Sch	ool District	Baseline (6 th grade) Sample Size ¹	Eligible age 19 sample size (% of baseline) ²	Age 19 participants (% of eligible) ³
Interv	vention School	District in Iowa		(,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,
	Lower Risk	126	109 (86.5%)	37 (33.9%)
1	Higher Risk	56	36 (64.3%)	22 (61.1%)
	Total	182	145 (79.7%)	59 (40.7%)
2	Lower Risk	154	143 (79.7%)	37 (30.8%)
		78	49 (62.8%)	, ,
	Higher Risk	232		27 (55.1%)
	Total Lower Risk		169 (72.8%)	64 (37.9%)
3		113	74 (65.5%)	38 (51.4%)
	Higher Risk	45	31 (68.9%)	19 (61.3%)
	Total	158	105 (66.5%)	57 (54.3%)
4	Lower Risk	199	171 (85.9%)	40 (23.4%)
	Higher Risk	88	61 (69.3%)	28 (45.9%)
	Total	287	232 (80.8%)	68 (29.3%)
	Lower Risk	418	316 (75.6%)	56 (17.7%)
5	Higher Risk	190	101 (53.2%)	32 (31.7%)
	Total	608	417 (68.6%)	88 (21.1%)
6	Lower Risk	354	272 (76.8%)	48 (17.6%)
	Higher Risk	208	137 (65.9%)	36 (26.3%)
	Total	562	409 (72.8%)	84 (20.5%)
7	Lower Risk	535	408 (76.3%)	62 (15.2%)
	Higher Risk	189	125 (66.1%)	37 (29.6%)
	Total	724	533 (73.6%)	99 (18.6%)
Interv	vention School	District in Pennsylvania		
	Lower Risk	163	119 (73.0%)	34 (28.6%)
1	Higher Risk	89	56 (62.9%)	28 (50.0%)
	Total	252	175 (69.4%)	62 (35.4%)
	Lower Risk	157	115 (73.2%)	39 (33.9%)
2	Higher Risk	57	38 (66.7%)	16 (42.1%)
	Total	214	153 (71.5%)	55 (35.9%)
	Lower Risk	596	365 (61.2%)	60 (16.4%)
3	Higher Risk	189	86 (45.5%)	24 (27.9%)
_	Total	785	451 (57.5%)	84 (18.6%)
	Lower Risk	258	183 (70.9%)	43 (23.5%)
4	Higher Risk	97	52 (53.6%)	23 (44.2%)
•	Total	355	235 (66.2%)	66 (28.1%)
5	Lower Risk	271	164 (60.5%)	52 (31.7%)
	Higher Risk	118	59 (50.0%)	23 (39.0%)
5	Total	389	223 (57.3%)	75 (33.6%)
	Lower Risk	<u> </u>	157 (79.7%)	41 (26.1%)
6	Higher Risk	77	60 (77.9%)	33 (55.0%)
6	0		· · · ·	· /
	Total	274	217 (79.2%)	74 (34.1%)
7	Lower Risk	286	231 (80.8%)	45 (19.5%)
	Higher Risk	174	129 (74.1%)	23 (17.8%)
	Total	460	360 (78.3%)	68 (18.9%)

Table 1. Sample and survey participation by school district and risk level.

1 $\frac{1}{1}$	ower Risk gher Risk otal ower Risk gher Risk otal ower Risk gher Risk	Sample Size1 ict in Iowa 171 85 256 124 67 191 124 45	size (% of baseline) ² 135 (78.9%) 57 (67.1%) 192 (75.0%) 90 (72.6%) 43 (64.2%) 133 (69.6%) 100 (80.6%)	(% of eligible) ³ 35 (25.9%) 31 (54.4%) 66 (34.4%) 33 (36.7%) 26 (60.5%) 59 (44.4%)
1 $\frac{1}{1}$	ower Risk gher Risk ower Risk gher Risk otal ower Risk gher Risk otal ower Risk gher Risk gher Risk	171 85 256 124 67 191 124	57 (67.1%) 192 (75.0%) 90 (72.6%) 43 (64.2%) 133 (69.6%)	31 (54.4%) 66 (34.4%) 33 (36.7%) 26 (60.5%) 59 (44.4%)
$\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ $	gher Risk otal ower Risk gher Risk otal ower Risk gher Risk otal ower Risk gher Risk	85 256 124 67 191 124	57 (67.1%) 192 (75.0%) 90 (72.6%) 43 (64.2%) 133 (69.6%)	31 (54.4%) 66 (34.4%) 33 (36.7%) 26 (60.5%) 59 (44.4%)
$\begin{array}{c} & \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ $	otal ower Risk gher Risk otal ower Risk otal ower Risk gher Risk gher Risk	124 67 191 124	192 (75.0%) 90 (72.6%) 43 (64.2%) 133 (69.6%)	66 (34.4%) 33 (36.7%) 26 (60.5%) 59 (44.4%)
$\begin{array}{c} & \begin{array}{c} & \end{array} \\ & & \end{array} \\ & & \end{array} \\ 2 & \begin{array}{c} & \begin{array}{c} & \begin{array}{c} & \end{array} \\ & \end{array} \\ & \end{array} \\ 3 & \begin{array}{c} & \begin{array}{c} & \begin{array}{c} & \end{array} \\ & \end{array} \\ & \end{array} \\ 3 & \begin{array}{c} & \begin{array}{c} & \begin{array}{c} & \end{array} \\ & \end{array} \\ & \end{array} \\ 3 & \begin{array}{c} & \begin{array}{c} & \begin{array}{c} & \end{array} \\ & \end{array} \\ & \end{array} \\ 5 & \begin{array}{c} & \begin{array}{c} & \begin{array}{c} & \end{array} \\ & \end{array} \\ & \end{array} \\ & \end{array} \\ 5 & \begin{array}{c} & \begin{array}{c} & \begin{array}{c} & \end{array} \\ & \end{array} \\ & \end{array} \\ 5 & \begin{array}{c} & \begin{array}{c} & \begin{array}{c} & \end{array} \\ & \end{array} \\ & \end{array} \\ 5 & \begin{array}{c} & \begin{array}{c} & \begin{array}{c} & \end{array} \\ & \end{array} \\ & \end{array} \\ 5 & \begin{array}{c} & \begin{array}{c} & \end{array} \\ & \end{array} \\ & \end{array} \\ 5 & \begin{array}{c} & \begin{array}{c} & \end{array} \\ & \end{array} \\ & \end{array} \\ 5 & \begin{array}{c} & \begin{array}{c} & \begin{array}{c} & \end{array} \\ & \end{array} \\ & \end{array} \\ 5 & \begin{array}{c} & \begin{array}{c} & \begin{array}{c} & \end{array} \\ & \end{array} \\ & \end{array} \\ 5 & \begin{array}{c} & \begin{array}{c} & \end{array} \\ & \end{array} \\ & \end{array} \\ & \end{array} \\ 5 & \begin{array}{c} & \begin{array}{c} & \begin{array}{c} & \end{array} \\ 5 & \begin{array}{c} & \begin{array}{c} & \begin{array}{c} & \end{array} \\ \\ & \end{array} \\ & \end{array} \\ & \end{array} \\ & \end{array} \\ \\ & \end{array} \\ & \end{array} \\ \\ & \end{array} \\ & \end{array} \\ \\ \\ & \end{array} \\ \\ & \end{array} \\ \\ & \end{array} \\ \\ \\ & \end{array} \\ \\ \\ \\$	ower Risk gher Risk otal ower Risk gher Risk otal ower Risk gher Risk	124 67 191 124	90 (72.6%) 43 (64.2%) 133 (69.6%)	33 (36.7%) 26 (60.5%) 59 (44.4%)
$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ $	gher Risk otal ower Risk gher Risk otal ower Risk gher Risk	67 191 124	43 (64.2%) 133 (69.6%)	26 (60.5%) 59 (44.4%)
$\begin{array}{c} & \overline{\mathrm{Tot}} \\ & \overline{\mathrm{Lov}} \\ 3 & \overline{\mathrm{Hig}} \\ & \overline{\mathrm{Tot}} \\ & \overline{\mathrm{Tot}} \\ 4 & \overline{\mathrm{Hig}} \\ & \overline{\mathrm{Tot}} \\ & \overline{\mathrm{Tot}} \\ 5 & \overline{\mathrm{Hig}} \\ & \overline{\mathrm{Tot}} \\ 5 & \overline{\mathrm{Hig}} \\ & \overline{\mathrm{Tot}} \\ & \overline{\mathrm{Tot}} \\ 6 & \overline{\mathrm{Hig}} \\ & \overline{\mathrm{Tot}} \\ & \overline{\mathrm{Tot}} \\ & \overline{\mathrm{Tot}} \\ 6 & \overline{\mathrm{Hig}} \\ & \overline{\mathrm{Tot}} \\ & \overline{\mathrm{Tot}}$	otal ower Risk gher Risk otal ower Risk gher Risk	191 124	133 (69.6%)	59 (44.4%)
$\begin{array}{c} & \begin{array}{c} & \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} & \end{array} \\ & \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} & \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} & \end{array} \\ \\ & \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} & \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} & \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} & \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} & \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} & \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} & \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} & \end{array} \\ \end{array}$	ower Risk gher Risk otal ower Risk gher Risk	124	1	· · · · · ·
$\begin{array}{c} 3 \\ & Hig \\ Tot \\ \\ Tot \\ \\ \\ 4 \\ Hig \\ Tot \\ \\ \\ \hline \\ \\ 5 \\ Hig \\ \hline \\ \\ \hline \\ \\ \hline \\ \\ \hline \\$	gher Risk otal ower Risk gher Risk			41 (41.0%)
4 $ \begin{array}{c} Iot \\ Iot \\ Iot \\ Tot \\ $	otal ower Risk gher Risk		29 (64.4%)	19 (65.5%)
$\begin{array}{c} & \begin{array}{c} & \end{array} \\ 5 \\ & \end{array} \\ \hline 7 \\ & \end{array} \\ \hline 7 \\ \hline 6 \\ \hline 7 \\ & \end{array} \\ \hline 7 \\ $	ower Risk igher Risk	169	129 (76.3%)	60 (46.5%)
$\begin{array}{c} 4 \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ $	gher Risk	212	163 (76.9%)	40 (24.5%)
$ \begin{array}{c} Tot \\ Lov \\ \overline{10} \\ $	-	102	75 (73.5%)	28 (37.3%)
5 $\frac{1}{1}$ 5 $\frac{1}{1}$ $\frac{1}{1$	otal	314	238 (75.8%)	68 (28.6%)
$ \begin{array}{c} 5 \\ Hig \\ Tot \\ 0 \\ \hline \hline 0 \\ \hline 0 \\ \hline \hline 0 \\ \hline \hline 0 \\ \hline 0 \\ \hline \hline \hline 0 \\ \hline \hline 0 \\ \hline \hline \hline \hline 0 \\ \hline \hline \hline \hline \hline 0 \\ \hline \hline$	ower Risk	355	264 (74.4%)	47 (17.8%)
$ \begin{array}{c} \hline \\ \hline \\$	gher Risk	201	126 (62.7%)	37 (29.4%)
$\begin{array}{c} & \begin{array}{c} & \begin{array}{c} Lov \\ Hig \\ Tot \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ 7 & \begin{array}{c} Lov \\ Hig \\ \hline Tot \\ \end{array} \\ \hline Tot \\ \hline Tot \\ \hline Tot \\ \end{array} \\ \hline Tot \\ \hline $		556	390 (70.1%)	84 (21.5%)
$\begin{array}{c} 6 \\ Hig \\ Tot \\ T$	ower Risk	418	318 (76.1%)	50 (15.7%)
$ \begin{array}{c} Tot \\ Loy \\ Tot \\ $	gher Risk	129	74 (57.4%)	31 (41.9%)
$ \begin{array}{c} $	-	547	392 (71.7%)	81 (20.7%)
$ \begin{array}{c} 7 \\ & \text{Hig} \\ & \text{Tot} \\ & \text{Tot} \\ \end{array} $ $ \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 4 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1$	ower Risk	399	305 (76.4%)	54 (17.7%)
$ \begin{array}{c} \hline Tot\\ \hline Tot \hline Tot\\ \hline Tot \hline T$	gher Risk	189	114 (60.3%)	34 (29.8%)
$ \begin{array}{c} \text{Control Sc} \\ \text{Lo} \\ 1 \\ \\ 1 \\ \\ 1 \\ \\ 2 \\ \\ 1 \\ \\ 1 \\ \\ 1 \\ \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1$	0	588	419 (71.3%)	88 (21.0%)
$ \begin{array}{c} Lo \\ Hightarrow \\ 2 \\ Lo \\ 2 \\ Hightarrow \\ Lo \\ 3 \\ Hightarrow \\ Lo \\ 4 \\ H \\ H $		ict in Pennsylvania	(11) (11.570)	00 (21.070)
1 Hi Lo 2 Hi 3 Lo 3 Hi 4 H	ower Risk	151	111 (73.5%)	37 (33.3%)
2 Hi 2 Hi 3 Hi 4 H	igher Risk	74	44 (59.5%)	23 (52.3%)
2 Hightarress Location 12 Loca	Total	225	155 (68.9%)	60 (38.7%)
2 Hightarress Location 12 Loca	ower Risk	158	130 (82.3%)	40 (30.8%)
3 Hi 3 Lo 4 H	igher Risk	40	28 (70.0%)	15 (53.6%)
3 High	Total	198	158 (79.8%)	55 (34.8%)
3 High	ower Risk	289	235 (81.3%)	44 (18.7%)
4 H	igher Risk	105	68 (64.8%)	23 (33.8%)
4 <u>H</u>	Total	394	303 (76.9%)	67 (22.1%)
4 H	ower Risk	598	447 (74.7%)	58 (13.0%)
	High Risk	190	113 (59.5%)	30 (26.5%)
Lo	Total	788	560 (71.1%)	88 (15.7%)
	ower Risk	346	285 (82.4%)	50 (17.5%)
	igher Risk	126	80 (63.5%)	24 (30.0%)
	Total	472	365 (77.3%)	74 (20.3%)
Lo	ower Risk	211	170 (80.6%)	39 (22.9%)
		95	63 (66.3%)	31 (49.2%)
	igher Risk	306	233 (76.1%)	70 (30.0%)
Ιn	igher Risk Total	244	201 (82.4%)	43 (21.4%)
	Total	55	42 (76.4%)	18 (42.9%)
/ 111	U	299	243 (81.3%)	61 (25.1%)

¹All 6th enrolled grade students were eligible for participation in in-school classroom surveys; passive parent consent and active student assent procedures were employed.

²The eligible sample includes those students that completed the 6^{th} grade baseline assessment and were enrolled in the same school district in 9^{th} grade as they were at the time of the baseline assessment.

³Eligible participants were stratified on the basis of gender and risk level at baseline. Lists of eligible participants by risk level within school district were then randomly ordered and recruited in that random order until targeted sample sizes with each stratum were met (or in a few cases, the eligible cell sample pool was exhausted).