



Dallas Independent School District

**FINAL EVALUATION OF THE 2004-2005
DISTRICTWIDE SAFETY INITIATIVE**

REIS05-179-2

**DIVISION OF EVALUATION
AND ACCOUNTABILITY**

Michael Hinojosa, Ed.D. Interim General Superintendent

Dallas Independent School District

Michael Hinojosa, Ed.D.
General Superintendent

FINAL REPORT
DISTRICTWIDE SAFETY INITIATIVE: 2004-2005

REIS04-179-2

L. Shane Hall

Approved Report of the Division of Evaluation and Accountability

Nancy Kihneman
Executive Director
Department of Special Projects Evaluation

Robert L. Mendro
Assistant Superintendent
Department of Research and Evaluation

Cecilia Oakeley
Associate Superintendent
Division of Evaluation and Accountability

Dallas, Texas
August 2005

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Abstract.....	1
Program Description.....	2
PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION.....	3
MAJOR EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND RESULTS.....	3
2.1 What are the major research findings in the literature on school safety issues?	3
Methodology.....	3
Results	3
2.2 What was the context of the Districtwide Safety Initiative?	9
Methodology.....	9
Results	9
2.3 What are the components of the Districtwide Safety Initiative?	13
Classroom Observation Forms	27
Reading Observations	31
Mathematics Observations	37
Staff Development.....	42
2.4 What are the characteristics of the campuses participating in the Safe and Civil Schools Program?	25
Methodology.....	25
Results	25
2.5 What was the budget for the Districtwide Safety Initiative?	30
Methodology.....	30
Results	30
2.6 How was the Districtwide Safety Initiative Implemented?	32
Methodology.....	32
Results	34

2.7 What were the outcomes of the Districtwide Safety Initiative? 76

 Methodology..... 76

 Results 76

SUMMARY 84

RECOMMENDATIONS 88

REFERENCES 89

List of Tables

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1 Discipline Offenses Warranting Off-Campus Placements, 2002-2004	10
2 2003 Youth Risk Behavior Survey Results	10
3 Citations Issued by DISD Police and Security Services, 2002-2004	11
4 2004 Safe School Survey Results	11
5 Safe and Civil Schools Five-Year Implementation Plan.....	17
6 Drug and Violence Prevention TEKS for Grades K-8, by Grade Level.....	18
7 Character Education Scope and Sequence For Grades K-8, by Grade Level.....	19
8 Foundations Schools' Students by Ethnicity	26
9 Foundations Schools Students by Socioeconomic Status	27
10 Foundations Students by LEP Status.....	28
11 Disciplinary Referrals for Foundations Schools, 2003-2004	29
12 2004-2005 Safety Initiative Budget by Organization and Function	30
13 2004-2005 Safety Initiative Budget, by Object	31
14 DISD Campuses Participating in Safe and Civil Schools, 2004-2005.....	35
15 Student Responses to Questions on Safety Issues	38
16 Student Responses to Questions on Student Interaction	38
17 Student Responses to Questions on Student-Staff Interactions.....	39
18 Student Responses to Questions on School Rules and Expectations.....	40
19 Student Responses to Questions on Student Attitudes and Perceptions	40
20 Staff Responses to Survey Questions on Student Safety Issues	41
21 Staff Responses to Survey Questions on Student Interactions	42
22 Staff Responses to Survey Questions on Student-Staff Interactions.....	42
23 Staff Responses to Survey Questions on School Rules and Standards.....	43
24 Staff Responses to Survey Questions on Student Attitudes and School-Family Relationships.....	43

List of Tables (Continued)

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
25 Staff Responses to Survey Questions on Staff Interactions and School Policies.....	44
26 Staff Responses to Survey Questions on Perceived School Problems	45
27 Parent Responses to Questions on Perceptions of Schools.....	46
28 Parent Responses to Questions on Safety Concerns	47
29 Results of Foundations Coaches Survey	49
30 Foundations Schools' Improvement Priorities and Planned Implementation Dates ...	50
31 Team Members' Perceptions of Foundations Program.....	53
32 START on Time Implementation Scores For Foundations Campuses	55
33 START on Time Perceptions	56
34 Results of CHAMPs Survey.....	59
35 CHAMPs Survey Results for Special Education Teachers	60
36 DISD Elementary and Middle School Campus Implementation Plans For Character Education	62
37 Homerooms and Social Studies Classrooms That Received Character Education and Violence Prevention Lessons, Fall 2004	64
38 Counselors Who Completed Breaking the Code of Silence Training, Fall 2004	65
39 Results of Drug and Violence Education (DAVE) Survey of P.E. Teachers	67
40 DAEP Enrollment by Grading Period, 2004-2005.....	72
41 DAEP Enrollment by Campus and Sex.....	73
42 DAEP Enrollment by Ethnicity.....	73
43 DAEP and Other District Teachers by Years of Experience in DISD	74
44 CHAMPs Survey Results for Village Fair DAEP Teachers	75
45 Disciplinary Referrals for Foundations Campuses, 2003-2004 and 2004-2005	77
46 Level 1 and Discretionary Offenses for Foundations Schools, 2003-2005.....	78
47 Mandatory Removals and Expellable Offenses for Foundations Schools.....	79
48 In-School and Out-of-School Suspensions for Foundations Campuses And Other Secondary Schools, 2003-2005.....	81

List of Tables (Continued)

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
49 Alternative Education Program Referrals for Foundations Campuses and Other Secondary Schools.....	82
50 Serious Free Behavior Index Scores for Foundations Campuses and Other Secondary Schools, 2003-2005.....	83

EVALUATION OF THE 2004-2005 DISTRICTWIDE SAFETY INITIATIVE

Evaluation Manager: L. Shane Hall

Abstract

The Dallas Independent School District's Districtwide Safety Initiative is a comprehensive effort aimed at improved safety. The initiative consists of 24 separate programs and strategies, and is designed to foster more coordination among district departments. Some programs and strategies were universal, aimed at all students; others were more targeted in nature.

The 2004-2005 evaluation focused on the universal programs: Safe and Civil Schools, Drug and Violence Education, and Character Education. It also examined the Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (DAEP) targeted intervention.

Safe and Civil Schools is a series of three programs designed to improve safety and civility in schools. The main program, Foundations, emphasizes data-driven decision-making by a campus-based team. Another program, CHAMPs, focuses on improved classroom management. The third program, START on Time, strives to reduce student tardiness. The Drug and Violence Education program called for training physical education teachers in Grades K-8 to deliver drug and violence prevention lessons. The character education program involved elementary and middle school counselors delivering lessons based on the Character Counts! program to students.

Sixteen secondary campuses (13 high schools, 3 middle schools) participated in the Foundations program. Student and staff survey data identified a series of safety concerns including bullying and assaults, thefts, students feeling unsafe in restrooms and parking lots, and a reluctance to tell staff members about students involved in dangerous or illegal activity. Most schools, however, chose to emphasize civility concerns, such as tardiness, and student behavior in common areas, in their improvement plans.

Fifteen of these schools implemented the START on Time program to reduce tardiness. More than 500 teachers and administrative staff underwent CHAMPs training. Specialists from Safe and Drug Free Schools presented the drug and violence education program to physical education teachers. Most of these teachers delivered drug and violence prevention lessons, but survey data suggest a need for training on the curriculum. About 87% of elementary homerooms received character education lessons, and 57% of middle school social studies classes received such lessons. The district operated two elementary disciplinary alternative campuses and the Village Fair alternative center for secondary students.

Because 2004-2005 was the first year of the safety initiative, outcomes data were limited. Disciplinary referral data for the 16 Foundations campuses indicate increases in overall referrals. However, minor Level 1 and discretionary offenses accounted for much of the increase. The increased referrals reflect more vigorous enforcement of standards, as encouraged by Safe and Civil Schools consultants.

It is recommended that Safe and Civil Schools participants collaborate more closely with district police and security specialists to emphasize safety concerns more vigorously.

Program Description

The Dallas Independent School District's Districtwide Safety Initiative represents the district's response to concerns about crime near schools and student safety. The five-year initiative began in 2004-2005 and is scheduled to continue through 2009. The district identified more than 20 separate strategies, interventions, and programs for addressing safety issues. Through this initiative, the district hopes to provide a more consistent and comprehensive approach to student safety, as well as foster more cooperation among district departments.

The district classified the array of programs and strategies into the following categories: universal programs, select interventions, targeted interventions, and enforcement programs. Universal programs consist of programs that will be implemented districtwide among all students. Select interventions include strategies for students with ongoing behavioral issues who did not respond adequately to the universal strategies. Targeted interventions focus on students with more serious disciplinary and behavioral issues. Such students did not respond adequately to universal or selected interventions. Enforcement programs consist of various strategies and efforts to reduce campus-based crime.

A steering committee oversees the implementation of the safety initiative. The committee identified the following goals for the initiative:

- Improve student achievement
- Increase the percentage of campus time that is free of serious offenses
- Decrease assaults on students and staff
- Decrease drug violations
- Decrease incidents of classroom disruption
- Decrease incidents of disorderly conduct
- Increase the scope of prevention and intervention programs
- Increase coordination among district departments
- Increase student attendance and reduce truancy
- Increase measurable outcomes and accountability

PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The purpose and scope of this report is to provide context and process information, as well as some outcome data, to assist program managers in assessing the implementation of the districtwide safety initiative.

MAJOR EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND RESULTS

2.1 *What are the major research findings on school safety issues?*

Methodology

A selection of research literature on school safety, drug and violence education, and character education provided data for this section. Much of the literature reviewed in this section consists of meta-analyses on school safety, drug and violence prevention, and character education. Meta-analysis is a method for summarizing findings from a literature review of a subject. This method groups results of multiple studies by some meaningful clustering strategy. The meta-analyst then uses quantitative procedures to summarize the findings of the individual studies, which serve as data points. Strictly speaking, a meta-analysis is more of a synthesis than an analysis.

Results

Safety and Effective Schools

Past research identifies safety and civility as important elements of effective schools. A synthesis of effective schools research by Cotton (1995) found the following:

- Teachers set clear standards for classroom behavior and apply them fairly and consistently;
- Teachers hold high expectations for student learning;
- Teachers interact with students in positive, caring ways;
- Everyone in the school community emphasizes the importance of learning;
- Administrators and teachers establish and enforce clear, consistent discipline policies;
- Administrators and teachers use validated practices for tobacco, alcohol, and drug prevention.

For classroom behavior standards, the research cited by Cotton (1995) found that teachers establish clear and specific rules; provide written behavior standards and teach them, re-teaching them as needed for grades K-3; clearly explain rules, discipline procedures, and consequences; apply equitable, consistent discipline; teach and reinforce positive behavior skills; stop disruptions quickly; and handle most disciplinary matters in the classroom, keeping office referrals to a minimum.

High expectations means that teachers set high standards for learning and hold students accountable for completing assignments, turning in work, and participating in classroom discussions. Effective schools research also found that teachers should monitor their own beliefs and actions to ensure that high expectations are communicated to all students, regardless of personal characteristics.

In student-teacher interaction, the research synthesis by Cotton found that teachers pay attention to student interests, problems, and accomplishments through interactions in and out of the classroom; encourage student effort; and encourage students to develop a sense of responsibility and self-reliance.

Research concluded that the school community should hold high achievement expectations and continually express expectations for improvement. The school also should develop mission statements, slogans, mottos, and displays that underscore its goals.

Cotton cited research supporting the need for clear and consistent discipline policies. Such policies specify acceptable behavior and consequences for infractions. Teachers and administrators should create a supportive school environment; administer disciplinary procedures in a neutral manner that focuses on the behavior, not the history or personality of student involved; and deliver sanctions that are commensurate with the offense committed. The research also found that schools should avoid expulsions and out-of-school suspensions whenever possible, favoring in-school suspension.

Validated drug and alcohol prevention practices include activities that not only give information, but also strive to influence attitudes and behavior. Prevention activities should begin in the primary grades and focus on making healthy choices. For older students, prevention

programs should include drug-specific activities. Finally, the research found that “scare tactics” are not effective.

Varied Approaches to School Safety

A study in the journal *Phi Delta Kappan*, cited by the Appalachia Educational Laboratory (1998), reported that 3,000,000 crimes occur annually in the nation’s public schools. Other studies have cited troubling statistics on school safety. The Josephson Institute of Ethics’ Report Card on the Ethics of American Youth surveyed more than 15,000 secondary school students and found that more than one-third (39% in middle school and 36% in high school) did not feel safe at school. More than 20% of high school boys indicated that they took a weapon to school at least once, and more than 60% said they could get drugs and guns if they wanted to do so. These statistics, coupled with high-profile incidents in the late 1990s, such as the school shootings in Arkansas and Colorado, have led to increased concern about school safety issues.

The 2003 *Youth Risk Behavior Survey* by the national Centers for Disease Control found that 6.1% of high school students surveyed had taken a weapon to school in the past year, and 9.2% were threatened or injured with a weapon. In addition, the survey found that 12.8% of the students had been in a physical fight on school grounds, and 5.4% of students did not go to school because of safety concerns. These percentages were higher among Hispanics and African-Americans.

In response, schools across the country have implemented programs and initiatives to teach students respectful and responsible behavior, and to foster a safer and more civil school environment. These efforts range from classroom activities to schoolwide programs. Some are broad-based in nature, addressing multiple facets of the school climate, while others focus on specific concerns, such as drug abuse, violence, or character education. The Appalachia Educational Laboratory (1998) identified three levels of intervention: primary, comprised of schoolwide programs universally administered to all students; secondary, interventions that target known at-risk students; and tertiary, interventions for students with chronic behavior problems.

Much of the research on school safety programs consists of evaluations of individual programs and initiatives. However, the California Attorney General’s Crime and Violence

Prevention Center produced a synopsis of strategies for reducing crime, violence, and substance abuse in schools, based on a review of some of those studies. “Exemplary practices” for preventing crime, violence, and substance abuse included:

- Strong adult role models and a “mentor-rich environment;”
- Clearly established and clearly communicated norms of behavior;
- Comprehensive instruction in social behavioral skills;
- A strong school environment with vigorous academic focus and adult influence;
- Targeted early childhood interventions;
- Resistance skills training to teach students about social influences – a model which recognizes that adolescents are vulnerable to social influences;
- Programs establishing and communicating norms of behaviors – establishing school rules and enforcing them consistently;
- Comprehensive social competency promotion programs, such as impulse control, stress management, and thinking skills for identifying problems and solutions;
- Behavior modification and programs that teach thinking skills to high-risk youths.

Drug Abuse Education

Drug and alcohol education in the United States has a lengthy history, beginning with the Temperance Movement in the 1840s, which sought to raise awareness of “the evils of alcohol.” After the 1933 repeal of prohibition, alcohol education shifted from an emphasis on abstinence to stressing responsibility. The 1970s saw a wide range of approaches to drug and alcohol education. Some methods continued the “evils of alcohol” approach. Some methods stressed objective scientific facts, and others emphasized responsible alcohol use.

During the 1980s, the predominant approach to drug and alcohol education was to create programs that would reduce substance abuse by increasing knowledge and changing attitudes. Another approach, known as the Social Influence Model, emphasized influences in society that pushed young people toward substance use. It also promoted programs such as Life Skills Training and “Just Say No.”

Gliksman and Smythe (1990) summarized the history of drug and alcohol education and examined literature reviews and meta-analyses that summarized the successes of various programs. The authors concluded that although individual successes exist, school-based drug education programs are generally ineffective or at best, inconsistently effective. Most positive effects, the authors concluded, were in knowledge gains about the effects of drug and alcohol use. Some programs fostered changes in attitudes as well, but the authors found that knowledge gains and attitudinal changes were rarely associated with positive behavioral changes. Gliksman and Smythe noted that the paucity of positive successes might be attributable in part to poor methodology, but that this is unlikely to be the sole reason.

A five-year longitudinal study of the Drug Abuse Resistance Education (DARE) program by Clayton, Cattarello, and Johnstone (1996) found no significant differences between intervention and comparison schools with respect to tobacco, alcohol, or marijuana use. They found that DARE had limited positive effects in terms of knowledge and attitudes, but that these effects tended to decay over time. This is consistent with findings in other evaluations of DARE, one of the most popular school-based drug education programs in the United States.

White and Pitts (1998) also found that most programs aimed at reducing or preventing substance abuse by young people had limited effects that dissipated over time. The authors used meta-analysis to assess such programs. The majority of studies examined were evaluations of school-based interventions.

Tobler and Stratton used meta-analysis to examine 120 school-based drug prevention programs. Their study considered not just the programs themselves, but the methods used for delivering content. The authors found that programs with an interactive delivery method were more effective than programs with little or no adolescent interaction, such as those that relied on didactic presentations. Large interactive programs had less impact, but were still more effective than their non-interactive counterparts, which the authors concluded could suggest implementation problems as programs increase in size.

Violence Prevention

Derzon and Wilson (1999) conducted a systematic review of programs aimed at reducing school violence. Using meta-analysis, they sought answers to two questions:

- How effective are school-based programs in reducing anti-social behavior?
- How effective are different programs in reducing anti-social behavior?

The first question ignored program type and examined data based on outcome measures of anti-social behavior, while the second question grouped studies by program strategy.

Based on a review of 83 studies, Derzon and Wilson found that programs were generally successful on most measures of anti-social activity, except for threats and student possession of weapons. Effect sizes for two other measures – gang activity and verbal aggression – were positive, but wide confidence intervals suggested mixed effects. When the authors examined the studies by program strategy, they found positive effects, but noted that the evidence was thin and based on a small number of studies for some program strategies. Derzon and Wilson also found a paucity of studies that included clear measures of physical violence.

Character Education

Evaluations of some of the various character education programs in use across the country show generally positive effects. Dallas Independent School District plans to implement the Character Counts! framework in its schools, as part of the districtwide safety initiative. Character Counts! is a coalition of schools, communities and non-profit organizations working to advance character education by teaching the Six Pillars of Character: trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, and citizenship. This coalition is a project of the Josephson Institute of Ethics, which developed materials and activities for schools to teach the Six Pillars of Character.

Character Counts! has more than 400 member organizations, including the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers. The Josephson Institute prepared a paper on character education for the then-incoming Bush administration in December 2000, suggesting the institute holds political influence. Given the popularity of Character Counts!, it is important that it be evaluated to determine its impact.

The most thorough study of Character Counts! under way is the 10-year study in South Dakota that began in 1998. Data compiled from extensive questionnaires for students and teachers indicated a decline in the number of students who committed anti-social acts, such as theft, substance abuse, physical violence, or vandalism. In addition, fewer students reported cheating on an exam or missing class without a legitimate excuse. Teachers also reported improved student behavior toward peers and adults.

Pennsylvania's character education initiative used various curricular approaches. A report prepared for the Pennsylvania Alliance for Character Education (Schumer, 2003) found that character education programs have the most impact when presented as schoolwide behavior models. Programs that integrated character education into the whole school were perceived to have greater impact than programs that treated good character as a subject to study each week.

2.2 *What was the context of the Districtwide Safety Initiative?*

Methodology

Program documents and interviews provided much of the contextual information. Results of the 2003 *Youth Risk Behavior Survey* and the 2004 *Safe School Survey* provided additional context data. Discipline referrals and DISD police citations served as additional data sources.

Results

A series of high-profile school shootings, especially the 1999 incident in Littleton, Colorado, thrust school violence and safety into the national spotlight. School safety issues presented greater challenges to educators, students, and parents across the country. Dallas Independent School District (DISD) is no exception to this increased concern about school safety.

DISD Safety Concerns

Most student offenses requiring off-campus placement in 2003-2004 increased over the previous school year. Table 1 shows data on incidents of student misbehavior that required placement in one of the district's off-campus disciplinary alternative education programs (DAEPs) or in the Dallas County Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program (JJAEP).

Table 1

Discipline Offenses Warranting Off-Campus Placements, 2002-2004

Offense Description	2002-2003	2003-2004	% Change
Serious misbehavior at an off-campus DAEP	64	115	+79.7
Firearms violation requiring a one-year expulsion	12	16	+33.3
Use, display, or possession of a firearm, illegal knife, club, or other prohibited weapon	36	49	+36.1
Sexual assault or aggravated sexual assault	3	12	+300.0
Murder, capital murder, or intent to commit murder	0	1	+100.0
Indecency with a child	20	24	+20.0
Class C assault (student on student)	158	252	+59.5
Bullying, including intimidation using racial slurs	39	67	+71.8
Fighting	554	553	-0.1
Sexual harassment/abuse not defined as mandatory or expellable	23	34	+47.8
Class A assault (student on student)	65	83	+27.6
Assault (student on school personnel)	145	207	+42.7

The federal Centers for Disease Control (CDC) administered the 2003 *Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS)* between February and December 2003 to a representative sample of students in grades 9-12 in more than 20 school districts across the nation, including Dallas. The survey contained some troubling findings for the district and schools nationwide regarding drugs, violence, and school safety. Table 2 displays national and DISD results. On all four items regarding drugs, violence, and safety, DISD students reported higher levels of violence and drug activity than students nationwide.

Table 2

2003 *Youth Risk Behavior Survey* Results

Survey Item	DISD	National
Percentage of students who were offered, sold, or given an illegal drug at school in one year.	39.2%	28.7%
Percentage of students who reported that they did not go to school one or more of the past 30 days because they felt unsafe.	10.0%	5.4%
Percentage of students who reported being in a physical fight in the last year.	43.0%	33.3%
Percentage of students who reported carrying a weapon once or more in the past 30 days.	18.2%	17.1%

The district's Police and Security Services department found an increase in school-based offenses from 2002-2003 to 2003-2004. Table 3 shows increases in police citations for various offenses, including assaults, drugs, disorderly conduct, and weapons seizures.

Table 3

Citations Issued by DISD Police and Security Services, 2002-2004

Offense Category	2002-2003	2003-2004
Aggravated Assaults	45	66
Employee Assaults	187	286
Sexual Assaults	10	34
Drugs	419	667
Disorderly Conduct	3,574	5,000
Classroom Disruption	1,273	1,201
No. of weapons seized on campus	20	44

The district's own 2004 Safe School Survey, administered to teachers, campus administrators, counselors, and nurses, supported the YRBS findings. A majority of respondents agreed that violent offenses were a problem at their schools, and that gang activity had increased. Table 4 illustrates results of the 2004 Safe School Survey.

Table 4

2004 Safe School Survey Results

Perception of the existence of the following offenses at your school:	% Agreed
Bullying, intimidation	63.5
Fighting, assaults	63.0
Truancy	59.2
Vandalism	58.1
Theft/burglary	57.2
Graffiti	53.7
Are the following factors increasing at your school:	
Graffiti/gang activity	56.2
Truancy	54.6
Suspension/expulsion rates	49.6
Availability of drugs	46.6
Disruptions related to student dress	41.5
Students on criminal probation	36.0

In response to the increase in violent incidents, the general superintendent directed the division of Employee and Safety Services to convene a task force on school safety. The task force convened in April 2004 and reviewed all programs and services related to school safety to identify gaps. The task force issued these findings:

- Lack of coordination among departments that provide safety-related programs and services;
- No systematic delivery system for prevention and intervention programs;
- No districtwide prevention systems;
- No systematic approach to gang intervention;
- Comprehensive plans related to disciplinary and juvenile justice alternative education programs (AEPs) have not been fully implemented.

The general superintendent charged the task force with developing a school safety initiative. The task force began work on the initiative in May 2004 and unveiled it that summer. The initiative involves a range of district departments, including Student Support and Special Services, Alternative Programs, Professional Development and Staff Training, Health Education, Police and Security Services, and Counseling Services. The initiative model requires a proactive approach and a continuum of interventions, ranging from universal efforts aimed at all students to targeted programs that focus on students with chronic behavior problems.

Goals and Expected Outcomes

The Districtwide School Safety Initiative's goal is to maintain a safe and secure environment. A steering committee, consisting of members of the school safety task force, oversees the implementation of the safety initiative. The steering committee set the following expected outcomes for the initiative:

- Increase the percentage of "campus time free of serious offenses;"
- Decrease the number of assaults on students and personnel;
- Decrease the number of drug violations;
- Decrease incidents of classroom disruption;
- Decrease incidents of disorderly conduct;

- Increase the scope of prevention and intervention programs and services for students and families;
- Increase coordination among district departments that provide safety-related programs and services;
- Increase students' and employees' perception that the school environment is safe and secure.

2.3 *What are the components of the Dallas Safety Initiative?*

Methodology

Program documents and department action plans provided descriptions of the components included in the Dallas Safety Initiative.

Results

The Dallas Independent School District's Safety Initiative consists of 24 separate programs and strategies, aimed at addressing safety issues. These efforts strive to provide a more consistent approach to safety across the district and foster more coordination among the district's departments. The programs and strategies in the Dallas Safety Initiative were classified under the following categories: universal programs, enforcement programs, select interventions, and targeted interventions.

Universal programs consisted of prevention and intervention strategies aimed at all students. Enforcement programs consisted of programs and strategies aimed at reducing crime on campus. Select interventions focused on students with ongoing behavior issues who did not respond adequately to the universal strategies. Targeted interventions focused on students with severe behavioral issues who did not respond adequately to the universal and/or select strategies.

The 2004-2005 evaluation of the districtwide safety initiative focuses on the universal components and the targeted intervention related to disciplinary alternative education programs (DAEPs). This section, however, describes all programs in each category, with an emphasis on those within the scope of the evaluation.

Universal Programs

Safe and Civil Schools. Safe and Civil Schools is a series of materials designed to help schools improve safety and civility of the school climate. The series is based on the belief that an improved school climate helps lay a foundation for enhanced student engagement and achievement. Oregon-based Teaching Strategies Inc. developed the Safe and Civil Schools series, which consists of three programs: Foundations, CHAMPs, and START on Time.

Foundations is a research-based program that focuses on improved safety and civility, and offers a comprehensive approach to help schools improve behavior management and discipline practices. The Foundations process relies on data-driven decision making; is directed by a site-based team; encourages involvement by the entire school staff, students, and families; and is an ongoing process built around an improvement cycle. The following beliefs drive the Foundations program:

- School is important to a student's success in life;
- All people in a school should be treated with dignity and respect;
- Kids come first;
- All adults in a school bear the ultimate responsibility for making the school safe, civil, and productive;
- Students should receive unconditional acceptance and high expectations from school personnel;
- Students should receive frequent positive feedback on their behavioral and academic efforts;
- School settings should be structured for student success;
- School staff should establish firm and clear limits for students;
- Expectations for student behavior should be clear, consistent, equitable, and directly taught to students;
- Student misbehavior should be corrected calmly, consistently, and immediately by any staff member who observes it;
- Addressing student misbehavior is a collaborative responsibility involving the entire staff;
- Teachers should have flexibility when designing their classroom management plans, but the plans should conform to the school effectiveness literature.

The Foundations program has three levels of content applications – school, classroom, and individual. Schoolwide applications focus on fostering a more invitational school climate; developing guidelines for success; improving safety and civility in the school's common areas, such as hallways and courtyards; and defining schoolwide beliefs on discipline management. The classroom applications strive for consistency in teaching behavior expectations, providing consistent consequences for misbehavior, and supporting teachers in dealing with chronic misbehavior. Individual applications strive to ensure no student “falls through the cracks,” that there are schoolwide systems for students with chronic behavior issues, and that there is coordination with other agencies and resources.

For 2004-2005, 16 DISD secondary schools (13 high schools and 3 middle schools) participated in the Foundations program. The high schools are W.W. Samuell, H. Grady Spruce, Lincoln, Bryan Adams, Woodrow Wilson, North Dallas, W.T. White, Roosevelt, Moises Molina, Pinkston, Sunset, Hillcrest, and Thomas Jefferson. The middle schools are Boude Storey, E.B. Comstock, and John B. Hood. Foundations will be phased in at the district's other secondary schools over the next two school years.

Each campus formed a Foundations team to guide the school in its use of the program. The Foundations teams' members include campus administrators, teachers, and other staff, such as counselors, specialists, and security personnel. The teams collect and analyze data on school safety and civility, determine procedures for managing common areas, and develop a comprehensive discipline management plan. In addition, one or two central administrative representatives act as coaches for each team. The coaches act as outside observers who assist the team in implementing the Foundations program. The coaches are not intended to serve in an evaluative capacity. Administrative personnel chosen as Foundations team coaches include instructional specialists, licensed school psychologists, and directors.

CHAMPs is the classroom management program of Safe and Civil Schools. CHAMPs stands for Conversation, Help, Activity, Movement, and Participation, which are the key aspects of the program. The CHAMPs program provides teachers with tools to improve classroom management, teach responsibility to students, and structure classrooms to promote responsible

student behavior. According to CHAMPs, the goal of classroom management is to develop a classroom of responsible and motivated students who are engaged in meaningful tasks. For 2004-2005, the district established a goal to implement CHAMPs in 74 elementary and secondary schools, training 800 teachers.

CHAMPs uses a series of modules to help teachers identify and maintain the effective parts of their current classroom management plan, while concurrently identifying and strengthening weak parts of the plan. For each classroom activity and transition, the program helps teachers clarify expectations for each aspect of CHAMPs:

- Conversation – Can students converse with each other during this activity? If so, about what, with whom, and for how long?
- Help – How do students get questions answered? How do they get the teacher's attention?
- Activity – What is the expected end product of this activity?
- Movement – Can students get out of their seats during the activity?
- Participation – What behaviors show that students are participating?

Safe Transitions and Reduced Tardies – the START on Time program – provides administrators and staff with strategies to get students to class on time, reduce tardiness, and free teachers from the responsibility of addressing tardiness, which disrupts instructional time. The program designates staff members to conduct “hall sweeps” and deal with tardy students quickly. The district planned to implement the program in 51 secondary campuses in 2004-2005, with particular emphasis on the 16 secondary schools that comprised the first Foundations cohort.

Overall, the district designed a five-year implementation plan for Safe and Civil Schools, with 2004-2005 as year 1. Table 5 displays the outline of that plan.

Table 5

Safe and Civil Schools Five-Year Implementation Plan

<u>Year 1 (2004-2005)</u>	
START on Time training	51 secondary schools
CHAMPs	Train the Trainers workshop for 10 district staff Train 400 classroom teachers Train 30 district staff as trainers of trainers District trainers will deliver CHAMPs instruction to 400 teachers
Foundations	16 secondary schools comprise cohort 1
<u>Year 2 (2005-2006)</u>	
CHAMPs	Train 400 classroom teachers 30 district staff members become trainers District trainers instruction 1,900 teachers
Foundations	Cohort 1 completes year 2 training 15 secondary schools comprise cohort 2
<u>Year 3 (2006-2007)</u>	
CHAMPs	District trainers train 2,400 teachers
Foundations	Cohort 1 completes year 3 training (final year of training) Cohort 2 completes year 2 training 15 secondary schools comprise cohort 3, complete first-year training
<u>Year 4 (2007-2008)</u>	
CHAMPs	District trainers train 2,100 teachers
Foundations	Cohort 2 completes year 3 training (final year of training) Cohort 3 completes year 2 training
<u>Year 5 (2008-2009)</u>	
CHAMPs	District trainers train 2,300 teachers
Foundations	Cohort 3 completes year 3 training (final year of training)

Drug and Violence Education. The district planned to implement the state’s drug and violence prevention curriculum in grades K-8 in 2004-2005 as part of physical education instruction. The district plan called for specialists from the department of health education to train physical education teachers in elementary and middle schools on the drug and violence prevention curriculum. The physical education teachers would then teach weekly half-hour lessons on drug and violence prevention, using the state scope and sequence. In addition, the plan called for integrating drug and violence prevention into the core curriculum, to reinforce messages against weapons, gangs, and substance abuse. The plan’s goals also included incorporating drug and violence prevention strategies into the district’s benchmark assessments.

Drug and violence prevention is part of the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) for health education. The TEKS related to drug and violence prevention include understanding the harmful effects of tobacco, alcohol, and drug abuse on physical and mental health; alternatives to substance abuse; legal consequences of substance abuse; self-control and conflict resolution; and strategies for avoiding violence, gangs, and drugs. Table 6 summarizes the drug and violence prevention TEKS for grades K-8, by grade level.

Table 6

Drug and Violence Prevention TEKS for Elementary School, by Grade Level

Grade Level	TEKS
K	Name harmful effects of tobacco, alcohol, drugs Identify ways to avoid harming self, others
1	Explain effects and how to avoid tobacco, alcohol, and drugs Identify ways to avoid drugs, weapons, dangerous situations
2	Identify and describe effects on body of substance abuse Identify ways to avoid injury, benefits of self-control Explain value of avoiding weapons and dangerous substances
3	Describe substance abuse's effects on physical, mental and social health Identify reasons for avoiding gangs, violence, and drugs
4	Identify similarities of and differences in prescription and "street" drugs, effects and consequences of substance abuse Identify ways to avoid drugs and list alternatives to drug use Identify strategies for avoiding gang violence Identify types of abuse
5	Describe use and abuse of prescription/non-prescription drugs Compare effects of medications and "street" drugs, short- and long-term effects and consequences of substance abuse Identify and describe alternatives to drug use Identify strategies for avoiding violence, gangs, and drugs
6	Analyze use and abuse of prescriptions/non-prescriptions Understand social influences on drug use Describe addiction to tobacco, alcohol, and drugs Know role of substance abuse in unsafe behaviors Conflict resolution and alternatives to violence Strategies for avoiding drugs, violence, gangs, weapons
7-8	Analyze and demonstrate strategies for preventing and responding to deliberate injuries. Understand the dangers associated with weapons Strategies for prevention of abuse and avoiding drugs, violence, gangs and weapons Know the impact of addiction and ways to prevent substance abuse

Character Education. The district planned to implement the Character Counts! program in grades K-8 in 2004-2005. The Josephson Institute of Ethics developed the Character Counts! program, which emphasizes the following six pillars of good character: trustworthiness, respect, caring, citizenship, fairness, and responsibility. The district plan for character education called for the Counseling Services Department to develop implementation strategies and train counselors to present lessons to elementary and middle school students. The minimum scope and sequence activities for grades K-8 specified that counselors present at least one guidance lesson per year that targets one of the six pillars of character. Counselors also were to present other lessons related to Character Counts! every three weeks. The curriculum included schoolwide activities, such as a Character Word of the Week program, which highlighted a particular character trait; visual displays to illustrate the Six Pillars of Character; and contests that awarded students for exhibiting positive character traits. Table 7 summarizes the character education scope and sequence by grade level.

Table 7

Character Education Scope and Sequence For Grades K-8, By Grade Level

Grade	Name of Activity	Description
K	Having good character	Students learn to demonstrate good school behavior
1	“Beeing” trustworthy	Students learn to define traits of trustworthiness
2	Respect Begins With You	Counselors demonstrate the value of treating others with respect
3	Responsible Me	Students identify responsibilities at home, school, and in the community
4	Learning to Be Fair at School	Students act as Supreme Court judges and make decisions about fairness
5	Having a Caring Classroom	Counselors encourage students to act more compassionate toward peers and family members
6	Good Citizenship – it’s your right	Students learn to define citizenship through an activity titled, “Are You a Good Citizen?”
7	Moral choices	Counselors stress the value of living with integrity and doing what is right
8	Responsible habits	Students receive recognition for existing responsible behaviors and learn that repeated practice develops responsible habits

Enforcement Programs

The district's Department of Police and Security Services was responsible for most of the enforcement programs and strategies, with additional involvement by the Facilities Support and Athletics departments.

Surveillance Cameras. At present, a variety of camera systems exists in district campuses. The new strategy called for developing a comprehensive surveillance camera program that includes a uniform standard for surveillance equipment in all district facilities. As part of this plan, Police and Security Services planned to install new surveillance cameras in hallways and other common areas at 22 high schools between December 2004 and May 2005.

Drug Detection and Canine Drug Search. Preliminary drug trace testing at five Project Safe Neighborhood schools revealed trace residue of illegal drugs, including heroin, cocaine, marijuana, and ecstasy. Under the Drug Detection and Canine Drug Search program, the Department of Police and Security Services planned drug trace detections for 46 secondary schools between November 2004 and April 2005. The department action plan called for a comparative analysis, with the first round of trace detections scheduled for October-December 2004, and the second round for January-April 2005. In addition, the department planned to conduct at least one canine drug search annually at each of the 46 secondary schools beginning in September 2004. The canine searches would supplement the drug trace detections and assist in developing appropriate drug prevention and intervention services.

Graffiti Removal. This program called for removal of all graffiti on school facilities as soon as possible. The targeted time frame for removal is within 24 hours of graffiti being reported. The district's Facilities Support department is responsible for graffiti removal.

Campus Monitor Training. This program called for campus monitors (employees assigned to monitor hallways and lunchrooms, as well as supervise students before and after school) to receive 21 hours of training to better manage and communicate with large groups of students. Training will include information on restraining students and code of conduct policies. The Department of Police and Security Services was responsible for program implementation.

Athletic Event Coverage. The Police and Security Services, and Athletics departments identified athletic events that pose concerns about potential misconduct by students or other participants. Identified events would receive additional police and security staff coverage. Security staff would use towers to monitor parking lots, and entrance and exit areas. Metal detectors would augment security measures when appropriate.

Select Interventions

Gang Intervention. Between August 2004 and August 2005, the Department of Police and Security Services planned a series of gang intervention efforts. The department trained a police officer as a specialist to conduct gang assessments and develop a database to identify gangs that are present in schools. Second, the department planned to prepare support materials on gang awareness and intervention, and to have them ready for DISD staff and parents by March 2005. Third, the department planned to implement a rapid response system for suppressing gang violence. Finally, the gang intervention specialist would identify effective programs and strategies for use in 10 Project Safe Neighborhood secondary schools, beginning in November 2004. The department plans to extend these strategies to the remaining secondary schools in 2005-2006 and phase them into elementary schools, beginning in 2006-2007.

In-School Suspension. The district's Discipline Management Department intends to develop a procedures manual for in-school suspension centers in secondary schools by January 2005. In November 2004, the department trained in-school suspension teachers in management procedures and gave them curriculum products, including a notebook of activities to use in core subject areas. The training will help ensure consistency of in-school suspension programs across the district.

Psychological and Social Services – Breaking the Code of Silence. “Breaking the Code of Silence” is an effort aimed at helping students recognize that they have responsibilities and options when they learn about a potentially violent situation. Activities encourage students to think about, discuss, and become part of the solution to school violence. The department of Student Services will offer Breaking the Code of Silence training to counselors working with students at all grade levels.

Group and Individual Counseling. The Student Services department and Youth and Family Centers will offer group and individual counseling on all campuses for students whose behavior has raised concern and who have been referred for a behavioral assessment.

Student Support Team Universal Screening. Student Services developed a screening instrument to identify physical, social, and emotional factors that may be detrimental to a student's academic success. The instrument provides a checklist of 10 behaviors that may have negative impacts on a student's performance, including tardiness, difficulty paying attention, physical concerns, and behaviors inappropriate for a student's age and grade level. Elementary teachers will use the instrument for the October Benchmark Assessment. Data will be compiled and returned to the teacher, principal, and the campus' Student Support Team (SST) for analysis.

Voluntary Drug Screening. Licensed Chemical Dependency Counselor interns, and staff from the Safe and Drug Free Schools program will conduct parent-approved oral drug screenings for about 200 students at each of the schools participating in the Safe and Civil Schools Foundations program. Screenings for drug use will include chemical assessment, oral specimen collection and analysis, and assistance as requested by parents for students who test positive.

Family Youth Interaction (FYI). Beginning in November 2004, students in secondary Disciplinary Alternative Education Programs (DAEPs) and their parents would participate in Family Youth Interaction. This is a seven-week course required for students who are repeat offenders and their parents. The course is designed to help students increase their level of responsibility at home, school, and with peers. It helps students improve their attitudes, decision-making skills, self-confidence, and sense of responsibility. It also helps parents renew communication skills, learn positive discipline, and develop behavior contracts with their children.

Targeted Interventions

Parent Information Forums. The Attendance Improvement and Truancy Reduction program conducts Parent Information Forums to focus on issues, solutions, and strategies for dealing with truancy cases. The forums' goals are to reduce the number of families in truancy court, give parents strategies for monitoring and improving their children's school attendance, and provide any needed social service referrals. Forums for parents of secondary students are held weekly. Forums for parents of elementary students were slated to begin in November 2004.

Parent Preparation Workshops. Beginning in August 2004, the Attendance Improvement and Truancy Reduction program began weekly preparation workshops for parents of seventh grade students at selected middle schools. These workshops address such issues as physiological development, managing a difficult teen, rewards and consequences, attendance monitoring, academic assistance, what to expect from a child's teacher, and where to get help if things are out of control. During the second semester, additional workshops will be held as needed at the selected schools.

School and Community Collaboration. Beginning in January 2005, the district planned to establish a pilot school and community extracurricular activity participation program for students in grades 7-9. Targeted students can participate in programs such as Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps (JROTC), Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Young Life, and Girls' Inc. These programs have not been offered in the past on their home campuses. Parent and student seminars will take place on a regular basis to monitor and improve student attendance.

Apprentice Program. A pilot apprentice program was to begin in January 2005 for a limited number of students who are in danger of not graduating or of dropping out of school. The students will work at after-school jobs with local businesses, or will participate in police and fire explorer programs. Participation in the program will be contingent on the student's daily school attendance.

Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program. Between September 2004 and June 2005, the Office of Student Discipline was to conduct exit interviews for expelled students in the Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program (JJAEP) who are returning to their home schools.

A representative of the student's home campus, who must have visited the student several times during the expulsion assignment, was required to attend these interviews. Also, the Placement Review Committee at the home school should have a transition plan for the student that includes appropriate educational placement and specific support services for the student.

Mental Health Services for Students in Disciplinary Alternative Education Programs. A mental health team consisting of a school nurse, school counselor, diagnostician, psychologist, and Licensed Chemical Dependency Counselor will provide services to all students assigned to a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (DAEP). The team will develop an individual service plan for every student and refer students requiring more comprehensive treatment to the district's Youth and Family Centers. Team development and training was scheduled for the fall semester of 2004, and service implementation was scheduled for the spring semester of 2005.

Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (DAEP). The DAEP program strives to improve the behavior of students assigned to disciplinary alternative schools by using behavior modification plans. The Student Support Team (SST) at each campus provides support to these students, with the DAEP's mental health team providing additional support to the students assigned to the facility. The teams emphasize students moving from the DAEPs to their home schools. Representatives from the students' home schools are required to visit students during their placement and to attend the exit conferences. By December 2004, the district's Alternative Programs department was to revise the procedures manual to give additional support to the DAEP campuses and the home schools.

2.4 *What are the characteristics of the campuses participating in the Safe and Civil Schools program?*

Methodology

District databases provided data on student characteristics, including ethnicity, and socioeconomic and limited English proficiency (LEP) status.

Results

Hispanics comprised the majority of students in the 16 Foundations schools. As shown in Table 8, more than 60% of the students were Hispanic. Another 27.8% of the students were African-American. Lincoln and Roosevelt high schools were exceptions, where more than 80% of the students were African-American. Whites, Asians, and American Indians comprised the remaining 8% of the schools' enrollment. It is important to note that the numbers shown in Table 8 represent only a snapshot of the schools' enrollment, taken at a single point in time.

Table 8

Foundations Schools' Students by Ethnicity

School Name		Ethnicity					Total
		Black	Asian	Hispanic	Am. Indian	White	
B. Adams	N	783	80	1,300	23	385	2,571
	%	30.5	3.1	50.6	0.9	15.0	100.0
Molina	N	206	29	2,327	11	36	2,609
	%	7.9	1.1	89.2	0.4	1.4	100.0
Hillcrest	N	504	24	896	3	279	1,706
	%	29.5	1.4	52.5	0.2	16.4	100.0
Jefferson	N	100	10	1531	3	20	1,664
	%	6.0	0.6	92.0	0.2	1.2	100.0
Lincoln	N	1079	0	51	2	0	1,132
	%	95.3	0.0	4.5	0.2	.0	100.0
Pinkston	N	393	4	636	1	10	1,044
	%	37.6	0.4	60.9	0.1	1.0	100.0
Roosevelt	N	622	0	119	0	2	743
	%	83.7	0.0	16.0	0.0	.3	100.0
Samuell	N	814	4	1137	4	43	2,002
	%	40.7	0.2	56.8	0.2	2.1	100.0
Spruce	N	679	3	812	2	66	1,562
	%	43.5	0.2	52.0	0.1	4.2	100.0
Sunset	N	46	4	1960	15	43	2,068
	%	2.2	0.2	94.8	0.7	2.1	100.0
White	N	394	61	1291	8	392	2,146
	%	18.4	2.8	60.2	0.4	18.3	100.0
Wilson	N	156	15	924	15	289	1,399
	%	11.2	1.1	66.0	1.1	20.7	100.0
N.Dallas	N	269	59	1437	5	29	1,799
	%	15.0	3.3	79.9	0.3	1.6	100.0
Comstock	N	409	1	469	3	31	913
	%	44.8	0.1	51.4	0.3	3.4	100.0
Hood	N	348	6	909	0	23	1,286
	%	27.1	0.5	70.7	0.0	1.8	100.0
Storey	N	224	1	400	0	4	629
	%	35.6	0.2	63.6	0.0	.6	100.0
Totals	N	7,026	301	16,199	95	1,652	25,273
	%	27.8	1.2	64.1	0.4	6.5	100.0

The majority of Foundations schools' students were eligible for free or reduced-price school lunches. Table 9 displays enrollment in the schools by socioeconomic status. Overall, nearly 61% of the students were of low socioeconomic status.

Table 9
Foundations Schools Students by Socioeconomic Status

School Name		Socioeconomic Status		Total
		Not Free or Reduced	Free or Reduced	
B. Adams	N	1,143	1,428	2,571
	%	44.5	55.5	100.0
Molina	N	1,065	1,544	2,609
	%	40.8	59.2	100.0
Hillcrest	N	958	748	1,706
	%	56.2	43.8	100.0
Jefferson	N	499	1,165	1,664
	%	30.0	70.0	100.0
Lincoln	N	348	784	1,132
	%	30.7	69.3	100.0
Pinkston	N	367	677	1,044
	%	35.2	64.8	100.0
Roosevelt	N	271	472	743
	%	36.5	63.5	100.0
Samuell	N	677	1,325	2,002
	%	33.8	66.2	100.0
Spruce	N	584	978	1,562
	%	37.4	62.6	100.0
Sunset	N	870	1,198	2,068
	%	42.1	57.9	100.0
White	N	1,028	1,118	2,146
	%	47.9	52.1	100.0
Wilson	N	802	597	1,399
	%	57.3	42.7	100.0
N. Dallas	N	690	1,109	1,799
	%	38.4	61.6	100.0
Comstock	N	150	763	913
	%	16.4	83.6	100.0
Hood	N	303	983	1,286
	%	23.6	76.4	100.0
Storey	N	174	455	629
	%	27.7	72.3	100.0
Total	N	9,929	15,344	25,273
	%	39.3	60.7	100.0

Table 10 displays the Foundations schools' students by limited English proficiency (LEP) status. As shown in the table, the majority of the students were LEP or previously LEP (exited).

Table 10

Foundations Students by LEP Status

School Name		LEP	Prior LEP (Exited)	Not LEP	Total
B. Adams	N	521	642	1,408	2,571
	%	20.3	25.0	54.7	100.0
Molina	N	570	1,193	846	2,609
	%	21.8	45.7	32.4	100.0
Hillcrest	N	571	363	772	1,706
	%	33.5	21.3	45.2	100.0
Jefferson	N	620	754	290	1,664
	%	37.3	45.3	17.4	100.0
Lincoln	N	13	28	1,091	1,132
	%	1.1	2.5	96.4	100.0
Pinkston	N	198	283	563	1,044
	%	19.0	27.1	53.9	100.0
Roosevelt	N	40	66	637	743
	%	5.4	8.9	85.7	100.0
Samuell	N	475	487	1,040	2,002
	%	23.7	24.3	51.9	100.0
Spruce	N	313	364	885	1,562
	%	20.0	23.3	56.6	100.0
Sunset	N	513	966	589	2,068
	%	24.8	46.7	28.4	100.0
White	N	354	729	1,063	2,146
	%	16.5	34.0	49.5	100.0
Wilson	N	280	448	671	1,399
	%	20.0	32.0	48.0	100.0
N. Dallas	N	579	701	519	1,799
	%	32.2	39.0	28.9	100.0
Comstock	N	159	234	520	913
	%	17.4	25.6	56.9	100.0
Hood	N	350	477	459	1,286
	%	27.2	37.1	35.7	100.0
Storey	N	100	249	280	629
	%	15.9	39.6	44.5	100.0
Total	N	5,656	7,984	11,633	25,273
	%	22.4	31.6	46.0	100.0

The 16 campuses participating in the Foundations program in 2004-2005 accounted for 5,657 disciplinary referrals in 2003-2004. Table 11 displays data from the district's Disciplinary Management Department on 2003-2004 referrals for the Foundations schools and other secondary campuses. Overall, the Foundations schools had higher rates of referrals for mandatory offenses, which require placement in an off-campus disciplinary alternative education program (DAEP). Mandatory offenses include gambling, class A assault on a student, class C assault on school personnel, non-felony drug and alcohol violations, and indecent exposure. The Foundations schools had lower rates of major offenses, which include academic cheating, fighting, disruption, hazing, and falsifying school records. Students who commit major offenses receive in-school or out-of-school suspension as punishment.

Table 11
Disciplinary Referrals for Foundations Schools, 2003-2004

Campus	Discretionary		Expellable		Major		Mandatory		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
B. Adams	54	43.9	6	4.9	0	0.0	63	51.2	123	100.0
Molina	201	16.3	5	0.4	961	77.8	68	5.5	1,235	100.0
Hillcrest	21	42.0	1	2.0	0	0.0	28	56.0	50	100.0
Jefferson	67	56.8	5	4.2	15	12.7	31	26.3	118	100.0
Lincoln	79	60.8	8	6.2	25	19.2	18	13.8	130	100.0
Pinkston	78	45.6	3	1.8	24	14.0	66	38.6	171	100.0
Roosevelt	27	19.1	0	0.0	105	74.5	9	6.4	141	100.0
Samuell	100	14.5	5	0.7	513	74.5	71	10.3	689	100.0
Spruce	79	10.7	10	1.4	593	80.6	54	7.3	736	100.0
Sunset	57	9.5	15	2.5	443	74.1	83	13.9	598	100.0
White	82	26.9	3	1.0	166	54.4	54	17.7	305	100.0
Wilson	33	41.8	4	5.1	10	12.7	32	40.5	79	100.0
N. Dallas	37	43.0	4	4.7	20	23.3	25	29.1	86	100.0
Comstock	54	8.1	1	0.2	576	86.7	33	5.0	664	100.0
Hood	165	48.4	2	0.6	165	48.4	9	2.6	341	100.0
Storey	56	29.3	1	0.5	125	65.4	9	4.7	191	100.0
Foundations										
Total	1,190	21.0	73	1.3	3,741	66.2	653	11.5	5,657	100.0
Other										
secondaries	4,132	21.5	149	0.8	13,961	72.7	955	5.0	19,199	100.0

2.5 *What was the budget for the Districtwide Safety Initiative?*

Methodology

A specialist in the district's Budget Development Department provided data on the budget for the Districtwide Safety Initiative. Data provided included details on funding by organization, function, and object.

Results

The Dallas Safety Initiative is a comprehensive effort aimed at improving safety and security across the district. The initiative consists of 24 separate programs and strategies, involving multiple district departments. All funds for the safety initiative came from the district's general operating fund. Nearly half of the funding went to the Department of Police and Security Services, as shown in Table 12, which displays the budget by organization. Five organizations – Alternative Programs, Program Development and Staff Training, Counseling Services, Police and Security, and Special Projects Evaluation – received safety initiative funds.

Table 12

2004-2005 Safety Initiative Budget by Organization and Function

Organization	Budget	% of Total Budget
Alternative Programs	\$115,171	20.6
Program Development and Staff Training	\$110,762	19.8
Counseling Services	\$18,000	3.2
Program Evaluation	\$42,293	7.6
Police and Security	<u>\$271,694</u>	<u>48.7</u>
Total Budget	\$557,920	100.0

Table 13 displays each organization's share of the budget by object, or planned expenditure. Police and Security Services allocated 75% of the funding to professional services, which included \$65,620 for gang intervention; \$80,000 for drug detection and enforcement; and \$47,920 for Project Safe Neighborhood. The remaining 25% of the department's funding consisted of salary and benefits for a Specialist IV position.

Professional services comprised the bulk of planned expenditures by Alternative Programs. The remaining 28% of funding consisted of salary and benefits for an administrative

assistant's position. Program Development and Staff Training allocated more than 90% of its funding to professional services. Evaluation funding went to evaluation services and compensation for the project evaluator. Counseling Services used most of its funding to purchase instructional materials.

Table 13

2004-2005 Safety Initiative Budget, by Object

Object	Budget	% of Budget
Police and Security Services		
Professional services	\$204,036	75.1
Compensation	\$67,658	24.9
Department total	\$271,694	100.0
Alternative Programs		
Professional services	\$82,957	72.0
Compensation	\$32,214	28.0
Department total	\$115,171	100.0
Program Development/Staff Training		
Professional services	\$103,263	93.2
Printing	\$7,499	6.8
Department total	\$110,762	100.0
Program Evaluation		
Compensation	\$42,293	100.0
Department total	\$42,293	100.0
Counseling Services		
Instructional materials	\$16,000	88.9
Consulting services	\$2,000	11.1
Department total	\$18,000	100.0

2.6 *How was the Districtwide Safety Initiative implemented?*

Methodology

The evaluation of the Dallas Safety Initiative for 2004-2005 focused primarily on the initiative's universal components: Safe and Civil Schools, Character Education, and Drug and Violence Prevention Education. The evaluation also examined the disciplinary alternative education programs (DAEPs), one of the initiative's target intervention efforts.

Because 2004-2005 was the first year of the initiative, this evaluation is mostly formative in nature. Formative evaluation (also called process evaluation) gathers information on program concepts and design, and assesses program implementation. Such evaluations furnish program administrators with findings that help guide program improvement. This evaluation report utilized various data collection and analysis methods to assess program implementation.

Safe and Civil Schools

A variety of sources provided implementation data on the Safe and Civil Schools program. District databases provided information on the schools, teachers, and students participating in the program. Staff, student, and parent surveys designed by Safe and Civil Schools provided perspectives on school safety issues, student and staff relationships, school rules and procedures, and perceived problems. Data from these surveys assisted the 16 Foundations schools' teams in identifying priorities for improvement. Interviews and open-ended questionnaires designed by the evaluator, with input from Safe and Civil Schools, as well as the District Safety Initiative steering committee, yielded further data on the activities of the Foundations teams and their administrative coaches. The interviews and questionnaires gathered data on team priorities for improvement, implementation plans, team functioning, and coaches' roles. A survey jointly developed by the project evaluator and a specialist from the Department of Alternative Programs assessed participant perceptions of the Foundations program and the training they received.

In addition to Foundations, Safe and Civil Schools has two other component programs: Safe Transitions and Reduced Tardies (START on Time), which aims to reduce student tardiness, and CHAMPs, a classroom management program. A checklist developed by Safe and

Civil Schools evaluated the implementation of START on Time in the 16 Foundations campuses. School reports and data from the open-ended questionnaires provided additional details about START on Time.

The Department of Professional Development and Staff Training provided a roster of teachers and other district employees who participated in CHAMPs. The department assisted the project evaluator in developing and administering a survey of CHAMPs participants. The evaluator and specialists from Professional Development and Staff Training distributed surveys in early April 2005, recommending that the teachers who participated in CHAMPs complete them on April 15, which was a designated staff development day. Schools returned completed CHAMPs surveys to their area offices for pickup by the evaluator or Professional Development staff members. Out of 523 distributed surveys, the evaluator received 342 completed ones, for a response rate of 65.4%.

Finally, documents from Safe and Civil Schools and the district's Alternative Programs Department provided additional implementation data.

Character Education

Surveys, interviews, program documents, and observations provided data on the character education program. The Counseling Services department administers an online survey that collects data on counselors' activities, such as individual and group counseling sessions, and risk assessments conducted. The survey included questions about character education activities. Counselors completed the online survey once each semester. The fall 2004 survey provided the data used in this report. Counseling Services did not have results from the spring 2005 administration available in time for this report.

Documents, observations, and interviews with Counseling Services directors provided additional implementation data. Each elementary and middle school campus in the district filed a character education implementation plan with the Department of Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities. The department furnished copies of those implementation plans to the project evaluator. Content analysis of these documents identified key elements of the character education implementation plans. Content analysis is a method for analyzing text material that

reduces it to more manageable data. Finally, the evaluator observed character education sessions to see how counselors delivered instruction.

Drug and Violence Prevention Education

The Texas Education Agency's website provided details on the scope and sequence of the state's drug and violence education curriculum. Interviews with program managers and surveys of physical education teachers provided program implementation data. The project evaluator developed a survey of physical education teachers, with input from program managers, and sent it to all elementary and middle school P.E. teachers through campus mail. Out of 233 mailed surveys, the evaluator received 97 completed ones, for a response rate of 41.6%.

Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (DAEP)

District student and personnel databases provided data on student enrollment in the five DAEP campuses for 2004-2005, and student and staff characteristics. The Office of Student Discipline supplied data on disciplinary referrals for 2004-2005. These data include the category of offense committed, the specific offense, the disciplinary action taken, and the campus on which the infraction occurred.

Results

Safe and Civil Schools

Safe and Civil Schools is a key component of the Dallas Safety Initiative and refers to a series of programs developed by Oregon-based Teaching Strategies Inc., designed to help schools improve the safety and civility of the school climate. The programs in the series consist of Foundations, CHAMPs, and START on Time.

Foundations, a research-based program, outlines a comprehensive approach to help schools improve behavior management and discipline practices. The program is an ongoing process built around a cycle of continuous improvement. A site-based team of campus professionals directs the Foundations program, which relies on data-driven decision-making and encourages involvement by the entire school staff, students, and families. Table 14 displays the 16 DISD secondary schools that participated in Safe and Civil Schools in 2004-2005. The district plans to implement Safe and Civil Schools over a five-year period from 2004-2009 with three

cohorts of secondary schools. The 16 schools that participated in 2004-2005 represent the first cohort.

Table 14

DISD Campuses Participating in Safe and Civil Schools, 2004-2005

High Schools	Middle Schools
Bryan Adams	E.B. Comstock
Hillcrest	John B. Hood
Thomas Jefferson	Boude Storey
Lincoln	
Moises Molina	
North Dallas	
L.G. Pinkston	
Franklin D. Roosevelt	
W.W. Samuell	
H. Grady Spruce	
Sunset	
W.T. White	
Woodrow Wilson	

CHAMPs is the classroom management component of Safe and Civil Schools. CHAMPs stands for Conversation, Help, Activity, Movement, and Participation, which are the key aspects of the program. CHAMPs provides teachers with tools to improve classroom management, teach responsibility to students, and structure classrooms to promote responsible student behavior. According to CHAMPs, the goal of classroom management is to develop a classroom of responsible and motivated students who engage in meaningful tasks. For 2004-2005, the district established a goal to implement CHAMPs in 74 elementary and secondary schools, including the 16 secondary schools that participated in Foundations and train 800 teachers.

CHAMPs uses a series of modules to help teachers identify and maintain the effective parts of their current classroom management plan, while concurrently identifying and strengthening weak elements of the plan. For each classroom activity and transition, CHAMPs helps teachers clarify expectations for each aspect of the program.

A third program in Safe and Civil Schools – START on Time – focuses on reducing student tardiness. START stands for Safe Transitions and Reduced Tardies. This component of Safe and Civil Schools provides administrators and staff with strategies to get students to class

on time and free teachers from addressing student tardiness, which disrupts instructional time. The program designates staff members to conduct “hall sweeps” and deal with tardy students quickly and consistently. The district planned to implement the program in all secondary schools, including the 16 secondary campuses that participated in Foundations in 2004-2005.

The 16 Foundations campuses met for two-day training sessions four times throughout the year. The first session took place in September; the second, in November; the third, February; and the final session took place in June. At each session, consultants from Safe and Civil Schools led the training, which included time periods for individual school teams to work among themselves. The first session provided an overview of the Foundations program. Topics covered included Foundations teams and the program process. Each school formed a Foundations team, whose membership included administrators, teachers, and other staff, such as counselors and security personnel. The program then required the teams to establish and maintain a regular meeting schedule, determine ground rules for those meetings, and assign specific roles to each team member.

In addition, one or two central administrative representatives acted as coaches for each team. The coaches functioned as outside observers who assist the teams in implementing the Foundations program. Administrative personnel chosen as Foundations team coaches include instructional specialists, licensed school psychologists, and directors. Safe and Civil Schools consultants emphasized that the coaches are not intended to serve in an evaluative capacity or to act as “spies” on team activities.

Because Foundations promotes a culture of data-driven decision-making, the program’s process involves collecting and analyzing multiple sources of data, including disciplinary referrals; surveys; and observations of common areas of the schools, such as courtyards and corridors. Each team reviewed data for its campus and used the data to identify goals for improved safety and civility. Based on these goals, the teams develop, adopt, and implement improvement plans. Each team monitors improvement efforts and revises plans, if necessary.

In the second year of the Foundations process, which extends over three years, schools should develop and post their “Guidelines for Success.” The guidelines communicate what a

school considers the most important skills, attitudes, or traits that foster student success in school and the world of work.

At the first training in September, Safe and Civil Schools consultants asked each team to collect and analyze data, and bring results to the November training, which focused on using data to prioritize improvement issues and develop a Foundations implementation plan. The third training, held in February, provided the schools an opportunity to review their efforts and discuss the implementation of START on Time. The final training, held in June, provided a review of the Foundations improvement cycle and allowed the schools to explore project goals for the next school year.

The schools conducted their own observations of common areas and reviewed their disciplinary referral data. Safe and Civil Schools developed student, parent, and staff surveys. The Department of Special Projects Evaluation printed and delivered student, parent, and staff surveys to the campuses, and later collected the completed forms for processing. The teams received spreadsheets of survey data for their schools, as well as tables of results. All Foundations schools administered the student and staff surveys, while the parent survey was optional. Most of the schools opted not to use it. The majority of the Foundations schools attempted to survey their entire student populations, while some campuses surveyed samples.

The student surveys contained questions on safety issues, student interactions, student interactions with staff, school rules and expectations, and student perceptions and attitudes regarding school. For each item on the survey, students marked whether they agreed or disagreed with the statement. The tables in this section aggregated student responses across all 16 Foundations campuses.

Students felt the least safe in school restrooms, parking lots, and taking the bus or walking to and from school, as shown in Table 15, which displays student responses to questions about safety issues. Students felt safest in their classrooms and the school cafeterias. A majority of students (56.4%) disagreed that other students would alert a staff member if they knew that another student was involved in something illegal or dangerous.

Table 15

Student Responses to Questions on Safety Issues

Question	Agree		Disagree	
	N	%	N	%
I feel safe in my classrooms.	9,089	85.6	1,529	14.4
I feel safe in the cafeteria/lunchroom.	8,312	76.1	2,610	23.9
I feel safe in the commons areas.	7,795	71.8	3,059	28.2
I feel safe in the hallways.	7,154	65.6	3,749	34.4
I feel safe in the locker rooms/gym.	6,994	64.6	3,835	35.4
I feel safe taking the bus or walking to/from school.	6,528	60.5	4,256	39.5
I feel safe in the parking lot.	6,611	61.2	4,197	38.8
I feel safe in the restrooms.	6,523	59.9	4,364	40.1
If students knew a student was involved in something illegal or dangerous, they would tell a staff member.	4,507	43.6	5,822	56.4

As shown in Table 16, most students agreed that it was easy to make friends, but disagreed that most students interacted respectfully among themselves. Students indicated that interactions were the most respectful in the classrooms and locker rooms or gyms. They cited the cafeterias and hallways as places in which students do not treat each other respectfully.

Table 16

Student Responses to Questions on Student Interaction

Question	Agree		Disagree	
	N	%	N	%
It is easy for students to make friends.	7,420	68.3	3,446	31.7
Students treat each other respectfully in their classrooms.	6,030	55.8	4,770	44.2
Students treat each other respectfully in the locker rooms/gym.	5,543	51.5	5,220	48.5
Students treat each other respectfully in the cafeteria.	3,862	35.6	7,001	64.4
Students treat each other respectfully in the parking lot.	5,284	49.3	5,441	50.7
Students treat each other respectfully in the commons areas.	5,291	49.0	5,513	51.0
Students treat each other respectfully in the bus loading areas.	5,017	46.9	5,688	53.1
Students treat each other respectfully on the buses.	4,696	44.1	5,949	55.9
Students treat each other respectfully in the hallways.	3,680	33.9	7,175	66.1

While Table 16 suggests that students do not treat each other respectfully, Table 17 indicates that they do not treat staff members with respect, either. More than half (53.4%) believed that students do not treat staff members with respect. However, most student respondents agreed that staff members were friendly, supportive, encouraging, and respectful toward them.

Table 17

Student Responses to Questions on Student-Staff Interactions

Question	Agree		Disagree	
	N	%	N	%
Staff members encourage students to do their best.	7,781	72.9	2,891	27.1
Staff members are supportive of students.	6,755	63.3	3,918	36.7
Staff members let students know when they do things right.	6,659	62.3	4,030	37.7
Staff members treat students respectfully.	6,464	60.6	4,206	39.4
If students have a problem they can't solve on their own, they know they can go to a staff member for help.	6,391	59.9	4,287	40.1
Staff members are friendly and helpful to students.	6,216	58.0	4,499	42.0
Students treat staff members with respect.	5,005	46.6	5,724	53.4
Staff members treat students fairly.	4,934	46.2	5,735	53.8

On most questions related to school rules and expectations, more than two-thirds of the students agreed that they were taught rules and standards for appropriate conduct. Table 18 suggests that schools appeared to do the best at clarifying classroom expectations, with more than 70% of students agreeing that teachers gave students a syllabus for most classes and did a good job of explaining grading policies.

Table 18

Student Responses to Questions on School Rules and Expectations

Question	Agree		Disagree	
	N	%	N	%
Students have been taught rules for behavior in classrooms.	8,758	82.3	1,887	17.7
For most classes, teachers give students a syllabus.	7,976	76.0	2,520	24.0
For most classes, teachers do a good job of explaining grading policies/procedures.	7,489	71.2	3,025	28.8
Students have been taught rules for behavior in the cafeteria/lunchroom.	7,425	69.6	3,243	30.4
For most classes, teachers do a good job of making sure students know they can get help if they fall behind.	7,189	68.5	3,308	31.5
Students have been taught rules for behavior in hallways.	7,281	68.3	3,381	31.7
Students have been taught rules for behavior in locker rooms/gym.	7,114	67.3	3,464	32.7
Students have been taught rules for behavior in bus loading areas.	6,798	64.9	3,679	35.1
Students have been taught rules for behavior in commons areas.	6,807	64.2	3,804	35.8
Students have been taught rules for behavior when riding buses.	6,393	61.0	4,087	39.0
Students have been taught rules of conduct in the restrooms.	6,306	59.5	4,285	40.5

Table 19 displays student responses to questions related to perceptions and attitudes about school. Most students were glad to come to school and considered their schoolwork important, but indicated that violence, substance abuse, theft, and student cliques were problems.

Table 19

Student Responses to Questions on Student Attitudes and Perceptions

Question	Agree		Disagree	
	N	%	N	%
I believe the work I do at the school is important.	8,674	81.7	1,937	18.3
Theft/damage of personal property by students is a problem.	8,154	77.5	2,366	22.5
Theft/damage of school property by students is a problem.	7,693	73.2	2,818	26.8
Students picking on other students is a problem.	7,613	72.5	2,894	27.5
Students bullying other students is a problem.	7,536	71.5	3,001	28.5
Students physically hurting other students is a problem.	7,420	70.5	3,108	29.5
Students having weapons is a problem.	7,370	70.3	3,115	29.7
Drug/alcohol/tobacco use by students is a problem.	7,322	69.7	3,177	30.3
I am proud to be part of the school.	7,084	67.3	3,439	32.7
I am glad to come to school most of the time.	6,808	64.3	3,785	35.7
Student cliques are a problem.	6,416	61.2	4,063	38.8
Inappropriate student language is a problem.	5,955	56.9	4,515	43.1

Staff members at the 16 Foundations schools also completed surveys. The staff surveys asked about student safety issues, student interactions among themselves, student-staff interactions, rules and expectations, student attitudes about school, parent and family perceptions of school, staff interactions and perceptions, and school problems. The tables in this section display results aggregated across all Foundations campuses.

Consistent with student responses to questions about student safety, staff members cited restrooms, and walking to and from school as places and situations in which students were most likely to feel unsafe, as shown in Table 20. Staff members surveyed also believed students feel safest in their classrooms. More than two-thirds of staff members believed students would not tell a staff member if they knew a student was involved in dangerous or illegal activity. However, most staff members agreed that parents and families believe the staff has done a good job of making schools safe for students.

Table 20
Staff Responses to Survey Questions on Student Safety Issues

Question	Agree		Disagree	
	N	%	N	%
Students feel safe in their classrooms.	688	87.4	99	12.6
Students feel safe in the cafeteria.	549	69.5	241	30.5
Students feel safe in the locker rooms/gym.	508	67.3	247	32.7
Parents and families feel the school has done a good job of making the school safe for students.	486	65.8	253	34.2
Students feel safe in the courtyard/commons areas.	510	65.4	270	34.6
Students feel safe in the parking lot.	491	63.8	278	36.2
Students feel safe in the hallways.	473	61.0	303	39.0
Students feel safe in the restrooms.	459	58.9	320	41.1
Students feel safe taking the bus, or walking to and from school.	382	50.5	375	49.5
If students knew a student was doing something dangerous or illegal, they would tell a staff member.	251	32.5	521	67.5

Regarding student interactions, staff members agreed that it is easy for students to make friends, but did not believe that students treat each other respectfully (Table 21). As shown in Table 22, they also disagreed that students treat them with respect. Most staff members believed that they were friendly and respectful to students.

Table 21

Staff Responses to Survey Questions on Student Interactions

Question	Agree		Disagree	
	N	%	N	%
It is easy for students to make friends.	605	78.7	164	21.3
Students treat each other respectfully in classrooms.	435	56.5	335	43.5
Students treat each other respectfully in the parking lot.	362	50.6	353	49.4
Students treat each other respectfully in the bus loading areas.	340	47.2	381	52.8
Students treat each other respectfully in the locker rooms/gym.	313	47.2	350	52.8
Students treat each other respectfully in the commons areas.	352	46.8	400	53.2
Students treat each other respectfully in the cafeteria	307	40.8	446	59.2
Students treat each other respectfully in the hallways.	272	34.5	517	65.5

Table 22

Staff Responses to Survey Questions on Staff-Student Interactions

Question	Agree		Disagree	
	N	%	N	%
Staff members encourage students to do their best.	738	92.8	57	7.2
Staff members are supportive of students.	713	89.8	81	10.2
Staff members let students know when they do things right.	687	89.2	83	10.8
Staff members are friendly and helpful to students.	700	88.4	92	11.6
Staff members treat students respectfully.	683	86.8	104	13.2
Staff members treat students fairly.	661	83.8	128	16.2
If students have a problem, they know they can go to a staff member for help.	647	83.2	131	16.8
Students treat staff members with respect.	313	39.5	477	60.5

As shown in Table 23, most staff members believed students were taught standards for behavior in various areas of schools. The restrooms ranked as the place where the largest percentage of staff members (38.7%) disagreed that students were taught rules for conduct. Classrooms and grading ranked the highest, with more than 90% of staff members agreeing that students are taught behavior standards and grading policies.

Table 23

Staff Responses to Survey Questions on School Rules and Standards

Question	Agree		Disagree	
	N	%	N	%
Teachers make sure students understand grading policies.	728	93.3	52	6.7
Students are taught rules for behavior in classrooms.	730	92.2	62	7.8
Teachers make sure students know how to get help if they fall behind.	699	92.0	61	8.0
Parents and families are told of standards for student behavior.	659	85.5	112	14.5
For most classes, teachers give students a syllabus.	611	80.5	148	19.5
Students are taught standards for behavior in the locker rooms/gym.	538	75.5	175	24.5
Students are taught rules for behavior in bus loading areas.	522	73.9	184	26.1
Students are taught rules for conduct when riding the bus or walking to and from school.	498	70.5	208	29.5
Students are taught rules for behavior in the commons areas.	541	70.4	227	29.6
Students are taught standards for behavior in the hallways.	543	69.8	235	30.2
Students are taught standards for behavior in the cafeteria.	533	68.6	244	31.4
Students are taught rules for behavior in restrooms.	467	61.3	295	38.7

Table 24 displays staff responses to questions on student attitudes about school, and school-family relationships. Although most staff members felt that students were glad to come to school most of the time, they did not believe that students consider their schoolwork important. The overwhelming majority of staff members believed the staff did a good job of fostering a positive school climate for students' families.

Table 24

Staff Responses to Survey Questions on Student Attitudes and School-Family Relationships

Question	Agree		Disagree	
	N	%	N	%
Parents and families who visit are welcomed, treated with respect, and encouraged to come back.	703	90.6	73	9.4
The staff does a good job of helping when families need it.	684	88.7	87	11.3
Families would be comfortable discussing school concerns with a staff member.	659	86.6	102	13.4
The staff does a good job of communicating with families.	640	83.0	131	17.0
Students are glad to come to school most of the time.	477	61.3	301	38.7
Students are proud to be a part of the school.	393	51.7	367	48.3
Students believe the work they do at school is important.	314	40.4	463	59.6

As shown in Table 25, most staff members believed the school had effective systems for behavior management, and working with at-risk and misbehaving students. More than 80% of staff members agreed that they treated their colleagues with respect.

Table 25

Staff Responses to Survey Questions on Staff Interactions and School Policies

Question	Agree		Disagree	
	N	%	N	%
I understand how and when to respond to student misbehavior.	734	100.0	0	0.0
I understand how and when to encourage students to do their best.	764	97.2	22	2.8
I understand my role in emergency situations.	706	90.5	74	9.5
I understand clearly how and when to monitor student behavior.	682	88.2	91	11.8
Staff members treat each other with respect.	648	83.1	132	16.9
The school has an adequate system for identifying and helping at-risk students.	507	66.5	255	33.5
I receive sufficient support when dealing with difficult students.	460	59.9	308	40.1
The school has a consistent approach to behavior management.	425	55.6	340	44.4

As shown in Table 26, staff members were most likely to rate inappropriate language and dress, excessive absences and tardiness, and student behavior with substitutes as the biggest problems in the 16 Foundations schools. More than 75% of staff members surveyed agreed that these issues were problems in their schools. Weapons and racial harassment rated lowest, with fewer than 40% of staff members rating these issues as problems in their schools.

Table 26
Staff Responses to Survey Questions on Perceived School Problems

Question	Agree		Disagree	
	N	%	N	%
Inappropriate student language is a problem.	636	81.4	145	18.6
Student behavior with substitutes is a problem.	626	80.7	150	19.3
Inappropriate student dress is a problem.	625	79.6	160	20.4
Excessive absences are a problem.	613	79.4	159	20.6
Excessive tardies are a problem.	605	77.8	173	22.2
Theft or damage of school property by students is a problem.	555	72.2	214	27.8
Students harassing other students are a problem.	548	71.2	222	28.8
Students bullying other students are a problem.	543	70.3	229	29.7
Student cliques are a problem.	513	67.5	247	32.5
Theft or damage of personal property by students is a problem.	509	66.0	262	34.0
Student drug, alcohol, and tobacco use is a problem.	500	65.6	262	34.4
Students physically assaulting other students are a problem.	501	65.1	268	34.9
Inappropriate sexual conduct between students is a problem.	499	64.1	280	35.9
Student threats/violence to staff members are a problem.	350	54.8	289	45.2
Sexual harassment is a problem.	333	43.7	429	56.3
Racial conflicts are a problem.	319	41.7	446	58.3
Racial harassment is a problem.	285	37.4	478	62.6
Students having weapons is a problem.	249	33.0	505	67.0

As stated earlier, the Safe and Civil Schools parent survey was optional. Most of the Foundations schools opted not to use it. Parents responded to the survey items by marking whether they agreed or disagreed with the question or statement. Only six of the 16 schools returned completed parent surveys for processing and analysis. Overall, less than 300 parents across these six schools completed and returned surveys. Table 27 displays parent responses to questions about their perceptions of the climate of their children's schools. In general, they rated the schools positively in terms of student safety, staff members, and relationships between schools and families. However, more than half of the parents surveyed disagreed that students treat each other respectfully.

Table 27

Parent Responses to Questions on Perceptions of Schools

Question	Agree		Disagree	
	N	%	N	%
Families who visit the school are welcomed, treated with respect, and encouraged to return.	234	88.6	30	11.4
If I had concerns about my student or the school, I would be comfortable discussing the situation with a staff member.	234	88.6	30	11.4
School/staff provides help when families ask for or need it.	214	85.9	35	14.1
Parents/families are informed about expectations for student behavior.	226	85.3	39	14.7
The staff has done a good job of making the school a safe place.	227	82.2	49	17.8
It is easy for students to make friends.	208	81.3	48	18.8
Staff members are friendly and helpful to students.	229	80.9	54	19.1
Students are proud to be part of the school.	210	80.8	50	19.2
Students believe the work they do at the school is important.	205	78.2	57	21.8
The school/staff does a good job of communicating with families.	202	76.8	61	23.2
Students generally feel safe at this school.	221	76.5	68	23.5
Students are glad to come to the school most of the time.	166	67.5	80	32.5
Students treat each other respectfully.	133	47.8	145	52.2

Table 28 displays parent responses to questions about safety concerns. Parents' concerns mirrored those of school staff, with more parents rating inappropriate language and dress as problems. Weapons possession by students appeared to be less of a concern, even though a majority of parents (53.6%) indicated that this issue concerned them. In addition, more than 60% of parents cited physical assaults and bullying as concerns.

Table 28
Parent Responses to Questions on Safety Concerns

Question	Agree		Disagree	
	N	%	N	%
Inappropriate student language is a problem at the school.	193	73.1	71	26.9
Inappropriate student dress is a problem at the school.	173	67.1	85	32.9
Students harassing other students is a problem at the school.	159	64.6	87	35.4
Student cliques are a problem at the school.	149	63.9	84	36.1
Students bullying other students is a problem at the school.	163	63.9	92	36.1
Theft/damage of personal property by students is a problem at the school.	158	62.7	94	37.3
Students physically assaulting other students is a problem at the school.	156	62.2	95	37.8
Drug/alcohol/tobacco use by students is a problem at the school.	142	58.0	103	42.0
Students having weapons is a problem at the school.	141	53.6	122	46.4

The survey also asked parents for their concerns about specific areas of their children's schools. Hallways, restrooms, and parking lots topped the list of concerns cited by parents. These concerns mirrored some of the safety concerns cited in the student survey. According to that survey, 40.1% of students did not feel safe in school restrooms. In addition, 38.8% and 34.4% of students, respectively, did not feel safe in the parking lots and hallways of their schools.

The November 2004 Foundations training session guided the teams in analyzing their survey, common area observation, and disciplinary referral data, and in using the data for developing and implementing a plan to improve one or more common areas, such as hallways, cafeterias, auditoriums, or courtyards. Safe and Civil Schools consultants told the 16 schools' teams they should either develop an improvement plan and implement it in the spring 2005 semester, or spend the spring 2005 semester preparing an improvement plan for fall 2005 implementation.

Representatives from central administration served as coaches to the Foundations teams. Under the Safe and Civil Schools program, a team coach acts as an objective observer as the team follows the Foundations process. Coaches meet periodically with their assigned teams, help teams motivate and inform their schools' faculty members, and help schools access other resources. Although the coaches are not intended to act in an evaluative capacity, they can help ensure that the teams meet regularly and follow the Foundations processes. District coaches included instructional specialists, area office representatives, and staff from the Department of Psychological Services.

To gain further insight into the teams' implementation of the Foundations program, the evaluator surveyed the coaches during the 2005 spring semester. The survey contained a mix of open- and closed-ended questions, yielding both qualitative and quantitative data. About 50% of the coaches returned completed surveys.

Coaches had varied views of their roles in relation to the teams with which they work. They often described themselves as consultants, facilitators, and troubleshooters for the teams. One coach described herself as a "neutral voice for highly charged topics." Duties listed by the coaches included data gathering and analysis; researching best practices in school safety and climate; facilitating communication among the schools, the district, and Safe and Civil Schools consultants; and accessing additional resources.

Table 29 displays results of the closed-ended questions on the coaches' survey. The questions asked coaches to convey their perceptions of how effectively their teams functioned. Although most coaches thought their assigned teams were cohesive, focused, and respectful of each other, only about half thought the teams effectively communicated their activities to the faculty, staff, and students at their schools. The Foundations program stresses involving the entire school community in the improvement process.

The survey also asked for suggestions to help teams function more effectively. Many coaches cited a need for better communication between the teams and their respective schools. Other coaches expressed a need for more support and involvement by campus administrators. One coach opined that an assistant principal or dean should take part in Foundations team

meetings rather than the principal because of the high demands on principals' time. Some coaches indicated a need for more specific program guidelines. They especially sought more specifics on the CHAMPs classroom management component. With more specific guidelines on CHAMPs, coaches believed that teachers could better see that program's benefits, rather than viewing the program as "just another set of papers." A few coaches thought an "exhaustion factor" had led some teams to view the Safe and Civil Schools program as another "must-do" on an already crowded field of responsibilities and obligations.

Table 29
Results of Foundations Coaches Survey

Question	% Agree	% Disagree	% Don't know/ Neutral
The team with which I work functions effectively as a cohesive unit.	73.3	20.0	6.7
Team members are focused on the tasks at hand during meetings.	86.7	13.3	0.0
Team members are respectful of each other during meetings and team activities.	93.3	0.0	6.7
The team with which I work involves all members in team activities.	80.0	20.0	0.0
The team effectively communicates its activities to the faculty, staff, and students.	53.3	26.7	20.0

An open-ended questionnaire given to the Foundations teams in February 2005 asked about their Safe and Civil Schools implementation plans, improvement priorities, and whether they planned to implement improvements in the spring of 2005 or in the 2005-2006 school year.

As shown in Table 30, nearly all of the Foundations schools identified hallways as priority common areas for improvement. The focus appears to be on improved behavior, respectful interactions, and reduced tardiness. Student survey data cited earlier found that about 65% of students feel safe in their schools' hallways, but that nearly 66% believe that students do not treat each other respectfully there. Staff survey data showed similar findings. More than 60% of staff members said students felt safe in the hallways, but nearly two-thirds said students do not treat staff members or each other with respect. Written comments in the February questionnaire included concerns about congestion, loitering, foul language, and misbehavior in the hallways.

Tardiness is related to hallway concerns, as well. If hallways are congested during pass periods, and students are lingering, more student tardiness is the likely result. Thirteen of 16 Foundations schools identified reducing student tardiness among their top priorities, and most of the schools that identified hallway behavior as an area for improvement also cited tardiness. Most of the schools planned to implement START on Time as part of their efforts to combat tardiness. START on Time is a component of the Safe and Civil Schools program that strives to reduce student tardiness.

Survey data support a focus on tardiness, as nearly 80% of staff members said excessive student tardiness was a problem. To summarize, the improvement priorities identified by each Foundations school in Table 30 find support in the survey data presented earlier in this section. This helps support a finding that the Foundations Schools are making data-driven decisions, an important element of the Safe and Civil Schools program.

Table 30 also highlights school cafeterias as an improvement priority. Ten of the 16 included the cafeteria as an area for improvement. Survey data found that students and staff believe that students do not interact respectfully there.

Table 30

Foundations Schools' Improvement Priorities and Planned Implementation Dates

Campus	Priorities for Improvement	Planned Implementation Date
Bryan Adams	Tardies, hallway behavior	Spring 2005
Molina	Tardies, hallways, cafeteria	2005-2006
Hillcrest	Hallway procedures, tardies	Spring 2005
Thomas Jefferson	Cafeteria, hallways, tardies, respect	2005-2006
Lincoln	Hallways, tardies	2005-2006
Pinkston	Tardies, cafeteria, hallways	Spring 2005
Roosevelt	Tardies, cafeteria	2005-2006
Samuell	Tardies, hallways, cafeteria	Spring 2005
Spruce	Tardies, hallways	Spring 2005
Sunset	Tardies, hallways	2005-2006
W.T. White	Hallways	Spring 2005
Woodrow Wilson	Cafeteria, hallway behavior, assemblies	Spring 2005
North Dallas	Tardies, cafeteria, hallways	2005-2006
Comstock	Tardies, school cafeteria, courtyard	Spring 2005
Hood	Tardies, cafeteria, hallways	2005-2006
Storey	Cafeteria, hallways	Spring 2005

To improve safety and civility in hallways, the Foundations schools undertook a variety of steps. Some schools enhanced supervision in the hallways, using additional staff members as monitors. Some campuses established a series of color-coded zones, with staff members assigned to monitor specific zones. In addition, these schools issued students color-coded hall passes, making it easier for monitors to ensure that students were where they were supposed to be. Other methods for reducing hallway congestion and improving student interaction included the use of one-way stairwells and rules that require students to always walk on the right side of the halls.

To inform students of standards for acceptable conduct, some schools conducted lessons on appropriate hallway behavior. Others used student-produced videos that illustrated acceptable hallway behavior. W.T. White High School, for example, produced student-made videos on hallway etiquette and reinforced them with posters made by art students that displayed examples of appropriate hallway behavior.

Foundations schools also initiated several efforts to improve civility in cafeterias. Some of these measures included adding more seats and serving lines, or even an additional lunch period to reduce congestion. Other schools enhanced staff supervision during lunch periods, and one campus added a color code to student identification badges, assigning a color based on the lunch period the student had.

Because this is only the first year of the Foundations program, there was a lack of hard data to suggest whether these and other efforts were successful. However, anecdotal information indicates positive results. Some schools reported less congestion in hallways, as well as a reduction in profanity, public displays of affection, and other behavioral infractions. Other campuses reported reduced crowding and more respectful interactions among students during lunch periods. Because Foundations relies on data-driven decision-making, the program advises participating schools to continue collecting data on disciplinary infractions and referrals, and to use them to assess the progress of their program. The program also emphasizes consistent enforcement of the rules, standards, and guidelines developed by the school. Because of the focus on data collection, consistent enforcement of standards, and immediate intervention in

disciplinary infractions, Safe and Civil Schools consultants told the participating schools that their disciplinary referral data might show increases in referrals for the first year. These increases will likely reflect more vigorous efforts to document disciplinary infractions and to intervene in them.

The Foundations schools' teams had their final training session in early June 2005. Final surveys given at that session and the previous one in February gauged team members' perceptions of the program and the training they received throughout the school year. Most team members viewed the program positively, as shown in Table 31. Overall, most team members thought Foundations provided useful, practical ideas for improving school safety and civility, and more than 90% found the training beneficial. More than 20% of team members were unsure of whether the program led to positive changes in school climate. This finding is expected, however, because of the short time in which the program has been in place. Further, as shown in a previous table, some of the schools' teams wanted to continue planning in 2004-2005 and wait until the next school year to implement improvement plans.

Table 31

Team Members' Perceptions of Foundations Program

Question	% Agree	% Disagree	% Don't know/ Neutral
Foundations training gave me useful, practical ideas for improving campus safety and civility.	97.0	2.0	1.0
Foundations training was engaging and conducted effectively.	91.9	3.0	5.1
Data were useful and helpful in identifying areas of need.	96.9	2.0	1.1
Our Foundations team functions effectively and stays focused on priorities for improvement.	88.9	5.1	6.1
Our Foundations team has adopted a set of ground rules and follows them in meetings.	87.8	8.1	4.1
Each member of our team is actively involved.	85.7	11.2	3.1
Our coach supports activities and is a useful addition to the group.	88.7	7.2	4.1
Our team effectively communicates information about team activities to the school staff.	88.7	8.2	3.1
Our team effectively communicates information to students and parents.	68.7	18.2	13.1
Campus leadership regularly attends team meetings and supports Foundations activities.	90.7	6.2	3.1
Overall, I believe the Foundations program will be effective in improving safety and civility.	93.9	3.0	3.1
Overall, Foundations training has been beneficial.	91.4	3.7	4.9
I have observed or perceived changes in school climate as a result of Foundations efforts.	75.3	2.5	22.2

In the spring semester of 2005, the steering committee for the district safety initiative announced the names of the second Safe and Civil Schools cohort. These 15 schools will begin Safe and Civil Schools Foundations training in 2005-2006. The 16 schools in the first cohort will undergo their second year of training for the program in 2005-2006. The 15 campuses comprising the second cohort are Florence, Pearl C. Anderson, Holmes, Spence, Edison, Stockard, Franklin, Marsh, Hill, and Gaston middle schools, and Seagoville, Carter, South Oak Cliff, Skyline, and Adamson high schools.

To assist schools that participate in the Foundations program, the district's Alternative Programs department plans to develop a website of successful program tools and strategies. The website, when complete, will act as a resource for Foundations schools to access and duplicate successful strategies employed by others.

As shown in previous tables, most of the Foundations schools identified tardiness as a serious problem and reducing it as a priority. To curtail student tardiness, most of these schools implemented the START on Time component of Safe and Civil Schools. START on Time is a CD-ROM-based program that offers methods for teachers and campus administrators to reduce student tardiness and the classroom disruption it causes. Persistent tardiness disrupts classroom instruction, because teachers have to interrupt lessons to deal with students who arrive late for class. Teachers may also be reluctant to teach some important material because persistently tardy students will miss it.

Under START on Time, some school staff members act as hall monitors to help ensure that students get to class on time and do not linger in hallways before school and between classes. After the tardy bell rings, all teachers close their classroom doors. Monitors then "sweep" the building for students loitering in hallways or restrooms. They escort these students to the school office, where the students receive tardy forms. The schools store students' tardiness data on a computer, which enables schools to respond to tardiness quickly. A second tardy generates a letter to the student's parents, and a fifth tardy requires a parent conference. More tardies can result in a two-day suspension.

The February training session for campuses participating in the Safe and Civil Schools included a session in which the schools assessed their implementation of START on Time. Each campus completed a checklist that asked the schools to the extent to which they implemented program elements, based on observations of passing periods at their campuses. For each element, the schools checked one of the following response categories: no evidence, some evidence, or full evidence. Each category carried with it a corresponding score. A rating of no evidence received no points; some evidence, five points; full evidence, 10 points.

Table 32 displays mean implementation scores for 15 of the 16 campuses in the Safe and Civil Schools program. One school opted not to use the program. The highest implementation scores related to “sweeps” of tardy students by assigned staff members. Lowest scores related to swept students completing START on Time forms and staff members intervening with misbehavior.

Table 32

START on Time Implementation Scores for Foundations Campuses

Checklist Item	Mean Implementation Score
A map, list, or table documents distribution of adults in different locations, providing full coverage of all places in which students might be during passing times.	6.43
There is a printed schedule defining which staff members are on the “positive sweep” for each passing time.	6.07
There is a printed schedule defining which administrative and security staff members are on sweep in which location during passing periods.	6.80
Adults are visible during pass periods, supervising classrooms and hallways.	6.43
Adults in the hallways are interacting in a friendly and supportive manner with students.	6.15
Adults in the hallways intervene with all perceived misbehavior.	5.00
When the bell rings, teachers immediately close their doors, do not allow students to enter, and begin class as soon as the door is closed.	5.71
Students not in class are “swept” by an adult within two minutes of the bell ringing.	6.80
All “swept” students are required to fill out the START on Time form that will be sent to parents.	5.00
Administrative/security staff check in with staff on the “sweep” to manage paperwork and deal with code of conduct violations.	7.14

Some schools cited their steps to improve student interactions in the hallways as part of their efforts to implement START on Time. At some campuses, the staff divided the campus into zones, with specific teachers and other staff assigned to monitor each zone. Little hard data were available on whether the Foundations schools experienced a decline in tardiness. However, some anecdotal information points to early successes. Many of the schools reported fewer tardy students. A few reported reductions in tardiness of 50% or more. When START on Time has been in place for a longer period, it will be important to evaluate whether schools that implemented the program have reduced student tardiness.

The project evaluator, assisted by a specialist from the Department of Alternative Programs, asked Foundations team members to rate their perceptions of START on Time. More than 80% of team members surveyed agreed that START on Time helped reduce student tardiness and make pass periods more orderly (Table 33). However, the results in Table 33 also raise concerns about supervision. One-third of team members indicated that their schools did not have adequate supervision of hallways during pass periods. Adequate supervision by staff members is an important element of START on Time, as they must intervene in incidents of misbehavior and “sweep” all tardy students.

Table 33
START on Time Perceptions

Question	% Agree	% Disagree	% Don't know/ Neutral
Students have been taught rules/expectations for behavior in the halls and on stairways.	76.6	13.5	9.9
Teachers understand procedures for dealing with student tardiness.	90.1	7.4	2.5
There is adequate supervision of hallways during pass periods.	59.3	33.3	7.4
Since implementing START on Time, pass periods are more orderly.	86.4	6.2	7.4
I believe START on Time has helped reduce student tardiness.	83.9	4.9	7.4

Foundations and START on Time are schoolwide components of Safe and Civil Schools. CHAMPs, a classroom management program, is the third component. The district planned to implement CHAMPs in 74 elementary and secondary schools in 2004-2005, including the 16 campuses that participated in Foundations. CHAMPs emphasizes planning, developing standards for classroom behavior, explaining the standards to students, and enforcing consequences consistently. The program encourages teachers to evaluate and revise their classroom management approaches. Specifically, CHAMPs recommends the following steps:

- Design rules that communicate your most important expectations – CHAMPs recommends posting these rules in a prominent place in the classroom.
- Develop consequences for common rule infractions – The consequences should fit the misbehavior, and teachers should apply them fairly and consistently.
- Develop and post “Guidelines for Success” – The guidelines should reflect what teachers consider the most important skills and attitudes that will help students be successful in school.
- Develop a plan for responding to misbehavior that classroom rules do not directly cover – Teachers should apply the response consistently and consider follow-up strategies if the initial response does not work.
- Develop an “attention signal” – This signal should get students’ attention quickly.
- Analyze the physical classroom setting and modify it if necessary – The physical setting should facilitate immediate teacher access to any part of the room and prompt the desired level of communication among students.
- Design a workable schedule – The schedule should include time for teacher-led instruction, cooperative tasks, independent tasks, and teaching behavioral expectations.
- Design routine policies for regular classroom activities and incidents – These include tardiness and absences, assigning work, homework, late work, class materials, and collecting student work.
- Design procedures for students to check off completed work – Examples include a posted wall chart, assignment sheet, or personal student checklist.
- Evaluate and improve presentational style – CHAMPs recommends that teachers consider the extent to which they present tasks in a manner that fosters enthusiasm, and models interest and motivation.
- Ensure that instructional expectations contain clear objectives for each activity – This means having clear course objectives, class activities to learn and practice, and assessment procedures that match objectives.
- Develop a feedback plan – Teachers should provide positive feedback for students who follow the rules and meet expectations.

- Develop a system of individual and whole-class rewards – Teachers can use these rewards for celebrations of student success.

Finally, CHAMPs suggests that teachers prepare lessons on behavioral expectations for each major activity. Teachers should instruct students on behavioral expectations for each major classroom activity and each major transition between activities. These instructions should address the key aspects of CHAMPs: Conversation, Help, Activity, Movement, and Participation. For each classroom activity, teachers should outline whether students can engage in conversation during the activity, how students should go about getting help from the teacher, the activity's expected end product, whether movement by students out of their seats is permissible during the activity, and what behaviors demonstrate student participation in the classroom.

CHAMPs training began in October, with a one-day session led by Safe and Civil Schools consultants. They conducted a "training of trainers" session the following day, instructing some DISD administrative personnel to lead CHAMPs sessions for other teachers.

The district's goal for 2004-2005 was for 800 teachers in 74 schools to complete CHAMPs training. Data provided by the Department of Professional Development and Staff Training indicate that 523 teachers, short of the target, and 51 central administrative staff members participated in CHAMPs. However, the 523 teachers represented 88 campuses, a higher number than the target of 74 campuses. Non-instructional personnel who participated in CHAMPs included specialists from Psychological Services, Beginning Teacher Support and Development, Safe and Drug Free Schools, Professional Development and Staff Training, and area offices.

The project evaluator, with assistance from Professional Development and Staff Training, developed and administered a CHAMPs survey to assess participants' perceptions of the program. The evaluator and specialists from Staff Training distributed the surveys to schools with teachers who participated in CHAMPs.

Because CHAMPs is a classroom management program, and the survey questions pertained to teachers, non-instructional personnel did not receive the survey. Area offices

received the completed surveys for collection by the evaluator and Professional Development and Staff Training. Overall, 64.5% of the participating teachers completed and returned surveys.

As shown in Table 34, more than 90% of teachers surveyed found CHAMPs training an effective and beneficial source of new ideas for classroom management. More than 80% of teachers indicated that they implemented CHAMPs procedures in their classrooms. There was less agreement, however, on the efficacy of these procedures. Although many teachers agreed that they were effective in improving student behavior, as many as a third were uncertain. Because this is the CHAMPs program’s first year in DISD, some uncertainty about the program’s impact is not surprising because of the short time in which the program has been in place. Over a longer time period, any impact on the classroom climate is likely to be clearer.

Table 34
Results of CHAMPs Survey

Question	Agree		Disagree		Neutral/ Don't Know	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
CHAMPs training provided me with new ideas for improving management of my classroom.	314	91.8	9	2.6	19	5.6
CHAMPs training materials were clear and easy to understand.	328	95.9	4	1.2	10	2.9
Trainers presented CHAMPs information in a clear and effective way.	316	92.4	12	3.5	13	3.8
Overall, I found CHAMPs training to be useful and beneficial.	308	90.0	9	2.6	25	7.4
I have a thorough understanding of when and how to teach CHAMPs expectations to students.	285	83.3	13	3.8	44	12.9
I have a thorough understanding of when and how to implement encouragement procedures to improve student motivation.	302	88.3	9	2.6	31	9.1
I have a thorough understanding of when and how to implement corrective procedures in response to misbehavior.	307	89.8	9	2.6	26	7.6
I am actively implementing CHAMPs procedures to teach and review expectations.	253	74.0	33	9.6	56	16.4
CHAMPs procedures have been effective in improving student behavior.	212	62.0	14	4.1	116	33.9
I am actively implementing encouragement procedures to improve student motivation.	298	87.1	9	2.6	35	10.2
Encouragement procedures have been effective in improving student behavior.	268	78.4	11	3.2	63	18.4
I am actively implementing corrective procedures to respond to misbehavior.	292	85.4	11	3.2	39	11.4
Corrective procedures have been effective in improving student behavior.	272	79.6	11	3.2	59	17.2

The teachers who underwent CHAMPs training included 51 special education teachers. Table 35 displays CHAMPs survey results for those teachers. In most cases, their responses were similar to the overall results (see Table 34). More than 90% of the special education teachers liked the training, and the majority implemented in their classrooms what they learned. Consistent with the overall results, some special education teachers were uncertain as to whether CHAMPs procedures were effective.

Table 35
CHAMPs Survey Results for Special Education Teachers

Question	Agree		Disagree		Neutral/ Don't Know	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
CHAMPs training provided me with new ideas for improving management of my classroom.	48	94.2	1	1.9	2	3.9
CHAMPs training materials were clear and easy to understand.	51	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Trainers presented CHAMPs information in a clear and effective way.	47	92.2	2	3.9	2	3.9
Overall, I found CHAMPs training to be useful and beneficial.	48	94.1	1	2.0	2	3.9
I have a thorough understanding of when and how to teach CHAMPs expectations to students.	40	78.5	1	1.9	10	19.6
I have a thorough understanding of when and how to implement encouragement procedures to improve student motivation.	44	86.3	1	1.9	6	11.8
I have a thorough understanding of when and how to implement corrective procedures in response to misbehavior.	45	88.2	1	2.0	5	9.8
I am actively implementing CHAMPs procedures to teach and review expectations.	31	60.8	7	13.7	13	25.5
CHAMPs procedures have been effective in improving student behavior.	24	47.0	2	4.0	25	49.0
I am actively implementing encouragement procedures to improve student motivation.	40	78.4	1	2.0	10	19.6
Encouragement procedures have been effective in improving student behavior.	36	70.6	1	1.9	14	27.5
I am actively implementing corrective procedures to respond to misbehavior.	39	76.5	2	3.9	10	19.6
Corrective procedures have been effective in improving student behavior.	36	70.6	0	0.0	15	29.4

Character Education

The district focused on implementing the Character Counts! character education program in elementary and middle schools in 2004-2005. The California-based Josephson Institute of Ethics developed the Character Counts! program. The program's "Six Pillars of Good Character" – trustworthiness, respect, caring, citizenship, fairness, and responsibility – comprise its foundation.

Counseling Services staff underwent a three-day training seminar at the Josephson Institute during the summer of 2004. In the fall semester of 2004, Counseling Services and the Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities departments asked all DISD campuses to submit a plan for implementing character education, using a template form provided by the departments. The plans included schoolwide activities for character education that the schools would implement.

Lessons are an important part of the character education program, especially in grades K-8. The Counseling Services plan called for elementary and middle school counselors to present at least one Character Counts! lesson during the school year. In addition, the counselors were to present additional lessons with content correlated to Character Counts! Elementary counselors usually presented to homeroom classes, while middle school counselors presented to classes in a core subject area. In most cases, social studies was the chosen core subject because of the ease of integrating character education content with the academic material. Besides the classroom guidance sessions, Counseling Services suggested the following schoolwide activities for elementary and middle schools:

- Character Word of the Week (Character WOW!) – A Character Word of the Week highlights a positive character trait each week. Schools can highlight the word of the week through morning announcements and visual displays, such as bulletin boards, to encourage students to practice positive character traits.
- Kids With Character – Each six weeks, a school focuses on one of the Six Pillars of Character (trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, and citizenship). Teachers and other staff members who notice a student exhibiting the positive character trait that is the focus of that six weeks period may complete a Character Counts! recognition form and submit it to the principal. Students "caught" displaying good character may receive certificates or other prizes.

- Six Pillars of Character – Counselors work with their schools’ Campus Instructional Leadership Teams (CILTs) to ensure that all areas of the building have displays of the Six Pillars of Character and diverse role models of character.
- Integration of Character Quotes – Counselors provide daily quotes based on the character theme of the month for morning announcements.
- Parent Involvement – Counselors conduct a parent meeting to introduce the framework for Character Counts! and suggest ways in which parents can support the Six Pillars of Character at home.

Table 36 displays the percentage of elementary and middle school campuses that included these suggested activities in their plans. Although all elementary and secondary schools submitted plans, the table includes only elementary and middle schools because they were the focus of the Character Education program in 2004-2005. All schools’ plans included character education lessons for grades K-8. In addition to specific Character Counts! presentations, many schools planned to reinforce character-related themes throughout the core academic curriculum. Examples of this included reading literature that illustrated good character, writing assignments, role-playing activities, and studying historical figures that exemplified qualities of good character.

Most schools’ implementation plans included reading character-related announcements and quotations during morning announcements over campus public address systems. In addition, many plans included a “Word of the Week” activity. This word would be a theme for character education lessons and related activities at the school for that week. Many schools also planned to recognize students for displaying good character. These included rewards such as certificates and coupons, and announcing or posting the names of students who were “caught showing good character.”

Table 36

DISD Elementary and Middle School Campus
Implementation Plans for Character Education

Suggested Activity	%
Character Education Lessons	100.0
Character WOW!	75.5
Integrations of Character Quotes	75.5
Six Pillars of Character	57.4
Kids With Character	56.5
Parent Involvement	12.0

In addition to the recommended schoolwide activities, some schools' implementation plans included community and civic activities, such as cleanup projects, recycling programs, clothing drives, canned food drives, voter registration drives, mock elections, and other activities designed to illustrate the value of citizenship. Although some elementary and middle schools included community and civic activities in their plans, they were more common in high schools' implementation plans.

The Counseling Services department's online survey assesses the activities of counselors and includes questions about character education lessons presented. Counselors complete the survey once each semester. The fall 2004 survey report provided the data used in this report. The spring 2005 data were not available at the time this report was prepared.

The Character Education action plan prepared by the Counseling Services department required counselors to deliver character education lessons to students in grades K-8. The department's online survey asked each elementary counselor to report the number of homerooms in his or her school and how many homerooms received character education and anti-violence lessons. As shown in Table 37, 86.7% of elementary homerooms received character education guidance lessons, and 87.1% received violence prevention lessons during the fall 2004 semester.

At the middle school level, counselors presented character education lessons to students in core subject area classes, usually social studies. Overall, 563 of 989 social studies classrooms or sections (56.9%) in DISD middle schools received character education lessons during the fall 2004 semester. Some counselors presented character education lessons to classrooms in other core subjects besides social studies. Data from the Counseling Services department survey indicated that middle school counselors presented a total of 611 character education lessons.

Table 37

Elementary Homerooms and Social Studies Classrooms That Received Character Education and Violence Prevention Lessons, Fall 2004

Lesson Type	N of homerooms or classrooms	% of homerooms/classrooms that received lessons
Character Education	4,062	86.7
Violence Prevention	4,062	87.1
Social Studies classes	989	56.9

Observations of some elementary-level character education lessons revealed a variety of approaches. In some lessons, a counselor read the students a story that illustrated the character trait under discussion. Students took notes while the counselor read the story. After the story, the counselor asked the students which characters exemplified the trait under discussion and how. In other observations the counselors gave students handouts that illustrated the character trait on which that day's lesson focused. These handouts included illustrations, graphic organizers, word puzzles, and worksheets. The counselors would then lead class discussions, asking students to define the character trait under discussion and give examples of when someone exhibited that trait.

The observations also revealed that the counselors linked the character education lessons to academic skills. For example, in some observations the counselors emphasized the value of reading, while another stressed the importance of taking good notes to a fifth grade class, noting that the students would soon start middle school.

Although the character education action plan for 2004-2005 focused on implementing character education in grades K-8, the Counseling Services department's survey also asked high school counselors about character education presentations. Results indicated that high school counselors gave a total of 366 character education presentations and 432 violence prevention presentations.

Breaking the Code of Silence is a select intervention of the Dallas Safety Initiative that is related to the character education component. *Breaking the Code of Silence* strives to help students recognize their responsibilities and options when they learn about a potentially violent

situation. The program's activities encourage students to think about, discuss, and become part of the solution to school violence. The district's Department of Student Services offered *Breaking the Code of Silence* training to counselors who work with students at all grade levels. The Counseling Services survey asked counselors whether they had completed *Breaking the Code of Silence* training. Table 38 indicates that more than 75% of counselors had completed the training by the end of the fall 2004 semester. Elementary counselors had the highest completion rate, at 80.4%. Data for the 2005 spring semester were not available for this report.

Table 38

Counselors Who Completed *Breaking the Code of Silence* Training, Fall 2004

Counselors	Completed Training		Did Not Complete		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Elementary	135	80.4	33	19.6	168	100.0
Middle School	40	72.7	15	27.3	55	100.0
High School	66	74.2	23	25.8	89	100.0
Total	241	77.2	71	22.8	312	100.0

Drug and Violence Education

The district began efforts to implement a drug and violence prevention and education program in 2004-2005. The Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities, and Physical Education departments were most involved in implementing this component of the districtwide safety initiative.

The action plan for this component included a recommendation to require a half hour each week of drug and violence knowledge and skills instruction in elementary and middle schools. For the first year of the initiative, the Safe and Drug Free Schools, and Physical Education departments identified physical education teachers for teaching drug and violence prevention skills in the elementary and middle schools. Specialists from Safe and Drug Free Schools introduced the physical education teachers to the state's drug and violence education (DAVE) curriculum, which the Texas Education Agency provided.

The Safe and Drug Free Schools department had eight specialists – one for each district area – conduct orientation for elementary and middle school physical education teachers. Specialists gave the teachers packets that outlined the drug and violence education program. The packets also included lessons, information on how to incorporate the lessons into physical education programs, and information for teachers to access the materials online. The amount of time available for orientation to the drug and violence education lessons varied with each individual teacher's schedule. Some were available to meet with the specialists for only a few minutes, while others had more time. Because of this, some teachers received more training and orientation than others on the drug and violence prevention curriculum.

Table 39 displays the results of the April 2005 survey of physical education teachers. One-fourth of the P.E. teachers disagreed that they received sufficient training to implement the DAVE curriculum, and another 11.5% were not sure. The varied times that the P.E. teachers had available for orientation may help explain why some teachers did not believe they had sufficient training. This suggests a need for more formal training on the curriculum to ensure effective implementation of drug and violence prevention lessons.

Nearly all of the teachers had given drug and violence prevention lessons, but were split on the perceived effects of this instruction. Nearly a third of the teachers were not sure or disagreed that the lessons helped students develop drug and violence resistance skills. More than 40% were unsure or disagreed that the lessons would help reduce drugs and violence in their schools. Because this is only the first year for the program, it is not unusual for many teachers to be uncertain about the program's impact. More valid findings about impact will be possible only when the program has been in place for a longer period of time.

Written comments from a few P.E. teachers included criticisms of the DAVE curriculum. Some teachers described the curriculum as unrealistic and lacking sufficient teaching materials.

Table 39
Results of Drug and Violence Education (DAVE) Survey of P.E. Teachers

Question	% Agree	% Disagree	% Neutral/ Don't Know
I received sufficient training to implement drug and violence prevention instruction.	63.5	25.0	11.5
I have given drug and violence education lessons to my students.	97.9	2.1	0.0
The DAVE curriculum includes useful information that develops student knowledge and attitudes about drugs and violence.	87.5	6.3	6.2
The DAVE curriculum is age-appropriate for the students being taught.	88.6	3.1	7.3
The DAVE curriculum provides factual information about the effects on individuals and communities of drugs and violence.	85.4	6.3	8.3
The DAVE curriculum includes strategies for avoiding drug use and violence.	89.6	4.2	6.2
The DAVE curriculum included interactive activities for students.	86.4	7.3	6.3
Students were engaged and attentive during drug and violence lessons.	82.3	11.5	6.2
The DAVE lessons help my students develop skills to resist drugs and violence.	68.7	7.3	24.0
Overall, I believe the DAVE lessons will help reduce drug use and violence in my school.	56.3	10.4	33.3

The Drug and Violence prevention action plan also recommended reinforcing drug and violence prevention skills through other curricula beyond physical and health education. Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities provided DAVE information and lessons to executive directors of core subjects and to the Curriculum and Instruction division. The action plan also recommended adding drug and violence prevention strategies to the district's benchmark assessments. The 2005-2006 benchmark assessments for certain grade levels will include questions on drug and violence prevention skills.

Disciplinary Alternative Education Programs (DAEPs)

The district operates five disciplinary alternative education program campuses. The Alternative Center at Village Fair in south Dallas houses three secondary-level DAEPs: a middle school center; a high school center; and Redirections, a campus for students with substance abuse-related violations of the district's student code of conduct. Village Fair became the site of the secondary-level DAEPs in 2002 after the district terminated a contract with a private firm, Community Education Partners, to manage a secondary alternative school.

There also are two elementary DAEPs: the south campus in south Dallas and the east campus in Seagoville. The south campus served elementary students from areas 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 with disciplinary offenses. The east campus served students from areas 1, 7, and 8.

When a student violated the code of conduct to warrant placement in a DAEP, his or her school completed a referral form, after which the school held a hearing that involved the student, the student's parent or guardian, and the principal. The school forwarded a removal form to the district's discipline management office, which after approval, sent it to the appropriate DAEP. The DAEP would then set up an intake hearing for the offending student.

All DAEPs used the Boys Town behavior point system to help teach and reward appropriate behavior. Upon enrollment in one of the disciplinary AEPs, students and their parents underwent orientation, in which rules and expectations, as well as the mechanics of the Boys Town behavior system, were explained. The system identified 16 social behaviors, such as following instructions, resisting peer pressure, and disagreeing appropriately, on which the students should work. Students carried yellow daily point sheets. Using these sheets, the staff at the DAEPs could award positive points for appropriate behaviors and negative points for misbehavior. The point system was divided into three levels. At the first level, students carried the yellow tally sheets on which the staff recorded points awarded. After a student accumulated sufficient points, he or she received promotion to the second level. The second level expectation was that students would develop enough self-awareness to know whether they deserved points. To this end, a student at this level negotiated with teachers and staff for points. Upon accumulation of sufficient points at the second level, the student advanced to the third level,

which provided greater freedoms within the school. At the third level, students did not carry tally sheets and collect points, but were expected to behave in a manner consistent with the Boys Town system principles.

Students who attended a disciplinary AEP for a full day without further misbehaviors were considered to have completed a “good day,” which counted toward completion of the placement period. When a student completed the requisite number of “good days,” he or she did not automatically return to the home campus. The DAEPs set up an incentive-based exit procedure, which considered appropriate dress and deportment, as well as successful completion of academic work. Students who met the requirements could return to their home campuses, while those who did not remained at the DAEPs for longer periods of time.

The academic program at the secondary DAEPs revolved largely around the four core courses, with the exception of a limited number of electives. Generally, students worked on the same courses they had worked on in their home campuses. If a student was enrolled at a DAEP during the end of a grading period, then grades received for work done at his or her home school were combined with those received at the DAEP to calculate a course grade. If a student withdrew from a DAEP in the middle of a grading period, then grades were sent to the home school to be incorporated into the next six-weeks grade, which was administered by the home school.

Both elementary DAEPs used the same instructional program used in the district's elementary schools, but strived to offer smaller class sizes. Students in grades 1-4 at the elementary DAEPs were in self-contained classes, while students in grades 5-6 had different teachers in the four core areas of reading/language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies.

The district's code of conduct identified four categories of offenses: major, discretionary, mandatory, and expellable. Major offenses disrupt the learning environment, but involve less serious consequences than DAEP placement. Major offenses included bus misconduct, disruptive use of a cellular telephone or paging device, dress code violations, insubordination, hazing, scuffling, profanity, or obscene gestures to other students. Disciplinary consequences for

major offenses included classroom management measures, in-school suspension, placement of the student in another classroom, peer mediation, referral to the Student Support Team, or confiscation of a cellular telephone and a mandatory fee for its return.

Discretionary offenses are more serious in nature and require removal of the offending student from the regular classroom. Examples of discretionary offenses included bullying, fighting, gang activity, profanity or obscene gestures toward school personnel, vandalism, and class C assault (student on student). Consequences for discretionary offenses included restriction from extracurricular activities, placement in a DAEP for up to 30 days, in-school suspension for up to 30 days, out-of-school suspension, notification of district police, or referral to the Dallas County juvenile authorities.

Mandatory offenses lack a discretionary component and required referral of the offending student to a DAEP for a minimum of 60 days. Offenses that warrant mandatory removals include class A assault on a student, class C assault on school personnel, non-felony drug violations, indecent exposure, retaliation against a school staff member, and non-expellable felony conduct. In addition to the mandatory DAEP placement, consequences include mandatory extracurricular activities restriction, referral to outside social services agencies, police notification, and referral to juvenile authorities.

Expellable offenses include violations of state law and infractions that occur in a DAEP. Such offenses require law enforcement notification and can be discretionary or mandatory, depending on the gravity of the offense. Discretionary expellable offenses included class A assault on school personnel, felony criminal mischief, setting a false alarm, terroristic threats, or persistent misbehavior while in a DAEP. Students who commit these offenses may be placed in the Dallas County Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program (JJAEP) or in a DAEP for 90 days at the district's discretion. Mandatory expellable offenses involved the legal system and included firearms possession, felony drug offenses, and sexual assault. Mandatory expellable offenses could require 90 days in a DAEP or JJAEP, but weapons offenses involving a firearm could require 180 days, equal to an entire school year.

Because of the transient nature of the enrollment in the DAEPs, it is difficult to obtain a precise count of the students enrolled. This report will report enrollment data in two ways: cumulatively and by six weeks. The cumulative data will report all students that spent a minimum of one day in a district DAEP. The six-weeks data will present a “snapshot” of enrollment at a single point in time for each six weeks grading period. These data also help illustrate use of the alternative campuses throughout the school year.

As shown in Table 40, enrollment in the DAEPs rose during the fall 2004 semester, then fell for the fourth six weeks before rising again during the rest of the spring 2005 semester. The middle school and Redirections campuses, both housed at the Village Fair alternative center, had the largest enrollments.

Table 40
DAEP Enrollment by Grading Period, 2004-2005

Six Weeks Grading Period	Middle School	High School	Redirections	Elementary East	Elementary South
1	64	95	150	22	28
2	206	177	177	54	77
3	261	201	198	93	87
4	270	162	227	85	83
5	268	241	273	94	94
6	298	215	317	132	106

The next set of tables examines the cumulative number of students referred to the DAEPs in 2004-2005. District student databases supplied the information. Overall, a total of 2,581 students attended at least one day at a district DAEP. The middle school DAEP had the highest number of students, with 787 attending during 2004-2005. The high school DAEP followed, with 658 students. Table 41 displays DAEP student enrollment by campus and sex. By individual campuses and overall, most of the students were male. The middle and high school DAEPs had the highest percentages of female students, with nearly 33% for each campus.

Table 41

DAEP Enrollment by Campus and Sex

Campus	Male		Female		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Middle School	529	67.2	258	32.8	787	100.0
High School	443	67.3	215	32.7	658	100.0
Redirections	490	83.3	98	16.7	588	100.0
Elementary East	239	84.5	44	15.5	283	100.0
Elementary South	225	84.9	40	15.1	265	100.0
Total	1,926	74.6	655	25.4	2,581	100.0

As shown in Table 42, which displays DAEP enrollment by ethnicity, Hispanics were the majority at the Redirections campus, and African-Americans were the majority at the high school and elementary DAEPs. At the middle school DAEP, Hispanics and African-Americans each comprised about 47% of the enrollment.

Table 42

DAEP Enrollment by Ethnicity

Campus	African-American		Asian		Hispanic		American Indian		White		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Middle school	372	47.3	6	0.8	370	47.0	4	0.5	35	4.4	787	100.0
High school	360	54.7	1	0.2	283	43.0	3	0.5	11	1.7	658	100.0
Redirections	172	29.3	3	0.5	377	64.1	5	0.9	31	5.3	588	100.0
Elem. East	142	50.2	1	0.4	117	41.3	0	0.0	23	8.1	283	100.0
Elem. South	141	53.2	1	0.4	115	43.4	2	0.8	6	2.3	265	100.0
Total	1,187	46.0	12	0.5	1,262	48.9	14	0.5	106	4.1	2,581	100.0

The next two tables examine characteristics of DAEP faculty and staff members. Personnel data found that staff at the DAEPs included 59 professional staff members and 8 administrative staff. Professional staff included 50 teachers, five counselors, a nurse, a youth action specialist, a visiting teacher, and a community liaison. Each DAEP had a counselor, while the nurse, youth action specialist, visiting teacher, and community liaison worked at the Village Fair alternative center, which housed the secondary-level alternative campuses.

Table 43 shows that DAEP teachers had less experience on average than other district teachers. It is important to note that personnel data included only a staff member's level of experience in DISD, and therefore will not display the level of experience of staff members who worked in other school districts or other professional settings. The large standard deviations indicate wide variation in years of experience. Among the DAEP teachers, 28% were newcomers to the district, and 74% had five years or less of district experience. For the district overall, 11% were newcomers, and 62% had five years or less with the district.

Table 43

DAEP and Other District Teachers by Years of Experience in DISD

Teachers	N	Mean Years of Experience	Standard Deviation
DAEP Campuses	50	4.84	6.71
Other DISD teachers	19,170	7.12	8.45

The 2004-2005 action plan for the DAEPs included a goal of providing staff management related to behavior modification and classroom management. To that end, teachers at the Village Fair alternative center underwent CHAMPs training in an October 2004 staff development session. The CHAMPs program is the classroom management component of the Safe and Civil Schools program, which was an important part of the district's safety initiative. Earlier sections of this report discuss the design and implementation of CHAMPs in greater detail.

Course evaluation forms used by the Department of Professional Development and Staff Training found that more than 90% of the faculty members who received CHAMPs training rated the program favorably. Respondents to the CHAMPs survey administered by the project evaluator in April 2005 included 18 teachers and administrators at the Village Fair alternative center. This represents about 50% of Village Fair's faculty and administration. Table 44 displays CHAMPs survey results for this group. Overall, the majority found CHAMPs beneficial and a source of new ideas. Consistent with the CHAMPs survey results discussed earlier, some teachers were unsure about the efficacy of the program's procedures. Because the CHAMPs

program is new to the district, and teachers took this survey only a few months after implementing the program's procedures, the uncertainty about effectiveness not surprising.

Table 44

CHAMPs Survey Results for Village Fair DAEP Teachers

Question	Agree		Disagree		Neutral/ Don't Know	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
CHAMPs training provided me with new ideas for improving management of my classroom.	16	88.9	2	11.1	0	0.0
CHAMPs training materials were clear and easy to understand.	18	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Trainers presented CHAMPs information in a clear and effective way.	17	94.4	0	0.0	1	5.6
Overall, I found CHAMPs training to be useful and beneficial.	16	88.9	1	5.6	1	5.5
I have a thorough understanding of when and how to teach CHAMPs expectations to students.	15	83.3	1	5.6	2	11.1
I have a thorough understanding of when and how to implement encouragement procedures to improve student motivation.	17	94.4	1	5.6	0	0.0
I have a thorough understanding of when and how to implement corrective procedures in response to misbehavior.	17	94.4	1	5.6	0	0.0
I am actively implementing CHAMPs procedures to teach and review expectations.	17	94.4	1	5.6	0	0.0
CHAMPs procedures have been effective in improving student behavior.	12	66.7	2	11.1	3	16.7
I am actively implementing encouragement procedures to improve student motivation.	16	88.9	1	5.6	1	5.5
Encouragement procedures have been effective in improving student behavior.	15	83.3	1	5.6	2	11.1
I am actively implementing corrective procedures to respond to misbehavior.	15	83.4	2	11.1	1	5.5
Corrective procedures have been effective in improving student behavior.	11	61.2	2	11.1	5	27.7

2.7 *What were the outcomes of the Districtwide Safety Initiative?*

Methodology

This is the first year of the district's safety initiative, and for that reason, only limited outcomes data were available. The outcomes discussed in this report pertain to the 16 campuses that comprise the first cohort of the Safe and Civil Schools program. The Office of Student Discipline collects data on disciplinary referrals across the district. The office supplied disciplinary referral data for 2003-2004 and 2004-2005 for this report.

The district's Department of Planning and Project Support compiles for each campus an index known as the Serious Free Behavior Index, or SFBI, which measures the percentage of the school year in which a given campus remained free of serious disciplinary infractions. The department divides a school's sum of discretionary, mandatory, and expellable offenses, and divides it by the average daily attendance, then uses that result to calculate a percentage. The higher a percentage, the fewer the serious incidents of student misconduct on that campus. The SFBIs do not include Level 1 offenses, which are less serious violations.

The Department of Planning and Project Support, with assistance from the evaluator of the safety initiative, developed a Safe Schools Survey for administration in May 2005. The questionnaire would survey campus staff about a wide range of safety issues in district schools. However, because the safety initiative and its component programs were in the initial stages of implementation, the initiative's steering committee decided not to use the Safe Schools Survey.

Results

Sixteen secondary schools comprised the first cohort of DISD campuses that participated in the Safe and Civil Schools program. The program emphasizes a data-driven approach to improving campus safety and civility. Safe and Civil Schools includes three component programs: Foundations, CHAMPs, and START on Time. The results discussed in this section pertain to the Foundations portion of Safe and Civil Schools. Foundations is a schoolwide process for improving school safety and security that encourages schools to form a committee to oversee implementation. An ongoing improvement cycle forms the heart of the Foundations

process, which encourages schools to develop a set of specific rules and guidelines, instruct students on them, and to enforce these rules and standards consistently.

During Foundations training in 2004-2005, Safe and Civil Schools consultants encouraged the schools to continue to monitor disciplinary referrals and other data. Because of a new emphasis on specific standards and consistent enforcement of them, the schools may see an increase in disciplinary referrals in the early stages of implementation.

Table 45 supports the assertion by Safe and Civil Schools consultants that referrals increase in the early stages of implementation. The table displays disciplinary referrals for the Foundations campuses for 2003-2004 and 2004-2005. Although some individual campuses reported a drop, overall disciplinary referrals increased 69.24% over last year across the 16 campuses. By comparison, disciplinary referrals for other secondary schools that did not participate in the program declined 27.7% for the same time period. Subsequent tables will demonstrate that less serious offenses accounted for much of the increase among the Safe and Civil Schools cohort. As stated previously, these higher numbers likely reflect more consistent enforcement and improved documentation rather than a higher incidence of student misconduct.

Table 45

Disciplinary Referrals for Foundations Campuses, 2003-2004 and 2004-2005

Campus	2003-2004 Referrals	2004-2005 Referrals	% Change
Bryan Adams	123	485	+294.30
Hillcrest	50	562	+1,024.00
Jefferson	118	72	-38.98
Lincoln	130	82	-36.92
Molina	1,235	595	-51.82
North Dallas	86	30	-65.12
Pinkston	171	261	+52.63
Roosevelt	141	306	+117.02
Samuell	689	964	+39.91
Spruce	736	2,117	+187.63
Sunset	598	995	+66.39
W.T. White	305	176	-42.30
Woodrow Wilson	79	250	+216.45
E.B. Comstock	664	790	+18.97
John B. Hood	341	1,146	+236.07
Boude Storey	191	743	+289.00
Foundations total	5,657	9,574	+69.24
Other secondary campuses	19,413	14,029	-27.73

The district's Code of Student Conduct identifies four levels of infractions: level 1, discretionary, mandatory, and expellable. Level 1 offenses involve acts that are disruptive, but are not serious enough to warrant placement in a disciplinary alternative school or notification of law enforcement authorities. Discretionary offenses are more serious and require removal of the student from the regular classroom.

As shown in Table 46, discretionary and level 1 offenses comprised 9,017 of the 9,574 total disciplinary referrals reported in Table 45 for the Foundations campuses. Level 1 referrals in 2004-2005 rose 96.8% from the previous year, and discretionary referrals increased 39% over the same time period. The most common level 1 referrals were for insubordination, single acts of disruptive behavior, leaving school grounds without permission, and dress code violations. These offenses constituted nearly 90% of level 1 referrals. The most common discretionary referrals involved fighting, bullying, gang activity, profanity, and obscene gestures to school personnel. These accounted for more than 80% of discretionary referrals.

Table 46

Level 1 and Discretionary Offenses for Foundations Schools, 2003-2005

Campus Name	Level 1 Offenses			Discretionary Offenses		
	03-04	04-05	% Change	03-04	04-05	% Change
Bryan Adams	0	310	N/A	54	114	+111.11
Hillcrest	0	519	N/A	21	22	+4.76
Jefferson	15	7	-53.33	67	19	-71.64
Lincoln	25	6	-76.00	79	59	-25.32
Molina	961	409	-57.44	201	132	-34.32
North Dallas	20	0	-100.00	37	16	-56.76
Pinkston	24	151	+529.16	78	69	-11.54
Roosevelt	105	160	+52.38	27	132	+388.88
Samuell	513	722	+40.74	33	200	+506.06
Spruce	593	1,986	+234.91	79	64	+18.99
Sunset	443	859	+93.90	57	92	+61.40
W.T. White	166	104	-37.35	82	41	-50.00
W. Wilson	10	102	+920.00	100	88	-12.00
Comstock	576	556	-3.47	54	217	+301.85
John B. Hood	165	884	+435.76	165	250	+51.52
Boude Storey	125	587	+369.60	56	140	+150.00
Total	3,741	7,362	+96.79	1,190	1,655	+39.07

Mandatory removals and expellable offenses involve more serious violations of the district's Student Code of Conduct and mandate student placement in an alternative school. Mandatory removals include non-felony drug and alcohol offenses, class A assault (student on student), class C assault (student on school personnel), non-expellable felony acts, inhalant abuse, indecent exposure, and public lewdness. These offenses require a minimum of 60 days in an off-campus disciplinary alternative education program (DAEP). Expellable offenses require notification of law enforcement authorities, as well as a minimum of 90 days in a DAEP or the Dallas County Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program (JJAEP). Expellable offenses include felony sexual assault, felony drug and alcohol offenses, and firearms possession.

As shown in Table 47, from the previous school year, mandatory removals declined 26.34%, and expellable offenses increased only 4.11% for the Foundations campuses. Among mandatory removals, assaults, student threats, and non-felony substance abuse offenses comprised more than 80% of the referrals. The most common expellable infractions included felony drug offenses, weapons violations, aggravated assaults, and terrorist threats.

Table 47

Mandatory Removals and Expellable Offenses for Foundations Schools, 2003-2005

Campus Name	Mandatory Removals			Expellable Offenses		
	03-04	04-05	% Change	03-04	04-05	% Change
Bryan Adams	63	53	-15.87	6	8	+33.33
Hillcrest	28	20	-28.57	1	1	0.00
Jefferson	31	43	+38.71	5	3	-40.00
Lincoln	18	15	-16.67	8	2	-75.00
Molina	68	46	-32.35	5	8	+60.00
North Dallas	25	12	-52.00	4	2	-50.00
Pinkston	66	33	-50.00	3	8	166.67
Roosevelt	9	13	+44.44	0	1	N/A
Samuell	71	39	-45.07	4	3	-25.00
Spruce	54	56	+3.70	10	11	+10.00
Sunset	83	37	-55.42	15	7	-53.33
W.T. White	54	24	-55.55	3	7	+133.33
W. Wilson	32	54	+68.75	5	6	+20.00
Comstock	33	12	-63.63	1	5	+400.00
John B. Hood	9	11	+22.22	2	1	-50.00
Boude Storey	9	13	+44.44	1	3	+200.00
Total	653	481	-26.34	73	76	+4.11

To summarize, less serious violations accounted for most of the overall increase in disciplinary referrals at the Foundations schools. As stated previously, this may reflect more vigorous, consistent enforcement of behavior standards, rather than a spike in actual incidents of student misbehavior. This is consistent with what Safe and Civil Schools consultants indicated would probably happen the first year. It is also important to note that some of the Foundations schools did not implement safety and civility improvement plans in the 2004-2005 school year, but opted to continue planning and then implement improvement efforts in 2005-2006. Further, it is worth noting that among more serious disciplinary offenses, mandatory removals declined, and expellable offenses rose by only a small percentage.

Safe and Civil Schools is a multi-year program, with training for this first cohort scheduled to extend into the next two school years. It is important to continue to monitor and analyze disciplinary referrals and other data from these schools to determine the effectiveness of the program over time.

The next set of tables will examine some of the disciplinary consequences employed by the Foundations schools over the 2003-2004 and 2004-2005 school years. This section will focus on the following measures taken in response to disciplinary infractions: in-school suspension, out-of-school suspension, DAEP referrals, and Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program (JJAEP) referrals.

In-school and out-of-school suspensions at the Foundations schools for 2004-2005 increased over the previous school year, as demonstrated in Table 48. By comparison, both types of suspensions decreased at other secondary campuses. In-school suspensions at the Foundations schools more than tripled, from 1,132 in 2003-2004 to 3,483 in 2004-2005. In addition, out-of-school suspensions jumped 36.6%, from 3,106 in 2003-2004 to 4,901 in the 2004-2005 school year. These findings are consistent with those related to disciplinary referrals for the Foundations campuses. These schools showed sharp increases in Level 1 and discretionary disciplinary referrals. Suspensions are common responses to such offenses, while more serious infractions often warrant placing the student in an off-campus alternative program. As previously discussed in the section on disciplinary referrals, the rise in suspensions suggests

more consistent enforcement of standards for behavior rather than a jump in actual student offenses.

Table 48

In-School and Out-of-School Suspensions for Foundations Campuses and Other Secondary Schools, 2003-2005

Campus Name	In-School Suspensions			Out-of-School Suspensions		
	03-04	04-05	% Change	03-04	04-05	% Change
Bryan Adams	0	347	N/A	0	3	N/A
Hillcrest	3	383	+12,666.67	0	142	N/A
Jefferson	17	3	-82.35	1	5	+400.00
Lincoln	28	7	-75.00	8	11	+37.50
Molina	69	44	-56.81	992	443	-55.34
North Dallas	15	0	-100.00	22	0	-100.00
Pinkston	0	153	N/A	38	37	-2.63
Roosevelt	0	66	N/A	126	158	+25.40
Samuell	171	412	+140.93	400	464	+16.00
Spruce	20	390	+1,850.00	587	1,615	+175.13
Sunset	423	873	+106.38	44	31	-29.54
W.T. White	64	7	-89.06	123	116	-5.69
W. Wilson	10	93	+830.00	0	30	N/A
Comstock	211	258	+22.27	409	499	+22.00
John B. Hood	2	30	+1,400.00	312	1,067	+241.99
Boude Storey	99	417	+321.21	44	280	536.36
Total	1,132	3,483	+207.68	3,106	4,901	+57.79
Other secondary schools	8,178	5,965	-27.06	8,404	6,414	-23.61

Table 49 displays data on DAEP and JJAEP referrals for the Foundations schools from 2003-2005. In 2004-2005, the Foundations campuses made 1,118 referrals to DAEPs, a 13.27% increase over the previous year. They also made 72 referrals to the JJAEP, a 14.29% increase over 2003-2004. Other secondary campuses reported fewer referrals in 2004-2005 from the previous school year. Once again, it is important to consider these data in light of earlier findings on disciplinary referrals. The increase in alternative school referrals may reflect more consistent enforcement of campus standards.

Table 49

Alternative Education Program Referrals for Foundations Campuses
and Other Secondary Schools, 2003-2005

Campus Name	DAEP Referrals			JJAEP Referrals		
	03-04	04-05	% Change	03-04	04-05	% Change
Bryan Adams	113	127	+12.39	3	8	+166.67
Hillcrest	32	36	+12.50	1	1	0.00
Jefferson	46	61	+32.61	4	3	-25.00
Lincoln	51	62	+21.57	8	2	-75.00
Molina	90	101	+12.22	5	7	+40.00
North Dallas	22	28	+27.27	3	2	-33.33
Pinkston	38	63	+65.79	3	8	+166.67
Roosevelt	126	81	-35.71	0	1	N/A
Samuell	72	86	+19.44	4	2	-50.00
Spruce	117	102	-12.82	10	10	0.00
Sunset	112	84	-25.00	11	7	-36.36
W.T. White	66	46	-30.30	3	7	+133.33
W. Wilson	65	122	+87.70	4	5	+25.00
Comstock	41	28	-31.71	1	5	+400.00
John B. Hood	25	48	+92.00	2	1	-50.00
Boude Storey	47	43	-8.51	1	3	+200.00
Total	987	1,118	+13.27	63	72	+14.29
Other secondary campuses	1,707	1,521	-10.90	137	129	-5.84

Table 50 displays the Serious Free Behavior Index (SFBI) scores for the 16 Foundations campuses in 2003-2004 and 2004-2005, as well as the SFBI for other secondary schools. The SFBIs for most of the Foundations schools in 2004-2005 declined from their 2003-2004 levels. North Dallas High School was the sole exception. Overall, the SFBI for all Foundations campuses was slightly lower than that of other secondary schools. The lower SFBIs for the Foundations schools may reflect more aggressive enforcement of discipline management plans and school standards.

Table 50

Serious Free Behavior Index Scores for Foundations Campuses
and Other Secondary Schools, 2003-2005

Campus	2003-2004 SFBI	2004-2005 SFBI	Change
Bryan Adams	95.98%	89.00%	-6.98
Hillcrest	98.35%	95.65%	-2.70
Jefferson	97.35%	93.97%	-3.38
Lincoln	94.11%	88.31%	-5.80
Molina	92.03%	89.91%	-2.12
North Dallas	96.47%	96.99%	+0.52
Pinkston	90.74%	84.77%	-5.97
Roosevelt	96.23%	69.68%	-26.55
Samuell	93.52%	83.93%	-9.59
Spruce	91.99%	87.00%	-4.91
Sunset	93.53%	90.94%	-2.59
W.T. White	96.49%	95.74%	-0.75
Woodrow Wilson	95.01%	85.07%	-9.94
Comstock	89.72%	71.77%	-17.95
John B. Hood	85.51%	76.96%	-8.55
Boude Storey	90.62%	71.15%	-19.47
All Foundations Schools	(not available)	87.97%	N/A
Other secondary campuses	(not available)	89.32%	N/A

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The 2004-2005 school year marked the beginning of the Districtwide Safety Initiative of the Dallas Independent School District, which planned to roll out this effort to improve school safety over a five-year period from 2004-2009.

The safety initiative consists of more than 20 separate programs and strategies, and involves multiple district departments. A steering committee oversees the initiative's implementation. The programs and interventions included in the safety initiative fall into the following categories: universal programs, enforcement programs, select interventions, and targeted interventions.

Universal programs consisted of prevention and intervention strategies aimed at all students. Enforcement programs consisted of programs and strategies aimed at reducing crime on campus. Select interventions focused on students with ongoing behavior issues who did not respond adequately to the universal strategies. Targeted interventions focused on students with severe behavioral issues who did not respond adequately to the universal and/or select strategies.

The 2004-2005 evaluation of the Districtwide Safety Initiative concentrated on the universal programs and one targeted intervention: the Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (DAEP). The universal programs consisted of the Safe and Civil Schools programs, character education, and drug and violence education. Safe and Civil Schools refers to a series of programs designed to improve school safety, enhance classroom management, reduce student tardiness, and foster a better school climate. The programs in this series consist of Foundations, CHAMPs, and START on Time.

The Foundations program represents a comprehensive, data-driven approach to behavior management and school safety and civility. A site-based team collects and analyzes data to identify priorities for school improvement, develops and implements an improvement plan, and monitors and revises the plan when needed. Sixteen DISD secondary schools (13 high schools and 3 middle schools) participated in Foundations in 2004-2005.

CHAMPs stands for Conversation, Help, Activity, Movement, and Participation, which are the program's key aspects. CHAMPs is the classroom management program in the Safe and Civil Schools series. The program provides teachers with tools to teach responsibility to students and structure classes to promote responsible student behavior.

Safe Transitions and Reduced Tardies (START on Time) strives to reduce student tardiness. The program designates staff members to "sweep" the halls and other common areas for tardy students and to deal with them quickly and consistently.

The Character Education component, another universal program, involved use of the Character Counts! program, developed by the Josephson Institute on Ethics. Under this program, elementary and middle school counselors would present guidance lessons that emphasize the Character Counts! program's six pillars of good character: trustworthiness, respect, caring, citizenship, fairness, and responsibility. In elementary schools, counselors would present to homeroom classes, while in middle school, counselors would present these lessons to core course classes, usually social studies.

The Drug and Violence Education program called for Safe and Drug Free Schools department specialists to provide orientation for physical education teachers in elementary and middle schools on the state's drug and violence prevention curriculum. P.E. teachers would then present weekly half-hour lessons on drug and violence prevention.

For the Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (DAEP), the district operated three secondary DAEPs at the Village Fair alternative center: a high school, a middle school, and Redirections, for students with substance abuse violations. The district also operated two elementary DAEPs.

The 2004-2005 budget for the safety initiative totaled \$557,920. Nearly half of that amount went to the district's Department of Police and Security Services.

Implementation of Safe and Civil Schools began in September 2004. Teams of teachers and administrators from the 16 schools in the Foundations program attended a series of two-day training sessions. Safe and Civil Schools consultants conducted the training, which allowed time for each school's team to work on its own improvement plans. The schools surveyed students,

staff members, and parents about safety, school climate, and student behavior issues. They also observed common areas, such as corridors, and examined data on disciplinary referrals.

Student survey data identified restrooms, campus parking lots, and walking to and from school as times and places in which students felt the least safe. School staff members also agreed that students did not feel safe in restrooms, parking lots, or when walking to and from school. The majority of students and staff members also agreed that students would not tell a staff member if they knew that a student was involved in something illegal or dangerous. Students and staff members also agreed that the following were problems in their schools: bullying, assaults, and thefts. They differed, however, in their perception of student weapons possession as a problem. Most students indicated that students having weapons was a problem in their schools, while less than a third of staff members identified this as a problem.

After reviewing all data sources, most of the 16 schools identified student tardiness, and behavior in hallways and school cafeterias as improvement priorities. Safe and Civil Schools consultants gave the schools the option of developing improvement plans to implement in the spring semester of 2005 or to spend the 2004-2005 year in planning and implement improvement efforts in 2005-2006. Nine of the 16 schools opted to begin implementing improvement plans in the 2005 spring semester, and seven chose to wait until 2005-2006. Most Foundations team members rated the training sessions positively and agreed that the program was a useful source of ideas for improving campus safety and civility.

Fifteen of the 16 campuses implemented the START on Time program. Surveys on perceptions of the program found that most team members agreed that students and teachers understood the procedures for dealing with tardiness. However, one-third of team members did not believe school hallways had adequate supervision during pass periods. More than 80% of team members agreed that pass periods had become more orderly and that START on Time helped reduce tardiness.

Overall, 523 teachers from 88 DISD campuses, as well as 51 central administrative staff members, attended CHAMPs training in 2004-2005. A CHAMPs survey, administered in April 2005, found that the majority of teachers thought the program provided new ideas for classroom

management and that they had a clear understanding of when and how to implement it in their classrooms.

For the Character Education program, all elementary and middle schools developed implementation plans and submitted them to the Safe and Drug Free Schools office. All included character education lessons, and many campuses included other schoolwide activities, such as a character-themed word of the week, character-related quotations and announcements, and recognition of students who exhibit strong character. An on-line survey administered once each semester by the Department of Counseling Services found that about 87% of elementary homerooms received character education lessons in the 2004 fall semester, and 57% of middle school social studies classrooms received such lessons. Data for the 2005 spring semester were not available for inclusion in this report.

For the Drug and Violence Education component, specialists from the Safe and Drug Free Schools department provided orientation for elementary and middle school physical education teachers on the state's Drug and Violence Education (DAVE) curriculum. The amount of orientation varied widely with teachers' schedules, so that some received more orientation than others. About 98% of P.E. teachers indicated in a spring 2005 survey that they had given drug and violence prevention lessons. However, more than one-third of the teachers expressed doubts about whether they had sufficient training to implement the lessons.

During 2004-2005, a total of 2,581 DISD students attended at least one day of school at an off-campus disciplinary alternative education program (DAEP). The middle school DAEP, housed in the Village Fair alternative center, had the highest cumulative enrollment. Nearly 75% of the students referred to the DAEPs were male. DAEP teachers, in general, had less experience (as measured by years in the district) than their counterparts in other district schools. As part of efforts to provide staff development, DAEP teachers participated in CHAMPs training in 2004-2005.

Because 2004-2005 was the first year of implementation for many of the safety initiative's component programs, only limited outcomes data were available. Disciplinary referral data and

the Serious Free Behavior Index (SFBI) scores from the Department of Planning and Project Support provided outcomes data for the Foundations schools.

Overall, the Foundations schools showed large increases in disciplinary referrals over the previous school year, but minor offenses accounted for much of the increase. Safe and Civil Schools consultants told Foundations schools' teams that they might see increases in referrals the first year of program implementation. More vigorous and consistent enforcement of school standards and rules, as promoted by the Safe and Civil Schools program, may account for much of the increased referrals. Mandatory removals, which require placement of offending students in DAEPs, declined among the Foundations schools, and expellable offenses increased only slightly.

Recommendations

- Survey data for the Safe and Civil Schools program identified multiple safety and civility concerns, including, but not limited to, thefts, physical assaults, and weapons. In addition, students felt the least safe in restrooms, parking lots, and walking to and from school. Yet, in selecting improvement priorities, schools in the Safe and Civil Schools Foundations program focused on matters of civility rather than safety, choosing to concentrate on reducing tardiness and improving behavior in hallways and cafeterias. There is no evidence that the participating schools' plans addressed safety-related issues such as the concerns cited earlier. While tardiness and student behavior in common areas are legitimate concerns, emphasizing them suggests a timid approach to improving school climate. It is recommended that Safe and Civil Schools participants, both present and future, devote more of their training to intervening in safety concerns. These schools, Safe and Civil Schools consultants, and the district's Police and Security Services department should collaborate more closely to foster greater efforts to improve school safety.
- Safe and Civil Schools survey data found that students and staff members agreed that most students would not tell a staff member if they knew another student was involved in dangerous or illegal activity. The Safety Initiative's Breaking the Code of Silence program is supposed to help address this problem and make students part of the solution to school violence. The program trained counselors in 2004-2005. It is recommended that this program be expanded to include presentations for teachers and students at all grade levels.
- Although nearly all elementary and middle school physical education teachers who were surveyed indicated that they had given drug and violence prevention lessons during 2004-2005, about 36% said they had not received sufficient training to implement the lessons or were not sure. The teachers received informal, one-on-one orientation on the state's drug and violence curriculum rather than actual training. The Safe and Drug Free Schools department should conduct more formalized training. Given the mixed record of success for drug education programs, as found in the research literature, this training should include instruction on the best practices for drug and violence education.

- Because many of the programs in the safety initiative were in the early stages of implementation in 2004-2005, the Safe Schools Survey was not administered, as previously scheduled in May 2005. Unfortunately, this was a missed opportunity for comprehensive data on the initiative's baseline year. The steering committee should administer this survey annually, beginning in 2005-2006. This would help build a source of longitudinal data on the safety initiative.

REFERENCES

- Appalachia Education Laboratory (1998). School-Based Programs to Promote Safety and Civility.
- California Attorney General's Crime and Violence Prevention Center, 2001. School Safety: Exemplary Practices (www.safestate.org).
- Clayton, R.R., Cattarello, A.M., and Johnstone, B.M. (1996). The Effectiveness of Drug Abuse Resistance Education (Project DARE): 5-Year Follow-Up Results. *Addiction* 93 (10), pp. 1475-1487.
- Cotton, Kathleen (1995). *Effective Schooling Practices: A Research Synthesis*. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.
- Derzon, James H., and Wilson, Sandra Jo (1999). An Empirical Review of School-Based Programs to Reduce Violence. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
- Gliksman, Louis, and Smythe, Cynthia (1990). A Review of School-Based Drug Education Programs: Do We Expect Too Much? From Engs, Ruth C. (ed.), *Controversies in the Addiction Field*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall-Hunt.
- Tobler, Nancy S., and Stratton, Howard H. (1997). Effectiveness of School-Based Drug Prevention Programs: A Meta-Analysis of the Research. *Journal of Primary Prevention* (Vol. 18, No. 1), pp. 71-128.