WellFlorida Council

Working Together for Healthy Communities

Marion County Safe and Drug Free Schools

2006-2007 Evaluation Report—*Without Attendance Objective*

August 2007

WellFlorida Council

Working Together for Healthy Communities

Marion County Safe and Drug Free Schools 2006-07 Evaluation Report

Final Report Without Attendance Objective

August 2007

Marion County Public Schools

Daniel Geer
Safe and Drug Free School Consultant

Scott Schwartz
Programmer Analyst

Michael Kennedy
Senior Programmer Analyst

WellFlorida Council

Shane Bailey
Associate Planner

Sandra Carroll
Data and Technology Coordinator

Jeff Feller, MSISE
Associate Director

Prepared by WellFlorida Council, Inc.
for Marion County Public Schools

WellFlorida Council

1785 NW 80th Blvd.

Gainesville, FL 32606

Tel: (352) 313-6500

Fax: (352) 313-6515

Web: www.wellflorida.org

Table of Contents

Overview of the 2005-06 SDFS Evaluation Process 1
Introduction 1
Background on the SDFS-Funded Mentor Program 1
Evaluation Components 3
Objective Evaluation of 2006-07 Proposed Outcomes 11
Introduction 11
Proposed Outcome Analysis 11
Objective 1 (Quantitative) 11
Objective 2 (Quantitative) 12
Baseline: A four question survey will be given to 10% of all students mentored through March 31, 2007. WellFlorida will randomly pick 10% of each school's mentored students that have been mentored since March 31, 200. 12
Objective 3 (Quantitative) 12
Objective 4 (Quantitative) 12
Objective 5 (Quantitative) 13
Outcome Objectives for Previous Years 13
Objective 6 (Quantitative) 13
Outcome Objective 7 (Quantitative) 15
Outcome Objective 8 (Quantitative) 17
Outcome Objective 9 (Qualitative) 18
Recommendations 20
Qualitative Evaluation Component 20
Student Focus Groups 20
Methodology 21
Overview of Key Findings 24
Mentor Meetings 24
Methodology 24
Overview of Key Findings 25
Summary of Recommendations 26
Appendices 28

Appendix A Mentor Contact Log Form 29
Appendix B Student Responses for Survey of Mentor Effectiveness 31
Appendix C Faculty/Staff Responses for Survey of Mentor Effectiveness..... 33
Appendix D Student Alcohol Survey 35
Appendix E Focus Group Instruction and Questions 37
Focus Group Introduction and Questions 38

Overview of the 2005-06 SDFS Evaluation Process

Introduction

Since the inception of the Safe and Drug Free Schools (SDFS) regular and Set-Aside programs in the Marion County school system, the WellFlorida Council has worked with Marion County Public Schools (MCPS) on the planning and evaluation of program activities.

Initially, the mentor program addressed in this evaluation was funded by SDFS Set-Aside Grant monies; however, when these monies were no longer available, MCPS allocated regular SDFS school district funds to preserving the mentor program. This evaluation will cover programs implemented under the Set-Aside Grant for the grant period covering the 2006-07 school year. WellFlorida, under the direction of the MCPS, has been responsible for preparing the SDFS evaluation since the 1996-97 school year.

Since the inception of the regular SDFS and set-aside programs in Marion County Public Schools, many beneficial programs have been generated and become self-sustaining based on activities initially funded by the SDFS and detailed in previous evaluations. These include a system-wide grant writer who was originally brought in to find additional funds for Safe and Drug Free Schools related programs at Howard Middle School. The services of the grant writer yielded such positive results, that the cost of this grant writer has been absorbed by school system funds and now the grant writer continues to bring new resources to the MCPS.

In addition, the Great Leaps reading program, highly successful and originally funded by SDFS, has expanded throughout the school system and is an example of the success of the SDFS program. The mentor program, piloted in Howard Middle School, has become a remarkable success, and though still largely funded by SDFS, the program has expanded to nine middle schools in Marion County.

Background on the SDFS-Funded Mentor Program

The federal government has an established program to allocate money to the states to develop Safe and Drug Free Schools programs in the school systems. In Florida, these funds have been allocated to the State Department of Education (DOE). Funds went to all school districts in Florida to support the teaching of curricula that will educate children on violence and drugs and stimulate the prevention of violent activity and drug use among school-aged children. A significant portion of the funds allocated to the states were carved out and allocated competitively to school districts that demonstrate the most significant need. The portion of the statewide SDFS funds that was carved out was known as the Set-Aside funds. Awards of Set-Aside funding ended in 2002-03.

When SDFS funding first became available, the MCPS created a SDFS Planning Committee to identify needs for violence and drug prevention and education in the school system and offer advice in the development of programs and strategies to address these needs. Under the direction of the MCPS, the SDFS Planning Committee conducted a district-wide needs assessment prior to

each Set-Aside Grant period. The purpose of these needs assessments is to identify students most at risk of becoming involved with alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs (ATOD) as well as violent activity. Needs assessments were prepared during the 1996-97 school years and more recently during the 1999-2000 school years.

The process of assessing the school district's needs relied on a variety of data sources. Extant reports including the County Risk Factor Report, the School Environmental Safety Incidents Report, the School District Prevention Needs Profile, the MCPS Drug Safety Report, and the School Advisory Council Reports were examined. Data were also extracted from the Marion County Total Educational Resource Management System (TERMS) database to analyze patterns of disciplinary action and state-reported incidents throughout the school system. In addition, focus groups were conducted with middle school students, guidance counselors, and Student Advisory Council chairs; and interviews were conducted with community leaders in the business, professional, political, and law enforcement communities as well as with school principals.

Due to the high degree of variability of discipline data at the school level, the planning committee reviewed TERMS data on disciplinary actions and state-reported incidents at the district level to identify specific populations with greatest need or if a particular action or actions was common throughout the school district. The analysis of TERMS data provided supporting evidence for selecting target populations and the types of behaviors upon which SDFS and Set-Aside programs would focus. The review of the existing data reports, conducting significance tests and performing a logistic regression with the data elements from TERMS, and conducting focus groups and interviews also supported the identification of a target population.

Review of these data indicated that students in grades 6, 7, and 8 (middle school) who have high numbers of absences from school and poor school performance as measured by cumulative grade point average (GPA) should be targeted. Students who show a pattern of frequent involvement in less serious types of disciplinary incidents were also identified. Based on the review of TERMS data, the characteristics that most commonly reflect the population that would benefit from a prevention and/or intervention program were male, African-American, students with high rates of reported discipline incidents, students receiving lower scores on standardized tests, and students who are absent from school more frequently than other students.

With this information, in 1996-97, the SDFS Planning Committee identified two schools, Howard and North Marion Middle Schools, as having the highest percentage of students with the above characteristics. These schools were then selected to be the focus of much of the Set-Aside activities for that grant period. Mentoring programs were implemented to address the identified concerns. Howard and North Marion were again selected for the 1998-99 to 1999-2000 Set-Aside Grant periods, while Belleview and Osceola Middle Schools were added to the mix.

The overall consensus of the planning committee was to develop a comprehensive plan that reduces ATOD and violent behaviors in schools. The emphasis of the program plan was to create a more nurturing environment so adolescents want to come to school and strive to excel in their academic endeavors. The original program plan set forth the programs to be implemented (based on their demonstrated success in research), the target populations and schools, and the objectives upon which to base the evaluation of the effectiveness of the Set-Aside programs. A

core element of this plan has been the implementation of school-based mentoring programs for students.

In 2000-01, it was determined that the Set-Aside funding would be used solely to fund mentor programs at nine middle schools in Marion County as well as South Ocala Elementary School. The 2000-01 Set-Aside funds were allocated in such a manner to cover one year of funding as opposed to the usual two years. As such, for 2001-02 and 2002-03, MCPS determined it would utilize regular Safe and Drug Free Schools funding to maintain the mentor programs at the nine middle and one elementary school.

Since the 2003-04 school year, the mentor program was sustained in the nine middle schools and South Ocala Elementary School as part of the regular SDFS funding, as Set-Aside funding was no longer available. Due to budget reductions South Ocala Elementary was not funded for the SDFS program for the 2006-07 year. As in years past, the evaluation that follows focuses on both quantitative and qualitative analysis of mentoring program activity for the 2006-07 school year based on the details in the 2005-06 program plan/application submitted to the Florida Department of Education. However, based on recommendations, the evaluation objectives were tailored, with input from the Marion County Safe and Drug Free Schools Planning Committee, to be more relevant to the current experiences with the mentor program.

Evaluation Components

The evaluation of SDFS program activities for the 2006-07 school years consists of the quantitative/objective evaluation of 2005-06 proposed outcomes and qualitative analysis with additional objectives aimed specifically at alcohol, tobacco, bullying, fighting, and attendance. There are five proposed quantitative outcomes of SDFS program activity in the 2006-07 program plans. An evaluation of each of these outcomes comprises the quantitative/objective evaluation component. The qualitative insights were derived from four focus groups conducted with mentored students. In the 2006-07 evaluation, both faculty and students were surveyed about the mentor program, as in previous evaluations. Additionally, students were surveys regarding alcohol use. The results from the student survey are available in Appendix B and the results from the faculty/staff survey are available in Appendix C.

A critical element of this evaluation is the collection of mentor contact information. This allows the SDFS liaison and evaluation staff to gain a better understanding of current mentor involvement, and when necessary, these contacts may be used to identify potential areas of improvement based on SESIR data. In 2006, WellFlorida worked with the SDFS mentors to develop a form and process for logging mentor contacts (Appendix A). The forms include student name, student identification and date of contact and reason for contact.

At the beginning of each school year, WellFlorida staff has met with mentors to explain the mentor contact logging process and how the forms were to be utilized. As part of the recommendations from the 2002-03 evaluation, the mentor contact form was reviewed again by the SDFS Planning Committee prior to the 2006-07 school years and updated accordingly.

Mentors were required to submit their mentor contact logs to staff within the first week of each month. In previous years, WellFlorida took the contacts and constructed a database to compile all mentor contact information from the forms. As of January 1, 2004, mentor contact forms

were submitted electronically to decrease data errors. The WellFlorida staff conducted trainings with the mentors on the electronic submission of mentor logs. All of the participating middle schools submitted mentor contact forms to WellFlorida.

As seen in Table 1, during 2006-07 mentors worked with 1645 different students and made 3,418 mentor contacts. Over six percent of the total student population at the nine schools participating in the program interacted with the mentors via a formal contact (these contacts do not include events such as lunch room duty and casual conversations with students). According to Table 1, Osceola Middle, Fort McCoy Middle, Dunnellon Middle, Fort King Middle, and Lake Weir Middle schools showed moderate increases in the number of student contacts compared to the 2005-2006 school year. Lake Weir increased the number of mentor contacts by 74.9 percent when compared to the previous year. It should be noted that beginning in the 2006-07 school year mentors no counted group contacts in the mentor contact logs. Only individual student mentoring sessions were reported.

Table 1. Mentor activity for all middle schools, 2004-05, 2005-06, and 2006-2007.

School	2004-2005		2005-2006		2006-2007		Percent Change 04-05 - 05-06		Percent Change 05-06 - 06-07		Percent Change 04-05 - 06-07	
	Students	Contacts	Students	Contacts	Students	Contacts	Students	Contacts	Students	Contacts	Students	Contacts
Belleview Middle School	189	484	121	227	73	134	(36.0)	(53.1)	(39.7)	(41.0)	(61.4)	(72.3)
Dunnellon Middle School	190	676	290	799	341	924	52.6	18.2	17.6	15.6	79.5	36.7
Fort King Middle School	338	749	334	687	380	800	(1.2)	(8.3)	13.8	16.4	12.4	6.8
Fort McCoy Middle School	147	177	40	137	78	150	(72.8)	(22.6)	95.0	9.5	(46.9)	(15.3)
Howard Middle School	93	107	213	323	77	108	129.0	201.9	(63.8)	(66.6)	(17.2)	0.9
Lake Weir Middle School	786	1696	140	299	314	523	(82.2)	(82.4)	124.3	74.9	(60.1)	(69.2)
North Marion Middle School	366	882	210	716	179	423	(42.6)	(18.8)	(14.8)	(40.9)	(51.1)	(52.0)
Osceola Middle School	249	649	107	116	69	149	(57.0)	(82.1)	(35.5)	28.4	(72.3)	(77.0)
West Port Middle School	153	248	254	483	134	207	66.0	94.8	(47.2)	(57.1)	(12.4)	(16.5)
Total	2511	5668	1709	3787	1645	3418	(31.9)	(33.2)	(3.7)	(9.7)	(34.5)	(39.7)

Source: Mentor Contact Database, WellFlorida, 2004-05, 2005-06, & 2006-07.

The roles of the mentors vary considerably from school to school based on the principal's needs. Consequently, the role of the mentor defines the reasons why students seek assistance from the mentor. As seen in Table 2, non-violent peer conflicts, planning for the future, and classroom/learning environment disruption are the top three leading reasons why students utilize the mentor during the 2006-07 school year.

Table 2. Reasons for mentor contacts, by school, 2006-07.

School	Contact Reason	2006-2007	
		Number	Percent
Belleview Middle	Family Issues	33	24.6
	Non-Violent Peer Conflict Issues	31	23.1
	Planning for the future	24	17.9
	Bullying	19	14.2
	Fighting/Violence	13	9.7
	Classroom/Learning Environment Disruption	8	6.0
	Attendance	3	2.2
	Relationship issues	3	2.2
	Total	134	100.0
Dunnellon Middle	Non-Violent Peer Conflict Issues	212	22.9
	Planning for the future	197	21.3
	Family Issues	171	18.5
	Classroom/Learning Environment Disruption	137	14.8
	Relationship issues	94	10.2
	Fighting/Violence	41	4.4
	Bullying	24	2.6
	Alcohol	20	2.2
	Academic Issues	18	1.9
	Tobacco and Other Drugs	9	1.0
	Attendance	1	0.1
	Total	924	100.0

Source: Mentor Contact Database, WellFlorida, 2006-07.

School	Contact Reason	2006-2007	
		Number	Percent
Ft. King Middle	Non-Violent Peer Conflict Issues	651	81.4
	Planning for the future	38	4.8
	Bullying	36	4.5
	Classroom/Learning Environment Disruption	29	3.6
	Fighting/Violence	19	2.4
	Relationship issues	12	1.5
	Attendance	7	0.9
	Academic Issues	5	0.6
	Family Issues	2	0.3
	Tobacco and Other Drugs	1	0.1
	Total	800	100.0
Ft. McCoy	Non-Violent Peer Conflict Issues	58	38.7
	Academic Issues	20	13.3
	Relationship issues	18	12.0
	Family Issues	15	10.0
	Attendance	13	8.7
	Planning for the future	12	8.0
	Fighting/Violence	7	4.7
	Classroom/Learning Environment Disruption	4	2.7
	Tobacco and Other Drugs	2	1.3
	Unknown	1	0.7
	Total	150	100.0

Source: Mentor Contact Database, WellFlorida, 2006-07.

School	Contact Reason	2006-2007	
		Number	Percent
Howard Middle	Classroom/Learning Environment Disruption	53	49.1
	Planning for the future	14	13.0
	Non-Violent Peer Conflict Issues	12	11.1
	Attendance	10	9.3
	Family Issues	10	9.3
	Bullying	4	3.7
	Academic Issues	3	2.8
	Fighting/Violence	1	0.9
	Relationship issues	1	0.9
	Total	108	100.0
Lake Weir Middle	Non-Violent Peer Conflict Issues	158	30.2
	Planning for the future	147	28.1
	Classroom/Learning Environment Disruption	136	26.0
	Family Issues	27	5.2
	Bullying	20	3.8
	Academic Issues	10	1.9
	Fighting/Violence	10	1.9
	Relationship issues	10	1.9
	Alcohol	3	0.6
	Attendance	2	0.4
	Total	523	100.0

Source: Mentor Contact Database, WellFlorida, 2006-07.

School	Contact Reason	2006-2007	
		Number	Percent
North Marion Middle	Classroom/Learning Environment Disruption	127	30.0
	Non-Violent Peer Conflict Issues	114	27.0
	Planning for the future	89	21.0
	Academic Issues	38	9.0
	Relationship issues	29	6.9
	Fighting/Violence	9	2.1
	Family Issues	8	1.9
	Bullying	7	1.7
	Attendance	1	0.2
	Tobacco and Other Drugs	1	0.2
	Total	423	100.0
Osceola Middle	Classroom/Learning Environment Disruption	30	20.1
	Non-Violent Peer Conflict Issues	28	18.8
	Academic Issues	22	14.8
	Bullying	21	14.1
	Relationship issues	15	10.1
	Fighting/Violence	11	7.4
	Attendance	8	5.4
	Alcohol	5	3.4
	Planning for the future	3	2.0
	Family Issues	2	1.3
	Tobacco and Other Drugs	2	1.3
	Unknown	2	1.3
	Total	149	100.0

Source: Mentor Contact Database, WellFlorida, 2006-07.

School	Contact Reason	2006-2007	
		Number	Percent
West Port Middle	Non-Violent Peer Conflict Issues	86	41.5
	Planning for the future	41	19.8
	Bullying	22	10.6
	Classroom/Learning Environment Disruption	21	10.1
	Academic Issues	10	4.8
	Family Issues	9	4.3
	Fighting/Violence	5	2.4
	Relationship issues	5	2.4
	Attendance	4	1.9
	Tobacco and Other Drugs	3	1.4
	Unknown	1	0.5
	Total	207	100.0
All Schools	Non-Violent Peer Conflict Issues	1350	39.5
	Planning for the future	565	16.5
	Classroom/Learning Environment Disruption	545	15.9
	Family Issues	277	8.1
	Relationship issues	187	5.5
	Bullying	153	4.5
	Academic Issues	126	3.7
	Fighting/Violence	116	3.4
	Attendance	49	1.4
	Alcohol	28	0.8
	Tobacco and Other Drugs	18	0.5
	Unknown	4	0.1
	Total	3,418	100.0

Source: Mentor Contact Database, WellFlorida, 2006-07.

Objective Evaluation of 2006-07 Proposed Outcomes

Introduction

Prior to examining each proposed objective and assessing the progress toward reaching those objectives, some preparatory comments are warranted. First, it should be noted that the SDFS regular and Set-Aside programs have generally been two-year funded programs. This evaluation will only cover the program for the 2004-05, 2005-06 and 2006-07 school years where deemed necessary. Many of the results from the 2004-05 evaluation, completed two years ago, have been used to generate baseline data for the 2006-07 evaluation. As such, data has been taken at the end of the 2006-07 school years and compared to 2004-05 data (the defined base year for the 2006-07 evaluation) as warranted by the previous objectives of prior years stated objectives.

In keeping with the outcome measures in the previous two evaluations, the 2006-07 evaluation will cover five newly proposed outcomes along with data selections used in previous years. Each outcome is stated below.

Proposed Outcome Analysis

Evaluation of Proposed Outcomes 1 and 2 is based on a review of alcohol use surveys provided by mentors who surveyed students that were specifically mentored for alcohol use/issues. The proposed Outcome 3, 4 and 5 is based on Marion County Total Educational Resource Management System (TERMS) database. Review of proposed Outcome 6-8 is based on previous year's data used by WellFlorida staff to measure outcomes previously established for the SDFS evaluation. Proposed Outcome 9 is based upon focus groups with students that participated in the mentoring program and on student and faculty/staff surveys. Therefore, each of the following proposed outcomes is reviewed and supported with primary and/or secondary sources of quantitative and qualitative data.

Objective 1 (Quantitative)

By June 1, 2007, Of the mentored students who drink and who have talked to the mentor about drinking, at least 75% will strongly agree or agree that the mentor has helped them make better decisions about not drinking alcohol.

Baseline: A four question survey will be given to 10% of all students mentored through March 31, 2007. WellFlorida will randomly pick 10% of each school's mentored students that have been mentored since March 31, 2007.

Analysis: Less than 10 percent of the students mentored turned in surveys for alcohol use. Therefore results for this objective are not accurate for the 10 percent of the student population that had mentoring contacts. At the end of the 2006-07 school years, 68.9 percent of students report feeling comfortable discussing alcohol use with the school mentor. 86.9 percent feel that mentors have encouraged them to make decisions not to drink alcohol.

Objective 2 (Quantitative)
By June 1, 2007, Of the mentored students who drink and who have talked to the mentor about drinking, at least 75% will strongly agree or agree that they drink less since they have been meeting with the mentor.

*Baseline***:** *A four question survey will be given to 10% of all students mentored through March 31, 2007. WellFlorida will randomly pick 10% of each school's mentored students that have been mentored since March 31, 200.*

Analysis: Less than 10 percent of the students mentored turned in surveys for alcohol use. Therefore results for this objective are not accurate for the 10 percent of the student population that had mentoring contacts. At the end of the 2006-07 school years, 85.2 percent of students report that they have discussed alcohol use with the school mentor. 65.6 percent feel that mentors have been helpful in dealing with issues involving alcohol use.

Objective 3 (Quantitative)
By June 1, 2007, At least 90% of all students mentored for a bullying issue will lower their bullying incidence rate by 10% after their initial mentor visit for bullying.

Baseline: Each student's individual bullying incidence rate during the school year of note prior to their first individual mentor contact for bullying.

Analysis: Out of 1645 students, 127 of those students met with the school mentor for bullying. 15 of those students were reported in the TERMS database for bullying at some point throughout the year. There were seven students that had repeat bullying incidents in the TERMS database after their first initial meeting with the mentor for bullying. Out of the 127 students mentored for bullying 120 (94.5%) did not have a bullying event after they had their first initial meeting with the mentor for a bullying incident.

Furthermore, there were 152 students identified in the TERMS database for bullying that did not meet with the school mentor. This further emphasizes the need and justification of the mentor. This shows definite impact on students and decrease in the number of incidents after meeting with the mentor.

Objective 4 (Quantitative)
By June 1, 2007, At least 90% of all students mentored for a fighting/violence issue will lower their fighting/violence incidence rate by 10% after their initial mentor visit for fighting/violence.

Baseline: Each student's individual fighting/violence incidence rate during the school year of note prior to their first individual mentor contact for fighting/violence issues.

Analysis: Out of 1645 students, 98 of those students met with the school mentor for fighting/violence issues. 34 of those students were identified in the TERMS database for fighting/violence issues, of those students eight had another incident reported in the TERMS database after their initial contact with a mentor. Out of the 98 students mentored for fighting 90

(91.8%) did not have a fighting event after they had the first initial meeting with a mentor for fighting.

Objective 5 (Quantitative)

By June 1, 2007, At least 90% of all students mentored for attendance issues will lower their absentee rate by 10% after their initial individual mentor visit for attendance issues.

Baseline: Each student's individual absentee rate during the school year of note prior to their first individual mentor contact for attendance issues.

Analysis: Additional data is currently being collected and will be fully reported in an addendum to this report for attendance.

Outcome Objectives for Previous Years

Objective 6 (Quantitative)

By June 1, 2007, reduce by at least 5 percent the percentage of students (in all nine middle schools) participating in a state reportable disciplinary incident as indicated by the 2004-2007 school system discipline records.

Baseline: According to 2004-2005 school system discipline records, 433 of 9,687 students (4.5 percent) at all nine middle schools participated in a state reportable disciplinary incident.

Analysis: At the end of the 2003-04 school years, the Florida Department of Education revised its codes for disciplinary incidents. The list was expanded from 130 to 218 general codes that can be used to report incidents. Moreover, of the revised 218 codes, 31 of the most serious incident codes were identified as state reportable. That is, they are reportable to the state and become part of a uniform disciplinary event/incident report created by the Florida Department of Education for each of the school districts in Florida.

As seen in Table 3, 425 of the 10,619 students at the nine schools participated in a state reportable incident during the 2006-07 school year. This represents 4.0 percent of the student body population of the nine middle schools participating in the SDFS program.

According to Table 3, there was no reportable percentage change from the 2004-05 and 2006-07 school years for the 9 schools as a whole; there was a 0.3 percent decrease from the 2005-06 and 2006-07 school years. Five of the ten schools achieved the 5 percent reduction in the percentage of their students participating in state reportable incidents.

Table 3. Students with state reportable incidents for all middle schools 2004-05, 2005-06 and 2006-07.

School Name	2006-07 Total Students	2006-07 Students with SRI*	2005-06 Students with SRI*	2004-05 Students with SRI*	2006-07 Percent of Students with SRI*	2005-06 Percent of Students with SRI*	2004-05 Percent of Students with SRI*	Percent Change between 2005-06 to 2006-07	Percent Change between 2004-05 to 2006-07
Belleview Middle	1317	64	76	50	4.9	5.8	3.8	-18.4	22.4
Dunnellon Middle	1257	40	61	35	3.2	5.2	3.1	-62.5	3.1
Fort King Middle	1087	42	50	62	3.9	4.6	5.8	-17.9	-48.7
Fort McCoy Middle	610	20	39	39	3.3	6.0	5.4	-81.8	-63.6
Howard Middle	1159	64	73	40	5.5	6.0	3.0	-9.1	45.5
Lake Weir Middle	1540	86	84	88	5.6	5.7	5.9	-1.8	-5.4
North Marion Middle	953	37	25	35	3.9	2.5	3.4	35.9	12.8
Osceola Middle	1274	40	37	54	3.1	3.1	5.0	0.0	-61.3
West Port Middle**	1422	32	24	26	2.3	1.8	1.9	21.7	17.4
Total	10619	425	**469**	**433**	4.0	**4.3**	**4.0**	**-7.5**	**0**

* SRI = State Reportable Incident

Source: Marion County TERMS Database, MCPS, 2004, 2005, 2006, and 2007.

As seen in Table 4, the highest percentage of state reportable incidents is derived from non-mutual fighting at 114 incidents. Disorderly conduct follows with 109 incidents accounting for 17.6 percent of the reportable incidents. Repeated misconduct incidents accounted for 14.5 percent of the overall total percentage of reportable incidents.

Table 4. Leading state reportable disciplinary incidents for Marion County Middle Schools, 2006-07.

Type of State Reported Incident	Students	Incidents	Percent
Alcohol	2	2	0.3
Bomb Threats	10	10	1.6
Bullying	14	15	2.4
Disorderly Conduct	91	109	17.6
Over the Counter Prescription Drugs	1	1	0.2
Illegal Drugs	22	22	3.6
Extortion/Threats/Bullying	26	28	4.5
Failure to comply with school rules	1	1	0.2
False fire alarms	4	4	0.6
Non-mutual fighting with injury	110	114	18.4
Violence against employee	19	20	3.2
Major disorder	3	3	0.5
Other serious misconduct	64	67	10.8
Repeated misconduct	63	90	14.5
Serious Campus Disruption	15	15	2.4
Sexual Harassment	21	25	4.0
Sexual Offence	15	15	2.4
Sexual Offences	3	3	0.5
Theft over $300	5	5	0.8
Possession of Tobacco under age 18	40	42	6.8
Trespassing	10	10	1.6
Extortion/Threats/Injury	5	5	0.8
Weapons	13	13	2.1
Total	557	619	100.0

Source: Marion County TERMS Database, MCPS, 2007.

Outcome Objective 7 (Quantitative)

By June 1, 2007, reduce by at least 10 percent the number of discipline referrals per 100 students (in all nine middle schools) as indicated by the 2004-05, 2006-06 and 2006-07 school system discipline records.

Baseline: According to 2004-2005 school system discipline records, there were 24,903 discipline referrals among the 10,957 students (in all nine middle schools and South Ocala Elementary School) for a rate of 227.3 discipline referrals per 100 students.

Analysis: As seen in Table 4, Outcome Objective 2 was not met by all schools, as the total number of discipline referrals per 100 students (in all nine middle schools) decreased by more than 10 percent in only two schools from the 2004-05 base year to the 2006-07 school year.

Table 4. Students with state reportable incidents for all middle schools, 2007.

School Name	2006-07 Total Students	2006-07 Discipline Referrals	2006-07 Discipline Referrals per 100 Students	2005-06 Discipline Referrals per 100 Students	2004-05 Discipline Referrals per 100 Students	Percent Change between 2004-05 and 2005-06	Percent Change between 2004-05 and 2006-07
Belleview Middle	1317	1890	143.5	126.2	144.3	-12.5	-0.5
Dunnellon Middle	1257	3581	284.9	339.4	215.3	57.7	32.3
Fort King Middle	1087	2859	263.0	257.7	292.6	-11.9	-10.1
Fort McCoy Middle	610	958	157.0	187.7	167.5	12.1	-6.2
Howard Middle	1159	3385	292.1	263.5	258.2	2	13.1
Lake Weir Middle	1540	4155	269.8	292.9	221.9	32	21.6
North Marion Middle	953	4102	430.4	604.2	603.5	0.1	-28.7
Osceola Middle	1274	1864	146.3	124.5	103.7	20.1	41.1
West Port Middle	1422	2452	172.4	167.3	156.3	7	10.3
Total	10619	25246	237.7	248.4	227.3	9.3	4.6

Outcome Objective 8 **(Quantitative)**

By June 1, 2007, reduce the rate of SESIR incidents per 100 students among in all nine middle schools that have a Safe and Drug Free School mentor by 20 percent.

Baseline: According to the Florida Department of Education, in 2000-2001 the rate of SESIR activities among students in Marion County was 10.7 percent higher than the comparable rate at the state-level: there were 41.23 SESIR incidents per 1,000 students in Marion County (1,634 incidents among 39,633 students), compared with 46.16 SESIR incidents per 1,000 students at a state-level (120,373 incidents among 2,607,593 students).

After reviewing the stated baseline data, WellFlorida found two errors in the baseline statement from the 2003-05 SDFS Evaluation Plan. The first error occurs when the baseline states that SESIR activities in Marion County in 2000-01 are higher than that of the state, but as can be seen by the stated baseline, Marion County is actually lower than the state-level, however, SESIR activity among the schools in the SDFS program were higher than that of the state for both the 2000-01 and 2003-04 school years. The second error occurs when the baseline data suggests that the number of SESIR incidents per 1,000 at the state-level in 2000-01 is 46.16. This figure is actually the rate for the state-level SESIR incidents in 2001-02. The accurate state-level rate for the 2000-01 school year is 52.23 SESIR incidents per 1,000 students (133,530 incidents among 2,556,615 students).

Analysis: Based on the errors found in the baseline statement, Objective 4 cannot be evaluated as stated, however, using school-level SESIR data for the 2000-01 and 2003-04 school years, the level of SESIR activities among the ten participating schools as stated in Outcome Objective 4 can be evaluated and compared to SESIR activity of the state.

Table 7 provides SESIR rates for 2004-05, 2005-06 and 2006-07 school years with the percent change from the 2004-05 and 2006-07 years. The rate of SESIR incidents per 1,000 students decreased by 18.2 percent overall, while Belleview, Howard Middle and Lake Weir middle schools saw their SESIR incidents increase over the three-year span.

Table 7. SESIR Data Comparisons for Marion County Middle Schools, 2004-05, 2005-06 and 2006-07.

SESIR RATES	2004-05			2005-06			2006-07			Percent Change Between 2004-05 and 2006-07
School	Total Students	Total Incidents	Rate per 1,000	Total Students	Total Incidents	Rate per 1,000	Total Students	Total Incidents	Rate per 1,000	
Belleview Middle	1,322	70	53	1303	73	56	1317	106	80.5	51.9
Dunnellon Middle	1,126	64	56.8	1182	61	51.6	1257	47	37.4	-34.2
Fort King Middle	1,064	110	103.4	1076	50	46.5	1087	55	50.6	-51.1
Ft. McCoy Middle	716	67	93.6	652	84	128.8	610	22	36.1	-61.5
Howard Middle	1,312	56	42.7	1216	37	30.4	1159	90	77.7	81.9
Lake Weir Middle	1,491	114	76.5	1484	0	0	1540	134	87.0	13.7
North Marion Middle	1,026	95	92.6	983	25	25.4	953	50	52.5	-43.3
Osceola Middle	1,074	97	90.3	1175	39	33.2	1274	46	36.1	-60.0
West Port Middle	1,369	39	28.5	1338	76	56.8	1422	39	27.4	-3.8
Total	10,500	712	67.8	10,409	445	42.8	10619	589	55.5	-18.2

Source: School Crime and Violence Incident Report, SESIR Database, MCPS, 2004-05, 2005-06 and 2006-07.

Outcome Objective 9 (Qualitative)

Objective 9.1: *By June 1, 2007, conduct 4 focus groups (randomly selected from the Marion County schools that have a SDFS mentor) with students that have utilized the mentor program to determine student perspective on effectiveness of the mentor program.*

Baseline: Satisfaction surveys conducted in 2002-03 indicate that 69.6 percent of responding students indicated that the mentor had helped them to do better with school work and grades; 80.4 percent indicated that mentors helped them get along better with teachers and classmates; and 90.1 percent of responding students indicated that the SDFS mentor had been helpful to them. Focus groups will be used to obtain further details of the student's perspectives.

Objective 9.2: *By June 2007, conduct a mentored student survey (one at each of the Marion County Middle Schools that has a SDFS mentor) that is identical to the survey conducted of mentored students in 2004-05, and raise the percentage that stated "True" by 10 percent for each of the three questions regarding mentored student satisfaction.*

Baseline: Satisfaction surveys conducted in 2004-05 indicate that 61.9 percent of responding students indicated that the mentor had helped them do better with school work and grades; 69.8 percent indicated that mentors helped them get along better with teachers and classmates; and 80.4 percent of responding students indicated that the SDFS mentor had been helpful to them. Focus groups will be used to obtain further details of student's perspectives.

Objective 9.3: *By June 2007, Conduct a faculty/staff survey (one at each of the Marion County schools that has a SDFS mentor) that is identical to the survey conducted of faculty/staff members in 2004-05, and raise the percentage of all respondents that stated they "Agree/Strongly Agree" by 10 percent for each of the three questions regarding faculty/staff satisfaction.*

Baseline: Satisfaction surveys conducted in 2004-05 indicate that 30.7 percent of faculty/staff participants agreed and 42.4 percent strongly agreed (total 73.2 percent) that the mentor helped make a positive difference with the academic performance of mentored students; 29.8 percent agreed and 47.3 percent strongly agreed (total 77.1 percent) that the mentor helped to make a positive difference in the behavior of mentored students; and 26.3 percent agreed and 54.1 percent strongly agreed (total 80.5 percent) that the mentor is a valuable member of the school staff.

Analysis: For the 2006-07 evaluation, WellFlorida conducted two surveys regarding both student perception of the mentor program as well as faculty and staff perception. The results from the survey of mentored students are provided in Appendix B Student Responses for Survey of Mentor Effectiveness. The SDFS middle schools had low participation in the student survey. For the nine schools, 65.6 percent of students indicated that the mentor program helped them to do better with schoolwork and grades. For the second question, 73.8 percent indicated that mentors helped them get along better with teachers and classmates. For the final question, 89.8 percent of responding students indicated that the SDFS mentor had been helpful to them representing a 3.4 percent increase from the 2005-06 year data. The number of responses from each school varied widely, thus, the overall results do not provide a true picture of mentored student perception. However, the results do show evidence that, in all, the majority of mentored students feel that the SDFS program does make a positive impact on various aspects of their educational experience.

In addition to the mentored student surveys, a survey of faculty/staff was conducted to determine their perception of mentor effectiveness. The results of the surveys for each school are provided in Appendix C Faculty/Staff Responses for Survey of Mentor Effectiveness. Overall, 29.9 percent of faculty/staff participants agreed and 46.5 percent strongly agreed (total 76.4 percent) that the mentor made a positive impact on students' academic performance among mentored students representing a 5.2 percent decrease from the 2005-06 Faculty/Staff survey. 29.1 percent agreed and 55.1 percent strongly agreed (total 84.3 percent) that the mentor helped to make a positive difference in the behavior of mentored students constituting a 1.5 percent increase from the prior year. Lastly, 28.3 percent agreed and 63.8 percent strongly agreed (total 92.1 percent) that the mentor is a valuable member of the school staff, which is a 2.5 percent increase over the previous year.

The focus groups were conducted at the end of the 2006-07 school year. Four schools were randomly selected for focus group participation. Overall, the four focus groups indicated a general satisfaction with the mentor program. During the focus groups, students discussed perceptions of the mentor program, communicating with others about the mentor program, personal experiences and involvement with the mentor program, and possibilities for improvement with the mentor program. The complete focus group report can be found in the qualitative section of this evaluation.

Recommendations

Considerable mentor contact data has been collected but the established objectives do not accurately portray the outcome objective for the purpose of evaluating the SDFS program's impact on mentored students. It is recommended that the following outcome or process objective be established for the mentor contact data:

- Objective: By June 1, 2008, At least 95% of all students mentored for a bullying issue will not have a repeat bullying incidence after their initial mentor visit for bullying.

  Baseline: Each student's individual bullying incidence rate during the school year of note prior to their first individual mentor contact for bullying.

- Objective: By June 1, 2008, At least 95% of all students mentored for a fighting/violence issue will not have a repeat fighting/violence incidence after their initial mentor visit for bullying.

  Baseline: Each student's individual fighting/violence incidence rate during the school year of note prior to their first individual mentor contact for bullying.

These objectives will measure the original intent of the program to reduce repetitive incidences by students participating in the program.

Qualitative Evaluation Component

Aside from the surveys analyzed in Outcome Objective 9, WellFlorida conducted four focus groups at the end of the 2006-07 school years to collect further qualitative data from students. Three mentor meetings were also held to gain insight into the mentors' perception of the SDFS program, along with an informal survey of mentors. An analysis of the focus groups and mentor meetings is provided below.

Student Focus Groups

The SDFS mentor program serves nine middle schools in Marion County. The program was developed as a comprehensive plan to reduce the risk factors contributing to higher occurrences

of student involvement with alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs (ATOD) as well as violent behaviors in schools. As part of the qualitative component of the evaluation process for the Safe and Drug Free Schools (SDFS) mentor program, WellFlorida conducted four focus groups during the third week of April 2007.

This report will outline how the focus groups were selected, conducted, the findings of that process, and recommendations that address key issues identified in the process. The instructions and questions used to conduct the focus groups can be found in Appendix D.

Methodology

Today there is a multitude of behavior modification programs throughout the schools in Florida and the greater United States. However, it is realized that not all of these programs will succeed in a given school. For this reason, students who utilized the SDFS mentor program were asked to participate in focus groups to determine their perceptions, attitudes, and recommendations regarding this program. To determine the composition of the focus groups, four of the nine middle schools that participate in the SDFS mentor program were randomly selected from the SDFS mentor program database. From the four randomly selected middle schools, mentors were asked to randomly select students from each of the middle schools. In order to account for absences and scheduling conflicts, 12 students were chosen from the selected middle schools and each focus group consisted of no fewer than 8 students and no more than 12 students. In addition, parental consent forms were distributed to the selected 12 students, and any parent who did not want their child to participate in the focus groups were also excluded.

Each focus group was held in classrooms of the selected middle schools in Marion County. Participants were advised that WellFlorida and the SDFS mentor program would maintain their confidentiality, and were asked to respect one another's confidentiality once the session ended.

The process used for conducting focus groups is fairly informal. The strength of this qualitative technique is flexibility; it is ideal for generating new ideas for investigation on an issue. Focus group members were encouraged to initiate discussion about concerns, preferences, and other issues that were not necessarily introduced by the facilitator or others in the group, but that they feel were relevant to the discussion. The questions that were developed focused on perceptions of the SDFS mentor program; communication with others about the SDFS mentor program; personal experiences and involvement with the SDFS mentor program; and recommendations regarding the SDFS mentor program. A copy of the instrument utilized for the focus groups can be found in Appendix D.

Focus Group Summaries

Generally, each focus group was comprised of 8-12 students who represented the target population. All participants were students of the selected middle schools from Marion County who had utilized the SDFS mentor program at some point over the past year. The comments of focus group participants in the following summaries reiterate the sentiments of either a single group member or the group as a whole and include direct quotes that reflect those viewpoints. This section merely summarizes what the participants said with no analysis applied.

Description of Target Population

As previously stated, all members were students of the selected middle schools from Marion County who had utilized the SDFS mentor program at some point over the past year. The students are of varying ages and from sixth to eight grades. The report that follows summarizes the common observations of all participants in the four focus groups.

Perception of mentors and the mentor program

Participants were asked what comes to mind when they hear the word "mentor" and what their friends, family, and teachers say about the mentor program. A vast majority of the participants indicated that a mentor was an "advisor" or a "counselor" as well as someone who "helps you". Some individuals within the focus group felt that mentors were "listeners" or people that "guide you". Each of the group participants named the designated SDFS mentor by name and described how they serve as a mentor. These comments included statements such as "someone to talk too"; "give encouragement"; and "help me make the right decisions".

The majority of participants among the focus groups indicated that their friends, family, and teachers say positive things about the mentor program. While most of participants indicated that their families knew that the mentor program existed at their school, a number of individuals in separate focus groups indicated that their families knew nothing of the program. Some participants noted that while teachers liked the mentor program, they did not like students missing class to go to meetings with the mentor. A few students within the focus groups talked about how the mentor sought them out to discuss personal issues, but a majority indicated that they sought out the SDFS mentor or were referred by teachers, guidance counselors or principals. Discussion by participants indicated that generally there was no negative stigma associated with the SDFS mentor program.

Communicating with others about the mentor program

When asked what they would tell a friend or family member about the SDFS mentor program, some participants talked about the emotional outlet that the mentors provide. This discussion led to comments about the role of mentors in outside school arenas as well as their roles in tutoring. Other participants discussed how they would like to have mentors in high school. Many students felt there was more chance of bullying to occur in the high school setting. The majority of participants indicated that they would state positive things about the mentor program to their friends and family.

Personal experiences and involvement with the mentor program

Across the separate focus groups, the majority of participants indicated that the mentor program is instrumental in alleviating tension among students and is critical to controlling violence in their schools. Several participants discussed personal experiences in which the mentors helped to ease relationships with their peers or to facilitate communication with students that had engaged in violent behavior such a bullying. Discussion clearly indicated that students were worried about increases in violence if the mentor program was not present at their schools. One student stated, "If it wasn't for (mentor) I'm sure I would have been expelled for fighting. (Mentor) helped me learn to deal with my problems in other ways than fighting." Other participants spoke about the role of mentors in counseling, specifically in issues that they found difficult to speak to their parents or friends about such as body mutilation or "cutting", alcohol and drugs. Some individual participants stated the mentors helped them with their academics.

When asked if they felt the mentor program made a difference at their schools, all participants said "yes". A few participants stated that the mentor program makes a difference because it allows for students to vent about teachers and parents without judgment. Several participants discussed how mentors helped to ease the pressures of schools, social cliques and arguments among peers. Bullying and fighting were especially discussed. The participants felt that without the mentors fighting and violence would be increased at the schools.

Possibilities for improvement with the mentor program

Participants were asked what is frustrating at their schools regarding the SDFS mentor program and what advice they could provide to improve the mentor program at their schools. The majority of participants talked about the availability of the mentor. Discussion centered on the number of students that utilize the mentor and the difficulties in seeing a mentor because their teacher did not want them to miss class. This was a repeated comment throughout all focus groups. A number of participants stated that the mentors should have certain schedules available prearranged with teachers so that they could meet. Most stated that teachers should be more compassionate and understanding when a student requests to go see the mentor.

The common advice that participants conveyed to solve the stated problems was to have more mentors available in the schools. Participants felt this would help the school and students by reducing violent activity and helping students who have personal problems or problems with their family. A few participants indicated that if mentors did not have to substitute for teachers and they were solely responsible to help students with counseling, academics, and guidance, it would solve some of the frustrations that students are feeling with the SDFS mentor program. Overall, participants had positive things to say about the mentor program.

Overview of Key Findings

Throughout the process of conducting focus groups, a variety of perspectives and ideas about the SDFS mentor program were identified. While not all the participants agreed, the major issues came up time and time again, with different focus groups adding new perspectives. A summary of the ideas taken from the focus groups is provided below.

Perceptions of mentors and the mentor program:
- Helps me deal with my emotions
- Someone who "listens"
- Someone that helps with problems
- Someone that helps you make the right decision

Communication with others about the mentor program:
- Participants all stated they would communicate positives about the program to peers
- Mentors show students both the positives and negatives of outcomes
- Mentors are "confidential"
- Mentors provide help on fighting, disciplinary and attendance issues

Personal experiences and involvement with the mentor program:
- Program is critical to stemming off violent behaviors and bullying
- Program helps control "rumors", peer pressure and fighting.
- Mentors help to deal with sensitive issues such as body mutilation or "cutting" and drugs
- Mentors are like having a grown-up friend to talk to and get reliable advice from

Possibilities for improvement with the mentor program:
- Allow mentors to focus on students and not on superfluous duties
- Secure more mentors in schools for students
- Develop a scheduling system with teachers to allow students that request a mentor meeting to do so

Mentor Meetings

WellFlorida staff met with the mentors on three separate occasions to conduct training on mentor data collection and to get feedback on how mentors perceived the program to be operating in 2006-07.

Methodology

The methodology by which the mentor meetings were conducted was informal. In the first meeting, the mentors were trained on contact tracking through the use of the Mentor Contact Log Form (Appendix A). The second meeting occurred during the 2006-07 school term and allowed the mentors to provide progress reports on their school's SDFS activities. It also served as a forum for mentors to ask questions and for WellFlorida staff to provide technical support. The third mentor meeting came at the end of the school year and allowed mentors to share their

concerns, preferences, and other issues that arose during the school year. Mentors dialogued with one another through loose facilitation from WellFlorida staff. Through this informal discussion, many comments and concerns were disclosed.

Overview of Key Findings

Briefly, mentors provided the following insights into mentor program operations during the informal discussions held by WellFlorida staff:

- Mentor concerns:

  A. Many of the students do not feel comfortable or feel their confidentiality will be broken if they discuss alcohol, tobacco or drugs with a mentor or school official.

  B. Mentors reported that school trainings regarding bullying should be conducted to educate both faculty and students of what bullying is and how to address the issue.

  C. Parents of all middle school students should receive an informational letter, brochure or packet describing the SDFS program and the responsibilities of the mentor in each school.

  D. Mentors would like for job description to change and include going into classes and discuss basic life-skills, bullying, impulse control, grades, time management, and how these issues relate to the future. This should be included in the job description to aid in the approach to teachers and principals to utilize the mentors to the best of their abilities.

Again, these comments and concerns were expressed by mentors at various informal meetings between the mentors and WellFlorida staff. An informal survey of mentor opinion was distributed by only a few were completed. They are neither prioritized issues nor recommendations but are reflections of the mentor perceptions on mentor program operations and potential areas of improvement.

Summary of Recommendations

There are a variety of recommendations to consider for further development and impact in the future of the SDFS program. The following section outlines the recommendations made throughout this evaluation including some general comments for clarification of each recommendation.

Recommendation 1. *Ensure that future Evaluation Plans for the Marion County Public Schools Safe and Drug Free Schools Program are thoroughly reviewed to maintain consistency and accuracy of the stated evaluation objectives and project components/deliverables.*

Two of the four objectives could not be fully evaluated due to discrepancies in the Evaluation Plan. The SDFS program liaison should work closely with WellFlorida staff to ensure the accuracy of all future Evaluation Plans, specifically relating to the development of the outcome objectives and baseline information that will be used to measure the effectiveness of the program.

Recommendation 2. *Outcome objectives should be changed to report for original intent of the program and reduce repeat incidences of issues.*

The following changes to the objectives will allow staff to evaluate the programs success at reducing repeat acts of incidences involving bullying and fighting/violence.

- Objective: By June 1, 2008, At least 95% of all students mentored for a bullying issue will not have a repeat bullying incidence after their initial mentor visit for bullying.

Baseline: Each student's individual bullying incidence rate during the school year of note prior to their first individual mentor contact for bullying.

- Objective: By June 1, 2008, At least 95% of all students mentored for a fighting/violence issue will not have a repeat fighting/violence incidence after their initial mentor visit for bullying.

Baseline: Each student's individual fighting/violence incidence rate during the school year of note prior to their first individual mentor contact for bullying.

Recommendation 3. *Mentors should make at least one presentation, as early in the school year as possible, at a full meeting of the faculty and staff for the purpose of presenting the mentor program and the mentors' roles and responsibilities.*

The presentation will allow for increased exposure of the mentors and the mentor program and will provide faculty/staff with an increased understanding of the benefits of the mentor program and how faculty/staff can utilize the mentor program to the benefit of their students.

Recommendation 4. *Fully distribute and collect alcohol, student and faculty surveys.*

Mentors should highly encourage students and faculty to complete surveys and follow-up with individuals to ensure that the surveys are completed and sent in for inclusion within the specified time periods allotted.

Appendices

A. Mentor Contact Log Form

B. Student Responses for Survey of Mentor Effectiveness

C. Faculty/Staff Responses for Survey of Mentor Effectiveness

D. Focus Group Instructions and Questions

Appendix A

Mentor Contact Log Form

2006-2007 MONTLY MENTOR CONTACT LOG

MONTH: MONTH and YEAR				
SCHOOL: NAME Middle School				
PLEASE TYPE INFORMATION IN ALL CAPS				
STUDENT LAST NAME	**STUDENT FIRST NAME**	**STUDENT ID**	**DATE OF CONTACT**	**CONTACT CODE**
LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	XXXXXXXXX	MM/DD/YY	XX

CONTACT CODES
1 = Academic Issues
2 = Tobacco and Other Drugs
3 = Attendance Issues
4 = Bullying
5 = Classroom/Learning Environment Disruption
6 = Family Issues
7 = Fighting/Violence
8 = Non-Violent Peer Conflict Issues
9 = Planning for the Future
10 = Relationship Issues
11= Alcohol
The contact code logged for each contact should reflect the MAIN reason for the mentor contact. DO NOT record multiple codes. Record only one code in the CONTACT CODE column on the mentor log.
Track mentor contacts for the whole month. Monthly mentor logs are due to Shane Bailey by the 5th of the following month.
DO NOT record group mentor contacts as we have done in the past. Record only individual student mentor contacts.
If you have any questions regarding completion of this mentor log, please contact:
Shane Bailey
WellFlorida Council
Phone: (352) 313-6500, Ext. 110
Email: sbailey@wellflorida.org

Appendix B

Student Responses for Survey

of Mentor Effectiveness

Table B1. Student responses to mentor effectiveness survey for nine SDFS Middle Schools in Marion County, 2006-07.

Question	TRUE		FALSE		NOT SURE		NO ANSWER	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
The mentor at my school has helped me do better with my schoolwork and grades.	193.0	65.6	33.0	11.2	66.0	287.0	2.0	0.7
The mentor at my school has helped me get along with my teachers and classmates.	217.0	73.8	35.0	11.9	40.0	13.6	2.0	0.7
The mentor at my school has been helpful to me.	264.0	89.8	5.0	1.7	23.0	7.8	2.0	0.7

Source: Student survey of mentor effectiveness, WellFlorida, 2006-07.

Appendix C

Faculty/Staff Responses

for Survey of Mentor Effectiveness

Table C1. Faculty responses to mentor effectiveness survey for nine SDFS Middle Schools in Marion County.

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Don't Know		No Answer	
Question	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
The mentor has helped make a positive difference with the academic performance of the students with whom he/she is working.	59.0	46.5	38.0	29.9	7.0	5.5	1.0	0.8	22.0	17.3	1.0	0.8
The mentor has helped make a positive difference in the behavior of the students with whom he/she is working.	70.0	55.1	37.0	29.1	5.0	3.9	2.0	1.6	12.0	9.4	1.0	0.8
The mentor is a valuable member of our staff.	81.0	63.8	36.0	28.3	4.0	3.1	1.0	0.8	4.0	3.1	1.0	0.8

Source: Faculty survey of mentor effectiveness, WellFlorida, 2006-07.

Appendix D

Student Alcohol Survey

Table C1. Student responses to mentor effectiveness against alcohol use survey for nine SDFS Middle Schools in Marion County, 2006-07.

Question	TRUE		FALSE		NOT SURE	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
I feel comfortable going to the mentor at my school to discuss alcohol use?	42	68.9	9.0	14.8	10.0	16.4
The mentor at my school has spoke to me about alcohol use?	52.0	85.2	6.0	9.8	3.0	4.9
The mentor at my school has been helpful to me for issues involving alcohol use?	40.0	65.6	6.0	9.8	15.0	24.6
The mentor at my school helps me make decisions not to drink alcohol?	53.0	86.9	3.0	4.9	5.0	8.2

Source: Student survey of mentor effectiveness, WellFlorida, 2006-07.

Appendix E

Focus Group Instruction and Questions

Focus Group Introduction and Questions

Marion County Safe and Drug Free Schools

April 2007

Hello and welcome to our focus group. A focus group is basically just a chance to talk with people who have something in common. So I'd like to thank you for joining our *discussion* group as we try understanding what the mentor program means to each of you.

My name is Shane Bailey and I work with WellFlorida Council. The Council is a group out of Gainesville that is working with the mentor program here in Marion County. The Safe and Drug Free Schools program provides the mentor, _____, which you have in your school. We are working on a report that will show the changes that having a mentor has brought to your school. It is very important that you participate, because what you say will help us better understand _____'s role at the school. The information you give us will be an important part of the final report. Are there any questions about the Council or the project we are doing for the mentor program?

I will be taking notes today to help make the written report of our talk.

All of you were asked to be here because you have worked with _____ in the past. You are not here because you are in trouble. We want to know what you think about the mentor program, how you use it, and any problems that students may have with the mentor. There are no right or wrong answers to any of the questions I am going to ask, and it is ok to disagree with someone else's ideas. Please feel free to tell me what *you* think.

I want to tell you a few rules before we get started. The first rule is that everything you say will stay between us. You have put only your first name on the cards we don't need to know who you are. We will not include your name in the written report. You may notice the tape recorder that is recording what we are saying. This is to make sure that what we write is what you have said, but the tape will be broken once the report is written.

As a second group rule, please do not repeat what we talk about today outside this room. It is important that we trust each other because we want you to feel comfortable talking.

The only other rule that I need you to follow is to speak only one person at a time. We don't want to miss anything anyone says, so it is important to not talk over one another or break into separate conversations.

Are there any questions about the focus group or what we are going to do today?
I have some questions, but they are only to help make sure we cover all of the ideas. I will use them to get us started and to keep our talk going, but you can talk about other things that you might think of along the way. Please feel free to share whatever you think is important for me to understand what the mentor program is at your school.

Are there any other questions?

Okay, let's get started. As a way of warming up, I would like to ask each of you what your favorite hobby is.

1.) When you hear the word “mentor” what comes to mind?

2.) Did you know you have a mentor program at this school? Your mentor is

_____.

3.) What would you tell a friend or a family member about the mentor program at school?

4.) What are some reasons why you would go to the mentor?

5.) What do your friends say about the mentor program? What do your teachers say? Family?

6.) Do you think the mentor program makes a difference at your school? Why or Why Not?

7.) How has the mentor program helped you personally? A friend?

8.) Have you discussed alcohol use with your mentor? How comfortable are you talking about alcohol use with your mentor?

9.) Have you ever discussed smoking or using tobacco with your mentor? How comfortable are you talking about smoking or using tobacco with your mentor?

10.) Can you describe what a "bully" is? Have you ever discussed "bullying" with your mentor?

11.) What is frustrating about the mentor program at your school?

12.) What advice can you give us to improve the mentor program at your school?

13.) Do you have any additional comments, questions, or concerns?