

## **Summary of End-of-Year Reports**

### **Grants for FY 2000**

House Bill 330 (1998), which established the Center for School Safety (CSS), also called for the appropriation of \$9 million during Fiscal Year 2000 to support a school safety grant process. During FY 1999, the Kentucky Department of Education oversaw the awarding of \$4 million to 40 school districts to support alternative education programming. With approval from the Board of Directors, the CSS at Eastern Kentucky University served as the point of contact for the FY 2000 school safety grant selection process.

The Board of Directors placed the highest priority on providing continuation funding to reapplying FY 1999 award recipients that showed promise for positive outcomes. Thirty-seven of the forty eligible districts re-applied and were awarded funding. Based on a multi disciplinary review process, the CSS Board of Directors also granted awards to 53 additional school districts for a total of 90 grants.

Attached to this report is a complete listing of the 90 school districts receiving school safety grants in FY 2000, including the number of districts served and the amount of each award.

One of the requirements for receiving a FY 2000 grant from the CSS was the inclusion of an evaluation plan for measuring the goals and objectives outlined in school district grant applications. An end-of-year report documenting the results of these evaluations was due to the CSS by July 25, 2000. The application also required that every funded proposal include a line item in their budget to address evaluation efforts. Districts were encouraged to seek the advice and services of researchers when designing and implementing their evaluation plan. The CSS sponsored two evaluation workshops in August 1999 to provide grantees with guidance on the evaluation component. Representatives of all funded programs attended these workshops and completed an "Evaluation Worksheet" that outlined the goals, measurable objectives, and outcome data sources as well as the respective program activities and process measures for each goal. This information should have been used to help districts determine the impact that funded services had on students, staff or other target populations.

The following report is a summary of outcomes achieved as reported by school districts receiving school safety funds in FY 2000. It is organized on the basis of specific funding categories that were established in House Bill 330.

## **Description of Funding Categories**

***Alternative Education Program*** – An alternative education program is an education program that provides both instruction and support services and/or treatment that specifically meets the identified needs of individual students. Priority for awarding these grants was given to programs that show evidence of the following:

1. A continuum of services;
2. Interventions to serve students who are at risk of school failure;
3. Interventions to serve students who engage in disruptive and disorderly behavior and are at risk of participation in violent behavior or juvenile crime; and
4. Students who have been suspended or expelled from school.

During FY 2000, 71 of the 90 funded programs (78%) addressed alternative education programming.

***Intervention Services*** – Intervention services are school-based preventive, developmentally corrective, support services or treatment provided to a student(s) who is at risk of school failure, is at risk of participation in violent behavior or juvenile crime, or has been expelled from the school district. Services may include, but are not limited to, screening to identify students at risk of emotional disabilities and antisocial behavior; direct instruction in academic, social, problem solving, and conflict resolution skills; psychological services; identification and assessment of abilities; counseling services; medical services; day treatment; parenting skills; and work and community service programs (HB 330, Section 2).

During FY 2000, 15 of the 90 funded programs (16%) provided intervention services.

***School Resource Officer*** – A school resource officer means a sworn law enforcement officer who has specialized training to work with youth at a school site. The school resource officer shall be employed through a contract between a local law enforcement agency and a school district (HB 330, Section 2).

Although many school districts have school resource officers, no districts chose to use school safety grant funds primarily for this purpose. The funding source for this initiative is typically Federal Community Oriented Policing (COPS) Funds.

***Training Programs*** – Training programs can include professional development programs for certified and classified staff, students, parents, and community members.

During FY 2000, only 2 of the 90 funded programs focused primarily on this category.

***Community-based Programs*** – Community-based programs demonstrate school-community partnerships through multi-agency collaboration, with but not limited to, mental health, juvenile justice, community-based services, prevention councils, courts, law enforcement, and other child or family serving organizations.

During FY 2000, only 1 of the 90 funded programs focused primarily on this category.

***Other Violence Prevention Programs*** - Other violence prevention programs include school safety efforts not previously mentioned. Examples include security equipment such as surveillance cameras or metal detectors.

During FY 2000, only 1 of the 90 funded programs focused primarily on this category.

### **Summary of Target Population**

Based on information reported by FY 00 grantees, the most common student population(s) served with school safety funds were those middle and high students in grades 8-12. Fifteen of the 90 funded programs served elementary students and nine targeted all students within the school district. The general characteristics of students targeted for services most often included behavioral problems (83%), followed by poor academic achievement (63%) and lack of attendance or truancy (34%).

### **Summary of Outcomes Achieved**

The following table outlines the indicators used by school districts to determine program effectiveness. As mentioned earlier, this summary is based on self-reported information from school districts receiving school safety grant funds in FY 2000. The table identifies the total number of districts using a specific indicator and the status of each indicator at the end of the year: S (objective was successfully met), P (progress was made but objective was not met), and NP (no progress was made or the district provided insufficient information to determine the status of the objective.)

**Table I.**

**Summary of Indicators used to determine FY 2000 program success**

<b>Total # of Districts Using This Indicator</b>	<b>Success</b>	<b>Progress</b>	<b>No Progress</b>	<b>Indicator</b>
10	6	3	1	Students/staff who report feeling safe at school (based on valid survey instrument)
62	40	15	7	Students receiving school suspensions, expulsions, office referrals.
50	27	15	8	Students who are reported as truant (chronic absences)
12	8	4		Students retained in a particular grade level
2	2			Number of students who bring a weapon to school (number of confirmed incidents)
1			1	Number of vandalism reports in a specified period
18	10	2	6	Students dropping out of school
29	23	5	1	Students, staff or teachers receiving training in a specific skill related to behavior/classroom management or school safety area
17	11	5	1	Successful transitions to adult living
6	4	2		Number of law/board policy violations
60	33	24	3	Student Achievement (i.e. grade point average, CATS, other test scores, or other indicators)
44	27	16	1	Student/Family Support (i.e. student counseling, parent support groups, student support groups, other indicators)
41	24	14	3	Other Indicators: i.e. increase vocational skills, installation of security equipment, increased community involvement, decreased referrals to an alternative program, expand alternative education program services, successful transition to home school, established student alternatives to violence, students resisting drugs or alcohol, reduction in bullying, etc.

Of the 90 districts receiving school safety grant funds in FY 2000, 77 (85%) achieved success in one or more of the stated objectives. Seven programs demonstrated progress toward at least one objective, and information was unavailable for six of the funded programs.

Although this summary reflects information reported by funded school districts, it is intended to provide only an overview of the types of program goals and objectives addressed with the use of safe schools funds as well as a summative outline of successes achieved. This report, however, does not provide detailed information regarding the quality of stated goals and objectives as reported by districts. It is also not intended to imply that if success is achieved in relation to targeted outcomes that the funded program is an overall effective one. For example, a district may have stated a minimal objective (i.e. reduce absenteeism by 1%). If this was achieved, the district received an “S” for success. At the same time, if a district stated an objective to reduce absenteeism among alternative education students by 15% but could only demonstrate a reduction of 10%, the program received a “P” for progress because it did not fully meet the stated objectives. However, it seems clear that the latter district achieved greater success.

### **Conclusion**

CSS reviewed all year-end reports submitted by funded districts for the 2000 Fiscal Year. Because this information is not sufficient to identify best and promising practices regarding school safety strategies, CSS will utilize this information in conjunction with other data collection activities to identify those programs or strategies producing strong outcomes in the promotion of safe and healthy learning environments.