

**Project Bridge
Year Two
Evaluation Report, 2008-2009**

Prepared by:

CH Lacey Consulting, Inc.
Candace H. Lacey, Ph.D., MBA
Research Consultant

September, 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION	6
CURRENT STATUS OF THE PROJECT	6
LITERATURE REVIEW	9
EVALUATION DESIGN	13
FINDINGS	15
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	53
RECOMMENDATIONS	55
REFERENCES	56

List of Tables

Table 1	Broward County School District Three-Year Demographic Comparison	16
Table 2	Two-Year Demographic Profile of Schools in the North Central Area	17
Table 3	Project Staff: September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2009	18
Table 4	Two-Year Comparison of Actual to Budgeted Spending	19
Table 5	Implementation Status of Project Bridge Activities	22
Table 6	Three-Year Comparison of Response Rates on ACS for NCA Secondary Schools	29
Table 7	Three-Year Comparison of the Number and Percent of Students in NCA Schools (6-12) Reporting on the ACS, “I feel safe at school.”	31
Table 8	Three-Year Comparison of the Number and Percent of Students in NCA Schools (6-12) Reporting on the ACS, “Students bring drugs or alcohol to my school.”	33
Table 9	Three-Year Comparison of the Number and Percent of Students in NCA Schools (6-12) Reporting on the ACS, “There is An Adult at School I can Talk to About My Personal Problems”	34
Table 10	Demographics Profile of Respondents Taking The District Prevention Assessment.....	36
Table 11	Two-Year Comparison of Students in Project School (6-12) Reporting They Missed One or More Days of School During the Previous 30 Days Because They Felt Unsafe at School or on the Way to and from School	37
Table 12	Two-Year Comparison of Students in Project Schools (6-12) Reporting They Were Involved in a Physical Fight on School Property during the Prior Twelve Months	38
Table 13	Two-Year Comparison of Students in Project Schools Reporting They Have Used Marijuana on One or More Occasions During the Previous 30 Days.	38
Table 14	Two-Year Comparison of Students in Project Schools (6-12) Reporting They Have Consumed Alcohol During the Previous 30 Days	39
Table 15	Two-Year Comparison of Students in Project Schools Reporting They Had Participated in a Prosocial Activity in Their School Last Year (07-08, 08-09).....	39
Table 16	Two-Year Comparison of Students Reporting They Had Participated in a Prosocial Activity in Their Community Last School Year (07-08, 08-09).....	40
Table 17	Three-Year Comparison of External Suspension Data for NCA Schools	40
Table 18	Three-Year Comparison of External Suspensions for Elementary, Middle and High School Students.....	42
Table 19	Three-Year Comparison of Internal Suspension Data for NCA Schools	42
Table 20	Three-Year Comparison of Internal Suspensions for Elementary, Middle and High School Students.....	43
Table 21	Two-Year Comparison of Data for Students in Project Schools (6-12) Reporting “Their Friends at School Think It Is All Right to Drink Alcoholic Drinks Like Beer, Wine Coolers, or Liquor”	44
Table 22	Two-Year Comparison of the Number and Percent of Students Receiving School Based Mental Health Services	45
Table 23	Three-Year Comparison of the Number and Percent of Students Receiving Mental Health Referrals to a Community Agency	48
Table 24	Number and Percent of Students in Project Schools (6-12) Responding to the Question “During LAST school year (2007-2008), did your class participate in alcohol, tobacco, or violence prevention classroom lessons?”	52

APPENDICES

A	Project Bridge Logic Model.....	58
B	List of North Central Area Schools.....	70
C	Demographic Data for Project Schools: 2007-08-2008-09.....	71
D	Description of Project Bridge Curriculum.....	75
E	Level of Implementation Comparison Report.....	77
F	Level of Implementation Summary Report.....	81
G	Project Bridge Timeline.....	83
H	Implementation Status of Project Activities.....	88
I	List of Project Bridge Partners.....	92

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

The purpose of this evaluation is to report the findings from the formative second year evaluation of Broward County Public Schools' (BCPS) Project Bridge-Connecting Communities with Schools for a Safer Tomorrow. The project is funded by a multi-year grant under the Coordinated Grants to Local Educational Agencies for Safe and Drug-Free Learning Environments in conjunction with the Department of Justice and Health and Human Services Program. The grant funding period covered in this report is the 2008-2009 school year.

Utilizing a roll-out model that will, over the course of the grant, support the implementation in the district's 273 schools and the collaborating private schools, Project Bridge supports system change at the macro (District and Community) and micro (school) levels. The following 11 goals provide the framework for Project Bridge activities and outcomes:

- Goal 1: Establish District policy and procedures for the implementation of prevention practices.
- Goal 2: Ensure a positive and safe learning environment.
- Goal 3: Develop collaborative partnerships with community agencies to reduce violent incidents in school.
- Goal 4: Decrease district-wide alcohol, tobacco, and other drug use.
- Goal 5: Implement a Social Norms approach to health promotion to combat underage drinking.
- Goal 6: Establish prosocial activities to enhance ATOD protective factors and increase academic achievement.
- Goal 7: Increase the use of positive behavioral classroom strategies.
- Goal 8: Increase community participation in project schools.
- Goal 9: Enhance communication between school personnel and community partners to increase student and family access to high quality, appropriate mental health services.
- Goal 10: Increase awareness of available social and emotional resources to pre-k parents.
- Goal 11: Increase caregiver involvement at the District's teen parent sites.

Evaluation Model

A modification of Stufflebeam's CIPP model was selected for this evaluation. This model was selected because, "A fundamental tenet of the CIPP model is that the most important purpose of evaluation is not to prove but to improve" (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007, p.331). In addition, the model provided a comprehensive framework for the development of the evaluation questions. The CIPP framework addresses project issues related to a context, input, process, and outcomes. To enhance the model, the evaluation also addresses sustainability, a key focus of this grant.

Research Design

In order to answer the questions related to the project goals and assess outcomes related to student growth, both quantitative and qualitative data were collected using parallel or simultaneous methodologies. Using mixed methods offers the most powerful evaluation of the project, addressing concerns about validity and reliability and thus the transferability of the findings to other settings.

Evaluative Questions

The Evaluation Questions follow the format of the Evaluation Model.

Context

1. Have the demographics of the students in the North Central Administrative Area stayed consistent so that the appropriate population is being served?

Inputs

2. Were any changes to the programs and services selected in the initial grant proposal made?
3. Were sufficient resources allocated to ensure grant specified project outcomes were attained?
4. What role has the Core Management Team played in program implementation, support, and sustainability?

Process

5. Is the project being implemented as intended?
6. What are the school-based Prevention Liaisons' perceptions regarding the obstacles and success of their program?
7. To what extent are evidence-based programs being implemented in project schools?

Product/Outcomes

8. Were District policy and procedures established for the implementation of prevention practices?
9. Did the percent of students in project schools (6-12) reporting they "Do not feel safe at school" decrease by 2%?
10. Did the percent of students in project schools (6-12) reporting, "Students bring drugs or alcohol to my school" decrease 2%?
11. Did the percent of students in project schools (6-12) reporting, "There is an adult at school I can talk to about my personal problems" increase 2%?
12. Did the percent of students in project schools (6-12) who report missing one or more days of school during the previous 30 days because they felt unsafe at school or on the way to and from school decrease 2%?
13. Did the percent of students in project schools (6-12) reporting they were involved in a physical fight on school property during the prior twelve months decrease 2%?
14. Did the percent of students in project schools (6-12) reporting they have used marijuana on one or more occasions during the previous 30 days decrease 2%?
15. Did the percent of students in project schools (6-12) reporting they have consumed alcohol during the previous 30 days decrease 2%?
16. Did the percent of students in project schools (6-12) reporting they had participated in a prosocial activity at their school increase 2%?

17. Did the percent of students in project schools (6-12) reporting engagement in community opportunities for prosocial involvement increase 2%?
18. Did the percent of internal suspensions in project schools (K-12) decrease 2%?
19. Did the percent of external suspensions in project schools (K-12) decrease 2%?
20. Did the social norm perception of students at project schools (6-12) regarding the acceptable use of alcohol decrease 2%?
21. Did the number of Civil Citation increase 10%?
22. Did the percent of students (K-12) who received school-based mental health services (school counselor, psychologist, social worker, or agency) increase 2%?
23. Did the percent of student mental health referrals (K-12) resulting in mental health services being provided in the community (in-patient or to a collaborating agency) increase 2%?
24. Did Pre-K parent attendance at Early Childhood Development classes increase?
25. Did the number of participants attending the Nurturing Parent Program at the teen parent sites increase?
26. Did students in the project schools (K-12) participate in any alcohol, tobacco, or violence prevention classroom lesson during the 2007-2008 school year?

Sustainability

27. Are there processes in place to assure project sustainability?

Summary of Findings

- Through most of the year, Project Bridge was fully staffed. At the end of the year the Project was staffed with a Project Director, Project Manager, seven Risk Reduction Specialists, four Staff Developers, four Case Managers, and a Database Research Assistant.
- Over the past two years, funds have been expended at a rate of 66.5%
- The Core Management Team has taken an active part in the planning and implementation of project activities.
- Project activities in the North Central Area have been fully or substantially implemented as intended.
- A district-wide bullying policy was implemented, and the development of a district-wide prevention policy will commence next year.
- School-based Prevention Liaisons reported “time” as the biggest challenge they face in facilitating program implementation. Their successes focused on positive changes the school climate.
- Currently, there is no process in place to track implementation of evidence-based programs.
- From baseline (06-07) to year one, there was a .7% decrease in the number of students who disagreed with the prompt, “I feel safe at school.” From the year one to the year two there was a 1.1 decrease. The project goal was a 2% annual decrease (ACS).
- There was a 2.8% decrease in the number of students reporting they did not attend school because they felt unsafe at school or on their way to and from school. The project goal was a 2% annual decrease (DPA)
- There was a 6% decrease in the number of students self-reporting they had been in a fight on school property in the past 12 months. The project goal was a 2% annual decrease (DPA)
- There was a 2.1% increase in the percent of students who reported there was an adult at school they could talk to regarding their personal problems. The project goal was a 2% annual increase (ACS).

- There was a 3.3% increase in the number of students who reported “students bring drugs or alcohol to my school.” The project goal was an annual 2% decrease (ACS).
- There was a 5% increase in the number of students reporting consuming alcohol on one or more occasions during the previous 30 days. The project goal was a 2% annual decrease (DPA).
- There was a 27% increase in the number of students who reported their friends felt it was alright to drink alcoholic beverages. The project goal was a 2% decrease (DPA).
- There was a 2.4% increase in the number of students who used marijuana during the previous 30 days. The project goal was a 2% annual decrease (DPA).
- There was 5.9% decrease in the number of students reporting they had participated in any school activities such as sports teams, band or chorus, school clubs, or student government. The project goal was a 2% annual increase (DPA).
- There was a 2.5% decrease in the number of students reporting they participated in a community activity during the past 12 months. The project goal was a 2% increase (DPA).
- There was a 28.9% increase in the number of external suspensions in NCAA schools. The project goal was a 2% decrease (data warehouse).
- There was a 79.7% increase in internal suspensions. The project goal is a 2% annual decrease (data warehouse).
- The Civil Citation Program has not yet been implemented.
- There was a 1.94% increase from the prior year in students who received school-based mental health services. The project goal was a 2% increase (TERMS database).
- There was a .14% increase from the prior year in students who received community-based mental health services. The project goal was a 2% increase (TERMS database).
- The Early Childhood Development Program began implementation this year in the NCAA. Baseline data were collected from attendance logs at classes held in two sites. Trainings were held in the spring and fall. Of the 327 parents eligible to attend training 49 (15%) participated.
- The Nurturing Parent Program began this year. Baseline data were collected from attendance logs at the three program sites. Teen fathers, teen mothers, and caregivers were invited to attend the sessions. Twenty-three sessions were held and 128 teens participated. The majority of the participants were teen fathers (n=103).
- Sustainability is a key focus of both the Core Management Team and Project Bridge Staff. Planning has commenced toward the development of a sustainability plan.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made for program improvement and to ensure sustainability.

Recommendation One:

Develop a process for tracking usage and impact of the evidence-based programs implemented as part of this project. This could be done with a brief online survey completed in December and May.

Recommendation Two:

Reported alcohol and marijuana use has increase in project schools, while the social norms campaign will be rolled out this year, it will not be delivered in all schools. Additionally, it only targets alcohol use. Consider creating a plan to address the increased used.

Recommendation Three:

Students report fewer opportunities for school-based and community based activities. While budget cuts have reduced these activities in schools and the communities, it is suggested that the Core Management Team address this issue to explore options with community partners and project staff.

Recommendation Four:

Changes in the way schools report both internal and external suspensions questions the viability of using this measure to track program progress. It is recommended that project staff work with the evaluator and the Core Management Team to identify clearer outcome measures (i.e., referral data). It is further recommended that if these measure change, baseline, and years one and two data are reported as an addendum to this report.

Recommendation Five:

While discussions continue on the implementation of the Civil Citation Program, consideration might be given to reevaluating this aspect of the project and replacing it with another outcome.

Recommendation Six:

With budget cuts affecting all schools and community agencies, it is recommended that project staff closely monitor school and community based mental health service referrals. These data may assist staff and the Core Management Team in managing resources.

Recommendation Seven:

It is recommended that attendance at both the Early Childhood Development Program and Nurturing Parent Program be monitored to ensure participation continues to grow.

Recommendation Eight:

To ensure sustainability, it is recommended that a draft of the sustainability plan be completed and reviewed by the end of the academic year.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this evaluation is to report the findings from the formative second year evaluation of Broward County Public Schools' (BCPS) Project Bridge-Connecting Communities with Schools for a Safer Tomorrow. The project is funded by a multi-year grant under the Coordinated Grants to Local Educational Agencies for Safe and Drug-Free Learning Environments in conjunction with the Department of Justice and Health and Human Services Program. The grant funding period covered in this report is the 2008-2009 school year.

Grantees receiving this award are required to create a Safe Schools Healthy Students (SS/HS) comprehensive community-wide partnership plan with local mental health and law enforcement agencies. These plans focus on providing students, schools, and families with a system for offering services and supports to help students develop the skills and emotional resilience necessary to promote positive mental health, engage in prosocial behavior, and prevent violent behavior and drug use; create schools and communities that are safe, disciplined, and drug-free environments; and engage parents, community organizations, and social services agencies to help develop an infrastructure that will institutionalize and sustain successful grant activities. Each plan focuses on five elements: (1) safe school environments and violence prevention activities, (2) alcohol and other drug prevention activities, (3) student behavioral, social, and emotional supports, (4) mental health services, and (5) early childhood social and emotional learning programs.

CURRENT STATUS OF THE PROJECT

Background

Project Bridge was funded in the Fall of 2007. During the first year of implementation, the North Central Administrative Area (NCA) was selected to receive grant related services. The North Central Area was home to 22 elementary schools serving 17,803 students, 8 middle schools serving 7,803 students, 7 high schools serving 10,803 students, 13 educational and vocational centers serving 3,430 students, and 36 charter schools serving 17,122 students. In total, 56,961 students were eligible to receive project related services during the first funding period. The initial grant application proposed utilizing a roll-out model that would, over the course of the grant, support the implementation in the district's then 273 schools and the collaborating private schools. Due to staffing and delivery issues, Project Bridge was not fully implemented in the North Central Area. Therefore, during year-two, services were not expanded to an additional administrative area. This decision was important to the ultimate success of the project because Project Bridge supports the development of system change at the macro (District and Community) and micro (school) levels. This type of change requires a level of implementation that ensures sustainability.

Project Goals and Performance Measures

In April, 2009, the Project Bridge staff, in collaboration with the Core Management Team, and the project evaluator, revised a project logic model which aligns project goals with objectives, process measures, and performance measures (Appendix A). Some performance measures are mandated by the grantor under the requirements of the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA). Six GPRA measures were identified for this cohort. Project goals and revised performance measures are presented below, GPRA measures are identified.

Goal 1: Establish District policy and procedures for the implementation of prevention practices.

Performance Measure:

By September 30, 2009, a district-wide prevention and anti-bullying policy will be submitted for board approval as evidenced by board agenda item.

Goal 2: Ensure a positive and safe learning environment.

Performance Measures:

For each project year, the percent of students in grades 3-12 who report they “do not feel safe at school” will decrease by 2% compared to baseline as measured by student responses to the Annual Customer Survey (ACS).

For each project year, the percentage of students in grades 6-12 who report missing one or more days during the past 30 days because they felt unsafe at school or on their way to and from school will decrease by 2% compared to baseline as measured by student responses to the District Prevention Assessment (DPA) (GPRA).

Goal 3: Develop collaborative partnerships with community agencies to reduce violent incidents in school.

Performance measures:

For each project year, the percentage of students (6-12) involved in a physical fight on school property during the just completed school year will decrease by 2% compared to baseline as measured by the DPA (GPRA).

For each project year, the percent of external suspensions in project schools will decrease 2% from baseline as measured by SESIR data.

For each project year, decrease by 2% the recidivism rate for civil Citations for students in project schools (6-12) as measured by school records.

Goal 4: Decrease district-wide alcohol, tobacco, and other drug use.

Performance Measures:

For each project year, the percentage of students (6-12) who report using marijuana on one or more occasions during the previous 30 days will decrease by 2% from baseline as measured by the DPA (GPRA).

For each project year, the percentage of students (grades 6-12) who report consuming alcohol on one or more occasions during the previous 30 days will decrease 2% from baseline as measured by the DPA (GPRA).

Goal 5: Implement a Social Norms approach to health promotion to combat underage drinking.

Performance Measures:

For each project year, decrease by 2% from baseline (at project secondary schools (6-12), the social norm perception regarding acceptable use of alcohol as measured by the DPA

For each project year, the percent of students at project schools (6-12) who report “students bring drugs or alcohol to my school” will decrease by 2% from baseline as measured by the ACS.

Goal 6: Establish prosocial activities to enhance ATOD protective factors and increase academic achievement.

Performance Measures:

For each project year, the percent of students reporting they had participated in a prosocial activity at their school will increase by 2% from baseline as measured by the DPA.

Goal 7: Increase the use of positive behavioral classroom strategies.

Performance Measure:

For each project year, the percent of internal suspensions in project schools (K-12) will decrease by 2% from baseline as evidenced by District SESIR data.

Goal 8: Increase community participation in project schools.

Performance Measures:

For each project year, the percent of students in project school (6-12) reporting, “There is an adult at school I can talk to about my personal problems” will increase by 2% over baseline as measured by student responses on the ACS.

For each project year, the percent of students in project schools (6-12) reporting engagement in community opportunities for prosocial involvement will increase 2% as measured by student responses on the DPA.

Goal 9: Enhance communication between school personnel and community partners to increase student and family access to high quality, appropriate mental health services.

Performance Measures:

For each project year, the percentage of students who receive school based mental health services (counselor, psychologist, social worker, collaborating agency) will increase by 2% from baseline as measured by the TERMS Database (GPRA).

For each project year, the percentage of student referrals (K-12) that result in mental health services being provided in the community (inpatient or to a collaborating agency) will increase by 2% from baseline as evidenced by the TERMS Database (GPRA).

Goal 10: Increase awareness of available social and emotional resources to pre-k parents.

Performance Measure:

By the end of the initiative, increase pre-K parental attendance at Early Childhood Development classes by 10% from as evidenced by attendance logs.

Goal 11: Increase caregiver involvement at the District's teen parent sites.

Performance measure:

By the end of the initiative, increase by 25% from baseline the number of participants attending the three teen parent sites as evidenced by attendance logs

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This review of the literature focuses on research related to program sustainability. This review looks at research related to support factors needed for sustainability including community and advocate support, funding and policy support, and leadership and stakeholder support. The review further examines what the literature refers to as Program or Agency Factors for Sustainability. This area focuses on Vision, Collaboration, and Integration into the Larger Organization, Professional and Staff Development, Marketing and Promotion, and Monitoring, Evaluation, and Planning for the Future.

Program Sustainability

Sometimes programs do not continue beyond the initial grant funding. This can be counterproductive if the need for the program still exists (Chinman, Imm, & Wandersman, 2004). However, if a program is to be successful, it must be sustainable after funding has ended. Sustainability is one of the most important aspects of any program or project (Institute for Educational Leadership, 2002) and may have two features: ensuring long term continuation and replication as well as responding to new challenges (Trottier, Denis, & Villeneuve, 2007). Programs that hope to continue as long as the program need exists must start planning for sustainability at the time of initial funding and/or implementation (Adelman & Taylor, 2003; Chinman, et al; Institute for Educational Leadership; Lamarsh & Potts, 2004).

The goal of program sustainability should be institutionalization and systemic change (Center for Mental Health in Schools, 2004a; Institute for Educational Leadership, 2002). Kramer (as cited in Center for Mental Health in Schools, 2004b) states "Institutionalization is the active process of establishing your initiative – not merely continuing your program, but developing relationships, practices, and procedures that become a lasting part of the community" (p. 1). When institutionalization is supported as systemic change, there are steps in the process: (a) creating readiness, (b) implementing changes with support, (c) using practices that ensure institutionalization, and (d) enabling stakeholders (Adelman & Taylor, 2003; Center for Mental Health in Schools, 2004b).

Support Factors Needed for Sustainability

There are a number of support factors needed to promote sustainability including community and advocate support, funding and policy support, as well as leadership and stakeholder support.

Community and Advocate Support

Enlisting community support and meshing with local needs is an important aspect of sustainability (Akerlund, 2000; Backer, 2000; Harvey, 2005; Marek, Mancini, & Brock, 2000; Paine-Andrews, Fisher, Campuzano, Fawcett, & Berkly-Patton, 2000). And having a clear understanding of the school and community context promotes sustainability (Benz, Lindstrom, Unruh, & Waintrup, 2004). Marek and Mancini (2004) discuss the importance of not only understanding the community context but also of gaining and involving community members, adding that “active community participation” and “local institution building” are relevant to sustainability (p. 2). The buy-in, approval, and adoption of the program by local leaders are also sustainability factors (Williams, 2006).

Broad community support can be enhanced by community advocates or champions (Minnesota Department of Human Services, 2006; Paine-Andrews, et al., 2000). Sustainability through systemic change is enhanced by the promotion of good will, and this can be promoted by finding an influential advocate or champion (Chinman, et al., 2004) or better yet, a “critical mass of champions” (Center for Mental Health in Schools, 2004b, p. 5).

Funding and Policy Support

Programs will have a better chance for sustainability if there is adequate funding and policy support. Planning for future funding needs to begin early with a fiscal plan that focuses on developing local sources and identifying funding gaps (Marek & Mancini, 2004; Minnesota Department of Human Services, 2006). Careful review of program records and analysis of costs and benefits can improve the likelihood of sustainability, as can long-term sources of funding (Akerlund, 2000; Williams, 2006).

One policy that is often a concern is the nature of funding for programs; when the funding is soft money, then the perception may exist that the program is going to end. One way to enhance resources for funding is to ensure that there is a strong policy commitment from all partners (Center for Mental Health in Schools, 2004b). Furthermore, an examination of policy at all levels -- federal, state, local, and memoranda of agreement/understanding between and among agencies -- may increase the chances of funding and thus sustainability (Three “Ps” of Sustainability, 2009). Another tactic that may enhance opportunities for funding is taking the necessary steps to “move policy in ways that would sustain the valued functions established through the project’s work” (Adelman & Taylor, 2003, p. 9).

Leadership and Stakeholder Support

Programs need competent leadership to provide goals, vision, and strategies (Marek & Mancini, 2004). In addition, appropriate organizational leadership dynamics are important for enhancing sustainability. Organizational leadership factors include clear vision, support for change by program managers, and shared leadership (Trottier, et al, 2007). The support of local community leaders can enhance sustainability (Williams, 2006); a coalition board is also valuable (Gomez, Greenberg, & Feinberg, 2005).

In addition to leadership support, programs need stakeholder and outside agency support to enhance sustainability. Often building a “cadre of stakeholders” is one of the first steps toward sustainability (Adelman & Taylor, 2003, p. 6). The stakeholders may include “family advocacy and support groups...public or private service agencies...informal and nonprofit resources (faith community,

recreation, neighborhood supports, family members....and local and state decision makers” (Institute for Educational Leadership, 2002, para. 9).

Program or Agency Factors for Sustainability

There are several programs or agency factors needed to promote sustainability including vision, collaboration, and integration into the larger organizational structure; professional and staff development; marketing and promotion; and monitoring, evaluation, and planning for the future.

Vision, Collaboration, and Integration into the Larger Organization

Programs that hope to achieve sustainability need to have a clear, common vision for the work to be accomplished (Adelman & Taylor, 2003; Center for Mental Health in Schools, 2004b). The vision for the program is created by clearly understanding the purpose of the program and gathering information about the “school and community vision, mission statements, current policies, and major agenda priorities” (Adelman & Taylor, 2003, p. 7). In addition to a clear vision, effective partnerships and/or collaborations are needed including alliance with the local community and agency leaders (Marek & Mancini, 2004; “Three ‘Ps’ of Sustainability,” 2009).

Integrating the program into the larger organizational structure is another means to promote sustainability (Adelman & Taylor, 2003; Center for Mental Health in Schools, 2004b; Chinman, et al., 2004). It is often helpful to find a niche for the program within the district and thereby create a match between district needs and program offerings (Benz, et al., 2004). This match may also be framed as a means to enhance a school’s ability to meet its mission (Center for Mental Health in Schools, 2004a) and perhaps to fulfill the mission for all students, not just a few (Adelman & Taylor, 2003). When there is reduced funding, programs that are

self-contained are less likely to be sustained than programs that are well integrated within the host organization(s). In other words, if a program is not integrated with other programs and services, it will be easier to cut when the initial funding ends. Therefore, program personnel should work to integrate their programs rather than to isolate and guard their programs. (Chinman, et al., p. 146)

Professional and Staff Development

One situation that presents a problem for sustainability is a lack of adequate staff training for program delivery (Marek & Mancini, 2004). In addition, “if the only people who operate the program are those fully funded by the program, when the funding ends there will be no one left to carry on any of its useful components” (Chinman, et al., 2004, p. 146). However, building human capacity through investment in staff development will increase sustainability (Center for Mental Health in Schools, 2004b; Trottier, et al., 2007). Other ways to promote sustainability through staff include involving staff in decision making (Marek & Mancini), enhancing staff motivation (Adelman & Taylor, 2003), mentoring and support (Benz, et al., 2004), and training people with secure jobs to train others (Chinman, et al.). One program highlighted the significance of a stable staff for maintaining sustainability and indicated that this happened in three ways:

First, staff members who had been with the program a long time had a clearer understanding of (a) their roles and responsibilities, (b) the unique ways in which the program contributed to the school's overall services to students, and (c) the importance of disseminating this knowledge to the larger school community. Second, staff members who had been with the

program a long time and who were confident in their roles and responsibilities were more effective in developing and maintaining purposeful relationships with other professionals in the school and community in order to support students and other staff.... Third, credible, stable staff brought an immediate positive image to the program as it was being implemented and ultimately a reputation that contributed to sustainability.... (Benz, et al., 2004, para. 22-23)

Marketing and Promotion

Promotion and marketing are imperative for program sustainability. Promotion or marketing may be formal, for example, presentations, newsletters, and media, or informal, for example, sharing information, enthusiasm, and experiences (“Three ‘Ps’ of Sustainability,” 2009). The important aspect is that the promotion needs to advertize information that shows the value of the program (Adelman & Taylor, 2003; Center for Mental Health in Schools, 2004a). The effectiveness of the program can be promoted by making the activities highly visible and marketing its successes (Chinman, et al., 2004; Marek & Mancini, 2004). Some suggestions for successful marketing and communication include maintaining a website where people can access program content, creating and using a toolkit, and developing a comprehensive social marketing plan (Minnesota Department of Human Services, 2006).

Monitoring, Evaluation, and Planning for the Future

Successful and sustainable programs need constant monitoring and evaluation (Akerlund, 2000; Center for Mental Health in Schools, 2004b; Marek & Mancini, 2004). Evaluations can add to sustainability if they show positive outcomes that document evidence of the program’s impact and include ways to communicate the results to stakeholders (Benz, et al., 2004).

Planning for the future, along with successful monitoring and evaluation, can also enhance sustainability. One important future plan might include broadening the program and/or replicating the program on a larger scale (Center for Mental Health in Schools, 2004a). For example, “the activity can be braided into other initiatives and presented as an integral part of a comprehensive, multifaceted, and cohesive approach...” (Adelman & Taylor, 2003, p. 10). One approach for future planning is to have a “Sustainability To Do List” that includes:

- Find the Right People
- Promote a Level Playing Field To Promote Inclusion and Honest Discussion
- Plan Early and Often
- Build Community Ownership
- Build Organizational Capacity and System Buy-In
- Maintain Momentum and Visibility
- Get the Word Out to Build the Public Will (Institute for Educational Leadership, 2002, para. 16).

Conclusion

Sustainability is often not achieved because this is a difficult process. However, sustainability is a possibility. One study shows that sustainability is a long-term process often taking 9 to 10 years or more to develop, continue, and sustain, and the process cannot be seen as finished (Trottier, et al.,

2007). Change, which often can promote sustainability, does happen and can be evidenced by organizational transformation and organizational perceptions (Trottier, et al).

Greene, (as cited in Williams, 2006), explains

...through relationship building, communication, coordination, leadership, membership, resources, commitment, and adaptability, collaborations can reduce or resolve conflict and respond to the changing environment in which they exist. Sustainability is not a final step in collaboration development but a process that requires deliberate action and commitment. (p. 245-46)

EVALUATION DESIGN

Evaluation Model

A modification of Stufflebeam's CIPP model is used for this evaluation. This model was selected because, "A fundamental tenet of the CIPP model is that the most important purpose of evaluation is not to prove but to improve" (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007, p.331). In addition, the model provided a comprehensive framework for the development of the evaluation questions. The CIPP framework addresses project issues related to a context, process, and outcomes. To enhance the model, the evaluation also addresses sustainability, a key focus of this grant.

Context evaluation refers to setting for the intended services. Since Project Bridge will be incrementally rolled out in the entire district, the context year is not only an overview of the district's demographics, but an in-depth view at the schools in the North Central Administrative Area that is the area to receive services during years one and two.

Input evaluation addresses the allocation of resources. "Input evaluation is the precursor of the success or failure and efficiency of a change effort (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007, p.338).

Process evaluation relates to the implementation of the activities linked to project goals and outcomes. Understanding the process the grantees undertook to implement this project helps in the development of recommendations for change and sustainability.

Product or Outcome evaluation focuses on judging the success of the evaluation in meeting the GPRA outcomes as well as the Project Outcomes. These outcomes are specifically defined in the project logic model and are realized through the project's objectives and activities.

The final prong of this model is **Sustainability**. Sustainability relates to the project's ability to not only maintain the current status but to also continue after funding has ceased. Looking at the program plan for achieving sustainability helps the evaluator make recommendations.

Although the results and findings are reported via questions, sub-questions, and outcomes, the evaluation framework provided a triadic structure for further reporting. That is, it provided the organization for synthesizing the results and findings into conclusions from which recommendations could be generated.

Research Design

To measure the impact of Project Bridge and provide a framework for sustainability, a dose response design was utilized. This design has been used successfully in numerous educational research studies to determine impact over time (see Bledsoe, Casterline, Johnson-Kuhn, & Haaga, 1999; Hootman, 2006; Phillips, & Duffin, 2006; Steinman, Ferketich, & Sahr, 2008). This design provides the most effective way of determining the impact of Project Bridge. As new schools or entire administrative areas are added to the cadre of participants, this design allows impact to be measure across time.

In order to answer the questions related to the project goals and assess outcomes related to student growth, both quantitative and qualitative data were collected using parallel or simultaneous methodologies. Using mixed methods offers the most powerful evaluation of the project, addressing concerns about validity and reliability and thus the transferability of the findings to other settings.

Evaluative Questions

The Evaluation Questions listed below follow the traditional format used within the CIPP framework. Product/Outcomes evaluation questions are presented according to the data collection instrument.

Context

1. Have the demographics of the students in the North Central Administrative Area stayed consistent so that the appropriate population is being served?

Input

2. Were any changes to the programs and services selected in the initial grant proposal made?
3. Were sufficient resources allocated to ensure grant specified project outcomes were attained?
4. What role has the Core Management Team played in program implementation, support, and sustainability?

Process

5. Is the project being implemented as intended?
6. What are the school-based Prevention Liaisons' perceptions regarding the obstacles and success of their program?
7. Have teachers been trained to implement evidence-based programs?

Product/Outcomes

8. Were District policy and procedures established for the implementation of prevention practices?
9. Did the percent of students in project schools (6-12) reporting they "Do not feel safe at school" decrease 2%?
10. Did the percent of students in project schools (6-12) reporting, "Students bring drugs or alcohol to my school" decrease 2%?
11. Did the percent of students in project schools (6-12) reporting "There is an adult at school I can talk to about my personal problems" increase 2%?
12. Did the percent of students in project schools (6-12) who report missing one or more days of school during the previous 30 days because they felt unsafe at school or on the way to and from school decrease 2%?
13. Did the percent of students in project schools (6-12) reporting they were involved in a physical fight on school property during the prior twelve months decrease 2%?

14. Did the percent of students in project schools (6-12) reporting they have used marijuana on one or more occasions during the previous 30 days decrease 2%?
15. Did the percent of students in project schools (6-12) reporting they have consumed alcohol during the previous 30 days decrease 2%?
16. Did the percent of students in project schools (6-12) reporting they had participated in a prosocial activity at their school increase 2%?
17. Did the percent of students in project schools (6-12) reporting engagement in community opportunities for prosocial involvement increase by 2%?
18. Did the percent of internal suspensions in project schools (K-12) decrease 2%?
19. Did the percent of external suspensions in project schools (K-12) decrease 2%?
20. Did the social norm perception of students at project schools (6-12) regarding the acceptable use of alcohol decrease 2%?
21. Did the number of civil citations increase 10%?
22. Did the percent of students (K-12) who received school-based mental health services (school counselor, psychologist, social worker, or agency) increase 2%?
23. Did the percent of student mental health referrals (K-12) resulting in mental health services being provided in the community (in-patient or to a collaborating agency) increase 2%?
24. Did Pre-K parent attendance at Early Childhood Development classes increase?
25. Did the number of participants attending the Nurturing Parent Program at the teen parent sites increase?
26. Did students in the project schools (K-12) participate in any alcohol, tobacco, or violence prevention classroom lesson during the 2008-2009 school year?

Sustainability

27. Are there processes in place to assure project sustainability?

FINDINGS

The following section of this evaluation presents the findings within the framework of the evaluative questions which guided the study.

Evaluative Question 1: Have the demographics of the students in the North Central Administrative Area stayed consistent so that the appropriate population is being served?

District Demographics

The Broward County Public School District is the sixth largest school district in the nation. The District is rich in diversity with a student population representing 166 countries and 50 languages. For the second year in a row, Broward County Public Schools was named a finalist for the Broad Prize for Urban Education. This annual \$2 million award honors the urban school districts that demonstrate the greatest overall performance and improvement in student achievement while reducing achievement gaps among ethnic groups and between low- and non-low-income students. Table 1 provides a comparison of the District’s demographics for baseline and the first two years of Project Bridge implementation. According to the *Twentieth Day Enrollment Breakdown*, 255,738 students were enrolled in the District’s schools in 2008-2009. This represents an enrollment drop of 3,167 students. With the exception of the decline in enrollment, little change has taken place over the

past two years. A majority of the students are Black (37.8%), followed by White (29.5%), and Hispanic (26.1%). English Language Learners (ELL) make up 9.6% of the student population and 11.5% of the students are in Exceptional Student Education Programs (ESE). Free or Reduced Lunch Programs (FRL) serve 48.2% of the student population, which is almost 5% increase over last year.

Table 1
Broward County School District Three-Year Demographic Comparison

	2006-2007		2007-2008		2008-2009	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Gender						
Male	135,344	51.5	133,133	51.4	131,629	51.5
Female	124,272	48.5	125,771	48.6	124,109	48.5
Ethnicity						
White	82,676	31.5	78,680	30.4	75,536	29.5
Black	97,68	37.2	97,131	37.5	96,690	37.8
Hispanic	66,412	25.3	66,781	25.8	66,621	26.1
Asian	8,578	3.3	8,644	3.3	8,784	3.4
Native American	509	0.2	7,134	2.8	524	.2
Multiracial	6,743	2.6	7,134	2.8	7,583	3.0
ELL	24,665	9.4	24,136	9.3	24,631	9.6
ESE	29,239	11.1	28,930	11.2	29,316	11.5
FRL	112,062	42.7	113,763	43.9	123,155	48.2
Total	262,616		258,904		255,738	

Note: Data obtained from 2006-2007, 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 Twentieth Day Enrollment Breakdown

North Central Administrative Area Demographics

The North Central Administrative Area (NCA) received grant related services during the first two years of funding. The NCA is home to 22 elementary schools, 8 middle schools, 7 high schools, 13 educational and vocational centers, and 36 charter schools. During the first year of the project, the NCA served 56,961 students. During the second year of the project, the Charter Schools were removed from the NCA. This resulted in a decrease of 991 students. Additionally, the NCA saw a decline in enrollment resulting in 38,848 students enrolled in NCA schools during the 2009-2009 school year. Appendix B provides a complete list of NCA schools.

Table 2 presents a two-year comparison demographic profile of the elementary, middle, high schools, and centers in the NCA. The majority of students in these schools are Black (54.6%, n=21,230) with almost equal percents of White and Hispanic students (19.8%, n=7,714 and 19.5%, n=7,606, respectively).

Students participating in the free or reduced lunch program accounted for 61.4% of the participants (n=23,891). Almost half of these students (48.9%) were in the area's elementary schools.

A small percent of students (12.0%) were in English language learner programs, and 11.6% were in exceptional student education programs. A comprehensive list of demographic information for each

school is included in Appendix C. Despite the declining enrollment, the demographics of the NCA have not changed over the past two years.

Table 2
Two-Year Demographic Profile of Schools in the North Central Administrative Area

	Elementary Schools		Middle Schools		High Schools		Centers		Charter Schools		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
Gender												
Male	07-08	9,326	52.4	4,008	51.4	5,425	50.2	1,993	58.1	8,467	49.5	29,219
	08-09	9,028	52.5	4,136	52.1	5,494	50.5	1,607	57.1			20,265
Female	07-08	8,477	47.6	3,795	48.6	5,378	49.8	1,437	41.9	8,655	50.5	27,742
	08-09	8,180	47.5	3,803	47.9	5,394	49.5	1,206	42.9			18,583
Ethnicity												
White	07-08	3,093	17.4	1,894	24.3	2,908	26.9	408	11.9	4,334	25.3	12,637
	08-09	2,913	16.9	1,730	21.8	2,771	25.5	300	10.7			7,714
Black	07-08	10,095	56.7	3,725	47.7	5,225	48.4	2,436	71.0	6,487	37.9	27,968
	08-09	9,868	57.3	3,966	50.0	5,343	49.1	2,053	73.0			21,230
Hispanic	07-08	3,516	19.7	1,671	21.4	2,094	19.4	519	15.1	5,269	30.8	13,069
	08-09	3,360	19.5	1,692	21.3	2,155	19.8	400	14.2			7,607
Asian	07-08	500	2.8	255	3.3	369	3.4	16	0.5	517	3.0	1,657
	08-09	479	2.8	242	3.0	381	3.5	10	0.4			1,112
Native Am.	07-08	58	0.3	19	0.2	13	0.1	4	0.1	33	0.2	127
	08-09	61	0.4	24	0.3	11	0.1	3	0.1			99
Biracial	07-08	541	3.0	239	3.1	194	1.8	47	1.4	482	2.8	1,503
	08-09	527	3.1	285	3.6	227	2.1	47	1.7			1,086
ELL	07-08	2,239	12.6	784	10.0	956	8.8	420	12.2	846	4.9	5,245
	08-09	2,644	15.4	680	8.6	963	8.8	384	13.7			4,671
ESE	07-08	2,220	12.5	853	10.9	896	8.3	617	18.0	1,256	7.3	5,842
	08-09	2,221	12.9	854	10.8	890	8.2	567	20.2			4,532
FRL	07-08	10,588	59.5	4,135	53.0	4,873	45.1	2,007	58.5	5,473	32.0	27,076
	08-09	11,684	67.9	4,841	61.0	5,417	49.8	1,949	69.3			23,891

Note: Data obtained from 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 Twentieth Day Enrollment Breakdown

Evaluative Question 2: Were any changes to the programs and services selected in the initial grant proposal made?

The following programs are implemented within Project Bridge. A more complete description of each program can be found in Appendix: D

- *Get Real About Violence* - Grades K-12
- *Too Good For Drugs* - Grades K-5
- *The Social Norms Approach* Grades 6-12
- *CHAMPs* - Grades K-12
- *Wraparound* - Grades K-12.
- *Nurturing Parent Program* - At-risk families with children, birth to 18 years.
- *Keepin It Real* - Grades 6-12

Each of these programs is appropriate for meeting the stated program goals.

In April 2009, project Logic Model (Appendix A) revisions reflected the recommendations of the Core Management Team that the proposed Teen Court Program be replaced with a Civil Citation program. This particular objective, which falls under Element 1: Safe School Environment and Violence Prevention Activities, has proven to be extremely difficult to implement due to the external interest and support required for implementation. The Core Management Team continues to explore the viability of implementing this program.

The Social Norming Campaign was initially going to be implemented by United Way with support from Project Bridge staff. This model has changed and an outside consulting firm (Salter<Mitchell) has been contracted to design a social norms toolkit which will be implemented by school-based Social Norms Coordinators under the direction of a Project Bridge Risk Reduction Specialist.

After review and discussion with project staff and upon approval of the Federal Project Officer, the academic outcome has been removed from the logic model. Originally placed under Element 2: Alcohol, Tobacco, and Other Drug Prevention Activities it was deemed an inappropriate measure of program success. Since all schools have extensive academic support for the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Tests, there was no way to attribute increased scores to project activities.

Evaluative Question 3: Were sufficient resources allocated to ensure grant specified project outcomes were attained?

This evaluative question addresses the issues of staffing and budget. During year two, the Project Manger left the grant in February. In January 2009, a new Project Manger was hired. In the interim, the Project Director assumed the management of the day-to-day project activities. As noted in Table 3, there are only two 12-month employees supporting grant activities. District policy does not allow 9 month employees to work over the summer. As noted by the asterisk in the table, one of the former Case Mangers assumed the responsibilities of Risk Reduction Specialist.

Due to budget cuts, the school district administrators placed a freeze on all hiring. At the start and end of the second project year, there were grant-funded positions that could not be filled because of this freeze. As further mandated by district policy, grant staff were terminated at the end of the second year. The positions were not eliminated, but required staff to go through a reapplication process. All positions are filled and prior grant staff were rehired in their prior project roles.

Table 3
Project Staff: September 1, 2008-August 31, 2009

Name	Position/Responsibility	Start Date	Status – employment
Amalio Nieves	Project Director	09/01/07	12 month employee
Amarylis Rijos	Database Research Asst.	12/01/07	12 month employee
Jennifer Thomas	Project Manager	09/01/07	Left Project 2/28/09
Tanya Lariau	Risk Reduction Specialist	12/1/07	9 month employees
Teri Williams	Risk Reduction Specialist	12/01/07	9 month employees
Sebrina James	Staff Developer	12/01/07	9 month employee

Name	Position/Responsibility	Start Date	Status – employment
Karen Moreland	Staff Developer	12/01/07	9 month employee
Jillian Batson	Case Manger	12/01/07	9 month employee
Lynette Drayton	Case Manager	12/01/07	9 month employee
Keane Matthews	Case Manger	12/01/07	9 month employee
Ruth Stennett*	Risk Reduction Specialist	12/01/07	9 month employee
Joel Monreal	Senior Case Manager	08/01/08	Left Project 04/01/09
Shelly Saunders	Risk Reduction Specialist	10/01/08	9 month employee
Sarah Arvelo	Risk Reduction Specialist	10/01/08	9 month employee
Sharon Forde-Marshall	Risk Reduction Specialist	10/01/08	9 month employee
Gloria Ortiz	Risk Reduction Specialist	10/01/08	9 month employee
Jennifer Thompson	Staff Developer	10/16/08	9 month employee
Micalle Julmiste	Case Manger	08/17/09	9 month employee
Donna Robinson	Staff Developer	01/13/09	9 month employee
Lenny Mujica	Project Manager	01/13/09	9 month employee
Andrea Granston-Leslie	Risk Reduction Specialist	02/19/09	9 month employee

Note: Information provided by Project Director

Cost Impact

During the 2007-2008 school year, the Broward County Public School District received federal grant funds totaling \$1,917,314. During the 2008-2009 school year, the District received \$1,443,434 in federal funding. Year-two concluded with \$95,769.02 encumbered funds. Overall, funds were expended at a rate of 66.5% over the two years. Table 4 provides a comparison of budgeted and expended funds for the two years.

Table 4

Two-Year Comparison of Actual to Budgeted Spending

Category	Budgeted	Expended
Personnel		
2007-2008	1,029,950	513,980.51
2008-2009	1,443,434	953,454
Fringe Benefits		
2007-2008	258,555.50	146,803.61
2008-2009	356,000	237,271
Travel		
2007-2008	18,044.25	2,570.04
2008-2009	20,227	10,339
Equipment		
2007-2008	50,904.00	
2008-2009	4,876	4,876

Category	Budgeted	Expended
Supplies		
2007-2008	229,174.25	39,853.57
2008-2009	104,817	37,599
Consultants/ Contracts		
2007-2008	255,000	231,195.50
2008-2009	189,581	148,231
Other		
2007-2008	10,000	1,200.00
2008-2009	10,000	0
Indirect Costs		
2007-2008	65,686	30,586.89
2008-2009	79,365	55,093
Equipment		
2007-2008		50,464.54
2008-2009	4,876	4,876
Totals		
2007-2008	1,917,314	1,016,654.66
2008-2009	2,208,300	1,446,863

Evaluative Question 4: What role has the Core Management Team played in program implementation, support, and sustainability?

During the first year of Project Bridge, the Core Management Team was formed with partners who signed a Memorandum of Agreement. These partners are all volunteering their time and talents to the program. None of the team members or their organizations are financially compensated or supported by grant funds.

The Federal Project Officer and members of the National Center’s Technical Assistance Team (NCTAT) (Tim Dunn and Jack Campana) conducted a monitoring visit in January. This comprehensive visit included meetings with the Core Management Team to help more clearly define the team’s role. Utilizing an Implementation Tool supplied by the NCTAT the Core Management Team evaluated their knowledge and support of project related activities. The evaluator prepared a report comparing the perceptions of the Core Management Team with Project Bridge Staff. (See Appendix E). This report created talking points for dialogue between project staff and the Core Management Team regarding roles and responsibilities. During a follow-up site visit in March, the NCTAT staff again met with the Core Management Team to solidify their understanding of their importance to the project’s management, implementation, and sustainability. Using a summary report prepared as part of the Implementation Tool Report, (see Appendix F), the Core Management Team identified priority areas in which to focus their efforts.

The Core Management Team meets monthly with district administration, project staff, and the evaluator collaborating on the management of grant activities. They have suggested changes to the Logic Model, requested staff to explore the role of the Case Mangers, and created ad hoc sub-

committees. These sub-committees focus on the creation of a project communications plan and the development of the centralized mental health electronic referral tracking system. Additionally, the Core Management Team is planning to develop a sustainability plan based on best practices and lessons learned from grant-funded activities. In summary, the Core Management Team is an active and vital part of all phases of project management.

Evaluative Question 5: Is the project being implemented as intended?

The Project Manager created a timeline at the beginning of the project. This timeline was based on the intention of fully implementing the project in the North Central Area during the 2007-2008 school year. However, due to delayed start up and incomplete implementation, the Core Management Team in conjunction with project staff and the Federal Project Officer determined that the project should not expand into a second region in year two. Thus, a revised timeline was submitted with the April report. This timeline has again been revised to reflect plans for the coming year. (See Appendix G).

The Project Bridge Logic Model (See Appendix A) specifically outlined activities and related process measures that needed to be implemented to successfully attain Government Performance Results Act outcomes specified by the grantor and project Performance Measures specified by the grantee. In late summer, the evaluator, Project Director, and Project Manager met to discuss the progress made toward implementing these measures. Table 5 presents these activities and the implementation stage for each activity. Because of the comprehensive nature of this grant, some of the activities are specific to the district while others are specific to the North Central Area.

Last year many of the activities identified in the grant were still in the planning phase at the end of the year. This year, a substantial number of activities, including those specific to the North Central Area have been fully or substantially implemented. The Anti-bullying Taskforce was formed and developed and implemented the Anti-bullying Policy. NCA schools all have Prevention Liaisons who oversee the Local Prevention Teams. Training in prevention curriculum, adopted ATOD curriculum, and district policies and procedures took place in schools, and with community partners. The Second Prevention Summit was held during the summer with 400 attendees. In addition, second year School-based Prevention Liaisons received booster training in project implementation while new Liaisons receive comprehensive three day training.

Progress has been made toward creating the Social Norms Campaign, and developing district-wide prevention policies. The Core Leadership is addressing the efficacy of implementing the Civil Citation Program, and project staff is awaiting the roll out of the Positive School Climate Template to begin working on Positive School Climate Plans. Table 5 categorizes level of implementation for Project Bridge activities; Appendix H presents a narrative review of the status of each activity. Significant progress has been made toward full implementation of activities in the NCA.

Table 5
Implementation Status of Project Bridge Activities

Fully Implemented	Substantially Implemented	Moderately Implemented	Minimally Implemented	Planning Stage
Form Project Bridge Advisory Coalition.				
Convene a Policy Development Team and anti-bullying taskforce.				
Write an anti-bullying policy.				
			Write a comprehensive prevention policy.	
Establish Local Prevention Teams North Central Area (NCA) schools	.			
Train Local Prevention Teams in NCA schools on District prevention curriculum, policies and procedures	.			
Local Prevention Teams in NCA will train faculty and staff on District prevention curriculum, policies and procedures in project schools.				

Fully Implemented	Substantially Implemented	Moderately Implemented	Minimally Implemented	Planning Stage
			Train SAFE Team members on District adopted prevention programs.	
			SAFE Teams will ensure that schools safety plans include prevention curriculum and strategies	
Establish a Positive School Climate Committee.				
				Train School Advisory Committee members in NCA schools to develop a Positive School Climate Plan.
				Develop Positive School Climate Plans in NCA schools.
Implement anti-bullying policy in all schools.				
				Implement Positive School Climate Plans in NCA schools.
			Establish new process for Safe Schools Healthy Student community involvement.	

Fully Implemented	Substantially Implemented	Moderately Implemented	Minimally Implemented	Planning Stage
Train community partners in violence prevention curricula.				
Implement violence prevention curricula in NCA schools.				
	Monitor fidelity of implementation of violence prevention curriculum in NCA schools.			
Co-sponsor Prevention Summit				.
				Train School Resource Officers and school administrators on Civil Citation process and procedures.
Train all community partners and project school Local Prevention Teams in adopted ATOD prevention curricula.				
Implementation of ATOD prevention curriculum in NCA schools.				

Fully Implemented	Substantially Implemented	Moderately Implemented	Minimally Implemented	Planning Stage
	Monitor fidelity of ATOD curriculum implementation in NCA schools			
			Develop school based Social Norming campaigns.	
				Train peer counselors to disseminate campaign information.
				Implement and monitor the Social Norms campaign.
			Develop a community coalition to assist in the identification, establishment, promotion, and implementation of prosocial activities in district schools.	
Complete a prosocial activities needs assessment of North Central Area schools.				
Provide professional development on available prosocial models such as SWAT and SADD				

Fully Implemented	Substantially Implemented	Moderately Implemented	Minimally Implemented	Planning Stage
Market prosocial clubs via Public Service Announcements on BCPS' Instructional Television Channel				
Train alternatively certified teachers and after-school providers in CHAMPS.				
	Monitor CHAMPS implementation and provide feedback and coaching as requested			
				Implement a media campaign to increase recruitment of possible 6-12 mentors.
			Institute a training curriculum to better prepare School Resource Officers to interact with students.	
	Identify and advertise prosocial activities for participation by school personnel and students.			

Fully Implemented	Substantially Implemented	Moderately Implemented	Minimally Implemented	Planning Stage
	Provide professional development activities for Schools with School-based Mental Health Teams focusing on collaboration with the district's CPST and identification and tracking of mental health referrals and Team procedures			
		Align appropriate mental health services with participating partners.		
		Centralize the screening and approval process allowing mental health providers easier access to the students they are serving.		
				Develop a process for communication and coordination between CPST and School-base Mental Health Teams.
		Collaborate with stakeholders to create a referral process for		

Fully Implemented	Substantially Implemented	Moderately Implemented	Minimally Implemented	Planning Stage
		schools to align with appropriate mental health service providers.		
				Create and distribute School Based Mental Health Team manuals to participating schools
		Develop, implement, assess, and revise media campaign aimed at pre-k parents' attendance at Early Childhood Development classes.		
Train project staff to implement the Nurturing Parent Program.				
Link with outside agencies available to implement Nurturing Parents Program				

Evaluative Question 6: What are the School-based Prevention Liaisons' perceptions regarding the obstacles and successes of their program?

As part of the training for the second year school Prevention Liaisons, they were asked to reflect back on the first year of the project and offer any insights on their challenges and successes. Overwhelmingly, the teachers responded that time was their biggest challenge. As one teacher explained, "Time is always a factor in trying to fit everything in on top of academics." Another teacher explained "They [teachers] talk a good game, but when it was time to get things started people were too busy – time."

When addressing successes teacher responded: “Kids actually caring about one another.” “Changing the climate of the school to be knowledgeable of prevention activities in the school’s learning community.” “Seeing the students identify kindness through our random acts of kindness box.” “Empowering the bystanders! Through PSAs and assemblies, students gained confidence to speak up and out against violence of any kind.” “Getting staff involved. They participated, specifically classroom teachers with students. They assisted students to get involved in developing a short presentation sending the message of anti-bullying and against violence using art poetry, skits, songs, poser point, etc.” “Better relationships with therapeutic agencies.” Many of the other comments focused on the reduction in bullying as this was a big focus of year one activities.

Evaluative Question 7: To what extent are evidence-based programs being implemented in project schools?

Currently, there is no procedure in place to track implementation.

Evaluative Question 8: Were district policies and procedures established for the implementation of prevention practices?

The establishment of district prevention policies and procedures is a long-term project goal. It is expected that the process will commence during the 2010-2011 school year. The anti-bullying policy and accompanying procedures manual were completed during year-one.

Data for Evaluative Questions 9, 10, and 11 were taken from secondary school (6-12) student responses to selected questions from the *Annual Customer Survey* (ACS). For the past 15 years, the ACS has been used to determine perceptions of students, teachers, and parents on issues such as school safety, home and school communications, and availability of services. Students complete the survey online. Table 6 displays the number of students receiving surveys along with the number returning the surveys and the response rate for students in NCA schools. Baseline and first and second year data are presented.

The total response rate for NCA schools for 2006-2007 was 82.6%, for 2007-2008 86.6%, and 74% for 2008-2009. This decrease in response rate makes comparisons of percent of increase or decrease for the total group difficult. Disaggregated data presents a clear picture of the annual trend.

Table 6
Three-Year Comparison of Response Rates on ACS for NCA Secondary Schools

School	Surveyed	Responded	Rate	
Middle Schools				
Bair	2006-2007	1212	1131	93.3
	2007-2008	1099	946	86.1
	2008-2009	1012	837	82.7
James Rickards	2006-2007	1022	916	89.6
	2007-2008	952	798	93.8

School		Surveyed	Responded	Rate
	2008-2009	924	819	88.6
Lauderdale Lakes	2006-2007	990	835	84.3
	2007-2008	920	771	83.8
	2008-2009	985	867	88.0
Lauderhill	2006-2007	836	652	78.0
	2007-2008	615	558	90.7
	2008-2009	620	370	59.7
Millennium	2006-2007	1445	1365	94.5
	2007-2008	1463	1441	98.5
	2008-2009	1528	1516	99.2
Nova	2006-2007	1194	902	75.5
	2007-2008	1236	1088	88.0
	2008-2009	1334	702	52.6
Westpine	2006-2007	1393	1248	89.6
	2007-2008	1470	1361	92.6
	2008-2009	1517	1271	83.8
TOTAL Middle Schools				
	2006-2007	8092	7049	87.1
	2007-2008	7755	6963	89.8
	2008-2009	7920	6382	80.5
High Schools				
Atlantic	2006-2007	567	373	65.8
	2007-2008	561	488	87.0
	2008-2009	579	420	72.5
Boyd Anderson	2006-2007	2443	1554	63.3
	2007-2008	2207	1608	72.9
	2008-2009	2138	1229	57.5
Northeast	2006-2007	1913	1810	94.6
	2007-2008	1996	1659	83.1
	2008-2009	1945	1372	70.5
Nova	2006-2007	2031	1562	76.9
	2007-2008	2041	1650	80.8
	2008-2009	2121	383	18.1
Piper	2006-2007	2693	2320	86.1
	2007-2008	2665	2558	95.9
	2008-2009	2625	2342	89.2
TOTAL High Schools				
	2006-2007	9647	7619	78.9
	2007-2008	9470	7963	84.0
	2008-2009	9408	5746	61.0
GRAND TOTAL 2006-2007		17739	14668	82.6
	2007-2008	17225	14926	86.6
	2008-2009	17163	12709	74.0

Evaluative Question 9: Did the percent of students in project schools (6-12) reporting they “do not feel safe at school” decrease 2%?

The original question on the ACS asks student to respond to the prompt, “I feel safe at school.” Therefore, the analysis used the “Disagree” response. For both the baseline year (06-07) and the first year of the project, a little over a quarter of the students in the NCA schools reported they did not feel safe at school (n=3,292, 22.6% and n=3,223, 21.6%). During year two, 445 (18.3%) students reported not feeling safe in school. This represents a 1.1% decrease in the number of students reporting not feeling safe in school. Table 7 presents the responses by school, for each level, and for the total group of respondents.

When the data are disaggregated, by middle and high school, there is a 6.2% decrease at the middle school level and a 3.8% increase at the high school level. Thus middle school students who responded to this survey fell more secure at school as compared to their high school counterparts.

Table 7
Three-Year Comparison of the Number and Percent of Students in NCA Schools (6-12) Reporting on the ACS, “I feel safe at school”

		Agree		Disagree		Undecided		Don't Know	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Bair	2006-2007	593	25.6	254	22.6	238	21.1	41	3.6
	2007-2008	465	50.4	226	24.5	195	21.2	36	3.9
	2008-2009	524	63.6	123	15.0	142	17.2	35	4.2
J. Rickards	2006-2007	563	61.8	155	17.0	147	16.2	45	5.0
	2007-2008	473	60.0	133	16.9	144	18.3	38	4.8
	2008-2009	496	61.4	121	14.9	162	20.0	29	3.6
Lauderdale Lks	2006-2007	357	43.0	259	31.2	177	21.3	37	4.5
	2007-2008	324	42.7	244	21.1	157	20.7	35	4.6
	2008-2009	403	47.1	234	27.3	166	19.4	52	6.1
Lauderhill	2006-2007	246	38.2	251	39	124	19.2	24	3.7
	2007-2008	254	46.5	439	35.7	78	14.0	20	3.7
	2008-2009	158	44.0	107	29.8	71	19.8	23	6.4
Millennium	2006-2007	770	56.9	289	21.3	252	18.6	41	3.0
	2007-2008	857	60.4	267	18.9	242	17.1	53	3.7
	2008-2009	898	84.5	242	16.3	273	18.3	76	5.1
Nova	2006-2007	491	54.8	198	21.1	175	19.5	32	3.6
	2007-2008	626	58.7	190	17.8	227	21.3	25	2.3
	2008-2009	383	55.8	133	3.6	140	20.4	30	4.4
Westpine	2006-2007	713	57.4	274	22.0	203	16.3	52	4.2
	2007-2008	770	60.8	287	21.3	235	17.5	53	3.9
	2008-2009	732	26.5	214	19.0	247	19.9	51	4.1

		Agree		Disagree		Undecided		Don't Know	
Total Middle	2006-2007	3733	53.3	1680	23.9	1316	18.8	272	3.9
	2007-2008	3769	53.1	1786	25.2	1278	18.0	260	3.7
	2008-2009	3594	57.1	1196	19.0	1201	19.1	296	4.7
Atlantic	2006-2007	263	70.9	38	10.2	63	17.0	7	1.9
	2007-2008	343	71.2	48	10.0	83	17.2	8	1.7
	2008-2009	326	78.0	30	7.2	53	12.7	9	2.2
B. Anderson	2006-2007	455	29.6	756	49.1	293	19.0	37	2.4
	2007-2008	758	48.0	436	27.6	322	20.4	64	4.1
	2008-2009	401	33.3	462	38.5	296	24.6	43	3.6
Northeast	2006-2007	1232	68.5	193	10.7	340	18.9	34	1.9
	2007-2008	1103	67.5	181	11.0	310	19.0	41	2.5
	2008-2009	836	61.5	170	12.5	299	22.0	53	3.9
Nova	2006-2007	1036	66.7	179	11.6	312	20.1	25	1.6
	2007-2008	1021	62.7	230	14.2	339	20.8	37	2.3
	2008-2009	260	69.7	41	11.0	62	16.6	10	2.7
Piper	2006-2007	1209	52.3	446	19.3	583	25.3	71	3.1
	2007-2008	1195	47.9	542	21.7	648	26.0	110	4.4
	2008-2009	1083	47.2	546	23.8	553	24.1	114	5.0
Total High	2006-2007	4195	55.4	1612	21.3	1591	21.0	174	2.3
	2007-2008	4420	56.5	1437	18.3	1702	21.8	260	3.2
	2008-2009	2906	51.5	1249	22.1	1263	22.4	229	4.1
Total All Schools	2006-2007	7928	54.4	3292	22.6	2907	19.9	446	3.1
	2007-2008	8189	54.9	3223	21.6	2980	19.9	520	3.5
	2008-2009	6500	54.5	2445	20.5	2464	20.6	525	4.4

Evaluative Question 10: Did the percent of students at project schools (6-12) reporting “students bring drugs or alcohol to my school” decrease by 2% from baseline?

As noted in Table 8, students in grades 6-12 in NCA project schools responding to the prompt “students bring drugs or alcohol to my school” showed a 9.9% decrease in their perception of drugs or alcohol being brought to school from baseline to year one and a 3.3% increase during year two. High school students reported a 1.7% decrease during year one, and a 4.3% increase during year two. Middle school students reported an 18.1% decrease during year one and a 3.3% increase at the end of year two.

Table 8

Three-Year Comparison of the Number and Percent of Students in NCA Schools (6-12) Reporting on the ACS, “Students bring drugs or alcohol to my school.”

School		Agree		Disagree		Undecided		Don't Know	
		N%	%	N%	%	N	%	N%	%
Bair	2006-2007	237	21.2	356	31.9	114	10.2	411	36.8
	2007-2008	238	25.4	231	25.8	104	11.6	335	37.3
	2008-2009	126	15.4	293	32.3	96	11.8	330	40.5
J. Rickards	2006-2007	182	20.0	298	32.7	108	11.8	324	35.5
	2007-2008	203	25.8	259	32.8	63	8.0	264	33.5
	2008-2009	273	34.1	182	22.8	92	11.5	254	31.7
Lauderdale Lakes	2006-2007	145	17.5	252	30.4	105	12.6	329	39.6
	2007-2008	126	16.9	252	33.8	73	9.8	296	39.6
	2008-2009	293	34.3	165	19.3	94	11.0	302	35.4
Lauderhill	2006-2007	218	33.9	164	25.5	63	9.8	198	30.8
	2007-2008	138	25.8	176	32.8	63	11.8	159	29.7
	2008-2009	118	33.6	83	23.6	40	11.4	110	31.3
Millennium	2006-2007	559	41.4	240	17.7	149	11.0	403	29.8
	2007-2008	35	25.5	369	26.2	188	13.3	494	35.0
	2008-2009	497	33.2	343	22.9	208	13.9	450	30.0
Nova	2006-2007	247	27.6	270	30.0	110	12.3	268	29.9
	2007-2008	236	22.2	306	28.8	124	11.7	397	37.4
	2008-2009	186	27.4	182	26.8	95	14.0	216	31.8
Westpine	2006-2007	237	19.1	427	34.5	144	11.6	431	34.8
	2007-2008	363	27.2	412	30.9	150	11.2	411	30.8
	2008-2009	216	25.8	339	27.7	167	13.6	405	33.0
Total Middle	2006-2007	3825	42.6	2007	22.3	793	8.8	2364	26.3
	2007-2008	1663	24.5	2005	29.5	765	11.3	2356	34.7
	2008-2009	1709	27.8	1587	25.8	792	12.9	2067	33.5
Atlantic	2006-2007	58	15.6	135	36.3	70	18.8	109	29.3
	2007-2008	107	22.4	178	37.3	58	12.2	134	28.1
	2008-2009	76	18.2	163	39.7	59	14.4	113	27.5
Boyd Anderson	2006-2007	618	40.3	236	15.4	204	13.3	475	31.0
	2007-2008	548	34.9	260	16.6	228	14.5	532	33.9
	2008-2009	457	38.0	194	16.1	203	16.9	349	29.0
Northeast	2006-2007	586	32.6	331	18.5	334	18.6	547	30.4
	2007-2008	454	27.7	363	22.2	307	18.8	513	31.3
	2008-2009	461	34.0	231	17.1	257	19.0	406	30.0
Nova	2006-2007	511	32.8	295	19.0	31	20.1	437	28.1
	2007-2008	623	38.9	338	21.1	272	17.0	370	23.1
	2008-2009	135	36.9	60	16.4	78	21.3	93	25.4
Piper	2006-2007	986	42.9	324	14.1	373	16.2	615	26.8

		Agree		Disagree		Undecided		Don't Know	
	2007-2008	960	39.2	326	13.3	479	19.5	686	28.0
	2008-2009	1071	46.7	268	11.7	406	17.7	546	23.8
Total High	2006-2007	2759	36.5	1321	17.5	1293	17.1	2183	28.9
	2007-2008	2692	34.8	1465	18.9	1344	18.9	2235	29.9
	2008-2009	2200	39.1	916	16.3	1003	17.8	1507	26.8
Total All Schools	2006-2007	6584	39.8	3328	20.1	2086	12.6	4547	27.5
	2007-2008	4355	29.9	3470	23.9	2109	14.5	4591	31.6
	2008-2009	3909	33.2	2503	21.2	1795	15.2	3574	30.4

Evaluative Question 11: Did the percent of students in project schools (6-12) reporting “There is an adult at school I can talk to about my personal problems” increase by 2% from baseline?

Data reported in Table 9 show a year one 3.1% increase over baseline in the percent of students in project schools (6-12) reporting, “There is an adult at school I can talk to about my personal problems” on the ACS. Year two data reflected a 2.1% increase.

When data are disaggregated for, middle school students report a 3.6% increase for year one and a 2.8% increase for year two. High school students’ responses reflected no change from base line and a .6% increase for year two.

Table 9

Three-Year Comparison of the Number and Percent of Students in NCA Schools (6-12) Reporting on the ACS, “There is an adult at school I can talk to about my personal problems”

		Agree		Disagree		Undecided		Don't Know	
School		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Bair	2006-2007	721	63.9	201	17.8	113	10.0	93	8.2
	2007-2008	604	66.1	145	15.9	89	9.8	75	8.2
	2008-2009	540	65.8	150	18.3	86	10.5	52	6.3
J. Rickards	2006-2007	591	64.8	127	13.9	93	10.2	101	11.1
	2007-2008	526	66.4	131	16.6	62	7.8	74	9.3
	2008-2009	537	66.5	126	15.6	72	8.9	72	8.9
Lauder. Lakes	2006-2007	559	67.3	158	19.0	69	8.3	45	5.4
	2007-2008	449	59.7	193	25.7	61	8.1	49	6.5
	2008-2009	544	63.3	176	20.5	87	10.0	53	6.2
Lauderhill	2006-2007	424	65.6	123	19.0	55	8.5	44	6.8
	2007-2008	326	59.8	130	23.9	59	10.8	30	5.5
	2008-2009	236	81.4	69	19.1	35	9.7	21	5.8
Millennium	2006-2007	825	60.8	274	20.2	123	9.1	134	9.9
	2007-2008	895	63.3	255	18.0	145	10.3	118	8.4
	2008-2009	1041	69.2	220	14.6	131	8.7	112	7.4
Nova	2006-2007	486	54.3	203	22.7	96	10.7	110	12.3

		Agree		Disagree		Undecided		Don't Know	
	2007-2008	502	46.9	295	27.6	167	15.6	105	9.8
	2008-2009	389	56.5	153	22.2	87	12.6	59	8.6
Westpine	2006-2007	767	61.8	245	19.7	121	9.8	708	8.7
	2007-2008	869	65.0	233	17.4	97	7.3	137	10.3
	2008-2009	732	58.9	214	17.2	247	19.9	51	4.1
Total Middle	2006-2007	4373	57.5	1331	17.5	670	8.8	1235	16.2
	2007-2008	4171	61.1	1382	20.3	680	9.9	588	8.6
	2008-2009	4019	63.9	1108	17.6	745	11.8	420	6.7
Atlantic	2006-2007	209	56.5	71	19.2	53	14.3	37	10.0
	2007-2008	275	57.1	79	16.4	90	18.7	38	7.9
	2008-2009	234	56.2	76	18.3	72	17.3	34	8.2
B. Anderson	2006-2007	787	51.0	434	28.2	169	11.0	152	9.9
	2007-2008	885	56.2	387	24.6	175	11.1	129	8.2
	2008-2009	687	56.7	281	23.2	152	12.5	93	7.7
Northeast	2006-2007	1016	56.3	295	16.4	285	15.8	210	11.6
	2007-2008	980	59.7	250	15.3	241	14.7	169	10.3
	2008-2009	799	59.0	176	13.0	229	16.9	152	11.2
Nova	2006-2007	790	50.8	327	21.0	275	17.7	163	10.5
	2007-2008	849	52.6	316	19.6	263	16.3	186	11.5
	2008-2009	228	60.	54	14.4	59	15.7	34	9.1
Piper	2006-2007	1157	50.2	522	22.6	377	16.3	251	10.9
	2007-2008	1313	53.0	485	19.6	406	16.4	272	11.0
	2008-2009	1210	52.7	494	21.5	380	16.5	213	9.3
Total High	2006-2007	3959	52.2	1649	21.8	1159	15.3	813	10.7
	2007-2008	4302	55.2	1517	19.5	1175	15.1	794	10.2
	2008-2009	3158	55.8	1081	19.1	892	15.8	526	9.3
Total All Schools	2006-2007	8332	54.9	2980	19.6	1829	12.0	2048	13.5
	2007-2008	8473	58.0	2899	19.8	1855	12.7	1382	9.5
	2008-2009	7177	60.1	2189	18.3	1637	13.7	946	7.9

Evaluative Questions 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17

Data for Evaluative Questions 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17 were collected via the Evaluator created *District Prevention Assessment (DPA)*. Most of these questions reflect data that were required to be collected at the student level in response to the GPRA measures. To ensure an adequate sample was drawn from the population of secondary schools in the NCA, a sample size calculator was utilized. Using a 5% margin of error and a 95% confidence interval sample size was calculated for each school.

The DPA is an online survey. The Risk Reduction Specialists supervised the data collection at the school level. A random sample of secondary school students from across grade levels completed the survey. The number of students completing the DPA was during year one (baseline) was 4,253. During year two 3,760 students completed the survey. Table 10 presents a demographic profile of the

survey respondents. At the middle school level, 2,253 students were surveyed during the first administration and 2,079 during the second administration. At the high school level, 2,000 students were surveyed for baseline and 1,681 for year one. Females accounted for 49.6% and 49.9% of the sample in each year. Males accounted for 50.4% and 50.1%, respectively.

For surveys completed by students who initially reported their ethnicity as “Other”, the evaluator reviewed how the students completed the blank following that choice. If the response was one of the categories the response was changed. For example, if the response was African-American, it was moved to Black. The same process was used when a country was used in place of an ethnic group. When no determination could be made or the descriptor was left blank the ethnicity was left as “Other.”

A majority of the respondents self-reported that they were Black (n=1,849; 1729 43.5%, 46%), followed by Hispanic students and White, non-Hispanic students. Again, Table 10 provides an overview of the demographic data.

Table 10
*Demographics Profile of Respondents Taking the District
 Prevention Assessment*

	N	%	N	%
	2007-2008		2008-2009	
Grade				
6	725	17.0	683	18.2
7	739	17.4	702	18.7
8	787	18.5	694	18.5
9	552	13.0	427	11.4
10	551	13.0	395	10.5
11	441	10.4	430	11.4
12	456	10.7	429	11.4
Level				
Middle School	2253	54	2079	55.3
High School	2000	47	1681	44.7
Gender				
Male	2142	50.4	1882	50.1
Female	2109	49.6	1878	49.9
Ethnicity				
American Indian	109	2.6	93	2.5
Asian American	117	2.8	98	2.6
Black, non-Hispanic	1849	43.5	1729	46.0
Hispanic	937	22.0	768	20.4
Multiracial	372	8.8	350	9.3
White, non-Hispanic	749	17.6	676	18.0
Other	118	2.8	46	1.2

Evaluative Question 12: Did the percent of students in project schools (6-12) who report missing one or more days of school during the previous 30 days because they felt unsafe at school or on the way to and from school decrease 2%?

Table 11 presents data for students in the project schools in grades 6-12 in the NCA. Baseline data indicate that 15.4% of the students (n=572) reported they missed one or more days of school during the past 30 days. First year data (baseline) indicate that 12.6% of the respondents reported missing at least one day of school. This represents a 2.8% decrease in the number of students who did not attend school because they felt unsafe at school or on their way to and from school. The project goal was a 2% annual decrease. A majority of students 86.5% (n=3,650) and 87.4% (n=3245) respectively, reported they had not missed any school.

Table 11

Two-Year Comparison of Student in Project Schools (6-12) Reporting They Missed One or More Days of School During the Previous 30 Days Because They Felt Unsafe at School or on the Way to and from School

	None		1 day		2 or 3 days		4 or 5 days		6 or more days		Total N
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Middle School											
2007-08	1909	85.5	116	5.2	125	5.6	33	1.5	51	2.3	2234
2008-09	1794	87.3	96	4.7	83	4.0	42	2.0	41	2.0	2056
High School											
2007-08	1741	87.6	93	4.7	83	4.2	22	1.1	49	2.5	1988
2008-09	1451	87.5	80	4.8	57	3.4	20	1.2	50	3.0	1658
Total											
2007-08	3650	86.5	209	5.0	208	4.9	55	1.3	100	2.4	4222
2008-09	3245	87.4	176	4.07	140	3.8	62	1.7	91	2.5	3714

Evaluative Question 13: Did the percentage of students in project schools (6-12) involved in a physical fight on school property during the prior twelve months decrease 2%?

Table 12 presents data for the project schools in the NCA. Over the past two years, a majority of students in the project schools, 75% and 81.2% reported that they were not involved in a physical fight during the past 12 months. However, 24.8% of the respondents reported being involved in a physical fight on school property during the past 12 months. First year data (baseline) indicate that 18.8% of the respondents reported missing being involved in a physical fight on school property during the past 12 months. This represents a 6% decrease. The project goal was a 2% annual decrease.

Table 12

Two-Year Comparison of Students Reporting in Project Schools (6-12) Reporting They Were Involved in a Physical Fight on School Property During the Prior Twelve Months

	0 times		1 time		2 or 3 times		4 or more times		Total
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Middle Schools									
2007-08	1522	68.4	372	16.7	230	10.	100	4.5	2224
2008-09	1549	76.0	274	13.4	128	6.3	88	4.3	2039
High Schools									
2007-08	1631	82.4	161	8.1	115	5.8	73	3.7	1980
2008-09	1456	87.5	93	5.6	62	3.7	53	3.2	1664
Total									
2007-08	3153	75.0	533	12.7	345	8.2	173	4.1	4204
2008-09	3005	81.2	367	9.9	190	5.1	141	3.8	3703

Evaluative Question 14: Did the percent of students (6-12) who report that they have used marijuana on one or more occasions during the previous 30 days decrease 2%?

Table 13 presents data from the DPA that indicate for year one (baseline) 10.2% of the respondents reported using marijuana on one or more occasions during the previous 30 days. Second year data indicate that 12.6% of the respondents reported using marijuana at least once. This represents a **2.4% increase** in the number of students who used marijuana during the previous 30 days. The project goal was a 2% annual decrease.

Table 13

Two-Year Comparison of Students in Project Schools (6-12) Reporting They Have Used Marijuana on One or More Occasions During the Previous 30 Days.

	0 days		1-2 days		3-9 days		10-19 days		20-30 days		Total
	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	%	n	%	N
Middle Schools											
2007-08	2072	92	63	2.8	32	1.4	15	.7	38	1.6	2220
2008-09	1888	92.2	64	3.1	33	1.6	11	.5	52	2.5	2048
High Schools											
2007-08	1696	84.8	80	4.0	68	3.4	40	2.0	91	4.6	1975
2008-09	1345	81.6	91	5.5	77	4.7	44	2.7	92	5.6	1649
Total											
2007-08	3768	88.6	143	3.4	100	2.4	55	1.3	129	3.0	4195
2008-09	3233	87.4	155	4.2	110	3.0	55	1.5	144	3.9	3697

Evaluative Question 15: Did the percent of students (6-12) who report that they have consumed alcohol during the previous 30 days decrease 2%?

Baseline data from the DPA indicate 18.1% of the respondents reported consuming alcohol on one or more occasions during the previous 30 days. First year data indicate that 23.1% of the respondents reported alcohol consumption. This represents a 5% increase. The project goal was a 2% annual decrease. Table 14 presents data for the project schools in the NCA.

Table 14

Two-Year Comparison of Students in Project Schools (6-12) Reporting They Have Consumed Alcohol During the Previous 30 Days

	0 days		1-2 days		3-9 days		10-19 days		20-30 days		Total
	n	%	n	%	N	%	N	%	n	%	N
Middle Schools											
2007-08	1988	88.3	155	6.9	39	1.7	18	.8	31	1.4	2231
2008-09	1744	85.0	194	9.5	56	2.7	27	1.3	30	1.5	2051
High Schools											
2007-08	1471	73.6	290	14.5	120	6.0	62	3.1	48	2.4	1991
2008-09	1113	66.8	279	16.8	163	9.8	42	2.5	68	4.1	1665
Total											
2007-08	3459	81.3	445	10.5	159	3.7	80	1.9	79	1.9	4222
2008-09	2857	76.9	473	12.7	219	5.9	69	1.9	98	2.6	3716

Evaluative Question 16: Did the percent of students in project schools (6-12) reporting they had participated in a prosocial activity at their school increase by 2% from baseline?

Between year one (baseline) and year two, there was a 5.9% decrease in the number of students reporting they participated in any school activities such as sports teams, band or chorus, school clubs, or student government. The project goal was a 2% annual increase. Table 15 presents these data.

Table 15

Two-Year Comparison Data on Students in Project Schools (6-12) Reporting They Had Participated in a Prosocial Activity in Their School Last Year

	Yes		No		Total
	n	%	n	%	N
Middle Schools					
2007-08	1113	50.2	1105	49.8	2218
2008-09	860	42.2	1179	57.8	2039
High Schools					
2007-08	1110	55.9	875	44.1	1985
2008-09	878	53.1	777	46.9	1655
Total					
2007-08	2223	52.9	1980	47.1	4203
2008-09	1738	47.0	1956	53.0	3694

Evaluative Question 17: Did the percent of students in project schools (6-12) reporting engagement in community opportunities for prosocial involvement increase by 2% from baseline?

There was a 2.5% decrease from year one (baseline) to year two in the number of students who indicated that they participated in a community activity during the past 12 months. The project goal was a 2% annual increase.

Table 16

Two-Year Comparison of Students in Project Schools (6-12) Reporting They Had Participated in a Prosocial Activity in Their Community Last School Year (2007-2008)

	Yes		No		Total
	n	%	n	%	N
Middle Schools					
2007-08	1131	50.9	1089	49.1	2220
2008-09	1026	50.2	1018	49.8	2044
High Schools					
2007-08	1045	52.9	932	47.1	1977
2008-09	801	48.1	863	51.9	1664
Total					
2007-08	2176	51.8	2021	48.2	4197
2008-09	1827	49.3	1881	50.7	3708

Evaluative Question 18: Did the percent of external suspensions in project schools (K-12) decrease 2%?

Second year data indicate a 28.9% increase from first year in the number of external suspensions in NCA schools. External suspensions in the elementary schools decreased by 5.7% while middle school suspensions increased by 56.6%. The project goal was a 2% decrease from baseline. Table 17 presents these findings. The dramatic increase in suspensions may be the result of a new discipline matrix implemented in the district. The electronic system now captures all infractions and enters them into the database. Summary data for elementary, middle, and high schools are presented in Table 18.

Table 17

Three-Year Comparison of External Suspension Data for NCA Schools

	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009
School	n	n	n
Banyan Elementary School	3	15	3
Broadview Elementary School	10	4	3
Castle Hill Elementary School	22	12	18
Challenger Elementary School	8	2	1

	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009
Endeavour Primary Learning Center	0	3	1
Floranada Elementary School	1	9	3
Horizon Elementary School	7	19	0
Larkdale Elementary School	3	42	4
Lauderhill Paul Turner Elem. School	35	29	41
Lloyd Estates Elementary School	5	6	2
Nob Hill Elementary School	2	2	12
North Andrews Gardens Elem.	0	0	2
Nova Blanche Forman Elementary	1	6	0
Nova Eisenhower Elementary School	2	4	2
Oakland Park Elementary School	0	6	13
Oriole Elementary School	1	9	4
Park Lakes Elementary School	52	44	61
Pinewood Elementary School	21	38	9
Royal Palm Elementary School	1	8	49
Sandpiper Elementary School	2	3	4
Village Elementary School	3	2	3
Welleby Elementary School	0	2	15
Total Elementary School	179	265	250
Bair Middle School	143	139	153
James S. Rickards Middle School	43	64	577
Lauderdale Lakes Middle School	201	233	141
Lauderhill Middle School	29	47	250
Millennium Middle School	82	185	22
Nova Middle School	47	70	103
Westpine Middle School	61	121	102
Total Middle School	606	859	1348
Atlantic Technical	0	1	2
Boyd H. Anderson High School	143	172	300
Northeast High School	146	126	275
Nova High School	64	95	112
Piper High School	142	431	227
Total High School	495	825	916
Grand Total	1280	1946	2514

Note: Data obtained from the TERMS database

Table 18

Three- Year Comparison of External Suspensions for Elementary, Middle, and High Schools

	2006-07 Baseline	2007-08 Year One	Change	%	2008-09 Year Two	Change	%
Elementary Schools	179	265	+86	+48	250	-15	-5.7
Middle Schools	606	859	+253	+41.7	1,348	486	+56.6
High Schools	495	825	+330	+66.7	916	+91	+11
Total	1,280	1,949	+669	+52.3	2,514	+565	+28.9

Evaluative Question 19: Did the percent of internal suspensions in project schools (K-12) decrease 2%?

Second year data indicate a 79.7% increase from first year in the number of internal suspensions in NCA schools. Internal suspensions in the elementary schools increased by 37.1% while middle school suspensions increased by 108.2%. The project goal was a 2% decrease from baseline. This dramatic increase may be the result of a new discipline matrix implemented in the district. The electronic system now captures all suspensions and enters them into the database. These findings are presented in Table 19. Table 20 presents aggregate data by elementary, middle, and high school totals.

Table 19

Three-Year Comparison of Internal Suspension Data for NCA Schools

School	2006- 2007	2007- 2008	2008- 2009
	n	n	n
Banyan Elementary School	10	32	16
Broadview Elementary School	3	6	5
Castle Hill Elementary School	2	13	33
Challenger Elementary School	6	14	8
Endeavour Primary Learning Center	0	1	0
Floranada Elementary School	1	9	4
Horizon Elementary School	7	48	28
Larkdale Elementary School	1	21	3
Lauderhill Paul Turner Elem.	3	56	58
Lloyd Estates Elementary School	11	10	4
Nob Hill Elementary School	4	3	21
North Andrews Gardens Elem.	0	10	4
Nova Blanche Forman Elementary	2	15	3
Nova Eisenhower Elementary School	0	12	8
Oakland Park Elementary School	2	6	12
Oriole Elementary School	9	14	35

School	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009
	n	n	n
Park Lakes Elementary School	1	77	141
Pinewood Elementary School	3	2	56
Royal Palm Elementary School	48	18	68
Sandpiper Elementary School	0	8	38
Village Elementary School	6	45	17
Welleby Elementary School	1	8	25
Total Elementary Schools	120	428	587
Bair Middle School	16	409	896
James S. Rickards Middle School	8	235	576
Lauderdale Lakes Middle School	31	233	156
Lauderhill Middle School	6	47	447
Millennium Middle School	68	201	5
Nova Middle School	18	174	316
Westpine Middle School	10	395	1086
Total Middle Schools	157	1694	3482
Atlantic Technical	0	0	2
Boyd H. Anderson High School	5	531	978
Northeast High School	22	442	361
Nova High School	45	332	684
Piper High School	8	300	602
Total High Schools	80	1605	2627
Grand Total	357	3727	6696

NOTE: Data obtained from the TERMS Database

Table 20

Three-Year Comparison of Internal Suspensions by Elementary, Middle, and High Schools

	2006-07 Baseline	2007-08 Year One	Change	%	2008-09 Year Two	Change	%
Elementary Schools	120	428	+308	+256.7	587	+159	+37.1
Middle Schools	157	1694	+1537	+978.9	3482	+1833	+108.2
High Schools	80	1605	+1525	+1906.2	2627	+1022	+63.8
Total	357	3727	+3370	+943.9	6696	+2969	+79.7

Evaluative Question 20: Did the social norm perception of students at project high schools regarding the acceptable use of alcohol decrease 2%?

In order to collect data related to the social norms project, a question was added to the DPA regarding perceptions of alcohol use, “Do your friends at school think that it is all right to drink alcoholic drinks like beer, wine coolers, or liquor?” Table 21 displays the findings for the schools in which the Social Norms campaign will be implemented during the 2009-2010 school year.

There was a 27% increase in the number of students responding that their friends felt it was all right to drink alcoholic beverages. The project goal was a 2% annual decrease. When the data for the schools scheduled to participate in the social norms campaign were compared to the other NCA schools, there was a -5.4% difference in the responses. As mentioned, the social norms campaign has not been implemented.

Table 21
Two-Year Comparison of Students in Project Schools (6-12) Reporting on the DPA, Their Friends at School Think Is All Right to Drink Alcoholic Drinks Like Beer, Wine Coolers, or Liquor

School		Yes		No		
		N	n	%	n	%
Rickards Middle						
	2007-08	317	75	23.7	238	75.1
	2008-09	346	141	40.8	205	59.2
Millennium Middle						
	2007-08	332	64	19.3	258	77.7
	2008-09	272	86	31.6	186	68.4
Westpine Middle						
	2007-08	386	76	19.7	302	78.2
	2008-09	315	105	33.3	210	66.7
Northeast High						
	2007-08	309	207	67.0	100	32.4
	2008-09	370	281	75.9	89	24.1
Piper High						
	2007-08	408	257	63.0	146	35.8
	2008-09	338	251	74.3	87	25.7
Total Social Norms Schools						
	2007-08	1750	679	38.8	1044	59.7
	2008-09	1641	864	52.7	777	47.3
Total Non-Social norm Schools						
	2007-08	2449	975	39.8	1474	60.2
	2008-09	2060	975	47.3	1085	52.7

Evaluative Question 21: Did the number of civil citations increase by 10% from baseline?

The Core Management Team (CMT) continues discussion on the implementation of the Civil Citation Program and aligning the program with community needs. To date, the program has not been implemented.

Evaluative Question 22: Did the percent of students (K-12) who received school based mental health services (school counselor, psychologist, social worker, or agency) increase 2%?

Data indicate .24% of students in project schools (K-12) received community-based mental health services during the baseline year and .28 % of students received services during the 2007-2008 school year. This represents an increase of .06% from baseline. During the 2008-2009 school year, 2.22% of students in project schools received services. This represents a 1.94% increase from the prior year. The project goal was a 2% increase. School level data are presented in Table 22.

Table 22

Three-Year Comparison of the Number and Percent of Students Receiving School Based Mental Health Services

School	Enrollment	N Referrals	%	
Elementary Schools				
Banyan	2006-2007	964	2	0.002
	2007-2008	652		0.000
	2008-2009	629	8	0.013
Broadview	2006-2007	966	1	0.001
	2007-2008	580		0.000
	2008-2009	577	5	0.009
Castle Hill	2006-2007	755	3	0.004
	2007-2008	485	6	0.012
	2008-2009	443	8	0.018
Challenger	2006-2007	1229	1	0.001
	2007-2008	821		0.000
	2008-2009	755	8	0.011
Endeavour	2006-2007	433		0.000
	2007-2008	203		0.000
	2008-2009	199	0	0.000
Floranada	2006-2007	742		0.000
	2007-2008	517	2	0.004
	2008-2009	474	31	0.065
Horizon	2006-2007	929		0.000
	2007-2008	650		0.000
	2008-2009	613	12	0.020
Larkdale	2006-2007	527		0.000
	2007-2008	296	4	0.014
	2008-2009	245	18	0.073

School		Enrollment	N Referrals	%
Lauderhill P.T.	2006-2007	727	0	0.000
	2007-2008	437	0	0.000
	2008-2009	462	8	0.017
Lloyd Estates	2006-2007	492		0.000
	2007-2008	287		0.000
	2008-2009	310	24	0.077
Nob Hill	2006-2007	843		0.000
	2007-2008	568		0.000
	2008-2009	541	5	0.009
N. Andrews Gardens	2006-2007	822	1	0.001
	2007-2008	547	6	0.011
	2008-2009	544	10	0.018
Nova Blanche Forman	2006-2007	786		0.000
	2007-2008	537		0.000
	2008-2009	539	22	0.041
Nova Eisenhower	2006-2007	808	1	0.001
	2007-2008	554		0.000
	2008-2009	517	3	0.006
Oakland Park	2006-2007	619		0.000
	2007-2008	348		0.000
	2008-2009	348	7	0.020
Oriole	2006-2007	725		0.000
	2007-2008	486	4	0.008
	2008-2009	499	3	0.006
Park lakes	2006-2007	1112		0.000
	2007-2008	704	11	0.022
	2008-2009	755	3	0.004
Pinewood	2006-2007	1049		0.000
	2007-2008	658		0.000
	2008-2009	625	2	0.003
Royal Palm	2006-2007	768		0.000
	2007-2008	521	1	0.002
	2008-2009	541	8	0.010
Sandpiper	2006-2007	831		0.000
	2007-2008	588		0.000
	2008-2009	592	5	0.008
Village	2006-2007	969		0.000
	2007-2008	603		0.000
	2008-2009	584	3	0.005
Welleby	2006-2007	869	9	0.010
	2007-2008	542	1	0.002
	2008-2009	558	17	0.030

School		Enrollment	N Referrals	%
Elementary Schools Total	2006-2007	17965	19	0.11
	2007-2008	11584	24	0.21
	2008-2009	11350	210	1.85
Middle Schools				
Bair	2006-2007	1106		0.000
	2007-2008	1103	13	0.012
	2008-2009	1015	15	0.015
Lauderdale Lakes	2006-2007	920	1	0.001
	2007-2008	929		0.000
	2008-2009	981	39	0.040
Lauderhill	2006-2007	613	5	0.008
	2007-2008	598	1	0.002
	2008-2009	598	24	0.040
Millennium	2006-2007	1466	1	0.001
	2007-2008	1484	3	0.002
	2008-2009	1523	59	0.039
Nova	2006-2007	1236		0.000
	2007-2008	1240	1	0.001
	2008-2009	1344	2	0.001
Rickards	2006-2007	2658	2	0.001
	2007-2008	960	2	0.002
	2008-2009	933	24	0.026
Westpine	2006-2007	1468		0.000
	2007-2008	1479		0.000
	2008-2009	1515	17	0.011
Middle School Total	2006-2007	9467	9	0.09
	2007-2008	7793	20	0.26
	2008-2009	7909	180	2.28
High Schools				
Boyd Anderson	2006-2007	2203	29	0.013
	2007-2008	2279	7	0.003
	2008-2009	2248	21	0.009
Northeast	2006-2007	1996	2	0.001
	2007-2008	2033	18	0.009
	2008-2009	2037	139	0.068
Nova	2006-2007	2035	2	0.001
	2007-2008	2058		0.000
	2008-2009	2128	50	0.023
Piper	2006-2007	2658	26	0.010
	2007-2008	2646	4	0.002
	2008-2009	2619	52	0.026
High School Total	2006-2007	8892	59	0.66
	2007-2008	9016	29	0.32

School	Enrollment	N Referrals	%	
	2008-2009	10155	262	0.26
All Schools Total	2006-2207	36324	87	0.24
	2007-2008	28393	73	0.26
	2008-2009	29414	652	2.22

Evaluative Question 23: Did the percent of student mental health referrals (K-12) resulting in mental health services being provided in the community (in-patient or to a collaborating agency) increase 2%?

Data indicate that 2.75% of students in project schools received community-based mental health services during the baseline year and 3.34 % of students received services during the 2007-2008 school year. This represents an increase of .59%.. During the 2008-2009 school year, .73% of students in project schools received services. This represents a 2.61% decrease in the number of students receiving services. The project goal was a 2% increase. Table 23 presents the school level data.

Table 23

Three-Year Comparison of the Number and Percent of Students Receiving Mental Health Referrals to a Community Agency.

School	Enrollment	N Referrals	%	
Elementary Schools				
Banyan	2006-2007	964	25	0.03
	2007-2008	652	27	0.04
	2008-2009	629	2	0.00
Broadview	2006-2007	966	29	0.03
	2007-2008	580	23	0.04
	2008-2009	577	4	0.01
Castle Hill	2006-2007	755	23	0.03
	2007-2008	485	10	0.02
	2008-2009	443	35	0.08
Challenger	2006-2007	1229	34	0.03
	2007-2008	821	33	0.04
	2008-2009	755	9	0.01
Endeavour	2006-2007	433	9	0.02
	2007-2008	203	3	0.01
	2008-2009	199	2	0.01
Floranada	2006-2007	742	11	0.01
	2007-2008	517	17	0.03
	2008-2009	474	1	0.01
Horizon	2006-2007	929	18	0.02
	2007-2008	650	23	0.04

School		Enrollment	N Referrals	%
	2008-2009	613	8	0.01
Larkdale	2006-2007	527	14	0.03
	2007-2008	296	18	0.06
	2008-2009	24	42	0.17
Lauderhill P.T	2006-2007	727	22	0.03
	2007-2008	437	23	0.05
	2008-2009	462	1	0.00
Lloyd Estates	2006-2007	492	40	0.08
	2007-2008	287	26	0.09
	2008-2009	310	1	0.00
Nob Hill	2006-2007	843	34	0.04
	2007-2008	568	25	0.04
	2008-2009	541	3	0.01
N. Andrews Gardens	2006-2007	822	46	0.06
	2007-2008	547	34	0.06
	2008-2009	544	1	0.00
Nova Blanche Forman	2006-2007	786	49	0.06
	2007-2008	537	20	0.04
	2008-2009	539	1	0.00
Nova Eisenhower	2006-2007	808	5	0.01
	2007-2008	554	3	0.01
	2008-2009	517	2	0.00
Oakland Park	2006-2007	619	35	0.06
	2007-2008	348	30	0.09
	2008-2009	348	11	0.03
Oriole	2006-2007	725	54	0.07
	2007-2008	486	38	0.08
	2008-2009	499	9	0.02
Park Lakes	2006-2007	1112	16	0.01
	2007-2008	704	16	0.02
	2008-2009	625	11	0.01
Pinewood	2006-2007	1049	19	0.02
	2007-2008	658	32	0.05
	2008-2009	6235	0	0.00
Royal Palm	2006-2007	768	31	0.04
	2007-2008	521	16	0.03
	2008-2009	541	4	0.01
Sandpiper	2006-2007	831	16	0.02
	2007-2008	588	12	0.02
	2008-2009	0	0	0.00
Village	2006-2007	969	12	0.01
	2007-2008	603	13	0.02
	2008-2009	584	5	0.01

School		Enrollment	N Referrals	%
Welleby	2006-2007	869	26	0.03
	2007-2008	542	24	0.04
	2008-2009	558	0	0.00
Elementary Total	2006-2007	17965	568	3.16
	2007-2008	11584	466	4.02
	2008-2009	11350	155	1.37
Middle Schools				
Bair	2006-2007	1106	63	0.057
	2007-2008	1103	32	0.029
	2008-2009	1015	10	0.010
Lauderdale Lakes	2006-2007	920	71	0.077
	2007-2008	929	59	0.064
	2008-2009	981	42	0.043
Lauderhill	2006-2007	613	23	0.038
	2007-2008	598	31	0.052
	2008-2009	598	1	0.002
Millennium	2006-2007	1466	42	0.029
	2007-2008	1484	50	0.034
	2008-2009	1523	3	0.002
Nova	2006-2007	1236	13	0.011
	2007-2008	1240	10	0.008
	2008-2009	1344	0	0.00
Rickards	2006-2007	2658	29	0.011
	2007-2008	960	31	0.032
	2008-2009	993	4	0.004
Westpine	2006-2007	1468	27	0.018
	2007-2008	1479	40	0.027
	2008-2009	1515	4	0.003
Middle School Total	2006-2007	9467	268	2.83
	2007-2008	7793	253	3.25
	2008-2009	7909	64	.81
High Schools				
Boyd Anderson	2006-2007	2203	70	0.032
	2007-2008	2279	60	0.026
	2008-2009	2248	1	0.44
Northeast	2006-2007	1996	33	0.017
	2007-2008	2033	61	0.030
	2008-2009	2037	0	0.000
Nova	2006-2007	2035	29	0.014
	2007-2008	2058	28	0.014
	2008-2009	2128	3	0.141
Piper High	2006-2007	2658	32	0.012
	2007-2008	2646	81	0.031

School		Enrollment	N Referrals	%
	2008-2009	2619	3	0.115
High School Total	2006-2007	8892	164	1.84
	2007-2008	9016	230	2.55
	2008-2009	11869	7	0.06
All School Total	2006-2007	36324	1000	2.75
	2007-2008	28393	949	3.34
	2008-2009	31128	226	.73

Evaluative Question 24: Did Pre-K parent attendance at Early Childhood Development classes increase?

The program began implementation this year in the NCAA. Baseline data were collected from attendance logs at classes held in two sites. Trainings were held in the spring and fall. Of the 327 parents eligible to attend training, 49 (15%) participated.

Evaluative Question 25: Did the number of participants attending the Nurturing Parent Program at the three teen parent sites increase?

The Nurturing Parent Program began this year. Baseline data were collected from attendance logs at the three program sites. Teen fathers, teen mothers, and caregivers were invited to attend the sessions. Twenty-three sessions were held and 128 teens participated. The majority of the participants were teen fathers (103).

Evaluative Question 26: Did students (6-12) in the project schools participate in any alcohol, tobacco, or violence prevention classroom lesson during the 2008-2009 school year?

As part of the District Prevention Assessment, students in grades 6-12 in project schools were asked if they had participated in any classroom prevention lessons during the previous 12 months. Responses are found in Table 24.

Students self-report indicates that 44.7% (n=1890) reported participating in some sort of alcohol, tobacco or violence prevention classroom lesson during year one. During year two, 40.1% of the students reported participation. For both years, the majority of students reported that they had not participated in any programs. These data were collected to track the implementation of prevention programs throughout the course of the project.

Table 24

Two-Year Comparison of the Number and Percent of Students in Project Schools Responding to the Question “During LAST school year, did your class participate in alcohol, tobacco, or violence prevention classroom lessons?”

	Yes		No		Total
	n	%	n	%	
Middle Schools					
2007-2008	1192	63.1	1038	44.4	2230
2008-2009	950	46.6	1090	53.4	2040
High Schools					
2007-2008	698	33.5	1298	65.0	1996
2008-2009	529	32.1	1118	67.9	1647
Total					
2007-2008	1890	44.7	2336	55.3	4226
2008-2009	1479	40.1	2208	59.9	3687

Evaluative Question 27: Are there processes in place to assure project sustainability?

Project staff and the Core Management Team are aware of the importance of planning for sustainability from the onset of a project. With this in mind, they are in the planning stages of developing a sustainability plan. Staff and Core Management Team members will be reviewing Johnson, Hays, Center, and Daley’s article “Building Capacity and Sustainable Prevention Innovations: A Sustainability Planning Model” to begin discussing the format they wish to take for the Project Bridge sustainability plan. Currently the following framework is in place for each of the elements. Additionally, the review of the literature for the Annual Evaluation focuses on program sustainability. Finally, the Project Director will be participating in the five week sustainability course offered by the Technical Assistance Center. He will share information from this course with the Core Management Team at the monthly meetings.

Current sustainability efforts for Element 1 focus on systems change within the Broward County School District. The development, training, and implementation of the Anti-Bullying Policy has been facilitated by grant staff. This impact on policy will continue as Project Staff work with District Staff to develop and implement prevention policies, and Positive School Climate Plans. In addition, procedural manuals, training materials, and resources are readily available on the OPP website for school and community access.

In collaboration with Discovery Health, plans are underway to create an online information warehouse where media and resources can be freely shared. This site will remain a living link long after grant funds have been expended.

Finally, using a train-the-trainer model, school level staff and community members are prepared to train faculty, staff, and employees on district prevention curriculum, policies and procedures.

Current sustainability efforts for Element 2 focus on training community partners, project staff, and school staff on available alcohol, tobacco, and other drug intervention resources and programs. Again, using a train-the-trainer model ensures all new staff will receive training.

Again this year, all project schools were offered the opportunity to participate in a school level needs assessment. Data from these assessments provided project staff to customize intervention programs identified as needed by school staff. Including school staff in the decision making process is a proven way of ensuring implementation and sustainability of intervention programs. Monies spent on the Social Norms Campaign

Current sustainability efforts for Element 3 include the implementation of the CHAMPS program and development of the pro social project. Again, the CHAMPS train-the-trainer model ensures that grant dollars are extended beyond the funding period. The PSAs created as part of pro social project provide a timeless vehicle for the continued development and expansion of the project.

Current sustainability efforts for Element 4 are reflected in the work of the Core Management Team in spearheading the design and implementation of an electronic data system to track referrals, treatment, and follow up. In addition, the Student Support Services Database and Risk Management System provide online resources can be used indefinitely for data collection and decision making. Finally, the common mental health assessment will provide a common basis for community agencies to communicate on the best possible service delivery option.

Current sustainability efforts for Element 5 include the opportunity for parents to participate in a parent training needs assessment survey. At this time these data have not been collected by the community agency responsible for this task. It is hoped that data from these assessments will provide project staff with the information necessary to customize programs identified as needed by parents/caregivers. Including parents in the decision making process is a proven way of ensuring implementation and sustainability of early childhood intervention programs.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The following section provides a summary of the findings from this evaluation. The data source is included in parenthesis at the end of the statement (District Prevention Assessment (DPA), Annual Customer Survey (ACS)).

- Through most of the year, Project Bridge was fully staffed. At the end of the year the Project was staffed with a Project Director, Project Manager, seven Risk Reduction Specialists, four Staff Developers, four Case Managers, and a Database Research Assistant.
- Over the past two years, funds have been expended at a rate of 66.5%
- The Core Management Team has taken an active part in the planning and implementation of project activities.
- Project activities in the North Central Area have been fully or substantially implemented as intended.
- A district-wide bullying policy was implemented, and the development of a district-wide prevention policy will commence next year.

- School-based Prevention Liaisons reported “time” as the biggest challenge they face in facilitating program implementation. Their successes focused on positive changes to the school climate.
- Currently, there is no process in place to track implementation of evidence-based programs.
- From baseline (06-07) to year one, there was a .7% decrease in the number of students who disagreed with the prompt, “I feel safe at school.” From year one to year two there was a 1.1% decrease. The project goal was a 2% annual decrease (ACS).
- There was a 2.8% decrease in the number of students reporting they did not attend school because they felt unsafe at school or on their way to and from school. The project goal was a 2% annual decrease (DPA).
- There was a 6% decrease in the number of students self-reporting they had been in a fight on school property in the past 12 months. The project goal was a 2% annual decrease (DPA).
- There was a 2.1% increase in the percent of students who reported there was an adult at school they could talk to regarding their personal problems. The project goal was a 2% annual increase (ACS).
- There was a 3.3% increase in the number of students who reported “students bring drugs or alcohol to my school.” The project goal was an annual 2% decrease (ACS).
- There was a 5% increase in the number of students reporting consuming alcohol on one or more occasions during the previous 30 days. The project goal was a 2% annual decrease (DPA).
- There was a 27% increase in the number of students who reported their friends felt it was alright to drink alcoholic beverages. The project goal was a 2% decrease (DPA).
- There was a 2.4% increase in the number of students who used marijuana during the previous 30 days. The project goal was a 2% annual decrease (DPA).
- There was a 5.9% decrease in the number of students reporting they had participated in any school activities such as sports teams, band or chorus, school clubs, or student government. The project goal was a 2% annual increase (DPA).
- There was a 2.5% decrease in the number of students reporting they participated in a community activity during the past 12 months. The project goal was a 2% increase (DPA).
- There was a 28.9% increase in the number of external suspensions in NCAA schools. The project goal was a 2% decrease (data warehouse).
- There was a 79.7% increase in internal suspensions. The project goal is a 2% annual decrease (data warehouse).
- The Civil Citation Program has not yet been implemented.
- There was a 1.94% increase from the prior year in students who received school-based mental health services. The project goal was a 2% increase (TERMS database).
- There was a .14% increase from the prior year in students who received community-based mental health services. The project goal was a 2% increase (TERMS database).
- The Early Childhood Development Program began implementation this year in the NCAA. Baseline data were collected from attendance logs at classes held in two sites. Trainings were held in the spring and fall. Of the 327 parents eligible to attend training 49 (15%) participated.
- The Nurturing Parent Program began this year. Baseline data were collected from attendance logs at the three program sites. Teen fathers, teen mothers, and caregivers were invited to attend the sessions. Twenty-three sessions were held and 128 teens participated. The majority of the participants were teen fathers (n=103).

- Sustainability is a key focus of both the Core Management Team and Project Bridge Staff. Planning has commenced toward the development of a sustainability plan.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are made for program improvement and to ensure sustainability.

Recommendation One:

Develop a process for tracking usage and impact of the evidence-based programs implemented as part of this project. This could be done with a brief online survey completed in December and May.

Recommendation Two:

Reported alcohol and marijuana use has increase in project schools, while the social norms campaign will be rolled out this year, it will not be delivered in all schools. Additionally, it only targets alcohol use. Consider creating a plan to address the increased used.

Recommendation Three:

Students report fewer opportunities for school-based and community based activities. While budget cuts have reduced these activities in schools and the communities, it is suggested that the Core Management Team address this issue to explore options with community partners and project staff.

Recommendation Four:

Changes in the way schools report both internal and external suspensions questions the viability of using this measure to track program progress. It is recommended that project staff work with the evaluator and the Core Management Team to identify clearer outcome measures (i.e., referral data). It is further recommended that if these measure change, baseline, and years one and two data are reported as an addendum to this report.

Recommendation Five:

While discussions continue on the implementation of the Civil Citation Program, consideration might be given to reevaluating this aspect of the project and replacing it with another outcome.

Recommendation Six:

With budget cuts affecting all schools and community agencies, it is recommended that project staff closely monitor school and community based mental health service referrals. These data may assist staff and the Core Management Team in managing resources.

Recommendation Seven:

It is recommended that attendance at both the Early Childhood Development Program and Nurturing Parent Program be monitored to ensure participation continues to grow.

Recommendation Eight:

To ensure sustainability, it is recommended that a draft of the sustainability plan be completed and reviewed by the end of the academic year.

REFERENCES

- Adelman, H.S., & Taylor, L. (2003). On sustainability of project innovations as systemic change. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 14*(1), 1-25. Retrieved from <http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/publications>.
- Akerlund, K.M. (2000). Prevention program sustainability: the state's perspective. *Journal of Community Psychology, 28*(3), 353-362. Retrieved from http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/safety/training/sustaining/prevention_pg33.html
- Backer, T.E. (2000). The failure of success: Challenges of disseminating effective substance abuse prevention programs. *Journal of Community Psychology, 28*(3), 363-373. Retrieved from http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/safety/training/sustaining/prevention_pg33.html
- Benz, M.R., Lindstrom, L., Unruh, D., & Waintrup, M. (2004) Sustaining secondary transition programs in local schools. *Remedial and Special Education, 25*(1), 39-50. Retrieved from <http://www.questia.com/Index.jsp>
- Center for Mental Health in Schools. (2004a). *Addressing barriers to learning: Sustainability and scale-up: It's about systemic change*. Los Angeles: Center for Mental Health in Schools at UCLA. Retrieved from <http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/pdfdocs>
- Center for Mental Health in Schools. (2004b). *Sustaining school and community efforts to enhance outcomes for children and youth: A guidebook and tool kit*. Los Angeles: Center for Mental Health in Schools at UCLA. Retrieved from <http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/pdfdocs>
- Chinman, M., Imm, P., & Wandersman, A. (2004). *Getting to outcomes, 2004: Promoting accountability through methods and tools for planning, implementation and evaluation*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand.
- Gomez, B.J., Greenberg, M.T., & Feinberg, M. (in press). *Sustainability of community coalitions: A study of 20 coalitions under communities that care*. Prevention Research Center, Pennsylvania State University. Retrieved from http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/safety/training/sustaining/prevention_pg33.html
- Harvey, D. (2005) *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Institute for Educational Leadership (2002). *Building sustainability in demonstration projects for children, youth, and families*. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Educational Leadership. Retrieved from <http://www.iel.org/>
- LaMarsh, J. & Potts, R. (2004). Sustain the change. *Industrial Management (46)*, 3.
- Marek, L.I., & Mancini, J.A. (2004). *Sustaining programs and supporting families: A training program for human services professionals*. Paper presented at the Children, Youth, and Families at Risk (CYFAR) annual conference, Seattle, WA. 2004.

- Marek, L.I., Mancini, J.A., & Brock, D.J. (2000). The national youth at risk program sustainability study. *Report to the USDA*, Washington, DC.
- Minnesota Department of Human Services. (2006). *Strategic Recommendations for Sustaining the CJI-AOD Initiative*. Retrieved from <http://www.dhs.state.mn.us/main/>
- Paine-Andrews, A., Fisher, J., Campuzano, M.K., Fawcett, S.B., & Berkly-Patton, J. (2000). Promoting sustainability of community health initiatives: An empirical case study. *Health Promotion Practice*, 1(3), 248-258. Retrieved from http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/safety/training/sustaining/prevention_pg33.html
- “Three ‘Ps’ of Sustainability.” (2009). *Florida Healthy Schools*, 2(6), 1.
- Trottier, L., Denis, J., & Villeneuve, M. (2007). Anchoring and sustaining change in healthcare organizations. *Infoletter*, 4(3), 2-5.
- Williams, K. (2006). Sustainability of school-community collaborations in grant-funded violence prevention programs. *Persistently Safe Schools 2006: Collaborating with Students, Families, and Communities*. Retrieved from <http://gwired.gwu.edu/hamfish/merlincgi/p/downloadFile/d/16852/n/off/other/1/name/642Sustainabilityofschool-communitycollaborati/>

Appendix A

Project Bridge Revised Logic Model

Project Bridge Revised March, 2009 Logic Model – Putting It All Together							
Needs and Needs Gaps	Goals	SS/HS Element(s)	Objectives	Activities	Partners	Process Measures	Indicators and GPRA
<p>NEED: The 12th Annual Customer Survey (ACS) administered to all students (K-12) indicated that 47% of respondents “did not feel safe at school.”</p> <p>GAP: A review of district policies indicate there are no policies guiding the delivery of prevention services and there is no anti-bullying policy.</p>	<p>Goal 1: Establish District policy & procedures for the implementation of prevention practices.</p>	<p>Element 1: Safe School Environment and Violence Prevention Activities</p>	<p>1. Short Term: A district-wide prevention and anti-bullying policy will be submitted for board approval by September 30, 2009.</p>	<p>(a) Form Project Bridge Advisory Coalition (PBAC) (Obj. 1).</p> <p>(b) Convene a Policy Development Team (PDT) and anti-bullying taskforce (Obj. 1).</p> <p>(c) Write a comprehensive prevention and anti-bullying policy, present to stakeholders, and submit to the BCPS School Board for approval (Obj. 1).</p>	<p>PBAC will meet quarterly to oversee grant-related activities.</p> <p>Project staff and PDT, comprised of community partners, will develop a comprehensive prevention and anti-bullying policy, and submit policy for board.</p>	<p>Minutes from PBAC and PDT meetings.</p> <p>Expert review of prevention and anti-bullying policy.</p> <p>Project Participant Survey (PPS) (PBAC and PDT members)</p>	<p>1. By September 30, 2009, a district-wide prevention and anti-bullying policy will be submitted for board approval as evidenced by board agenda item.</p> <p>2. By the end of the project, a district-wide prevention policy will be submitted for board approval as evidenced by board agenda item.</p>
<p>NEED: The ACS administered to all students in grades (K-12) indicated that 47% of respondents “did not feel safe at school.” Additionally, 2007</p>	<p>Goal 2: Ensure a positive and safe learning environment.</p>	<p>Element 1: Safe School Environment and Violence Prevention Activities</p>	<p>1. Long term: The number of students in grades 6-12 who report they agree or strongly agree they “do not feel safe at school” will decrease 2% annually 2. For each project year,,</p>	<p>(a) Establish Local Prevention Teams (LPTs) at project schools (Obj.1&2).</p> <p>(b) Train LPTs on District prevention curriculum, policies and procedures (Obj. 1&2).</p>	<p>Project school Principals and project staff will develop LPTs.</p> <p>Project staff, community partners, and consultants will</p>	<p>Number of LPTs established</p> <p>Number of LPT members trained and Staff Development Survey (SDS) and PPS</p>	<p>1. For each project year, the number of students in grades 6-12 who report they agree or strongly agree that they “do not feel safe at</p>

Project Bridge Revised March, 2009 Logic Model – Putting It All Together

Needs and Needs Gaps	Goals	SS/HS Element(s)	Objectives	Activities	Partners	Process Measures	Indicators and GPRA
<p>Florida School Indicators Report reflects that over 98,000 BCPS student have been absent 21 or more days.</p> <p>GAP: A review of the district’s 273 schools safety plans revealed that less than 10% of schools identified district adopted prevention programs. Additionally, the Safe Community Initiative (SCI), an anti-bullying task-force, was created in 2006, but little progress has been made.</p>			<p>the percent of students at project high schools (6-12), who report “students bring drugs or alcohol to my school” will decrease by 2% from baseline as measured by the ACS..</p> <p>2. Long-Term: The percentage of students report missing one or more days of school during the previous 30 days because they felt unsafe at school or on the way to and from school will decrease by 2% annually compared to baseline. (GPRA).</p>	<p>(c) LPTs will provide training on policies, prevention curriculum, and procedures in project schools (K-12) (Obj.1&2).</p> <p>(d) Train SAFE team members on District adopted prevention programs (Obj.1&2).</p> <p>(e) SAFE Teams will ensure that school safety plans include prevention curriculum and strategies (Obj.1&2).</p> <p>(f) Establish a Positive School Climate Committee (PSCC) (Obj.1&2).</p> <p>(g) Train School Advisory Committee members in project schools to develop Positive School Climate Plan (PSCP) (Obj. 1&2).</p> <p>(h) Develop PSCP in Project schools (Obj.1&2).</p> <p>(i) Implement anti-bullying policy in all</p>	<p>train LPTs in District prevention curriculum, policies and procedures</p> <p>School Resource Offices SROs and project staff will deliver district adopted prevention programs to SAFE Team members.</p> <p>Project Staff will convene PSCC.</p> <p>PSCC develops Positive School Climate Template and provides staff development to School Advisor Committee members at project schools.</p> <p>BCPS Research services will administer the ACS and DPA</p> <p>PBAC will review findings from ACS and DPA to guide program implementation.</p>	<p>Number of faculty/staff trained SDS, and PPS.</p> <p>Number of SAFE Team members trained SDS, & PPS.</p> <p>Number of project school safety plans which include prevention curriculum and strategies</p> <p>PSCC minutes</p> <p>Number of SAC members trained SDS, and PPS.</p> <p>Review School Climate Plans</p> <p>Implementation surveys and focus groups</p> <p>PPS completed by all participants.</p>	<p>school” will decrease by 2% compared to baseline as measured by student responses to the ACS.</p> <p>2. For each project year, the percentage of students in grades 6-12 who report missing one or more days during the past 30 days because they felt unsafe at school or on their way to and from school will decrease by 2% compared to baseline as measured by student responses to the District Prevention Assessment (DPA) (GPRA).</p>

Project Bridge Revised March, 2009 Logic Model – Putting It All Together

Needs and Needs Gaps	Goals	SS/HS Element(s)	Objectives	Activities	Partners	Process Measures	Indicators and GPRA
				schools (Obj.1& 2). (j) Implement PSCP in project schools (1&2).			
<p>NEED: School Environmental Safety Incident Reporting (SESIR) data from 2005-06 indicate that there were 3,064 incidents of fighting and violence in grades K-12. Additionally, participants at town hall meetings and community partners noted a need for greater community participation in school-based prevention efforts. GAP. Based on a District needs assessment a fragmentation in the delivery of prevention services was identified.</p> <p>NEED: Alternative to External Suspension (AES)</p>	<p>Goal 3: Develop collaborative partnerships with community agencies to reduce violent incidents in schools.</p>	<p>Element 1: Safe School Environment and Violence Prevention Activities</p>	<p>1. Long-Term: The percentage of students (6-12) involved in a physical fight on school property during the prior twelve month will decrease 2% compared to baseline. (GPRA). 2. Long-Term: The percent of external suspensions in project schools (K-12) will annually decrease 2% from baseline. 3. Long-Term: The recidivism rate for students in secondary project schools (6-12) receiving Civil Citations will decrease by 2% per year from baseline..</p>	<p>(a) Establish new process for SS/HS community involvement (Obj. 1). (b) Train community partners in adopted violence prevention curricula (Obj. 1). (c) Implement violence prevention curricula in project schools (Obj. 1). (d) Monitor fidelity of implementation of violence prevention curriculum (Obj. 1). (e) Co-sponsor a Prevention Summit (Obj. 1). (a) Monitor SESIR data (Obj. 2). (a) Train SROs and School Administrators on Civil Citation Program process and procedures (Obj. 3).</p>	<p>Project staff and the Community Involvement Department will establish guidelines for SS/HS community partner approval process.</p> <p>Sunserve and GLSEN will training and consultation on issues related to Gay, Lesbian, Bi-sexual, and transgender youth.</p> <p>Archways & Women in Distress will provide supplemental implementation of violence prevention curriculum.</p> <p>Project staff will train community partners in adopted violence prevention curricula.</p>	<p>Review of new policy and interviews</p> <p>The number of community partners trained in violence prevention curriculum, SDS, and PPS.</p> <p>The number of schools implementing violence prevention curricula.</p> <p>Interviews w/ staff</p> <p>Implementation logs</p> <p>Classroom observation</p> <p>Prevention Summit Evaluations</p> <p>Implementation logs</p>	<p>1. For each project year, the percentage of students (6-12) involved in a physical fight on school property during the just completed school year will decrease by 2% compared to baseline as measured by the DPA (GPRA).</p> <p>2. For each project year, the percent of external suspensions in project schools will decrease 2% from baseline as evidenced by SESIR data.</p> <p>3. For each project year, decrease by 2% the recidivism rate for Civil Citations for students in</p>

Project Bridge Revised March, 2009 Logic Model – Putting It All Together

Needs and Needs Gaps	Goals	SS/HS Element(s)	Objectives	Activities	Partners	Process Measures	Indicators and GPRA
<p>site data reflects over 17,000 disciplinary referrals (IDEA eligible students are by law capped at a 10 day suspension prior to implementation of a new Individual Education Plan.) Recidivism rates based on this attendance are approaching 20%.</p> <p>GAP: The current Teen Court model was utilized in only 2 middle schools during 2005-06 serving 3 students.</p>					<p>Classroom teachers will implement violence prevention curriculum. Project staff will monitor implementation and coach classroom teachers.</p> <p>Safe Community Initiative will sponsor, plan, market, and evaluate the Prevention Summit.</p> <p>Project Staff and SROs will be trained on Civil Citation Program</p>	<p>Number of Civil Citations Issued</p>	<p>Project Schools (6-12) as evidenced by school records.</p>
<p>NEED: National Survey on Drug Use and Health found Broward rate of past month alcohol use was highest of all the areas surveyed in FL with a past 30-day use rate of 29%. According to the 2006 Florida Youth Substance</p>	<p>Goal 1. Decrease district-wide alcohol, tobacco and other drug use</p>	<p>Element 2 Alcohol, Tobacco, and Other Drug (ATOD) Prevention Activities</p>	<p>1. Long-Term: The percentage of students (6-12) who annually report that they have used marijuana on one or more occasions during the previous 30 days will annually decrease 2% from baseline (GPRA).</p> <p>2. Long-Term: The percentage of</p>	<p>(a) Train all community partners and project school LPTs in adopted ATOD prevention curricula (Obj. 1 & 2).</p> <p>(b) Implement ATOD prevention curriculum (Obj.1 & 2).</p> <p>(c) Monitor fidelity of ATOD curriculum implementation (Obj.1 & 2).</p>	<p>Community partners, project staff, and school staff will participate in staff development activities.</p> <p>Classroom teachers will implement ATOD prevention curriculum.</p> <p>Archways will</p>	<p>The number of community partners and LPTs trained in ATOD prevention curriculum, SDS, and PPS</p> <p>The number of schools implementing violence prevention curricula.</p>	<p>1. For each project year, the percentage of students (6-12) who report using marijuana on one or more occasions during the previous 30 days will decrease 2% from baseline as measured by student responses</p>

Project Bridge Revised March, 2009 Logic Model – Putting It All Together

Needs and Needs Gaps	Goals	SS/HS Element(s)	Objectives	Activities	Partners	Process Measures	Indicators and GPRA
<p>Abuse Survey (FYSAS) Overall lifetime marijuana use was 16% in 2006. Past-30-day marijuana use is 7%.</p> <p>GAP: Based on a needs assessment, fragmentation in the delivery of prevention services was identified. Also, participants at town hall meetings and community partners noted a need for greater community participation in school-based prevention efforts.</p>			<p>students (grades 6-12) who report that they have consumed alcohol during the previous 30 days will annually decrease 2% from baseline (GPRA).</p>		<p>facilitate the supplemental implementation of ATOD prevention curriculum.</p> <p>Project staff will monitor fidelity of implementation and coach teachers</p>	<p>Implementation logs and observation</p>	<p>to the DPA (GPRA).</p> <p>2. For each project year, the percentage of students (grades 6-12) who report consuming alcohol on one or more occasions during the previous 30 days will decrease 2% from baseline as measured by the DPA (GPRA).</p>
<p>NEED: FYSA data indicate alcohol is the most commonly used drug among Broward County youth with an overall prevalence of 52% for lifetime use, and 64% among high school students, and a reported 27% past</p>	<p>Goal 2. Implement a Social Norms approach to health promotion to combat underage drinking</p>	<p>Element 2: Alcohol, Tobacco, and Other Drug Prevention Activities</p>	<p>1. Long-Term: The social norm perception of students (at 16 project high schools) regarding acceptable use of alcohol will decrease annually 2% from baseline.</p> <p>2. Long Term: The number of students at project high schools</p>	<p>(a) Develop school based Social Norming campaigns (Obj. 1).</p> <p>(b) Train School- based Social Norms Designee to disseminate campaign information. (Obj. 1).</p> <p>(c) Implement and monitor the Social Norms campaign (Obj. 1&2).</p>	<p>Hire external consultant to work with project secondary schools to develop campaign</p> <p>Project staff will train School-based Social Norms Designee</p> <p>School-based Social Norms</p>	<p>Surveys</p> <p>Focus Groups</p>	<p>1. For each project year, decrease by 2% from baseline (at project secondary – 6-12 schools), the social norm perception regarding acceptable use of alcohol as measured by the</p>

Project Bridge Revised March, 2009 Logic Model – Putting It All Together

Needs and Needs Gaps	Goals	SS/HS Element(s)	Objectives	Activities	Partners	Process Measures	Indicators and GPRA
<p>30-day use.</p> <p>The ACS indicated that 68% of students report “students bring drugs and alcohol to my school.”</p> <p>GAP: Universal underage drinking prevention programs exist in only one out of 74 District’s secondary schools.</p>			<p>(6-12), who report “students bring drugs or alcohol to my school” will decrease by 2% annually from baseline by the end of the initiative.</p>		<p>Designee will implement a Social Norms marketing campaign at each school</p> <p>Project staff will monitor and coach the School-based Social Norms Designee</p>		<p>DPA.</p> <p>2. For each project year, the percent of students at project high schools (6-12), who report “students bring drugs or alcohol to my school” will decrease by 2% from baseline as measured by the ACS.</p>
<p>NEEDS: Based on results from the FYSAS, Broward County students reported a need for Community Opportunities for Prosocial Involvement.</p> <p>As reflected by 2007 state standardized test scores, 42% of students tested below proficiency in reading and 33% tested below proficiency in mathematics.</p>	<p>Goal 3. Establish prosocial activities to enhance ATOD protective factors and increase academic achievement.</p>	<p>Element 2: Alcohol, Tobacco, and Other Drug Prevention Activities</p>	<p>1. Long Term: The percent of student in project schools (6-12) who report participating in a pro social activity at school will increase by 2% annually from baseline.</p>	<p>(a) Develop a community coalition to assist in the identification, establishment, promotion, and implementation of prosocial activities (Obj. 1, 2, &3).</p> <p>(b) Complete a prosocial activities needs assessment in project schools K-12 (Obj. 1, 2, &3).</p> <p>(c) Provide professional development on available prosocial models such as SWAT and SADD</p>	<p>PBAC sub-committee will participate in the planning and selection of appropriate prosocial activities.</p> <p>Project staff, community partners, and school prevention liaisons will participate in prosocial activities professional development</p> <p>The Broward County Health Department will</p>	<p>Focus group with community coalition Members & PPS</p> <p>Review of needs assessments</p> <p>Number of attendees at professional development activities and PDS</p> <p>Review of Social Marketing Plans</p> <p>Number of public services announcements aired</p>	<p>1. For each project year, students in project schools (6-12) will report a 2% increase in their involvement in school-based opportunities for prosocial involvement as measured by the DPA.</p>

Project Bridge Revised March, 2009 Logic Model – Putting It All Together

Needs and Needs Gaps	Goals	SS/HS Element(s)	Objectives	Activities	Partners	Process Measures	Indicators and GPRA
<p>Increasing BCPS' 68% graduation rate. Was identified as one top priorities at the 2007 Broward County Youth Summit GAP: According to the Citizens Concerned About Our Children Settlement Agreement, 11% of BCPS secondary schools have been identified as not offering extra-curricular (pro-social) activities.</p>				<p>(Obj. 1, 2, &3). (d) Market prosocial clubs via Public Service Announcements on BCPS' Instructional Television Channel (Obj. 1, 2, &3).</p>	<p>assist in the development and training of SWAT chapters. The Florida Students Against Destructive Decisions will assist in the training and development of SADD chapters. BCCOSA will assist in the development and training of D-YF-IT chapters. Project staff will develop a plan to market prosocial activities to students and families.</p>		
<p>Need: A report by BCPS Research Services indicate suspension rates for Black students 18% were higher than the rates for Hispanic (9%) or White students (8%).</p>	<p>Goal 1 Increase the use of positive behavioral classroom strategies.</p>	<p>Element 3 Student Behavioral, Social, and Emotional Supports</p>	<p>1. Long Term: The percent of internal suspensions in project schools (K-12) will decrease annually by 2% from baseline.</p>	<p>(a) Train all new teachers, college interns, administrators, and aspiring administrators, to effectively utilize the CHAMPS classroom management. program (Obj.1). (b) Train after-school providers in CHAMPS</p>	<p>Project Staff will provide CHAMPS Training. Dr. Randy Sprick, will serve as CHAMPS consultant. Project Staff will develop</p>	<p>Number of teachers, college interns, administrators, and aspiring administrators trained. Pre-Post knowledge test.</p>	<p>1. For each project year, the percent of internal suspensions in project schools (K-12) will decrease by 2% from baseline as evidenced by SESIR data.</p>

Project Bridge Revised March, 2009 Logic Model – Putting It All Together

Needs and Needs Gaps	Goals	SS/HS Element(s)	Objectives	Activities	Partners	Process Measures	Indicators and GPRA
<p>GAP: Out of 2,086 teachers hired in 2005-06, 29% were certified alternatively and lacked training in classroom mgt.. Additionally, none of the after school providers have training in classroom management.</p>				<p>ParaPro classroom management program. (Obj.1)</p> <p>(c) Train teachers and administrators in at-risk schools to effectively utilize CHAMPs classroom strategies (Obj. 1).</p> <p>(d) Provide feedback and coaching as needed in high risk schools (Obj. 1).</p>	<p>professional dev. model and training packets for CHAMPs ParaPro</p> <p>Project staff will provide follow-up coaching and monitor SESIR data.</p>	<p>Focus groups with Project Staff</p>	<p>.</p>
<p>NEED: The ACS indicated that 27% of responding students did not feel “there is an adult at school I can talk to about my personal problems.” Additionally, NAACP Advancement Project’s recommendation for BCPS discipline policies includes training SROs on effectively interacting with youth.</p> <p>GAP: BCPS now</p>	<p>Goal 2 Increase community participation in project schools.</p>	<p>Element 3 Student Behavioral, Social, and Emotional Supports</p>	<p>1. Long Term: The number of project school students (6-12) reporting, “There is an adult at school I can talk to about my personal problems” will annually increase 2% compared to baseline.</p> <p>2. Long Term: The number of students in project schools (6-12) reporting engagement in community opportunities for prosocial involvement will annually increase 2% compared to baseline.</p>	<p>(a) Implement a media campaign to increase recruitment of possible 6-12 mentors (Obj. 1 & 2).</p> <p>(b) Institute a training curriculum to better prepare SROs to interact with students. (Obj. 1& 2).</p> <p>(c) Identify and advertise prosocial activities for participation by school personnel and students (Obj. 1& 2).</p>	<p>Community partners will participate in the formulation of a media campaign to increase recruitment of mentors.</p> <p>Coordinating Council of Broward, BCCOSA, and the Broward Workshop will assist in the recruitment of mentors.</p> <p>SROs/SRDs will participate in professional development to enhance positive</p>	<p>Number of new mentors</p> <p>Number SROs participating in training and SDS.</p> <p>Review prosocial activities</p> <p>Coaching logs</p> <p>Observation Rubrics</p>	<p>1. For each project year, the number of students in project school (6-12) reporting, “There is an adult at school I can talk to about my personal problems” will increase by 2% over baseline as measured by student responses on the ACS.</p> <p>2. For each project year, the number of students in project schools (grades 6-12)</p>

Project Bridge Revised March, 2009 Logic Model – Putting It All Together

Needs and Needs Gaps	Goals	SS/HS Element(s)	Objectives	Activities	Partners	Process Measures	Indicators and GPRA
<p>coordinates 1,900 volunteers for its 20 mentor programs. Over 25,000 (93% gap) could benefit from mentoring.</p>					<p>engagement skills.</p> <p>The North, Central, and South Broward Mini-Anti Drug Coalitions will provide activities connecting students with positive role models.</p>		<p>reporting engagement in community opportunities for prosocial involvement will increase 2% as measured by student responses on the DPA.</p>
<p>NEED: Only 5 out of 273 schools currently have a piloted mental health collaboration to identify and serve at-risk students.</p> <p>GAP: Mental health partners indicated school communication regarding at-risk student assigned to their agencies was difficult or non-existent. Additionally, current school-based mental health teams and CPST members indicated a need for increased communication between the two</p>	<p>Goal 1 Enhance communication between school personnel and community partners to increase student and family access to high quality, appropriate mental health services.</p>	<p>Element 4: Mental Health Services</p>	<p>1. Long Term: The number of students (K-12) who receive school based mental health services (school counselor, psychologist, social worker, or agency) will increase by 2% from baseline for each project year initiative (GPRA).</p> <p>2. Long Term: By the end of the initiative, the percent of student mental health referrals (K-12) resulting in mental health services being provided in the community (in-patient or to a collaborating agency) will increase by 2% from baseline (GPRA).</p>	<p>(a) Provide professional development for SBMHT schools focusing on collaboration with the district's CPST and identification and tracking of mental health referrals and SBMHT procedures (Obj. 1 & 2).</p> <p>(b) Align appropriate mental health services with participating partners (Obj. 1 & 2).</p> <p>(c) Centralize the screening and approval process allowing mental health providers easier access to the students they are serving (Obj. 1 & 2).</p> <p>(d) Develop a process for communication/ coordination between</p>	<p>Educational Technology Services (ETS) and PCG to enhance current data systems to generate and track referral, treatment, and follow up (District Mental Health Database).</p> <p>Mental Health Partners will participate in development of student and partner referrals; serve on SBMHTs; provide services to at-risk students; work with school personnel designing proposed treatment. DJJ will participate in SBMHT to work with adjudicated</p>	<p>Number of SBMH team members attending training, SDS, and PPS.</p> <p>Develop matrix of services and partners.</p> <p>Focus group with project staff and mental health partners Expert Review</p> <p>Review SBMHT Manuals and number of manuals distributed.</p>	<p>1. For each project year the percentage of students who receive school based mental health services (counselor, psychologist, social worker, collaborating agency) will increase by 2% from baseline as measured by the TERMS Database (GPRA)</p> <p>2. For each project year, the percentage of student referrals (K-12) that result in mental health services being provided in the community(inpati</p>

Project Bridge Revised March, 2009 Logic Model – Putting It All Together

Needs and Needs Gaps	Goals	SS/HS Element(s)	Objectives	Activities	Partners	Process Measures	Indicators and GPRA
<p>groups.</p> <p>NEED: Out of 273 schools, only 5 schools currently have a piloted mental health collaboration to identify and serve at-risk students.</p> <p>GAP: Currently, BCPS does not have a system to refer or track mental health referrals. Additionally, there are no documented procedures for School-Based Mental Health Teams</p>				<p>CPST and school-based mental health teams (Obj. 1 & 2).</p> <p>(e) Collaborate with stakeholders to create a referral process for schools to align with appropriate mental health service providers (Obj. 1& 2)</p> <p>(f) Establish best practices for SBMHT, create and distribute SBMHT manuals to participating schools (Obj. 1 & 2).</p>	<p>youth.</p> <p>The Dept. of Children and Families will provide oversight and consultation.</p> <p>Henderson Mental Health will provide case management and specialized interventions</p> <p>SROs will refer at-risk students to the SBMH teams.</p> <p>BCPS Family Counseling will act as a primary referral source for non-Medicaid students and their families.</p> <p>Healthy Families Broward will be the primary referral source for younger siblings of students referred to SBMH teams.</p> <p>Mental Health partners will participate in SBMHT</p>		<p>ent or to a collaborating agency) will increase by 2% from baseline as evidenced by the TERMS Database (GPRAs)</p>

Project Bridge Revised March, 2009 Logic Model – Putting It All Together

Needs and Needs Gaps	Goals	SS/HS Element(s)	Objectives	Activities	Partners	Process Measures	Indicators and GPRA
					professional development. 211 (First Call for Help) will serve as a referral source to SBMHT. Chrysalis Center, Smith Comm. Mental Health Archways, Memorial and Children’s Home Society will serve on the Advisory Coalition and SBMHT		
NEED: District attendance records indicate that only 7% of pre-K parents attend workshops offered by Early Childhood Dev. despite availability of childcare & transportation GAP: The Teen Advisory Committee indicated there was no media campaign on BCPS Instructional	Goal 1: Increase awareness of available social and emotional resources to pre-k parents	Element 5: Early childhood Social and Emotional Learning Programs	1. Long Term:, Pre-K parent attendance at Early Childhood Development classes will increase by 10% from baseline by the end of the initiative	(a) Develop, implement, assess, and revise media campaign (Obj. 1).	Project staff, School Readiness, and Healthy Families will identify resources currently being underutilized by disengaged families & assist in the development and promotion of media campaign.	Focus groups with project staff, school readiness and healthy families personnel and program participants.	1. By the end of the initiative, increase pre-K parental attendance at Early Childhood Development classes by 10% from baseline as evidenced by attendance logs.

Project Bridge Revised March, 2009 Logic Model – Putting It All Together

Needs and Needs Gaps	Goals	SS/HS Element(s)	Objectives	Activities	Partners	Process Measures	Indicators and GPRA
Television to engage parents in parent-centered workshops.							
NEED: The BCPS' Teen Parent Advisory Board, reported mothers attending the parent centers only had 30% paternal support. GAP: No programs are offered for fathers.	Goal 2: Increase caregiver involvement at the District's teen parent sites.	Element 5: Early childhood Social and Emotional Learning Programs	1. Long Term: The number of participants attending the Nurturing Parent Program (NPP) at the three teen parent sites will increase by 25% from baseline by the end of the initiative.	(a) Train project staff to implement the NPP (Obj.1). (b) Link with outside agencies available to implement NPP (Obj.1).	Project staff and community partners will participate in NPP professional development.	Number of project staff and community partners trained and SDS. List of agencies available to implement NPP.	1. By the end of the initiative, increase by 25% from baseline the number of participants attending the three teen parent sites as evidenced by attendance logs.

Appendix B

North Central Area Schools

Elementary Schools

Banyan
Broadview
Castlehill
Challenger
Endeavour
Floranada
Horizon
Larkdale
Lauderhill P.T.
Lloyd Estate
Nob Hill
North Andrews
Nova blanche
Nova Eisenhower
Oakland Park
Oriole
Park Lakes
Pinewood
Royal Palm
Sandpiper
Village
Welleby

Middle Schools

Bair
James Rickards
Lauderdale Lakes
Lauderhill
Millinnium
Nova
Westpine

High Schools

Boyd Anderson
Northeast
Nova
Piper

Centers

William McFatter
Dave Thomas
Hallandale Adult Center
Seagull
Sunset
Sheridan Technical
Whiddon-Rogers
Wingate Oakes

Appendix C

Demographics of North Central Area Schools 2007-2008 – 2008-2009

School Name	N	n Black %	n White %	n Hispanic %	n Other %	n Free Reduced Lunch %	n ESE %	n LEP %	
Elementary									
Banyan	2007-08	964	498	189	185	92	483	147	62
			52%	20%	19%	10%	50%	15%	6%
	2008-09	917	485	169	173	90	471	124	45
			53%	18%	19%	10%	51%	13%	5%
Broadview	2007-08	966	375	71	450	70	779	173	330
			39%	7%	47%	7%	81%	2%	34%
	2008-09	954	366	86	422	80	772	135	308
			38%	9%	44%	8%	80%	14%	32%
Castlehill	2007-08	755	730	6	9	10	686	112	67
			97%	1%	1%	1%	91%	15%	9%
	2008-09	717	700	6	5	6	639	89	39
			98%	1%	1%	1%	90%	12%	5%
Challenger	2007-08	1229	502	267	366	94	505	179	111
			41%	22%	30%	8%	41%	14%	9%
	2008-09	1116	451	246	319	100	522	134	92
			40%	22%	29%	9%	47%	12%	8%
Endeavour	2007-08	433	415	3	4	11	416	61	66
			96%	1%	1%	3%	96%	14%	15%
	2008-09	399	382	5	7	5	367	41	80
			96%	1%	1%	1%	92%	10%	20%
Floranada	2007-08	742	88	421	208	25	249	208	64
			12%	57%	28%	3%	33%	28%	9%
	2008-09	646	65	365	185	31	236	131	73
			10%	57%	27%	5%	37%	20%	11%
Horizon	2007-08	929	412	173	248	96	568	144	193
			44%	19%	27%	10%	61%	15%	21%
	2008-09	882	384	171	235	92	539	110	181
			44%	19%	28%	10%	61%	12%	21%
Larkdale	2007-08	527	511	2	8	6	497	129	52
			97%	0%	2%	1%	94%	24%	10%
	2008-09	453	444	4	1	4	422	71	69

School Name	N	n Black %	n White %	n Hispanic %	n Other %	n Free Reduced Lunch %	n ESE %	n LEP %
		98%	1%	0	1%	93%	16%	15%
Laudhill PT 2007-08	727	680	16	12	19	678	88	95
		94%	2%	2%	3%	93%	12%	13%
2008-09	725	682	14	11	18	669	77	78
		94%	2%	2%	2%	92%	11%	11%
Lloyd Estate 2007-08	492	279	44	142	27	449	99	240
		57%	9%	29%	5%	91%	20%	49%
2008-09	485	267	43	151	21	439	86	225
		55%	9%	32%	4%	91%	18%	46%
Nob Hill 2007-08	843	286	293	193	71	378	179	52
		34%	35%	23%	8%	49%	21%	6%
2008-09	773	254	272	172	70	328	125	51
		33%	35%	22%	9%	42%	16%	7%
N.Andrews 2007-08	822	144	302	338	38	499	122	144
		18%	37%	41%	5%	61%	15%	17%
2008-09	822	151	298	335	38	478	96	147
		18%	36%	41%	5%	58%	12%	18%
Nova BF 2007-08	786	310	214	179	83	359	164	111
		39%	27%	23%	11%	46%	21%	14%
2008-09	784	321	205	175	83	379	94	116
		41%	30%	20%	9%	48%	10%	11%
Nova Ewr 2007-08	808	338	238	155	77	354	151	96
		42%	29%	19%	10%	44%	19%	11%
2008-09	782	319	238	156	69	377	78	88
		41%	30%	20%	9%	48%	10%	11%
Oakland Park 2007-08	619	256	96	234	33	533	106	217
		41%	16%	38%	5%	86%	17%	35%
2008-09	598	246	97	222	33	521	81	232
		41%	16%	37%	5%	87%	13%	39%
Oriole 2007-08	725	669	11	27	18	682	77	125
		92%	2%	4%	2%	94%	11%	17%
2008-09	751	695	9	27	20	688	77	121
		92%	1%	4%	3%	92%	10%	16%
Park Lakes 2007-08	1112	979	20	65	48	992	127	177
		88%	2%	6%	4%	89%	11%	16%
2008-09	1140	989	20	93	38	1003	132	235

School Name	N	n Black %	n White %	n Hispanic %	n Other %	n Free Reduced Lunch %	n ESE %	n LEP %
		87%	2%	8%	3%	88%	11%	21%
Pinewood 2007-08	1049	620	136	231	62	651	223	89
		59%	13%	22%	6%	62%	21%	8%
2008-09	955	581	116	184	74	613	138	96
		61%	12%	19%	8%	64%	14%	10%
Royal Palm 2007-08	768	742	1	6	19	722	81	87
		97%	0%	1%	2%	94%	11%	11%
2008-09	766	739	1	14	12	702	88	93
		96%	0	2%	2%	92%	11%	12%
Sandpiper 2007-08	831	274	282	214	61	328	157	49
		33%	34%	26%	7%	39%	18%	6%
2008-09	839	287	284	215	53	391	130	46
		34%	34%	26%	6%	46%	15%	5%
Village 2007-08	969	842	22	62	43	843	113	181
		87%	2%	6%	4%	87%	12%	19%
2008-09	846	730	19	53	44	733	83	177
		86%	2%	6%	5%	87%	10%	21%
Welleby 2007-08	869	318	257	205	89	370	148	51
		37%	30%	24%	10%	43%	17%	6%
2008-09	858	325	245	202	86	392	101	52
		38%	28%	23%	10%	46%	12%	6%
Middle								
Bair 2007-08	1106	517	295	203	91	613	153	64
		47%	27%	18%	8%	55%	13%	6%
2008-09	1017	499	241	174	103	627	106	68
		49%	24%	17%	10%	62%	10%	7%
Laude Lake 2007-08	920	775	28	81	16	749	124	111
		84%	3%	9%	2%	81%	13%	12%
2008-09	1006	836	29	105	36	818	97	141
		83%	3%	10%	4%	81%	10%	14%
Lauderhill 2007-08	613	588	2	14	9	550	91	68
		96%	0%	2%	1%	90%	15%	11%
2008-09	605	585	2	11	7	563	72	62
		97%	9	2%	1%	93%	12%	10%

School Name	N	n Black %	n White %	n Hispanic %	n Other %	n Free Reduced Lunch %	n ESE %	n LEP %
Millennium 2007-08	1466	600	363	410	93	742	174	86
		41%	25%	28%	6%	51%	12%	6%
2008-09	1505	626	349	426	104	809	154	100
		97%	0	2%	1%	93%	12%	10%
Nova 2007-08	1236	448	381	276	131	487	211	142
		36%	31%	22%	11%	39%	17%	11%
2008-09	1357	573	385	265	134	604	130	104
		41%	28%	19%	10%	44%	10%	8%
J. Rickards 2007-08	952	177	393	354	28	722	81	87
		19%	41%	37%	3%	76%	9%	9%
2008-09	941	167	363	368	43	604	152	102
		18%	38%	40%	5%	64%	16%	11%
Westpine 2007-08	1468	645	400	312	111	741	176	99
		44%	27%	21%	8%	50%	12%	7%
2008-09	1508	680	361	343	124	816	143	103
		45%	24%	23%	8%	54%	9%	7%
High								
B. Anderso 2007-08	2203	1965	54	116	68	1521	299	282
		89%	2%	5%	3%	69%	14%	13%
2008-09	2390	2133	49	132	76	1647	249	299
		89%	2%	5%	3%	69%	10%	12%
Northeast 2007-08	1996	552	756	617	71	962	220	199
		28%	38%	31%	4%	48%	11%	10%
2008-09	2109	569	785	678	77	1110	181	219
		27%	37%	32%	4%	53%	8%	10%
Nova 2007-08	2035	741	755	377	162	682	343	211
		36%	37%	19%	8%	34%	17%	10%
2008-09	2198	844	723	441	190	835	116	248
		38%	33%	20%	9%	38%	5%	11%
Piper 2007-08	2658	1345	661	481	171	1228	299	167
		51%	25%	18%	6%	46%	11%	6%
2008-09	2699	1419	645	471	164	1365	263	167
		52%	24%	18%	6%	50%	10%	6%

Appendix D

Project Bridge Evidence Based Programs

Prior to the development of Project Bridge, members of the grant writing team conducted a needs assessment. District staff, community agency representatives, private school representatives, and members of the District Advisory Committee were invited and attended. The purpose of this meeting was to identify programs and services that would best provide for the students, families, and community. The following evidence-based programs were selected for implementation:

Get Real About Violence (GRAV) developed by the Comprehensive Health Education Foundation for use with students in grades K-12 is a violence prevention curriculum recognized by the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention as a promising program. GRAV is based on the proven research of Hawkins and Catalano (risk/protective factors), Botvin (social skills), and Goldstein (normative education.) Effectiveness studies were conducted with a cross section of cultural groups. The program targets a wide range of violent behavior, including bullying, teasing, and spreading rumors among younger children, and threats and assaults in later years.

Too Good For Drugs (TGFD) developed by the Mendez foundation for use with students K-5 is an alcohol, tobacco, and other drug prevention curriculum recognized by the Substance Abuse Mental Health Systems Administration (SAMHSA) as a model program. TGFD is also based on the proven risk and protective factor research pioneered by Hawkins and Catalano. This program was tested with students of varying racial and ethnic groups, and found effective with White, Hispanic/Latino, African American, and Asian American students. Five interwoven components appear throughout the curriculum: Goal Setting, Decision Making, Bonding with Others, Identifying and Managing Emotions, and Communicating Effectively.

The Social Norms approach was first suggested by sociologist H. Wesley Perkins and later refined Alan Berkowitz for use with secondary students from diverse cultural groups to correct negative misperceptions (usually overestimations of use) and to identify, model, and promote the healthy, protective behaviors that are the actual norm in a given population. When properly conducted, it is an evidence-based, data-driven process, and a very cost-effective method of achieving large-scale positive results.

CHAMPs (Conversation, Help, Activity, Movement, Participation)/ParaPro, was developed for use with teachers of K-12 students. The curriculum helps teachers design a proactive approach to classroom management. The design is based on 20 years of research on teacher and school effectiveness.

Wraparound is an evidenced-based approach to implementing individualized, comprehensive services within a system of care for youth with complicated multi-dimensional problems. One population for whom wraparound has proven particularly useful is those children and adolescents with severe emotional and behavioral problems. Wraparound is identified as a SAMHSA promising program appropriate for students in grades K-12.

Nurturing Parent Program developed by Stephen Bavlok targets all at-risk families with children, birth to 18 years. This program has been adapted for Hispanic, African American, and teen parents. The Nurturing Parent Programs are also recognized by SAMHSA, The National Registry of Parenting Programs, and the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Keepin It Real is culturally competent and age appropriate, (grades 6-12). The program is available through Discovery Health Connections. The program has been designated a “model program” by the Center for Substance Abuse Programs.

Appendix E

Level of Implementation Tool Staff and Core Leadership Comparison

Domain 1: CAPACITY BUILDING

1a. The Initiative has created a professional development plan to support program implementation.

Low Implementation (Core Team)

Medium Implementation (Project Staff)

1b. Professional development system builds capacity within and across partners.

Medium Implementation (Core Team) and (Project Staff)

Domain 2: COMMUNICATIONS/MARKETING

2a. The Initiative has a communications plan.

Low Implementation (Core Team) and (Project Staff)

2b. Project leadership collaboratively develops effective communications plan to sustain programs.

Low Implementation (Core Team) and (Project Staff)

Domain 3: CULTURAL COMPETENCE

3a. Initiative has a culturally and linguistically competent organizational structure.

Medium Implementation (Core Team) and (Project Staff)

3b. Initiative has culturally and linguistically competent engagement strategies.

Low Implementation (Core Team)

Medium Implementation (Project Staff)

3c. Initiative has a culturally and linguistically competent services, activities, and interventions.

Medium Implementation (Core Team)

Full Implementation (Project Staff)

Domain 4: EVALUATION

4a. Data is collected on all performance indicators, GPRA measures, and process measures specified in the logic model; data collected meets federal and local needs and reporting requirements.

Full Implementation (Core Team) and (Project Staff)

4b. Data collection process is managed well, evaluation resources are allocated appropriately (e.g., they support evaluation of all outcomes and concentrate resources strategically), and evaluation process is monitored and assessed.

Low Implementation (Core Team)

Medium Implementation (Project Staff)

4c. Evaluation is culturally relevant and sensitive.

Medium Implementation (Core Team) and (Project Staff)

4d. Project leadership uses evaluation to improve implementation, make decisions about program, and sustainability, and support systems changes.

Medium Implementation (Core Team) and (Project Staff)

4e. Project leadership works to sustain evaluation processes.

Low Implementation (Core Team)

Full Implementation (Project Staff)

Domain 5: FINANCE

5a. Initiative has sound financial systems in place.

Medium Implementation (Core Team)

Full Implementation (Project Staff)

5b. Initiative has developed shared responsibility across partners and multiple strategies to ensure financial sustainability.

Low Implementation (Core Team)

Full Implementation (Project Staff)

Domain 6: IMPLEMENTATION OF PROGRAMS/ACTIVITIES

6a. Initiative has identified and selected appropriate programs/activities for implementation, and developed their fit with their schools or agency contact.

Medium Implementation (Core Team)

Full Implementation (Project Staff)

6b. Initiative builds infrastructure for implementation of program activities.

Medium Implementation (Core Team) and (Project Staff)

6c. Initiative implements EBIs with as high a level of fidelity as possible.

Low Implementation (Core Team) and (Project Staff)

6d. Initiative builds infrastructure for sustainability of program activities.

Low Implementation (Core Team) and (Project Staff)

Domain 7: LEADERSHIP

7a. Project leadership develops positive relationships with partners and members of the community.

Medium Implementation (Core Team) and (Project Staff)

7b. PD develops distributed leadership of Initiative within partner organizations

Medium Implementation (Core Team) and (Project Staff)

7c. Project leadership and district infrastructure become integrated and congruent.

Low Implementation (Core Team)

Medium Implementation (Project Staff)

Domain 8: MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNANCE

8a. Management structures and roles are clearly defined and include adequate supervision of PD and other staff.

Low Implementation (Core Team)

Medium Implementation (Project Staff)

8b. PD and others use management tools to keep Initiative on track.

Medium Implementation (Core Team) and (Project Staff)

8c. Project leadership has created a safe and supportive environment and effective mechanisms for problem solving.

Full Implementation (Core Team) and (Project Staff)

8d. Project leadership plans to integrate key management tasks into district and partner organizations.

Medium Implementation (Core Team) and (Project Staff)

Domain 9: PARTNERSHIPS

9a. Collaborative decision making is the norm for the partnership.

Low Implementation (Project Staff)

Medium Implementation (Core Team)

9b. Frequency of partnership meetings and structures for communication have been established.

Medium Implementation (Core Team) and (Project Staff)

9c. Partners have a shared vision and commitment for the Initiative's goals and outcomes.

Low Implementation (Core Team) and (Project Staff)

9d. Partnership reviews and updates logic model and other planning tools.

Low Implementation (Core Team) and (Project Staff)

9e. Partners each carry the message of the Initiative to different audiences.

Low Implementation (Core Team) and (Project Staff)

9f. Partnership members advocate within their own agencies for Initiative vision, coordinated policy changes, and allocation of resources.

Low Implementation (Core Team) and (Project Staff)

9g. Partners share responsibility for achieving goals and understand differing levels of responsibility.

Low Implementation (Core Team)

Medium Implementation (Project Staff)

9h. Partners work to produce systems change supporting Initiative goals.

Medium Implementation (Core Team) and (Project Staff)

9i. Partnership actively plans to sustain Initiative activities.

Low Implementation (Core Team) and (Project Staff)

Domain 10: POLICY

10a. Project leadership has assessed existing policies and procedures relevant to Initiative's and district's goals, identified changes needed, and coordinated policy across partners.

Low Implementation (Core Team) and (Project Staff)

10b. Project leadership communicates policies to stakeholders and institutionalizes staff training on policies.

Low Implementation (Core Team) and (Project Staff)

10c. Policy and protocol are used effectively to support systems change.
Low Implementation (Core Team) and (Project Staff)

Domain 11: STRATEGIC PLANNING

11a. Initiative has a strategic plan that includes vision, mission, goals, objectives, activities, outcomes, and timelines.

Medium Implementation (Core Team) and (Project Staff)

11b. Strategic plan is revisited and revised periodically.

Low Implementation (Project Staff)

Medium Implementation (Core Team)

11c. Strategic plan includes an adequate assessment of needs and environment (for example, uses a SWOT model or similar approach) and uses ongoing data driven CQI procedures.

Low Implementation (Core Team) and (Project Staff)

11d. Strategic plan includes Initiative elements, and its vision, mission, and goals include systems change and other sustainability strategies.

Low Implementation (Core Team) and (Project Staff)

11e. Goals of Initiative are embedded into other long term plans within the community, e.g., Initiative is integrated with other school and community task forces, initiatives, etc.

Low Implementation (Core Team)

Medium Implementation (Project Staff)

Appendix F

Levels of Implementation Summary Report

Areas of Agreement

Full Implementation

4a. Data is collected on all performance indicators, GPRA measures, and process measures specified in the logic model; data collected meets federal and local needs and reporting requirements.

8c. Project leadership has created a safe and supportive environment and effective mechanisms for problem solving.

Medium Implementation

1b. Professional development system builds capacity within and across partners.

3a. Initiative has a culturally and linguistically competent organizational structure.

4c. Evaluation is culturally relevant and sensitive.

4d. Project leadership uses evaluation to improve implementation, make decisions about program, and sustainability, and support systems changes.

6b. Initiative builds infrastructure for implementation of program activities.

7a. Project leadership develops positive relationships with partners and members of the community.

7b. PD develops distributed leadership of Initiative within partner organizations.

8b. PD and others use management tools to keep Initiative on track.

8d. Project leadership plans to integrate key management tasks into district and partner organizations.

9b. Frequency of partnership meetings and structures for communication have been established.

9h. Partners work to produce systems change supporting Initiative goals.

11a. Initiative has a strategic plan that includes vision, mission, goals, objectives, activities, outcomes, and timelines.

Low Implementation

2a. The Initiative has a communications plan.

2b. Project leadership collaboratively develops effective communications plan to sustain programs.

6c. Initiative implements EBIs with as high a level of fidelity as possible.

6d. Initiative builds infrastructure for sustainability of program activities.

9c. Partners have a shared vision and commitment for the Initiative's goals and outcomes.

9d. Partnership reviews and updates logic model and other planning tools.

9e. Partners each carry the message of the Initiative to different audiences.

9f. Partnership members advocate within their own agencies for Initiative vision, coordinated policy changes, and allocation of resources.

9i. Partnership actively plans to sustain Initiative activities.

10a. Project leadership has assessed existing policies and procedures relevant to Initiative's and district's goals, identified changes needed, and coordinated policy across partners.

10b. Project leadership communicates policies to stakeholders and institutionalizes staff training on policies.

10c. Policy and protocol are used effectively to support systems change.

11c. Strategic plan includes an adequate assessment of needs and environment (for example, uses a SWOT model or similar approach) and uses ongoing data driven CQI procedures.

11d. Strategic plan includes Initiative elements, and its vision, mission, and goals include systems change and other sustainability strategies.

Appendix G

Project Bridge Updated Timeline March 2009

Month	Activities	Person Responsible	Progress
5-12	Introduce Anti-bullying and prevention policy revision to PBAC and form sub-committee to write and revise anti-bullying and prevention policy (ongoing monthly)	Project Director & Project Manager	Completed
Six Month Milestone: All staff are hired and trained. Active collaboration between project partners has been established (Core Team). Evaluation design has been fully developed and processes in place to administer evaluation, prevention team/liaison guidelines are in place and referral process for screening new partners in place.			
6-12	Partner with the Safe Community Initiative and review needs and resources (ongoing monthly)	Project Director & Project Manager	Completed
6-24	Begin training first administrative area prevention liaisons/teams in Too Good For Drugs, Get Real About Violence, and CHAMPs ParaPro	Risk Reduction Specialists, & CHAMPs trainers	In progress
6-12	Begin training second administrative area alternatively certified teachers in CHAMPs.	CHAMPs trainers	Completed
6-12	Begin training second administrative area after school providers in CHAMPs ParaPro	CHAMPs trainers	completed for all administrative areas
6-24	Begin training community partners in Too Good For Drugs & Get Real About Violence, and CHAMPs ParaPro	Risk Reduction Specialists, & CHAMPs trainers	In progress
Six Month Milestone: Anti-bullying policy revision is presented to the board for approval			
6-12	Begin training and coaching of SBMHT for first administrative area.	Project Manager, Risk Reduction Specialists	Completed
Six Month Milestone: SAFE Teams trained in ATOD and violence prevention,			
10-48	Begin disseminating Nurturing Parent Program at the 4 teen parent sites. (ongoing)	Project Manager, Risk Reduction Specialists	In progress
11-24	Work with 17 th Circuit Court and partners to formalize teen court model. (ongoing monthly)	17 th Circuit Court & Project Manager	Core Team has replaced this

Month	Activities	Person Responsible	Progress
			activity with Civil Citation program
11-24	Collaborate with partners to begin the mentor media outreach campaign. (find resources, develop campaign, and implement campaign) (ongoing monthly)	Risk Reduction Specialists & Youth Mentoring Department	In progress
11-24	Collaborate with partners to begin early childhood outreach campaign. (find resources, develop campaign, and implement campaign) (ongoing monthly)	Risk reduction Specialists & School Readiness	In progress
12	12 month federal report	Project Director, Project Manager, & Evaluator	Completed
Year 1 Milestone: Framework for School-based Mental Health Teams (SBMHT) in place, SBMHT manual produced for project schools, First Prevention Summit conducted, first cadre of prevention liaisons/teams and community partners are trained in ATOD and violence prevention, establishment of social norms campaigns begin			
Month	Activities	Person Responsible	Progress
13	Present revised anti-bullying policy to Core Team for approval	Project Director	Completed
14	Present revised anti-bullying policy to the school board for approval	Project Director & Leah Kelly	Completed
13-24	With sub-committee, begin planning second prevention summit (securing location, speakers, vendors, and advertising). (ongoing monthly)	Project Director, Project Manager & Core Team	In progress
13-24	Begin training second administrative area after school providers in CHAMPs ParaPro	CHAMPs trainers	Completed
13-24	Continue training community partners in Too Good For Drugs & Get Real About Violence	Risk Reduction Specialists, & CHAMPs trainers	In progress
13-24	Meet with evaluators to review and revise activities - project partners review evaluation data, adopt mid-course corrections if needed. (ongoing monthly)	Project Manager & Evaluators	In progress
13-24	Present Positive School Climate Plans to Executive Leadership Team and Principals	Project Director and Leah Kelly	In progress
19-36	Present prevention policy to Core Team for approval	Project Director	In progress
19-60	Meet with Student Support Services Data Management team to collaborate on internet-based	Project Director	In progress

Month	Activities	Person Responsible	Progress
	tracking and referral process. (ongoing monthly)		
19-24	Convene Core Team sub-committee to partner with existing prosocial clubs such as Students Working Against Tobacco, Drug Free Youth in Town, and Students Against Destructive Decisions. (Conduct a needs assessment of all schools K-12 and discuss existing variables impeding chapter formulation, identify opportunities for prosocial students, and market to students) (ongoing monthly)	Project Manager & Risk Reduction Specialists	In progress
19-36	Roll out new SBMHT model to all four administrative areas	Project Manager, Leah Kelly and Core Team	In progress
19-36	Continue working with community mental health partners to discuss School-Based Mental Health Team (SBMHT) evidenced-based practices, barriers, collaboration with CPST and record framework. (ongoing-monthly)	Project Manager and Risk Reduction Specialists	In progress
19-48	Train all project schools on availability prosocial activity implementation procedures (link with state chapters, e.g. SADD, SWAT, DYFIT) (ongoing)	Risk Reduction Specialists	In progress
19-36	Work with Broward Sheriff's Office and partners to formalize Civil Citation model. (ongoing monthly)	BSO and Project Manager	In progress
19-36	Begin training second administrative area prevention liaisons/teams in Too Good For Drugs & Get Real About Violence.	Risk Reduction Specialists, & CHAMPs trainers	Not done
19-36	Begin training and coaching of SBMHT for all four administrative areas. (ongoing)	Project Manager, Risk Reduction Specialists	Not done
All	Evaluation data collection and analysis, revise program as necessary	Project Director & evaluator	Not done
24-36	Begin training second administrative area alternatively certified teachers in CHAMPs.	CHAMPs trainers	Not done
24-36	Complete production of Civil Citation model and disseminate to project school prevention liaisons/teams.	Project Director, Project Manager & BSO	Not done
24	24 month report	Project Director, Project Manager, & Evaluator	Not done
Year 2 Milestone: District-wide prevention policy is presented to board for approval, a formalized civil citation program is in at least 4 secondary schools, Mentor recruitment campaign will be in place, and early childhood outreach campaign in place, second prevention summit conducted second cadre of prevention liaisons/teams and community partners trained in ATOD and violence prevention.			

Month	Activities	Person Responsible	Progress
25-36	SAFE teams members trained in ATOD and violence prevention curricula	Risk Reduction Specialists and Special Investigative Unit	Not done
25-36	With sub-committee, begin planning third prevention summit (securing location, speakers, vendors, and advertising). (ongoing monthly)	Project Manager & PBAC	Not done
25-36	Meet with evaluators to review and revise activities - project partners review evaluation data, adopt mid-course corrections if needed. (ongoing monthly)	Project Director & Evaluators	Not done
36	Present prevention policy to the school board for approval	Project Director & Leah Kelly	Not done
36	36 month federal report	Project Director, Project Manager, & Evaluator	Not done
36-48	Begin training third administrative area prevention liaisons/teams in Too Good For Drugs & Get Real About Violence.	Risk Reduction Specialists, & CHAMPs trainers	Not done
36-48	Continue training alternatively certified teachers in CHAMPs.	CHAMPs trainers	In progress
36-48	Continue training after school providers in CHAMPs ParaPro	CHAMPs trainers	In progress
36-48	Continue training community partners in Too Good For Drugs & Get Real About Violence	Risk Reduction Specialists, & CHAMPs trainers	In progress
36-48	Continue training and coaching of SBMHT for all administrative areas. (ongoing)	Project Manager, Risk Reduction Specialists	Ongoing
Year 3 Milestone: Third prevention summit conducted, Third cadre of prevention liaisons/teams and community partners trained in ATOD and violence prevention,			
36-48	With sub-committee, begin planning fourth prevention summit (securing location, speakers, vendors, and advertising). (ongoing monthly)	Project Manager & PBAC	Not done
48	48 month report/Project Evaluation completed	Project Director, Project Manager, & Evaluator	Not done
Tentative timeline for months 48-60 (IF APPROVED)			
48-60	Begin training fourth administrative area prevention liaisons/teams in Too Good For Drugs &	Risk Reduction	Not done

Month	Activities	Person Responsible	Progress
	Get Real About Violence.	Specialists, & CHAMPs trainers	
48-60	Continue training all administrative areas' alternatively certified teachers in CHAMPs.	CHAMPs trainers	In progress
48-60	Continue training all administrative areas' after school providers in CHAMPs ParaPro	CHAMPs trainers	In progress
48-60	Continue training community partners in Too Good For Drugs & Get Real About Violence	Risk Reduction Specialists, & CHAMPs trainers	In progress
48-60	Begin training and coaching of SBMHT for all administrative areas. (ongoing)	Project Manager, Risk Reduction Specialists	In progress
48-60	Meet with evaluators to review and revise activities - project partners review evaluation data, adopt mid-course corrections if needed. (ongoing monthly)	Project Manager & Evaluators	Not done
48-60	Project school SROs and school administration will be trained on Positive Climate Plans. (ongoing monthly)	Project Director	In progress
<p>(2011) Year 4 Milestone: Fourth prevention summit conducted, local prevention teams established at all project schools, statistically significant increase in safety perceptions by all stakeholders, Positive Climate Plans established at all project schools, all project school prevention teams trained in ATOD and violence prevention curricula, all project schools implementing ATOD and violence prevention curricula, fighting and harassment/ATOD in project schools will have decreased 10%, 30-day use of marijuana will have decreased by 10%, recidivism rates in the district's AES sites will have decreased 10%, social marketing campaigns will be in place in each of the district's 4 administrative areas, perception of acceptable alcohol use and the number of students reporting use will have decreased by 10%, prevention teams will be aware of all prosocial activities, 50% more prosocial chapters will be available to students, 95% of alternatively certified teachers will have been trained in CHAMPs, 90% of afterschool providers will have been trained in CHAMPs Parapro, disciplinary referrals will have decreased by 10%, students will report that they have an adult in campus that they can talk to, students will report more engagement in opportunities for prosocial involvement, electronic systems will be in place to track referral, treatment, and follow-up of mental health interventions, all participating schools will have a functioning SBMHT, excessive student absences will have decreased by 10%, community partners & project schools will collaborate with the district's CPST, and teen mothers at the district's teen parent sites will have greater knowledge on positive parenting styles.</p>			

Appendix H

Implementation Status of Project Activities

Activities	Current Status
Form Project Bridge Advisory Coalition.	The team has been formed
Convene a Policy Development Team and anti-bullying taskforce.	The Team has been established and is meeting regularly. They have completed the bullying policy, and are raising their own money to support their work.
Write an anti-bullying policy.	The anti-bullying policy has been written and approved by the school board. It is currently being implemented in all district schools.
Write a comprehensive prevention policy.	The prevention policy has not yet been written as resources have focused on the writing the State mandated bullying policy. It will be completed by the end of the project
Establish Local Prevention Teams (LPT) in North Central Area (NCA) schools.	Principals at each school have selected Prevention Liaisons. Liaisons are responsible for selecting teams.
Train LPT in NCA schools on District prevention curriculum, policies and procedures.	Prevention Liaisons and teams have been trained on the anti-bullying policy. In addition, they have attended the Prevention Summit, held in the Spring of 2009 adm were trained on curriculum and program goals and sustainability.
LPTs will train faculty and staff on District prevention curriculum, policies and procedures in project schools.	Discovery Health curriculum was purchased, training was held and the prevention curriculum is being used. According to the staff at Discovery Health, Broward County is the largest user of this resource.
Train SAFE Team members on District adopted prevention programs.	The Broward County Sheriffs Office staff is conducting a needs assessment and will provide results to project staff to discuss training.
SAFE Teams will ensure that schools safety plans include prevention curriculum and strategies.	Project staff have met will School Investigative Office representatives to outline department specific responsibilities. A plan is being developed for implementation in the schools.
Establish a Positive School Climate Committee.	This has been completed and the committee meets on a regular basis.
Train School Advisory Committee members in NCA to develop a Positive School Climate Plan.	The Committee is working on the creation of a positive school culture template to replace the current discipline plans. It is expected to be reviewed by principals with a Fall 2010-11 roll-out.
Develop Positive School Climate Plans in NCA schools.	Plans will be written and reviewed during the summer for the 2010-2011 school year.

Activities	Current Status
Implement Positive School Climate Plans in NCA.	Plans will be implemented during the 2010-2011 school year
Implement anti-bullying policy in all schools.	The state mandated anti-bullying policy has been implemented in all District school in the Fall, 2008.
Establish new process for Safe Schools Healthy Schools community involvement.	A meeting was held in Sept., 2008 with the Community Involvement Department to review current procedures and discuss modifications the project is still in process.
Train community partners in adopted violence prevention curricula.	Community partners were trained in Discovery Health and have received pass codes to freely utilize the resource.
Implement violence prevention curricula in NCA schools.	Curriculum were implemented in NCA schools.
Monitor fidelity of implementation of violence prevention curriculum in NCA schools.	Monitoring of usage of Discovery Health is being conducted by project staff.
Co-sponsor Prevention Summit.	The Second Prevention Summit was held in June, 2009 and planning has begun on the next Summit.
Train School Resource Officers and school administrators on Civil Citation process and procedures.	Discussion is still underway to determine the efficacy of implementing this program given local budget cuts.
Train all community partners and project school LPTs in adopted ATOD prevention curricula.	Discovery Health Connections has been purchased and partners and project schools have been trained.
Implementation of ATOD prevention curriculum in NCA schools.	Curriculum Implementation has taken place.
Monitor fidelity of ATOD curriculum implementation in NCA schools.	Discovery Health usage reports and a staff created survey are being used to monitor implementation.
Develop school based Social Norming campaigns.	A consulting firm has been hired to develop a Social Norms Toolkit which will form the basis of the project. The kit should be ready in late fall.
Train peer counselors to disseminate campaign information.	Pending implementation of campaign training will take place.
Implement and monitor the Social Norms campaign.	Pending implementation of campaign training will take place
Develop a community coalition to assist in the identification, establishment, promotion, and implementation of prosocial activities in schools.	The Core Team has identified members and three committees have been established.
Complete a prosocial activities needs assessment in	This has voluntarily been completed in NCA schools and data has been provided to

Activities	Current Status
NCA schools.	them via one-on-one meetings with the Risk Reduction Specialist.
Provide professional development on available prosocial models such as SWAT and SADD.	Training was completed in the NCA
Market prosocial clubs via Public Service Announcements on BCPS' Instructional Television Channel.	Videos were created and disseminated as well as presentations at the Summer Prevention Academy
Train alternatively certified teachers and after-school providers in CHAMPS.	Training has taken place for alternatively certified teachers, para-professionals, and public after-school providers.
Monitor CHAMPS implementation and provide feedback and coaching as requested.	Staff Developers are providing onsite assistance at high need schools. They are in the process of developing tools for additional data collection.
Implement a media campaign to increase recruitment of possible 6-12 mentors.	This is in the planning stages with a target of Fall, 2010.
Institute a training curriculum to better prepare SROs to interact with students.	SROs have been trained in the anti-bullying policy and drug prevention. Training will be ongoing throughout the project. The Broward Sheriff's Office Needs Assessment will provide information on further training needs.
Identify and advertise prosocial activities for participation by school personnel and students.	Based on the findings of the school needs assessment, activities have been identified and shared with project staff as a means of advertising.
Provide professional development for schools with School-based Mental Health Teams focusing on collaboration with the district's CPST and identification and tracking of mental health referrals and SBMHT procedures.	Training has been provided for school psychologists, social workers, and guidance counselors. Training will continue throughout the project.
Align appropriate mental health services with participating partners.	The SedNet Matrix of partners and services has been updated and shared via the District's Intranet. The SBMH case managers will complete an assessment of resource allocation by Oct. 2009
Centralize the screening and approval process allowing mental health providers easier access to the students they are serving.	A team of school and community members is currently working toward developing a pilot program to be implemented during the 2009-2010 school year
Develop a process for communication and coordination between CPST and SBMH Teams.	While communication is taking place, no formal process is currently in place. The process should evolve as a result of the new electronic screening and approval process.
Collaborate with stakeholders to create a referral	For the 2009-2010 school the focus is on working with students in graduation rate

Activities	Current Status
process for schools to align with appropriate mental health service providers.	innovation zones (at-risk students) to refer them to providers for health services..
Create and distribute SBMH Team manuals to participating schools.	Based on the findings from a focus group, the manual will be redesigned.
Develop, implement, assess, and revise media campaign aimed at Pre-K parents attendance at Early Childhood Development classes.	A calendar with developmentally appropriate activities for parents to do with their children was distributed to all pre-school parents in public and private schools.
Train project staff to implement the Nurturing Parent Program (NPP).	Project staff have been trained to implement the NPP program.
Link with outside agencies available to implement NPP.	The use of outside agencies has been reevaluated and it was determined that it is better to use school personnel to implement the project to ensure sustainability.

Appendix I

List of Project Bridge Partners

211 First Call for Help
Memorial Healthcare System
American Lung Association
Archways
ASPIRA of Broward County
Broward County Comprehensive School Health Advisory Committee (BCCSHAC)
Broward County Public Schools (BCPS) - Before & After School Child Care
BCPS - Student Support Services
BCPS – Severely Emotionally Disturbed Network (SEDNET)
BCPS – Community Involvement
BCPS – Diversity Department
BCPS – Psychological Services
BCPS – Family Counseling Program
Broward County Health Department
Broward Regional Health Planning Council
Broward Sheriff’s Office
Department of Children & Families – Circuit 17
Florida Department of Juvenile Justice
Florida Students Against Destructive Decisions (SADD)
Hanley Center
Women in Distress
Broward Mental Health Association
Nova Southeastern University
Chrysalis Center
Children’s Services Council
Children’s Services Administrative Division
Discovery Health
SunServe
No More Tears
Safe Schools South Florida
Spectrum Programs
The Starting Place
Drug Free Youth In Town (DYFIT)
The Champion Leader
First Priority
United Way of Broward County – Commission on Substance Abuse