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Colonial America and Grim Determinism

- No effort to “correct or educate” wayward individuals, rather respond to them according to religious doctrine
- Reliance upon shaming and/or severe punishment

Period of Transition and Free-Will (1790-1830)

- Crime control centered upon apprehending criminals and providing swift and sure adjudication and punishment that was focused upon ensuring greater pain than the pleasure which resulted from the crime
- No concern with rehabilitation or academic education, rather specific deterrence (individual offender) and general deterrence (population at large)
Jacksonian Era and Social Determinism (1830)

- The discovery of prisons, asylums, and alms-houses as “good” or socially organized environments
- The policy was to take criminals out of “bad” city environments and place them in a “good” institutional environments to retrain or change them (spiritual-coat-of-armor) with a focus upon work and strict regimen compliance, not academic education

1850 – The Discovery of Recidivism

- Many individuals leaving prison were returning – leading to the belief that to successfully change criminals required earlier and earlier intervention
- This led to the rise of youth reformatories to retrain young criminals who were not as “fixed” in their criminal careers as were adult offenders but with the same focus upon work and compliance, not academic education
- The prevailing belief was that criminals and delinquents did not have the necessary mental skills and discipline to academically achieve
- Consequently, the rehabilitation focus was on training for manual work and associated labor careers for males and homemaking skills for females (Rothman, 1969)
I – Overview: History of Juvenile Justice Education

1880’s to Present – The Rehabilitative Ideal and Rhetoric of Education

- Rise of probation and parole for more individualized retraining (1880’s)
- The invention of the Juvenile Court (1899-forward)
- The official goals involved a shift toward treatment, academic education, and vocational training in both juvenile and adult corrections revealing an emerging effort toward “individual empowerment” and increased societal integration of juvenile and adult offenders in response to a changing society’s economic and industrial structure and needs

Throughout 20th Century

- Despite the rhetoric of individual treatment, academic education, individual empowerment; treatment and academic education in juvenile and adult corrections has been largely uneven, fragmented, and deficient at best
- With few exceptions, there has been a focus upon control within prisons and youth reformatories
- Academic education an afterthought until recent years
Florida’s juvenile justice system came under scrutiny in 1983 through class action litigation regarding poor conditions of confinement and educational services (Bobby M. case).

As legislatively mandated, in 1995-1996 the newly created Department of Juvenile Justice developed a Quality Assurance system to monitor custody, care, and treatment services.

Simultaneously, the Department of Education developed a Quality assurance system to monitor educational services.

In 1998, DOE contracted with the College of Criminology and Criminal Justice at FSU establishing The Juvenile Justice Educational Enhancement Program (JJEEP).
Since 1998, the FSU College of Criminology and Criminal Justice, through its Center for Criminology and Public Policy Research, has performed annual quality assurance (QA) reviews, provided technical assistance, and conducted research on the education programs in the state’s approximately 160 juvenile incarceration facilities as part of JJEEP.

Each year the QA standards for these education programs have been evaluated and elevated to continuously improve education services for the more than half a million youth that have been served in Florida since 1998.

JJEEP’s longitudinal research has determined that youth who experience higher academic achievement while incarcerated are more likely to return to school upon release and if they remain in school, their prospects for employment are increased and their likelihood of re-arrest drops significantly.
Based on the recognized success of Florida’s JJEEP project, FSU’s College of Criminology and Criminal Justice received federal funding in 2005 to assist other states in implementing NCLB requirements in their juvenile justice schools.

From the project’s national surveys of states, conferences held with the states’ key juvenile justice education personnel, and site visits to individual states, FSU found that NCLB requirements have largely improved the juvenile justice education services in many states.

I – Overview: No Child Left Behind
However, most states were only partially successful in implementing NCLB requirements.

Because of organizational diversity, lack of consensus on education best practices and, very importantly, patterned difficulty in hiring qualified teachers and general financial scarcity, the states’ abilities to fully implement NCLB were limited.

As a result, and despite these efforts, most youth in juvenile justice incarceration facilities across the country remain “lost education opportunities.”

If these youth could receive quality and effective education services, the returns to society would be substantial.
Increasing recognition of financial scarcity, associated competition for employment and economic globalization have contributed to an emerging acknowledgement of the value of education in corrections to successfully reintegrate adult and juvenile offenders into society with competitive academic and vocational skills.

Prior research has conclusively established that investments that improve academic achievement and high school graduation rates significantly reduce crime and increase economic competitiveness for both juvenile and adult offenders.
Education: An Investment in our Country

Earnings and unemployment for year-round, full-time workers age 25 and over, by educational attainment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Attainment</th>
<th>Median Annual Earnings, 1997</th>
<th>Unemployment Rate (Percent), 1998</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional degree</td>
<td>$71,700</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>62,400</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>40,100</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate degree</td>
<td>31,700</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college, no degree</td>
<td>30,400</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than a high school diploma</td>
<td>19,700</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II – The Importance of JJEd

Relationship between Parental Educational Level and the Educational Attainment of their Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF PARENTS</th>
<th>% CHILDREN ATTAINING BACHELOR’S DEGREE OR BETTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No H.S. Diploma</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.S. Graduate</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voc/Tech</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earned Bachelor's</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Degree</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Chronicle of Higher Education, August 27, 1999
Effective education systems are a critical component of a successful and prosperous society. Education prepares leaders, inspires innovation, opens minds, and changes the trajectory of juvenile and adult lives. It is a necessity for the success of a nation, and it is almost impossible to quantify. If we try to put numbers to it, we find that the cost savings of such a critical part of our culture is, as one would imagine, extraordinary.

If you take, for example, the number of juvenile offenders confined in custodial institutions in 2006—210,390—assume varying success rates of that population, and use a lifetime economic gain average of $5.7 million (average between the estimated $4.2 to 7.2 million) (Cohen & Piquero 2009) for each individual desisting from a criminal career, you will find the following cost benefits.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education success rate for 210,390 student population</th>
<th>Number of youth prevented from reoffending each year</th>
<th>Economic gain from preventing students from becoming career criminals For 1-year period</th>
<th>Economic gain from preventing students from becoming career criminals For 5-year period</th>
<th>Economic gain from preventing students from becoming career criminals For 10-year period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10,519</td>
<td>59,958,300,000</td>
<td>299,791,500,000</td>
<td>599,583,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>21,039</td>
<td>119,922,300,000</td>
<td>599,611,500,000</td>
<td>1,199,223,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>42,078</td>
<td>239,850,300,000</td>
<td>1,199,251,500,000</td>
<td>2,398,503,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 2008, 1 in 100 Americans were behind bars (The PEW; Center on the States, 2008)

- The U.S. incarcerates more people than any other country in the world with 2.3 million adults followed by China with 1.5 million
- From 1987 to 2007 America’s prison population has nearly tripled

More than 600,000 adult inmates are released from federal and state prisons each year

Nearly 300,000 juveniles exit residential facilities each year (using census data from OJJDP 2006 annual report)

Approximately 900,000 adult and juvenile inmates are released each year from commitment

Combined reconviction rates within one year for both adults and juveniles average 25.3% nationally or approximately 228,000 each year (conservative estimate based on a one year follow-up)

The lifetime economic losses of a high school dropout ranges from $675,000 to $1 million

High school graduation has also been found to reduce involvement in crime

The total economic costs of one youth dropping out of high school for a life of crime and substance abuse ranges from $4.2 to $7.2 million

Cohen & Piquero “The Monetary Value of Saving a High Risk Youth,” Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 2009
Education services and capacities of correctional education settings are insufficient for this population. This results in a pattern of lost education opportunities for these troubled and at-risk populations.

The resulting uneducated youth create a substantial financial burden to society because of their disproportionate unemployment, involvement in crime and substance abuse.

Without education achievement and high school graduation, the life prospects for these incarcerated youth are dismal at best.
What emerged from the NCLB Collaboration Project’s work with states and organizations was the need to enhance communication, visibility, research, and policy development in the field of juvenile as well as adult correctional education.

Several organizations already existed in the field of juvenile justice, but they primarily focused upon custody and care issues.

While the Correctional Education Association (CEA) focus was on education, its emphasis had largely been centered upon adult correctional education.

In developing the Alliance, therefore, the intent was to bring together juvenile and adult correctional educators and related personnel in the common pursuit to advance correctional education in an era of unprecedented reliance upon incarceration and ever-increasing costs despite our continuing economic recession.
The purpose of this Alliance is to build consensus for a national research and policy agenda that will advance the field of education in juvenile and criminal justice.

While housed and fiscally operated by FSU, the Alliance is comprised of advisory board members and participants representing organizations and state agencies throughout the country.
The primary audience of the Alliance includes existing organizations and state agencies involved in the education of students in the juvenile and criminal justice systems such as detention centers, juvenile residential commitment programs, day treatment programs for at-risk youth, and juveniles in the criminal justice system.

Secondary audiences include federal and state policymakers, institutions, and individuals who are responsible for educating students in the juvenile and criminal justice systems.
IV – The Alliance for Juvenile Justice Education

Goals

1. Build alliances between and among established organizations and state agencies involved with the education of students in juvenile and criminal justice systems.

2. Promote citizen awareness and legislative support for quality education in the juvenile and criminal justice systems.

3. Collect, analyze, and report data on the relationship between juvenile and criminal justice education and successful community reentry.

4. Codify juvenile and criminal justice education standards toward identifying uniform models.

5. Increase professional development opportunities for educators in the juvenile and criminal justice systems.
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