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Introduction

The School, Family, and Community Partnership Process was designed as an integrated, school-based intervention for improving the outcomes of children served in classrooms for students who have emotional and behavioral disorders. A quasi-experimental design was developed in order to evaluate the effectiveness of the partnership process in improving outcomes for participating students. Students were in a special Education program for students who have emotional disturbances at two comparable middle schools and their parents served as the participants. TEWMS (N = 23) served as the intervention site while RBSMS (N = 24) was the comparison school. Data were collected at baseline, 12, and 18 months. The purpose of this paper is to:

Method

The intervention consisted of the implementation of the School, Family and Community Partnership Process (Duchnowski, Kutash, & Rudo, 1997). This approach was based on concepts fundamental to the System of Care (Stroul & Friedman, 1986) and Wraparound (Burns & Goldman, 1999), and emphasized a focus on strengths, families as equal decision-making partners, and cultural competency. Training sessions were conducted.

Results

Comparability of Schools and Staff at Baseline

The experimental and comparison schools were similar in the population from which they drew their students, school size, number of students served in programs for emotional disturbances, and... At the comparison school... the CBCL (t = 2.59, p = .02; t =... stayed (RBSMS-S). There was also...

Discussion

The overall baseline results indicate no significant differences between the intervention and comparison schools, and the...
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Table 1 Input and Output Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Variable Type</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inputs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth population</td>
<td>Non-discretionary</td>
<td>12,435</td>
<td>25,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty (%)</td>
<td>Non-discretionary</td>
<td>19.01</td>
<td>8.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita income ($)</td>
<td>Non-discretionary</td>
<td>21,871</td>
<td>5,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential episodes</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-residential episodes</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures ($1,000)</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
<td>1,266</td>
<td>3,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outputs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth served</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-pool-funded FAPT</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool-funded FAPT</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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