even with his ability to move across boundaries of race and class, Geno still perceives himself as "an outsider," both in the status- and power-dominated world of doctors and surgeons and in the Latino communities similar to the one in which he grew up. He remembers thinking he was "crossing an imaginary line" when he went off to college—a line that he could never go back across. "You leave all that behind when you leave the community. I really cannot go back to being a Mexican American who is part of a poor Hispanic community."

In 1993, he was a successful trauma surgeon in private practice in Atlanta. Having completed almost eight years of medical training, he was doing something he loved, and he was good at it. He spent most of his time at Georgia Baptist Hospital, just a mile from the Martin Luther King Center and Ebenezer Baptist Church. Nearby, Sweet Auburn Avenue, the epicenter of the historical African American business community, had tumbled into public housing and boarded-up buildings from its heyday during segregation.

Geno's patients in Atlanta, mostly young African American men, reminded him of many of the young men in his community in East LA. "When I entered medical school, I always planned on going back to my community and practicing. Instead, I found myself in a different city, with a different sort of community, but in terms of violence, it was very much the same," Geno remembered. He started working with community groups, feeling more satisfaction in focusing on violence prevention. He knew then that private practice would not be enough for him. That's when a call from his former residency director, Bob Mackersie, now at the San Francisco General Hospital and University of California at San Francisco, gave him the opportunity to tie his two worlds together.

“He told me about this new fellowship funded by TCWF and wanted to know if I was interested.” In 1993, Geno quit his private practice, taking a 70 percent cut in salary in the process, moved to San Francisco, and began the fellowship. “My partners thought I was crazy. I had just begun to earn a good income and my oldest son was heading to college.” It wasn’t the first time Geno had relied on intuition to make a major life decision. He had been halfway through college and married with a baby on the way when the realization he should become a doctor came like “a whack on the head.” Upon reflection, though, he describes it more deeply as the convergence of his strong sense of the power of the spiritual world with his desire to help his community—almost like a calling. “From that day on, it was like I was always supposed to be a physician.”

Coming into the fellowship represented one of those unique life transitions when it is necessary to take several steps back in order to move forward. Geno laughingly relates the persona of a trauma surgeon: “You’re arrogant, strong-willed, and able to make death-defying decisions in a single second.” Suddenly, he found himself “at the back of the class,” struggling to understand “the public health model” and its use in violence prevention. Most of the other fellows had greater knowledge and more experience than Geno, but he became increasingly thankful for that. He credits the other fellows—“what they had between their ears”—for teaching him things he could not have learned in fifty years on his own.

Geno said he was hesitant to collaborate with other fellows because “I really did not know what I was doing, and I was fearful I would pull someone else down.” His one regret about the fellowship is significant. He believes that he mastered all of the public health information that should have allowed him to earn an MPH [Masters in Public Health] during the fellowship, but that was not an option when he started. He thinks he would be more credible in the field of violence prevention if he had the MPH. He does not think the fellowship carries the same weight.

Watching Geno interact with surgical residents at JPS Hospital or with wounded gang members in an ER, you can see the combination of a great surgeon and a knowledgeable public health advocate, personas nurtured by the VPI. His voice is quiet, forcing the residents to lean forward to hear his comments and questions. His eyes travel over large X-ray sheets of a wound site, his finger gently following an unseen pathway between violence and healing. When he finally speaks, there is an inviting question mark at the end of his sentence, drawing out the resident leaning over his shoulder, building the confidence the resident will need. For Geno, teaching is as important as learning. “I just want them to ask one good question. That’s how I know they are learning. Most of these kids have never experienced violence firsthand, but it’s only when you understand where it comes from that you can treat the cause, not the symptoms,” he states. “It’s true that the same slant of the eyes or color of skin will get you through the door, but if there is no empathy, there is no ‘mas’. It’s [all about] empathy and experientially understanding the culture.”

Geno says that empathy comes through watching and listening. When he was ten, Geno worked in his uncle’s store during the summer, cleaning up. Customers and neighbors would come by, wanting to talk about some problem: family, money, politics—it really

did not matter. His uncle would sit and listen and listen as the words—a torrential mixture of Spanish and English—and gestures flowed out and filled the store. When the person finished, his uncle would sit quietly, as if to say, “Is that all? Are you sure you don’t have more?” Then he would speak quietly and briefly, just like Geno.

There is something about dominant forms of leadership that is highly verbal. It’s a form of leadership characterized by taking action and being forward, being active and talkative. But Geno demonstrated a different form of leadership—a leadership that focuses more on listening and not saying a lot. He also says there is a temporal relationship to leadership whereby people try to get something done in a hurry. “Yes, I guess you could say that I am trying to be like my uncle, and he was a leader,” said Geno.

In 1993, as part of the fellowship, Geno began attending meetings of RAP (Real Alternative Programs) in the Mission District that surrounds San Francisco General. RAP, one of the VPI-funded community programs, focuses on youth and ways to address the poverty, discrimination, fragmentation of families, alienation, gangs, drugs, and a host of other issues that stand between most of the 14-year-olds in the neighborhood and a good life. Like his uncle, Geno attended the meetings and sat in the back and listened. He was never “Dr. Tellez,” and he never had an answer, only a question: “What can I do to help you?”

Others in the VPI thought, that of all the fellows, Geno would have an easier time of combining academic research and community outreach. Unlike many of the other fellows, he had come from a community like the Mission District and he was Latino. But Geno was very aware that he had “crossed the line” when he went off to college and became a physician, and it would be no easier for him to cross back over that line than it was for fellows from middle-class Anglo backgrounds. So he sat and he listened for months.

“I remember, after about a year of going to those meetings, that one night, someone at the table—I didn’t sit at the table but in the chairs behind the people sitting at the table—turned to me and said, ‘Geno, do you have something to add?’ I said ‘No, I think you are doing good work, and I am here to support you in whatever way I can’.” After that, the people began to open up to him and include him more in the discussion and decision making. He had demonstrated that he was something other than the outside expert/physician who would tell the community what to do and then leave. What Geno describes does not sound like a highly active process for building collaboration. But he thinks that even in building collaborations within communities, something about the dominant paradigm of leadership drives people to push too fast—a failure, he suggests, to recognize something called “community time” that moves more slowly than other forms of time.

As quiet as he may be, Geno still believes in the power of “voice.” He points to the revolution in medicine for particular populations, such as women and minorities. He ties that directly back to the increasing number of women and minorities in major policy positions in the last thirty years. “It’s the same for social change: the more diverse the

people in power, the more diverse the focus on solutions for change.” He uses that point to support one of the goals of the academic fellowship that focused on recruiting more minorities into health professions.

For the same reason, he remains hopeful that the VPI will continue to impact public perceptions about violence prevention. “When I was growing up, the only violence prevention was the cops,” said Geno. That view may be changing, but only slightly. During his fellowship, Geno surveyed trauma surgeons around the country to learn their perceptions about the major causes of trauma and the reasons those causes did not match the public health data. “They almost universally focused on automobile and motorcycle trauma. In response to questions about the role of trauma centers in preventing violence, they basically said it was not their job.” His move to Texas after several years in the Bay Area only reinforced his sense that change will be slow. “When I got to Texas, I found that ‘violence prevention’ generally meant shooting someone before they shot you.”

Geno found the media advocacy training during the fellowship provided him with one more way to reach communities. He applied this training multiple times during his fellowship while being interviewed by the media. This also continued subsequent to his fellowship. For example, an Op-Ed piece that he wrote was published in the *Chicago Tribune*. “The media advocacy has been invaluable, because I have interacted with the media so much. It has helped me know what the media wants and [has enabled me] to teach others [how to do media advocacy] ...I was a good person to talk about violence prevention, because I was a doctor and a trauma surgeon. There was that hard copy and visual recognition tied to the fellowship and to my profession.”

To test his training, I asked him what he would say if he had thirty seconds in front of the board of TCWF. Without pause, he focused on the long table in front of him, as if the empty chairs had suddenly filled, and said in his commandingly quiet voice, “In the development of the VPI, or development of any change strategy, you need data. But you also need the people from communities to be part of that. Throwing the two groups together is going to take time, and you need to give it time. Timelines are research-oriented, and that timeline does not work in communities. You need patience. In the end, be proud that people who wanted to learn something had an opportunity to learn it.”

Lessons Learned about Developing Leadership within the Violence Prevention Field

Earlier parts of this report have focused on the impact of the VPI leadership programs on individuals, organizations, professions, communities and the field of violence prevention. This ten-year retrospective evaluation provides a unique opportunity to compare three distinct professional and leadership development strategies over time and to assess the effectiveness of specific leadership development approaches for achieving targeted program goals. These lessons can be integrated into leadership investment strategies by TCWF and the broader philanthropic community.

In this section, we discuss the strengths of placing the leadership program within the broader initiative. Next, we talk about some important leadership qualities as well as competencies and strategies to include in leadership programs. We also make some comparisons about key differences between the three leadership programs. And lastly, we look at a number of specific issues related to leadership development: financial resources, diversity and sustainability.

Key Innovations of the VPI Leadership Program

The experience of VPI fellows and awardees testifies to the success of strong leadership development practices and to four particular innovations that could advance the field of leadership development:

- Connecting leadership programs to a broader Initiative magnifies their impact
- Providing unrestricted award funds, supports innovation at the community level
- Mentoring young people develops the next generation of leaders and also strengthens the leadership capacity of the mentor
- Paying attention to healing past wounds empowers leaders to give back to their community

Inclusion as part of a broader initiative

Situating the leadership programs within the broader VPI added value to the individual experiences of participants and enhanced their collective impact on violence prevention efforts. The goal of the VPI leadership program was to build a critical mass of leaders in the violence prevention field. The surveys and interviews indicate that situating the leadership program within the broader initiative had an added value beyond the impact of such a program as a stand alone. Participants were inspired and encouraged by being part of something bigger than themselves. They benefited from training relevant to their specific work area (e.g., research or community). Yet they also developed important universal violence prevention leadership capacities through new relationships, networks, and collaborations—capacities that enabled them to leverage their work across different sectors to prevent violence. Many foundations attempting to build a critical mass of leadership within a specific field would benefit from the VPI model that tailored training to different sectors of the field, while connecting their work through a broad analytical framework and convenings such as the annual conferences.

Important leadership qualities, competencies, and strategies

To have an enduring impact within a field, leadership programs need to develop a critical mass of committed leaders that have the breadth of perspective to develop multi-solution approaches and the ability to build cross-sectoral and multi-ethnic partnerships. As seen earlier in the report, leadership program participants demonstrated these important universal leadership capacities. As a result of their participation in the VPI, the majority of academic fellows, community fellows and Peace Prize awardees refer to the “broadening impact” of their experiences. They also expressed high levels of increased commitment to violence prevention. Community fellows, academic fellows, and Peace Prize

awardees exercised leadership across boundaries of race, class, and disciplines to prevent violence. Boundary-crossing leaders were profiled and legitimized through their recognition as Peace Prize awardees and community fellows. Their model inspired collaborative behavior and expanded the VPI network and opportunities for collaboration.

A strength of the leadership program was its recognition that there is no one-size-fits-all leadership model for the reduction of violence. This realization allowed the different VPI leadership programs to develop and leverage context-specific skills and resources for its participants. For instance, TCWF leadership recognized the strategic importance of increasing the racial and ethnic diversity of health professionals engaged in policy decision making about violence prevention. To build this capacity, training was offered for academic fellows around a set of core competencies (e.g., public health model of violence prevention, policy interventions, and media and policy advocacy). While community fellows developed competency in these areas too, their focus was more frequently on building community capacity.

Using diverse adult learning principles maximized the development of skills and capacities of participants. These principles were complementary and addressed the different learning styles and interests of participants.

Peer learning: As evident in earlier stories, participants from both programs cited the value of the learning that occurred within their cohort among peers. This is an important, sustainable source of ongoing learning and support for leadership program participants.

Core curriculum and individual learning: Although academic fellows had access to group training opportunities, they also developed individual learning plans in conjunction with their PIs about how they would expand their violence prevention knowledge and skills. Outside of cohort sessions, community fellows were supported in their individual learning needs by program coordinators. This balance addressed predictable individual interest and needs, while building the cohesiveness of the cohort around core learning activities.

Self-reflection: The fellowship gatherings, community fellows retreats, and VPI conferences all created opportunities for participants to step back from their work and benefit from the chance to pause and reflect, both individually and collectively.

Experiential learning: The fellowship training sessions and individual learning projects provided important opportunities for practical learning applicable to participants' work.

The inclusion of nontraditional leaders and design elements enriched the leadership program. Starting with the selection process, nontraditional leaders (e.g., ex-convicts and priests) were chosen to participate in the program. This diversified the backgrounds, experiences, and skills that were brought to the program. Nontraditional design elements included the focus on healing and spirituality and the unrestricted use of fellowship funds.

Community fellows identified personal qualities and skills as more important for leadership than traditional field-specific competencies. When community fellows were asked what they considered the most important violence prevention leadership skills, they consistently listed listening, humility, empathy, healing, spirituality, respect, work inside/out,

and risk taking. Of course, there were some variations in language, but the themes were strong and best captured in the words of fellows themselves.

“You have to share what is on the inside and model the kind of leadership you want to encourage in youth.”

“You need to believe that what you do can prevent violence. You need patience, understanding, and inner strength.”

“It is important that you don’t think you know everything and that you listen to others.”

These are defining qualities of effective community leadership articulated and modeled by community fellows. These leadership practices empower communities by honoring their inherent wisdom and capacity to develop effective solutions. One community fellow articulates a distinction between community and mainstream leadership in this way:

“The term leadership suggests that I accomplished something significant or put myself in a position that caused me to be a leader. That is mainstream thought. You do not make yourself a leader. You are listened to or you are not. It is the community that makes you.”

Utilization of participants’ experiences and skills strengthened individual and cohort learning. Like academic fellows, community fellows also reported an important increase in their knowledge around the core competencies, but this was not their central story. They gave voice to the importance of tapping the resources of their fellowship cohort to design a program that would meet their needs as a community.

“We were people bringing different perspectives from different communities that were all having the same problem. Each fellow brought leadership skills to the table and shared their perspective, their commitment, and their challenges.”

Many leadership participants, as well as others in the VPI, recognized the rich resources fellows and awardees brought to the VPI. These resources could have been utilized more fully during and subsequent to their participation.

Key comparisons across the different leadership programs

The Peace Prize Award and the Academic and Community Fellowship Programs successfully incorporated different design elements to support their specific goals. TCWF’s support for these distinct leadership development approaches allows for some important comparisons and learning. These comparisons confirm the importance of recognition and convenings and offer an entirely new mentoring design element that could increase the impact of leadership development programs on the next generation of leaders.

The benefits of leadership recognition outweigh the concerns and should be integrated into all leadership programs for maximum impact. Recognition awards are supported by the philanthropic community for many reasons: recognition can help to legitimize an area of

work, a field, or a new model of leadership; it can attract people to a field; it can inspire others to good work; it can reward good work and encourage commitment; it can increase the visibility of good work; and it can help to attract new resources for work that has been recognized. Stories shared about the profound effect that recognition had on personal commitment and the ability to attract new resources suggest that the Peace Prize Award succeeded on many of these fronts. It is interesting to note that recognition from the Peace Prize Award was often reported to have a greater impact on award recipients and their work than the fellowship programs had on the participating fellows and their respective work. These successes suggest that strengthening the recognition component of all of the programs would increase their impact.

A common criticism of recognition awards is that they honor one individual for the work of many and may cause jealousy or resentment. A couple of fellows expressed their discomfort with being singled out. The other side of this argument is that Peace Prize awardees also reported ways in which their families, organizations and communities felt an increased sense of pride in response to the recognition. This may suggest that the publicity had a positive ripple effect that extended to people beyond the awardee.

Peace Prize awardees could have benefited from increased opportunities for peer learning and support. The power of social capital cultivated through the VPI convenings has been clearly established in stories fellows shared in earlier sections of this report. Academic and community fellows benefited from the opportunity to develop relationships and learn with and from others in the field of violence prevention. The Peace Prize awardees did value the opportunities at VPI conferences to learn from and connect with other leaders in the field. They may also have benefited from more structured opportunities to meet, learn from, and support each other, especially in subsequent years as their numbers grew. Within the field of leadership development other award programs like the MacArthur Award are moving in the direction of creating more cohort experiences for recipients and alumni. Witnessing the cohort camaraderie of academic and community fellows, one Peace Prize awardee suggested the value of establishing “a learning community among the awardees, a retreat, a web-based space, salons. Each awardee has a wealth of knowledge that could be enhanced by relationship building.”

Mentoring as a formalized component of leadership programs cultivated the next generation of leaders and benefited the mentors. While many leadership programs develop leaders with the hope that they, in turn, will develop others, only TCWF has integrated the mentoring of youth by fellows into the fabric of their program. With a cadre of young future leaders cultivated by community fellows, the mentoring component of the Community Fellowship Program stands out as an important innovation for the field of leadership development.

The dominant trend in leadership development focuses participants on their own leadership development and raises a question about whether the demands of mentoring may be burdensome or may diminish the fellowship experience. By community fellows’ own accounts, this was not the case. When asked about the most important part of the fellowship,

80% selected mentoring, and as demonstrated earlier, many found it personally rewarding and felt that it contributed to their own learning.

The academic fellows benefited enormously from being mentored by PIs, their program coordinators, and other VPI members. This was a particularly important feature of their program, since many fellows were entering new careers, navigating unfamiliar institutions, and experiencing a very steep learning curve. Although the community and academic fellows operated in different contexts, community fellows may have benefited from mentors, while a more formal mentoring component for the Academic Fellowship Program could serve to attract more young people of color to health professions.

Financial resources

Personal financial stability increased community leadership capacity; unrestricted funds are a particularly effective strategy for achieving this outcome. TCWF charted new learning for the field of leadership development. The provision of unrestricted funds to the Peace Prize recipients and award funds to community fellows to support their work has demonstrated clearly the value of resources to alleviate financial hardship and provide financial stability to individuals leading at the front of change. To be financially compensated for work that was often under or unsubsidized enabled violence prevention leaders to increase the sustainability and impact of their work. Fellows and awardees closest to the sources of violence are closer to poverty as well. Those choosing to work in violence prevention without compensation often make the choice at great costs to their families and personal well-being. Many spoke of personal poverty, family deprivation, and dire financial problems. Those in a position to allocate resources are usually too far removed from poverty to understand the incredible toll and drain of financial instability on the capacity of committed leaders. As one fellow put it, “Life-saving investments in those who are potentially among the most effective leaders in their field can not be underestimated.”

The financial award of \$25,000 in unrestricted funds to Peace Prize Awardees was highly unusual, if not unique, and provides one of the starkest lessons for the field of leadership development. One of the Peace Prize Awardees shares a story about the use of his unrestricted award to finally spend time on a family vacation that renewed the entire family’s commitment to his work. He explains that the award allowed him to give something back to his family after years of absence and deprivation. Both the Peace Prize Award and the support for community fellows move financial resources into the hands of committed and innovative individuals who often work as volunteers and endure financial hardships that threaten their health, family well being and ultimately, their ability to continue their violence prevention work. The stories of Peace Price Awardees and community fellows provide strong testimony that these resources stabilized and enhanced their commitment and capacity to serve violence prevention efforts.

Community innovations were effectively supported by identifying and distributing resources to social entrepreneurs. Several foundations are recognizing social entrepreneurial fellowships as a way to distribute resources to community innovators with a track record of success, passion, and promising ideas. The award amount attached to the Community Fellowship Program supported expansion of violence prevention efforts and

innovation at the community level as detailed throughout this report. It also supported expansion and innovation among academic fellows, many of whom had only recently embarked upon their careers and did not yet have a track record of success.

Diversity

Bringing together such a diverse group of people created dynamic learning opportunities; however, there was a widespread feeling that more intentional efforts would have had increased benefits. The report is filled with testimonies about the transformation, healing, and dynamic learning that occurred within both cohorts among fellows of different backgrounds, class, gender, race, and disciplines. Perhaps because these experiences were so profound, some participants also indicated strong disappointment about missed opportunities to build relationships and collaboration, especially between academic and community fellows.

One fellow described the VPI as a “microcosm of society.” Perhaps this is why the VPI was such an important laboratory for learning to build relationships across a range of differences, including differences between academic and community fellows. However, it is important to put these challenges in perspective. Most leadership programs that successfully recruit a diverse base of participants grapple with these same issues. Some have found their efforts advanced by:

- Stating explicit values about inclusion and respect for differences;
- Demonstrating a willingness to acknowledge and address divisions, specifically racial, class, gender, and community/academic divisions;
- Offering training in dialogue and group processes;
- Employing a structural design that facilitates cross-program interaction; and
- Promoting joint work and opportunities for collaboration.

Leadership participants and coordinators gave a lot of thought to what could have been done to minimize the tensions in relationship development and collaboration among such a diverse group of individuals. Some of their suggestions are reflected above; additional ones include:

- Making an explicit statement about TCWF’s commitment to and plans for achieving diversity and social justice;
- Recognizing the need for personal responsibility and self-examination regarding one’s own position of power and privilege;
- Identifying ways for participants to recognize the value of working together;
- Dealing openly with issues of diversity at the beginning of the initiative and throughout its implementation; and
- Acknowledging the time it takes to bridge gaps, establish communication, and learn different languages.

It’s easy to fixate on what did not work and miss those things that did. Important examples exist of successes within the VPI experience that attest to the fulfillment of the vision to capitalize on differences.

Learning about history: A number of fellows talked about the importance of learning about their history as well as the history of others. “I believe that we repeat patterns in

history with race and class. Those who do not know history—not just their own history, but that of others as well—are doomed to repeat it.”

Collaborative projects: The fellows who did enter into academic and community fellowship collaborations grew tremendously in their ability to build relationships across cultures and expand their perspectives.

Boundary crossers/bridge leaders: Some of the academic fellows made it past the initial, and sometimes painful, rejections of community fellows ready to dismiss them because of their positions. The academic fellows who built bridges for themselves have the potential to serve as bridges for others. They share their insights on how to do it: “Be humble, be willing to listen and learn.”

One academic fellow offers an important reminder: “Even the conflict and the drama that arose out of our fellowship served to better temper me. Conflict is a part of real life and something that none of us—whether we choose to take on the mantle of leadership or not—can avoid forever when we are advocating for a cause.”

Sustaining Leadership Networks and Alumni Connections

Efforts to sustain leadership networks and alumni connection can enhance leadership investments. It is clear that the VPI leadership programs strengthened the commitment and capacity of current violence prevention leaders and the next generation. The initiative also cultivated the emergence of new leadership networks. The challenge over the next 5 years, one faced by many foundations investing in leadership, is how to sustain these networks. The Academic Fellowship Program has had success with the creation of an unrestricted fund of up to \$1000 per year per fellow that has allowed individuals to continue their violence prevention efforts subsequent to their fellowship in very tangible ways (e.g., hire a statistical consultant to assist with research, make a presentation at a conference, and subscribe to a professional journal). While the overall amount of money distributed to date is relatively small (about \$26,000), among those academic fellows who utilized the fund, 69% said that it was “extremely helpful” and 23% said it was “moderately helpful” in facilitating their ongoing work in violence prevention.

Fellows were surveyed about post fellowship involvement. When asked about specific types of support to facilitate their ongoing work in violence prevention subsequent to their fellowship, about half of the academic and community fellows said that ways to stay involved in the VPI, help to obtain funds for violence prevention work, and training and networking opportunities would be “extremely helpful.”

Within the broader field of leadership development, foundations are concerned about how to fully capitalize on their investment. A number of strategies focus on how to seed the initiative of fellows with support that will enable them to transition to more self-sufficient alumni organizations:

- Seed funds available for collaborative projects
- Organizing support for continued annual or bi-annual convenings
- Planning grants for the formation of an alumni organization
- Consultant funds for hiring an alumni to develop an alumni organization
- Technology support for connecting fellows

Conclusion

The story of the leadership program is one story but many voices. Voices that represent different backgrounds, experiences and perspectives but remain united in their commitment to violence prevention and making a positive difference in the lives of individuals and communities. The leadership program provided a unique opportunity for individuals to reflect, share, learn and pursue new activities. We found participants who had been changed forever by their VPI experience both personally and professionally; sometimes these changes were transformational. Some of the participants played important leadership roles that brought about systemic changes to mitigate violence in their organizations, professional specialties and communities—generating research to improve the care of victims of violence, accessing the media to support gun safety policies and leveraging new resources for violence prevention.

The leadership program goals, stated at the beginning of this report, were largely met: violence prevention leaders were recognized and promoted and communities were able to empower themselves through this recognition; the Academic Fellowship Program supported the professional training of ethnic minorities and women in violence prevention; and community grassroots leaders were linked with each other and received support through leadership development. The last goal—to build a critical mass of community leaders and professionals who are positioned and prepared to serve as advocates and institute programs and policies to prevent violence against youth and foster safer and healthier communities—is a little more difficult to assess since the definition of “critical mass” is elusive. Some might argue that the fifteen or so ‘founding fathers’ of our republic were a crucial “critical mass.” Or, as one Peace Prize awardee noted of the VPI network, “there are perhaps twenty people who are extraordinarily successful and they know how to work state legislatures and Congress. They also know how important data is [to policy and change]. They were doing it [violence prevention] and they will continue to do that. I think it is in part the inspiration that Wellness provided.”

The leadership program and its placement in the broader initiative was an ambitious endeavor. In particular, the foundation made a bold decision to choose non-traditional leaders, support healing practices and allow the use of unrestricted funds. The ten-year retrospective evaluation of TCWF’s investment in building leadership of a field provided a unique opportunity for learning about the long-term impact of leadership programs. Through speaking to individuals, up to nine years after their participation, we gained a perspective not afforded most evaluations. We found that most individuals continue to work to prevent violence in their workplaces and communities; some of these efforts focus on more far reaching audiences such as changing the discourse about violence in medical specialties and new violence prevention policies at the state level. Additionally, many leadership participants continue their work to cultivate the next generation of leadership in violence prevention—some through their ongoing relationships with fellowship mentees, others through new mentoring opportunities.

As an evaluation team comprised of members of a learning community of leadership researchers and practitioners, we also learned a great deal from people involved in the VPI. It was a privilege to have access to a large number of extraordinary leaders and to formulate some hypotheses about leadership development and systemic change. The VPI reminds us

that leadership, whether collective or individually derived, exists primarily as a catalyst for change. As a result of our evaluation work, we have a deeper understanding of some of the crucial components of transforming change and the leadership tasks required of that change, namely that

- Change needs to be commonly conceived, collaboratively constructed, and jointly implemented
- Change needs to resonate with core public values
- Change needs to be planned
- Change needs to be articulated internally and externally
- Change needs to be systemic and comprehensive
- Change needs to be enduring
- Change needs to encompass healing, spirit, and respect for life and resources
- Change needs to transform the self as well as others

We are also reminded that change is paradoxical: it is visible and measurable and it is also invisible and enduring. The invisible and ineffable nature of transforming change lives in and through people mostly in an invisible sense, in large and small acts of everyday life. But transformation's gossamer tracings can be discerned in many ways—in shared history, in strengthened communities, in enlightened research, in the vital connections of elders and young people, and in policies and practices that support non-violent approaches to conflict. The invisible contributions of the leadership program and the broader VPI may never be measurable but they are enduring nonetheless.

Appendix A: TCWF Leadership Program Evaluation Team Members

Jah'Shams Abdul-Mu'min is co-founder of the Non-Traditional Leadership Institute, a leadership training and development organization that focuses critical consciousness, healing, and leadership capacity to support non-traditional leaders in making healthy lifestyles in their community. He is also the newly selected executive director of the Violence Prevention Coalition of Greater Los Angeles. Jah'Shams has taught Community Planning and Economic Development and is the former Deputy Director/Community Outreach for Inglewood's Coalition for Drug and Violence Prevention. Before that, he served as the Executive Director of the AI Wooten Jr. Heritage Center, a youth development and educational organization. The recipient of numerous awards and recognition for his volunteerism, Jah'Shams has participated in several prestigious fellowship programs: The Thornton F. Bradshaw Humanities Fellowship, the Eureka Communities Fellowship, the Coro Fellowship and the Salzburg Fellowship. From 1995 - 1998, Jah'Shams was a fellow in the W.K. Kellogg National Leadership Fellowship Program.

Kim Ammann Howard, Ph.D., is an evaluation and organizational learning consultant who has extensive experience designing and implementing evaluations that look at individual, organizational, systems, and community change. Her areas of expertise include health policy, organizational capacity, leadership development, economic development, substance abuse, and violence prevention. She has collaborated with multiple partners and organizations including community-based agencies, local and state government, academic institutions, and philanthropic foundations as well as numerous ethnic and cultural populations both in the United States and abroad. Dr. Howard has worked with individuals and groups to identify appropriate evaluation methods, measures and data sources; design survey tools; collect and analyze quantitative and qualitative data; and communicate research findings to a variety of stakeholders including practitioners, funders, and policymakers. Her clients include: the Charles and Helen Schwab Foundation, the David and Lucile Packard Foundation, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, The Omidyar Foundation, the Trauma Foundation, University of California at San Francisco, and the Stanford School of Medicine. She received her PhD from the Johns Hopkins School of Public Health in Health Policy and Management.

Deborah Meehan is the founder and executive director of the Leadership Learning Community (LLC). The LLC strengthens the practice of leadership development by linking the inquiry, practice and resources of those committed to this work. The LLC is supported by a funding collaborative of 12 foundations. In 1991 Deborah received a Kellogg National Leadership fellowship. She has served as a consultant for the W.K. Kellogg Foundation to build an alumni association for the 700 leadership alumni of the Kellogg program. Deborah has also conducted leadership program evaluations and has produced leadership scans, literature reviews and made program recommendations on behalf of The California Wellness Foundation, The California Endowment, the Echoing Green Foundation, the S.H. Cowell Foundation, the Lucille and David Packard Foundation, the Hess Leadership Institute and the Eureka Communities Fellowship Program.

Georgia Sorenson, Ph.D., is a Senior Scholar at and the founder of the James MacGregor Burns Academy of Leadership at the University of Maryland. A presidential leadership scholar, she is currently Visiting Senior Scholar at the Jepson School of Leadership Studies at the University of

Richmond as well as Adjunct Professor at Williams College and Ewa University in Seoul, Korea. Dr. Sorenson serves as Professor and Advisor to The National School of Administration of the People's Republic of China. She is co-author of *Dead Center: Clinton-Gore Leadership and the Perils of Moderation*, with James MacGregor Burns. Her next book, due out in 2004, is a 4-volume comprehensive *Encyclopedia of Leadership* with George Goethals and James MacGregor Burns. She has served on many boards of directors of leadership enterprises, including The International Board of Tokyo Jogakkan University in Japan, The Thierry Graduate School of Leadership in Belgium, The W.K. Kellogg Leadership Fellows Program, The Leadership Learning Community, the Asian Pacific Women's Leadership Institute, the AED/Ford Foundation New Generation Leadership Program, US Department of Education Eisenhower Leadership Group, Leadernet and Learn to Lead.

Claire Reinelt, Ph.D., is a Senior Evaluation Consultant with Development Guild/DDI in Brookline, Massachusetts. Her particular areas of expertise are designing and implementing evaluations for leadership development programs; developing strategic plans and measurable program outcomes; enhancing an organization's capacity to capture, integrate, and utilize lessons learned from its programs; and conducting feasibility studies with a particular expertise in assisting clients to focus and refine their case for support. Dr. Reinelt's clients include the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, the David and Lucile Packard Foundation, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, the Leadership Learning Community, the Echoing Green Foundation, the American Cancer Society and Harvard School of Dental Medicine.

Robert L. Williams, Ph.D., is the associate director and a senior fellow at the J.W. Fanning Institute for Leadership at the University of Georgia. He has developed leadership programs and served as lead faculty for the past 15 years for more 30 national or regional leadership programs, primarily focused on education, health care, the environment, and social advocacy. He was a guest scholar at the Joint Center for Political Studies in Washington, D.C., one of the few policy centers focused on issues of African-Americans, where he focused on leadership development for elected officials and the leadership role of African-American churches. He has been a consultant on leadership development for the Pew Charitable Trusts, the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, the Kettering Foundation and state foundations. He has conducted qualitative, participatory research on the emergence and leadership of social advocates and is the author of several articles and book chapters on adult development and social advocacy.

James MacGregor Burns, Ph.D., served as a consultant to the project. Burns is considered by many to be the foremost leadership scholar in the United States. His books on FDR's presidential leadership have won the Pulitzer and National Book Award. His 1978 book, *Leadership*, is considered a classic in the field. His new book, *Transforming Leadership*, was released in June 2003. A political scientist, his degrees are from Williams College and Harvard University. Currently he is a Senior Scholar at the Jepson School of Leadership Studies at the University of Richmond.

Appendix B: TCWF Leadership Program Survey Instruments

VPI Leadership Program Survey for Academic Fellows

The purpose of this survey is to obtain information about your fellowship experience so that we can better understand and document what the fellowship program has accomplished and the lessons that can be learned for The California Wellness Foundation and for others interested in leadership programs nationwide. Thank you for taking the time to share your experiences, thoughts, and opinions; there are no right or wrong answers.

This survey should take approximately 20 to 30 minutes to complete. This is a very important step in truly understanding the individual differences in the fellowship experience. Your participation is voluntary, and you may decline to answer any question for any reason. Your individual responses will be kept strictly confidential; however, the evaluators will be able to match responses to specific individuals for follow-up purposes. Your responses will be combined with those of other fellows and won't be released in any way that would identify you or your specific response to any question.

At the end of the survey, you will have an opportunity to provide anonymous input about your fellowship experience. These responses will be separate from your other survey responses and will not be linked to your name in any way, even to the evaluators.

If you have questions about the content of the survey, please contact Kim Ammann Howard at the Leadership Learning Community, 510-559-9939.

Name: _____

Fellowship Start Date: _____ Fellowship End Date: _____

A. Descriptive Information

A1. Gender: Male Female

A2. Age: 20-29 30-39 40-49 50-59 60+

A3. Ethnicity: African American Latino/Hispanic Native American
 Caucasian Asian
 Pacific Islander Other specify: _____)
 Multi-ethnic (specify: _____(_____))

A4. Please list your graduate degree(s) and associated major(s) (for example, PhD in public health): _____

A5. Current workplace or work status (Please check the one that best applies):

- Community-based Private Government University
- Foundation Self-employed Unemployed
- Medical care facility Clinical practice
- Other (specify: _____)

A6. In what way(s) have you been involved in violence prevention since the end of your fellowship (mark all that apply)?

As part of paid work position(s) (Briefly describe:

_____)

Volunteer opportunities (Briefly describe:

_____)

A7. Are you currently involved in violence prevention? Yes No

B. Recruitment

B1. How did you hear about the academic fellowship program?

B2. Please indicate the reason(s) that you wanted to participate in the fellowship (mark all that apply):

- Personal experience with violence Violence in your community
- Previous work experience Learning opportunities
- Networking opportunities Funding to pursue violence prevention work
- Recognition of your violence prevention work
- Interest in gaining research experience
- Other (specify: _____)

C. Involvement in Fellowship

C1. On average, how much time did you spend on fellowship activities each week?

- <10 hours 11-20 hours 21-30 hours 31-40 hours 40+ hours

C2. What types of activities or strategies did you pursue as part of your fellowship and how often did you use them?

	Did not use this strategy	Used this strategy rarely	Used this strategy sometimes	Used this strategy often	This strategy was core to my work
a. Provide clinical care or another type of direct service					
b. Develop new projects or products					
c. Mobilize others to join efforts to prevent violence					
d. Advocate for changes in policies to prevent violence					
e. Expand the resources available to my organization or community					
f. Influence public opinion about violence prevention					
g. Develop ways to measure tangible results					
h. Other (specify):					

C3. By your own standards, how successful do you think you were in pursuing each of these activities or strategies?

	No success	Little Success	Moderately Successful	Extremely successful	Did not use this strategy
a. Provide clinical care or another type of direct services					
b. Develop new projects or products					
c. Mobilize others to join efforts to prevent violence					
d. Advocate for changes in policies to prevent violence					
e. Expand the resources available to my organization or community					
f. Influence public opinion					

about violence prevention					
g. Develop ways to measure tangible results					
h. Other (specify):					

C4. Did the focus of your individual fellowship goals and activities change over time?

Yes No

If Yes, how much did each of the following contribute to this change?

	Not at All	Only a Little	A Lot	Cannot Answer
a. Personal issues				
b. Work commitments				
c. New violence prevention opportunities arose				
d. Underestimated time to achieve original goals				
e. Lack of funds				
f. Change in perspective about violence prevention				
g. Other (specify):				

C5. During your fellowship, to what extent were each of the following issues a challenge?

	Not a Challenge at All	A Little Challenging	Somewhat Challenging	A Significant Challenge
a. Limited time				
b. Lack of financial support				
c. Lack of technical support				
d. Lack of supervision or coaching				
e. Unclear expectations				
f. Personal commitments				
g. Geographical distance between fellows and meetings				
h. Professional commitments				
i. Other (specify):				

--	--	--	--	--

C6. During your fellowship, to what extent were each of the following an important source of support?

	No Support	A Little Support	Some Support	Lots of Support	Not Applicable
a. Principal investigator at your fellowship site					
b. Fellowship program coordinators Liz McLoughlin and Peggy Skaj					
c. Other VPI grantees					
d. Other fellows in your cohort					
e. Colleagues					
f. Family members					
g. Friends					
h. Other (specify):					

D. Sources of Fellowship Support

Your principal investigator

D1. On average, how many hours a month did you spend with your principal investigator? _____

D2. In what way(s) did your principal investigator assist you (mark all that apply)?

- Provided input about my fellowship plans
- Helped me with the development and implementation of my fellowship project
- Provided me with information about violence prevention
- Introduced me to colleagues
- Took me to meetings
- Provided me with a personal example of someone with leadership or values
- Assisted me with my career pursuits
- Other (specify: _____)

D3. Overall, how effective was your principal investigator at providing guidance and support to you during your fellowship?

- Very effective

- Moderately effective
- A little effective
- Not effective

Other individuals at your fellowship site

D4. Were any other individuals at your fellowship site an important source of support during your fellowship?

- Yes
- No (If no, skip to D8)

If yes, please specify name(s) and position(s): _____

D5. On average, how many hours a month did you spend with this individual (or these individuals)?

D6. In what way(s) did you spend time with this individual (or these individuals) (mark all that apply)?

- Provided input about my fellowship plans
- Helped me with the development and implementation of my fellowship project
- Provided me with information about violence prevention
- Introduced me to colleagues
- Took me to meetings
- Provided me with a personal example of someone with leadership or values
- Assisted me with my career pursuits
- Other (specify: _____)

D7. Overall, how effective was this individual (or these individuals) at providing guidance and support to you during your fellowship?

- Very effective
- Moderately effective
- A little effective
- Not effective

Fellowship program coordinators

D8. Below is a list of ways in which the fellowship program coordinators, Liz McLoughlin and Peggy Skaj, provided support to fellows. How important was each of the following activities or actions to your fellowship experience?

	Not Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Very Important	Not Applicable
a. Orientation to the fellowship					
b. Understanding the core competencies					
c. Knowledge about the VPI					
d. Integration into the VPI					
e. Monthly updates of fellowship projects					
f. Advocacy trainings					
g. Personal mentoring (help with personal or professional issues)					
h. Other (specify):					

D9. Overall, how effective were Liz and Peggy at providing guidance and support to you during your fellowship?

- Very effective
- Moderately effective
- A little effective
- Not effective

E. Effectiveness of Overall Program and Specific Program Activities

E1. The goal of the academic fellowship program is to increase the number of professionally trained health professionals committed to violence prevention. Keeping this goal in mind, how effective was the overall fellowship program:

- Not effective
- A little effective
- Moderately effective
- Very effective

E2. Again keeping this goal in mind, please rate the effectiveness of each of the following fellowship activities:

	Not Effective	A Little Effective	Moderately Effective	Very Effective	Did not participate
a. Individual fellowship project					
b. Monthly meetings					
c. Annual VPI conferences					
d. Fellows retreats					

	Not Effective	A Little Effective	Moderately Effective	Very Effective	Did not participate
e. Policy advocacy training					
f. Media advocacy training					
g. Involvement and support at site level					
h. PCVP library					
i. UCSF violence prevention course					
j. Being part of the VPI					
k. Collaboration with communities outside of VPI					
l. Opportunity to develop relationships with others in my cohort					
m. Academic fellows fund					
n. Fellowship portfolio					
o. Other (specify):					
Comments:					

F. Developing Relationships and Collaborating with Other VPI Grantees

F1. How important to your fellowship were relationships with individuals from each of the following groups?

	Not Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Very Important	Did not interact with anyone from this group
a. Community fellows					
b. Peace Prize awardees					
c. Pacific Center for Violence Prevention					
d. Community Action programs					
e. The California Wellness Foundation staff					
f. Fellows from your cohort					
g. Berkeley Media Studies Group					
h. Public Education Campaign					

	Not Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Very Important	Did not interact with anyone from this group
i. Other VPI grantees (specify):					
Comments:					

G. Effect of participation in the fellowship program

The next set of questions asks about the effect of participation in the fellowship program on your personal growth, knowledge gains, skills development, and your profession or specialty.

To take into account different experiences prior to the fellowship, we offer two different response options related to “no effect.” The first option, “no effect due to experience prior to the fellowship,” may be used to indicate no effect if you entered the fellowship program with a high level of aptitude, knowledge, or skill related to the specific statement. The second option, “no effect as a result of the fellowship program,” can be used to indicate that you did not experience any change in this particular area due to the program itself. For example, an individual who had been working in gun violence prevention for many years may not think that the program had an effect on his knowledge about gun violence due to his prior experiences rather than what was offered as part of the program; as a result, he would choose the “no effect due to experience prior to the fellowship.”

Personal growth

G1. For each of the following statements, rate the effect that participation in the fellowship program has had on your personal growth?

	No effect due to experience prior to the fellowship	No effect as a result of the fellowship program	Little Effect	Moderate Effect	A Large Effect
a. I am more comfortable around people who are different from me					
b. I have more clarity about my own values and what is important to me					
c. I am more comfortable					

	No effect due to experience prior to the fellowship	No effect as a result of the fellowship program	Little Effect	Moderate Effect	A Large Effect
expressing my beliefs					
d. I am better at acknowledging the contributions of others					
e. I have a deeper appreciation of my culture and community					
f. I have a deeper appreciation of other cultures and communities					
g. I have a greater recognition that conflict is an inherent and desirable part of change					
h. My commitment to violence prevention work has been strengthened					
i. I am more realistic about what I can accomplish in my work.					
j. I have a stronger support network for my violence prevention work					
k. Other (specify):					

G2. What **single aspect of the program** most contributed to your personal growth and why?

Knowledge Development

G3. For each of the following statements, rate the effect your participation in the fellowship program has had on your knowledge development?

	No effect due to experience prior to the fellowship	No effect as a result of the fellowship program	Little Effect	Moderate Effect	A Large Effect
a. I know more about the public health approach to violence prevention					
b. I know more about the					

	No effect due to experience prior to the fellowship	No effect as a result of the fellowship program	Little Effect	Moderate Effect	A Large Effect
epidemiology of violence					
c. I know more about the causes of violence and potential policy interventions					
d. I know more about the causes of firearm injuries and potential policy interventions					
e. I know more about different community perspectives on violence and its prevention					
f. I know more about ways to use the media to promote violence prevention efforts					
g. I know more about ways to sustain violence prevention work					
h. I have a better understanding of the policy and political process of change					
i. Other (specify):					

G4. What **single aspect of the program** most contributed to increasing your knowledge why?

Ability to Enhance Violence Prevention Efforts

G5. For each of the following statements rate the effect your participation in the fellowship program had on your ability to enhance violence prevention efforts?

	No effect due to experience prior to the fellowship	No effect as a result of the fellowship program	Little Effect	Moderate Effect	A Large Effect
a. I am better able to share what I learn with others					
b. I am better at engaging others in violence prevention activities					
c. I am more effective working with a diverse group					
d. I am more effective at obtaining support for violence prevention work (financial, political, community)					
e. I am more effective in using research to support violence prevention efforts					
f. I am better able to develop and implement violence prevention activities					
g. I am more capable of using the media to promote violence prevention					
h. I have increased access to leaders who can assist with my work					
i. My capacity to formulate a clear plan of action has improved					
j. Other (specify):					

G6. What single aspect of the program most contributed to your ability to enhance violence prevention efforts and why?

Impact on your profession or specialty

G7. In what ways has the academic fellowship program impacted your profession or specialty (mark all that apply)?

Please think about the impact on your profession as a result of your involvement as well as the involvement of others individuals who participated in the program.

- Interest in violence prevention among my colleagues has increased.
- Presentations about violence prevention have increased.
- Publications about violence prevention have increased.
- Opportunities to pursue violence prevention work has improved.
- The involvement of under represented groups has increased.
- Other (specify: _____)

H. Post-fellowship Transition or Involvement in Violence Prevention

H1. To what extent is each of the following a challenge to your ongoing work in violence prevention?

	Not a Challenge at All	A Little Challenging	Somewhat Challenging	A Significant Challenge
a. Lack of rewards (for example, professional or personal)				
b. Lack of financial resources				
c. Lack of opportunities				
d. Other professional commitments				
e. Personal commitments				
f. Other (specify):				

H2. In what way(s) are you still involved with the VPI (mark all that apply)?

- Communicate with other academic fellows
- Communicate with other community fellows
- Communicate with fellowship program coordinators, Liz McLoughlin and Peggy Skaj

- o Communicate with TCWF staff
- o Collaborate on VPI-related activities
- o Receive written information from VPI grantees (for example, meeting minutes, newsletter or email updates)
- o Attend VPI conferences or meetings
- o Utilize fellowship fund
- o Utilize Pacific Center Web site
- o Utilize VPI Listserv
- o Other (specify: _____)

H3. How helpful has each of the following post-fellowship activities been in facilitating your ongoing work in violence prevention?

	Not at all Helpful	A Little Helpful	Moderately Helpful	Extremely Helpful
a. Fellows fund				
b. VPI listserv				
c. Receive meetings of monthly meetings				
d. Library help				
e. Gifts of books on violence prevention (“Lost Boys” and “Preventing Violence”)				
f. Personal mentoring (help with personal or professional issues)				
g. Other (specify):				
Comments:				

H4. How helpful would each of the following post-fellowship activities have been in facilitating your ongoing work in violence prevention?

	Not at all Helpful	A Little Helpful	Moderately Helpful	Extremely Helpful
a. Ongoing ways to stay involved in the VPI (e.g., financial support to attend conference after fellowship ended)				
b. Help to find a violence prevention-related job				
c. Help to obtain funds to pursue violence prevention research or programs				
d. Ongoing training opportunities				
e. Ongoing networking opportunities				
f. Ongoing information updates to support violence prevention work (newsletters, Web site)				
g. Other (specify):				
Comments:				

I. Closing Questions

I1. What do you think is the most significant achievement that can be attributed to your fellowship experience?

I2. If you had to do it again, would you participate in the program? Yes No

Anonymous Portion of the Survey:

This next section of the survey is completely anonymous, even to the evaluators. Your responses in this section will not be linked to any personal identifiers.

I3. Please comment on anything else that you think is important for us to know.

VPI Leadership Program Survey for Community Fellows

The purpose of this survey is to obtain information about your fellowship experience so that we can better understand and document what the fellowship program has accomplished and the lessons that can be learned for the California Wellness Foundation and for others interested in leadership programs nationwide. Thank you for taking the time to share your experiences, thoughts and opinions; there are no right or wrong answers.

This survey should take approximately 20 to 30 minutes to complete. This is a very important step in truly understanding the individual differences in the fellowship experience. Your participation is voluntary, and you may decline to answer any question for any reason. Your individual responses will be kept strictly confidential; however, the evaluators will be able to match responses to specific individuals for follow-up purposes. Your responses will be combined with those of other fellows and won't be released in any way that would identify you or your specific response to any question.

At the end of the survey, you will have an opportunity to provide input about your fellowship experience that will be kept separate from your other survey responses and will not be linked to your name in any way.

If you have questions about the content of the survey, please contact Kim Ammann Howard at the Leadership Learning Community, 510-559-9939.

Name: _____

Fellowship Start Date: _____ Fellowship End Date: _____

A. Descriptive Information

A1. Gender: Male Female

A2. Age: 20-29 30-39 40-49 50-59 60+

A3. Ethnicity: African American Latino/Hispanic Native American

White Asian

Pacific Islander Other (specify: _____)

Multi-ethnic (specify: _____)

A4. Education: Less than high school Some high school

High school degree or GED Technical degree

Some college Undergraduate degree Graduate degree

A5. Type of agency currently work in:

- Community-based Private Government University
- Foundation Self-employed Unemployed
- Other (specify: _____)

A6. In what way(s) have you been involved in violence prevention since the end of your fellowship (mark all that apply)?

- As part of paid work position(s) (Briefly describe:
_____)
- Volunteer opportunities (Briefly describe:
_____)

A7. Are you currently involved in violence prevention? Yes No

B. Recruitment

B1. Please indicate the reason(s) that you wanted to participate in the fellowship (mark all that apply):

- Personal experience with violence Violence in your community
- Previous work experience Learning opportunities
- Networking opportunities Funding to pursue violence prevention work
- Recognition of your violence prevention work
- Other (specify: _____)

C. Involvement in Fellowship

C1. Were your fellowship activities part of your job? Yes No

C2. On average, how much time did you spend on fellowship activities each week?

- <10 hours 11-20 hours 21-30 hours 31-40 hours 40+ hours

C3. How did you spend your fellowship funds (mark all that apply)?

- Your own salary
- Programmatic expenses (for example, start or augment violence prevention services or programs; salary of staff)
- Stipend for mentees
- Training or professional development opportunities
- Technical (computer equipment and related technical training)

o Travel o Other (specify: _____)

C4. What types of activities or strategies did you pursue as part of your fellowship and how often did you use them?

	Did not use this strategy	Used this strategy rarely	Used this strategy sometimes	Used this strategy often	This strategy was core to my work
a. Provide direct services					
b. Develop new projects or products					
c. Develop new and emerging leaders (for example work with mentees)					
d. Mobilize others to join efforts to prevent violence					
e. Advocate for changes in policies to prevent violence					
f. Expand the resources available to my organization or community					
g. Bring together individuals from diverse backgrounds to engage in dialogue or action to prevent violence					
h. Influence public opinion about violence prevention					
i. Develop ways to measure tangible results					
j. Other (specify):					

C5. By your own standards, how successful were you in pursuing each of these activities or strategies?

	No success	Little success	Moderately Successful	Extremely successful	Did not use this strategy
a. Provide direct services					
b. Develop new projects or products					
c. Develop new and emerging leaders (for example with mentees)					

d. Mobilize others to join efforts to prevent violence					
e. Advocate for changes in policies to prevent violence					
f. Expand the resources available to my organization or community					
g. Bring together individuals from diverse backgrounds to engage in dialogue or action to prevent violence					
h. Influence public opinion about violence prevention					
i. Develop ways to measure tangible results					
j. Other (specify):					

C6. If you began a direct service program, what type of service program did you initiate?

C7. Did the focus of your individual fellowship goals and activities change over time?

- Yes No

If Yes, how much did each of the following contribute to this change?

	Not at All	Only a Little	A Lot	Cannot Answer
a. Personal issues				
b. Work commitments				
c. New violence prevention opportunities arose				
d. Underestimated time to achieve original goals				
e. Lack of funds				
f. Change in perspective about violence prevention				
g. Other (specify):				

C8. During your fellowship, to what extent were each of the following issues a challenge?

	Not a Challenge at All	A Little Challenging	Somewhat Challenging	A Significant Challenge
a. Limited time				
b. Lack of financial support				
c. Lack of technical support				
d. Lack of supervision or coaching				
e. Unclear expectations				
f. Personal commitments				
g. Other professional commitments				
h. Geographical distance between fellows and meetings				
i. Other (specify):				

C9. During your fellowship, to what extent were each of the following an important source of support?

	No Support	A Little Support	Some Support	Lots of Support	Not Applicable
a. Your employer					
b. VPI community fellow program coordinators (Eureka or Community Partners)					
c. Other VPI grantees					
d. Other fellows in your cohort					
e. Colleagues					
f. Family members					
g. Friends					
h. Other (specify):					

D. Being a Mentor

D1. Did you mentor youth as part of your fellowship?

- Yes
- No (If no, skip to Section E)

D2. If Yes, how many youth did you mentor? _____

D3. In choosing mentees, how important were the following?

	Not at All Important	A Little Important	Somewhat Important	Very Important
a. Age				
b. Gender				
c. Leadership experience				
d. Youth at high risk				
e. Other (specify):				

D4. On average, how many hours per week did you spend with your mentees? _____

D5. In what way(s) did you spend time with your mentees (mark all that apply)?

- Involved them in my organization
- Brought them to the VPI conference or retreats
- Brought them to other VPI activities
- Introduced them to key people who work in violence prevention
- Assisted them with their educational pursuits
- Talked to them about their leadership strengths and weaknesses
- Discussed or demonstrated leadership and values
- Provided support for personal issues
- Other (specify: _____)

D6. In what way(s) did you spend the money allocated for mentees (mark all that apply)?

- Work stipend Attendance at a VPI conference or retreat Training
- Other (specify: _____)
- Did not have money for mentees

D7. Do you still mentor your mentee(s)? Yes No

D8. Is your mentee(s) still involved in violence prevention work? Yes No

D9. How did you learn to be mentor (mark all that apply)?

- From my mentor From my previous experience VPI training
- Other (specify: _____)

E. Effectiveness of Overall Program and Specific Program Activities

E1. The goal of the community fellows program was to support community leaders in their violence prevention efforts through leadership and professional development. Keeping this goal in mind, how effective was the overall fellowship program:

- Very effective
- Moderately effective
- A little effective
- Not effective

E2. Again keeping this goal in mind, please rate the effectiveness of each of the following fellows activities:

	Not Effective	A Little Effective	Moderately Effective	Very Effective	Did not participate
a. Learning plan					
b. Financial compensation					
c. My work to prevent violence in the community					
d. Policy advocacy training					
e. Media advocacy training					
f. Annual VPI conferences					
g. Fellows retreats					
h. Overall coordination of community fellows program by the fellowship coordinator (Eureka or Community Partners)					
i. Training and technical assistance provided by the fellowship coordinator (Eureka or Community Partners)					
j. Being part of the broader VPI					
k. Opportunity to develop relationships with other fellows in my cohort					
l. Mentoring youth					
m. Other (specify):					
Comments:					

F. Developing Relationships and Collaborating with Other VPI Members

F1. How important to your fellowship were relationships with individuals from each of the following VPI groups?

	Not Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Very Important	Did not interact with anyone from this group
a. Academic fellows					
c. Peace Price awardees					
d. Pacific Center for Violence Prevention					
e. Community Action programs					
f. The California Wellness Foundation staff					
g. Fellows from your cohort					
h. Berkeley Media Studies Group					
i. Public Education Campaign					
j. Other VPI grantees (specify):					
Comments:					

G. Effect of participation in the fellowship program

The next set of questions asks about the effect of participation in the fellowship program on your personal growth, knowledge gains, and skills development.

To take into account different experiences prior to the fellowship, we offer two different response options related to “no effect.” The first option, “no effect due to experience prior to the fellowship,” may be used to indicate no effect if you entered the fellowship program with a high level of aptitude, knowledge, or skill related to the specific statement. The second option, “no effect as a result of the fellowship program,” can be used to indicate that you did not experience any change in this particular area due to the program itself. For example, an individual who had been working in gun violence prevention for many years may not think that the program had an effect on his knowledge about gun violence due to his prior experiences rather than what

was offered as part of the program; as a result, he would choose the “no effect due to experience prior to the fellowship.”

Personal Growth

G1. For each of the following statements, rate the effect that participation in the fellowship program has had on your personal growth?

	No Effect due to experience prior to the fellowship	No Effect as a result of the Fellowship Program	Little Effect	Moderate Effect	A Large Effect
a. I am more comfortable around people who are different from me					
b. I have more clarity about my own values and what is important to me					
c. I am more comfortable expressing my beliefs					
d. I am better at acknowledging the contribution of others					
e. I have a deeper appreciation of my culture and community					
f. I have a deeper appreciation of other cultures and communities					
g. I have a greater recognition that conflict is an inherent and desirable part of change					
h. My commitment to violence prevention work has been strengthened					
i. I am more realistic about what I can accomplish in my work.					
j. I have a stronger support network for my violence prevention work					
k. Other (specify):					

G2. What single aspect of the program most contributed to your personal growth and why?

Knowledge Development

G3. For each of the following statements, rate the effect your participation in the fellowship program has had on your knowledge development?

	No Effect due to experience prior to the fellowship	No Effect as a result of the Fellowship Program	Little Effect	Moderate Effect	A Large Effect
a. I know more about the public health approach to violence prevention					
b. I know more approaches to conflict mediation and resolution					
c. I know more about the causes of violence and potential policy interventions					
d. I know more about the causes of firearm injuries and potential policy interventions					
e. I know more about different community perspectives on violence and its prevention					
f. I know more about ways to use the media to promote violence prevention efforts					
g. I know more about ways to sustain violence prevention work					
h. I have a better understanding of the policy and political process of change					
i. Other (specify):					

G4. What single aspect of the program most contributed to your knowledge development and why?

Ability to Enhance Violence Prevention Efforts

G5. For each of the following statements rate the effect your participation in the fellowship program had on your ability to enhance violence prevention efforts?

	No Effect due to experience prior to the fellowship	No Effect as a result of the Fellowship Program	Little Effect	Moderate Effect	A Large Effect
a. I am better able to share what I learn with others					
b. I am better at engaging others in violence prevention activities					
c. I am more effective working with a diverse group					
d. I am more effective at obtaining support for violence prevention work (for example, financial, political, community)					
e. I am better able to develop and implement violence prevention activities					
f. I am more capable of using the media to promote violence prevention					
g. I have increased access to leaders who can assist with my work					
h. My capacity to formulate a clear plan of action has improved					
i. Other (specify):					

G6. What single aspect of the program most contributed to your ability to enhance violence prevention efforts and why?

Organizational Impact

G7. During your fellowship, were you working in an organization?

o Yes

o No (If no, skip to question G10)

G8. For each of the following statements, rate the effect your program participation in the fellowship program has had on your organization?

	No Effect due to experience prior to fellowship	No Effect as a result of the Fellowship Program	Little Effect	Moderate Effect	A Large Effect
a. The existing violence prevention work (programs, training) has been strengthened					
b. New violence prevention work (programs, training) has been implemented					
c. The capacity to communicate a desired future to colleagues has improved					
d. Our ability to project what programs will cost has improved					
e. Our ability to measure impact of programs on violence reduction has improved					
f. Our ability to attract or leverage funds has improved					
g. Recognition of our work has increased					
h. Our ability to determine what our organization or community needs or wants has improved					
i. Our organizational capacity to address violence prevention has improved					
j. Other (specify):					

G9. What single aspect of the program most contributed to your fellowship's impact on your organization and why?

Community or Social Impact

G10. What effect did your program participation have on your community?

	No Effect due to experience prior to the fellowship	No Effect as a result of the Fellowship Program	Little Effect	Moderate Effect	A Large Effect
a. Public awareness about violence prevention has increased					
b. There is more frequent dialogue about the ways to address violence					
c. There is more confidence that violence in my community can be prevented					
d. More people are involved in local efforts to prevent violence					
e. There is increased collaboration among key players or organizations to address violence					
f. There is an increased capacity to tolerate conflict of ideas					
g. Policy makers are more knowledgeable about the needs of the community					
h. Other (specify):					

G11. What single aspect of the program most contributed to your fellowship's impact on your community and why?

Post-fellowship Transition or Involvement in Violence Prevention

H1. To what extent is each of the following a challenge to your ongoing work in violence prevention?

	Not a Challenge At All	A Little Challenging	Somewhat Challenging	A Significant Challenge
a. Lack of professional or personal rewards				
b. Lack of financial resources				
c. Lack of opportunities to pursue violence prevention				
d. Other professional commitments				
e. Personal commitments				
f. Other (specify):				

H2. In what way(s) are you still involved with the VPI (mark all that apply)?

- Communicate with other academic fellows
- Communicate with other community fellows
- Communicate with VPI community fellows program coordinators from Eureka or Community Partners
- Communicate with The California Wellness Foundation staff
- Collaborate on VPI-related activities
- Receive written information from VPI grantees (for example, meeting minutes, newsletter or email updates)
- Attend VPI conferences and meetings
- Utilize Pacific Center Web site
- Utilize VPI listserv
- Other (specify: _____)

H3. How helpful would each of the following post-fellowship activities have been in facilitating your continued work in violence prevention?

	Not at all Helpful	A Little Helpful	Moderately Helpful	Extremely Helpful
a. Ongoing ways to stay involved in the VPI (for example, financial support to attend conference once fellowship ended)				
b. Help to find a violence prevention-related job				
c. Help to obtain funds for violence prevention work				
d. Ongoing training opportunities				
e. Ongoing networking opportunities				
f. Ongoing information updates to support violence prevention work (newsletters, Web site)				
g. Other (specify):				
Comments:				

H. Closing General Questions

I1. What do you think is the most significant achievement that can be attributed to your fellowship experience?

I2. If you had to do it again, would you participate in the program? Yes No

Anonymous Portion of the Survey:

For this next section of the survey, you will have the opportunity to provide input that is kept separate from your other survey responses and will not be linked to your name in anyway.

1. Please comment on anything else that you think is important for us to know.

VPI Leadership Program Survey for Peace Prize Awardees

The purpose of this survey is to obtain information about your experience being a California Peace Prize Awardee and how it impacted your work in violence prevention. This information will help us better understand and document the impact of the California Peace Prize Award Program and the lessons learned for The California Wellness Foundation and for others interested in leadership recognition efforts nationwide. Thank you for taking the time to share your experiences, thoughts and opinions; there are no right or wrong answers.

This survey should take approximately 15 to 20 minutes to complete. Your participation is voluntary, and you may decline to answer any question for any reason. Your individual responses will be kept strictly confidential; however, the evaluators will be able to match responses to specific individuals for follow up purposes. Your responses will be combined with those of other California Peace Prize Awardees and won't be released in any way that would identify you or your specific response to any question.

If you have questions about the content of the survey, please contact Kim Ammann Howard at the Leadership Learning Community, 510-559-9939.

Name: _____

Year received reward: _____

A. Descriptive Information

1. Gender: Male Female

2. Age: 20-29 30-39 40-49 50-59 60+

3. Ethnicity: African American Latino/Hispanic Native American White
 Asian
 Pacific Islander Other (specify: _____)
 Multi-ethnic (specify: _____)

4. Education: Less than high school Some high school
 High school degree or GED Technical degree
 Some college Undergraduate degree Graduate degree

5. Current workplace or work status (Please check the one that best applies)
 Community-based Private Government University
 Foundation Self-employed Unemployed

Other (specify: _____)

6. Are you currently involved in violence prevention? Yes No
7. Total years working on violence prevention? ____ years
8. Number of years working on violence prevention since receiving the California Peace Prize Award?
_____ years
9. What led you to devote your time and energies to violence prevention? (Please mark all that apply)
- Personal experience with violence Violence in my community
- Professional opportunity Other (specify: _____)

B. Media coverage

- 1a. Did you receive media coverage as a result of being a California Peace Prize Awardee? (If no, skip to question B2)
- Yes
 No
- 1b. If yes, how many times did you receive some type of recognition in the media?
- Once
 Twice
 Three times
 More than four times
- 1c. What types of media coverage did you receive? (Please mark all that apply)
- Daily mainstream newspaper (e.g., SF Chronicle, LA Times)
 Local community newspaper
 Newsletter
 Television
 Radio
 Magazine
 Other (specify: _____)
2. Had you received media coverage of your work prior to becoming a California Peace Prize Awardee?
- Yes
 No

3. Has any of the following happened to you as a result of being a California Peace Prize Awardee?
(Please mark all that apply)

- Invited to be a speaker at a meeting or conference
- Responded to requests for information about my work
- Presented legislative testimony
- Appointed to a leadership position (for example, on a commission or board)
- Served as a consultant
- Other (specify: _____)

C. Impact of Receiving California Peace Prize Award

1. As a result of receiving the California Peace Prize Award, did the focus of your violence prevention work change?

- Yes
- No

If Yes, in what ways did your work change?

2. For each of the following statements, rate the effect that being a California Peace Prize Awardee has had on your personal growth.

	No Effect	Little Effect	Moderate Effect	A Large Effect
a. I have a deeper appreciation of my culture and community				
b. I have more clarity about my own values and what is important to me				
c. I am more comfortable expressing my beliefs				
d. My commitment to violence prevention work has been strengthened				
e. I have a stronger support network for my violence prevention work				
f. Other (specify):				

3. What was the most significant impact of being a California Peace Prize Awardee on your personal growth?

4. For each of the following statements, rate the effect that being a California Peace Prize Awardee has had on your ability to enhance the violence prevention efforts.

	No Effect	Little Effect	Moderate Effect	A Large Effect
a. I am better able to influence people to get involved in violence prevention efforts				
b. I am better able to gain the support of influential people such as elected officials and policy makers				
c. I am more effective at obtaining support for my violence prevention work (financial, political, community)				
d. I have increased access to leaders who can assist with my work				
e. I receive more requests for input about violence prevention				
f. Other (specify):				

5. What was the most significant impact of being a California Peace Prize Awardee on your ability to enhance violence prevention efforts?

6. For each of the following statements, rate the effect that being a California Peace Prize Awardee has had on your organization.

	No Effect	Little Effect	Moderate Effect	A Large Effect
a. The existing violence prevention work (programs, training) has been strengthened				
b. New violence prevention work (programs, training) has been implemented				
c. Our organization is more influential with elected officials and policy makers				
d. Our ability to attract or leverage funds has improved				
e. Recognition of our work has increased				
f. We have been able to attract more volunteers				
g. Our organizational capacity to address violence prevention has improved				
h. Other (specify):				

7. What was the most significant impact of being a California Peace Prize Awardee on your organization?

8. For each of the following statements, rate the effect that being a California Peace Prize Awardee has had on your community.

	No Effect	Little Effect	Moderate Effect	A Large Effect
a. Public awareness about violence prevention has increased				
b. There is more frequent dialogue about the ways to address violence				
c. More people are involved in local efforts to prevent violence				
d. My community has strengthened its laws and policies that prevent violence				
e. There is increased collaboration among key players or organizations to address violence				
f. Other (specify):				

9. What was the most significant impact of being a California Peace Prize Awardee on your community?

D. Your involvement with the VPI

1. Prior to receiving the California Peace Prize Award, were you involved in The California Wellness Foundation’s Violence Prevention Initiative?

- Yes
- No

If Yes, in what ways?

2. As a result of receiving the California Peace Prize Award, were you involved in the Violence Prevention Initiative?

- Yes
- No

If Yes, in which of the following ways? (Please mark all that apply)

- Continued to attend VPI annual conference or other VPI meetings after receiving my award
- Participated in conversations with other VPI grantees
- Collaborated with other VPI grantees (for example, on projects, policy efforts, funding)
- Served as a resource to VPI grantees
- Received information from VPI grantees (for example, newsletters, e-mail updates)
- Other (specify: _____)

E. Closing questions

1. What was most rewarding about receiving the California Peace Prize Award?

2. What was most challenging about being a California Peace Prize Awardee?

3. What was most unexpected or surprising about being a California Peace Prize Awardee?

4. What recommendations would you make to improve the California Peace Prize Award Program?

5. Please discuss anything else that you think is important for us to know.

Appendix C: TCWF Leadership Program Interview Questions

California Peace Prize Awardees

[Read to interviewee prior to starting the survey] Thank you for agreeing to participate in this interview. The purpose of this interview is to obtain information about your fellowship experience so that we can better understand and document what the fellowship program has accomplished and the lessons that can be learned for The California Wellness Foundation and for others interested in leadership programs nationwide. Thank you for taking the time to share your experiences, thoughts, and opinions; there are no right or wrong answers.

This interview should take no longer than 60 minutes to complete. Your participation is voluntary, and you may decline to answer any question for any reason or to stop the interview at any time. If you give your permission, I would like to tape record the interview. Your individual responses will be kept strictly confidential. Your responses will be combined with those of other fellows and won't be released in any way that would identify you or your specific response to any question. If you would like me to turn off the recorder at anytime I would be happy to do so.

Post-award involvement in violence prevention

1. (Review survey prior to interview) Clarify their involvement in violence prevention since receiving their California Peace Prize Award including current work.

Impact of award

2. In what ways has receiving the California Peace Prize Award impacted (or influenced) the following (Probe: positive and negative effects):
 - a. Yourself (Probe: changes in perception of self and self by others, impact on work such as personal sustainability and commitment)
 - b. Your family
 - c. Your organization
 - d. Your community
 - e. Efforts to prevent violence
3. What did the award enable you to accomplish that you would not have, had you not received the award? (Probe: impact on personal sustainability and commitment)
4. What do you do differently as a result of receiving the California Peace Prize Award? (Probe: new strategies, collaboration, new or expanded programs, innovations)
5. What could have made your award experience more successful or positive? (Probe: what Foundation could have done differently)

Media

6. How did the increased media attention impact your work (e.g., to promote your message, influence public opinion, and attract new resources such as volunteers, funding, or partners)?

Support, Development, and Learning

7. What are the specific qualities and skills you need for doing violence prevention work?
8. What supports the development of these qualities and skills?

Leadership

9. Has your ability to effectively lead violence prevention work changed as a result of the recognition from the award? If so, in what ways?
10. Have your own perceptions of your leadership changed as a result of receiving this award? And if so, in what ways?
11. Did the award change community perceptions about your leadership role in this work? And if so, with what impact?
12. Do you think of yourself as someone involved in leading violence prevention work? Why or why not? (Probe: what role they see themselves playing in the leadership process)

Social Capital

13. (Prior to interview, look at survey to see the ways in which they were involved in the VPI and ask as applicable) In what specific ways did being part of a larger group affect your work? Specifically, how about being part of a cohort with other fellows? Being part of the VPI - The Academic Fellows? Community fellows? Other VPI groups? (Probe: specific examples regarding different levels of networking, collaboration, impact, and learning)
14. Do you see signs or examples of a developing violence prevention movement or field? If so, what caused it to happen? If not, what have been the barriers?
15. Is there anything else that you would like to discuss?

Community Fellows

[Read to interviewee prior to starting the survey] Thank you for agreeing to participate in this interview. The purpose of this interview is to obtain information about your fellowship experience so that we can better understand and document what the fellowship program has accomplished and the lessons that can be learned for The California Wellness Foundation and for others interested in leadership programs nationwide. Thank you for taking the time to share your experiences, thoughts, and opinions; there are no right or wrong answers.

This interview should take no longer than 60 minutes to complete. Your participation is voluntary, and you may decline to answer any question for any reason or to stop the interview at any time. If you give your permission, I would like to tape record the interview. Your individual responses will be kept strictly confidential. Your responses will be combined with those of other fellows and won't be released in any way that would identify you or your specific response to any question. If you would like me to turn off the recorder at anytime I would be happy to do so.

Post-fellowship involvement in violence prevention

1. (Prior to the interview, review written survey about involvement in violence prevention involvement since the end of their fellowship – paid and volunteer) Ask for clarifying information as needed. If it is not explicit, also ask for specifics about the ways in which they consider their work to be violence prevention.

Impact of fellowship

2. What are the main ways that your fellowship experience has impacted (or influenced) the following? (Probe: positive and negative effects) How about for:
 - a. Yourself (Probe: changes in perception of self and self by others, impact on work such as personal sustainability and commitment)
 - b. Your family
 - c. Your organization
 - d. Your community
 - e. Efforts to prevent violence
3. What has changed most for you as a result of being involved in the fellowship? (Probe: new strategies, collaboration, new or expanded programs, innovations, what couldn't have accomplished)

Leadership

4. In what ways has the fellowship supported your leadership or helped you to more effectively lead violence prevention work in your organization, community or field?
5. What kind of leadership is needed to strengthen violence prevention? (Probe: what's missing from the understanding of leadership as typically practiced, positive models of leadership in violence prevention based on fellows' experiences, and ways this type of leadership can be supported and developed)
6. In your work, how do you support the leadership of others?

Mentoring

Prior to interview, review survey information to determine whether they had a mentee. Also ask for clarifying information as needed (e.g., who they mentored, what they did, and whether their mentor is still involved in violence prevention).

7. What was the impact of your mentoring relationship on your mentee(s)? How about on you? (Probe: learning)

Support, Development, and Learning

8. What are the three most important qualities and skills you need for doing violence prevention work?
9. What supports the development of these qualities and skills? (Probe: whether or not supported by program)

Community/Social Capital/Movement

10. In what specific ways did being part of a larger group affect your work? Specifically, how about being part of a cohort with other community fellows? Being part of the VPI - The Academic Fellows? Peace Prize Awardees? Other VPI groups? (Probe: for specific examples regarding

different levels of networking, collaboration, impact, and learning; examples of group accomplishments and leadership qualities and skills of the group)

11. As a result of your participation in the fellowship program, do you feel as though you are part of a violence prevention movement or field? What specifically makes you feel this way?
12. Do you see signs of a developing violence prevention movement or field? If so, what caused it to happen? If not, what have been the barriers?

Diversity

13. In what specific ways did the program impact your understanding of other cultural perspectives and your ability to work with others who were different from you?

Recommendations

14. In what ways could the fellowship have been improved?

Probe:

- Mentoring relationships
- Types of support and development during and after the fellowship
- Ways to address race and class issues
- Design and goals of the community fellows' program
- Selection criteria and how participants may differ from those who have been chosen in the past

15. Is there anything else that you would like to discuss?

Academic Fellows

[Read to interviewee prior to starting the survey] Thank you for agreeing to participate in this interview. The purpose of this interview is to obtain information about your fellowship experience so that we can better understand and document what the fellowship program has accomplished and the lessons that can be learned for The California Wellness Foundation and for others interested in leadership programs nationwide. Thank you for taking the time to share your experiences, thoughts, and opinions; there are no right or wrong answers.

This interview should take no longer than 60 minutes to complete. Your participation is voluntary, and you may decline to answer any question for any reason or to stop the interview at any time. If you give your permission, I would like to tape record the interview. Your individual responses will be kept strictly confidential. Your responses will be combined with those of other fellows and won't be released in any way that would identify you or your specific response to any question. If you would like me to turn off the recorder at anytime I would be happy to do so.

Post fellowship experience and impact of fellowship

1. Prior to the interview, review written survey about violence prevention involvement since the end of their fellowship (paid and volunteer) and ask for clarifying information as needed. If it is not explicit, also ask for specifics about the ways in which they consider their work to be violence prevention. Also clarify their involvement in violence prevention work prior to the fellowship.

2. What are the main ways that your fellowship experience has impacted (or influenced) the following (Probe: specific changes, positive and negative effects)?
 - a. Your work (Probe: impact on work such as personal sustainability and commitment)
 - b. Yourself (Probe: changes in perception of self and self by others)
 - c. Your fellowship site
 - d. Your field or professional specialty
3. (Ask when applicable based on responses to written surveys) As you probably know, one of the main goals of the fellowship program was to increase the number of women and persons of color who work to prevent violence in their role as health professionals. In what ways has your fellowship experience helped you to share or apply your perspectives as a woman and/or person of color?

Mentoring

4. What was most meaningful to you personally about your relationship with your principal investigator? How about professionally? What would you have changed?

Diversity

5. In what specific ways did the program impact your understanding of other cultural perspectives and your ability to work with others who are different from you? (Probe: challenges and benefits)

Social Capital/Community/Movement

6. In what specific ways did being part of a larger group affect your work? Specifically, how about being part of a cohort with other academic fellows? Being part of the VPI – The community fellows? Peace Prize Awardees? Other VPI groups? (Probe: for specific examples regarding different levels of networking, collaboration, impact, and learning)
7. As a result of your participation in the fellowship program, do you feel as though you are part of a violence prevention movement or field? If so, what specifically makes you feel this way?
8. Do you see signs or examples of a developing violence prevention movement or field? If so, what caused it to happen? If not, what have been the barriers?

Support, Development, and Learning

9. What are the three most important qualities and/or skills you need for doing violence prevention work?
10. What supports the development of these qualities and skills? (Probe: whether or not supported by program, infrastructure at the site level,)

Leadership

11. In what ways has the fellowship supported your development as a leader? (or helped you to more effectively lead violence prevention work in your organization or field)
12. What kind of leaders or leadership is needed to strengthen violence prevention? (Probe: what's missing from the understanding of leadership as typically practiced, positive models of leadership in violence prevention based on fellows' experiences, and ways this type of leadership can be supported and developed)

Recommendations

13. In what ways could the fellowship have been improved?

Probe:

- Specific changes at fellowship site level
- Mentoring relationship with principal investigator
- Types of support and development during the fellowship
- Types of support and development after the fellowship
- Ways to address race and class issues
- Design and goals of the academic fellows program

14. Is there anything else that you would like to discuss?

Academic Fellowship Program Leadership Coordinator Questions

Early Engagement and Vision

1. How were you (the Trauma Foundation) involved in shaping the VPI Initiative?
2. What was the Trauma Foundation hoping through its involvement in this effort?
3. What assumptions do you think the foundation made about how to influence change in regards to policy, discourse, and the practice of violence prevention that shaped the design and implementation of the initiative? In what ways do you think these assumptions have held up and in what ways have they been challenged?

Foundation Assumptions and Goals regarding AF Program

4. What were the foundation's assumptions about why academic fellowships were an important component of this initiative?
5. What did you understand TCWF's goals to be in launching the academic fellowship program? In what ways did these goals evolve over time?
6. Do you think the foundation's original intent was accomplished? How or how not? (Probe: site vs. overall program, conceptually and practically, and goal of fellowship to increase number of women and persons of color in the health professions who incorporate violence prevention into their careers)

AF Program

7. Given your experience as the academic fellowship program coordinator, what would you say were the program's primary strengths? What were its weaknesses?
8. How did the academic fellowship program evolve and change over time? Probe:
 - Goals
 - Requirements (Probe: overall program vs. site)
 - Recruitment (Probe: what worked and didn't work, selection criteria such as disciplines represented and place in career, length of fellowship, and external issues such as affirmative action and high cost of living)
 - Communication between the coordinators and fellows; coordinators and sites

- Site selection
 - Its relationship to other components of the VPI
 - Contextual or external factors (e.g., focus on criminal justice, economics, etc.)
9. How did issues of race and class emerge in the academic fellowship program and the VPI? How were these addressed? What changes, if any, would you make in the way these issues were addressed?
10. In what ways did money become an issue in the fellowship program? How were these issues addressed? What changes, if any, would you recommend in how money should be allocated and distributed?

Your role

11. How would you describe your role as a program coordinator? (Probe: challenges, rewards, surprises) How did it evolve over time?
12. How would you describe your mentoring role? What impact did mentoring have on fellows? How about for you? (Probe: learning, strengths and weaknesses, what would have done differently, geographic and other issues that may have interfered with developing strong mentoring relationships)

Institutional relationships

13. How would you describe your relationship with the site coordinators? (Probe: how each was a resource to the other; collaboration; points of tension; strengths and weaknesses of sites)
14. How would you describe your relationship with the foundation's leadership for this initiative? (Probe: strengths, weaknesses, issues of continuity, vision)

Impact of the fellowship program

15. What were the most significant ways that fellows were impacted by their involvement in the fellowship program? (Probe: changes in attitudes, knowledge, and skills; personal and professional development, etc.)
16. What indicators were used to determine the success of the fellowship program? Or what are the best indicators of success of the program? (Probe: for fellows, principal investigators, and coordinators)?
17. How did the academic fellowship institutions change as a result of the having the fellowship program at their site? (Probe: interest and involvement in violence prevention, new practices or programs, institutionalization of fellowship activities, etc.)
18. In what specific ways did the fellowship program have an impact on the specialties or fields in which fellows work? (Probe: increase in violence prevention presentations, publications, career opportunities, number of women and persons of color, etc.)
19. In what ways was the fellowship program impacted by the recruitment of women and people of color (e.g., ways it impacted what fellows pursued, theories or models of violence prevention pursued, etc.)

Challenges and recommendations

20. What were the three biggest challenges of the fellowship program for fellows? For PIs and their institutions? For yourself?
21. What have been the biggest challenges for fellows to continue to work in violence prevention? What has facilitated continued work?
22. What would you do differently as the fellowship coordinator if you were to start the program over again? (Probe: mentoring of fellows, institutional support, involvement with broader VPI, etc.)
23. In what other ways could the fellowship have been improved? (Probe: role of Foundation and fellowship coordinators, interaction with other VPI members, design and structure of fellowship including what the fellowship would have looked like if it was more structured)
24. Is there anything else that you would like to discuss?

Community Fellowship Program Leadership Coordinator Questions

Foundation Assumptions and Goals regarding CFP

1. What did you understand the foundation's goals to be in launching the community fellowship program? In what ways did these goals evolve over time?
2. What were the foundation's assumptions about why the community fellowship program was an important component of this initiative?
3. Do you think the foundation's original intent was accomplished? How or how not?

Your role

4. How would you describe your role as a community fellowship program coordinator? (Probe: challenges, rewards, surprises) How did it evolve over time?
5. What was the perspective (or perspectives) that you brought to the program? What contribution did you want to make? To what extent do you feel as though you were successful in doing so?
6. How would you describe your mentoring role? What impact did mentoring have on fellows? How about for you? (Probe: learning, strengths and weaknesses, what would have done differently, geographic and other issues that may have interfered with developing strong mentoring relationships)

Institutional relationships

7. How would you describe your relationship with the foundation's VPI leadership? (Probe: Strengths, weaknesses, issues of continuity, vision)
8. Were you aware of different agendas, perspectives, and goals? If so, how were these dealt with? (Probe: areas of tension or disagreement, how conflict played out, and who was involved such as foundation staff, other staff from coordinating agencies, fellows, etc.)

CF Program

9. Given your experience as the community fellowship program coordinator, what would you say were the program's primary strengths? What were its weaknesses?
10. What do you think were the most important skills for fellows to attain as part of their fellowship experience? To what extent did this occur? Why or why not?
11. How did the community fellowship program evolve and change over time? Probe:
 - Goals
 - Requirements (Probe: individual fellows vs. coordinators)
 - Recruitment
 - Communication between the coordinators and fellows
 - Its relationship to other components of the VPI
 - Other factors external to the VPI that may have impacted the fellowship program
12. Was money an issue in the fellowship program? If so, how were these issues addressed? What changes, if any, would you recommend in how money should be allocated and distributed?
13. Did issues of race and class emerge in the fellowship program and the VPI? If so, how were these addressed? What changes, if any, would you make in the way these issues were addressed?

Impact of the fellowship program (Probe: success stories)

14. What indicators were used to determine the success of the fellowship program? Or what are the best indicators of success of the program? (Probe: for overall program, individual fellows, coordinators)
15. What were the most significant ways that fellows were impacted by their involvement in the fellows program? (Probe: changes in attitudes, knowledge, and skills; personal and professional development, etc.)
16. What were the most significant ways that fellows' organizations and communities were impacted by their involvement in the fellows program? (Probe: changes in focus, programs, levels of support, funding, institutionalization, etc.)
17. In what specific ways did the fellowship impact you professionally? How about personally? (Probe: what do differently as a result of the program, learning from being part of the broader VPI, etc.)

Challenges and recommendations

18. What were the three biggest challenges of the fellowship program for fellows? For yourself?
19. What have been the biggest challenges for fellows to continue to work in violence prevention? What has facilitated their continued work?
20. What would you do differently as the fellowship coordinator if you were to start the program over again? (Probe: mentoring of fellows, types of support, involvement with broader VPI, etc.)
21. In what other ways could the fellowship have been improved? (Probe: role of Foundation and fellowship coordinators, interaction with other VPI members, design and structure of fellowship, etc.)

22. Is there anything else that you would like to discuss?

Principal Investigators of Academic Fellowship Program

[Read to interviewee prior to starting the survey] Thank you for agreeing to participate in this interview. The purpose of this interview is to obtain information about The California Wellness Foundation's VPI Academic Fellowship Program so that we can better understand and document what the fellowship program has accomplished and the lessons that can be learned for The California Wellness Foundation and for others interested in leadership programs nationwide. Thank you for taking the time to share your experiences, thoughts, and opinions; there are no right or wrong answers.

This interview should take no longer than 60 minutes to complete. Your participation is voluntary, and you may decline to answer any question for any reason or to stop the interview at any time. If you give your permission, I would like to tape record the interview. Your individual responses will be kept strictly confidential. Your responses will be combined with those of other principal investigators and won't be released in any way that would identify you or your specific response to any question. If you would like me to turn off the recorder at anytime I would be happy to do so.

Opening question

1. Given your experience as principal investigator of the academic fellowship program at your site, what would you say are the program's primary strengths and weaknesses for you and your institution?

Recruitment

2. How did the recruitment of fellows at your site evolve over time? (Probe: what worked and didn't work, selection criteria such as disciplines represented and place in career, length of fellowship, and external issues such as affirmative action and high cost of living)

Mentoring

3. What was the impact of your mentoring relationship on your fellows? How about on you? (Probe: learning, strengths and weaknesses, what would have done differently)
4. To what extent are the fellows from your site still working in violence prevention? (Probe: facilitators and barriers)

Site specific

5. What types of institutional support are important for you to successfully implement the fellowship program at your site? To what extent did you receive those types of support?
6. What were the three biggest challenges of the fellowship program for fellows? How about for yourself and your institution?
7. (If applicable) How did this fellowship differ from other fellowships at your site? (Probe: strengths and weaknesses)

Impact of the fellowship program

8. What were the most significant ways that fellows were impacted by their involvement in the fellowship program? (Probe: changes in attitudes, knowledge, and skills; personal and professional development, etc.)
9. In what specific ways did the fellowship impact you professionally? How about personally? (Probe: what do differently as a result of the program, learning from being part of the broader VPI, etc.)
10. How did your institution change as a result of the having the fellowship program at your site? (Probe: interest and involvement in violence prevention, new practices or programs, institutionalization of fellowship activities, etc.)
11. In what specific ways did the fellowship program impact your specialty or field? (Probe: increase in violence prevention presentations, publications, career opportunities, number of women and persons of color, etc.)

Program goals

12. What do you think the goals of the academic fellowship program were when you started? How did they evolve for you?
13. Do you think The California Wellness Foundation's original intent was accomplished? How or how not? (Probe: site vs. overall program, conceptually and practically, and goal of fellowship to increase number of women and persons of color in the health professions who incorporate violence prevention into their careers)

Recommendations

14. What would you do differently if you were going to start the fellowship at your site again? (Probe: mentoring of fellows, institutional support, involvement with broader VPI, etc.)
15. In what other ways could the fellowship have been improved? (Probe: role of Foundation and fellowship coordinators, interaction with other VPI members, design and structure of fellowship including what the fellowship would have looked like if it was more structured)
16. Is there anything else that you would like to discuss?

Leadership Learning Community

This evaluation was conducted by members of the **Leadership Learning Community (LLC)**. The LLC is a national non-profit membership organization for those who run, fund, study and provide services to leadership development efforts.

Our mission is to build a learning community that strengthens leadership development by sharing ideas, resources, the results of inquiry, lessons learned, and innovative practices.

General questions about the LLC can be directed to **Deborah Meehan**, executive director at **deborah@leadershiplearning.org**. To learn more about the organization and the field of leadership development, please visit the LLC website at www.leadershiplearning.org.