

**ACCESS 2009–2010 Summary:  
Transition School-Community Liaisons**

**SS/HS Focus Area:** *Safe school environments and violence prevention activities*

**ACCESS Goal:** *Decrease recidivism rates to Disciplinary Alternative Education Placements (DAEP)*

**Cost (2009–2010):** **\$175,680**

**Program Overview**

Within the Austin Independent School District (AISD), school community liaisons (SCLs) function as school based social workers, connecting students and families with school and community based supports and services.<sup>1</sup> The developers of the Austin Community Collaboration to Enhance Student Success (ACCESS) grant recognized that students returning to their home campuses following disciplinary placements represented a high need population who could benefit from dedicated SCL support. To address this service gap, the ACCESS grant proposed three new SCL positions: one



*Second Year (2008–2009)*

The





being a year of partial implementation, the average non program rate increases beyond that of the program years (2008–2009 and 2009–2010) to 12.0%. Given the wide year to year fluctuation in repeat referral rates, no firm conclusion can be drawn about the impact of the transition SCL position on repeat ACES removals. A clearer story emerges when the proportion of discretionary removals is examined over time (Figure 2). The proportion of discretionary removals shows a clear downward trend when both full program years (2008–2009 and 2009–2010) are compared with the non program years (2005–2006 and 2006–2007) and the partial implementation year (2007–2008).

**Table 1. Students Removed to Alternative Center for Elementary Students (ACES), 2005–2006 Through 2009–2010 School Years**

Measure	School year	
	2005–2006 through 2007–2008	2008–2009 through 2009–2010
Number of students	191	188
Number of removals	208	208
Number of schools represented	52	58
Grade		
Kindergarten, 1 <sup>st</sup> , 2 <sup>nd</sup>	52 (27.2%)	39 (20.7%)
3 <sup>rd</sup> and 4 <sup>th</sup>	72 (37.7%)	79 (42.0%)
5 <sup>th</sup> and 6 <sup>th</sup>	67 (35.1%)	70 (37.2%)
Gender		
Female	26 (13.6%)	29 (15.4%)
Male	165 (86.4%)	159 (84.6%)
Offense type (first removal) <sup>a</sup>		
Aggressive behavior (student focused)	69 (36.1%)	52 (27.7%)
Aggressive behavior (adult focused)	29	



## **ALC Transition School-Community**



**Table 2. Alternative Learning Center (ALC) Transition School-Community Liaison Services Delivered, Services**



SCL's efforts than were other schools. The transition SCL, in consultation with ACCESS and ALC staff, selected a core set of five middle schools (Burnet, Dobie, Covington, Mendez, and Parades) and one high school (Lanier) upon which to focus his activity. The selection of these specific schools was based on the strength of the relationship developed with campus staff over the prior year, as well as the







The SCL would plan to be present at the school for re enrollment, to facilitate the process. Approximately half of the time, a procedural (e.g., a student not yet un enrolled from prior placement) or other type of problem would arise that need to be resolved. A campus located transition meeting was planned for the same day, involving the students, parent(s), and an administrator, as well as a campus counselor and campus based community service providers (e.g., Communities in Schools), if applicable. The focus of this campus meeting was to update school staff about the progress the student had made while away and to review the school rules and expectations related to schedule, behavior, attendance, and the student's academic plan. The discussion was intended to function as a verbal behavioral contract between the student and the administrator. The meeting concluded with a written transition plan and the expectation that the SCL would follow up weekly for 4 to 6 weeks, checking in with the student, parent(s), and administration.

The approach taken with students transitioning back from juvenile detention was similar. However, the often unpredictable release schedule of juvenile detention, which was dependent on a variety of circumstances related to each individual case and the action of the court, made it more difficult to schedule pre transition meetings. As a consequence, the SCL often had to play catch up with students who already had been released and might have been re enrolled, or might have attempted to do so.

During this initial semester, the JJ SCL served a total of 40 students. Most of the services delivered fell into three categories: social service connections (20.7%;  $n = 76$ ); academic resource connections (29.4%;  $n = 108$ ); and information (31.9%;  $n = 117$ ).

### ***Second Year (2008–2009)***

Several important changes occurred during the second year of program implementation. First, the selection criteria for JJ cases were revised to eliminate the 2 week or longer detention period and a predefined set of schools. Instead, students with three or more detention episodes were the target detention population; however, the selection criterion for Day Enrichment remained the same, with all students eligible. Second, the SCL went out on maternity leave.

number of different service types also increased slightly from 4.4 (2008–2009) to 4.9 (2009–2010), a change of 11%. Details regarding the services delivered are provided in Table 3.

**Table 3. Juvenile Justice Transition School to Campus Liaison (SCL)  
Services Delivered, 2008–2009 and 2009–2010 School Years**

Service type	2008–2009		2009–2010	
	All service instances <sup>a</sup>	% of service episodes receiving service <sup>b</sup>	All service instances <sup>a</sup>	% of service episodes receiving service <sup>b</sup>
Short term problem solving	2.0% ( <i>n</i> = 12)	14.9% ( <i>n</i> = 10)	15.9% ( <i>n</i> = 162)	61.3% ( <i>n</i> = 46)
Social service connection	23.3% ( <i>n</i> = 139)	77.6% ( <i>n</i> = 52)	17.4% ( <i>n</i> = 177)	80.0% ( <i>n</i> = 60)
Health/medical service connection	0.3% ( <i>n</i> = 2)	3.0% ( <i>n</i> = 2)	0.3% ( <i>n</i> = 3)	2.7% ( <i>n</i> = 2)
Mental health service connection	6.5% ( <i>n</i> = 39)	32.8% ( <i>n</i> = 22)	0.3% ( <i>n</i> = 3)	4.0% ( <i>n</i> = 3)
Academic resource connection	20.6% ( <i>n</i> = 123)	88.1% ( <i>n</i> = 59)	12.8% ( <i>n</i> = 130)	68.0% ( <i>n</i> = 51)
Crisis intervention	0.0% ( <i>n</i> = 0)	0.0% ( <i>n</i> = 0)	0.5% ( <i>n</i> = 5)	4.0% ( <i>n</i> = 3)
ARD support/special education	3.7% ( <i>n</i> = 22)	17.9% ( <i>n</i> = 12)	0.0% ( <i>n</i> = 0)	0.0% ( <i>n</i> = 0)

## **Program Outcomes**

### ***Methodology***

Program effectiveness for the JJ SCL was calculated based on intra year recidivism to juvenile court data, based on data provided by court staff. Although



establish the local capacity necessary for students to transition successfully. Although this adjustment may have led to more manageable caseloads at the secondary level, it highlighted the large numbers of students who could not be served through the grant.

The experience of the SCLs also highlighted specific opportunities for implementing systemic solutions to improve the likelihood of students transitioning successfully, even without the direct involvement of a specialized SCL. When a student is unenrolled from his or her home campus or a disciplinary placement, gap in time occurs, during which no campus has the student



## Appendix A

### School-Community Liaison Service Definitions

Service type	Definition
Short term problem solving	AI/SD meeting with teacher, administrator, or colleague (parent also may attend meeting) to assess and create action plan
Social service connection	Linking client with food stamps, insurance, 211, neighborhood centers, Catholic charities, juvenile probation, Connections, daycare, etc.
Health/medical service connection	Referral/consultation/sharing information with doctor, immunization clinic,



**Appendix B**  
**Alternative Center for Elementary Students (ACES) Transition School-Community Liaison**  
**Services Delivered, 2008–2009 and 2009–2010 School Years**



## Appendix B

### ACES Offense Type Definitions

Not all violations listed below occurred; they represent how potential violations listed within the AISD *Administrative Discipline Procedures Manual* were grouped for the analysis presented here. Underlined numbers reflect mandatory removal for that offense code.

Aggressive behavior (student focused):

*Inappropriate language or gestures to student (005), harassment/intimidation/threat of student (010), physical aggression against students (015), fighting/mutual combat (020), assault with injury against a student (025), aggravated assault against a student (030), making a false report (035), gang related activity (037), school related gang violence (040)*

Aggressive behavior (adult focused):

*Inappropriate language or gestures to adult (045), harassment/intimidation/threat of adult (050), physical aggression against adults (055), assault with injury against an adult (060), aggravated assault against an adult (065), and retaliation against school employee (070)*

Disruption/insubordination:

*Disruption of educational process (310), failure to follow instructions (325)*

Alcohol/drugs:

*Inappropriate use of over the counter medicine (155), drug paraphernalia (195), tobacco violation (200), possession of marijuana/other controlled substance misd. (160), consumption of marijuana/other controlled substance misdemeanor. (165), under the influence of marijuana/other controlled substance misd. (170), sale or distribution of marijuana/other controlled substance misd. (175), abuse of glue or aerosol paint (205), possession of marijuana/other controlled substance felony (180)*



# AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

## SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

Meria J. Carstarphen, Ed.D.

## OFFICE OF ACCOUNTABILITY

William Caritj, M.Ed.

## DEPARTMENT OF PROGRAM EVALUATION

Holly Williams, Ph.D.

Cinda Christian, Ph.D.

## AUTHOR

Simon T. Tidd, Ph.D.

Lindsay M. Lamb, Ph.D.

## BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Mark Williams, President

Vincent Torres, M.S., Vice President

Lori Moya, Secretary

Cheryl Bradley

Annette LoVoi, M.A.

Christine Brister

Robert Schneider

Tamala Barksdale

Sam Guzman