

**Evaluating Problem Solving in Colorado Springs:
The 1999 School-Based Partnership Program**

By

Craig D. Uchida
Carol Putnam

21st Century Solutions, Inc.
December 2001

This report and project were supported by Grant No. 1999-CK-WX-K005 awarded by the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, U.S. Department of Justice to 21st Century Solutions, Inc. Points of view 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 law enforcement agency involved in the study.

Copyright © by Craig D. Uchida and 21st Century Solutions, Inc. The U.S. Department of Justice reserves a royalty-free, nonexclusive, and irrevocable license to reproduce, publish or otherwise use, and to authorize others to use, this document for Federal Government purposes. No part of this document may be reproduced in any forms, by any means (including electronic, photocopying, recording or otherwise) without the prior written permission of the U.S. Department of Justice and the authors.

Published by:
21st Century Solutions, Inc.
P.O. Box 12279
Silver Spring, MD 20908
(301) 438-3132
www.e-21stCenturySolutions.com
CDUchida@aol.com

Evaluating Problem Solving in Colorado Springs: The 1999 School-Based Partnership Program

Table of Contents

Section	Page Number
Introduction	4
Section 1. Background	5
Section 2. Crime, Safety and School Resource Officers	14
Section 3. Reducing Disputes: Problem Solving at Doherty High School	21
Section 4. Improving Safety at Harrison High School	27
Section 5. Cleaning up the Neighborhood: Problem Solving at Mitchell High School	35
Section 6. Tackling Assaults and Disturbances at Sierra High School	42
Section 7. Reducing Drug Use at Wasson High School	49
Section 8. Problem Solving in Schools: Summary and Recommendations	56
References	61

Evaluating Problem Solving in Colorado Springs: The 1999 School-Based Partnership Program

Introduction

In 1998 and 1999 the COPS Office initiated major grant programs to deal with crime and disorder problems in schools. The idea behind the program was to assist police and schools in implementing Problem-Oriented Policing, a strategy first developed by Herman Goldstein in 1979. While police agencies had successfully used the problem-solving model for crime and disorder problems on city streets, in parks and recreational areas, and in public housing, rarely did they work with schools to deal with day-to-day problems. The School-Based Partnership program (SBP) was an attempt to encourage law enforcement to work with school administrators, students, faculty and parents using this model. Over 250 jurisdictions received funding in 1998 and 1999 at a cost of over \$30 million. As part of the grant, the COPS Office required that law enforcement provide funds to evaluators to document and describe the implementation of the program. In 1999, the Colorado Springs Police Department (CSPD) received one of these grants to conduct problem-solving projects in five high schools.

CSPD selected 21st Century Solutions, Inc. as its evaluator. During a two-year period, staff of 21st Century Solutions, Inc. made site visits, conducted in-person interviews, analyzed data from the schools and police, worked closely with the School Resource Officers, and observed a variety of activities. This document describes the implementation of the problem-solving model and discusses possible impacts of the project on the schools and police.

The report is divided into eight sections. The first section provides background information about Colorado Springs, the police department, schools, and the problem-solving partnership grant. We also discuss our research methods, including research questions, data sources, and analysis. Section 2 examines the literature on school-based programs and problem oriented policing to provide a context for this study and the work of police officers in schools. Sections 3 through 7 report on the problem-solving activities at each of the five high schools. Section 8 concludes with a summary of our findings and recommendations.

Section 1. Background

Colorado Springs

Colorado Springs is located in the middle of the state of Colorado, at the base of the Rocky Mountains and is part of the “Front Range.” Pikes Peak looms to the west of the city about 14,000 feet above sea level, usually topped with snow. The city covers 184 square miles, mostly flatlands that are part of the Great Plains, but is over 6,000 feet above sea level. The city has grown from 281,000 in 1990 to over 360,000 in 2000, an increase of over 28%. The racial and ethnic make up of the city is 75% white, 12% Hispanic, 6% African American, 3% Asian American, and 3% American Indian and mixed races.

The Colorado Springs Police Department (CSPD) has primary jurisdiction in the city and has over 750 employees, including 531 sworn officers. Over 40% of the officers respond to calls for service on a regular basis. This is accomplished despite the low number of officers for a city of its size. Compared to other relatively large cities, Colorado Springs has one of the lowest ratios of officers per thousand. The national average is about 2.7 officers per thousand; CSPD has 1.5 officers per thousand.

For the last 10 years, Chief Lorne Kramer has led the department and has followed a community policing philosophy. CSPD’s community policing approach includes community engagement, organizational adaptation and “total problem-oriented policing.”

The department has three stations located throughout the city —one to the north (Falcon), one downtown (Gold Hill) and one to the south (Sand Creek). A commander at each station oversees a patrol unit, traffic enforcement, investigations, a Neighborhood Policing Unit (NPU), and crime analysis.

Most patrol officers in the department actively engage in problem-oriented policing. A survey of patrol officers conducted by 21st Century Solutions, Inc. in February 2000 found that nearly 85% of the officers said that they had done a POP project in the previous year (Uchida, et al, 2001). Furthermore, we found that over a five-year period, officers participated in over 2,000 POP projects of varying levels of intensity (Maguire, et al., 2001).

Five separate School Districts oversee 69 elementary schools, 18 middle schools, and 13 high schools in Colorado Springs. The districts are referred to as Colorado Springs Districts 2, 11, 12, and 20 and El Paso County District 14. Each district has its own superintendent and policies regarding security issues.

School-Based Programs in Colorado Springs

The Colorado Springs Police Department has been formally active in schools since 1989 when the Drug Abuse Resistance Education (DARE) program began. Through a grant from a local foundation, CSPD initiated the DARE program in School District 20. During the 1990s DARE expanded quickly, and at its peak, officers taught the DARE curriculum at all 69 elementary

schools in Colorado Springs. In 1998 the DARE program ended because a citywide evaluation found that the effects of the program were not lasting. Data from a 1996 Youth Lifestyle survey also showed that alcohol and tobacco use increased for students in grades 6 through 8. CSPD replaced DARE with the “Adopt-a-School” program for elementary school children and focused more energy on middle school and high school students. The Adopt-a-School program includes patrol officers, detectives, and traffic officers who attend special events and train students in crime prevention and drug awareness.

A Middle School Task Force, including both officers and school staff, selected the Project Alert substance abuse prevention curriculum to teach in middle schools. In 1998, 12 Prevention Resource Officers (PROs) began teaching sessions of Project Alert to 6th graders. “Booster sessions” for 7th and 8th graders were added the following year. Currently, nine PROs work in 18 middle schools during the school year.

For high school students, the School Resource Officer (SRO) program began in earnest in 1999. The model for this program was an officer who began working in Harrison High School in 1995 on a part-time basis. With funding from the COPS Office in 1999¹ and with funds from the schools and the police department, 12 SROs now work fulltime in 12 of the 13 high schools in Colorado Springs.² The primary goal of the SROs is to “help provide a safe and secure environment in and around the schools.”

All school-based officers work under a sergeant as part of the Neighborhood Policing Unit (NPU) at each division. These positions are competitive and advertised internally. Officers apply for the positions and are selected by the commander, lieutenant and sergeant at each station.

The School-Based Partnership Grant

Colorado Springs is located about 60 miles south of Littleton, CO the site of Columbine High School, where 12 students and a teacher were killed and 24 others wounded by two students on April 20, 1999. Coincidentally, the deadline for the COPS Office School-Based Partnership Grant program was April 30, 1999. CSPD did not intend to apply for a school-based grant until the tragic and lethal assault took place at Columbine. But just as September 11, 2001 has become a turning point for the nation, April 20, 1999 was a “wake-up” call for schools and police agencies across the country. CSPD recognized the similarities between the demographics of Littleton and Colorado Springs, saw that problem solving could be effectively used in schools, and acknowledged that they needed to act to prevent a similar incident. In fact, immediately after the Littleton tragedy, three young boys walked into a Colorado Springs high school dressed in black trench coats, emulating the two students in Littleton. They were unarmed, turned away by school security, and charged with trespassing, as they were not students of the school. With these tensions and concerns about safety in schools, CSPD administrators decided to apply for grant funds. The department was given until May 7, 1999 to turn in its proposal. In September the department was awarded the grant.

¹ Through the Cops in Schools program and the School-Based Problem Solving grant, officers were hired and equipment purchased.

² The remaining high school is for deaf students and does not require an officer on campus.

The proposal called for problem solving activities to take place in five high schools – Doherty, Harrison, Mitchell, Sierra, and Wasson. Table 1 shows the problem types that were originally selected by School Resource Officers (SROs) and other stakeholders at each school.

Table 1. High Schools and Problem Types

High School	Problem Type
Doherty	Disputes that pose a threat to safety
Harrison	Disputes that pose a threat to safety
Mitchell	Students loitering/littering in the neighborhood
Sierra	Assaults and physical disturbances
Wasson	Drug activity in and around the school

In addition to the SROs and their participating schools, a project director, two NPU sergeants and three members of CSPD’s Grants and Planning Division helped to manage the grant. A full-time crime analyst and evaluation assistance by 21st Century Solutions, Inc. was paid for by the grant, along with computers for each of the schools.

CSPD agreed to follow the SARA model for problem solving within each of the schools.

The grant application specified the basis for the problems in each school. They are as follows.

Doherty High School. *Problem type: Disputes that pose a specific threat to student safety.* The Falcon Division Crime Analysis Unit showed that 214 calls for service were reported for Doherty High School from August 1, 1998 to April 28, 1999. These calls showed 22 runaway incidents, 21 fights/disturbances/assaults, 18 acts of violence, 14 trespassing calls, and 9 narcotics complaints. Most of the narcotics complaints were for marijuana. In addition, a survey conducted by an administrator at the school showed that out of 74 respondents, 23 said they had carried a deadly weapon, 58 used some kind of illegal drug, 34 were involved in fighting, and 30 committed an act of vandalism. Because this information was all encompassing, the Assistant Principal and the SRO believed that it would be most useful to target “disputes that pose a specific threat to student safety.”

Harrison High School. *Problem type: Disputes that pose a specific threat to student safety.* The SRO, faculty, staff and security personnel believed that disputes in school were a major threat to the safety of the school attendees. Gangs, defiant behavior, fighting, and property damage were problems within the school. Reductions in calls for

service, reduction in fear among students and faculty, and reductions in school suspensions and disciplinary actions were among the goals of this effort.

Mitchell High School. *Problem type: Other Disorder that relates to a specific crime or student safety problem.* At Mitchell High School from January 1 to April 25, 1999, 21 case reports were taken for a variety of crimes: assaults (6 reports), burglary of motor vehicles (2), narcotics (8), and thefts (5). Administrators believed that these disorders hinder the academic progress of individual students and also disrupt the school itself, businesses, and neighbors in the area. A sergeant, the principal, and SRO believed that a root cause of these problems was truancy and poor attendance at school. A major goal of this problem-solving effort was to reduce the number of calls for service from neighbors and the surrounding community.

Sierra High School. *Problem type: Assaults.* At Sierra High School assaults appeared to be a major problem according to the School Resource Officer and the principal. To deal with students involved in assaults the school used suspensions and expulsions for a specific time frame and then considered criminal charges and other consequences. These policies were not effective in reducing the number of assaults. As a result, a long-term solution through problem solving was sought. Reducing calls for service for assaults, decreasing the number of school-related suspensions and disciplinary actions, and increasing student awareness and consequences of behavior were the goals of this problem-solving project.

Wasson High School. *Problem type: Drug dealing/use on school grounds.* According to the Assistant Principal and SRO the main reason for the drug problem seemed to be with the incoming 9th grade population at the beginning of the school year. They believed that 9th graders were unaccustomed to dealing with their new-found freedom in high school and did not know the consequences of involvement in drug activity. The 9th graders were not the only ones involved in drug use, but based on data from drug-related suspensions over the past few years, 9th graders predominated.

Evaluation Methods

Research Questions and Methods

For this evaluation, we asked a number of questions related to implementation and the impact of SARA model within the five high schools. At each step of the SARA process we asked specific questions. For example, during the scanning phase we asked: What was done? By whom? Who were the stakeholders and key players involved in the process?

For the analysis phase we asked: What was the process for doing analysis? Who was involved? What types of data were used? What were the sources of the information? Did the partners look at the offenders, victims, and locations? How long was this phase (months, days)?

During the response phase we wanted to know what happened and who was involved. How was the response implemented? What resources did they draw upon to conduct the response phase?

How long was this phase (months, days)? What were the challenges and obstacles encountered by those who participated?

In looking at the assessment phase we again stressed questions about who, what and how did things take shape? What types of data were used in this phase?

Impact Questions

To assess the impact of the program we asked: What was the impact of the school-based partnership project on the police, school, and participants? What were the effects on calls for service, complaints, in-school disciplinary actions, and other indicators? Did perceptions of the problem change? Why? How? Did other changes occur over time?

Data Collection

To answer these evaluation and research questions we conducted interviews with key stakeholders, analyzed survey results collected by the school and police, observed activities, and reviewed police documents and newspaper articles in the Colorado Springs *Gazette* over the two-year period.

We relied on data collected by each school. Table 2 shows the type of data collected during or prior to the analysis phase of the process. This information was provided to 21st Century Solutions, Inc. as it became available. As indicated, all five schools had calls for service information and disciplinary data. Three of the schools conducted student surveys and two conducted teacher surveys.

Table 2. Data for the Analysis Phase by School

Data type	Doherty	Harrison	Mitchell	Sierra	Wasson
Student survey	--	Yes	--	Yes	Yes
Faculty survey	--	Yes	--	--	Yes
Discipline data	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Calls for Service	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Interviews	Yes	--	--	Yes	--
Other data	--	--	Yes (observations)	--	Yes (arrest data)

Evaluators attended three organizational meetings with all SROs, assistant principals, and other grant participants from December 1999 until May 2000. At these meetings members of the teams raised questions, issues, and problems about the grant.

We gained access to data on police calls for service, the number of police incident reports, and administrative timesheet information. The SROs produced monthly updates on the progress of their projects and the evaluators provided comments and suggestions about the types of information the officers should be collecting on an on-going basis. We conducted observations of the SROs and the school staff as they worked on grant issues but also accompanied them when other duties took precedence. During the Response Phase, the larger organizational meetings were discontinued as officers focused on their particular school.

As the individual projects entered the Assessment Phase, we interviewed a wide variety of individuals who had participated or came into contact with the process. We conducted over 90 interviews and had informal conversations with civilian and sworn police personnel, school administrators, teachers, security officers, students, community members and business owners. Additionally, ride-alongs with patrol officers occurred at all three divisions, to get a sense of how the SRO program was being perceived by officers not directly involved with any school-based activities.

These interviews, observations, and data are the basis for describing the process and outcomes of the school-based partnership grant.

Cross-School Information

The Schools

The five selected schools vary in terms of demographic characteristics. Tables 3 and 4 present basic demographic information for the participating schools.

Table 3. Number and Percent of Students by Grade for the Participating Schools

High School	9th grade	10th grade	11th grade	12th grade	Total number
Doherty	673 (34%)	475 (24%)	396 (20%)	435 (22%)	1,979
Harrison	402 (39%)	268 (26%)	175 (17%)	185 (18%)	1,030
Mitchell	479 (36%)	320 (24%)	320 (24%)	213 (16%)	1,332
Sierra	422 (37%)	331 (29%)	228 (20%)	160 (14%)	1,141
Wasson	424 (30%)	354 (25%)	368 (26%)	268 (19%)	1,414

Table 4. Demographic Characteristics of the Participating Schools (in percent)

School	White	Hispanic	African American	Asian	American Indian	Free Lunch	Reduced Lunch	Neither
Doherty	80%	10%	6%	3%	1%	6%	5%	89%
Harrison	40	29	24	6	1	*	*	*
Mitchell	61	19	14	5	2	27	9	63
Sierra	41	18	33	7	1	37		63
Wasson	64	18	14	2	2	21	12	67

*Not reported

School size ranges from approximately 1,030 students at Harrison to almost 2,000 at Doherty. Ninth graders made up the largest classes at each school, with over 30 percent of the student body at that level.

Doherty’s student population is a reflection of the general population of Colorado Springs in terms of race and ethnicity. Ethnic diversity is greatest at Harrison and Sierra High Schools. At both schools about 40 percent of the students are white, six to seven percent are Asian American and one percent is American Indian. At Harrison, however, the Hispanic population is 29 percent while at Sierra the Hispanic population is similar to Wasson and Mitchell with 19 percent. At Sierra, 33 percent of the students are African American. Mitchell and Wasson are similar in their racial composition.

At Mitchell, Sierra, and Wasson, over one-third of the students are eligible for a free or reduced cost lunch. This contrasts with Doherty where 11 percent are eligible. Data from Harrison were unavailable.

The types of calls for service also vary among the schools. Table 5 shows the number of calls for selected incidents and the rate of their occurrence based on the number of students at each school. By using rates rather than actual number of calls for service, we obtain a more accurate comparison among the schools. According to police, however, the number of calls for service is deceptive, for some schools do not regularly report incidents to the police through 9-1-1 but report incidents to the SRO. The SRO does not always report his or her activities to the communications center and thus the number of calls is underrepresented. Keeping this in mind as a caveat, Sierra had the highest rates per 1,000 students for assaults, harassment, and suspicious behavior.

Table 5. Number of Calls for Service and Rate of Incidents for the Participating Schools, 1999

Type of Incident	Doherty		Harrison		Mitchell		Sierra		Wasson	
	# of calls	Rate per 1000								
Assault	10	5	10	9.7	11	8.3	16	14.0	8	5.7
Sex Crimes	1	.5	0	0	1	.75	2	1.8	3	2.1
Weapons	4	2	0	0	5	3.8	0	0	2	1.4
Burglary	2	1	1	1.0	3	2.3	1	.87	3	2.1
Theft	17	8.6	8	7.8	16	12.0	2	1.8	35	24.8
Harassment	6	3	1	1.0	3	2.3	7	6.1	1	.71
Suspicious Behavior	17	8.6	3	2.9	10	7.5	12	10.5	10	7.1
Vandalism	25	12.6	4	3.9	11	8.3	6	5.3	17	12.0

Wasson had the highest rates for theft and sex crimes, Doherty for suspicious behavior and vandalism, and Mitchell the highest for weapons and burglary.

Stakeholder Involvement

Stakeholders were involved at every school. The SRO was responsible for putting together a team of administrators, faculty, students, and perhaps community residents or business people to participate in the problem-solving process. Table 6 shows the number and types of stakeholders involved at each school. These vary depending on the interest of each of the parties. Mitchell had the largest group of stakeholders with 13, almost doubling the number in each of the other schools.

Table 6. Type of Stakeholder Involvement by School

Stakeholders	Doherty	Harrison	Mitchell	Sierra	Wasson
School Admin.	2	1	2	1	2
Campus Security	--	1	1	1	1
Students	2	3	4	3	2
Community Members	2		3	--	--
Others	--	1	2	--	--
SRO	1	1	1	1	1

Training

The school-based partnership grant paid for an external consulting team to provide training for all five stakeholder teams in March 2000. Forty people from the five schools attended the two-day session that focused on problem-oriented policing in schools. Instructors taught elements of the SARA model and explained how it could be used in schools. Reviews of the training varied widely based on each individual's level of expertise with regard to problem solving and team building. Less experienced participants found the training very helpful, with some experienced individuals liking it simply because it got "everyone on the same page", or, in other words, provided an underlying template to follow. Other participants who had extensive problem-solving backgrounds thought that the training might have been better if the trainers knew the police departments, school districts, and the selected problem types better coming into the training. A few individuals remarked that the training was probably too long for the students given their attention span and the fact that high school students are not used to such an intense focus for two complete days.

Summary

This section has established the foundation for the problem-solving partnerships that occurred within each of the five high schools in Colorado Springs. The next section covers issues raised in previous studies regarding schools, crime and disorder, and police involvement.

Section 2. Crime, Safety and School Resource Officers

During the late 1990s, the Nation turned its collective attention to school crime and safety. Because of shootings in Columbine High School and other schools parents, teachers, students, policymakers, school administrators, law enforcement, and community groups seek ways to reduce crime and fear of crime and return the school to the “safe haven” that it once was. This section examines our current knowledge about crime and safety in schools and what we know about school resource officers. We then turn to a discussion of problem oriented policing and how it applies to crime, safety and SROs.

Crime and Safety in Schools

What we know about crime and safety in schools is derived primarily from survey research. A number of Federal agencies and private entities³ have all sponsored surveys of students, teachers, principals, or victims of crime. These studies provide useful information about the school environment, victimization of teachers and students, and disciplinary action. From these national surveys we know that crime is declining in schools and the number of guns being carried to school has been reduced (Annual Report on School Safety, 1998: 1). We also know that of crimes reported to police during the 1996-97 school year, 10 percent of all public schools reported one or more serious violent crimes to law enforcement. Another 47 percent of public schools reported at least one less serious or nonviolent crime to police; the remaining 43 percent did not report any of these crimes to the police (Annual Report on School Safety, 1998:3).

We know that school-associated violent deaths are rare (Small and Tetrick, 2001).

The School-Associated Violent Deaths Study indicates that less than 1 percent of the more than 1,350 children who were murdered in the first half of the 1998-1999 school year were killed at school. In the entire school year of 1998-99, 34 incidents occurred in which a child or adult was murdered or committed suicide at the school, resulting in 50 deaths. Of these, 34 were students. Small and Tetrick also point out that the number of multiple-victim homicides at school has declined from six incidents in the 1997-98 school year to two in the 1998-99 school year.

Nonfatal crimes of theft, rape, sexual assault, robbery, aggravated assault, and simple assault against students at school declined from 144 per 1,000 students in 1992 to 101 per 1,000 students in 1998. Students are less likely to be victimized at school than away from school. Data indicate that both violent crimes and nonfatal violent crimes are less likely at school than elsewhere. But more students have been victims of theft at school than away from school.

Data also show that teachers in urban schools are “more vulnerable to crime at school than are those in suburban schools” (Small and Tetrick, 2001). For example, teachers in urban schools were more likely to be the victims of violent crimes (40 of every 1,000) than were teachers in suburban or rural schools (24 out of every 1,000). Teachers, like students, are also victims of theft.

³ These include: the National Center for Education Statistics, the Centers for Disease Control, the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the National Institute of Justice, the Joyce Foundation, the American School Health Association, the American Medical Association, and the Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan.

We also know that some school-based prevention efforts are effective. Dr. Denise Gottfredson found positive effects on measures of crime and delinquency for programs that were aimed at building school capacity to initiate and sustain innovation. She also found that programs were successful if they were aimed at establishing school rules and improving the consistency of enforcement and if they communicated norms through school-wide campaigns. Positive effects were also found if comprehensive instructional programs focused on a range of social competency skills (Gottfredson, 1997: 5-55). Gottfredson noted that with the exception of DARE evaluations, “the evaluations of school-based prevention programs funded by [the Office of Justice Programs] are generally too weak to justify conclusions about the effectiveness of the programs.” This suggests that school-based prevention programs that include a law enforcement or legal intervention have not been adequately examined.

While a number of studies on police in schools have been conducted, only one looks at the effects of the problem-solving model and the collaborative partnership between police and schools. Kenney and Watson (1998) recently conducted a quasi-experiment in two high schools in Charlotte-Mecklenburg (NC). The authors found that students in West Mecklenburg High (treatment school) reported experiencing less fear of specific areas of the school campus and reported far fewer incidents of having to fight to protect themselves. Teachers felt safer in the school and more willing to confront misbehaving students. School administrators reported a significant reduction in incidents requiring student supervision with the largest reduction being “student-student conflict” suspensions. The authors also reported that the students at West Mecklenburg High became empowered through the problem-solving model. Though this experiment showed positive results, it is unclear whether those same results can be replicated in other locations.

Currently, 21st Century Solutions, Inc. is conducting intensive case studies in five locations. In two sites, Seattle and Redlands (CA), quasi-experiments are underway to determine the effectiveness of problem solving.

School Resource Officers

Over the last five years, placing police officers in schools has become an important tool toward improving school safety. Not only may an officer’s presence assist in deterring crime and enforcing the law, but with community policing techniques the officer may also assist in developing stronger ties to the school community and engage in problem solving – techniques that could lead to an improvement in the quality of life of the school. Yet we know very little about what these officers do and what their impacts are on school life.

School Resource Officers in the Context of Community Policing

As an application of community policing ideas, school resource officers are expected to interact with the community, engage in problem-oriented policing, and serve to a certain degree as agents of change within their organizations (Maguire, et al., 1999). While a variety of definitions and explanations of community policing exist, it is generally agreed that it includes three elements: community interaction and engagement, problem solving, and organizational adaptation (see for example, Bayley, 1994 and the Community Policing Consortium, 1994).

Community engagement combined with problem-oriented policing means that SROs ought to engage their school communities in identifying problems, analyzing their causes, formulating responses, and assessing the effectiveness of these responses. It means that officers should be working with other agencies to solve problems in schools as well as collaborating with school officials and students to deal with specific problems. Generally, problem solving or problem oriented policing (POP) emphasizes the preconditions for crime (e.g., guns, cash) and preventing or reducing the convergence of offenders and targets of crime in place and time. POP recommends itself as a method of effective policing by its rational approach to problem definition, analysis, action, and assessment of results. Evidence implies that this approach is effective. In a Kansas City project, police focused enforcement activity on gun crime hot spots, increased gun seizures, and reduced gun crimes (Sherman, et al., 1995). In Boston, police and a number of other agencies and community organizations (a) identified a problem of youthful male gun-related homicides, (b) analyzed the problem as involving a contagious fear that produced a perceived need for self-defense and hence gun carrying, (c) took steps to focus on serious gang offenders and to demonstrate that police and other agencies would crack down on gun-related violence. There has been a 70% reduction in homicide among 14-24 year-old males (Kennedy, et al., 1996). In Newport News, police working with community members analyzed crime problems, targeted burglaries in an apartment complex, robberies associated with prostitution, and vehicle theft in specific downtown areas. They implemented tailored responses and observed a 34% reduction in burglaries, 39% reduction in prostitution-related robberies, and a 50% reduction in thefts from vehicles (Eck and Spelman, 1987).

In addition to working with the community and problem solving, the school resource officer may also serve as an example of how community policing can change the way in which officers behave. Under the community policing philosophy police organizations are urged to implement a more democratic management style and to alter their traditional organizational structures. These changes, according to reformers, are essential internal steps in improving external service delivery. The goal is to create a flexible, non-bureaucratic organization in which individual officers and supervisors feel free to take initiative and design custom solutions to unique local problems. Theoretically, under community policing, SROs should have more freedom to develop special programs and custom responses to problems within schools.

What we know about SROs

At present, not a great deal is known about how SROs across the country approach police work. Most of our information comes from three sources: (a) the Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics (LEMAS) sample survey, (b) surveys conducted by the Center for the Prevention of School Violence (CPSV), and (c) the National Study of Delinquency Prevention in Schools (NSDPS).

The LEMAS sample survey of 3,400 responding police agencies in 1997 (Reaves and Goldberg, 1999) is based on a survey of all agencies with 100 or more officers and a sample of smaller agencies that completed a briefer questionnaire. Tabulations made for this study based on the LEMAS reports of agencies with 100 or more full-time sworn officers reveal that almost 500 of these 651 larger agencies employed 4,096 full-time SROs. In large agencies, the number of SROs ranged from 0 (in 154 or 24% of agencies) to 211 (in 1 agency). Most police agencies are

small, so among the 13,600 state and local police agencies and 664,000 full-time sworn officers, there were of course many more agencies with SROs and many more SROs in 1997 than are indicated by these numbers. Three-eighths of *local* police departments had full-time sworn school resource officers, for a total of 9,400 local SROs – over 2% of all full-time local sworn officers (Reaves and Goldberg, 2000). Among *all agency sizes and types*, tabulations from the LEMAS data produced in preparing this report imply that nationally about 6,500 agencies employ at least one full-time sworn SRO (35% of agencies), amounting to over 13,300 SROs nationwide.

A second source of information about SROs comes from a survey of North Carolina SROs and informal surveys of attendees at a conference of the National Association of School Resource Officers (NASRO) conducted by the Center for the Prevention of School Violence (CPSV, 1996; Riley and McDaniel, 1999). In North Carolina, SROs indicated that half of their time was spent in law enforcement duties such as foot patrols and inspections, almost all carry guns and three-quarters wear uniforms. The North Carolina SROs spent a third of their time “counseling” and 17% of time teaching. In a survey conducted by NASRO and the National School Safety and Security Services during a convention of the NASRO, Trump (2001) found that at least half of the job of SROs consisted of “preventative duties with 56 percent of them describing their role as a 50/50 mix of preventative and reactionary duties and 35 percent of them saying that the majority of their role deals with proactive, preventative duties.” Only 7 percent of the SROs said that the majority of their emphasis is on enforcement and investigation duties. The North Carolina results imply that new SROs spent more time in law enforcement activities, and those with more experience said they spent more time “counseling.”

It is not clear what the officers are doing when counseling or teaching, because both of these terms may encompass a broad range of activities. It is worth noting, however, that counseling is not among the crime prevention activities for which evidence of effectiveness was found in recent reviews (D. Gottfredson 1997; D. Gottfredson, Wilson and Najaka, 2001). Some forms of instruction intended to prevent crime (and problem behavior more generally) have been found to be effective when implemented fully and well, but it is clear that many prevention activities in schools involving instruction are *not* implemented with enough quality to be effective (D. Gottfredson and Gottfredson, 1999; G. Gottfredson and Gottfredson, 1999).

Reports from the North Carolina survey accounts for *all* of officer time in three areas -- law enforcement, counseling, and teaching. These three activities appear to be emphasized in the training curricula of the Center for School Safety, which refers to a triad of work as law enforcement officer, law-related counselor/advisor, and law-related education teacher. The NASRO training material for SROs also speaks of a triad of roles of law enforcement officer, counselor, and educator, and participants receive training in the role of “counselor or problem solver” (NASRO, 1999).⁴ A focus on these three pre-defined areas presumably produced the result that activities in enforcement, counseling, and teaching add to 100% of officer’s time. We cannot tell how much of SRO time is devoted to such things as problem-oriented policing, school

⁴This appears to help individual youths with problems rather than being a reference to problem-oriented policing or the application of anything like the SARA model.

or community surveys, planning together with school personnel or students to solve problems, and so on.

Research on school safety and delinquency prevention implies that it may be these general planning, program development, and problem-solving activities that hold the most potential for crime prevention and school safety. Problem schools are often overwhelmed, despite the heroic efforts of educators to cope with them (Emmer, 1992; D. Gottfredson, Gottfredson, and Skroban, 1998; G. Gottfredson and Gottfredson, 1987).

Effective programs to reduce disorder have, nevertheless, been demonstrated in schools with multiple problems. In one of these (D. Gottfredson, 1988), a structured planning and problem-solving method (G. Gottfredson, 1984) similar to but somewhat more complex than the SARA model was applied in a three-year effort to reduce disorder in a troubled Baltimore City school. The program designed and implemented interventions to increase the predictability of responses to disciplinary infractions, increase rewards for appropriate behavior, and increase social support. The program reduced disorder.

The same problem solving and planning method was applied in programs in seven secondary schools (D. Gottfredson, 1988) to develop school-specific plans for improvement. The effort increased the clarity and consistency of school rules, student success, and attachment; and by reducing problem behavior it improved staff morale. In another study, eight schools participated in a program to increase the clarity of school rules and to promote their application in a fair, firm, and consistent way (D. Gottfredson, G. Gottfredson, and Hybl, 1993). Again, in the context of a planning and problem-solving framework, mechanisms for attending to and responding to student behavior were improved. Evaluation showed that the program's effectiveness differed from school to school in approximate proportion to the quality of program implementation, and it was effective in reducing conduct problems in high implementation schools.

Related approaches to reducing problem behavior on the way to and from school have been attempted in several places. G. Gottfredson, Gore, and Jones (1998) engaged school faculty and students in planning to prevent problem behavior and improve attendance in a very unsafe school. After two years, attendance rose about 5% above historical levels and teacher morale and school safety improved dramatically, although the school remained very disorderly.

A third source of information about what SROs do comes from the National Study of Delinquency Prevention in Schools (NSDPS) (G. Gottfredson, et al., 2000). A national sample of schools was surveyed to learn about their programs to prevent delinquency and promote school safety. Seventy-one of the school security programs about which detailed information was collected involved police officers in the school (79% of these designated SROs and 21% with another appellation). Seventy-four percent of the programs had uniformed officers, 27% had plain clothed officers, and less than 1% used undercover officers (a few schools reported more than one dress style). In contrast to the North Carolina survey, officers carried guns in 80% of the schools, and another weapon in 73%. In 86% of schools officers were expected to make arrests. Interestingly, officers were expected to challenge every offense in only 50% of the schools. The NSDPS also provides information from programs in which police personnel assist in instruction. In 73% of these the officers teach. In addition officers consult with teachers on

general classroom management practices and procedures (32%), consult with teachers experiencing difficulties to improve classroom management (30%), develop plans for in-classroom management of students who present behavior problems (21%), consult with administrators on classroom management programs (30%), assist teachers with classroom tasks (7%), assist in communication with students' homes (52%), and assist with students whose primary language is not English (3%).

Because of the growing emphasis in American police agencies on problem-oriented and community-oriented policing, it appears likely that these approaches are likely to be found to some degree in the work of SROs.

Problem Oriented Policing

The most well known method for implementing Problem-Oriented Policing (POP) is the SARA model, which stands for Scanning, Analysis, Response, and Assessment. John Eck and William Spelman in 1987 first developed the SARA model in their study of the Newport News (VA) Police Department.

Scanning involves identifying a specific problem at a specific location. There are a variety of methods for identifying the problems to be solved. Police can talk with citizens or other officers, check calls-for-service records, or request information about problems from other agencies. The idea is to narrow the scope of the problem so that it is manageable and reasonable to deal with. In schools, police can talk with students, teachers, administrators and parents to identify specific problems and to narrow the scope of those problems. At this stage, "stakeholders" or those who have something invested in the school and problem are identified to assist in solving the problem.

Analysis means collecting and analyzing data about the problem selected during the scanning stage. During this stage, officers and stakeholders must ask a series of specific questions about the victim, suspect, and location of the problem or crime. What are the characteristics of the victim and suspect? Where does the problem occur? Officers must keep an open mind about the various kinds of data that might be useful in answering these questions. For example, they may conduct citizen or business surveys, interview victims, officers, or others familiar with the problem or conduct surveillance. They might also gather "non-traditional" measures from non-police agencies. Armed with useful data and insightful analysis, officers are often able to uncover information that is useful for developing creative response strategies.

In schools, existing data from disciplinary records, calls for service, and attendance might be analyzed. Student, faculty, or neighborhood surveys might be developed and implemented to gain information about the perceptions of problems. Environmental surveys are also conducted; these surveys require an observer to write down areas where students loiter, engage in fights, smoke, drink, or use drugs. Data from these surveys provide officers and partners with information about vulnerable or high-risk locations.

In the *Response* stage, officers and other problem-solvers use the information collected during the analysis stage in an attempt to solve (or reduce the scope of) the problem. In some instances,

the response can constitute a single action (such as an arrest or an eviction) by a single agency. In other cases, the response may be a complicated, multifaceted strategy that relies on the cooperation of police, other local officials, and citizens. At this stage officers and stakeholders formulate short-term and long-term goals.

In the *Assessment* stage, the agency systematically examines the efficacy of its response strategy. In some cases, the assessment may be very simple. For instance, if the source of the problem is a single offender, and the offender has moved a far distance away or is serving a long prison term, then the problem may have been effectively solved. In most POP cases, the assessment should be more involved and more systematic. The basic question to be answered during this stage is whether the response was effective. Good assessments move beyond this simplistic approach, examining the duration of effectiveness. For instance, if police attempt to alleviate a problem with speeding motorists by issuing citations over a short period, they should follow this up by determining how long it takes before the effects of the increased enforcement begin to diminish. Another important issue during assessment is displacement. A response cannot be judged effective for reducing crime in one area if it increases crime in another area. This stage of the SARA process is systematically ignored by many agencies professing to practice POP. Taking this stage seriously is one of the major challenges to implementing POP.

We included this brief discussion of the SARA model to illustrate the notion of POP as a dynamic process involving a series of stages. Many of these stages fall outside the routine processes of police work and criminal investigation. They involve data collection, systematic analysis, the design of creative solutions that may or may not involve the invocation of a formal criminal justice response (such as arrest), and the involvement of other agencies and organizations. This is the model that the COPS Office used as the standard for the school-based partnership grant.

We now turn to a discussion of the school-based partnership program in five high schools in Colorado Springs. Each of the following sections addresses similar issues, including steps in the SARA process and challenges and successes in carrying out the project.

Section 3. Reducing Disputes: Problem Solving at Doherty High School

The School

Doherty High School (Doherty) is the largest school participating in the School-Based Partnership project with nearly 2,000 students. The school is located in a mixed business and residential area of Colorado Springs. A commercial/retail area stands directly across the street from the school and a number of fast food restaurants serve the area about two blocks south. Single-family homes border the other three sides of the school grounds, but for the most part, the school is quite close to a main thoroughfare with a lot of commercial activity.

The student population closely mirrors the general population in Colorado Springs. That is, whites make up 80 percent of the student body, Hispanics 10 percent, African Americans six percent, Asians three percent and American Indians one percent. Approximately 11 percent of the students participate in the free or reduced lunch program. School policy forbids 9th graders from leaving campus at lunch hour unless they have earned the privilege (through his or her grade point average and good behavior). Other students are allowed to leave for lunch.

Doherty currently has four security officers (three of whom are retired CSPD officers) and 16 video cameras placed in a number of areas. Three of the four security officers were new during the 1999-2000 school year; one officer has been at the school for the past five years. The 1999-2000 school year was the first year that a School Resource Officer (SRO) had been assigned to Doherty and it was also the officer's first year as an SRO.

Of the 196 police calls for service at Doherty during 1999, the largest number of calls came in for traffic (28 calls), followed by vandalism (25 calls), theft and suspicious person or behavior (17 calls each).

The Scanning Phase

The stakeholder group for this project consisted of an Assistant Principal, the Dean of Students, two students, two community members and the SRO. The stakeholders felt that there was no problem that stood out from the rest. They decided, therefore, to focus on disputes that posed a specific threat to student safety at or around the school.

During the Scanning Phase, the stakeholders learned that Doherty does not collect data on disputes unless the student is suspended. To determine the nature and extent of the problem, other agencies were consulted by the SRO. For example, the City Attorney and the District Attorney's office were asked about how disputes that led to fights were reported in the past. The SRO learned that officers would respond to the school regarding a fight, the principal would sign the complaint, and then the court would determine whether the fight was an assault. Both the City Attorney and the DA's Office were pleased to have an SRO working in Doherty because the officer would make sure all the important information would be included in the complaint, would take appropriate action and would be a primary point of contact.

The SRO also spoke with the Probation Office and was told that students who are on probation may have their probation violated if they are not attending or are having problems at the school.

The Analysis Phase

During the Analysis Phase, the stakeholders conducted informal surveys with students who were victimized and with the offenders. They learned that many of the disputes involved offenders and victims who have experienced bullying. Of the 80 students who were interviewed, 67 students (84 percent) admitted to bullying other students and admitted that they were victims of bullying as well. These bullying incidents occurred at the school and at several businesses in the vicinity of Doherty. Victims and their perpetrators were students who were not attending class. Apparently, students would cut class to smoke cigarettes because they cannot smoke on campus. They would go to the local businesses or the neighborhoods to hang out and smoke. Several businesses and residents in the neighborhood indicated that they were concerned with the students' behavior because they thought that the students could damage property.

According to school records, 97 students were suspended during the 1999-2000 school year. The reasons for the suspensions were collapsed into seven categories and are presented in Table 1 below. An "intervention" incident is defined as the SRO or security staff receiving an anonymous note indicating that a student is bullying or threatened another student. That student would then be brought to the office and the school would decide to either suspend the student or give another appropriate discipline. The SRO received nine anonymous tips from students that prevented disputes or harassment from occurring.

Table 1. Suspensions for the 1999-2000 School Year

Type of Incident	Number of Incidents
Assaults	12
Fights	17
Weapons	7
Drugs	19
Harassment	14
Insubordination	9
Intervention	19
Total:	97

Five of the above categories are either precursors or results of disputes—assaults, fights, weapons, harassment and intervention.

Of those students suspended, 70 percent were male. The grade level with the most suspensions were freshmen, with 52 percent, followed by sophomores at 23 percent, juniors at 14 percent and seniors at 11 percent.

During the Analysis Phase, the stakeholders and the SRO found that a repeat offender was responsible for many of the assaults and problems. They spent approximately 20 hours identifying him and another 40 hours were spent responding to this individual who was assaulting and menacing as many as 20 different students at Doherty. There were seven documented cases in which this repeat offender robbed, assaulted or menaced students and he is suspected in 30 additional incidents. It is believed that these incidents are related because they occurred within several blocks of Doherty and the surrounding area. In addition the stakeholders found that many of his victims were truant from school at the time of the incidents. This offender was suspended at the beginning of the year, but has continued to be involved in incidents near the school.

The Response Phase

One response was implemented during the Analysis Phase – wearing identification cards. To identify trespassers and to ensure the safety of students, identification cards had to be worn visibly during the 1999-2000 school year. Surprisingly, students complied with this request without much debate. Because compliance was so good, in the 2000-2001 school year students only needed to have their IDs with them to be presented on demand. In order to avoid having to visibly wear their IDs again, some Doherty students reported 11 trespassing students from other schools.

In response to business owners' complaints, the School Resource Officer met with the managers of the businesses and one outcome was to post "No Loitering" signs. Additionally, the businesses hired extra-duty officers to work during the hours that the fighting and assaults occurred (during lunch and after school). Since the students were parking in handicapped parking spaces, the extra-duty officers also enforced parking violations and were there to keep the peace when vehicles were towed. These actions resulted in fewer fights and assaults. The businesses also formed a "Business Watch" to assist with other problems occurring in the area. The stakeholders and SRO hope that the Business Watch will continue to reduce the number of problems and promote a safer environment for students.

In the neighborhood surrounding the school, residents agreed to notify school administrators when students were seen acting in a suspicious manner. The school would then send campus security to check on what the students were doing. Additionally, residents were given video cameras to capture student behavior on film. School staff along with the SRO reviewed the tapes and identified students who were smoking marijuana and bullying others. Several students were suspended because of bad behavior caught on video.

To foster a less antagonistic relationship among the businesses, neighbors and students, the stakeholders arranged for different extra-curricular clubs to pick up trash around the businesses and the neighborhood.

The school and the SRO also started monitoring victims and offenders and contacted them to see if they were having problems. These problems could be with other students, non-students and at home. The contact was weekly and victims and offenders were encouraged to meet with the staff at any time if s/he was having a problem.

Students were encouraged to report bullying and harassment anonymously; notes could be placed in the SRO’s school mailbox. If an incident was reported, the principal and the SRO would then speak with the student(s) involved. The school, if needed, would suspend the student and if a crime was committed, the SRO would take action. Some of these cases were strictly intervention. Interventions occurred when it was learned that bullying was taking place prior to a fight or assault. For 14 students, the discipline was suspension.

Overall, during the 1999-2000 school year, over 200 hours were spent by the stakeholders on the target problem, with approximately 15 percent of that time spent on follow-up issues, such as time in court when a response resulted in a student arrest.

The Assessment Phase

School administrators suspended 121 students during the 2000-2001 school year, a 24 percent increase from the previous year. Table 2 displays the types of incidents that resulted in a suspension.

Table 2. Suspensions for the 2000-2001 School Year

Type of Incident	Number of Incidents
Assaults	5
Fights	10
Weapons	2
Drugs	20
Harassment	23
Insubordination	26
Intervention	34
Total:	120

While the overall number of suspensions increased, it is important to look at the seriousness of the event as well. Between the two school years, the number of assaults dropped from 12 to five, the number of fights dropped from 17 to 10 and the number of weapons found dropped from seven to two⁵. Suspensions for the more serious infractions were cut in half. The categories of reported incidents that saw an increase between the two school years were for harassment (from 14 to 23), insubordination (from 9 to 26) and intervention (19 to 34), which are the less serious infractions. Because Doherty adopted a no tolerance policy regarding bullying and harassment, suspensions increased.

⁵ Incidentally, the two students charged with bringing a weapon to school indicated that they had brought the weapon for protection from students who no longer went to Doherty. The SRO worked with these two students to file case reports on the offenders.

Suspended students were predominantly male (65 percent) and freshmen (40 percent). We had hoped that District 11 or the school would be able to provide data on all incidents, not just the ones that resulted in suspension. Doherty staff members were able to provide a breakdown of incidents for the 2000-2001 school year, but because of District 11 computer software problems, they were not able to provide us with comparable statistics for the 1999-2000 school year.

Faculty and students expressed an increased obligation to report inappropriate activity such as harassment, threats and bullying. Students told faculty that they feel safer and are more willing to report these activities by writing a note and placing it unsigned in the SRO's mailbox. The SRO also noticed a large increase in the number of anonymous tips. He believes that this increase occurred because of the increased level of trust between the students and him. During the months of November and December 2000, students were responsible for 17 anonymous tips that prevented 13 fights or assaults.

The SRO also received tips from Student Crime Stoppers indicating when a fight might take place or that bullying was occurring at the school. Additionally, witnesses to incidents left notes for him. The project also received cooperation from offenders and victims. For example, in one fight that happened this school year, the students turned themselves in before the school initiated any action.

While there were more reports of bullying and harassment, a number of incidents were resolved by allowing the students to discuss their differences. Students were more willing to approach staff and the SRO about their problems. Additionally, verbal disagreements increased and were reported to the school staff. Mediation handled these verbal disputes. Overall, the school administration and the SRO were pleased with the students' willingness to report threats.

In April 2001, the repeat offender mentioned during the Analysis Phase accepted a plea bargain. This particular juvenile, who was charged as an adult, agreed to six years in a juvenile facility with the stipulation that he could remain there if no incidents occurred at this facility. If an incident does occur, he will spend 18 years in prison. A second offender, who is an adult and conspired with the juvenile, was also charged with robbery and assault. The adult did not take a plea bargain and is due to come to trial in the near future. During this investigation, the SRO worked directly with the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms and the Juvenile Division of the El Paso County District Attorney's Office when it was learned that the two offenders possessed stolen firearms. Students, along with business owners, have said that since the arrest of this particular juvenile and his adult partner, incidents have greatly decreased.

There are several other situations in which Doherty students have been charged with assaults and suspended. The SRO and school staff have been monitoring these students. Some of these students are now in the process of going through District 11 school discipline procedures. This process could lead to expulsion, which would eliminate the possibility that they will ever attend Doherty again

Close monitoring of potential offenders also worked well. Students who were suspended during the fall semester returned on January 30, 2001. In the following month, the SRO noted an

upswing in the number of disputes with one assault and four fights occurring in the first 14 days of February. A follow-up of the incidents revealed that students returning from their suspensions committed all of these incidents and appropriate discipline was decided upon quickly.

The stakeholders have been told that students now feel safer at Doherty High School and the surrounding neighborhood. The stakeholders re-contacted victims and offenders at the end of the school year and most feel safer.

During the 2000-2001 school year, there were some complaints from the residents living east of the school. However, the neighbors and businesses surrounding the school have increased their participation, are more understanding, and seem eager to assist the school in solving problems. Businesses are taking an active role in reporting students who are truant and are causing problems.

The project did not seem to have a significant impact on police calls for service. The total number of police calls for service at Doherty increased by two percent, from 196 calls in 1999 to 200 calls for service in 2000. The largest number of calls followed the same pattern as last year with traffic calls as the most (42 calls), followed by vandalism (22), theft (17) and suspicious person or behavior (14). The seven percent increase in traffic calls seems to have been offset by a variety of other types of calls decreasing nominally.

The Impact of the Project

Given the general problem definition selected by the stakeholders, comments from students, school staff, neighborhood, residents and business owners were general in nature and often focused on the presence of the SRO in the school.

Students expressed that they feel safer and more relaxed this school year, that there is a different atmosphere at the school since the School Resource Officer started working in Doherty.

Businesses located near the school were pleased with the way the students have conducted themselves this year. The project helped bridge the communication gap with both the businesses and neighbors. As one stakeholder remarked, "last year a lot of the communication was general "griping" about problems caused by students"; this year, residents will call if they have a specific problem or witness a student dispute without the general complaints about noise or litter.

The faculty indicated that they feel that there is less tension between the students and are actively taking a larger role in reporting student infractions. With the SRO on-site, some faculty members are less intimidated about reporting student incidents.

For the future, the school continues to think of ways to reduce the number of disputes even more. The staff is currently trying to implement a mentoring program that would allow victims and offenders to pair up with a positive peer whom they could express their concerns and ideas.

Section 4. Improving Safety at Harrison High School

The School

Harrison High School (Harrison) has approximately 1,030 students currently enrolled and sits on the southeast corner of an interstate and a four-lane road (Circle Drive). The school facility is a single-story complex with a common area in the center and is built in a circular design with inner and outer hallways. There are no security cameras inside the school. The school has one main entry/exit for vehicles and a walkway towards an overpass on Circle Drive. There is also a pedestrian tunnel west under the interstate. The school is located in a business area with hotels, restaurants, and a shopping center nearby. A middle school sits to the northwest and is separated by a chain link fence.

As mentioned earlier, Harrison was the pilot school for the SRO program. In the beginning an officer worked in the school four hours a week four years prior to the official CSPD SRO program. Once the official program started, the position was expanded to 20 hours a week and is now full-time.

The racial composition of the student body is 40 percent white, 29 percent Hispanic, 24 percent African American, six percent Asian American, and 1.5 percent American Indian or Alaskan Native. The school is almost equally split by males (51 percent) and females (49 percent). Thirty-nine percent of the student body is in ninth grade, 26 percent in tenth grade, 17 percent in eleventh grade and 18 percent in twelfth grade.

In 1999, Harrison had 117 calls for service, 12 of which were for assaults or domestic situations, nine were for disturbances and eight were for theft.

The Scanning Phase

Safety is the primary concern according to faculty, staff and security personnel. Administrators believe that safety and security are essential parts of the academic learning environment. Furthermore, administrators feel that each student, teacher and staff member must focus on the educational mission without fear of criminal activities. Therefore, Harrison High School focused on disputes that pose a specific threat to student safety.

The school itself faces problems similar to other schools in the area -- gangs, defiant behavior, fighting, drug/alcohol abuse and property damage. To control these activities with the limited resources at hand, the school has been in a reactive mode in intervention and prevention practices.

During the scanning phase, stakeholders were identified and selected. They include a school board member, an assistant principal, school security, students and the SRO. All were in agreement that this grant would focus on disputes that pose a specific threat to school safety, especially fighting, assaults and physical violence.

To determine the nature and extent of school-related disputes in the commercial areas surrounding the school, local business owners and managers were contacted and provided school phone numbers in order to report any student/school-related problem or concerns. During the course of the grant project, no calls were received from local businesses.

The Analysis Phase

The stakeholders reviewed a wide variety of data during the Analysis Phase. The following types of data were reviewed for the project:

- School disciplinary records provided each semester, including assaults/fights with and without injuries, time, location of occurrence, causes (if known), participants, and repeat offenders/victims;
- Police calls for service (CFS) including case reports and signed complaints;
- Informal student, teacher, and staff surveys; and
- Existing district school disciplinary policies, school laws, rules of due process, as well as laws regarding Special Education (SPED) as well as Severely Intellectually Educationally Disadvantaged (SIED) students were also reviewed.

Through these data, questions were answered concerning school safety and victims, locations, and offenders. Victims of disputes were primarily male students (80 percent). Teachers and staff were also victims as four assaults took place in 1999-2000. Stakeholders determined that many of the male victims were freshmen or “immature students” -- particularly those who “place little or no value on academics.” Fear among most students at Harrison is limited. Mainstream students “just do what they are supposed to do and their level of fear is low.” On some occasions they are concerned, but they tend to stay away from problem areas and unruly students.

The locations of the disputes are in the student parking lot, areas in front of the school (near the bus pick-up area), the commons area, as well as classrooms and hallways. Most of the disputes take place during lunch periods and after school. Some isolated incidents occur at sporting events, but with more staff and security present, incidents are kept to a minimum. In addition to disputes, other crimes are also taking place at these locations. Property crime (student theft) and damage to student vehicles leads to assaults, intimidation, fighting, and harassment.

Stakeholders said that offenders were students with “low self-esteem with anger control problems.” Most of these students attend school but do not necessarily attend their classes. For them, “school is nothing more than a social gathering place.” The offenders live in three primary areas – Gold Hill, Sand Creek, and in unincorporated areas of the county. Over 60 percent live in single-family residences and 40 percent reside in apartment complexes.

Based on these data stakeholders decided to focus on the offenders and the location of the problems. When looking at offenders, approximately 80% to 85% of offenders who create disputes then get into physical confrontations. Additionally, of the 59 students suspended for fights or assaults, 32 (54 percent) were repeat offenders.

The Response Phase

With the beginning of the 2000-2001 school year, the formal response portion of the SARA model began. During the summer months, the stakeholders analyzed the school safety problem as originally identified and implemented the following response strategies:

1) For repeat offenders, the stakeholders directed the SRO to intervene by contacting the parents to provide assistance with these matters. In response to this situation, school officials and the SRO attempted to find appropriate service agencies that address the needs of the family as well as maintain a safe and secure atmosphere in the school. Some of these agencies include the Community and Schools (CIS) Program, Pikes Peak Juvenile Task Force (PPJTF) Needs Assessment Center, Department of Human Services, Probation, as well as other social welfare agencies. These agencies can provide such services as alternative school placement, home schooling, work/school placement, drug and alcohol counseling, anger management courses, basic life coping skills, stress management and therapeutic placement after an assessment.

2) To fix problem locations, the stakeholders conducted a Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) review. Based on this review, the following improvements were made:

- a. Safety chain installed to keep other vehicular traffic out of school bus parking area
- b. Chain link fence installed along northwest exit door of the 900 wing, a location with high incidents of student fights/assaults.
- c. Landscaping ties placed around patio area of the self contained Special Education classroom, another area for fights and assaults
- d. Chain link fence and gate also installed along the northwest corner of the main school building to the southwest fence of the football field. When the gate is secure, students/non-students are then forced to use one of the main entry exits.

3) To reduce the number of student disputes in the parking lot, school parking permits are now required. All students must have a valid driver's license, proper vehicle registration, and current proof of insurance.

4) To reduce the congestion in the common areas during lunch time, the stakeholders proposed open campus for seniors. However, both the administration and parents must approve open campus for each senior.

5) School teachers, administrators, and security modified their deployment scheme in order to have as much adult supervision as possible during the critical times, such as lunch or after school.

Response Phase: Initial Implementation Challenges

When school began on August 28, 2000, some unforeseen events dramatically impacted the Response Phase. Over 200 ninth grade students were sent home for several days because of a

computer problem that did not allow them to be enrolled. This created numerous problems with parents, as well as students who just came to school to hang out until their classes were assigned. Non-enrolled students created concerns for discipline and caused minor disruptions at school and caused an initial spike in the number of disputes handled for the school year.

The biggest change which directly affected school safety and the number of disputes was the decision to conduct school hours the same as those of Gorman Middle School, located directly to the north. This decision allowed for students from both schools to ride the buses together. The pick-up location after school had to be changed in order to accommodate 17 buses at one time. The new designated location was the student parking lot between both schools. This created problems because students must walk through the parking lot to get on buses while other students who drive are leaving the area.

Confusion in the student parking lot began on the first day of school with students from both schools converging at the bus pick-up location after dismissal. As a result, administrative staff as well as security from both schools responded to provide adult supervision. Harrison students riding buses were re-routed through the parking lot so as not to interfere with vehicle traffic. Several students and parents voiced their concerns for safety, however no injuries occurred. But a major concern was the increase of disruptive behavior (assaults and fights) on the buses and at several bus stops after school. In response to this the following was implemented:

- Placement of video cameras on select buses
- School bus monitors when available
- Identification of errant students for school follow-up and possible criminal charges

Since the consolidation of busing for Gorman and Harrison students more fights and assaults have taken place. More arrests been made and parent, administration and SRO conflict/resolution meetings have taken place on a daily basis. During the first few weeks of the 1999-2000 school year, there were 11 school bus incidents; this year, there were 25 within the same time period, resulting in a total of 67 parent/student conflict resolution meetings.

The above responses continued until the first part of January 2001, at which time the grant focused on the Assessment portion of the SARA problem-solving model to include statistical data, considerations and recommendations as appropriate.

The Assessment Phase

The general consensus is that the perception of school safety is higher; however, on the negative side, Harrison has the highest rate of suspensions and expulsions of any high school in the state of Colorado. As Table 2 shows, while there has been an increase in expulsion incidents, there has also been an increase in using alternative interventions as well, such as student mediation and parental conferences.

Table 2. Disciplinary activities in two school years

August 1999 to May 2000		August 2000 to May 2001	
Dispute Interventions	Number of Incidents	Dispute Interventions	Number of Incidents
Expulsions	4	Expulsions	31
Student Mediation	195	Student Mediation	353
Parent Conference	387	Parent Conference	746
	586		1,130

As displayed in Table 3, dispute-related measurements dropped nine percent between the 1999-2000 school year and the 2000-2001 school year. Given the unforeseen issues regarding the school buses at the beginning of the 2000-2001 school year, we can only wonder whether the decrease might have been larger if the sharing of school buses had not been implemented.

Table 3. Type of Disputes and Number of Incidents, by School Year

August 1999 to May 2000		August 2000 to May 2001	
Type of Dispute	Number of Incidents	Type of Dispute	Number of Incidents
Fights	87	Fights	74
Weapons	3	Weapons	6
Bus Misconduct	17	Bus Misconduct	17
Gang Activities	5	Gang Activities	5
	112		102

Three primary response areas were identified – require parking permits, open the campus for seniors, and make CPTED changes in designated areas. Changes in these areas had very positive results.

1. Parking permits:

With the understanding that student parking is a privilege and identification of every vehicle in the parking lot is designed for safety and security, total compliance was obtained. Since the beginning of school, no reported incidents of *Criminal Mischief* or *Theft from a Vehicle* has been reported, as compared to four (4) incidents of Criminal Mischief and three (3) Thefts from last year's statistics.

2. Open campus for seniors:

There have been no real negative problems noted, as most seniors are concerned with graduating. Another positive aspect is that the commons area is less congested during both lunch periods for a more relaxed environment.

3. CPTED improvements:

It appears that these minor changes have helped deter a number of disputes involving defiant behavior, fighting, assaults, and gang type activities.

In assessing the response to the school bus issue in which both Harrison High and Gorman Middle Schools share the afternoon buses, the placement of video cameras and school bus monitors had a dramatic positive impact. Only two fights and assaults occurred between January 5, 2001 and February 15, 2001 and only one student who failed to comply has been expelled.

Impact of the Project

As mentioned earlier, Harrison High School has the highest suspension and expulsion rate per student population than any other high school in the state. One of the main reasons that this occurs is that the school administration is dedicated to maintaining a safe and secure atmosphere. Problems posed by students who engage in violent or disruptive behavior have not been tolerated. In many cases, alternative out of school placement has been provided for those students. However, the main focus is the welfare of the vast majority of students and their teachers.

Appendix A

Crime Triangle Questions and Answers for Harrison High School

A. VICTIMS

1. WHO ARE THE VICTIMS?

- Primarily students; 80% are male
- Teachers/staff - 4 assaults on staff out of 120 employees
- Non-students - rival gang members or troublemakers responding to school to harass and/or fight students.

2. WHAT ARE THEIR CHARACTERISTICS?

- Freshmen (9th graders) and/or immature students, i.e., gang kids and those students who place no value on academics
- Other students that exhibit behavior that is detrimental to the physical safety of other students or staff.
- Of these identified above, the following percentages apply:
 - a) Male 70% / Female 30%
 - b) White 27%, Black 33%, Hispanic 35%, other 5%

3. DOES THE PROBLEM TRANSLATE INTO FEAR AMONG OTHER STUDENTS, TEACHERS AND STAFF?

- More frustration than fear. School laws and district policies make it difficult to remove problem students to alternative environments. Three-, five- and 10-day suspensions do not seem to have much effect, as students are required by law to attend school until age 16.

4. WHAT IS THE LEVEL OF FEAR AMONG STUDENTS?

- “Main stream” students just do what they are supposed to do. Their level of fear is low, although they do have some concerns for their safety. However, they stay away from problem areas and unruly students.

- Marginal “at-risk” students that are at school but not in class have a much higher sense of fear as they are in the wrong places at the wrong times.

5. HAVE VICTIMS REPORTED INCIDENTS TO THE SCHOOL AND/OR POLICE?

- All known incidents are recorded on student statement forms for both suspects as well as victims. These incidents are ultimately placed in their Record File.
- Depending on the nature of the incident, police intervention is reported when it results in conflict resolution or criminal charges being placed against the offenders.

B. CRIME ENVIRONMENT

1. WHERE DOES THE PROBLEM OCCUR?

- Student parking lot, in front of the school (bus pick-up area), commons area, inside of the school, as well as classroom hallways.
- Any area that is not adequately monitored by security cameras.
Note: District policy does not allow any security cameras inside school buildings.

2. WHEN DOES THE PROBLEM OCCUR?

- Usually during lunch periods and after school.
- Isolated incidents also take place at sporting events. However, more staff and security are present which help keep incidents at a minimum.

3. WHAT OTHER RELATED PROBLEMS/CRIMES ARE TAKING PLACE?

- Property crimes of student thefts, criminal damage to student vehicles, etc. lead to assaults, intimidation, fighting and harassment.

4. DESCRIBE THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT OF THE SCHOOL.

The school itself sits on the southeast corner of I-25 and Circle Drive. It is a single story complex with a common area in the center and is built in a circular design with inner and outer hallways. There are no security cameras inside of the school per the District policy.

5. DESCRIBE THE AREA AROUND THE SCHOOL.

The school has one main entry/exit for vehicles and a walkway towards an overpass on Circle Drive. There is also a tunnel (west) under I-25. It is located in a business area and has no residences close by. A Middle School sits to the northwest and is separated by a chain link fence.

C. OFFENDERS

1. BASED ON SCHOOL/POLICE REPORTS, WHO ARE THE OFFENDERS (characteristics)?

- Low self esteem students with anger control issues.
- Students with limited social skills
- Others - gangs, cliques, groups of the “same like” kids (non-mainstream).

2. DO THE OFFENDERS ATTEND SCHOOL OR NOT?

- Most are students and attend school, however, they do not go to assigned classes. School is nothing more than a social gathering place.

3. WHERE DO THE KNOWN OFFENDERS LIVE?

- 35% Gold Hill (CSPD) West Division.

- 35% Sand Creek (CSPD) East Division.
- 30% El Paso County (Sheriff's Department).
- 60% Live in single family residences.
- 40% Reside in apartment complexes.

4. ARE THEY COMMITTING OTHER CRIMES OR CREATING PROBLEMS?

- Criminal mischief in and around school.
- Disorderly conduct
- Drug/Alcohol abuse
- Harassment/Intimidation of other students.
- Driving violations
- Other "at-risk" behavior that is detrimental to the safety of students and staff.
- Approximately 80% to 85% of these students are identified as those who create disputes that lead to physical confrontations.

5. HOW DO OFFENDERS EXPLAIN THEIR BEHAVIOR?

- 75% don't seem to care, and their parents will make excuses for them. Non-accountability and no desire for education leads to more "at-risk" behavior.

Section 5. Cleaning up the Neighborhood: Problem Solving at Mitchell High School

The School

Mitchell High School (Mitchell) faces west and is predominantly a one-story structure with parking for everyone (students, staff, and visitors) in the front of the school. Approximately 1,350 students attend Mitchell, of which 61 percent are white, 19 percent Hispanic, 14 percent African American, five percent Asian American and two percent American Indian. A School Resource Officer has worked at the school part-time since December 27, 1998; the position became full-time in September 2000. Prior to the project, Mitchell experienced increases in the number of case reports taken for thefts, narcotics and assaults.

Directly across from the high school is an apartment complex that stretches the same length as the school. In prior years, this complex had some drug/gang activity, but some environmental changes (such as gates to allow only one access in and out) have diminished this activity. The other three borders of the school are primarily residential single-family dwellings. Nearby, there are several shopping centers and a large mall that the students can walk to at lunchtime and/or after school.

The Scanning Phase

From January to May 2000, the stakeholders met informally until they decided on the specific problem, and then formal meetings began. During the Scanning Phase, three formal meetings occurred with 13 individual participants -- three citizens, the security supervisor, the dropout intervention specialist, the community liaison, four students, two assistant principals and the SRO. They identified the problem type as: *other disorder that relates to a specific crime or student safety problem*. The “other disorder” translated into loitering and truancy. This problem was based on comments received from residents in the area.

Residents north and east of the school (in the single family houses) experienced problems with students who loitered on their streets, smoked cigarettes and left trash. According to school sources, narcotics are normally found on students loitering and smoking, which may be a secondary problem to examine. While underage purchase of tobacco, use and possession of tobacco on school grounds are citable offenses, possession of tobacco off of school grounds is not. Therefore, the major administrative recourse for this problem is that if a student is “habitually truant” (a student can be counted absent or tardy if more than 10 minutes late), s/he can be suspended.

A number of citizens routinely complained to school officials about loitering students, according to an Assistant Principal who kept notes on the number of calls in her personal scheduler. Many of the homeowners in this neighborhood are retirees and they observed large groups of kids hanging out in the streets, yards, and on the sidewalks near the school; citizens assumed that the students were involved in gang or drug-related activity because of their group behavior. These students created traffic problems because they did not use the crosswalks.

Stakeholders agreed that the problem occurred mainly before school, during lunch and after school hours.

The Analysis Phase

The stakeholders looked at the problem from the three perspectives of the crime triangle—victim, location, and offender. For the citizens, the loitering affected their perception of safety in the neighborhood. The residents were afraid to approach large groups of juveniles and assumed that the students were involved in delinquent behavior. They also did not like to clean up the trash and litter that the students left behind. For the school, the loitering generates concerns about tardiness and overall attendance. From the students' perspective, they felt harassed for trying to smoke and talk with friends during breaks. Most of the offenders' parents know that they smoke and are smokers themselves.

None of the existing school or police data sources directly recorded information on this problem. In 1999, the largest number of calls for service at Mitchell High School was narcotics-related calls, followed by theft, runaway notifications, and assaults. There were also 10 traffic related calls to the police in 1999. The residents did not call the police about the students hanging out, but called school administrators. The police were called if the student gathering resulted in something more serious like property damage or a fight. The SRO, school security and other staff responded when circumstances allowed, but sometimes by the time the school official arrived, the students had dispersed.

To document specific locations and the extent of the problem, community members and school staff spent two weeks observing the areas around the school and counted the number of students who gathered at specific locations (the data are provided in Appendix A). Observations took place at various times before school, during breaks and at lunchtime. The number of students loitering ranged from two to 46, with an average of 16 students at each incident.⁶ The 47 documented incidents occurred at 14 different locations, with the largest number of loitering incidents (15 each) occurring within 100 feet of the school and at the corner of Tappan Drive and San Miguel. Tappan Circle was also a problem location, with five total incidents, and there were five incidents at specific addresses on Tappan Drive.

These data assisted the stakeholders because they clearly identified problem areas. The stakeholders also realized that the numbers served as a baseline for comparison after the response phase was completed.

The Response Phase

A number of responses were implemented at the beginning of the 2000-2001 school year (August) and continued beyond the grant period. The stakeholder group recommended a variety of approaches that focused on all sections of the crime triangle:

- 1) To make students aware of the complaints by the neighbors, the school made announcements regarding loitering in the community.

⁶ The largest number skews the average slightly; the median is 15 and the mode is 11.

- 2) For the 2000-2001 school year, the school initiated in-house detention. Instead of sending students home when caught misbehaving, they were kept at the school. In the past when some students were released to go home because of a disciplinary issue they would stay in the neighborhood, waiting for their friends to be dismissed. In-house detention prevented this type of behavior.
- 3) The school repositioned the location of the campus supervisor, security and an assistant principal during the lunch hour to limit the students' access to the residential neighborhoods.
- 4) A new surveillance camera was placed to view the problem location of Tappan Drive and San Miguel.
- 5) To try and bridge the gap between the school's smoking policy and the desire of students to smoke anyway, there is now a small area just northeast of the school (not on school property) that has been beautified and a trashcan is placed there for students' use. While this response was not necessary given the prohibition of tobacco on school grounds, it does address the students' feelings of being harassed for "no good reason."
- 6) Students caught misbehaving are assigned to school and neighborhood cleanup. This punishment is not reserved for those who only loiter or litter -- one student stole a calculator, admitted to it when confronted, and was assigned cleanup.

Once the responses were selected, the school staff, the SRO and the security officers implemented the recommendations. The stakeholders tried to garner more community involvement through appearances at "voluntary quit-smoking" meetings, but the citizens did not follow through. The school hoped that community members would join the students in meetings so that they would feel more comfortable with the students, and vice versa. Student participation also dwindled during the Response phase, mainly into informal contacts and contact with offenders when being assigned to neighborhood cleanup.

The Assessment Phase

The primary means of assessment was periodic observation by security staff for a one-month period from December 2000 to January 2001. Specific observation data are provided in Appendix B.

There were 51 observed incidents over the **four**-week observation period, compared to 47 during the Analysis phase over a **two**-week period, a large decrease in the overall observed incidents per week. The average number of students involved per incident is also down from 16 to 5. Therefore, this project had a definite impact on decreasing the number of incidents per week and the number of students involved in each incident.

The project had less of an impact on problem locations, with the corner of Tappan Drive and San Miguel still having a large number of incidents (11 during the Assessment Phase observation period). A video camera is still directed at this location and the citizen who lives near this

location continues to contact the school when students are loitering. It is estimated that when he calls and the video is checked, there is a group gathered there about two out of every 10 calls. This either means that the citizen is not calling promptly or the students are not loitering for a very long time. This location will continue to be monitored.

No other residents have complained this school year and they seem happy with the results. Informal interviews with community members confirmed this finding—all of them stated that the number of incidents has been reduced and that there are fewer students at one time found loitering.

School officials believe that this project has impacted related problems such as narcotics use and truancy problems. In police calls for service data, Mitchell had 11 narcotics-related incidents from January to June 2000; from August 2000 to December 2000, it only had nine incidents. At the time this report was completed, truancy data were not yet available from the school.

The school will continue to assess this problem past the end of the grant, given its on-going nature.

Impact of the Project

From our interviews with stakeholders we found that the number one positive impact of this project was a better relationship between the community and the school. Community residents now contact the school regularly with comments and concerns. They know whom to call when and have established better and quicker communication with school administrators. Citizens seem more comfortable interacting with the students, especially since the size of the groups have become smaller. Community members also indicated that they do not immediately assume that the students are up to “no good,” that they are just trying to find a place to smoke. Most community members interviewed stated that they were not aware of the conflicting regulations between the law and local school regulations prior to working together with the school on this project. Residents also noted that there was less trash and litter around and one community stakeholder stated that he “really liked the litter patrols.”

Most stakeholders noted the decline in student and community member participation during the Response and Assessment phases as having some effect on the overall impact of the problem. One stakeholder did note that s/he did not think the teachers really knew about the project and maybe they should have been included as well.

Overall, the project succeeded in reducing the loitering caused by students who wanted to smoke. The project continues to move forward even after the completion of the activities under the grant.

Appendix A: Observational Data on Loitering at Mitchell HS (February 16 to March 1, 2000)

Date	Time	Location	Number Of Students
16-Feb	1210	Within 100 feet	31
16-Feb	1212	Tappan Dr and San Miguel	25
16-Feb	1215	San Miguel and Potter	2
16-Feb	1220	1417 Tappan Drive	5
16-Feb	1222	Tappan Dr and San Miguel	15
16-Feb	1330	Tappan Dr and San Miguel	17
16-Feb	1350	Tappan Dr and San Miguel	6
16-Feb	1420	Within 100 feet	17
17-Feb	640	Tappan Dr and San Miguel	5
17-Feb	647	Tappan Dr and San Miguel	10
17-Feb	1102	Within 100 feet	UNK
17-Feb	1105	Tappan Dr and San Miguel	25
17-Feb	1208	Within 100 feet of school	17
17-Feb	1220	Within 100 feet of school	UNK
22-Feb	650	Tappan Dr and San Miguel	23
22-Feb	1103	Within 100 feet	11
22-Feb	1155	Within 100 feet	15
22-Feb	1210	Tappan Dr and San Miguel	5
22-Feb	1225	Within 100 feet	11
22-Feb	1320	Tappan Circle	10
22-Feb	1420	Within 100 feet	15+3 in veh
23-Feb	645	Tappan Dr and San Miguel	11
23-Feb	655	Tappan Circle	14
23-Feb	1100	Tappan Dr and San Miguel	20
23-Feb	1103	Within 100 feet	14+veh
23-Feb	1120	1316 Tappan Circle	15
23-Feb	1200	Within 100 feet	17
23-Feb	1205	1331 Tappan Cir	13
23-Feb	1211	1401 Potter	9
24-Feb	650	Tappan Dr and San Miguel	18
24-Feb	1100	Within 100 feet	20
24-Feb	1140	Tappan Circle	16
24-Feb	1155	Within 100 feet	30+
24-Feb	1223	Within 100 feet	20
24-Feb	1330	San Miguel	10
27-Feb	1335	Fosdick Drive	9

Appendix A: Observational Data on Loitering (Cont'd)

Date	Time	Location	Number Of Students
28-Feb	1100	Tappan Dr and San Miguel	18
28 -Feb	1110	4OIO Tappan Dr	10
28-Feb	1115	Foster Circle	4
28-Feb	1155	Tappan Circle	13
28-Feb	1205	Foster Circle	12
29-Feb	1100	Within 100 feet	46
29-Feb	1110	Tappan Dr and San Miguel	24
29-Feb	1120	4O36 Tappan	7
29-Feb	1220	Tappan Dr and San Miguel	21
01-Mar	1100	Tappan Circle	37
01-Mar	1112	Farmcrest Store	45

Appendix B: Assessment Phase Observational Data on Loitering at Mitchell HS (December 4, 2000 to January 18, 2001)

Date	Time	Location	Number Of Students
4-Dec	1140	Potter and San Miguel	2
4-Dec	1210	Tappan Dr and San Miguel	8
5-Dec	1405	1417 Tappan Drive	1
5-Dec	640	Tappan Dr and San Miguel	7
5-Dec	655	Tappan Dr and San Miguel	3
6-Dec	1100	Tappan Dr and San Miguel	4
6-Dec	730	Within 100 ft.	6
6-Dec	1111	Tappan Dr and San Miguel	3
7-Dec	1200	Tappan Dr and San Miguel	13
7-Dec	640	Smoker's Corner w/100 ft	2
7-Dec	650	Smoker's Corner w/100 ft	6
7-Dec	1058	1417 Tappan Drive	5
8-Dec	1330	Potter and San Miguel	3
8-Dec	630	Tappan Dr and San Miguel	2
8-Dec	645	1417 Tappan Drive	7
8-Dec	1105	Within 100 ft.	9
11-Dec	1132	Tappan Dr and San Miguel	1
11-Dec	615	1417 Tappan Drive	4
11-Dec	648	Potter and San Miguel	7
12-Dec	1103	Smoker's Corner w/100 ft	2
12-Dec	1129	Tappan Dr and San Miguel	8
12-Dec	1206	Middle of Tappan Cir	7
12-Dec	1218	Tappan Dr and San Miguel	5
13-Dec	1300	Within 100 ft.	3
13-Dec	1200	Smoker's Corner w/100 ft	2
13-Dec	1220	Within 100 ft.	6
13-Dec	1255	San Miguel and Murray	11
18-Dec	1400	1331 Tappan Cir	2
18-Dec	655	Tappan Dr and San Miguel	5
19-Dec	1049	Within 100 ft.	6
19-Dec	1315	Tappan Circle	3
20-Dec	1358	Smoker's Corner w/100 ft	7
20-Dec	640	San Miguel and Murray	3
21-Dec	1310	Fosdick Dr	5
21-Dec	634	Fosdick Dr	3
22-Dec	1116	Tappan Dr and San Miguel	2
22-Dec	650	Smoker's Corner w/100 ft	2
22-Dec	1100	Foster Cir	9
8-Jan	1310	1401 Potter	4
8-Jan	655	Foster Cir	4
8-Jan	1216	Within 100 ft.	6
9-Jan	1410	Tappan Dr and San Miguel	13
9-Jan	630	4036 Tappan	6
10-Jan	1125	1417 Tappan Drive	13
10-Jan	1159	Potter and San Miguel	11
10-Jan	1210	Tappan Circle	2
17-Jan	630	Smoker's Corner w/100 ft	4
17-Jan	1110	Potter and San Miguel	1
17-Jan	1130	San Miguel and Murray	6
18-Jan	650	Smoker's Corner w/100 ft	5
18-Jan	655	1417 Tappan Drive	3

Section 6. Tackling Assaults and Disturbances in Sierra High School

The School

Sierra High School (Sierra) is a neighborhood school of approximately 1,200 students located in the Southeast portion of Colorado Springs. This area is historically a lower socio-economic area of the city. Fifty-two percent of the school district's families are low income and 37 percent of the students are on free or reduced lunch status. The demographic breakdown of the school is 41 percent white, 33 percent African-American, 18 percent Hispanic, seven percent Asian American, and one percent Native American.

In terms of security measures, the school grounds are monitored by video cameras that record 24 hours a day. There are four cameras, two of which are black-and-white fixed video and the other two are remote-controlled mobile color cameras.

A School Resource Officer (SRO) has worked at Sierra since 1996. Early on in the grant period, the original SRO was replaced by a new officer. The former SRO formed the initial stakeholder group, attended the March 2000 training and worked with the group until the problem was selected. The incoming SRO attended the March training as well and assumed the grant responsibilities after the training.

The Scanning Phase

The stakeholders' group consisted of three students, a security guard, an assistant principal and the SRO. All the stakeholders attended a training session on March 9-10, 2000 at the Colorado Springs Training Academy. This was considered the initial team meeting of the stakeholders' group. During this training, the group agreed that the problem type would be assaults or physical disturbances that were a direct result of gossip or "he said, she said" incidents.

Data from the police supported this decision: Sierra had 128 calls for service in 1999 -- the largest number of those was for assaults (16 calls), followed by disturbances (15) and runaways (13).

The goal of this project was to implement a long-term solution that would reduce the number of calls for service for assaults. A long-term solution would also lower administrative time spent on such incidents and would reduce student suspension time. The stakeholders' group discussed assaults on teachers, but agreed that this type of incident did not fit into the narrowly defined problem ("he said, she said" incidents that lead to physical disturbances) that the stakeholder group attempted to resolve.

The current procedure in dealing with students involved in assaults in school is to suspend or expel the student for a specific time frame and then consider criminal charges. The school student handbook states:

“students found fighting will be suspended. Parents notified. The Colorado Springs Police Department will be contacted to ticket the offenders. In most cases involving

violent or gang-related fights, the student may be suspended for an additional period of time or recommended for expulsion."

According to an assistant principal, the punishment for a first incident of fighting/assault is a three-day suspension. The punishment for the second offense is a five- to 10-day suspension and the possibility of recommendation for expulsion.

Through informal interviews with administrative staff and students, it was determined that assaults due to rumors result in a large number of disputes. An assistant principal informed the group that over 90 percent of the disturbances at Sierra High School are a direct result of "he said, she said" incidents. School administrative staff stated that a lot of time is spent on preventing physical conflicts through stopping rumors.

The next step taken by stakeholders was to determine the similarities across incidents. They concluded that all physical disturbances that were a result of "he said, she said" were similar in dynamics. When one party hears about another talking "smack" about them or a rumor, a common response is for one subject to verbally confront the other subject. Such a confrontation has the possibility of leading to a physical disturbance.

The Analysis Phase

During the Analysis phase, the problem was studied from a variety of angles. In particular, the stakeholders focused on the Crime Problem Triangle and dealt specifically with the offenders, victims, and locations.

The stakeholders determined that the offender was always a student at Sierra between grade 9 and 12 and not former students or outsiders. The gender of the offender did not matter since there was an almost equal amount of violence between males and females. The victims had the same demographic characteristics as the offenders.

Some questions asked by the stakeholder group dealt with both the victim and the offender. The group asked if the victims or the suspects were repeat offenders. Based upon the discussion, it was determined that the victim and suspect very rarely re-offend on school campus. Therefore, if there were 18 police calls for service, there would be at least 36 participants in the disturbance. The stakeholder group confirmed that during some of the disturbances, more than two students were involved in the fight.

The stakeholders also found that almost an equal number of males and females were victims and offenders, as well as an equal number of freshmen through seniors that offend. The only possible drop-off in the grade level participation was when a senior was close to graduation and he feared a suspension/expulsion that would harm his chances of graduating.

Not much data were maintained on the location of disturbances at the school, though they found that a majority of physical confrontations occurred during lunch, access period and after school. The stakeholders tried to focus in on the location by examining videotapes from surveillance cameras. Unfortunately, the rear portion of the school is not covered by video cameras, but

apparently is an area where a number of disturbances and suspicious activities occur. Students are aware that the cameras do not cover this area and therefore engage in illicit activity there.

Two locations that were identified as having the most problems were a corner across the street approximately 100 feet from the school grounds and the hallways. Students also indicated that a large number of unreported disturbances occur in the restrooms during passing periods. These restroom disturbances usually involve pushing or shoving with the result not being equivalent to an assault. Another problem location was in the individual classrooms when a teacher steps away. The general consensus was that a large number of the disturbances occur inside the commons or dining room area, outside the main doors on campus and outside on the school grounds.

By looking at the problem through calls for service, the project's crime analyst provided data that showed that there were 18 disturbance calls at Sierra High School from September 1, 1999 to April 26, 2000. Of these calls, six generated official police reports and the other 12 were solved by unknown means.

The stakeholder group determined that the amount of time dealing with "he said, she said" or rumor control is not necessarily proportional to the number of police calls for service regarding disturbances. A large number of school personnel deal with these rumor control issues, including school administrators, counselors, teachers, security, and the school resource officer. This is reflected in the number of fights, assaults and batteries in the semester discipline reports for the school. In the 1999-2000 school year, 56 fighting incidents were logged.

Tracking the amount of time spent on these assaults was difficult because many people in the school deal with this issue. Some disturbances may have been solved by a summons being issued and no official report written. This type of police solution is common for local city charges for a harassment or fighting charge. The City of Colorado Springs does not require an official police report for formal charges to be brought before city court. According to an assistant principal, minor disturbances were not referred to the police department due to a lack of criminal charges. In these cases, the school takes appropriate action in the way of in-school suspension, out-of-school suspension, or expulsion.

The stakeholders group discussed the conditions or events that precede the problem, or what caused the disturbance. The group believed that students at Sierra High School are not properly equipped with the necessary social skills to peacefully resolve verbal conflicts. They believed that this is due to a lack of social maturity.

The stakeholders also examined the fear level among students. The types of concerns that students showed were toward possible criminal charges, school repercussions or possible retaliation from other students in the school.

To gain feedback beyond the stakeholder group, a survey was designed by the stakeholders and reviewed by the principal. In May 2000, the survey was randomly distributed to 200 students in grades 9 through 11. Seniors were excluded because only two weeks remained in the school

year and the stakeholders believed that the seniors' responses might not be as relevant as students who would be returning for the next school year. Without the senior class, the student population is approximately 900 students. About 22 percent of the targeted student population was surveyed.

Overall, 70 percent of the students surveyed felt safe at Sierra High School. While 19 percent of the students felt that assaults were a moderate to large problem at Sierra, when specifically asked about rumors as the cause for assaults, 60 percent felt that "he said, she said" situations led to the assaults. Sixty-six percent of the students surveyed had been the victims of such gossip. Nineteen students reported being the victim of an assault at Sierra and 75 percent of these individuals reported the assault to the school.

The student stakeholders evaluated the survey data and decided that the students at Sierra feel relatively safe and that assaults are the major problem. They also added that a number of the surveys were not returned or were lost by the student stakeholders. They decided that a better accountability system needed to be created for the next set of surveys.

Potential Responses

In a brainstorming session, the stakeholder group discussed a number of ways to prevent assaults. Ideas from the group included: police action, teen court, educational videos, peer counseling, diversity training, rewards for proper actions, discipline for those who spread the rumors, and after-school programs. One tool that was suggested was using and promoting Student Crime Stoppers to report incidents of violence or possible future fights.

Another potential tool was Channel One, the school's video announcement system. One proposal was using either a "COPS" spin-off or ongoing soap opera-style production. The shows would use actual Sierra High School students in the productions of mock situations that could lead to assaults. The students would then show how to appropriately deal with the issues through nonviolent solutions. Another way to combat the problem through the use of video was possibly utilizing school athletes. Sierra is a school that is dominated by school athletics. Different athletes could do public service announcements speaking out against the violence.

The student stakeholders decided to produce a short series of public service announcements (PSAs) that would be aired on the closed circuit channel at the school. The student stakeholders were tasked with coming up with some scripts. However, problems with video equipment prohibited making the PSAs a reality.

The group also addressed attacking the underlying time and location problems. Potential responses include: moving or eliminating the access period; shortening the lunch hour; making a schedule of all staff, including teachers, that would ensure that the hallways and remote areas of the school are monitored at all times; and adding cameras to the rear and less monitored areas of the school.

The Response Phase

Between the 1999-2000 school year and the 2000-2001 school year, a new principal was hired. The new principal believes that physical conflicts as a result of "he said, she said" are a national problem. He also indicated how this can be a major problem at Sierra High School sporting events. The principal agreed to assist the project in solving this problem.

During the 2000-2001 school year, the school adopted a zero tolerance policy for fights on campus. The policy is evenly enforced between all students, including athletes. This has not necessarily been the case in previous years.

To garner support and to publicize the goals of the project, the SRO met with nearly 20 different school groups and classes during the 2000-2001 school year. The meetings included Sierra staff, the Sierra High School Accountability Committee (made up of members from the community), guest lecturing in classrooms and other student meetings.

Sierra also decided to start using a "Behavior Rubric" to grade students on appropriate standards of behavior. The Rubric was developed over a number of years and involved a wide variety of school staff using problem-solving techniques. Students receive regular academic grades but then also receive a second set of grades for responsible behavior, respect for peers, respect for staff, respect for the school and overall cooperation. Students are rated as "In Progress," "Essential," "Proficient," or "Advanced" for each of the five categories. While of interest to the grant project, the Behavior Rubric grades were not available before the end of the project due to computer programming changes.

When looking at the problem location that is across the street from the school, it was discovered that the students were congregating there to smoke cigarettes. The corner is privately own property, so the students were told that an alternate location would have to be found. While speaking to these students, they were asked if there was anything that could be done that would prevent the large number of disputes. The students indicated that setting up some tables, putting in a trashcan and generally finding a nicer place for the students to retreat to might reduce the number of altercations. The SRO and the school started talking to the county about a piece of unoccupied land that is a little farther from the school but not in a residential area. The school is continuing to pursue getting access to this space.

To impact another problem location, teachers have been assigned to hall duty. This has reduced the number of fights in the hallways.

To help the school resolve disputes regarding rumors more informally, the school formed a peer counseling/mediation group. Twenty students participated in two days of peer mediation training and the group underwent additional training throughout the year. For the school year, the peer mediation group conducted 29 sessions, 12 of which assisted students in working through their issues with "he said, she said" problems. The group set up tracking and follow-up forms so that individuals who went through mediation will be monitored into the next school year.

The stakeholder group decided to convene a non-violence rally as the official end of the project. Some of the stakeholders donated much of their personal time to assist in organizing this event. The Nonviolence Peace Rally was held on March 8, 2001 at the World Arena, a large professional sports arena. The program was a huge success, attracting local news media coverage. The keynote speaker was nationally renowned speaker, Michael Chapman. Mr. Chapman is a reformed gang member from the Miami area who spoke to the audience for an hour. Also speaking during the event was Colorado Springs Mayor Mary Lou Makepeace, Colorado Springs Chief of Police Lorne Kramer, and School District 2 Superintendent Vic Myers. Approximately 2,500 students attended from Sierra High School, Harrison High School, Tutmose Academy, James Irwin Charter School, and New Horizons Alternative School. The rally evoked a very positive overall response. One teacher stated that this was the best behavior that she has ever seen from Sierra High School students.

The Assessment Phase

A tragic event impacted the Assessment Phase. On April 28, 2001, the SRO at Sierra died. This was a devastating blow to the school, the police department, the community (the SRO lived in the neighborhood close to the school), and to the evaluators. To commemorate his passing, the school held a memorial service, attended by all students, teachers, and members of the police department. Students gave emotional speeches about the officer. A large outpouring of grief and sympathy came forward in the last six weeks of the school year.

After his death, the project lost momentum and without his leadership stakeholders were unable to fully assess the success of their responses.

Calls for service data and school discipline data were available and indicated that changes occurred. Examining police data, the number of calls for service decreased 38 percent between the two school years, dropping to 10 from 16. The largest number of calls for service was for runaways (18 calls), followed by suspicious persons or behavior (17) and disturbances (15).

When examining the school data, the number of fights, assaults and batteries actually increased slightly, from 56 in the 1999-2000 school year to 58 in the 2000-2001 school year. However, the student suspension rate dropped 49 percent between the two school years. This is an indication that alternative methods of discipline, such as mediation and parental conferences, are being utilized more.

The project was also able to proactively prevent some assault situations. The SRO, school and security staff members were able to prevent 12 fights from happening and decreased the seriousness of at least two encounters.

Overall Impact

Following his death, the SRO's office was cleaned out and the post-project student surveys and other project information were disposed of before the information could be collated and included in this report. In a number of conversations between the evaluators and the school staff, it was determined that the cost of potentially traumatizing students by re-surveying them about the

project outweighed the benefit of having the survey information. Unfortunately, we could not determine the overall impact of the project on the school.

Section 7. Reducing Drug Use at Wasson High School

The School

Wasson High School (Wasson) has approximately 1,400 students for the 2000-2001 school year. Wasson is part of School District 11 and is located in a residential area that has many alleys between the houses. A number of parks are within a few blocks to one mile away, including the largest park in Colorado Springs, Palmer Park. There are also commercial areas within a ½ mile radius of the school.

The student body is 64 percent white, 18 percent Hispanic, 14 percent African American, two percent Asian American and two percent American Indian. Twenty-one percent of the students receive free lunches and 12 percent receive lunch at a reduced rate.

Wasson's school day differs from the other schools involved in the partnership program. The school runs on a quarterly system, which means that students can complete a course and receive credit in one-quarter of the year. At Wasson, this means that there are four classes a day that are 90 minutes in length.

During 1999, Wasson had 169 calls for service. Theft was the largest category, with 35 calls, followed by 17 calls for service regarding vandalism.

The Scanning Phase

During the Scanning Phase, a stakeholder group was formed and was comprised of the SRO, a teacher, two students, a security officer and an assistant principal. This group determined that drug activity seemed to be the most prevalent problem both in and around the school. During the 1999-2000 school year, there were 42 disciplinary actions involving either drugs or drug paraphernalia, according to school records. Before the grant began, approximately 50 hours were used for substance abuse interdiction responses about the perceived drug problem.

Police department calls for service indicate 13 calls to Wasson during the 1999-2000 school year. As with the other schools, these calls do not reflect all police-involved activities because of the presence of the on-site SRO.

The stakeholders reviewed the differences between how police handled drug situations versus how a high school handled them. School policy involves suspension of any student caught with "baggies," as they are viewed as paraphernalia. For CSPD baggies alone are not enough to establish drug dealing, a student has to take money for drug dealing to be charged. For the school, any offense that involves dealing, even for a first time offender, will lead to a suspension. Any student caught with paraphernalia will receive a suspension hearing. If it is a first-time offense, usually the school will require a drug test and the student cannot return until he or she has tested negative for drugs.

The stakeholders thought that certain factors might be contributing to the problem. Wasson is an "open campus" -- students can come and go freely throughout the day. Additionally, Wasson has

classes off campus. For example, the bowling class is held in a bowling alley located several blocks away in a strip mall that has a history of drug activity.

Additionally, the stakeholders identified some locations that may attract students who want to use drugs. South of the school is a viaduct, a concrete lined irrigation ditch, that is deep enough to block the view of passersby. According to some students, vehicles will pick up students and go elsewhere to deal drugs or get high during the school day. Students leave campus without the use of vehicles to go to alleys in the residential neighborhood, and other secluded spots to deal and use drugs.

The Analysis Phase

All the stakeholders played a part in the Analysis Phase of the process. The Assistant Principal and the SRO spent approximately 10 hours a week each on the Analysis Phase. The teacher and students each spent about one hour a week to assist in this process.

For these stakeholders, the Analysis Phase consisted of two distinct parts. This occurred because data from the student and teacher surveys were not available until fall 2000 even though the surveys were administered in the spring of 2000. During the first phase, the stakeholders looked at the available school and police data for patterns and trends. As a result of these data, the group implemented some responses. Second, after analyzing the results of the student and teacher surveys, another group of responses was implemented.

A closer look at the school discipline records show that there were 31 different drug-related incidents from January to May 2000. Eleven students received both a suspension and an expulsion hearing while 20 students received suspensions only. Offenders were primarily male, with the largest number in ninth grade (15 offenders). Sixty-one percent of the offenders were white, 35 percent Hispanic and three percent African American. All of the offenders were either past or present students at Wasson High School.

Through the analysis of school discipline records along with interviews of administrative and security personnel, the most prevalent time for drug use was determined to be lunchtime. The entire school has lunch from 10:15 a.m. until 11:00 a.m. Informal interviews with both victims and suspects indicate that most of the drug dealing on campus takes place between 7 and 10:15 a.m.

All of the incidents of drug use or possession of drug paraphernalia were occurring either on school grounds or within a three-block radius of the campus.

The stakeholders also looked at specific suspects to determine their activities throughout the city. They believed that certain individuals were contributing to problems at other schools. CSPD's Metro Vice, Narcotics and Intelligence unit investigated two students who were suspended from Wasson for possession of drugs. Both of the students were suspected of using drugs and selling to other students. One was suspended and not allowed to return to school. He had been observed in the area of Wasson and Mitchell High School, picking up students at lunch and then returning them later in the day.

The stakeholders discussed the need to standardize the questions asked of suspects during follow-up interviews in an effort to adequately understand the problem. Since the SRO was only at the school 20 hours a week during this phase, he was not always notified of incidents that were minor in nature that occurred during his absence.

Some of the questions that stakeholders used in determining appropriate responses included:

- 1) How did you know that drugs were available?
- 2) How did you find out who was dealing drugs and where you would have to go to get them?
- 3) What is the approximate age of the person from whom you purchased the drugs?
- 4) Is the person who supplied the drugs a student at Wasson High School? A different area high school?
- 5) Where did you purchase the drugs? Did you purchase the drugs on the Wasson High School campus? If yes, where? At what time?
- 6) Why did you start using drugs? (Peer pressure, home life, school pressures?)

In the spring of 2000, Wasson High School students and faculty participated in a survey to identify safety and drug issues. The survey was administered to students and school staff who had a class during first period. Participants were asked a wide range of questions, including ones about attitudes and perceptions about drugs, alcohol, tobacco, violence and weapons in and around the school.

In October 2000, the student and faculty survey results were released by District 11 officials and provided to the Wasson stakeholder group. Out of a total of 1,250 students present for first period, 658 took part in the project (53 percent response rate). Forty-five out of 130 faculty surveys were completed (35 percent response rate).

The demographics of the respondents were:

- 51% male and 49% female;
- 29% Freshmen, 30% Sophomores, 27% Juniors and 14% Seniors;
- 56% White, 15% Hispanic/Latino/Latina, 13% Other, 11% African Americans, Native 3% Americans and 2% Asian Americans.

Overall, the demographics of the students completing the survey correspond well to the overall demographics of the school; though, the large number of students indicating “Other” in the race category makes it difficult to insure the racial mix was comparable.

The students identified marijuana (82 percent), alcohol (71 percent), LSD (52 percent) and Ecstasy (52 percent) as either a big problem or somewhat of a problem. Students indicated that a friend’s home was the most frequent location where they usually drink or smoke marijuana. Home was identified as the second most frequent place students would use either alcohol or marijuana. Although not the most identified problem, 56 percent said that students buying drugs at school was a problem and 52 percent responded that students selling drugs at school was a problem. Forty-eight percent of students felt a moderate to high pressure to try or use drugs.

One problem location identified by both the student and faculty surveys was Wasson Park, located approximately one block from the school.

The Response Phase

During the initial Response Phase, four campus security staff, the School Resource Officer, and District 11 security officials spent about 250 hours on various activities regarding drug use and possession. The school district used a private company to conduct “dog sniffs” on 10 separate occasions in the parking lot and inside the building. In addition, campus security and school officials spent time at key locations during lunch and passing periods to keep non-students away from the campus.

Between the two school years, the group lost several stakeholders. The Assistant Principal departed and took the same position at another high school. She was eventually replaced by another Assistant Principal. The security officer took a newly created position as a truant officer, so another security officer joined the group. One student stakeholder became involved in numerous other student activities and had to be replaced. The SRO met with the three new stakeholders individually to give them a brief overview and trained them in the SARA model. He met with them individually to bring them up to speed so that the group meetings would be more productive and not repetitive for the returning stakeholders.

One of the responses included increasing the awareness of drug counseling available at Wasson. During the spring semester of the 1999-2000, only one stakeholder was aware that a drug and alcohol counselor was at the school every Tuesday for one hour. Although information about counseling is available, very few students take advantage of it. So, efforts were made to better publicize this resource.

Another response involved working with Student Crime Stopper board members to encourage students to call the Crime Stoppers telephone number with any information about drug dealing and use in and around the campus. Additionally, Crime Stoppers assisted in educating other students about the problem of drugs at Wasson. This organization still suffers from the appearance of being simply a “narc” group; however, more students approached both the SRO and other school staff personnel to report incidents of all types after Crime Stoppers made the effort.

Additionally, to draw attention to the issue, the SRO taught drug awareness seminars during health class at least once a quarter. The SRO taught eight health and two other classes about drug-related issues.

Since the beginning of the 2000-2001 school year, the administration compiled a list of “at risk” students, including those at risk for drug and alcohol usage. These individuals were selected to participate in the Colorado Department of Corrections’ Shape-Up program. During this field trip, inmates talked about their lives prior to incarceration, explained the long-term consequences of their choices, and gave an overview of prison inmate life. The students ate lunch with the inmates and spent time in small groups with them. Many of the students were “amazed” to learn that 95 percent of the inmates indicated that alcohol and/or drugs were part of the reason they

were in prison. Additionally, the inmates spoke very frankly about what they did when they did not go to school and how truancy always led to additional problems.

To catch students who used illegal substances during lunch, the security staff and the SRO conducted hall sweeps for tardy students right after the lunch period. During the sweeps, students who were in the hall after the bell were issued after-school detention notices. During detention, students were seen individually and the security and administrative staff were able to detect signs of drug or alcohol use.

In January 2001, the school district added a new position to help combat the drug problem -- Dropout Prevention/Transition Coordinator. The position deals primarily with 9th graders making the transition from middle school to high school where there is considerably more freedom. This coordinator will also be dealing with second and third year high school students who are at risk of dropping out of school. Additionally, the coordinator agreed to become a stakeholder.

In terms of working on problem locations, both Wasson Park and Palmer Park have been targeted for increased supervision. For example, Wasson security personnel concentrated on contacting the students who were loitering at Wasson Park. The open area of the park, where the offenders congregate, is conducive to the disposal of evidence. Therefore, security personnel were monitoring and contacting students seen leaving this park as they returned to the school campus. Additionally, security is closely monitoring an area called Smoker's Hill, not letting the students go into alleys and not letting cars stop. Random daily checks are conducted in a large underground pipe that runs between Wasson and a middle school. The pipe is large enough for students to walk through.

During the third quarter of the 2000-2001 school year, District 11 instituted a new policy that allowed canine searches in classrooms. During the first use of canines in the classroom, only one search resulted and there were no arrests.

The Assessment Phase

The total number of overall arrests increased by 54 percent at Wasson over the two-year period. During the 1999-2000 school year, there were 44 total arrests at Wasson. There were 95 arrests for the 2000-2001 school year. Not unexpectedly, then, the number of arrests for drugs and alcohol offenses went from 31 for the 1999-2000 school year to 45 for the 2000-2001 school year, an increase of 45 percent.

Forty-eight percent of the offenders were in the ninth grade, 19 percent in the tenth grade, 25 percent in the eleventh grade and eight percent in the twelfth grade. Offenders were primarily white (62 percent), followed by Hispanics with 22 percent and African Americans with 16 percent. During the 2000-2001 school year, there were three repeat offenders, all white males. There was no discernable pattern in terms of time of day, ranging from before school to after school events.

There was one felony and 22 misdemeanor arrests for marijuana. Arrests for drug paraphernalia were the second most frequent to occur (eleven times), followed by alcohol arrests with nine incidents, and two arrests for Schedule II drugs. There were also 10 drug or alcohol-related incidents that involved the police but did not result in arrest.

A number of reasons account for this dramatic increase in drug and alcohol arrests. There is a marked difference in the amount of cooperation and information the SRO received between the 1999-2000 school year and the 2000-2001 school year. At least four of the arrests for drugs or paraphernalia were a direct result of other students contacting either the SRO or a school staff member. The SRO received reports on methods of drug delivery -- that students agree to meet to conduct a drug deal and then obtain passes out of class to accomplish it.

An additional development during the 2000-2001 school year was that offenders were more willing to talk about the locations of delivery. Offender interviews indicated that most of the sales of marijuana were occurring away from campus and that those students that were using marijuana during the school day were going away from the school for fear of being caught. One of the prime areas was Palmer Park. The park, located minutes from Wasson, is a large, naturally preserved area with numerous parking areas that are partially hidden from the main road. Although the suspects' cars can be seen from the road, it is difficult to approach the suspect cars without giving advanced warning.

Furthermore, some of the offenders stated that they utilize some of the secluded residential areas around Palmer Park. While it is encouraging to know that the students are aware of increased enforcement and are taking the activity elsewhere, displacement presents a new set of issues that will need to be dealt with in the future. However, it does show that the actions that have been taken have moved some of the activity from the campus.

Students also seem to be less likely to bring drugs to Wasson. This can be substantiated by the decreasing number of times the drug dog is alerting to lockers or cars. Since the canine searches were not yielding as many "hits," it was theorized students must have been carrying the illegal substances on their person or in their backpacks. However, when the dog searched the classrooms, it only alerted one time and there was nothing found when the student and backpack were searched.

Progress is also being made with alternatives to arrest. The SRO and the Dropout Prevention/Transition Coordinator have worked closely since the beginning of the year and their efforts have produced positive results on one individual who was arrested at the beginning of the 2000-2001 school year for a drug-related incident. To date, this student has shown marked improvement in both his personal life and academic endeavors.

Impact of the Project

The SARA project had an impact on the number of drug arrests for the 2000-2001 school year. One stakeholder felt that a number of the most serious offenders were expelled and that, since the project, there were not a lot of problem locations remaining. The stakeholders learned valuable information about where, when and how students were buying drugs and led to

increased offender apprehensions. Long-term, however, school administrators hope to see a decrease in the number of substance-abuse arrests and disciplinary actions. Therefore, while they continue to build ways to interdict before students can buy drugs or discourage drug use on campus, school administrators will continue to provide counseling and educational awareness programs and use the services of the Dropout Prevention/Transition Coordinator. In our interviews with stakeholders, they suggested that early and intensive work with 9th graders is important as well as with seniors who transfer in during the fourth quarter to try to obtain the necessary credits to graduate. Additional educational programs that target specific groups, like athletes, where there is rumored to be substance abuse, may be tried and, if successful, expanded to other after-school groups.

Interviews with offenders and tips from students are eliciting better information about what the students are using and how they are hiding it on campus. Stakeholders mentioned that they obtained information about a dealer who was hiding drugs in the computer stands in the library. Another dealer was actually selling drugs during class time. A student poured bottled water out of its container and refilled it with clear alcohol. Tips like this have led the teachers, staff, students, security and even the SRO to become more aware of their surroundings and the potential for students to use drugs and alcohol on campus.

Narcotics issues have led to more interaction with community members and the parks' units. In one park, discussions between Wasson project stakeholders, the park unit, and citizens who like to use the park disclosed that the park was being used during lunch hour for narcotics dealing. To discourage drug trafficking, the park unit started operating the sprinklers during lunch hour.

Overall, all the members felt that the partnership was a success and looked forward to continuing to work on solutions to the drug and alcohol issues at Wasson.

Section 8. Problem Solving in Schools: Summary and Recommendations

Five School Resource Officers working in five different high schools with five individual problems successfully implemented the SARA model. Each officer worked in partnership with multiple stakeholders to identify a problem, analyze it, respond to it, and assess their work. All of the projects had both qualitative and quantitative achievements. The partnerships encouraged better communication between students and SROs. Additionally, all of the stakeholders indicated that the school was perceived as safer, regardless of what police and/or school data revealed.

For the targeted problems, four out of the five schools either saw a decrease in incidents, saw less severe instances of the incidents and/or saw an increased use of alternative sanctions instead of suspension or expulsion. The schools that selected more specific problems (drugs and assaults) had an easier time showing an actual decrease in the targeted problem.

Table 1 summarizes the information about problem solving in all five high schools. It shows the schools, states their problems, enumerates the types of data collected at the analysis phase, lists the responses and assessment, and shows the impact.

Doherty High School. The largest of the five schools in our study, Doherty has a student population that reflects the general population of Colorado Springs. The SRO formed a stakeholder group of seven people from the school and the community. They identified the problem in Doherty as “disputes that pose a threat to safety.” The disputes arose because students who were suspended were harassing and bullying other students off-campus and creating situations that were uncomfortable for neighbors and businesses. Through careful analysis the SRO also identified a repeat offender who was creating a number of problems for students. The stakeholders responded with a number of tactics that led to a reduction in assaults, weapons and suspensions. We found that students felt safer, more communication occurred between businesses, the community and the school, and that faculty saw a reduction in tension at the school.

Harrison High School. The student population at Harrison is the smallest of our five schools, with about one-half the number as Doherty. Harrison is ethnically and racially diverse, with the highest percentage of Hispanics among our group. The SRO and stakeholders selected “disputes that pose a threat to safety” as its problem and basically targeted fights and disagreements in the parking lot and at lunchtime. In response to the problem, the SRO used CPTED methods to try to ease traffic congestion and parking problems. Unfortunately, a change in policy by the School District exacerbated the problem. By combining bus schedules with the middle school, more students and more congestion arose. The school acted quickly to try to remedy these problems (e.g., video cameras on buses, accommodation of buses in the parking area), but fights and disagreements continued. The good news was that instead of arrests or suspensions, alternatives such as peer mediation and parent conferences were used as a means to deal with issues between students. While suspensions and expulsions increased, a decrease in fights occurred and students felt safer overall.

Mitchell High School. A mid-sized school, Mitchell has a student population of about 1,350 of whom 61 percent are white and 39 percent are minorities. The SRO put together

the largest stakeholder group – 13 individuals participated on a regular basis. The stakeholders identified the problem as “other disorder,” which translated into loitering and littering in the neighborhood surrounding the school. The problem occurred because students sought a location to smoke cigarettes without being harassed by school administrators. But by congregating on street corners in the neighborhood and smoking and hanging out, the students created fear among the residents. To alleviate the problem, the SRO and stakeholders educated the students about loitering and littering, asked the residents to report problems to them, and invoked in-school suspensions and clean up chores to violators. This led to an observed reduction in hanging out and littering in the neighborhood. Residents complained less and communicated with the school more regularly.

Sierra High School. Sierra’s student population, like Harrison’s is ethnically and racially diverse. The SRO and stakeholders identified assaults and physical disturbances as the main problems in the school. To reduce the problem, the SRO met with over 20 different student groups, educating them about violence and seeking ways to alleviate fights. The principal and school administrators worked with other schools to bring 5,000 students and parents to the Nonviolence Peace Rally at the local sports arena. A zero-tolerance position on fights, peer mediation, increased supervision, and upgrades in standards of behavior resulted in a decrease in calls for service and the prevention of at least 12 fights. Unfortunately, the school also confronted tragedy when the SRO died at the end of the school year. His death left a void in the school and the community and resulted in the partial completion of the assessment stage.

Wasson High School. Like Mitchell High School, Wasson is a mid-size school (1,414 students) with a student population that is 64 percent white and 36 percent minority. With five stakeholders the SRO examined calls for service and arrests, results of student and faculty surveys, and discipline data to determine that drugs was of major concern. Using enforcement techniques (drug sniffing dogs, hallway sweeps, and crime stoppers), education, and prevention (Dropout Coordinator) fewer drugs were brought to the school. While more arrests occurred, alternatives were also stressed.

The Challenges

Overall, the problem solving projects were successfully completed. At the same time, the SROs and stakeholders met with and overcame a number of challenges and obstacles during the grant period. Among these challenges were: misunderstanding about the problem solving grant, changes in personnel, confusion over roles and responsibilities, stakeholder participation, access to credible data, and other priorities.

Misunderstanding about the grant. The Colorado Springs Police Department applied for the school-based partnership grant immediately after the Columbine High School tragedy. In rushing to submit the proposal to the COPS Office the SROs were asked to write a brief summary of the most serious problem or problems they faced within their schools. The accelerated turnaround time to get the information from the schools and to apply for the grant led to confusion that permeated the grant all the way to its end date. Officers and school staff assumed that because they had identified existing problems that they would be able to get funding for items to help them during the response phase. When they learned that funds could

not be used for technology and other needs, they were upset and felt that they could not implement the types of changes that would remedy the problems.

Table 1. Summary of Problem Solving Activities

High School	Problem Type	Analysis	Response	Assessment	Impact
Doherty	Disputes that pose a threat to safety – fighting, assaults, bullying	Discipline data, calls for service, interviews	Wearing ID cards; “Business Watch”; Residents videotape; SRO contacts w/victims and offenders	Assaults/weapons/suspensions reduced; faculty and students report bullying, harassment; repeat offender caught and removed; more participation by neighbors and businesses	Students feel safer; businesses communicating with the school; faculty see less tension
Harrison	Disputes that pose a threat to safety – target fights, disagreements in parking lot and lunch	Student/faculty surveys, discipline data, calls for service, interviews	Zero tolerance for fights; Intervene with repeat offenders; use CPTED; require parking permits; increase supervision at lunch	Increase in expulsions, use of peer mediation, and parent conferences; decrease in fights and assaults	Students feel safer
Mitchell	Students loitering/littering in the neighborhood	Discipline data, calls for service, observations	Increase student awareness of problem in area; in-school detention; change areas of supervision; add camera; CPTED; trash cleanup	Reduction in loitering observed; fewer complaints from neighbors; reduction in narcotics calls	Increased public communication; better understanding of problem among students
Sierra	Assaults and physical disturbances	Student/faculty surveys, discipline data, calls for service, interviews	Zero tolerance for fighting; SRO meet with groups; upgrade standards of behavior; peer mediation; increase supervision; Nonviolence Peace Rally	Decrease in calls for service; increase in reporting of fights; decrease in suspensions; at least 12 fights prevented	Could not determine the impact
Wasson	Drug activity in and around the school	Student/faculty surveys, discipline data, calls for service, arrest data	Publicize drug counseling; use student crime stoppers; ID high risk students; use hall sweeps and drug dogs; add	Increase in drug arrests; better communication with offenders; less drugs brought to Wasson; increase in	Expulsion of serious drug offenders removed much of the drug problem; better communication with users and with

			Dropout Coordinator; improve safety of Palmer Park	alternatives to arrest	the community
--	--	--	--	------------------------	---------------

Changes in personnel. Four out of five schools went through personnel changes that affected the projects. At Sierra, for example, the SRO changed after the grant was awarded to CSPD. A new principal took over for school year 2000-2001 and the assistant principal withdrew from the stakeholder group. Another stakeholder dropped out because his work schedule conflicted with the meeting times for the group. Replacements were found for these stakeholders, but the disruption created more work for the SRO who had to re-educate the new stakeholders. At Wasson, three stakeholders were replaced; at Harrison a new assistant principal joined the group; and at Mitchell students had to be replaced. In addition, at the school district level, a new superintendent and student services director took over District 2 (overseeing Harrison and Sierra).

Roles and responsibilities. Participants did not understand their specific roles as stakeholders, analysts, and responders to the problem. More importantly, three of the five schools were new to the SRO program and did not know what to expect from the SRO or CSPD about their roles and responsibilities during the school year. The learning curve for these schools was higher and steeper from the outset and the problem-solving grant exacerbated the issues.

Stakeholder participation was an on-going challenge, especially during the 2000-2001 school year. The projects all had issues such as: when to recruit stakeholders, balancing other school activities, losing or sustaining stakeholders between one school year and the next, and coordinating schedules for meetings for a majority of the stakeholders.

Access to data. Information about school discipline, attendance, and other measures were not readily available at each school. Furthermore, because the schools were part of two different school districts, uniformity of data was also an issue. Participants were frustrated by the inability to obtain access to security data due to problems caused when changing vendor software systems. Additionally, there was confusion about the level of information that would be available from the school and in the format that would be provided to users of the data.

Other priorities. As with most schools and school administrators, other needs and “hot button issues” had higher priority than the school-based project. In particular, the Colorado Scholastic Aptitude test took stakeholders away from fully participating during the Response phase.

Other Issues

The evaluators received some indications that full-time SROs may be feeling isolated, cut off from the NPU, patrol officers and even other SROs. While the evaluators did not survey all SROs, some of the SROs who participated in this project stated that they would like a forum that allows school-based officers to get together and discuss problems at their school and see if other officers may have had similar situations and discuss solutions.

Recommendations about Future School-Based POP Projects

On the basis of the comments that the evaluators received over the course of the project, the following suggestions are made for future programs of this type:

- Develop a strategic plan using the SARA model as a guideline. Include timelines, definitions of roles and responsibilities, and training documents about problem-oriented policing
- Start this type of project after an SRO has had a year within the school, so that the various roles between the SRO, security staff and administrative staff has solidified and become routine.
- Closely review school and security data to ensure that the level of detail available is sufficient for appropriate documentation, especially when it involves anonymous tips or incidents where students or staff prevent or decrease the severity of the situation. For example, teachers might forget to report preventive contacts to the stakeholders or might exclude key pieces of information such as the exact location of an incident.
- Discuss with the school the overall calendar schedule for at least a two-year period to make adequate plans to work around school testing times or other times when students or staff will be extremely busy.
- Recruit and/or replace stakeholders prior to the end of the school year to avoid the new school year activity frenzy.
- Start the procurement process for computer equipment as early as possible
- Design and collect appropriate data as early as possible to track information regarding school discipline and other activities

References

- Annual Report on School Safety* (1998). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice and U.S. Department of Education.
- Bayley, D. (1994). *Police For the Future*. NY: Oxford University Press.
- Center for the Prevention of School Violence (1996). *North Carolina's School Resource Offices: A Profile* (Research Bulletin). [<http://www.ncsu.edu/cpsv/center.html>]
- Community Policing Consortium (1994). *Understanding Community Policing: A Framework for Action* (Bureau of Justice Assistance Monograph). Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.
- Eck, J.E. and W. Spelman (1987). *Problem Solving: Problem-Oriented Policing in Newport News*. Washington DC: Police Executive Research Forum.
- Emmer, E. (1992). Recommendations for Needed Research – Goal Six: Creating Safe, Disciplined, and Drug Free Schools. Austin, TX: University of Texas.
- Goldstein, H. (1990). *Problem-Oriented Policing*. NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Gottfredson, D. C. (1988). “An Evaluation of An Organization Development Approach to Reducing School Disorder,” *Evaluation Review*, 11, 739-763.
- Gottfredson, D. C. (1997). “School-Based Crime Prevention.” In L.W. Sherman, D. Gottfredson, D. McKenzie, J. Eck, P. Reuter, and S. Bushway (eds.). *Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising: A Report to the United States Congress*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Gottfredson, D. C. (2001). *Schools and Delinquency*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Gottfredson, D. C. and G.D. Gottfredson (1999). “Program, Population, and Provider Correlates of Strength of School-Based Prevention Programs.” Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology, Toronto.
- Gottfredson, D.C., G. Gottfredson, and L. Hybl (1993). Managing Adolescent Behavior: A Multi-Year, Multi-School Study. *American Educational Research Journal*, 30, 179-215.
- Gottfredson, D.C., G. Gottfredson, and S. Skroban (1998). “Can Prevention Work Where It is Needed Most?” *Evaluation Review*, 22, 315-140.

- Gottfredson, D.C., C. Wilson, and S. Najaka (2001). "School-Based Crime Prevention." In D. Farrington, L. Sherman, and B. Welsh (eds.), *Preventing Crime*. United Kingdom: Harwood Academic Publishers.
- Gottfredson, G. D. (1984). "A Theory-Ridden Approach to Program Evaluation: A Method for Stimulating Researcher-Implementer Collaboration," *American Psychologist*, 39, 1101-1112.
- Gottfredson, G. D., T. Gore, and E. Jones (1998). *Developing School Capacity for Guardianship: An Assessment*. Ellicott City, MD: Gottfredson Associates.
- Gottfredson, G. D. and D. Gottfredson (1985). *Victimization in Schools*. NY: Plenum.
- Gottfredson, G. D. and D. Gottfredson (1987). *Using Organization Development to Improve School Climate* (Report No. 17). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools.
- Gottfredson, G. D. and D. Gottfredson (1999). "School-Level Correlates of Strength of School-Based Prevention Programs." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology, Toronto.
- G. Gottfredson, D. Gottfredson, E. Czeh, D. Cantor, S. Crosse, and I. Hantman (2000). *Summary: National Study of Delinquency Prevention in Schools*. Ellicott City, MD: Gottfredson Associates, Inc.
- Kennedy, D., A. Piehl, and A. Braga (1996). "Youth Gun Violence in Boston: Gun Markets, Serious Youth Offenders, and a Use Reduction Strategy," Boston, MA: Kennedy School of Government.
- Kenney, D. and T. S. Watson (1998). *Crime in the Schools: Reducing Fear and Disorder with Student Problem Solving*. Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum.
- Maguire, E., K. Hassell, and C. Uchida (2001). *Problem-Oriented Policing in Colorado Springs*. Silver Spring, MD: 21st Century Solutions, Inc.
- Maguire, E., J. Kuhns, C. Uchida and S. Cox (1999). "Measuring Community Policing at the Agency Level," unpublished manuscript, University of Nebraska at Omaha.
- National Association of School Resource Officers (1999). "Training Announcement: 40 Hour Basic School Resource Officer Course," [<http://www.nasro.org>].
- Reaves, B. and A. Goldberg (1999). *Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics, 1997*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Reaves, B. and A. Goldberg (2000). *Local Police Departments 1997*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Riley, P and J. McDaniel (1999). "School Resource Officers: What We Know, What We Think We Know, What We Need to Know," Paper presented at the NIJ Conference on School Safety, Washington, DC.

Sherman, L. J. Shaw, and D. Rogan (1995). *The Kansas City Gun Experiment: Research in Brief*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Small, M. and K. Tetrick (2001). "School Violence: An Overview." *Juvenile Justice*, Vol. VIII, No. 1, June: 3-12.

Trump, K. (2001). *2001 NASRO School Resource Officer Survey*. Boynton Beach FL: NASRO.

Uchida, C., S. Solomon, E. Maguire, K. Hassell (2000). *Evaluating the Colorado Springs Community Policing Demonstration Center: A Report on the Patrol Officer Survey*. Silver Spring, MD: 21st Century Solutions, Inc.