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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Safe Schools Healthy Students (SS/HS) initiative brought $9 million to Albuquerque Public Schools (APS) to support violence prevention and the development of safe and healthy learning environments for students. A cornerstone of the initiative was bringing together the school district with diverse community partners, including local law enforcement agencies, mental health service providers, early childhood agencies, and juvenile justice agencies.

OUTCOMES

Some of the major outcomes of the collaborative Albuquerque SS/HS initiative included:

- The development of formal and informal inter-agency partnerships aimed at improving school safety and preventing violence

- **Joint training of law enforcement** from the Albuquerque Police Department, the Bernalillo County Sheriff’s Department, and the APS Police Department as School Resource Officers, shifting their focus to violence prevention and resource-sharing

- The founding of the New Mexico Association of School Resource Officers

- **A 53% reduction** in the number of students referred to the juvenile justice system

- The discovery that students who received Health and Wellness services both before and after their first discipline infraction were half as likely to have a second infraction

- The development of a permanent Bullying and Violence Prevention Coordinator position, housed in the APS Student, Family, and Community Supports Division

- The development of the Don’t Just Stand There anti-bullying task force, made up of members from APS, the University of New Mexico, Bernalillo County, and others, that will continue to conduct an anti-bullying campaign after the life cycle of the SS/HS grant

- **A 93% increase in mental health service provision** to the most high-need students

- The development of a cross-agency home visitation work group that collaborates to provide services to at-risk families with children ages zero to three

- The training of over 1,500 school and agency staff members, along with parents, in the Nurtured Heart Approach, which enhances healthy outcomes for children and families
**Systems Change**

The SS/HS initiative also generated major systems changes within APS and the partner agencies. These included:

- **Increased collaboration with community partners.** The themes of working collaboratively, improving community partnerships and linkages, and building relationships, were woven throughout the grant’s activities. Ongoing collaborations between APS and various community partners resulted in improved personal and departmental relationships, shared capacity building, resource-sharing across agencies, shared training and professional development opportunities, innovative and creative programmatic approaches, and ultimately, better service provision to students and families.

- **Creation of district-level and community infrastructure to support ongoing school safety and violence prevention.** The development and implementation of new policies, procedures, positions, and data collection systems will ensure that several grant-funded activities will continue into the future.

- **Shifts in philosophy.** There have been several philosophical shifts in the ways district staffs, community agencies, and school staff members approach collaborative relationships with one another, school safety, and student behavior. These include moving the focus from reactive to proactive strategies, and moving from a punitive model for student offenders to one that focuses on positive youth development and violence prevention.

**Lessons Learned**

The SS/HS initiative changed how the school district and community agencies work together. Over the course of the five-year grant, initiative organizers learned several important lessons:

1. **Collaboration between a large school district and community agencies and organizations nets significant gains for students.** In APS, tangible benefits were noted in reductions in the number of students referred to the juvenile justice system, improved provision of mental health services, and more coordinated early childhood services.

2. **Multi-agency collaboration is often challenging, but barriers can be overcome** by having an outside facilitator, sharing data, hosting joint professional development, rallying around a single issue, and celebrating successes together.

3. **Evidence-based programs are difficult to implement to fidelity** in a large school district, due in part to training requirements, cost, and established school schedules and policies.

4. **Support from district leadership and individual school administrators is vital** for the success of programmatic efforts. Securing leadership support early in the initiative process creates a more effective initiative overall.
I. INTRODUCTION

Safe Schools Healthy Students (SS/HS) is a federal initiative born from collaboration between the U.S. Departments of Health and Human Services, Education, and Justice with the goal of creating safe and secure schools and preventing school violence. Safe school environments are essential to promoting healthy student development and academic success, and they help students and their families feel connected to their communities.

Addressing issues that threaten the safety of the school environment—such as bullying, fighting, substance abuse, and inadequate provision of mental health services—requires a community-wide approach; schools cannot solve these problems on their own. A cornerstone of the SS/HS initiative was the development of a school-community partnership that includes representatives of the local school district, law enforcement agencies, mental health agencies, and juvenile justice agencies. Together, these partners worked to create new services, integrate existing ones, and implement a community-wide plan for change to contribute to safe, respectful, and drug-free school environments while promoting vital social skills and healthy childhood development. The initiative focused on five major elements:

- Element One: Safe School Environments and Violence Prevention Activities
- Element Two: Alcohol, Tobacco, and Other Drug Prevention Activities
- Element Three: Student Behavioral, Social, and Emotional Supports
- Element Four: Mental Health Services
- Element Five: Early Childhood Social and Emotional Learning Program

The Albuquerque SS/HS initiative began in 2008, with $2.4 million of federal funding per year for four years. SS/HS activities continued in a fifth, no-cost extension year. The initiative officially ended in June 2013, but activities and partnerships created by SS/HS will continue long beyond the life cycle of the grant. This evaluation report describes progress made towards the initiative’s goals and objectives, highlights some of the major evaluation activities undertaken during the grant, and explores the long-lasting systems changes in the school district and greater community resulting from the initiative.

SS/HS MANAGEMENT – THE CORE TEAM

Albuquerque Public Schools (APS) was the lead agency in the collaborative SS/HS initiative, providing oversight of programs and services as specified in the logic model, ensuring compliance with federal audit and reporting requirements, submitting annual progress reports, and coordinating local collaboration. The SS/HS Program Manager was housed in APS’ Coordinated School Health Department (previously the Health and Wellness Department), a part of the Student, Family, and Community Supports Division (SFCS). The Program Manager also served as the lead for the SS/HS Core Team, the collaborative body made up of community partners that helped guide the initiative’s activities. By the end of the funding cycle, the Core Team was made up of the following members:

- Albuquerque Public Schools, Student, Family and Community Supports Division
- Albuquerque Public Schools, Early Childhood Programs
The Southwest Family Guidance Center, YDI, and New Day Youth and Family Services joined the Core Team in 2010 as a result of several community-wide summits focusing on juvenile justice and early childhood collaboration. The Bernalillo County Sheriff’s Department (BCSO) and the Albuquerque Police Department (APD) joined the initial Core Team in 2009, and participated through 2011.

The Core Team also developed a Juvenile Justice Action Team and participated in a number of advisory committees representing different sectors of the community: the School-Wide Positive Behavioral Supports (SWPBS) Advisory Council, the APS Early Childhood Collaborative, the Children’s Court’s Alternative to Detention Steering Committee, the APS SS/HS Coordination Committee, the Student Advisory Council, and the Bernalillo County Youth Coalition.

The current SS/HS Core Team members are committed to continue and expand upon the partnerships and projects established by the SS/HS initiative. In the last Core Team meeting in May 2013, the Southwest Family Guidance Center agreed to sustain the functions of facilitating and coordinating partnership activities, with the first follow-up meeting set for August 2013. The Core Team will follow-up on team goals and replicate successful pilot projects supporting safe schools and healthy students.

SS/HS ACTIVITIES

The Core Team and SS/HS staff developed a logic model to guide the initiative’s activities, focusing on the five elements listed above. The complete logic model can be found in Appendix A.

Table 1 lists the major activities supported by the initiative, and indicates whether or not activities were completed or not, and whether or not they will be sustained into the future. Objectives are shown in bold; objective outcomes are discussed in greater detail in Chapter III.
### TABLE 1. SUMMARY OF PROJECT STATUS BY ELEMENT, OBJECTIVE AND ACTIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELEMENT 1: SAFE SCHOOL ENVIRONMENTS AND VIOLENCE PREVENTION ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>Activity Implementation</th>
<th>Activity Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives/Activities</strong></td>
<td>F=Fully Implemented</td>
<td>S= Sustained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P=Partially Implemented</td>
<td>NS=Not Sustained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Decrease the percentage of 9th grade students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in seven high schools who did not go to school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one or more days during the past 30 days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because they felt unsafe at school or on their</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>way to and from school by 5% from baseline to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2012.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Decrease the percentage of 9th grade students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in seven high schools who have been in a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physical fight on school property in the 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>months prior to the survey by 5% from baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to October 2012.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1, 2.1 Provide positive outreach to</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identified school-age gang members and their</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>families to support them in transition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>away from gang and violent activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2, 2.2 Provide gang awareness training to</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school staff and parents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3, 2.3 Provide training to APS School Resource</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers (SROs) in school safety issues,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de-escalation, and mediation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4, 2.4 Coordinate community-wide meetings to</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improve coordination of prevention programming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in APS schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Decrease the percentage of parents and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guardians who do not agree that their children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are safe at APS schools by 5% from baseline to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2012.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Conduct education and distribute</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information regarding school safety programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and outcomes, crisis management procedures,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and safety policies to staff, students, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>families.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Update school site safety plans and</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inform parents about school safety plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Buy equipment for (SROs) in 12 high schools</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Year One and inform parents and community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about the intent and use of this equipment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Decrease the rate of office behavioral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>referrals related to violence in School-Wide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Behavioral Supports (SWPBS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementing schools by 10% from baseline to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2012.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Develop district SWPBS organizational</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>structures to guide district action plans and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secure resources and support for sustainable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Provide technical assistance and training</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for 32 schools to develop, monitor, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implement effective SWPBS teams, action plans,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and behavior systems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Train and coordinate 32 SWPBS coaches to</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provide on-site training and guidance for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWPBS implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Deliver presentations to 10 schools per</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>year in Year One and Year Two that express an</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interest in implementing SWPBS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Use School-Wide Information Systems (SWIS) at 25 schools and customize APS student information system (SchoolMax).</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ELEMENT 2: ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, AND OTHER DRUG PREVENTION ACTIVITIES

1. Decrease the percentage of 9th grade students in seven high schools who report current (30 day) marijuana use by 10% from baseline to October 2012.

2. Decrease the percentage of 9th grade students in seven high schools who report current (30 day) alcohol use by 10% from baseline to October 2012.

1.1, 2.1 Seven Project SUCCESS/Crossroads counselors will provide substance abuse education, counseling, referral, and awareness raising services in eight high schools. | F | S |

1.2, 2.2 Provide Parent Involvement Program (PIP) classes to students and parents at ten high schools including one alternative high school. | F | S |

1.3, 2.3 Provide Project ALERT substance abuse prevention classes for students at 24 middle schools (six per year). | P | NS |

### ELEMENT 3: STUDENT BEHAVIORAL, SOCIAL, AND EMOTIONAL SUPPORTS

1. Increase the percentage of 9-12 grade students who report participating in pro-social extracurricular activities at school and/or in pro-social group activities outside of home and school by at least 5% from baseline to October 2012.

1.1 Provide access to innovative free and/or affordable pro-social activities during and after school hours for high school students. | F | NS |

1.2 Design and conduct a youth-driven social marketing campaign to increase participation in pro-social activities. | F | NS |

2. Increase the percentage of 9-12 grade students who report having an engaged, caring, and supportive adult at home, school, and/or in the community by 5% from baseline to October 2012.

3. Increase the percentage of parents who agree that APS provides sufficient information and opportunity for parent engagement by 6% from baseline to May 2012.

2.1 Seven APS Family Liaison Specialists will provide training, coordination, and coaching in parent involvement strategies based on the Epstein Model for staff and parents at 14 schools each year. | P | NS |

2.2 APS will coordinate with New Mexico Parent Information and Resource Center/PRO, ENLACE, and other family engagement community organizations to offer family engagement services to a minimum of four schools. | F | NS |

2.3 Develop partnerships with community mentoring agencies to extend mentoring opportunities to students. | P | NS |
| 2.4 | Provide school-wide training to staff in suicide signs and bullying prevention to enhance their ability to provide safe, supportive, and caring environments. Safe School Ambassador training will be provided for students in a minimum of three schools. | F | S |
| 2.5 | Provide ASCA Model Training to 240 APS counselors to enhance their ability to provide and connect students with social, emotional, and behavioral supports. | F | S |
| 3.3 | An interactive, user-friendly website will be designed to coordinate and provide information on 1) parent engagement opportunities, 2) pro-social activities for students, and 3) state, city, county, and APS resources and initiatives. | F | S |

**ELEMENT 4: MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES**

| 1 | Increase the number of students receiving school-based mental health services by 10% from baseline to May 2010. |
| 1.1 | Expand the Brief Family Counseling Program to two more clusters currently without services to provide counseling and facilitate referral to local public mental health agencies. | F | NS |
| 1.2 | Increase the number of schools with contracted community mental health providers who provide on-site therapeutic services. | F | NS |
| 1.3 | Implement a suicide prevention campaign/event designed by and for youth each year to inform youth about community services available. | F | NS |
| 2 | Increase the percentage of mental health referrals for students that result in mental health services being provided in the community by 8% from baseline to May 2012. |
| 2.1 | Develop formal agreements and procedures to coordinate mental health services in the community for youth with more serious health problems. | F | S |
| 2.2 | Assist students and families in finding appropriate behavioral services in the community and facilitate interagency agreements between schools, juvenile justice, and residential centers. | F | S |
| 2.3 | Promote early identification of youth with mental health issues through training of city and community center staff using the Typical or Troubled curriculum. | F | NS |
| 2.4 | Collect referral and follow-through data on Health and Wellness Team referral forms and provide teams and principals with monthly feedback reports that list community-based student referrals and whether each student actually received services. | F | S |

**ELEMENT 5: EARLY CHILDHOOD SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL LEARNING PROGRAMS**

| 1 | Improve the quality of early childhood collaboration and service delivery as perceived by early childhood stakeholders in Albuquerque/Bernalillo County by May 2011. |
1.1 Assist Early Childhood agencies and stakeholder groups set clear and comprehensive goals, strategies, and processes to facilitate continuous improvement in collaboration and service delivery. | F | S 

2 Provide screening to 200 children each year age five and younger who would otherwise not be screened for social, emotional, and behavioral development and school readiness through May 2012. 

2.1 Two nurses and one health assistant will provide developmental screenings to 200 children ages 0-5 within the Albuquerque/Bernalillo County area per year. | P | NS 

3 Provide appropriate social and emotional follow-up services for 55 children and their families identified through developmental screenings each year through May 2012. 

3.1 Provide services to children identified through developmental screenings, home visitation programs, using Parents as Teachers and Born to Learn. Family Facilitators will visit 55 families per year on a weekly basis. | P | S 

3.2 Provide intensive services for children with mental health disabilities and their families, including home visitation and referrals to local public mental health agencies when treatment is indicated. | P | S 

3.3 Develop universal family mental health and social service referral policies and procedures for the Albuquerque/Bernalillo County community as a whole. | F | S 

3.4 Provide training in Parents as Teachers and Born to Learn to APS and City of Albuquerque staff. | F | S 

3.5 Provide training in the Nurtured Heart Approach to parents, APS staff, City of Albuquerque staff, and Community Agency staff. | F | S 

**CULTURAL CONTEXT AND POPULATION SERVED**

APS is comprised of 89 elementary, 27 middle, 13 high, 11 alternative schools, and 33 charter schools, which serve nearly 90,000 students. Approximately two thirds of the APS student population is Hispanic, 23% is Caucasian (White), 5% is Native American, 3% is Black, and 2% is Asian. 66% of all APS students qualify for Free and Reduced Priced Lunch.

To meet the needs of the community and its diverse student population, the SS/SH staff and Core Team focused implementation activities on three APS clusters with the highest needs (Rio Grande, Highland, and West Mesa clusters). A complete list of the major programs implemented by school and year can be found in Appendix B.

SS/HS funds were also used to support the hiring of bilingual counselors, and provide mental health services to undocumented and homeless students. Materials such as a bullying prevention brochure were also made available in Spanish. SS/HS implemented alternative, free, after-school programs in numerous high schools to provide access to pro-social activities for students who do not participate in traditional high school activities and have limited financial resources.
II. PROJECT GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND OUTCOMES

The main intents of the SS/HS Initiative as defined by the Core Team were to 1) Close the community’s gaps in services, 2) Ensure effective change in, and access to, resources, policies, programs, and services, 3) Implement an integrated, comprehensive community-wide plan designed to create safe, respectful, and drug-free school environments, and 4) Promote pro-social skills and healthy childhood development in Albuquerque-area youth.

After their initial planning retreat in 2009, the Core Team agreed on five priorities: 1) Focus attention on programs and activities that promote the increase of pro-social behavior, 2) Highlight approaches that work, 3) Provide multiple opportunities to educate each other on what each agency is doing, 4) Focus on schools within three clusters, and 5) Look for specific opportunities to pilot systems change initiatives.

The specific goals and objectives as relating to the SS/HS elements are outlined below. Six of the objectives were required by the SS/HS initiative to conform to the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA). The complete GRPA report covering all four years and the no-cost extension year can be found in Appendix C.

ELEMENT ONE OUTCOMES

Element One Goal: Increase safety, security, and peaceful conduct at every APS school within a safe, respectful, and drug-free environment so that teachers and students can focus on learning.

OBJECTIVE 1

GPRA 1: The percentage of ninth grade students in seven high schools who report missing one or more days of school during the previous 30 days because they felt unsafe at school or on the way to and from school will decrease 5% from baseline to October 2012 as measured by student responses to the NM Youth Risk and Resiliency Survey (YRRS)\(^1\).

Data for this indicator was obtained from the Project SUCCESS/Crossroads Prevention Education Series (PES) Survey, rather than the NM YRRS due to the annual availability of the data. Data were collected in the fall of each year, after students participated in Project SUCCESS. Data for 2013 were collected in the spring semester, after the PES curriculum was implemented.

\(^1\) The original GPRA measure read “Decrease the percentage of 9-12 graders in five high schools who did not go to school one or more days during the past 30 days because they felt unsafe at school or on their way to and from school by 5% from baseline to October 2012.” This target was narrowed to ninth graders only because data was available for annual data collection, rather than biannually for 9-12\(^{th}\) graders. Targets, baseline, and actual performance figures were updated for GPRA measures 1-4 during Year Two, and are shown in this section using only ninth grade data obtained from surveys as part of the Project SUCCESS/Crossroads Prevention Education Series Survey.
TABLE 2. GOAL 1, OBJECTIVE 1 RESULTS – STUDENTS FEELING SAFE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator, Project SUCCESS/Crossroads Prevention Education Series Survey</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Baseline 2008</th>
<th>Year 1 2009</th>
<th>Year 2 2010</th>
<th>Year 3 2011</th>
<th>Year 4 2012</th>
<th>Year 5 2013</th>
<th>Percent change: (Baseline to 2013)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of students who responded “one or more days” to the question: “During the past 30 days, on how many days did you not go to school because you felt unsafe at school or on your way to or from school?”</td>
<td>7.7% or less</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>8% decrease</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This objective was met in Years Two and Five of the SS/HS initiative. In addition, the 2011 YRRS for Albuquerque Public Schools showed that 7.4% of students missed school due to feeling unsafe. Due to larger sample sizes, the YRRS is likely more accurate, and is reflective of a trend towards greater school safety in APS schools.

OBJECTIVE 2

**GPRA 2: The percentage of ninth grade students in seven high schools who are involved in a physical fight on school property during the previous 12 months will decrease by 5% from baseline to October 2012 as measured by student responses to the NM Youth Risk and Resiliency Survey.**

Data for this objective were also obtained from the Project SUCCESS/Crossroads Prevention Education Series survey, administered each fall. Data for 2013 were collected in the spring semester.

TABLE 3. GOAL 1, OBJECTIVE 2 RESULTS – FIGHTING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator, Project SUCCESS/Crossroads Prevention Education Series Survey</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Baseline 2008</th>
<th>Year 1 2009</th>
<th>Year 2 2010</th>
<th>Year 3 2011</th>
<th>Year 4 2012</th>
<th>Year 5 2013</th>
<th>Percent change: (Baseline to 2013)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of students who responded “one or more times” to the question: “During the past 12 months, how many times were you in a physical fight on school property?”</td>
<td>21.1% or less</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>30% decrease</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2 This measure was also adjusted from originally measuring 9-12th graders to only ninth graders.
This objective was met and surpassed each year, with increasingly better results over the span of the SS/SH initiative. Year Five showed a total decrease of 30% over the baseline, far surpassing the objective of a 5% decrease in the number of ninth graders who reported being involved in a physical fight on campus.

2011 YRRS data for Albuquerque Public Schools showed even greater progress, and indicated that only 13% of students had engaged in a physical fight on school property in the 12 months prior.

**OBJECTIVE 3**

*Decrease the percentage of parents and guardians who do not agree that their children are safe at APS schools by 5% from baseline to May 2012.*

Data for this objective were obtained from the district’s Quality of Education Parent Survey, administered each spring.

**TABLE 4. GOAL 1, OBJECTIVE 3 RESULTS – PARENT SURVEY ON SCHOOL SAFETY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator, APS Quality of Education Parent Survey</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Baseline 2008</th>
<th>Year 1 2009</th>
<th>Year 2 2010</th>
<th>Year 3 2011</th>
<th>Year 4 2012</th>
<th>Year 5 2013</th>
<th>Percent change: (Baseline to 2013)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of parents who disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement:</td>
<td>6.6% or less</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>24% decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“My child is safe at school.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentage of parents who disagree that their children are safe in school declined steadily over the course of the SS/HS initiative. The target was met and surpassed every year, and by 2013, there was a total 24% decrease from baseline, far surpassing the 5% target decrease.

**OBJECTIVE 4**

*Decrease the rate of office behavioral referrals related to violence in SWPBS-implementing schools by 10% from baseline to May 2012.*

Data were obtained from APS SchoolMax obtained through the NM State Accountability Reporting System for schools implementing School-Wide Positive Behavior Supports (SWPBS).

**TABLE 5. GOAL 1, OBJECTIVE 4 RESULTS – VIOLENCE INFRACTIONS AT SWPBS SCHOOLS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator, APS SchoolMax</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Baseline 2008-09 SY</th>
<th>Year 1 2009-10 SY</th>
<th>Year 2 2010-11 SY</th>
<th>Year 3 2011-12 SY</th>
<th>Year 4 2012-13 SY</th>
<th>Percent change: (Baseline to 2013)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average rate of violence-related infractions per 100 students at schools implementing SWPBS</td>
<td>11 or fewer</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36% decrease</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This objective was achieved in 2008-09, 2011-12, and 2012-13, showing an overall 36% reduction in violence-related referrals at schools implementing SWPBS.

**ELEMENT TWO OUTCOMES**

**Element Two Goal:** Reduce and prevent substance use and abuse among Albuquerque-area youth by coordinating strategies that address change at the individual, classroom, school, family, and community levels.

**Objective 1**

*GRPA 3: The percentage of ninth grade students in seven high schools who report using marijuana on one or more occasions during the previous 30 days will decrease 10% from baseline to October 2012, as measured by student responses to the NM Youth Risk and Resiliency Survey.*

Data for this objective were obtained each fall from the Project SUCCESS/Crossroads Prevention Education Series Survey. Data for 2013 were available only for the spring semester.

**TABLE 6. GOAL 2, OBJECTIVE 1 RESULTS – MARIJUANA USAGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator, Project SUCCESS/Crossroads Prevention Education Series Survey</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Baseline 2008</th>
<th>Year 1 2009</th>
<th>Year 2 2010</th>
<th>Year 3 2011</th>
<th>Year 4 2012</th>
<th>Year 5 2013</th>
<th>Percent change: (Baseline to 2012)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of students who responded “one or more times” to the question:</td>
<td>24.7% or less</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td><strong>24.1%</strong></td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>12% decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“During the past 30 days, how many times did you use marijuana?”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This measure was met in the Year Four of the SS/HS initiative. Since 2003, APS figures regarding marijuana use have mirrored statewide figures showing no upward or downward trend but suggesting a persistently high prevalence level of 9-12 grade current, 30-day marijuana use. Results from the 2011 Youth Risk Behavior Survey show that 28% of New Mexico high school students used marijuana one or more times in the preceding 30 days, compared to 23% of high school students nationwide.

Despite the persistently high rates of marijuana usage in New Mexico, evaluation results suggest the SS/HS-funded Project SUCCESS/Crossroads program may be having a positive impact on APS students’ harm perceptions and intentions to use marijuana. Results from the 2011-12 Prevention Education Series Survey showed the following positive changes from pre-test to post-test:

- The percentage of students saying they would *definitely not* smoke marijuana in the next six months increased from 48% to 55%.

---

3 As noted under Element One, objectives for GPRA 1-4 were changed from 9-12 graders to ninth graders only, in order to obtain annual data.
- The percentage of students saying marijuana causes *a lot of harm* increased from 26% to 38%.
- The percentage of students saying they *know a lot* about where to find help if they want to quit using tobacco, alcohol or other drugs increased from 22% to 37%.

Project SUCCESS/Crossroads will be sustained beyond the life cycle of the SS/HS initiative through the Student, Family, and Community Supports Division (SFCS).

**OBJECTIVE 2**

*GPRA 4: The percentage of ninth grade students in seven high schools who report consuming alcohol on one or more occasions during the previous 30 days will decrease 10% from baseline to October 2012, as measured by student responses to the NM Youth Risk and Resiliency Survey.*

As with GPRA measures 1-3, data for this objective were obtained each fall from the Project SUCCESS/Crossroads Prevention Education Series Survey rather than from the NM YRRS. Data for 2013 were available only for the spring semester.

**TABLE 7. GOAL 2, OBJECTIVE 2 RESULTS – ALCOHOL USAGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator, Project SUCCESS/Crossroads Prevention Education Series Survey</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Baseline 2008</th>
<th>Year 1 2009</th>
<th>Year 2 2010</th>
<th>Year 3 2011</th>
<th>Year 4 2012</th>
<th>Year 5 2013</th>
<th>Percent change: (Baseline to 2013)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of students who responded “one or more days” to the question:</td>
<td>36.0% or less</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>40.0% decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“During the past 30 days, on how many days did you have at least one drink of alcohol?”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This objective was met and surpassed each year, with increasingly better results over the span of the SS/SH initiative. Year Five showed a total decrease of 40% over the baseline, far surpassing the objective of a 10% decrease in the number of ninth graders who reported using alcohol in the 30 days prior.

Evaluation results suggest the Project SUCCESS/Crossroads program may have contributed to reductions in alcohol use. Results from the fall 2012-13 Prevention Education Series Survey showed positive changes from pre-test to post-test in harm perceptions:

- The percentage of students saying alcohol causes *a lot of harm* increased from 36% to 45%.

**ELEMENT THREE OUTCOMES**

*Element Three Goal: Provide the behavioral, social, and emotional supports to foster positive relationships for youth, promote meaningful parental / caregiver / family and community involvement, and help Albuquerque-area youth succeed academically.*
OBJECTIVE 1

*Increase the percentage of 9-12 grade students who report participating in pro-social extracurricular activities at school, and/or in pro-social group activities outside of home and school, by at least 5% from baseline to October 2012.*

This objective was measured by looking at three questions on the New Mexico Youth Risk and Resiliency Survey for high school students, grades 9-12. Results are reported for students in Bernalillo County only, and were available in 2005 (baseline), 2007, 2009, and 2011.

**TABLE 8. GOAL 3, OBJECTIVE 1 RESULTS – PRO-SOCIAL ACTIVITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question, YRRS</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>2005 (Baseline)</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>Percent change: (Baseline to 2011)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At school I am involved in sports, clubs, or other extra-curricular activities (such as band, cheerleading, or student council).</td>
<td>46.5% or more</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>3.2% increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside of my home and school, I am a part of clubs, sports teams, church/temple, or other group activities.</td>
<td>40.1% or more</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>2.4% decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside of my home and school, I am involved in music, art, literature, sports, or a hobby.</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>6.8% decrease</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results indicate that student participation in pro-social activities at schools increased, though participation in community-based activities declined. For Albuquerque Public Schools, each of the indicators was slightly higher than for Bernalillo County as a whole. 2011 results for APS from the YRRS were as follows: 49% were involved in sports, clubs, etc. *at school*; 38% were involved in clubs, sports, church, etc. *outside of school*; and 45% were involved in music, art, etc., *outside of school*. Because data is not available for APS in prior years, growth in these areas within the school district alone cannot be calculated.

Overall, this objective was not met. However, the SS/HS initiative funded and coordinated various pro-social activities including hip-hop dance classes, an art program that used student-created murals to discourage graffiti, and intra-mural sports activities, among others.

OBJECTIVE 2

*Increase the percentage of 9-12 grade students who report having an engaged, caring and supportive adult at home, at school, and/or in the community by 5% from baseline to October 2012.*

For 2005, 2007, and 2009, the YRRS reported a composite score of various measures that together determined the percentage of students with an engaged, caring, and supportive adult at home, school, and in the community. However, this composite score was not available for 2011. Therefore, progress on this objective was determined by comparing four individual YRRS questions—two regarding adults at home, and one each regarding adults at school and in the community.
TABLE 9. GOAL 3, OBJECTIVE 2 RESULTS – CARING ADULT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question, YRRS</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>2005 (Baseline)</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>Percent change: (Baseline to 2011)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In my home, here is a parent or some other adult who listens to me when I have something to say.</td>
<td>49.2% or more</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>9.4% decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my home, there is a parent or some other adult who believes that I will be a success.</td>
<td>70.1% or more</td>
<td>66.8%</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>2.4% decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At my school, there is a teacher or some other adult who really cares about me.</td>
<td>36.2% or more</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>11.9% increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside of my home and school, there is an adult who really cares about me.</td>
<td>62.0% or more</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>4.9% increase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown above, the percentage of students who indicated that they have a parent or adult at home who listens to them and/or believes they will be a success decreased from baseline to 2011. Meanwhile, a greater percentage of students reported having adult in their school or community who cared about them in 2011 compared to 2005. This finding was especially notable in schools, reflecting a total increase of nearly 12%, surpassing the objective of increasing by 5%.

**Objective 3**

*Increase the percentage of parents who agree that APS provides sufficient information and opportunity for parent engagement by 6% from baseline to May 2012.*

Data to measure progress on this objective were obtained from the district’s annual Quality of Education Parent Survey. The original proposed measure of parent engagement was eliminated from the survey, and was replaced with the question shown in the table below.

TABLE 10. GOAL 3, OBJECTIVE 3 RESULTS – PARENT PARTICIPATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question, Quality of Education Parent Survey</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>2007-08 (Baseline)</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>Percent change: (Baseline to 2012-13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School personnel encourage me to participate in my child’s education.</td>
<td>86.9% or more</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td><strong>87.0%</strong></td>
<td>86.6%</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
<td>4.4% increase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This objective was surpassed in the 2009-10 school year. Parents' indication of how much schools encouraged them to participate declined slightly in the following three years, but still remains higher than in the baseline year.
ELEMENT FOUR OUTCOMES

Element Four Goal: All Albuquerque-area students who need mental health services will receive timely and appropriate high-quality mental health services either at school or through community referral.

OBJECTIVE 1

GPRA 5: The number of students who receive school-based mental health services as defined below \(^4\) will increase by 10% from baseline to May 2010.

Data for this objective were obtained through student service records collected by the APS Health and Wellness Project for Outcomes Management Systems (POMS).

TABLE 11. GOAL 4, OBJECTIVE 1 RESULTS – MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES ON CAMPUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator, POMS</th>
<th>Target(^5)</th>
<th>Baseline 2008</th>
<th>Year 1 2009</th>
<th>Year 2 2010</th>
<th>Year 3 2011</th>
<th>Year 4 2012</th>
<th>Year 5* 2013</th>
<th>Percent change: (Baseline to 2013)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of students who received school-based mental health services</td>
<td>Year 1: 2,460 + Year 2: 3,308 + Year 3: 4,470 +</td>
<td>2,278</td>
<td>3,007</td>
<td>4,217</td>
<td>3,926</td>
<td>4,490</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This measure was surpassed to such an extent in Years One and Two that evaluators increased the targets both for Year Two and Year Three. Targets were surpassed in every year except Year Three, though the figure for that year still represented a 72% increase over baseline in the number of students receiving school-based mental health services. SS/HS support was significant in effecting this change:

- In 2008-09, SS/HS funds supported Community Mental Health Providers in Schools (CMHP) services in seven of fifteen new school sites. In total, 90 schools were served by Brief Family Counselors (BFC) and/or CMHP in 2008-09, up from 75 sites the previous year.
- In 2009-10, SS/HS funds were used to hire two additional bilingual counselors, and expand F BFC services to two additional clusters (Rio Grande and Albuquerque) serving 27 schools. BFC services were also added for 14 schools in the Highland cluster through a contract with the Southwest Family Guidance Center. SS/HS funds were also used to continue CMHP services at 26 schools, including several that experienced an increase in undocumented students needing services, and several serving homeless students. A total of 605 students were served at schools with continued SS/HS-funded CMHP services. Two new schools were also served by CMHP counselors during this time.

\(^4\) For the purposes of reporting on this SS/HS project objective, APS distinguishes between “mental health services” provided on school property and those provided off-campus. APS defines “school-based mental health services” as mental health services that are provided on school property by APS Brief Family Counselors and Community Mental Health Providers.

\(^5\) Targets for GPRA 5 were updated in Years Two and Three due to meeting and easily surpassing the initial target each year.
• In 2010-11, SS/HS funds continued to support the new BFC services. A reorganization of the model extended services to students and families in two additional clusters (Sandia and Del Norte). During this year, SS/HS funds ensured the continued provision of CMHP services to 27 schools, including expanded services to undocumented students, and new services to four additional schools.

• In 2011-12, BFC and CMHP counselors together provided one-on-one counseling services to 1,467 students, family counseling services to the families of 107 students, and group counseling sessions to 30 students.

Upon the end of grant cycle, APS will lose 2.5 counseling positions previously funded by SS/HS, as well as an annual budget of $150,000 to support services for undocumented students and their families including bilingual case management.

The transition plan for 2013-14 is for the remaining counseling positions to be funded by the district, and they will aim to absorb the clients from the other positions by redistributing counselors to the highest need areas.

**OBJECTIVE 2**

**GPRA 6:** The percentage of student referrals that result in mental health services being provided in the community will increase by 8% from baseline to May 2012, as measured by surveys and referral records submitted monthly by school Health/Mental Health Teams.

Data for this objective were collected each spring through an online survey of Health and Wellness (H&W) Team leaders.

**TABLE 12. GOAL 4, OBJECTIVE 2 RESULTS – MENTAL HEALTH REFERRALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator, H&amp;W Team Survey</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Baseline 2009</th>
<th>Year 1 2010</th>
<th>Year 2 2011</th>
<th>Year 3 2012</th>
<th>Percent change: (Baseline to 2012)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of students referred for off-campus mental health services during a typical month who actually received off-campus services</td>
<td><em>64% or more</em></td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>5% decrease</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This objective was reached in Year One of the SS/HS initiative. Surveys to the Health and Wellness Teams revealed several reasons why referrals did not always result in the provision of off campus services. Those included: lack of parental follow-through, denial of need, financial limitations, and lack of transportation. Many survey respondents also emphasized the advantages of expanding school-based

---

6For the purposes of reporting on this SS/HS project objective, APS defines “mental health services being provided in the community” as behavioral health services provided off campus by/at: community-based mental health providers, out-patient clinics, day programs, residential treatment facilities, psychiatric hospitals, and out-patient psychiatric facilities.
mental health services rather than relying on off-campus community-based services, and believed that on campus services were in fact meeting the needs of most students.

Although the objective was not met in most years, this performance measure prompted the Student, Family, and Community Supports Division to improve its data collection mechanisms. New referral forms were developed, with the hopes that they would spur greater follow-through of referral services. In addition, SharePoint, a web-based data collection application, was purchased for the Division, and was unrolled during the 2012-13 school year. This marks a major shift in how data will be collected, analyzed, and hopefully used to guide decision-making in the Division. More details can be found in Chapter V.

**ELEMENT FIVE OUTCOMES**

**Element Five Goal:** Ensure that Albuquerque-area children are ready for school and have the social, emotional, and behavioral skills that are essential for future healthy interpersonal relationships, association with nonviolent peers, and academic success.

**OBJECTIVE 1**

*Improve the quality of early childhood collaboration and service delivery as perceived by early childhood stakeholders in Albuquerque/Bernalillo County by May 2011.*

Baseline data for this objective were collected through the Albuquerque Community Early Childhood Services Integration Assessment survey in September 2009 (see Appendix FF), and in 2013 with the Bernalillo County Home Visitation Work Group Evaluation Report (see Appendix HH).

Baseline data from the 2009 assessment revealed a low level of existing collaboration within the early childhood (EC) community. For instance, only 21% of study participants indicated that “early childhood programs have a formal ongoing collaborative structure with common vision, joint activities, and members from all parts of the EC system.”

As a result of this needs assessment, the Bernalillo County Home Visitation Work Group (BCHVWG) was formed, and has met monthly since October 2010. The successes and challenges of the work group were documented in a final evaluation report and were presented to the community at a concluding SS/HS event entitled *Why Collaboration Matters* on June 5th, 2013. The evaluation determined that the work group has led to various collaborative efforts, including joint professional development opportunities, improved knowledge about different agencies’ programs and eligibility requirements and therefore improved rates of cross-referrals, and the development of common referral form. Media coverage of the work group’s efforts and individual partner agencies has led to increased awareness of home visitation services in the broader community.

The development and on-going success of the work group indicates that this objective was met.

See Chapters IV and V for more detail about the evolution of the home visitation program and its systems change impacts on Albuquerque’s early childhood community.
OBJECTIVE 2

Provide screening to 200 children each year, age five and younger, who would otherwise not be screened for social, emotional, and behavioral development and school readiness, through May 2012.

Due to numerous institutional barriers this objective was not met. The initial nurse practitioner who was hired to carry out screenings resigned after a few months of service. A hiring freeze at APS prevented hiring of a replacement. Once the freeze was lifted, no eligible applicants applied for the job, despite extensive advertising within APS and in the community. Main reasons for lack of response could be: 1) a nurse shortage in New Mexico and salary being lower in APS than the average market; 2) lack of bilingual applicants; 3) lack of nurse practitioners with experience in community and pediatric care.

An adjusted plan to replace the nurse practitioner with two registered nurses was negotiated with the Child Find Unit in the Special Education Department, with no closure. Finally, the leadership of Special Education informed APS Health and Wellness Department in August 2011 that they would not move forward with the proposed arrangement. Additional efforts were made to set up contractual arrangement with community health providers with no results. After numerous obstacles to provide developmental screening for children 3-5, the APS Nursing Department committed to do annual visual, hearing, weight and height screening for all pre-K students in APS Fall 2012.

The SS/HS Core Team recommends that the partners continue to bring together community stakeholders to break down barriers to service provision and design a collaborative plan to meet the ongoing need for developmental screening.

OBJECTIVE 3

Provide appropriate social and emotional follow-up services for 55 children and their families identified through developmental screening each year, through May 2012.

This objective was partially met due to contractual barriers with project partners.

The original grant partner, the City of Albuquerque, was not able to move forward with the implementation of the program. With approval of the Federal Program Manager, a contract was developed with the University of New Mexico Center for Development and Disability to provide home visitation services to 55 young children, ages 0-3, using the Parents as Teachers (PAT) model.

A total of 35 families and their children were enrolled in Year Four and Year Five and received scheduled visits with PAT Parent Educators. In compliance with the PAT evidence-based protocol, first year Parent Educators can complete no more than 12 visits per week. Neither APS’ SS/HS staff nor other Core Team partners were aware of this restriction when the original objective of 55 families was developed. As such, based on PAT’s evidence-based model, with one full time and one half -time Parent Educator, only 35 families received services, with 18 maximum visits per week provided.
III. EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

APS’ Research, Deployment and Accountability Department (RDA) took lead responsibility for the SS/HS project evaluation. The period between July 2008 and January 2009 was devoted mainly to project and evaluation planning. The Lead Evaluator worked closely with the SS/HS Program Manager to refine the logic model and develop process, performance, and outcome measures. The SS/HS evaluation plan was also developed and submitted during this time (see Appendix D).

Evaluation activities between February 2009 and January 2010 spanned all five elements of the SS/HS project, and included evaluability assessments for Early Childhood programs, Project SUCCESS/Crossroads, Project ALERT, and SWPBS. Data collection and reporting systems for various programs were also investigated during this time, and a district-wide school climate survey was developed and administered. Performance planning and monitoring systems and tools were also developed.

From February 2010 to January 2011, evaluation activities continued to focus on cultivating internal capacity for planning, monitoring and continuous improvement. Formative evaluations were conducted for Project ALERT, SWPBS, Project SUCCESS/Crossroads, and the Parent Involvement Program (PIP). In each case, programmatic strengths were highlighted and barriers were identified for program improvement. A formative evaluation of the Nurtured Heart Approach at Helen Cordero Primary School was conducted by external evaluators.

Evaluation activities from February 2011 to January 2012 included a formative evaluation of the Juvenile Justice program, formative and outcome evaluations of SWPBS, Project SUCCESS/Crossroads, PIP and Family Engagement Specialists (FES), and the school climate survey.

Evaluation activities during the no-cost extension year included the school climate survey, a formative evaluation of the Nurtured Heart Approach training model, and the culmination of a social network analysis to prevent violence conducted at four high schools.

The following is a complete list of evaluation products conducted during the SS/HS initiative, by project element. In addition, several evaluation activities fall under multiple elements, and are listed here as Cross-Element products.

CROSS-ELEMENT

SCHOOL CLIMATE SURVEYS
- APS District-Wide School Climate Survey – individual school reports (2010)
- District-Wide School Climate Survey 2010 & 2011 (2012)
- 2012-13 School Climate Survey Reports for Individual Schools (2013)
- District-Wide School Climate Survey, 2012-13 Evaluation Brief (2013)

ADDITIONAL EVALUATION ACTIVITIES
- Evaluation Assessment of Existing Data Sources (2011)
• Social Networks & Collaboration for Violence Prevention in Albuquerque Public Schools (2013)

ELEMENT ONE

SWPBS
• APS SWPBS SET Summary Brief (2010)
• School-Wide Positive Behavior Support Perceived Needs for District Services (2011)
• APS SWPBS School-Wide Evaluation Tool (SET) Reports for Individual Schools (2011, 2012)
• School-Wide Positive Behavior Support Evaluation Highlights (March 2012)
• SWPBS Evaluation Summary: Improving Implementation (2013)

ADDITIONAL EVALUATION ACTIVITIES
• School Resource Officer Program(s) Recommendations (2011)

ELEMENT TWO

PROJECT SUCCESS/CROSSROADS
• Project SUCCESS/Crossroads Evaluability Assessment and Formative Evaluation (2009)
• Project SUCCESS/Crossroads Fidelity Assessment Strategies and Adaptations (2010)
• Project SUCCESS/Crossroads Prevention Education Series & Parent Involvement Program Student and Parent Survey Results Fall 2010 (2010)
• Project SUCCESS/Crossroads Evaluation Brief (2012)
• Project SUCCESS/Crossroads Prevention Education Series & Parent Involvement Program Student and Parent Survey Results Fall 2011 (2012)
• Project SUCCESS/Crossroads Prevention Education Series & Parent Involvement Program Student and Parent Survey Results 2011-2012 (2012)
• Project SUCCESS/Crossroads Formative Evaluation Presentation (2010)
• Project SUCCESS/Crossroads Parent Involvement Program 2009-10 Evaluation Summary (2010)

PROJECT ALERT

ELEMENT THREE

• Epstein Model Implementation Fidelity Matrix (2010)
• Family Engagement Specialist Program Performance & Results Report (2011)
• Family Engagement Specialist Program Evaluation Highlights (2012)
Element Four

- Student Referrals to Mental Health Services (2009)
- West Mesa High School Health-Mental Health Team Referral Data (2010)

Element Five

Nurtured Heart
- Nurtured Heart Advanced Trainer Survey Results (2012)
- Nurtured Heart Approach at Helen Cordero Primary School Formative Evaluation, 2010-11 (2013)

Early Childhood Collaboration/Home Visitation
- Albuquerque Community Early Childhood Services Integration Assessment (2009)
- Bernalillo County Home Visitation Capacity Assessment (2010)

The following section describes in more detail some of the evaluation efforts and findings of the larger projects conducted during the SS/HS initiative.

Cross-Element

There were several evaluation activities that spanned multiple elements. These included the District-Wide School Climate Survey, a data collection evaluation report (see Appendix F), and collaborative projects, such as the social network summit report (see Appendix F) and the social network analysis for violence prevention.

District-Wide School Climate Survey
RDA administered a District-Wide School Climate Surveys in spring 2010, spring 2011, and fall 2012. Surveys for 2010 and 2012 were sent to all school-based staff, while only a sample of staff was surveyed in 2011.

Individual School Climate Surveys

Individual schools with a high enough response rate received school-level results in 2010 and 2012. These were meant to provide useful information to school administrators and staff in ongoing efforts to improve school climate; they were not made public. In 2010, 118 schools (70 elementary, 27 middle, 13 high, and 8 alternative) qualified for individual school reports (see Appendix N for a sample). In 2012, 89 schools (61 elementary, 21 middle, 3 high, and 4 alternative) were provided with individual school reports as well as a resource guide of SS/HS and other APS initiatives aimed at improving school climate, reducing bullying, improving behavior and more (see Appendix O).
District-Wide School Climate Survey, 2010 & 2011

Results from the 2010 and 2011 school climate surveys were summarized into a single report (see Appendix P). The survey focused on six topics associated with school success: school working environments, learning supports and barriers, parent involvement, student behavior, safety, and health.

Most staff (over 65%) reported their schools were safe, supportive and inviting places to work and learn. Staff from elementary and alternative schools were more likely to rate their schools highly. At the 44 APS schools with highest school climate scores, staff reported: effective behavior management, supportive learning environments, coordinated instruction, and support for parent involvement.

Disruptive student behavior was cited as a moderate or severe problem at every school level. Teachers commented that student behavior problems disrupted learning and diminished instructional time and quality, even in the classrooms of seasoned teachers. Other top-reported problems were: bullying (elementary and middle schools); lack of respect (middle schools); cutting classes (high schools), and alcohol & drug use (high schools).

School-wide student behavior management was seen as key to improving student behavior and achieving excellent student instruction. Almost all teachers (91%) said they had very effective classroom management skills, but only half said their schools handled student behavior effectively.

District-Wide School Climate Survey, 2012

The survey instrument was modified slightly in 2012. It focused on four broad areas: safety and well-being, teaching and learning, interpersonal relationship, and institutional environment.

Over 85% of respondents indicated that their schools were safe for students and staff, and 90% indicated that their schools provided a supportive and inviting place for students to learn (see Appendix JJ).

70% of respondents felt that their schools effectively handled student discipline. As in previous years, disruptive student behavior was a concern at all school levels. One fifth of elementary respondents also reported that bullying was a moderate or severe problem, along with half of middle school respondents. Cutting classes and alcohol and drug use were again identified by high school staff as the largest behavior problems at their schools.

Respondents were asked to identify areas in which staff needed additional training and support. The top five training needs identified were: closing the achievement gap, addressing problem behaviors in the classroom, improving parental involvement, classroom management skills, and serving special education students.

Sustainability. As a result of the SS/HS initiative, school administrators and staff have come to expect the annual school climate survey, and some are using its results to guide school improvement efforts. RDA is considering administering the school climate survey biennially, if resources allow.
SOCIAL NETWORKS & COLLABORATION FOR VIOLENCE PREVENTION IN ALBUQUERQUE PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 2013

Reports from the New Mexico Children, Youth and Families department suggested that juvenile justice referral rates from some APS schools were disproportionately high. Juvenile justice officials also reported that many referrals were inappropriate, unnecessarily exposing students to the criminal justice system. They argued that minor, non-criminal offenses could be resolved more effectively within school settings, with approaches addressing the underlying causes of problem behavior. Furthermore, suspending, expelling and referring students into the juvenile justice system could have important implications for graduation rates and the achievement gap.

RDA together with Dickmann and Associates, LLC conducted a multi-year evaluation study to clarify the nature of disciplinary offenses and responses in APS schools, identify strengths and weaknesses of school-based security and student support systems, and elucidate the factors that facilitate and prevent referrals into the juvenile justice system. SS/HS partners hoped they would gain insights into actions that could minimize disciplinary exclusion, thereby improving graduation rates and equalizing educational opportunities. Methods included a social network survey in four schools, focus groups and interviews, and analyses of student discipline, police, and mental health service data.

The evaluation addressed the following questions:

1. What are the patterns of disciplinary infractions and of school and police responses to those infractions?
2. What security and social, emotional and behavioral support services exist in APS schools, what are the quality and reach of those services, and what are their impacts on student behavior, juvenile justice referrals, and school safety?
3. How well do school staff members work together, as unified networks, to assure student success and school safety?
4. How do schools and community agencies work together to prevent and facilitate student referrals into the juvenile justice system?
5. What has been done to improve networks for student success and school safety, and what additional steps are recommended?

The evaluation confirmed that almost half of suspensions came from minor offenses, such as disruptive behavior and disrespect, and that Black, Hispanic and Native American students had significantly higher suspension rates than White or Asian students. Drug violations accounted for the largest number of APS Police Department (APSPD) arrests and referrals into the juvenile justice system, underscoring the importance of continuing school-based substance abuse education, prevention, and treatment services.

The evaluation also determined that APS secondary schools have within them all the components necessary for comprehensive violence prevention, school safety, and student success. However, schools have different structures governing how these components function together as larger systems. More importantly, evaluators found that the differences in network structure correlated with important
student and school outcomes. The centrality of school security personnel, in terms of the provision of support and resources to staff throughout the school, correlated with decreases in suspensions, state reportable infractions, and police reports. In addition, students who received Health and Wellness (H&W) services both before and after their first infraction were half as likely to have a second infraction. This suggests that early referrals to H&W Teams, followed by preventive and ongoing mental health services, could reduce the incidence and severity of problem behaviors at school.

School resource officers (SROs) who play a central and preventive role were found to significantly improve school safety and student behavior. However, SRO practices varied due to differences in training, differences in how individual SROs see their roles, and differences in agency expectations and philosophies. Some SROs emphasize the law enforcement component of their job. Other SROs play educational, counseling, and preventative roles in addition to law enforcement. Social network results suggest that SROs who play the full set of SRO roles help minimize disciplinary problems.

Finally, inter-agency collaboration supported by the SS/HS initiative was found to improve student services and reduce juvenile justice referrals.

Evaluation recommendations included: sustaining collaboration among juvenile justice, mental health, education and youth service agencies; continuing SRO training for all law enforcement agencies working in APS schools; promoting alternatives to out-of-school suspension; and enhancing mental health referral and service allocation processes.

See Appendix CC for the complete report.

**ELEMENT ONE. SAFE SCHOOL ENVIRONMENTS AND VIOLENCE PREVENTION ACTIVITIES**

Numerous activities were undertaken to address this element, including improved training of school resource officers, improving crisis management, gang prevention efforts, suicide prevention efforts, anti-bullying initiatives, and a focus on improving school climate.

Evaluation activities for this element focused on SWPBS and the School Resource Officer program recommendations (see Appendix G).

**SCHOOL-WIDE POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL SUPPORTS (SWPBS)**

School-Wide Positive Behavioral Supports (SWPBS) is a nationally-recognized evidence-based program that provides a decision-making framework for selecting, integrating, and implementing behavioral practices to improve academic and behavior outcomes for all students. Similar to Response to Intervention (RtI), SWPBS provides students with behavior interventions based on their level of need. Tier I interventions involve employing the following features in all school settings for all students: (1) three to five behavioral expectations are defined, taught and reinforced consistently by all staff; (2) consequences for violating behavioral expectations are defined and implemented consistently school-wide; (3) student behavior data are collected and reviewed regularly throughout the year to continually improve behavior management; and (4) a school administrator and SWPBS team actively support and
coordinate SWPBS implementation. Approximately 80% of students are projected to respond positively to Tier 1. Tier 2 applies small group interventions to a second group of students (5–10%) who continue to engage in problem behaviors above acceptable levels. Tier 3 provides individualized interventions for the remaining 1–5% of students who have persistent behavior problems and skill deficits.

**IMPLEMENTATION.** Prior to the SS/HS initiative, 17 APS schools participated in a state-led SWPBS initiative that ended in spring of 2007, and three additional schools were implementing SWPBS without formal training. During spring 2009, the Lead Evaluator and SWPBS Manager used a modified version of the SWPBS Team Implementation Checklist to assess schools’ implementation levels and identify training needs. The assessment determined that key SWPBS features were lacking at all sites, indicating low to moderate levels of fidelity. A SWPBS district leadership team was formed, and various trainings were conducted. SS/HS funds also paid for four schools to renew their subscriptions to SWPBS’s School-Wide Information System (SWIS), a behavior data-tracking system.

In January 2010, Apex Education conducted an Evaluability Assessment of APS’ SWPBS initiative (see Appendix H), which led to additional training and capacity building activities with representatives from each of the 17 participating schools. Throughout 2010, the APS Health and Wellness SWPBS Unit continued to work to increase the number of schools implementing SWPBS at a high level of implementation. Four schools dropped out of the initiative, and an additional 11 were recruited, for a total of 25 schools implementing SWPBS. All school teams attended at least two SWPBS training sessions, and 24 schools received coaching. A total of 11 schools were trained in the use of SWIS.

During 2011, one new school adopted SWPBS, and three schools abandoned the initiative, for a total of 23 schools implementing SWPBS. By the end of 2011, six schools were fully implementing Tier 1. Training, coaching, and the development of district-wide capacity and infrastructure for SWPBS continued through 2011. Attempts to develop 10 local trainers and 25 district coaches were unsuccessful, however. In addition, the SWPBS Advisory Council disbanded in spring 2011, as it was unable to leverage resources, foster political support and promote SWPBS visibility. A new sustainability team made up of principals, SWPBS facilitators and Health and Wellness staff formed at the end of 2011.

In 2012, there were multiple attempts at creating a SWPBS leadership team, but these were unsuccessful. Nevertheless, trainings continued at existing school sites in both Tier 1 and Tier 2/3 interventions. Schools also continued to receive technical assistance and support throughout the year as well. Due to funding constraints, the district chose not to support SWPBS beyond the life cycle of the grant. Individual schools wishing to pursue SWPBS will do so with monies from their operational budgets.

**EVALUATION.** Evaluation activities of SWPBS were numerous. They included the initial Evaluability Assessment, annual School-Wide Evaluation Tool (SET) reports, various formative assessments, an

---

7 The SET is used to assess the level of implementation by assessing which SWPBS features are in place. It also serves as a tool for schools to determine their annual goals, evaluate current efforts, revise procedures as needed, and track progress from year to year. SET evaluations were conducted in 2010, 2011, and 2012. In the interest of space, the appendix includes a summary of all SET findings from 2010, and two individual school SET reports (one from 2011 and one from 2012). 2011 and 2012 SET reports from all schools evaluated informed the final evaluation summary discussed below.
assessment of perceived needs, and several evaluation briefs that were combined into one final evaluation summary. Complete reports can be found in Appendices H—M. The assessment of perceived needs and the final evaluation report are discussed in more detail below. Despite extensive evaluation efforts, results were not accepted or integrated by the SWPBS Manager.

**School-Wide Positive Behavior Support Perceived Needs for District Services: Survey of School Leaders and SWPBS Facilitators, 2011**

Forty-one principals, teachers, counselors and other staff representing 21 SWPBS-implementing schools participated in the APS School-Wide Positive Behavior Support (SWPBS) Needs Assessment Survey in September 2011. Respondents described the following outcomes of the SWPBS programs in their schools:

- A general perception of improved student behavior, reduced office discipline referrals and staff turnover, and the creation of caring, respectful school climates.
- Good or excellent processes for developing disciplinary procedures were reported by 81% of responding principals and SWPBS team members.
- SWPBS assessment tools helped schools develop school-wide disciplinary systems, according to 70% - 80% of survey respondents.

Several respondent comments highlight their perception of how SWPBS’s positive impact on their schools:

- **SWPBS has had a huge impact on our school culture.** We can turn around behavior choices for most of our students that remain here. New students who come to our school see a big difference in the positive climate. They love the celebrations and recognitions for good behavior choices.

- **SWPBS has impacted the way the staff and teachers speak to the students.** Focusing on the positive behaviors of the students makes the school a positive learning environment...The hallways are calm and quiet. The students enjoy being recognized for their positive behavior and strive to follow the behaviors in the behavior matrix.

- The impact is difficult to measure, but profound. It has provided a “culture” and a community where caring and respectful behavior is expected. Although individual behaviors aren’t always respectful, SWPBS creates an accountability among students and staff where the norm is kindness. It allows for the community to be empowered with the expectation that all deserve respect and the culture empowers the by-standers to speak up when respect is not modeled. When we have visitors to our school they frequently speak about how wonderful our community is. We don’t have staff members requesting to leave for transfers, providing consistency year to year.

The purpose of the evaluation was to determine how the district could best support schools’ efforts at SWPBS implementation, with the following findings:

- About half of survey respondents chose Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports as their schools’ highest priority needs, but over half said basic Tier 1 processes were fair or poor.
- Priorities at even the highest implementing schools included solidifying and reinforcing SWPBS Tier 1 and Tier 2 practices.
• Most schools needed on-site services from a SWPBS coordinator monthly or less often in 2011-12, according to 86% of respondents.
• School staff trainings were seen as the most beneficial training format in 2011-12, according to 56% of respondents.

The evaluation helped SS/HS staff and the SWPBS Coordinator better plan and coordinate SWPBS trainings that took place during 2012-13.

_School-Wide Positive Behavior Support Evaluation Summary: Improving Implementation, 2013_

This summary report highlighted the major findings and recommendations from three 2012 evaluation briefs and a 2011 evaluation report (included as appendices to the evaluation summary).

The 2011 evaluation report addressed the following questions:

1. What level of support did SWPBS schools receive?
2. To what extent was SWPBS implemented with fidelity?
3. Is implementing SWPBS with fidelity associated with improved behavioral outcomes?
4. Is implementing SWPBS with fidelity associated with improved academic outcomes?

Building on those findings, the 2012 briefs explored these topics:

5. What conditions are required for the successful implementation of SWPBS? (Brief #1)
6. What is the relationship between SWPBS and Response to Intervention (RtI)? (Brief #2)
7. What are the issues related to data collection and use in the SWPBS model? (Brief #3)

The evaluations determined that there was an overall low level of SWPBS implementation in APS schools (ten of 25 schools implemented to fidelity in 2010-11; four of 23 implemented to fidelity in 2011-12). Barriers to implementation included:

• Schools attempted to implement SWPBS before they were fully ready.
• Buy-in and commitment to SWPBS did not extend throughout some schools.
• Schools attempted to implement Tiers 2 and 3 before Tier 1 systems were fully established and understood by SWPBS team members and other school staff.
• There were multiple challenges to good data collection.

Even when schools were implementing well, the evaluation found that higher levels of SWPBS implementation were not associated with lower levels of reported disciplinary infractions. Furthermore, analyses found no association between academic outcomes and whether or not a school had implemented SWPBS. Because of a lack of good behavioral data, it would not be possible to tie academic gains to SWPBS anyway. Finally, while most study participants felt that SWPBS was improving school climate and student behavior at their school, there were no correlations between SWPBS implementation and positive school climate survey results.
At the same time, there were promising indications that in 2010-11 SWPBS schools were improving academically as a group. Analyses looked at the difference between a school’s expected performance and actual performance over three years. Schools that initially did not meet expected levels of performance and implemented SWPBS with fidelity did see improvements and exceeded their expected levels of academic performance. Schools not implementing with fidelity also started out behind but did not meet expected levels of improvement. These results suggest two possible, complementary conclusions. First, schools that do well with SWPBS are more likely to improve academically, which could be attributed both to SWPBS and the likelihood that they are also working toward improving curriculum and instruction. Second, schools that struggle with SWPBS are likely to struggle with school improvement in general.

SUSTAINABILITY. Ultimately, APS district leadership chose not to pursue SWPBBS as a district-wide approach to improve student behavior and school climate. However, the evaluation summary offers various recommendations for improving implementation should the district choose to adopt the framework again in the future.

ELEMENT TWO. ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, AND OTHER DRUG PREVENTION ACTIVITIES
The SS/HS initiative implemented several programs to stem substance use and abuse among APS students. These included Project SUCCESS/Crossroads, the Parent Involvement Program (PIP), and Project ALERT. Evaluation activities included ongoing data collection and formative evaluations for Project SUCCESS and Project ALERT.

PROJECT SUCCESS/CROSSROADS
Project SUCCESS (Schools Using Coordinated Community Efforts to Strengthen Students) is an evidence-based program to prevent and reduce substance use. APS integrated Project SUCCESS into its Crossroads high school substance abuse prevention program and Parent Involvement Program (PIP) in 2005-2006. SS/HS funding was used to sustain and expand these programs starting in 2008-2009.

IMPLEMENTATION. Ten Project SUCCESS/Crossroads counselors (seven funded by SS/HS) provided alcohol, tobacco, and other drug prevention services in eleven high schools during the SS/HS life cycle. They conducted individual and group counseling sessions, administered the Prevention Education Series (PES) substance abuse prevention curriculum, linked students to APS and community resources and coordinated school-wide substance abuse prevention events and projects. Project SUCCESS/Crossroads counselors also facilitated PIP, a four-session after-school curriculum offered to students with drug or alcohol infractions, and their parents/guardians, as an alternative to out-of-school suspension.

EVALUATION. The evaluation of Project SUCCESS/Crossroads included an evaluability assessment, formative evaluation, fidelity assessment, and ongoing student and parent surveys. Counselors submitted student contact data to the Health and Wellness Data Management Unit on a weekly basis, and they used an online survey tool to track the sources of student referrals. On an annual or more frequent basis, the Lead Evaluator presented and discussed evaluation results with counselors, program administrators, SS/HS staff, and Core Team members. Results were used to improve program design and
implementation, to develop and revise data collection instruments, and to monitor and report program
performance.

The evaluation started with an evaluability assessment, conducted by an external evaluator in the spring
of 2009. Results suggested that: (1) Crossroads program implementation varied greatly across sites; (2) data collection was inconsistent, and most counselors did not believe that evaluation results accurately reflected their efforts or program outcomes; (3) counselors believed they needed full-time status to fully implement program activities; (4) the Prevention Education Series (PES) education curriculum was an imperfect fit for high school students, and was implemented inconsistently across sites; and (5) PIP was considered successful (see Appendix Q).

The evaluator led counselors and program administrators in a participatory process of modeling actual inputs and activities, and projecting realistic short-term, intermediate and long-term outcomes. The following actions ensued: (1) counselors were reallocated to full-time assignments at six traditional high schools, (2) the PES curriculum for 9th graders was updated and standardized, (3) data collection forms used to track program activities were revised, and (4) student and parent surveys were developed to evaluate the effects of PES and PIP on students’ and parents’ knowledge, perceptions and intentions.

In January 2010, the Lead Evaluator presented formative evaluation results from fall 2009 Crossroads program implementation. A total of 932 ninth graders at five schools completed PES classes, 197 students participated in individual counseling sessions, 116 students participated in PIP sessions, and 48 students completed the four-session PIP cycle. Numbers were projected to rise significantly, with the hire of four additional counselors. PES and PIP survey results suggested positive impacts on harm perceptions, normative beliefs, knowledge of support resources, substance use intentions, and adult connectedness. A major concern, however, was the small number of small group counseling sessions (9) and student participants (22). Other questions of fidelity were revealed as well, generating plans for an in-depth fidelity assessment (see Appendix W).

The fidelity assessment was conducted in May 2010, led by the Lead Evaluator and advised by an expert in substance abuse prevention planning and evaluation Crossroads counselors and program managers identified gaps between what was being implemented and what was specified in the Project SUCCESS model, and then strategized solutions and adaptations given local conditions and resources. For example, the revelation that six counselors had never received Project SUCCESS training led to a week-long Project SUCCESS training in Albuquerque. Evaluation results showed that the dosage of Crossroads counseling was far lower than the 8-12 sessions specified by Project SUCCESS, with most counseled students receiving no more than two sessions per year. Motivational Interviewing was selected as an adaptation because it is designed to change behavior in just one or two counseling sessions. Small group counseling was acknowledged as a key component of Project SUCCESS, and the fidelity assessment clarified inherent logistical difficulties. PIP became the main vehicle for accomplishing Project SUCCESS small group sessions, albeit after school and with only the highest risk students. Plans also were made to formalize agreements with school principals in an effort to increase the numbers of students referred to PIP and encourage completion of the four-session PIP cycle, given early evaluation evidence that PIP prevented recidivism among substance use offenders (see Appendix X).
Adaptations were formalized in a logic model that showed intended activities, dosage levels and outcomes (see Appendix R).

Surveys were conducted by Crossroads counselors throughout each year to determine the effectiveness of PES and PIP education sessions on the drug and alcohol related beliefs, intentions and practices of students and parents. RDA produced reports of survey results each semester and year, and reviewed results with counselors and program administrators at the end of each school year. Counselors used survey results to progressively refine the PES and PIP curricula. Results also informed GPRA objectives 1-4. Evaluation briefs summarizing PES and PIP survey results can be found in Appendices S—X.

Student contact data collected by the H&W department and analyzed by RDA show that PES reached about half of all ninth graders (about 2,000 students) at seven high schools each year. About 3,000 upper-grade students received a shortened version of the PES curriculum. Survey results indicate that PES classes had positive impacts on the knowledge, perceptions, and protective factors that prevent and reduce substance use. Harm perceptions related to most substances increased, knowledge of support resources improved, and intentions to use some substances decreased.

PES also increased students’ protective factor of adult connectedness, with 73% of students saying they would probably or definitely contact counselors if they have concerns or questions.

About 300 students and their parents/guardians participated in PIP sessions conducted by Crossroads counselors each year, and about half of those participants completed all four sessions in the PIP series. PIP survey results indicated sizeable impacts on student harm perceptions, intentions to use alcohol, marijuana, and other drugs, and knowledge of resources. In addition, PIP sessions were shown to influence parents’ knowledge, beliefs, and parenting practices. In 2012, by the end of their PIP sessions, most parent participants (70%) said they would be much more likely to put prescription drugs where their teens cannot access them, set clear rules and expectations (73%), closely monitor their teens’ school night activities (71%), and use active listening skills with their teens (71%).

Even more significantly, evaluation results suggest that PIP prevented recidivism among substance use offenders. In 2010-11, for example, 87% of the 109 students who completed four sessions of PIP did not have a repeat drug or alcohol offense for the remainder of the school year. In 2009-10, 92% of PIP completers did not reoffend.

SUSTAINABILITY. Project SUCCESS/Crossroads and PIP will be sustained in all high schools currently funded by SS/HS through Medicaid funding.

PROJECT ALERT

Project ALERT is a school-based curriculum intended to prevent adolescents from using drugs. Classroom teachers of 6th to 8th grade students are trained to implement an 11-lesson curriculum that includes small group exercises, games, role modeling, skills practice, psychodrama, videos, and parent-involved homework. Three booster lessons are designed to extend the core curriculum’s effects.
The program targets four cognitive risk factors: (1) intentions to use substances in the future, (2) beliefs about the benefits or negative consequences of using substances, (3) normative beliefs about the prevalence of substance use and its acceptability to others, and (4) resistance self-efficacy (the belief that one can successfully resist pressures to use substances). Research has linked all four risk factors to substance use behavior.

IMPLEMENTATION. Project ALERT was implemented in six middle schools in 2008-09, and an additional four middle schools in 2009-10. A total of 646 students participated in 2008-09, and an additional 447 students participated in 2009-10. Initial evaluations using the Project ALERT Fidelity Instrument checklist indicated a moderate level of program fidelity—ranging from 50% to 100%.

EVALUATION. Evaluation activities for Project ALERT included an evaluability assessment and implementation evaluation (see Appendix Y). Results are discussed below.


The initial evaluation was to include an evaluability assessment, implementation evaluation, and outcome evaluation. In the evaluability assessment phase, RDA reviewed program documents, including the Project ALERT logic model. RDA also consulted with program staff to identify early implementation challenges and successes, clarify Year Two program plans and implementation targets, create a theory of change logic model, and outline evaluation methods.

RDA designed the Project ALERT implementation evaluation to measure curriculum fidelity, student participation and dosage, and perceived implementation strengths, challenges and outcomes. The evaluation found that some teachers expressed enthusiasm for the Project ALERT and reported student benefits including increased knowledge about illegal substances and resistance skills. However, implementation diverged in many ways from initial program plans and curriculum designs. Teacher training was delayed. School schedules were also a major barrier, limiting the number of participating classrooms and the ability to implement booster sessions. The evaluation recommended enhanced collaboration among district staff, finding acceptable program adaptations, and regularly reviewing the program. Furthermore, evaluation recommended that consideration be given to developing systemic approaches to substance abuse prevention that were not entirely reliant on classroom education, but included community, family, and government partners as well.

The outcome evaluation portion of the study was halted after the release of two national reports that showed that Project ALERT on its own, did not positively influence adolescent intentions to use alcohol, cigarettes, and marijuana, their beliefs about substance use consequences, normative beliefs, resistance self-efficacy, or substance using behavior (Ringwalt, et.al, 2009; Clark, et.al., 2010).

SUSTAINABILITY. APS did not sustain Project ALERT after the 2009-10 school year.
ELEMENT THREE. STUDENT BEHAVIORAL, SOCIAL, AND EMOTIONAL SUPPORTS

SS/HS activities for this element included various pro-social activities and the Family Engagement Specialist (FES) program. FES was evaluated.

FAMILY ENGAGEMENT SPECIALIST PROGRAM

The FES program focused on building the capacity of schools to use the evidence-based model of School, Family and Community Partnerships advanced by Joyce Epstein and the National Network of Partnership Schools, based at Johns Hopkins University.

The Epstein model articulates six types of family and community involvement: parenting, communicating, volunteering, learning at home, decision-making, and collaborating with the community. District facilitators (called “Specialists” by APS) are to help schools develop and implement one-year action plans as well as structures and policies that support family and community involvement. One of the first steps is to build an Action Team for Partnerships (ATP) that includes school employees, parents, students and community members. Facilitators train and coach ATP members in managing sustainable teams and in implementing and evaluating the action plans.

IMPLEMENTATION.

Between 2009 and 2012, the Family Engagement Specialist (FES) program provided training, coaching and technical assistance to enhance family and community involvement at 38 APS schools.

The original intent of the SS/HS initiative was for Specialists to serve 14 schools each year, for a total of 56 schools over four years. Program staff reported that the tasks of establishing ATPs, fostering policy improvements, and building staff and volunteer skills took longer than one year. Specialists stayed longer than one year at most schools, limiting their ability to serve additional schools, and limiting the total number of schools served to 38.

A total of 137 Family Engagement Coordinators and/or ATP leaders were recruited and trained through May 2011.

EVALUATION. Evaluation activities included developing a fidelity matrix, conducting formative evaluations to document fidelity and identify program challenges, and evaluations of final outcomes (see Appendices Z-BB).

The SS/HS Lead Evaluator worked with Specialists to develop a fidelity matrix of FES program activities and a logic model of purposes and expected outcomes, in order to clarify alignments to the Epstein model and to enhance the intentionality of Specialist activities. For example, Specialists attended many meetings. The fidelity matrix clarified their roles in those meetings, both to help Specialists be purposeful about accomplishing Epstein goals, and to help them articulate those links in their monthly reports.

Formative evaluations helped identify program fidelity and barriers to implementation. Evaluation determined that by the end of the third year of FES services, only one school had a fully established ATP,
while ten had partly established ATPs. Action plans had been completed by two schools, while three schools had partly completed action plans.

In addition, a number of significant deviations and adaptations to the Epstein model were identified. These included: (1) a ratio of one Specialist to two schools, compared to the Epstein model’s ratio of 1 Facilitator to 30 schools; (2) Educational Assistant positions for jobs requiring high level skills in communication, training and management; and (3) lack of a district plan and policies to support school-level FES program implementation. Later, as Specialists struggled to develop ATPs, another adaptation was developed: the recruitment of classroom Family Engagement Coordinators to serve as classroom leaders, devised as a first step toward parent involvement in ATPs.

One of the biggest challenges to FES program success was the operation of multiple family engagement initiatives across the district and within schools. Family Friendly Schools and ENLACE were two parent involvement programs that operated in many of the same schools and during the same time period as the FES program. These programs competed for resources and advanced different approaches, creating confusion about district expectations, and undermining implementation and effectiveness. Adopting a unified approach to family and community involvement at the district level, with a clear plan and set of strategies, would increase prospects for success.

A challenge confronted by Specialists at the school level was the difficulty of recruiting and maintaining parent participation in formal leadership roles. This constrained the development of ATPs and other parent engagement groups.

Finally, high level skills are required to accomplish Epstein Facilitator tasks, but the FES job description required and paid for a high school diploma. The Epstein model involves developing organizational structures, policies and procedures; training school staffs and community members; and facilitating the development of clear and measurable plans. These tasks require high level skills in communications, coaching, technical assistance, and professional development.

Despite these barriers, evaluation showed positive results from the FES program. Qualitative data collected from Specialists and school principals suggest that Specialist activities increased family participation at school events and on school leadership councils; aligned the activities of different parent engagement groups; created school-wide systems and schedules for parent involvement; developed family–friendly policies and communication practices; and decreased truancy.

As an example, one school principal reported, “Parent participation in weekly coffees is up from 3-4 to 8-10. There are two family events every month and participation is usually 50-80 or more, as opposed to one event per year drawing 80 or more participants.”

A counselor noted that her school’s Specialist “helped parents find their voice, found ways for them to volunteer, and got fathers to think about their involvement in their child’s educational experience” such that “this community is beginning to see that they have value in the school setting.”

Results from APS District-wide School Climate Surveys suggest that FES schools improved the coordination of parent and community involvement efforts from 2010 to 2011. However, staff members
at these schools were no more likely in 2012 to agree their schools were welcoming to and facilitated parent involvement than in 2011.

**Sustainability.** SS/HS funds were not allocated to support continuation of the FES program.

**Element Four. Mental Health Services**

The SS/HS initiative led to a dramatic increase in mental health service provision in APS schools. Evaluation activities related to this element included capacity building, Health and Wellness Team surveys, social network analysis, and technical assistance related to the Prevention Intervention Program for Youth (PIPY).

**Mental Health Services**

The system of mental health services in APS schools consists of Health and Wellness (H&W) Teams, Community Mental Health Providers (CMHP), and Counseling Services For Families (CSFF), all coordinated by the Comprehensive Services Manager of the Student, Family and Community Supports Division (formerly the Health and Wellness Department). H&W Teams meet weekly or bi-weekly at most schools to triage services for students exhibiting social, emotional, behavioral, attendance and/or other problems. H&W Teams convene school counselors, nurses, and administrators. Until 2009-10, school psychologists and social workers also participated as core members, with psychologists playing a leadership role and offering clinical guidance.

Over the course of the SS/HS initiative, multiple studies were conducted to assess and recommend process improvements for APS’ H&W Team system. A survey of H&W Team leaders was conducted annually regarding the referral of students to off-campus mental health providers (GPRA 6). Just over half of student referrals to off-campus mental health providers each year were estimated to result in actual services. Survey results prompted consideration of strategies to improve H&W Team referral tracking and follow-up. Data reviews conducted in 2009 revealed that only 31% of H&W teams submitted referral data to the H&W department. This finding catalyzed plans for a data feedback system that would regularly provide summary reports to school leaders and H&W team members showing the numbers of students reviewed at H&W Team meetings and whether they had received recommended services.

In the spring of 2011, social network analysis was used to explore H&W Team structures and their impacts on the student referral process. Evaluators used social network simulations to compare the normal H&W team structure to the brokerage structure used at West Mesa High School (WMHS) (see Appendix KK). The WMHS Dean of Students acted as a broker by gathering student information from the wider school community to share at team meetings, and by coordinating service referrals to both internal and external providers. Evaluators concluded that having a H&W team was important for helping students get referred to mental health services. However, adding a broker to the H&W Team increased the team’s centrality and the density of the referral network, which produced the following benefits: (1) information flowed more quickly and efficiently, (2) administrators and other key stakeholders were more likely to be advised about and contribute to the referral process, and (3)
appropriate services were obtained more quickly. The WMHS principal used evaluation results to apply for grant funding to sustain the Dean of Students position.

Evaluation of the two school-based mental health service programs—Community Mental Health Providers and Counseling Services For Families—consisted of: (1) the analysis of student contact data collected by the H&W Data Management Unit; (2) the H&W Team Survey, which in 2012 was expanded to assess H&W team functioning and the perceived effectiveness of school-based mental health services; and (3) social network analysis. Analyses showed that the number of students receiving therapeutic and case management services through the CSFF and CMHP programs doubled during the SSHS initiative, to 4,490 students by 2011-12. The number of schools with these services also increased, from 78 to 122. The majority of H&W Team leaders reported satisfaction with CMHP and CSFF services. Satisfaction was highest when the provider met the following criteria: he or she (1) was at the school multiple days per week; (2) took time to connect with students and school staff; (3) consistently served the same school; (4) handled referrals promptly; and (5) made efforts to reach out to parents. However, analyses of H&W service records revealed disparities in service provision across and within schools. Lack of CMHP availability was cited at 33% of schools overall and at 64% of middle schools. Satisfaction with CSFF services varied by service region, with schools in the Rio Grande, Albuquerque and Valley clusters reporting the least satisfaction with service availability and referral efficiency.

The importance of service availability was underscored by the evaluation finding that students who received school-based mental health services both before and after their first disciplinary infraction were half as likely to have a second infraction as students who had an infraction but received no health and wellness services. This finding highlighted the importance of early referrals to H&W Teams, and of preventive and ongoing health and wellness services, for reducing the incidence and severity of problem behaviors at school, improving school climate and safety, and reducing arrests and referrals into the juvenile justice system.

These evaluation results were summarized in the 2013 Social Networks & Collaboration for Violence Prevention report (see Appendix CC). Details were discussed with the SFCS Division Director, Counseling Director and Counseling Manager, with recommendations to formalize and equalize the distribution of school-based mental health services as well as to improve the collection of H&W Team and student referral data so that service needs may be estimated and compared to actual service provision.

**PREVENTION INTERVENTION PROGRAM FOR YOUTH (PIPY)**

The Prevention Intervention Program for Youth (PIPY) was created to reduce student referrals into the juvenile justice system, increase the number of students who successfully transition back to school from juvenile detention, and decrease recidivism.

**IMPLEMENTATION.** PIPY was introduced as a pilot project at Jimmy Carter Middle School (JCMS), chosen because of its large size and high rate of juvenile justice referrals.

The PIPY project consisted of case management services, provided by two caseworkers, and a coordinating team of school and community partners. The PIPY coordinating team represented Juvenile Probation, the Bernalillo County Youth Services Center (BCYSC), school administration, APS Police,
school counselors, the school’s Behavior Intervention Program, the district’s Family Engagement program, and the school social worker. The SS/HS Coordinator facilitated the team and guided the caseworkers.

Caseworkers worked three days per week at JCMS. They connected high-risk students and their families with resources and services related to mental health, gang intervention, clothing and housing, mediation, and other needs. Together with the coordinating team, the caseworkers aimed to help the school establish sustainable early intervention systems and services, as well as evidence-based disciplinary policies, processes and practices. Objectives included reducing the number of referrals to In-School-Suspension, reducing the frequency of severe disciplinary infractions, and reducing referrals to detention and Juvenile Probation.

Caseworkers worked two days per week at the BCYSC, providing case management and follow-up services to students discharged from detention. Their work also entailed assisting parents and guardians in navigating the juvenile justice system and finding appropriate community-based behavioral services. Short-term, their objective was to increase the proportion of students who left detention with clear and realistic educational plans. Longer term, their work was intended to increase the proportion of youth leaving detention that enrolled and stayed in educational programs.

One of the main strategies of the PIPY project was to enhance inter-agency collaboration so that more high-risk youth would receive community-based services and supports. Plans entailed designing a “seamless” behavioral services referral process; establishing service agreements among the BCYSC, APS and community providers; and establishing collaborative systems for tracking and continuously improving the provision of services to high-risk youth.

EVALUATION. The Lead SSHS Evaluator provided evaluative services to the PIPY project, but a formal program evaluation was never planned or commissioned. The Lead Evaluator worked with the PIPY coordinating team to outline PIPY services and strategies and intended short-term and long-term objectives. Performance indicators were identified for tracking program progress. The Lead Evaluator also summarized data on student disciplinary referrals and suspensions. Finally, JCMS was one of the four sites involved in the SS/HS evaluation of social networks and collaboration for violence prevention (see Appendix CC).

The Lead SS/HS Evaluator engaged a consultant to develop a database for collecting, managing and reporting PIPY caseworker services and clients. In addition to providing data for evaluation purposes, the database was intended to help caseworkers manage their services, and help the PIPY team monitor and ensure fidelity to program intentions, including target populations. The database was designed to facilitate exchanges with other educational and juvenile justice data systems. Also, because the BCYSC Assistant Director of Operations expressed interest in deploying the database across various BCYSC programs, the database was designed with flexibility so it could be used in other settings.

The consultant developed the database in close collaboration with the caseworkers, Lead SS/HS Evaluator and SS/HS Coordinator. Several meetings were held with the BCYSC Assistant Director of
Operations. When the database was presented for deployment, however, the BCYSC officials in charge of information technology said they would instead develop their own data system.

The caseworkers reported that the number of bookings into juvenile detention from JCMS declined from seven in 2010 to two in 2011. They also reported that recidivism was low among PIPY clients, with only five of the 93 youth served in spring 2011 entering the juvenile justice system after receiving services.

Despite these successes, the PIPY project faced challenges. For one, it lacked clear and decisive management. The caseworkers were hired by the BCYSC and the BCYSC Assistant Director of Operations had formal supervisory authority over their work. In practice, the caseworkers turned to the SS/HS Coordinator for guidance because their own organization did not provide it. Decisions, however, often had to wait for approval from the BCYSC. Implementation also lacked ongoing management.

In addition, the PIPY project lacked active collaboration from one of its core partner agencies. Representatives of the Juvenile Probation Office attended PIPY collaboration team meetings with APS and school representatives, however BCYSC representation was rare and communications outside meetings were slow.

Without clear and decisive management, and without active collaboration from a core partner, the PIPY project struggled to develop and maintain a strategic focus. Problems were discussed in team meetings but fully implementing proposed solutions was slow.

**Sustainability.** The PIPY project was not sustained.

**Element Five. Early Childhood Social and Emotional Learning Program**

The SS/HS initiative contributed significantly to improved collaboration within the local early childhood community. Two programs evaluated included the Nurtured Heart Approach and the Bernalillo County Home Visitation Work Group.

**The Nurtured Heart Approach**

The Nurtured Heart Approach (NHA) is a method to promote positive child development and behavior. It was developed by Howard Glasser of the Children’s Success Foundation as an intervention for treating intensely difficult children in family therapy. Recently, NHA has been applied to promote positive behavior among children of all circumstances and in a wide range of settings, including schools. Impacts of the NHA in school settings are described by the Children’s Success Foundation as improved school climate, decreased disciplinary referrals, increased teaching time, improved student attendance, decreased referrals to Special Education, decreased teacher sick days, and increased parent satisfaction and involvement.

NHA employs a set of simple methodologies aimed at building inner strength and resiliency for children by channeling children’s intensity into positive and constructive outlets, which facilitates success at home and in the classroom. It can be implemented on a one-to-one basis, in individual classrooms, or at the school-wide level.
NHA strategies are consistent with child development theory and research, and with many well-established child development programs that include a focus on recognizing positive behavior; establishing clear rules, limits and expectations; and providing swift, appropriate, but not harsh consequences for undesired behaviors. In the NHA, these concepts are expressed as three “stands”:

1. Purposefully “energize” children’s experiences of success;
2. Absolute refusal to energize and reward negativity; and
3. Absolute clarity and consistency in implementing rules and consequences.

Teachers can implement additional tools such as positive behavior charts or the awarding of points for prizes. However, these are not necessary for program fidelity.

IMPLEMENTATION. The Nurtured Heart Approach in APS began with the training of a few staff members primarily working in one school, and has grown to reach hundreds of teachers, counselors and administrators, and dozens of schools in the district. The Student, Family, and Community Supports Department plans to ensure that it continues to reach students of all ages throughout the district beyond the life cycle of the SS/HS grant.

NHA was first introduced to Albuquerque by the City’s Division of Child and Family Development Services for use in Head Start centers. In 2009, one psychologist and one early childhood specialist working with the City of Albuquerque attended a NHA Advanced Training in Chicago, and six staff members from the Helen Cordero Primary School (HCPS) attended an Advanced Training in Tucson. The HCPS opened in fall 2009 with NHA as a core approach (see following section).

In 2010, all teachers at HCPS received NHA introductory training, coaching, materials, and mentoring. The school’s parent liaison and social worker began facilitating NHA training and home visit coaching for parents in English and Spanish. In an effort to expand NHA within the school district, a one-day introductory training was held, and 25 people from APS and other community-based agencies participated. Six of those trained were selected to attend the annual week-long Advanced Training in Tucson in 2011.

In 2011, in addition to sending the six staff members to Advanced Training, SS/HS funded three introductory training workshops with Howard Glasser and his lead trainer, Lisa Bravo, for APS teachers, parents, and community agencies. Six additional workshops were held in the fall by local NHA Advanced Trainers for parents, social workers, counselors, school nurses, and others. Approximately 500 staffs were trained during 2011, including pre-K and Head Start teachers, after-school staff, family liaisons, counselors, nurses, behavior redirector staff, special education teachers, NM Department of Health staff, and private clinicians.

In 2012, 15 more staff members trained to become NHA Advanced Trainers. A survey conducted in fall 2012 of local NHA Advanced Trainers indicated that together, they had trained over 7,000 parents, teachers, and community agency staff.

In addition, during the 2012-13 school year, three more introductory trainings were held with Lisa Bravo. Over 750 people attended, representing 158 schools and community organizations. Attendees
included teachers, principals, counselors, parent liaisons, parents, and more. Highlighting the growth and reach of NHA in the local community, the Nurtured Heart Global Summit will be held in June 2013 in Albuquerque.

EVALUATION. Evaluation activities for the Nurtured Heart Approach included an in-depth evaluation of the NHA in the Helen Cordero Primary School and a survey to understand existing capacity of local NHA Advanced Trainers.

The Nurtured Heart Approach at Helen Cordero Primary School, 2010-11

The Helen Cordero evaluation report identified perceived outcomes of the NHA, examined implementation challenges and success factors, and made recommendations for spreading the NHA to other schools (see Appendix DD). Data came from focus groups with school staff members and parents, key informant interviews, and a staff survey. All stakeholder groups (parents, teachers, administrators, and other school staffs) cited positive benefits and outcomes associated with the Nurtured Heart Approach. Results included improvements in school climate, parent engagement and satisfaction, and student behavior.

Improvements in school climate were reported by 60% of staff survey respondents overall. Interviewees described a “lighter atmosphere” and positive shifts in how teachers act and speak with one another. Communications with students also changed, according to interviewees. Using the NHA, teachers were more likely to notice and acknowledge student efforts, and “treated students with patience, kindness, respect and love.” The NHA also increased parent involvement and satisfaction, according to focus group and interview results. Although school administrators reported a decrease in office disciplinary referrals compared to the school’s first year, analyses of actual student behavior data were not possible due to incomplete records and data. Nevertheless, school staff members and parents described the following impacts of the NHA on HCPS children: less hyperactivity, better cooperation, more positive attitudes, and more generosity, kindness, affection and harmony.

The evaluation showed that there were not school-wide improvements in student attendance and academic performance as a result of the NHA. Nevertheless, all stakeholder groups were enthusiastic about its use at HCPS.

Staff recommendations for improving the effectiveness of NHA training included having differentiated sessions for different needs and expertise levels, more sessions for new staff members and for specific topics, and more interactive training formats.

The following factors were listed as reasons for the successful implementation of the NHA at HCPS:

- Having parents as champions of the NHA at the school made them a driving force for its ongoing implementation.
- The principal was a consistent champion of the approach, and worked collaboratively with other school staff members and parents to ensure implementation.
- The vast reach of NHA among staff; even custodial staff was trained in the approach.
- The approach is applicable in home and school settings, and has immediately observable results.
The program faced challenges as well. Those included:

- Two to three full days of training are required for staff members to fully learn NHA concepts and techniques, but this amount of professional development time is difficult or impossible for APS schools to arrange. At HCPS, providing some training but not enough gave many staff members a false sense of NHA proficiency.
- Implementing an internal NHA mentoring model is difficult because mentors usually have full schedules during the school day and are not available to observe and mentor during classroom time.
- The NHA may not be sufficient in all situations or on its own. Underlying the NHA is an assumption that misbehavior is rooted in a desire for attention. Other reasons for misbehavior, such as lack of knowledge or skill, may require additional behavioral approaches. Consistency in selecting, training, and practicing these complementary approaches will be necessary for achieving NHA outcomes.
- The lack of data on NHA activities and student behavior at HCPS was a barrier to establishing clear NHA objectives, monitoring progress for continuous improvement, and measuring outcomes.

*Nurtured Heart Advanced Trainer Survey, 2012*

The Lead Evaluator administered a survey to local NHA Advanced Trainers in fall 2012 to determine how engaged they already were with NHA training and coaching activities, what their capacity and interest to expand this activity was, and what resources they might require to support them in these efforts. Results showed that 18 of the 24 trainers who responded to the survey had trained school staff, parents, or other community-based agency staff (see Appendix EE). In total, they had trained over 7,000 people in the NHA in the community.

Trainers were enthusiastic about expanding their training efforts in the district; however, only 13 of the respondents indicated that they felt adequately prepared to teach or coach others. They indicated that having access to training materials, opportunities to network with one another, and additional training for themselves would be useful. Although the All Faiths Receiving Home had created NHA resource bins available for trainers, none had availed themselves of this tool.

Of survey respondents who had never trained others, the main reasons cited were lack of time and opportunity, and the fact that training others in NHA was outside of their professional role. This highlights the importance of carefully selecting individuals to participate in the week-long NHA Advanced Training who will be able to then return to train, coach, and mentor others in the district.

**SUSTAINABILITY.** APS plans to sustain NHA through the Student, Family and Community Supports department.

**EARLY CHILDHOOD COLLABORATION AND HOME VISITATION**

One of the major strategies employed to meet the Element Five goal was to improve the quality of early childhood (EC) collaboration and service delivery. Yearly summits convening local agencies involved in...
education and early childhood activities led to several strategic plans and eventually the creation of the Bernalillo County Home Visitation Work Group (BCHVWG) in 2010.

Home visitation is an evidence-based program that includes visits to a family’s home as a primary service delivery strategy for pregnant women or children from birth to age five. Home visitation programs offer a continuum of services based on families’ preferences, needs, and risk factors. Outcomes include improved maternal and child health, prevention of child injuries and abuse, improvement in school readiness and achievement, reductions in crime and domestic violence, and more.

EVALUATION. Evaluation activities related to early childhood collaboration include an initial assessment survey, a home visitation capacity assessment, and a final evaluation report.

*Albuquerque Community Early Childhood Services Integration Assessment, 2009*

This assessment drew from a survey that used six EC frameworks and instruments, and was developed with input from more than 20 local and national early childhood experts. It examined four dimensions of Albuquerque’s early childhood community: infrastructure, services, program operations, and family engagement practices. 123 responses were collected (see Appendix FF).

Results showed very low baseline levels of collaboration across all levels. For instance, although agency directors may have been in communication, those directly providing services were rarely informed of coordination efforts. The EC community lacked a formal structure including all local EC agencies, and sharing resources for planning, monitoring, and training was rare.

As a result of the survey, an *Element Five Early Childhood Strategic Plan* was created outlining core strategies and implementation steps on how EC services could be designed, implemented, and linked together in a comprehensive local system of EC services. This plan was finalized in 2010, and discussed at the *Albuquerque Community Early Childhood Services Network Summit*, attended by 28 different area agencies.

*Bernalillo County Home Visitation Capacity Assessment*

The summit referenced above led to a series of follow-up meetings, including one that focused specifically on home visitation services. The *Bernalillo County Home Visitation Capacity Assessment* was conducted to determine the existing status of home visitation services, identify potential expansion of services, and determine unmet need (see Appendix GG).

The assessment determined that the need for home visitation services was greater than the existing capacity of services available. Existing capacity was able to provide service coverage to 8% of all Bernalillo County mothers, 20% of first time mothers, and 60% of all teen mothers. Most home visitation services focused on providing services in the highest risk zones of Bernalillo County, particularly the International Zone of Southeast Albuquerque.

Some of the key recommendations from this assessment included:

- Form a work group of home visitation stakeholders in Bernalillo County.
• Develop common intake forms and an intake process for the home visitation system as a whole.
• Develop shared outreach and referral functions.
• Develop common professional development and training for home visitation staff.

As a direct result of this capacity assessment, several advances in early childhood collaboration were made: 1) the Bernalillo County Home Visitation Work Group was formed by seven home visitation agencies and has met monthly since September 2010, 2) short- and long-term strategies were developed for joint professional development and the development of a common intake form for home visitation services, and 3) the NM Children, Youth, and Family Department (CYFD) and Department of Health were able to use the report findings in grant applications and to allocate funding to Bernalillo County.

The Bernalillo County Home Visitation Work Group: Improving the Quality of Early Childhood Collaboration and Service Delivery in Bernalillo County, Evaluation Report, 2013

This report was commissioned in 2012 to document the history, successes, and challenges of the BCHVWG, as well as provide recommendations for the future direction of the group (see Appendix HH).

Beginning in September 2010, the BCHVWG has met on a monthly basis to focus on the coordination of home visitation services, heighten the awareness of home visitation services, align referral activities, and provide joint professional development. The evaluation revealed the numerous accomplishments of the work group. These included enhanced networking and relationships between individual home visitors, heightened awareness of home visitation services in the community, opportunities for joint professional development, improved understanding of other agencies’ work and therefore improved referral rates for clients, and the creation of a shared referral form. These benefits are discussed in detail in Chapter V, as they provide examples of broader long-term systems change in the local home visitation and early childhood community.

In addition to the many accomplishments of the BCHVWG, the evaluation uncovered several challenges facing the group as it looks to the future. These include:

• Mission Statement and Goals: A lack of a mission statement with goals and objectives has allowed the group to follow a free-flowing, emergent direction; however, more concrete direction may be needed to sustain interest and commitment.
• Centralized Referral Process: A seamless process with “no wrong doors for families” is needed to ensure that all families can receive appropriate referrals and access to home visitation services. The BCHVWG supports and endorses a wide variety of program models with diverse, and at times, conflicting values represented. This diversity presents the need for thoughtful movement toward centralization that continues to respect all programs and models.
• Need for Data: The impact of the work group is unclear. Outside of anecdotal comments, there are no data to support claims of more referrals, more families served, enhancement of families’ experiences with home visitation, or the effectiveness of the common referral form.
SUSTAINABILITY. The BCHVWG has been extremely successful, and plans to continue to convene monthly and work collaboratively. This was reiterated at a celebration of SS/HS collaboration successes on June 5, 2013. The UNM Center for Development and Disability and CYFD are currently working together to find a way to continue to pay the group’s facilitator to sustain her position after the SS/HS initiative ends.
IV. SYSTEMS CHANGE

The federal Safe Schools Healthy Students initiative emphasizes long-term systems change within communities. Participating schools and local agencies are meant to coordinate and integrate their services, improve communication and information-sharing, and therefore be better able to prevent school violence and respond to crisis situations.

The Albuquerque SS/HS community needs assessment conducted during the planning stages of the grant life cycle revealed that, among other things, APS lacked:

1. a fully integrated **community approach** to address risk factors that are barriers to learning;
2. a **system to capture uniform, detailed, and actionable data** and information regarding threats to a positive school climate;
3. focused programming that promotes the development of a positive learning environment as envisioned in the CDC Coordinated School Health Model; and
4. sufficient **properly trained staff and community partnerships** to provide a framework to connect universal, secondary, and intensive supports and services for all current and future students.

Specific, measurable objectives were developed to address these issues, as outlined in Chapter III, and various programs and initiatives were deployed to meet those objectives. However, APS’ Safe Schools Healthy Students initiative also had broader aims. The overarching vision for the project was for APS to “**partner** with families and communities to serve as a catalyst for change to create safer schools and healthier students.” The overarching goal was “to **link and integrate** existing and new services and activities into a comprehensive **community-wide** plan for change that creates safer schools and healthier students.”

These broader aims are not as easily defined or measured as the specific objectives. They require change at a deeper level, including everything from adjusting the way departments operate to shifting individuals’ attitudes. The final evaluation identified three wide-reaching and long-term systems changes within APS as a result of SS/HS funding. These include the following:

- **Increased collaboration with community partners, among APS departments, and within schools.**
  
The themes of working collaboratively to align programs and services, improving community partnerships and linkages, and building relationships were woven throughout the grant’s activities. On-going collaborations between APS and various community partners resulted in improved understanding of each other’s services, shared capacity building, resource-sharing across agencies, shared training and professional development opportunities, innovative and creative programmatic approaches, and ultimately, better service provision to students and families. Improved communication and collaboration between APS departments and within schools themselves also resulted from the SS/HS initiative. The following programs benefited from and contributed to collaboration efforts:
  
  > Juvenile Justice/Mental Health collaboration (Cross-Element)
  > School Resource Officer program (Element One)
Bullying prevention (Element Three)  
Mental health service provision (Element Four)  
The Nurtured Heart Approach (Element Five)  
Early Childhood Collaboration/Home Visitation Program (Element Five)

**Creation of new district-level, school, and community infrastructure.** The development and implementation of new policies, procedures, positions, and data collection systems will ensure that several grant-funded activities will continue into the future. These support continued efforts at collaboration and work towards promoting safety in APS schools. Major initiatives that led to infrastructural systems change include:

- School-Wide Positive Behavioral Supports (Element One)  
- Bullying prevention (Element Three)  
- Mental health service provision (Element Four)  
- Early Childhood Collaboration/Home Visitation Program (Element Five)

**Shifts in philosophy.** There have been several philosophical shifts in the ways district staffs, community agencies, and school staff members approach collaborative relationships with one another, school safety, and student behavior. These include moving the focus from reactive to proactive strategies, and moving from a punitive model for student offenders to one that focuses on positive youth development and violence prevention. Contributors to philosophical systems change include:

- School-wide Positive Behavioral Supports (Element One)  
- School Resource Officer training (Element One)  
- Juvenile Justice/Mental Health collaboration (Element Four)  
- The Nurtured Heart Approach (Element Five)

The SS/HS programs and initiatives in APS that have fostered the systems changes listed above are described in detail here.

**CROSS-ELEMENT**

**Juvenile Justice/Mental Health Collaboration**

One of the initial topics that the SS/HS Core Team chose to focus on was the “School-to-Prison Pipeline.” This term refers to specific educational policies and practices that have the effect of pushing students, especially students of color and students with disabilities, out of schools and toward the juvenile and criminal justice systems. When schools use zero-tolerance discipline policies, they directly send children and youth into the juvenile justice system by criminalizing a wide variety of student behavior, including misdemeanor offenses that do not pose a serious, ongoing threat to school safety. In addition, common school practices such as out-of-school suspension, expulsion, and the failure to re-integrate students returning from juvenile justice placements, limit students’ opportunities to learn and make them more likely to drop out of school.
Reports from the New Mexico Children, Youth and Families Department (CYFD) suggested that juvenile justice referral rates from some APS schools were disproportionately high. Juvenile justice officials also reported that many referrals were inappropriate, unnecessarily exposing students to the criminal justice system. They argued that minor, non-criminal offenses could be resolved more effectively within school settings, with approaches addressing the underlying causes of problem behavior.

To address this, the Core Team developed the goal of “reducing the number of youth who enter the juvenile justice system from APS schools, and increase the proportion of students who receive school-based, school-linked or community-based early intervention services that prevent the escalation of problems into more serious disciplinary infractions and juvenile justice referrals, by improving professional networks and communications within and between schools, community-based organizations, juvenile justice agencies and others, and by building solid support and inter-agency referral systems.”

Efforts to reduce the School-to-Prison Pipeline required extensive collaboration between APS, law enforcement, and community mental health providers at the district and school levels, and resulted in a reduction of student referrals to the juvenile justice system. The following sections describe the evolution of the Core Team’s efforts in this area through collaboration, and a positive side effect that stemmed from this work—a philosophical shift in how youth offenders are viewed by law enforcement, school officials, and those working in juvenile justice.

Collaboration

In 2009, the Core Team organized a Walkabout focused on gang prevention, pro-social activities and solutions, for the various partner agencies to learn more about one another.

2009 also saw the implementation of Prevention Intervention Program for Youth (PIPY) —a pilot project at Jimmy Carter Middle School (JCMS) aimed at reducing student referrals into the juvenile justice system, increasing the number of students who successfully transition back to school from juvenile detention, and decreasing recidivism (see Chapter IV). The PIPY coordinating team included representatives from Juvenile Probation, the Bernalillo County Juvenile Detention Youth Services Center (BCYSC), school administration, the APS Police Department (APSPD), school counselors, the school’s Behavior Intervention Program, the school social worker, the district’s Family Engagement program, and SS/HS staff.

Through the PIPY project, BCYSC caseworkers connected high-risk students at JCMS and their families with resources and services related to mental health, gang intervention, clothing and housing, mediation, and other needs. They also worked with students at the BCYSC, providing case management and follow-up services to students discharged from detention with the objective of increasing the proportion of students who left detention with clear and realistic educational plans. Caseworkers reported that the number of bookings into juvenile detention from JCMS declined from seven in 2010 to two in 2011, and that recidivism was low among PIPY clients, with only five of the 93 youth served in spring 2011 entering the juvenile justice system after receiving services.
In spring 2010, the Core Team collaborated to put on a one-day Juvenile Justice/Mental Health Collaboration Summit. Representatives from SS/HS programs, APS schools, law enforcement, mental health, juvenile justice, early childhood agencies and the District Attorney’s and Senator Bingaman’s offices attended.

One result of the summit was the formation of the Juvenile Justice Action Team, with representatives from APS, law enforcement, juvenile justice, and other community organizations. An action plan was developed focusing on reducing the stream of juveniles into the justice system by improving communication between partner agencies, building a referral and mental health service providing system, and increasing the number of students who get early intervention services. Specific strategies included:

1) Develop better understanding of why and how referrals are made from schools to juvenile detention/probation.
2) Define what constitutes challenging disruptive behavior on school grounds.
3) Review suspension, Special Education and administrative policies.
4) Determine and define how to handle minor infractions within the school community rather than via a police report.
5) Implement training/capacity building on the national “pipeline” issue.
6) Design and implement a Pilot Project [PIPY].
7) Map existing services and identify gaps.
8) Train caseworkers/probation officers in available services in APS schools.
9) Train School Resource Officers on how to access/refer to available services.
10) Identify what each agency can do with specific roles and responsibilities.

In 2011, the Southwest Family Guidance Center (SFGC) spearheaded the Next Step program at West Mesa High School, highlighting a key collaborative effort between mental health service providers and law enforcement. This model was created as an alternative to sending students to detention. School Resource Officers (SROs) would refer students with first-time non-violent offenses to the Next Step program rather than sending them to the detention center (BCYSC). Students would then receive an online needs assessment and receive mental health and other services from community partners as needed. The goal was to engage students and parents in problem-solving and to seek alternative services and solutions rather than simply employing punitive consequences. The founder of SFGC, noted at the Why Collaboration Matters event in June 2013 that Next Step and other collaborative SS/HS initiatives have led to a tremendous increase in accessibility of services to the students that most need them, in addition to the reduction of students into the juvenile justice system.

In 2011, the BCYSC informed APS of a 53% reduction in bookings for delinquent acts occurring on schools grounds: from 185 bookings in August-December 2010 to 87 bookings from August-December 2011. This was viewed as a major success due to the SS/HS initiative and the multiple collaborative projects it supported and helped create.
Shift in Philosophy

As a result of SS/HS efforts to reduce the flow of youth into the justice system, the APSPD and members of the juvenile justice community have reported a major shift in how they work with one another and how they approach student offenders.

Members of the APSPD, mental health providers, and juvenile justice Core Team members noted how previously, they were unclear about one another’s roles and protocols. Now, because of the relationships they’ve established through the SS/HS initiative, they are able to communicate better and work together to find solutions for individual students. There is a greater level of trust and understanding between the various agencies, and they are more aware of the alternatives to simply booking students into the detention center. They feel comfortable contacting each other with questions about individual cases, and know who to seek out for assistance within particular agencies. The APSPD Lieutenant noted at a May 2013 Core Team meeting:

Knowing people is critical. Now we have people to refer the kids to, and now we know the answers to the kids’ problems is not always the D-Home. So many kids have mental health issues, and getting them into the juvenile justice system is not always the best way to help them. We very seldom take kids to the D-Home now.

This echoes a statement he made two years prior:

It’s a critical thing for us in law enforcement to have alternatives. When I started with the school police about seven years ago, we didn’t have many alternatives. I would take kids to the juvenile detention a lot for fighting. Because the kids were mad. They wouldn’t talk to us. We didn’t have anybody to refer them to. We’d just take them to the D-Home and it seemed like that was all we could do to address that need. It’s been critical to develop relationships with Health and Juvenile Probation, so we don’t just have one thing to do with the kids.

The Chief Probation Officer of the NM CYFD also highlighted the shift in how agencies work together:

We used to get kids booked into the detention center from schools for non-violent, non-serious misdemeanor offenses. And there was somewhat of a struggle between agencies.

There has been a lot of work around clarifying what everyone’s role is and getting a better understanding of why the officers make the decisions that they make, why probation then makes the decisions that we make, and detention. I see a huge increase in the constructive collaboration that goes on between us.

Core Team members also discussed the evolution of how they view student offenders. The Chief Probation Officer’s quote from above continues:

Now the intention isn’t always, you know, hook them and book them and prosecute to the fullest. The intention now is what do they need and how do we get them that? And do they have to be removed from the school in order for that to happen?

This shift in how students are viewed and treated has had other positive ripple effects. By finding alternative solutions besides taking students directly to BCYSC (the Detention Home or “D-Home”), the
officers are spending more time on site at schools to ensure school safety. This also allows them more time to develop more positive and friendly relationships with students. Students, in turn, are more likely to view law enforcement in a positive light, and seek out SROs as trusted advisors and confidantes.

Bringing together mental health providers, juvenile justice, and law enforcement under the umbrella of the SS/HS initiative has had a lasting impact on the way these groups interact with one another and the youth they serve.

**Element One**

**School Resource Officer Training**

Training School Resource Officers (SROs) was an important part of addressing the School-to-Prison Pipeline, as discussed above. The SS/HS initiative’s involvement with the school police force began with the simple procurement of safety equipment and evolved into the goal of reducing the flow of youth into the juvenile justice system. These efforts led to shared statewide training and the development of a state organization of school resource officers.

**Collaboration**

Initial SRO training focused exclusively on the APSPD. In 2009, five new SROs from APSPD were trained and received basic SRO certification, learning how SROs can help prevent school violence. Two APSPD officers attended the National Association of School Resource Officers (NASRO) training in Baltimore, and received advanced SRO certification.

In 2010, SS/HS staff helped organize trainings that brought together the three law enforcement agencies that work in APS schools—the APSPD, the Albuquerque Police Department (APD), and the Bernalillo County Sheriff’s Department (BCSO). That year, 40 SROs from the three agencies received training in conflict mediation and conflict resolution. Later that year, two APSPD sergeants attended the annual NASRO training in Orlando. SS/HS staffs recognized the value of this national training, and wanted to expand it to more SROs, but costs were prohibitive. To overcome this barrier, SS/HS staffs reached out to bring NASRO trainers to Albuquerque, and opened up the training to SROs from around New Mexico.

In 2011, 25 SROs from the three local law enforcement agencies as well as SROs from around the state attended a NASRO training in Albuquerque. An additional local NASRO training took place in 2013, and was attend by SROs from APSPS, APD, and BCSO.

Bringing together officers from the three law enforcement agencies represented an unprecedented level of collaboration among these groups. Although there was some resistance, and more traditional ideas about and approaches to working with youth were not entirely overcome, the seed was planted for future collaboration and systems change.

**Community Infrastructure**

The local 2011 NASRO training was very successful and generated statewide buzz about the benefits of having SROs in schools as a way to prevent school violence. As a result, the New Mexico Association of
School Resource Officers was formed. The movement to train police officers as school resource officers, with the expanded role and focus on prevention that this entails, gained momentum at the state level.

Another result of these efforts was the participation of the SS/HS Manager in the New Mexico Education Sub Committee/House Joint Memorial 21 Task Force. This group worked to legislate equal access to youth services statewide and to prevent suspensions and referrals to the juvenile justice system. The committee’s final recommendations included basic SRO training for all law enforcement officers working New Mexico schools.

These infrastructural developments represent important steps forward for juvenile justice in Albuquerque and New Mexico as a whole.

Shift in Philosophy

NASRO defines SROs’ roles as threefold: they act as teachers, counselors, and law enforcement officers. This shifts the responsibility from exclusively reacting to student offenses to proactively creating positive relationships with students and focusing on the prevention of negative behaviors.

The APSPD Lieutenant reports a cultural shift within his department and some APS schools about how students are viewed and treated. Previously some students were assumed to be “bad kids.” Now, officers are able to recognize the challenges facing the youth, and understand that providing them with appropriate mental health and other services is good not only for them, but also for schools and the larger community. At the 2013 Why Collaboration Matters SS/HS celebration event the Lieutenant commented, “It’s such a neat thing to see the kids succeed because they get what they need.”

This change—of working to help students solve their problems, instead of punishing them as the source of problems—highlights a major philosophical shift for many law enforcement officers, and fits perfectly with the collaborative efforts of bringing law enforcement, juvenile justice, and mental health care providers together.

School-Wide Positive Behavior Supports (SWPBS)

SWPBS is a framework for improving student behavior at the school and classroom level. It requires the implementation of various systems, as well as a philosophical shift in how behavior is approached.

School Infrastructure

Schools that implemented SWPBS were required to develop consistent policies regarding student behavior. Expectations for positive behaviors and consequences for problem behaviors were standardized across all classrooms and in all school settings (i.e. the cafeteria, hallways, etc.). Furthermore, expectations for positive behavior were explicitly taught to students, and students were recognized and rewarded for adhering to school rules.

SWPBS also required extensive data collection, either through SWIS or through SchoolMax. Although the program faced challenges with data collection, some schools were able to make important gains in this
regard, and plan to continue collecting behavior data as a way to evaluate and refine their behavior management strategies.

The benefit of creating new systems to address student behavior is captured in these two quotes from staff members at SWPBS-implementing schools (see Appendix J):

*Prior to implementing, our staff each had their own set of rules for how students should behave in a given school environment. We now have outlined clear expectations for each area. The students get a clear, consistent message from every staff member. Prior to SWPBS, our students did not always follow through when asked to behave in a given way. With our student acknowledgement system and the students are eager to demonstrate expected behaviors.*

*The use of acknowledgments to recognize students meeting the behavioral expectations has helped call attention to the reality that behavior does impact academics and safety at our school...The use of a data system (SWIS) to track and report areas of need for individuals or a group is invaluable for intervention and assigning effective consequences to develop the appropriate social behaviors.*

**Shift in Philosophy**

The move from primarily focusing on negative behavior and consequences to proactively recognizing and rewarding positive behavior represented an important philosophical shift in behavior management. Staff members at SWPBS-implementing schools reported that this change, along with the systems put in place by SWPBS teams, had the following impacts: improved student behavior, a reduction in office discipline referrals and staff turnover, and the cultivation of caring, respectful school climates. This quote highlights the benefits of this shift in how youth and behavior management are approached:

*SWPBS has impacted the way the staff and teachers speak to the students. Focusing on the positive behaviors of the students makes the school a positive learning environment...The hallways are calm and quiet. The students enjoy being recognized for their positive behavior and strive to follow the behaviors in the behavior matrix.*

**Element Three**

**Bullying Prevention**

APS has had a Bullying Prevention Policy in place since 2007. However, the Safe Schools Healthy Students initiative brought bullying prevention to the forefront of district attention, and led to the development of the first comprehensive anti-bullying program initiative in the district. Collaboration across local agencies as well as at the state level was critical to the success and growth of this program. In addition, the development of district-level policies, procedures, and positions will ensure APS’ future commitment to bullying prevention, and highlights one of the most important systems change impacts of the SS/HS grant. The bullying prevention initiative required relatively little SS/HS funding, but is responsible for one of the SS/HS initiative’s most celebrated impacts.

**Collaboration**

In 2009, the SS/HS Manager worked with program managers from all five elements of the SS/HS grant along with additional APS departmental staff to draft an action plan to coordinate new and existing
bullying prevention efforts across APS departments and community agencies. The SS/HS Manager, APS’ Health and Wellness Department Director and APS’ Safety Resource Counselor (SRC) also participated in a working group convened by several State of New Mexico departments (Children, Youth and Families; Health; and Public Education) to determine the status of bullying prevention efforts in the state, research evidence-based strategies, and make recommendations for bullying prevention programs across the state.

In 2010, SS/HS staff created a bullying prevention brochure, which was distributed widely throughout the district, and developed the local SS/HS website (www.abqsafeschools.org) which focuses primarily on bullying prevention and awareness. Wide media coverage of these efforts led to invitations for SS/HS staff to work collaboratively with the University of New Mexico Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Questioning (LGBTQ) Resource Center and the Bernalillo County Commissioner on bullying prevention in the wider community. In fall 2010, the County’s bullying prevention policy was finalized, with significant participation by the SS/HS Coordinator.

In 2011, a unique coalition made up staff from APS SS/HS, Bernalillo County Parks and Recreation Department, and UNM’s LGBTQ Resource Center formed the Don’t Just Stand There Stop Bullying Now Task Force (DJST) to address bullying through agency collaboration, training, and awareness-raising focused on the importance of bystanders standing up against bullying. A community-wide student-led campaign was developed to engage youth, parents, school staff, and partner agencies. More than 10,000 students and adults participated in a variety of bullying prevention activities, including:

- flash mobs of a choreographed anti-bullying dance
- public service announcements
- marches
- panel discussions

The DJST Task Force also developed a common definition for bullying, which is now used district-wide as well as in after-school programs, sports, and summer programming provided by Bernalillo County. This definition and common message about bullying prevention has been reinforced through the creation of a logo, and giveaways of bracelets and T-shirts at community events. In addition, tip sheets for youth and adults were produced and widely distributed, and a film was created with footage from various anti-bullying events. The various innovative approaches to raise awareness about bullying and engage youth were a direct result of community partnerships, and received significant media coverage in the community. Furthermore, media coverage shifted from negative stories of bullying to positive prevention-oriented stories. The success of DJST’s campaign resulted in national coverage of APS’ bullying prevention strategy in the bulletin Bullying Prevention and Intervention: Snapshots from Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiatives (Education Development Center, Inc., 2012).

In 2013, the DJST Task Force organized New Mexico’s first Bullying Prevention Symposium. This event was attended by nearly 100 people from around the state, including APS district and school staff, community organization and government agency staff, and parents. The Task Force plans to organize this event annually. Furthermore, the Task Force itself will continue beyond the life cycle of the SS/HS initiative with participation by APS district staff. Bernalillo County has already allocated funding for the
Task Force and next year’s symposium. The success of the DJST Task Force highlights its relevance in the community, and its collaborative nature marks an important system change for the school district and the other participating agencies.

The Safe Schools Ambassador (SSA) program is another important anti-bullying effort, and was initiated in three APS middle schools in 2011. SSA is a student-centered approach that trains youth leaders to help stop bullying and violence among their peers. Community Matters, a non-profit organization that aims to empower youth to transform their schools and communities, was responsible for training the student ambassadors, and represents another important example of district-agency collaboration to prevent bullying. Since 2011, additional schools have joined, and currently 16 middle schools and three high schools have SSA programs. SSA has been identified by the APS Board of Education as the primary vehicle to prevent bullying at the middle and high school levels. Recommendations from recent Board strategic planning efforts include rolling out an SSA program in all district middle and high schools, though funding has not yet been allocated.

**District Infrastructure**

The SS/HS initiative has generated several systems changes in APS that will allow for the sustainability of bullying prevention in the district.

In 2010, The SS/HS Coordinator and the School Resource Counselor (SRC) developed a template to help APS schools finalize their site-based bullying response plans. This led to the development of a district-wide Bullying Prevention Task Force charged with creating a single, universal plan for how schools address allegations of bullying, and to address professional development needs for school personnel in regards to bullying.

The district bullying prevention plan was rolled out in 2011. It includes a student/parent reporting form for bullying incidents, and specifies appropriate roles for administrators, counselors, and other staff members, and the necessary actions to be taken after a bullying incident. All district staff completed a mandatory online bullying prevention training, and will continue to be trained annually. The SS/HS Coordinator and the SRC also worked to streamline discipline referral forms, so that all schools at the same level would use the same one. The agreed-upon universal definition of bullying is included on the forms, along with a checklist to help staff determine if a given conflict is truly an incident of bullying. Despite their efforts, there is some variation among discipline referral forms at different schools.

In 2012, the district created a full-time position for a Bullying and Violence Prevention Coordinator, which was filled by the SS/HS Coordinator. This position, housed in the Student, Family, and Community Supports Division (formerly Health and Wellness) will help ensure that bullying prevention awareness and activities become part of school culture—a true district-wide systems change for APS. The SRC position will also continue beyond the life cycle of the SS/HS initiative. Funding for the continuation of both positions has already been allocated by the district.

Finally, the SS/HS website created in 2010 continues to be a central community and statewide resource for bullying prevention. It provides informational resources for youth, parents, and community members about bullying and suicide prevention, among other things. Once the SS/HS initiative at APS ends, the
bullying prevention portions of the website will transition to a different domain and will be maintained and updated by the DJST Task Force. Partner agencies including Bernalillo County and UNM have allocated funding for the continued sustainability of the site.

ELEMENT FOUR

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

The SS/HS initiative has provided funding for various counseling positions, and has helped increase the number of students receiving mental health services at school and at off-site community locations (see Chapter III). There were also several ways that the SS/HS initiative created longer-lasting systems change related to mental health services within the Student, Family, and Community Supports Division (SFCS), though these were especially challenging to implement, due to staff turnover at the leadership level and other internal issues. Nevertheless, systems changes are evident in the development of district infrastructure (new procedures and forms) that eventually led to a new system for electronic data collection.

Collaboration

As a result of the SS/HS initiative, collaboration increased greatly between school personnel, including Health and Wellness (H&W) Teams, administration and school resource officers, outside mental health providers, and those working in juvenile justice. Over the course of the initiative, mental health service provision in APS schools increased by 93% over baseline. Schools were able to provide services for some of the most high-need low-resource students and their families, who otherwise would not likely receive the counseling and mental health services they need. The district was also able to implement same-day suicide assessments for students exhibiting self-harm ideation. In 2012-13 alone, outside community agencies performed over 800 suicide assessments, approximately 30% of which were deemed to be high-risk. Collaboration between schools and community mental health providers has led to improved accessibility of services, better integration among service providers, and prevention of violence, suicide, and other negative behaviors among APS students.

District Infrastructure – Data Collection

In 2009, evaluators created a survey of H&W Team leaders in order to capture baseline data for GPRA measure 6. The survey asked respondents to estimate the number of students referred to off-campus mental health services in an average month, and the number of students who actually received those off-campus services. This survey has been repeated annually every spring, with the exception of the no-cost extension year. In addition to providing the needed GPRA data, the survey prompted several attempts to make improvements in data collection, documentation, and usage (see Chapter IV).

One of these was the development of a new H&W Team Referral Form that includes both on-campus and off-campus referrals and follow-up information. The intention was that collecting this information

---

8 Portions of the website related to early childhood initiatives and mental health information will be migrated to the SCFS Division website.
would have an intervention effect and increase follow-through of off-campus mental health referrals.

There were several challenges in collecting data from the H&W Teams, and data were never collected from all Teams, despite multiple attempts from SS/HS and SFCS staff. In 2009, as a way to improve response rates and streamline the process, evaluators began exploring web-based options for collecting mental health service referral information.

In 2011, SharePoint was chosen as the best option for this data collection, and in 2012, the SFCS Division piloted the use of this program for the first time. The data repository of the application was designed to match that of other data systems to facilitate the data processing and analysis of outcomes for the Division. The first SS/HS program to benefit from the SharePoint data collection and communication system was the Counseling Services for Families program. An online data collection tool was developed and put into use by the program’s participating counselors in numerous schools. Based on start-up experiences of the pilot program, staffs made adjustments to its configuration to improve overall capacity. In 2013, the SFCS Division’s Data Management staff completed online training that provided an in-depth understanding of the development/configuration requirements for the system. Furthermore, staff worked to complete the online tool design of two additional SS/HS-funded programs (Project SUCCESS/Crossroads PES and PIP programs) so that they can be implemented at the start of the 2013-2014 school year.

The adoption of SharePoint have enabled the SFCS Division to maintain a web-based data system that allows it to efficiently process large amounts of data for multiple programs operating in numerous settings throughout the school district, for the first time ever. Although shifting the culture of the Division to one that emphasizes the importance of data collection, analysis, and usage has been a challenge, the adoption of SharePoint marks a significant achievement in this regard, and will continue to be a legacy of the SS/HS initiative into the future.

**Element Five**

**Nurtured Heart Approach Training Model**

As noted in Chapter IV, the Nurtured Heart Approach (NHA) is a transformative system that helps adults work with challenging children, and improves not only outward behavior, but children’s supply of “inner wealth” as well. One of the most notable features of how NHA was implemented through the SS/HS initiative was its collaborative training model.

**Collaboration**

The SS/HS initiative led to a shift from the normal school-based only training model to the inclusivity of a broad swath of community members and agencies. From the beginning of the grant, NHA trainings were open not only to APS teachers and staff, but also to public and private pre-K staff members, mental health workers, social workers, parents, and those working in juvenile justice. It also touched a wide range of role groups within schools, including general education and special education teachers, administrators, family liaisons, counselors, SROs, after-school staff, and in some cases, clerical, food services, and janitorial staff as well.
What began as a ripple turned into a tide in 2012, as more and more people in the community became aware of NHA and its positive impacts. Entire schools and agencies requested to have their staff trained. Raising community awareness about NHA through media coverage, and expanding its reach to a variety of schools, agencies, and professionals will help ensure that children experience the positive effects of NHA in a variety of settings: at home, in day cares and pre-K programs, in elementary, middle and high schools, and also with counselors, after-school settings, and in the juvenile justice system.

The openness and inclusivity of this model extended beyond Albuquerque, and was replicated by a neighboring community, Los Alamos. With guidance from the APS SS/HS Manager, Los Alamos hosted an NHA training for its school district, and opened it up to the local early childhood, mental health, and juvenile justice communities as well. This is a major shift in how school districts tend to operate, and represents an important systems change in the region.

The Nurtured Heart Approach will be sustained in APS through the creation of a new NHA Coordinator position within the SFCS Division. However, once it is no longer operating with funding and requirements from SS/HS, it is unclear whether or not the community collaboration element will remain inherent to the NHA training model. This evaluation recommends continuing the model of community inclusivity, both to benefit the children who will be touched by NHA and to retain the relationships built between APS and the various organizations as a result of this initiative.

**Shift in Philosophy**

The Nurtured Heart Approach requires those practicing it to engage in a new way with children—refusing to energize negative behaviors, relentlessly acknowledging the positive, and consistently administering appropriate consequences while remaining “emotion-neutral.” This often necessitates an internal change. Parents, teachers, and administrators practicing NHA report feeling better themselves, not just because of improved student behavior, but because of their own changed thinking and approach. One teacher said:

*The NHA has changed the way I speak to kids when I have discipline referral issues, the way I relate to them and have a conversation with them. Rather than “why did you do this?!” it’s more about letting them know what I think they’ve been doing well, and then questioning.*

An Advanced NHA Trainer working at APS noted:

*NHA has transformed my relationships with other people. I believe that NHA can change the life of our children and their families. NHA can change the world!*

**EARLY CHILDHOOD COLLABORATION/Bernalillo County Home Visitation Work Group**

As described in Chapter IV, the Bernalillo County Home Visitation Work Group (BCHVWG) emerged after a needs assessment identified that demand far surpassed existing capacity of home visitation services in the community. Because of this finding, the tone was set for collaboration rather than competition among home visitation agencies. Key stakeholders identified the potential to work together to improve services for the community, and due to the large demand for services, they were not threatened by competition for clients. Since September 2010, the BCHVWG has met monthly and has grown into a
venue for true cross-agency collaboration, with benefits to individual home visitation service providers, the organizations they work for, and the families they serve.

**Collaboration**

The BCHVWG has met consistently on a monthly basis for almost three years. Meetings are open to home visitation and other early childhood stakeholders to share information and improve services. The group composition includes a wide variety of stakeholders, with representation from program administrators, home visitors, and the early childhood community. This representation enables linking home visitation agencies to other early childhood organizations and key system agents such as CYFD, the Department of Health, and Bernalillo County. This has helped elevate home visitation to be recognized as a part of the larger continuum of services for children and families. Local media coverage has also helped raise awareness in the community about home visitation and its benefits for families.

The BCHVWG meetings have been facilitated by a paid coordinator, using SS/HS funds. This leadership has played a critical role in building trust, maintaining communication, setting a tone of respect for all programs and approaches to home visitation. Conflict and competition are alleviated through providing a venue for home visitors to share their concerns and support each other. Evaluation revealed that participants feel a strong sense of ownership in the group and take an active role in decision-making. They describe a democratic process, and note that shared decision-making has also helped reduce perceived risks and competition for individual stakeholders.

One of the major benefits of collaboration has been information-sharing between agencies about their individual programs and eligibility requirements. Due to the high level of trust that has developed among participants, people feel more comfortable and knowledgeable about other home visitation services, and therefore are better able and more likely to refer clients to the appropriate organizations for assistance. This has resulted in greater service provision to families who may have a hard time navigating the various agencies, each of which has different eligibility requirements.

Another important benefit and systems change in the community is shared professional development among the agencies. BCHVWG members report that small agencies often struggle with being able to provide professional development activities for their employees. The collaboration created by the SS/HS initiative and the work group led to seven unique professional development activities, open to all local home visitation agencies and other early childhood stakeholders. Ideas for professional development often emerged from conservations at the monthly BCHVWG meetings, and included childhood development topics as well as other issues relevant to their clients, such as immigration, state and national legislation, public benefits, and health care reform. Sharing professional development opportunities helps agencies reduce costs, and creates a ‘cross-fertilization’ of ideas that enriches and enhances the local home visitation and early childhood communities.

One final way that this initiative is creating systems change is by expanding the model of collaboration statewide. CYFD is spearheading the approach to bring together and align home visitation services in other parts of New Mexico. The local facilitator of the BCHVWG has already met with agencies from two
other counties to provide guidance as they initiate similar collaborative efforts in their areas. This helps build home visitation as a system rather than simply a collection of individual programs.

Community Infrastructure

Several concrete efforts will create longstanding systems change in the local home visitation and early childhood community. First was the creation of an outside facilitator position for the BCHVWG. This position was funded by SS/HS and contributed greatly to the successful functioning of the group. Participants are eager to continue the group’s monthly meetings, and recognize the importance of having a dedicated independent facilitator. CYFD and UNM’s Center for Development and Disability (CDD) are currently working together to find funding to sustain this position.

Additionally, the BCHVWG worked over a period of months to develop a common referral form, which is continually reviewed and revised as needed. The form is being used primarily to educate and inform professionals and families about home visitation options in Bernalillo County. Community providers (doctors, nurses, early childhood organizations and agencies) appreciate the ease and convenience of the one-page common referral form. While not quantifiably verified, there is a perception that the form has increased the referrals to their programs and has increased the practice of cross-referring of families from one program to another. This has helped ground home visitation in the continuum of family services, and allows home visitation to play a connecting role for families.

The group has a long-term goal to develop a common intake form or shared screening process as well. Due to differences in agencies’ funding sources, which sometimes dictate eligibility, universal screening and centralized intake is more of challenge, but the group plans to embark on this in the future.

Finally, as a result of the SS/HS initiative, APS entered into contracts with UNM CDD for two different programs. The first contract was for intensive service provision to young children with mental health intervention and treatment needs, and their families, including home visitation and referrals to local public mental health agencies when indicated. The second contract was to provide home visitation services to children ages zero to three, using the Parents as Teachers (PAT) model. These contracts represent the first time APS has worked with the UNM CDD in such a capacity. The importance of this work is such that the CYFD will continue to fund these programs, and will help expand the PAT program into Albuquerque’s South Valley, an area of particular need.
V. CHALLENGES AND OVERCOMING BARRIERS

As evidenced in the previous chapter, the Safe Schools Healthy Students (SS/HS) initiative has led to important systems changes both in APS and the broader community. This section describes some of the challenges faced by the initiative, as well as some of the important factors that helped the initiative overcome these barriers.

CHALLENGES

DISTRICT-WIDE IMPLEMENTATION IN A LARGE DISTRICT

APS is the largest school district in New Mexico, serving nearly 90,000 students at 89 elementary schools, 27 middle schools, 13 high schools, and 11 alternative schools. The initial SS/HS grant application was written with the intention of full district-wide implementation. The Core Team later decided to focus on three high-need clusters (West Mesa, Rio Grande, and Highland). Nevertheless, SS/HS programs and resources were spread widely and thinly across schools (see Appendix B). This meant that many APS schools and their students were exposed to small pieces of SS/HS programming, but none were able to experience the initiative as a whole. This diminished the overall impact of the grant, and limited the possibility of thoroughly evaluating school-wide or initiative-wide impacts. Furthermore, because of the initial intention to use SS/HS funds district-wide, APS was disqualified for future SS/HS funding.

IMPLEMENTING EVIDENCE-BASED PROGRAMS

Evidence-based programs are often considered the gold standard for schools wanting to implement changes, whether in student behavior or academic progress. The SS/HS initiative included several evidence-based programs, including SWPBS, Project SUCCESS/Crossroads, Project ALERT, and Family Engagement Specialists (FES) that had very specific requirements and guidelines for implementation. Despite the proven successes of these programs elsewhere, their implementation proved challenging in APS. Barriers included:

- **Program design.** Project ALERT and Project SUCCESS/Crossroads suffered because program designs were not fully compatible with established APS practices. For instance, school schedules limited the number of classrooms able to participate in Project ALERT and Crossroads. Counselors and school staffs were unable to provide the required dosage of programming due to schedules, curriculum demands, and high absenteeism among the highest need students. Pressures for teachers to keep students in classrooms were also barriers to allowing individual students to participate in Crossroads counseling sessions. Although counselors made appropriate adaptations in some instances, resources and structures at the school and district levels required for full implementation were lacking.

- **Training demands.** SWPBS, for instance, has significant training and coaching requirements for teachers and school administrators. Making sufficient time for training, coaching, and holding regular SWPBS team meetings, was a challenge for many schools, and may have contributed to less-than-full implementation at many sites.
• **Cost.** Tied to training is the significant cost of implementing some evidence-based programs. In addition, the large size of the district made it impossible to implement these programs district-wide in a cost-effective manner.

• **Conflicting models.** In the case of the Family Engagement Specialists program (FES), implementers faced the challenge of having multiple family engagement initiatives operating across the district and within individual schools. These programs competed with FES for resources and promoted different approaches, creating confusion about district expectations, and undermining implementation and effectiveness.

• **Leadership support.** In some cases, not having support both from district leaders and school administrators created challenges to implementation of evidence-based programs like SWPBS. Schools that were able to successfully implement these programs had strong buy-in by school administrators. A quote from a teacher interviewed for the SWPBS Needs Assessment (Appendix J) highlights this struggle:

*We desperately need administrative buy-in, consistency in using and following behavioral consequences for the administrator and the staff. The school climate, in general, does not support SWPBS and is deteriorating in just about all areas.*

**INDIVIDUAL PROGRAM MANAGEMENT AND STAFFING ISSUES**

One of the challenges facing the SS/HS Project Manager (PM) was that she did not have direct supervision of individual program staff or managers. In some cases, poor program management or a mismatch of employee skills to a particular position undermined successful program implementation and effectiveness. This was evident with the Family Engagement Specialists and SWPBS programs, among others. However, the PM did not have the authority to make staffing changes. Those who did have authority over staffing were not always directly involved with or invested in the SS/HS initiative and may not have had an incentive to make staffing changes. A general lack of accountability for the work of individual program staff may have also contributed to this problem.

Another institutional challenge was a hiring freeze at APS due to budgetary restrictions. Despite having an independent funding source through SS/HS, the PM could not hire program staff for certain projects because of the freeze. The Parents as Teachers program, SWPBS, and school-based counseling services especially suffered at various points during the grant cycle for this reason. At other times, the lengthy hiring process meant that staff members were sometimes not hired until well into the school year, thereby minimizing program impact.

**DATA COLLECTION**

The SS/HS initiative as a whole, as well as individual programs, required a significant amount of data collection. This proved to be a challenge at the individual classroom level, within APS departments, and among partner agencies. The Lead Evaluator spent a substantial amount of time working to improve data collection for the initiative. In the case of PIPY, significant efforts were made to develop data collection systems that could be used by the partner agency (BCYSC). However, bureaucratic barriers within BCYSC undermined deployment of the database.
Individual schools implementing SWPBS also struggled with consistently and accurately collecting data. Ultimately, this affected the ability of evaluators to assess the effectiveness and outcomes of the program.

ENTRENCHED PHILOSOPHIES
Core Team members noted that it was a challenge for some area law enforcement agencies and officers to shift their approach from viewing youth exclusively as offenders. This was especially difficult for officers in APD and BCSO, whose organizations are devoted primarily to crime prevention and law enforcement. The 2013 social network analysis (Appendix CC) recommends the development of shared agreements among law enforcement agencies regarding training requirements for School Resource Officers, which may help overcome this barrier.

COLLABORATION
The SS/HS initiative can be credited with fostering significant collaboration between APS and community organizations and agencies. Nevertheless, this was at times a challenging task. The SS/HS project manager discovered that collaboration required constant managing, and individual personality conflicts prevented successful collaboration between agencies in a few instances. Sharing resources and sharing credit for successes also proved to be sources of conflict at times.

LEADERSHIP SUPPORT
One of the largest challenges faced by Albuquerque’s SS/HS initiative was a lack of buy-in and support at the upper leadership level within APS. Grant development did not involve district leaders to a sufficient level to foster ownership at this level. Federal and state pressures to improve academic performance were felt more strongly than the importance of violence prevention. SS/HS staffs were not able to successfully capitalize on the link between students’ social-emotional needs, school climate, and academic performance in order to bring the former issues to the forefront of district attention. Despite multiple attempts by SS/HS staff to share information and publicly celebrate successes, district leaders did not know much about the initiative, and were not invested or involved in planning the SS/HS initiative or the individual programs resulting from it.

There was a lack of ownership by district leadership, which in some cases translated to a lack of support for the initiative. This also contributed to a lack of accountability for the success or failure of key programs. For instance, the implementation of some SS/HS programs, like SWPBS, was never embraced or enforced by district leaders. The lack of support at the district level may have contributed to low levels of implementation. For instance, when new principals came to SWPBS-implementing schools, there was no incentive or requirement for them to continue with implementation. Program success often depended upon the level of involvement and interest of school leaders, and staffing changes sometimes affected the continuity and success of programs.

Challenges with leadership support were not exclusive to APS; partner agencies also faced this barrier. Despite a willingness and interest from “on-the-ground” staff, agency leaders did not always have the needed level of buy-in to create a functioning partnership. In other cases, partners and their leadership agreed to be active participants in SS/HS programming, but were unable to fulfill those obligations. For instance, although the Bernalillo County Youth Services Center (BCYSC) was a key partner in the PIPY
project and was responsible for hiring the PIPY case managers, the BCYSC was rarely represented at coordination meetings for this program, and did not maintain communication in other ways. Without clear and decisive management, and without active collaboration from a core partner, the PIPY project struggled to develop and maintain a strategic focus.

OVERCOMING BARRIERS

The following factors were identified by Core Team members and evaluators as helping to overcome some of the challenges listed above and contributing to the overall success of the initiative.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT

One of the strengths of the Albuquerque SS/HS initiative was that it had the same Program Manager throughout the five-year grant period. Core Team members noted that the competence and consistency of the PM were key in making the initiative a success. Particular qualities that she possessed included having a diplomatic leadership style; being able to bridge the different spheres of a public school district, community organizations, and public agencies; being a systems thinker; being perseverant in the face of multiple institutional barriers; and continually bringing the Core Team and other partners back to the a long-term vision of the initiative.

Having the same internal Lead Evaluator for the first four years of the initiative also bolstered its success. The Lead Evaluator was able to work closely with the PM, lending more consistency and continuity to the project, and helping to promote its vision. Having an internal evaluator was especially useful when it came to supporting the various data needs of individual programs of the initiative. The Lead Evaluator worked closely with the SFCS Division’s statistician to determine needs for capturing mental health data, which led to the eventual procurement of SharePoint by that department, and she collaborated with the Student Information Systems (SIS) department, leading to a decision to add a behavior data tracking module to the district’s main school data system, SchoolMAX. This module is aligned with SWIS, the behavior data tracking system used for schools implementing SWPBS, and will be implemented in the future.

COLLABORATION

The SS/HS initiative faced challenges in achieving collaboration, but it was able to make tremendous steps forward in this area. Some of the factors that helped foster collaboration between APS and community organizations included the following:

- **Focusing on a Single Issue.** Identifying specific issues to tackle helped partner organizations rally together to work collaboratively. One example include the many groups that worked together on the anti-bullying campaign, leading to the development of the *Don’t Just Stand There* Task Force, which is funded and will continue well beyond the grant cycle. Focusing on stopping the School-to-Prison pipeline was a unifying issue for the juvenile justice community, and led to multiple summits and eventually major systems changes (see Chapter V).
• **Outside Facilitator.** In the early childhood community, hiring an independent facilitator to convene the Bernalillo County Home Visitation Work Group (BCHVWG) helped bring many different agencies together, and allowed them all to come to the table with the same level of influence. The *Juvenile Justice Action Team* also had an independent facilitator. This helped create level playing fields for participation among agencies, and encouraged more democratic processes within the collaborative groups.

• **Rotating Meeting Space.** The members of the SS/HS Core Team took turns hosting Core Team meetings. This helped individual members become more familiar and comfortable with one another’s agencies, helped create a level playing field for participation, and reinforced the importance of each organization in the collaborative.

• **Shared Data.** Baseline assessment evaluations also helped create a common level of understanding among partner agencies, and allowed them to move forward together in a collaborative way. The BCHVWG, for example, was formed after a needs assessment identified that demand for home visitation services far surpassed the existing capacity by local agencies to provide services. This made it clear that there was no need to compete for clients, which allowed a more collaborative relationship between agencies to form.

• **Shared Training Opportunities.** The SS/HS initiative created many opportunities for shared training across agencies (see Chapter V). The Nurtured Heart Approach, School Resource Officer training, and professional development within the BCHVWG were all examples of this. For instance, NHA training was open to APS staff, community agencies working in early childhood, members of the juvenile justice community, and parents. The SS/HS initiative opened up SRO training to officers from all school districts in New Mexico. Members from nine partner agencies in the BCHVWG attended multiple trainings together. These joint training opportunities modeled collaboration through sharing of resources and space, and ensured that smaller agencies and districts had access to quality training activities. In addition, opening up an organization’s training to other agencies fostered good will among them, and also served to ensure that all participants were on the same page with professional development.

• **Shared Successes.** A final way that the SS/HS initiative promoted collaboration was through the joint celebration of successes. Examples include the public presentation of the PIPY project results at local and national conferences, which brought together various members of the juvenile justice community to both recognize success and spread the message to new audiences, and the *Why Collaboration Matters* luncheon that highlighted the successes of early childhood collaboration through the SS/HS initiative.
VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are based on the findings of this evaluation report, and the multiple evaluation activities conducted over the course of the SS/HS initiative.

1. Continue to foster collaborative relationships between key departments at APS (such as the Student, Family, and Community Supports (SFCS) Division and the Early Childhood Office), and community partners, such as those working in early childhood, mental health, law enforcement, and juvenile justice. Community partnerships were key to the success of the SS/HS initiative.
   
   a. APS leaders should designate representatives from appropriate departments to participate in the Core Team meetings that will be sustained by community partners beyond the life cycle of the SS/HS initiative.

2. Acknowledge the importance of mental health and substance abuse services for student success and school safety, and take steps to operationalize their funding district-wide. APS has pioneered the strategy of bringing community mental health providers into schools to serve the most at-risk youth, and should be commended for its efforts.
   
   a. Continue to fund counselors providing drug prevention and mental health services to students, including undocumented and homeless youth.

3. Continue to publicly celebrate the successes of APS bullying prevention and other positive support programs.
   
   a. Continue to provide material for the abqsafe.schools.org website (which will migrate to the Don’t Just Stand There website) highlighting APS’ many anti-bullying and pro-social activities and campaigns, so that parents, students, and the community are aware of these efforts.

4. Continue to open APS trainings to community partner agencies to foster collaboration, alignment, and service provision.
   
   a. Continue to support the statewide effort to train all School Resource Officers (SROs), and open local SRO training to officers throughout New Mexico.
   
   b. Continue to open Nurtured Heart Approach training to other early childhood organizations, parents, and others so that students will experience the approach in all environments.
5. **Make decisions at the district level about which evidence-based programs to employ, and provide adequate resources to support their full implementation.**

   a. Before adopting evidence-based programs, ensure that there are sufficient 1) staff members at the district level to provide supportive services, and 2) time for the appropriate amount of training and coaching needed by school staff.

   b. Before implementing programs, identify which schools will be most receptive and best able to implement them fully before committing time and money.
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