



**TITLE IV: Safe and Drug Free Schools  
Annual Program Report  
Anchorage School District**

---

**CENTRAL SCHOOL OF SCIENCE  
1405 E STREET  
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501  
(907)742--5100**

**Coordinator** ROBERT ATKINSON  
**Phone Number** (907) 742-5118  
**Email** Atkinson\_Robert@asdk12.org  
**Date** Wednesday, October 22, 2008

---

**What methods did you use to report the results of your grant to interested members of the public? Some examples would be your school newsletter, parents' meeting, or your school web site.**

Teachers were first informed at a faculty meeting and a report will go out in the final newsletter of the year.

**Major Accomplishment**

The grant money was used this year to fund a portion of the Lunch With Myself (LWM) program. We initially tried to make the program more of a task based model and we immediately discovered that it was defeating the purpose of the program. The purpose is to modify behavior by taking away their lunchtime social period. The program was an effective deterrent for most of the students assigned LWM however, a small percentage of students failed to change their behavior no matter what was tried.

**Students Served**

<b>Elementary</b>	0
<b>Middle School</b>	250
<b>High School</b>	0

**Services and Activities Provided:**

During this school year, our school provided the following activities:

- After-School or before-school programs
  - Community service projects
  - Curriculum acquisition or development
  - Drug prevention instruction
  - Parent education/involvement
  - Special, one-time events (Please describe below)
  - Teacher/staff training
  - Violence prevention instruction
1. We conducted two sessions of Three-Day Science Intensives where nothing was taught but science.
  2. We participated in the annual Mix-It-Up Day sponsored by the Southern Poverty Law Center.
  3. We offer an after school homework center funded by Indian Education.
  4. Students have access to the library starting at 7:30 in the morning.
  5. The first three days of school were utilized for team building, outside picnic, and a spirit rally.
  6. We had more assemblies with more variety of talent than we've had in the last 10 years.
  7. We had our first play production in years.
  8. 17 students participated in the Native Youth Olympics (NYO) and two went to the state finals.
  - 
  -

**Specialized Program Use**

Our school used the following specialized program(s):

- Life Skills Training
- 40 Developmental Assets Framework
- Aggressors, Victims and Bystanders

**Coordination**

Our school's drug and violence prevention program coordinates with the following other agencies and organizations for the services

indicated:

Law enforcement officials

- Joint Service Delivery, Referrals
- Teacher, Staff Training

Parent group(s)

- Advisory Council
- Fund Raising

## **Student and Parent Involvement**

Students **were not** involved in design, delivering, or critiquing drug or violence prevention programs.

Parents **were not** involved in design, delivering, or critiquing drug or violence prevention programs.

## **Activity Reports**

### **Coordinator Addendum**

#### **Brief Description**

My job was to coordinate the Lunch With Myself (LWM) program and fulfill the grant writing requirements.

The Lunch With Myself (LWM) program was established to modify students classroom behavior. Typically, morning detentions were assigned to students that disrupted classroom learning. Morning detention is effective for students whose parents have a way to drive them to school 30 minutes before school starts. A good number of students can't get to school in time for morning detention so LWM was established to fill the needs of these students. What we found was that teachers would much rather assign LWM than a morning detention because they don't have to write out the detention report or call the parents. When a student misbehaves now, all the teacher has to do is announce the LWM to the student and email me with the information. I have them report to the lunch detention and I call and inform the parents of what happened. The detention is recorded in their student center account.

#### **Needs Assessment**

- a. None uses

#### **Evaluation Methods**

- a. None used

#### **Data Summary**

No Data

#### **Other Comments**

The program has proven to be very popular with the teachers and very unpopular with the students.

### **Lunch with Myself**

#### **Brief Description**

The Lunch With Myself (LWM) program was established to modify students classroom behavior. Typically, morning detentions were assigned to students that disrupted classroom learning. Morning detention is effective for students whose parents have a way to drive them to school 30 minutes before school starts. A good number of students can't get to school in time for morning detention so LWM was established to fill the needs of these students. What we found was that teachers would much rather assign LWM than a morning detention because they don't have to write out the detention report or call the parents. When a student misbehaves now, all the teacher has to do is announce the LWM to the student and email me with the information. I have them report to the lunch detention and I call and inform the parents of what happened. The detention is recorded in their student center account.

#### **Needs Assessment**

- a. We utilized the SCCS of 2008 to determine that more work is needed in the Social and Emotional Skills arena. Social and Emotional Learning: This factor reflects students' ability to think about the consequences of their actions and to empathize with
- b. Social and Emotional Learning scores utilizing the SCCS of 2008 showed Central lagging behind Overall Middle Schools and the District scores.

#### **Evaluation Methods**

- a. The evaluation tool was a pre and post survey. The pre-survey had 60 respondents and the post-survey had 62 responses.

#### **Data Summary**

An email attachment was sent to Becky Severson.

Here are the Pre and Post Survey Questions.

Pre Survey are on the first set of Yes/No % tables. Post Survey are on the second set of Yes/No % tables. The third line shows the percentage increase or decrease between pre and post surveys.

1. Are you in charge of your behavior? Yes 98.3% No 1.7% Yes 100% No 0% +1.7% -1.7%
2. Are you responsible for your behavior in the classroom? Yes 98.3% No 1.7% Yes 93.5% No 6.5% -4.8% +4.8%
3. Do you have a choice in how you behave? Yes 86.6% No 13.4% Yes 77.4% No 22.5% -11.2% +11.2%
4. Is there a link between your behavior and you being in Lunch With Myself? Yes 55% No 45% Yes 62.9% No 37.1 +7.9% -7.9%
5. Does your behavior affect those around you in school? Yes 53.3% No 46.7% Yes 58% No 42% +4.7% -4.7%
6. Do you think the Lunch With Myself program improves your behavior? Yes 51.6% No 48.4% Yes 33.8% No 66.1%
  
7. Do you think the Lunch With Myself program should be cancelled and that we bring back more early morning detentions? Yes 15% No 85% Yes 33.8% No 66.1% +18.8% -18.8%
  
8. Would you prefer a full day of ISS or just one day of Lunch With Myself? ISS 11.6% LWM 88.3% ISS 27.4% LWM 72.6% +15.8% -15.8%

My analysis of each question follows:

Question one was to establish who they thought was running their lives. They increased their percentage to 100% of being in charge in the post survey.

Question two related to their behavior in class and once again it was to establish who was in charge of them in the classroom. There was a slight drop in accepting responsibility for their classroom behavior in the post survey.

Question three was still in the positive range regarding choice in behavior. There was a noticeable jump in students not taking responsibility for the choices they make during the post survey taken in the lunchroom. I believe the lunchroom location where the post survey was taken influenced this negative outcome.

Question four saw a jump in what I call the "learning curve" with respect to their actions and consequences. The uptick in understanding the link between their behavior and getting LWM is what we hoped would happen.

Question five saw a small change moving in the positive direction in understanding how their behavior affects those around them in school.

Question six could be interpreted several ways. My personal favorite is that they hated LWM so much, that they wanted to say it didn't improve their behavior so that we'll try another approach other than LWM. The other way of viewing it is that the program is not effective in changing behavior. All the teachers input I've heard is that it is an excellent for instantly modifying the whole classrooms behavior and questions four and five post survey responses support this.

Question seven once again shows that they really don't like the LWM program. My observation is that the shift towards bringing back morning detentions demonstrates their disdain for the LWM program.

Question eight is another noticeable percentage bump saying that they would rather have ISS than lose a lunch time with their friends.

### Other Comments

The activity was a success according to the teachers. The program is not liked by the students if you review the pre and post surveys. What we hear from the teachers is that once they give one person a LWM, the rest of the class straightens up for the remainder of the period. What we hear from the students is that they hate it because it robs them of their lunchtime social with their friends. What we want from the program is for them to modify their disruptive behavior or deal with the consequences.

There are a certain number of students that won't modify their behavior no matter what intervention tool we utilize. When they get a LWM from a teacher they often say "I don't care. Give me another. LWM is fun." When they start to back talk and continue to disrupt the classroom they are removed and a more serious consequence is mandated. Approximately 12 students have received over 20 lunchtime detentions. They are the same students that have received numerous ISS and OSS referrals.

Beginning March 16th, I gave 60 students on their first lunch detention the pre-survey to fill out. Then for the post survey on April 29 (eight grade) and April 30 (for the 7th grade) I handed it to the same students in the lunchroom. This was a mistake. What I saw occurring was students sitting next to them adding input to the student specific survey. I don't think the data is as accurate a notation from the students surveyed as a "one person at a time" due to the added influence from the friends sitting next to them in the lunchroom.

LWM is also utilized as a passing time behavior and dress code modifier. If students are causing a ruckus or walking around with their pants sagging way too low, or wearing too long tee shirts, they are warned first and then if requests are not followed through with, they will be given a LWM. Even though they have been warned, the LWM always comes as a surprise. The usual response is them showing a degree of disgust and disbelief.