

**CHARACTERISTICS OF SDFSCA  
SEA AND GOVERNORS' PROGRAMS:**

**VOLUME I  
Summary of the 1999–2000  
Data Collection**

**Sarah M. Bennett-Harper  
Martine G. Brizius  
Sonia J. Donaldson  
Emily K. Grim  
Janice Lee  
Kelly D. Long  
Barbara I. Williams**

**Prepared for:**

**Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program  
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education**

**U.S. Department of Education**

**Contract No. ED-01-CO-0082**

**2002**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
1	Introduction.....	1-1
	Organization of This Report .....	1-2
2	SEA and Governors’ SDFSCA Programs: Implementation Data.....	2-1
	SEA SDFSCA Programs .....	2-1
	Governors’ SDFSCA Programs.....	2-6
3	Drug Prevalence Data .....	3-1
	Cigarette Use.....	3-3
	Alcohol Use .....	3-5
	Marijuana Use.....	3-7
	Cocaine Use .....	3-8
	Inhalants/Other Illegal Drugs.....	3-9
4	School Safety Data.....	4-1
	Safety Prevalence Data .....	4-1
	Students Brought Weapons to School During Last 30 Days .....	4-3
	Students Not Attending School Because They Felt Unsafe During last 30 Days .....	4-4
	Students Threatened or Injured With a Weapon on School Property during Last 12 Months.....	4-5
	Student Property Stolen or Deliberately Damaged at School During last 12 Months .....	4-6
	Students in Physical Fight on School Grounds During Last 12 Months .....	4-7
	Safety-Related Incident Data .....	4-8
	Incidents, Offenders, and Weapons-Related Incidents in Elementary Schools .....	4-10
	Victims in Elementary Schools.....	4-12
	Types of Offenders in Elementary Schools .....	4-13
	Elementary Schools Reporting Incidents.....	4-14
	Elementary Schools Reporting Weapons-Related Incidents .....	4-16
	Incidents, Offenders, and Weapons-Related Incidents in Middle Schools .....	4-17
	Victims in Middle Schools .....	4-19
	Types of Offenders in Middle Schools .....	4-20
	Middle Schools Reporting Incidents.....	4-21
	Middle Schools reporting Weapons-Related Incidents.....	4-22
	Incidents, Offenders, and Weapons-related Incidents in Senior High Schools .....	4-23
	Victims in Senior High Schools.....	4-24
	Types of Offenders in Senior High Schools .....	4-25
	Senior High Schools Reporting Incidents.....	4-27

	Senior High Schools Reporting Weapons-Related Incidents .....	4-28
	Youth Arrest Data .....	4-29
	Alcohol/Drug-Related Youth Arrests .....	4-32
	Violence-Related Youth Arrests .....	4-34
5	SDFSCA Goals and Objectives .....	5-1
	Procedure for Analyzing Goals and Objectives .....	5-1
	Characteristics of SEA and Governors' Program Goals .....	5-4
	Assessing State Progress Reports .....	5-6
6	Epilogue .....	6-1
	Implementation Data: SEA and Governors' Program .....	6-1
	Age of First Use Remains a Significant Issue .....	6-3
	SDFSCA School Safety Data Are Supported by Other National Data .....	6-3
	Program Goals and Objectives, and Progress reports .....	6-4
	Looking Toward the Future of SDFSCA Data Collection.....	6-4

## LIST OF APPENDIXES

A	Methodology
B	State-by-State Goals and Objectives
C	State-by-State Prevalence Rates
D	List of State-Nominated Exemplary Programs
E	SEA Reporting Form
F	Governors' Reporting Form
G	SEA Tables
H	Governors' Tables
I	Definitions of Crimes

## LIST OF TABLES

<b>Table</b>		<b>Page</b>
2-1	Factors used to make decisions regarding the distribution of the 30 percent of SEA funds to be given to the LEAs with greatest need: Reporting period 1999–2000 .....	2-2
2-2	Criteria used to review and approve LEA applications: Reporting period 1999–2000 .....	2-3
2-3	Number of schools and students in LEAs that received SDFSCA funding, by level of school: Reporting period 1999–2000 .....	2-3
2-4	Number of LEAs using SDFSCA funds to provide drug prevention or violence prevention services or activities: Reporting period 1999–2000 .....	2-4
2-5	SDFSCA-funded LEAs’ involvement of community agencies and students in drug and violence prevention activities: Reporting period 1999–2000 .....	2-4
2-6	Number of states and LEAs providing various services/activities: Reporting period 1999–2000 .....	2-5
2-7	Number and percent of LEAs that involved community organizations in specific SDFSCA-funded drug and violence prevention services/activities: Reporting period 1999–2000 .....	2-6
2-8	Number and percent of recipients, by category, who received services through SDFSCA Governors’ programs: Fiscal year 1999–2000 .....	2-6
2-9	Number and percent of recipients by age group served by SDFSCA Governors’ programs: Fiscal year 1999–2000 .....	2-7
2-10	Number and percent of primary awards of varying durations made through SDFSCA Governors’ programs: Fiscal year 1999–2000 .....	2-8
2-11	Number and percent of primary awards made by size category through SDFSCA Governors’ programs: Fiscal year 1999–2000 .....	2-8
2-12	Number and percent of awards for services/activities made through SDFSCA Governors’ programs: Fiscal year 1999–2000 .....	2-9
3-1	Number of states/territories conducting prevalence surveys, by grade: Reporting period 1999–2000 .....	3-1
3-2	Number of states/territories that used specific surveys for their prevalence survey: Reporting period 1999–2000 .....	3-2

**LIST OF TABLES (continued)**

3-3	Frequency of students' use of cigarettes within the last 30 days: Reporting period 1999–2000 .....	3-4
3-4	Age of first use of cigarettes reported for 10th graders: Reporting period 1999–2000 .....	3-5
3-5	Frequency of students' use of alcohol within the last 30 days: Reporting period 1999–2000 .....	3-6
3-6	Age of first use of alcohol reported for 10th graders: Reporting period 1999–2000 .....	3-6
3-7	Frequency of students' use of marijuana within the last 30 days: Reporting period 1999–2000 .....	3-7
3-8	Age of first use of marijuana reported for 10th graders: Reporting period 1999–2000 .....	3-8
3-9	Frequency of students' use of cocaine within the last 30 days: Reporting period 1999–2000 .....	3-8
3-10	Number of states reporting students' age of first use of various substances: Reporting period 1999–2000 .....	3-9
3-11	Use of various substances within the last 30 days: Reporting period 1999–2000 .....	3-10
4-1	Frequency with which students brought weapons to school during the last 30 days: Reporting period 1999–2000.....	4-3
4-2	Frequency with which students did not attend school because they felt unsafe at or on the way to school during last 30 days: Reporting period 1999–2000 .....	4-4
4-3	Frequency with which students were threatened or injured with a weapon on school property during last 12 months: Reporting period 1999–2000 .....	4-5
4-4	Frequency with which student property was stolen or deliberately damaged on school property during last 12 months: Reporting period 1999–2000 .....	4-6
4-5	Frequency with which students were in a physical fight on school property during last 12 months: Reporting period 1999–2000 .....	4-7
4-6	Number of incidents, offenders, and weapons-related incidents per 1,000 students reported in elementary schools: Reporting period 1999–2000 .....	4-11

**LIST OF TABLES (continued)**

4-7	Number of victims per 1,000 students who were students, school personnel, or non-school personnel involved in incidents reported in elementary schools: Reporting period 1999–2000.....	4-13
4-8	Number of offenders per 1,000 students who were students or non-students involved in incidents reported in elementary schools: Reporting period 1999–2000 .....	4-14
4-9	Number of elementary schools that reported incidents: Reporting period 1999–2000 .....	4-15
4-10	Number of elementary schools, among those that reported one or more incidents, that also reported weapons-related incidents: Reporting period 1999–2000 .....	4-16
4-11	Number of incidents, offenders, and weapons-related incidents per 1,000 students reported in middle schools: Reporting period 1999–2000.....	4-17
4-12	Number of victims per 1,000 students who were students, school personnel, or non-school personnel involved in incidents reported in middle schools: Reporting period 1999–2000 .....	4-19
4-13	Number of offenders per 1,000 students who were students or non-students involved in incidents reported in middle schools: Reporting period 1999–2000 .....	4-20
4-14	Number of middle schools that reported incidents: Reporting period 1999–2000 .....	4-21
4-15	Number of middle schools, among those that reported one or more incidents, that also reported weapons-related incidents: Reporting period 1999–2000 .....	4-22
4-16	Number of incidents, offenders, and weapons-related incidents per 1,000 students reported in senior high schools: Reporting period 1999–2000	4-23
4-17	Number of victims per 1,000 students who were students, school personnel, or non-school personnel involved in incidents reported in senior high schools: Reporting period 1999–2000 .....	4-25
4-18	Number of offenders per 1,000 students who were students or non-students involved in incidents reported in senior high schools: Reporting period 1999–2000 .....	4-26
4-19	Number of senior high schools that reported incidents: Reporting period 1999–2000 .....	4-27
4-20	Number of senior high schools, among those that reported one or more incidents, that also reported weapons-related incidents: Reporting period 1999–2000 .....	4-28

**LIST OF TABLES (continued)**

4-21	Total youth arrests, total and percent of youth arrested for alcohol/drug-related offenses, and total and percent of youth arrested for violence-related offenses, by state: 1999.....	4-30
4-22	Percentage of youth arrested for alcohol/drug-related offenses, and percentage of the total youth population, by state and age group: 1999.....	4-32
4-23	Percentage of youth arrested for violence-related offenses, and percentage of the total youth population, by state and age group: 1999.....	4-34
5-1	Summary of characteristics of SEA and Governors' programs goals and objectives: 1999–2000 .....	5-5

## **Chapter 1**

### **Introduction**

Congress enacted the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act (DFSCA) in 1986 to expand and strengthen drug and alcohol abuse education and prevention programs in communities throughout the nation. The DFSCA State and Local Grants Program was designed to encourage and support broad-based cooperation among schools, communities, parents, and governmental agencies to bring the nation “significantly closer to the goal of a drug-free generation and a drug-free society.” The reauthorization of the Act in October 1994 added violence prevention as a key component of the program and changed the Act’s title to the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act (SDFSCA) of 1994 (PL 103-382).

The U.S. Department of Education (ED) is responsible for administering the SDFSCA and annually distributes SDFSCA funds to the states through application by state education agencies (SEAs) and other state agencies designated by the Governor’s office. The state agencies then provide program-level funding through another set of application processes. Based on estimates from the 1992–93 school year, over 40 million students received direct services funded by the DFSCA.

The current data collection has two foci. First, in accordance with requirements of the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) of 1993, ED has developed performance indicators for its programs, including SDFSCA. One source of information that allows tracking of these indicators is the collection of data on state-level SDFSCA activities. Second, the Department continues to focus on the assessment of the implementation and outcomes of SDFSCA activities, including the more recently added emphasis on preventing or minimizing the exposure of students to violence or crime in their school environments. The passage of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, which continued authorization for SDFSCA activities, further strengthened the imperatives for demonstrating measurable outcomes from federally funded education initiatives.

Specifically, state-level SDFSCA data collection activities conducted for this report covered the following areas:

- Implementation and outcomes of the SEA and Governors’ SDFSCA programs;
- States’ progress toward attaining their goals for drug and violence prevention;
- Prevalence of drug use and violence by youth in schools and communities;



- School safety; and
- Youth arrests for alcohol/drug use and violence-related activities.

Data were solicited from all states and territories with SDFSCA programs. However, the Education Department General Administration Regulations (EDGAR) allow territories to elect to consolidate funds from the major Elementary and Secondary Education Act State-Administered Programs (Titles I, II, IV, and VI) under one or more of those programs. This means a territory such as Guam may elect to spend its SDFSCA allocation under an authority other than SDFSCA programs. Consequently, although SDFSCA funds were received and distributed, this territory would have no program data related to SDFSCA. On the state-by-state tables in the appendix, such territories are designated as “not applicable.”

In Chapters 2, 3, and 5, data included in the tables comes from two sources. Table 2-1 through 2-7 and 3-1 through 3-11 are based on data from the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Consolidated State Performance Report for State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and Goals 2000: Educate America Act for reporting on School Years 1999–2000 and 2000–2001, Section J – Priority: Safe, Drug-Free School Environment, ESEA, Title IV, Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act. Tables 2-8 through 2-12 are based on data from the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program, The Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act Reporting Form for Governors’ SDFSCA Programs 1999–2000 School Year. Table 5-1 incorporates data from both of these sources. In Chapter 4, Tables 4-1 through 4-20 are based on data from the Consolidated State Performance Report referenced above. Tables 4-21 through 4-23, youth arrest data, are based on the compilation of data from two sources: Federal Bureau of Investigation, Criminal Justice Information Services Division, Uniform Crime Reporting Program, Communication Unit, the 1999 Age, Sex, and Race Youth Arrests Master File; and U.S. Bureau of Census, Population Division, Population Estimates Program, Population Estimates for the United States and States by Single Year of Age and Sex: July 1, 1999 for calendar year 1999.

## **Organization of This Report**

Chapter 2 presents information concerning the operation of the SEA and Governors’ programs. Chapter 3 presents data regarding the prevalence of drug use in 10th and 12th grades. Chapter 4 contains information regarding school safety, including prevalence of violence in and around schools, and on youth arrests for alcohol/drug-related and violence-related incidents. Chapter 5 discusses progress

made in attainment of goals and objectives of the SDFSCA programs by the states and Chapter 6 contains a summary and broad-based conclusions. The report also contains the following appendices:

- Appendix A – Methodology
- Appendix B – State-by-State Goals and Objectives
- Appendix C – State-by-State Prevalence Rates
- Appendix D – List of State-Nominated Exemplary Programs
- Appendix E – SEA Reporting Forms
- Appendix F – Governors’ Reporting Forms
- Appendix G – SEA Tables
- Appendix H – Governors’ Tables
- Appendix I – Definitions of Crimes

The programs listed in Appendix D were submitted by the SEA and the Governors’ SDFSCA programs for 1999–2000 in response to Question J-1.c of the SEA Performance Reporting Form and Question 1.c of the Governors’ form. The full descriptions of the programs submitted are contained in a separate volume of the report, *Characteristics of SDFSCA SEA and Governors’ Programs — Volume 2: 1999–2000 Exemplary Programs*.

## Chapter 2

### SEA and Governors' SDFSCA Programs: Implementation Data

This chapter focuses on responses concerning funding issues and services provided by the SEA and Governors' SDFSCA programs in each state for the 1999–2000 reporting period. When comparisons are appropriate and instructive, data from previous reporting periods (i.e., 1995–96, 1996–97, 1997–98, and 1998–99) also are presented. The first section reviews the responses concerning the SEA programs, followed by those concerning the Governors' programs.

#### SEA SDFSCA Programs

As mandated by statute, each SEA must distribute 90 percent of its funds to local education agencies (LEAs), and 30 percent of this amount must go to those LEA programs demonstrating the greatest need for additional funds. Need is determined on the basis of criteria identified by each state, such as rates of alcohol or drug use among youth, rates of youth victimization by violence and crime, extent of illegal gang activity, and rates of expulsions and suspensions of students from schools.

In Question J-2.a of the reporting form, SEAs were asked to cite which of 13 possible factors were used to determine which LEAs had the greatest need for additional funding. As shown in Table 2-1, the four most commonly cited were alcohol and drug use rates (83 percent), followed by student expulsions or suspensions from schools and referral to alternative education programs, school dropout and absenteeism rates, and rates of violent or criminal victimization of youth (73 percent each). The least cited factor was illegal gang activity (38 percent), followed by local implementation of research-based approaches (40 percent).

Data from previous reporting periods show very similar results. For example, in all years since 1995–96, the factor that was most used by SEAs to determine greatest need was alcohol and drug use rates, used by 74 percent of the states in 1995–96 and 83 percent in 1999–2000. The other three factors most frequently reported in 1999–2000 were also among the top four or five categories in previous years, with the exception of rates of school dropout and absences. This last factor rose in importance from 1995–1996, when 60 percent of SEAs reported it, to 1999–2000 when 73 percent did so.

The least cited factors also have changed little over the years. In 1995–96, participation in alcohol and drug treatment was reported by 40 percent of SEAs. In 1997–98, a new factor added to the performance reporting form to reflect the emphases of the newly implemented Principles of Effectiveness — local implementation of research-based approaches — was cited by 36 percent of SEAs.

**Table 2-1**  
**Factors used to make decisions regarding the distribution of the 30 percent of SEA funds to be given to the LEAs with greatest need: Reporting period 1999–2000**

Factor	States reporting	Percent citing use
Alcohol/drug use rates among youth .....	43	83
Student expulsions/suspensions from schools and referrals to alternative education programs.....	38	73
Rates of school dropout and absences.....	38	73
Rates of violent or criminal victimization of youth .....	38	73
Rates of arrest and conviction of youth for violent, alcohol and other drug-related crime .....	37	71
School violence or vandalism .....	36	69
Level of district poverty .....	34	65
Reported child abuse and domestic violence incidence.....	31	60
Referrals to juvenile court.....	25	48
Participation in alcohol/drug treatment (voluntary and involuntary)	22	42
Other factors.....	21	40
Local implementation of research-based approaches .....	21	40
Illegal gang activity.....	20	38

NOTE: American Samoa, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico are also included for all state enumerations.

Question J-2.b of the reporting form asked SEA officials to indicate which criteria they used to review and approve LEA applications for SDFSCA funding. As can be seen in Table 2-2, of the eight criteria presented in the question, those most commonly used by SEAs include application conforms to the law (98 percent), LEA needs assessment (88 percent), and project based on research or proven model (79 percent), while the least commonly cited were recommendations of peer reviewers, and success in meeting LEA goals and objectives (both with 62 percent).

SEAs' top two criteria for approving LEA applications have not changed since 1995–96, when the most frequently used criteria also was that the application conformed to the law (100 percent), and LEA needs assessment (94 percent). However, a notable shift in the third most frequently cited criterion occurred in 1997–98. From 1995–96 through 1997–98, the third criterion was continuation of previously approved projects, used by 74, 80, and 71 percent of SEAs in those respective years. In 1998–99, however, the third most frequently cited criterion was project based on research or proven model, at 71 percent, increasing to 79 percent by 1999–2000. As noted above, the timing of this shift coincides with the increasing emphasis of the SDFS Program on its Principles of Effectiveness.

**Table 2-2**  
**Criteria used to review and approve LEA applications: Reporting period 1999–2000**

Criterion	States reporting	Percent citing use
Application conforms to the law .....	51	98
LEA needs assessment .....	46	88
Project based on research or proven model .....	41	79
Continuation of previously approved projects .....	37	71
Outcome data/measures of effectiveness .....	35	67
Recommendation of peer reviewers.....	32	62
Success in meeting LEA measurable goals and objectives.....	32	62
Other criteria .....	14	27

NOTE: American Samoa, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico are also included for all state enumerations.

Table 2-3 reports the number of schools and students, by level of school, in LEAs that had services supported in whole or in part with SDFSCA funds. Data show that with a total of 46 states reporting, nearly 19 million elementary students and nearly 18 million middle and high school students were reached with these funds. These numbers are each about 1 million higher than those reported for 1998–1999, with 45 states reporting. In comparison, the number of elementary students being reached in 1995–96 was slightly over 13 million and the number of older students was slightly over 12 million. However, only 37 states reported.

**Table 2-3**  
**Number of schools and students in LEAs that received SDFSCA funding, by level of school: Reporting period 1999–2000**

Level of school	States reporting	Schools	Students
Elementary schools .....	46	72,699	18,824,778
Middle schools .....	45	20,509	7,706,313
High schools.....	45	24,504	10,197,071
Total .....	46	117,712	36,728,162

NOTE: American Samoa, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico are also included for all state enumerations.

SEAs were asked how many LEAs used SDFSCA funding to provide either drug or violence prevention services or activities. Table 2-4 shows that about 14,000 LEAs provided drug prevention services or activities, while almost 13,000 provided violence prevention services or activities. These are substantial increases from the corresponding 1995–96 totals of slightly more than 12,000 and slightly more than 9,000 LEAs, respectively, that provided those services or activities. Additionally, LEAs increased their emphasis on provision of violence prevention services or activities over the years covered by this data collection. In 1999–2000, the number of LEAs providing violence prevention service was 93 percent of the number of those providing drug prevention services, compared to 79 percent providing violence prevention in 1995–96.

**Table 2-4**  
**Number of LEAs using SDFSCA funds to provide drug prevention or violence prevention services or activities: Reporting period 1999-2000**

Service/activity	States reporting	Number of LEAs
Drug prevention services/activities.....	49	14,003
Violence prevention services/activities.....	49	12,996

NOTE: American Samoa, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico are also included for all state enumerations.

SEAs were asked to provide information on the number of LEAs that involved community agencies or organizations in their various SDFSCA-funded drug and violence prevention services and activities. SEAs also were asked to indicate how many SDFSCA-funded LEAs involved students in the design, delivery, or critique of drug or violence prevention services or activities. Table 2-5 shows that more than 10,600 LEAs involved community agencies, while slightly more than 7,000 had student participation.

The number that involved community agencies was similar to the 1998–99 total, while the number that had student participation increased by about 2,000 from that year. For the 1995–96 reporting period, slightly over 6,000 involved community agencies or organizations, while almost 3,000 involved students. Thus, the proportion of LEAs that involved students in the design and implementation of prevention programs increased from less than one-half to two-thirds of the number of LEAs that involved community groups.

**Table 2-5**  
**SDFSCA-funded LEAs' involvement of community agencies and students in drug and violence prevention activities: Reporting period 1999–2000**

Criteria	States reporting	Number of LEAs
LEAs involving community agencies or organizations in SDFSCA drug and violence prevention activities .....	45	10,646
LEAs involving students in the design, delivery, or critique of drug or violence prevention activities.....	42	7,037

NOTE: American Samoa, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico are also included for all state enumerations.

Table 2-6 presents a ranking of various activities and services provided with SDFSCA funds, together with the number of LEAs providing each service. The services that the greatest number of LEAs reported providing were drug prevention instruction (10,764), violence prevention instruction (9,662), teacher/staff training (9,530), and student support services (8,594). Those provided by the fewest number of LEAs were services for out-of-school youth (1,452) and security services (both equipment and personnel, 1,964 and 2,220, respectively). Among the many types of possible services, LEAs continue to be most likely to provide instructional services that are directly related to the primary aim of SDFSCA, namely drug and violence prevention. These numbers and their rank varied minimally from those for 1998–99.

In 1995–96, three of these same activities were among the top four reported by the LEAs: drug prevention instruction (9,300), teacher/staff training (8,400) and violence prevention instruction (6,400). In that year, however, teacher/staff training was ranked higher than violence prevention instruction, and curriculum acquisition/development was ranked fourth (6,300) instead of student support services.

**Table 2-6**  
**Number of states and LEAs providing various services/activities: Reporting period 1999–2000**

Service/activity	States reporting	LEAs providing service	
		Number	Percent
Drug prevention instruction .....	48	10,764	
Violence prevention instruction .....	47	9,662	
Teacher/staff training .....	48	9,530	
Student support services .....	48	8,594	
Parent education/involvement .....	47	7,634	
Conflict resolution/peer mediation .....	46	6,886	
Curriculum acquisition/development .....	45	6,728	
Special, one-time events .....	43	6,580	
After- or before-school programs .....	45	4,639	
Alternative education programs .....	45	3,799	
Community service projects .....	44	3,792	
Other services/activities .....	47	3,062	
Security personnel .....	46	2,220	
Security equipment .....	45	1,964	
Services for out-of-school youth (school age) .....	43	1,452	

NOTE: American Samoa, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico are also included for all state enumerations.

SEAs were asked to provide further details on their SDFSCA-funded LEAs that involved community agencies or organizations. Of the four specific types of drug and violence prevention services and activities mentioned, the most frequently cited were those relating to public awareness activities (77 percent) and joint service delivery, including referrals (76 percent), while the least cited were those pertaining to fundraising (23 percent of LEAs) (Table 2-7).

In 1995–96, the same two activities were used by the highest percentage of LEAs, 81 and 77 percent respectively. The least used were activities pertaining to fundraising, 27 percent.

**Table 2-7**  
**Number and percent of LEAs that involved community organizations in specific SDFSCA-funded drug and violence prevention services/activities: Reporting period 1999–2000**

Service/activity	States reporting	LEAs	
		Number	Percent
Public awareness activities .....	38	6,479	77
Joint service delivery, including referrals .....	38	6,372	76
Teacher/staff training .....	38	5,771	69
Fundraising .....	38	1,963	23

NOTE: American Samoa, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico are also included for all state enumerations.



## Governors' SDFSCA Programs

In addition to programs funded through the SEAs, various groups of individuals, both students and nonstudents, received services through SDFSCA programs funded by the Governor's office of each state. As shown in Table 2-8, the total number of individuals served during this period by such programs was 9,658,978. Fifty-five percent of these recipients were school-aged youth in public and private schools. Other recipients served were other community members (19 percent), parents and guardians (14 percent), school-aged youth not in school (3 percent), teachers and other school personnel (2 percent), and law enforcement officials (1 percent). This pattern differed only slightly from the previous four reporting periods, when parents and guardians received services more frequently than other community members.

**Table 2-8**  
**Number and percent of recipients, by category, who received services through SDFSCA Governors' programs: Fiscal year 1999–2000**

Service recipient	States reporting	Recipients	
		Number	Percent
School-aged youth in public/private schools .....	54	5,276,790	55
Other community members.....	53	1,787,281	19
Parents or guardians.....	54	1,362,688	14
Unknown.....	53	685,853	7
School-aged youth not in school.....	53	250,545	3
Teachers and other school personnel .....	53	223,445	2
Law enforcement officials .....	54	72,376	1
Total .....	54	9,658,978	100

NOTE: American Samoa, District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands are also included for all state enumerations. Because of rounding, percents may not add to 100.

Table 2-9 displays the number and percentage of individuals in various age groups who received services through the Governors' SDFSCA programs in 1999–2000. The largest group of recipients was those 19 years or older (22 percent), followed by 13- to 15-year-olds (17 percent). The next largest age groups receiving services were 16- to 18-year-olds (14 percent) and 10- to 12-year-olds (13 percent).

The age group receiving the most services, 19 years or older, was the same as the previous three reporting periods. However, the 13- to 15- year-olds received more services than the 16- to 18-year-olds, which had not been the case for the 1997–98 or 1998–99 reporting periods. In 1995–96, 13- to 15-year-olds were the highest percentage of recipients by far (55 percent).

**Table 2-9**  
**Number and percent of recipients by age group served by SDFSCA Governors’ programs: Fiscal year 1999-2000**

Age of recipient	States reporting	Recipient	
		Number	Percent
19 years or older.....	53	2,128,937	22
Unknown.....	53	1,868,041	19
13 to 15 years old.....	53	1,643,312	17
16 to 18 years old.....	53	1,368,169	14
10 to 12 years old.....	53	1,263,162	13
5 to 9 years old.....	53	1,093,457	11
Less than 5 years old.....	53	246,280	3
Total.....	53	9,611,158	100

NOTE: American Samoa, District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands are also included for all state enumerations.

A total of 1,989 primary awards were made through the Governors’ programs.<sup>1</sup> As Table 2-10 shows, 74 percent of awards were for the duration of at least 1 year, but less than 18 months. Seventeen percent of the awards were for at least 9 months but less than 1 year, 5 percent were for less than 9 months, and 4 percent were for at least 18 months. These data are similar to the last four reporting periods, where over half of the awards were for the duration of at least 1 year, but less than 18 months.

**Table 2-10**  
**Number and percent of primary awards of varying durations made through SDFSCA Governors’ programs: Fiscal year 1999–2000**

Duration of award	States reporting	Awards	
		Number	Percent
At least 1 year, but less than 18 months.....	54	1,475	74
At least 9 months, but less than 1 year.....	54	346	17
Less than 9 months.....	54	98	5
At least 18 months.....	54	70	4
Total.....	54	1,989	100

NOTE: American Samoa, District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands are also included for all state enumerations.

<sup>1</sup> The 1,989 awards are an unduplicated count where each award is counted only once.

Table 2-11 shows the size of primary awards distributed, along with the number and percentage of these awards. Of the 1,989 awards distributed, the largest percentage (35 percent) fell in the range of \$5,000 to \$24,999. This also is true for the previous reporting periods, where the percentage of the awards that fell within this range, varied from 31 to 41 percent.

**Table 2-11**  
**Number and percent of primary awards made by size category through SDFSCA Governors’**  
**programs: Fiscal year 1999–2000**

Size of award	States reporting	Awards	
		Number	Percent
Between \$5,000 and \$24,999 .....	54	703	35
At least \$50,000 .....	54	550	28
Between \$25,000 and \$49,999 .....	54	404	20
Less than \$5,000 .....	54	332	17
Total .....	54	1,989	100

NOTE: American Samoa, District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands are also included for all state enumerations.

Table 2-12 displays the number and percentage of awards that provided various types of services and activities provided through the Governors’ programs. The services and activities most widely provided were drug prevention instruction (67 percent), program coordination (66 percent), violence prevention instruction (62 percent), and services for youth in school (59 percent). The services and activities least offered were security personnel and equipment (8 percent) and student protection activities (10 percent). Although the order has fluctuated slightly, these services and activities have remained the most and least frequently provided in the previous four reporting periods, as well.

**Table 2-12**  
**Number and percent of awards for services/activities made through SDFSCA Governors’**  
**programs: Fiscal year 1999–2000**

Service/Activity	States reporting	Awards	
		Number	Percent
Drug prevention instruction .....	52	1,340	67
Program coordination.....	53	1,319	66
Violence prevention instruction .....	53	1,227	62
Service for youth in school .....	53	1,181	59
Dissemination/media activities .....	53	890	45
Program evaluation .....	53	887	45
Training for parents, community .....	52	871	44
Parent education/involvement.....	51	853	43
After- or before-school programs .....	52	831	42
Youth/student support services .....	53	784	39
Conflict resolution/peer mediation.....	53	763	38
Anti-gang activities.....	52	649	33
Comprehensive services/programs .....	53	622	31
Community service projects .....	53	577	29
Special, one-time events .....	53	547	28
Prejudice-related violence prevention.....	52	530	27
Drug and violence prevalence surveys.....	52	444	22
Services for out-of-school youth.....	52	406	20
Curriculum acquisition/development.....	53	412	21
Alternative education programs .....	53	382	19
Student protection activities.....	53	192	10
Security personnel/equipment.....	52	157	8
Other .....	52	82	4

NOTE: American Samoa, District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands are also included for all state enumerations.

**Chapter 3**  
**Drug Prevalence Data**

Section 4117 of the SDFSCA requires that states report “data on the prevalence of drug use and violence by youth in schools and communities.” In order to implement this provision, ED staff advised state SDFSCA personnel that they could meet this requirement by conducting a prevalence survey once every 3 years for a sample of students in 12th grade and 10th grade, with an 8th grade survey being optional. Historically, most states have conducted a prevalence survey every other year.

The reporting form asks the SEA to indicate when the state administered a prevalence survey, the instrument used, and how many students participated. States predominately use the Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS), developed by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), to obtain information on alcohol, cigarette, and other drug use. The YRBS has traditionally been administered every spring in odd-numbered years. Therefore, in the 1999–2000 reporting year, a lower number of surveys were conducted than were in the 1998–99 reporting period. In 1998–99, 14 states conducted a prevalence survey in 8th grade, 37 in the 10th grade, and 38 in the 12th grade. In the 1999–2000 year, the number of states conducting prevalence surveys dropped to 10 for grades 8 and 10, and 9 for grade 12.

**Table 3-1**  
**Number of states/territories conducting prevalence surveys, by grade: Reporting period 1999–2000**

Grade	Number of states reporting	Conducted survey
8 .....	23	10
10 .....	39	10
12 .....	40	9

NOTE: American Samoa, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico are also included for all state enumerations.

Despite the heavy reliance on the YRBS, SEA program staff use a variety of prevalence instruments, including those they develop themselves. The YRBS, however, is the most frequently cited survey for 10th and 12th grade students (Table 3-2). State and locally developed surveys continue to be more frequently used for 8th graders than other surveys, but because so few states conduct an 8th grade survey, only data from 10th and 12th grade students will be presented in the remainder of this chapter. The discussion accompanying each table is supplemented by corresponding data from the national 1999 YRBS. The national YRBS data show percentages of 10th and 12th graders who have used cigarettes, alcohol, marijuana, and cocaine.

**Table 3-2**

**Number of states/territories that used specific surveys for their prevalence survey: Reporting period 1999–2000**

<b>Prevalence survey</b>	<b>Grade 8</b>	<b>Grade 10</b>	<b>Grade 12</b>
Number of states reporting.....	23	40	41
YRBS .....	8	28	28
State/local.....	11	8	9
Other .....	4	4	4

NOTE: American Samoa, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico are also included for all state enumerations.

An advantage of using the YRBS for state collection of prevalence information is the availability of nationally representative data for comparison purposes. The state data collected and summarized from the 1999–2000 reporting forms are reported to ED as percentages and, therefore, cannot be combined to provide national estimates of prevalence. To aid in understanding the SDFSCA prevalence information, 1995 national YRBS data were used to establish percentage break points for the data tables. Further information about the percentage breaks is contained in the box below.

### Understanding Percentage Breaks in Prevalence Tables

Data from the 1995 national YRBS were initially used to help set the breaking points in the tables reported in this chapter and the following chapter. The breaking point is the point at which a condition or behavior becomes important statistically.\* The purpose of this approach is to establish meaningful breaks based on the great differences in use of different substances (for example, alcohol and cocaine). Meaningful breaks are those that distribute the responses in a manner that shows helpful distinctions, such as age of first use or number of times or number of days a substance was used, which can then be used to pinpoint a critical change of behavior or target areas of greatest or least need. Non-meaningful breaks may result in all responses appearing in one category, thus obscuring any distinctions that might be useful for assessment or development of prevention strategies.

This emphasis on targeting meaningful distinctions in the data reported often results in the use of breaks that vary from table to table. For example, 22 states reported more than 50 percent of 10th graders in 1999–2000 used alcohol in the 30 days prior to administration of the YRBS, while 24 states reported fewer than 5 percent of 10th graders had ever used cocaine within that same period. While a 50 percent breaking point is meaningful and appropriate when displaying data related to alcohol use, that same 50 percent breaking point would obscure the small amount of cocaine use.

\*For example, Table 3-6 uses less than 15 percent, 15-25 percent, and more than 25 percent as breaking points to determine the age of first alcohol use.

### Cigarette Use

SEAs were asked to record the percentage of students in grades 8, 10, and 12 who reported using cigarettes **within the past 30 days**. SEAs also were asked to provide data concerning the **age of first use** of cigarettes for students in each of those grades. If only data that combined smoking and smokeless tobacco were available, states and territories were asked not to report them. Reported use of cigarettes within the past month was measured in days and included use in any location, not just on school property.

During the 1999–2000 reporting period, 19 states indicated that more than 15 percent of their 10th graders had smoked cigarettes on 20 or more days **within the last 30 days**, while 27 states indicated the same to be true of 12th graders (Table 3-3). On the other hand, 16 states in 1999–2000 reported that 65 percent of their 10th graders had **not** smoked within the last 30 days, while 8 states reported the same for 12th graders. The 1999 national YRBS reported similar results for 10th graders who had smoked cigarettes on 20 or more days.

**Table 3-3**  
**Frequency of students' use of cigarettes within the last 30 days: Reporting period 1999–2000**

Frequency	Grade 10	Grade 12
Number of states reporting.....	30	31
States reporting more than 65 percent of their students had not used cigarettes within last 30 days.....	16	8
States reporting more than 10 percent of their students had used cigarettes on 1 to 5 days within last 30 days .....	16	18
States reporting more than 10 percent of students had used cigarettes on 6 to 19 days within last 30 days .....	1	2
States reporting more than 15 percent of students had used cigarettes on 20 or more days within last 30 days .....	19	27

NOTE: American Samoa, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico are also included for all state enumerations.

SEAs were asked to record the percentages of students at each grade level who reported first use of cigarettes at 10 years or younger, 11 to 12 years, 13 to 14 years, and 15 years or older. Data for **age of first use** of cigarettes are shown in Table 3-4. For 1999–2000, 27 of the 29 states reporting indicated that 15 to 25 percent of their 10th graders had first smoked at age 13 to 14, while 28 states reported that less than 15 percent had first smoked a cigarette at 10 years or younger.

For the 1998–99 reporting period, similar data were reported: 34 of 38 states reporting indicated that 15 to 25 percent of their 10th grade students had their first cigarette at age 13 to 14. During that same period, 28 states reported that less than 15 percent of their 10th grade students had smoked a whole cigarette for the first time at 10 years or younger. The 1999 national YRBS reported 24.5 percent of 10th grade students had first used cigarettes by age 13 to 14.



**Table 3-4**

**Age of first use of cigarettes reported for 10th graders: Reporting period 1999–2000**

Age	States reporting use by less than 15 percent of students	States reporting use by 15–25 percent of students	States reporting use by more than 25 percent of students
Number of states reporting.....	29	29	29
10 years or younger.....	28	1	0
11 to 12 years.....	11	18	0
13 to 14 years.....	1	27	1
15 years or older.....	29	0	0

NOTE: American Samoa, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico are also included for all state enumerations.

**Alcohol Use**

For items on alcohol use, SEAs were asked to indicate the percentage of students who had used alcohol for a certain number of days within the 30-day period preceding administration of the YRBS and who had first used alcohol at different ages. As shown in Table 3-5, 10 of the 32 states reporting indicated that during the 1999–2000 reporting period, more than 15 percent of their 10th grade students had used alcohol weekly on 6 to 19 days **within the last 30 days**. Twenty-four states reported weekly alcohol use (6–19 days) for more than 15 percent of 12th graders in the past 30 days. For the 1998–99 reporting period, states reported this level of alcohol use for 10th grade students, while 28 out of 35 states reported this level for 12th grade students. The reported alcohol use is measured in days and includes use at any location, not just on school property. The 1999 YRBS found that 13 percent of 10th graders and 20 percent of 12th graders used alcohol on 6 to 19 days during a 30-day period.

**Table 3-5****Frequency of students' use of alcohol within the last 30 days: Reporting period 1999–2000**

Frequency	Grade 10	Grade 12
Number of states reporting.....	32	33
States reporting more than 50 percent of their students had not used alcohol within the past 30 days.....	22	6
States reporting more than 35 percent of their students had used alcohol on 1 to 5 days within last 30 days .....	6	15
States reporting more than 15 percent of their students had used alcohol on 6 to 19 days within last 30 days .....	10	24
States reporting more than 5 percent of their students used alcohol on 20 or more days within last 30 days.....	2	5

NOTE: American Samoa, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico are also included for all state enumerations.

Of the 29 states reporting **age of first use** of alcohol by 10th graders in 1999–2000, all reported that less than 15 percent of their 10th graders drank alcohol for the first time at age 10 or younger, while 21 reported that more than 25 percent of their 10th graders first used alcohol at age 13 to 14 (Table 3-6). For 1998–99, 3 of 38 states reporting indicated that 15 to 25 percent of 10th graders had first used alcohol at age 10 or younger, and 27 states also reported more than 25 percent of 10th graders had first used alcohol at 13 to 14. The 1999 national YRBS reported that 31.8 percent of 10th grade students had a first drink of alcohol at age 13 to 14.

**Table 3-6****Age of first use of alcohol reported for 10th grades: Reporting period 1999–2000**

Age	States reporting use by less than 15 percent of students	States reporting use by 15–25 percent of students	States reporting use by more than 25 percent of students
Number of states reporting.....	29	29	29
10 years or younger.....	29	0	0
11 to 12 years.....	17	12	0
13 to 14 years.....	1	7	21
15 years or older .....	29	0	0

NOTE: American Samoa, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico are also included for all state enumerations.

## Marijuana Use

Of the SEAs reporting marijuana use by youth for the 1999–2000 SDFSCA reporting period, 10 states indicated that more than 15 percent of their 10th graders had smoked marijuana 1 to 9 times **within the last 30 days**, and 17 states reported this to be true of their 12th graders (Table 3-7). Reported use is measured in number of times and includes use at any location, not just on school property.

**Table 3-7**  
**Frequency of students' use of marijuana within the last 30 days: Reporting period 1999–2000**

Frequency	Grade 10	Grade 12
Number of states reporting .....	31	32
States reporting more than 75 percent of their students had not used marijuana within last 30 days .....	18	11
States reporting more than 15 percent of their students had used marijuana 1 to 9 times within last 30 days .....	10	17
States reporting more than 5 percent of their students had used marijuana 10 to 39 times within last 30 days .....	22	25
States reporting more than 5 percent of their students had used marijuana 40 or more times within last 30 days .....	8	18

NOTE: American Samoa, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico are also included for all state enumerations.

**Age of first use** of marijuana was reported in 1999–2000 to be 13 to 14 years by 21 of 28 states for 15 to 25 percent of their 10th graders. Twenty-eight states reported that less than 15 percent of their 10th graders initiated marijuana use at age 10 or younger, while the same number of states reported first use at age 11 to 12 (Table 3-8). In the 1999 high school YRBS results, 21 percent of 10th graders nationally reported first use of marijuana at age 13 to 14, the same result as in 1997.

**Table 3-8**  
**Age of first use of marijuana reported for 10th graders: Reporting period 1999–2000**

Age	States reporting use by less than 15 percent of students	States reporting use by 15–25 percent of students	States reporting use by more than 25 percent of students
Number of states reporting.....	28	28	28
10 years or younger.....	28	0	0
11 to 12 years.....	28	0	0
13 to 14 years.....	6	21	1
15 years or older.....	28	0	0

NOTE: American Samoa, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico are also included for all state enumerations.

### Cocaine Use

State reports indicate that the use of cocaine in the form of crack, powder, or freebase was not a significant problem among high school students. In 1999–2000, 24 states reported more than 95 percent of their 10th graders had **not** used cocaine during the last 30 days, while 24 states reported similarly for 12th graders (Table 3-9). Data from the national YRBS indicated that 90 percent of 10th graders in 1999 had never used any form of cocaine, representing an increase of 2 percent from 1997.

Because the number of states reporting **age of first use** of cocaine is so small, data are not reported in this document. It should be noted that the national YRBS no longer collects information on the age of first use for any form of cocaine.

**Table 3-9**  
**Frequency of students' use of cocaine within the last 30 days: Reporting period 1999–2000**

Frequency	Grade 10	Grade 12
Number of states reporting.....	30	31
States reporting more than 95 percent of their students had not used cocaine within last 30 days.....	24	24
States reporting more than 5 percent of their students had used cocaine 1 to 9 times in the last 30 days.....	3	3
States reporting more than 5 percent of their students had used cocaine 10 or more times in the last 30 days*.....	0	0

\* This row summarizes data reported for the response categories regarding students having used cocaine 10 to 39 or 40 or more times in the last 30 days.

NOTE: American Samoa, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico are also included for all state enumerations.

## Inhalants/Other Illegal Drugs

For most states, a statewide YRBS provided the data for the drug prevalence information in this report up to this point. However, the YRBS does not include items on **age of first use** and use **within the last 30 days** for either inhalants or other illegal drugs. States continue to have difficulty reporting these data. Using other surveys, six states were able to report data for age of first use of inhalants, and two states were able to report for other illegal drugs (Table 3-10). All these states reported that for all ages of first use, inhalants were used by less than 15 percent of students.

**Table 3-10**  
**Number of states reporting students' age of first use of various substances: Reporting period 1999–2000**

Age	States reporting use by less than 15 percent of students	States reporting use by 15–25 percent of students	States reporting use by more than 25 percent of students
<b><i>Inhalants*</i></b>			
Number of states reporting.....	6	6	6
10 years or younger.....	6	0	0
11 to 12 years.....	6	0	0
13 to 14 years.....	6	0	0
15 years or older .....	6	0	0
<b><i>Other illegal drugs*</i></b>			
Number of states reporting.....	2	2	2
10 years or younger.....	2	0	0
11 to 12 years.....	2	0	0
13 to 14 years.....	2	0	0
15 years or older .....	2	0	0

\* This question was not asked on the 1999 YRBS.

NOTE: American Samoa, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico are also included for all state enumerations.

Eighteen of the 25 reporting states indicated more than 95 percent of their 10th grade students had **not** used inhalants within the last 30 days, while 21 states reported similarly for 12th grade students. Seven states were able to report data for other illegal drugs **within the last 30 days** (Table 3-11).

**Table 3-11**  
**Use of various substances within the last 30 days: Reporting period 1999–2000**

Frequency	Grade 10	Grade 12
<b><i>Inhalants<sup>1</sup></i></b>		
Number of states reporting.....	25	26
States reporting more than 95 percent of their students had not used inhalants within last 30 days.....	18	21
States reporting more than 5 percent of their students had used inhalants 1 to 9 times in the last 30 days .....	2	2
States reporting more than 5 percent of their students had used inhalants 10 or more times in the last 30 days .....	0	0
<b><i>Other illegal drugs<sup>1</sup></i></b>		
Number of states reporting.....	7	8
States reporting more than 95 percent of their students had not used other illegal drugs within last 30 days .....	1	2
States reporting more than 5 percent of their students had used other illegal drugs 1 to 9 times in the last 30 days .....	5	5
States reporting more than 5 percent of their students had used other illegal drugs 10 or more times in the last 30 days <sup>2</sup> .....	0	0

<sup>1</sup> This question was not asked on the 1999 YRBS.

<sup>2</sup> This row summarizes data reported for the response categories regarding students having used other illegal drugs 10 to 39 or 40 or more times in the last 30 days.

NOTE: American Samoa, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico are also included for all state enumerations.

## **Chapter 4**

### **School Safety Data**

One of the purposes of the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act is to support programs that prevent violence in and around schools. Additionally, the authorization for the Governors' programs emphasizes a comprehensive, community-based approach to the prevention of violence by youth and promotion of violence-free lifestyles for youth. The legislation requires the Department of Education to report to Congress on "the frequency, seriousness, and incidence of violence in elementary and secondary schools in the States" as well as "data on the prevalence of violence by youth in schools and communities" (Section 4117 of the SDFSCA of 1994).

Three general types of information are reported in this chapter: safety prevalence data (state reporting of survey data from samples of students regarding safety in and around schools); incidence data on school safety (counts reported by administrative record-keeping systems); and youth arrest data. The data on incidents in schools and on safety prevalence were collected through the SDFSCA SEA reporting form. Data on youth arrest rates were gathered from nationally available sources, i.e., the U.S. Bureau of the Census, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Uniform Crime Reporting System, in order to minimize burden on state personnel.

#### **Safety Prevalence Data**

Safety prevalence data were collected by most states as part of the administration of the Youth Risk Behavior Survey from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, or other nationally available prevalence surveys. Some states added questions similar to those on the YRBS to their own locally developed state prevalence surveys.

For each SDFSCA reporting year, ED asks states to collect prevalence data at least once within a 3-year period that includes the current reporting year as well as the two prior reporting years. Thus, data reported on the 1999–2000 SEA SDFSCA reporting form may have come from any of the 3 years allowed: 1997–98, 1998–99, or 1999–2000. The data are to be collected from a sample of 10th and 12th graders, with an 8th grade survey being optional.

In each of the tables in this section, data are shown for states that reported the complete set of data requested for a grade level. (Appendix C presents all the prevalence data reported by the states.)

An explanation about the percentage breaks used in the data tables of this section of the chapter is contained in the text box below.

### **Understanding Percentage Breaks in Prevalence Tables**

Data from the national 1995 YRBS were used initially to help set the breaking points used in the safety prevalence data tables. The breaking point is the point at which a condition or behavior becomes important statistically.\* The purpose of this approach was to establish meaningful breaks based on actual reported prevalence of safety-related incidents in schools across the country. Meaningful breaks are those that distribute the responses in a manner that shows helpful distinctions, such as age, number of times, or number of days, that can be used to pinpoint a critical change of behavior or to target areas of greatest and least need. Nonmeaningful breaks may result in all responses appearing in one category, thus obscuring any distinctions that might be useful for assessment or development of prevention strategies.

This emphasis on targeting meaningful distinctions in the data reported often results in the use of breaks that vary from table to table. For example, students are more likely to have had property stolen or deliberately damaged on school property than to have been threatened or injured with a weapon on school property. So the break for the number of states reporting frequency of students not having stolen or damaged property is 65 percent. The break for states reporting students not having been threatened or injured with a weapon is 90 percent. While a 90 percent breaking point is meaningful and appropriate when displaying data related to threats and injury with a weapon, that same 90 percent would obscure distinctions between data on property stolen or deliberately damaged on school property.

\* For example, Table 4-4 used more than 65 percent, more than 15 percent, more than 10 percent, and more than 5 percent as breaking points to present the frequency with which students' property was stolen or deliberately damaged on school property.

The discussion accompanying each table is supplemented by similar data from the national YRBS. The national YRBS data track the experiences of 10th and 12th graders with each of the five YRBS safety measures that were incorporated into the SDFSCA SEA reporting form.



## Students Brought Weapons to School During Last 30 Days

In 1999–2000 no states reported that more than 5 percent of 10th and 12th graders had brought a weapon to school on **1 day** during the last 30 days (Table 4-1). In 7 states, more than 5 percent of the 10th graders reporting that they had brought a weapon to school on 6 or more days **during the last 30 days**; 11 states reported the same frequency of data for 12th graders.

In comparison, 1999 YRBS data for the United States show that 2 percent of 10th graders and 1 percent of 12th graders had carried a weapon on **1 day** on school property during the last 30 days. National YRBS data for 1999 on students who had carried a weapon to school on **6 or more days** showed that 3 percent of 10th graders and 4 percent of 12th graders reported this frequency.

**Table 4-1**  
**Frequency with which students brought weapons to school during the last 30 days: Reporting period 1999–2000**

Frequency	Grade 10	Grade 12
Number of states reporting.....	30	31
States reporting that more than 90 percent of their students brought no weapons to school during last 30 days .....	24	24
States reporting that more than 5 percent of their students brought weapons to school on 1 day.....	0	0
States reporting that more than 5 percent of their students brought weapons to school on 2 or 3 days.....	2	1
States reporting that more than 5 percent of their students brought weapons to school on 4 or 5 days.....	0	0
States reporting that more than 5 percent of their students brought weapons to school on 6 or more days.....	7	11

NOTE: American Samoa, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico are also included for all state enumerations.

## Students Not Attending School Because They Felt Unsafe During Last 30 Days

In 1999–2000, five states reported that more than 5 percent of the 10th graders had missed **1 day** of school during the last 30 days because they felt unsafe on the way to school (Table 4-2), while four states reported the same for 12th graders. In that same year, one state reported that more than 5 percent of the 10th and 12th graders missed 2 or 3 days of school **during the last 30 days** because they felt unsafe.

The national YRBS data are consistent with the SDFSCA data on this safety-related measure. In the 1999 YRBS, 3 percent of 10th graders reported having missed **1 day** of school during the last 30 days because they felt unsafe at or on the way to school, compared to 2 percent of 12th graders. That same year, 1 percent of both 10th graders and 12th graders reported having missed school for **2 or 3 days** during the last 30 days because of feeling unsafe.

**Table 4-2**  
**Frequency with which students did not attend school because they felt unsafe at or on the way to school during last 30 days: Reporting period 1999–2000**

Frequency	Grade 10	Grade 12
Number of states reporting.....	29	30
States reporting more than 95 percent of their students missing no days of school.....	11	28
States reporting more than 5 percent of their students missing 1 day of school.....	5	4
States reporting more than 5 percent of their students missing 2 or 3 days of school.....	1	1
States reporting more than 5 percent of their students missing 4 or more days of school*.....	0	0

\* This row summarizes data reported for the response categories regarding students missing 4 or 5, and 6 or more times in the last 30 days.

NOTE: American Samoa, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico are also included for all state enumerations.

**Students Threatened or Injured With a Weapon on School Property During Last 12 Months**

In 1999–2000, four states reported that more than 5 percent of their 10th graders had been threatened or injured with a weapon on school property **one time** during the last 12 months; two states reported the same for 12th graders (Table 4-3). For both grade levels, no state had more than 5 percent of their students reporting that they had been threatened or injured with a weapon on school property **two or more times** during the last 12 months.

According to 1999 national YRBS data, 4 percent of 10th graders had been threatened or injured with a weapon on school property **one time** during the last 12 months, while 2 percent of 12th graders had had that experience. Also in 1999, 2 percent of 10th graders and 1 percent of 12th graders nationally reported having been threatened or injured with a weapon on school property **two or three times** during the last year.

**Table 4-3**  
**Frequency with which students were threatened or injured with a weapon on school property during last 12 months: Reporting period 1999–2000**

Frequency	Grade 10	Grade 12
Number of states reporting.....	27	27
States reporting more than 90 percent of their students not threatened or injured on school property.....	22	25
States reporting more than 5 percent of their students threatened or injured on school property 1 time .....	4	2
States reporting more than 5 percent of their students threatened or injured on school property 2 or more times* .....	0	0

\* This row summarizes data reported for the response categories regarding students having been threatened or injured 2 or 3 times, 4 or 5 times, 6 or 7 times, 8 or 9 times, 10 or 11 times, and 12 or more times.

NOTE: American Samoa, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico are also included for all state enumerations.

## Student Property Stolen or Deliberately Damaged at School During Last 12 Months

Two states in 1999–2000 reported that more than 15 percent of their 10th graders had property stolen or deliberately damaged **one time** on school grounds during the last 12 months, and one state also reported similar findings for their 12th graders (Table 4-4). Three states reported that more than 10 percent of 10th graders had their property stolen or deliberately damaged **two or three times** during the last 12 months, but only one reported similar findings for their 12th graders.

The 1997<sup>1</sup> national YRBS data show that 19 percent of 10th graders had property stolen or deliberately damaged on school property **one time** during the last 12 months, as did 16 percent of 12th graders. Also in the national YRBS, 11 percent of 10th graders and 9 percent of 12th graders reported that their property had been stolen or deliberately damaged **two or three times** on school property during the last 12 months.

**Table 4-4**  
**Frequency with which student property was stolen or deliberately damaged on school property during last 12 months: Reporting period 1999–2000**

Frequency	Grade 10	Grade 12
Number of states reporting.....	5	5
States reporting more than 65 percent of their students whose property was not stolen or damaged on school property.....	5	5
States reporting more than 15 percent of their students whose property was stolen or damaged 1 time on school property.....	2	1
States reporting more than 10 percent of their students whose property was stolen or damaged 2 or 3 times on school property.....	3	1
States reporting more than 5 percent of their students whose property was stolen or damaged 4 or more times on school property *.....	0	0

\* This row summarizes data reported for the response categories regarding students whose property was stolen or damaged 4 or 5 times, 6 or 7 times, 8 or 9 times, 10 or 11 times, and 12 or more.

NOTE: American Samoa, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico are also included for all state enumerations.

<sup>1</sup> The 1999 national YRBS did not include this question.

### Students in Physical Fight on School Grounds During Last 12 Months

In 1999–2000, four states reported more than 10 percent of the 10th graders were in a physical fight **one time** at school during the last 12 months (Table 4-5). There were no states that reported the same frequency for the 12th graders. One state reported more than 5 percent of 10th graders being in **two or three** physical fights on school grounds, but no state reported 12th graders being in this number of fights that same year.

National YRBS data for 1999 are fairly consistent with the SDFSCA data, showing that 10th graders were more likely than 12th graders to have experienced this problem. Twelve percent of 10th graders were in a physical fight **one time** on school grounds during the last 12 months, while fewer 12th graders (5 percent) engaged in this same behavior. In the 1999 YRBS data, 4 percent of 10th graders and 2 percent of 12th graders reported that they had been in a physical fight **two or three times** on school grounds during the last 12 months.

**Table 4-5**  
**Frequency with which students were in a physical fight on school property during last 12 months:**  
**Reporting period 1999–2000**

Frequency	Grade 10	Grade 12
Number of states reporting.....	26	26
States reporting 85 percent or more of students reported not being in a fight .....	21	26
States reporting 10 percent or more of students being in a fight 1 time .....	4	0
States reporting 5 percent or more of students being in a fight 2 or 3 times.....	1	0
States reporting 5 percent or more of students being in a fight 4 or more times* .....	0	0

\* This row summarizes data reported for the response categories regarding students having been in a fight 4 or 5 times, 6 or 7 times, 8 or 9 times, 10 or 11 times, and 12 or more.

NOTE: American Samoa, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico are also included for all state enumerations.

## **Safety-Related Incident Data**

The data in this portion of the SEA SDFSCA annual data collection have been reported by states since the 1995–96 reporting period. Many other topics of the data collection were addressed similarly in prior SDFSCA biennial reports, but the items concerning incidents in schools were added to the reporting form after passage of the SDFSCA of 1994. Definitions for the safety-related terms are presented in the text box that follows.

Data used to develop the tables in this section were reported by the states as numbers of incidents, offenders, victims, and weapons-related incidents. The elementary, middle, and senior high school student populations of each state were then used to calculate the numbers per 1,000 students. Student enrollments were taken from the NCES 1999–2000 Common Core of Data (CCD) Public School Universe Survey data, which show state-level figures on student population. The enrollments for grades 1–5 were used to estimate each state’s elementary school population, those for grades 6–8 were used for the middle school population, and those for grades 9–12 for the senior high school population. Because the classification of grade grouping for elementary, middle, and senior high school is not standardized (and indeed varies not only from state to state and district to district, but within districts as well), the calculations per 1,000 students shown in these tables should be considered estimates.

For all the safety incidents reported, the numbers of offenders and victims are unduplicated counts. That is, a person involved as an offender or as a victim in one or more incidents is counted only once for that reporting period. The purpose of reporting an unduplicated count is to have a measure of the number of persons involved in the total number of incidents reported by a state. For example, if the unduplicated number of offenders in a state is less than the number of incidents, then some offenders were involved in more than one incident. On the other hand, if the number of offenders is greater than the number of incidents, one or more incidents involved more than one offender. Similarly, the number of victims reported by a state may be greater or less than the number of offenders since an offender may be involved in an incident that has no victim (such as possession of drugs) or more than one victim (such as some robberies). The number of victims thus may also be greater or less than the number of incidents. All tables in this section display data from only those states that reported data for all subitems of the relevant question.

### **SDFSCA Safety-Related Definitions\***

**Incident:** A violation of a statute or regulation; it may involve **one or more** victims and **one or more** offenders. For reporting purposes, an incident of prohibited behavior is the single most serious act that occurs in a given overall incident. Incidents (ordered from most serious to least serious) include the following: homicide; sexual battery (including rape); robbery; battery; breaking and entering/burglary; larceny/theft; motor vehicle theft; kidnapping; arson; threat/intimidation; use or possession of drugs (other than alcohol); sexual harassment; sex offenses (non-forcible); vandalism; weapon possession; unclassified offenses; alcohol (liquor law violations); tobacco (where declared illegal); trespassing; fighting; disorderly conduct; as well as other major offenses; and other state (district or municipal) defined offenses.

**Non-school personnel:** An individual who was neither a student nor school personnel for the district reporting the incident.

**Non-student:** An individual who is not a student in the school or district reporting the incident.

**Offender:** An individual, whether student or not, involved in committing an incident of prohibited behavior. There may be more than one offender involved in any single incident.

**School personnel:** A teacher, administrator, or other school staff member such as support staff or maintenance worker; includes a school-based law enforcement officer such as a school resource officer.

**Student:** An individual who is enrolled as a PK-12 student in the school district reporting the incident at the time the incident occurred.

**Victim:** The recipient of a criminal act, usually used in relation to personal crimes.

**Weapon:** Any instrument or object possessed or used to inflict harm on another person, or to intimidate any person. Examples include firearms of any kind (operable or inoperable loaded or unloaded); all types of knives, chains, pipes, razor blades or similar instruments with sharp cutting edges; ice picks, dirks, other pointed instruments (including pencils, pens); nunchakus; brass knuckles; chins stars; billy clubs; tear gas guns; electrical weapons or devices (stun guns); BB or pellet guns; and explosives or propellants.

**Weapons-related incident:** Any incident that involves possession, use, or intention of use of any instrument or object to inflict harm on another person, or to intimidate a person, as well as any incident that is somehow related to the possession, use or sale of weapons but where the use, possession, or sale of weapons was not the main offense (e.g., burglary, trespassing, vandalism); in other words, any incident for which a weapon is present.

\*These definitions are from the OESE Consolidated State Performance Report for State Formula Grant Programs for SY 1999–2000, p.86.

Of all the states reporting any safety-related incident data in 1995–96, only one was able to report a complete set. While 10 states reported a complete set of incident data in 1998–99, only 6 states did so in 1999–2000. An examination of the five reporting periods from 1995–96 to 1999–2000 showed that states that reported incident data continued to struggle more with certain questions than with others for various reasons. In 1999–2000, for example, some states with new SDFSCA coordinators were unable to report an unduplicated number of offenders or victims involved in incidents, even though those states had reported these data previously. Another problem was caused because in this year’s data collection form, the question about the number of offenders was missing the parenthetical reminder that the number was to be unduplicated. Additionally, disaggregation of incident data by school level and/or by the number of schools reporting number of incidents remained a problem for several states, including two that were previously able to report such data. Some states persisted in reporting the student gun-possession data required by the Gun-Free Schools Act, but not the larger set of weapons-related data needed for the SDFSCA report. Clearly, states are facing continuing or recurring challenges in fulfilling the SDFSCA data collection requirements.

On the other hand, two states reported complete sets of incident data for the first time this year. A few states also indicated that reporting systems were being developed or revised to collect requested incident data for future reporting years.

### **Incidents, Offenders, and Weapons-Related Incidents in Elementary Schools**

Table 4-6 presents data on the number of incidents of prohibited behavior, of offenders, and of weapons-related incidents per 1,000 students in elementary schools, by state, for 1999–2000. These data are shown together to facilitate comparison between the three data categories. For example, if a state’s number of offenders per 1,000 students is much lower than its number of incidents per 1,000 students, such data would indicate that many offenders are involved in more than one incident. The number of weapons-related incidents per 1,000 students is shown in this table as a measure of the relative severity of the number of all incidents occurring in a state.

Over the 5-year period from 1995–96 to 1999–2000, the number of states that are able to report a complete set of data for all three types of data shown in Table 4-6 increased. Compared to 6 states in 1995–96, 23 were able to report a complete set of data by for the 1999–2000 reporting period (25 states did in 1998–99). Additionally, for 1999–2000, 36 and 33 states, respectively, were able to



**Table 4-6****Number of incidents, offenders, and weapons-related incidents per 1,000 students reported in elementary schools: Reporting period 1999–2000**

State	Incidents	Total offenders (unduplicated counts)	Weapons related- incidents
Number of states reporting.....	36	23	33
Alaska .....	123	101	1
American Samoa .....	16	MD	MD
Arizona.....	100	73	2
Arkansas.....	1	MD	MD
California .....	8	MD	MD
Colorado.....	17	MD	1
District of Columbia .....	61	25	2
Florida.....	33	MD	1
Georgia.....	195	81	1
Hawaii.....	16	MD	1
Idaho .....	120	MD	2
Indiana .....	72	MD	1
Kentucky.....	64	29	*
Louisiana.....	95	67	1
Maine .....	155	72	1
Michigan .....	26	25	1
Minnesota.....	34	20	1
Mississippi .....	87	44	1
Montana .....	13	8	2
New Hampshire .....	18	14	*
New Jersey.....	6	4	1
New Mexico.....	36	MD	3
New York.....	13	5	1
North Carolina .....	2	2	*
Ohio .....	50	41	2
Oklahoma.....	41	MD	2
Pennsylvania.....	15	13	2
Rhode Island .....	44	34	1
South Dakota.....	239	118	3
Texas.....	48	48	1
Utah.....	8	5	1
Vermont .....	38	MD	3
Washington.....	59	44	3
West Virginia .....	63	MD	*
Wisconsin.....	7	MD	*
Wyoming .....	10	7	*

\* Ratio is less than 1.

MD = Missing data.

report data for incidents and weapons-related incidents, while offender data were reported by 23. In comparison, for 1995–96, only 18, 24, and 8 states, respectively, were able to report data for incidents, weapons-related incidents, and offenders. Since 1998–99, however, the numbers of states able to report data for weapons-related incidents and for offenders have dropped; that year, 37 and 28 states were able to report those data, compared to 33 and 23 in 1999–2000.

At the elementary level, for most states, the number of weapons-related incidents per 1,000 students is much lower than the number of overall incidents per 1,000 students, but four states had three or more weapons-related incidents per 1,000 students in 1999–2000. For 1999–2000, however, **no** states reported that they had **no** weapons-related incidents at this level of schooling, compared to the five states in the 1998–99 reporting period. Twelve states reported a number of offenders per 1,000 students that was at least 10 points lower than the number of incidents per 1,000 students. These states, therefore, had a higher proportion of offenders who were involved in multiple incidents than did states with a smaller difference between the measures of incidents and of offenders.

### **Victims in Elementary Schools**

Table 4-7 presents the number of victims per 1,000 students, by state, for the 1999–2000 reporting period. Only those states that were able to report an unduplicated count for all of the categories of victims are shown in this table, that is, 16 compared to the 3 states able to meet that requirement in 1995–96. Again, however, comparison with 1998–99 is disappointing. In that year, 20 states were able to report complete data on victims in elementary schools. Additionally, states that did not have complete data on types of victims were more likely to have data on the number of victims who were students and school personnel than on victims who were non-school personnel.

Of 16 states reporting the number of victims per 1,000 students, 14 had a higher ratio of victims that were students than were school personnel. For three states, this number for students ranged 45 to 93 points higher than the number for school personnel. In comparison, in 1998–99, three states reported that this number for students ranged 41 to 71 points higher than for school personnel.

**Table 4-7****Number of victims per 1,000 students who were students, school personnel, or non-school personnel involved in incidents reported in elementary schools: Reporting period 1999–2000**

State	Students	School personnel	Non-school personnel	Unknown category
Number of states reporting .....	16	16	16	16
Alaska .....	70	4	*	1
Arizona .....	48	3	*	5
District of Columbia .....	23	24	20	0
Kentucky .....	17	4	*	*
Michigan .....	13	2	0	*
Minnesota .....	2	*	*	*
Mississippi .....	24	2	0	*
New Jersey .....	2	1	0	*
New Mexico .....	23	2	*	0
New York .....	6	1	0	*
North Carolina .....	*	1	0	0
South Dakota .....	105	12	*	*
Texas .....	5	*	*	3
Utah .....	1	*	0	0
Washington .....	38	4	*	1
Wyoming .....	7	1	0	*

\* Ratio is less than 1.

**Types of Offenders in Elementary Schools**

States were asked to provide an unduplicated count of the types of offenders involved in incidents in elementary schools. Table 4-8 presents data on the types of offenders involved in incidents reported, by state, for 1999–2000. The reporting form specified that the sum of the number of offenders of each type should equal the total number of offenders reported in the preceding question. The number of states able to report a complete set of these data has increased considerably. Again, three states were able to report a complete set of these data for 1995–96. By 1999–2000, 18 states were able to report all of the data. However, in 1998–1999, that number of states was 23. Consistently, over the 5-year reporting periods from 1995–2000, states with incomplete data on the types of offenders were more likely to have data on offenders who were students than were non-students.

The majority of offenders reported were students. For offenders who were non-students, two states had a number per 1,000 students that was one or higher in 1999–2000, compared to only one state in 1998–99.

**Table 4-8**  
**Number of offenders per 1,000 students who were students or non-students involved in incidents reported in elementary schools: Reporting period 1999–2000**

State	Students	Non-students	Unknown category
Number of states reporting.....	18	18	18
Alaska .....	101	*	*
Arizona.....	73	1	3
District of Columbia .....	25	8	8
Kentucky .....	29	*	*
Maine .....	72	*	5
Michigan .....	25	*	0
Minnesota.....	20	0	0
Mississippi .....	44	*	0
New Hampshire .....	14	*	0
New Jersey .....	4	*	1
New York.....	5	0	*
North Carolina .....	2	0	0
Pennsylvania .....	13	0	0
South Dakota.....	118	*	*
Texas .....	48	0	0
Utah.....	5	0	0
Washington .....	44	*	*
Wyoming .....	7	0	*

\* Ratio is less than 1.

### Elementary Schools Reporting Incidents

Table 4-9 shows data on the number of elementary schools reporting numbers of incidents for 1999–2000. The reporting form specified that the number of schools reported across all categories in the table should sum to the total number of elementary schools in the state that year, which may have been different from the number of SDFSCA-funded elementary schools. More states were able to report a complete set of data over the 5 years from 1995–96 to 1999–2000. Ten states reported a complete set of data in 1995–96, while 24 states were able to do so by 1999–2000. The number of states reporting these data only dropped by one since 1998–99.

**Table 4-9****Number of elementary schools that reported incidents: Reporting period 1999–2000**

State	No incidents	1 to 5 incidents	6 to 10 incidents	11 to 24 incidents	25 or more incidents	Schools not reporting data	Total schools
Number of states reporting .....	24	24	24	24	24	24	24
Alaska .....	87	83	11	27	33	19	260
American Samoa.....	20	0	0	0	0	12	32
Arizona .....	187	187	96	146	283	82	981
District of Columbia.....	2	21	16	38	32	3	112
Florida .....	326	386	204	271	344	0	1,531
Georgia .....	0	117	81	155	638	191	1,182
Hawaii .....	66	53	19	27	8	0	173
Indiana .....	320	194	118	209	308	0	1,149
Kentucky .....	144	226	140	187	183	0	880
Louisiana .....	92	18	74	60	222	11	477
Maine.....	178	101	32	51	90	8	460
Michigan.....	818	277	90	116	263	2,785	4,349
Mississippi.....	112	126	75	63	123	33	532
Montana.....	417	40	9	9	9	2	486
New Hampshire.....	0	11	15	3	27	257	313
New Jersey .....	583	508	83	48	16	0	1,238
New Mexico .....	124	150	74	53	42	0	443
Pennsylvania.....	932	770	256	171	74	81	2,284
Rhode Island.....	70	67	30	35	22	0	224
South Dakota .....	176	55	19	31	74	35	390
Texas .....	1,584	862	299	407	730	0	3,882
West Virginia .....	136	124	64	80	69	4	477
Wisconsin .....	68	82	23	17	16	1078	1,284
Wyoming.....	191	30	4	4	3	3	235

## Elementary Schools Reporting Weapons-Related Incidents

For the elementary schools in each state that reported one or more incidents in 1999–2000 (see Table 4-9), a number of those schools also reported weapons-related incidents within each of the ranges specified (Table 4-10). Ten states were able to report a complete set of these data for 1995–96. Although 19 states were able to report these data for 1999–2000, 26 did so in 1998–99.

**Table 4-10**  
**Number of elementary schools, among those that reported one or more incidents, that also reported weapons-related incidents: Reporting period 1999–2000**

State	No weapons-related incidents	1 to 5 weapons-related incidents	6 to 10 weapons-related incidents	11 to 24 weapons-related incidents	25 or more weapons-related incidents	Schools not reporting data	Total schools reporting any incidents
Number of states reporting .....	19	19	19	19	19	19	19
American Samoa.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arizona .....	468	221	16	7	0	0	712
District of Columbia..	68	37	2	0	0	0	107
Florida .....	698	473	31	2	1	0	1,205
Georgia .....	587	388	15	0	1	0	991
Hawaii .....	80	27	0	0	0	0	107
Indiana .....	612	210	7	0	0	0	829
Maine.....	224	49	1	0	0	0	274
Mississippi.....	278	84	4	1	3	17	387
Montana.....	37	23	2	3	0	2	67
New Hampshire.....	14	34	0	0	0	8	56
New Jersey .....	509	144	2	0	0	0	655
Pennsylvania.....	647	593	20	10	1	0	1,271
Rhode Island.....	0	67	30	35	22	0	154
South Dakota .....	132	41	3	3	0	0	179
Texas .....	2,117	174	6	0	1	0	2,298
West Virginia .....	272	61	1	2	0	1	337
Wisconsin .....	100	33	2	1	1	1	138
Wyoming.....	28	13	0	0	0	0	41

## Incidents, Offenders, and Weapons-Related Incidents in Middle Schools

Tables 4-11 to 4-15 present data on the number of middle school incidents, offenders, victims, and weapons-related incidents for reporting period 1999–2000. States that reported this information for elementary schools were generally able to report it for middle schools. Twenty-one states were able to report a complete set of data for all three types of data shown in Table 4-11.

Again, as seen at the elementary level, weapons-related incidents were much lower than overall incidents. At the middle school level, 13 states had three or more weapons-related incidents per 1,000 students, ranging up to a high of nine, while 17 states reported a number of incidents per 1,000 students that was at least 10 points higher than the number of offenders per 1,000 students at the middle school level.

**Table 4-11**  
**Number of incidents, offenders, and weapons-related incidents per 1,000 students reported in middle schools: Reporting period 1999–2000**

State	Incidents	Total offenders (unduplicated) counts	Weapons-related incidents
Number of states reporting.....	36	21	33
Alaska .....	187	147	9
American Samoa .....	8	MD	MD
Arizona.....	150	114	3
Arkansas.....	1	MD	MD
California .....	14	MD	MD
Colorado.....	194	MD	4
District of Columbia .....	80	41	8
Florida .....	130	MD	4
Georgia.....	506	MD	2
Hawaii.....	78	MD	2
Idaho .....	196	MD	3
Indiana .....	440	MD	2
Kentucky.....	196	82	1
Louisiana.....	277	176	2
Maine .....	200	91	2
Michigan .....	67	64	2
Minnesota.....	81	47	2
Mississippi .....	236	92	1
Montana .....	39	26	2
New Hampshire .....	82	24	1
New Jersey .....	27	24	2
New Mexico.....	85	MD	7
New York.....	56	24	3

**Table 4-11****Number of incidents, offenders, and weapons-related incidents per 1,000 students reported in middle schools: Reporting period 1999–2000 (continued)**

State	Incidents	Total offenders (unduplicated) counts	Weapons-related incidents
North Carolina .....	8	MD	1
Ohio .....	82	71	3
Oklahoma .....	111	MD	3
Pennsylvania .....	47	42	3
Rhode Island .....	192	162	2
South Dakota.....	514	148	3
Texas.....	238	232	1
Utah.....	51	24	2
Vermont .....	77	MD	2
Washington .....	190	119	5
West Virginia .....	320	MD	1
Wisconsin.....	33	MD	1
Wyoming .....	67	57	2

MD = Missing data.



## Victims in Middle Schools

Table 4-12 shows that at the middle school level, the number of victims per 1,000 students ranged as high as 94 for victims who were students, while at the elementary level, the maximum for this number was 105 (see Table 4-7). For middle schools, over the 5-year period from 1995–96 to 1999–2000, 1999–2000 was the only year in which the number of victims who were students was higher at the elementary level than at the middle school level. A shift in trend data for only 1 year should be interpreted with caution. The change may be caused by altered SEA reporting procedures as well as by a change in actual victimization of students.

**Table 4-12**

**Number of victims per 1,000 students who were students, school personnel, or non-school personnel involved in incidents reported in middle schools: Reporting period 1999–2000**

State	Students	School personnel	Non-school personnel	Unknown category
Number of states reporting.....	15	15	15	15
Alaska .....	94	13	2	6
Arizona.....	48	2	*	*
District of Columbia .....	24	20	17	0
Kentucky.....	37	7	*	0
Michigan.....	19	3	*	2
Minnesota.....	8	*	1	*
Mississippi .....	53	4	*	*
New Jersey.....	8	3	*	1
New Mexico.....	51	3	1	0
New York.....	19	3	*	1
North Carolina .....	1	1	0	0
South Dakota.....	90	14	*	3
Texas.....	17	2	1	12
Utah.....	10	1	0	0
Wyoming .....	40	3	0	1

\* Ratio is less than 1.

## Types of Offenders in Middle Schools

At the middle school level, the number of offenders per 1,000 students ranged as high as 232 for offenders who were students (Table 4-13), while at the elementary level, the maximum for this number was 118 (see Table 4-8). Over the period 1995–96 to 1999–2000, the number of offenders who were students reached a high of 338 for middle schools in 1997–98.

**Table 4-13**  
**Number of offenders per 1,000 students who were students or non-students involved in incidents reported in middle schools: Reporting period 1999–2000**

State	Students	Non-students	Unknown category
Number of states reporting.....	17	17	17
Alaska .....	147	0	3
Arizona.....	114	1	*
District of Columbia .....	41	5	7
Kentucky .....	82	*	*
Maine .....	91	*	1
Michigan .....	64	*	2
Minnesota.....	47	0	0
Mississippi .....	92	2	0
New Hampshire .....	24	0	0
New Jersey.....	24	*	2
New York.....	24	*	*
Pennsylvania.....	42	0	0
South Dakota.....	148	0	*
Texas.....	232	*	0
Utah.....	24	0	*
Washington .....	119	*	0
Wyoming .....	57	*	*

\* Ratio is less than 1.

## Middle Schools Reporting Incidents

Table 4-14 shows data on the number of middle schools reporting numbers of incidents for 1999–2000. Twenty-four states were able to report a complete set of these data for 1999–2000, one more than for 1998–99. In comparison, there were only nine such states for 1995–96.

**Table 4-14**  
**Number of middle schools that reported incidents: Reporting period 1999–2000**

State	No incidents	1 to 5 incidents	6 to 10 incidents	11 to 24 incidents	25 or more incidents	Schools not reporting	Total schools
Number of states reporting	24	24	24	24	24	24	24
Alaska .....	58	43	10	15	25	0	151
American Samoa .....	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Arizona.....	1	6	6	16	136	13	178
District of Columbia .....	0	3	2	7	18	2	32
Florida.....	32	22	14	36	402	0	506
Georgia.....	0	11	10	13	304	13	351
Hawaii.....	1	3	2	7	28	0	41
Indiana .....	22	22	17	20	251	0	332
Kentucky.....	7	10	21	33	210	0	281
Louisiana.....	20	29	24	38	157	1	269
Maine .....	3	5	9	21	58	2	98
Michigan .....	174	165	44	45	184	615	1,227
Mississippi .....	11	56	32	39	74	5	217
Montana .....	166	21	10	7	17	0	221
New Hampshire .....	0	8	2	4	34	20	68
New Jersey.....	157	224	107	137	85	0	710
New Mexico.....	13	15	8	29	73	0	138
Pennsylvania .....	43	306	206	290	257	20	1,122
Rhode Island .....	0	38	11	4	3	0	56
South Dakota.....	49	35	12	19	49	11	175
Texas.....	126	177	90	177	851	0	1,421
West Virginia.....	3	14	6	21	126	4	174
Wisconsin.....	155	92	39	47	69	97	499
Wyoming .....	26	14	4	5	19	0	68

### Middle Schools Reporting Weapons-Related Incidents

For each state whose middle schools reported one or more incidents in 1999–2000, as presented in Table 4-14, Table 4-15 shows the number of those schools that also reported weapons-related incidents within each of the ranges specified. Nine states were able to report a complete set of these data for 1995–96, while 19 states were able to report complete data for 1999–2000. In 1998–99, however, 23 states reported these data.

**Table 4-15**  
**Number of middle schools, among those that reported one or more incidents, that also reported weapons-related incidents: Reporting period 1999–2000**

State	No weapons-related incidents	1 to 5 weapons-related incidents	6 to 10 weapons-related incidents	11 to 24 weapons-related incidents	25 or more weapons-related incidents	Schools not reporting data	Total schools reporting any incidents
Number of states reporting	19	19	19	19	19	19	19
American Samoa.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arizona .....	59	81	16	4	3	1	164
District of Columbia.....	8	14	6	2	0	0	30
Florida .....	111	245	74	27	17	0	474
Georgia .....	110	157	17	12	0	42	338
Hawaii .....	16	19	5	0	0	0	40
Indiana.....	158	138	12	2	0	0	310
Maine.....	55	35	2	1	0	0	93
Mississippi.....	81	106	7	0	0	7	201
Montana.....	31	21	2	1	0	0	55
New Hampshire.....	8	24	4	0	0	12	48
New Jersey .....	295	233	21	4	0	0	553
Pennsylvania.....	539	488	24	5	3	0	1,059
Rhode Island.....	0	38	11	4	3	0	56
South Dakota .....	84	27	3	1	0	0	115
Texas .....	1,028	243	16	5	3	0	1,295
West Virginia .....	101	60	2	0	0	4	167
Wisconsin .....	169	70	4	0	3	1	247
Wyoming.....	21	18	2	1	0	0	42

## Incidents, Offenders, and Weapons-Related Incidents in Senior High Schools

Table 4-16 presents data on the number of senior high school incidents, offenders, and weapons-related incidents for the 1999–2000 reporting period. Over the 5-year reporting period, the number of states that were able to report a complete set of data increased from 6 states for 1995–96 to 24 states in 1998–99, then dropped to 21 states by 1999–2000.

As at the elementary and middle school levels, the ratios of weapons-related incidents at the senior high level were much lower than for overall incidents. In 1999–2000, the maximum number of weapons-related incidents per 1,000 students at the senior high school level was 10, compared to the 9 at the middle school level (see Table 4-11). Additionally, at the senior high school level, 5 fewer states than at the middle school level reported a number of weapons-related incidents per 1,000 students that was three or higher. Similarly, 15 states reported a number of incidents per 1,000 students that was at least 10 points higher than the number of offenders per 1,000 students at the senior high school level, compared to 17 states reporting a comparable difference at the middle school level.

**Table 4-16**  
**Number incidents, offenders, and weapons-related incidents per 1,000 students reported in senior high schools: Reporting period 1999–2000**

State	Incidents	Total offenders (unduplicated count)	Weapons-related incidents
Number of states reporting.....	37	21	34
Alaska .....	192	185	2
American Samoa .....	40	MD	MD
Arizona.....	147	123	3
Arkansas.....	1	MD	MD
California .....	25	MD	MD
Colorado.....	154	MD	3
District of Columbia .....	54	33	10
Florida.....	87	MD	3
Georgia.....	423	157	2
Hawaii .....	74	MD	2
Idaho .....	68	MD	2
Illinois .....	35	MD	1
Indiana .....	456	MD	2
Kentucky.....	244	123	1
Louisiana.....	217	129	1
Maine .....	542	150	2
Michigan .....	MD	58	1
Minnesota.....	70	49	2
Mississippi .....	228	101	1
Montana .....	27	21	1

**Table 4-16****Number incidents, offenders, and weapons-related incidents per 1,000 students reported in senior high schools: Reporting period 1999–2000 (continued)**

State	Incidents	Total offenders (unduplicated count)	Weapons-related incidents
New Hampshire .....	105	35	1
New Jersey .....	33	30	2
New Mexico .....	68	MD	5
New York .....	59	25	3
North Carolina .....	11	MD	1
Ohio .....	37	31	2
Oklahoma .....	75	MD	3
Pennsylvania .....	29	27	2
Rhode Island .....	137	115	1
South Dakota .....	296	127	2
Texas .....	134	MD	1
Utah .....	36	21	1
Vermont .....	78	MD	2
Washington .....	257	84	3
West Virginia .....	292	MD	1
Wisconsin .....	42	MD	1
Wyoming .....	65	55	2

MD = Missing data.

**Victims in Senior High Schools**

Table 4-17 shows that at the senior high school level, the number of victims per 1,000 students ranged as high as 60 for victims who were students, compared to a high of 94 at the middle school level for 1999–2000 reporting period (see Table 4-12). Over the 5 years from 1995–96 to 1999–2000, no clear pattern was apparent when comparing these senior high and junior high data. For 1998–99, the number for victims who were students reached a maximum of 71 at the senior high school level, compared to a high of 123 at the middle school level.

**Table 4-17**

**Number of victims per 1,000 students who were students, school personnel, or non-school personnel involved in incidents reported in senior high schools: Reporting period 1999–2000**

State	Students	School personnel	Non-school personnel	Unknown category
Number of states reporting.....	16	16	16	16
Alaska .....	59	7	*	1
Arizona.....	42	8	1	5
District of Columbia .....	18	22	10	0
Kentucky.....	28	4	*	*
Michigan.....	17	2	*	*
Minnesota.....	7	*	1	*
Mississippi.....	39	3	*	*
New Jersey.....	8	2	*	1
New Mexico.....	23	2	2	0
New York.....	17	3	*	1
North Carolina .....	1	1	0	0
South Dakota.....	60	16	*	1
Texas.....	13	1	*	9
Utah.....	8	1	0	0
Washington.....	49	6	*	2
Wyoming.....	21	2	*	2

\* Ratio is less than 1.

### **Types of Offenders in Senior High Schools**

Table 4-18 shows that at the senior high level, the number of offenders per 1,000 students was lower than at the middle school level, i.e., 185 compared to 232 (see Table 4-13). In 1998–98, the pattern was reversed. For the senior high level, the number of offenders who were students ranged as high as 269, compared to 254 at the middle school level.

**Table 4-18****Number of offenders per 1,000 students who were students or non-students involved in incidents reported in senior high schools: Reporting period 1999–2000**

State	Students	Non-students	Unknown category
Number of states reporting.....	16	16	16
Alaska .....	185	*	*
Arizona.....	123	10	2
District of Columbia .....	33	3	10
Kentucky .....	123	*	*
Maine .....	150	*	2
Michigan .....	58	*	*
Minnesota.....	49	0	0
Mississippi .....	101	1	*
New Hampshire .....	35	*	0
New Jersey .....	30	*	3
New York.....	25	*	*
Pennsylvania .....	27	0	0
South Dakota.....	127	*	*
Utah.....	21	*	*
Washington .....	84	1	*
Wyoming .....	55	*	*

\* Ratio is less than 1.



## Senior High Schools Reporting Incidents

Table 4-19 presents data on the number of senior high schools reporting numbers of incidents for 1999–2000. As seen at the elementary and middle level, more states are able to report a complete set of data since the data collection began in 1995–96. Eleven states reported complete data in 1995–96, while 24 states were able to do so for both 1998–99 and 1999–2000.

**Table 4-19**  
**Number of senior high schools that reported incidents: Reporting period 1999–2000**

State	No incidents	1 to 5 incidents	6 to 10 incidents	11 to 24 incidents	25 or more incidents	Schools not reporting data	Total schools
Number of states reporting	24	24	24	24	24	24	24
Alaska .....	79	61	24	17	23	7	211
American Samoa.....	1	0	0	1	4	5	11
Arizona .....	26	56	44	49	200	61	436
District of Columbia.....	3	6	4	7	12	1	33
Florida .....	45	24	11	35	327	0	442
Georgia .....	0	15	13	13	297	16	354
Hawaii .....	1	2	1	1	37	0	42
Indiana .....	8	13	12	16	302	0	351
Kentucky .....	2	9	7	16	234	131	399
Louisiana .....	34	26	23	38	104	3	228
Maine.....	5	14	5	11	95	3	133
Michigan.....	101	152	50	61	364	935	1,663
Mississippi.....	18	73	39	42	76	11	259
Montana.....	120	15	13	13	12	0	173
New Hampshire.....	0	1	1	5	32	37	76
New Jersey .....	29	47	47	92	158	0	373
New Mexico .....	11	30	15	22	59	0	137
Pennsylvania.....	51	327	125	178	227	24	932
Rhode Island.....	0	2	0	2	40	0	44
South Dakota .....	24	44	16	23	58	12	177
Texas .....	384	222	110	183	739	0	1,638
West Virginia .....	1	6	6	15	118	2	148
Wisconsin .....	104	94	40	54	109	30	431
Wyoming.....	20	13	12	9	21	0	75

## Senior High Schools Reporting Weapons-Related Incidents

Table 4-20 shows the number of senior high schools, among those that reported one or more incidents, that also reported weapons-related incidents for the ranges specified. Ten states were able to report a complete set of data for 1995–96, while 23 states reported these data for 1998–99 and 19 states did so for 1999–2000.

**Table 4-20**  
**Number of senior high schools, among those that reported one or more incidents, that also reported weapons-related incidents: Reporting period 1999–2000**

State	No weapons-related incidents	1 to 5 weapons-related incidents	6 to 10 weapons-related incidents	11 to 24 weapons-related incidents	25 or more weapons-related incidents	Schools not reporting data	Total schools reporting any incidents
Number of states reporting .....	19	19	19	19	19	19	19
Arizona .....	184	135	18	11	1	0	349
District of Columbia ..	7	11	6	5	0	0	29
Florida .....	72	219	67	30	9	0	397
Georgia .....	115	192	19	8	0	4	338
Hawaii .....	11	23	4	3	0	0	41
Indiana .....	183	140	12	5	3	0	343
Kentucky .....	166	92	7	1	0	0	266
Maine.....	75	45	4	1	0	0	125
Mississippi.....	100	121	5	0	0	4	230
Montana.....	29	23	1	0	0	0	53
New Hampshire.....	8	17	8	0	0	6	39
New Jersey .....	151	172	15	6	0	0	344
Pennsylvania.....	442	391	16	6	2	0	857
Rhode Island.....	2	29	11	2	0	0	44
South Dakota .....	119	18	3	1	0	0	141
Texas .....	915	311	22	6	0	0	1,254
West Virginia .....	78	53	3	1	0	10	145
Wisconsin .....	202	85	5	2	3	0	297
Wyoming.....	28	25	0	2	0	0	55

## **Youth Arrest Data**

The data presented in this section reflect youth arrest rates for calendar year 1999. In order to minimize data collection burden on the states, these rates were calculated for the states by Westat staff using two national data sources — youth population data from the Bureau of the Census and youth arrest data collected by the collaborative, local-state-federal Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) program of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

In order to correspond to the two major emphases of the SDFSCA law—drug use prevention and violence prevention—youth arrest data are presented with emphases on alcohol/drug and violence-related arrests. These two data categories are based on UCR definitions for alcohol/drug offenses and for violent offenses. Appendix I contains a complete list of offenses included in these two categories, as well as the other UCR-defined offenses that were added to these two categories to obtain the total number of youth arrests.

The total number of youth arrests varies greatly among states because of the vast differences in their total youth populations. Data in Table 4-21 emphasize youth arrests for alcohol/drug-related offenses and for violent offenses as percentages of all youth arrests in each state. Nevertheless, any comparisons between state percentages should be made with an awareness that states voluntarily reported their own arrest data. Since some states did not include arrest data from their largest cities or from their rural areas, their data were incomplete and resulted in inaccurate, low arrest rates.

It is useful to examine the percentages of total youth arrests in a state that youth arrests for particular offenses compose. In 1999, the percentage of all youth that were arrested for alcohol/drug offenses ranged from a low of 16 to a high of 53 percent. In comparison, the lowest percentage for any state in 1995 was 9 percent, while the highest was 46 percent. In 1999, the percentage of all youth arrested in a state for violent offenses ranged from a low of 1 percent to a high of 10 percent. In 1995, the corresponding range was 1 percent, to 13 percent. Thus, in the 4 years from 1995 to 1999, the percentage of all youth arrested for alcohol/drug-related offenses increased 7 percent, while the percentages of all youth arrested for violent offenses decreased 3 percent.

**Table 4-21**

**Total youth arrests, total and percent of youth arrested for alcohol/drug-related offenses, and total and percent of youth arrested for violence-related offenses, by state: 1999**

State	Total youth arrests	Alcohol/drug-related arrests		Violence-related arrests	
		Total	Percent	Total	Percent
Alaska	6,290	1,724	27	229	4
Alabama	17,962	5,359	30	748	4
Arkansas	20,694	4,765	23	655	3
Arizona	66,760	21,449	32	1,674	3
California	305,023	84,234	28	18,422	6
Colorado	62,078	15,857	26	1,117	2
Connecticut	30,911	8,921	29	1,208	4
Dist. of Columbia	MD	MD	MD	MD	MD
Delaware	7,956	2,012	25	617	8
Florida	MD	MD	MD	MD	MD
Georgia	23,515	5,587	24	509	2
Hawaii	12,707	1,974	16	237	2
Iowa	26,043	7,858	30	764	3
Idaho	20,607	4,952	24	306	1
Illinois	45,454	9,265	20	3,409	7
Indiana	38,484	9,810	25	1,578	4
Kansas	MD	MD	MD	MD	MD
Kentucky	5,576	2,110	38	256	5
Louisiana	48,089	9,808	20	1,906	4
Massachusetts	23,757	8,824	37	2,440	10
Maryland	63,085	24,206	38	3,018	5
Maine	10,971	2,593	24	147	1
Michigan	51,337	15,772	31	1,981	4
Minnesota	69,153	21,277	31	1,419	2
Missouri	37,172	9,410	25	1,169	3
Mississippi	15,867	4,018	25	269	2
Montana	5,204	1,031	20	173	3
North Carolina	58,716	14,203	24	2,515	4
North Dakota	8,430	2,731	32	63	1
Nebraska	21,998	7,097	32	230	1
New Hampshire	5,548	1,972	36	70	1
New Jersey	85,517	27,609	32	3,445	4
New Mexico	12,472	4,271	34	464	4
Nevada	28,444	6,969	25	586	2
New York	145,903	52,745	36	11,190	8
Ohio	65,033	13,623	21	1,776	3
Oklahoma	12,733	3,365	26	350	3
Oregon	38,879	10,702	28	733	2
Pennsylvania	98,412	24,114	25	4,270	4

**Table 4-21****Total youth arrests, total and percent of youth arrested for alcohol/drug-related offenses, and total and percent of youth arrested for violence-related offenses, by state: 1999 (continued)**

State	Total youth arrests	Alcohol/drug-related arrests		Violence-related arrests	
		Total	Percent	Total	Percent
Rhode Island	8,715	2,418	28	268	3
South Carolina	31,493	10,344	33	1,334	4
South Dakota	9,315	3,474	37	115	1
Tennessee	28,805	6,425	22	876	3
Texas	211,466	54,145	26	5,240	2
Utah	34,793	8,032	23	621	2
Virginia	48,710	11,183	23	1,220	3
Vermont	2,750	1,447	53	34	1
Washington	52,632	14,208	27	1,756	3
Wisconsin	MD	MD	MD	MD	MD
West Virginia	4,150	1,243	30	106	3
Wyoming	9,705	3,962	41	91	1

MD = Missing data.

NOTE: Because of the voluntary self-reporting by states and localities to UCR, total youth arrest data may not reflect the actual number of youths arrested in each state.

## Alcohol/Drug-Related Youth Arrests

Table 4-22 presents 1999 state data on percentages of youth arrested for alcohol/drug-related offenses, and the percentage of the state's total youth population that is represented by the specific age group. As shown, arrests for alcohol or other drug-related offenses of youth age 12 or younger represented 1 percent or less of total arrests for that age group. As in prior reporting years, the youngest group that had a percentage of alcohol/drug arrests that exceeded the age group's percentage of the youth population was the 13–14 age group. For most states, the youngest age group in which such a difference occurred was the 15–16 age group. All the 47 states that reported data had arrest percentages ranging from 3 to 21 percent higher than that age group's representation in the youth population. In 1995, for 45 of the 49 states that reported, the differences for that group ranged from 1 to 17 percent, but for 2 states, the rate of arrests was still lower than the age group's representation in the state's youth population.

For each successive age group, these differences covered a wider range. For the 17–18 age group, the differences ranged from 18 to 32 percent higher than the group's representation in the population. The range of differences for the 19–21 age group was 23 to 58 percent. This pattern was repeated over the 4 years from 1995 to 1999.

**Table 4-22**

**Percentage of youth arrested for alcohol/drug-related offenses and percentage of the total youth population, by state and age group: 1999**

State	Under 10		10–12		13–14		15–16		17–18		19–21	
	%Youth Arrests	%Youth Pop.	%Youth Arrests	%Youth Pop.	%Youth Arrests	%Youth Pop.	%Youth Arrests	%Youth Pop.	%Youth Arrests	%Youth Pop.	%Youth Arrests	%Youth Pop.
AK	*	54	1	18	10	12	18	6	31	6	40	6
AL	*	55	*	16	2	11	10	5	30	6	59	6
AR	*	54	*	17	2	11	9	6	31	6	57	6
AZ	*	57	1	16	7	11	18	5	32	5	42	5
CA	*	58	1	16	6	10	15	5	28	5	50	6
CO	*	54	1	17	6	11	17	6	32	6	45	6
CT	*	55	*	18	3	11	16	5	35	5	45	5
DC	MD	60	MD	15	MD	9	MD	4	MD	6	MD	7
DE	*	56	1	17	4	11	16	5	33	6	47	6
FL	MD	55	MD	17	MD	11	MD	5	MD	5	MD	5
GA	*	56	*	17	2	11	9	5	34	6	55	6
HI	*	57	4	16	13	10	26	5	24	6	34	6
IA	*	52	*	17	3	12	13	6	33	6	52	6

**Table 4-22**

**Percentage of youth arrested for alcohol/drug-related offenses and percentage of the total youth population, by state and age group: 1999 (continued)**

State	Under 10		10-12		13-14		15-16		17-18		19-21	
	%Youth Arrests	%Youth Pop.	%Youth Arrests	%Youth Pop.	%Youth Arrests	%Youth Pop.	%Youth Arrests	%Youth Pop.	%Youth Arrests	%Youth Pop.	%Youth Arrests	%Youth Pop.
ID	*	53	*	16	5	11	17	6	33	6	43	7
IL	*	56	1	16	6	11	21	5	33	6	39	6
IN	*	55	*	17	3	11	13	6	33	6	50	6
KS	MD	53	MD	17	MD	12	MD	6	MD	6	MD	6
KY	*	54	*	16	3	11	13	6	31	6	53	7
LA	1	53	1	16	3	11	12	6	32	6	52	7
MA	*	55	*	17	3	11	15	5	36	5	45	5
MD	*	55	*	17	5	11	19	5	33	5	42	5
ME	*	50	*	18	4	13	13	6	34	6	48	6
MI	*	54	*	17	3	12	11	6	35	6	51	6
MN	*	52	*	18	4	12	16	6	35	6	45	6
MO	*	54	*	17	3	12	10	6	36	6	51	6
MS	*	54	*	16	2	11	11	6	32	6	55	6
MT	1	50	1	18	7	12	24	6	38	7	30	7
NC	*	56	*	17	3	11	11	5	31	5	55	6
ND	*	50	*	17	3	12	17	6	34	7	45	7
NE	*	53	*	17	3	12	14	6	34	6	49	6
NH	*	52	*	19	3	12	12	6	38	6	47	5
NJ	*	56	*	17	3	11	15	5	35	5	46	5
NM	*	54	1	17	9	11	22	6	30	6	38	6
NV	*	58	1	17	9	11	23	5	30	5	37	5
NY	*	57	*	17	2	11	13	5	32	6	52	6
OH	*	54	1	17	4	12	15	6	33	6	48	6
OK	*	53	*	17	1	12	5	6	29	6	64	6
OR	*	54	1	17	6	12	17	6	31	6	44	6
PA	*	53	*	18	3	12	15	6	34	6	48	6
RI	*	55	*	18	4	11	15	6	35	5	47	6
SC	*	54	*	17	3	11	11	5	33	6	52	6
SD	*	52	*	17	3	12	16	6	33	7	48	7
TN	*	55	*	17	2	11	10	5	31	6	56	6
TX	*	57	1	16	4	11	12	5	33	6	50	6
UT	*	56	1	16	6	11	18	5	33	6	42	7
VA	*	55	*	17	2	11	11	5	31	6	55	6
VT	*	50	*	18	2	12	15	6	37	7	46	6
WA	*	54	1	17	6	11	17	6	32	6	45	6
WI	MD	52	MD	18	MD	12	MD	6	MD	6	MD	6
WV	*	52	*	17	2	12	9	6	33	7	56	7
WY	*	50	*	17	4	13	17	7	36	7	42	7

MD = Missing data.

\* Rounds to less than 1 percent.

NOTE: Because of rounding, percents may not add to 100.

## Violence-Related Youth Arrests

Table 4-23 presents, for each state, the percentage of all arrests that were for violent offenses in an age group and the group's percentage of the total youth population. As seen with the arrest data for alcohol and drugs, the first appearance of a percentage of arrests that exceeded the age group's percentage of the youth population occurred at the 13–14 age group. For 1999, 21 states reported arrests for violent offenses in this age group that ranged from 1 to 11 percent greater than that group's representation in the youth population. For 1995, 32 states reported arrests that ranged from 1 to 10 percent greater. It should also be noted that 22 states in 1999 reported arrests for violent offenses at less than this age group's representation in the youth population; the corresponding number of states in 1995 was 13.

For each successive age group in 1999, the percentage differences covered a wider range. At the 15–16 age group, the differences ranged from 6 to 22 percent more than the group's percentage of the youth population. For the 17–18 age group, the differences ranged from 16 to 40 percent higher than the group's representation, and for the 19–21 age group, 17 to 48 percent. For the 15–16 age group, the differences in 1995 ranged from 1 to 30. The 17–18 age group differences ranged from 12 to 26 percent, while the 19–21 age group differences ranged from 5 to 50.

**Table 4-23**

**Percentage of youth arrested for violence-related offenses and percentage of the total youth population, by state and age group: 1999**

State	Under 10		10-12		13-14		15-16		17-18		19-21	
	%Youth Arrests	%Youth Pop.	%Youth Arrests	%Youth Pop.	%Youth Arrests	%Youth Pop.	%Youth Arrests	%Youth Pop.	%Youth Arrests	%Youth Pop.	%Youth Arrests	%Youth Pop.
AK	1	54	5	18	10	12	19	6	27	6	38	6
AL	*	55	2	16	5	11	13	5	28	6	52	6
AR	*	54	3	17	8	11	17	6	28	6	44	6
AZ	1	57	6	16	13	11	20	5	27	5	33	5
CA	1	58	3	16	11	10	20	5	26	5	39	6
CO	*	54	5	17	11	11	19	6	27	6	37	6
CT	1	55	4	18	12	11	22	5	26	5	35	5
DC	MD	60	MD	15	MD	9	MD	4	MD	6	MD	7
DE	*	56	6	17	13	11	19	5	26	6	35	6
FL	MD	55	MD	17	MD	11	MD	5	MD	5	MD	5
GA	1	56	3	17	6	11	13	5	31	6	46	6
HI	1	57	5	16	12	10	21	5	28	6	32	6
IA	1	52	7	17	10	12	20	6	27	6	35	6
ID	2	53	8	16	14	11	21	6	24	6	30	7
IL	*	56	7	16	16	11	26	5	22	6	29	6



Table 4-23

Percentage of youth arrested for violence-related offenses and percentage of the total youth population, by state and age group: 1999 (continued)

State	Under 10		10-12		13-14		15-16		17-18		19-21	
	%Youth Arrests	%Youth Pop.	%Youth Arrests	%Youth Pop.	%Youth Arrests	%Youth Pop.	%Youth Arrests	%Youth Pop.	%Youth Arrests	%Youth Pop.	%Youth Arrests	%Youth Pop.
IN	1	55	6	17	13	11	19	6	24	6	38	6
KS	MD	53	MD	17	MD	12	MD	6	MD	6	MD	6
KY	1	54	3	16	8	11	12	6	28	6	50	7
LA	1	53	5	16	11	11	19	6	24	6	40	7
MA	*	55	3	17	12	11	20	5	29	5	36	5
MD	2	55	6	17	14	11	21	5	26	5	31	5
ME	1	50	2	18	9	13	22	6	29	6	37	6
MI	1	54	3	17	8	12	14	6	30	6	45	6
MN	1	52	6	18	14	12	21	6	28	6	30	6
MO	1	54	3	17	7	12	17	6	29	6	42	6
MS	*	54	1	16	5	11	14	6	29	6	50	6
MT	1	50	11	18	9	12	28	6	25	7	26	7
NC	1	56	2	17	5	11	14	5	30	5	48	6
ND	4	50	2	17	23	12	22	6	23	7	26	7
NE	*	53	3	17	6	12	17	6	30	6	44	6
NH	*	52	3	19	9	12	20	6	37	6	32	5
NJ	1	56	4	17	12	11	22	5	27	5	34	5
NM	1	54	4	17	11	11	24	6	28	6	35	6
NV	1	58	4	17	12	11	23	5	27	5	35	5
NY	*	57	3	17	13	11	25	5	26	6	33	6
OH	*	54	5	17	13	12	21	6	24	6	37	6
OK	*	53	1	17	5	12	13	6	28	6	52	6
OR	1	54	4	17	14	12	24	6	25	6	33	6
PA	1	53	5	18	11	12	20	6	25	6	38	6
RI	1	55	5	18	15	11	23	6	24	5	32	6
SC	*	54	4	17	9	11	15	5	30	6	42	6
SD	1	52	10	17	13	12	20	6	30	7	26	7
TN	1	55	2	17	8	11	14	5	28	6	47	6
TX	*	57	4	16	11	11	20	5	27	6	37	6
UT	2	56	9	16	18	11	23	5	23	6	24	7
VA	1	55	2	17	9	11	18	5	27	6	43	6
VT	*	50	1	18	7	12	19	6	46	6	29	6
WA	1	54	5	17	14	11	23	6	26	6	32	6
WI	MD	52	MD	18	MD	12	MD	6	MD	6	MD	6
WV	*	52	2	17	6	12	12	6	25	7	55	7
WY	*	50	3	17	8	13	23	7	32	7	34	7

MD = Missing data.

\* Rounds to less than 1 percent.

NOTE: Because of rounding, percents may not add to 100.

## Chapter 5

### SDFSCA Program Goals and Objectives

The Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act of 1994, Section 4112, requires that states develop measurable goals and objectives for drug and violence prevention as a part of their application for funds. States included their goals and objectives with the 1999–2000 reporting forms and indicated whether their goals and objectives had changed since submitting them with their applications to the Department of Education. This chapter presents a summary of the characteristics of these goals and objectives. A complete compilation of all SEA and Governors’ program goals and objectives is contained in Appendix B, along with information from each program indicating progress toward achieving them.

#### **Procedure for Analyzing Goals and Objectives**

The review of 1999–2000 goals and objectives for SEA and Governors’ programs followed the same procedures developed and used for the 1997–98 and 1998–99 reporting periods. Westat researchers identified eight broad categories that the goals<sup>1</sup> encompassed. Based on a summary of the categories, the paragraphs that follow describe the accompanying characteristics. Also provided are illustrative examples taken directly from the goals and objectives submitted by the states.

**Student Safe and Drug-Free directly related outcome goals.** These goals focus on the result of the programs to prevent students’ use of alcohol, tobacco, or other drugs (ATOD) as measured by incidence and prevalence data. Included are measures such as delay in or reduction of the initiation, use, and availability of ATOD, or reduction of violent incidents and arrests. Goals also could focus on attitudes toward ATOD use or knowledge about ATOD in general. For this category, two situations were identified: the goal applies either to activities *on school grounds and in the community* or *on school grounds only*. Examples of states’ goals include:

- *By the year 2000, reduce alcohol and drug use among school-aged youth.* (school and community)
- *Reduce number of criminal and violence incidents in schools.* (school only)

---

<sup>1</sup>Throughout this chapter, the term “goals” is frequently used in place of “goals and objectives.”

**Student indirect outcome goals.** The goals in this category are not directly related to substance abuse and violence. Instead, they target factors thought to be protecting or improving the student environment, such as decreasing dropout rates, meeting certain academic performance standards, increasing school attendance, and improving student-teacher/staff relationships, which should have an impact on student behaviors and attitudes toward substance abuse and violence. Examples of states' goals include:

- *Five percent decrease in the dropout rate of rural students.*
- *The number of students who reach state or equivalent standards will steadily increase.*

**Teachers/staff outcome goals.** These goals involve or have an effect on teachers' attitudes and well-being, such as better teacher performance or reduction of the attacks on teachers. Examples of states' goals include:

- *Reduce number of physical assaults on teachers.*
- *The number of professional staff members who meet the teacher standards will increase.*

**Program Safe and Drug-Free directly related outcome goals.** These goals are geared toward the establishment of specific and research-based ATOD or violence prevention, intervention, or post-intervention programs, services, and activities, such as implementation of policies related to violence and substance abuse; the implementation of needs, risk, and resource assessments; and statewide media campaigns. Examples of states' goals include:

- *Implement early intervention strategies for children and youth with substance abuse and violence-related problems.*
- *An on-going statewide needs assessment will be conducted.*

**Program indirect outcome goals.** As with student indirect outcome goals, these goals are not directly related to substance abuse and violence. Instead, they involve programs and activities that can assist in achieving the goals of directly related programs, such as professional development for

teachers, promotion of community service, or the implementation of alternative activities, including extended day/school programs or parenting skills classes. Examples of states' goals include:

- *A 10 percent increase in LEAs providing alternative activities in their districts by May 1999.*
- *To promote and support positive social networks among youth.*

**Process goals.** These goals are written for process-related activities such as collaboration between the SDFSCA programs and community organizations, collaboration with law enforcement organizations, establishment of parental involvement committees, coordination between federal and state programs, and provision of technical assistance to LEAs. Examples of states' goals include:

- *Promote partnerships and establish links among the education, parent, and business communities to support children and schools.*
- *Increase the capacity of communities to engage in comprehensive collaborative prevention planning to address youth and violence and substance abuse problems.*

**Measurable goals.** A characteristic of the goals and objectives, aside from the content, is the degree to which they can be evaluated, that is, their *measurability*. As stated in the SDFSCA's Principles of Effectiveness, goals and objectives must be measurable.<sup>2</sup> A goal or objective is measurable if it answered the following questions: by when? what percentage of whom/what? and where? In addition, the goal or objective had to specify a measurable behavior (the what) that would change (e.g., alcohol consumption, smoking cigarettes, or carrying a weapon to school), and had to specify the measurement instrument to be used, along with a baseline year. The following goals submitted by states meet these criteria:

- *By the year 2000, increase the proportion of youth under the age of 21 years who abstain from alcohol by 5 percent from baseline data. (Baseline established with CDC YRBS.)*
- *By September 2001, decrease by 5 percent the percentage of students reporting cigarette use at least once a week based on 1995 statewide Student Survey data.*

---

<sup>2</sup> See the four Principles of Effectiveness, as posted in the *Federal Register*, June 1, 1998.

By themselves, only a very limited number of the goals and objectives could meet these requirements for measurability. Therefore, researchers had to look for measurability information (baseline, survey data, etc.) that might exist in the supplemental information reported by states. When possible, researchers also used the information provided by each program concerning progress toward achieving goals and objectives for this purpose. Finally, when summarizing this information at the SEA or Governors' program level, all, none, or only some of the goals could be classified as measurable (in Table 5-1, this latter type is labeled "partially"). The fact that some goals and objectives are not measurable does not mean that their content is poor; in fact, the most measurable goals and objectives are not necessarily the most meaningful ones. However, it is necessary that the goals and objectives are clearly articulated in order to be useful for analysis.

### **Characteristics of SEA and Governors' Program Goals**

Each of the 1999–2000 goals was first read and categorized separately by two Westat researchers, and then reviewed again in a group meeting. Review of the data concerning the characteristics of the submitted goals and objectives produced a set of observations summarized below (and in Table 5-1).

- As in last year's report, the goals most frequently submitted by states are *process goals* (81 percent of the SEA programs and 75 percent of the Governors' programs). These goals typically center on improving the coordination of drug- or violence-related services and activities. However, states also frequently mention capacity building in their process goals. Capacity building generally targets improvements to states' organizational infrastructures (e.g., improving state grant-making capabilities to LEAs or improving communications between local and state agencies).
- Following process type goals, the second most commonly submitted goals by states are *program direct outcome goals*. Seventy-six percent of SEA programs and 71 percent of the Governors' programs submitted these goals.
- The third most commonly submitted goals by states are *student direct outcome goals in school and community*. Sixty-one percent of SEA programs and 64 percent of the Governors' programs submitted these goals. Also, 44 percent of the SEA programs submitted *student direct outcome goals in schools only*.
- SEA and Governors' programs also submitted a fairly sizable number of *indirect outcome goals*, both student and program. Thirty-one percent of SEA programs submitted student indirect outcome goals, and 45 percent of the Governors' programs submitted program indirect outcome goals. Indirect goals cover issues such as dropout prevention programs, domestic violence information, and after-school academic programs and tutorials.

- The SDFSCA requires that states submit *measurable goals and objectives*. Twenty-six percent of the SEA programs and 20 percent of the Governors' programs submitted measurable goals. In addition, 31 percent of the SEA programs and 35 percent of the Governors' programs submitted partially measurable goals.

**Table 5-1**

**Summary of characteristics of SEA and Governors' programs goals and objectives: 1999–2000\***

Characteristic	SEA programs		Governors' programs	
	Total	Percent	Total	Percent
Number of states submitting goals and objectives .....	54	100	55	100
Student Safe and Drug-Free directly related outcome goals — in school and community...	33	61	35	64
Student Safe and Drug-Free directly related outcome goals — in school only .....	24	44	10	18
Student indirect outcome goals .....	17	31	11	20
Teachers/staff outcome goals .....	14	26	2	4
Program Safe and Drug-Free directly related outcome goals .....	41	76	39	71
Program indirect outcome goals .....	18	33	25	45
Process goals .....	44	81	41	75
Measurable goals:				
Yes .....	14	26	11	20
No .....	22	41	25	45
Partially .....	18	33	19	35

\* If no new goals for the 1999–2000 reporting period were reported, goals provided from a previous reporting period were used.

NOTE: Three states/territories submitted the same goals for the SEA and Governors' programs. Some complex goals fit into more than one category, so were counted more than once; therefore, percents will add to more than 100.

## **Assessing State Progress Reports**

Along with the requirement to submit “measurable goals and objectives for drug and violence prevention,” there is a requirement to submit “the state’s progress toward attaining its goals for drug and violence prevention.” As noted earlier in this chapter, only a limited number of goals and objectives could meet a strict definition of measurability. Specifically, 14 SEA programs (26 percent) and 11 Governors’ programs (20 percent) met the measurability criteria. The 1999–2000 numbers are nearly identical to those reported for the 1998–99 reporting period, when 15 SEA programs (28 percent) and 11 Governors’ programs (20 percent) met similar measurability criteria.

The issue of measurability is critical. Progress is virtually impossible to assess without clear measurable goals and objectives that are consistent across time. Like previous reports, the 1999–2000 analysis of goals revealed that frequently there are serious mismatches between a state’s submitted goals and the information or data submitted to document progress. And while a few states submitted extremely detailed progress reports, including quantifiable information and data reports tied directly to their goals, most states submitted either sketchy progress reports or none at all. Under these circumstances, clearly the 1999–2000 progress reports are not suitable for a thorough quantitative analysis such as the one conducted for the goals in this report. For those attempting to monitor states’ progress in a general sense, a review of the drug and school safety prevalence data reported in Chapters 3 and 4, which are more objective and consistent over time, is more useful than a review of states’ progress reports.

## Chapter 6

### Epilogue

This final chapter briefly reflects on findings from 5 years of the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act SEA and Governors' programs: 1995–96, 1996–97, 1997–98, 1998–99, and 1999–2000. Influenced by the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, the 1994 law required that data be reported on the incidence and prevalence of drug use and violence by youth in schools, as well as youth's experiences with both problems in their schools. Two other requirement of this law increased the emphasis on reporting outcomes for federal expenditures. The first was that states submit their goals and objectives for their SDFSCA programs along with descriptions of the "state's progress toward attaining its goals for drug and violence prevention," while the second called for states to assess and report on the effectiveness of their prevention programs. Findings on the SDFSCA reporting forms therefore relate to both program implementation and program outcomes.

#### **Implementation Data: SEA and Governors' Programs**

The implementation of SDFSCA was affected by how the states responded to the challenge of increased reporting requirements, and how they implemented their programs in accordance with the authorized activities and other administrative parameters specified in the new law. The challenges for state SDFSCA coordinators were threefold:

- To learn a new set of definitions, instructions, and data items for the reporting requirements;
- To communicate that information to LEA personnel; and
- To revise or design their state systems to collect the needed data.

In response, the national Safe and Drug-Free Schools (SDFS) Program offered a series of nationwide training sessions to all state coordinators. Additional technical assistance was provided to the coordinators throughout the data collection process by two contractors, Westat and Research Triangle Institute (RTI).

The revised Governors' reporting form contained fewer questions than the SEA form, and covered only one of the topics that was new to the SDFSCA: reporting on the state's



progress toward achieving its program goals. Not surprisingly, the Governors' programs, as a group, showed little change over time in ability to report the types of data specified in the form. On the other hand, most of the new outcome provisions were included in the SEA reporting form, and reporting of several subsets of the data initially necessitated extensive technical assistance (TA) to the states. The sections on implementation data were the least changed from prior years, so the vast majority of states were able to report those data on both the Governors' and the SEA forms.

Perhaps the best measure of the increase in the SEAs' ability to provide these data is the number of states able to report the prevalence and incidence of certain drug and violence behaviors. Although the prevalence and incidence reporting *requirements* were new in the 1994 act, a majority of states were already using the Youth Risk Behavior Survey for measuring prevalence of drug and safety-related issues. No such uniform instrument was in use for reporting incident data. Thus, it was not surprising that only one state was able to report the complete sets of incident data for the 1995–96 SDFSCA reporting year. Although 10 states did so in 1998–99, that number dropped to 6 in 1999–2000, attesting to the continuing struggle among states to achieve and maintain the specified incident reporting.

Data submitted on program implementation by the state SEA and Governors' programs showed only a few minor changes over the 5 reporting years. This is to be expected during implementation of a single law that operated under a relatively stable set of regulations. One such change for 1999–2000 was the shift reported in the priority of age groups served by the Governors' programs. Governor's offices and state health agencies, possibly being a bit more free to choose which age groups to serve, reported for that year that the second most frequently served age group was the 13- to 15-year-olds, which had been the third most frequently served group in the previous year. Such targeting would seem to respond to recent data that have targeted the ages of 13 to 14 as a critical time for prevention efforts.

In 1998, midway through implementation of the SDFSCA, ED adopted an additional set of guiding principles for SEA and Governors' Programs — the Principles of Effectiveness, which required grant recipients to:

- Base programs on an assessment of objective data about the drug and violence problems in the schools and communities served (Principle 1);
- Establish a set of measurable goals and objectives (Principle 2);

- Design activities based on research that provides evidence that the strategies used prevent or reduce drug use, violence, or disruptive behavior (Principle 3); and
- Evaluate programs periodically to assess progress (Principle 4).

Principle 3 no doubt influenced one clear shift reported by SEAs in their priorities among the various criteria for funding LEAs. “Project based on research or proven model” emerged as the third most frequently cited criterion in 1997–98 and remained frequently cited through 1999–2000.

### **Age of First Use Remains a Significant Issue**

For the 1999–2000 reporting period, drug prevalence data on “age of first use” remains as significant an issue as when it was targeted in the 1998–99 SDFSCA report. Twenty-seven states reported that 15 to 25 percent of their 10th graders had first smoked cigarettes at ages 13 to 14. Twenty-one states reported more than 25 percent of their 10th graders had first used alcohol at 13 to 14, and 21 states reported that 15 to 25 percent of their 10th graders first used marijuana at age 13 to 14. These findings generally match those reported by the national YRBS cited in Chapter 3. The age of first use remains a serious concern because early teen smoking relates to later increased risk of drug use and dependence. This connection was highlighted by a 1998 analysis<sup>1</sup> of data from the 1992 National Longitudinal Alcohol Epidemiological Survey showing that lifetime smokers who reported first smoking regularly at age 13 or younger were nearly 2.5 times more likely to report lifetime drug use than were those who began smoking at age 17 or older.

### **SDFSCA School Safety Data Are Supported by Other National Data**

Overall, school safety data sets summarized in this report follow findings from other national data sets.<sup>2 3</sup> SDFSCA performance data show that elementary schools are less likely than

---

<sup>1</sup> *Drinking in the United States: Main Findings from the 1992 National Longitudinal Alcohol Epidemiological Survey (NLAES)*. U.S. Alcohol Epidemiological Data Reference Manual, Vol. 6, First Ed., November 1998. National Institutes of Health Publication No. 99-3519.

<sup>2</sup> In addition to the comparisons made with national Youth Risk Behavior Survey prevalence data cited in Chapters 4, consider the report *Indicators of School Crime and Safety 2001* issued jointly by the U.S. Department of Education and the Bureau of Justice Statistics.

<sup>3</sup> *Youth Violence: A Report of the Surgeon General*. 1999. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Surgeon General, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, the National Institutes of Health, National Institute of Mental Health, and the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Center for Mental Health Services. Rockville, MD, and Atlanta, GA.

either middle or high schools to report safety-related incidents of any type. At the high school level, rates of such incidents are higher at the 10th grade than the 12th grade.

The 1999 alcohol and drug-related youth arrest data support the finding discussed earlier concerning the appropriate age to first intervene in the lives of adolescents to prevent violence and alcohol and drug use or abuse. The first age group at which a majority of states had a percentage of youth arrested for alcohol and other drug offenses that was higher than the group's percentage of the state's youth population was the 15- to 16-year-olds. In addition, the age at which a majority of states had a percentage of youth arrested for violent offenses that was higher than the group's percentage of the state's youth population was 15 to 16.

These data clearly convey the seriousness of the safety issues in the Nation's schools, as well as the continuing difficulty of the data collection and reporting task. It is imperative that both the challenge posed by these findings, as well as the problems in schools that the data measure, receive concentrated attention from the national SDFS Program in the future years.

### **Program Goals and Objectives, and Progress Reports**

The state SDFSCA goals and objectives reported for 1999–2000 were similar to those that were reported in previous reporting years. The low number of SEA and Governors' programs that reported measurable goals and objectives was noted as early as the 1995–96 and 1996–97 reports and continues to be the most significant observation from these data. In addition, few states submitted detailed progress reports, and there frequently were serious mismatches between the goals and objectives submitted and the content of the progress reports.

### **Looking Toward the Future of SDFSCA Data Collection**

The primary functions of these data are to highlight areas of progress and remaining problems at all levels of the system — local, state, and national — and to inform state and national decisions. Some evidence exists that the system is serving both functions. In the summary of the 1995–96 and 1996–97 SDFSCA performance reports, the Epilogue closed with “Continuing improvements in local, state and federal data collection and reporting will assist practitioners and policymakers in designing and implementing more effective programs to prevent and reduce youth drug use and violence.” This report cannot present systematic data on state and local uses of the SDFSCA performance data. After completion of the 2000–2001

report, a modification of the reporting form will be needed, and the cycle will begin another set of planning, programming, and feedback loops.