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Texas Youth Commission Population
Fiscal Year 2006

4800 Residential End-of-Year Population
16 Median age at commitment
89% Males
11% Females
44% Hispanic
34% African-American
22% Anglo
Texas Youth Commission Population Characteristics (FY 06)

41% Serious Mental Health Problems
46% Chemically Dependent
52% Families with histories of criminal behavior
36% History of abuse/neglect
34% Self-identified gang members at intake
48% Two or more felony offenses prior to TYC
Texas Youth Commission Population Entry Performance Levels & Special Needs

Median Reading 6th Grade (4 yrs behind)
Median Math 5th Grade (5 yrs behind)
40% Eligible for Special Education
7% Eligible for English as a second language
83% I.Q.s below mean score of 100
Educational Performance Data Collection

- Required by state statute – quarterly reports
- Consistent definitions & collection procedures for over 7 years (i.e., trend data available)
- Aligned with Title I, Part D accountability criteria
- Disaggregated by school & student populations (gender, ethnicity, special programs)
- Used for accountability & program improvement
Key Performance Measures

19%  **READING at Grade Level**: Percentage of students reading at grade level at time of release (TABE)

71%  **READING Gain**: % students released attaining 1.0 Month Reading Gain per month of instruction

71%  **MATH Gain**: % students released attaining 1.0 Month Math Gain per month of instruction

49%  **Diploma / GED Completion**: % students released at age 16 or above...who earned a diploma or GED within 90 days after release
Additional Performance Measures

100% **Average Daily Attendance (ADA)** – percent of students in attendance daily on average.

98% **Career & Technology Education ADA** – No. students in attendance in CATE courses daily on average.

60% **Constructive Activity Rate** – within 1 month of release, % in school, technical training program, college, or employed.

2.5 **Course Credits** – Average # credits completed per semester...baseline info.
Quarterly Results

- Reviewed by principals & all campus educators
- Used to revise Improvement Plan as needed
- Used to target staff development topics
- Used to determine discretionary funding priorities
- Analyses sent to Central Office
- Shared with Executive leaders
- Shared with Board
- Shared with Governor & Legislators
# READING & MATH GAINS 1ST - 4TH QTR CUMULATIVE  09/01/2005 - 08/31/2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post-Test Location</th>
<th>READING: Percentage of students released from a TYC Institution attaining 1.0 Months Reading Level Gain per month of instruction</th>
<th>MATH: Percentage of students released from a TYC Institution attaining 1.0 Months Math Level Gain per month of instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of Youth Released w/ Test Score</td>
<td># Making 1.0 Read Gain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APSS</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRTC</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERJC</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GaSS</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GiSS</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSS</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSSJCF</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCSJCF1</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCSJCF2</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOAU</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RJSJCC1</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RJSJCC2</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VFCA</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTSS</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYC</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>2182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GED or Diploma Rate

Overall Summary Results: GED Target is 49%. Agency met the target with 48.69%. Five schools exceeded the target; 5 schools met the target; 4 schools missed the target.

Al Price: Missed target; achieved 36%, an improvement over 4th quarter of fiscal year. Performance may have been higher if youth who had GED/diploma and were nearing release had been released from Al Price rather than other TYC facilities due to Hurricane Rita. At the time of the hurricane, nearly 70 youth on campus had a GED and/or Diploma.

Crockett: Missed target; achieved 34.3%. Currently 85 students on campus have passed GED/Diploma but await release. Lowest performance among sub-population with severe mental health needs plus reading and math disabilities. Increasing participation in small group instruction with special reading program.
GED or Diploma Rate

Corsicana: Exceeded the target; achieved 56%. We have significantly increased the number of youth we are GED testing. We have also increased our focus on GED preparation in all classes. This campus has highest percent of youth with emotional disturbance (70%) and mental retardation (10%).

Evins: Missed the target; achieved 30%. Evins has 50 students (18.1%) who are limited English proficient. This factor is related to low performance in several GED test areas. ERJC school has been short approx. 4 teachers (math and English) this year and for the quarter. During this quarter, multiple students were tested, but few passed. Efforts are still being intensified for providing GED preparation. There are multiple instances of either shutdown or slowdown to note for the quarter. Student movement is still an issue inside the building with both teachers and JCO staff unable to control youth at times.

Gainesville: Exceeded the target; achieved 63.38%. The second highest rate for a TYC institution and is indicative of the overall quality of the education program. Specific highly skilled reading and math teachers prepare youth who are approaching readiness in performance to test for GED completion. A teacher aide provides small group tutoring for students with special needs.
Education-Workforce Program Monitoring

• 3 Year Cycle
• Prior Local Self-Review
• Central Office & Trained Peer Evaluators
• Desk Audit & On-Site Review
• Coordinated with Corrections & Treatment
• Provides Profile of Performance on Operational Areas and Program Areas
• Basis for Program Improvement Plan (PIP)
• Re-visited within 1 year for Assessment of PIP items
Operational Areas

- Accountability
- Assessment & Evaluation
- Compliance
- Coordination
- Curriculum & Instruction
- Data Management & Data Integrity
- Leadership, Planning, & Decision-Making
- Personnel
- Policies & Procedures
Education-Workforce Program Monitoring

Program Areas

• Academic
• English as a Second Language
• Instructional Technology
• Special Education
• Transition
• Workforce Development
# Program Improvement Plan for Identified Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Improvement Plan Item</th>
<th>Objective(s)</th>
<th>Action Steps</th>
<th>Responsible Person(s)</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Verification Date</th>
<th>Status (Planned, Underway, Completed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
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