

The author(s) shown below used Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice and prepared the following final report:

Document Title: Integration of Law Enforcement into School Safety: The Milwaukee Initiative

Author(s): Rick Lovell, Ph.D. ; Carl E. Pope, Ph.D. ; Scott Canevit, M.S.

Document No.: 209266

Date Received: March 2005

Award Number: 2001-IJ-CX-0037

This report has not been published by the U.S. Department of Justice. To provide better customer service, NCJRS has made this Federally-funded grant final report available electronically in addition to traditional paper copies.

Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

**INTEGRATION OF LAW ENFORCEMENT
INTO SCHOOL SAFETY:
THE MILWAUKEE INITIATIVE**

Final Report

Rick Lovell, Ph.D.

Carl E. Pope, Ph.D.

University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

Scott Canevit, M.S.

This report was prepared under Grant #2001-IJ-CX-0037

from the National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice.

Points of view or opinions expressed in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice or the viewpoint of the Milwaukee Public Schools

INTEGRATION OF LAW ENFORCEMENT INTO SCHOOL SAFETY:

THE MILWAUKEE INITIATIVE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PROJECT INTRODUCTION	1
PHASE ONE: THE SCHOOL SAFETY COUNCIL	2
PHASE TWO: DISTRICT/ SCHOOL LEVEL PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION	6
EVALUATION METHODOLOGY	9
FINDINGS	11
DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS	22
CONCLUSION	28
APPENDIX A: SAFETY COUNCIL NOTES	
APPENDIX B: DRUG INCIDENTS BY SCHOOL	
APPENDIX C: EXAMPLES OF GIS MAPPING	
APPENDIX D: 10 SCHOOLS OFFICE REFERRAL DATA	

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

INTEGRATION OF LAW ENFORCEMENT INTO SCHOOL SAFETY: THE MILWAUKEE INITIATIVE

PROJECT INTRODUCTION

This project (Integration of Law Enforcement in School Safety) was funded by the National Institute of Justice and awarded to the Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS). The project was implemented through the MPS Division of Security and Safety. The purpose was to document and assess efforts initiated by MPS to enhance integration of law enforcement into school safety. The MPS Division of Security and Safety led a two year pilot initiative (September, 2001 through August, 2003) to increase communication and collaboration across a number of organizations in (1) planning and policy development regarding school safety, (2) development of tailored strategies to enhance safety at target schools, and (3) implementation of the strategies to alleviate specific problems in and around the target schools. The Milwaukee Police Department (MPD) was central to each element of the initiative.

Documentation and assessment of the initiative involved both a process evaluation and a limited impact evaluation utilizing both quantitative and qualitative research methods. The Criminal Justice Department at the University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee (Drs. Lovell and Pope) was awarded a subcontract from MPS to conduct the evaluation. The project was administered by MPS Division of Safety and Security and was implemented in two distinct phases across the two-year period of the project.

Significance of the Project

Research literature has begun to address the nexus of law enforcement and school safety from various perspectives. The literature reports a number of potential and actual types of interface, collaboration, or partnerships (e.g., see White et al., 2001; Casella, 2002; Welsh et al., 2003; Jackson, 2002; and Johnson, 1999). However, this project was envisioned and implemented in a manner and with a scope of collaboration not previously reported.

PHASE ONE: THE SCHOOL SAFETY COUNCIL

During the first phase of the project, the MPS Division of Safety and Security coordinated the creation of a *School Safety Council* (SSC) to engage in planning and guiding activities specific to the initiative. The SSC was comprised of representatives from MPS, MPD, the Milwaukee County Sheriff's Department, Boys and Girls Clubs (Truancy Abatement and Burglary Suppression Program), Milwaukee County Transit Security, Community Partners, the Milwaukee Fire and Police Commission, Milwaukee's Project COMPASS, and other community agencies (see Appendix A). Council members volunteered their time and met approximately every two months for the first year.

Expectations of the School Safety Council included the following:

- Provide a forum in which representatives of law enforcement agencies, MPS, and selected community organizations could address issues of school safety in Milwaukee in a focused manner

- Enhance communication and collaboration among MPS elements, law enforcement agencies, and other represented organizations concerning school safety issues
- Provide the basis for continuing enhancement of communication and collaboration concerning school safety issues in Milwaukee to extend beyond the funded initiative
- Conduct a needs assessment and prioritize school safety issues to be addressed during the initiative
- Provide guidance and direction for the second phase of the initiative, including prioritizing problems to be addressed and selection of target areas/sites

During Phase One (covering September, 2001 through June, 2002), the SSC was created, organized to meet its expectations, conducted an in-depth needs assessment, and provided the necessary guidance and direction for Phase Two of the initiative.

(Chronological documentation of School Safety Council activities is included at Appendix A).

Needs Assessment

The SSC reviewed data and additional information submitted to them in order to make decisions regarding the scope and nature of activities to be undertaken during the 24-month time-line of this project. Data and information were provided through Milwaukee's Project COMPASS, the Crime Analysis Section of the Milwaukee Police Department, the MPS Division of Security and Safety, the MPS Division of Technology,

and the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Department of Criminal Justice (Drs. Lovell and Pope). Data and information included:

(1) Geographic Information Systems (GIS) analysis of state crimes reported over designated periods within and around all MPS middle and high schools. This information included analyses of crimes reported to police and arrests by weekdays within one thousand foot zones for: all juvenile offenses and arrests, juvenile armed robbery offenses and arrests, juvenile property damage offenses and arrests, juvenile theft offenses and arrests, juvenile weapons offenses and arrests, juvenile sexual assault offenses and arrests, juvenile weapons offenses and arrests, juvenile disorderly offenses and arrests, juvenile auto theft offenses and arrests, juvenile battery offenses and arrests, juvenile drug offenses and arrests, all juvenile violent offenses and arrests, and selected adult offenses and arrests. (See Appendix C for examples.)

(2) Data on student incidents, office referrals, and administrative actions, which were reported across all middle and high schools over a five-year period. These student incidents included such activities as classroom disruption, non-compliant behavior, disorderly conduct, battery and assault, and others. Appendix B includes examples of office referral data examined for ten schools. (See Appendix D for examples.)

(3) Data on patterns of student suspensions and expulsions.

(4) Limited data on citations for municipal ordinance violations issued by MPD officers in selected police districts for the range of offenses encountered.

(4) Anecdotal information provided by various members of the SSC.

The SSC used the data and information to select ten high schools and middle schools for more intensive analysis, especially with regard to the use and distribution of drugs in areas surrounding the schools, gangs and gang related activities in surrounding areas; and general safety issues within the communities surrounding the schools (a 1000 foot buffer zone). From this, The SSC prioritized (1) drugs and drug activities, (2) gangs and gang activities, and (3) safety areas surrounding schools, particularly during transition times (going to and from school) as problems to be addressed at specific target schools during Phase Two of the initiative. Primary attention would also be given to increasing the level of communication between the targeted schools and the police districts in which they were located.

The SSC selected three high schools and one middle school (representing various areas of the city) as the focus of Phase Two efforts. There was one target school in each of four of Milwaukee's seven police districts. Phase Two involved planning at the police district/school level to develop tailored strategies to address problems specific to the selected schools and surrounding areas. At this level planning would involve the target school's administrators and selected staff, police district commander and selected staff, the Director and Deputy Director and members of the MPS Division of Security and Safety, the Director of Community Partners, commanders or representatives of MPD supporting elements (i.e., Sensitive Crimes Unit, Intelligence, Vice) and Drs. Lovell and Pope.

PHASE TWO: DISTRICT/SCHOOL LEVEL PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION OF TAILORED STRATEGIES

During the time period June, 2002 to September, 2002 preparations were made for Phase Two of the initiative - planning and implementation of tailored strategies to address the SSC's priorities at the police district/ target school level. In order to accomplish this:

- An initial meeting was held with the Chief of Police, the MDP Captain having liaison responsibilities with MPS, and Dr. Pope.
- The commanders of the four districts in which the target schools were located, the commanders of the MPD intelligence unit and the MPD vice unit, the Director and Deputy Director of MPS Security and Safety, the Director of Community Partners, and Drs. Lovell and Pope met to discuss initiation of Phase Two.
- Community Partners, a Safe and Sound effort under Weed and Seed, actively joined the project. (Community Partners covers the city, with an operative working in each of twenty designated city sectors, including those surrounding the target schools, to gather information and enhance the life and well-being of persons residing in those areas.) Community Partners is best explained as the outreach component of Milwaukee's Safe and Sound Initiative. This initiative approaches crime by offering more after school and weekend programming for children, youth and families, along with coordinated law enforcement efforts, and with the use of accountable outreach.

- Drs. Lovell and Pope met with Community Partners to discuss the role of Community Partners (development and communication of information from surrounding neighborhoods), to explain the project and to elicit operatives' cooperation.

During September, 2002, meetings were held at each of the target schools with the principals, assistant principals, the respective police captains and their designated school squad officers (each MPD police district assigns 3-4 officers with cars to respond to calls for service from schools in the district and to monitor the schools while maintaining liaison with the schools and MPS Division of Security and Safety personnel - MPS Division of Security and Safety personnel operate within the schools), the Director of Community Partners, Community Partners operatives, the Deputy Director of MPS Division of Security and Safety, Security and Safety personnel within each school, and Drs. Lovell and Pope. The aims of these meetings included:

- Complete explanation of the initiative
- Development of plans for enhanced communication between target schools and the police district
- Identification and prioritization of the most significant problems specific to each target school meeting the SSC's priorities
- Development of and agreement on specific strategies to address the foremost problems (in each site these involved problems at transition times - going to school and from school and problems including "outsiders," gangs, and other surrounding neighborhood issues)

- Gaining commitment to the initiative

During the time period October, 2002 through June, 2003, the agreed upon strategies were implemented. These strategies included:

- At High School #1 - (a) use of “decoy” cars and increased police presence at dismissal time to decrease influence of “outsiders,” particularly gang members; (b) increased use of citations to control the broad avenue fronting the school’s entrance; (c) increased attention to drug house operations in the surrounding neighborhood; and (d) enhanced communication among the school’s administrators, the police district commander, and Community Partners.
- At High School #2 - (a) police saturation for a designated period and regularly thereafter of two problematic intersections on major adjacent avenues; (b) increased police presence at dismissal time on the broad avenue fronting the school’s entrance; (c) police “sweeps” of a nearby park during school hours and at dismissal time (where “outsiders” and students posed a problem); and (d) enhanced communication among the school’s administrators, the police district commander, and Community Partners.
- At High School #3 - (a) increased police presence and periodic use of additional police resources at dismissal time; (b) increased police presence and monitoring of a nearby transit “transfer point,” where “outsiders” periodically confronted students and students from different high schools

exchanged buses, resulting in problems; and (c) enhanced communication among the school's administrators, the police district commander, and Community Partners.

- At the Middle School - (a) focused police presence on a neighboring store at arrival and dismissal time, where youth congregating resulted in problems; (b) increased police presence and monitoring along transition routes at arrival and dismissal time; and (c) enhanced communication among the school's administrators, the police district commander, and Community Partners.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

Data collection for this project included both qualitative and quantitative methods. As part of a process evaluation information was collected on the development and operation of the School Safety Council. The evaluation team attended all meetings of the SSC, taking notes and observations as well as providing information to be used for conducting the needs assessment analysis. The evaluation team conducted interviews and meetings (both pre and post) with MPS administrators at the four target schools, the district police captains, the representatives from intelligence and vice units, and school squad officers. The evaluation team also held numerous meetings with administrators from MPS Division of Safety and Security. This allowed the evaluation team the opportunity to observe and document progress on grant activities.

The evaluation team also conducted a limited impact evaluation. Since the time frame of this project was relatively short, an ongoing impact evaluation could not be

conducted. Nevertheless, there was an opportunity to evaluate police activity around the target schools for the short term. The qualitative methods noted above also were used in this process. In addition the evaluation team was able to obtain limited quantitative data to assess project activities at the targeted schools. The MPD vice division provided data regarding drug activity taking place around the target schools. School squad officers provided the evaluation team a log of incidents they recorded during the project period.

FINDINGS

Drug Arrest Data Analysis

Drug incident data were collected from Geographic Information System (GIS) maps developed by the MPD crime analysis division (See Tables in Appendix B – the maps themselves were confidential and are not included in this report). Mapping covered 1000 foot zones surrounding each of the target schools. During the data collection period, a total of 128 drug-related incidents were recorded across all zones (including youth and adults) which resulted a total of 112 arrests (some arrests were for multiple offenses). It is important to keep in mind that these incidents occurred within the 1000 foot zones, but did not necessarily involve the schools, school students, or even youth. Therefore these offenses *do not* contribute directly to assessment of the project; rather, they provide information with which to better understand the contexts of implementation.

Marijuana offenses, which included possession offenses and intention to distribute, comprised approximately 51% of all drug-related incidents. Cocaine incidents, which included possession, intent to distribute, and manufacture and deliver offenses,

comprised 30.5% of all incidents. Other drug offenses, including heroin and possession of drug paraphernalia, comprised the rest of the drug incidents (approximately 19%). High School #3 had the most drug incidents (a total of 52) in its surrounding area, followed by High School#1 (47), High School #2 (15), and finally the Middle School (14) in their respective surrounding areas.

No discernible pattern can be found regarding drug incident reports. However, drug arrests increased during the fifth month (December 27, 2002 to January 24, 2003) for a total of 23 and the sixth month (January 24, 2003 to February 21, 2003) for a total of 36 arrests. These two months comprised a total of 46% of all of the arrests made during the reporting period. The other months remained relatively stable.

It should be noted that there was missing data during this reporting period. There were no available data for the first two weeks of the reporting period for the High School #2 area, and some weeks were missing for all the school areas. The data showed no consistent patterns regarding drug activities within the 1000 foot zones.

School Squad Activity Data Analysis

School squad data were collected from patrol logs maintained by the district school squads (See Tables which follow). Across the target schools a total of 60 arrests were reported by the school squads (Table 1), 71 citations were issued (Table 2) and 58 incidents recorded in the school squad logs indicated no action was taken (Table 3). Regarding incidents in which no action was taken, some of these were due to follow-up investigations, unfounded incidents, and other administrative functions. Regarding arrests, 14 were for violent incidents, 32 were for incidents in which the patrols

responded for trouble with student calls, and 14 were for other incidents, such as drugs or possession of fireworks. The Middle School had the most arrests of any schools (36), followed by High School #3 (24). Regarding citations issued by school patrols, 23 were for violent incidents, 2 were issued during monitoring activities, 19 were for incidents in which the patrols responded for trouble with students, and 25 were for other incidents. The reporting period was replete with missing data. Data were missing for High School #2 and data were available for High School #1 for only the months of February through May, 2003. As such, it was not possible to discern with confidence patterns regarding the types of incidents and how they were attended to by the school patrols.

It should also be pointed out that the school squads frequently were busy attending to other business at other schools. This is important when examining the monitoring activity of the school squads at the target schools (Table 4). The school squad responsible for HS#3 recorded a total of 41 monitoring activities throughout the recording period, while the squad responsible for the Middle School recorded 11 monitoring activities, and the squad responsible for High School #1 recorded no monitoring activities. An examination of the patrol logs reveals that the activity of the patrols is diffused among many other schools and activities, especially regarding district two. Also, patrols clearly did not record every time they conducted monitoring activities.

Table 1: Arrests by School Patrols

School	Violence Incidents	Monitoring Activities	Trouble Calls	Other Incidents	Total
High School # 2	4	0	1	7	12
High School # 3	2	0	21	1	24
High School # 1	0	0	0	0	0
Middle School	12	0	11	13	36
Total	18	0	33	21	72

Data for High School #1 was available only for February – May, 2003

Table 2: Citations Issued by School Patrols

School	Violence Incidents	Monitoring Activities	Trouble Calls	Other Incidents	Total
High School # 2	19	0	14	4	37
High School # 3	18	2	10	11	41
High School # 1	1	0	3	2	6
Middle School	4	0	6	12	22
Total	42	2	33	29	106

Data for High School # 1 was available only for February – May, 2003

Table 3: No Action Taken by School Patrols Responding

School	Violence Incidents	Trouble Calls	Other Incidents	Total
High School # 2	0	0	1	1
High School # 3	15	14	9	38
High School # 1	1	2	1	4
Middle School	4	3	9	16
Total	20	19	20	59

Data for High School # 1 was available only for February – May, 2003

Table 4: Monitoring Activity Times Recorded by School Patrols

School	Arrival Time	During School Hours	Departure Time	Total
High School # 2	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a
High School # 3	12	3	26	41
High School # 1	0	0	0	0
Middle School	1	7	3	11
Total	13	10	29	52

Data are missing for High School # 2

Data for High School # 1 was available only for February – May, 2003

Geographic Information System (GIS) Analysis of Juvenile Arrests

As noted earlier Geographic Information System maps were created focusing upon police arrest patterns within and around selected schools for the year 2000. The data were obtained from the Crime Analysis Division of the Milwaukee Police Department. This was part of a needs assessment and was provided to the School Safety Council (SSC) in order to assist them in determining which schools should be the focus of intervention strategies. The data were compiled for weekdays and included the following categories: all juvenile arrests; juvenile armed robbery arrests; juvenile property damage arrests; juvenile theft arrests; juvenile weapons arrests; juvenile sexual assault arrests; juvenile disorderly arrests; juvenile auto theft arrests; juvenile battery arrests; juvenile drug arrests; and all juvenile arrests for violent crimes. These data were descriptive in nature, providing information on juvenile criminal activity in which an arrest occurred.

It should be noted, however, that the majority of incidents involving juveniles do not result in an arrest for a state crime. A more common practice is to issue a municipal citation to the juvenile. Unfortunately, municipal citation data were not available across all the areas. As discussed below, information regarding municipal citations are most commonly available in the reports of school squad officers and, thus, specific to their activities.

Appendix C contains examples of the GIS maps that were produced for the project. The first 3 maps in Appendix C are examples utilized for purposes of illustration. The first map identifies all middle and high schools located within the city of Milwaukee. It also identifies those schools selected for additional analysis before targeting the final four schools for intervention activities. The map identifies violent crimes per 10,000 persons and the boundaries for Safe and Sound Community Partners. Again, Community Partners is a Weed and Seed operation in which partners are assigned specific sectors of the city to identify community problems, identify at risk behaviors, and provide information to law enforcement. Three of the targeted schools are located within these boundaries while the fourth school (the middle school) is located on the fringe of these boundaries.

The first map shows that higher rates of violent crimes are clustered within certain areas of the city. These areas can generally be characterized as low income, with high rates of poverty, deteriorated housing and a high concentration of minorities, principally African American and Hispanic. The schools located within these areas also tend to be the most problematic with higher incidences of violent/aggressive behavior both within the school and the surrounding community.

The next two maps are more specific and show patterns of juvenile arrest for violent crimes within two of the targeted high schools and within a 1000' zone surrounding them as well as an area extending from there. Both of these maps indicate that arrests of juveniles for violent crimes are not very prevalent. Moreover, the higher violent arrest rates for juveniles are not concentrated within the schools but rather in the adjacent community. Similar patterns are shown in the GIS maps for all juvenile drug

arrests within and around the same schools. First, juvenile drug arrests are not prevalent within the schools but are more concentrated within the community. Second, there is not a high incidence of arrests for juvenile drug activity. This may indicate that minor drug activity (smoking a marijuana cigarette) may be handled as a municipal citation while the “harder” drugs involving use and distribution may be more likely to be charged as a state crime. However, this is mere speculation since the available data do not allow this issue to be answered in a definitive manner. Additional GIS maps for other offenses are included in Appendix C as examples.

Interviews and Observations

The overall aim of the project was to enhance the integration of law enforcement into school safety. The School Safety Council was formed and included the desired key representatives (See Appendix A). The SSC operated as described earlier through Phase I, and the project operated as described earlier through Phase Two, including continuing operation of the SSC, the district/school level planning and implementation of tailored strategies. Assessment of the implementation of the project, essentially a process evaluation, required heavy reliance on qualitative components. This was supplemented by limited quantitative components (described above), which provided information on potential outcomes and broadened perspective on implementation. Observations and interviews were utilized to document progress, explore strengths and areas in need of improvement, and identify factors which enhanced or inhibited implementation of the project.

Observations revealed that the elements of the project were implemented as described earlier (Also, see Appendix A). From across the observations, the following is key. Observation of meetings, planning sessions, and activities showed a high level of commitment to the project among the various participants, especially key participants from MPS Division of Security and Safety and the Milwaukee Police Department, as well as key persons at the target schools during Phase Two. It is important to note that cooperation and collaboration were maintained across the Phases primarily by the Director and Deputy Director of the MPS Division of Security and Safety, and by the MPD Captain designated as liaison to MPS and the project, together with a strong expression of support from the Chief of Police.

With Phase Two occurring in four different police districts, with four target schools, coordination and communication were essential to implementation, and again, these key persons were observed to maintain the impetus for implementation. In itself this effort at implementation established relationships and mechanisms for enhancing integration of law enforcement into school safety which have the potential for continuing far beyond the project time period.

As described earlier, interviews were conducted (pre and post) with key administrators in the MPS Division of Security and Safety, with principals of the Phase Two target schools, with police commanders from the police districts, with school squad officers, and with other key participants. Much useful information resulted. The information from interviews was examined to identify recurring themes. Several important themes emerged across interviews. These are identified below by theme, with brief explanation.

Collaboration

Participants reported at the inception of the project that MPS, MPD, and other agencies/organizations had collaborated over time. There was consensus among participants that there had not been a well-coordinated effort at collaboration and that the representatives of the key organizations had never all “been to the table” at once to discuss school safety, integration of law enforcement, collaboration, and related issues, much less to seek to operate together in this area for a two year period. By the end of Phase Two participants discussed the need for continuation of a version of the SSC, tailored to continue the key relationships and organized to provide policy guidance on school safety at the system level.

Communication

While participants discussed communication among agencies and community organizations at the system level, most attention was directed to communication at the police district/school level. At the inception of the project, and again at the inception of Phase Two, participants focused responses on inconsistency in communication between school principals, assistant principals, and other staff and police district commanders and other personnel. Participants emphasized the following:

- Inconsistent attendance at scheduled semi-annual meetings conducted by police commanders by district.
- Variation in communications between police and school officials by school (i.e., some schools and police district commanders/other

personnel have more consistent, more effective communication than others.

- Problems of understanding, especially within the schools, of “police business” versus “school business,” the need to understand the school squads as a scarce resource (not to be tied up by “stacking calls”- piling additional, non-police business cases onto officers when they respond to an appropriate case call), and the need to engage in in-service education to bring all potentially involved persons “up to speed” in understanding what the police should handle, when to call, and related issues.
- Relationships between school squad officers, school safety staff, and other school personnel – especially noting that school squads tend to develop good relationships with school personnel at the operational level and this forms the basis for continuing communication over time – also noting that school squads are busy, responding to many schools, and there may be variation or inconsistency in communication due to demands on attention and time.

Interviews revealed at the close of Phase Two that communication between police and schools had increased at each of the target schools though only minimally at HS#2.

Participants pointed out that the intended communication with Community Partners had not occurred between any of the four schools and Community Partners. However, interviews with police commanders revealed that regular communication between police

and Community Partners had occurred. Further, participants observed that the regular communication scheduled between designated school and police liaisons did not take place at HS#2, was sporadic at HS#3 and the MS, and was relatively frequent with some inconsistency at HS#1. Participants cited numerous demands and responsibilities as the reasons for not implementing these communication strategies as intended.

Transition Times

Principals and other officials from the target schools (Phase Two), as well as school squad officers and district commanders identified times of transition (arrival and beginning of school; dismissal and return to home) as especially problematic.

Participants noted specific problems which had occurred and continued to occur at each of the schools including (1) violence promoted and/or perpetrated by “outsiders,” often gang members, on school property and along school routes; (2) “spillover” and direct effects of drug houses operating in surrounding neighborhoods; (3) difficulties with “outsiders” and with rival school factions at city transit bus transfer points, nearby parks, and along adjacent thoroughfares.

Regarding HS # 1, HS # 2, and HS # 3, participants discussed difficulties with control of broad avenues fronting the schools’ locations. Particular problems were noted as being associated with (1) traffic control; (2) with inability to restrict access at transition times, these avenues being public places; (3) with ability to control areas where students board city transit buses; and (4) with problems occurring at intersections just beyond school property. Participants discussed efforts of principals and school safety

personnel to control these areas at transition times, emphasizing needs for police presence and activity.

Results of Phase Two

Participants discussed their observations and perceptions of the Phase Two activities. From across responses and sites, the following are important and notable:

- In general, participants indicated that collaboration had increased between elements of MPD and the target schools, as well as between MPD and the Division of Security and Safety at the system level – particularly noting emphasis given department wide by the Chief of Police, directing increasing attention to the schools – and particularly noting the efforts of school squads and other police elements in carrying out the tailored strategies.
- Participants pointed out difficulties in carrying out the communication strategies, as presented above.
- Participants involved with HS # 2 and with the MS (including school and police participants) judged their components of Phase Two to be successful, including alleviating transition time problems to the extent possible and improving communication, enhancing integration of law enforcement into school safety at district/school level of operation.
- Participants involved with HS # 1 and HS # 3 judged their components of Phase Two to be overall successful, with some reservation. At HS # 3 transition time problems were directly addressed and alleviated; however,

over time, regular communication was noted to be an issue by the school administrators. This prompted a meeting and a new strategy for communication too late in the project for comment.

At HS # 1 school administrators discussed the availability of police, especially at dismissal time, as a problem. While agreeing that the tailored strategy activities had been carried out, and while revealing that the school administrators had not carried out the intended strategy for regular communication, these administrators pointed out that several calls for service at dismissal time had resulted in waiting as much as an hour or an hour and a half for the police to arrive. This led to important discussions, and the realization that school squads must respond to numerous schools within a district. In the same district as HS # 1, there are two other high schools, each with safety issues similar to HS # 1, and four middle schools, plus elementary schools. Participants realized that all the high schools dismiss at the same time, creating difficulties on many days for response by school squad officers. Participants discussed the need to address this issue, working on it for the long term, beyond the project.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Background

As part of the Hamilton Fish National Institute on School and Community Violence the evaluation team (Drs. Lovell and Pope) conducted another project focusing specifically on youth violence and aggressive behavior within MPS. This earlier project, funded by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, also involved a collaborative working relationship with MPS and MPD, which, in turn, served as a foundation for the current efforts. In the course of evaluating programs that focused on school violence the evaluation team also focused on the working relationship between MPS and MPD. Interviews and focus groups were conducted with teachers, MPS administrators, MPD Captains and school squad officers. Rather than utilizing School Resource Officers (sworn officers directly assigned to specific schools) MPD utilizes school squads, which respond to all schools located within each district. These school squads are under the direct control of the district captain and respond to such incidents as disorderly conduct, thefts, batteries, fights and other incidents occurring within the schools. As part of the Hamilton Fish Project, the evaluation team conducted a series of “ride alongs” with school squad officers in two police districts. This enabled the evaluators to observe the relationship between the school squads and administrators, teachers and MPS students as well as the manner in which they conducted business.

Several observations were important. Oftentimes there was confusion over what constituted school business and what constituted police business. It was not uncommon for officers to be called to the schools for minor incidents that did not constitute an ordinance violation or a misdemeanor offense or state crime. These incidents, such as

classroom disruption, could be handled at the school level with the possibility of an in school or out of school suspension. When officers arrived at the school, administrators frequently brought a series of other incidents to their attention – a process referred to as “stacking the calls”. This situation caused a strain on a limited resource, police manpower. Thus there was a failure to effectively communicate between MPS and MPD. Periodically, meetings were scheduled between the district captains, school principals, assistant principals and, on occasion, the District Attorney’s office. The purpose of these meetings was to share information, bring up issues and work to insure cooperation among all participants. Unfortunately these meetings were poorly attended thus, again, inhibiting effective communication.

In the aftermath of the violence that occurred at Columbine High School in Littleton, Colorado, and a series of related incidents, attention focused on prevention and response. Most major police departments worked cooperatively with school districts to develop strategies to handle and respond to these horrific incidents. Milwaukee was no exception. The idea of developing a coordinated effort to deal with such widespread violence is a reasonable and sound approach. However, the reality is that incidents such as Columbine are relatively rare events. Nothing of that nature has ever taken place within the city of Milwaukee. Equally troublesome and more common are the daily problems (e.g. drug use and distribution, gang activity, assaults and the like) occurring within and around Milwaukee Public Schools. Therefore, there is a need for attention to developing enhanced communication and more effective strategies for dealing with these common incidents, which was the focus of this project.

The School Safety Council

The School Safety Council proved to be an effective strategy for the development and sharing of information and coordinating activities with the Milwaukee Public Schools, the Milwaukee Police Department, and other organizations. This council had wide diversity and community involvement (see Appendix A for a listing of council members). In fact, this was the first instance in which such a group had come together over an extended period of time to give direction to activities affecting the safety of MPS schools.

The primary purpose of the SSC was to guide and give direction to strategies to ensure school safety. While the evaluation team provided information (especially with regard to the needs assessment), the SSC had ultimate decision making responsibility. The council decided which four of MPS middle and high schools would be targeted for Phase Two and what the focus of the interventions would be (gang activity, drug use and distribution at the schools and neighborhoods surrounding them). As noted earlier, the actual strategies were determined at meetings held with the evaluation team, MPS administrators, the police captains, Community Partners and others.

District/School Level Planning and Implementation of Strategies

The strategies developed for Phase Two at each target school are outlined above. Interviews and observations of meetings and activities revealed that increased communication and collaboration occurred at the district/school level, as well as at the administrative levels of MPS and MPD. The administrators of the MPS Division of Security and Safety coordinated and facilitated meetings and planning across the target

schools. The administrators of the MPS Division of Security and Safety monitored the progress of the project while maintaining communication with the command level of MPD. The police commander assigned as MPD liaison facilitated communication and planning across the target schools and respective police districts. The police commander facilitated communication between the command level of MPD and MPS administrators, while monitoring the progress of the initiative.

Planning for strategies was successfully accomplished for each target school in each respective police district. Cooperation and collaboration at each of the planning meetings was outstanding. Interventions across all schools focused on increased police presence in areas surrounding the schools. Since earlier communication indicated that problem student behaviors were most likely to occur before and after the school day this became the focus of police activity. Each police district increased the level of police patrol at these times for specified periods of time. In addition, particular problem areas were also targeted. For example, at the middle school there was a particular corner grocery store at which students congregated after school in which disturbances and neighborhood complaints were common. The police in that district increased their presence at this store, which solved the problem. At one of the high schools there was a particular bus stop at which students from multiple schools converged, this created a large number of disturbances and fights among students. Again, the police increased their presence at that bus stop, and issued a number of municipal citations, which rectified the problems.

At one level these strategies seemed to be effective as indicated by interview responses from both the schools and the police. At another level, however, the

quantitative data failed to document any major changes. While police data documented the nature of these problems and increased police activity, there were no major changes in the trends observed. This was not unexpected given the relatively short time frame of the interventions and the limited impact evaluation. Continuing the interventions and evaluating them over time may have produced some marked results. While there is no way of knowing, the qualitative data indicated that these activities were implemented in a successful manner.

As noted above, a major focus of this project was to increase the level of communication and cooperation between the participating schools and their respective police districts. Overall, this goal was accomplished. Meetings between the school principals (and their representatives) and the district captains (and their representatives) were highly productive. Information was shared and plans were put in place to deal with the problems that were identified.

However, the strategies for each target school included plans for increasing routine communication between school administrators and police district commanders and among the schools, the police district commanders, and operatives of Community Partners. Interviews with school officials and the director of Community Partners revealed that communication between the schools and Community Partners did not materialize as intended, although communication between Community Partners and the police districts did take place. Further, the plans put in place for weekly communication between the schools and the district stations were only partially successful.

Routine communication between the schools and police district commanders was excellent at High School #1 and was improved but inconsistent at the other three target

schools. At all target schools the police school squad officers maintained communication through regular visits and calls for service. The inconsistency noted (through interviews of school administrators and police commanders) occurred in that plans for regular (weekly) communication, to be initiated by designated school officials did not occur as planned. This could be due to workload pressures of MPS administrators or just oversight. The schools did call the districts when specific problems occurred such as gang activity (and the police did respond) but not on a continuous or regular basis. This issue should be revisited at a future time and a mechanism put in place to encourage continued routine communication between the police and schools.

Similarly, the original plan was to enhance the role of Community Partners in communicating and sharing information with the schools and the police. Since Community Partners have employees working in school neighborhoods (collecting information and assisting residents) they would be an ideal resource. While the police and community partners have worked together in the past (their main office is located in a police substation) the schools have not taken advantage of this resource. Moreover, across the targeted schools administrators had no idea that they even existed. Representatives of Community Partners were present at the initial meetings with school administrators and the police. They explained what they did, what resources they had, what information they collected and how they could assist the schools. Unfortunately, the schools were never able to take advantage of this resource. Therefore, future efforts in dealing with school safety issues should try to enhance the collaboration between the schools and community partners.

CONCLUSION

The MPS *Integration of Law Enforcement into School Safety* project was successfully implemented. *Moving from successful creation and operation of the School Safety Council to Phase Two planning and implementation of strategies at the police district/school level represented important and valuable achievements in this project.*

In both phases of the project there was strong collaboration and communication.

During Phase Two, police in the four districts did increase their presence before and after the school day for specified periods of time. Although the quantitative data did not underscore dramatic changes during Phase Two, the time for implementation and evaluation was brief. Follow up interviews with school administrators and the police indicated that the strategies were effective in alleviating specific problems. The approach to increasing communication and collaboration, as well as planning and implementing strategies at this level, is very promising.

The direction taken in this project should be considered in future initiatives focusing on school safety. In sum, the objectives of this project were achieved and could be enhanced and replicated in other settings.

LESSONS LEARNED

- It is possible to establish effective collaboration and partnerships to enhance the role of law enforcement in dealing with school safety issues.
- Enhanced police presence during times of transition, before and after the school day, is important in ensuring school safety.

- It is possible to increase the level of communication between school and police administrators.
- Law enforcement, school administrators and community agencies will participate together in efforts to increase school safety as evidenced by the creation of the MPS School Safety Council.
- Targeting specific problem behaviors in areas surrounding schools, in this case gang activity and drug use/distribution, is a sound and effective strategy.
- Efforts to enhance school safety should not only focus on the schools themselves but also the surrounding areas in which they are located.

SELECTED REFERENCES

- Casella, R. (2002). "Where Policy Meets the Pavement: Stages of Public Involvement in the Prevention of School Violence." **International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education**, Vol. 15, No. 3, 349-372.
- Jackson, A. (2002). "Police-school Resources Officers' and Students' Perceptions of the Police and Offending." **Policing**, 25, 3, 631-650.
- Johnson, I. M. (1999). "School Violence: The Effectiveness of a School Resource Officer Program in a Southern City." **Journal of Criminal Justice**, Vol. 27, No. 2, 173-192.
- Welsh, J. et al. (2003). "Promoting Safe Schools and Healthy Students in Rural Pennsylvania." **Psychology in the Schools**, Vol. 40(5), 457-472.

White, M. et al. (2001). "The School-Police Partnership: Identifying At-Risk Youth through a Truant Recovery Program." **Evaluation Review**, Vol.25. No.5, 507-532.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

APPENDIX A

SAFETY COUNCIL NOTES

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

APPENDIX B

DRUG INCIDENTS BY SCHOOL

Appendix B Table 1: Total Drug Incidents by School

School	Marijuana Offenses	Cocaine Offenses	Heroin Offenses	Other Drug Offenses c	Other Drug Related Offenses d	Total Number of Offenses
High School # 2 a	11	3	0	0	1	15
High School # 3 b	23	22	3	2	2	52
High School # 1 b	20	14	1	2	10	47
Middle School b	11	0	0	0	3	14
Total	65	39	4	4	16	128

a Data were missing during weeks 1, 2, 14, 15, 16, 24, 25, 26, and 31

b Data were missing during weeks 14, 15, 16, 24, 25, 26, and 31

c Includes drug offenses not specified in reports by type

d Includes violations such as possession of drug paraphernalia and the Uniform Controlled Substances Act

Appendix B Table 2: Drug Incidents by School, Month 1 (September 6, 2002 to October 4, 2002)

School	Marijuana Offenses	Cocaine Offenses	Heroin Offenses	Other Drug Offenses^c	Other Drug Related Offenses^d	Total Number of Offenses
High School # 2^a	0	1	0	0	0	1
High School # 3^b	1	3	0	0	3	7
High School # 1^b	0	0	0	0	1	1
Middle School^b	1	0	0	0	0	1
Total	2	4	0	0	4	10

^a Data were missing during weeks 1, 2, 14, 15, 16, 24, 25, 26, and 31

^b Data were missing during weeks 14, 15, 16, 24, 25, 26, and 31

^c Includes drug offenses not specified in reports by type

^d Includes violations such as possession of drug paraphernalia and the Uniform Controlled Substances Act

Appendix B Table 3: Drug Incidents by School, Month 2 (October 4, 2002 to November 1, 2002)

School	Marijuana Offenses	Cocaine Offenses	Heroin Offenses	Other Drug Offenses ^c	Other Drug Related Offenses ^d	Total Number of Offenses
High School # 2 ^a	1	0	0	0	1	2
High School # 3 ^b	4	0	0	1	1	6
High School # 1 ^b	2	1	0	0	0	3
Middle School ^b	2	0	0	0	1	3
Total	9	1	0	1	3	14

^a Data were missing during weeks 1, 2, 14, 15, 16, 24, 25, 26, and 31

^b Data were missing during weeks 14, 15, 16, 24, 25, 26, and 31

^c Includes drug offenses not specified in reports by type

^d Includes violations such as possession of drug paraphernalia and the Uniform Controlled Substances Act

Appendix B Table 4: Drug Incidents by School, Month 3 (November 1, 2002 to November 29, 2002)

School	Marijuana Offenses	Cocaine Offenses	Heroin Offenses	Other Drug Offenses ^c	Other Drug Related Offenses ^d	Total Number of Offenses
High School # 2 ^a	2	2	0	0	0	4
High School # 3 ^b	1	2	2	0	0	5
High School # 1 ^b	4	1	0	0	0	5
Middle School ^b	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	7	5	2	0	0	14

^a Data were missing during weeks 1, 2, 14, 15, 16, 24, 25, 26, and 31

^b Data were missing during weeks 14, 15, 16, 24, 25, 26, and 31

^c Includes drug offenses not specified in reports by type

^d Includes violations such as possession of drug paraphernalia and the Uniform Controlled Substances Act

Appendix B Table 5: Drug Incidents by School, Month 4 (November 29, 2002 to December 27, 2002)

School	Marijuana Offenses	Cocaine Offenses	Heroin Offenses	Other Drug Offenses ^c	Other Drug Related Offenses ^d	Total Number of Offenses
High School # 2 ^a	0	0	0	0	0	0
High School # 3 ^b	1	1	0	0	0	2
High School # 1 ^b	0	0	0	0	0	0
Middle School ^b	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	1	1	0	0	0	2

^a Data were missing during weeks 1, 2, 14, 15, 16, 24, 25, 26, and 31

^b Data were missing during weeks 14, 15, 16, 24, 25, 26, and 31

^c Includes drug offenses not specified in reports by type

^d Includes violations such as possession of drug paraphernalia and the Uniform Controlled Substances Act

Data were missing for December 6, 2002 to December 27, 2002

Appendix B Table 6: Drug Incidents by School, Month 5 (December 27, 2002 to January 24, 2003)

School	Marijuana Offenses	Cocaine Offenses	Heroin Offenses	Other Drug Offenses^c	Other Drug Related Offenses^d	Total Number of Offenses
High School # 2^a	1	0	0	0	0	1
High School # 3^b	3	2	1	1	0	7
High School # 1^b	6	4	0	1	2	13
Middle School^b	2	0	0	0	0	2
Total	12	6	1	2	2	23

^a Data were missing during weeks 1, 2, 14, 15, 16, 24, 25, 26, and 31

^b Data were missing during weeks 14, 15, 16, 24, 25, 26, and 31

^c Includes drug offenses not specified in reports by type

^d Includes violations such as possession of drug paraphernalia and the Uniform Controlled Substances Act

Appendix B Table 7: Drug Incidents by School, Month 6 (January 24, 2003 to February 21, 2003)

School	Marijuana Offenses	Cocaine Offenses	Heroin Offenses	Other Drug Offenses ^c	Other Drug Related Offenses ^d	Total Number of Offenses
High School # 2 ^a	6	0	0	0	0	6
High School # 3 ^b	9	7	0	0	1	17
High School # 1 ^b	3	2	1	1	3	10
Middle School ^b	3	0	0	0	0	3
Total	21	9	1	1	4	36

^a Data were missing during weeks 1, 2, 14, 15, 16, 24, 25, 26, and 31

^b Data were missing during weeks 14, 15, 16, 24, 25, 26, and 31

^c Includes drug offenses not specified in reports by type

^d Includes violations such as possession of drug paraphernalia and the Uniform Controlled Substances Act

Data for period of February 14 – February 21, 2003 were missing

Appendix B Table 8: Drug Incidents by School, Month 7 (February 21, 2003 to April 18, 2003)

School	Marijuana Offenses	Cocaine Offenses	Heroin Offenses	Other Drug Offenses^c	Other Drug Related Offenses^d	Total Number of Offenses
High School # 2^a	0	0	0	0	0	0
High School # 3^b	2	2	0	0	0	4
High School # 1^b	2	0	0	0	0	2
Middle School^b	1	0	0	0	0	1
Total	5	2	0	0	0	7

^a Data were missing during weeks 1, 2, 14, 15, 16, 24, 25, 26, and 31

^b Data were missing during weeks 14, 15, 16, 24, 25, 26, and 31

^c Includes drug offenses not specified in reports by type

^d Includes violations such as possession of drug paraphernalia and the Uniform Controlled Substances Act

Data for period February 21, 2003 to April 4, 2003 were missing

Appendix B Table 9: Drug Incidents by School, Month 8 (April 18, 2003 to May 16, 2003)

School	Marijuana Offenses	Cocaine Offenses	Heroin Offenses	Other Drug Offenses ^c	Other Drug Related Offenses ^d	Total Number of Offenses
High School # 2 ^a	1	0	0	0	0	1
High School # 3 ^b	2	3	0	0	0	5
High School # 1 ^b	2	4	0	0	0	6
Middle School ^b	1	0	0	0	0	1
Total	6	7	0	0	0	13

^a Data were missing during weeks 1, 2, 14, 15, 16, 24, 25, 26, and 31

^b Data were missing during weeks 14, 15, 16, 24, 25, 26, and 31

^c Includes drug offenses not specified in reports by type

^d Includes violations such as possession of drug paraphernalia and the Uniform Controlled Substances Act

Data for period May 2-9, 2003 were missing

Appendix B Table 10: Drug Incidents by School, Month 9 (May 16, 2003 to June 6, 2003)

School	Marijuana Offenses	Cocaine Offenses	Heroin Offenses	Other Drug Offenses ^c	Other Drug Related Offenses ^d	Total Number of Offenses
High School # 2 ^a	0	0	0	0	0	0
High School # 3 ^b	0	2	0	0	0	2
High School # 1 ^b	1	2	0	0	4	7
Middle School ^b	1	0	0	0	2	3
Total	2	4	0	0	6	12

^a Data were missing during weeks 1, 2, 14, 15, 16, 24, 25, 26, and 31

^b Data were missing during weeks 14, 15, 16, 24, 25, 26, and 31

^c Includes drug offenses not specified in reports by type

^d Includes violations such as possession of drug paraphernalia and the Uniform Controlled Substances Act

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

APPENDIX C

EXAMPLES OF GIS MAPPING

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

APPENDIX D

10 SCHOOLS OFFICE REFERRAL DATA

SCHOOL: 008 ACADYEAR: 00/01

INCCODE incident-code

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
loitering	1	7	.1	.1	.1
trespassing	2	1	.0	.0	.2
gambling	3	19	.4	.4	.5
disorderly conduct	5	6	.1	.1	.6
battery	7	15	.3	.3	.9
possession of a weap	10	4	.1	.1	1.0
threats with or the	11	3	.1	.1	1.0
possession of a gun	12	3	.1	.1	1.1
sexual assault	13	2	.0	.0	1.1
vandalism	21	16	.3	.3	1.4
possession of stolen	22	3	.1	.1	1.5
theft/larceny	23	8	.2	.2	1.6
poss./own.& use of i	31	22	.4	.4	2.1
possession w/intent t	32	3	.1	.1	2.1
tardiness	41	11	.2	.2	2.3
truancy	42	20	.4	.4	2.7
inappropriate dress	43	2	.0	.0	2.7
chronic lack of supp	44	2	.0	.0	2.8
inappropriate person	45	65	1.2	1.2	4.0
refusal to work or f	46	3098	58.4	58.4	62.4
classroom disruption	47	857	16.1	16.2	78.5
use of profanity	48	518	9.8	9.8	88.3
leaving without perm	49	365	6.9	6.9	95.2
harrassment/verbal a	50	60	1.1	1.1	96.3
personal threat	51	42	.8	.8	97.1
assault	52	46	.9	.9	98.0
fighting	53	107	2.0	2.0	100.0
gang symbols	54	1	.0	.0	100.0
.	.	3	.1	Missing	
	Total	5309	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 5306 Missing cases 3

SCHOOL: 008 ACADYEAR: 99/00

INCCODE incident-code

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
loitering	1	5	.2	.2	.2
trespassing	2	3	.1	.1	.3
gambling	3	2	.1	.1	.4
disorderly conduct	5	4	.1	.1	.5
possession of a weap	10	2	.1	.1	.6
threats with or the	11	2	.1	.1	.7
possession of a gun	12	1	.0	.0	.7
sexual assault	13	2	.1	.1	.8
false fire alarms	14	1	.0	.0	.8
other similar offens	16	1	.0	.0	.9
vandalism	21	11	.4	.4	1.3
possession of stolen	22	1	.0	.0	1.3
theft/larceny	23	5	.2	.2	1.5
poss./own.& use of i	31	9	.3	.3	1.8
possession w/intent t	32	1	.0	.0	1.9
other substances/mat	33	1	.0	.0	1.9
tardiness	41	44	1.6	1.6	3.5
truancy	42	21	.8	.8	4.3
chronic lack of supp	44	4	.1	.1	4.5
inappropriate person	45	19	.7	.7	5.2
refusal to work or f	46	1320	48.6	49.0	54.2
classroom disruption	47	554	20.4	20.6	74.7
use of profanity	48	338	12.4	12.6	87.3
leaving without perm	49	227	8.4	8.4	95.7
harrassment/verbal a	50	33	1.2	1.2	97.0
personal threat	51	22	.8	.8	97.8
assault	52	10	.4	.4	98.1
fighting	53	49	1.8	1.8	100.0
gang symbols	54	1	.0	.0	100.0
.		24	.9	Missing	
Total		2717	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 2693 Missing cases 24

SCHOOL: 022 ACADYEAR: 00/01

INCCODE incident-code

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
loitering	1	1	.1	.1	.1
disorderly conduct	5	3	.2	.2	.3
battery	7	1	.1	.1	.3
threats with or the	11	1	.1	.1	.4
vandalism	21	1	.1	.1	.5
possession of stolen	22	1	.1	.1	.5
theft/larceny	23	3	.2	.2	.7
poss./own.& use of i	31	1	.1	.1	.8
tardiness	41	22	1.4	1.4	2.2
truancy	42	2	.1	.1	2.3
chronic lack of supp	44	5	.3	.3	2.7
inappropriate person	45	2	.1	.1	2.8
refusal to work or f	46	1018	66.0	66.0	68.8
classroom disruption	47	340	22.0	22.0	90.8
use of profanity	48	117	7.6	7.6	98.4
leaving without perm	49	8	.5	.5	98.9
personal threat	51	8	.5	.5	99.4
assault	52	2	.1	.1	99.5
fighting	53	7	.5	.5	100.0
Total		1543	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 1543 Missing cases 0

SCHOOL: 022 ACADYEAR: 99/00

INCCODE incident-code

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
loitering	1	4	.3	.3	.3
trespassing	2	1	.1	.1	.4
disorderly conduct	5	7	.5	.5	.8
possession of stolen	22	2	.1	.1	1.0
tardiness	41	11	.8	.8	1.8
refusal to work or f	46	881	62.3	62.4	64.2
classroom disruption	47	398	28.2	28.2	92.4
use of profanity	48	89	6.3	6.3	98.7
leaving without perm	49	7	.5	.5	99.2
assault	52	1	.1	.1	99.2
fighting	53	6	.4	.4	99.6
gang symbols	54	5	.4	.4	100.0
.		1	.1	Missing	
Total		1413	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 1412 Missing cases 1

SCHOOL: 024 ACADYEAR: 00/01

INCCODE incident-code

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
loitering	1	173	5.8	5.8	5.8
trespassing	2	4	.1	.1	6.0
gambling	3	16	.5	.5	6.5
disorderly conduct	5	11	.4	.4	6.9
battery	7	2	.1	.1	7.0
possession of a weap	10	6	.2	.2	7.2
possession of a gun	12	1	.0	.0	7.2
sexual assault	13	7	.2	.2	7.4
vandalism	21	10	.3	.3	7.8
possession of stolen	22	2	.1	.1	7.8
theft/larceny	23	13	.4	.4	8.3
poss./own.& use of i	31	40	1.3	1.4	9.6
other substances/mat	33	1	.0	.0	9.7
tardiness	41	61	2.0	2.1	11.7
truancy	42	37	1.2	1.3	13.0
inappropriate dress	43	2	.1	.1	13.0
chronic lack of supp	44	11	.4	.4	13.4
inappropriate person	45	20	.7	.7	14.1
refusal to work or f	46	836	27.9	28.2	42.3
classroom disruption	47	846	28.2	28.6	70.9
use of profanity	48	389	13.0	13.1	84.1
leaving without perm	49	300	10.0	10.1	94.2
harrassment/verbal a	50	33	1.1	1.1	95.3
personal threat	51	37	1.2	1.3	96.6
assault	52	24	.8	.8	97.4
fighting	53	74	2.5	2.5	99.9
gang symbols	54	2	.1	.1	99.9
other similar offens	55	2	.1	.1	100.0
.		39	1.3	Missing	
Total		2999	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 2960 Missing cases 39

SCHOOL: 024 ACADYEAR: 99/00

INCCODE incident-code

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
loitering	1	206	9.0	9.0	9.0
trespassing	2	1	.0	.0	9.0
gambling	3	14	.6	.6	9.7
disorderly conduct	5	16	.7	.7	10.4
possession of a weap	10	2	.1	.1	10.4
false fire alarms	14	2	.1	.1	10.5
vandalism	21	4	.2	.2	10.7
theft/larceny	23	3	.1	.1	10.8
burglary	24	1	.0	.0	10.9
arson	25	1	.0	.0	10.9
poss./own.& use of i	31	18	.8	.8	11.7
possession w/intent t	32	2	.1	.1	11.8
other substances/mat	33	1	.0	.0	11.8
tardiness	41	62	2.7	2.7	14.6
truancy	42	72	3.1	3.1	17.7
chronic lack of supp	44	10	.4	.4	18.1
inappropriate person	45	5	.2	.2	18.4
refusal to work or f	46	597	26.0	26.1	44.4
classroom disruption	47	648	28.2	28.3	72.8
use of profanity	48	296	12.9	12.9	85.7
leaving without perm	49	158	6.9	6.9	92.6
harrassment/verbal a	50	29	1.3	1.3	93.9
personal threat	51	27	1.2	1.2	95.1
assault	52	25	1.1	1.1	96.2
fighting	53	85	3.7	3.7	99.9
gang symbols	54	3	.1	.1	100.0
.	.	8	.3	Missing	
	Total	2296	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	2288	Missing cases	8		

SCHOOL: 032 ACADYEAR: 00/01

INCCODE incident-code

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
loitering	1	3	.1	.1	.1
trespassing	2	1	.0	.0	.1
disorderly conduct	5	15	.3	.4	.5
reckless vehicle use	6	1	.0	.0	.5
battery	7	17	.3	.4	1.0
possession of a weap	10	2	.0	.1	1.0
vandalism	21	28	.6	.7	1.7
theft/larceny	23	17	.3	.4	2.2
poss./own.& use of i	31	30	.6	.8	2.9
possession w/intent t	32	1	.0	.0	3.0
other substances/mat	33	3	.1	.1	3.0
truancy	42	9	.2	.2	3.3
chronic lack of supp	44	15	.3	.4	3.7
refusal to work or f	46	1342	27.4	34.7	38.4
classroom disruption	47	1187	24.2	30.7	69.0
use of profanity	48	390	8.0	10.1	79.1
leaving without perm	49	426	8.7	11.0	90.1
harrassment/verbal a	50	91	1.9	2.4	92.5
personal threat	51	86	1.8	2.2	94.7
assault	52	32	.7	.8	95.5
fighting	53	152	3.1	3.9	99.5
gang symbols	54	21	.4	.5	100.0
.	.	1030	21.0	Missing	
	Total	4899	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	3869	Missing cases	1030		

SCHOOL: 032 ACADYEAR: 99/00

INCCODE incident-code

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
loitering	1	15	.4	.5	.5
disorderly conduct	5	7	.2	.2	.8
battery	7	8	.2	.3	1.0
possession of a weap	10	4	.1	.1	1.2
threats with or the	11	1	.0	.0	1.2
vandalism	21	11	.3	.4	1.6
possession of stolen	22	1	.0	.0	1.6
theft/larceny	23	6	.1	.2	1.8
poss./own.& use of i	31	10	.2	.3	2.2
tardiness	41	4	.1	.1	2.3
truancy	42	5	.1	.2	2.5
chronic lack of supp	44	9	.2	.3	2.8
inappropriate person	45	2	.0	.1	2.8
refusal to work or f	46	861	21.2	29.4	32.2
classroom disruption	47	1094	27.0	37.4	69.6
use of profanity	48	259	6.4	8.8	78.4
leaving without perm	49	250	6.2	8.5	87.0
harrassment/verbal a	50	23	.6	.8	87.7
personal threat	51	58	1.4	2.0	89.7
assault	52	42	1.0	1.4	91.2
fighting	53	171	4.2	5.8	97.0
gang symbols	54	21	.5	.7	97.7
other similar offens	55	65	1.6	2.2	99.9
.	59	2	.0	.1	100.0
.	.	1125	27.8	Missing	
	Total	4054	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	2929	Missing cases	1125		

SCHOOL: 047 ACADYEAR: 00/01

INCCODE incident-code

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
loitering	1	2	.1	.1	.1
trespassing	2	4	.2	.2	.2
disorderly conduct	5	52	2.0	2.0	2.2
battery	7	8	.3	.3	2.5
possession of a weap	10	7	.3	.3	2.8
threats with or the	11	4	.2	.2	2.9
possession of a gun	12	1	.0	.0	2.9
sexual assault	13	8	.3	.3	3.2
other similar offens	16	2	.1	.1	3.3
vandalism	21	4	.2	.2	3.5
possession of stolen	22	2	.1	.1	3.5
theft/larceny	23	4	.2	.2	3.7
poss./own.& use of i	31	2	.1	.1	3.8
tardiness	41	14	.5	.5	4.3
truancy	42	31	1.2	1.2	5.5
inappropriate person	45	8	.3	.3	5.8
refusal to work or f	46	951	35.7	35.9	41.7
classroom disruption	47	947	35.6	35.7	77.4
use of profanity	48	197	7.4	7.4	84.8
leaving without perm	49	40	1.5	1.5	86.3
harrassment/verbal a	50	17	.6	.6	87.0
personal threat	51	20	.8	.8	87.7
assault	52	15	.6	.6	88.3
fighting	53	309	11.6	11.7	100.0
other similar offens	55	1	.0	.0	100.0
.		11	.4	Missing	
	Total	2661	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	2650	Missing cases	11		

SCHOOL: 047 ACADYEAR: 99/00

INCCODE incident-code

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
loitering	1	16	.8	.8	.8
gambling	3	2	.1	.1	.9
disorderly conduct	5	3	.2	.2	1.1
battery	7	4	.2	.2	1.3
robbery	9	1	.1	.1	1.4
threats with or the possession of a gun	11	2	.1	.1	1.5
sexual assault	12	3	.2	.2	1.6
vandalism	13	14	.7	.7	2.4
possession of stolen theft/larceny	21	3	.2	.2	2.5
possession of stolen theft/larceny	22	2	.1	.1	2.6
theft/larceny	23	5	.3	.3	2.9
poss./own.& use of i tardiness	31	1	.1	.1	3.0
tardiness	41	34	1.8	1.8	4.7
truancy	42	20	1.1	1.1	5.8
chronic lack of supp	44	1	.1	.1	5.9
inappropriate person	45	8	.4	.4	6.3
refusal to work or f	46	472	24.8	24.9	31.2
classroom disruption	47	822	43.2	43.3	74.5
use of profanity	48	118	6.2	6.2	80.7
leaving without perm	49	52	2.7	2.7	83.4
harrassment/verbal a	50	20	1.1	1.1	84.5
personal threat	51	22	1.2	1.2	85.7
assault	52	13	.7	.7	86.3
fighting	53	250	13.1	13.2	99.5
gang symbols	54	6	.3	.3	99.8
other similar offens	55	3	.2	.2	100.0
.	.	7	.4	Missing	
Total		1904	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 1897 Missing cases 7

SCHOOL: 048 ACADYEAR: 00/01

INCCODE incident-code

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
trespassing	2	3	.1	.1	.1
gambling	3	7	.2	.2	.3
possession or use of	4	5	.1	.1	.4
disorderly conduct	5	3	.1	.1	.5
battery	7	9	.2	.2	.7
extortion	8	1	.0	.0	.8
robbery	9	1	.0	.0	.8
possession of a weap	10	3	.1	.1	.9
threats with or the	11	7	.2	.2	1.1
possession of a gun	12	3	.1	.1	1.1
sexual assault	13	20	.5	.5	1.7
vandalism	21	18	.5	.5	2.2
possession of stolen	22	5	.1	.1	2.3
theft/larceny	23	11	.3	.3	2.6
arson	25	3	.1	.1	2.7
other similar offens	26	1	.0	.0	2.7
poss./own.& use of i	31	23	.6	.6	3.3
tardiness	41	108	2.8	2.9	6.2
truancy	42	157	4.1	4.2	10.5
inappropriate dress	43	2	.1	.1	10.5
chronic lack of supp	44	47	1.2	1.3	11.8
inappropriate person	45	5	.1	.1	11.9
refusal to work or f	46	657	17.2	17.7	29.7
classroom disruption	47	1421	37.2	38.4	68.0
use of profanity	48	394	10.3	10.6	78.7
leaving without perm	49	139	3.6	3.8	82.4
harrassment/verbal a	50	31	.8	.8	83.3
personal threat	51	73	1.9	2.0	85.2
assault	52	58	1.5	1.6	86.8
fighting	53	474	12.4	12.8	99.6
gang symbols	54	12	.3	.3	99.9
other similar offens	55	2	.1	.1	100.0
.	59	1	.0	.0	100.0
.	.	115	3.0	Missing	
Total		3819	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	3704	Missing cases	115		

SCHOOL: 048 ACADYEAR: 99/00

INCCODE incident-code

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
loitering	1	3	.2	.2	.2
gambling	3	2	.1	.1	.4
disorderly conduct	5	122	8.9	9.1	9.5
battery	7	5	.4	.4	9.8
possession of a weap	10	5	.4	.4	10.2
possession of a gun	12	4	.3	.3	10.5
sexual assault	13	2	.1	.1	10.7
vandalism	21	5	.4	.4	11.0
possession of stolen	22	1	.1	.1	11.1
poss./own.& use of i	31	11	.8	.8	11.9
tardiness	41	8	.6	.6	12.5
truancy	42	27	2.0	2.0	14.5
chronic lack of supp	44	5	.4	.4	14.9
inappropriate person	45	10	.7	.7	15.6
refusal to work or f	46	212	15.5	15.8	31.4
classroom disruption	47	558	40.8	41.6	73.0
use of profanity	48	157	11.5	11.7	84.7
leaving without perm	49	78	5.7	5.8	90.5
harrassment/verbal a	50	11	.8	.8	91.4
personal threat	51	25	1.8	1.9	93.2
assault	52	10	.7	.7	94.0
fighting	53	77	5.6	5.7	99.7
gang symbols	54	4	.3	.3	100.0
.	.	26	1.9	Missing	
	Total	1368	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	1342	Missing cases	26		

SCHOOL: 056 ACADYEAR: 00/01

INCCODE incident-code

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
trespassing	2	1	.0	.0	.0
possession or use of	4	3	.1	.1	.2
disorderly conduct	5	1513	48.0	69.1	69.3
battery	7	9	.3	.4	69.7
threats with or the	11	2	.1	.1	69.8
possession of a gun	12	5	.2	.2	70.0
sexual assault	13	24	.8	1.1	71.1
bomb threats	15	5	.2	.2	71.4
refusal to work or f	46	128	4.1	5.8	77.2
classroom disruption	47	16	.5	.7	77.9
use of profanity	48	149	4.7	6.8	84.7
leaving without perm	49	4	.1	.2	84.9
harrassment/verbal a	50	35	1.1	1.6	86.5
personal threat	51	52	1.6	2.4	88.9
assault	52	76	2.4	3.5	92.4
fighting	53	167	5.3	7.6	100.0
.	.	965	30.6	Missing	
	Total	3154	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	2189	Missing cases	965		

SCHOOL: 056 ACADYEAR: 99/00

INCCODE incident-code

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
loitering	1	9	.5	.5	.5
trespassing	2	1	.1	.1	.6
gambling	3	21	1.1	1.2	1.8
disorderly conduct	5	1243	67.1	71.7	73.5
reckless vehicle use	6	3	.2	.2	73.7
battery	7	16	.9	.9	74.6
extortion	8	2	.1	.1	74.7
robbery	9	2	.1	.1	74.8
possession of a weap	10	3	.2	.2	75.0
sexual assault	13	5	.3	.3	75.3
poss./own.& use of i	31	2	.1	.1	75.4
chronic lack of supp	44	1	.1	.1	75.5
refusal to work or f	46	110	5.9	6.3	81.8
classroom disruption	47	24	1.3	1.4	83.2
use of profanity	48	101	5.5	5.8	89.0
leaving without perm	49	2	.1	.1	89.2
harrassment/verbal a	50	11	.6	.6	89.8
personal threat	51	27	1.5	1.6	91.3
assault	52	39	2.1	2.3	93.6
fighting	53	111	6.0	6.4	100.0
.	.	119	6.4	Missing	
	Total	1852	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	1733	Missing cases	119		

SCHOOL: 065 ACADYEAR: 00/01

INCCODE incident-code

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
loitering	1	1	.0	.0	.0
trespassing	2	1	.0	.0	.0
disorderly conduct	5	5	.1	.1	.2
battery	7	15	.3	.3	.5
extortion	8	1	.0	.0	.5
possession of a weap	10	3	.1	.1	.6
threats with or the	11	2	.0	.0	.6
sexual assault	13	4	.1	.1	.7
bomb threats	15	2	.0	.0	.7
other similar offens	16	4	.1	.1	.8
vandalism	21	30	.6	.7	1.5
possession of stolen	22	2	.0	.0	1.5
theft/larceny	23	16	.3	.4	1.9
arson	25	2	.0	.0	1.9
poss./own.& use of i	31	9	.2	.2	2.1
possession w/intent t	32	1	.0	.0	2.1
tardiness	41	44	.9	1.0	3.1
truancy	42	149	3.2	3.3	6.4
chronic lack of supp	44	37	.8	.8	7.2
inappropriate person	45	4	.1	.1	7.3
refusal to work or f	46	1577	33.7	34.6	41.9
classroom disruption	47	1794	38.3	39.3	81.2
use of profanity	48	373	8.0	8.2	89.4
leaving without perm	49	28	.6	.6	90.0
harrassment/verbal a	50	109	2.3	2.4	92.4
personal threat	51	87	1.9	1.9	94.3
assault	52	98	2.1	2.1	96.4
fighting	53	149	3.2	3.3	99.7
gang symbols	54	12	.3	.3	100.0
.	59	2	.0	.0	100.0
.	.	121	2.6	Missing	
Total		4682	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4561 Missing cases 121

SCHOOL: 065 ACADYEAR: 99/00

INCCODE incident-code

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
loitering	1	1	.0	.0	.0
gambling	3	7	.1	.1	.1
possession or use of	4	1	.0	.0	.2
disorderly conduct	5	7	.1	.1	.3
battery	7	22	.4	.4	.7
extortion	8	1	.0	.0	.7
possession of a weap	10	7	.1	.1	.8
threats with or the	11	2	.0	.0	.8
sexual assault	13	7	.1	.1	.9
vandalism	21	20	.3	.3	1.3
possession of stolen	22	1	.0	.0	1.3
theft/larceny	23	15	.3	.3	1.6
arson	25	2	.0	.0	1.6
poss./own.& use of i	31	8	.1	.1	1.7
tardiness	41	97	1.6	1.7	3.4
truancy	42	208	3.5	3.6	7.0
inappropriate dress	43	1	.0	.0	7.0
chronic lack of supp	44	212	3.6	3.6	10.6
inappropriate person	45	7	.1	.1	10.8
refusal to work or f	46	2242	37.6	38.5	49.3
classroom disruption	47	2138	35.8	36.7	86.0
use of profanity	48	414	6.9	7.1	93.1
leaving without perm	49	68	1.1	1.2	94.3
harrassment/verbal a	50	70	1.2	1.2	95.5
personal threat	51	57	1.0	1.0	96.4
assault	52	59	1.0	1.0	97.5
fighting	53	130	2.2	2.2	99.7
gang symbols	54	18	.3	.3	100.0
.	.	148	2.5	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	5970	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 5822 Missing cases 148

SCHOOL: 387 ACADYEAR: 00/01

INCCODE incident-code

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
battery	7	2	1.4	11.1	11.1
possession of a weap	10	1	.7	5.6	16.7
other substances/mat	33	1	.7	5.6	22.2
inappropriate person	45	2	1.4	11.1	33.3
refusal to work or f	46	4	2.9	22.2	55.6
classroom disruption	47	3	2.2	16.7	72.2
use of profanity	48	2	1.4	11.1	83.3
fighting	53	3	2.2	16.7	100.0
.	.	120	87.0	Missing	
	Total	138	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	18	Missing cases	120		

SCHOOL: 008 ACADYEAR: 00/01

Group DISPCODE Disposition 1-3: Summary

Category label	Code	Count	Pct of Responses	Pct of Cases
Teacher/Parent Conference	11	8	.1	.2
Teacher/Student/Administrator Conference	12	4	.0	.1
Administrator/Student Conference	13	2725	28.3	51.3
Admin/Stud/Par/Tchr Telephone Conference	14	1543	16.0	29.1
Admin/Par/Student Conference	15	116	1.2	2.2
Admin/Par/Stud/Teacher Conference	16	52	.5	1.0
Tchr/Stud/Parent Conference	17	7	.1	.1
Warning to Stud.and/or Parent	19	343	3.6	6.5
Referral to Counselor	20	40	.4	.8
Referral to Social Worker	21	7	.1	.1
Referral to School Psychologist	23	3	.0	.1
Referral to Stud.Assist.Co-ordinator	24	2	.0	.0
Referral to Human Relations Co-ord.	25	7	.1	.1
Collection of Inappropriate personal pro	28	1	.0	.0
Detention	30	103	1.1	1.9
Pending Suspension	31	454	4.7	8.6
In-School Suspension	32	5	.1	.1
Suspension 1/2 day or less	33	93	1.0	1.8
Suspension 1 day	34	800	8.3	15.1
Suspension 2 days	35	492	5.1	9.3
Suspension 3 days	36	2485	25.8	46.8
Suspension More than 3 days	37	99	1.0	1.9
Field Counselor Involvement	38	100	1.0	1.9
Change in Student's Porgram	39	12	.1	.2
Police Referral	41	131	1.4	2.5
Other	42	1	.0	.0
Removal from Local Site	43	1	.0	.0
Other (Suspension 5 days)	44	1	.0	.0
		-----	-----	-----
	Total responses	9635	100.0	181.6

2 missing cases; 5,307 valid cases

SCHOOL: 008 ACADYEAR: 99/00

Group DISPCODE Disposition 1-3: Summary

Category label	Code	Count	Pct of Responses	Pct of Cases
Teacher/Parent Telephone Conference/Lett	9	4	.1	.1
Teacher/Student Conference	10	13	.3	.5
Teacher/Parent Conference	11	54	1.3	2.0
Teacher/Student/Administrator Conference	12	5	.1	.2
Administrator/Student Conference	13	950	22.1	35.0
Admin/Stud/Par/Tchr Telephone Conference	14	529	12.3	19.5
Admin/Par/Student Conference	15	382	8.9	14.1
Admin/Par/Stud/Teacher Conference	16	31	.7	1.1
Tchr/Stud/Parent Conference	17	9	.2	.3
Contract With Student	18	4	.1	.1
Warning to Stud.and/or Parent	19	168	3.9	6.2
Referral to Counselor	20	17	.4	.6
Referral to Social Worker	21	23	.5	.8
Referral to School Psychologist	23	1	.0	.0
Referral to Stud.Assist.Co-ordinator	24	1	.0	.0
Referral to Human Relations Co-ord.	25	3	.1	.1
Financial/Service settlement	29	1	.0	.0
Detention	30	70	1.6	2.6
Pending Suspension	31	348	8.1	12.8
In-School Suspension	32	68	1.6	2.5
Suspension 1/2 day or less	33	77	1.8	2.8
Suspension 1 day	34	359	8.4	13.2
Suspension 2 days	35	218	5.1	8.0
Suspension 3 days	36	835	19.4	30.7
Suspension More than 3 days	37	32	.7	1.2
Field Counselor Involvement	38	39	.9	1.4
Change in Student's Porgram	39	8	.2	.3
Police Referral	41	46	1.1	1.7
Other	42	2	.0	.1
Other (Suspension 5 days)	44	2	.0	.1
		-----	-----	-----
	Total responses	4299	100.0	158.3

1 missing cases; 2,716 valid cases

SCHOOL: 022 ACADYEAR: 00/01

Group DISPCODE Disposition 1-3: Summary

Category label	Code	Count	Pct of Responses	Pct of Cases
Teacher/Student Conference	10	4	.2	.3
Teacher/Parent Conference	11	6	.4	.4
Teacher/Student/Administrator Conference	12	6	.4	.4
Administrator/Student Conference	13	916	56.9	59.4
Admin/Stud/Par/Tchr Telephone Conference	14	3	.2	.2
Admin/Par/Student Conference	15	73	4.5	4.7
Tchr/Stud/Parent Conference	17	4	.2	.3
Contract With Student	18	37	2.3	2.4
Warning to Stud.and/or Parent	19	4	.2	.3
Referral to Counselor	20	1	.1	.1
Exclusion from Extra-curricular activiti	27	1	.1	.1
Collection of Inappropriate personal pro	28	1	.1	.1
Detention	30	68	4.2	4.4
Pending Suspension	31	78	4.8	5.1
In-School Suspension	32	12	.7	.8
Suspension 1/2 day or less	33	1	.1	.1
Suspension 1 day	34	6	.4	.4
Suspension 2 days	35	1	.1	.1
Suspension 3 days	36	350	21.7	22.7
Suspension More than 3 days	37	7	.4	.5
Change in Student's Porgram	39	30	1.9	1.9
Removal from Local Site	43	2	.1	.1
		-----	-----	-----
	Total responses	1611	100.0	104.5

1 missing cases; 1,542 valid cases

SCHOOL: 022 ACADYEAR: 99/00

Group DISPCODE Disposition 1-3: Summary

Category label	Code	Count	Pct of Responses	Pct of Cases
Teacher/Student Conference	10	3	.2	.2
Teacher/Parent Conference	11	11	.6	.8
Teacher/Student/Administrator Conference	12	3	.2	.2
Administrator/Student Conference	13	1170	69.1	82.9
Admin/Stud/Par/Tchr Telephone Conference	14	8	.5	.6
Admin/Par/Student Conference	15	18	1.1	1.3
Admin/Par/Stud/Teacher Conference	16	1	.1	.1
Tchr/Stud/Parent Conference	17	3	.2	.2
Contract With Student	18	2	.1	.1
Warning to Stud.and/or Parent	19	7	.4	.5
Detention	30	58	3.4	4.1
Pending Suspension	31	188	11.1	13.3
In-School Suspension	32	5	.3	.4
Suspension 1/2 day or less	33	1	.1	.1
Suspension 1 day	34	7	.4	.5
Suspension 2 days	35	12	.7	.8
Suspension 3 days	36	185	10.9	13.1
Suspension More than 3 days	37	3	.2	.2
Change in Student's Porgram	39	8	.5	.6
Police Referral	41	1	.1	.1
		-----	-----	-----
	Total responses	1694	100.0	120.0

1 missing cases; 1,412 valid cases

SCHOOL: 024 ACADYEAR: 00/01

Group DISPCODE Disposition 1-3: Summary

Category label	Code	Count	Pct of Responses	Pct of Cases
Teacher/Parent Telephone Conference/Lett	9	18	.6	.6
Teacher/Student Conference	10	1	.0	.0
Teacher/Parent Conference	11	9	.3	.3
Teacher/Student/Administrator Conference	12	4	.1	.1
Administrator/Student Conference	13	449	13.9	15.0
Admin/Stud/Par/Tchr Telephone Conference	14	30	.9	1.0
Admin/Par/Student Conference	15	112	3.5	3.7
Admin/Par/Stud/Teacher Conference	16	9	.3	.3
Contract With Student	18	9	.3	.3
Warning to Stud.and/or Parent	19	332	10.2	11.1
Referral to Counselor	20	11	.3	.4
Referral to Social Worker	21	1	.0	.0
Referral to School Psychologist	23	2	.1	.1
Exclusion from Extra-curricular activiti	27	1	.0	.0
Detention	30	214	6.6	7.1
Pending Suspension	31	142	4.4	4.7
In-School Suspension	32	87	2.7	2.9
Suspension 1/2 day or less	33	19	.6	.6
Suspension 1 day	34	582	18.0	19.4
Suspension 2 days	35	225	6.9	7.5
Suspension 3 days	36	841	26.0	28.1
Suspension More than 3 days	37	125	3.9	4.2
Change in Student's Porgram	39	9	.3	.3
Other	42	6	.2	.2
Removal from Local Site	43	2	.1	.1
		-----	-----	-----
	Total responses	3240	100.0	108.1

2 missing cases; 2,997 valid cases

SCHOOL: 024 ACADYEAR: 99/00

Group DISPCODE Disposition 1-3: Summary

Category label	Code	Count	Pct of Responses	Pct of Cases
Teacher/Parent Telephone Conference/Lett	9	2	.0	.1
Teacher/Student Conference	10	4	.1	.2
Teacher/Parent Conference	11	4	.1	.2
Teacher/Student/Administrator Conference	12	21	.5	.9
Administrator/Student Conference	13	1446	31.5	63.1
Admin/Stud/Par/Tchr Telephone Conference	14	403	8.8	17.6
Admin/Par/Student Conference	15	438	9.5	19.1
Admin/Par/Stud/Teacher Conference	16	35	.8	1.5
Tchr/Stud/Parent Conference	17	10	.2	.4
Contract With Student	18	218	4.8	9.5
Warning to Stud.and/or Parent	19	241	5.3	10.5
Referral to Counselor	20	14	.3	.6
Referral to Social Worker	21	5	.1	.2
Referral to Student Services Team	22	1	.0	.0
Referral to School Psychologist	23	24	.5	1.0
Detention	30	164	3.6	7.2
Pending Suspension	31	119	2.6	5.2
In-School Suspension	32	14	.3	.6
Suspension 1/2 day or less	33	52	1.1	2.3
Suspension 1 day	34	508	11.1	22.2
Suspension 2 days	35	194	4.2	8.5
Suspension 3 days	36	470	10.2	20.5
Suspension More than 3 days	37	88	1.9	3.8
Field Counselor Involvement	38	4	.1	.2
Change in Student's Porgram	39	5	.1	.2
Police Referral	41	49	1.1	2.1
Other	42	47	1.0	2.1
Removal from Local Site	43	9	.2	.4
		-----	-----	-----
	Total responses	4589	100.0	200.3

5 missing cases; 2,291 valid cases

SCHOOL: 032 ACADYEAR: 00/01

Group DISPCODE Disposition 1-3: Summary

Category label	Code	Count	Pct of Responses	Pct of Cases
Teacher/Student Conference	10	5	.1	.1
Teacher/Parent Conference	11	22	.4	.5
Teacher/Student/Administrator Conference	12	17	.3	.3
Administrator/Student Conference	13	479	8.5	9.8
Admin/Stud/Par/Tchr Telephone Conference	14	88	1.6	1.8
Admin/Par/Student Conference	15	25	.4	.5
Admin/Par/Stud/Teacher Conference	16	35	.6	.7
Tchr/Stud/Parent Conference	17	5	.1	.1
Contract With Student	18	14	.2	.3
Warning to Stud.and/or Parent	19	302	5.4	6.2
Referral to Counselor	20	22	.4	.5
Referral to Social Worker	21	3	.1	.1
Detention	30	137	2.4	2.8
Pending Suspension	31	62	1.1	1.3
In-School Suspension	32	62	1.1	1.3
Suspension 1/2 day or less	33	8	.1	.2
Suspension 1 day	34	2161	38.3	44.3
Suspension 2 days	35	1112	19.7	22.8
Suspension 3 days	36	918	16.3	18.8
Suspension More than 3 days	37	34	.6	.7
Field Counselor Involvement	38	115	2.0	2.4
Change in Student's Program	39	11	.2	.2
Police Referral	41	5	.1	.1
Other	42	2	.0	.0
		-----	-----	-----
	Total responses	5644	100.0	115.7

20 missing cases; 4,879 valid cases

SCHOOL: 032 ACADYEAR: 99/00

Group DISPCODE Disposition 1-3: Summary

Category label	Code	Count	Pct of Responses	Pct of Cases
Teacher/Parent Telephone Conference/Lett	9	1	.0	.0
Teacher/Student Conference	10	2	.0	.0
Teacher/Parent Conference	11	13	.3	.3
Teacher/Student/Administrator Conference	12	5	.1	.1
Administrator/Student Conference	13	372	8.6	9.2
Admin/Stud/Par/Tchr Telephone Conference	14	2	.0	.0
Admin/Par/Student Conference	15	5	.1	.1
Admin/Par/Stud/Teacher Conference	16	4	.1	.1
Tchr/Stud/Parent Conference	17	5	.1	.1
Contract With Student	18	14	.3	.3
Warning to Stud.and/or Parent	19	124	2.9	3.1
Referral to Counselor	20	10	.2	.2
Referral to Social Worker	21	6	.1	.1
Referral to Human Relations Co-ord.	25	1	.0	.0
Detention	30	210	4.9	5.2
In-School Suspension	32	18	.4	.4
Suspension 1/2 day or less	33	2	.0	.0
Suspension 1 day	34	1727	39.9	42.6
Suspension 2 days	35	666	15.4	16.4
Suspension 3 days	36	951	22.0	23.5
Suspension More than 3 days	37	12	.3	.3
Field Counselor Involvement	38	152	3.5	3.7
Change in Student's Porgram	39	15	.3	.4
Police Referral	41	4	.1	.1
Other	42	4	.1	.1
		-----	-----	-----
	Total responses	4325	100.0	106.7

0 missing cases; 4,054 valid cases

SCHOOL: 047 ACADYEAR: 00/01

Group DISPCODE Disposition 1-3: Summary

Category label	Code	Count	Pct of Responses	Pct of Cases
Teacher/Parent Telephone Conference/Lett	9	10	.3	.4
Teacher/Student Conference	10	2	.1	.1
Teacher/Parent Conference	11	2	.1	.1
Teacher/Student/Administrator Conference	12	3	.1	.1
Administrator/Student Conference	13	740	20.3	27.9
Admin/Stud/Par/Tchr Telephone Conference	14	16	.4	.6
Admin/Par/Student Conference	15	466	12.8	17.6
Admin/Par/Stud/Teacher Conference	16	5	.1	.2
Contract With Student	18	124	3.4	4.7
Warning to Stud.and/or Parent	19	2	.1	.1
Detention	30	439	12.1	16.6
Pending Suspension	31	3	.1	.1
Suspension 1 day	34	341	9.4	12.9
Suspension 2 days	35	279	7.7	10.5
Suspension 3 days	36	1038	28.5	39.1
Suspension More than 3 days	37	44	1.2	1.7
Field Counselor Involvement	38	4	.1	.2
Monitored Attendance Program	40	4	.1	.2
Police Referral	41	71	2.0	2.7
Other	42	41	1.1	1.5
Removal from Local Site	43	7	.2	.3
		-----	-----	-----
	Total responses	3641	100.0	137.3

9 missing cases; 2,652 valid cases

SCHOOL: 047 ACADYEAR: 99/00

Group DISPCODE Disposition 1-3: Summary

Category label	Code	Count	Pct of Responses	Pct of Cases
Teacher/Parent Telephone Conference/Lett	9	1	.0	.1
Teacher/Student Conference	10	2	.1	.1
Teacher/Parent Conference	11	7	.3	.4
Administrator/Student Conference	13	28	1.3	1.5
Admin/Stud/Par/Tchr Telephone Conference	14	11	.5	.6
Admin/Par/Student Conference	15	304	13.6	16.0
Admin/Par/Stud/Teacher Conference	16	1	.0	.1
Tchr/Stud/Parent Conference	17	1	.0	.1
Contract With Student	18	332	14.9	17.4
Warning to Stud.and/or Parent	19	3	.1	.2
Detention	30	172	7.7	9.0
Pending Suspension	31	83	3.7	4.4
Suspension 1/2 day or less	33	1	.0	.1
Suspension 1 day	34	352	15.8	18.5
Suspension 2 days	35	100	4.5	5.3
Suspension 3 days	36	652	29.3	34.3
Suspension More than 3 days	37	47	2.1	2.5
Field Counselor Involvement	38	1	.0	.1
Change in Student's Porgram	39	1	.0	.1
Police Referral	41	8	.4	.4
Other	42	120	5.4	6.3
Other (Suspension 5 days)	44	1	.0	.1
		-----	-----	-----
	Total responses	2228	100.0	117.1

1 missing cases; 1,903 valid cases

SCHOOL: 048 ACADYEAR: 00/01

Group DISPCODE Disposition 1-3: Summary

Category label	Code	Count	Pct of Responses	Pct of Cases
Teacher/Parent Telephone Conference/Lett	9	3	.1	.1
Teacher/Student Conference	10	6	.1	.2
Teacher/Parent Conference	11	6	.1	.2
Teacher/Student/Administrator Conference	12	38	.8	1.0
Administrator/Student Conference	13	1308	26.9	34.2
Admin/Stud/Par/Tchr Telephone Conference	14	103	2.1	2.7
Admin/Par/Student Conference	15	51	1.0	1.3
Admin/Par/Stud/Teacher Conference	16	7	.1	.2
Tchr/Stud/Parent Conference	17	7	.1	.2
Contract With Student	18	24	.5	.6
Warning to Stud.and/or Parent	19	12	.2	.3
Referral to Counselor	20	4	.1	.1
Referral to Social Worker	21	26	.5	.7
Referral to Student Services Team	22	7	.1	.2
Referral to School Psychologist	23	20	.4	.5
Referral to Stud.Assist.Co-ordinator	24	1	.0	.0
Referral to Human Relations Co-ord.	25	2	.0	.1
Referral to M-Team	26	24	.5	.6
Exclusion from Extra-curricular activiti	27	5	.1	.1
Collection of Inappropriate personal pro	28	1	.0	.0
Financial/Service settlement	29	3	.1	.1
Detention	30	1012	20.8	26.5
Pending Suspension	31	146	3.0	3.8
In-School Suspension	32	109	2.2	2.9
Suspension 1/2 day or less	33	14	.3	.4
Suspension 1 day	34	532	10.9	13.9
Suspension 2 days	35	492	10.1	12.9
Suspension 3 days	36	660	13.6	17.3
Suspension More than 3 days	37	83	1.7	2.2
Field Counselor Involvement	38	2	.0	.1
Change in Student's Porgram	39	1	.0	.0
Police Referral	41	89	1.8	2.3
Other	42	68	1.4	1.8
Other (Suspension 5 days)	44	1	.0	.0
		-----	-----	-----
	Total responses	4867	100.0	127.4

0 missing cases; 3,819 valid cases

SCHOOL: 048 ACADYEAR: 99/00

Group DISPCODE Disposition 1-3: Summary

Category label	Code	Count	Pct of Responses	Pct of Cases
Teacher/Student Conference	10	275	10.4	20.1
Teacher/Student/Administrator Conference	12	247	9.3	18.1
Administrator/Student Conference	13	1012	38.1	74.0
Admin/Stud/Par/Tchr Telephone Conference	14	69	2.6	5.0
Admin/Par/Student Conference	15	24	.9	1.8
Admin/Par/Stud/Teacher Conference	16	63	2.4	4.6
Tchr/Stud/Parent Conference	17	6	.2	.4
Warning to Stud.and/or Parent	19	32	1.2	2.3
Referral to Counselor	20	3	.1	.2
Referral to Social Worker	21	2	.1	.1
Referral to Student Services Team	22	2	.1	.1
Referral to School Psychologist	23	5	.2	.4
Detention	30	114	4.3	8.3
Pending Suspension	31	98	3.7	7.2
In-School Suspension	32	7	.3	.5
Suspension 1/2 day or less	33	11	.4	.8
Suspension 1 day	34	285	10.7	20.8
Suspension 2 days	35	70	2.6	5.1
Suspension 3 days	36	206	7.8	15.1
Suspension More than 3 days	37	54	2.0	4.0
Change in Student's Porgram	39	2	.1	.1
Police Referral	41	45	1.7	3.3
Other	42	21	.8	1.5
Removal from Local Site	43	1	.0	.1
Other (Suspension 5 days)	44	1	.0	.1
		-----	-----	-----
	Total responses	2655	100.0	194.2

1 missing cases; 1,367 valid cases

SCHOOL: 056 ACADYEAR: 00/01

Group DISPCODE Disposition 1-3: Summary

Category label	Code	Count	Pct of Responses	Pct of Cases
Teacher/Parent Telephone Conference/Lett	9	3	.1	.1
Teacher/Student Conference	10	3	.1	.1
Administrator/Student Conference	13	13	.4	.4
Admin/Stud/Par/Tchr Telephone Conference	14	1	.0	.0
Admin/Par/Student Conference	15	12	.4	.4
Admin/Par/Stud/Teacher Conference	16	8	.2	.3
Tchr/Stud/Parent Conference	17	1	.0	.0
Contract With Student	18	4	.1	.1
Warning to Stud.and/or Parent	19	1910	56.6	60.6
Referral to Counselor	20	8	.2	.3
Referral to Social Worker	21	1	.0	.0
Referral to Student Services Team	22	19	.6	.6
Referral to School Psychologist	23	5	.1	.2
Referral to M-Team	26	12	.4	.4
Exclusion from Extra-curricular activiti	27	2	.1	.1
Financial/Service settlement	29	5	.1	.2
Detention	30	20	.6	.6
Pending Suspension	31	128	3.8	4.1
Suspension 1/2 day or less	33	19	.6	.6
Suspension 1 day	34	273	8.1	8.7
Suspension 2 days	35	515	15.3	16.3
Suspension 3 days	36	255	7.6	8.1
Suspension More than 3 days	37	10	.3	.3
Field Counselor Involvement	38	46	1.4	1.5
Police Referral	41	70	2.1	2.2
Removal from Local Site	43	1	.0	.0
Other (Suspension 5 days)	44	32	.9	1.0
		-----	-----	-----
	Total responses	3376	100.0	107.1

2 missing cases; 3,152 valid cases

SCHOOL: 056 ACADYEAR: 99/00

Group DISPCODE Disposition 1-3: Summary

Category label	Code	Count	Pct of Responses	Pct of Cases
Teacher/Parent Conference	11	2	.1	.1
Administrator/Student Conference	13	23	1.2	1.2
Admin/Stud/Par/Tchr Telephone Conference	14	3	.2	.2
Admin/Par/Student Conference	15	3	.2	.2
Warning to Stud.and/or Parent	19	1150	58.4	62.1
Referral to Counselor	20	3	.2	.2
Referral to Student Services Team	22	9	.5	.5
Referral to School Psychologist	23	6	.3	.3
Financial/Service settlement	29	7	.4	.4
Detention	30	24	1.2	1.3
Pending Suspension	31	167	8.5	9.0
In-School Suspension	32	1	.1	.1
Suspension 1/2 day or less	33	5	.3	.3
Suspension 1 day	34	174	8.8	9.4
Suspension 2 days	35	182	9.2	9.8
Suspension 3 days	36	118	6.0	6.4
Suspension More than 3 days	37	28	1.4	1.5
Field Counselor Involvement	38	26	1.3	1.4
Police Referral	41	37	1.9	2.0
		-----	-----	-----
	Total responses	1968	100.0	106.3

0 missing cases; 1,852 valid cases

SCHOOL: 065 ACADYEAR: 00/01

Group DISPCODE Disposition 1-3: Summary

Category label	Code	Count	Pct of Responses	Pct of Cases
Teacher/Parent Telephone Conference/Lett	9	21	.3	.4
Teacher/Student Conference	10	56	.8	1.2
Teacher/Parent Conference	11	39	.6	.8
Teacher/Student/Administrator Conference	12	32	.5	.7
Administrator/Student Conference	13	3091	43.6	66.0
Admin/Stud/Par/Tchr Telephone Conference	14	100	1.4	2.1
Admin/Par/Student Conference	15	187	2.6	4.0
Admin/Par/Stud/Teacher Conference	16	22	.3	.5
Tchr/Stud/Parent Conference	17	12	.2	.3
Contract With Student	18	122	1.7	2.6
Warning to Stud.and/or Parent	19	294	4.1	6.3
Referral to Counselor	20	37	.5	.8
Referral to Social Worker	21	15	.2	.3
Referral to Student Services Team	22	5	.1	.1
Referral to School Psychologist	23	11	.2	.2
Referral to Stud.Assist.Co-ordinator	24	1	.0	.0
Referral to Human Relations Co-ord.	25	1	.0	.0
Exclusion from Extra-curricular activiti	27	1	.0	.0
Financial/Service settlement	29	2	.0	.0
Detention	30	761	10.7	16.3
Pending Suspension	31	947	13.4	20.2
In-School Suspension	32	33	.5	.7
Suspension 1/2 day or less	33	4	.1	.1
Suspension 1 day	34	433	6.1	9.3
Suspension 2 days	35	231	3.3	4.9
Suspension 3 days	36	503	7.1	10.7
Suspension More than 3 days	37	34	.5	.7
Field Counselor Involvement	38	11	.2	.2
Change in Student's Porgram	39	3	.0	.1
Police Referral	41	72	1.0	1.5
Other	42	6	.1	.1
		-----	-----	-----
	Total responses	7087	100.0	151.4

2 missing cases; 4,680 valid cases

SCHOOL: 065 ACADYEAR: 99/00

Group DISPCODE Disposition 1-3: Summary

Category label	Code	Count	Pct of Responses	Pct of Cases
Teacher/Parent Telephone Conference/Lett	9	58	.6	1.0
Teacher/Student Conference	10	48	.5	.8
Teacher/Parent Conference	11	30	.3	.5
Teacher/Student/Administrator Conference	12	47	.5	.8
Administrator/Student Conference	13	4033	44.1	67.6
Admin/Stud/Par/Tchr Telephone Conference	14	135	1.5	2.3
Admin/Par/Student Conference	15	101	1.1	1.7
Admin/Par/Stud/Teacher Conference	16	42	.5	.7
Tchr/Stud/Parent Conference	17	15	.2	.3
Contract With Student	18	42	.5	.7
Warning to Stud.and/or Parent	19	654	7.2	11.0
Referral to Counselor	20	45	.5	.8
Referral to Social Worker	21	23	.3	.4
Referral to Student Services Team	22	9	.1	.2
Referral to School Psychologist	23	14	.2	.2
Referral to Stud.Assist.Co-ordinator	24	3	.0	.1
Referral to M-Team	26	4	.0	.1
Exclusion from Extra-curricular activiti	27	1	.0	.0
Collection of Inappropriate personal pro	28	4	.0	.1
Financial/Service settlement	29	2	.0	.0
Detention	30	1256	13.7	21.0
Pending Suspension	31	1176	12.9	19.7
In-School Suspension	32	38	.4	.6
Suspension 1/2 day or less	33	3	.0	.1
Suspension 1 day	34	383	4.2	6.4
Suspension 2 days	35	283	3.1	4.7
Suspension 3 days	36	558	6.1	9.3
Suspension More than 3 days	37	23	.3	.4
Field Counselor Involvement	38	30	.3	.5
Change in Student's Porgram	39	4	.0	.1
Police Referral	41	63	.7	1.1
Other	42	3	.0	.1
Removal from Local Site	43	9	.1	.2
Other (Suspension 5 days)	44	2	.0	.0
		-----	-----	-----
	Total responses	9141	100.0	153.2

2 missing cases; 5,968 valid cases

SCHOOL: 387 ACADYEAR: 00/01

Group DISPCODE Disposition 1-3: Summary

Category label	Code	Count	Pct of Responses	Pct of Cases
Teacher/Parent Telephone Conference/Lett	9	2	1.4	1.4
Admin/Stud/Par/Tchr Telephone Conference	14	2	1.4	1.4
Admin/Par/Student Conference	15	9	6.5	6.5
Admin/Par/Stud/Teacher Conference	16	1	.7	.7
Suspension 1/2 day or less	33	1	.7	.7
Suspension 1 day	34	28	20.3	20.3
Suspension 2 days	35	16	11.6	11.6
Suspension 3 days	36	58	42.0	42.0
Suspension More than 3 days	37	1	.7	.7
Field Counselor Involvement	38	2	1.4	1.4
Other	42	17	12.3	12.3
Removal from Local Site	43	1	.7	.7
		-----	-----	-----
	Total responses	138	100.0	100.0

0 missing cases; 138 valid cases