

NCJRS  
SEP 5 1979  
ACQUISITIONS

STUDENT ADVISOR: INTERVENTION VERSUS INTAKE  
EVALUATION REPORT

Hillsborough County Criminal Justice Planning Unit  
Evaluation Capability

Keith S. Templeman, Program Evaluation Specialist

January, 1978

63478

### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This evaluation report was completed under a Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) Grant: Evaluation Capability for the Hillsborough County Criminal Justice Planning Unit, Grant No. 76-A1-12-A301 and its continuation Grant No. 77-A1-12-AA01. As such, this report is an evaluation of another LEAA Grant: Student Advisor: Intervention versus Intake, Grant No. PS-75-AS-12-A1C2 and its continuations, Grant No. 76-A1-12-FA01 and Grant No. 77-A1-12-FA01.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Student Advisor program is administered by the Hillsborough County School Board, under the general supervision of the Department of Education for Exceptional Students, Programs for the Socially Maladjusted. The program is currently in its third and final year of operation under Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) funding. Continuation of the Student Advisor program beyond June, 1978, will be dependent upon the Hillsborough County School Board's ability to provide local funding.

The Student Advisor program employs full-time Student Advisors in selected junior high schools throughout Hillsborough County to work with delinquent and other problem youth in an effort to prevent truancy, reduce suspensions, improve academic performance and reduce acts of delinquency. The students in the project are referred from the Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services (DHRS), the local law enforcement agencies, deans,

principals and various other school system personnel.

The reasons for referrals range from delinquent offenses to school problems such as truancy, disruptive classroom behavior and suspensions. Once admitted to the program the students receive a variety of services including individual and group counseling, family counseling and educational remediation.

During the first year of the Student Advisor program, a variety of problems were encountered. The most notable of these include the following: the initial implementation of the program was delayed due to administrative and technical grant problems; the design of the program was not adequately coordinated with project staff, school principals and the state and local criminal justice planning offices; and the selection and assignment of personnel was not done with the full approval of the school principals (even though the the procedure used was in line with the school system's prior practices). By the end of the grant year, these and other minor problems were resolved to the satisfaction of most of the parties involved.

Consequently, a number of budgetary and programmatic grant modifications were required.

Even under the adverse conditions during the first year grant period the Student Advisors did a commendable job in implementing a program at their respective schools to provide needed services. They created a positive environment conducive to helping children, developed necessary relationships with school and other community resources and provided on-going counseling and educational services which otherwise would not have been available.

Interviews with school personnel, including principals, deans, guidance counselors, human relations specialists and teachers, revealed varying levels of understanding and support of the program. Most interviewees however, had confidence in the Student Advisor at their respective schools and felt the Student Advisor program offered services which were needed yet were not otherwise available. Particularly, many individuals interviewed thought the Student Advisors' ability to provide on-going counseling services and to make

home visits were two of the most valuable parts of the program.

In order to obtain additional data regarding the Student Advisor program, a stratified, systematic sample of 169 students was drawn, representing slightly more than 15% of the nearly 1000 students served by the Student Advisor program during the second grant year. Utilizing this sample population, basic biographic and demographic information and data regarding academic performance, self-concept, absences and suspensions from school, and referrals to DHRS for delinquent offenses were collected where available. These data are reflected in the Student Advisor Client Profile on the following page and are compared with the evaluation objectives in the following paragraphs. It should be noted that the evaluation objectives are not identical with the 1976 grant objectives in all cases but were felt by this evaluator to be the most appropriate and practical measures for program assessment (1976 was the base year from which data were drawn).

# STUDENT ADVISOR CLIENT PROFILE

## FAMILY STATUS (N<sup>1</sup>=168)

Living with both Natural  
Parents: 32.7% (55)

Living with a Single  
Parent only: 55.4% (93)

Other living arrangements  
(foster parents, other  
relatives, etc.): 11.9% (20)

## REASON FOR REFERRAL (N=169)

Juvenile Justice referral  
(arrest/offense and/or  
detention): 39.0% (66)

Truancy or Suspension  
referrals: 48.5% (82)

Other (family and/or  
school problems): 12.4% (21)

## RACE (N=169)

Black: 29.0% ( 49)

White: 65.1% (110)

Hispanic: 05.9% ( 10)

## GRADE (N=168)

Seventh grade students: 4% (07)

Eighth grade students: 44% (74)

Ninth grade students: 52% (87)

## AGE (N=169)

Average Age: 14.7 years

Range: From 13 to 17 years

Most Frequent Age: 15 years

Percent from 14 to 15 years: 76.3%

## REFERRAL SOURCE (N=168)

Dean: 52% (88)

Other School Personnel: 11% (18)

Juvenile Justice (law  
enforcement, DHRS, etc.): 35% (59)

Parents/Self-referrals: 02% (03)

## SEX (N=168)

Male: 55% (93)

Female: 45% (76)

---

<sup>1</sup> N= represents the number of students in the sample where the required information was available and reported.

### Measurable Objectives

1) Three measures were chosen to show academic achievement: the Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT) for math; the Spache Diagnostic and Reading Scale (SPACHE); and the students' math and English grades (not included in the 1976 grant objectives). The WRAT pre-test and post-test comparison was the only measure which showed the students making the required 40% increase in academic achievement.

2) The Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale (PIERS-HARRIS) showed an increase in self-concept of more than the criterion level of 10%.

3) The sample data reveal that only 41.9% of the students met the success criterion of at least a 25% improvement in attendance (the evaluation objective required 80% to meet this criterion).

4) During the school year 30.3% of the students in the Student Advisor project were suspended as compared to the maximum of 20% allowable under the evaluation objective. However, the average number of suspensions per student suspended was decreased from the previous year.



5) Of the sample students, 21.5% were referred to DHRS for delinquent offenses (during the remainder of the school year), compared to the maximum of 20% allowable under the evaluation objective.

6) After admission to the program 9.8% of the students were detained as a result of a delinquent offense as compared to the maximum of 10% allowable under the evaluation objective.

Thus, the sample population data reveal that half of the evaluation measurable objectives were achieved. Close scrutiny of the data available, however, indicates that most of the students in the program made progress with regard to at least one or two of the objectives. That is to say, that of the students who did poorly in one area, a high percentage of them made gains in other areas.

It should be noted that data collected and reported by the project staff on all students in the 1976 program are more positive than the evaluation sample data. More specifically, the project staff report that when compared to the 1976 grant objectives the project data reveal that all the objectives were met. The evaluation data do not support these findings.

In concert with the qualitative and quantitative evaluation data on the Student Advisor program, six specific program recommendations are provided while other recommendations and comments address both future evaluation efforts and the program in general. All these recommendations are supportive in nature, but suggest the need for establishing a single set of sound program goals and objectives, using the Student Advisor program as an alternative to traditional school disciplinary procedures, reducing caseload sizes, standardizing data collection procedures, establishing specific, written treatment goals for each student in the program, developing specific criteria for release of students from the program and implementing procedures to improve evaluability.

Although not discussed at length in this report, a critical question that arises from this evaluation is "What results can we reasonably expect from such a program?" The program rationale suggests that the provision of counseling and educational services will result in some immediate kinds of effects like improved self-concept and improved academic achievement which in turn will help the student improve his

attendance and his behavior at school (reduced suspensions) and in the community (reduced delinquency and detentions). Should the operation of the program be adversely affected by some "environmental" problems or should the immediate results not be fully achieved, what will be the effect on the expected outcomes? And furthermore, should we really expect all students in the program to make changes with regard to each of the six success criteria, regardless of their needs? The evaluation recommendation which addresses written treatment goals for each student is particularly important in this regard.

Overall, this report recognizes the need for services for delinquent and disruptive students in schools, the potential of the Student Advisor program for providing these services, and the current achievements of the Student Advisor program in light of the program's goals and objectives. Further, this report provides recommendations which should lead to improvement in the planning and operation of the Student Advisor program.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Executive Summary.....	i
Introduction.....	1
Background.....	4
Project Description.....	14
Goals and Objectives.....	21
Data Analysis.....	25
Sampling Procedure.....	29
Student Advisor Client Profile.....	33
Assessment of Outcomes.....	37
Academic Achievement.....	42
Absences and Suspensions.....	48
DHRS Referrals and Detention.....	51
Overall Achievement.....	54
School Staff's Assessment.....	55
Group Analysis.....	60
Conclusions and Recommendations.....	62
Program.....	65
Evaluation.....	74

### Appendices

A. Student Advisor Evaluation Design.....	
B. 1975 Measurable Objectives.....	
C. 1975 Revised Measurable Objectives.....	
D. 1976 Measurable Objectives.....	
E. 1977 Measurable Objectives.....	
F. Student Advisor Case Survey/Student Advisor Survey..	
G. Comparison of 1976 Objectives versus Evaluation Objectives.....	

## INTRODUCTION

This report is an evaluation of the Student Advisor: Intervention vs Intake project, and as such, includes sections on the background and history of the project, a description of the program, program goals and objectives, data analysis and resulting conclusions and recommendations. Attention focuses on the second year Student Advisor project. Reference is made necessarily to implementation and first year project activities to gain insight into the development of the project, problems encountered and project changes implemented. Conclusions and Recommendations have implications for the third year project and subsequent local School System institutionalization of the Student Advisor project.

The evaluation process by which this report was developed began in early 1976 with the award of an LEAA grant, Evaluation Capability for the Hillsborough County Criminal Justice Planning Unit, and with the execution of a contract for evaluation consultant services. Along with the Evaluation Capability staff, the consultant reviewed all available materials related to the Student Advisor project including grant applications, quarterly progress

reports and the first year project's final narrative report. Meetings were then held with the Student Advisor project director and his staff to discuss the purpose of our evaluation activities, to review Student Advisor project goals and objectives, to discuss operating procedures, to review a draft evaluation design and to reach concurrence on a final evaluation design (Appendix A). Upon completion of these activities, the evaluation specialist met on several occasions with selected Student Advisors and principals to further review project concepts and operations; and with the evaluation consultant to obtain suggestions on the structure and content of this evaluation report.

It is important that this report be read with two basic goals in mind. First, from the inception of this report throughout the duration of the evaluation process, emphasis has been placed on the following:

- A) To provide recommendations to the project director and other Student Advisor project personnel regarding program operations, appropriate program objectives and further evaluation activities, and
- B) to provide feedback to the Hillsborough Criminal Justice

Planning Council which will  
facilitate the local decision-  
making process.

Second, it should be clearly understood that this evaluation report is both a qualitative and quantitative evaluation of the Student Advisor project. Although no long-term outcome measures are utilized, this report represents a reasonably thorough description and analysis of the Student Advisor project.

Beyond this report, evaluation activities will be on-going. It is anticipated that the implementation of the recommendations contained herein will improve future evaluations of the Student Advisor project, including the refined measurement of project outcome.

### BACKGROUND

The Student Advisor: Intervention vs Intake project was begun in July, 1975 with the award of an LEAA Grant No. PS-75-AS-12-A102, in the amount of \$240,000 to the Hillsborough County Board of County Commissioners. The project has now completed its second grant year, under LEAA continuation Grant No. 76-A1-12-FA01, and has begun the third year project activities (Grant No. 77-A1-12-FA01).

The Student Advisor project design was a replication of a Teacher/Counselor project once run by the Juvenile Court in Hillsborough County. Under the Teacher/Counselor project, full-time county teachers were employed part-time by the Juvenile Court, after school and evenings, and were utilized to supervise a small caseload of delinquent youths from their respective schools. The Teacher/Counselor project, however, was discontinued with the statewide Division of Youth Services assumption of probation services for youth in 1971.

Prior to submission of the initial Student Advisor grant application, the untimely death of the



Supervisor of Programs for the Socially Maladjusted interrupted the final development of the LEAA grant application and the school system's pre-implementation planning for the project. An interim Supervisor was selected to continue the planning of the Student Advisor project. However, this personnel change caused some unavoidable delay in implementation.

At the beginning of the Student Advisor project a number of additional problems were encountered which affected the implementation and operation of the first year project. First, the Bureau of Criminal Justice Planning and Assistance delayed award of the initial grant application for 1975 LEAA funds, primarily as a result of a number of technical problems with the application itself and a lack of adequate justification for a few of the budget items. The necessary modifications were completed and, upon further review by the Bureau, the grant award was made on July 31, 1975.

Second, the LEAA Regional Office affixed a number of special conditions to the 1975 (statewide) Comprehensive Criminal Justice Plan -- unrelated to the local grant application but nevertheless affecting all 1975 grant awards -- and in so doing created a "fund-flow" problem. This prohibited the Student Advisor project and two other local projects from receiving the necessary federal funds

to begin their projects on schedule.

Due to the above delays, the program supervisor was not officially employed until October, 1975. The individual Student Advisors were then screened, selected, trained and assigned to their respective school on November 24, 1975, over halfway through the second quarter of the project year and three months into the school year.

Upon being assigned to their respective schools, a number of problems immediately faced many of the Student Advisors. Some of the principals were concerned that they were allowed only limited input regarding the individual Student Advisor selected for their school, and further, that the Student Advisor did not work for the principal but rather worked for the Supervisor of Programs for the Socially Maladjusted. Other school personnel expressed their doubts with the project due to their past experience with other federally funded projects; namely, it appeared to them that federal funding had been "unjustly" withdrawn from other projects just when they were beginning to operate smoothly.

The Student Advisors also found themselves in schools where the school personnel were actively involved in regular on-going school functions and did

not have the time for the additional coordination required to effectively implement the Student Advisor project. Furthermore, few of the Student Advisors were provided with adequate office space, easy access to telephones and other needed resources.

Most of the above-described problems were resolved satisfactorily by the individual Student Advisors on a school-by-school basis. In general, Student Advisors were eventually provided ample office space, with some privacy, essential office equipment and reasonable access to a telephone. Beyond this, increased faculty understanding of the project and increased cooperation among all the school staff were cultivated by the individual Student Advisors with the assistance of the respective principals, deans and guidance personnel, and the Supervisor of Programs for the Socially Maladjusted.

After the project had been operating for approximately three months the need for a number of programmatic and budgetary changes was identified by the project staff. Consequently, the project supervisor initiated a series of meetings with the Planning Unit staff and the Bureau of Criminal Justice Planning and Assistance Juvenile Delinquency Team to resolve the existing problems and make the appropriate grant adjustments. These adjustments caused changes in the administration of

the project, the goals and objectives and the project budget, and are discussed briefly in the following pages.

Administratively, the coordinator position was eliminated and replaced by a Resource Student Advisor. The function of the Resource Student Advisor was to provide assistance in the coordination of counseling and educational resources and in the development of individual treatment plans for students; to coordinate the in-service training program; and to assist the program supervisor with some of the administrative and supervisory duties.

Additional clarification was also provided regarding the criteria for selection of program participants, caseload size for Student Advisors, relationship with the School Resource Officer Program (a related crime prevention program operated in some of the same schools by the Tampa Police Department) and some new educational implications. The criteria for selection and the educational implications were particularly important.

The original grant application indicated that Student Advisors were to work with pre-delinquent and delinquent youths in an effort to prevent acts of truancy, suspensions, disruptions and subsequent acts

of delinquency. But, during the first part of the grant year, the students served by the Student Advisor program were exclusively truancy referrals. Specific criteria for selection of program participants were developed after the first three months of program activities, which shifted the project focus back to the delinquent youth. These criteria aligned the Student Advisor project more closely with the intent of the original grant application.

The educational implications identified in the grant adjustment expanded the program treatment design. Because pre-delinquent and delinquent youths were frequently several years below their expected grade level in academic subjects, the Student Advisor project proposed to increase academic achievement in two subject areas. This was to be accomplished through the involvement of the Resource Student Advisor and utilization of individualized instruction, including extensive use of audio-visual equipment and instructional materials. Thus, the program also focused attention on remedial education and tutoring, rather than purely counseling or social work.

When the Student Advisor project was implemented during the 1975-76 school year the Student Advisors worked under the direct supervision of the Supervisor of Programs for the Socially Maladjusted. The Student

Advisors were assigned to junior high schools around the county, but, unlike the regular school faculty, were not under the immediate control of the school principals. This type of organizational structure allowed for a uniform program direction including a ready access to the Supervisor of Programs for the Socially Maladjusted and the other Student Advisors for frequent exchange of ideas and in-service training.

During the second project year (1976-77 school year) the Student Advisor organizational structure was changed so that the Student Advisors worked under the general supervision of the Supervisor of Programs for the Socially Maladjusted and under the direct supervision of their respective school principals, like all other regular school faculty members. With this structure, the project varied with each principal's understanding of the project and the perception of the school's need relative to the project. In general, this variance affected the type of youth served in each school by emphasizing one or more of the admission criteria, as determined by each principal. The major advantage of this type of organizational structure was that having the Student Advisor under the supervision of the school principal allowed for more intra-school communication and cooperation.

Beyond the above-described implementation and operational problems, the Student Advisor project has encountered considerable difficulty in operationally defining terms used in the measurable objectives and evaluation sections of the grant. Particularly, the project is thought to have some effect on school attendance and school performance, i.e., truancy, suspensions, expulsions, disruptions, academic performance, and self-concept. Unfortunately, these terms have been ill-defined or the methods of measuring changes in these variables have been ill-defined. Consequently, the measurement of project performance has been highly subjective and the subject of possible criticism.

As a result, a considerable amount of time during both the first and second year grants was devoted by the project staff, the Supervisor of Programs for the Socially Maladjusted, the Planning Unit staff and the Evaluation Consultant in more clearly conceptualizing the short range and long range goals of the project and developing measurable objectives which accurately describe project activities and which are measurable with reasonable ease.

Before proceeding to the Project Description section, it is important that the reader understand

the current status of the Student Advisor project with regard to the reduced LEAA funding support in the second and subsequent grant years. As a result of the local depreciating ratio funding formula (an incremental decrease in LEAA funding support the second and subsequent years) and a steady decrease in Hillsborough County's LEAA allocation over the last few years, the LEAA participation in the Student Advisor project was significantly reduced in 1976 and 1977. Furthermore, the fourth year of LEAA funding (the final year of funding eligibility) was not approved by the local Planning Council during the 1978 planning process due to the Hillsborough County School Board's inability to increase local funding for the program, the real intent of the LEAA "seed" concept.

The reduced level of funding in 1976 and particularly in 1977 was critically important in light of the large first year grant amount of \$240,000. The point is that the reduction in LEAA funding support in combination with the lack of increased local funding support from the School Board has significantly affected the level of services provided by the project. For example, during the first year project the grant provided for seventeen Student Advisors, one Resource



Student Advisor, one Clerk Typist and a percentage of the project supervisor's salary; during the second year project the grant provided for twelve Student Advisors and one Clerk Typist; and during the final year only six Student Advisor positions were funded. Consequently, the level or quantity of services has been reduced as a result of the decreased work force, even if the quality of services has improved.

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Student Advisor: Intervention vs Intake project is administered by the Hillsborough County School Board under the general supervision of the Department of Education for Exceptional Students, Programs for the Socially Maladjusted. The project employs full-time Student Advisors in selected junior high schools to work with delinquent and pre-delinquent youths in an effort to prevent acts of truancy, reduce suspensions, reduce disruptive classroom behavior and reduce subsequent acts of delinquency. The Student Advisor project infers a strong relationship between self-concept, school performance, truancy/suspensions, disruptive behavior and delinquency.

The Student Advisor project has established three criteria for the selection of youths to participate in the project. Listed in priority order, these criteria are as follows:

- 1) Youths referred from the Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services (DHRS) Single Intake or Office of Youth Services (OYS) Detention (secure and non-secure detention),

- 2) youths referred from local law enforcement agencies (identified through offense/arrest reports), and
- 3) school referrals for truancy, disruptive classroom behavior, suspension, expulsions, etc.

Although operated independently at fourteen separate schools, the project maintains a common direction by placing the highest priority upon the delinquent prone youth (law enforcement and DHRS referrals) while other, school-related, referrals have a lower priority for selection.

Youths are referred to Student Advisors by a variety of referral sources. The Supervisor of Programs for the Socially Maladjusted reviews local law enforcement offense/arrest reports and DHRS Detention records to identify delinquent prone youths who attend schools having Student Advisors. These youths are then referred to the respective Student Advisor for inclusion in his regular caseload.

Student Advisors also accept school referrals, generally received from the school deans. Other school resources such as guidance counselors, teachers, school resource officers and human relations specialists, account for a limited number of additional school referrals.

The Student Advisor reviews each of the school referrals, but as mentioned earlier, these have a lower priority for selection than do the DHRS and law enforcement referrals.

Upon receipt of each referral, the Student Advisor reviews the circumstances of the case, the reason for referral and the related criteria for selection, the current active caseload and any other factors which may affect the selection of the youth involved. At this time the Student Advisor attempts to initiate conferences with teachers, deans, guidance counselors, the youth and the youth's parents to determine the needs of the youth and the family, and to coordinate any services which are to be provided. As a part of this process individual goals are established for each youth in the program toward which the youth and the Student Advisor can work.

Once a youth is accepted into the project and the individual goals for the youth have been established, the Student Advisor implements the treatment program through the provision of one or any combination of individual, group and family counseling, educational remediation and referral to other resources for specialized service requirements. Because of the

individual differences in the youths referred, the project is designed to provide short-term crisis counseling for some youths and a more long-term service to other youths.

The short-term counseling usually involves one or two informal counseling sessions, a follow-up conference with the school teacher and dean, a home visit and possibly a referral to another school or community resource. This type of service intervention might be the result of a remote but bothersome school-related problem or a minor delinquent offense that can be resolved to the satisfaction of all parties in a reasonably short period of time.

The more long-range counseling usually begins with one or two individual counseling sessions in order to determine how the Student Advisor might best assist the youth in meeting the individual goals established during the referral process. In general, the Student Advisors utilize individual and group counseling depending on the youth's needs and their own personal preferences. Educational remediation and family counseling are utilized to augment the other counseling services. These counseling and educational sessions are scheduled on a regular basis and continue for the duration of the school year, from two to ten months.

The length of time a particular student remains on the Student Advisor's active caseload and the intensity of services provided while on the caseload are dependent upon the individual needs of the youth. Throughout the school year each Student Advisor must continually reassess his active caseload in light of new referrals, the criteria for selection and the progress being made by each youth, and thus determine whether to continue, terminate or alter the services being provided.

Throughout the program the individual Student Advisors attempt to maintain a reasonably relaxed and informal environment. Educational remediation and individual counseling sessions are private and sometimes very personal. In this respect, the subject matter during these sessions is confidential and the Student Advisor acts as a therapist and an ombudsman as the need requires.

The project guidelines require that each Student Advisor maintain a minimum active caseload of fifty (50) youths and maintain a casefile on each youth accepted as an active case in the program. Although no standard format for the collection and maintenance of "client-oriented" data is specified in these guidelines, project reporting requirements for the LEAA

grant and for the regular school system records include the collection, maintenance and reporting of necessary biographic, demographic and other related data. This information includes reason for and source of referral, attendance and suspension records for the current and previous years, the number of family, group and individual counseling contacts, and pre- and post-test Piers Harris, WRAT and Spache scores. Beyond their unique counseling, educational and data collection responsibilities, the Student Advisors function like other regular faculty members. Consequently, each Student Advisor is utilized to execute special job-related assignments as determined appropriate by their respective school principal. In this respect, the Student Advisors have become an extension of the regular school personnel providing services not otherwise available from the school, such as home visits; individual family and group counseling; and educational counseling and remediation.

The Student Advisor project staff has also developed a working relationship with local law enforcement agencies and with DHRS intake and detention personnel through the individual efforts of the Student

Advisors themselves and the Supervisor of Programs for the Socially Maladjusted. These relationships have assisted the Student Advisors in working with delinquent prone youths.

No attempt was made to collect personal data on the Student Advisors, however, a brief profile of them is an important part of the project description. The Student Advisors as a group appear to represent a reasonable mixture of individuals with respect to age, race and sex. Their employment experiences are primarily as teachers and guidance counselors with the school system. Their training and education are in the areas of secondary education and guidance counseling. All the Student Advisors possess the minimum qualifications as defined in the following job description used by the school system:

Rank II with Certification in guidance or school social work (Visiting Teacher). Ability to work as a member of a team. Background in child growth and development and in learning and social problems of secondary students. Competency in individual counseling and group work with pupils and parents. Skill in working cooperatively with teachers about students. One year teaching experience or experience in field of certification.



## GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Since the inception of the Student Advisor project, a series of project measurable objectives have been generated. Appendix "B" lists the measurable objectives as defined by the 1975 LEAA grant application, Appendix "C" lists the revised 1975 measurable objectives and Appendix "D" lists the 1976 LEAA grant measurable objectives. Appendix "A" also includes an expanded list of measurable objectives which is a part of a long range evaluation design for the Student Advisor project. Furthermore, the final grant year is now operating on a fifth set of objectives for the project (Appendix E). To some extent each of these lists is overlapping, with each successive list including slight modifications which were intended to either clarify the objectives (operationally define) or to more accurately represent the intent of the project.

For this evaluation report, attention will focus on the measurable objectives which might be considered by either the school system or the justice system to

be "outcome" objectives. These objectives are included below for easy reference:

1. To improve academic achievement of the students served by 40% (Measure: WRAT, Spache and grades).
2. To increase self-concept of students served by 10%. (Measure: Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale).
3. To improve the attendance of 80% of the students being served by the Student Advisors by 25%.
4. To prevent 80% of the students being served by the Student Advisors from being expelled or suspended from school.
5. To prevent 80% of the students being served by the Student Advisors from being referred to the Office of Youth Services Intake.

6. To prevent 90% of the students being served by the Student Advisors from entering the Hillsborough County Regional Detention Center.

It should be noted that these objectives are a combination of the objectives utilized for the second and third years of the Student Advisor project. Comparison of the two sets of objectives (Appendices D & E) reveals a similarity of intent. The specific criterion measures specified for the "attendance" and the "academic achievement" objectives, however, are slightly different.

These objectives were selected for use in this evaluation because of the desire to learn what results were produced by the project activities. The current data collection and reporting efforts were initiated with this ultimate goal in mind. A continued reliance on the analysis of the process or activity objectives would not produce this knowledge.

A related critical point needs to be made at this time. These objectives and the entire project rationale imply that there is a cause and effect

relationship between the Student Advisor project activities and the intended outcomes. We hope the project is a major contributor to such outcomes. But, it is beyond the scope of this report to draw such a conclusion. Neither the evaluation design nor the sampling techniques utilized in the current data analysis are adequately rigorous to reasonably test a causal relationship. Simply put, the data provided are descriptive in nature and only limited inferences can be made at this time regarding the cause of the outcomes obtained.

## DATA ANALYSIS

The data analysis for this evaluation was begun by reviewing the Student Advisor project's quarterly and final progress reports to determine the utility of the existing data for the evaluation. In doing this it was found that much of the reported data was not appropriate for future analysis for the following two reasons: numerous changes in the measurable objectives throughout the project have affected the data collected; and the data collection and reporting procedures used in the development of progress reports have reduced the data to a form not amenable to further analysis.

The first problem is that the measurable objectives have undergone considerable changes since the project's inception. As stated in the Background and in the Goals and Measurable Objectives sections of this report, these changes were made to better represent the intent and actual activities of the project and to more clearly define the objectives. Operationally defining the

objectives has been a major obstacle since data needed to measure progress toward "desired" objectives were not made available through regular school operating procedures. Thus, time-consuming and sometimes highly impractical data collection procedures would have to have been implemented to collect the required data. The option chosen, of necessity, was that the objectives were modified where possible and the more readily available, yet somewhat less desirable data, were utilized.

This problem can be exemplified by looking at the objective relating to "truancy" (Appendix B). The School System does not verify all excused and unexcused absences. The only available data is either attendance or non-attendance (total absences). Thus, the measurable objective was revised to reflect a desired change in attendance even though these data are only rough estimates or approximations of "truancy" with considerable variance due to the influence of other factors such as extended illnesses, suspensions, family circumstances, travel, etc.

Similarly, truancy and other measures such as suspensions and academic performance (grades) are influenced by individual differences in deans and

teachers, differential interpretations of school policies and procedures and the application of these to individual students. Thus, suspensions and grades, like absences, are practical but not the most desirable measure of student behavior.

The second problem relates to data previously collected and reported and the procedures used to collect each of the separate data sets. Specifically, when Student Advisors report on the status of their caseload with respect to the outcome measures, the data is collected on a case-by-case basis but reported in mass for their respective schools. Further, these data are aggregated for the whole project. The primary problem with these data is that they are useless for reporting cumulative frequencies of events over more than one quarter.

For example: during Quarter I ('76 - '77) 12% of the students on the Student Advisor caseloads were reported to have been suspended. During Quarter II, 15% were reported suspended. For that six-month period we can only state that, "from 15 to 27% ( $15\% + 12\%$ ) of the students were suspended", since the least possible percent

suspended in total was the 15% suspended in Quarter II (which assumes the 12% from Quarter I were also suspended in Quarter II) and the greatest possible percent suspended in total was 15% + 12% (which assumes the 12% from Quarter I were not suspended a second time during Quarter II).

A further compounding of this problem is possible if it is found that quarterly suspension rates are derived by averaging the monthly suspension rates, or if suspension rates for the whole program are derived by averaging the suspension rates for each school, irrespective of the caseload sizes at each school.

As a result of these problems, the data from quarterly and final reports were not utilized directly in this data analysis. Quarterly data were utilized, only as a guide in interpreting trends in "high delinquency" and "high suspension" schools.



### Sampling Procedure

After reviewing the existing data it was determined that sampling of the nearly 1000 youths would be necessary in order to minimize the time and effort required for data collection and analysis. A minimum of a 15% sample of the full Student Advisor service population was desired by the evaluation staff and the project supervisor.

A stratified, systematic sampling procedure was chosen as the most practical and was utilized in lieu of random sampling. Specifically, the entire Student Advisor service population was stratified by school and by the number of student/Student Advisor contacts. Within these strata a systematic sample of 169 students (slightly more than the desired 15% sample) was then drawn. This procedure was chosen to ensure that a sample of students from each school was included, and to ensure that the sample included youths with different amounts of contact with the Student Advisors (two groups were defined, using the number of Student Advisor contacts during the project year as the differentiating criterion).

The sample was stratified by school because of the wide variety in school sizes; delinquency

rates at each school; suspension and "truancy" rates at each school; Student Advisor caseload sizes at each school; and individual differences in procedures used by deans, principals and Student Advisors at each school. Twelve students from thirteen schools and thirteen students from the fourteenth school constituted the total sample of 169 students.

The sample was compared by school on a number of variables including age, race, sex, family status, grade, reason for referrals, etc., and statistically significant differences were identified on only age and race. The general trend regarding the age of students in the sample was that three of the schools had slightly older students (an average<sup>1</sup> age of 15.2 years) and five schools had slightly younger students (an average age of 14.3 years). The average of the total sample was 14.7 years.

With respect to race, the presence of Hispanic students was highly variable, ranging from 0% in ten schools to 25% in two schools; although statistically significant, these differences were not felt to be practically significant. Three schools

---

<sup>1</sup> In this evaluation text, average is used interchangeably with arithmetic mean.

seemed to have a disproportionately high percentage of white students (83-91%); the same three and one additional school seemed to have a correspondingly low proportion of black students (8-17%); two schools had a disproportionately low percentage of white students (15-41%); and one school had a disproportionately high percentage of black students (58%).

The second stratification of the sample was by the number of student/Student Advisor contacts during the project year. This was done to identify any relationships between outcomes and length of time in the program and/or intensity of service provided. Specifically, 46.7% of the sample had over twenty formal contacts with the Student Advisors during the course of the project, while the remaining 53.3% had twenty or fewer contacts. However, since the Student Advisors maintained a client caseload of from seventeen to one hundred sixteen students per school (an average caseload of 67.5 students per school)<sup>1</sup>, and since from five to sixty-four

---

<sup>1</sup> Student Advisor: Intervention versus Intake, Project No. 76-A1-12-FA01, 4th Quarterly Report, July 15, 1977.

students per school (an average of approximately 20-25 students)<sup>1</sup> had more than twenty contacts with the Student Advisors the sample of 169 students slightly over-represents the group of students with "over twenty contacts".

The sample analysis also compared the groups, stratified by the number of contacts on the same variables utilized in the "by school" comparisons. There were no significant differences among these groups on any of the variables. However, because of the criterion measure used to differentiate between these two groups, namely "20 formal contacts", the groups were different in terms of both the average length of time in the program (averages of 5.22 months for the "under 20 contacts" group and 7 months for the "over 20 contacts" group), and a subjective question asking the Student Advisors' "best guess" of the level of intervention provided each youth (which addresses the frequency of contacts rather than the duration of participation in the project).

The lack of a rigorous random selection procedure obviously threatens the validity of these sample data. However, the decision to use

---

<sup>1</sup> Based on an informal survey of Student Advisors at the end of the 1976-77 school year.

a stratified, systematic sampling procedure was made by the evaluation staff and the Student Advisor project supervisor based upon the logic that the resulting data would best represent the service population while differentiating among youths receiving different amounts or levels of service, under different conditions.

After the sample of students was selected, Student Advisors obtained various bits of requested data from their individual case files and available school records. In addition, Student Advisors completed a short objective/subjective questionnaire regarding themselves and the operation of the Student Advisor project at their respective schools (Appendix F). The number of referrals to DHRS intake including the number which resulted in detention for each individual in the sample was obtained through the cooperation of DHRS intake and detention screening personnel. These data, along with information gathered during personal interviews, constitute the base data used for this analysis.

#### Student Advisor Client Profile

The ages of the students in the sample of the Student Advisor service population ranged from

# STUDENT ADVISOR CLIENT PROFILE

## FAMILY STATUS (N<sup>1</sup>=168)

Living with both Natural  
Parents: 32.7% (55)  
Living with a Single  
Parent only: 55.4% (93)  
Other living arrangements  
(foster parents, other  
relatives, etc.): 11.9% (20)

## REASON FOR REFERRAL (N=169)

Juvenile Justice referral  
(arrest/offense and/or  
detention): 39.0% (66)  
Truancy or Suspension  
referrals: 48.5% (82)  
Other (family and/or  
school problems): 12.4% (21)

## RACE (N=169)

Black: 29.0% ( 49)  
White: 65.1% (110)  
Hispanic: 05.9% ( 10)

## GRADE (N=168)

Seventh grade students: 4% (07)  
Eighth grade students: 44% (74)  
Ninth grade students: 52% (87)

## AGE (N=169)

Average Age: 14.7 years  
Range: From 13 to 17 years  
Most Frequent Age: 15 years  
Percent from 14 to 15 years: 76.3%

## REFERRAL SOURCE (N=168)

Dean: 52% (88)  
Other School Personnel: 11% (18)  
Juvenile Justice (law  
enforcement, DHRS, etc.): 35% (59)  
Parents/Self-referrals: 02% (03)

## SEX (N=168)

Male: 55% (93)  
Female: 45% (76)

---

<sup>1</sup> N= represents the number of students in the sample where the required information was available and reported.

thirteen to seventeen, with an average age of 14.7 years. With regard to race, 65% of the sample students were white, 29% were black and 6% were Hispanic. With regard to sex, 55% of the students were males and 45% were females.

Although a complete analysis of the students' family status was not made, the Student Advisors reviewed the case files of the sample of 169 students and classified each student into one of three "family status" groups. For 168 students where this information was reported, 33% lived with both their natural parents, 55% lived with a single parent, and 12% lived in some other family situation such as with one natural and one step-parent, foster parents, or other relative, etc.

In 168 of the 169 cases in the sample, information regarding the school grade each student was attending was obtained. These data indicate that 4% were in the seventh grade (only three of the fourteen schools include seventh grade students), 44% were in the eighth grade and 52% were in the ninth grade.

The Student Advisors also reported for each of the 169 students in the sample the reason for referrals to the project, the referral source (N=168), and a subjective assessment of the origin

of each of the youth's problems. Of the referrals, 39% were made as a result of a juvenile justice contact, 44% were made as a result of truancy from school, 59% were made as a result of suspension from school, and 12% were made for some other reason.

Thirty-three percent of the Student Advisor referrals were received from the Supervisor of the Student Advisor project; 31% for arrests reported by local law enforcement agencies and 2% for arrests resulting in detention reported by detention center personnel. An additional 2% were received directly from DHRS intake and counseling staff.<sup>1</sup>

Sixty-two percent of project referrals were referred by school personnel for truancy, suspensions and other school-related problems; 52% from deans, and 10% from other school personnel.

The remaining 3% were self and parent referrals.

When asked "In your opinion, what is the

---

<sup>1</sup> Data reported for Referral Source and Reason for Referral are not consistent; 39% reported as result of criminal justice contact and 35% referred from a criminal justice agency. No justification for this variation was identified.



basis of this student's problems?" the Student Advisors reported 40% of the youths had family-related problems, 16% had school-related problems, 18% had problems with peer relationships, 18% had self-concept problems and 7% had other related problems.

And finally, for the sample of 169 students the average length of time in the Student Advisor program was 6.1 months; 17% from 1 to 3 months; 36% from 4 to 6 months and 47% from 7 to 9 months. It is interesting to note that 30% of the sample students were in the program for 9 months - the duration of the school year.

#### Assessment of Outcomes

One way of attempting to show what the Student Advisor program has done is to indicate the types and quantity of activities the project staff have been involved in with the students, i.e., what kind and amount of services were provided to students by the Student Advisors and what services were provided which would otherwise not have been provided by the schools? To some extent the identification and testing of

students, the short-term crisis counseling and the long-term counseling and educational services provided by the Student Advisors were described in the Project Description section of this report. The amount of these services provided has also been briefly described in the first portion of the Data Analysis through identification of caseload sizes and the length of time students were involved with the project during the school year.

At the end of the school year another attempt was made to further define the amount and type of services provided. In the Case Survey the Student Advisors were asked to rate each case on the "level of intervention" provided, as defined in the questionnaire<sup>1</sup>, with respect to educational services, individual counseling, group counseling and family counseling. This rating revealed that 28% of the sample students had at least two, one-half hour contacts per week, for a minimum of sixty days; 31% had less than one contact every two weeks; and the remainder fell somewhere in between. Although

---

<sup>1</sup> Appendix "E", Student Advisor Case Survey; (See the key to questions No. 8 through 12.) Again, this is a subjective measure of the frequency of quality contacts with the students.

most counselors used all of the above approaches to some extent, individual counseling was the preferred method with 34% of the sample (N=156; one Student Advisor did not respond to the "type of counseling" questions) participating in individual counseling sessions at least twice a week. Similarly, only 17.8% of the sample fell into the "most frequent" Family Counseling category and 10.9% in the "most frequent" Group Counseling category. Further, 87.3% of the sample cases received little or no family counseling, thus revealing that family counseling was the least used method of interaction.

Beyond the description of the types and quantity of activities provided through the Student Advisor project there was a need to identify the quality of service provided. The only objective indicator available of service quality is an assessment of the degree to which expected outcomes were achieved. The following portion of the data analysis will examine patterns of behavior exhibited by the sample students with regard to 1) academic achievement, 2) absences and suspensions from school and 3) subsequent delinquent (and status offense) behavior.

Because no comparison or control group was available, only an analysis of within-group differences and a comparison of student behavior/achievement while in the program with prior behavior/achievement were possible. Within this context a number of questions could have been asked about the sample students with respect to observed behavior during the project. Three questions of this nature were chosen and, at a minimum, each will be answered as this report addresses the selected evaluation measures. The three questions are as follows:

On the average, how did the students change on each evaluation measure?

Beyond this, what percentage of the students improved and what percentage made a reasonable improvement on each measure?

And finally, if a student did poorly with regard to a particular measure did the student make progress in another area?

Prior to proceeding to the analysis of academic achievement, attendance, suspension and delinquency data, one final note regarding the data reported is important. Only those cases which had both pre-test and post-test data available (actual pre-test and post-test data; or previous year and current year data) were included in the assessment of the respective measure. That is, cases were deleted from the statistical analyses unless both pre-test and post-test scores were available. In each separate analysis, differences in means for the group of students with only pre-test or post-test scores and the group of students with both pre-test and post-test scores were examined. In no instance was a statistically significant difference found. For example, of the 169 students in the sample, 149 received the WRAT pre-test, 121 received the WRAT post-test, and thus, only 121 cases included both the pre-test and the post-test. However, the difference between the means (mean pre-test scores) for the full 149 students with pre-tests and the 121 with both pre-tests and post-tests was not statistically significant.

Because of the above procedure, the data presented in the following sections never include

the total sample of 169. Thus, whenever data is reported the number of cases is reported.

#### Academic Achievement

Four measures were used to assess academic gains made by students in the program, the Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT), the Spache Diagnostic Reading Scale (SPACHE) and school grades in math and English subjects. For the WRAT and the SPACHE, pre-tests and post-tests were administered by the Student Advisors to students when they entered the program and at the end of the school year. Math and English grades in two consecutive nine-week grading periods were also obtained by the Student Advisors for students in the program.

The average pre-test score on the WRAT (math scale) for the 121 sample students with both pre-test and post-test scores was 5.28 grade levels. The average post-test score on the WRAT was 6.21. Comparing the pre-test scores with the post-test scores yields an increase in the average score of 0.92<sup>1</sup> grade levels. A within-groups T-test indicates that this difference is statistically significant

---

<sup>1</sup> The difference of the pre-test and post-test means.

( $T = -9.40$ ;  $p \leq 0.01$ ). However, the data do not allow us to say the Student Advisor project "caused" this increase.

Looking at the differences between individual pre-test and post-test scores on the WRAT, it can be seen that 80.2% of the students made some improvement. Similarly, approximately 10% of the sample showed no change from pre-test to post-test and approximately 10% had lower post-test scores than pre-test scores.

The changes identified by the WRAT for the students in the program have to be reconsidered in light of the project measurable objective which calls for a 40% increase in academic achievement. The .92 difference between the average pre-test and post-test scores on the WRAT represents approximately a 50% increase over the average yearly gain in grade level for the sample population.<sup>1</sup> Considered another way, nearly 57% of the students improved more than the average yearly gain in grade level. Thus, the measurable objective regarding academic achievement was met (as demonstrated by the WRAT).

---

<sup>1</sup> Average yearly gain in grade level was derived by dividing average school grade (8.5) into average pre-test score on WRAT (5.28 grade level); or 0.6 grade level per school year.

The average pre-test score on the SPACHE (reading scale) for the 117 sample students with both pre-test and post-test scores was 5.94 while the average post-test score was 6.60. Thus, the average student showed an improvement of 0.66 grade levels. A within-group T-test indicates that this difference is significant ( $T = -8.39$ ;  $p \leq 0.01$ ) but again, the data do not allow us to say the Student Advisor project "caused" this increase.

On the SPACHE Reading Scale 57.3% of the sample students made some improvements as demonstrated by an examination of individual differences from the pre-test to the post-test. At the same time, 38.5% of the students showed no change on the SPACHE from the pre-test to the post-test, while 4.3% did worse on the post-test than on the pre-test.

Considering these data as compared to the expected outcomes defined by the academic achievement measurable objective, the average increase in level of 0.66, as measured by the SPACHE, did not meet the criterion level of 40% increase in academic achievement. The difference



between SPACHE pre-test scores and post-test scores reveals that approximately 50% of the students did make gains in excess of the average yearly gain in grade level for the sample population<sup>1</sup>.

Comparing school grades over the two selected grading periods shows that only 21.9% (N=155) of the students made improvements in math grades and only 28.0% (N=157) made improvements in English grades, while 25.8% and 19.1%, respectively, made worse grades in the second grading period. Thus, the majority of students made no changes in either direction from the first to the second grading period. Furthermore, most of the students made poor math and English grades (D's or F's) in both grading periods.

The math and English grades for the sample students, in conjunction with the SPACHE and WRAT scores, reveal an interesting point which may be evident from just the SPACHE and WRAT scores alone, but in any case, a point which is critically important in putting the academic achievement data into perspective. Specifically, the students in the sample are extremely poor students. That is, 66.5%

---

<sup>1</sup> Average yearly gain derived by dividing average school grade (8.5) into average pre-test score on SPACHE (5.94) to yield 0.7 level increase per school year.

of them made D's or F's in math and 63.6% of them made D's or F's in English (1st grading period). Furthermore, their average scores on the SPACHE and WRAT (pre-test) indicate that the students were as much as 2.6 to 3.2 years behind their expected grade levels in reading and math, respectively. The data also indicate that the gap between academic achievement (WRAT and SPACHE scores) and the actual school grades the students were attending, was not appreciably reduced. Thus, the students' poor academic performance has certain implications regarding what should be expected of the Student Advisor project. Surely, half the task to be accomplished is to motivate these students to improve their academic standings.

The closest thing to this "motivation" that the Student Advisor project attempted to measure was the students' self-concept. The Piers-Harris Childrens' Self-Concept Scale (PIERS-HARRIS) was the instrument used for this measurement and like the WRAT and SPACHE, it was administered when the students entered the program and at the end of the school year.

The average PIERS-HARRIS pre-test score for the 137 students with both pre-test and post-test scores was 49.8. The average post-test score for these same 137 students was 56.2. Thus, the average increase on the PIERS-HARRIS from pre-test to post-test was 6.4. This increase in the average score represents a 13% increase, as compared to the criterion level of 10% increase.

An analysis of individual differences from pre-test to post-test shows that 73.7% of the students (N=137) had higher self-concept scores at the end of the school year, while 59.9% of the students' scores showed increases of more than the project's criterion level of 10%. In contrast, 24.1% of the students had lower post-test scores than pre-test scores. A further examination of individual differences from pre-test to post-test reveals the interesting and important fact that a disproportionate number of students who scored high on the pre-test (60 or better compared to the sample mean of 49.8) showed decreased post-test scores.

Returning to the academic achievement measure, an attempt was made to identify any effect the audio-visual equipment used in this project may have had on either grades or scores on the WRAT and SPACHE. To do this the Student Advisors identified both the level of educational remediation/counseling provided each student in the sample<sup>1</sup> and the degree to which the audio-visual equipment was utilized in their respective schools (exclusively by the Student Advisor, shared with other school personnel, and exclusively by other school personnel)<sup>2</sup>. An analysis of these data showed no strong correlation between use of the equipment, the level of intervention and academic achievement.

#### Absences and Suspensions from School

In order to identify any improvement in attendance and behavior at school the Student Advisor project collected data on the incidence of absences and suspensions during the current and previous years for each student. The intent was to compare each student's track record

---

<sup>1</sup> Student Advisor Case Survey, Question #9. (Appendix F)

<sup>2</sup> Student Advisor Survey, Question #4. (Appendix F)

(previous year) with the incidence of absences and suspensions during the current year and thereby identify changing behavior patterns which might be attributable to the intervention of the Student Advisor. The criterion levels for acceptable change established in the project measurable objectives were to improve attendance of 80% of the students by a minimum of 25% and to prevent 80% of the students from being suspended (or expelled)<sup>1</sup> from school.

The mean number of days absent during the previous year was 37.4 days (N=149) while the mean for the current or program year was 31.5 days (N=149). The difference between these means was found to be significant ( $T = 2.65$ ;  $p \leq 0.01$ ) and represents an average improvement in attendance of nearly 16%. An analysis of individual scores further indicates that 34.9% of the students missed more days from school this year than last year, while 62.4% missed fewer days this year. Of the 62.4% who showed improved attendance during the program year, only 66.7% (41.6% of the total sample) met the success criteria of at least a 25% improvement in attendance. Thus, the attendance measurable objective was not fully achieved.

---

<sup>1</sup> No data regarding the number of expulsions was collected for this analysis.

An interesting note regarding absences is the relationship between absences and the independent variable "grades". Specifically, a within-groups T-test reveals that only the ninth grade students experienced a significant reduction in absences from the previous year ( $T = 2.04$ ;  $p \leq 0.05$ ). This could mean that the Student Advisor program was most effective with ninth graders or that maturation affected the results.

The mean number of suspensions during the previous year was 0.6 ( $N=152$ ) while the mean number of suspensions during the current or program year was 0.7 ( $N=152$ ). Thus, an increase in the average number of suspensions per student was actually experienced. More precisely, of the 152 students 37 or 24.3% were suspended during the previous year for an average of 2.6 suspensions per student suspended (95 total suspensions). Similarly, 46 or 30.3% were suspended during the program year for an average 2.3 suspensions per student suspended (106 total suspensions). Thus, more students were suspended, more suspensions were actually experienced but

the average number of suspensions per student suspended decreased.

#### DHRS Referrals and Detention

Data concerning both referrals to DHRS for delinquent offenses and referrals which resulted in detention were received from DHRS detention screening records. It was noted as these data were analyzed that some inconsistencies were present. As a result, a larger number of missing cases was recorded than with the previously discussed data (suspensions, absences, WRAT, SPACHE, etc.). Therefore, the number of students referred to DHRS for intake and the number detained have to be considered conservative.

In addition, two other factors need to be considered in reviewing data on DHRS referrals and detentions. First, the follow-up periods for these data range from three (3) to ten (10) months while previous year's data in each case is a full twelve (12) month period. Thus, a strict comparison of these previous year versus current year offense data must be avoided. And second, due to the small number of both referrals to DHRS intake and detentions,

only frequency data are appropriate. Even then, considerable caution must be exercised in comparing these data.

Of the 135 students with both current year and previous year offense data available, DHRS records indicate 40.7% had been referred to intake during the previous one-year period.<sup>1</sup> Of these 55 students, 42 (76.4%) had been referred to DHRS only once in the last year and 13 (23.6%) had been referred to DHRS from two to four times.

Data from current year records reveals that 21.5% of the students (N=135) were referred to DHRS intake for delinquent offenses (including status offenses). Of these 29 students, 24 (82.8%) were referred only once and 5 (17.2%) were referred from one to five times.

Of the 164 students, with both current year and previous year detention data available, 11 (6.7%) were detained at least once during the year preceding their admission to the Student Advisor project, for a total of 16 separate detentions. Since admission, 16 (9.8%) students were detained for a total of 21 detentions (already exceeding previous year totals).

---

<sup>1</sup> One year prior to admission to the program, not the prior school year.



These raw offense and detention data have to be reconsidered in light of the project measurable objectives which call for not more than 80% of the students being referred to DHRS intake and not more than 10% being detained. In this respect, 21.5% of the sample were referred to intake and 9.8% were detained (both secure and non-secure detention). Thus, the detention objective was achieved while the objective regarding offenses/referrals to DHRS was not fully achieved.

It should be noted at this time that the evaluation objectives and the 1976 grant objectives (the year from which base data were obtained) are not identical, however, the project staff report that data collected on the entire population served during the 1976 project year reveal that all the 1976 objectives were met. The evaluation data do not support these findings, even when compared to the 1976 grant objectives as stated in the original grant application. A brief analysis of the 1976 objectives, the evaluation objectives, the evaluation results and the reported project results is included in Appendix G.

## Overall Achievement

The final question regarding the achievement of students in relation to the outcome measures remains to be answered, Specifically, if a student did poorly on one of the selected evaluation measures, did the student make progress in another area? A review of the data indicates that a reasonably high percentage of the students who did poorly on each measure made some improvement in two or three of the other areas. For example, 70% and 67.6% of those students who made no gains in self-concept, did show improved attendance and WRAT scores, respectively. Similarly, more than 50% of the students who showed no improvement in their WRAT scores, their SPACHE scores, or the number of suspensions, were absent from school fewer days during the program year than in the previous year.

This general trend reveals two possible implications. First, because of the varied and multiple expected outcomes, one might suspect that most students will make some gains, with or without the Student Advisor program intervention, merely because of maturation or because of the school and other life experiences to which each student is

subject. The other possible implication is that because of the varied goals of the Student Advisor project and the individual attention provided each student, only gains in a few specific areas should be expected; that is, "the Student Advisor project can't be everything to everyone!"

These possible implications are particularly important with respect to the Conclusions and Recommendations section of this report. Unfortunately however, the data available for this evaluation are not sufficient to support or reject either contention.

#### School Staff's Assessment

As part of this report, interviews were conducted with all the Student Advisors, the Supervisor of Programs for the Socially Maladjusted, and the principals, deans, guidance and human relations staff from over half of the schools where the Student Advisor project was implemented. The general responses from these people and their individual comments provide considerable insight into the operation of the Student Advisor program including the advantages and problems associated with the project.

The general and overriding comments by a majority of the interviewees revealed that the Student Advisor program was able to provide services to the schools, the students, and the families of students that were much needed but were not otherwise available. Particularly, the ability to work with a student on an individual basis, whether involving tutoring, individual or family counseling, was seen as one of the strongest parts of the program. Furthermore, most deans and principals cited the Student Advisors' ability and willingness to make home visits and solicit the involvement and interest of the parent as an essential factor in successfully working with these "problem" students.

The interviews, however, pointed out a number of problems which seriously hampered the project's implementation and operation. First, the principals cited the lack of individual choice in selecting the Student Advisors at their respective schools as a problem. Most indicated they were lucky in receiving a Student Advisor with whom they could work, however, most felt that more discretion on the part of the principals should have been allowed in the selection

of Student Advisors or the acceptance of the Program at their school for that matter. Second, the principals expressed concern that direct supervision of the individual Student Advisors should have been their responsibility from the beginning and that the Department of Programs for the Socially Maladjusted should have had only the general responsibility to ensure compliance with program guidelines. Third and still closely related, the school staff interviewed indicated the need for a clearer understanding of the program and the expected results, particularly in light of the many changes in direction which occurred throughout the duration of the project.

Another interesting criticism was also pointed out during the course of the interviews. Namely, one principal contrasted the Student Advisor project with both its predecessor, the Teacher-Counselor Program, and the School Resource Officer Program. In doing so, it was pointed out that one of the major deficiencies in the Student Advisor program design is the lack of authority, power or "clout" which might be needed in requiring student participation in counseling or other activities. So, while the Student Advisors had the resources to deal with the problem students, participation was generally on a volunteer basis and thus, a reduction in effectiveness was perceived.

Interviews with the Student Advisors themselves generally revealed that they had developed the necessary relationships with the Supervisor of Programs for the Socially Maladjusted, the school personnel and other community resources to do their jobs effectively. In addition, most Student Advisors felt the program was worthwhile and they were making progress with students on their caseloads.

The Student Advisors also pointed out various problems which they felt affected their ability to impact more significantly on the students. Many Student Advisors felt the need to be more independent from their respective school administrators in order to be more effective. Specifically, most Student Advisors felt they were given some school assignments which were somewhat inappropriate under the grant yet necessary in order to maintain good school relations. However, some Student Advisors felt their "special" school assignments prevented them from devoting their full energies to the students on their caseloads, and thus, reduced their effectiveness appreciably.

The Student Advisors indicated that the paperwork required of them due to grant reporting requirements

was burdensome and detracted from their counseling and casework activities. And finally, the Student Advisors indicated that because of grant objectives they were required to carry more students on their caseloads than they could adequately supervise and counsel.

## Group Analysis

The original purpose for comparing the "contact" groups was to analyze the differences in achievements in relation to "levels of intervention". With the data gathered during the program year on each of the selected evaluation measures, within-group T-tests reveal that both Group I and Group II students improved their scores on the PIERS-HARRIS, WRAT and SPACHE tests (consistent with the overall sample results and with the same limitations regarding cause and effect relationships). In addition, the Group II students made improvements in math grades ( $T = 2.05$ ;  $p \leq 0.05$ ) while the Group I students made no significant changes, and the Group I students made improvements in attendance ( $T = 3.05$ ;  $p \leq 0.01$ ) while the Group II students made no significant changes. Thus, these appear to be the only effects which might be related to the intensity and duration of intervention services provided to the students.

Although no statistical tests were appropriate it is interesting to note that Group I students experienced less total offenses (referrals to DHRS)



and detentions than Group II students during both the previous year and the current year. The Group I students, however, were involved in more status offenses in both years than the Group II students.

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Student Advisor program was founded on principles which are considered sound given the existing knowledge regarding the prevention of juvenile delinquency and the identification and treatment of delinquent and other problem children. Namely, school, law enforcement, probation, intensive supervision (halfway houses, start centers, day-care programs, etc.) training school and aftercare programs all utilize some form, formal or informal, of either counseling, education, and/or vocational training in their efforts to help youths whom they have identified as "having problems." These individual agencies often cite the lack of adequate community resources as a major obstacle in dealing with such problem youth. The Student Advisor program was designed to partially fill this gap; to select youth having a combination of school and other offense related problems and to provide the individual counseling and educational services needed.

Within this context, the Student Advisors developed caseloads of students at their respective schools and provided a variety of services. Based upon the number of students actually served, the types and amounts of services provided, the reflections of the Student Advisor program staff, the impressions of the other professional staff in the schools and a rudimentary comparison of "treatment techniques" utilized by the Student Advisors and the "treatment staff" in other related programs, it is apparent that the Student Advisor program has in fact provided services to meet the identified needs. The Student Advisors who worked in the program are a group of dedicated, well educated, experienced, concerned and capable individuals. Most have weathered adverse conditions in their respective schools and have done a commendable job in setting up and conducting a program in their respective schools which compromised as little as possible the needs of the school, the students and the expectations of the federal grant proposal. In this respect too, the program performed well.

With respect to the program measurable objectives, the sample population data indicate that two of the

program measurable objectives were fully achieved (Self-Concept and Detentions), two of the objectives were not achieved (Suspensions and Absences), and the remaining two objectives were met in part (Academic Achievement -- depending upon the specific measure utilized) or were very nearly met (Referrals to DHRS Intake -- 78.5% were not referred compared to the criterion of 80%). When these data are considered, it cannot be said that the Student Advisor project was totally successful.

The following conclusions and recommendations will summarize the information presented in the previous sections of this report as it is related to the major problems of the program and will provide suggestions which it is reasonable to believe will impact on the program's performance. Although these are considered by this evaluator to be the "major problems", most are not major in terms of their size or complexity, but rather are fairly simple and have practical and "do-able" solutions. In fact, some of the recommendations have been implemented in the third year grant program already.

## Program

Recommendation: The Student Advisor program should develop goals, objectives and working guidelines which clearly define the scope of the program, the tasks to be accomplished and specific operational policies and procedures to be utilized.

The Student Advisor program never had a single set of goals and objectives which were clearly understandable and acceptable by the Student Advisor staff, the school staff and the granting agency<sup>1</sup>, simultaneously. Said plainly, the Student Advisor program was caught in the middle of two groups, the individual schools in which the program was implemented, and the granting agency, which were often viewed as if they were in conflict. The schools, on the one hand, recognized a need to serve students who were habitually truant from school, suspended from school, or otherwise disruptive in school, while the granting agency perceived a need to serve youths who had come to the attention of law

---

<sup>1</sup> Granting agency meaning LEAA, the Bureau of Criminal Justice Planning & Assistance, and the Hillsborough County Criminal Justice Planning Unit.

enforcement for some delinquent act or who were at risk of becoming delinquent (and were required by law to focus on this group of youth). In reality, a considerable amount of overlap among the two groups of youths was present and the only conflict was a difference of opinion as to the approach to be utilized by the program. Nevertheless, the result was that no one was completely satisfied with the program goals and objectives and continued change in the program's operation occurred.

The above recommendation is necessary to resolve this problem and can best be accomplished by conducting a series of working meetings to further define the needs and responsibilities of all parties involved. Since no further LEAA funding is planned, this process should be simplified. However, all principal figures in the program administration and operation still need to reach a consensus on the key issues prior to continuation of the program into the next school year.

In addition, prior to program continuation, a formal orientation for all school staff should be developed and utilized. The program is only as

good as the support and cooperation of the entire school staff and the other related community resources, particularly law enforcement, DHRS and court personnel.

Recommendation: Increased emphasis should be placed on utilizing the Student Advisor program as an alternative to the traditional methods of dealing with problem students in the schools.

The Student Advisor program was designed to "fill the gap" by providing services to students that would not otherwise be available to them. In this respect, the program was able to provide continuing services to a large number of students who might have otherwise received only one-time or periodic counseling from the teacher, dean or principal. However, the program was not heavily used as an alternative to the traditional reprimand or other punitive methods of dealing with problem students in the schools. (In fact, students known by school staff to be on the Student Advisors'

caseloads were often disciplined without even notifying the Student Advisor of the impending action.) The real advantage of using the Student Advisor program as an alternative is that it is a constructive way of handling problems while keeping the student in school. The recent expansion of the in-school suspension program is an indication that this kind of an alternative is practical.

The relationship between this recommendation and the first recommendation is important. Related guidelines and operating procedures need to be clearly defined and understood. This could be accomplished during a series of pre-implementation planning and orientation sessions.

Recommendation: The Student Advisor program should strictly limit the size of caseloads in order to improve the quality of services provided.

Recognized state and national standards for probation and aftercare services indicate that caseload sizes should be limited to 35 clients. Throughout the Student Advisor project caseloads extended to more than 100 students. Caseloads of



this size ultimately result in quality service for only a limited number of students and a very superficial involvement with a majority of students. A reduction in caseload size is needed. Such a reduction also needs to be accompanied by an emphasis on quality of service rather than quantity of contacts. In this respect, the Student Advisor project can only be expected to provide on-going quality services to a limited number of selected students.

It should be noted that caseload and workload can be differentiated. This type of case management scheme allows for both an active caseload of students requiring intensive, quality services and additional special assignments such as truancy investigations, parental interviews, background and social histories and follow-up contacts. The total workload then is the combination of caseload assignments and special assignments. The real advantage is that this differentiation yields better accountability and a more accurate description of services provided.

Recommendation: The Student Advisor program should develop standard data collection procedures for the uniform collection and maintenance of information.

The maintenance of accurate and complete case files and other related records of program activities is an essential part of the sound management and operation of any service program such as the Student Advisor program. Standard data collection procedures and instruments help in routinizing the collection of these data and thus minimize the burden of record keeping and eliminate lengthy record searches for retrieval of required data after the fact. At a minimum, consideration should be given to the development of standard intake and exit interview forms which provide for input from the student, family, school personnel, DHRS and law enforcement personnel, and the Student Advisor; and a Student Advisor/student contact form which documents contacts and progress made.

This recommendation also carries with it the suggestion that a policy on confidentiality and maintenance of records (beyond the specific school

year), should be developed by the program within the general guidelines established by the School Board. Confidentiality could be at least partially addressed by the separation of case file information into one section with general demographic and program activity data and another section with personal, confidential information. Maintenance of records beyond the program year would then include only the maintenance of that data which is non-confidential in nature.

Recommendation: The Student Advisor program should develop written treatment goals for each student accepted into the program.

Since the Student Advisor program serves a variety of students with a variety of individual needs it seems reasonable that each student should only be expected to make progress toward the resolution of his respective problems. The only way to measure such progress is to identify the specific problems, to work toward some agreed-upon goals for the specific student, and to identify at

regular intervals the degree to which the goals were met.

This type of goal-oriented approach also has benefits with regard to measuring program performance. As was stated earlier, the Student Advisor program cannot be expected to be "everything to everyone." This goal-oriented approach will allow the Student Advisor program to assess directly its ability to assist students in areas where they need specific help, rather than trying to assess indirectly its ability to assist students in general.

Recommendation: The Student Advisor program should develop a policy and specific criteria for release of students from the "active caseload" status.

The most current literature on the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency no longer recognizes the use of extended periods of "treatment" as being the most effective means of rehabilitation of juvenile delinquents. Rather, most treatment programs accept the fact that their maximum impact

will occur within the first three to six months; that is, the theory of diminishing returns applies to the treatment of juvenile delinquents. This recommendation advocates the acceptance of that theory. In fact, if the students in the Student Advisor program are functioning at such a level as to require either psychological services or educational remediation extending beyond this period, other community or school resources should be utilized.

Within such a "maximum time" criteria the Student Advisor program should develop other criteria for determining the appropriate condition under which a student should be released from the active caseload. These criteria should be related to the general program goals and the specific goals established for each youth who enters the program.

### Evaluation

No specific recommendations for future evaluations of the Student Advisor program have been made. However, the following paragraphs discuss some of the problems of evaluating the Student Advisor program and suggest steps which could be taken to improve evaluability.

The first and most serious problem with the current evaluation of the Student Advisor program is that there was no control or comparison group. Thus, a comparison of actual outcomes with expected outcomes (measurable objectives) and an analysis of within-group differences was the best possible method of assessing the program. If identifying the "true effects" of the program is desirable, an experimental design using a control or comparison group will be necessary. This could be accomplished by identifying two or three other county schools with characteristics similar to the Student Advisor schools, for use as a comparison group.

Second, future evaluation should focus on a few specific outcome objectives. For monitoring purposes a combination of process and outcome objectives

may be appropriate and this basic kind of progress assessment may allow the use of from six to ten objectives. For any future intensive evaluation, however, consideration should be given to identifying no more than one measure for academic achievement, one measure for in-school behavior and one measure for delinquent behavior. Decisions regarding the most appropriate measure for each of these areas should be made prior to program continuation.

Third, care should be taken to ensure that follow-up and data collection procedures are consistent. That is, follow-up periods for each measure should be consistent for each student in the program rather than having variable follow-up periods dependent upon the date the student enters the program. Similarly, data reported by DHRS should be scrutinized for accuracy and consistency. These problems were present during the current evaluation and are reasons for questioning the program outcomes.

Fourth and finally, short-term follow-up procedures should be implemented by the Student Advisor program. This will provide a measure of parent, student and school satisfaction with services provided,

will ensure that release from the program was appropriate and that subsequent adjustment, with respect to school and family, is progressing. A client follow-up of thirty days would be reasonable with the Student Advisor program.

Overall, this report recognizes the need for services for delinquent and disruptive students in schools, the potential of the Student Advisor program for providing these services, and the current achievements of the Student Advisor program in light of both the program's goals and objectives and the operational problems encountered. Further, recommendations are provided which should lead to improvement in the planning and operation of the program.



APPENDIX A

Evaluation Design:

The Student Advisor: Intervention versus Intake

## EVALUATION DESIGN

Program Name: The Student Advisor: Intervention Versus Intake

General Purpose of Program: To employ a full time student advisor for each eighth and ninth grade school center to work on a daily basis with predelinquent and delinquent youth in an effort to prevent acts of truancy, suspensions, disruptions, and subsequent acts of delinquency.

---

### I. Introduction

This evaluation design is based upon available documents relating to the initiation and operation of the student advisor program, including grant proposals, quarterly progress reports, data and informational forms in use by the project, discussions with staff of the Criminal Justice Planning Unit, and discussions with the project director and student advisors regarding operations, goals, objectives, measures, problems, and plans.

The content of this design does not depart drastically from the material in the reports submitted by the project director. Since the project has reported rather extensively on the objectives, measures, and data collected, the purpose of this design will not be to suggest massive revision of the self-evaluation procedures already being employed, but rather the intention is to provide a more standardized approach to goals, objectives, measures, process, and outcomes consistent with established operations of the project and also compatible with the evaluation procedures in the other funded projects under the

jurisdiction of the Hillsborough County Criminal Justice Planning Unit. This evaluation design will also attempt to reorganize the goals and objectives, make suggestions regarding the quantitative measures, and elaborate on the evaluability of the objectives.

The organization of this Evaluation Design begins with an outline of the current objectives reorganized into clusters of goals with specific objectives to reach the goals. Following the outline are comments regarding the comprehensive set of goals and objectives with remarks about the relative contribution of the process and outcome objectives and suggestions for future phases of the program. The major part of the report consists of statements of the process and outcome goals and objectives of the program, each being followed by comments on the data processing required for evaluation of the objectives, and interpretation specifications and suggestions. Within this serial listing, additional objectives and goals are suggested for internal evaluation and possibly for subsequent external evaluation of the program. Finally, summary recommendations are made and remarks are offered about extra material which should be included in a Final Evaluation Report.

## II. Outline of Current Goals and Objectives

- A. Goal: Establish and maintain the program
  - 1. Objective: Employ personnel
  - 2. Objective: Train personnel
- B. Goal: Identify and select clients for the program
  - 1. Objective: Establish criteria and priorities
  - 2. Objective: Select the clients
- C. Goal: Develop relationships with supporting services
  - 1. Objective: Hold conferences with school and community persons
  - 2. Objective: Integrate services for delinquent youth
  - 3. Objective: Consult with Programs for the Socially Maladjusted
  - 4. Objective: Identify educational, vocational, medical, or similar problems and make proper referrals
- D. Goal: Reduce delinquent and disruptive behavior
  - 1. Objective: Increase school attendance
  - 2. Objective: Reduce school disruptions and suspensions
  - 3. Objective: Reduce criminal offense reports
  - 4. Objective: Reduce recidivism to the Detention Center
- E. Goal: Improve academic and social behavior
  - 1. Objective: Improve the self-concept
  - 2. Objective: Improve academic achievement
  - 3. Objective: Establish individual goals
  - 4. Objective: Provide prevocational experiences
- F. Goal: Assess the effectiveness of the procedures and techniques of the program

### III. Comments on Current Goals and Objectives

The objectives of the project have been grouped into six functional categories, each category labeled as a major goal. Within each goal more specific and measurable objectives are stated. The first three goals are commonly called "process" goals in the terminology of evaluation research. That is, they are concerned with establishing, maintaining, and modifying the procedures, the operations, and the working arrangements of the program. By themselves, of course, they say nothing about the major purpose hoped for at the beginning of the program: to prevent acts of truancy, suspensions, disruptions, and subsequent acts of delinquency by the target population. But, the process goals must be reached, more or less, before it is possible to proceed to the more important "outcome" goals. Hence, process goals are not insignificant and it is wise in the early phases of a program to formally list them and assess, rather than just assume, their accomplishment. After a program is well established, only periodic check should be made on process measures and less time should be spent on them and on their evaluation--unless something seems to be going wrong or working poorly in the organizational process. The main reason that emphasis should be taken away from process is that with limitations of time and effort, the outcomes measures may be neglected.

It may be seen from the Outline of Current Goals and Objectives that major emphasis was placed on process objectives in the Student Advisor Program. The employment and training of personnel, the selection of

clients, and the development of working relationships with related agencies and resources are all necessary steps in getting the program going. In subsequent reports on this program there will not be the need to spend as much time on such objectives.

Goals D and E are "outcome" goals. Actually, though, only the objectives under Goal D are the final outcome objectives promised in the purpose of the program; namely, the reduction of truancy, disruptions, suspensions, offenses, and delinquency. The objectives under Goal E appear to be outcome objectives and, indeed, are outcomes of the treatments of the program. But in terms of the stated purpose of the program, they are only preliminary steps having to do with the personal, social, and academic improvement of the students, and only assumed to be related to subsequent reduction in delinquent and other inappropriate behaviors. And they probably are related--but sooner or later such assumed relationships must be empirically demonstrated. The objectives under Goal F are process objectives; however, they are directly linked to outcomes in the intention to identify what in process is related or not related to positive outcome. As less time is spent on process objectives of program establishment as the program proceeds, more time and effort should be spent on self-analysis and search for cause and effect relationships. Only by identifying what does and does not work may improvement be made in the results of the program.

Thus, from a brief examination of the goals and objectives attended to by the program, some preliminary conclusions may be stated. Primarily, it is seen that greater emphasis has been placed on process

than on outcome goals, but an emphasis that may not be severely out of balance in the early phases of the program. Still, more attention should be placed on the outcome measures. Particularly, effort should be expended to assure that the outcome objectives are well-stated and capable of appropriate measurement. Further comments will be made regarding these measures in the body of this report.

#### IV. Listing of Goals and Objectives

The goals and objectives are listed below with comments on Data Processing and Interpretation for each objective. It is not the purpose of this Evaluation Design to state the actual results which are found in the Progress Reports of the program. However, remarks of Critique will be made as appropriate on difficulties with the objectives as stated and as measured. Additionally, "potential" goals and objectives will be listed along with the "current" goals and objectives found on the Outline. In some cases these potential objectives may be needed for proper evaluation of the program; in other cases they may be desirable for the future if time and resources of the program permit their examination.

A. Goal: Establish and maintain the operations and structure of the student advisor program.

1. Process Objective: Employ 100% of the personnel necessary to implement the program.

Data Processing: Inspect employment results. Compare positions filled with grant specifications.

Interpretation: Assess whether all positions have been filled with persons meeting qualifications and within a reasonable period after funding date. Explain any discrepancies.

2. Process Objective: Provide an intensive in-service training program for the student advisors in techniques for handling behavior disorders, both initially and throughout the duration of the program.



**CONTINUED**

**1 OF 2**

Data Processing: Record dates of training sessions, attendance, and describe content of training. Accumulate hours of training and any evidence of increase in student advisor performance after training.

Interpretation: Assess whether training was adequate in terms of content, duration, and timeliness. Assess the results of any measurements of the knowledge or skill gained by the student advisors.

3. Process Objective: Classify the Student Advisors in terms of significant professional differences.

Data Processing: Inspect records and interview personnel regarding education, counseling techniques, and professional experience.

Interpretation: Determine dimensions on which to distinguish Student Advisors that might differentially affect success and failure with different kinds of students.

4. Process Objective: Determine and establish the most effective and efficient organizational structure for the program.

Data Processing: Examine available records and interview personnel involved in the Program and in the school administrations regarding the relationship of the Program to the school system and to the optimal organizational structure.

Interpretation: Assess data collected and attempt to determine the optimal structure and relationships viable under existing financial and legal constraints. Discuss the constraints and means for resolution of the obstacles to improved organization.

B. Goal: Identify and select the clients for the program.

1. Process Objective: Establish criteria and priorities for need of the program services.

Data Processing: Inspect all available sources of information such as school records and community agency records to ascertain the types of students with problems related to the purposes of the student advisor program. Review the purposes of the program, the capabilities of the advisors, and other resources available to the program.

Interpretation: Make a comparative analysis of the needs of the potential client population and the capabilities of the program. On this basis eligibility criteria and priorities for admittance to the program should have been established. Critique the criteria and priorities in view of experience in the program.

2. Process Objective: Select the clients for the program.

Data Processing: Inspect all available records on individual students and compare information with criteria and priorities.

Interpretation: Identify all students meeting eligibility requirements for the program. Classify the students by the priorities for treatment. Critique the classification scheme in view of experience in the program.

3. Process Objective: Classify the clients according to characteristics which might identify those more or less amenable to various program treatments.

Data Processing: Inspect records for differential characteristics.

Interpretation: Determine identifiable classifications with prospects for different treatment requirements, such as the origin and nature of the offense that led to selection for the program.

C. Goal: Develop relationships with supporting services and resources.

1. Process Objective: Hold conferences with school and community persons interested in the students. Record numbers and types of conferences held for students, type of assistance received, and any evidence of success or failure. Classify conferences held by various resources.

Interpretation: Assess any patterns in the kinds of conferences held and judged to be helpful. Identify trends in the frequency of contacts and try to explain them. Indicate whether conferences were held within the criterion of 14 days of referral. Evaluate any measures of success or failure of the conferences by student problem area and nature of the contact. Suggest ways to improve in the future.

2. Process Objective: Integrate services to delinquent youth by establishing a more positive working relationship between schools, the Division of Youth Services, Pupil Personnel Services, and Exceptional Child Education.

Data Processing: Record joint conferences between the agencies mentioned and project personnel. Record other contacts and

relationships with the agencies. Record data on any ratings of success or failure and areas of particularly good or bad experiences.

Interpretation: Integrate data available indicating whether progress has been made in integrating services and improving relationships with the several supporting agencies. Reach judgments regarding areas of success and areas of little progress. Describe any salient problems in working with the agencies. Make suggestions for the future in improvement of these relationships.

3. Process Objective: Student advisors will consult with the Supervisor of Programs for the Socially Maladjusted and with other student advisors periodically to resolve common problems.

Data Processing: Record contacts with the Supervisor of Programs for the Socially Maladjusted. Record joint meetings of the student advisors and the major topics discussed.

Interpretation: Assess the adequacy and the frequency of the contacts and the joint meetings. Indicate any patterns in the kinds of problems discussed. Assess any measures or judgments of the usefulness of the conferences. Make suggestions for the future as to the need for such conferences, the recommended frequency, and preferred format.

4. Process Objective: Identify those youth participating in the student advisor program who have educational, vocational, medical, or other related needs and refer them to the appropriate school or community resource. Provide follow-up to insure that the needed service is provided.

Data Processing: Record the number of referrals to the various school and community resources. Record information on adequacy of services provided by the resource.

Interpretation: Judge the adequacy of the referral process by assessing both the efficiency and accuracy of referral by the student advisors and also the adequacy of services rendered by the resource. Describe problems to be overcome and make suggestions for future use of referrals to these and other potential resources.

D. Goal: Reduce delinquent and disruptive behavior.

1. Outcome Objective: Increase the average daily attendance of students served by the program.

Data Processing: Examine attendance records for students before and after they were served by the student advisors. Compare total absences before and after and also unexcused absences.

Interpretation: Discuss the validity and reliability of excused and unexcused absences for judging this objective. Give comparisons on both measures and attempt to reach a meaningful interpretation of attendance changes for the students. Compare the figures with the criterion of a 12% increase.

Critique: These dependent measures must be defined precisely, meaningfully, and standardized across schools. Otherwise, their meaning will be ambiguous and invalid.

2. Outcome Objective: Reduce the number of disruptions and suspensions in the schools.

Data Processing: Compile the records of suspensions before and after the start of the student advisor program. Compare suspensions and disruptions overall and by schools. Also, compare these measures for the students served by the program, as well as for school populations as a whole.

Interpretation: Explain any differences before and after for both the whole population and for those served by student advisors. Describe problems in collecting data on the disruptions measure and plans for improvement next year. Describe the lack of standardization of the meaning and use of suspensions from school to school and the impact this has on interpretation. Reach reasonable conclusions regarding the effect of the student advisor program on these undesirable behaviors.

Critique: These dependent measures must be more precisely and meaningfully defined. Without standardized meaning and recording across the school system, the results will remain relatively meaningless.

3. Outcome Objective: Reduce the number of criminal offense reports filed on the students.

Data Processing: From the records of local law enforcement agencies, compile the number of offense reports for the students in the student advisor school populations and also separately for the students served by the student advisors.

Compare these data for periods before and during the term of the student advisor program.

Interpretation: From the comparative data, reach conclusions regarding significant reductions in offense reports. Carefully interpret the meaning of the figures available from the law enforcement agencies after discussing the problems with the measurements.

Critique: More complete data must be obtained for clear interpretation.

4. Outcome Objective: Reduce the recidivism rate of the eighth and ninth grade students to the Hillsborough Regional Detention Center.

Data Processing: Compile data on recidivism from records of the Hillsborough Regional Detention Center regarding students in the student advisor program.

Interpretation: Describe the temporal inability to measure this objective. Indicate plans for correction next year.

Critique: Since this objective was not measured this year, be sure that appropriate comparative data are available for assessment next year.

- E. Goal: Improve academic and social behavior of students in the student advisor program.

1. Outcome Objective: Improve the self-concept of the students in the student advisor program.

Data Processing: Administer the Piers-Harris self concept scale to students before and after being served by student



advisors. Compare the mean scores before and after the program.

Interpretation: Describe the meaning of any significant change in the mean scores on the scale.

Critique: Care must be taken in attributing cause when interpreting any changes in self concept scores. There are several possible determining variables.

2. Outcome Objective: Improve academic achievement in at least two subject areas for students in the program.

Data Processing: In the selected subject areas for each student, collect data on grade point averages and any other available means of measuring level of achievement. Compare the scores before and after time in the student advisor program. Indicate what per cent of the students improved in performance.

Interpretation: Describe the change, if any, in academic achievement and assess the magnitude of the change in comparison to the criterion goal of improvement by five per cent of the students in the program.

3. Outcome Objective: Establish individual goals for each person in the program.

Data Collection: Inspect records of students for planning and delineation of goals. Determine the proportion of students with established goals.

Interpretation: Comment on the degree of success in attaining this objective. Discuss the major problems in accomplishing this objective and the persons to be involved. Discuss any future plans for assessing whether the goals are realistic and whether the students subsequently meet their respective goals.

4. Outcome Objective: The project will insure prevocational exploratory experiences for 100% of the youth, and vocational training in the form of job placement for 10% of youth in the program through existing Work-Experience Programs in the present system.

Interpretation: Give the reasons why this objective can not be reached at this time.

5. Outcome Objective: Improve behavior and attitudes of students in the classroom, in the home, and in relationship to the Student Advisors and other resource persons.

Data Processing: Develop techniques for the rating and judgment of behavior and attitudes in the classroom, in the home, and in the Advisor setting. Collect judgments on the students from teachers, peers, parents, and officials as appropriate.

Interpretation: Compare the ratings before, during, and after treatment in the program and interpret these more subtle measures of progress.

F. Goal: Assess the procedures and techniques used by the student advisors.

1. Process Objective: Identify those procedures and techniques used by the student advisors which best contribute to the goals of the project..

Data Processing: Compile the opinions and evidence of the student advisors regarding the efficiency and effectiveness of procedures and practices.

Interpretation: Identify areas of agreement and disagreement regarding the success and failure of various practices.

Interpret these agreements and disagreements and attempt to reach recommendations for modifications in future procedures. Indicate any future plans for more objective measurement of the effectiveness of procedures and practices.

2. Process Objective Linked to Outcomes: Determine whether different kinds of students are more amenable to treatment than others.

Data Processing: Using the student classifications to be developed from a prior objective, collect data on the measures of success and failure by student classification.

Interpretation: Assess the relative success of the treatment on the various groupings of students. Attempt to explain the reasons for the differences in success.

3. Process Objective Linked to Outcomes: Determine whether different kinds of Student Advisors are more successful than others with the students.

Data Processing: Using the classification scheme previously developed in an earlier objective for distinguishing advisors, collect data on the relative success of the different classes.

Interpretation: Assess the relative success of the different categories of Student Advisors; by counseling techniques, by attitude or approach to the clients, and by individual differences considered to be significant.

4. Process Objective Linked to Outcomes: Determine whether different kinds of treatment practices (apart from Student Advisor characteristics) are more successful than others.

Data Processing: Construct classifications of different practices of advising; such as individual versus group treatment, and the degree of use of the several supporting services and resources previously identified and used by the program.

Interpretation: Assess the relative success of different methods and the use of different resources and services. Attempt to explain any differences in progress obtained.

5. Process Objective Linked to Outcomes: Determine whether any intervariable interactions occur among the different kinds of students, the different kinds of advisors, and the different treatment practices.

Data Processing: Collect data on the combined groupings of the levels of the above variables. Compare the success of the various combinations.

Interpretation: Assess the relative progress of these variable combinations in order to determine which combinations of students, advisors, and treatments result in success or in failure. Attempt to understand the differences found in order to revise practices and procedures and to recognize the determinants of progress under control or not under control of the program. Such an understanding should lead to feedback throughout the operations and structure of the program.

6. Process Objective: Evaluate the criteria of progress.

Greater effort should be expended in refinement of the criteria of success and failure. Not only should existing measures be improved, but new and better measures developed. Only through sensitive, reliable, valid, and sophisticated dependent measures will any possible results of the efforts of the program be demonstrated.

G. Goal: Assess the relative costs/benefits of the program.

Whenever feasible, attention should be directed not only to determining what procedures produce benefits and progress in the program, but also to the relative costs of different benefits. Practical human judgments must be made regarding the feasibility and social value of procedures and programs in terms of human but also fiscal realities. Only sophisticated data on the real costs/benefits can assure a basis for appropriate decisions.

## V. Concluding Comments

While interpretive comments were made throughout the list of goals and objectives, certain general comments are appropriate at this time. From an examination of the several process measures it appears that the initiation and establishment of the program was accomplished and sufficiently documented. In the future less time and effort should be expended on the collection of data documenting the daily processes, unless problems occur, or more penetrating self-analysis of the procedures seems warranted. On the other hand, more time and effort should be spent on the outcome measures, particularly on the direct outcomes related to reducing delinquent and other inappropriate behaviors. The indirect outcome measures of improvement of academic, personal, and social behavior are certainly meaningful, but they do not constitute the major purpose of the program. To the extent that relationships between these personal variables and behavioral variables of maladaptive behavior can be demonstrated, they will make a greater impact. The set of direct outcome measures of delinquent and inappropriate behavior does appear to cover reasonably well the possible criterion measures available in the local community and the school system. However, the major problem with these objectives--and there is a problem--is that as a set their measures were often ambiguous, unreliable, or incomplete. It is important for this program to direct more effort toward the precise, reliable, and valid measurement of the promised outcome objectives, since only through their sophisticated measurement can a foundation be developed for improvement of the program and, indeed, for justification of continued funding.

## VI. Evaluation Report

This "Evaluation Design" does not constitute the outline of the "Evaluation Report." Such a report would also include more descriptive introductory material and several concluding sections of considerable importance.

### A. Extra achievements

Extra achievements of the project should be enumerated; goals not planned but accomplished, successes not expected, and achievements beyond those explicitly anticipated should be described.

### B. Problems

Problems in the operation of the program should be thoroughly discussed; especially problems and constraints related to the accomplishment or failure to reach explicit goals, modifications that would lead to greater efficiency and effectiveness, the manner in which the inevitable problems were solved, and the problems remaining unsolved.

### C. Conclusions

Overall conclusions about the results of the program should be developed, taking into account the validity of the objectives, the supporting data, and the procedural constraints. Also, the costs/benefits should be assessed and subjective remarks made about the results in terms of their importance and difficulty of achievement.

APPENDIX B

1975 Student Advisor Measurable Objectives



### Schedule A (continuation sheet #3)

Each Student-Advisor would have a minimum case load of fifty (50) clients and would be employed for the normal ten (10) months school year. The Program Coordinator would be employed for eleven (11) months as would the Clerk Typist to insure the proper completion of all reports at the end of each school year and adequately plan for the beginning of each school year prior to return of students.

It would be the responsibility of the Student-Advisors working with the Principal or his appointed representative to make the services through the school system and community available to each student identified as pre-delinquent and delinquent according to the criteria prescribed by the Florida Juvenile Justice System.

#### II. Measurable Objectives:

##### Project Goals:

1. Reduce the conditions which are depriving youth an opportunity for an education and are contributing to the crime rate.
2. Provide daily intervention between secondary school age students and problems contributing to school truancy, dropouts, expulsions and suspensions.

##### Objectives to Meet Goals:

1. Employ 100% of the personnel necessary to implement the program. Objectives to be accomplished within sixty (60) days after funding date.
2. Provide an initial intensive in-service program for the Student-Advisors in techniques for handling behavior disorders to begin within ninety (90) days after funding date. Training would continue throughout the school year.
3. The Student-Advisor will identify 100% of the youth in each secondary school through school records, teacher conferences, community agency involvement, and other pertinent sources to determine youth most evident in need of services which will prevent further school failure. Objectives to be accomplished within thirty (30) days after employment.
4. Establish a priority for approaching the list based on the needs of the individual youth identified. (This list would include all identified youth previously referred to the School Security Office.) Objective to be accomplished thirty (30) days after employment.

Schedule A (continuation sheet #4)

5. Initiate a conference with each Dean, Guidance Counselor and Teacher responsible for the educational program of the youth in an initial effort to resolve any conflict. Include the youth in the conferences. Objectives to be accomplished within fourteen (14) days after priorities are established.
6. Each Student-Advisor will consult with the Program Coordinator and/or the Supervisor of Programs for the Socially Maladjusted and other Student-Advisors monthly for two (2) hours in an in-service program designed as an effort to resolve similar problems.
7. The program will reduce the number of disruptions and suspensions in the eighth and ninth grade school centers in 1974-75 by 10% as compared to the number in 1973-74 for the same monthly time periods. A rate will be determined in order to allow for population growth.
8. The program will identify 100% of the youth who will directly benefit from early pre-vocational exploratory experiences with referral being made to the appropriate school resource or community agency.
9. The project will insure pre-vocational exploratory experiences for 100% of all youth and vocational training in the form of job placement for 10% of all youth in the program through existing Work-Experience Programs in the existing system.
10. The program will increase the Average Daily Membership for Hillsborough County eighth and ninth grade school centers by twenty percent (20%), based on days lost during preceding school year directly related to truancy.
11. There exists a direct correlation between truancy and residential and non-residential daylight burglary and larceny. The project will reduce the incidence of residential and non-residential daylight burglary and larceny during school hours by five percent (5%). Base line data has been obtained from the Project for Pre-Delinquent and Delinquent Identification and Planning, Tampa Police Department, Hillsborough County Sheriff's Department, Temple Terrace Police Department, and Plant City Police Department.
12. The Project will reduce delinquency in Hillsborough County eighth and ninth grade school centers by twenty percent (20%) as compared to the same time period in 1973. This objective will be measured by offense reports from the Tampa Police, Hillsborough County Sheriff, and the Division of Youth Services for individual schools.

Schedule A (continuation sheet #5)

13. The Project will reduce the recidivism rate of delinquency in Hillsborough County eighth and ninth grade centers by twenty percent (20%) as compared to the same time period in 1973. This objective will be measured by offense reports from the Division of Youth Services in individual schools.
14. It will be necessary to improve the self-concept of socially maladjusted students in eighth and ninth grade centers. This objective will be measured by the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale. An increase in self-concept for each student of ten percent (10%) will be found from pre to post testing.
15. The Project will identify those procedures and techniques used by the project personnel which best contribute to the goals of the Project. Student-Advisors will provide information during quarterly planning sessions which will identify the procedures most commonly found to be effective in working with delinquent youth. This information will be summarized by the Project Evaluator in quarterly reports.
16. The Project will integrate services to delinquent youth by further establishing a more positive working relationship between schools, the Division of Youth Services, Pupil Personnel Services, and Exceptional Child Education. Project Personnel will engage in joint conferences between all the units mentioned above during the school year and this information will be summarized in quarterly reports.
17. It will be necessary to write individual goals for youth identified for the Project. General overall goals will include:
  - a. Initial termination of disruptive classroom behavior.
  - b. Improvement of self-concept.
  - c. Improved performance in at least two subjects.
  - d. Identification of vision/hearing problems.
  - e. Improvement in peer relationships. Measurement of these goals will include:
    - a. Decrease in number of descriptive behaviors and subsequent suspensions.
    - b. Increased scores on Piers-Harris Self-Concept Scale.

Schedule A (continuation sheet #6)

- c. Referral on all youth will be made to the Department for Communication Disorders/Exceptional Child Education.
- d. Teacher reports, reports from school administration and group observation by Student-Advisors.

III. Procedures and Timetable:

The procedures to be employed in meeting the objectives of the Project include a meeting with the Junior High Principals' Advisory Council in order to begin an implementation of the Project. This meeting would be preceded by a meeting with the Supervisor of School Security and his staff to establish basic procedures for initial lists of youth most in need of these services, and who are reported still in school.

Further, an outline of laws and procedures for implementing these laws that pertain to school attendance would be devised. Plans would be made for the clarification of laws and procedures at the first in-service training meeting by the Supervisor of Security.

It would be necessary to establish payroll procedures with the Business Department of the School System in order to reimburse for services and for accountability of funds expended in all areas.

IV. Evaluation:

1. 100% of all youth served will be individually evaluated daily as to the initial base data for truancy established in each case versus the trend in absentees on a daily continuum. This data will be compiled daily, weekly, monthly, and quarterly, and utilized in the quarterly reports to be submitted to the Governor's Council on Criminal Justice. This data will also be utilized to determine the effectiveness of the intervention in individual group cases.
2. The types of services to be offered will include a daily conference with each youth receiving services to determine if problems need resolving. A home visit to consult with parents will be initiated in order to clarify the Student-Advisor role and solicit parental cooperation. This visit will be accomplished by the Student Advisor quarterly or as the need arises. The compilation of data will be accomplished by the Program Coordinator and evaluated by the Coordinator of Evaluation in the Project for Pre-Delinquent Delinquent Identification and Planning.
3. A comparison of the numbers of referrals to the Division of Youth Services Intake, for cases supported by data confirming a persistent delinquency pattern, will be initiated with the Supervisory staff of the Division of Youth Services county regional centers in order to provide base line data for comparison of new cases referred. It will be the intent of the Project to include the Supervisory Staff of the Division of Youth Services, and other agencies, in the in-

APPENDIX C

Student Advisor - Revised Measurable Objectives, 1975

STUDENT ADVISOR: INTERVENTION VS INTAKE

REVISED MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES, 1975

1. Employ 100% of the personnel necessary to implement the program. Objectives to be accomplished within sixty (60) days after funding date.
2. Provide an initial intensive in-service program for the Student Advisors in techniques for handling behavior disorders to begin within ninety (90) days after funding date.
3. The Student Advisor will identify 100% of the youths, in the schools to which a student advisor is assigned, that are eligible for his/her services. A minimum of fifty (50) and a maximum of eighty (80) youths will be served at any given time.
4. Maintain a list of youths eligible for the program. The list should be approached in the following priority:
  - (a) Youths returning to school from detention.
  - (b) Youths identified from police offense/arrest records.
  - (c) Habitual truants

This list of between fifty and eighty youths will be developed within thirty (30) days of employment. The list will be updated each month. Establish a priority for approaching the list based on the needs of individual youth identified. Objective will be accomplished thirty days after employment.

5. Conferences will be held as needed with school and/or community individuals interested in a particular student. Whenever appropriate the youth will be included in the conferences. Conferences should be held within fourteen (14) days of the youth's referral.
6. Each Student Advisor will consult with the Supervisor of Programs for the Socially Maladjusted, or his representative, and other Student Advisors monthly for two (2) hours in an in-service program designed to resolve similar problems.

7. The program will reduce the number of truancies and suspensions in the eighth and ninth grade centers in 1975-76 by 10% as compared to the number in 1974-75.
8. Identify those youths participating in the Student Advisor program who have educational, vocational, medical, or other related needs and refer them to the appropriate school or community resource. Provide follow-up to ensure that the needed services are provided. A record will be maintained of the number of referrals to various school and community resources.
9. In eighth and ninth grade centers the truancy will be reduced by 10%. A reduction in days lost, as a result of truancy, would result in an increase in average daily attendance.
10. Reduce by 10% the number of offense/arrest reports filed on youths from eighth and ninth grade centers.
11. Reduce by 10% the number of youths entering the Hillsborough Regional Detention Center from eighth and ninth grade centers.
12. It will be necessary to improve the self-concept of socially maladjusted students in eighth and ninth grade centers. This objective will be measured by the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale. An increase in self-concept for each student of 10% will be found from pre- to post-testing.
13. The project will identify those procedures and techniques used by the project personnel which best contribute to the goals of the project. Student Advisors will provide information during quarterly planning sessions which will identify the procedures most commonly found to be effective in working with delinquent youth. This information will be summarized by the project evaluator in quarterly reports.
14. The project will intergrate services to delinquent youth by further establishing a more positive working relationship between schools, the Division of Youth Services, Pupil Personnel Services, and Exceptional Child Education. Project personnel will engage in joint conferences between all the units mentioned above during the school year and this information will be summarized in quarterly reports.

15. It will be necessary to determine individual goals for youth identified for the project. General goals will include:

- (a) Improvement of self-concept.
- (b) Improved performance in at least two subjects.
- (c) Identification of vision and/or hearing problems.
- (d) Improvement in the following areas:  
Measurement of these goals will include:
  - 1) Increased scores on Piers-Harris Self-Concept Scale
  - 2) Referral of all youths will be made to the Department for Communication Disorders, Department of Education for Exceptional Students.
  - 3) Teacher reports, reports from school administration and group observation by Student Advisors.

16. Improved academic achievement by four (4) months for those youths participating in this project (in those schools where audio-visual equipment provided by this project is utilized), in at least two (2) subject areas.

Reading will be measured with the Spache Diagnostic Reading Scale (this is a diagnostic instrument) and mathematics will be measured with the Wide Range Achievement Test.



APPENDIX D

1976 Student Advisor Measurable Objectives

## B. Measurable Objectives

- Objective 1. The Student Advisor will identify 100% of youth in the school that are eligible for his or her services. A minimum of fifty (50), a maximum of eighty (80) youths will be served at any given time. Priorities for selection of youth are as follows:
- Youths who are returning to the school system from the Hillsborough County Regional Detention Center. This includes youths in both secure and non-secure detention.
  - Youths who have been identified as having committed an offense and upon whom an offense report is filed with one of the law enforcement agencies within Hillsborough County.
- Objective 2. Provide an inservice program for the Student-Advisors in (1) techniques for handling behavior disorders (2) available community resources (3) data collection (4) counseling techniques (individual and group) and (5) record maintenance. Training will continue throughout the year with meetings being held bi-weekly.
- Objective 3. To prevent 80% of the students being served by the Student Advisor from committing actions of delinquency.
- Objective 4. To prevent 80% of the students being served from being suspended or expelled from school.
- Objective 5. To prevent 80% of the students being served from being referred to the Office of Youth Services Intake.
- Objective 6. To improve average daily school attendance among students being served by the Student Advisor by 70%.
- Objective 7. Improve academic achievement by four (4) months for those youths participating in this project (in those schools where audio visual equipment provided by this project is utilized) in mathematics and reading. Reading will be measured by the Spache Diagnostic Reading Scale and mathematics will be measured with the Wide Range Achievement Test.
- Objective 8. Initiate a conference with each dean, guidance counselor and/or teacher, responsible for the educational program for the youth to be served, in an initial effort to prevent duplication of services and to resolve any conflict in working with the youth. Whenever appropriate, the youth will be included in these conferences. These conferences will be held within fourteen (14) days of receipt of the youth's referral.
- Objective 9. Each Student Advisor will consult regularly with the Supervisor for Programs for the Socially Maladjusted and other Student Advisors.

- Objective 10. Identify those youth participating in the project who have educational, vocational, medical or other related needs and refer them to the appropriate school or community resource. A record will be maintained of all such referrals and follow-up provided to insure that the needed service is being provided.
- Objective 11. Reduce by ten percent (10%) the number of youths entering the Hillsborough Regional Detention Center from eighth (8) and ninth (9) grade centers, served by this project.
- Objective 12. Improve the self-concept of socially maladjusted youth in eighth (8) and ninth (9) grade centers served by the project. This objective will be measured by the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale. An increase in self-concept of ten percent (10%) will be found between pre and post tests.
- Objective 13. The project will integrate services to delinquent youth by creating a more positive working relationship between schools, the Office of Youth Services, Student Services, and the Department of Education for Exceptional Students. Project personnel will engage in joint conferences between all agencies providing human services.
- Objective 14. The project will identify those procedures and techniques used by the project personnel which best contributes to the goals of the project. The Student Advisors will provide information during the regular quarterly planning sessions which will identify the procedures most commonly found to be effective in working with delinquent youth. This information will be summarized in the quarterly reports.
- Objective 15. It will be necessary to determine individual goals for youth identified for the Project. General overall goals will include but will not be limited to:
- a. Improvement of self-concept.
  - b. Improvement of performance in at least two subject areas.
  - c. Referral to program for hearing or vision impaired if appropriate.
  - d. Referral to department for communications disorders if deemed appropriate.

APPENDIX E

1977 Student Advisor Measurable Objectives

## B. MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES:

The following four objectives have been deemed appropriate for all of the students that will be served by the Student Advisors.

1. To prevent eighty percent (80%) of the students being served by the Student Advisors from being suspended or expelled from school.
2. To prevent eight percent (80%) of the students being served by the Student Advisors from being referred to the Office of Youth Services Intake.
3. To improve the attendance of eighty percent (80%) of the students being served by the Student Advisors by twenty-five percent (25%).
4. To prevent ninety percent (90%) of the students being served by the Student Advisors from entering the Hillsborough County Regional Detention Center.

The above objectives will be accomplished by all of the students being served by the Student Advisors. The Student Advisor will select one of the following objectives and each student will accomplish either objective 5 or 6 but an effort will not be made to accomplish objectives 5 and 6 by all students. The two objectives that will follow deal with self-concept and poor academic functioning. Students will be evaluated and those students with the poorest self-concept will be counseled with regard to that objective. The students with the greatest academic deficits will be provided remediation and therefore that objective will be dealt with with that particular student.

5. To improve academic achievement in those students selected for remediation as a result of poor academic functioning by forty percent (40%) over what the student would be expected to improve without remediation.
6. To increase self-concept in students selected to be counseled with regard to improvement of their self-concept on the Piers-Harris Self-Concept Scale by ten percent (10%).

APPENDIX F

Student Advisor Case Survey

Student Advisor Survey

1976 - 77 School Year

STUDENT ADVISOR CASE SURVEY

1. Youth's Name
2. Group (a) 20 or more contacts (b) less than 20 contacts
3. Age
4. Race
5. Sex
6. Reason for Referral (specific):

- 1) Detention
- 2) Offense
- 3) Suspension/Expulsion
- 4) Truancy
- 5) Other
- 6) Don't Know

7. Family Status:

- 1) Both natural parents
- 2) Single parent home
- 3) Other (foster, other relative, etc.)
- 4) Don't Know

Using the following key, select the "Level of Intervention" you feel best describes the intensity of service you provided this student for at least sixty (60) days, for each "treatment technique":

- (1) Light: less than one (1) contact (of  $\frac{1}{2}$  hour duration) each two-week period.
- (2) Moderate: more than one (1) contact each two-week period but less than two (2) contacts per week.
- (3) Heavy: at least two (2) contacts per week.

STUDENT ADVISOR CASE SURVEY  
1976 - 77 School Year

8. Overall Services
9. Educational Guidance and/or Remediation
10. Individual Counseling
11. Group Counseling
12. Family Counseling
13. In your opinion, what is this student's overall chance of success (reduced suspensions, truancy, rearrest rates, etc.)?
  - 1) poor      2) average      3) good
14. In your opinion, what is the basis of this student's problems?
  - 1) family                      4) self-concept
  - 2) school                      5) other
  - 3) peer group
15. How would you rate this student's expressed interest in positive change and involvement with the Student Advisor program?
  - 1) low      2) moderate      3) high
16. Has this student recently developed a strong relationship with some person that might affect his behavior in a positive way? (check only one)
  - 1) student advisor
  - 2) school resource officer
  - 3) dean
  - 4) other school personnel
  - 5) other students
  - 6) family member
  - 7) Don't know
17. For how many months did you provide at least a moderate level of counseling/educational services to this youth? (none (0) to ten (10) months).



1976 - 77 School Year

STUDENT ADVISOR SURVEY

1. Name
2. Area of Concentration
3. Preferred "treatment technique"
4. Audio Visual Equipment:
  - (1) Primary use by teachers
  - (2) Primary use by self
  - (3) Primary use -- other school staff
  - (4) Shared use -- teachers, Student Advisors, etc.
  - (5) Not available at this school
5. Do your Deans and Principals consult you prior to suspension or expulsion of students on your caseload?
  - 1) sometimes
  - 2) frequently
  - 3) always
6. Do you get referrals from the School Resource officer?
  - 1) sometimes
  - 2) frequently
  - 3) always
7. Referrals from other school personnel (excluding Deans and Principals)?
  - 1) sometimes
  - 2) frequently
  - 3) always
8. Referrals from Deans and Principals?
  - 1) sometimes
  - 2) frequently
  - 3) always

STUDENT ADVISOR SURVEY  
1976 - 77 School Year

9. How many youths could you work with during the course of a year and expect to have a significant effect upon (that is, what should be your active caseload size for you to be most effective)?
10. Organizationally, can a Student Advisor operate more effectively under the direct supervision of the School Principal, the School Dean, or the Supervisor of Programs for the Socially Maladjusted? Why?

APPENDIX G

Comparison of 1976 Objectives

Versus

Evaluation Objectives

### COMPARISON OF 1976 OBJECTIVES VERSUS EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

Evaluation Objectives	1976 Project Objectives	Rationale for Change	Evaluation Results	Reported Project Results
1. To improve academic achievement by 40% (WRAT, SPACHE and school grades).	5. To improve academic achievement by 4 months (WRAT and SPACHE only).	Given that the project operates on a 10-month year, 4 months out of 10 is equivalent to 40% change. Expressing the objective in % is consistent with other objectives. Use of school grades was not called for under the grant objectives.	The WRAT scores indicate improvement in math by 50% -- 10% more than required by the objective. The SPACHE scores and school grades indicate success criterion was not achieved.	WRAT and SPACHE scores reported in project final report indicate 1 month per month gain in reading and 1.1 year gain in math over the seven month period (average in the program). Project reports that this meets success criterion stated in the objective.
2. Increase Self-concept by 10%.	7. Increase Self-concept by 10%.	No Change	13% increase in the average self-concept score.	No data reported
3. To improve attendance of 80% of students by 25%.	4. To improve average daily attendance among students by 70%.	This objective was stated incorrectly. Project staff wanted to say that "70% of students would improve their attendance when compared to the previous year." The evaluation objective is much less stringent when compared to the 1976 grant objective as written, yet much more stringent than what was actually intended by the project staff.	Only 41.9% of the sample population met the criterion. However, 62.4% of the sample missed fewer days and the overall sample population improved by 16.0%.	Project reports that 75.8% improved their attendance. (Based on a random sample of over 100 students); and the overall sample improved by 25%.

COMPARISON OF 1976 OBJECTIVES VERSUS EVALUATION OBJECTIVES (continued)

Evaluation Objectives	1976 Project Objectives	Rationale for Change	Evaluation Results	Reported Project Results
4. To prevent 80% of target youth from being suspended or expelled.	(Obj. #2)  Same	No Change	30.3% of sample were suspended.	Project reports that only 12.12% of total students were suspended; ranging from 5% to 16.06% per quarter (12.12% being the mean).
5. To prevent 80% of target youth from being referred to Office of Youth Services (OYS).	(Obj. #3)  Same	No Change	21.5% of the sample population were referred to DIIRS.	Project reports that only 12.6% of the students served were charged with delinquent offenses while in the program.
6. To Prevent 90% of target youth from entering Hillsborough Regional Detention Center (HRDC).	6. Reduce by 10% the number of youths entering the HRDC from eighth and ninth grade centers with Student Advisor programs.	Data not available on objective as written. Project has been reporting data necessary for objective as <u>revised</u> .	9.8% of youth detained during school year.	In no quarter was 10% of students confined to HRDC (mean number per quarter was 4.69%).

**END**