

Final Report for Project STOP AY 01-02

The following report presents a final revision of the evaluation for the STOP Project, AY 01-02. The final report includes baseline and year-end grades for two of the largest schools, Martin Luther King Middle School and Thomas Jefferson Middle School, and partial baseline and year-end data for North Fork, Oak Creek Intermediate and Wilson Intermediate Schools. In addition, partial baseline data and year-end data was also taken from Dairyland Elementary, Opportunity School, and Webster School.

Overall Statistics Inclusive of CY January-March 2002

Juvenile arrest rates per 100,000 population

Madera County's overall juvenile arrest rate is 6527 per 100,000¹. This figure will be compared to the arrest percentages of the juveniles in STOP. Because the numbers of arrests for the STOP Program is so low, calculation of rates will not yield reliable statistical estimates. Therefore, in this report, we used percentages instead of rates.

Successful completion of probation

No juveniles completed probation during the 01/02 fiscal year time frame. Only one juvenile was placed on probation in regards to a truancy matter. The juvenile is currently under probation supervision.

Successful completion of restitution and court-ordered community service responsibilities

No juveniles completed restitution or court ordered community. Since the program is truancy related, restitution is not an issued. One juvenile was ordered community service and has not yet completed this responsibility.

¹ The source for arrest and juvenile population figures is the California Department of Justice; Juvenile Justice Profiles, 1990 - 2000 (Tables 3C and 4C) Offense by County and Population Statewide. The juvenile arrest rate per 100,000 of juvenile population has been projected by taking the total juvenile arrests, divided by the total juvenile population and multiplying by 100,000 per county, per year.

Arrest, incarceration and probation violation rates of the program participants:

The following Table 1 shows the numbers of STOP Participants who have experienced other difficulties with law enforcement agencies. As can be seen, few students have other law enforcement difficulties. The percentages are based on N=314, for the available records where information was included on legal intervention background. Only a small minority of the students experienced serious problems with the legal system, making them excellent participants for early prevention and intervention. Table 1 shows other law enforcement intervention experienced by the STOP participants.

Law Enforcement Intervention and problems other than truancy	Number	%
Probation previous contact with family	177	56.37
Other law enforcement intervention	67	21.34
Arrested	9	2.90
Misdemeanor offenses	64	20.38
Incarcerated	10	2.90
Status offense	4	1.27
Problems other than truancy	5	1.59
Felony offense	5	1.59
Repeated Grade	37	11.78
Dropped the Program	45	13.0

Table 1 Law Enforcement Intervention

The repeated grade category, including 12% of the students, is an established risk factor for truancy and dropout, as well as delinquency. The high percent of misdemeanor offenses is also a cause for concern.

Project STOP Other Client Statistics

As can be seen in **Table 2**, the STOP program effectively retained a high caseload of students and effectively kept them from advancement to Steps 3 or higher of the STOP Sequence.

Step	Number	Percent of Total
Step 1 Referral is made	346	100
Step 2 Initial parent meeting with Probation Officer	76	22.0
Step 3 Parent meeting	20	5.8
Step 4 Meeting scheduled	5	1.4
Step 5 Student's last step before court	2	0.6

Table 2 Step 1-Step 5

Table 3 gives reasons for inactivity. As can be seen, most of the students are inactive due to transfers or moving out of the district. The STOP Program effectively retained a high caseload.

STOP Inactive reason	N	% of inactive cases
Moved	13	28.9
Referred in error	6	13.3
Ward of the court (602)	11	24.5
Transferred different school	15	33.3
Total inactive (final number)	45	100.0

Table 3 STOP Inactive/Reason

School Contextual Variables

The school context for many of the students is indicative of the overall achievement of individual students and an indicator of risk. **Table 4** is an indicator of the poverty status and the risk factor of the academic performance of the students in the program. Many of the STOP schools show low API with some improvement (**Table 5**). The intervention school sites have shown some growth from 2000-01, but one of the largest schools, Thomas

Jefferson Middle School, declined from 2000-01 as indicated by the academic performance index scores in **Table 5**. Scores are based on SAT-9 performance and other academic indicators. A school's API gives a measure of academic risk applicable to the school level of analysis.

In addition, many of the students attend schools where a majority of students come from low-income families, as shown by statistics on free or reduced lunches at the intervention schools (see **Table 4**) during AY 2000-01, the most current year for which reliable data is available from the California Department of Education. Only Oak Creek and Webster Schools do not have majority low-income families.

School	Percent Free or Reduced Lunches-School Year 2000-01
Dairyland Elementary	63.4%
Jefferson (Thomas) Middle	63.2%
King (Martin Luther Jr.) Middle	78.6%
North Fork Elementary	52.6%
Oak Creek Intermediate	27.4%
Opportunity School	100.0%
Webster Elementary	24.7%
Wilson Elementary	73.0%
Source: California Dept. of Education, Educational Demographics Unit, 2002	

Table 4 Schools: Free or reduced lunch as an indicator of poverty status

SCHOOL NAME	% TESTED	API01	API00	GROWTH	% GROWTH	TARGET	MET COMP TARGET?	MET SCHOOL-WIDE AND COMP TARGET?
Dairyland Elementary	100	676	620	56	9%	9	Yes	Yes
Jefferson (Thomas) Middle	97	595	615	-20	-3%	9	No	No
King (Martin Luther Jr.) Middle	99	522	511	11	2%	14	No	No
North Fork Elementary	99	704	711	-7	-1%	4	No	No
Oak Creek Intermediate	98	867	823	44	5%	NA	Yes	Yes
Webster Elementary	99	787	795	-8	-1%	1	No	No
Wilson Elementary	100	554	568	-14	-2%	12	No	No

Source: California Department of Education, Educational Demographics Unit, 2002.

Table 5 Schools API DATA

Number of STOP Participants by School

Table 6 below shows the total number of students participating in STOP by school as of 6/22/2002. The majority of students attend either Martin Luther King Middle School or Thomas Jefferson School Middle School (205 or 59.3% of the total caseload).

School Site	Frequency	Percent
Thomas Jefferson	101	29.2
Martin Luther King	104	30.1
Wilson Middle School	47	13.6
Oak Creek Intermediate	29	8.4
Webster Elementary	25	7.2
North Fork Elementary	19	5.5
Dairyland Elementary	12	3.5
Enterprise Secondary	9	2.6
Total	346	100.0

Table 6 School Site

Ethnic Breakdowns

Table 7 breaks down STOP participants by ethnicity. There are 164 males and 150 females (52.2 and 47.8% respectively). The largest ethnic group represented in the STOP program is Hispanic, with 56.4% of the students of Hispanic ethnicity.

Ethnicity	Number	Percent of Active Participants
Hispanic	195	56.4
Non-Hispanic White	108	31.2
African American	7	2.2
Native American	4	1.3
Asian	2	0.6
Total with data on ethnicity	316	91.3
Missing ethnicity data	30	8.3
Total	346	100.0

Table 7 Ethnic Breakdowns

System Interventions

Table 8 shows other system interventions experienced by the STOP participants. As can be seen, a good percentage of students have other psychosocial risk factors that may affect attendance at school and grades, but some are receiving interventions, such as Boys and Girls Club, Cal-Learn or therapy. The percentages and numbers vary from the other tables because there are 314 students that have completed documentation of other system intervention.

Intervention (total N=314 for system interventions data)	Number	Percentage
Documented poverty level or below (reduced or free lunch)	134	55.1
Known to CPS (family)	106	43.6
Therapy (student)	33	13.6
Currently not residing with family/non-family members in residence	21	9.1
Boys and Girls Club enrollee (as a percentage of 314 cases)	28	8.9
ESL classes (student)	21	8.6
Family member on probation	19	7.8
TANF	16	6.6
Family member incarcerated	10	4.1
Parent in parenting classes	10	4.1
Family member on parole	9	3.7
Parents in Adult Education	4	1.6
Student in Cal-Learn	1	0.4

Table 8-Other Interventions Received by Families of Students In STOP

Baseline Grade Point Averages

This section compares data across years for the entire group of students, as seen in **Tables 9-10**. As can be seen, this group of participants tends toward academic problems, and early intervention such as that offered by STOP is essential to assisting students to improve their grades. Those getting additional probation contact with families tended towards higher GPA's in both semesters. Students getting probation contact with the family showed significant improvement at the end of the academic year, in that their second semester mean GPA was significantly higher than the other group.

Additional probation contact with family ("intense case management")		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
First Semester GPA	Did not receive	73	1.9037	1.00036	.11708
	Received	122	2.0948	1.08780	.09848
Second Semester GPA	Did not receive	61	1.6967	1.00070	.12813
	Received	121	2.0358	1.03821	.09438

Table 9: Group Statistics

t-test for Equality of Means Comparing the two intervention groups (additional probation contact vs. none)							
	t	df	Sig. 2-tailed	Mean Difference	S.E. of differ- ence	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
GPA at beginning of AY 01-02						Lower	Upper
	-1.249	161.747	.213	-.1912	.1530	-.49328	.11097
Second semester GPA							
	-2.131	124.459	.035	-.3391	.1591	-.65406	-.02413

Table 10 Independent Samples Test

The report shows the progress made by the STOP Program and attests to the effectiveness of the intervention in halting the progress from first truancy to possible court action. Given the risk status of the students enrolled in this program, the ability to keep students out of further trouble is remarkable. The STOP Program substantiates the effectiveness of the program, because it shows the majority of the resources were being used in early intention and prevention. The majority of the students were in Step 1 and 2, which further attests to the effectiveness of the increased case contact of the probation officer with the family and the student. The Step Process involves 5 Steps with sub-levels in Step 1 and Step 2. Therefore, increased contact by the probation officer was associated with a significant increase in G.P.A. from the baseline to the end of the academic year. There was a significant difference between the group without probation contact and the group with substantial contact from the probation officer. The "case managed" group (additional probation contact with the family) showed significantly higher G.P.A. than the other group at the end of the year.

Conclusions

This report attests to the effectiveness of STOP in preventing further advancement to SARB and other sanctions that follow repeated trancies. Students whose families received more intense case management from the probation officers were more likely to do better in school, as shown by higher grade point averages among the group getting additional probation contact with the family.

While there is no comparison group in this evaluation study, the students were followed for an entire academic year, and grades from the beginning to the end were tracked. Based on grades and on the records of interactions kept by the probation officers, it is clear that their hard work paid off in improved grades and avoidance of additional truancy.

The incarceration, arrest and felony percentages in this group were low as well, in comparison to the juvenile arrest rates and felony rates at the county level. It can be concluded that STOP is an effective program in both prevention of truancy and in further contact with law enforcement. Early intervention paid off in lower truancy, higher grades and less crime among this group of juveniles.