

**PROGRAM AREA**  
**SUPPORTIVE SERVICES FOR STUDENTS**  
**IN LOCAL PUBLIC SCHOOL**



Prepared by:

The Evaluation Unit of the New Jersey  
State Law Enforcement Planning Agency

April, 1979

66289

PROGRAM AREA  
SUPPORTIVE SERVICES FOR STUDENTS  
IN LOCAL PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Prepared by:

The Evaluation Unit of the New Jersey  
State Law Enforcement Planning Agency

April, 1979

This report is based on research supported by Grant Number 78-NI-AX-0004 awarded to the New Jersey State Law Enforcement Planning Agency by the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice. The opinions it contains are those of the authors and are not necessarily shared by the U.S. Department of Justice.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Preface.....	1
Executive Summary and Recommendations.....	2
Statement of Problem.....	5
Description of Program Area.....	6
Methods.....	12
Project Descriptions.....	14
Data Analysis.....	18
Summary.....	38
References.....	39
Appendix.....	41

## LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
Table 1: Sex, Ethnic Background and Age at Intake of Students.....	19
Table 2: Highest Grade Completed, Family and Probation Status of Students.....	20
Table 3: Source of Referral For Students by Project.....	22
Table 4: Average Change in Camden's Students' Math Scores From Time 1 To Time 2.....	25
Table 5: Average Change in Camden's Students' Reading Scores From Time 1 To Time 2.....	25
Table 6: Average Change in Elizabeth's Students' Math Scores From Time 1 To Time 2.....	27
Table 7: Average Change in Elizabeth's Students' Reading Scores From Time 1 To Time 2.....	27
Table 8: Average Change in New Brunswick's Students' Math Scores From Time 1 To Time 2.....	28
Table 9: Average Change in New Brunswick's Students' Reading Scores From Time 1 To Time 2.....	28
Table 10: Average Change in Orange's Students' Math Scores From Time 1 To Time 2.....	30
Table 11: Average Change in Orange's Students' Reading Scores From Time 1 To Time 2.....	30
Table 12: Summary of Average Behavior and Attendance Changes.....	35
Table 13: Reason For Termination of Students.....	36

## PREFACE

This report marks the conclusion of a full year evaluation of the program area, Supportive Services for Students in Local Public Schools. The report is based on data collected in four educational projects funded by the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency: Alternative Educational Program for Camden City, The Learning Center of Elizabeth, Redshaw Educational Alternative Program of New Brunswick and Orange Alternative Educational Program. The data concerns all students who were enrolled in these projects for any or all of the academic year, September, 1977, to June, 1978. Cooperation of the project directors and teachers is gratefully acknowledged.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This report is based on an investigation of four alternative school projects funded by the New Jersey State Law Enforcement Planning Agency. The main purpose of their funding is to enable schools to address an array of student problems, such as multiple trancies and suspensions, high numbers of absences, school vandalism and poor academic achievement, which characterize delinquent or delinquency-prone youth. Projects are designed to provide low student-to-teacher ratios, separate educational facilities and equipment and other community services when needed for the students who are enrolled in the projects. Further, projects are intended to serve as models for other schools to show that the creative use of limited funds and educational resources can accomplish effective delinquency prevention in public schools.

In general, the projects which are included in this evaluation are seen as successful, insofar as the project students remain in school and are given personalized instruction and attention. The measures used to assess student progress show that gains are made. Project services are seen to have a positive effect on students, although more data is needed to indicate specific project strengths and weaknesses. However, were it not for these projects, many of these students would not have attended school at all. In light of this, their improvements seem to be more substantial and impressive.

The following policy recommendations emerge from a year-long evaluation of the program area, Supportive Services for Students in Local Public Schools. The evaluation consisted of, primarily, two types of data collection: informal observations and literature reviews and formal questionnaires and interviews. Therefore, recommendations are based on both types of data collection,

Recommendations

1. Most of the students who participated in the school projects were referred from in-school sources. It had been assumed by project administration that a larger portion of students would be referred from community agencies and other out-of-school referral sources. It is recommended, therefore, that projects develop ties with community agencies which could serve as referral sources for future student participants. (21-22)\*
  
2. Projects stressed the need to monitor student academic performance. Initially, testing is necessary to determine the skill levels of students for the appropriate delivery of academic instruction. Repeated testings will measure subsequent changes and improvement. It was found, however, that only one of the four projects had tested all of its students upon project entrance and termination. For that reason, it is recommended that projects administer formal testing to every student upon their entrance into the program. Additional testings should occur periodically so that projects can document improvement for all students, including those who terminate prior to the end of the academic year. (23-31)
  
3. According to programmatic goals, projects are oriented towards improving students' behavior and attendance practices in school. Accordingly, it is necessary for projects to maintain careful records to detect particular student problems. It was found, however, that some of the projects did not record all suspensions and absences. Thus, it is recommended that projects maintain

\*The numbers following each recommendation refer to the pages wherein supportive data and discussion are presented.

daily records of students' practices to determine if projects have any impact on student behavior and attendance. (32-35)

4. Mainstreaming is the practice of returning students to the regular school from which they had come to the project. Mainstreaming may occur at the end of the year so that a student will return to regular classes the following Fall, or it may occur before the school year ends. It was found that some students who are mainstreamed early experience readjustment problems in their regular classes. Although projects are aimed at mainstreaming project participants, they are encouraged to do so carefully. It is recommended that projects define specific criteria for students to achieve so that termination and mainstreaming is positive for the students and the school. (36-37)
  
5. It is recommended that follow-up contacts be made with all project participants at regular intervals after their termination. This is encouraged for two primary reasons: (a) Follow-up information can document any problems which students may encounter after they leave the program. This information will enable project staff to more adequately prepare new students for their eventual reentry into classes. (b) Follow-up information can serve as a useful means for a project's self-evaluation. If a project's students maintain good behavior and attendance practices along with improved academic performance after their reentry into regular classes, the project may be regarded as successful. In addition, if students have no (further) contact with the juvenile justice system, the projects again may be regarded as successful.



### STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

Considerable attention has been devoted to the relationship between school failure and juvenile delinquency. Various private and public agencies have produced countless reports aimed at understanding the nature and extent of this relationship. Central to this understanding is the expectation that individuals who have contact with the juvenile justice system or later on, the criminal justice system, are likely to have a record of poor school performance, often accompanied by poor school attendance and behavior (President's Commission, 1967a: 69-74; National Advisory Committee, 1976: 101-28; Governor's Advisory Committee, 1977: 253-4, 256-7; U.S. Dept. of H.E.W., 1972: 6-10; Crime and Delinquency, July, 1978; Reckless and Dinitz, 1972: 3-41; Wenk, 1974). Poor academic performance, in turn, tends to damage self-esteem. An outcome of these inter-related problems of poor performance and low self-esteem is truancy and/or rebellion against school authorities.

It has been suggested that the school can decrease the likelihood of poor academic performance and delinquency by helping students gain a more positive self-image. One way of deterring delinquency is, thus, to improve academic performance. In terms of specific program proposals, it has been suggested that schools retain problem students rather than expel or suspend them, as is the current practice. The alternative school projects, then, will provide schools a positive environment in which problem students can be retained. The ultimate goal of such a program is to prevent juvenile delinquency.

#### DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM AREA

On the national level, recognition of the problem emerged in 1974 when Congress passed the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. This act recommended that states make funds available to public schools for the implementation of programs aimed at delinquent or pre-delinquent youth. High truancy rates, vandalism and other school-related offenses were defined as important national problems, worthy of attention and funding, because of their direct bearing on the criminal justice system (JJDP Act, 1974).

On the state level, the New Jersey State Law Enforcement Planning Agency responded to the JJDP Act with the development of the program area, Supportive Services for Students in Local Public Schools. Six separate projects were originally funded in this program area (N.J. State Criminal Justice Plans, 1976-78). The projects were designed to eliminate or discourage arbitrary expulsion and suspension of truant youth. Along those lines, the projects were intended to provide school administrators with the option of holding or retaining students in school. Under the supervision of specially selected project teachers, the youth would be involved in a classroom environment with a low student/teacher ratio, in which alternative educational curricula might be available on an individual basis, and which would be provided in an economical manner. It was also intended that these programs should utilize other existing community agencies to provide counseling, medical, vocational and other supplementary services should they be needed by the students. Overall, these projects would serve as a first step in providing special attention to selected junior high

school age students in public schools who would otherwise be ineligible for specially funded educational services and projects.

The portion of the school population likely to be included in these school projects represents students who have been identified as delinquent or pre-delinquent and who have already experienced a variety of failures in their school careers. Junior high school students were selected as the target population. This is the school level and age during which there is often a sharp increase in dropout rates and other school problems. Thus, it was felt that intervention would most benefit students of this school level and age, thereby maximizing the possibility of preventing juvenile delinquency problems. Since school attendance is only required by State law until age 16, the effectiveness of a later program would obviously be reduced.

The urban settings in which the public school projects are found contain large pockets of ethnic minority and economically disadvantaged individuals.\* The community services available to them are often inadequate and of poor quality. The schools which serve them also appear to fit this pattern (U.S. Dept. of Health, 1972:6). Classroom overcrowding, insufficient resources and facilities, and high student/teacher ratios characterize them. In addition, many students in the urban schools do not speak English as their native language, and this deficiency may create difficulties for them in their learning experiences. These social, cultural, and economic factors contribute to the need for the type of personal direction and instruction offered by the school projects funded by the New Jersey State Law Enforcement Planning Agency.

---

\*For demographic information related to the communities in which the four projects are located, please refer to the Appendix.

The following goals, as delineated in the Criminal Justice Plan for New Jersey - Applicants Guide: 1978 (87), were established for this program area:

1. To increase . . . the number of school districts where projects have been developed through assistance from this program area.
2. To increase to 300 the number of students receiving services as a result of this program area.
3. To provide projects within local school districts to help reduce vandalism, disruptive behavior, arbitrary suspension and truancy and which should be designed to encourage a positive learning environment for all students.
4. To create programs of community involvement within local public schools to provide alternatives for those juveniles who would otherwise be suspended or expelled from the ongoing school program.
5. To provide supportive services within local school districts that would encourage the educational progress of those unclassified students having difficulty adjusting in the traditional school setting.
6. To develop model projects which can be replicated in other school districts.

The goals of this program area specify the particular student problems and needs toward which project intervention is directed. In contrast, no clear set of daily operating procedures is specified in the program area goals. Therefore, the local school projects differ markedly from each other although the variations are in project staff, activities, facilities and budget rather than specific goal differences.

#### Focus of Program Area Evaluation

In order to evaluate this program area and four of the projects funded within it,\* a number of major assumptions were identified concerning routine project operation and the students who participate in these projects. These major assumptions served to focus this evaluation of the program area, Supportive Services for Students in Local Public Schools.

1. Delinquency prevention projects funded in the local public schools must respond to those students who are ineligible for special education projects and who perform well below average in school. These students usually have additional problems which characterize them as likely candidates for juvenile justice system involvement. Among these problems are truancy, suspensions, expulsions, voluntary dropouts,

---

\*It should be noted that five projects were in operation during fiscal year 1977 although only four participated in this evaluation. One project was excluded due to a variety of internal conditions which existed at the initial stages of the evaluation last year. Further, the research design of the evaluation did not readily lend itself to the daily operation of the school project in question. Therefore, the decision was made to exclude this project from the present evaluation.

anti-social behavior and vandalism. Schools must identify and keep records of the problems before they refer students to the school projects.

2. Students are referred to the school projects either from in-school or out-of-school sources. In-school referral agents are teachers, Child Study Team members and other school administrators. People who may refer students from outside of the school include representatives of juvenile courts, probation departments, social service agencies, parents or other family representatives. Voluntary self-referrals are also accepted. In order to assess external agencies' knowledge of project resources, information must be collected by the projects identifying the referral source for each student admission.
3. Upon admittance into the projects, the quantity and severity of students' problems must be assessed. Immediate academic testing will determine math and reading deficiencies so that individualized instruction can be administered. Personal histories and previous academic records should also be examined.
4. Projects must closely monitor student attendance practices, including excused and unexcused absences. In addition, records of students' suspensions and tardiness should be maintained.

5. Other community agencies that can provide services for the specific needs of clients should be identified and coordinated by the projects.
  
6. Student terminations should be made by project personnel when students show sufficient improvement or when the projects feel they no longer serve a useful purpose for the student. In either case, explicit termination criteria should be delineated by the projects and information collected for each student who is terminated from the project.

## METHODS

The implementation of an evaluation in the Supportive Services for Students in Local Public Schools Program Area progressed through many stages over the course of the past year. [The culmination of this effort yielded a data collection form which was to be completed by program administrators for each student enrolled in the school projects. This form, known as the Student Intake Form, was to be used as a record-keeping device on each student.] Upon entrance, the student's relevant background data is obtained. Subsequent math and reading test scores may be recorded as the tests are initially administered soon after project entrance.

Shortly after the student's arrival, the project administrator is asked to provide background information on a variety of topics. This information pertains to attendance patterns, suspension data and referrals to juvenile court or the family intake unit which have occurred in the year preceding the student's program enrollment. This information is continually updated during the course of the student's program involvement. Before the student leaves the program, final math and reading scores and the reason for program termination are also entered onto the Student Intake Form. The result should be a detailed record of the student's performance for the periods both immediately before entering the program and while in the program.

Aside from monitoring student progress as described above, the evaluation process also consisted of periodic site visits, observation of class proceedings and interviews with project personnel. In all cases, an attempt was made to develop and maintain a simple and easily managed data collection



process, whether it occurred in the interviews or on the actual data collection forms. Throughout all stages of data collection, collaboration of project staff was considered to be of a high priority.

Collection of the data was hampered by the mismatch between the time schedule of the school projects and the time schedule of the evaluation study. The school projects, of course, operate according to the normal academic year. The evaluation study, on the other hand, did not begin until December and additional time was necessary for the construction of the Student Intake Forms. Consequently, the school projects were well underway before the distribution of the forms to the project administrators. As a result, pre-entrance data for individual students were more difficult to obtain and were subject to the type of distortion common to all data which is collected on events after they have occurred. This also increased the amount of missing and unavailable data, the implications of which will be more fully discussed in the data analysis section.

Analysis of project and student outcome will be the next topic considered. These are a result of information obtained in two ways: the Student Intake Forms and personal interviews with project staff. Emphasis will be placed on project differentiation as it pertains to the overall program area evaluation. In all cases, data interpretations will be made within the context of the program area's major assumptions, identified in an earlier section of the report.

## PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS

This section will give an overview of the four projects which participated in the evaluation of the Supportive Services for Students in Local Public Schools program area. The main features of each project will be described, with particular emphasis on the major differences which exist among the projects.

1. Alternative Education Program for Camden City - This project is the only one of the four which owns and occupies an entire building, thereby providing space for a variety of facilities in addition to four available classrooms. The building which houses the Camden School Project is located in the downtown area near Rutgers University. It is accessible to the students through public transportation or walking. Contained in the school are the four classrooms, a woodworking shop, a darkroom, one office, a lounge and a cafeteria. In addition to the project director/head teacher, the professional staff consists of two teachers, one teacher/counselor, one reading specialist and one teacher's aide.

Activities normally occupy a full day, with academic classes conducted in the mornings and electives and remedial classes occurring in the afternoons. Biweekly individual counseling sessions which last an hour are scheduled with each student for the purpose of discussions on behavioral and educational development. Weekly group counseling sessions involving groups of ten students also take place. In addition, physical recreation, camping and other cultural field trips are scheduled as regular activities in the school program.

2. The Learning Center of Elizabeth - This project is located within the Grover Cleveland Junior High School, Elizabeth's largest junior high school. The project director is the only full-time staff member who serves as the project's head teacher. Six additional teachers work in the Learning Center during their free period and two teacher's aides who are supported with Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (C.E.T.A.) funds complete the staff. The physical make-up of the project site consists of two rooms, one classroom which is used for teaching and another room which is used for private or group counseling sessions, parent meetings or other small conferences. The junior high school is located on the outskirts of the community, yet this does not pose any apparent transportation difficulties for the students.

The Learning Center operates on individual periods for the project's students. There is a capacity for up to ten students each period. Remedial education and diagnostic services are provided. Individual and group counseling is available through the Union County Youth Service Bureau. In addition to counseling, the Youth Service Bureau also accommodates the Learning Center's students in recreational activities after school. Students may come to the Learning Center for a different number of periods each day. The duration of their stay in the program varies according to each student, although students have remained as brief as four weeks or as long as the entire school year. The project also serves the school by providing a short term, in-school alternative to suspension. In addition, the project serves the student with an intimate educational environment, where a student to teacher ratio is 3 to 1. Field trips are scheduled each Friday for those students whose preceding week's attendance was perfect.

3. Redshaw Educational Alternative Program of New Brunswick - New Brunswick's school project operates two classes, a separate seventh grade and a separate eighth grade class. Two teachers and one teacher's aide comprise the staff. The project is located in the Chester Redshaw School which is the city's only middle school. It is conveniently located in the middle of New Brunswick. Two classrooms, located in an area apart from the regular school program, are the only in-school facilities set aside for the Learning Center. Any private conferences or counseling done inside the school take place in borrowed rooms.

The morning schedule consists of four instructional periods in regular academic subjects. Three afternoons per week are devoted to gym, health and other elective activities. In the remaining two afternoons, the students attend individual and group counseling provided by the New Brunswick Community Youth Services Center. Field trips are also scheduled for Learning Center students. A maximum of twenty-five students may be enrolled in the project at any one time. A few students may attend one or two classes in the regular school, but in general, most students spend their entire day with the Learning Center project. A unique feature of this project is the involvement of two probation officers from the Middlesex County Probation Department who participate in counseling sessions both at the school and at the Community Youth Services Center.

4. Orange Alternative Education Program - Orange's program rents space in the local YMCA for its classrooms and facilities. Two rooms are available; one is used strictly for classes and the other is primarily an office but is used for classroom instruction, when needed. The YMCA is located in the center of the community and is easily accessible to all students.

The project director does not participate in the daily program. However, she is available for private student counseling sessions in addition to frequent meetings with the two, full-time staff members. One teacher and one teacher/social worker carry on the daily operation of the project.

A maximum of twelve students are enrolled at any one time in the school project. Some participate for an entire day although most attend the regular school for at least part of each day. Students take gym, lunch and certain electives at the regular school and attend the project for basic academic instruction, group and individual counseling. Field trips are regularly planned for the students. Prior to termination from the project, students are mainstreamed back into their regular classes for a half day at a time. This is done to ease their readjustment into regular school.

## DATA ANALYSIS

This section will consist of several parts. First, the background of the four student populations will be described. Next, a number of measures will be examined which serve as indicators of individual student's performance within the projects. These measures, taken from the Student Intake Forms, are the basis for comparative assessments of the students before and after their involvement in the projects. Throughout this section, data which was obtained in personal interviews with the project staffs will be included. Implications of the findings will be discussed as they pertain to the individual projects and to the program area, in general.

### Student Backgrounds: Sex, Ethnic Background, Age at Intake, Highest Grade Completed, Family and Probation Status

Inspection of Tables 1 and 2 reveals some striking similarities of the students' backgrounds in the four projects. Well over half of the students in each project are male, and at least two out of every three students are Black. The ethnic background of these students reflects the ethnic make-up of the schools in which the projects operate.

Most project students range in age from thirteen to fifteen years old. In New Brunswick and Orange, all of the students were in the seventh or eighth grades. There is a wide distribution of the highest grades completed by the Camden project students. This is explained by the fact that Camden's alternative school is non-graded and upon entrance into it, students are not assigned to a particular grade level based on their past school records. Thus, students who attend the project in Camden represent a variety of ages and grades. The large percentage of students in all projects who are between

Table 1 :  
SEX, ETHNIC BACKGROUND AND  
AGE AT INTAKE OF STUDENTS

	Camden		Elizabeth		New Brunswick		Orange	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Sex</b>								
Male	66	75	26	67	18	69	13	65
Female	22	25	13	33	8	31	7	35
Totals	88	100	39	100	26	100	20	100
<b>Ethnic Background</b>								
White	0	0	2	5	0	0	5	25
Black	66	75	32	82	18	69	15	75
Hispanic	21	24	5	13	8	31	0	0
Other	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	88	100	39	100	26	100	20	100
<b>Age at Intake*</b>								
18 or Older	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
17	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0
16	17	19	0	0	0	0	0	0
15	25	29	6	15	3	12	5	25
14	15	17	17	44	12	46	7	35
13	10	11	16	41	6	23	6	30
12	8	9	0	0	4	15	1	5
11	1	1	0	0	1	4	1	5
Missing Information	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	88	100	39	100	26	100	20	100

\*Age at intake was based on year of birth as contained on the Student Intake Form

Table 2:

HIGHEST GRADE COMPLETED, FAMILY AND  
PROBATION STATUS OF STUDENTS

	Camden		Elizabeth		New Brunswick		Orange	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Highest Grade Completed</b>								
5th or less	20	23	0	0	0	0	0	0
6th	17	20	0	0	12	46	8	40
7th	26	30	28	74	14	54	12	60
8th	14	16	10	26	0	0	0	0
9th	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0
10th	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Family Status</b>								
Two Parents	25	29	13	33	10	38	9	45
One Parent	58	66	25	64	15	58	7	35
Relative/ Guardian	3	3	1	3	0	0	3	15
Foster Care	2	2	0	0	1	4	0	0
Resident/ Institution	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Probation Status</b>								
On Probation	25	29	4	16	7	27	2	10
Not On Probation	62	71	21	84	19	73	18	90
<b>Total</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>100</b>



thirteen and sixteen and of junior high school grade level may be explained by the eligibility requirements of the four projects.

Less than half of the students in any of the projects have two parents. In all projects but Orange, the majority of the students live in a single-parent family. The student's probation status was also requested on the Student Intake Form, although formal documentation from county probation departments was not required. A minority of the students in all four projects reported that they were on probation when they entered the program.

#### Source of Referral

The source of referral indicates the individual or agency having the greatest responsibility for sending a student to the school projects. As previously stated, both in-school and out-of-school agents initiate these referrals. Examination of Table 3 reveals that all of the referrals in New Brunswick and Orange and 94% of those in Elizabeth were made by people located within the school. The Camden project, too, receives its greatest percentage of referrals from school sources, although many student referrals were received from non-school sources. One male volunteered himself for participation in the Elizabeth project. Although other students may have sought self-referrals, project records documented only one approved student request for admittance.

A number of implications may be drawn from the above findings. It is expected that the schools are responsible for the greatest number of referrals. School teachers and administrators would most likely be the first to detect the school-related problems characteristic of potential project participants.

Table 3:

SOURCE OF REFERRAL FOR STUDENTS BY PROJECT

Referral Source	Camden		Elizabeth		New Brunswick		Orange	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
School	55	64	37	94	26	100	20	100
Court/Probation	16	19	1	3	--	--	--	--
Social Service Agency	14	16	--	--	--	--	--	--
Parent/Home	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--
Self-Referral	--	--	1	3	--	--	--	--
Total	86	100	39	100	26	100	20	100

In a similar vein, the low number of out-of-school referrals occurs because three of the four projects serve only one school in the community. Therefore, they have little contact with community service agencies and other out-of-school individuals who could make project referrals.

### Changes in Math and Reading Scores

The data discussed in this section represent the changes in math and reading test scores for the four project populations. Upon entrance into the program, students are tested for math and reading skills; upon exit or termination, the same tests are administered once again. The difference between the two scores represents the amount of change which has occurred in the student's math and reading skills between the two measurement points.

Each of the projects used different instruments to test their students. Whereas some of the tests measure the results in grade levels, others calculate the results in percentages. Consequently, students' test scores are not comparable from one project to another. Thus, they are presented separately in this section according to specific project populations.

As will be seen in the following tables, students participated in the alternative school programs for varying lengths of time, anywhere from a month to more than a full academic year (180 days). For this reason, the students' skill changes and improvements appear in Tables 6 through 13 based on the length of time in which they were enrolled in their respective projects.

It should also be noted that the following analysis excludes nearly half of the students who participated in the school projects. If a student is not tested upon entrance or, more commonly, upon exit from the project, then a difference in his/her test skills cannot be documented. Very often, a student departed from the project prematurely and may have done so without the explicit approval of the project director. In these instances, it was

often impossible to administer final tests. Therefore, if only one score were reported for a student, his/her case was excluded from analysis.

1. Camden: The data contained in Table 4 present the changes which occurred on the math scores of 23 Camden students who were given math skill tests at the beginning and end of their project participation. (This figure represents only 26% of the total of the project's students.) The instrument used to evaluate the students in math is the Wide Range Achievement Test (math sub-test). It is a timed, individually administered test which measures skills from a basic computational level upwards to advanced math skills. The range of the test is .5 to 16.3 which is coordinated with grade level. Thus, if a student earns a score of 4.5 it may be said that his/her skills are comparable with those expected midway through the fourth year in school. The test is based upon standardized national norms.

As can be seen in Table 4, the range of student math scores varied from a low score of 3.0 (third grade level) at the initial testing to a high score of 9.4 (ninth grade, fourth month) at the final testing. The average improvement for this entire group of students was slightly over one grade level. As expected, the students who remained in the program for the longest period scored the largest improvement.

The reading test used by Camden's project is the Silent Reading Comprehension Test which is a non-standardized test which measures gross levels of comprehension achievement. Scores vary in range from two to eight, and do not coordinate with grade levels. Thus, if a student scores on the fourth level, information must be gathered for diagnosis from the nature of the material itself. A score below the second level indicates severe reading problems which require further testing.

Table 4 :

AVERAGE CHANGE IN CAMDEN'S STUDENTS' \*  
MATH SCORES FROM TIME 1 TO TIME 2

Length Of Time In Program	Number Of Students	Range In Scores From Time 1 To Time 2	Average Change Per Student
Less Than 100 Days	--	--	--
101-125 Days	2	4.5-6.0	.8
126-150 Days	1	5.3-5.9	.6
151-180 Days	20	3.0-9.4	1.2
181 Days Or More	--	--	--
Total	23	3.0-9.4	1.1

Table 5 :

AVERAGE CHANGE IN CAMDEN'S STUDENTS' \*  
READING SCORES FROM TIME 1 TO TIME 2

Length Of Time In Program	Number Of Students	Range In Scores From Time 1 To Time 2	Average Change Per Student
Less Than 100 Days	1	7-7	No Change
101-125 Days	--	--	--
126-150 Days	1	5-6	1
151-180 Days	21	1-9	.7
181 Days Or More	--	--	--
Total	23	1-9	.7

\*The average number of days the Camden students were enrolled in the project was 171 days.

The data in Table 5 show that the average amount of change which occurred among those Camden students who took the initial and final reading test was just over a half grade level. Their scores ranged from the first level of reading to the ninth, although they do not correspond to grade levels. The one student who participated in the program less than 100 days made no improvement on the reading test.

2. Elizabeth: The math diagnostic test used by this project produces scores composed of ten levels, each having five or more skills within it. The data in Table 6 present the change scores for the Elizabeth students, all of whom were administered this test at project entrance and termination. Aside from those nine students who participated in the project for less than 100 days, the remaining 30 students produced a pattern with the changes in their math skills. It appears, on the basis of this information, that the longer the students remained in the project, the larger was their average change on the math tests. Again, a wide variance was noted among their initial and final test scores, which ranged from a low score of 2.5 to a high score of 12.1.

All 39 of Elizabeth's students were also given reading tests upon their entrance and exit from the project. The test which is used is a diagnostic reading test which produces scores of whole levels ranging from five to twelve. The figures in Table 7 represent the average level changes on students' reading skills between the two test times. As can be seen, the average improvement for the students was one level, regardless of the amount of time in which they were enrolled in the program.

3. New Brunswick: The math testing instrument used in this project is the same Wide Range Achievement Test as the one used in Camden. A total of

Table 6 :

AVERAGE CHANGE IN ELIZABETH'S STUDENTS' \*  
MATH SCORES FROM TIME 1 TO TIME 2

Length Of Time In Program	Number Of Students	Range In Scores From Time 1 To Time 2	Average Change Per Student
Less Than 100 Days	9	3.3-12.0	2.4
101-125 Days	4	6.0-9.0	1.0
126-150 Days	13	4.3-12.1	1.8
151-180 Days	10	2.5-11.0	2.6
181 Days Or More	3	5.0-12.0	3.2
Total	39	2.5-12.1	2.2

Table 7 :

AVERAGE CHANGE IN ELIZABETH'S STUDENTS' \*  
READING SCORES FROM TIME 1 TO TIME 2

Length Of Time In Program	Number Of Students	Range In Scores From Time 1 To Time 2	Average Change Per Student
Less Than 100 Days	9	5-8	1
101-125 Days	4	5-9	1
126-150 Days	13	5-12	2
151-180 Days	10	5-9	1
181 Days Or More	3	5-8	1
Total	39	5-12	1

\*The average number of days the Elizabeth students were enrolled in the project was 133 days.

Table 8 :

AVERAGE CHANGE IN NEW BRUNSWICK'S STUDENTS' \*  
MATH SCORES FROM TIME 1 TO TIME 2

Length Of Time In Program	Number Of Students	Range In Scores From Time 1 To Time 2	Average Change Per Student
Less Than 100 Days	--	--	--
101-125 Days	3	3.4-7.7	1.5
126-150 Days	1	2.9-4.9	2.0
151-180 Days	13	1.5-6.8	1.5
181 Days Or More	--	--	--
Total	17	1.5-7.7	1.5

Table 9 :

AVERAGE CHANGE IN NEW BRUNSWICK'S STUDENTS' \*  
READING SCORES FROM TIME 1 TO TIME 2

Length Of Time In Program	Number Of Students	Range In Scores From Time 1 To Time 2	Average Change Per Student
Less Than 100 Days	--	--	--
101-125 Days	3	3.5-7.3	.5
126-150 Days	1	4.8-5.4	.6
151-180 Days	13	.5-7.9	.9
181 Days Or More	--	--	--
Total	17	.5-7.9	.8

\*The average number of days the New Brunswick students were enrolled in the project was 164 days.



17 students in the New Brunswick project (65% of that project's participants) were tested twice in math. As presented in Table 8, the average change per student was one and a half grade levels. Their range of scores varied from a low score of 1.5 (first grade, fifth month) to a high score of 7.7 (seventh grade, seventh month).

The same type of instrument was used to test reading skills of New Brunswick's project students. Table 9 shows that the average reading score was improved by less than a full level, although the improvements tended to increase the longer the students remained in the program.

4. Orange: The math test administered to the project students is a diagnostic test developed by Orange Middle School personnel. The test provides a grade score based on 100 items. The three basic areas covered by this test are content (numeration, fractions and symbols), operation (addition, subtraction, multiplication, division and mental computation) and application (word problems, missing elements, money, measurement and time). In each area, items are arranged in order of increasing difficulty. The student's test performance is derived from subtracting the total amount incorrect from 100. Table 10 presents differences computed between the first testing and the second for the nine students who were tested both times. The six students who stayed in the program the longest improved over four times more than the three students who left the program after a brief enrollment. On the average, the students improved their original test scores by 17 points. The range for these tests varied from a low score of 12 (out of 100) to a high score of 96 (out of 100).

The reading and language arts test used in Orange was also developed

Table 10 :

AVERAGE CHANGE IN ORANGE'S STUDENTS' \*  
MATH SCORES FROM TIME 1 TO TIME 2

Length Of Time In Program	Number Of Students	Range In Scores From Time 1 To Time 2	Average Change Per Student
Less Than 100 Days	3	50-68	4
101-125 Days	--	--	--
126-150 Days	6	12-96	23
151-180 Days	--	--	--
181 Days Or More	--	--	--
Total	9	12-96	17

Table 11 :

AVERAGE CHANGE IN ORANGE'S STUDENTS'  
READING SCORES FROM TIME 1 TO TIME 2

Length Of Time In Program	Number Of Students	Range In Scores From Time 1 To Time 2	Average Change Per Student
Less Than 100 Days	3	50-88	6
101-125 Days	--	--	--
126-150 Days	6	20-88	26
151-180 Days	--	--	--
181 Days Or More	--	--	--
Total	9	20-88	19

\*The average number of days the Orange students were enrolled in the projects was 113 days.

by Orange Middle School personnel. It consists of word identification, passage comprehension, sentence structure, grammatical usage, spelling, punctuation and capitalization. One hundred items are contained on the test. A student's test performance is derived from subtracting the total amount incorrect from 100. The data in Table 11 shows that the average reading score improved 19 points among the nine students who were tested both initially and at termination. As with their math tests, those six students who participated the longest seemed to improve the most.

To summarize these findings, on the average, academic improvements were noted in all of the projects among the students who had been tested upon their project entrance and, again, upon termination. Overall, approximately half of all students who were enrolled in the projects took both sets of tests.

At first sight, the academic gains measured in this section might seem modest, since students should be expected to improve their academic skills for each year they are in school. However, the students in these projects quite likely perform below average on all academic skills and the improvements in math and reading for these students are positive. Furthermore, many of these students have such low skill levels that one full year of improvement may exceed their previous two or three years of achievement. Although the reading scores are not as high as the math scores, reading deficiencies may not be easily overcome in one year. It may also be that reading tests, when repeated, do not capture slight changes which occur over the course of the year. Many of these students are sufficiently impaired in their reading skills so that one year of instruction may be an inadequate amount of time for major changes to occur. In either case, improvement was found among students in all four projects and this finding is a merit of the program area.

### School Behavior and Attendance Figures

The data discussed in this section represent the average changes in attendance and suspension figures for the populations in all four projects. The two points of comparison were: (1) the period of time spent immediately before a student's entrance into the project, and (2) the period of time the student spent in the program. The project administrators who completed the forms were asked to compare, whenever possible, equal periods of time, so that for a student who was in the program for an entire year, one year before involvement should be used as the period of comparison. In this way, it was possible to compare attendance and suspension figures during the period of the student's involvement to an equal period of time before the student was involved in the project.

Four separate measures will be discussed in this section, two which assess student behavior and the other two which measure student attendance. Times suspended counts the suspension incidents in which a student was involved. Days suspended counts the number of days a student was out of the classroom due to suspensions, although the separate number of incidents is not considered. Days absent includes the total days the student was absent from school whereas unexcused absences counts the absences which occurred without written or verbal acknowledgement of a parent or guardian.

It should be noted, however, that some of this information was not available to the projects and, therefore, could not be used in an assessment of student performance. These figures were not collected in the pre-project enrollment periods of many students. Similarly, during project operation, some of this information was not recorded. For instance, Camden's

staff routinely discourages all suspensions. Consequently, they reported virtually no suspension incidents or days of suspension for the students in that project.

Camden: As mentioned above, suspension data was not reported by the staff. Unexcused absences were also unavailable in the students' past records so that a comparison to similar data during project participation was, likewise, impossible. Information on days absent, however, was available for 50 of the project's 87 students (58% of total project enrollment). An average decrease of 1.1% in the rate of attendance was found from the pre-involvement period (Time 1) to the project involvement period (Time 2). This means that, on the average, the students' rate of attendance in school was slightly lower while they were enrolled in the project than it was before they entered it. The decrease, however, is minimal which suggests that factors such as inclement weather could account for the minor variation. In general, one could conclude that Camden's students' attendance rates remained the same while they were project participants, although we are unable to assess improvement in their suspension behavior.

Elizabeth: All four measures of behavior and attendance showed improvements while the Elizabeth students were project enrollees. On all measures but unexcused absences, comparative data were available for nearly every student in the project. On the fourth, unexcused absences, information was usually not collected by the school prior to the students' participation in the program.

Elizabeth's project students showed small improvements in their rates of suspension incidents and days suspended while they participated in the program. The most noteworthy gains made by these students occurred in their attendance records. On the average, the students were absent 10.3% less time once they

enrolled in the project. Those students who had available information on unexcused absences improved their records over the previous year by about 11%.

New Brunswick: Like Elizabeth's students, the New Brunswick students showed improvements in their behavior and attendance. The more dramatic improvements occurred on the absent days and unexcused absences than on the suspension data. For these students, the amount of time during their project enrollment which was consumed by suspensions was about 4% less than in their previous year of school. An average improvement of 16% was computed for unexcused absences, which means that greater parental cooperation existed along with better student attendance practices once these students became project participants.

Orange: Many of the students in the Orange project had missing data on all measures except days absent from their year before project entrance. For the ten students on whom suspension information was available, suspension rates remained virtually unchanged. Nearly all of the students had comparative attendance figures, however, and their records revealed a slight improvement in days absent during project enrollment. In contrast, the rate for Orange's students on unexcused absences was a little worse when they were in the program compared to their pre-project enrollment period.

In conclusion, the available data show slight gains made by most students. Table 12, which presents the aggregate findings for the four projects, has been included. As can be seen, the attendance rates generally show more substantial improvements than do the suspension rates. This suggests that students spend more time in school and, similarly, appear to behave slightly better, as noted by improvements in suspension rates.

Table 12 :

SUMMARY OF AVERAGE BEHAVIOR AND ATTENDANCE CHANGES

Measures	Camden*		Elizabeth		New Brunswick		Orange	
	Number Of Students	Percent Rate	Number Of Students	Percent Rate	Number Of Students	Percent Rate	Number Of Students	Percent Rate
Times Suspended	--	--	37	1.3	24	3.7	10	-0.5
Days Suspended	--	--	37	5.4	24	1.6	10	-1.5
Days Absent	50	-1.1	36	10.3	24	7.0	19	2.4
Unexcused Absences**	--	--	7	13.8	24	16.1	9	-2.6

\*The lack of data from the Camden project is due to their practice of not suspending students from their program.

\*\*Pre-project truancy and unexcused absence information was not routinely recorded for students by three of the four schools in which the projects are located. As a result, data is scarce for all project students but those in New Brunswick.

---

Note: Table 12 contains data on rates of change in student behavior and attendance patterns between pre-involvement and during-involvement periods. A positive number indicates the percent of improvement; a negative number indicates the percent of deterioration or worsening in the suspension or absentee rate among the students who had comparative data. For example, thirty-seven Elizabeth students had comparative data on the number of times they were suspended both before their program enrollment and during it. As seen in Table 12, a change of 1.3% was calculated for their suspension rate meaning that the average improvement in suspensions was 1.3% better than the preceding period of time. In contrast, the 50 Camden students who had comparative absence information had a change of -1.1% meaning their attendance was 1.1% worse when they were in the program than before they entered it.

Reason for Termination

The final piece of information requested on the Student Intake Forms concerned the student's termination from the project. Examination of Table 13 reveals that the largest percentage of students in all four projects terminated from the project at the end of the school year. Further, many of those in Camden and in New Brunswick actually did not terminate. Rather, their enrollments were extended for another year in the following fall semester.

Table 13 :

REASON FOR TERMINATION OF STUDENTS

Reason	Camden		Elizabeth		New Brunswick		Orange	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
School Year Ended	45	52	35	90.0	18	68	14	70
Reentered Classes	9	10.5	1	2.5	2	8	3	15
Reentered Classes With Improvement Noted	9	10.5	1	2.5	--	--	--	--
Transferred To Other Educational Facility	6	7	--	--	3	12	--	--
Moved From School District	3	4	1	2.5	1	4	3	15
Dropped Out Of School	8	9	--	--	--	--	--	--
Incarcerated	6	7	--	--	1	4	--	--
Other	--	--	1	2.5	1	4	--	--
Total	86	100	39	100	26	100	20	100

Missing Information = 2



A variety of other termination reasons were included on the forms, but it seems that most students did not terminate for any reason other than the arrival of the end of the year. In Camden, a handful of students dropped out of school or were incarcerated, but they represent a small minority of students. Therefore, these termination reasons must be seen as unimportant.

Overall, it appears that projects were not in the practice of terminating students before the end of the year. However, this stands in direct contrast to an expressed aim of these projects, which was to mainstream students into regular classes as early as possible. In an attempt to explain this inconsistency, some project staff expressed concern for those terminated students who had experienced problems after reentering the regular school program. It appears that some project students had experienced a lack of acceptance in school which was a result of their being stereotyped as "problem" or "special" students. Project students' reputations might predetermine that they will encounter reentry difficulties and, therefore, could explain the tendency of projects to keep their students enrolled for the entire academic year.

### SUMMARY

The four school projects examined in this report provided appropriate services to the students who were enrolled in their programs. Students were tested and given individualized academic instruction. Additional time in the projects was consumed by field visits, counseling and other activities designed to motivate students and build their enthusiasm for school. It was found that students' academic performance improved slightly during project enrollment. In addition, students' attendance practices were found to be better than they were in a comparable period of time prior to project enrollment. Insofar as the projects monitored behavior, students' suspensions were minimally improved. It is along a non-measurable dimension, however, where the most worthwhile effect of this program area may be realized. Many of these students would have dropped out or been truant from school had they not had these projects to attend. Thus, the projects held students in school where they could improve their personal, social and academic skills. In general, then, to the extent that these projects strive to prevent juvenile delinquency, they appear to be effective in pursuit of this goal.

REFERENCES

Crime and Delinquency, Volume 24, Number 3. July, 1978.

Criminal Justice Plan for New Jersey, 1976. The New Jersey State Law Enforcement Planning Agency. Dissemination Document #21.

Criminal Justice Plan for New Jersey, 1977. The New Jersey State Law Enforcement Planning Agency. Dissemination Document #24.

Criminal Justice Plan for New Jersey - Applicants Guide, 1978. The New Jersey State Law Enforcement Planning Agency. Dissemination Document #28.

Governor's Adult and Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee. Standards and Goals for the New Jersey Criminal Justice System: Final Report. New Jersey State Law Enforcement Planning Agency. Dissemination Document No. 27. 1977.

National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. A National Strategy to Reduce Crime. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973 (e).

National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. Criminal Justice System. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973 (d).

National Advisory Committee on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention - Report of the Task Force on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976.

President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967 (a).

President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. Task Force Report - Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967 (b).

Reckless, Walter C. and Dinitz, Simon. The Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency--An Experiment. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 1972.

State of New Jersey. Office of Business Economics, Division of Planning and Research, New Jersey Department of Labor and Industry. Minority Population and Density by Municipality. June, 1974.

State of New Jersey. Office of Demographic and Economic Analysis. Division of Planning and Research. Per Capita Money Income for New Jersey. May 17, 1978.

State of New Jersey. Office of Management Information, Division of Administration and Finance, New Jersey Department of Education. New Jersey Public School Racial/Ethnic Data, 1977-1978. May, 1978.

Uniform Crime Reports: Crime in New Jersey - 1976. Trenton: State of New Jersey, Division of State Police Uniform Crime Reporting Unit, 1976.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration. Delinquency Prevention Through Youth Development. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972.

Wenk, Ernst A. Schools and Delinquency Prevention. Hackensack, New Jersey: National Council on Crime and Delinquency. June, 1974.

APPENDIX

Community Demographics

Table A-1 is inserted to give an overview of the communities in which the projects are located. In general, they are all urbanized communities. Estimated density of each community's population is high while per capita average incomes are all under \$5,000, a figure well below the poverty level.

Data on the ethnic makeup of the projects' communities is included in Table A-2. As can be seen, over one-third of Orange's and Camden's populations are Black whereas Elizabeth's and New Brunswick's Blacks number less than one-quarter of their total populations. In each community, less than seven per cent of the total population is Hispanic or any "other" ethnic group. For all four communities, the predominant ethnic group is White. It should be noted, however, that Blacks and Hispanics are the predominant ethnic groups in the schools from which project students are drawn.

Table     A-1     :

JURISDICTION DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Jurisdiction	1976 Estimated Population <sup>1</sup>	1976 Estimated Density Per Square Mile	1974 Average Income <sup>2</sup>	Index Crime Rate Per 100,000 <sup>3</sup>
Camden	100,535	11,582.4	3,207	9,852.2
Elizabeth	114,685	9,810.5	4,681	7,756.0
New Brunswick	42,790	7,780.0	4,267	10,530.5
Orange	33,300	15,136.4	4,778	10,843.8

1. State of New Jersey, Uniform Crime Reports: 1976. pp. 10-25.
2. Office of Demographic & Economic Analysis, Division of Planning and Research, State of New Jersey. Per Capita Income for New Jersey, May, 1977.
3. State of New Jersey, Uniform Crime Reports: 1976. pp. 108-35.

Table       A-2       :

ETHNIC BACKGROUND OF POPULATION (NUMBER AND PER CENT)  
BY JURISDICTION, 1970<sup>1</sup>

Ethnic Background	Camden		Elizabeth		New Brunswick		Orange	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
White	54,779	54	90,795	80	30,311	72	20,596	63
Black	40,132	39	17,480	16	9,517	23	11,630	36
Hispanic	6,526	6	3,351	3	1,481	4	35	--
Other	1,114	1	1,028	1	576	1	305	1
Total	102,551	100	112,654	100	41,885	100	32,566	100

<sup>1</sup>Office of Business Economics, Division of Planning & Research, New Jersey Department of Labor & Industry. Minority Population and Density by Municipality. June, 1974.



Social Characteristics of Municipal School Systems

Tables A-3 and A-4 contain information regarding the general school populations of the municipalities in which the four school projects are located. Table A-3 shows that in all four cities the largest ethnic group in the public schools is Black, although in Elizabeth, nearly equal percentages of students are White, Black and Hispanic. The data in Table A-4 reveal that the sex and ethnic background of the reported dropouts from the public schools are somewhat similar. In all cities but Elizabeth, a higher percentage of Black students are dropouts from the public schools than are White or Hispanic students.

Table     A-3     :

ETHNIC BACKGROUND OF PUBLIC SCHOOL STUDENT ENROLLMENT  
(NUMBER AND PER CENT) BY SEX AND JURISDICTION, 1977<sup>1</sup>

Ethnic Background And Sex	Orange		Elizabeth		New Brunswick		Orange	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
White								
Male	1,116	11	2,529	32	360	14	289	13
Female	1,094	11	2,277	32	328	13	249	12
Total	2,210	11	4,806	32	688	14	538	12
Black								
Male	6,637	66	2,696	35	1,610	64	1,884	83
Female	6,341	65	2,585	36	1,575	64	1,750	84
Total	12,978	65	5,281	35	3,185	64	3,634	83
Hispanic								
Male	2,347	23	2,444	31	528	21	68	3
Female	2,341	24	2,136	30	553	22	72	3
Total	4,688	24	4,580	31	1,081	22	140	3
Other								
Male	10	.1	114	1	22	1	26	1
Female	12	.1	116	2	13	1	19	1
Total	22	.1	230	2	35	1	45	1
Total								
Male	10,110	51	7,783	52	2,520	51	2,267	52
Female	9,788	49	7,114	48	2,469	49	2,090	48
Total	19,898	100	14,897	100	4,989	100	4,357	100

<sup>1</sup>Office of Management Information, Division of Administration and Finance, New Jersey Department of Education, New Jersey Public School Racial/Ethnic Data, 1977-1978, May, 1978.

Table A-4 :

ETHNIC BACKGROUND OF PUBLIC SCHOOL STUDENT REPORTED DROPOUTS  
(NUMBER AND PER CENT) BY SEX AND JURISDICTION, 1977<sup>1</sup>

Ethnic Background And Sex	Camden		Elizabeth		New Brunswick		Orange	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
White								
Male	25	14	64	34	11	9	10	30
Female	16	11	52	44	19	21	6	29
Total	41	13	116	38	30	14	16	29
Black								
Male	111	63	59	31	81	69	23	68
Female	90	66	31	26	62	70	14	67
Total	201	64	90	29	143	69	37	67
Hispanic								
Male	41	23	61	32	26	22	1	3
Female	31	23	34	29	8	9	1	5
Total	72	23	95	31	34	16	2	4
Other								
Male	--	--	7	4	--	--	--	--
Female	--	--	1	1	--	--	--	--
Total	--	--	8	3	--	--	--	--
Total								
Male	177	56	191	62	118	57	34	62
Female	137	44	118	38	89	43	21	38
Total	314	100	309	100	207	100	55	100

<sup>1</sup>Office of Management Information, Division of Administration and Finance, New Jersey Department of Education, New Jersey Public School Racial/Ethnic Data, 1977-1978, May, 1978.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE COMPLETION OF DATA COLLECTION FORMS:

1. Information is to be recorded for all students enrolled in the school program, regardless of their entry date.
2. Each form is to include the appropriate jurisdiction identification numbers:

<u>Project</u>	<u>Jurisdiction Number</u>
Camden	1
Elizabeth	2
New Brunswick	3
Orange	4

3. Each form is also to include a unique three digit client identification number which may range from 001 to 999. The client identification number is to be assigned by the school director or head teacher.
4. Fill out one form for each student enrolled in the program. For those students who participated in the program for the entire preceding year and who participated again this year, fill out two forms, one for each year of their involvement. Assign different client identification numbers on each form. For easy identification of those continuing students, add 100 to the first identification number assigned. For example, John Jones is assigned #051 last year; this year he is assigned #151.
5. The numbers which appear in parentheses are for computer purposes and should be disregarded.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR SPECIFIC QUESTIONS ON DATA COLLECTION FORMS:

1. Highest Grade Completed: Code the number of the highest (most recent grade) completed by the student. For instance, a student now enrolled in the 8th grade probably has completed up through the 7th grade. Therefore, an 07 will be recorded in the appropriate boxes for the question. 19 will be recorded only when that information is not known.
2. Months Enrolled in Program Last Year: Record the exact number of months in which the student participated in the program the previous year. 0 should be recorded if the student did not participate the preceding year.
3. First Day in Program: The date of the first school day this year should be recorded if the student has attended the program since the start of this academic year.
4. Math and Reading Score: Record the appropriate numbers, eliminating any decimal points. For instance, a grade level of 5.2 should be recorded as 052. A grade of 85 should be recorded as 085.
5. Last Day in Program: The final date in which the student attended the program should be recorded. If this date is the final day of the school year, record that date.
6. Times Suspended: Record the total number of suspension incidents, disregarding the length of each suspension. If a student was suspended one time for ten days, 001 should be recorded.

7. Days Suspended: Record the total number of days suspended, disregarding the number of incidents. If a student was suspended a total of twelve days, 012 should be recorded.
8. Days Absent: Record the total numbers of days which the student was absent from school. This number should include excused and unexcused absences.
9. Absences Excused: Record the total number of days absent which were accounted for by parental excuse, either verbal or written.
10. Juvenile Court/Intake Referrals: Record the total number of referrals made to juvenile court and family intake for the student.
11. The period of time DURING PROGRAM INVOLVEMENT should approximate the period of time PRIOR TO PROGRAM INVOLVEMENT. However, the number of days considered in each period may vary slightly. The chart below illustrates the method for counting school days within pre-involvement and involvement periods.

<u>ENTRANCE DATE</u>	<u>PRE-INVOLVEMENT PERIOD</u>	<u>PRESENT INVOLVEMENT PERIOD</u>
A. First Day of Current Academic Year (Ex.: 09/10/77)	Last Academic Year (Ex.: 09/76 - 06/77) No. of School Days=180	Current Academic Year (Ex.: 09/77 - 06/78) No. of School Days=180
B. Middle of Current Academic Year (Ex.: 01/10/78)	First Half of Current Academic Year (Ex.: 09/77 - 12/77) No. of School Days=90	Second Half of Current Academic Year (Ex.: 01/78 - 06/78) No. of School Days=90
C. Middle of Previous Academic Year (Ex.: 02/01/77)	One and One Half Academic Years Preceding Entrance (Ex.: 09/75 - 06/76 and 09/76 - 01/77) No. of School Days=270	Second Half of Previous Academic Year <u>and</u> Full Current Academic Year (Ex.: 02/77 - 06/77 and 09/77 - 06/78) No. of School Days=270

NEW JERSEY STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT PLANNING AGENCY  
PUBLIC SCHOOL STUDENT RETENTION PROGRAM EVALUATION

17 STUDENT INTAKE FORM (1, 2)

JURISDICTION (3)

STUDENT NUMBER (4-6)

SEX (7)

- 1. MALE
- 2. FEMALE

DATE OF BIRTH (8-13)

ETHNIC BACKGROUND (14)

- 1. WHITE
- 2. BLACK
- 3. HISPANIC
- 7. OTHER \_\_\_\_\_

FAMILY STATUS (15)

- 1. TWO PARENTS
- 2. ONE PARENT
- 3. RELATIVE/GUARDIAN
- 4. FOSTER CARE
- 5. RESIDENTIAL HOME/INSTITUTION
- 7. OTHER \_\_\_\_\_
- 9. UNKNOWN

FIRST DAY IN PROGRAM (20-25)

INITIAL MATH SCORE (26-28)

INITIAL READING SCORE (29-31)

**PRIOR TO PROGRAM INVOLVEMENT:**

NUMBER OF SCHOOL DAYS (32-34)

TIMES SUSPENDED (35-37)

DAYS SUSPENDED (38-40)

DAYS ABSENT (41-43)

ABSENCES EXCUSED (44-46)

JUVENILE COURT/INTAKE  
REFERRALS (47-49)

HIGHEST GRADE COMPLETED (16)

- 1. 5th OR LOWER
- 2. 6th
- 3. 7th
- 4. 8th
- 5. 9th
- 6. 10th
- 7. 11th OR HIGHER
- 9. UNKNOWN

PRESENT PROBATION STATUS (17)

- 1. ON PROBATION
- 2. NOT ON PROBATION
- 9. UNKNOWN

SOURCE OF REFERRAL (18)

- 1. SCHOOL
- 2. COURT/PROBATION
- 3. SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCY
- 4. PARENT/HOME
- 5. SELF-REFERRAL
- 6. MULTIPLE REFERRALS \_\_\_\_\_
- 7. OTHER \_\_\_\_\_
- 9. UNKNOWN

MONTHS ENROLLED IN PROGRAM  
LAST YEAR (19)

- 0. NOT APPLICABLE
- 1-8 ACTUAL NUMBER OF MONTHS
- 9. NINE MONTHS OR MORE

LAST DAY IN PROGRAM (50-55)

FINAL MATH SCORE (56-58)

FINAL READING SCORE (59-61)

**DURING PROGRAM INVOLVEMENT:**

NUMBER OF SCHOOL DAYS (62-64)

TIMES SUSPENDED (65-67)

DAYS SUSPENDED (68-70)

DAYS ABSENT (71-73)

ABSENCES EXCUSED (74-76)

JUVENILE COURT/INTAKE  
REFERRALS (77-79)

REASON FOR TERMINATION (80)

- 1. SCHOOL YEAR ENDED
- 2. REENTERED CLASSES
- 3. REENTERED CLASSES WITH IMPROVEMENT NOTED
- 4. TRANSFERRED TO OTHER EDUCATIONAL FACILITY
- 5. MOVED FROM SCHOOL DISTRICT
- 6. DROPPED OUT OF SCHOOL
- 7. INCARCERATED
- 8. OTHER \_\_\_\_\_
- 9. UNKNOWN



BRENDAN T. BYRNE  
GOVERNOR

JOHN J. MULLANEY  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

GOVERNING BOARD  
John J. Degnan

CHAIRMAN

State of New Jersey

STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT PLANNING AGENCY

3535 QUAKER BRIDGE RD.  
TRENTON, NEW JERSEY 08625  
TELEPHONE 609 292-5670

May 11, 1978

Dear Project Directors:

In hopes of ascertaining thorough and accurate evaluation data on the students enrolled in your school programs, please answer the following questions concerning the evaluation effort. Please be specific.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Very truly,

Elinor Gould Zimmerman  
Principal Program Analyst  
Evaluation Unit

1. Name and describe the math tests used to record math scores for the students in your program. Include an explanation of the scoring procedure, scale upon which the score is based, or cite an example and include its interpretation.
  
2. Do the same as the above for reading scores.
  
3. Describe any other indicators or measures you have collected on your own and would like to include in the evaluation of your program. Use the bottom of the page and include additional sheets, if needed.

Project Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Grant # \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Director: \_\_\_\_\_ Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

Contact Person(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

Socio-Political Climate

1. Decision-making Structure (Formal and Informal)  
Organizational Structure; Policy-makers; Managers, Citizens/Clients;  
Other Organizational/Bureaucratic relationships; Bureaucratic restraints

2. Social Area Analysis  
Socio-demographic factors (Population density; socio-economic status;  
Ethnic and Age Composition of Target Population)

Transportation

3. Social Indicators  
Extent of Crime (Area; socio-demographic factors of the crime population)

Social Services (H.E.W.; D.C.A; YM-YWCA; DYFS; Church Groups; etc.)



Project Climate

1. Personnel (# staff; education level; how chosen?; types of staff functions)
2. Client Characteristics (Diagnostic or screening criteria; age, ethnicity, usual problems, etc.)
3. Program Methods (Goals and Objectives; Barriers to Goals and Objectives; Actual program operation; methods of client intake and termination, etc.)
4. Physical Plant Characteristics (# sites, # rooms and functions of rooms, equipment, etc.)
5. Geographic setting (center of community, near schools, etc.)
6. Community Interaction (Types of Referring Agencies; advantages and limitations of referring agencies) Citizen Input
7. Funding

RECOMMENDED CHANGES ON DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS FOR FUTURE  
EVALUATIONS OF THIS PROGRAM AREA

The basic background information on the Student Intake Form should continue to be collected. However, it is recommended that a number of additional items be included for future evaluations. These items consist of:

- probation status information at termination
- family status information at termination
- source of referral: specific in-school referral sources

should also be included, such as:

1. specific teacher
2. school disciplinarian
3. Child Study Team Member
4. other school administrator(s)

specify \_\_\_\_\_

It is further recommended that the Student Intake Form be revised to serve as a daily record-keeping device. This will enable project staff to monitor attendance, suspension and truancy incidents on a daily, routine basis. In addition, tests should be administered more frequently than is currently practiced, and all test results should also be included. This additional information will enhance future evaluations and assessments of project impact.

A follow-up questionnaire should also be sent by project staff at

periodic intervals following a student's termination from the project. The questionnaire which follows is one suggested\* format for this instrument.

---

\*The enclosed follow-up questionnaire is one currently used by Camden. Their follow-up effort is done completely under their own initiative and had been in use before the origination of this present evaluation.

NAME \_\_\_\_\_ QUESTIONNAIRE COMPLETED BY \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_ POSITION \_\_\_\_\_

PHONE \_\_\_\_\_ DATE COMPLETED \_\_\_\_\_

D.O.B. \_\_\_\_\_

PLACEMENT OF STUDENT AFTER LEAVING AEP \_\_\_\_\_

DATE STUDENT ENROLLED IN PROGRAM/SCHOOL \_\_\_\_\_

ATTENDANCE RECORD:

DAYS PRESENT \_\_\_\_\_

DAYS ABSENT \_\_\_\_\_

BEHAVIOR RECORD: (WITHIN SCHOOL)

NUMBER OF SUSPENSIONS \_\_\_\_\_

DESCRIPTIVE STATEMENT SUMMARIZING STUDENT'S BEHAVIOR:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

BEHAVIOR RECORD: (OUTSIDE SCHOOL)

NUMBER OF REFERRALS TO JUVENILE COURT \_\_\_\_\_

NUMBER OF DETENTIONS AT JUVENILE

INSTITUTIONS \_\_\_\_\_ NAME OF FACILITY \_\_\_\_\_

ACADEMIC RECORD: (MOST CURRENT TERM)

MATH \_\_\_\_\_ ENGLISH \_\_\_\_\_ OTHERS: \_\_\_\_\_

SCIENCE \_\_\_\_\_ READING \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_

SOCIAL STUDIES \_\_\_\_\_ PHYS. ED. \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_

DESCRIPTIVE STATEMENT SUMMARIZING ACADEMIC STANDING OF STUDENT:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

BASED UPON YOUR OBSERVATION DESCRIBE THE STUDENT'S ADJUSTMENT TO YOUR SCHOOL AND THE VALIDITY OF HIS/HER PLACEMENT THERE.

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**END**