SAFE AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS COORDINATOR HANDBOOK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary of Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Acts Programs in Virginia School Divisions: 1995-2006

SUMMARY OF SAFE AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES PROGRAMS IN VIRGINIA SCHOOL DIVISIONS: 1995 to 2006

March 2007

Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act Program
Office of Student Services
Virginia Department of Education

Prepared by
Anne J. Atkinson, Ph.D.
PolicyWorks, Ltd.
Richmond, Virginia

SUMMARY OF 2005-2006 SDFSCA PROGRAMS IN VIRGINIA SCHOOL DIVISIONS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report summarizes information from Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act (SDFSCA) Progress Reports from one hundred thirty-four (134) local school divisions (LEAs) in Virginia. Information from SDFSCA Progress Reports is used for multiple purposes including reporting to the U. S. Department of Education (USED), required program monitoring and state-level planning of training and technical assistance to support local programming. The report summarizes new information from 2005-2006 Progress Reports and includes selected comparisons with data from nine previous reporting years. For the first time, school divisions submitted their reports using a Web submission process.

Virginia school divisions were allocated a total $6,059,700 in SDFSCA funds in 2005-2006. LEA allocations ranged from a low of $2,219 (Highland County) to a high of $576,087 (Fairfax County). Total SDFSCA funding averaged $50,078 across all participating school divisions.

SDFSCA funds supported drug prevention programs and activities in 97 percent of LEAs and violence prevention programs and activities in 96 percent of LEAs. SDFSCA prevention services were provided in a total 1,475 Virginia schools with enrollments totaling 857,343. There was a marked decline (from 913 to 848) in the number of elementary schools with SDFSCA-funded programs on services while the number of middle schools and high schools with such programs or services. This pattern reflects greater targeting of local SDFSCA programming at middle and high schools. In 2005-2006, SDFSCA programming was reported to be in 79 percent (1,548) of Virginia's schools.

Consistent with the central focus of SDFSCA programming, activities reported most frequently across elementary, middle, and high school levels were age-appropriate drug and violence prevention activities. Ranking second across all levels was dissemination of drug

and violence prevention information to schools and communities. Activities reported least frequently for 2005-2006 were 1) establishing and maintaining school safety hotlines, 2) safe zones of passage, 3) community service, 4) background checks of school employees, 5) drug testing. The general pattern of school division SDFSCA programs and services has remained relatively stable since 1995.

School divisions are required by SDFSCA Principles of Effectiveness [SDFSCA, Section 4115(a)] to base their programs on a needs assessment using objective data that can include use of youth survey data, school discipline, crime, and violence data, and community social indicator data. Drug and/or violence-related youth surveys were reported to have been conducted in 57 percent of Virginia's school divisions in 2005-2006.   In addition to conducting needs assessments using objective data, school divisions are also to actively collaborate with community-based preventions needs assessments. About 56 percent of school divisions reported use of school discipline, crime, and violence data and 93 percent reported using social indicator data. About 60 percent of school divisions reported collaboration with community-based prevention needs assessments.

SDFSCA applications are required to be developed "through timely and meaningful consultation" with representatives of prescribed groups.   In 2005-2006, all but four school divisions (97%) reported consultation with teachers and other staff, parents, students, and community-based organizations. About 93 percent reported consultation with representatives of schools to be served, including private schools, 87 percent reported consultation with experts in drug and violence prevention such as medical, mental health and law enforcement professionals, and 54 percent consulted with state and local government officials.   Strategies used by school divisions to have "meaningful and ongoing consultation with and input from

parents in the development of the SDFSCA application and administration of the SDFSCA program or activity" included heavy reliance on either SDFSCA Advisory or Health Advisory groups and presentations to parent-teacher organizations and community-based groups that include parent representatives. Publications served as a second primary avenue of communication used by school divisions to invite parent consultation and input into SDFSCA programs.

Schools involved community agencies and organizations extensively in their SDFSCA-funded drug and violence prevention activities in 2005-2006. Eighty-eight percent of school divisions reported involvement by law enforcement agencies with almost 80 percent reporting school resource officer (SRO) involvement and 44 percent reporting Drug Abuse Resistance Education (D.A.R.E.) involvement. Almost 25 percent reported involvement of school security officers. Also involved with SDFSCA efforts were mental health/substance abuse services (85%), parent/citizen groups (78%), social services/juvenile probation (71%). in well over half of school divisions are mental, and faith communities (38%). Only one school division reported involvement of no community agencies or organizations. Other community agencies/ organizations frequently reported to be involved were health departments, health advisory boards, drug coalitions, the Cooperative Extension Service, Offices on Youth, and local recreational and youth development organizations such as Boys and Girls Clubs. About 60 percent of school divisions reported that student participated in designing or critiquing the SDFSCA drug or violence prevention programming.

School divisions were asked to indicate their level of need for assistance from the Virginia Department of Education in each of sixteen programmatic or issue areas. Responses revealed strong to moderate demand for all areas listed. When program/issue areas receiving

priority and moderate need ratings are examined together, it was found that more than half of

school divisions had either priority or moderate need for assistance in evaluation methods and

strategies [57.46% (77)], selecting and implementing research-based violence prevention

strategies [54.47% (74)], community collaboration [51.49% (69)], and selecting and

implementing research-based drug education programs [50.75% (68)].

Fifty-five local SDFSCA Coordinators chose to comment on local needs and to

suggest ways the VDOE can best assist their efforts. Comments clearly indicate that

Coordinators recognize and appreciate the ongoing efforts of the VDOE to support them in

their roles and want the VDOE to continue efforts to keep them informed. Funding continues

to be a central concern of many Coordinators, particularly in smaller localities that receive

very modest levels of funding. Coordinators expressed concern about declining funding and

challenges of attempting to provide supplemental programming with such limited resources.

> The complete report is on the
> "Foundations of School Safety in Virginia" disk.

Detailed Instructions and Background Information for Use in Completing the Annual Safe and Drug-Schools and Communities Act Progress Report for 2006-2007 (DRAFT)

Draft
DETAILED INSTRUCTIONS AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION

For Use in Completing the Annual Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act Progress Report for 2006-2007

Authorization for Collecting Progress Report Information

Section 4116 of the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act of 2001 (SDFSCA) requires states to collect information on state and local programs conducted with assistance through the SDFSCA. Information collected from school divisions is used by the Virginia Department of Education in reports to the United States Department of Education and to inform state-level development of training, technical assistance, and other support for local prevention programs.

Purpose of Program and General Use of Funds

The Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act (SDFSCA) supports "programs that:
1) prevent violence in and around schools;
2) prevent the illegal use of alcohol, tobacco, and drugs;
3) involve parents and communities; and
4) are coordinated with related federal, state, school, and community efforts and resources to foster safe and drug-free learning environments that support student academic achievement." (Title IV, Part A, Section 4002, Purpose).

SDFSCA funds are to be used to establish, operate, and improve programs of school drug and violence prevention and early intervention. SDFSCA programs are intended to support the five *No Child Left Behind* (NCLB) goals, which are:
- All students will reach high standards, at a minimum, attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics by 2013-2014.
- All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum, attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- By 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- **All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug-free, and conducive to learning.**
- All students will graduate from high school.

I. PREVENTION SERVICES

Questions A.1. and A.2.

A.1. Did your school division provide drug prevention activities using SDFSCA funding? Yes/No

A.2. Did your school division provide violence prevention activities using SDFSCA funding? Yes/No

Questions A.1. and A.2. provide documentation of the implementation of SDFSCA-supported drug prevention and violence prevention activities. SDFSCA funding may be used for drug and violence prevention activities. Based on objective data from their local SDFSCA needs assessment, school divisions may choose to direct their SDFSCA allocation to drug prevention activities, to violence prevention activities, or to both drug and violence prevention activities.

Definitions

For Questions B.1 through D.2. – Please note the definitions being used for purposes of this report:

Elementary School – A school classified as elementary by state or local practice and composed of any span of grades not above Grade 6. Combined elementary/junior high schools are considered junior high schools and combined elementary and secondary schools (e.g., K-12 buildings) are classified as high schools for this report.

Junior High School – A separately organized and administered school intermediate between elementary and senior high school, which might also be called a middle school, usually includes Grades 7, 8, and 9; Grades 7 and 8, or Grades 6, 7, and 8. Combined elementary/junior high schools are considered junior high schools for this report; junior/senior high school combinations are defined as senior high schools.

Senior High School – A school offering the final years of school work necessary for graduation, usually including Grades 10, 11, and 12; or Grades 9, 10, 11, and 12. Combined junior and senior high schools are classified as high schools for this report; combined elementary and secondary school (e.g., K-12 buildings) are classified as high schools.

Questions B.1 through D.2.

B.1. How many elementary schools in your school division provided prevention services to students? Please count only those schools at which these services were funded in whole or in part by SDFSCA.
    Number of public elementary schools: _____

B.2. Of the students enrolled in these schools during the 2005-2006 school year, how many received services that were funded in whole or in part by SDFSCA?
    Number of elementary students: _____

C.1. How many middle/junior high schools in your school division provided prevention services to students? Please count only those schools at which these services were funded in whole or in part by SDFSCA.
    Number of public middle/junior high schools: _____

C.2. Of the students enrolled in these schools during the 2005-2006 school year, how many received services that were funded in whole or in part by SDFSCA?
    Number of middle/junior high school students: _____

D.1. How many senior high schools in your school division provided prevention services to students? Please count only those schools at which these services were funded in whole or in part by SDFSCA.

Number of public senior high schools: _____

D.2. Of the students enrolled in these schools during the 2005-2006 school year, how many received services that were funded in whole or in part by SDFSCA?
Number of senior high school students: _____

For questions A.1., B.1., and C.1., report the number of elementary, middle/junior high, and senior high schools in which either drug or violence prevention activities or services funded in whole or part by SDFSCA were provided. Based on their local SDFSCA needs assessment, school divisions may choose to target funding to specific grade levels or specific schools. Therefore, the number of schools providing SDFSCA prevention activities or services may be fewer than the total number of schools in the school division.

For questions A.2., B.2., and C.1., report the number of students who received or were involved with SDFSCA-funded activities/services. If all students received services or were involved in SDFSCA-funded activities, then the number of students reported would be equal to the school's enrollment. If training was provided for an entire faculty of a school as part of a school-wide bullying prevention program, for example, it is presumed that all students benefited from the initiative and all students would be counted. If, however, SDFSCA programs/services targeted a single grade level or a specific group of students, then only students in that grade level or specific group would be counted.

Question E.1.a through aa.

Listed in Question E.1. provides documentation of the types of SDFSCA programs/ activities being implemented and the grade levels at which the programs/activities are being implemented.   The programs/activities listed are those authorized in Section 4115(b) of the SDFSCA and the list uses statutory language.

Select the SDFSCA programs/activities that were implemented in your school division in 2006-2007 and indicate the grade levels at which the programs/activities were implemented. Programs/activities that were not implemented should simply be left blank.

Question F.1.a through h.

All components of Question F are designed to document compliance with statutory requirements of the

---

SDFSCA Principles of Effectiveness

Section 4115(a), SDFSCA -
(1) IN GENERAL. For a program or activity developed pursuant to this subpart to meet the principles of effectiveness, such program or activity shall be:

> (A) Based on an assessment of objective data regarding the incidence of violence and illegal drug use in the elementary schools and secondary schools and communities to be served, including an objective analysis of the current conditions and consequences regarding violence and illegal drug use, including delinquency and serious discipline problems, among students who attend such schools (including private school students who participate in the drug and violence prevention program) that is based on ongoing local assessment or evaluation activities;

> (B) Based on an established set of performance measures* aimed at ensuring that the elementary schools and secondary schools and communities to be served by the program have a safe, orderly, and drug-free learning environment;

> (C) Based on scientifically-based research that provides evidence that the program to be used will reduce violence and illegal drug use;

> (D) Based on an analysis of the data reasonably available at the time of the prevalence of risk factors and high or increasing rates of reported cases of child abuse and domestic violence; protective factors, buffers, and assets; or other variables in schools and communities in the state identified through scientifically-based research; and

> (E) Inclusive of meaningful and ongoing consultation with and input from parents in the development of the application and administration of the program or activity.

(2) PERIODIC EVALUATION

> (A) REQUIREMENT. The program or activity shall undergo a periodic evaluation to assess its progress toward reducing violence and illegal drug use in schools to be served based on performance measures described in Section 4114(d)(2)(B).

> (B) USE OF RESULTS. The results shall be used to refine, improve, strengthen the program, refine the performance measures, and made available to the public upon request with public notice of such availability provided.

SDFSCA, including Section 4115(a) that is known as "Principles of Effectiveness."

*Also referred to as "measurable objectives" in application.

Question F.1.a. focuses on the SDFSCA needs assessment.

In Question F.1.a.i., report whether any type of youth survey was conducted in 2006-2007.

In Question F.1.a.ii., if a youth survey was conducted, report which survey was used.

Question F.1.a.iii., focuses on three components of the needs assessment process. Report all components that were a part of your school division SDFSCA needs assessment. Note: pay particular attention to principles of effectiveness (1)(A) and (1)(D).

Question F.1.b. focuses on requirements for consultation with specific groups and parents.

Question F.1.b.i. documents compliance with the requirement that that the SDFSCA application for 2005-2006 was developed "through timely and meaningful consultation" with the entities listed. Section 4114 (a) and (b) requires such consultation. Many school divisions use a SDFSCA Advisory Council to meet this requirement. Although no longer required by law, an advisory group has been demonstrated to be effective in meeting requirements for both consultation and coordination with other community prevention efforts.

Question F.1.c. documents compliance with the requirement for parent consultation and input in both the development of the SDFSCA application and the administration of the program. Section 4115(a)(1)(D), SDFSCA, requires "meaningful and ongoing consultation with and input from parents in the development of the application and administration of the program or activity." Many school divisions use a SDFSCA Advisory Council that includes parent representation, as well as communications with existing parent organizations, to meet this requirement.

Question F.1.d. documents compliance with the requirement that SDFSCA programs be based on "scientifically-based research." Section 4115(a)(1)(C) requires that SDFSCA programs be "based on scientifically-based research that provides evidence that the program to be used will reduce violence and illegal drug use."

Question F.1.e. documents compliance with the requirement that SDFSCA programs establish performance measures* aimed at ensuring safe, orderly, and drug-free learning environments. Section 4115 (a)(1)(B) requires that SDFSCA programs be "based on an established set of performance measures aimed at ensuring that the elementary schools and secondary schools and communities to be served by the program have a safe, orderly, and drug-free learning environment." (*Also referred to as "measurable objective in application.")

The listing of specific objectives* that were established and reporting of results to date provide documentation of progress in establishing and maintaining safe, orderly, and drug-free learning environments. (*Also referred to as "measurable objective" in application.")

Questions F.1.f. and F.1.g. document compliance with requirements that SDFSCA programs conduct periodic evaluation, use the findings to refine and improve programs, and report evaluation findings publicly. Section 4115(a)(2)(A) and (B) require the program or activity to "undergo a periodic evaluation to assess its progress toward reducing violence and illegal drug use in schools" and that "results shall be used to refine, improve, strengthen the program, refine the performance measures*, and made available to the public upon request with public notice of such availability provided." (*Also referred to as "measurable objective" in application.")

Question F.1.h. documents compliance with requirements that SDFSCA programs be coordinated with other substance abuse and violence prevention programs. Section 4114(c)(1)(B) requires SDFSCA programs to be "coordinated with other federal, state and/or local programs in the delivery of substance abuse and violence prevention programs and services."

Question G. Comprehensive K-12 Drug and Violence Prevention Programs

Question G. provides an overview of the school division's comprehensive K-12 drug and violence prevention programming.

Note that SDFSCA funds are intended to supplement local drug and violence prevention activities. A comprehensive local school division program provides drug and violence prevention activities at every

grade level, K-12. Please use the official, nationally-recognized name of evidence-based programs being implemented rather than a locally-developed name.

Question H. Community Agencies and Organizations Involved with SDFSCA Program

Question H.1. documents the involvement of other agencies and organizations in the school division's SDFSCA program. Simply select the entities involved from the list provided. Specify any "other" entity involved.

Question H.2. documents the types of community involvement that were part of the SDFSCA program. Simply select the types of involvement from the list provided. Specify any "other" types of involvement.

Question H.3. documents student participation in designing or critiquing the SDFSCA drug/violence prevention program.

Question I. SDFSCA Program Assessment of Needs

Question I.1. is designed to provide the Virginia Department of Education with information about how it can assist school divisions with drug/violence prevention efforts. Listed in the table are topics/issues in which local SDFSCA Coordinators have frequently expressed interest. Use the first three answer columns to indicate your level of interest in the topic/issue. Use the last three answer columns to report the type of resource or assistance that would be most helpful to you.

Following the Assessment of Needs table is a space where you may write comments and recommendations on local needs and describe in greater detail how the Department of Education can best assist you. Comments are invited but not required.

Annual Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act Progress Report for 2006-2007 (DRAFT)

<div align="center">

Draft
Annual Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act
Progress Report for 2006-2007

AUTHORIZATION FOR COLLECTING THIS INFORMATION

</div>

Section 4116 of the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act of 2001 requires the collection of certain information about state and local implementation of SDFSCA. States are required to submit information on state and local programs supplemented with SDFSCA funds. Information from school divisions is required for inclusion in Virginia's report to the United States Department of Education.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS
1**.** The time period covered by this report is July 1, 2006 to June 30, 2007.

2**.** Please complete the entire form. Do not leave spaces blank. Indicate information that is not available or not applicable by using the following abbreviations: MD = missing data; NA = not applicable; if a response is "0" or "None.

3**.** This PDF is your copy of the form to retain for your records. This will be helpful in the event we need to clarify information.

4**.** If you have any questions about completion of this form, please call Jo Ann Burkholder at (804) 371-7586 or e-mail at JoAnn.Burkholder@doe.virginia.gov

5**. Macintosh Users:** Please be sure to use Internet Explorer to complete this form rather than Safari.

I. PREVENTION SERVICES

A.1. Did your school division provide drug prevention activities using SDFSCA funding?
___ YES
___ NO

A.2. Did your school division provide violence prevention activities using SDFSCA funding?
___YES
___ NO

FOR QUESTIONS B.1. THROUGH D.2. -- PLEASE NOTE THE DEFINITIONS BEING USED FOR PURPOSES OF THIS REPORT.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL: A school classified as elementary by state or local practice and composed of any span of grades not above Grade 6. Combined elementary/junior high schools are considered junior high schools and combined elementary and secondary schools (e.g., K-12 buildings) are classified as high schools for this report.
JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL: A separately organized and administered school intermediate between elementary and senior high schools, which might also be called a middle school, usually includes Grades 7, 8, and 9; Grades 7 and 8, or Grades 6, 7, and 8. Combined elementary/junior high schools are considered junior high schools for this report; junior/senior high school combinations are defined as senior high schools.
SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL: A school offering the final years of school work necessary for graduation, usually including Grades 10, 11, and 12; or Grades 9, 10, 11, and 12. Combined junior and senior high schools are classified as high schools for this report; combined elementary and secondary schools (e.g., K-12 buildings) are classified as high schools.

B.1. How many elementary schools in your school division provided prevention services to students? Please count only those schools at which these services were funded in whole or in part by SDFSCA.

Number of public elementary schools: _____

B.2. Of the students enrolled in these schools during the 2006-2007 school year, how many received services that were funded in whole or in part by SDFSCA?

Number of elementary students: _____

C.1. How many middle/junior high schools in your school division provided prevention services to students? Please count only those schools at which these services were funded in whole or in part by SDFSCA.

Number of public middle/junior high schools: _____

C.2. Of the students enrolled in these schools during the 2006-2007 school year, how many received services that were funded in whole or in part by SDFSCA?

Number of middle/junior high students: _____

D.1. How many senior high schools in your school division provided prevention services to students? Please count only those schools at which these services were funded in whole or in part by SDFSCA.

Number of public senior high schools: _____

D.2. Of the students enrolled in these schools during the 2006-2007 school year, how many received services that were funded in whole or in part by SDFSCA?

Number of senior high school students: _____

E.1. Below is a list of services that your school division might have provided as part of its SDFSCA program. Please indicate which services were provided as a part of your school division's SDFSCA program during the 2006-2007 school year and at what grade levels the services were provided. Services reported here should have been supported in part or in total by SDFSCA funds.

Services/Activities	*Check if Provided*		
	Elementary School	Middle School	High School
a. Age-appropriate and developmentally based activities that -- address the consequences of violence and the illegal use of drugs, as appropriate; promote a sense of individual responsibility; teach students that most people do not illegally use drugs; teach students to recognize social and peer pressure to use drugs illegally and the skills for resisting illegal drug use; teach students about the dangers of emerging drugs; engage students in the learning process; and incorporate activities in secondary schools that reinforce prevention activities implemented in elementary schools.			
b. Activities that involve families, community sectors, and a variety of drug and violence prevention providers in setting clear expectations against violence and illegal use of drugs and appropriate consequences for violence and illegal use of drugs.			
c. Dissemination of drug and violence prevention information to schools and the community.			
d. Professional development and training for, and involvement of, school personnel, parents, and interested community members related to drug and violence prevention.			
e. Community-wide planning and organizing activities to reduce violence and illegal drug use, which may involve gang activity prevention.			
f. Acquiring and installing metal detectors, electronic locks, surveillance cameras, or other related equipment and technologies.			
g. Reporting criminal offenses committed on school property.			
h. Developing and implementing comprehensive school security plans or obtaining technical assistance for such plans.			
i. Supporting safe zones of passage activities that ensure that students travel safely to and from school, which may include bicycle and pedestrian safely programs.			

Services/Activities	Check if Provided		
	Elementary School	Middle School	High School
j. Hiring and mandatory training, based on scientific research, of school security personnel (including school resource officers) who interact with students in support of SDFSCA youth drug and violence prevention activities.			
k. Expanded and improved school-based mental health services related to illegal drug use and violence by qualified school-based mental health service providers.			
l. Conflict resolution programs, including peer mediation programs and youth anti-crime and anti-drug councils and activities.			
m. Alternative education programs or services for violent or drug abusing students that reduce the need for suspension or expulsion or that serve students who have been suspended or expelled from regular educational settings, including programs or services to assist students to make continued progress toward meeting the State's academic achievement standards and to reenter the regular education setting.			
n. Counseling, mentoring, referral services, and other student assistance practices and programs, including assistance provided by qualified school-based mental health services providers.			
o. Programs that encourage students to seek advice from, and to confide in, a trusted adult regarding concerns about violence and illegal drug use.			
p. Drug and violence prevention activities designed to reduce truancy.			
q. Age-appropriate, developmentally-based violence prevention and education programs that address victimization associated with prejudice and intolerance.			
r. Consistent with the Fourth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, the testing of a student for illegal drug use or the inspecting of a student's locker for weapons or illegal drugs or drug paraphernalia, including at the request of or with the consent of a parent or legal guardian of the student, if the local educational agency elects to so test or inspect.			
s. Emergency intervention services following traumatic crisis events that have disrupted the learning environment			
t. Establishing or implementing a system for transferring suspension and expulsion records, consistent with section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act, by a local school division to any public or private elementary school or secondary school.			
u. Developing and implementing character education programs, as a component of drug and violence prevention programs.			
v. Establishing and maintaining a school safety hotline.			
w. Community service, including community service performed by expelled students, and service-learning projects.			
x. Conducting a nationwide background check of local school division employees.			
y. Programs to train school personnel to identify warning signs of youth suicide and to create an action plan to help youth at risk of suicide.			
z. Programs that respond to the needs of students who are faced with domestic violence or child abuse.			
aa. Evaluation of any SDFSCA activities and the collection of objective data used to assess program needs, program implementation, or program success in achieving goals and objectives.			

F.1. Listed below are core requirements of SDFSCA. Please indicate the activities and approaches your school division used during 2006-2007 to comply with these requirements. Activities and services reported here do not have to have been supported in part or in total by SDFSCA funds.

a. Needs assessment (SDFSCA regulations require school divisions to complete a needs assessment. This requirement was completed if the 2006-2007 application was approved.)

Check if your SDFS program complied with this requirement ❑

i. Was a youth survey conducted in 2005-06?

___ YES
___ NO

ii. If a youth survey was conducted, which survey was used? *Check all used*
___ Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS)
___PRIDE Survey
___Communities that Care
___Search Institute Youth Survey
___American Drug Survey
___A locally-developed survey
___Other survey, please specify:

iii. Needs assessment process included which of the following? *Check all used*

___School division active collaboration with a community-based prevention needs assessment.
___Analysis of local discipline, crime, and violence data for school safety planning.
___Analysis of community risk and protective factors using social indicator data.

b. Consultation with organizations (SDFSCA regulations require school divisions to work with other local, state and federal organizations for program planning, collaboration of resources and monitoring of progress. A description of this requirement was detailed in the 2006-2007 application if it was approved.

Check if your SDFS program complied with this requirement ❏

i. The school division's SDFSCA application was developed 'through timely and meaningful consultation' with:

Check all that apply

__State and local government representatives,
__Representatives of schools to be served (including private schools),
__Teachers and other staff, parents, students, and community-based organizations, and
__Others with relevant and demonstrated expertise in drug and violence prevention activities (such as medical, mental health, and law enforcement professionals).

c. Parent consultation and input (SDFSCA regulations require school divisions to consult with parents and utilize their input into the program planning, collaboration and monitoring of the program's progress. A description of this requirement was detailed in the 2006-2007 application if it was approved.)

Check if your SDFS program complied with this requirement ❏

Please list specific strategies used by the school division in 2006-2007 to include meaningful and ongoing consultation with and input from parents in the development the application and administration of the SDFSCA program or activity.

d. Programs based on scientifically-based research. (SDFSCA regulations require school divisions to utilize scientifically-based research (also referred to as evidence-based) curricula, programs, practices or strategies that support the list of authorized activities in the regulations. These were identified in the measurable objectives and supports services and activities section of the 2006-2007 approved application.

Check if your SDFS program complied with this requirement ❏

Please list each evidence-based program being implemented using SDFSCA funding.

e. Performance measures (i.e., measurable objectives) aimed at ensuring safe, orderly, and drug-free learning environment were established.
(SDFSCA regulations require school divisions to establish measurable outcomes derived from an analysis of the needs assessment. An approved application contained measurable objectives.)

Check if your SDFS program complied with this requirement ❏

f. Period evaluation and use of results (SDFSCA regulations require school divisions to conduct periodic evaluations of the measurable objectives and to use the results to strengthen the program.)

Check if your SDFS program complied with requirements ❏

List your 2006/07 SDFS measurable objective(s) here as written in the application. (Application may be accessed through the OMEGA.)	Report the results to date in achieving the 2006/07 for each measurable objective. Provide summative, quantitative and qualitative numeric data.	Briefly describe the specific methods and/or instruments used to assess the progress toward attaining each measurable objective.

g. Public reporting (SDFSCA regulations require school divisions to notify the public of the availability of information about its' progress toward reducing violence and substance use.)

Check if your SDFS program complied with this requirement ❏

Briefly describe how the school division notified the public of the availability of information about its assessment of progress toward reducing violence and illegal drug use.

h. Coordination with other prevention programs (SDFSCA regulations require school divisions to notify the public of the availability of information about its' progress toward reducing violence and substance use.)

Check if your SDFS program complied with this requirement ❏

Please describe how your plan for drug and violence prevention was coordinated with other Federal, State, and local programs for drug and violence prevention.

G. COMPREHENSIVE K-12 DRUG AND VIOLENCE PREVENTION

Please report your local K-12 comprehensive drug and violence prevention program using the table format below. Report curricula, supplemental activities, and support services.
Note: SDFSCA funds are intended to supplement local drug and violence prevention activities. A comprehensive local school division program provides drug and violence prevention at every grade level, K-12. Please use the official, nationally-recognized name of evidence-based programs being implemented rather than locally-used names.

Grade Levels	Classroom-Based Curricula	Supplemental Activities	Support Services
SAMPLES			
SAMPLE Grade 1	Quest: Skills for Growing (a comprehensive health curriculum with strongly positive ratings for general information, awareness and resistance skills, and personal and social skills development)	Parent training: How to Raise a Drug-Free Child	Counseling Services
SAMPLE Grade 7	Life Skills Training	Peer Mediation Program	Student Assistance Program Services, School- and community-based intervention programs and services with indicated students.
SAMPLE Grade 9	Michigan Model for Comprehensive School Health	Peer Education Program; SADD; OP/G Program	Student Assistance Program Services; School- and community-based intervention programs and services with indicated students.
Kindergarten			
Grade 1			
Grade 2			
Grade 3			
Grade 4			
Grade 5			
Grade 6			
Grade 7			
Grade 8			
Grade 9			
Grade 10			
Grade 11			
Grade 12			

H.1. Please indicate the types of community agencies and organizations which were involved in your school division's SDFSCA-funded drug and violence prevention activities in 2006-2007.

AGENCY/ORGANIZATION/RESOURCE	Check If Involved
a. Law enforcement	
i. D.A.R.E. Officer	
ii. CLASS ACTION: Teens and the Law	
iii. School Resource Officer (Not security personnel. Key difference: school resource officers are sworn law enforcement officers with authority to arrest)	
iv. School Security Officer	
b. Mental health/substance abuse services	
c. Social services or juvenile probation	
d. Parent or citizen groups (PTA, Prevention Federations, Kiwanis, etc.)	
e. Faith community	
f. No community agencies or organizations were involved	
g. Other (Please specify)	

H.2. Please indicate the types of community involvement which occurred in SDFSCA-funded drug and violence prevention activities in 2006-2007.

Type of Community Involvement	Check if the Activity Occurred
a. Joint service delivery, including referrals	
b. Teacher/Staff training	
c. Public awareness activities	
d. Fund raising	
e. Other (Please specify)	

H.3. During the 2006-2007 school year, did students participate in the designing or critiquing of drug or violence prevention programming?

___ YES
___ NO

ASSESSMENT OF NEEDS

I.1 This section will help the Virginia Department of Education identify ways it can assist you in your drug and violence prevention efforts.

• For each of the topics listed in the table below, please indicate your level of need for assistance. Check only one of the three 'Need' columns.
• Next, indicate the type of assistance you prefer: Publication, Training, and Technical Assistance. Check all that apply.

Topics	Priority Need	Moderate Need	Limited Need	Publication	Training	Technical

Topics	Priority Need	Moderate Need	Limited Need	Publication	Training	Technical
Example: Curricula, selection and use						
Character / citizenship education						
Community collaboration						
Conflict resolution / peer mediation programming						
Crisis planning and Management						
Drug education-selection and implementing research-based curricula						
Drugs-Information on specific types: (List types you are interested in learning more about)						
Evaluation-methods and strategies						
Needs assessment - comprehensive, using objective data						
Parent consultation / input strategies						
Prevention basics-terms, concepts, and what the research shows						
Program planning-establishing goals and objectives for results						
School safety assessment and planning						
Student Assistance Programming						
Student surveys						
Violence prevention-selecting and implementing research-based strategies						
Youth leadership development						
Other (please specify)						

This space has been provided to invite your written comments and recommendations regarding your own perspective of local needs. Please comment on how the Department of Education can best assist your efforts in promoting safe and drug-free schools in Virginia.

**Summary of
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Programs
in Virginia School Divisions 2006 - 2007**

SUMMARY OF SAFE AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES PROGRAMS IN VIRGINIA SCHOOL DIVISIONS

2006 - 2007

April 2008

Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act Program
Office of Student Services
Virginia Department of Education

Prepared by
Anne J. Atkinson, Ph.D.
PolicyWorks, Ltd.
Richmond, Virginia

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

SUMMARY OF 2006-2007 SDFSCA PROGRAMS IN VIRGINIA SCHOOL DIVISIONS
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report summarizes information from Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act (SDFSCA) Progress Reports from one hundred thirty-five (135) local school divisions (LEAs) in Virginia. Information from SDFSCA Progress Reports is used for multiple purposes including reporting to the U. S. Department of Education (USED), required program monitoring, and state-level planning of training and technical assistance to support local programming. The report summarizes new information from 2006-2007 Progress Reports and includes selected comparisons with data from previous reporting years. School divisions submitted their reports using a Web submission process.

Virginia school divisions were allocated a total $4,772,578 in SDFSCA funds in 2006-2007. LEA allocations ranged from a low of $982 for the Virginia School for the Deaf and Blind at Hampton to a high of $480,852 for Fairfax County.   Average SDFSCA funding was $35,352 across all participating school divisions. The total allocated to LEAs in 2006-2007 was $1,287,122 less than the amount allocated in 2005-2006.

Ninety-six (96) percent of school divisions used SDFSCA funds to support drug prevention activities and 96 percent used the funds to support drug prevention activities; the overwhelming majority of school divisions used SDFSCA funding to support both drug and violence prevention efforts.

SDFSCA prevention services were provided in a total 1,477 Virginia, representing 79 percent of Virginia's schools. These included 833 elementary schools, 345 middle schools, and 299 high schools. There was a small decline in the number of elementary schools with SDFSCA-funded programs; however, the number of middle schools with such programs increased and the number of high schools remained almost the same. These data reflect a continuing pattern of greater targeting of local SDFSCA programming at middle and high school levels.

Consistent with the central focus of SDFSCA programming, the activity reported most frequently across elementary, middle, and high school levels was age-appropriate drug and violence prevention activities. Ranking second across all levels was dissemination of drug and violence prevention information to schools and communities. Activities reported least

frequently for 2006-2007 were establishing and maintaining school safety hotlines, community service, metal detectors, safe zones of passage, and drug testing. The general pattern of school division SDFSCA programs and services has remained relatively stable since 1995.

School divisions were asked to identify specific evidence-based programs that were implemented in 2006-2007 using SDFSCA funding. The program most frequently cited was Life Skills Training [37.78%] followed by the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program [21.48%], Second Step (19.26%), Character Counts (14.07%), and Al's Pals, Get Real About Violence, and Too Good for Drugs (each 12.59%). The Olweus Bullying Prevention Program experienced marked growth, increasing from 11.19 percent in 2005-2006. Student assistance programs were reported by almost half of Virginia school divisions; 56 percent reported having at least one component of such programming.

School divisions are required by SDFSCA Principles of Effectiveness [SDFSCA, Section 4115(a)] to base their programs on a needs assessment using objective data that can include use of youth survey data, school discipline, crime, and violence data, and community social indicator data. Drug and/or violence-related youth surveys were reported to have been conducted in 55 percent of Virginia's school divisions in 2006-2007. About 95 percent of school divisions reported use of school discipline, crime, and violence data and 59 percent reported using social indicator data. In addition to conducting needs assessments using objective data, school divisions are also to actively collaborate with community-based preventions needs assessments. About 61 percent of school divisions reported collaboration with community-based prevention needs assessments.

SDFSCA applications are required to be developed "through timely and meaningful consultation" with representatives of prescribed groups. In 2006-2007, 96 percent of school divisions reported consultation with teachers and other staff, parents, students, and community-based organizations. About 90 percent reported consultation with representatives of schools to be served, including private schools, 88 percent reported consultation with experts in drug and violence prevention such as medical, mental health and law enforcement professionals, and 55 percent consulted with state and local government officials. Strategies used by school divisions for ongoing consultation with and input from parents included heavy reliance on either SDFSCA Advisory or Health Advisory groups or presentations to parent-

teacher organizations and community-based groups that include parent representatives. Publications served as a second primary avenue of communication used by school divisions to invite parent consultation and input into SDFSCA programs.

Schools involved community agencies and organizations extensively in their SDFSCA-funded drug and violence prevention activities in 2006-2007. Eighty-seven percent of school divisions reported involvement by law enforcement agencies with almost 75 percent reporting school resource officer (SRO) involvement and 39 percent reporting Drug Abuse Resistance Education (D.A.R.E.) involvement. Over 25 percent reported involvement of school security officers. Also involved with SDFSCA efforts were mental health/substance abuse services (82%), parent/citizen groups (69%), social services/juvenile probation (82%), and faith communities (36%). Four school divisions reported involvement of no community agencies or organizations. Additional community agencies/ organizations frequently reported to be involved were health departments, health advisory boards, drug coalitions, the Cooperative Extension Service, Offices on Youth, and local recreational and youth development organizations such as Boys and Girls Clubs. About 52 percent of school divisions reported that students participated in designing or critiquing the SDFSCA drug or violence prevention programming.

School divisions were asked to indicate their level of need for assistance from the Virginia Department of Education in each of sixteen programmatic or issue areas. Responses revealed strong to moderate demand for all areas listed. When program/issue areas receiving priority and moderate need ratings were examined together, it was found that more than half of school divisions had either priority or moderate need for assistance in evaluation methods and strategies, selecting and implementing research-based violence prevention strategies, community collaboration, and selecting and implementing research-based drug education programs.

Fifty-four local SDFSCA Coordinators chose to comment on local needs and to suggest ways the VDOE can best assist their efforts. Comments clearly indicate that Coordinators recognize and appreciate the ongoing efforts of the VDOE to support them in their roles and want the VDOE to continue efforts to keep them informed and to provide networking opportunities. Funding continues to be a central concern of many Coordinators, particularly in smaller localities that receive very modest levels of funding. Coordinators

expressed concern about declining funding and challenges of attempting to provide supplemental programming with such limited resources.

SUMMARY OF SAFE AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ACT PROGRAMS IN VIRGINIA SCHOOL DIVISIONS: 2006-2007

This report summarizes information from Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act (SDFSCA) Progress Reports from one hundred thirty-five (135) Virginia school divisions, including the Virginia Department of Correctional Education and Schools for the Deaf and Blind in Hampton and Staunton. Information from SDFSCA Progress Reports is used for multiple purposes including reporting to the U. S. Department of Education (USED), required program monitoring, and state-level planning of training and technical assistance to support local programming. The report summarizes new information from 2006-2007 Progress Reports and includes selected comparisons with data from ten previous reporting years. The SDFSCA Progress Report that school divisions completed for 2006-2007 was designed to align with specific statutory requirements of Title IV of the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* and to collect additional data on student assistance programs. The re-designed SDFSCA Progress Report has enabled the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) to examine SDFSCA programming more closely, with particular emphasis on strategies being employed to comply with statutory requirements. School divisions submitted their 2006-2007 SDFSCA Progress Reports using a Web submission process.

Virginia school divisions were allocated a total $4,772,578 in SDFSCA funds in 2006-2007. LEA allocations ranged from a low of $982 for the Virginia School for the Deaf and Blind at Hampton to a high of $480,852 for Fairfax County.   Average SDFSCA funding was $35,352 across all participating school divisions. The total allocated to LEAs in 2006-2007 was $1,287,122 less than the amount allocated in 2005-2006.

I.   *Prevention Services: Prevalence*

Ninety-six percent [95.56% (129) of school divisions reported that SDFSCA funds were used to support *drug prevention* programs and activities in 2006-2007 and

96.30 percent (130) reported that funds were used to support ***violence prevention*** activities; the overwhelming majority reported supporting both drug and violence prevention programs and activities. Five school divisions reported using these funds for drug prevention only and six school divisions reported using the funds for violence prevention only.

In 2006-2007, SDFSCA prevention services were provided in a total 1,477 Virginia, representing 79 percent of Virginia's schools. These included 833 elementary schools with enrollments totaling 366,863; 345 middle schools with enrollments totaling 199,888; and 299 high schools with enrollments totaling 281,434 students. There was a small decline (from 848 to 833) in the number of elementary schools with SDFSCA-funded programs or services; the number of middle schools with such programs or services increased from 326 to 345 and the number of high schools remained almost the same. These data reflect a continuing pattern of greater targeting of local SDFSCA programming at middle and high school levels. Information on the prevalence of SDFSCA prevention activities from 1997-1998 through 2006-2007 is summarized below in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1. Prevalence of SDFSCA Prevention Activities, 1997-2007

Drug Prevention Activities	1997-98 LEAs n = 134	1998-99 LEAs n = 133	1999-00 LEAs n = 132	2000-01 LEAs n = 131	2001-02 LEAs n = 130	2002-03 LEAs n = 132	2003-04 LEAs n = 134	2004-05 LEAs n = 134	2005-06 LEAs n = 134	2006-07 LEAs n = 135
Provided SDFSCA drug prevention activities	97% (130)	96% (128)	98% (130)	99% (130)	99% (129)	95% (126)	98% (131)	97.01% (130)	97.76% (131)	95.56% (129)
Did not provide SDFSCA drug prevention activities	3% (4)	<1% (1)	1% (2)	1% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	2% (3)	2.99% (4)	2.24% (3)	4.44% (6)
Did not respond	0% (0)	3% (4)	0% (0)	0% (0)	1% (1)	5% (6)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

Violence Prevention Activities	1997-98 LEAs n = 134	1998-99 LEAs n = 133	1999-00 LEAs n = 132	2000-01 LEAs n= 131	2001-02 LEAs n = 130	2002-03 LEAs n = 132	2003-04 LEAs n = 134	2004-05 LEAs n = 134	2005-06 LEAs n = 134	2006-07 LEAs n = 135
Provided SDFSCA violence prevention activities	89% (119)	89% (119)	93% (123)	96% (126)	95% (124)	98% (130)	95% (127)	95.52% (128)	95.52% (128)	96.30% (130)
Did not provide SDFSCA violence prevention activities	11% (15)	8% (10)	8% (11)	4% (5)	4% (5)	2% (2)	5% (7)	4.48% (6)	4.48% (6)	3.70% (5)
Did not respond	0% (0)	3.01% (4)	0% (0)	0% (0)	1% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

Table 2. Schools and Enrollment Where Prevention Activities Were Provided, 1997-2007

Schools Where SDFSCA Prevention Activities Were Provided	1997-98 LEAs n = 134	1998-99 LEAs n = 133	1999-00 LEAs n = 132	2000-01 LEAs n= 131	2001-02 LEAs n = 130	2002-03 LEAs n = 132	2003-04 LEAs n = 134	2004-05 LEAs n = 134	2005-06 LEAs n = 134	2006-07 LEAs n = 135
Elementary Schools	970	991	1076	1039	1013	1117	978	913	848	833
Elementary Enrollment	380,533	424,650	437,475	448,327	448,327	507,137	440,036	402,036	369,036	366,863
Middle Schools	312	347	328	340	340	355	341	334	326	345
Middle School Enrollment	190,169	208,861	183,485	209,539	209,539	241,721	221,423	218,556	191,415	199,888
High Schools	291	308	298	297	297	315	296	301	301	299
High School Enrollment	251,856	259,555	248,128	269,378	277,138	289,814	278,968	298,266	296,892	281,434
	Totals 2006-07	**Schools: 1,477 (79.28% of 1863 VA Public Schools)**								
		Students: 848,185 (69.84% of 1,214,501 Virginia Public School Students)								

II. Types of SDFSCA Prevention Programs and Services

A. Activities by Grade Levels

School divisions reported whether they had provided any of 27 types of activities authorized by the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act (Title IV of the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*). School divisions reported whether the types of activities were provided at the elementary, middle, and/or high school levels. The list of 27 types of activities replaced a list of 16 categories used for reporting from 1995 through 2004. Consistent with the central focus of SDFSCA programming, the activity reported most frequently across elementary, middle, and high school levels was age-appropriate drug and violence prevention activities. Ranking second across all levels was dissemination of drug and violence prevention information to schools and communities. Other activities that ranked high across all grade levels included 1) activities that involve families and communities in setting clear expectations against violence and illegal use of drugs, 2) professional development and training for school personnel, parents, and community members, and 3) counseling, mentoring, referral services, and other assistance. Activities reported least frequently for 2006-2007 were 1) establishing and maintaining school safety hotlines, 2) community service, 3) metal detectors, 4) safe zones of passage, and 5) drug testing. The general pattern of school division SDFSCA programs and services has remained relatively stable since 1995, although growth has been observed in character education programming and in programs that encourage students to seek advice from/confide in trusted adults regarding violence and drug use at the elementary and middle school levels. This growth appears to be associated with growth in bullying prevention programs.

Elementary Programming

In 2006-2007, the SDFSCA-funded activities implemented in elementary schools by the greatest number of school divisions included age-appropriate and developmentally based drug and violence prevention activities [76.30% (103)], dissemination of drug and violence prevention information [65.93% (89)], character education [60.00% (81)] professional development and training for school personnel and parents [57.04% (77)], and activities that involve families, communities, and prevention providers in setting

clear expectations against violence and use of drugs [57.04% (77)]. SDFSCA-funded activities least prevalent in Virginia elementary schools in 2006-2007 included school safety hotlines [8.89% (12), community service [10.37% (14)], drug testing [12.59% (17)], and metal detectors [14.81% (20)].   Numbers of school divisions implementing activities in all categories in elementary schools are summarized in Table 3.

Middle School Programming

In 2006-2007, the SDFSCA-funded activities implemented in middle schools by the greatest number of school divisions included age-appropriate and developmentally based drug and violence prevention activities [87.41% (118)], dissemination of drug and violence prevention information [75.56% (102)], professional development [69.63% (94), programs that encourage students to seek advice/confide in trusted adults [68.89% (93)], and counseling/mentoring/student assistance programs [68.15% (92)]. SDFSCA-funded activities least prevalent in Virginia middle schools in 2006-2007 included school safety hotlines [11.85% (16)], safe zones of passage [19.26% (26)] installing metal detectors, locks, cameras and related equipment [19.26% (26)]. Numbers of school divisions implementing activities in all categories in middle schools are summarized in Table 3.

High School Programming

In 2006-2007, the SDFSCA-funded activities implemented in high schools by the greatest number of school divisions included age appropriate and developmentally based drug and violence prevention activities [81.48% (110)], dissemination of drug and violence prevention information [77.78% (105)], professional development and training [65.19% (88)], and counseling/mentoring/ student assistance programs [65.19% (88)]. SDFSCA-funded activities least prevalent in Virginia high schools in 2006-2007 included school safety hotlines [11.85% (16)], supporting safe zones of passage activities [21.48% (29)], community service [24.44% (33)], and establishing systems for transferring suspension/expulsion records among schools [25.19 (34)]. Numbers of school divisions implementing activities in all categories in high schools are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. Types of SDFSCA Prevention Programs and Services Provided in Virginia School Divisions, 2006-2007

School Divisions Reporting Selected Prevention Activities by School Grade Level						
SDFSCA Authorized Activities	Elem. School	Elem. Rank	Middle School	MS Rank	High School	HS Rank
a. Age-appropriate and developmentally based drug and violence prevention activities	76.30% (103)	1	87.41% (118)	1	81.48% (110)	1
b. Activities that involve families, community sectors, and a variety of drug and violence prevention providers in setting clear expectations against violence and illegal use of drugs and appropriate consequences for violence and illegal use of drugs.	57.04% (77)	4 (tie)	67.41% (91)	6	66.44% (87)	6
c. Dissemination of drug and violence prevention information to schools and the community.	65.93% (89)	2	75.56% (102)	2	77.78% (105)	2
d. Professional development and training for, and involvement of, school personnel, parents, and interested community members related to drug and violence prevention.	57.04% (77)	4 (tie)	69.63% (94)	3	65.19% (88)	3 (tie)
e. Community-wide planning and organizing activities to reduce violence and illegal drug use, which may involve gang activity prevention.	42.96% (58)	11	56.30% (76)	10	56.30% (76)	8
f. Acquiring and installing metal detectors, electronic locks, surveillance cameras, or other related equipment and technologies.	14.81% (20)	24	19.26% (26)	25 (tie)	25.93% (35)	23
g. Reporting criminal offenses committed on school property.	35.56% (48)	14	45.19% (61)	13	48.15% (65)	13
h. Developing and implementing comprehensive school security plans or obtaining technical assistance for such plans.	40.74% (55)	13	44.44% (60)	14 (tie)	43.70% (59)	15
i. Supporting safe zones of passage activities that ensure that students travel safely to and from school, which may include bicycle and pedestrian safely programs.	22.22% (30)	21	19.26% (26)	25 (tie)	21.48% (29)	26
j. Hiring and mandatory training, based on scientific research, of school security personnel (including school resource officers) who interact with students in support of SDFSCA youth drug and violence prevention activities.	16.30% (22)	22	30.37% (41)	21	34.81% (47)	20
k. Expanded and improved school-based mental health services related to illegal drug use and violence by qualified school-based mental health service providers.	26.67% (36)	19	40.74% (55)	17	40.74% (55)	18
l. Conflict resolution programs, including peer mediation programs and youth anti-crime and anti-drug councils and activities.	45.93% (62)	10	65.93% (89)	7	65.19% (88)	3 (tie)
m. Alternative education programs or services for violent or drug abusing students that reduce the need for suspension or expulsion or that serve students who have been suspended or expelled from regular educational settings, including programs or services to assist students to make continued progress toward meeting the State's academic achievement standards and to reenter the regular education setting.	15.56% (21)	23	44.44% (60)	14 (tie)	51.11% (69)	11
n. Counseling, mentoring, referral services, and other student assistance practices and programs, including assistance provided by qualified school-based mental	49.63% (67)	7 (tie)	68.15% (92)	5	65.19% (88)	3 (tie)

School Divisions Reporting Selected Prevention Activities by School Grade Level						
SDFSCA Authorized Activities	Elem. School	Elem. Rank	Middle School	MS Rank	High School	HS Rank
health services providers.						
o. Programs that encourage students to seek advice from, and to confide in, a trusted adult regarding concerns about violence and illegal drug use.	57.04 (77)	4 (tie)	68.89% (93)	4	63.70% (86)	7
p. Drug and violence prevention activities designed to reduce truancy.	42.22% (57)	12	54.81% (74)	11	54.07% (73)	9
q. Age-appropriate, developmentally-based violence prevention and education programs that address victimization associated with prejudice and intolerance.	49.63% (67)	7 (tie)	57.78% (78)	9	47.41% (64)	14
r. Consistent with the Fourth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, the testing of a student for illegal drug use or the inspecting of a student's locker for weapons or illegal drugs or drug paraphernalia, if the local educational agency elects to so test or inspect.	12.59% (17)	25	25.93% (35)	22 (tie)	27.41% (37)	22
s. Emergency intervention services following traumatic crisis events that have disrupted the learning environment.	34.81% (47)	15	38.52% (52)	18	42.22% (57)	17
t. Establishing or implementing a system for transferring suspension and expulsion records, consistent with section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act, by a local school division to any public or private elementary school or secondary school.	23.70% (32)	20	25.93% (35)	22 (tie)	25.19% (34)	24
u. Developing and implementing character education programs, as a component of drug and violence prevention programs.	60.00% (81)	3	61.48% (83)	8	49.63% (67)	12
v. Establishing and maintaining a school safety hotline.	8.89% (12)	27	11.85% (16)	27	11.85% (16)	27
w. Community service, including community service performed by expelled students, and service-learning projects.	10.37% (14)	26	20.74% (28)	24	24.44% (33)	25
x. Conducting a nationwide background check of local school division employees.	31.11% (42)	16	31.11% (42)	20	31.11% (42)	21
y. Programs to train school personnel to identify warning signs of youth suicide and to create an action plan to help youth at risk of suicide.	30.37% (41)	17	42.22% (57)	16	42.96% (58)	16
z. Programs that respond to the needs of students who are faced with domestic violence or child abuse.	27.41% (37)	18	34.81% (47)	19	37.04% (50)	19
aa. Evaluation of any SDFSCA activities and the collection of objective data used to assess program needs, program implementation, or program success in achieving goals and objectives.	46.67% (63)	9	53.33% (72)	12	52.59% (71)	10

B. Evidence-Based Programs Being Implemented

School divisions were asked to identify specific evidence-based programs that were implemented in 2006-2007 using SDFSCA funding. The program most frequently

cited was Life Skills Training [37.78% (51)], followed by Olweus Bullying Prevention [21.48% (29)], and Second Step [19.26% (26)]. Nineteen (14.07%) school divisions implemented Character Counts and 17 (12.59%) each reported implementing Al's Pals, Get Real About Violence, and Too Good for Drugs programs. Eleven (8.15%) each reported implementing Here's Looking at You and Student Assistance Programs. Too Good for Violence was reported implemented by nine (6.67%) school divisions, Project ALERT was implemented by eight (5.93%), and Peer Mediation was reported by seven (5.19%). Six (4.44%) school divisions each reported implementing Not-on-Tobacco and Reconnecting Youth programs. Lion's Quest, Success In Stages, and YADAPP were each reported by five (3.70%) school divisions. Four school divisions (2.96%) each reported implementing Guiding Good Choices, Red Ribbon Campaigns, Responding in Peaceful and Positive Ways (RIPP), School Resource Officer, Signs of Suicide (SOS), and Too Good for Drugs II programs. An additional ten programs were each reported implemented by three school divisions, an additional 17 programs were each reported implemented by two school divisions, and 81 other programs were each reported implemented by a single school division. Some programs that school divisions reported to be "evidence-based" do not appear on lists of programs that have undergone a nationally-recognized expert review process.

It is important to note that this list of evidence-based programs represents programming funded through the SDFSCA and does not represent all prevention programming being implemented in school divisions. All programs cited in SDFSCA progress reports and the numbers of school divisions implementing each program are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4. Most Frequently Cited Evidence-Based Programs Used in Virginia School Divisions, 2006-2007

Number/ Percentage of School Divisions	Evidence-Based Programs
51 (37.78%)	Life Skills Training
29 (21.48%)	Olweus Bullying Prevention
26 (19.26%)	Second Step Violence Prevention
19 (14.07%)	Character Counts
17 (12.59%)	Al's Pals, Get Real About Violence, Too Good For Drugs
11 (8.15%)	Here's Looking at You , Student Assistance Programs

Number/ Percentage of School Divisions	Evidence-Based Programs	
9 (6.67%)	Too Good for Violence	
8 (5.93%)	Project ALERT	
7 (5.19%)	Peer Mediation Program	
6 (4.44%)	Not-on-Tobacco Program, Reconnecting Youth	
5 (3.70%)	Lion's Quest, Success In Stages, YADAPP	
4 (2.96%)	Guiding Good Choices, Red Ribbon Campaigns, RIPP (Responding in Peaceful and Positive Ways), School Resource Officer, Signs of Suicide (SOS), Too Good For Drugs II	
3 (2.22%)	All Stars Class Action Keep A Clear Mind Parenting Wisely Positive Action	Question, Persuade, Refer (QPR) SADD Club Steps to Respect Stop Bullying Now Stop the Violence program
2 (1.48%)	Atlas and Athena Program Building Respect program Conflict mediation Counseling services FAST PATHS - Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies Protecting Me/Protecting You Relate for Kids	SODA Strengthening Families Talk It Out Teens Overcome Problems with Alcohol, Marijuana, and Other Drugs Too Good For Drugs and Violence Towards No Drug Abuse (TND) Youth Connections
1 (0.74%)	2000 No Smoking Program Adolescent Transitions Program Adult Mentorship: Lunch Buddies After Prom Party After School Program Anger Management Alcohol-Edu Alternative Education Best Practice (AEBP) Baby Think it Over Blueprint for Action Blue Thunder (anti-internet violence data) Campus Monitor Cantor Assertive Discipline Program Can We Talk Cessation Chesapeake Pride Team. Children are People Too Community of Caring (for our middle and high school) Community Works Program (Teen Crimes and Communities) Connect Ed (emergency calling system to alert parents and families) Creating Lasting Family Connections Crime/Violence Report DARE Drug abuse counseling Drug Testing Exercising Character Family Matters Gangs in Virginia	Pals For Peers Parent Expectations Support Achievement (PESA) Parenting for Prevention. Parenting With Love and Limits PASS Program Peacemaker's Program Peace Talks Violence Prevention Program Preventing Bullying at School curriculum Prevention Services Project Success Prom Promise PULSAR Regional Violence Coordinator collaboration with law enforcement, families, and community members to stop gang violence Relate for Teens Respect and Protect Risk Watch Safe Kids and Pride clubs S.A.V.E. (Students Against Violence Everywhere) Say It Straight Say No to Drugs Say No to Violence Security Badges Service Club Service-learning Seven Challenges TATU (Teens Against Tobacco Use)

Number/ Percentage of School Divisions	Evidence-Based Programs	
	Gateway Drugs Action Pack Program Health for Life Healthy Relationships Here Now and Down the Road Internet Safety Training Intervening with Teen Tobacco Users Just say No Keep My Cool (anger management program) Kelso's Choice Kick Butts Day Activities Kids Connection Leadership Academies Management For Youth Michigan Model for Comprehensive School Health None For The Road	The Great Body Shop Tobacco Education Group Too Smart To Start Towards No Tobacco (TNT) Truancy Prevention Violence Prevention Visions of You Voices Why Try Youth Media Compendium Program Youth Violence Training Zero Bullies

C. Student Assistance Programs

School divisions were asked to report whether there was a student assistance program anywhere in their division and, if so, they were asked the grades served and the program components that were present in their program.   Sixty-three (63) school divisions, or 46.67percent, reported having a student assistance program; however, 75, or about 56 percent reported having at least one element of a student assistance program and providing services at elementary, middle, or high school levels. Data on the grade levels at which there is programming and the program components that are present are summarized in Table 5.

Almost half of all school divisions reported having SAP services at the middle or high school levels; 59, or about 44 percent reported services at both the middle and high school levels. Twenty-eight percent (38) reported SAP services at the pre-kindergarten through grade 5 level. Components of SAP programming that appear to be most prevalent are collaboration with community agencies and resources (45.93%), integration with other school-based programs (45.19%), and internal referral process (43.70%). About one-third of school divisions report a problem solving team/case management system (34.07%), student support groups (31.11%), SAP-related staff development (30.37%), or program awareness activities (29.63%). Only about one-quarter reported

program evaluation (26.67%) or the program being established in school board policy (24.44%). Closer examination of data on program components suggests that the number of school divisions reporting having a student assistance program may be a little inflated; some school divisions reported having a program but reported only one or two program components, raising some doubt as to whether programming being reported could legitimately be considered a functioning student assistance program. This is an area that requires closer examination. It may be helpful to establish a more standardized definition of what components must be present to be considered a student assistance program.

Table 5. Student Assistance Programs: Grade Levels Served and Program Components Present, 2006-2007

Student Assistance Programs in Virginia Schools	
Grades Served	*Percentage/Number of LEAs*
Grades Pre-K - 5	28.15% (38)
Grades 6 – 8	48.15% (65)
Grades 9 - 12	49.63% (67)
Program Components	*Percentage/Number of LEAs*
School Board Policy - Program established in school board policy.	24.44% (33)
Staff Development - SAP-related training provided.	30.37% (41)
Program Awareness - SAP awareness activities conducted	29.63% (40)
Internal Referral Process - Process in place to identify and refer students; self-referral encouraged.	43.70% (59)
Problem Solving Team and Case Management - System in place to assist and monitor student's progress.	34.07% (46)
Student Assistance Program Evaluation - SAP Program is evaluated periodically.	26.67% (36)
Educational Student Support Groups - Groups provided, based on assessed needs.	31.11% (42)
Cooperation and Collaboration with Community Agencies and Resources - School and community resources coordinated.	45.93% (62)
Integration with Other School-Based Programs such as character education, parent education, conflict resolution, mediation.	45.19% (61)

III. Local Needs Assessment

School divisions are required by SDFSCA Principles of Effectiveness [SDFSCA, Section 4115(a)] to base their programs on a needs assessment using objective data that

can include use of youth survey data, school discipline, crime, and violence data, and community social indicator data. School divisions provided information about their use of youth surveys and other elements of the local SDFSCA needs assessment.

A. Use of Youth Surveys

Drug and/or violence-related youth surveys were reported to have been conducted in 52 percent of Virginia's school divisions [51.85% (70)] in 2006-2007. Of those reporting youth surveys in 2006-2007, about 12 percent (16) used the PRIDE Survey, over 9 percent (13) used the Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS), and about 4 percent (5) used the Communities That Care Survey (CTC). Over 20 percent (27) reported using locally-developed surveys and 21 percent (28) reported using other surveys. "Other" surveys reported included the Virginia Tobacco Settlement Foundation survey and several types of surveys associated with specific programs such as the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program, Too Good for Drugs, and Life Skills Training.   Responses about youth surveys are summarized below in Table 6.

Table 6. Youth Surveys Reported Conducted in Virginia School Divisions, 1997-2007

Types of Youth Surveys	1997-98 LEAs n = 134	1998-99 LEAs N = 133	1999-00 LEAs n = 132	2000-01 LEAs n = 131	2001-02 LEAs n = 130	2002-03 LEAs n = 132	2003-04 LEAs n = 134	2004-05 LEAs n = 134	2005-06 LEAs n = 134	2006-07 LEAs n = 135
Any student surveys	48% (64)	43% (57)	47% (62)	53% (69)	48% (62)	50% (67)	52.73% (72)	50.00% (67)	55.97% (75)	54.81% (74)
YRBS	7% (9)	11% (15)	10% (13)	12% (16)	10% (13)	8% (10)	11.94% (16)	7.46% (10)	8.21% (11)	9.63% (13)
PRIDE	13% (17)	14% (19)	15% (20)	13% (17)	14% (18)	18% (21)	17.16% (23)	15.67% (21)	18.66% (25)	11.85% (16)
Communities That Care	6% (8)	<1% (1)	3% (4)	5% (6)	5% (6)	4% (5)	6.72% (9)	4.48% (6)	5.22% (7)	3.70% (5)
Search Institute/ Assets	0% (0)	2% (2)	2% (3)	7% (9)	2% (3)	2% (3)	2.24% (3)	0.75% (1)	0.75% (1)	0.74% (1)
American Drug Survey	<1% (1)	2% (2)	3% (4)	0% (0)	2% (2)	2% (2)	2.24% (3)	2.24% (3)	1.49% (2)	0.00% (0)
Locally-developed survey	17% (23)	20% (26)	14% (18)	18% (23)	14% (18)	11% (14)	8.96% (12)	13.43% (18)	14.18% (19)	20.00% (27)
Other surveys	16% (21)	9% (12)	11% (15)	15% (20)	14% (18)	18% (24)	12.69% (17)	20.15% (27)	20.90% (28)	20.74% (28)

B. Other Elements of Needs Assessment

In addition to conducting needs assessments using objective data, school divisions are also required to actively collaborate with community-based preventions needs assessments. About 95 percent of school divisions reported use of school discipline, crime, and violence data and about 59 percent reported using social indicator data. About 61 percent of school divisions reported collaboration with community-based prevention needs assessments. These findings suggest the need for additional emphasis to be placed on use of social indicator data and school-community collaboration in prevention needs assessments. School division responses related to elements of SDFSCA needs assessment are summarized below in Table 7.

Table 7. Number of Virginia School Divisions Reporting Selected Elements of Their Needs Assessment Process, 2006-2007

Elements of Needs Assessment	School Divisions 2003-04	School Divisions 2004-05	School Divisions 2005-06	School Divisions 2006-07
Analysis of local discipline, crime, and violence data for school safety planning.	82.09% (110)	86.57% (116)	92.54% (124)	94.81% (128)
Analysis of community risk and protective factors using social indicator data.	54.48% (73)	56.72% (76)	55.97% (75)	58.52% (79)
School division active collaboration with a community-based prevention needs assessment.	58.96% (79)	55.97% (75)	60.45% (81)	61.48% (83)

IV. Involvement of Community Agencies/Organizations, Parents, and Students in SDFSCA Prevention Programming

A. Consultation with Organizations

SDFSCA applications are required to be developed "through timely and meaningful consultation" with representatives of prescribed groups. In 2006-2007, 96 percent [95.56% (129)] of school divisions reported consultation with teachers and other staff, parents, students, and community-based organizations. About 88 percent [88.15%

(119)] reported consultation with those with expertise in drug and violence prevention such as medical, mental health and law enforcement professionals. Representatives of schools to be served, including private schools, were consulted by 90.37 percent (122) of school divisions and representatives of state and local government were consulted by 54.81% (74) school divisions.   These findings suggest the need for greater consultation with state and local government representatives. Reports of consultation with prescribed groups are summarized in Table 8.

Table 8. Number of Virginia School Divisions Reporting Consultation with Selected Organizations, 2006-2007

Organizations Consulted with in Development of SDFSCA Application	School Divisions 2003-04	School Divisions 2004-05	School Divisions 2005-06	School Divisions 2006-07
Teachers and other staff, parents, students, and community-based organizations.	96.27% (129)	98.51% (132)	97.01% (130)	95.56% (129)
Others with relevant and demonstrated expertise in drug and violence prevention activities (such as medical, mental health, and law enforcement professionals).	91.79% (123)	92.54% (124)	86.57% (116)	88.15% (119)
Representatives of schools to be served (including private schools)	85.82% (115)	88.06% (118)	93.28% (125)	90.37% (122)
State and local government representatives	55.97% (75)	61.19% (82)	54.48% (73)	54.81% (74)

B. Parent Consultation and Input

Using the modified SDFSCA reporting format, school divisions briefly described specific strategies used in 2006-2007 to include "meaningful and ongoing consultation with and input from parents in the development the SDFSCA application and administration of the SDFSCA program or activity." School divisions appear to rely heavily upon either SDFSCA Advisory or Health Advisory groups that include parent representation to meet requirements for consultation. About half of school divisions [48.89% (66)] cite consultation with such groups among the strategies they use. Over 64 percent of school divisions [64.44% (87)] include presentations to parent-teacher organizations as part of the consultation process. Presentations to community-based groups such as drug task forces and prevention coalitions that include parent representatives were cited by nearly 40 percent [39.26% (53)] of school divisions.

Publications served as a second primary avenue of communication used by school divisions to invite parent consultation and input into SDFSCA programs. Over sixty percent [60.74% (85)] of school divisions reported use of some type of publication or public notice. Specific strategies reported by school divisions are included in Appendix B.

C. Types of Community Organizations Involved with SDFSCA Activities

School divisions were asked to report the types of community agencies/organizations involved in their SDFSCA-funded drug and violence prevention activities. Responses for 1997-98 through 2006-2007 are summarized in Table 9. In 2006-2007, nearly 87 percent of school divisions [86.67% (117)] reported involvement by **law enforcement agencies.** Over 75 percent [75.56% (102)] reported school resource officer (SRO) involvement, 39 percent [38.52% (52)] reported Drug Abuse Resistance Education (D.A.R.E.) involvement, and over one-third [35.56% (48)] reported involvement with the law-related education program, CLASS ACTION: Virginia Teens and the Law.   Using the amended SDFSCA reporting format, school divisions reported for the third year whether school security officers were involved with SDFSCA efforts. Over a quarter [26.67% (36)] reported school security officer involvement in SDFSCA programs.

Mental health/substance abuse services were reported to be involved with SDFSCA efforts in over 80 percent of school divisions [82.22% (111)] in 2006-2007. **Social services or juvenile probation services** were reported to be involved with SDFSCA efforts in 92 (68.15%) school divisions, increasing from a low of 78 (58.21%) in 2003-2004. Involvement of **parent or citizen groups** declined slightly [to 68.89% (93)] as did **faith community** involvement that increased [to 35.56% (48)]. Four school divisions (2.96%) reported no other community agency/ organization involvement. Various other community agencies/ organizations were reported to be involved in over 30 percent of school divisions [(32.59% (44)] in 2006-2007. The other community agencies most frequently cited were health departments, local health advisory boards, local prevention coalitions, the Cooperative Extension Service, Offices on Youth, and local recreational and youth development organizations such as Boys and Girls Clubs.

Although involvement declined slightly across most types of community agencies and organizations from 2005-2006 to 2006-2007, patterns of involvement have remained generally comparable over the past ten years.

Table 9. Community Agencies and Organizations Involved with School Division SDFSCA Programs, 1997-2007

Agencies/ Organizations	1997-98 LEAs n = 134	1998-99 LEAs n = 133	1999-00 LEAs n = 132	2000-01 LEAs n = 131	2001-02 LEAs n = 130	2002-03 LEAs n = 132	2003-04 LEAs n = 134	2004-05 LEAs n = 134	2005-06 LEAs n = 134	2006-07 LEAs n = 135
Law enforcement	94% (126)	92% (122)	91% (120)	92% (121)	88% (114)	80% (106)	73.13% (98)	89.55% (120)	88.06% (118)	86.67% (117)
D.A.R.E.	86% (115)	83% (110)	81% (108)	79% (104)	72% (94)	57% (75)	47.01% (63)	46.27% (62)	44.03% (59)	38.52% (52)
CLASS ACTION: Teens and the Law	30% (40)	29% (38)	36% (47)	29% (38)	35% (46)	32% (42)	29.85% (40)	28.36% (38)	34.33% (46)	35.56% (48)
School Resource Officer (SRO)	40% (54)	48% (64)	68% (90)	73% (96)	73% (95)	73% (96)	71.64% (96)	75.37% (101)	79.10% (106)	75.56% (102)
School Security Officer	N/A	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	17.16% (23)	21.64% (29)	24.63% (33)	26.67% (36)
Mental health/ substance abuse services	81% (109)	80% (107)	77% (102)	79% (103)	81% (105)	77% (102)	78.36% (105)	83.58% (112)	85.07% (114)	82.22% (111)
Social svcs / juvenile probation	63% (85)	67% (89)	66% (87)	69% (91)	68% (88)	64% (85)	58.21% (78)	67.91% (91)	70.90% (95)	68.15% (92)
Parent or citizen groups	75% (100)	73% (97)	67% (89)	69% (90)	69% (90)	73% (96)	72.39% (97)	73.13% (98)	77.61% (104)	68.89% (93)
Faith community	27% (36)	32% (42)	29% (38)	36% (47)	34% (44)	35% (46)	29.85% (40)	35.07% (47)	38.06% (51)	35.56% (48)
No community agencies/org anizations involved	1% (2)	<1% (1)	2% (3)	2% (2)	2% (2)	4% (5)	2.99% (4)	2.24% (3)	0.75% (1)	2.96% (4)
Other	31% (42)	27% (36)	26% (34)	26% (34)	27% (35)	27% (36)	26.87% (36)	23.88% (32)	31.34% (42)	32.59% (44)

D. Types of Community Involvement

Four types of community involvement in SDFSCA programs have been defined by the U.S. Department of Education. Each year, school divisions have been asked to

report the types of involvement that occurred in their communities. Three-quarters [76.30% (103)] of school divisions reported joint service delivery or involvement in teacher/staff training [75.56% (102)]. Over 72 percent [72.59% (98)] reported community involvement in public awareness activities and less than ten percent [9.63% (13)] reported community involvement in fund-raising. Other types of involvement, reported by 10.37 percent (14), included advisory and planning roles, business civic clubs contributions, Prom/Graduation celebrations, and program volunteers. All responses for 1997-1998 through 2006-2007 are summarized in Table 10. Patterns of involvement have remained relatively stable throughout the ten-year period examined.

Table 10. Types of Community Involvement with School Division SDFSCA Programs, 1997-2007

Types of Community Involvement	1997-98 LEAs n = 134	1998-99 LEAs n = 133	1999-00 LEAs n = 132	2000-01 LEAs n = 131	2001-02 LEAs n = 130	2002-03 LEAs n = 132	2003-04 LEAs n = 134	2004-05 LEAs n = 134	2005-06 LEAs n = 134	2006-07 LEAs n = 135
Joint service delivery, including referrals	78% (104)	79% (105)	74% (98)	79% (103)	77% (100)	72% (95)	74.63% (100)	76.87% (103)	80.60% (108)	76.30% (103)
Teacher/staff training	67% (90)	68% (90)	73% (96)	74% (97)	70% (91)	72% (95)	77.61% (104)	76.87% (103)	79.10% (106)	75.56% (102)
Public awareness activities	83% (111)	75% (100)	80% (106)	77% (101)	78% (101)	73% (96)	76.12% (102)	69.40% (93)	76.87% (103)	72.59% (98)
Fund raising	19% (26)	17% (23)	16% (21)	17% (22)	19% (25)	16% (21)	11.94% (16)	8.96% (12)	8.21% (11)	9.63% (13)
Other	13% (18)	15% (20)	10% (13)	13% (17)	12% (15)	18% (24)	16.42% (22)	17.16% (23)	19.40% (26)	10.37% (14)

E. Student Involvement

Students were reported to have participated in designing or critiquing the SDFSCA drug or violence prevention programming in about 50 percent [51.11% (69)] of school divisions in 2006-2007. School divisions reporting no student participation in 2006-2007 numbered 66 or (48.89 %). Levels of student involvement that have steadily declined from 1997-98 through 2006-2007 are summarized below in Table 11. These finding suggest the need for greater emphasis to be placed on student participation in designing and/or critiquing SDFSCA programming.

Table 11. Student Involvement in SDFSCA Programs, 1997-2007

Student participation	1997-98 LEAs n = 134	1998-99 LEAs n = 133	1999-00 LEAs n = 133	2000-01 LEAs n = 131	2001-02 LEAs n = 130	2002-03 LEAs n = 132	2003-04 LEAs n = 134	2004-05 LEAs n = 134	2005-06 LEAs n = 134	2006-07 LEAs n = 135
LEAs reporting student participation	72% (96)	71% (94)	69% (91)	71% (93)	66% (86)	64% (85)	63.43% (85)	58.96% (79)	59.70% (80)	51.11% (69)
LEAs reporting no student participation	28% (38)	29% (39)	29% (38)	27% (35)	27% (35)	31% (41)	32.84% (44)	41.04% (55)	40.30% (54)	48.89% (66)

V. Performance Measures

School divisions are required by the SDFSCA to establish performance standards aimed at ensuring safe, orderly, and drug-free learning environments. These performance standards are typically expressed as program goals that represent longer-term outcomes that school divisions intend to achieve. The goals reported by school divisions reflect a substantial focus on reducing incidents of discipline, crime, and violence in schools. Goals were more likely to be keyed to reducing the prevalence of alcohol, tobacco, and/or other drug use in school divisions where there are youth survey data. There is clearly a broad range of proficiency among school divisions in developing appropriate, measurable goals and in selecting appropriate measures to assess progress in achieving goals; some school divisions use quite sophisticated and appropriate measures of performance while others use questionable measures and provide rather weak evidence of performance. Implementation measures such as numbers served and numbers trained are relatively strong; outcome measures are consistently weaker. Program objectives and results to date are reported in Appendix C.

VI. LEA Training/Technical Assistance Needs

School divisions were asked to indicate their level of need for assistance from the Virginia Department of Education in each of sixteen programmatic or issue areas. The list of program/issue areas was derived from an analysis of programs and issues of

greatest interest to SDFSCA Coordinators in recent years. Responses represent levels of demand for training, technical assistance, and publications to support local SDFSCA programming. Responses in fall 2007 revealed strong to moderate demand for all areas listed. An index of need was calculated to compare relative levels of demand across the programmatic areas listed. The index was produced using a weighting of responses in which priority need = 3, moderate need = 2, and limited need = 1.

The highest index of need scores were registered for student assistant program implementation (1.84), evaluation methods and strategies (1.79), youth leadership development (1.75), conflict resolution/peer mediation (1.75), selecting and implementing research-based violence prevention programs (1.74), and using objective data for needs assessment (1.73). School division responses related to their needs for assistance from the Virginia Department of Education are summarized below in Table 12.

Table 12. Summary of School Division Needs – From Fall 2007 Progress Reports

Topics	Priority Need	Moderate Need	Limited Need	Need Index
Student Assistance Program Implementation	21.48% (29)	25.93% (35)	34.81% (47)	1.84
Evaluation-methods and strategies	14.81% (20)	36.30% (49)	32.59% (44)	1.79
Conflict resolution/peer mediation programming	14.07% (19)	32.59% (44)	34.81% (47)	1.75
Youth leadership development	17.78% (24)	25.93% (35)	38.52% (52)	1.75
Violence prevention-selecting and implementing research-based strategies	12.59% (17)	36.30% (49)	34.07% (46)	1.74
Needs assessment-comprehensive, using objective data	14.81% (20)	29.63% (40)	36.30% (49)	1.73
Drug education-selection and implementing research-based curricula	14.81% (20)	28.15% (38)	40.74% (55)	1.69
Crisis planning and management	9.63% (13)	33.33% (45)	39.26% (53)	1.64
Parent consultation / input strategies	13.33% (18)	27.41% (37)	43.70% (59)	1.64
Program planning-establishing goals and objectives for results	8.89% (12)	28.89% (39)	37.78% (51)	1.62
Student surveys	12.59% (17)	23.70% (32)	42.22% (57)	1.62
Community collaboration	8.15% (11)	28.89% (39)	42.22% (57)	1.57

Topics	Priority Need	Moderate Need	Limited Need	Need Index
Drugs-Information on specific types	8.89% (12)	27.41% (37)	42.96% (58)	1.57
School safety assessment and planning	8.15% (11)	25.19% (34)	43.70% (59)	1.54
Character / citizenship education	8.15% (11)	21.48% (29)	49.63% (67)	1.48
Prevention basics-terms, concepts, and what the research shows	4.44% (6)	23.70% (32)	50.37% (68)	1.42

Programmatic areas for which there is greatest demand for training are student assistance program implementation [36.30% (49)], conflict resolution/peer mediation [33.33% (45)], evaluation methods and strategies [32.59% (44)]. Other programmatic areas with over 30 percent of school divisions reporting a demand for training include growth leadership development [31.11% (42)], selecting and implementing research-based violence preventing programs [31.11% (42)], crisis planning and management [30.37% (41)].

Areas for which there is greatest demand for publications are community collaboration [60.00% (81)], selecting and implementing research-based drug education [46.67% (63)], drug information [45.93% (62)], parent consultation/input strategies basics [45.93% (62)], prevention basics [45.93% (62)]. Other programmatic areas with at least 40 percent of school divisions reporting a demand for publications include youth leadership development [43.70 % (59)], character/citizenship education [49.96% (58)], selecting and implementing research-based violence prevention [42.22% (57)], and school safety assessment and planning [40.00% (54)]. Levels of school division demand for training and publications are summarized below in Table 13.

Table 13. Summary of School Division Needs: Training, Technical Assistance, and Publications

Topics	Training/Technical Assistance	Publications
Character / citizenship education	17.04% (23)	42.96% (58)
Community collaboration	17.04% (23)	60.00% (81)
Conflict resolution/peer mediation programming	33.33% (45)	34.81% (47)
Crisis planning and management	30.37% (41)	39.26% (53)
Drug education-selection and implementing research-based curricula	24.44% (33)	46.67% (63)
Drugs-Information on specific types	17.78% (24)	45.93% (62)

Topics	Training/Technical Assistance	Publications
Evaluation-methods and strategies	32.59% (44)	37.78% (51)
Needs assessment- comprehensive, using objective data	31.11% (42)	37.78% (51)
Parent consultation / input strategies	22.96% (31)	45.93% (62)
Prevention basics-terms, concepts, and what the research shows	16.30% (22)	45.93% (62)
Program planning-establishing goals and objectives for results	28.15% (38)	33.33% (45)
School safety assessment and planning	22.96% (31)	40.00% (54)
Student Assistance Program Implementation	36.30% (49)	35.56% (48)
Student surveys	23.70% (32)	38.52% (52)
Violence prevention-selecting and implementing research-based strategies	31.11% (42)	42.22% (57)
Youth leadership development	31.11% (42)	43.70% (59)

VII. *Comments of School Division SDFSCA Coordinators*

General comments were provided by fifty-four (54) school division SDFSCA Coordinators. Their comments provide much insight into school division perspectives, concerns, issues, successes, and challenges. All SDFSCA Coordinators' comments are reported verbatim in Appendix B. From these comments the following observations can be made:

First, Coordinators recognize and appreciate the ongoing efforts of the VDOE to support them in their roles and want the VDOE to continue efforts to keep them informed. The following comments are representative:

"The VDOE trainings are always excellent and the staff is very quick to respond to questions that our division has. We appreciate all of the support that we get from VDOE.

"The Virginia Department of Education, Office of Safe and Drug Free Schools has been a wonderful resource to FCPS. We look forward to working with them for many years to come."

"Thank you to the VA Department of Education and Arlene Cundiff for the expert guidance and support. The dissemination of information to the localities from the DOE assists the schools and communities in our mission of drug and alcohol and violence prevention."

"Thanks for the technical assistance meetings and the wealth of publications and resource materials."

"The Title IV office provides a wealth of information and opportunities for training. In the last few years a number of opportunities and publications have been available that address the areas we marked as needs."

"Department of Education specifically Office of Student services is extremely helpful in all aspects of the grant process. They make the LEA job easier. Smyth County as others always need support on issues of Bullying prevention programs particularly at the high school level. Truancy is an underlying issue that continually needs attention - it is a symptom of other issues. Thank you for all your support."

Funding continues to be a central concern of many Coordinators, particularly in smaller localities that receive very modest levels of funding. Coordinators expressed concern about declining funding and challenges of attempting to provide supplemental programming with such limited resources. The following comments are representative:

"ACPS gets so little money, and is expected to do a great deal with just a little. This makes it difficult as in many cases, program materials exceed our budget."

"Schools are constantly being asked to do more for less."