

School-based probation officers coordinate re-entry, provide supervision for students returning to school following juvenile justice placement.

School Safety

UPDATE

School-based juvenile probation: Everyone benefits

The Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency has been supporting school-based juvenile probation efforts since 1992. This innovative program, first conceptualized in Lehigh County, Pennsylvania, is the first of its kind to physically place full-time juvenile probation officers in public school facilities. The Lehigh County Juvenile Probation Department, working with the Allentown School District, developed the idea for school-based probation to provide closer monitoring of juveniles' behavior and to assist the school district in handling increasing incidents of acting-out behavior exhibited by juvenile probation clients returned to the public schools.

The Lehigh County experience

Allentown is a rapidly growing city in eastern Pennsylvania with a population of 106,000. In the mid 1980s, the Lehigh County Juvenile Probation Department detected a rise in juvenile delinquency in the Allentown area accompanied by an increase in the sophistication and seriousness of the offenses committed.

Simultaneously, the Allentown School District was experiencing increased numbers of dropouts, behavior problems, and drug use and abuse among students. School officials also were discovering that many students who exhibited one at-risk behavior at school were involved in other at-risk behaviors, such as delinquency.

In response, the probation department and school district joined forces to create the Juvenile Justice Education Program in 1984. Under this program, juvenile probation officers would travel to the Allentown schools to present informa-

tion to assemblies and special classes concerning the consequences for delinquent behavior and the intricacies of the juvenile justice system.

As a strong relationship continued to grow between the school district and the probation department, the concept of the School-Based Probation Services Program was formed. At inception, the five overall goals of the program were to:

- strengthen the cooperation and communication between the school district and the probation department;
- enable juvenile justice professionals to educate school personnel about the duties, functions and limitations of the juvenile justice system;
- provide the school with an alternative approach for suspended students and students with behavioral problems;
- act as a liaison between the school district, the juvenile probation department, the police departments and the youths' families; and
- attack drug use and abuse by having the juvenile justice professionals train school officials on signs of abuse.

In August 1990, through a \$50,000 grant from the Pennsylvania Juvenile Court Judges' Commission, this concept was brought to life. The School-Based Probation Services Program, administered through the Lehigh County Juvenile Probation Department, was the first program of its kind to physically place full-time juvenile probation officers in public schools.

The Juvenile Court Judges' Commission's 12-month start-up grant provided funding for the salaries and benefits of two full-time, school-based probation officers, and the school in return provided each probation officer with an appropriate room, desk, telephone and on-site supplies. Allentown's four middle schools were selected for initial program implementation as it was believed the students in this age bracket would benefit most from the services provided.

To allow the school-based probation officers to spend the majority of their time on site, the county developed a dual case management system for school-based probation clients. Under this system, juveniles are assigned to two probation officers: a school-based officer responsible for developing treatment plans and monitoring the day-to-day behavior of

the youths and a court-based probation officer responsible for attending all court proceedings and other out-of-school aspects of case proceedings.

The daily duties of the school-based probation officer include providing the school with an up-to-date list of students assigned to school-based probation, monitoring the school attendance and behavior of school-based probation clients, and intervening in crisis situations involving these youths.

School-based probation officers are often asked to actively participate in coordinating community service and other programming for students suspended from school and to coordinate re-entry conferences for targeted students returning to school following placement in a juvenile justice facility. In some cases the school-based officers also conduct home and family visits and serve as youth advocates by referring clients to needed resources not available through the school system.

In its first year of operation, the School-Based Probation Services Program was an unparalleled success, effecting dramatic changes in the school behavior and performance of the middle-school youths it served: Detentions and suspensions dropped 4 percent; tardiness, 9.5 percent; absenteeism, 15 percent; and dropouts, 29 percent. In addition, grade averages increased 4.1 percent.

As the program's success continued to grow, two additional school-based officers were appointed in the 1993-94 academic year to expand services to the district's two high schools. The program carried over its levels of success to these schools as well, with an estimated 57 percent increase in school attendance and a 24 percent decrease in disciplinary referrals.

In addition to the numbers, the program has elicited a positive response from school officials and students. School officials remark enthusiastically on the dedication and professionalism of the juvenile probation officers. Moreover, although the probation officers work only with youths assigned to school-based probation, school officials report their mere presence has reduced the incidence of behavioral problems among the student body in general.

Expansion and replication

The Juvenile Court Judges' Commission continued to support the Lehigh County program through June 1993 with 12-month continuation grants of \$37,500 awarded in August 1991 and 1992. In 1992, the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency (PCCD) and its Juvenile Advisory Committee began working to expand the availability of school-based probation services. Initial goals of the Commission were to expand this type of service to include high schools as well as middle schools and to spur the replication of this program in other counties and school districts.

Another top priority was to ensure that new programs could benefit from the experience and successes of the Lehigh

County program. However, the Commission also recognized that the program structure would need to retain a substantial amount of flexibility to adapt to the varying needs of the individual counties and school districts.

In order to qualify for PCCD grant monies, applicants were required to incorporate the following program objectives for probation clients in the targeted school(s):

- decrease disciplinary referrals;
- decrease the number of days and times of detentions and suspensions;
- decrease the days of absenteeism;
- increase the number of positive school reports on probation students as measured by teachers' quarterly comments;
- increase the percentage of completed homework assignments and improve the grades of students;
- reduce recidivism (defined as a re-arrest or new juvenile court referral); and
- minimize placements.

Grant applicants were also required to include letters of support from the administrator of each school the program would serve. Prior to the start of each project, a written agreement between the court and the school(s) detailing the duties and responsibilities of the program had to be submitted.

This requirement was designed to establish and clarify the role of the school-based probation officer in terms agreeable to both the probation department and the school district and to ensure, for the Commission's purposes, that the school-based officer would not be functioning as a general disciplinarian for the schools.

In an effort to guarantee continued program operation after the expiration of federal seed monies, the Commission also required each applicant county to submit a formal record of its intention to absorb the operating cost of the school-based probation department after a three-year funding period. In return, PCCD promised to provide 75 percent of program start-up and operational costs for the first year, 50 percent for the second year and 25 percent for the third year.

The Commission offered the first school-based probation grant of \$79,000 to Bucks County in September 1992 to replicate the Lehigh Model in its Bensalem High School. The Commission further fulfilled its promise in June 1993, providing over \$885,000 in funding to 17 counties (including Lehigh County) for the implementation and operation of school-based probation programs.

In the second year, the Commission continued funding the 18 original programs and sponsored 17 new programs. As of 1995, the Commission has provided a total of almost \$3.5 million in federal Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention funds and Drug Control and Systems Improvement funds to support 35 school-based probation programs across the

COVER STORY

Commonwealth.

The Lehigh County experience provided a firm foundation of knowledge for others to build upon. However, Pennsylvania is a vast state of diverse populations and problems. In the replication process, each county was therefore encouraged to thoroughly analyze its needs and to personalize the program model accordingly.

Subtle differences in program implementation and operation can be observed in each of the state's 35 programs, from the dress and image of the probation officers in the schools to the officer's daily responsibilities and duties. For example, in some programs a probation officer is assigned to one specific school, while in others one probation officer may divide his/her time between two or more school buildings. The two major differences in programs observed across the Commonwealth include the number and types of schools being served and the use of a single or dual case management system.

In a single case management system, the school-based probation officer is responsible for all aspects of case processing. Counties implementing this system believe its main benefits are consistency for the youth and a closer relationship between the probation officer and the juvenile.

In the dual case management system, the school-based officer is responsible for all school-based monitoring, while a court-based officer handles court procedures and other out-of-school aspects of case management. Counties implementing this model believe its greatest benefit is allowing the school-based officer to remain in the schools full-time.

Role specifically defined

One of the greatest concerns in program implementation was the ability of the school district and probation department to share relevant information while still maintaining confidentiality of sensitive information.

Both school and juvenile court records are usually kept confidential within the individual systems to ensure a child is not labeled or otherwise stigmatized. However, with the two entities combining resources to better fulfill the needs of troubled youths, it became obvious that some information would need to be shared.

For example, one of the main objectives of school-based probation is to improve the school performance of participants. To monitor this improvement, the probation officer must be provided with records of the students' prior achievement levels. In return, the schools need to be kept informed as to which students are participating in school-based probation and what special educational or therapeutic student needs are discovered through diagnostic service that could and should be addressed through school programming.

The extent of information shared, and with whom it is to be shared, is often specified in the written agreements be-

tween the school district and probation departments.

A concern of the Commission and county probation departments in initial implementation was thoroughly defining the role and duties of the school-based probation officers. It was feared, and in some cases the fear was realized, that the school districts would expect the probation officer to serve as a disciplinarian for the general student body.

Although this problem was encountered in initial program implementation in several counties, most programs report it was quickly resolved through open communication with the school district and its personnel.

In Pennsylvania, the Department of Education sponsors a program known as the Student Assistance Program (SAP). Through this program, school staff are professionally trained to help identify and support students at risk of substance abuse and mental health concerns.

The issue at hand in many school districts is whether probation officers should be called upon to serve on the Student Assistance Program team. Some fear that officers' active participation may violate the primary purpose of the team's services, which is to help, not discipline, the students.

In most cases, the school-based officers have been welcomed aboard as members of the SAP team, sharing their professional knowledge and experience in devising programming to meet the needs of at-risk and problem youths. In some programs, however, the school district has opted to limit the probation officers' participation to only those cases involving school-based probation clients.

In developing any new program or service within the juvenile justice system, precautions must be taken to ensure that the initiative is indeed providing a new and valuable service to juveniles falling within the current jurisdiction of the juvenile courts and that it is not expanding the system to include additional youths. The program model in Pennsylvania requires that school-based probation is reserved for youths within the jurisdiction of the juvenile court.

However, there is still some concern that by placing the officers in the schools, where they will automatically observe increased numbers of delinquent behaviors, the result may be additional referrals to the juvenile system and/or further involvement with the juvenile system by probation youths.

PCCD provided one mechanism to safeguard against this occurrence by requiring the school-based officers to work only with those youths already on juvenile probation and not to serve as general disciplinarians for the student body.

In addition, it has been the experience of the numerous programs across the Commonwealth that school-based probation officers have a true dedication to helping the youths avoid instances of inappropriate behavior. Their role in the schools has been described as one of guidance, assistance, and providing a tough hand when needed to help youths avoid

situations that may lead them into contact with or further involvement with the juvenile justice system.

The vision of the Lehigh County Probation Department and the Allentown School District, combined with the support of the Juvenile Court Judge's Commission, brought to life one of the most innovative and exciting new programs in juvenile justice today — school-based probation.

Reprinted with permission from Pennsylvania Progress, © National Center for Juvenile Justice, March 1995, Vol. 2, No. 1, written by Megan Clouser. Technical assistance materials regarding school-based probation are available from NCJJ. Please contact Megan Clouser at 717/233-3343.

Juvenile probation/school partnerships

School systems complain that unruly, truant, ill-prepared or otherwise disruptive youth detract from the quality of education for all. Because education rather than behavior control is argued to be the true mission of the school, a common response to disruptive behavior is to separate such youth from the mainstream by placing them in special programs. Sometimes through repeated suspensions or even expulsions, these youth are eliminated from the schools. These practices bring complaints from the juvenile justice system, among others, that schools are not taking appropriate responsibility, are not flexible enough, and are not otherwise responsive to the needs of those constituents who are troubled youth.

Establishing programs that form partnerships between juvenile probation departments and schools represents an innovative approach to effective interventions with youthful offenders. The following summary describes a variety of approaches being used by juvenile probation departments. Many other possibilities are also feasible depending on the needs, resources and the creativity of those involved.

The Kern County (Bakersfield, California) Probation Department reports that it first placed a juvenile probation officer on a high school campus in 1979. Since then, the program has grown to the point of having on-campus officers at six high school campuses, with three additional officers who serve a number of outlying campuses.

The Yuba County (Marysville, California) Probation Department has two programs that work in partnership with the local school district, the *Truancy Intervention Program*, begun in 1981 and the *Probation and Schools Success Program (PASS)*, begun in 1986. Through PASS, deputy probation officers are located at various community schools. A recent effort toward prevention was developed through collaboration of the Marysville Joint Unified School District, Yuba County Department of Social Services and the probation department. Staff from these agencies are placed at elementary school sites.

Another kind of partnership between probation and education is exemplified in Monterey County, California. The Community School Program has been developed to address the educational needs of youth who have dropped out or been expelled from all other educational programs. A contract that specifies expectations for attendance, proper attire, productivity and conduct is developed among the youth, their parents and the school personnel. Consequences for violations of the contract are clear and may include incarceration. Personal and family counseling, substance abuse counseling, gang interventions, vocational training and employment programs are included in the program. A probation officer is in the classroom full time assisting youth with assignments, delivering professional services and developing working relationships with the students. Youths in the program may return to public schools, earn GEDs or continue in the Community School.

A different approach has been reported by the Clark County (Jefferson, Indiana) Probation Department. Through the county's volunteer services department, a volunteer school liaison officer program has been developed. The liaison officer provides some specific services and helps keep lines of communication open between the agency and the school.

Activities that are common to diverse school/probation partnership programs include:

- providing early intervention services to students/families;
- providing services to non-ward minors referred to probation for a variety of offenses (minor law violations, school problems and family problems);
- counseling young people in danger of being expelled due to truancy problems;
- monitoring attendance, grades and behavior of youth on probation or informal adjustment; and
- providing an alternative educational program for dropouts or youth expelled from other school programs.

The funding and working arrangements between juvenile probation departments and the schools vary. In one instance, a school and a probation department jointly pay the salaries of the officers involved. In another community, the school district provides funding. In another case, the school furnishes office space and equipment and the probation department provides the officer. In Monterey County, the probation department provides a room and an on-site probation officer to enforce daily attendance and behavior standards. The county office of education staffs the program with a teacher and an aide and equips the program with furniture and supplies.

Excerpted with permission from Perspectives, Winter 1992, © 1992 by The American Probation and Parole Association. The information was compiled by Ann H. Crowe, coordinator of juvenile justice programs, The Council of State Governments.

Claiming all youth: three helpful views from the experts

Dealing with youth at risk of leaving school requires “know-how” and an understanding of behavior theories regarding disaffected youth. Buying the following books will net the reader the benefit of several good seminars minus the seminar budgetary strain.

Antisocial Behavior in School: Strategies and Best Practices pulls together material that is too often missing in teacher training programs that may be long on theory and short on practical application. Knowing how to recognize a potential dropout is one thing; knowing what to do and how to begin to reach the child behind the potential statistic is altogether different.

School-controlled factors are not the sole causes of academic failure and a high dropout rate. However, such factors can be at least partially mitigated by a prepared, aware teaching staff. Societal violence is a public health issue requiring multifaceted responses. One response needs to be an adequately trained corps of teachers equal to the task of dealing appropriately with students who exhibit symptoms of impairment due to social conflict.

Specific book sections include: establishing a schoolwide discipline plan; managing teacher/student interaction; conducting social skills training for entire classrooms; creating individualized behavior management and support programs to prevent escalated, hostile teacher/student confrontations; employing parent involvement procedures; and using conflict-reducing playground strategies. Case studies follow strategy suggestions to illustrate intervention applications.

Those who must interact with disruptive students need to be especially knowledgeable about behavior management techniques, conflict cycles and specific misbehavior triggers. Step-by-step outlines guide the reader through the entire conflict process, ranging from recognizing both school- and nonschool-based behavior triggers to debriefing and initiating recovery phases.

This text has lots of practical refresher information for anyone who deals with students regularly, but is especially recommended for teacher training candidates who have never set foot in a classroom.

•••

Putting experience into practice describes *How to Establish an Alternative School* by John Kellmayer. The author is a school administrator with 20 years of experience working in several alternative school settings, including one for emotionally disturbed teen-agers, one for chronically disruptive high school students and one school-within-a-school for “hard core discipline cases.”

The book presents a detailed overview of the volume of work involved in establishing and sustaining a viable alternative education program, beginning with an explication of the political realities that surround the creation of an alternative school.

The material explains the elements of effective alternative programs; different alternative school models, with advantages and disadvantages for each model; the planning involved in setting up an alternative program; curriculum options; school administration; student needs; choosing a faculty; and both cognitive and affective evaluation for each type of program.

Kellmayer’s educational and disciplinary philosophies are interwoven, delivering a personal account as well as his instructional mission. *How to Establish an Alternative School* packs a lot into the proverbial nutshell.

•••

Those who deal with students often get enmeshed in schools’ day-to-day minutiae. Professionals weary of routine and needing something to recharge mental staleness should try *Reclaiming Youth at Risk: Our Hope for the Future*.

The book visits a familiar topic using philosophical discussions that redirect thought processes into the “how” of creating nurturing environments for all children. Infusion of Native American cultural practices focuses on matching societal expectations with children’s capabilities and their corresponding empowerment. *Reclaiming Youth at Risk* is a great reminder of why so many have chosen to work with at-risk students in the first place. Its holistic emphasis places the child and the child’s problems in perspective, leaving the reader thinking, “We can do this. Let’s go!”

Antisocial Behavior in School: Strategies and Best Practices, by Hill M. Walker, Geoff Colvin and Elizabeth Ramsey, 1995, 481 pages, Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, 511 Forest Lodge Rd., Pacific Grove, CA 93950-5098, 408/373-0728. *How to Establish an Alternative School*, by John Kellmayer, 1995, 144 pages, Corwin Press, Inc., 2455 Teller Rd., Thousand Oaks, CA 91320, 805/499-9774. *Reclaiming Youth at Risk: Our Hope for the Future*, by Larry Brendtro, Martin Brokenleg and Steve Van Bockern, 1990, 100 pages, National Educational Service, 1610 W. Third St., P.O. Box 8, Bloomington, IN 47402, 812/336-7700.

Our Club provides a positive alternative to drugs, gangs

Can you picture the 9-year-old daredevil leaning against his squatty mountain bike's handlebars, proudly trying a backward test ride of his new bike? Such a feat may be a cinch to visualize, but perhaps not the way he paid for the bike — using “incentive dollars” at the Our Club Mall in Little Rock, Arkansas. This youth and hundreds of others earn Our Club Dollars to use in this special mall by being members in good standing of one of nine Our Clubs located in Pulaski County in the heart of Arkansas.

Now in its fourth year of operation, the Our Club Program is a proactive incentive program for high-risk youth and their families. Under the Our Club concept, these children and their families “are viewed as resources to be developed, nurtured, and supported” rather than as “dys-functional units that must be diagnosed and repaired.”

Our Club began with the idea that neighborhoods and communities can form partnerships to provide children and their families with positive alternatives to drugs, gangs, ignorance, unemployment, frustration and anger, low self-esteem, violence, delinquency and other such behaviors threatening the future of youth today.

Our Club classes and activities take place after school, evenings, weekends and during the summer. Participants earn incentive points by taking part in classes and other Our Club events as well as by performing services such as mentoring, tutoring and various other volunteer efforts. Our Club Dollars are awarded to Our Club members in good standing based on the number of points received for documented, council-approved services and activities. These dollars may be spent for incentives purchased only at the Our Club Mall, which opened April 30, 1994.

The mall is “a facility that receives, manages and distributes goods and services donated by the corporate community, congregations, civic groups and other organiza-

tions,” according to the Our Club manual. Currently approximately 600 members are involved in the various Our Clubs, while adults and volunteers taking part in Our Club classes number 325.

Serving eight municipalities

The Pulaski County Council for Children and Youth Services (PCCCYs) administers the program, which serves youth in Little Rock and the surrounding Pulaski County. The council is a coalition of county, state and local governments, civic groups and service organizations, businesses, churches and other associations. The council's motto, “It takes a whole community to raise a child,” is derived from an African folk maxim.

The program targets youth ages six to 18 who may be involved with gangs, lagging academically, or limited by constraints such as poverty, low self-esteem and lack of family guidance. However, no one who wants to participate is turned away, according to James H. Carter, Director of the Office of Juvenile Services for Pulaski County.

A half-cent sales tax passed by the city of Little Rock in December of 1993 included \$160,000 to fund six of the nine Our Club sites. Additional funding comes from two three-year grants. The W. K. Kellogg Foundation of Battle Creek, Michigan, awarded the PCCCYs \$719,634 for use in improving community residents' health and providing health services by fostering supportive networks of schools, churches and other community organizations.

The Winthrop Rockefeller Foundation awarded the council \$184,910 to develop the Our Club Entrepreneurial/Stock Investment Education Program. This program promotes economic education, work opportunities and investment experience that will lead to reducing poverty, youth crime and violence in Pulaski County. The Youth Entrepreneurship Program provides business development training. Twenty percent of all existing grants pays for training, Our Club Mall operations, student workers and other aspects of operations.

How an Our Club functions

Not all Our Clubs look exactly alike, nor do they all offer the same mix of programs and services. The nine Our Club programs follow scheduled shopping hours in the Our Club Mall, which is open three weeks a month.

Each Our Club member is issued a personal identifica-

STRATEGIES/PROGRAMS

tion card and number as well as a checkbook incorporating the same identification. Youths write checks for purchases, keep a register for such checks, and must balance checkbooks according to the monthly statements each member receives.

The program manual developed by PCCCYs provides details on all aspects of Our Club and Our Club Mall operations. In addition to banking practice for all members, the Our Club experience also includes training and work in the mall for two youths ages 14 to 18 from each program site. The manual states that "The Our Club Dollar incentives are designed to teach and reinforce youth that responsibility, performance, and achievement have tangible benefits for:

- setting and meeting goals;
- learning basic payroll procedures and calculating earnings;
- valuing sound money management;
- writing checks and balancing a checkbook; and
- learning to bargain shop."

Our Club membership

Becoming an Our Club member usually involves a visit to a facility by the child and his/her parents for an orientation and tour given by staff or volunteers. Each prospective member receives a recommendation to develop a set of personal goals — such as wanting to get along better with parents, learning to cope with anger — and a set of achievement goals — such as planning to raise grades or buying a car. A probation period of at least 30 days is required before a youth becomes a full-fledged member.

During that period the prospective member must put in 12 hours in the summer and six hours in the fall before beginning to earn points. Each month thereafter, to remain an active Our Club member, participants must take part in at least 12 hours of approved Our Club classes/activities (from June 1 to August 31) or a minimum of 6 hours (from September 1 to May 31).

If a member misses 30 or more consecutive days, his/her membership will become invalid, and no points will be carried over if the youth decides to rejoin. Moreover, if a youth at any time is disruptive or disrespectful, points are subtracted from his/her "account."

Neighborhood involvement

Underscoring the premise that "It takes a whole community to raise a child" is the program's emphasis on the active involvement of residents of each neighborhood in which an Our Club is located.

The very detailed Our Club manual states, "The ultimate goal should be to involve every family in the neighborhood

in the Our Club initiative. To be certified as a participating Our Club Neighborhood, the organization must be able to document that a minimum of 10 percent of the residents of the geographic area are actively involved in planning, developing, and managing the Our Club initiative in the neighborhood."

In line with that mandate, the council assists the organization by providing information management technology to document and track active neighborhood involvement. Such involvement requires "a minimum of four hours a month of direct work on one or more aspects of the program, such as:

- serving on one or more committees of the neighborhood organization;
- volunteering to assist in the Our Club facility;
- being a support group facilitator;
- giving a part-time job to an Our Club youth, and/or
- providing facilities or space for Our Club activities."

Community involvement

Wider community involvement is reflected in the membership of the Pulaski County Council for Children and Youth Services. The council's board includes all municipal mayors, the Pulaski County judge and standing committee chairpersons. To become a member of the PCCCYs, an organization must have the approval of its board of directors or CEO; make a commitment to provide services, programs, resources, volunteer or technical assistance to participating Our Clubs; and commit to actively participating on at least one of the 10 standing committees.

Basically, the council organizations collaborate and share resources to help the Our Club groups of concerned individuals, churches and business leaders solve problems facing children and families in every neighborhood.

Current reality includes statistics that reveal increasing youth involvement in the use of drugs, weapons and violence. Young people are dropping out of the education mainstream. Effective community partnerships must be formed to take the lead in reducing youth crime and violence and guaranteeing students safe school environments. Pulaski County's Our Club Program offers an encouraging model of such a partnership. As evidenced by its thorough Our Club manual, the Pulaski County Council for Children and Youth Services has toiled diligently and well to provide a positive, instructive, detailed plan for working with children and their families to accomplish positive goals.

Inquiries for more information about the Our Club Program should be addressed to James H. Carter, Director, Juvenile Services, 201 South Broadway, Suite 370, Little Rock, AR 72201, 501/340-8250.

NSSC REPORT

Send your good news to NSSC

The National School Safety Center's mandate is to focus national attention on cooperative solutions to problems that disrupt the educational process. Weekly calls for help and information come to the Center from concerned citizens such as parents, educators, students, law enforcement personnel, media representatives, juvenile justice and judiciary representatives, and others. Basically their requests are the same: What positive interventions are currently being made to ensure that this country's children are being educated in safe learning environments?

Individuals and agencies concerned with issues related to promoting and preserving safe schools regularly contribute to NSSC holdings. The NSSC resource center includes a growing collection of more than 50,000 articles, publications and videos for reference use on site. Individuals may also call for appointments to do research at the Center, to request information and to purchase NSSC resources.

NSSC urges you to contribute articles, news clips, sample videos and other types of information about your own successful preventive and interventional efforts related to school crime and violence. Information about the following topics is

specifically requested: victim support groups for students and staff members; programs to mediate truants and dropouts; policies and in-school programs to deal effectively with disruptive students; school-to-work transitions; instructional alternatives targeting students suspended/expelled from regular school settings; plans to increase parental support in schools and effective parent/child communication; and transitions for individuals exiting the juvenile justice system to re-enter traditional school settings.

The sharing of expertise and information can cut short development time and reduce implementation time in creating compelling partnerships needed to solve problems confronting today's students, parents and educators. Send your good news to the NSSC School Safety News Service. Join an information network designed to support the growth and development of the nation's chief resource — its youth.

There is still time to register for upcoming **School Safety Leadership Training** programs. Each three-day "train the trainers" program offers practical instruction, training materials and camera-ready overheads on a variety of school safety topics. The 1996 program dates and locations are as follows:

- January 10-12, 1996 Los Angeles, CA
- March 6-8, 1996 Honolulu, HI

NON-PROFIT ORG.
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
PEPPERDINE
UNIVERSITY

NATIONAL SCHOOL SAFETY CENTER
PEPPERDINE UNIVERSITY
24255 PACIFIC COAST HIGHWAY
MALIBU, CA 90263

represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Departments of Justice or Education or Pepperdine University. NSSC makes no warranty, expressed or implied, nor assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product or process described herein. Copyright © 1995 by the National School Safety Center. Executive Editor: Ronald D. Stephens Editor: June Lane Arnette Associate Editors: Sue Ann Meador and Marjorie Cresswell Walsleben Special Counsel: Bernard James Business Manager: Jane M. Grady Contributing Writers: Megan Clouser and Ann H. Crowe

The *School Safety Update* is published by the National School Safety Center to communicate current trends and effective programs in school safety. As a component of the NSSC *School Safety News Service*, the newsletter is published six times each school year: the newsletter is published three times a year in the fall, winter and spring. Annual subscription to *NSSC School Safety News Service*: \$59.00. Correspondence should be addressed to: NSSC, 4165 Thousand Oaks Blvd., Suite 290, Westlake Village, CA 91362, telephone 805/373-9977, FAX 805/373-9277. Prepared under Grant No. 85-MU-CX-0003 and funded in the amount of \$1.2 million by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice, and the U.S. Department of Education in partnership with Pepperdine University. Points of view or opinions in this document do not necessarily