

Prevention, Impact, & Methods:

A report on Project REAL's REALSafe Relationship Violence Prevention Workshops, and the methods & math used to create their searchable index of Nevada high school's 2026-27 senior classes projected to experience relationship violence during their lifetimes.

REALSafe is a free relationship-violence prevention workshop developed in response to Nevada's 2017 legislative goals.

Despite strong indicators of success and requiring relatively little classroom time, Project REAL continues to face barriers to reaching more schools.

To help overcome those barriers, we created a searchable database that projects the lifetime relationship-violence risks facing each Nevada high school's graduating seniors and the potential impact of REALSafe's intervention among them.

*While the database mini-site provides an executive summary, this supporting report takes a deeper look at the workshop, database, calculations, and judgment calls behind both. **

**The supporting website may be viewed here:
<https://projectrealnv.org/projections2026>*

Table of Contents

Part I: REALSafe

The Scope & Scale: Relationship Violence Impacts <i>Everyone</i> .	Pg. 03
A REALSafe Overview	Pg. 03
Origins	Pg. 04
Barriers & Their Design Impact	Pg. 05
The Workshop's Methodology & Design	Pg. 07
Efficacy & Impact	Pg. 09
Failures & Responsive Course Adjustments	Pg. 11
The Challenges of Delivery	Pg. 12
The Database Response	Pg. 14

Part II: The Database Project

Overcoming Delivery Challenges: Our 2026-27 Database Project	Pg. 16
The Database: What It Is & How to Interpret It	Pg. 16
On Deliberate Restraint & Conservative Projections	Pg. 17
Assumptions, Limitations, & Judgment Calls	Pg. 18
The Workbook: A Quick Guide To Navigating the Data	Pg. 19
The Math I: Senior Class Enrollment Projections	Pg. 20
The Math II: REALSafe's Impact Projections	Pg. 23

Part III: Student Roots, State Support

Students Fought For This: About SB108	Pg. 26
---------------------------------------	--------

Appendices

Appendix A: Student Safeguards	Pg. 29
Appendix B: Senior Enrollment Projection Calculations	Pg. 31
Appendix C: Report Composition and Evaluation Practices	Pg. 35

Part I: REALSafe

The Scope & Scale: Relationship Violence Impacts *Everyone*.

In the United States, research suggests that between 25% and 28.1% of women, and between 14.3% and 21.2% of men, will experience physical violence from an intimate partner at least once during their lifetimes. Those figures represent two sets of national estimates, both used in Project REAL's new school-level database to illustrate the potential scale of relationship violence to Nevada's education stakeholders. The database, the reasoning behind both models, and the methods used to develop its projections are explained later in this report. But as Project REAL contextualizes for the students being served, what if relationship violence never happens to them personally?

Consider the people they'll care about over the course of their lives: family, friends, romantic partners, coworkers, and neighbors. If a student eventually knows just 20 women and 21 men well enough to care about their safety, the conservative rates suggest that approximately eight of those people could experience physical violence from an intimate partner during their lifetimes. Under the updated rates, that number rises to approximately ten. That means students who never experience relationship violence themselves (*as well as you, as the audience of this report*) are likely to know 8 – 10 people who will (without intervention).

Recognizing the warning signs of abusive behavior, understanding how controlling relationships can escalate, and knowing how to respond safely could make a meaningful difference in their lives and the lives of people they care about.

A REALSafe Overview

The REALSafe workshop begins with students receiving a printed copy of *Adulting 101*, a 200-page guide offering hundreds of insights into how young adult lives intersect with laws in often unanticipated ways. A 10-minute introductory video then highlights topics ranging from apartment leases and security deposits to tax returns and working with lawyers.¹

With the guide's value established, the workshop shifts to relationship violence through an unexpected activity. Using conservative, pre-COVID estimates, the presenter asks a calculated number of students to stand without explaining why. A slide then reveals that they represent the number of classmates statistically likely to experience relationship violence during their lifetimes: approximately 1 in 4 women, 1 in 7 men, and 1 in 3 non-cisgender people. The revelation typically produces a noticeable shift in the room.

Following an extensive content warning and another opportunity to choose an alternative experience, students become the central characters in a 50-minute story about their relationship with someone named Kendall. Animated storytelling and enormous projections of largely unoccupied scenery, sometimes filling screens the size of theatrical backdrops, help students imagine themselves living through the experience.

For the first 35 minutes, the relationship seems nearly perfect before rapidly spiraling into abusive control and ending in an unexpected burst of violence. The progression mirrors how abuse can develop and escalate in ways that victims, and sometimes first-time perpetrators, may not anticipate.

The remaining 15 minutes include a real-world case study (currently Gabby Petito and Brian Laundrie), an optional student survey, and an introduction to the guide's 17 pages on dangerous relationships and domestic violence, encouraging students to learn how recognizing abusive patterns early can help prevent their escalation.

¹ The introductory video can be viewed here: <https://projectrealnv.org/adulting/intro>

Origins

Adulthood 101 offers 12 sections covering more than 100 topics. While financial challenges would face the majority of students served, five factors contributed to relationship violence becoming the subject of the first workshop and remaining central to how Project REAL prioritizes schools for printed guide distribution:

- 1) The relationship violence chapter was completed with significant input from industry experts in July 2021, while Adulthood 101 was being prepared for its anticipated May 2022 release. This made it a strong candidate for piloting a standalone experience based on one section of the guide.
- 2) By July 2021, reports of intimate partner violence, teen dating violence, and demand for domestic violence hotlines had increased sharply during the COVID-19 pandemic.
- 3) Statistically, students are more likely to experience relationship violence than any other form of violent crime, with various forms of financial harm representing another substantial risk much later in their lives (beginning at 30 years-plus). This made relationship violence particularly important to address before students entered adulthood.
- 4) Abusive relationships can be economically destructive, affecting victims immediately and over extended periods. Beyond direct financial harm, these relationships can shape professional careers, employment opportunities, educational decisions, housing arrangements, and the choices available to victims long after the abuse itself.
- 5) Perhaps most importantly, people who eventually experience relationship violence often do not expect to become victims. Few grow up imagining themselves in an abusive relationship, and many fail to recognize the danger until they are already trapped. Among more than 100 subjects in a 200-page guide, this material was particularly vulnerable to being skipped by students who assumed it did not apply to them. Unlike subjects students might consult when they encounter a specific legal or financial problem, relationship violence prevention is most valuable before the problem develops.

These considerations made relationship violence a natural priority for the Adulthood 101 pilot. They also created a challenge: the students most in need of prevention information might be among the least likely to seek it out without a compelling reason.

Adulthood 101 was originally conceived as a guide distributed to freshmen and used throughout all four years of high school, through workshop days, homerooms, study halls, and other recurring opportunities to explore different sections. Those mechanisms are not consistently available across Nevada high schools.

The first print run was limited to 8,000 guides, against a statewide senior population of roughly 45,000. Seniors were the immediate priority because the guide would reach them before graduation, when access through schools would become much more difficult. Project REAL continues to pursue the longer-term goal of placing the guide with every incoming freshman, while concentrating its current statewide efforts on reaching seniors before they leave school.

The limited supply of printed guides also requires choices about distribution. Schools that host REALSafe receive priority for printed copies, pairing the material with an experience designed to motivate students to read it. Other distribution methods, including introductory-video presentations and distribution during graduation rehearsals or other senior activities, help extend reach when a full workshop is not possible.

The distinction matters because printed guides distributed alongside REALSafe are not simply another way to provide access to Adulthood 101. They are part of an experience specifically designed to increase the likelihood that students will engage with select portions of the guide that will be of use to nearly every recipient, yet which is the content they are most likely to skip past and ignore.

Barriers, and Their Impact on Workshop Design

The Adulting 101 guide had been in development since June 2016. During its six-year development, Nevada adopted legislation that made Project REAL's original vision for delivering portions of the material in schools more feasible.

Originally proposed by the Nevada Youth Legislature, Senate Bill 108 (2017) directed the Nevada Department of Education to support age-appropriate criminal law instruction in social studies and health classes. The resulting guidance established a framework that closely aligned with Project REAL's work, specifying:

Where and how the instruction should be delivered:

"Senate Bill 108 requires the Nevada Department of Education to ensure resources and professional learning in criminal law are provided to students in a public school. This may occur in courses of social studies and health. All content should be addressed in an age-appropriate manner and should be included and delivered within exiting lessons and learning tasks. Content and resources should be differentiated across grades 9-12 and incorporate, as much as possible, open and free educational resources. School districts should work with external partners to support curriculum, instruction, and professional learning."

The criminal law subjects to be addressed:

"Per SB108, the instruction must include the following topics: • Sexual conduct, including, without limitation, sexual assault, statutory sexual seduction, sex trafficking and sexting • Alcohol and controlled substances, including, without limitation, driving under the influence and the possession, use and distribution of alcohol and controlled substances • Domestic violence • Stalking"

The information students should receive about victims and witnesses:

"Also, the instruction must provide information to assist victims and witnesses of such crimes, including, without limitation: • The rights of victims • Resources available to victims • The rights and responsibilities of a person who witnesses any such crime • Information concerning how to report such a crime and where to seek assistance".

Together, these provisions created a clear opening for Project REAL to bring relationship violence prevention into classrooms through the intersection of law, personal safety, and students' everyday lives.²

Once relationship violence prevention was selected as a topic for the Adulting 101 pilot, REALSafe was designed for delivery primarily through Government classes, which share the school year with Economics and are generally taken by high school seniors. This approach served two purposes. It placed the workshop within a subject area consistent with SB108's emphasis on criminal law and social studies, while also helping ensure that the audience consisted primarily of older students.

That second consideration was particularly important given Nevada's traditionally cautious approach to relationship and sex education. As a guest of the school districts, Project REAL sought to respect that caution, including the concerns of parents who might object to younger students receiving instruction involving intimate relationships, sexual violence, and abuse. Concentrating on seniors allowed the workshop to address these subjects with students approaching adulthood, while minimizing potential objections associated with delivering the same material to younger grades.

However, an appropriate classroom did not necessarily offer sufficient time. Since 2018, Government and Economics have operated on a half-year split at many schools. Teachers must cover substantial course requirements while accommodating graduation activities, recruiters, law-enforcement presentations, and other

² The report & recommendations resulting from that legislation is available here:
https://webapp-strapi-paas-prod-nde-001.azurewebsites.net/uploads/SB_108_Resources_93aa59e8ff.pdf

requests for access to seniors. Even securing one block period or two standard periods can be difficult. Additional visits are harder still, and classroom teachers cannot be expected to conduct follow-up lessons after a guest workshop. Moving REALSafe into Health classes would not eliminate these limitations. Health courses face their own instructional-time constraints, and moving the workshop to a subject often taken by younger students could reintroduce the very age-appropriateness concerns that helped shape the decision to focus on seniors.

These constraints also disrupted the original four-year *Adulting 101* vision. Instead of repeated opportunities to engage with different topics, REALSafe often had to make a lasting impression during a single visit not just for the guide's value (which would have been built up over time) but for the relationship violence content in particular, with independent reading carrying the learning forward.

The workshop's current format was therefore not Project REAL's first choice for teaching relationship violence prevention. It developed in response to the limited time schools could realistically provide, the courses through which the material could reach seniors, and the need to accomplish something meaningful within those restrictions.

Given five full class days, Project REAL could offer a substantially different experience. The fictional story would be shorter, less personal, and less intense because it would no longer need to carry so much of the experience by itself. A more conventional instructional sequence could include:

- Day 1: Myths, prevalence statistics, and the traps that can make leaving difficult, including finances, children or pets, leases, and isolation.
- Day 2: A shorter fictional story followed by the first real-world case study.
- Day 3: A second case study, followed by cycles of abuse and recognizable warning signs.
- Day 4: The legal dimensions of abuse, including when conduct becomes criminal, applied to the fictional story and both case studies.
- Day 5: Perspectives from a domestic-violence prosecutor, a survivor, and possible perpetrator enrolled in batterers' intervention.

That longer format could incorporate pre- and post-assessments, graded participation, and modest at-home reading. It would provide time to teach, test, revisit, and apply the material. But it would require classroom access that schools, and Government/Economics courses in particular, generally cannot provide outside agencies. Compressing the same academic sequence into a single visit would leave too little time for students to understand why it mattered to them personally.

Because the comprehensive model could not be delivered reliably statewide, REALSafe required a different approach to the time schools could provide.

The Workshop's Methodology & Design

REALSafe is not a workshop that 'teaches'.

By design (in response to the factors limiting what can be delivered), REALSafe is an experience that serves as an intellectual sales-pitch:

Students are shown how they could become victims of relationship violence without knowing they're getting trapped. Then, the choice of what to do with the Adulting guides (and the relationship violence material in particular) is left to them. They have the choice to:

- A) Blow it off as 'an interesting day in class' that was a break from the usual, or
- B) Read and learn from the 17 pages on relationship violence included in the 200-page Adulting 101 guides they received when first entering the workshop, in order to take steps to protect themselves and people they care about?

To get as many students as possible to read the prevention material on their own, the story is intense and personal, and both the intensity and personal nature are deliberate.

The fictional partner, Kendall, is not assigned a fixed gender. The presentation allows students to imagine Kendall as a partner of the gender to which they are attracted, widening the number of students who can place themselves in the relationship rather than experiencing the story as something happening to another person. Large photographs of largely empty scenery, sometimes projected onto screens the size of theatrical backdrops, allow students to imagine themselves and their friends inside the scenes. The absence of identifiable people in most of the imagery is intentional: students are not watching someone else's relationship unfold, but imagining their own.

The presenter tells the story through animated, expressive narration rather than simply reading a script. Most of the experience is narrative storytelling, with brief moments of acted dialogue during some of the most intense exchanges. The combination of delivery, imagery, and the amount of time spent developing the fictional relationship is intended to make the experience feel increasingly personal.

The experience is also localized. A school scene may feature a recognizable common area on the campus hosting the workshop. Students in Las Vegas may be told that a gap year takes them to Los Angeles, while students in White Pine or Lincoln County may hear that the same experience takes place in Las Vegas. A scene at a fancy restaurant uses a real location within roughly 20 minutes of the school. These details are intended to make the fictional relationship feel like something that could plausibly develop within the students' own lives. Sound effects are also being explored to deepen the immersion further.

Even the transition between the story's ending and the real-world case study that follows is part of the deliberate design. The story concludes in a sudden, violent, and seemingly ridiculous to imagine end. Students who have imagined Kendall as a female partner are told that she reacts on instinct, striking them across the skull with a Yeti or Stanley cup kept by the door, resulting in their death. Students who imagined Kendall as a male are told that he strangles them resulting in the same outcome. Presenting both endings allows students to remain the central character in the story regardless of the gender they have imagined for Kendall. This is part of the workshop's deliberate personalization, not two separate scenarios delivered to different audiences.

The facilitator then invites students to question whether Project REAL's passion for relationship violence prevention has led to an exaggerated story with an extreme, seemingly unlikely conclusion. That suspicion is explicitly welcomed rather than dismissed.

The workshop immediately transitions to footage of Gabby Petito and Brian Laundrie. Their relationship timeline is narrated over the video, introducing students to a real-world case that is different from, yet disturbingly similar to, the fictional experience they have just imagined themselves living through.

The combination of

- The initial standing exercise visually showing the likelihood in the room,
- Repeated reminders of lifetime occurrence statistics,
- The possible-future story where they become victims that is customized to be as plausible of an experience they could have (while casting as wide a net as possible) and it's the shocking ending,
- The invitation for critical suspicion of our story crafting, and
- The final reveal of the real word case that mirrored it...

...each of those elements were crafted to work together.

The result of this pitch-like design is that the majority of participating students leave with key takeaways, including:

- Students are likely to know people who experience relationship violence.
- Intelligent people can become trapped without recognizing the warning signs early.
- Students themselves are not exempt from that risk.
- Patterns of coercion and abuse can become more recognizable with knowledge, although recognizing them does not guarantee safety or make leaving simple.
- The guide's 17 pages can help students identify warning signs, seek assistance safely, support others, and recognize troubling behavior in themselves as well as in potential partners.

While not ideal compared to the preferable multi-session model, the extended story is essential to REALSafe's single-day design and overall strategy. It's important to note though that the story and its intensity were neither unquestioned nor untested. When Project REAL experimented with shortening the story to make more room for academic instruction, the result was a substantial reduction in impact. Students simply had not spent enough time imagining themselves in the relationship for its deterioration to feel personal.

This matters because one of the greatest challenges in relationship violence prevention is that most people never anticipate becoming victims. Many cannot imagine ever needing to call law enforcement because of a romantic partner, until the first incident occurs. Presenting the subject primarily through academic instruction risks reinforcing the assumption that relationship violence is someone else's problem.

REALSafe's story is designed to challenge that assumption. By allowing students to spend considerable time imagining themselves in a seemingly healthy relationship before watching it gradually become dangerous, the experience establishes a personal relevance that academic instruction alone may struggle to achieve. An academically denser presentation might communicate more information during class, but do less to convince students that the subject concerns their own lives. That tradeoff becomes particularly important when most students have no pre-existing relationship with the workshop facilitator, and therefore no established foundation of trust. REALSafe must capture their attention, establish credibility, and convince them of the material's personal relevance within the limited time available.

The choice, then, was between establishing that personal relevance or using the available time to deliver more academic content, potentially reinforced through a graded quiz. The experience of shortening the story reinforced Project REAL's decision to prioritize the former. The objective is to get the highest possible number of students to actually learn the material, rather than simply remember enough to pass a quiz. REALSafe aims to make students want to read it for themselves, then trusts them to do so.

The Workshop's Efficacy & Impact

More than 6,000 responses have been collected through voluntary post-experience surveys between October 2021 and October 2026. Among students answering the question about reading the relationship violence content (RV content) in the *Adulthood 101* guides they received, approximately 75% report intending to read it as a direct result of participating in the workshop. The historical results include 3,868 responses at 75.3% and 746 additional responses at 71.6%, producing a combined intended-reading rate of approximately 74.7%, rounded to 75%.

On average per school, at least another 10% plan to hold onto the guide for an extended period of time in order to read other content in it, leaving them with an extended opportunity to study the RV content in the future if they change their minds, or curiosity simply gets the better of them.

Ultimately, approximately 85% of students served are leaving with the guides and an intention to hold onto them, meaning even students who aren't prioritizing the relationship violence material in the immediate aftermath of the prevention experience still have lasting opportunities to engage with it at a later date.

The students' choice to learn about relationship violence for personal reasons has real value. Research on motivation and self-directed learning helped inform REALSafe's development, particularly the importance of students recognizing the personal relevance of material and choosing to engage with it independently. That principle is central to the workshop's research-based design: establishing enough personal relevance during the experience that students voluntarily continue learning after it concludes.

Approximately 75% of surveyed students answering the reading-intention question report intending to read the relationship violence material, not because they're being graded on it, and not even for extra credit. They're choosing to do this to benefit themselves. This is not simply an ability to complete a quiz on human interactions: the goal is to help build communities whose members can recognize and safely respond to cycles of abuse and control that form the foundation of danger and violence in abusive relationships, before those patterns become so complex that escaping them becomes even more difficult.

A higher performance rate would obviously be preferable. Among all activities Project REAL offers, at least 84% of students report having a positive experience, demonstrating that the organization can consistently reach more than 80% of students with its experiences. With just a single class period available for such a sensitive subject, however, Project REAL considers the approximately 75% intended-reading rate one of the strongest outcomes plausibly achievable on a reliable basis within those limitations.

As explained in greater detail in Part II, Project REAL's projected prevention impact distinguishes between all students participating in REALSafe and the smaller group statistically likely to experience relationship violence during their lifetimes: approximately 1 in 4 women, 1 in 7 men, and 1 in 3 non-cisgender students.

Within that smaller group, Project REAL's model anticipates that approximately 75% of students reached by REALSafe will recognize the warning signs and avoid or leave a potentially dangerous relationship as a result of what they independently learn from their *Adulthood 101* guides. If achieved, that would represent a 75% reduction in projected future victimization among participating students, changing the estimated lifetime risk from 1 in 4 to 1 in 16 for women, 1 in 7 to 1 in 28 for men, and 1 in 3 to 1 in 12 for non-cisgender students.

Research supporting REALSafe's methodology provides two important foundations: school-based relationship violence prevention programs have demonstrated reductions in victimization and perpetration, while studies of self-directed learning and student autonomy have shown positive effects on motivation, engagement, and learning outcomes.

Together, these findings support REALSafe's approach of establishing the personal relevance of relationship violence and motivating students to independently study the prevention material. With approximately 75% of

surveyed students consistently reporting an intention to undertake that learning, Project REAL considers its anticipated prevention-impact estimates a reasonable basis for projecting REALSafe's long-term benefits. A longitudinal evaluation, now in the earliest stages of planning, will provide an opportunity to examine those outcomes over time.³

[continued on next page]

³ Farmer, C., et al. (2023). "School-Based Interventions to Prevent Dating and Relationship Violence and Gender-Based Violence: Systematic Review and Network Meta-Analysis." *American Journal of Public Health*, 113(3), 320–330. An analysis of 68 trials found significant long-term reductions in dating-violence victimization and perpetration, alongside improvements in knowledge and attitudes.
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9932388/>

Arrojo, S., Santirso, F. A., Lila, M., Gracia, E., & Conchell, R. (2024). "Dating Violence Prevention Programs for At-Risk Adolescents: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis." *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 74, 101893. An analysis of interventions for at-risk adolescents found significant reductions in combined dating-violence victimization and perpetration outcomes, including reductions in physical victimization.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2023.101893>

"A Meta-Analytic Review of the Relationships Between Autonomy Support and Positive Learning Outcomes." (2023). *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 75, 102235. Synthesizing 153 studies involving 213,612 participants, this review found positive relationships between autonomy support and students' motivation, engagement, self-regulated learning, and other educational outcomes.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2023.102235>

Kaya, M., Güvercin Seğin, G., & Arslan, Z. (2026). "The Effects of Self-Directed Learning–Oriented Interventions on Student Learning Outcomes: A Second-Order Meta-Analysis." *International Journal of Educational Research*. Synthesizing 12 previous meta-analyses covering approximately 43,775 students, this study found statistically significant benefits for self-directed learning interventions, including academic achievement, skills, and self-regulated learning. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2026.103071>

Failures & Responsive Course Adjustments

Across more than 150 sessions and more than 10,000 students served since REALSafe launched in October 2021, Project REAL has documented four incidents regarded as critical failures.

- Two involved students crying during the story without stepping away, and
- Two involved students abruptly leaving during particularly intense moments.

In all four incidents, teachers had been provided instructions in advance about the workshop's intensity, the importance of preparing students, easy-exit seating, and a nearby quiet space where students could step away without explaining themselves or disclosing personal information.

Students also receive extensive content warnings, including advance notice of three particularly intense moments. They are told they may leave with their belongings or leave them behind and may simply say they need to use the restroom. Students who step out during the story are asked not to return until it concludes, providing privacy for anyone who needs more time outside.

After the first incident involving a student crying without leaving, three slides were added to show when the story would become especially intense, including the buildup to its most difficult moments. This gives students more concrete information than a general warning alone.

Schools are also offered a lower-intensity quiet-room alternative based on the relationship violence material in *Adulting 101*. Since October 2021, 23 students among more than 10,000 participants have chosen to step away from the primary experience. Their use of that option demonstrates the importance of making safeguards available independently of the four documented critical incidents.

While the workshop's intensity is central to its methodology, protecting trauma-impacted students remains an ongoing priority.

Four documented critical incidents among more than 10,000 participants represent a very low occurrence rate across five years of delivery. Nevertheless, each incident has informed continued efforts to improve students' ability to recognize difficult moments in advance and step away without embarrassment or pressure.

Instructor participation remains a challenge. Although schools receive advance instructions, some teachers do not provide the warnings before students enter. Repeating the explanation once students are seated cannot fully replace advance notice, particularly when students may feel pressure to remain. Project REAL continues working to improve compliance while recognizing its limited authority as a guest of school districts.

The complete teacher instructions, student safeguards, and quiet-room alternative are included in Appendix A.

[continued on next page]

The Challenges of Delivery

Despite REALSafe being offered free to any school willing to schedule it, securing and maintaining bookings remains difficult. The workshop reaches approximately 8–12 schools annually, demonstrating that other high schools can accommodate the experience, but getting onto their calendars remains a challenge.

So what are the barriers?

As explained, Project REAL primarily delivers REALSafe through Government/Economics classes for several reasons:

- SB108 (2017), originally proposed by the Nevada Youth Legislature, established a framework for age-appropriate criminal law instruction through social studies and health classes, including relationship and sexual violence.
- Government/Economics classes primarily serve high school seniors, offering an older audience consistent with that framework and Nevada's cautious approach to relationship and sex education.
- Delivering the workshop through existing classes avoids the additional coordination required for an all-senior assembly, although assemblies remain an option.

That choice, however, creates scheduling challenges of its own.

Our Selected Class (Govt / Econ) and reduced times

Since 2018, Government/Economics has operated on a half-year split at many schools. As several instructors have explained, they're being asked to deliver what previously amounted to a full year's material in half the time. Finding flexible days for guest speakers and workshops is understandably difficult.

Our Selected Class (Govt / Econ) and competing demands

Those same teachers are frequently asked to accommodate recruiters, graduation meetings, law-enforcement presentations, and other senior activities. REALSafe is competing for time that schools are already struggling to allocate, even when staff support its goals.

Our Unique Methodology, Non-traditional Approach, & Lingering Discomfort

The logistical challenges help explain why schools struggle to schedule REALSafe in the first place. They do not fully explain why some schools that have already hosted the workshop are reluctant to invite it back. Although Project REAL communicates the workshop's content and methodology in advance, recurring feedback from schools where return bookings have been difficult generally falls into five categories:

- They found the intensity jarring
- They'd prefer different topics from Adulthood 101 be taught
- If relationship violence had to be the focus, they'd prefer an academic lesson
- They'd like the story to be shorter
- The students seemed 'bummed / drained' after

Unlike the scheduling challenges, REALSafe's unique methodology can present a barrier to both new schools considering the workshop and schools deciding whether to host it again. Even when its purpose and design are fully explained, the unconventional approach can make educators uncomfortable with the experience or unconvinced of its value.

That feedback isn't from every school, but it has been consistent among some schools where securing a second booking has proven difficult. These concerns are taken seriously, and it's reasonable to ask why Project REAL doesn't simply adjust the workshop to address them.

In fact, that question is a major reason for this report. As established in the preceding sections, several factors shaped REALSafe's approach:

- Most students do not anticipate becoming victims of relationship violence, making the material particularly easy to dismiss as someone else's problem.
- Schools generally cannot provide enough time for the more comprehensive, academically structured experience Project REAL would prefer.
- The extended fictional story is intended to establish personal relevance before students are asked to learn the material independently.
- When Project REAL experimented with shortening the story to accommodate more academic instruction, its impact was substantially reduced.
- Approximately 75% of students answering the relevant survey question report intending to read the relationship violence material voluntarily after participating.

These factors do not negate the concerns raised by teachers and administrators.

REALSafe can be emotionally draining, and schools have legitimate reasons to consider the immediate effects on students, the classroom environment, and the instructional time being committed, but they do explain why shortening the story, reducing its intensity, or replacing it with a conventional lecture is not necessarily an improvement. Those changes could make the workshop more comfortable to host while undermining the very mechanism designed to motivate students to learn the material. At the same time, the workshop's safeguards, presentation methods, and delivery arrangements remain appropriate subjects for continued improvement, as demonstrated by the adjustments discussed earlier.

Some readers may view this report's detailed explanation of REALSafe's methodology as defensive. But Project REAL's purpose is not to dismiss criticism or insist that the workshop cannot be improved. It's to explain why its unusual format exists, what has been learned through its delivery, and why certain suggested changes may carry consequences for the prevention outcomes the experience is intended to achieve.

Ultimately, the challenge is not simply convincing more schools to schedule REALSafe. It is helping educators understand both the potential long-term benefits and the immediate demands of hosting it, while continuing to respond to concerns without compromising the experience's central objective.

For schools unable to accommodate the full workshop, other *Adulting 101* distribution options remain available. Part II examines how Project REAL's statewide database can help schools and education stakeholders evaluate the potential scale of relationship violence among their students, the projected preventive impact of REALSafe, and the opportunities to reach more Nevada seniors before graduation.

[continued on next page]

The Database Response

Already this school year, Project REAL has provided schools with packets of recommendation letters from Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and administrators encouraging them to make time for REALSafe. Unfortunately, those endorsements have not meaningfully improved the booking process, prompting the search for another approach.

The workshop itself offered a possible solution. When the story was shortened to accommodate more academic instruction, students were less likely to see relationship violence as something that could happen to them. Yet the standing exercise and illustrated storytelling demonstrated how much more seriously students considered the issue when abstract statistics were made personal and tangible.

That observation inspired a new approach to reaching educators: rather than presenting statewide or national statistics alone, illustrate what relationship violence could mean for the students at each individual school. The result was the development of a searchable, school-level database designed to make the potential scale of relationship violence, and the projected impact of prevention, easier for Nevada's education stakeholders to visualize. Part II explains how the database was developed, how its projections are calculated, and how to interpret its findings.

[continued on next page]

Part II: The Database Project

Overcoming Delivery Challenges: Our 2026–27 Database Project

Since 2023, Project REAL has maintained enough trained staff and travel funding to deliver REALSafe workshops to as many as half of Nevada's high school seniors annually, yet has only been able to secure bookings at approximately 8–12 high schools each year.⁴

The largest obstacle is not whether Project REAL is willing or able to provide the experience. It is finding room on school calendars.

As explained in Part I, the obstacles include limited instructional time, competing demands on Government/Economics classes, and occasional discomfort with REALSafe's intensity and unconventional methodology.

These challenges are understandable, particularly for teachers balancing their academic responsibilities with numerous requests for access to seniors and academic obligations they cannot simply set aside, yet the schools that regularly partner with Project REAL demonstrate that when administrators and Government/Economics teams decide REALSafe is worth prioritizing, the time can be made available.

The challenge is helping schools that recognize relationship violence as an important issue but have not prioritized scheduling the workshop to better understand what making that time available could mean for their students. A similar challenge applies to schools that have experienced REALSafe but remain uncertain whether its unusual approach warrants another visit.

The 2026–27 Database Project is Project REAL's response to that challenge.

The tool gives each school's stakeholders (including Government/Economics PLC teams, administrators, parents, and student leaders) a clear picture of the potential consequences of relationship violence prevention opportunities going undelivered within their own graduating class.

The database tool does this by projecting how many seniors at an individual school could experience physical violence from an intimate partner during their lifetimes without effective prevention, and how many of those outcomes REALSafe might help prevent if given the classroom time needed to deliver the workshop.

The result is a searchable database, available through Project REAL's 2026 Projections mini-site, accompanied by a downloadable workbook containing the source data and calculations readily available for inspection.

Schools can examine the 2026–27 senior-class enrollment Project REAL projected using federal data, select between two national lifetime prevalence models, and then view the resulting estimates of students who could

⁴ At current funding levels, Project REAL can distribute approximately 15,000 printed copies of *Adulting 101* annually, with another 30,000 digital access kits available at substantially lower cost. Schools can also distribute the digital material through printed flyers or electronic communications, making access to the guide possible for every graduating senior in Nevada.

Printed guides are prioritized for schools hosting REALSafe, with digital kits used if the printed supply is exhausted. After April 30, remaining printed guides are allocated to graduation rehearsals and other senior activities on a first-to-confirm basis, regardless of the dates of those events, with the goal of distributing the full annual inventory. Printed guides remain the preferred method of delivery.

experience relationship violence, and the projected likely reduction resulting directly from the impact of REALSafe's delivery.

The underlying workbook combines publicly available federal enrollment records, school-level enrollment projections for years where official figures are not yet available, national estimates of lifetime physical intimate partner violence, and Project REAL's historical student evaluation results. The enrollment projections remain the same regardless of which prevalence model is selected; only the estimated occurrence rates change.

Even before development began, Project REAL anticipated that the resulting figures would be difficult to confront. At many of Nevada's larger high schools, even conservative estimates suggest that approximately 100 students in a single graduating class could experience physical violence from an intimate partner during their lifetimes. Applying national statistics to individual schools makes the scale of the problem far more immediate than percentages alone.

For that reason, the project was not designed to produce the highest defensible estimates. Where reasonable choices existed, assumptions generally favored conservative enrollment estimates and lifetime occurrence rates, while still allowing users to examine results using more recent national prevalence figures. This approach was established deliberately to avoid inflated or sensationalized projections, particularly for audiences unfamiliar with how common relationship violence is.

In several respects, this means the database may present the lower end of what could reasonably occur. That is intentional. Even the more conservative projections illustrate a problem substantial enough to warrant serious attention, without needing to exaggerate its scale.

The objective is not to frighten schools into scheduling REALSafe. It is to provide a concrete, school-specific basis for assessing whether the potential benefits of prevention justify making time for the experience.

Using projected graduating-class enrollment, national lifetime relationship violence estimates, and REALSafe's historical evaluation results, the database provides schools with a concrete illustration of the potential scale of relationship violence among their seniors and the preventive impact REALSafe is anticipated to achieve. The following sections explain the tool's features, calculations, and the reasoning behind its projections.

The Database: What It Is & How to Interpret It

The public database is available at <https://projectrealnv.org/projections2026/>. Visitors select a county, a school, and one of two prevalence models. The widget then displays three connected figures:

Projected Total of Seniors Enrolled

An estimated number of students in that school's 2026–27 graduating class, using the most up-to-date enrollment data provided by federal agencies.

Number of Seniors Expected to Experience Violent Relationships At Least Once Without Prevention

This is a subset from the projected total of enrolled seniors at the schools that are estimated to experience physical violence from an intimate partner at least once during their lifetimes under the selected national prevalence model, by gender

Anticipated Workshop Impact

This is the estimated number of students within each gender's projected lifetime-risk subset whose future experiences REALSafe is anticipated to change by helping them recognize, avoid, or leave potentially dangerous relationships. The projection applies the workshop's 75% anticipated prevention-impact rate to each subset (75% being the average across all schools / genders of students that opt to read the relationship violence prevention material on their own time).

These figures are intended to be read together.

The third figure is derived from the second, not from the entire senior class.

A school with 500 projected seniors, for example, is not being assigned a 75% prevention estimate across all 500 students.

The 75% factor is applied only to the smaller group projected to experience physical intimate partner violence over their lifetimes.

The Conservative (pre-2020) model applies lifetime physical-intimate-partner-violence estimates of 25% for females and 14.3% for males. The Updated model applies 28.1% and 21.2%, respectively. Selecting a different prevalence model does not change projected enrollment. It changes the projected lifetime-risk group, after which the same 75% anticipated workshop-impact assumption is applied.

The database models graduating classes, not the entire high school, and does not identify which students might experience violence. Its figures are school-level projections, not individual predictions. The downloadable workbook provides the underlying enrollment figures and calculations. Appendix B details the enrollment projection approach, with formulas and worked examples.

On Deliberate Restraint & Conservative Projections

The project was designed with three calculation problems in mind:

- 1) In the past, when books were allocated to schools that were anticipated as returning, Project REAL would use the previous year's Junior-class (11th grade) enrollment to project the current year's Senior (12th grade) enrollment. More often than not, the allocation would be 50-100 books too high.
- 2) Even conservative estimates of lifetime relationship violence are difficult to accept when applied to a school that educators and families know personally. The intention was not to find the largest defensible count. It was to build a school-level illustration that could withstand concerns about exaggeration while still showing how serious the issue remains.
- 3) While relationship violence occurs across economic and social backgrounds, its prevalence is not identical in every community. A well-designed projection tool therefore needs to produce estimates that remain reasonably credible across communities with different levels of risk. Some populations experience substantially higher rates, while others experience lower rates. The challenge is developing projections with a high degree of likelihood across those differences, without pretending to know the precise lifetime risk facing students at each school.

These three concerns shaped how the database was developed, beginning with its enrollment projections.

Rather than simply advancing the previous year's juniors into the next senior class, the database uses each school's historical enrollment patterns to estimate how students progress between grades. This approach accounts for changes in class sizes that a simple one-year comparison would miss. It also avoids adding students based on assumptions about how large a graduating class should be, even when school-level observations suggest a projection may be low.

That distinction is important because every additional student included in an enrollment projection also increases the number statistically expected to experience relationship violence. Inflating enrollment, even unintentionally, would make an already difficult set of figures harder to accept.

The second consideration was which lifetime occurrence rates to apply.

The database offers two models: Conservative (pre-2020), using 25% for women and 14.3% for men, and Updated, using 28.1% and 21.2%, respectively. Providing both allows stakeholders to examine the differences without requiring them to accept the higher estimates as the starting point.

The third concern, differences between communities, presented a more complicated problem. National lifetime occurrence rates cannot establish the precise risk facing students at an individual Nevada school. Applying different rates to schools based on assumptions about their neighborhoods, economic conditions, or student populations would introduce judgments that the available data cannot reliably support.

Instead, the same prevalence assumptions are applied consistently across schools, with the Conservative model providing a more restrained basis for comparison. This does not mean every school has the same actual level of risk. It means the database avoids assigning higher or lower risks to particular communities without sufficient evidence to justify doing so.

Finally, REALSafe's anticipated prevention impact is calculated using a 75% factor, reflecting the approximately 74.7% combined intended-reading rate reported by students answering the relevant survey question. Rather than suggesting a higher level of engagement or impact, the database uses that rounded figure consistently across the projected lifetime-risk population. The relationship between intended reading and anticipated prevention is a modeling assumption, addressed in the following section.

Together, these decisions reflect a deliberate effort to avoid appearing alarmist, exaggerating the scope of relationship violence, or overstating REALSafe's anticipated impact. The database does not inflate graduating classes, assign higher risk rates to particular communities, or rely exclusively on the more recent and higher national prevalence figures.

The significance is that even under the more restrained assumptions, the projected number of students who could experience physical violence from an intimate partner during their lifetimes remains disturbingly high.

The database was not designed to present the worst possible outcome.

It was designed to demonstrate that even a more conservative picture of the problem is serious enough to warrant attention without requiring schools to accept the highest available estimates to recognize the potential value of prevention.

Assumptions, Limitations, & Judgment Calls

The database joins four kinds of information: federal enrollment records establishing historical school headcounts, school-level progression patterns projecting future senior classes, national lifetime physical-IPV prevalence rates estimating potential future victimization, and REALSafe survey findings informing projected prevention impact. Together, these sources provide the foundation for the database's school-level projections, with each serving a distinct purpose in the calculation.

The two prevalence models allow users to compare a restrained pre-2020 baseline with updated national lifetime physical-IPV estimates. The Conservative model applies 25% for females and 14.3% for males; the Updated model applies 28.1% and 21.2%. Both use the same school enrollment projections. The reasons for offering both are explained in the preceding section.

The figures concern lifetime physical violence by an intimate partner, not only violence occurring while students are in high school. Physical IPV is also narrower than all forms of relationship violence; controlling, psychological, sexual, and other harmful behavior can occur outside the category represented by these rates. The projections therefore are not counts of every student who could experience any form of abuse.

The workshop's standing exercise also discusses non-cisgender students and cites a separate prevalence estimate for that population. The database does not create a third non-cisgender enrollment category because the school-level source data used for projections report female and male counts rather than a separate reliable count of students by gender identity. That does not mean non-cisgender students are excluded from REALSafe or presumed to face no risk; it means the database cannot calculate their specific risk as a separately quantified group from these enrollment records. The female/male calculations should not be read as a complete account of differences in risk by gender identity.

Actual senior classes may differ from modeled enrollment because of transfers, retention, boundary changes, school restructuring, reporting differences, and unusual cohorts. No discretionary upward adjustment was added merely because individual schools reported graduating classes larger than the model might suggest.

REALSafe's 75% anticipated workshop-impact factor is grounded in five years of student evaluations, with approximately 74.7% of respondents to the relevant question reporting an intention to independently read the prevention material. Rounded to 75%, that consistently observed rate provides the foundation for projecting how many students within the lifetime-risk population may avoid or leave potentially dangerous relationships as a result of the experience. The model anticipates that voluntary engagement with the prevention material will change the future outcomes of a comparable proportion of those students. Project REAL considers this a reasonable working estimate, supported by the consistency of its student evaluations and the research-informed methodology behind REALSafe. Longer-term evaluation is in the early stages of planning.⁵

The database is therefore concrete about what has been observed, what has been calculated, and what is projected. It is intended to show the potential scale of the issue at each school and what REALSafe could accomplish if its anticipated preventive effect is achieved. It is not designed to identify future victims or exaggerate the case for scheduling the workshop.

The Workbook: A Quick Guide To Navigating the Data

The workbook has been designed to be easily navigable for those looking to dive into the data the projection tool is pulling from, but it's order can be a bit unexpected, so this quick-glance guide is meant to help.

Columns A-E:	School & Region identification
Columns F-G:	Projections of Senior enrollment 2026-27
Columns H-I:	Projected number of seniors in the 2026–27 class likely to experience physical violence from an intimate partner during their lifetimes, under the workbook's applicable prevalence assumptions.
Columns J-K:	Anticipated prevention impact among the projected lifetime-risk populations in Columns H–I, using REALSafe's 75% workshop-impact assumption.
Column L:	Strictly a visual element designed to separate the numbers being shown in the tool from those used to calculate those amounts.
Columns M-N	Senior Enrollment projections for 2025-26, since that data wasn't available when the tool was created. Those figures are used - along with Columns O-AL – to produce the projections listed in Columns F-G.

⁵ For example, see various studies / reports cited in footnote 3.

The Math I: Senior Class Enrollment Projections

The latest federal school-level enrollment figures available for this project cover the 2024–25 school year. Nevada's enrollment numbers were obtained from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES).

To estimate the seniors attending each school in 2026–27, the database examines how enrollment changed as students moved from sophomore to junior and junior to senior classes over several prior years.

Two methods were developed: a preferred calculation based on how students progress between grades, and a fallback based on the school's recent senior-class sizes when the preferred calculation cannot be supported.

Both methods use each school's own enrollment history rather than applying a statewide growth assumption.

Step 1: Establish Historical Progression Rates

For each school, the model examines two patterns:

- How the number of juniors compares with the number of sophomores enrolled the preceding year.
- How the number of seniors compares with the number of juniors enrolled the preceding year.

Each comparison is performed over three historical transitions, giving the most recent year 50% weight, the preceding year 30%, and the oldest year 20%.

This weighting gives greater importance to recent enrollment patterns without ignoring earlier changes. When a historical comparison is unavailable, its weight is removed and the remaining usable weights are adjusted proportionally.

The resulting rates describe changes in school enrollment, not the verified progress of individual students or their likelihood of graduating.

Step 2: Estimate the 2025–26 Senior Class

The seniors attending in 2025–26 were juniors in 2024–25, the most recent year for which federal enrollment figures were available.

To estimate their senior-class enrollment, the model takes the observed number of juniors and applies the school's historical junior-to-senior progression rate.

Illustrative formula:

A = Number of juniors enrolled in 2024–25
B = Weighted historical junior-to-senior progression rate
Projected 2025–26 seniors = $A \times B$

The result is rounded to the nearest whole student. This creates an estimated 2025–26 senior class, which also provides a recent reference point when the fallback method is needed.

[continued on next page]

Step 3: Project the 2026–27 Senior Class

The seniors attending in 2026–27 were sophomores in 2024–25. Because two school years separate the observed enrollment from the graduating class being projected, the calculation follows two stages:

- First, the observed 2024–25 sophomores are advanced to their estimated junior-class size in 2025–26.
- Then, that estimated junior class is advanced to its projected senior-class size in 2026–27.

Each stage uses the school's corresponding historical progression rate.

Illustrative formula:

A = Number of sophomores enrolled in 2024–25
B = Weighted historical sophomore-to-junior progression rate
C = Weighted historical junior-to-senior progression rate
 $\text{Projected 2026–27 seniors} = A \times B \times C$

The final result is rounded to the nearest whole student.

This method accounts for changes that typically occur between grades rather than assuming every sophomore will remain enrolled at the same school through graduation.

Step 4: Use Senior-Class History When Cohort Data Are Inadequate

Some schools do not have enough usable historical information to calculate both progression rates reliably. When that occurs, the fallback method uses the projected 2025–26 senior class alongside the school's actual senior-class enrollment from the four preceding years.

The five figures are weighted according to their recency:

- Projected 2025–26 seniors: 40%
- Actual 2024–25 seniors: 25%
- Actual 2023–24 seniors: 15%
- Actual 2022–23 seniors: 10%
- Actual 2021–22 seniors: 10%

The fallback produces a weighted average of these senior-class sizes, giving more importance to recent enrollment while retaining historical context.

Illustrative formula:

A = Projected 2025–26 senior enrollment
B = Actual 2024–25 senior enrollment
C = Actual 2023–24 senior enrollment
X = Actual 2022–23 senior enrollment
Y = Actual 2021–22 senior enrollment
 $\text{Projected 2026–27 seniors} = (A \times 40\%) + (B \times 25\%) + (C \times 15\%) + (X \times 10\%) + (Y \times 10\%)$

This formula illustrates the calculation when all five figures are available. If an observation is unusable, its weight is removed and the remaining weights are adjusted proportionally, provided the school still meets the minimum-data requirements. The result is rounded to the nearest whole student.

The fallback is not a separate prediction of annual enrollment growth. It is a way to estimate the senior class using recent senior-class sizes when the preferred progression method cannot be applied.

Step 5: Handle Missing Data and Produce School Totals

Federal enrollment records sometimes contain missing, suppressed, or otherwise unusable student counts. These cannot be treated as actual enrollment or assumed to represent zero students. Where sufficient historical information is unavailable, the database reports NP/UA (Not Projected / Unavailable with Current Data) rather than creating an unsupported estimate. Schools identified as closed are handled separately.

Every calculation is performed independently for students reported as female and male. The two projected headcounts are rounded to whole students and then added to produce the school's projected senior-class total. The resulting enrollment projection remains the same regardless of which relationship violence prevalence model a visitor selects.

Appendix B provides the complete technical calculations, historical weighting rules, missing-data procedures, and Excel formulas underlying this methodology.

[continued on next page]

The Math II: REALSafe's Impact Projections

Once the projected 2026–27 senior enrollment has been established, the database uses two additional calculations to estimate the potential scale of relationship violence at that school and the number of future outcomes REALSafe could help prevent.

The first identifies the subset of seniors statistically expected to experience physical violence from an intimate partner during their lifetimes. The second applies REALSafe's anticipated prevention-impact rate to that smaller group.

Step 1: Establish the Projected Lifetime-Risk Population

The database calculates lifetime relationship violence risk separately for female and male seniors using whichever prevalence model the visitor selects:

- **Conservative (pre-2020):** 25% for females and 14.3% for males.
- **Updated:** 28.1% for females and 21.2% for males.

Each rate is applied to the corresponding projected senior enrollment, producing the number of students statistically expected to experience physical intimate partner violence at least once during their lifetimes, before accounting for REALSafe's potential preventive impact.

Illustrative formula:

A = Projected female seniors

B = Selected female lifetime prevalence rate

C = Projected male seniors

X = Selected male lifetime prevalence rate

Projected female lifetime-risk population = $A \times B$

Projected male lifetime-risk population = $C \times X$

Total projected lifetime-risk population = Female lifetime-risk population + Male lifetime-risk population

Each gender's resulting population is rounded to whole students before the two figures are added. These calculations apply national lifetime occurrence rates to the graduating class. They do not suggest that the projected violence will occur during the school year, or that particular students can be identified as future victims.

Step 2: Apply REALSafe's Anticipated Prevention Impact

As explained in Part I, approximately 75% of students answering the relevant post-workshop survey question report intending to read the relationship violence prevention material in their *Adulthood 101* guides voluntarily.

That rate was established through five years of optional, anonymous student surveys, with more than 6,000 responses collected overall. The intended-reading results have remained remarkably consistent across schools serving different geographic and economic communities, generally falling within 2.5 percentage points of 75% when REALSafe was delivered in its established format. Combined with the survey's deliberate efforts to encourage candid responses and broader participation, Project REAL considers that consistency a strong basis for confidence in the approximately 75% intended-reading rate.⁶

Project REAL uses that intended-reading rate as the basis for its anticipated prevention-impact model.

⁶ The evaluation practices and supporting considerations are explained in Appendix C.

The distinction between the populations is essential: the 75% factor is not applied to every student attending the school. It is applied only to the smaller group already projected to experience physical intimate partner violence during their lifetimes. Within that group, the model anticipates that approximately 75% of students reached by REALSafe will learn enough from the prevention material to recognize warning signs and avoid or leave potentially dangerous relationships before they escalate.

Illustrative formula:

A = Projected female lifetime-risk population

B = Projected male lifetime-risk population

C = REALSafe's anticipated prevention-impact rate of 75%

Projected female prevention impact = $A \times C$

Projected male prevention impact = $B \times C$

Anticipated Workshop Impact = Projected female prevention impact + Projected male prevention impact

As with the lifetime-risk estimates, each gender's projected impact is rounded to whole students before the results are combined.

Step 3: Interpret the Resulting Change in Projected Risk

The three figures displayed by the database now represent distinct but connected populations:

- The total number of seniors projected to attend the school.
- The smaller group statistically expected to experience physical intimate partner violence during their lifetimes under the selected prevalence model.
- The portion of that lifetime-risk group whose future experiences REALSafe is anticipated to change through prevention.

The anticipated workshop impact represents a projected reduction in future victimization within the second group, rather than a percentage reduction applied to the entire graduating class.

Illustrative formula:

A = Total projected lifetime-risk population

B = Total anticipated workshop prevention impact

Remaining projected lifetime-risk population after REALSafe = $A - B$

Under the model, the anticipated preventive effect changes the projected outcomes for approximately three-quarters of the students who would otherwise fall within the lifetime-risk population. That is the relationship illustrated by the database's *Anticipated Workshop Impact* figure.

Step 4: Understand the Basis for the Prevention Projection

The 75% factor is grounded in students' reported intentions to independently study the prevention material after experiencing REALSafe. The workshop's methodology is specifically designed to motivate that decision, rather than relying on students retaining information long enough to complete a graded assessment.

Applying that rate to the lifetime-risk population involves a further assumption: that voluntary engagement with the prevention material will help a comparable proportion of those students recognize, avoid, or escape dangerous relationships that might otherwise result in physical violence.

That connection forms the basis of Project REAL's anticipated prevention impact. The model reflects REALSafe's central objective: motivating students to independently acquire knowledge that can directly influence their decisions in future relationships, helping them recognize, avoid, or leave potentially dangerous situations before physical violence occurs.

While the research that informed REALSafe's development provides substantial, converging evidence supporting the expectation that a significant portion of the projected 75% prevention-impact group will avoid or leave dangerous relationships before physical violence occurs,

Project REAL is also in the early stages of planning a longitudinal evaluation. That evaluation will examine those outcomes over time, with the goal of directly verifying the long-term preventive effects of REALSafe's specific methodology, building upon an already well-supported research foundation.

The complete technical calculation sequence, including the order of rounding and the corresponding spreadsheet formulas, is provided in Appendix B.

[continued on next page]

Part III: Student Roots, State Support

Pathway to Delivery: SB108 & Student Advocacy (2017)

In 2017, Nevada students helped create a path for bringing practical criminal-law education into the state's high schools, including instruction about relationship violence, sexual assault, stalking, and other laws that could profoundly affect their lives.

That effort became Senate Bill 108, developed through the Nevada Youth Legislature, a program in which students appointed by Nevada's state senators work together to introduce legislation addressing issues important to young people. The proposal originated with a concern about teaching consent and preventing sexual and relationship violence, then expanded into a broader effort to help students understand the laws, rights, and responsibilities they would encounter as young adults.

The students also recognized an important challenge: Nevada has long struggled to reach consensus about what belongs in health and sex education classes. By approaching relationship and sexual violence through criminal law, and including other subjects relevant to young adults, the proposal offered a way to address these issues through established academic courses. The participating youth legislators worked alongside their legislative mentors to develop an approach capable of earning support in the Legislature.

SB108 passed in 2017, directing the State Board of Education to examine how criminal-law instruction could be incorporated into existing social studies requirements and pursue recommendations for implementation. The Nevada Department of Education subsequently published SB108 instructional resources describing age-appropriate delivery through social studies and health classes, with an emphasis on incorporating the material into existing lessons and working with external educational partners.^{7 8 9}

The Department's guidance specifically addresses:

- Domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, and other criminal offenses relevant to young adults.
- Victims' rights and the responsibilities of witnesses.
- How crimes can be reported and where victims and witnesses can seek assistance.
- Age-appropriate instruction integrated into existing social studies and health classes.
- Partnerships with outside organizations that can help schools deliver the material.

Project REAL is specifically identified among the educational resources in the Department's published SB108 guidance, recognizing the organization's role in supporting practical law-related education for Nevada students.

Taken together, the student-led legislation and the Department's subsequent guidance established a practical path for delivering this instruction within Nevada's existing educational structure. Schools can address these subjects through classes students already attend, draw on outside educational partners, and provide meaningful exposure to the material without creating an entirely separate course.

⁷ Nevada Department of Education, *SB108 Resources*:

https://webapp-strapi-paas-prod-nde-001.azurewebsites.net/uploads/SB_108_Resources_93aa59e8ff.pdf

⁸ Nevada Senate Committee on Education, March 21, 2017, hearing minutes, pages 11–13:

<https://archive.leg.state.nv.us/Session/79th2017/Minutes/Senate/EDU/Final/586.pdf>

⁹Nevada Legislature, *SB108, As Enrolled (2017)*: https://archive.leg.state.nv.us/Session/79th2017/Bills/SB/SB108_EN.pdf

REALSafe puts that approach into practice.

As established in Part I, REALSafe primarily serves high school seniors through Government/Economics classes, using an experience built around the legal and personal consequences of relationship violence. Students receive *Adulthood 101*, including 17 pages addressing dangerous relationships, recognizable patterns of abuse, and resources for seeking help. The workshop is designed to establish the material's personal relevance and motivate students to learn more independently.

The approach differs from conventional academic instruction, but serves the same educational priorities identified through SB108: helping students recognize conduct that may become dangerous or criminal, understand the consequences of abusive behavior, and know where assistance can be found.

The support for this kind of learning is not confined to the students who participated in the Nevada Youth Legislature nearly a decade ago. REALSafe's voluntary post-experience surveys consistently show that approximately 75% of students answering the relevant question intend to read the relationship violence material in their guides. That decision is not driven by grades, extra credit, or a requirement to complete the reading. It reflects students choosing to learn more about a subject they have come to recognize as relevant to themselves and people they care about.

There is a meaningful connection between those responses and the original student-led effort. Nevada's youth legislators identified a need for practical instruction that could help their peers navigate dangerous situations before experiencing them. The Legislature supported a route toward incorporating that instruction into existing classes, and the Department of Education subsequently identified the subjects, delivery approaches, and outside resources available to support schools.

REALSafe offers schools an established way to put those educational priorities into practice, at no cost, while addressing the same difficulties of limited instructional time that make outside educational experiences challenging to accommodate.

For educators considering whether to prioritize the workshop, the significance extends beyond Project REAL's projected prevention outcomes. Nevada students advocated for this education, the state developed a framework for providing it, and thousands of students participating in REALSafe have responded by expressing a willingness to continue learning the material on their own.

The opportunity already exists. The remaining challenge is getting more schools to use it.

That is the purpose behind Project REAL's continued outreach and the database developed for the 2026–27 school year: helping more Nevada schools recognize the value of making time for prevention, and extending an educational opportunity that Nevada students themselves helped make possible.

There is an important difference between adults deciding that students should receive information and students identifying information they want themselves and their peers to have.

The youth legislators who developed SB108 recognized that students were approaching adulthood without practical knowledge of laws that could shape their safety, relationships, and futures. They wanted that knowledge incorporated into the education Nevada students already receive, rather than leaving young people to discover its importance only after something had gone wrong.

That same concern remains visible in the responses of students participating in REALSafe today. Approximately 75% of students answering the relevant voluntary post-workshop survey question report intending to read the relationship violence material independently. They are not receiving a grade or extra credit for doing so. They are choosing to learn more because the experience has helped them recognize why the information could matter.

And the value of that knowledge extends beyond protecting themselves. Students can use it to recognize troubling behavior affecting friends, family members, and future partners, understand when and how to seek assistance, and identify harmful patterns in their own conduct before those patterns escalate.

Nearly a decade after Nevada students brought SB108 forward, the path they helped establish remains available to schools. The state has identified the subjects to be addressed, the instructional settings through which they can be delivered, and educational partners, including Project REAL, capable of supporting that work. REALSafe offers schools a practical way to act on those priorities while giving students the opportunity to continue learning long after the workshop ends.

The point is not simply that students helped inspire an educational initiative. Nevada students asked for this information because they understood that they and their peers deserved a chance to recognize dangerous behavior, make informed decisions, and seek help before relationship violence changed their lives.

REALSafe is one response to that request. Expanding access to it is a continuation of the work those students began.

Appendix A: Student Safeguards & Alternative Participation Procedures¹⁰

The following instructions are provided to teachers weeks before our arrival, with the goal of protecting students who may be particularly affected by the workshop's intensity while preserving their privacy and ability to participate.

- **Teachers : Escort All Classes, Manage Room Entry**

Once each class arrives at the presentation location, each classes' instructors need to be at the front of the line, and make an announcement before the kids enter the room.

Before the students enter, the teacher needs to casually and informally announce something akin to this message (not verbatim, but this general message and the casual delivery built into the wording of it):

Hey everyone, this workshop features about 15 minutes that can get very intense with aggressive shouting, relationship conflict, and threatening or controlling behavior.

If something you've experienced or witnessed makes you think those moments could become overwhelming, we've set aside some easy-exit seats so you can step out if you need to.

If you have left a really bad relationship because of something like that, or even have some stuff you're dealing with where something like a door slamming can be upsetting, you'll probably want one of those seats just in case.

If you're feeling sick or think you may need to step out for another reason, you can use one too. The seats are there for people who need them, rather than as another place to spend the period.

If you need an easy-exit seat, hang back for a second and we'll get you situated before everyone else goes in.

The front row of seats will be held open, as well as a few aisle seats on the sides of each row. Then, the teachers can just waive the Project REAL presenter over to place any of the students that self-selected an easy-exit seat

- **Quiet Down / Standby Location Selection:**

Please arrange a nearby place where students can step away if they need to leave the presentation because of its intensity. Ideally, this is the hallway just outside the room or another nearby space where they can settle for a few minutes and, if appropriate, rejoin once the most intense portion has concluded. A library or more distant location also works if needed.

Project REAL asks that the step-away location not automatically be the counseling or social work office. The goal is to give students a low-pressure way to regulate without requiring them to explain what they are feeling or disclose something personal simply because they needed to leave the room. If a student chooses to seek additional support or shares something requiring follow-up, normal school protocols should of course apply. While most students will never use the space, but it is important that it genuinely be available for the students who need it. Since REALSafe launched in October 2021, 23 students out of more than 10,000 participants have chosen to step away. Those students are exactly why Project REAL built the option into the experience.

¹⁰ Readers seeking insight into the practices employed in student surveys: see Appendix C.

Schools may use this quiet-space model on its own or choose to offer our quiet-room alternative.

- **Quiet-Room Alternative (Optional):**

Schools that can provide a separate supervised room may allow students who are concerned about the workshop's intensity to complete an alternate version instead. Students watch the same Adulting 101 introductory video, then complete an open-book assignment using the approximately 17 pages of relationship-violence material in the guide. The assignment requires a 70% score and is designed so students need to actually read and follow the material rather than simply guess through it. Project REAL can provide results to the school after each workshop day.

The goal is to provide a substantially lower-intensity way for students to engage with information that may still be useful to them, without turning the alternative into a free period for students who simply do not want to attend the workshop.

Additionally, students are provided an extensive content-warning with additional instructions specifically designed to maintain their privacy while giving them numerous opportunities to step away:

- 1) They are reminded of the content, and then shown three slides that indicate the buildup to intensity, the first subtle loud-and-angry moment in the workshop, and the scene immediately preceding the story-portion's particularly intense ending.

These slides were added after the first crying-without-departing incident, to create greater understanding of when to leave.

- 2) They are instructed they can take their bags with them, or leave them in their chairs to return late, and simply indicate to the people nearby they need to step out to the restroom.
- 3) The facilitator asks students that leave for the restroom to not return to their seats till after the story is over, creating additional cover if they remain out of the room till the story concludes.

The intensity of the workshop is essential to its design and the success rates we've achieved, but Project REAL is continually working to refine the workshop's protection of trauma-impacted students to avoid any incidents like the four we've had. While 4 known incidents among 10,000 students served by the workshop over 5 years is an excellent track records, Project REAL believes those 4 and any future occurrence are preventable.

The greatest challenge with this is instructor participation: while Project REAL's coordinators and facilitators stress the importance of the warnings, many teachers fail to deliver them. While the workshop facilitator provides the instructions to the students for what's meant to be a second time during the content explanations, the students are already seated at that point, which creates a pressure to stay. Still, Project REAL continues to work on getting teachers to participate in that aspect, but as guests of the district our ability to direct their activities is limited.

Appendix B: 2026-27 Enrollment Projection Math & Methodologies

The 2026–27 Database Project uses historical enrollment records from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), with 2024–25 being the most recent school year available when the workbook was developed. The workbook calculates projected enrollment separately for female and male students at each school. It uses historical grade-to-grade enrollment patterns to estimate the size of graduating classes rather than assuming that the previous year's juniors will all become seniors the following year.

The calculation has two parts:

1. Projecting 2025–26 senior enrollment, based primarily on students enrolled as juniors in 2024–25.
2. Projecting 2026–27 senior enrollment, based primarily on students enrolled as sophomores in 2024–25.

The workbook's historical records appear in Columns O–AL. The 2025–26 projections are calculated in Columns M–N, while the final 2026–27 projections appear in Columns F–G.

B.1 Historical Enrollment Records and Progression Rates

For each school and reported sex, two historical progression rates were established:

- **Grade 10 → Grade 11:** The following year's junior enrollment divided by the preceding year's sophomore enrollment.
- **Grade 11 → Grade 12:** The following year's senior enrollment divided by the preceding year's junior enrollment.

Each rate uses three historical comparisons:

Enrollment transition	Weight
2023–24 → 2024–25	50%
2022–23 → 2023–24	30%
2021–22 → 2022–23	20%

The most recent enrollment changes receive the greatest weight.

Weighted progression rate: $(A \times 50\%) + (B \times 30\%) + (C \times 20\%)$

A, B, and C represent the three historical grade-progression ratios, newest to oldest.

If a historical comparison cannot be calculated because its enrollment data are unavailable or unusable, that comparison is excluded and the remaining weights are adjusted proportionally.

The workbook uses a progression multiplier of 1 when no valid historical rate can be calculated. This fallback prevents an unavailable progression rate from automatically producing a calculation error; it does not represent a verified finding that enrollment remained unchanged.

The resulting rates are applied in the two projection calculations below.

B.2 Part One: Projecting 2025–26 Senior Enrollment

Students expected to be seniors in 2025–26 were juniors in 2024–25. The preferred calculation begins with the actual 2024–25 junior enrollment and applies the school's weighted historical Grade 11 → Grade 12 progression rate.

Preferred formula:

Projected 2025–26 seniors = 2024–25 juniors × weighted Grade 11 → Grade 12 progression rate

The result is rounded to the nearest whole student. This calculation is performed independently for female and male enrollment, producing the figures in **Columns M–N** in the workbook.

Alternative calculation

When the 2024–25 junior count is unavailable, the workbook instead uses a weighted average of the three most recent observed senior classes:

Senior enrollment	Weight
Actual 2024–25 seniors	50%
Actual 2023–24 seniors	30%
Actual 2022–23 seniors	20%

Alternative formula:

$$\text{Projected 2025–26 seniors} = (A \times 50\%) + (B \times 30\%) + (C \times 20\%)$$

Where:

- A = Actual 2024–25 senior enrollment
- B = Actual 2023–24 senior enrollment
- C = Actual 2022–23 senior enrollment

Unavailable observations are excluded, and the remaining weights are adjusted proportionally. If no usable observations remain, the workbook returns NP/UA rather than a calculated enrollment figure.

The resulting 2025–26 projections also serve as inputs to the alternative 2026–27 calculation.

B.3 Part Two: Projecting 2026–27 Senior Enrollment

Students expected to be seniors in 2026–27 were sophomores in 2024–25.

The preferred calculation therefore advances the observed sophomore class through two successive grades.

First calculation:

$$\text{Projected 2025–26 juniors} = \text{2024–25 sophomores} \times \text{weighted Grade 10} \rightarrow \text{Grade 11 progression rate}$$

Second calculation:

$$\text{Projected 2026–27 seniors} = \text{Projected 2025–26 juniors} \times \text{weighted Grade 11} \rightarrow \text{Grade 12 progression rate}$$

Combined formula:

$$\text{Projected 2026–27 seniors} = \text{2024–25 sophomores} \times \text{weighted Grade 10} \rightarrow \text{Grade 11 rate} \times \text{weighted Grade 11} \rightarrow \text{Grade 12 rate}$$

The final calculation is rounded to the nearest whole student. The intermediate progression calculation is not separately rounded. Female and male enrollment are calculated independently, producing the final figures in **Columns F–G**.

This is the preferred projection method because it begins with the actual enrollment of the graduating class's most recently observed grade and incorporates the school's historical enrollment changes across both remaining years.

Alternative calculation

When the 2024–25 sophomore count is unavailable, the workbook uses the projected 2025–26 senior class together with four years of actual senior enrollment.

Senior enrollment	Weight
Projected 2025–26 seniors	40%
Actual 2024–25 seniors	25%
Actual 2023–24 seniors	15%
Actual 2022–23 seniors	10%
Actual 2021–22 seniors	10%

Alternative formula:

$$\text{Projected 2026–27 seniors} = (A \times 40\%) + (B \times 25\%) + (C \times 15\%) + (X \times 10\%) + (Y \times 10\%)$$

Where:

- A = Projected 2025–26 senior enrollment
- B = Actual 2024–25 senior enrollment
- C = Actual 2023–24 senior enrollment
- X = Actual 2022–23 senior enrollment
- Y = Actual 2021–22 senior enrollment

Only usable observations contribute to the weighted average. If an observation is unavailable, its weight is removed and the remaining weights are adjusted proportionally. The resulting figure is rounded to the nearest whole student. The alternative method uses recent senior-class sizes rather than projecting the last observed senior class forward by an assumed annual growth percentage.

B.4 Missing Enrollment Data and School Status

NCES records occasionally contain suppressed or unavailable enrollment figures.

In the workbook, two suppression markers are represented numerically:

- † is represented as 0.02.
- ‡ is represented as 0.01.

These are placeholders for unavailable records, not fractions of a student. The workbook requires actual enrollment counts of at least one student when calculating usable grade-progression comparisons. Suppressed values are therefore excluded from those comparisons and from the weighted senior-enrollment averages.

A genuine enrollment count of zero is treated differently from an unavailable or suppressed record. The workbook also applies two status checks before producing its senior enrollment projections.

NP/UA: Not Projected / Unavailable with Current Data

If two or more of the four historical senior-enrollment observations for the relevant reported sex contain suppression markers, the workbook returns NP/UA. The check is performed separately for female and male senior histories.

CLOSED

A school is designated CLOSED when its reported Grade 10, Grade 11, and Grade 12 enrollment for both sexes is zero across the two most recent years represented in those grade records. The CLOSED check is distinct from the suppression and missing-data checks. A school is not classified as closed merely because enrollment information is unavailable.

The workbook evaluates the school-closure condition first, followed by the historical senior-data availability requirement. It then selects the applicable preferred or alternative calculation.

B.5 Workbook Columns Used in the Calculations

The relevant data and calculation columns are organized as follows:

Columns Contents

F–G	Projected female and male seniors, 2026–27
H–I	Projected lifetime physical-IPV occurrence, female and male
J–K	Anticipated REALSafe prevention impact, female and male
M–N	Projected female and male seniors, 2025–26
O–R	Historical male Grade 10 enrollment
S–V	Historical female Grade 10 enrollment
W–Z	Historical male Grade 11 enrollment
AA–AD	Historical female Grade 11 enrollment
AE–AH	Historical male Grade 12 enrollment
AI–AL	Historical female Grade 12 enrollment

Historical enrollment records within each grade group are arranged from 2024–25 back through 2021–22. The 2025–26 calculations use the Grade 11 and Grade 12 records. The preferred 2026–27 calculations additionally use Grade 10 history to estimate progression through both remaining grades.

B.6 Applying Relationship Violence and Prevention Rates

Once the final 2026–27 senior enrollment has been projected, the remaining calculations are substantially simpler.

The workbook's displayed lifetime-risk and prevention figures use the Conservative (pre-2020) prevalence assumptions:

- **Female lifetime physical IPV:** 25%, or 1 in 4.
- **Male lifetime physical IPV:** 1 in 7, approximately 14.3%.
- **Anticipated REALSafe prevention impact:** 75%.

The resulting projected lifetime-risk populations appear in **Columns H–I**, while anticipated prevention impacts appear in **Columns J–K**.

Lifetime-risk calculations:

Projected female seniors $\times$ 25% = Projected female lifetime-risk population
Projected male seniors $\times$ 1/7 = Projected male lifetime-risk population

Anticipated prevention calculations:

Projected female seniors $\times$ 25% $\times$ 75% = Anticipated female prevention impact
Projected male seniors $\times$ 1/7 $\times$ 75% = Anticipated male prevention impact

Each result is rounded to the nearest whole student. Importantly, the workbook calculates anticipated prevention directly from projected enrollment and the two applicable percentages. It does not first round the lifetime-risk count and then multiply that rounded result by 75%. This distinction matters because those two calculation sequences can occasionally produce slightly different whole-student results.

The public database offers an additional option.

Although the workbook's displayed lifetime-risk and prevention columns use the Conservative prevalence assumptions, the public tool can calculate results under either the Conservative or Updated model. The Updated model substitutes lifetime prevalence rates of 28.1% for females and 21.2% for males. The selected prevalence model changes the projected lifetime-risk and anticipated prevention-impact figures. It does not change the underlying senior enrollment projections. The database therefore uses one school-specific enrollment projection, with two selectable approaches to estimating lifetime physical intimate partner violence and its potential reduction through REALSafe. The evidentiary basis and limitations of the 75% anticipated prevention-impact factor are addressed in Part II and Appendix C.

Appendix C: Report Composition and Evaluation Practices.

Given the sensitive subject matter addressed throughout this report, its use of student feedback and program performance data, and its reliance on information drawn from multiple sources, several aspects of its preparation, evaluation practices, and evidentiary scope warrant clarification.

On Student Feedback & Evaluation Practices

Between October 2021 and October 2026, REALSafe collected more than 6,000 responses through optional, voluntary, anonymous post-workshop surveys. These surveys were conducted as part of Project REAL's regular assessment of its educational experiences.

REALSafe's voluntary, anonymous surveys were deliberately designed to encourage candid evaluations, including strongly negative reactions. Students are explicitly invited to criticize the experience when that reflects their views, and the surveys include harsh, aggressive, and sarcastic response options rather than limiting students to politely worded feedback. One example:

I didn't have to do a thing in class today, and this was absolutely the worst experience of all time. No student should ever have to sit through this garbage, ever.

The objective was to make negative responses as welcome and accessible as positive ones, reducing pressure to provide favorable evaluations while encouraging broader participation.

Presenters have regularly observed students pointing out some of the more aggressive or sarcastic response options to classmates who were not participating, followed by those classmates appearing to open the survey on their own devices. These recurring observations suggest that the approach has helped encourage participation among students who might otherwise have declined to respond.

Across participating schools, intended-reading results were notably consistent when REALSafe was delivered in its established format, including the full-length illustrated story. Regardless of school location, rural or urban setting, or community economic circumstances, reported rates generally remained within approximately 2.5 percentage points of 75%.

That consistency does not extend to earlier pilot versions without projected imagery or experimental deliveries using a shortened story, which produced different results and were not treated as representative of the established workshop model.

Historical responses to the relevant reading-intention question yielded approximately 74.7% when combined, rounded to 75%. This figure is based on students who voluntarily submitted surveys and answered that question, rather than every student who attended REALSafe.

The volume and consistency of those responses provide substantial grounds for confidence in the results. More than 6,000 voluntary, anonymous survey responses were collected over five years, with more than 30 responses received in approximately 90% of surveyed sessions. Across schools serving communities with different economic characteristics, including rural and urban populations, intended-reading rates generally remained within 2.5 percentage points of 75% when REALSafe was delivered in its established format.

The consistency of these results is particularly meaningful given the survey's deliberate encouragement of critical responses, the recurring observations of previously reluctant students choosing to participate, and the consistency of results across different schools and years. Rather than relying on a small number of

unusually favorable sessions, the reported rate reflects a substantial body of feedback collected through regular program delivery.

The combination of more than 6,000 voluntary, anonymous responses, substantial participation across sessions, deliberate encouragement of candid criticism, and consistently similar results across schools provides Project REAL with a strong practical basis for confidence in the approximately 75% intended-reading rate. That consistency is particularly significant given the different geographic and economic communities served, and the substantially different results observed when experimental workshop formats departed from REALSafe's established methodology.

On Report Composition & Evidentiary Scope

This document is an organizational progress report covering the development, delivery, methodology, and observed performance of REALSafe, together with the school-level projections developed for the 2026–27 Database Project. Its preparation draws on established research, routine program records, voluntary student evaluations, published external data, and the calculations and assumptions described in Part II and Appendix B.

These sources serve distinct purposes. Program records and delivery experiences document REALSafe's implementation and adjustments over time. Voluntary post-experience surveys provide students' assessments and reported intentions following participation. Published federal enrollment figures and national relationship violence estimates supply the external data used in the database, while the calculations described in Part II and Appendix B establish the resulting projections.

REALSafe's anticipated prevention impact begins with a consistent finding: **approximately 75% of surveyed students answering the relevant question report intending to independently read the relationship violence prevention material after participating in the workshop.**

The database uses that 75% rate to project how many students, among those statistically expected to experience physical intimate partner violence during their lifetimes, could avoid or leave dangerous relationships as a result of what they learn.

The reasoning behind that projection has substantial research support. Multiple peer-reviewed studies and meta-analyses have demonstrated measurable reductions in victimization and perpetration through relationship violence prevention education, while research on self-directed learning shows that personal motivation and student autonomy improve engagement and learning outcomes. Together, these findings provide substantial, converging evidence supporting REALSafe's expectation that meaningful prevention benefits will result from students choosing to learn the material for themselves.

While that research provides strong grounds for expecting positive outcomes among a substantial portion of the projected prevention-impact population, Project REAL is also in the early stages of planning a longitudinal evaluation. The goal is to examine those outcomes over time, directly evaluate the long-term preventive effects of REALSafe's specific methodology, and determine how closely the results correspond with the model's projections.

Throughout the report, direct observations, voluntary student responses, published external findings, and calculated projections are identified according to their respective roles. This allows readers to distinguish REALSafe's documented performance from the anticipated long-term benefits modeled by the database, while understanding the evidence and reasoning supporting both.