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I – Project Overview

- In 2005, FSU was awarded funding from Congress through OJJDP to establish the Juvenile Justice NCLB Collaboration Project

- In the first two years of operation the Project:
  - Completed telephone interviews with state agency representatives
  - Conducted two national surveys
  - Hosted two conferences of state administrators in juvenile justice education

- Currently,
  - Planning a third conference in April
  - Conducting site visits of states to determine where the field of juvenile justice education stands nationally
  - Planning regional conferences to review case study findings and recommendations for the national data clearinghouse
I Cont. – Survey and Conference Results

- Identified the administrative structure of juvenile justice education in each state and developed a typology
- Assessed the current level of NCLB implementation in the states
- Identified impediments states experienced when implementing NCLB
- Identified strategies states employed to overcome implementation impediments
- Assessed states’ capacities to evaluate their juvenile justice schools and measure student outcomes
II – Juvenile Justice Education Systems
II Cont.

- These **various administrative structures** are important to understanding how policies such as NCLB are implemented in various settings.

- This diversity mostly grew out of regional and local differences in how juvenile courts were implemented and local governance structures.

- Also impacting how states operate their juvenile justice education systems has been **litigation**.

- Contributing to these various administrative structures has been frequent litigation in juvenile justice education over the past 25 years (EDJJ, San Francisco Law Center, CRIPA investigations, Lexus Nexus).
II Cont. – Lawsuits in Juvenile Justice Education – 1978 to Present

- Total Education Cases: 51
- Custody Care Also: 17
- States: 28
- States with Multiple Cases: 13
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II Cont. – Type of Penal Institutions Cited for Violations

- Post Adjudication: 30
- Detention: 22
- Jail: 4
- Prison: 5
Based on the identified 51 cases, the most common outcomes regarding juvenile justice education related lawsuits are:

- Settlement Agreements
- Consent Decrees
- Court Orders

Often results in some form of administrative reorganization.
III – NCLB: Implementation & Impact

- NCLB’s reforms focus on
  - Teacher Quality
  - Academic Gains
  - Post-Release Outcomes
  - Evaluation
HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS (HQT)

- Only 12% reported that all of their facilities were exempt from meeting HQT requirements
- An additional 26% indicated that particular program types were exempt
- 70% of states reported that more than half of the classes taught in juvenile facilities were taught by HQT
- 54% of states reported that the number of highly qualified teachers increased from the previous year

TRANSITION SERVICES

- 33% of states reported significant progress from the previous year in providing transition services for students
- 51% reported making moderate progress
III Cont. – NCLB Level of Implementation

ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS (AYP)

- 55% of states exempt all facilities from AYP
- An additional 13% exempt particular facility types
- In lieu of AYP, most states collect various educational measures such as pre and post reading and math test scores

OVERALL PROGRESS

- States indicated that the most progress was made in the area recruiting and retaining teachers, followed by interagency collaboration and providing transition services
- The area which received the least attention was meeting NCLB requirements in short-term facilities or detention centers
Although many states and juvenile justice schools may be having difficulty in meeting some of the requirements of NCLB, most agree that the law provides this field with an opportunity to improve the quality of services.

NCLB has brought attention and accountability to juvenile justice education.

Many state administrators, although they may differ slightly with the actual accountability methods in NCLB, recognize that it provides them with a means to access resources and hold programs accountable.

Given the potential for NCLB to impact educational services for juvenile justice students, the Project’s surveys and conferences have focused upon the policy’s implementation impediments and strategies.
III Cont. – Impediments to Highly Qualified Teachers

- Teaching multiple subjects, levels, and sub fields
- State teacher *shortage* and competing with public schools to recruit teachers
- **Misperceptions** about the environment of juvenile justice facilities leads makes recruiting more difficult
- High turnover rates (some facilities are *training grounds* for new teachers who then leave to work in the public schools)
- **Misperceptions** and lack of training regarding juvenile justice systems
- Education funding is often based on periodic student head counts; population fluctuation in juvenile facilities effect funding and staffing
III Cont. – Strategies for Recruiting and Retaining Highly Qualified Teachers

- Increasing awareness about teaching in juvenile justice
- Collaborating with local colleges and universities for early recruiting and teaching practicum
- Providing attractive financial packages such as full-year contracts, gas stipends or critical shortage bonuses for teaching in facilities
- Student loan forgiveness, tuition reimbursement, Title II teaching incentives
- Encouraging spec. ed. teachers to become certified in core academic areas
- Transferring teachers or students to facilities based on educational needs
- Eliminating self-contained spec. ed. classes
- Using one teacher for two subject areas or team teaching
- Using internet resources and online learning systems
III Cont. – Impediments to Providing Effective Transition Services

- Lack of coordination among state and local agencies to provide services
- Lack of cooperation from local school districts when students are attempting to return to school
- Keeping them in school once they decide to return
- Public school officials often have a negative attitude to returning students

Short-Term Facilities

- Not enough time to identify student needs and provide services

Student Follow-up

- Large case loads in probation and aftercare
- Lack of tools to track students after release
- Large distances between facilities and students’ home communities
III Cont. – Strategies for Providing Transition Services

- Providing access to post-secondary education to students who already have a diploma or GED
- Identifying local school district transition specialists
- Develop Memorandums of Understanding with local schools or districts
- Educational training for probation officers
- Having an education liaison within probation/parole
- Temporarily placing students in alternative school settings after release
- Coordinating job placement services prior to release
III Cont. – Impediments to Measuring Educational Outcomes and Program Evaluation

- Inaccurate and non-reporting of student information (test scores)
- **Linking** information and data together from various agencies and districts (lack of accessibility; incompatible data; confidentiality)
- Having **valid** and **reliable** testing measures for juvenile justice students (particularly for short term facilities)
- High student mobility
- The methods of **AYP** have been incompatible with temporary educational settings
- **Follow-up methods**, measures and time periods vary widely across the nation
- Overcoming these impediments is critical for having student performance data available when state and federal policy opportunities arise for funding, resources and emerging requirements
III Cont. – Strategies for Measuring Educational Outcomes and Conducting Program Evaluation

- Most states are using pre and post testing in lieu of AYP; using computerized adaptive assessments
- Assigning state test scores to students’ home schools while in detention
- Developing data sharing task forces, agreements or review boards across state and local agencies (Juv. Just., Educ., Labor, etc.)
- Establishing unique student identifiers that would be available to multiple state agencies
- Tracking education and employment outcomes through probation/parole
- Conducting student follow-up surveys
- Contacting schools, employers and youth at designated intervals
III Cont. – Collaboration Strategies

- Most states have **Memorandums of Understanding** or **Interagency Agreements**
- **Multi agency task forces** for data sharing, transition services, accountability and monitoring
- **Partnerships** with universities and community colleges for evaluation, teacher recruitment, access to post-secondary education
- Funding an FTE from one agency that would reside in a partnering agency
- Serving on **governor** task forces
- Establishing an **advisory board** for education
**IV – Assessing the State of Juvenile Justice Education Post NCLB**

- The Project is committed to conducting research that improves the quality of educational services for juvenile justice involved youth
- Currently planning site visits to selected states with the purpose of:
  1. Evaluating and reporting on the national state of juvenile justice education post NCLB
  2. Assessing the implementation of NCLB and determining the impact that NCLB has had on student services and outcomes
  3. Determining the impact our project has had on NCLB’s implementation
  4. Collecting information to begin the development of a National Data Clearinghouse for the field of juvenile justice education
Site selection is based on a stratified sample that considers states’ administrative structure, size and geographic location.

Methods are primarily based on a review of state documents and interviews with key personnel.

Interviews are informed based on each state’s prior survey responses.
Policies

- The primary state statute(s) governing juvenile justice education services.
- Interagency agreements between state agencies responsible for juvenile justice and education services.
- State policies regarding NCLB for juvenile justice education, including a list of exemptions or modifications to NCLB requirements as they relate to juvenile justice education.
- State strategic plan or documented initiatives in juvenile justice education.
IV Cont. – Documents

Outcome Data

- List of student level measures used to determine the academic gains of youth during their involvement of the juvenile justice system
- List of community reintegration measures used to determine the long-term outcomes of youth after their release from juvenile justice facilities
- Most recent annual report(s) regarding juvenile justice education. These reports may have been provided to your state legislature, the department secretary, the federal government, or other reporting agencies.
Juvenile Justice Education Services

- Program monitoring and/or evaluation instruments
- Most recent evaluation results regarding juvenile justice education services
- Total annual funding and per pupil funding for education in juvenile justice facilities
- Number of juvenile justice education teachers and aggregate qualifications (i.e. rates of professional license/certification, rates of in-field teaching status by core subject area)
IV Cont. – Interviews

- State Juvenile Justice Education Administrator
- State Level Transition Specialist – knowledgeable regarding the transition services provided to juvenile students statewide
- Research/Data Manager – responsible for collecting and reporting juvenile justice student information
- Program Monitor/Evaluator – responsible for education services in the state’s juvenile institutions
- Personnel staffing specialist – if responsible for principal or teacher recruitment in the state’s juvenile justice education system
- State Title I, Part D coordinator (if applicable)
- Counterpart in cooperating agency (if applicable)
IV Cont. – Results

- A confidential, state specific report that can be used for evaluation, administrative, and policy planning purposes

- State specific reports will be consolidated into a national report on the current state of juvenile justice education

- The national report will be available to all states and can be used for both state and national policy in juvenile justice education

- Information and data collected during the site visits can demonstrate the feasibility of establishing a national data warehouse for the field of juvenile justice education
V – Employing our Juvenile Justice Educational Experience and Data Clearinghouse with Adult Correctional Education

- As you learned this morning from Blomberg’s plenary address – we would like to include adult correctional education in our national data clearinghouse.

- A juvenile and adult correctional education could “empower” a level of collaboration that would have the capacity to move the filed forward in a time where recourses are becoming ever more scarce.
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