

**NOMINATION FOR THE 2002 HERMAN GOLDSTEIN AWARD  
FOR EXCELLENCE IN PROBLEM-ORIENTED POLICING**



**SUBMITTED BY: ILLINOIS STATE POLICE**

# Table of Contents

---

I. Summary.....	1
II. Description.....	2
<b>A. Scanning</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>B. Analysis</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>1. County Demographics</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>2. Mental Health Survey Concerns School Officials</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>3. Past Practices</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>4. Problem Definition</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<i>Perceived Lack of Sanctions by Criminal Justice System</i>	
<i>Widespread Availability of Alcohol and Drugs</i>	
<i>Limited Community and Parental Involvement</i>	
<i>Low Self-Esteem and Depression</i>	
<b>C. Response</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>1. Identification of Resources</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>2. Formation of Partnership Between Police and Schools</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>3. Funding</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>4. Getting Started (2000-2001)</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<i>Graduated Enforcement</i>	
<i>School Authorization</i>	
<i>Definition of SRO Responsibilities</i>	
<b>5. Program Expansion (2001-2002)</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>D. Assessment</b> .....	<b>12</b>
<b>1. Student Perceptions</b> .....	<b>12</b>
<i>Sense of Safety</i>	
<i>Police and School Efforts</i>	
<b>2. School Incidents</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<b>3. Local Community Endorsement</b> .....	<b>14</b>
<b>4. Conclusions</b> .....	<b>14</b>
III. Reference List.....	16
IV. Agency and Officer Information.....	17
Attachments.....	19
<i>Assessment Tool for Predicting Violent Juvenile Behavior</i>	
<i>Graduated Enforcement</i>	
<i>2002 Illinois State Police, Youth in Crisis Field Guide</i>	
<i>Illinois State Police, Adopt -A-School, Student Survey Summary</i>	

# Summary

---

## *Adopt -A-School*

1. *Scanning.* Illinois State Police (ISP) District 12 saw the need for more adult/youth and police/youth interaction in two, small, downstate communities and formed a local partnership to address growing juvenile misconduct and criminal behavior. Salem, in Marion County, and Vandalia, in Fayette County, Illinois, welcomed additional efforts to reduce serious misconduct occurring in their high schools ~ especially truancy and aggressive behavior.

2. *Analysis.* According to a survey of 8<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> graders in Marion County, more than half of the students who use drugs or alcohol started prior to the 9<sup>th</sup> grade. Students were exposed to bullying, drug and alcohol use, weapons, and sexual advances, but felt the school and police had exerted few sanctions against such behavior. Many of their parents were not involved with the schools at all. Misconduct occurred both on and off campus. The communities did not have a standard protocol for enforcement or referral of troubled or problem juveniles.

3. *Response.* A *dopt-A -School* was the result of a multi-year planning effort by ISP, two local high schools, the court probation units, local police agencies, and mental health groups. With a 2000-2001 grant from the Illinois Violence Prevention Authority, off-duty ISP officers were hired by the schools as School Resource Officers (SROs) to interact with students, design and implement a graduated enforcement protocol, provide classroom teaching, and participate in counseling sessions for students and parents. They provided more than 500 hours of support during the first year, reported 5,900 contacts with students, and participated in 200 counseling sessions with parents, students, and school staff

4. *Assessment* After one year, school administrators in Salem reported an 86 percent reduction in serious misconduct cases, an 85 percent reduction in truancy, and a 90 percent reduction in local police calls to the participating schools. Students at both schools reported less gang-related activity and fewer students saw fights at school or on buses. Vandalia students were well aware of the police/school efforts to address juvenile violence, and felt safer at school after *A dopt-A -School* was implemented. On the other hand, many students at Salem High School felt unsafe at school and perceived the enforcement of rules to be unfair. *This* perception is being addressed during the 2001-2002 school year. Schools, parents, and police are very enthusiastic about this program. Three local police departments now have seven SROs working in the *schools*.

## II. *Description*

---

### A. *Scanning*

In 1999, ISP Sergeant Michael Mobley, District 12, noted that police rarely interacted with youth in Fayette and Marion Counties unless the youths had committed crimes or traffic offenses. Many unhealthy activities such as alcohol and marijuana use, gang interaction, bullying, aggression, truancy, and minor vandalism were not handled or tracked by police — although these other activities were often precursors to more serious offenses. For example, Salem Community High School in Marion County was plagued by approximately 200 truancies per year; but police were not informed, and parents were not consulted about appropriate interventions. When truant students were later implicated in thefts, burglaries, and serious vandalism, local law enforcement agencies responded, but little preventive or follow-up action was taken. School administrators and ISP recognized the need to establish a uniform process for identifying, targeting, and addressing these precursor activities. As a result, they hoped to provide a safer school environment and prevent further, more serious juvenile offences. Communities wanted to increase police presence.

### B. *Analysis*

#### 1. **County Demographics**

District 12 covers a ten-county area in south-central Illinois. According to the 2000 U.S. Census, the combined population of Fayette and Marion Counties is 63,000 residents ~ including more than 4,500 juveniles between the ages of 15 and 19. In 2000, there were 2,140 index crimes but only

102 full-time police officers in these two counties. According to Crime in Illinois 2000, the crime rate for Fayette and Marion Counties respectively was 2,079.7 and 4,228.4 per 100,000 residents.

**Table I : Overview of Target Area, 1999-2000**

	Population (2000)	Full-time Law Enforcement Officers	Total Crime Index		Crime Rate per 100,000 Residents	
			1999	2000	1999	2000
Fayette County	21,802	29	458	446	2,079.7	2,045.7
Vandalia	6,975	13	292	245	4,359.7	3,152.5
Marion County	41,691	73	1,768	1,694	4,228.4	4,063.2
Salem	7,909	14	510	408	6,689.4	5,158.7

Two like-sized communities, Vandalia and Salem, would become the pilot sites for this project. In 2000, Vandalia reported 40 burglaries, 163 thefts, and 8 vehicle thefts. Salem reported 41 burglaries, 352 thefts, and 8 vehicle thefts. Both communities were experiencing problems with juveniles off-campus.

**Table 2: Enrollment and Truancy**

	Enrollment	Chronic Truancy Rate
Vandalia Community High School	518	6.2 percent
Salem Community High School	876	4.4 percent

## 2. Mental Health Survey Concerns School Officials

Illinois State Police District 12 worked with the Marion County Health Department to form the Marion County Health Action Committee (MCHAC). In 1995, the MCHAC, in conjunction with the Southern Illinois University, Research and Development Department and Health and Safety Department, administered a 159-item "adolescent survey" to 1,082 students in 8<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> grades in

the 17 school systems in Marion County. This survey showed that students were exposed to and used alcohol and drugs at a young age, and 12 percent had nobody to talk to about drugs.

School officials in two communities were especially concerned. Both Salem and Vandalia welcomed any additional assistance to address growing violence, substance abuse, and truancy in their schools. Specific behaviors were identified as especially troublesome including: disorderly conduct; bullying; drug use; and, vandalism, which occurred on campus or *en route* to and from school. Both schools expressed interest in forming a School Resource Officer (SRO) Program, but local police departments could not word to dedicate a full-time officer to the schools, nor was school funding earmarked for such a program.

### **3. Past Practices**

In 1999, as part of the "District 12 Safe School Guide," a 20-item checklist for predicting violent juvenile behavior was disseminated and discussed with all schools (see Attachment 1). Also in 1999, the Marion Board of Education implemented a closed campus policy, restricting access to the school and prohibiting students from leaving campus without parental supervision.

The primary *form* of discipline for problem students in both schools was "crisis classes" (akin to in-school detentions). When first-time offenders were assigned to these classes, recidivism was low. Of 124 juveniles in contact with the ISP Juvenile Officer who attended such classes in 1997-1998, none were cited for repeat offenses. Citing this success, school administrators increased referrals. The following year, 471 students from Salem and 450 students from Vandalia schools attended crisis classes.

#### 4. Problem Definition

The adolescent survey was repeated for several years and continued to reflect high student drug use, student vandalism, thefts, and depression. Further, the survey suggested to MCHAC that students did not feel adults cared one way or the other about their behavior, and that students were often unsupervised and, subsequently, were vulnerable to negative peer influences. Also, both schools expressed concern about high truancy rates, which were at 4.4 and 6.2 percent for Salem and Vandalia Community High Schools, respectively (2000). Working with school and mental health officials, Sergeant Mobley identified the following four factors related to criminal behavior by the area's youth:

*Perceived Lack of Sanctions by Criminal Justice System.* The MCHAC survey indicated there were problems with the effectiveness of the local criminal justice agencies. Only one-fifth of the students said illegality was a deterrent to substance use. Further, courts, police, and probation departments influenced only one percent of former users to quit. In many small, rural communities in District 12, when a juvenile committed a criminal offense, a police officer would "pick up" the offending minor, write a "cove?" citation, refer the *youth to the* court system, and move on. While local officers were available to respond to incidents, little preventive contact with students was made.

The judicial process was slow. Most counties had a tremendous backlog of cases with long delays before initial hearings. In fact, the initial hearing might be postponed five months or more after the incident. In 1999, there were 1,800 pending cases in Marion County ranging from curfew violations to murder. Juvenile cases were not a priority. Since police efforts focused on

responding to calls and punishments were delayed, youth felt little judicial impact on their behaviors.

**Widespread Availability of Alcohol and Drugs.** Three-fourths of students surveyed reported illegal substances (ranging from alcohol to controlled prescription drugs) were "easy or fairly easy" to obtain, and more than half said they used these substances. Further, 27 percent said they started using alcohol prior to the 7<sup>th</sup> grade. Despite the high level of substance abuse, the schools and local police did not directly and consistently try to curb students' exposure to older students selling drugs or offering alcohol.

**Table 2: Marion County Students' Access to illegal Substances, 1996-1997**

Students Reporting Substance was Easy/Fairly Easy to Obtain	
Tobacco	76%
Alcohol	73%
Marijuana	54%
Cocaine	29%

**Limited Community and Parental Involvement.** Twenty-four percent of students went home to an empty house, and thirty-four percent of them indicated their parents were not at all involved with the school. On the other hand, when adults, including parents and church members, were available to students, the teens appeared less likely to be involved with gangs and to commit violent acts. Church and family were the two leading reasons students said they stopped using drugs or drinking. Still, there was no community-wide method to identify at-risk youth, to establish ongoing intervention programs, to involve parents, or to refer youth for mental health counseling.

*Low Self Esteem and Depression.* Despite their young age, almost one-third of the students "never felt optimistic." The MCHAC concluded the prevalent use of alcohol and drugs, coupled with the low level of community interest in their activities, were directly related to depression among Marion County youths.

### *C. Response*

#### **1. Identification of Resources**

There was an evident need for added, day-to-day police presence and a community-wide focus on youth. The ISP proposed to formalize a network of local police, schools, parents, and churches as a safety net for vulnerable students. This network would:

- + establish a method for identifying youth at risk for violent behavior;
- + develop and implement programs to overcome those risks, including appropriate parental and police notification, remediation, sanctions, and counseling; and,
- secure funding for programs.

Based on the interest already expressed by school and mental health professionals in Salem and Vandalia, the logical starting place was in those communities. Together, approximately 1,400 senior high school students and 150 staff in the two pilot schools were available to support the initiative. Local police, with just 27 full-time officers, did not initially commit personnel as SROs.

#### **2. Formation of Partnership Between Police and Schools**

The cornerstone of the initiative was the active, formalized partnership of community members. Current partners include: state, county, and local police; youth; parents; schools; communities; probation departments; courts; and, social service agencies. Called *A dopt-A -School*, the plan called

for consistent presence of police in the schools, increased student-officer interaction, and assistance for school administrators to establish protocols for discipline and referrals and inter-agency involvement. The long-term dedication of officers to the schools was intended to convey that misconduct would be taken seriously and that police and administrators cared about the students. Working under contract with each school, officers would identify and deter problem behaviors, allowing educators to focus more on teaching.

Three purposes of *Adopt-A-School* were defined:

- to reduce violence/crime and the fear of violence/crime and related problems in the schools and communities;
- to encourage local police agencies to become more proactively involved with local youth and related problems; and,
- to demonstrate that part-time SROs were a cost-effective deterrent to juvenile misconduct at school, on school buses, and *en route* to and from school.

### **3. Funding**

The partnership was awarded a \$29,400 violence prevention grant from the state-supported Illinois Violence Prevention Authority for the 2000-2001 school year, and later, a \$30,900 grant for the 2001-2002 school year. This grant enabled the project to hire SROs part-time to coordinate the effort, develop procedures, and commence on-campus details.

### **4. Getting Started (2000-2001)**

Starting in July 2000, protocols for graduated enforcement and maintenance of juvenile records were established. SRO responsibilities were specified. In the fall, ten ISP officers became certified Juvenile Officers, trained as SROs, and hired by the schools.

*Graduated Enforcement.* School administrators, probation departments, and ISP developed and implemented a graduated enforcement protocol for student misconduct, which outlined when police and parents were to be called. Actively involved in its design were students, teachers, local police, state's attorneys, and parents (see Attachment 2). This protocol complemented the existing discipline code for on-campus infractions and truancy. The graduated enforcement protocol also included a "Youth in Crisis Field Guide," a one-page overview of statutory and custody requirements (see Attachment 3).

*School Authorization.* To meet statutory restrictions on dissemination of juvenile criminal records, each school was required to form a School Law Enforcement Unit and create a "subject" file as authorized in the United States Code, Annotated.<sup>1</sup> Student information was shared between the SRO and the School Law Enforcement Unit in accordance with the Illinois Compiled Statutes.<sup>1</sup>

*Definition of SRO Responsibilities.* Since the *Adopt -A-School* SROs were off duty ISP officers, proposed activities were reviewed in light of statutory requirements and ISP chain-of-command issues. Statutes governing juvenile files and inter-agency communication about juvenile suspects required special attention. A "School Resource Officer Guide" was developed and presented to officers during training. The plan called for SROs to provide coverage for approximately five hours per week at each school. Working under the shared direction of ISP District 12 command and the respective school superintendents, SROs served four basic functions — enforcement, counseling, teaching, and technical assistance.

---

<sup>1</sup> 20USCA: 123 2g(a)(4)(B)(ii).

105ILCS 1016(a)(6.5).

- + *Enforcement.* The SROs patrolled hallways, parking lots, and routes to and from school, looking for disruptive conduct and violations of school rules. In addition to increased visibility, which was in itself a deterrent, the SROs often spoke with students and knew them by name. Older students were less open about approaching younger students when a police officer was nearby. Both on-campus and off campus, SRO presence ensured students safe passage to and from school.

When students violated school rules, they were immediately assessed against the graduated enforcement protocol. Parents, counselors, and police were contacted and were involved in the students' intervention. When gang-related behavior was observed, SROs were required to submit an ISP form called the "ISP Notification of Gang Behavior".

Two ISP K-9 Officers conducted thirty searches on campus during the nine-month school period. The SROs were required to meet the standard of "reasonable suspicion" rather than "probable cause" to effect a search on campus.'

*Counseling.* The SROs talked regularly with students about problem behaviors, and reminded them of community expectations. The SROs provided guidance to students, parents, teachers, and staff. They also linked families to support services both inside and outside of the school. Another component of counseling was listening to and reassuring students who appeared troubled or afraid.

---

<sup>3</sup> *Vernonia v. Sch. Dist.47Jv. Acton*, 132L.Ed.2d 564,115 S.Ct. 2386 (1995) and *People v. Pruitt*, 278111. App 3d 194, 662 N.E.2d 540 (1st Dist. 1996).

- *Teaching.* The SROs presented classroom lectures on traffic and personal safety, the legal process, and Illinois laws. The officers were also available to answer students' questions which arose from day-to-day.
- *Technical Assistance.* The SROs provided technical and administrative assistance to the community on system-wide interventions. They trained officers, outlined SRO duties, and assisted with establishing appropriate and legal protocols. Sergeant Mobley also wrote correspondence and grant applications on behalf of the partnership.

**Table 3: First -Year Outputs  
SRO Activity- in 2001-2002**

<b>Hours Worked</b>	530
Student Contacts	5,95
Administration Cases Handled	181
Number of Presentations	54
Number of Students/Parents Counseled	200
Reports Filed	8
K-9 Searches conducted for Drugs and Weapons	30
Students Expelled for Violence, Weapons, or Drugs	

**5. Program Expansion (2001-2002)**

After the initial success, six local police agencies eventually requested to participate. The Salem Police Department assigned one officer full-time as a community/school resource officer (not grant-funded). Four Fayette County deputies were trained in anticipation of becoming SROs, and two Vandalia Police officers attended Juvenile Officer School and will expand Adopt-A -School to the Vandalia Junior High School.

## ***D. Assessment***

### **1. Student Perceptions**

In the spring of 2000, and again in 2001, a 37-item survey was administered at both pilot schools (see Attachment 4). Results were mixed:

*Sense of Safety.* Forty percent of Salem students felt safe at school all of the time, considerably fewer than a year before, while almost three-fourths of Vandalia students reported feeling safe at school all of the time.

- More Salem Community High School students reported racial conflicts and had been threatened or received unwanted sexual advances than a year earlier. More students thought drugs were acquired easily. They were more likely to think truancy and vandalism were problems. On the other hand, they witnessed fewer fights on buses or at school, and were less likely to think fellow students were gang members.
- More Vandalia students reported they had observed tobacco and drug use on and around campus than a year earlier, but did not think drugs were any easier to obtain. Fewer students were threatened, had to fight to protect themselves, or saw fights on the bus. Most thought that very few fellow students were gang members or that misconduct was gang-related.

---

<sup>a</sup> School officials attributed this insecurity and some of the expressed negativism to an in-school bomb threat which had occurred one week before the survey. A short time after the survey, investigators quickly arrested two juveniles, who were subsequently expelled.

***Police and School Efforts.*** More students at both schools thought police were working with the schools to correct problems but the perceived effectiveness and fairness of those efforts was in doubt.

- . Forty-four percent of Salem students thought schools and police were doing all they could to identify and address crime at school; only 30 percent thought the courts, police, and probation departments were effective; and, only half thought rules were enforced fairly at school or in the community.
- However, at Vandalia, 60 percent of students thought school and police were doing all they could, and slightly more than half thought the courts, police and probation departments were a deterrent to criminal behavior. An overwhelming 85 percent (20 percent more than a year earlier) thought rules were enforced fairly *in their community*. Only 43 percent thought rules were enforced fairly *in school and* thought school officials followed up on disturbances.

## 2. **School Incidents**

*Violence, drug use, and truancy*were*greatly reduced* at both schools.

- Students at Salem Community High School reported: 86 percent fewer serious misconduct cases, including disorderly conduct, verbal assault, fighting, possession of drugs/paraphernalia; 80 percent fewer after-lunch truancies (from 198 to 40); 85 percent fewer overall truancies, and 90 percent fewer local police calls to the school for assistance.'

---

<sup>5</sup> Comparison, 1999-2000 and 2000-2001.

- Teachers at Vandalia were sending more students to the office for discipline but expulsions for major infractions actually decreased. Expulsions for alcohol use, truancy, and drug possession decreased 100 percent, 68 percent, and 50 percent, respectively.<sup>6</sup>
- More than 90 percent of the juvenile problems which surfaced during the first year were addressed outside of the court system. Problems were immediately identified, and appropriate sanctions or treatments were imposed with the help of the school, parents, and counselors.
- Chronic truancy increased from 6.2 to 7.0 percent at Vandalia but decreased from 4.4 percent to 1.0 percent at Salem.

Increased seat belt use was a secondary, unanticipated benefit. After the closed-campus and graduated enforcement programs were implemented at Salem, student seat belt use increased to 99 percent and there were no vehicle crashes over the lunch period.

### **3. Local Community Endorsement**

Not only did school officials and parents demonstrate their support, but six local departments have asked to participate and seven new SROs have been identified. Only two parents challenged the discipline imposed on their children.

### **4. Conclusions**

Police and schools can be an effective deterrent without involving the already backlogged court system. However, when officials and administrators take stronger disciplinary action, students may *think* the discipline is not fair.

---

<sup>6</sup> First quarter results only.

Illinois State Board of Education, School Report Cards, 2000-2001.

- . Using classroom instruction or written materials, police and schools need to inform students about the need for and results of the enforcement policies to help students to feel safer. Not only do *A dopt-A-School* partners want the schools to be safer, but they want the students and staff to *feel* safe. In Salem, in particular, officials need to address the *perceived* safety and violence in light of the *actual* number of incidents.
- Police and schools need to be more visible in their presence and response, and ensure even-handed enforcement. More local police presence may also reassure students that the community-wide efforts are substantial, effective, and *fair*.
- The cost of implementation can be offset by reduced absenteeism which will result in increased state funding, fewer police calls for service, and more teacher focus on education. The cost of maintaining an SRO program for five hours each week is approximately \$15,000 per year, or less than \$22 per year, per student.

### III. *Reference List*

---

#### *Academic Sources and Studies*

Marion County Health Action Committee, Adolescent Survey, 1995 - Drug and Alcohol Use, Southern Illinois University, Research and Development Department and Health and Safety Department

Resource Guide for Creating Positive Programs for Addressing Juveniles in Communities, Approaches for Schools and Police, Education and Law Enforcement Partnership Committee of Southwest Illinois

#### *Other Sources, Consultations*

Alton School System, Alton, Illinois; Resource Officer Program  
National Association of School Resource Officers, Boynton Beach, Florida  
Park Forest, Illinois Police Department; Police Liaison Program  
Regional Superintendent of Schools Marion, Washington, Clinton Counties; Discipline Procedures

#### *Other Sources and Printed Material*

Belleville Consolidated School System, Belleville, Illinois; Discipline Policy  
Bloomington, Illinois; Police School Resource Officer Guide  
Collinsville, Illinois; School Discipline Policy  
Illinois Attorney General; Legal Guidelines for Schools  
Illinois State Police; Use of Force Continuum  
Illinois Revised Statutes; Juvenile and School Laws  
Nashville, Illinois; Police School Resource Officer Guide  
Regional Institute of Community Policing, Springfield, Illinois; Community Policing Guide  
Salem Community High School; Policies and Procedures  
Scottsdale Arizona Police Department; School Resource Officer Policies and Procedures  
State of New York, Police Juvenile Association; School Resource Officer Instructor Curriculum Guide  
Vandalia Community High School; Policies and Procedures

## *IV. Agency and Officer Information*

---

**1 .At what level of the police organization was this problem-solving initiative adopted (e.g., the entire department, a few select officers, etc.)?**

The project was defined and implemented by ISP District 12, including the involvement of district command. Ten off-duty ISP Juvenile Officers worked as SROs in each of the target schools. In 2001-2002, the program was expanded to three other police departments.

**2. Did officers or management receive any training in problem-oriented policing and/or problem solving before this project began or during its execution?**

All ISP cadets receive eight hours of community policing training, which includes a four-hour block on problem-solving. Sergeant Mobley, one of the original 67 dedicated ISP Community Policing Officers and a Violence Prevention Specialist, received 80 hours of community policing training in 1996. Further, all officers hired before 1996 received four- to eight-hour blocks of problem-oriented policing training in 1999.

**3. Were additional incentives given to police officers who engaged in problem solving?**

No financial incentives are provided to officers who participate in problem-solving. There are, however, some indirect benefits, including working with the schools, local communities, etc. The ISP also sponsors an annual Problem-Oriented Policing (POP) program, which allows six teams of officers to showcase their POP projects and compete for special recognition.

ISP officers participating in this project were reimbursed at the overtime rate for "hireback" details at the schools.

**4. What resources and guidelines (manuals, past problem-solving examples, etc.) were used, if any, by police officers to help them manage this problem-solving initiative?**

- ISP Safe Schools Unified Emergency School Contingency Plan
- ISP Problem-Oriented Policing Form Guidelines
- ISP School Resource Officer Guide

**5. What issues/problems were identified with the problem-oriented policing model or the problem-solving model?**

None.

**6. What general resources (financial and/or personnel) were committed to this project, and of those resources, what went beyond the existing department budget?**

One Sergeant worked approximately eight hours per week in establishing the program, submitting grant applications and compiling end-of-year reports. All enforcement hours were paid from an annual grant of approximately \$30,000.

**7. Project Contact Person:**

<b>a. Name</b>	Michael L. Mobley
<b>b. Rank</b>	Sergeant
<b>c. Address</b>	Illinois State Police District 12 401 Industrial Drive, Suite A
<b>d. City/State</b>	Effingham, Illinois 62401
<b>e. Phone</b>	217-347-2711
<b>f Fax</b>	217-347-2740
<b>g. E-mail</b>	michael_mobley@isp.state.il.us

**Assessment Tool for Predicting Violent Juvenile Behavior  
from the National School Safety Center**

1. Has a history of tantrums and uncontrollable angry outbursts.
2. Characteristically resorts to name calling, cursing, or abusive language.
3. Habitually makes violent threats when angry.
4. Has previously brought a weapon to school.
5. Has a background of serious disciplinary problems at school and in the community.
6. Has a background of drug, alcohol, or other substance abuse or dependency.
7. Is on the fringe of his/her peer group with few or no close friends.
8. Is preoccupied with weapons, explosives, or other incendiary devices.
9. Has previously been truant, suspended, or expelled from school.
10. Displays cruelty to animals.
11. Has little or no supervision and support from parents or a caring adult.
12. Has witnessed or been a victim of abuse or neglect in the home.
13. Has been bullied and/or bullies or intimidates peers or younger children.
14. Tends to blame others for difficulties and problems she or he causes her/himself.
15. Consistently prefers TV shows, movies, or music expressing violent themes and acts.
16. Prefers reading materials dealing with violent themes, rituals, and abuse.
17. Reflects anger, frustration, and the dark side of life in school essays, or writing projects.
18. Is involved with gang or an antisocial group, on the fringe of peer acceptance.
19. Is often depressed and/or has significant mood swings.
20. Has threatened or attempted suicide.

Answer Key: Each affirmative answer is assigned five points. Add the total affirmative answers to determine this youth's level of risk for juvenile violence.

5 - 20: Youngster is potentially at risk for juvenile misbehavior.

25 - 50: Youngster is at risk and needs a significant amount of positive support, mentoring, role modeling and positive skill building.

**55 and above:** Youngster is a "ticking time bomb." The child and his or her immediate family is at risk; get some help immediately. Seek support from law enforcement, social and health services, parenting classes and the family court or other youth-serving professionals.

## Graduated Enforcement

1. First Minor Offense (minor violations occurring on school property, minor traffic, ordinance violations, school code violations and others as defined by the school handbook) will be handled administratively by the school. Infractions will result in placement in a crisis class or similar corrective measure.

The SRO will complete an *ISP Juvenile Process Form* and forward it to the Juvenile Coordinator at ISP District 12 headquarters.

The School Law Enforcement Unit would contact the parents and document the incident in the Law Enforcement Unit File.

2. Second and Subsequent Violations. The affected student will be placed in a crisis class or similar corrective measure as school code directs, processed as the crime dictates (*see reference statutes*), and referred to the School Law Enforcement Unit. The unit will take either of the following actions:
  - If applicable, an ISP citation will be completed for an Illinois Statute violation and, if *applicable*, a juvenile report will be completed for the violation. The information will then be provided to the county juvenile probation officer for diversion (*see Youth in Crisis Field Guide*).
  - If applicable, an ISP citation will be completed for a city ordinance violation and provided to the city attorney for prosecution. If required, a juvenile report will be completed for the violation.
3. Felonies and Misdemeanors. All felonies and misdemeanors will be investigated and handled according to the Juvenile Court Act.705ILCS.

## 2002 Illinois State Police - Youth in Crisis Field Guide

Category	Required Police Action	Custody Requirements				
		Custody Type	Juvenile Officer	Crisis Intervention	DCFS*	Probation
L. DELINQUENT MINOR (Criminal Offense) [705 ILCS 405/5-10_5]						
A. UNDER AGE 10	Release to parent/guardian or appropriate custodian. No secure detention for a delinquent minor under age 10 = 6 hours hold.	Temporary Custody Non-Secure	YES	YES	NO	YES IF Incarcerated
B. AGE 10 THROUGH 16	Secure custody allowed for: 6 hours (ages 10 & 11) 12 hours (ages 12 - 16) 24 hours (for Violent Crime)	Arrest Custody Secure	YES	NO	NO	YES IF Incarcerated
IL STATUS OFFENSES (Ex-pi 111 mat Consumption of Alcohol)						
A. UNDER AGE 17	Notice to Appear	Custody Non-Secure	YES	NO	NO	NO
B. 17 AND OVER	Process as an adult; Cash, I-Bond, NTA		NO	NO	NO	NO
III. MRAI Minor Requiring Authoritative Intervention (runaway) 05 ILCS 40513-3]						
UNDER AGE 18	Notify parents/guardians: attempt to reunify family 6 hour time limit from first encounter	Limited Custody Non-Secure	YES	YES	NO	NO
A. Parents accept youth	Release to parent/guardian	Limited	YES	YES	NO	NO
B. Parents accept youth but youth refuses to return home.	Turn youth over to Crisis Intervention Service "	Limited	YES	YES	NO	NO
C. Parents/Guardians cannot be contacted.	Turn youth over to Crisis Intervention Service "	Limited	YES	YES	NO	NO
IV. DEPENDENT Minor UNDER AGE 18 1705 ILCS 4051241						
Parent cannot care for child (e.g. parents arrested and cannot care for youth)	Turn youth over to DOES or Crisis Intervention Service	"Possible" Protective Custody Non-Secure	NO	YES	YES	NO
V. NEGLECTED OR ABUSED MINOR 05 ILCS 405/2-31						
UNDER AGE 18	Call Child Abuse Hotline (800) 252-2873	"Possible" Protective Custody Non-Secure	YES ISP Policy	NO	YES	NO
VI. LOCKOUT [705 ILCS 40512-31 (7)(1) ILCS 4052-41						
A. AGES 11 THROUGH 17 Youth reports lockout and wants to return home, and parent accept youth home.	Notify and release youth to parents/guardians	"Possible" Protective Custody Non-Secure	NO	NO	NO	NO
B. AGES 11 THROUGH 17 Parents refuse to accept youth or cannot be contacted	Turn youth over to Crisis Intervention Service "	Protective Custody Non-Secure	NO	YES	NO	NO
C. UNDER AGE 11	Call Child Abuse Hotline (800) 252-2873	Protective Custody Non-secure	NO	YES	YES	NO

\* Illinois Department of Children and Family Services  
" Hudson Home

**Illinois State Police *Adopt-A-School***  
**Student Survey Summary May 2000 - May 2001**

		Salem Community High School		Vanrialia Community High School		Change		
Number of Students Responding		71	66	<u>300</u>	<u>170</u>			
In your opinion, are the following a problem at your school?		Pre	Post			Post	SCHS	VCHS
1.	Alcohol	Yes	54%	59%	49%	48%	+5	-1
2.	Drugs	Yes	69%	70%	41%	50%	+1	+9
3.	Gangs	Yes	7%	6%	8%	2%	-1	-6
4.	Racial Conflicts	Yes	17%	24%	18%	13%	+7	-5
5.	Tobacco	Yes	75%	75%	56%	52%	0	4
6.	Truancy	Yes	33%	42%	36%	42%	+9	+6
7.	Weapons, guns, knives, etc.	Yes	3%	12%	11%	6%	+9	-5
8.	Vandalism	Yes	36%	59%	28%	16%	+23	-12
9.	Violence	Yes	37%	38%	32%	22%	+1	-10
10.	I have had things stolen from me at school.	Yes	27%	36%	49%	48%	+9	-1
11.	I have had money or things taken from me by force.	Yes	1%	5%	6%	5%	+4	-1
12.	I have been physically threatened.	Yes	21%	27%	24%	20%	+6	-4
13.	I have had to fight to protect myself	Yes	11%	9%	15%	9%	-2	
14.	I have been physically hurt or injured at school due to others.	yes	6%	9%	13%	9%	+3	-1
15.	I have had unwelcome sexual advances or propositions at school.	Yes	9%	18%	13%	15%	+9	+2
16.	I have witnessed fights at school.	Yes	84%	75%	75%	75%	-9	0
17.	I have witnessed fights on the school bus.	Yes	14%	9%	36%	17%	-5	-19

Attachment 4 continued

		Salem Community High School		Vandalia Community High School		Change	
		Pre	Post	Pre	Post	SCHS	VCHS
		18. I have seen students carrying a <b>weapon: Gun, Knife, Club, Chemical (mace)</b> at school or on the bus.	Yes	19%	20%	30%	25%
19. I have seen students possessing or using illegal <b>drugs</b> , during school hours, at or around the school, or on the bus.	Yes	39%	47%	33%	38%	+8	+5
20. I have seen students possessing or using <b>Alcohol</b> during school hours, at or around the school, or on the bus.	Yes	26%	26%	20%	20%	0	0
21. I have seen students possessing or using <b>Tobacco</b> products, during school hours, at or around the school, or on the bus.	Yes	77%	79%	70%	77%	+2	+7
22. Is there a process or place in your school for students to report disruptions such as: crime, violence, bullies, threats, problems, etc.?	Yes	97%	83%	78%	74%	-14	4
23. Do school staff or <i>officials</i> follow up on reports of disruptions?	yes	74%	74%	73%	59%	0	-14
24. Do the Police in your area appear to work with the school to identify and correct these problems?	Yes	61%	68%	68%	81%	+7	+13
25. In your estimation, what percentage of the school population have been involved with "gang" related activities such as: drugs, parties, weapons, social gatherings, etc.	None	10%	17%	39%	85%	+7	+46
	<25%	30%	23%	42%	87%	-7	+45
	25%	11%	12%	36%	23%	+1	-13
	50%	19%	18%	22%	25%	-1	+3
	75%	30%	30%	4%	0%	0	-10
	>75%	0	0	7%	5%	0	-2
26. To what extent are gangs involved with disruptions at your school: fights, disturbances, thefts, violence, or drugs.	None	47%	40%	71%	85%	-7	+14
	<25%	41%	41%	42%	49%	0	+7
	25%	11%	06%	25%	15%	-5	-10
	50%	1%	5%	17%	8%	+4	-9
	75%	0%	5%	4%	0%	+5	-4
	>75%	0	0	7%	5%	0	-2

**Attachment 4 continued**

	Salem Community High School		Vandalia Community High School		Change		
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	SCHS	VCHS	
27. Does the school administration seem aware of the extent of any gang problems in the school and communities?	<i>Yes</i>	45%	48%	45%	43%	+3	-2
28. Does the school administration have clear guidelines for reporting and handling gang and violence problems in the school and surrounding communities?	<i>Yes</i>	68%	67%	60%	60%	-1	0
29. Does it appear the police work in and around the school on a regular basis to suppress: gang, violence, and drug activities?	<i>Yes</i>	59%	55%	67%	74%		+7
30. Do you believe that the school administration and police are doing all they can to identify and address: gang or gangs, violence, and drug problems in and around the schools.	<i>Yes</i>	45%	44%	53%	60%	-1	+7
31. Would you say it was EASY or HARD for people under age 18 to get Illegal drugs: including alcohol and tobacco AT SCHOOL?	<i>Easy</i>	67%	76%	72%	73%	+9	+1
32. Would you say it is EASY or HARD for people under age 18 to get Illegal drugs: including alcohol and tobacco?	<i>Easy</i>	90%	94%	84%	86%	+4	+2
33. In your opinion, have the Police and Courts been effective at deterring: violence, crime, drugs, and gangs at your school and community?	<i>Yes</i>	37%	30%	53%	55%	-7	+2
34. Do you know of any students that say they are gang members?	<i>Yes</i>	13%	18%	25%	18%	+5	-7
35. In general, how fairly do you think the rules and laws are enforced at school?	<i>Fairly</i>	64%	53%	66%	43%	-11	-23
36. In general, how fairly do you think the rules and laws are enforced in your community?	<i>Fairly</i>	73%	50%	65%	85%	-23	+20
37. I feel safe at school all the time.	<i>Yes</i>	66%	40%	72%	73%	-26	+1