

“Research Brought to Life”

“The Quality Assurance Process”



JJEEP Directors

Quality Assurance – Julie Orange

Technical Assistance –Thelma J.Nolan



**2008 Juvenile Justice Education Institute and Southern
Conference on Corrections**




Presentation Outline

- I. JJEEP' s Mission & Vision
- II. Quality Assurance Process
- III. QA Review Protocol
- IV. Exemplary Programs
- V. System Improvement Process



Mission & Vision of JJEED

- ❖ JJEED's mission is to ensure that each student assigned to a Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) program receives high-quality educational services that increase that student's potential for future success.
- ❖ **JJEEDs four main functions are to:**
 - ❖ Conduct research that identifies educational best practices
 - ❖ Conduct annual QA reviews of DJJ educational programs
 - ❖ Provide technical assistance to improve educational programs
 - ❖ Provide annual policy recommendations to the DOE



Process

Collaboration is the Key!

- ❖ 5 Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) regions
- ❖ 67 School Districts in FL; 45 have DJJ programs
- ❖ Department of Education
- ❖ JJEEP Administration



Process

Collaboration is the Key!

- ❖ Review & revision of standards- annually with solicited input from stakeholders
- ❖ Schedules are developed annually by program administrators from each of DJJ's 5 regions and the JJEEP QA Review Director
- ❖ State Statute mandates DJJ and JJEEP reviews take place at the same time, every effort is made to conduct JJEEP's QA review with the DJJ reviewers



Changes to the 2008-2009 QA Standards & Process

- ❖ Review cycle (August- June)
- ❖ District-wide QA reviews- limited
- ❖ Transmittal of records to the school district transition contact
- ❖ Community Reintegration – notifying transition contact 1 week prior to exit



Changes to the 2008-2009 QA Standards & Process

- ❖ 10 days for assessments (detention as well)
- ❖ Progress monitoring data (PMRN or automated student database system)
- ❖ A++ Legislation/Statute
 - ❖ ePEPs
 - ❖ FACTS.org
 - ❖ Career class



Continuing Priorities

- ❖ NCLB Requirements
- ❖ “Highly Qualified Teachers”
- ❖ Just Read! Florida
- ❖ Promising Practices – meeting community reintegration needs



JJEEP' s efforts for improvement

- ❖ Communication – list serv, materials posted on our web site, reviewer contacts
- ❖ Compliance versus Diagnostic
- ❖ Use of research/data for continuous improvement of QA standards and process
- ❖ Partners for improvement



QA Review Protocol

- ❖ Self-reports-due July 18th
- ❖ JJEEP contacts school district and program to review self-report information and conduct phone interviews as appropriate the **Wednesday** (afternoon) prior to the review.
- ❖ Reviewer reviews previous years QA reports, TA reports and any corrective action plans received.



QA Review Protocol

❖ **QA Reviewer Contacts:**

- ❖ DJJ Lead Reviewer
- ❖ School district contract manager
- ❖ On-site Educational Administrator
- ❖ Program Administrator



On-Site Protocol

- ❖ Initial DJJ entrance meeting
- ❖ Education entrance meeting
- ❖ Explain process
- ❖ Identify contact person
- ❖ Schedule interviews and exit meeting
- ❖ Schedule is agreed upon
- ❖ Tour facility



QA Methodology

Document Review, Interviews, and Observations

❖ Review

- ❖ self-report documents
- ❖ student files (open and closed)
- ❖ curricular documents
- ❖ contract/cooperative agreement
- ❖ personnel documentation
- ❖ school improvement plan
- ❖ school district comprehensive reading plan
- ❖ policies and procedures
- ❖ lesson plans/ grade books
- ❖ community involvement documents
- ❖ transition protocol/strategies



Document review is a guide for interviews and observations

Interview

Students

Teachers

Support staff

School district staff

Facility staff

Case management

Transition coordinator

Observe

Classrooms

Transition Mtgs.

Treatment Team

Faculty Mtgs.



Communication

- ❖ Daily debriefing with DJJ
- ❖ Daily debriefing with lead educator and other interested parties to discuss concerns, clarify questions, provide list of other information needed
- ❖ As needed with contract manager and/or program administration



Formal Exit Meeting

- ❖ Preliminary ratings and findings for each indicator are presented
- ❖ Brief summary of findings
- ❖ Questions addressed
- ❖ Reviewer evaluation form



Back at the JJEER Ranch

- ❖ Findings discussed with JJEER staff & QA Review Director
- ❖ Formal QA review report is written
- ❖ Buddy Review
- ❖ QA Review Director approval
- ❖ Formal Editing
- ❖ Report is submitted to the DOE



Back at the JJEER Ranch

- ❖ Strive for consistency and accuracy
- ❖ DOE has final approval
- ❖ Report submitted to:
 - ❖ School district superintendents
 - ❖ School district contract manager
 - ❖ Principal or lead educator



Rating Guidelines

- ❖ Multiple data sources to evaluate quality
- ❖ Policy, document review, interviews and observations
- ❖ Preponderance of evidence to determine whether the intent of the indicator is being met
- ❖ **POLICY + PRACTICE = OUTCOME**



QA Rating Scale

- ❖ Each indicator is rated using a 10-point scale
- ❖ Superior –7,8,or 9-
 - ❖ Outcome is clearly being met, program exceeds the overall requirements- innovative approach, extended services, and/or evident program-wide dedication to the overall performance of the indicator.



QA Rating Scale

- ❖ Satisfactory Performance- 4,5, or 6
 - ❖ Expected outcome is clearly being met, all requirements of the indicator are being met, minor exceptions or inconsistencies.
- ❖ Partial Performance – 1,2, or 3
 - ❖ Expected outcome is not being met and/or there are frequent exceptions and inconsistencies.



QA Rating Scale

- ❖ Nonperformance-0
 - ❖ Expected outcome is clearly not being met, and the specific requirements of the indicator are not being significantly addressed.



Exemplary Programs

- ❖ Purpose- to acknowledge high-performing programs
- ❖ To provide more assistance & interventions to low performing programs



Exemplary I

- ❖ Program that receives an overall average score of 7.0 or higher
- ❖ No on-site visit for one year
- ❖ Telephone Review of self-report information
- ❖ 2nd & 3rd year will receive 1 day review of critical benchmarks



Exemplary II

- ❖ Based on previous overall QA score of 6.5 or higher
- ❖ Program will receive a shortened one-day review of critical benchmarks for 2 years
- ❖ Full review after 2 years



Exemplary Programs

- ❖ Must submit self-report survey
- ❖ Recommendations will be addressed in QA report
- ❖ If major deficiencies are found (fail more than 1 critical benchmark) or there has been an educational provider change –full review



System Improvement Process

- ❖ **Purpose:** Reduce the amount of time JJEEP staff spend monitoring programs that exceed state standards and increase technical assistance (TA) to low-performing programs.
- ❖ To meet the goal, JJEEP and the DOE have developed and implemented a comprehensive system of corrective action and TA that is guided by research in current best practices and integrated into all activities.



Corrective Action Process

The corrective action process facilitates collaborative efforts of programs and school districts to identify and correct systemic problems contributing to unsatisfactory QA ratings.

Corrective Action Plan (CAP)

Programs who receive a below satisfactory rating for one or more of Standards 1,2,or 3 will receive a CAP.

School districts who receive a below satisfactory rating for Standard 4 for two or more consecutive years will receive a CAP.

Program CAPs

QA Cycle	Trigger	Action
Year 1	Fail standard 1,2,or 3	CAP required
Year 2	Fail the same standard two consecutive years	CAP required DOE notified for assistance/ intervention and/or sanctions
Year 3+	Fail the same standard three (or more) consecutive years	CAP required Program remains on DOE list for assistance/ intervention and or/ sanctions

School District CAPs

QA Cycle	Trigger	Action
Year 1	Fail Standard 4	Deficiencies noted in QA report
Year 2	Fail Standard 4 two consecutive years	CAP required
Year 3	Fail Standard 4 three consecutive years	CAP required DOE notified for assistance/ intervention/sanctions
Year 4+	Fail standard 4 four (or more) consecutive years	CAP required School district remains on DOE list for assistance/ intervention and/or sanctions



CAP Completion

- ❖ Establish a corrective action team
- ❖ Develop the action plan
- ❖ Complete and return CAP to QA Review Director (within 90 days)
- ❖ Ensure superintendent signs implementation page **AFTER** the CAP has been implemented



Technical Assistance (TA)

TA PROTOCOL

New Programs

School district contract managers are responsible for notifying JJEEP within 30 days of notification that a new juvenile justice program is being placed in their school districts.

Educational Provider Change

School district representatives should inform JJEEP within two weeks of notification of an educational provider change.



Technical Assistance (TA)

Corrective Action Follow-up

A program who fails one of Standards 1, 2, or 3 and has a passing overall average score (4.00 or higher) will receive a CAP and follow-up TA.

A school district who fails Standard 4 for two consecutive years will receive a CAP and follow-up TA.

Failing Programs

A program whose average score is less than 4.00 will receive a CAP and a TA visit that may include:

- JJEEP reviewer and DOE representative (as appropriate)
- Reviewer-conducted needs assessment(s)
- Report of needs assessments results
- Follow-up TA as needed



TA and CAPS in 2006

- 47 programs received CAPS
- 17 programs received on-site TA visits
- 16 programs received off-site TA
- 11 programs on the DOE Intervention list
- 3 programs closed



TA and CAPS (2007-2008)

- ❖ 37 total CAPS
- ❖ 15 School Districts received CAPS
- ❖ 16-programs closed
- ❖ 6-programs received on-site visits
- ❖ 15-programs are scheduled for on site visits (TA and/or CAP follow-up)
- ❖ 25-programs received off-site assistance
- ❖ 10- programs are on the DOE Intervention list



New Programs/Provider Change

- ❖ 2007-2008- 4 New Programs in School Districts
- ❖ 3 programs have received Mock QAs
- ❖ 2 programs are scheduled to receive a Mock QA (10/08)
- ❖ 4 programs have a change of provider



DOE Assistance

- ❖ For programs or school districts identified as needing assistance/intervention and/or sanctions, JJEEP staff may facilitate a meeting with all relevant parties (i.e., JJEEP administrators, DOE representatives, school district officials, provider personnel, program leadership, and DJJ staff when appropriate).



State Board Rule

- ❖ *Intervention and/or sanctions are referenced in Rule 6A-6.05281 (10), FAC.*
- ❖ **Intervention**
 - ❖ Technical assistance to the program
 - ❖ Follow-up educational program review



Sanctions

- ❖ Public release of unsatisfactory findings, the intervention, and/or corrective actions proposed
- ❖ Assignment of a monitor, master, or management team
- ❖ Reduction in payment or withholding of state and/or federal funds

Q & A



“Research Brought to Life”

Contact Us for Information

Thelma J. Nolan & Julie Orange



JJEEP
325 John Knox Road
Bldg. L, Suite 102
Tallahassee, FL 32303
(850) 414-8355



**Visit our website for information on research,
standards, technical assistance documents, and links
related to juvenile justice education**

www.criminologycenter.fsu.edu