Case Study Methods

Purpose

The purpose of conducting state case studies was to describe the current status of juvenile justice education, and ways in which NCLB has impacted these systems and services. The case studies had four main objectives.

1. Collecting information and data from states to begin the development of a National Information Clearinghouse for the field
2. Evaluating and reporting the current national state of juvenile justice education post NCLB
3. Assessing how well states have implemented NCLB requirements in their juvenile justice education systems and determine the extent to which NCLB has impacted the services and outcomes of the states’ delinquent population
4. Determining the impact that the Juvenile Justice NCLB Collaboration Project had on states’ implementation of NCLB

Prior survey results revealed variation across states with respect to the type of state agencies responsible for juvenile justice education as well as the level of administrative centralization within states. States were selected based upon the degree of administrative centralization for juvenile justice education services and the size of the state’s juvenile justice population.

Methods

The objective of the on-site data collection was to obtain detailed descriptions of states’ policies, practices, and accountability efforts regarding the implementation of NCLB requirements. Site visit methods included developing a pre-site visit report based on each state’s 2006 and 2007 survey responses. This information included the state’s juvenile justice organizational structure and a description of their NCLB implementation impediments and strategies. State’s primary contacts were interviewed by phone to request documents and identify personnel to interview during the visit. The site visits consisted of interviewing key personnel and gathering state level documents that related to NCLB policies, accountability, outcomes, and data. The development of interviews and documentation review methods was guided by prior survey and conference results.

In regards to the data clearinghouse, the site visits served as a feasibility study in determining the type of information states have that would contribute to the clearinghouse. This included reviewing states’ monitoring or evaluation standards for juvenile justice schools; department evaluation reports, legislative reports, and annual reports; and state laws and agency polices relating to juvenile justice education and NCLB.

Methods also determined the extent to which major NCLB requirements had been implemented, which implementation strategies were used, and the methods for evaluating the success of NCLB implementation and resulting outcomes. Interview questions and
documentation review included the areas of recruiting and retaining highly qualified
teachers, providing transition services that assist youth in returning to school and/or
gaining employment post-release, program monitoring and evaluation, and measuring
youth’s academic gains and community reintegration outcomes.

Finally, interview questions included determining the impact that NCLB and this Project
had on the educational services in the states’ juvenile justice education systems.
Interviews included each state’s director or superintendent of juvenile justice education
and the person(s) responsible for coordinating educational transition services, data and
research, program monitoring, and personnel staffing.

Each case study resulted in a report that identified and described the states
implementation and evaluation of NCLB requirements in their respective juvenile justice
education system. The case study reports for the four selected states are: Delaware,
Massachusetts, New Mexico, and Virginia.